

# CITY OF MORRO BAY

## **Community-Wide and Government Operations 2005**

### **Baseline Greenhouse Gas Emissions Inventory**

---

*Prepared for:*



SAN LUIS OBISPO AIR POLLUTION CONTROL DISTRICT  
ON BEHALF OF THE CITY OF MORRO BAY

*Prepared by:*



860 WALNUT STREET, SUITE B  
SAN LUIS OBISPO, CA 93401-2725

January 2011



# BASELINE GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS INVENTORY

## Credits and Acknowledgements

Report prepared by PMC for the San Luis Obispo Air Pollution Control District on behalf of the City of Morro Bay.

### PMC PROJECT TEAM

Tammy Seale, Project Manager  
Jaime Hill, Associate Planner  
Scott Kaiser, Assistant Planner

### WITH ASSISTANCE FROM:

#### ***Air Pollution Control District***

Larry Allen, Air Pollution Control Officer  
Aeron Arlin Genet, Planning and Outreach  
Manager  
Melissa Guise, Air Quality Specialist  
Dean Carlson, Air Quality Engineer

#### ***City of Morro Bay***

Rob Livick, Director, Public Services  
Department  
Kathleen Wold, Planning Manager, Public  
Services Department  
Cris Brazzi, Finance Department  
Cindy Jacinth, Public Services Department

#### ***County of San Luis Obispo***

Janice Campbell, Agriculture Department

#### ***IWMA***

Peter Cron, Analyst

#### ***PG&E***

John Bohman, Green Communities and  
Innovator Pilots

#### ***Southern California Gas Company***

Colby Morrow, Environmental Affairs  
Program Manager, Customer Programs

#### ***ICLEI – Local Governments for Sustainability***

Jonathan Strunin, Program Officer  
Allison Culpén, Program Associate

#### ***California Air Resources Board***

Tom Scheffelin, Analyst, Transportation  
Analysis Section

Jon Taylor P.E., Manager, Transportation  
Analysis Section

#### ***Waste Solutions, Inc.***

Tom Martin



## Table of Contents

Executive Summary.....	1
1. Introduction .....	7
1.1 Purpose of a GHG Inventory.....	7
1.2 Climate Change – Legislative Background .....	9
1.3 The Cities for Climate Protection Campaign .....	12
1.4 Local Sustainability and Climate Change Mitigation Activities .....	13
2. Community and Government Operations Inventory Methodology .....	15
2.1 Baseline and Forecast Years.....	15
2.2 The Two Inventories: Community-wide and City Government Operations.....	15
2.3 Data Collection and Methodology .....	17
2.4 Data Sources .....	18
2.5 Data Limitations .....	20
2.6 Clean Air and Climate Protection Software 2009 .....	22
3. Community GHG Inventory Results .....	24
3.1 Community-Wide Emissions by Scope .....	24
3.2 All Scope Emissions By Sector .....	26
3.3 Transportation.....	27
3.4 The Built Environment (Residential, Commercial, Industrial) .....	29
3.5 Waste .....	31
3.6 Other – Off-road Agricultural Equipment.....	32
3.7 Other – Commercial and Recreational Boating.....	33
3.8 Community Emissions by Source .....	34
3.9 Per Capita Emissions .....	35
4. City Government Operations GHG Emissions Inventory Results .....	37
4.1 City Government Operations Inventory Results .....	37
4.2 Building Sector.....	39
4.3 Vehicle Fleet and Transit Fleet .....	39
4.4 Employee Commute .....	40
4.5 Streetlights and Traffic Signals .....	42

# COMMUNITY-WIDE AND GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS 2005

4.6	Water and Sewage .....	42
4.7	Waste .....	44
4.8	Other – Miscellaneous Equipment .....	44
4.9	City Emissions by Source .....	44
5.	Forecast.....	46
6.	Conclusion and Next Steps.....	48

## LIST OF FIGURES

Figure ES-1:	Community GHG Emissions by Sector .....	2
Figure ES-2:	City Government Portion of Community-Wide GHG Emissions.....	3
Figure ES-3:	City Government Operations GHG Emissions by Sector .....	3
Figure ES-4:	2020 and 2025 City of Morro Bay Business-as-usual GHG Emissions Forecast .....	5
Figure ES-5:	Business-as-usual Forecast in Relation to State-Recommended Reduction Targets .....	6
Figure 1-1:	The Greenhouse Gas Effect.....	7
Figure 1-2:	California Climate Change Emissions and Targets.....	10
Figure 1-3:	The ICLEI Five-Milestone Process .....	12
Figure 2-1:	The Relationship Between Community-Wide and City Government Inventories.....	16
Figure 2-2:	GHG Emissions Scopes .....	18
Figure 3-1:	2005 Community GHG Emissions by Scope .....	25
Figure 3-2:	2005 Community GHG Emissions by Sector .....	26
Figure 3-3:	Community GHG Emissions by Fuel Source .....	27
Figure 3-4:	Built Environment GHG Emissions by Sector .....	29
Figure 3-5:	Built Environment GHG Emissions by Source .....	29
Figure 3-6:	Residential GHG Emissions by Source .....	30
Figure 3-7:	Commercial/ Industrial GHG Emissions by Source.....	30
Figure 3-8:	Waste GHG Emissions by Type .....	32
Figure 3-9:	Community GHG Emissions by Source .....	34
Figure 4-1:	City Government Operations Contribution to Community-Wide GHG Emissions.....	38
Figure 4-2:	City Government Operations GHG Emissions by Sector .....	38
Figure 4-3:	Building GHG Emissions by Source .....	39
Figure 4-4:	Vehicle Fleet Fuel Consumption per Year by Type.....	40

# BASELINE GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS INVENTORY

Figure 4-5:	City Government Operations GHG Emissions by Source .....	45
Figure 5-1:	2020 and 2025 Business-as-usual Projected Growth in Community-Wide GHG Emissions.....	46
Figure 6-1:	GHG Forecast in Relation to Reduction Targets .....	49

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 2-1:	Data Sources for Community Analysis, 2005 .....	19
Table 2-2:	Data Sources for City Government Operations Analysis, 2005 .....	20
Table 3-1:	GHG Emissions Sources Included in 2005 Community Inventory by Scope and Sector .....	24
Table 3-2:	Community GHG Emissions per Sector per Scope (Metric Tons of CO <sub>2</sub> e) ...	25
Table 3-3:	Community GHG Emissions by Sector (Metric Tons of CO <sub>2</sub> e).....	27
Table 3-4:	Transportation GHG Emissions by Road Type .....	28
Table 3-5:	Transportation GHG Emissions by Fuel Source .....	28
Table 3-6:	Residential GHG Emissions by Source .....	30
Table 3-7:	Commercial/Industrial GHG Emissions Sources.....	31
Table 3-8:	Waste GHG Emissions by Waste Type .....	32
Table 3-9:	Community GHG Emissions by Source .....	35
Table 4-1:	2005 City Government Operations GHG Emissions by Sector .....	38
Table 4-2:	Building Sector GHG Emissions by Source, 2005 .....	39
Table 4-3:	Days of City Employee Travel by Commute Mode .....	41
Table 4-4:	Employee Commute VMT by Vehicle and Fuel Type .....	42
Table 4-5:	City Government Operations GHG Emissions by Source .....	45

## APPENDICES

Appendix A:	CACP2009 Detailed Report for Community-Wide Emissions, 2005
Appendix B:	CACP2009 Detailed Report for City Government Operations Emissions, 2005
Appendix C:	Detailed Methodology for Community-Wide Inventory
Appendix D:	Detailed Methodology for City Government Operations Inventory
Appendix E:	City Employee Commute Survey, 2010



## Executive Summary

Climate change is quickly becoming a high priority among policymakers and residents alike. In September 2008, the City Council made a commitment to evaluating Morro Bay's contribution to global climate change through the development of a Community-Wide and City Government Operations Baseline Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Emissions Inventory (Inventory). This Inventory identifies the major sources of greenhouse gas emissions within the city<sup>1</sup> and provides a baseline against which future progress can be measured. This Inventory includes two components: (1) a community-wide analysis and (2) a City government operations analysis. It is important to note that the City government operations inventory is a subset of the community inventory, meaning that all City government operations emissions are included in the commercial/industrial, transportation, waste, or "other" categories of the community-wide inventory. The City government operations inventory should not be added to the community analysis; rather it should be looked at as a slice of the complete picture. Specifically, this Inventory does the following:

- Calculates GHGs from community-wide<sup>2</sup> activities, including City government operations, within the City's jurisdictional boundary in calendar year 2005;
- Identifies the major sources of greenhouse gas emissions from community-wide sources and City government operations;
- Provides City decision-makers and the community with adequate information to inform policy decisions; and
- Forecasts how emissions will grow in the community if no behavioral changes are made.

---

<sup>1</sup> In this report, the term "city" refers to the area inside the jurisdictional boundary of the City of Morro Bay, whereas "City government" refers to those activities which are under the operational control of City agencies.

<sup>2</sup> "Community-wide" or "community" refers to all activities within the city (as defined above), including those from businesses, industrial processes, residents, vehicles, and City government operations.

### What are Greenhouse Gas Emissions (GHGs)?

Gases that trap heat in the Earth's atmosphere are called greenhouse gases, or GHGs. Greenhouse gases include carbon dioxide, methane, nitrous oxide, and fluorinated gases. While many of these gases occur naturally in the atmosphere, modern human activity has led to a steep increase in the amount of GHGs released into the atmosphere over the last 100 years. Collectively, these gases intensify the natural greenhouse effect, thus causing global average surface temperatures to rise, which in turn affects global climate patterns. GHGs are often quantified in terms of CO<sub>2</sub> equivalent, or CO<sub>2</sub>e, a unit of measurement that equalizes the potency of GHGs.

Source: [Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change \(IPCC\), 2007](#)


The 2005 community-wide and City government operations baseline GHG Inventory represents a key step in the City of Morro Bay's efforts to improve air quality, enhance sustainability, and ensure the safety and comfort of its residents for generations to come. In addition, this Inventory allows the City to quantitatively track and take credit for its numerous efforts related to energy efficiency and the mitigation of global climate change.

## COMMUNITY-WIDE GHG INVENTORY RESULTS

The community of Morro Bay emitted approximately 67,936 metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent (CO<sub>2</sub>e) in the baseline year 2005. As shown in **Figure ES-1**, the transportation sector was by far the largest contributor to emissions (57.0%), producing approximately 38,690 metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub>e in 2005. Emissions from the residential sector were the next largest contributor (22.5%), producing approximately 15,272 metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub>e. The commercial and industrial sectors combined accounted for 16.3% of the total. Emissions from solid waste comprised 4.0% of the total, and emissions from other sources such as agricultural equipment comprised less than 1.0%.

The majority of emissions from the transportation sector were the result of gasoline consumption in private vehicles traveling on local roads, Highway 1, and other state highways. GHG figures from the waste sector are the estimated future emissions that will result from the decomposition of waste generated by city residents and businesses in the base year 2005, with a weighted average methane capture factor of 60.0%.<sup>3</sup>

**FIGURE ES-1: COMMUNITY GHG EMISSIONS BY SECTOR**




<sup>3</sup> In 2005, the San Luis Obispo Air Pollution Control District reported methane capture rates for the Chicago Grade and Cold Canyon landfills. The methane recovery factors of the landfills are based on the system operations at that time.

# BASELINE GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS INVENTORY


## CITY GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS GHG INVENTORY RESULTS

City government operations and facilities produced approximately 1,765 metric tons of greenhouse gas emissions in 2005. As displayed in **Figure ES-2**, this represents approximately 2.5% of total community-wide emissions in the city. City government emissions result from waste, energy consumption from water and wastewater facilities, buildings, streetlights and other facilities, fuel consumption by the vehicle fleet and employee commutes, and miscellaneous equipment. The largest contributor to the City's emissions (23.5%) was from employees commuting to and from work. Employee commute produced 414 metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent. The wastewater facilities was the second largest contributor to the City's emissions (23.1%) producing 407 metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent. The vehicle fleet and buildings and facilities were the next largest contributors (20.1% and 10.1%) producing 355 and 178 metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent, respectively. Solid waste and water delivery infrastructure both contributed six percent (6%) of the City's emissions while streetlights and traffic signals contributed 4.9 percent of the City's total (refer to **Figure ES-3**).

**FIGURE ES-2: CITY GOVERNMENT PORTION OF COMMUNITY-WIDE GHG EMISSIONS**



**FIGURE ES-3: CITY GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS GHG EMISSIONS BY SECTOR**



City government operations emissions are a subset of the total community-wide emissions as outlined above. However, similar to the way in which businesses and factories perform their own facility-scale GHG Inventories this Inventory analyzes City emissions separately to identify cost-saving and emissions-reducing strategies in the future. The methodology for estimating emissions from local government operations is guided specifically by the Local Government Greenhouse Gas Inventory Protocol developed by the California Air Resources Board, ICLEI – Local Governments for Sustainability, and the California Climate Registry.

## **DATA LIMITATIONS**

This Community-Wide and City Government Operations Baseline GHG Emissions Inventory captures the major sources of greenhouse gases caused by activities within the city per standard practice. However, it is important to note that some likely emission sources were not included in the Inventory, either because of privacy laws, lack of data, or a lack of reasonable methodology for calculating emissions. It is estimated that the sources not included in the inventory comprise less than 5.0% of total emissions in the city. It is likely that as greenhouse gas inventories become more common, methodology and accessibility to data will improve.

The sources that could not be included due to privacy laws, lack of data availability, and/or a reasonable methodology include the following:

- Refrigerants from City government operations facilities and vehicles;
- Propane, wind or solar energy consumed by the community-at-large;
- Recreational off-road equipment and vehicles;
- Recreational and commercial watercraft; and
- Residential septic tanks systems.


These limitations are explained further in this document.

## **FORECAST AND NEXT STEPS**

If consumption trends continue the pattern observed in 2005 emissions will reach 86,589 metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub>e by 2020, or a 27.5% increase over 2005 baseline levels. By 2025 emissions will reach 93,012 metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub>e, or a 36.9% increase over 2005 baseline levels.

# BASELINE GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS INVENTORY


**FIGURE ES-4: 2020 AND 2025 CITY OF MORRO BAY BUSINESS-AS-USUAL GHG EMISSIONS FORECAST**



With this information, the City can make an informed determination of a reduction target. Conformance with the State of California’s recommended reduction of 15% below present levels by 2020 would result in a 42.5% reduction below the city’s business-as-usual emissions. By 2025 the reduction would increase to 62.7% below business-as-usual (**Figure ES-5**).<sup>4</sup>

<sup>4</sup> AB 32 Scoping Plan, page 27 states that CARB encourages local governments to “move toward establishing similar goals for community emissions that parallel the State commitment to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by approximately 15 percent from current levels by 2020.” <http://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/scopingplan/scopingplan.htm>

## FIGURE ES-5: BUSINESS-AS-USUAL FORECAST IN RELATION TO STATE-RECOMMENDED REDUCTION TARGETS



It is likely that the city's emissions are already below the business-as-usual forecast due to sustainability efforts initiated by the City since 2005.

# BASELINE GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS INVENTORY

## 1. Introduction

In June 2009, the City Council adopted a resolution to join ICLEI – Local Governments for Sustainability (ICLEI) and to authorize the preparation of a greenhouse gas emissions (GHG) baseline inventory. In committing to the project, the City of Morro Bay embarked on an ongoing, coordinated effort to reduce the GHG emissions that cause global warming, to improve air quality, and to reduce costs.

This section introduces the Inventory, defines key terms used throughout the Inventory, and provides an overview of climate change science and regulation in California.

[ICLEI](#), formerly the Intergovernmental Council of Local Environmental Initiatives, is now named ICLEI – Local Governments for Sustainability. The nonprofit organization provides technical assistance to more than 1,000 local governments worldwide on quantifying and reducing greenhouse gas emissions.

### 1.1 PURPOSE OF A GHG INVENTORY


This Inventory represents completion of the first step in the City’s climate protection process. As advised by ICLEI, quantifying recent-year emissions is essential to establish: (1) a baseline against which to measure future emission levels, and (2) an understanding of where the highest percentages of emissions are coming from, and, therefore, the greatest opportunities for emissions reductions. This Inventory presents estimates of greenhouse gas emissions in 2005 resulting from the community as a whole.

### *Climate Change – Legislative*

#### *Background*

Scientific consensus holds that the world’s population is releasing greenhouse gases faster than the earth’s natural systems can absorb them. These gases are released as byproducts of fossil fuel combustion, waste disposal, energy use, land-use changes, and other human activities. This release of gases, such as carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>), methane (CH<sub>4</sub>), and nitrous oxide (N<sub>2</sub>O), creates a blanket around the earth that allows light to pass through but traps heat at the surface preventing its escape into space (**Figure 1-1**). Known as the greenhouse effect, models show that this phenomenon could lead to a 2°F to 10°F temperature

**FIGURE 1-1:  
THE GREENHOUSE GAS EFFECT**



Source: Tufts University

increase over the next 100 years. The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) warns that most of the warming observed over the last 50 years is attributable to human activities.<sup>5</sup>

Although used interchangeably, there is a difference between the terms “climate change” and “global warming.” According to the State, climate change refers to “any long-term change in average climate conditions in a place or region, whether due to natural causes or as a result of human activities.”<sup>6</sup> The use of the term “climate change” is becoming more prevalent because it encompasses all changes to the climate, not just temperature. Additionally, the term “climate change” conveys temporality, implying that climate change can be slowed with the efforts of local, regional, state, national, and world entities.

Changes in the earth’s temperature will have impacts for residents and businesses in the City of Morro Bay. Some of the major impacts to the Central Coast expected to occur include the following, separated by sector.<sup>7,8</sup>

- **Coastline:** Morro Bay’s coastline could face inundation as a result of sea level rise and global warming. As temperatures rise, the ocean waters rise as well due to thermal expansion and the melting of glaciers and snowpack. The state’s 2009 Climate Change Impacts Assessment (the 2009 Scenarios Project) estimates that sea levels will rise by 12 to 18 inches by 2050 and 21 to 55 inches by 2100. This level of sea rise has the potential to negatively affect groundwater salination as well as the size and attractiveness of local beaches, which could affect property values and the tourism industry in the county;
- **Reduced Water Supply:** The 2009 Scenarios Project estimates a decrease in precipitation of 12 -35% by 2050. Higher temperatures are also expected to increase evaporation and make for a generally drier climate. In addition, more precipitation will fall as rain rather than snow, which will cause snow to melt earlier in the year and not in the warmer, drier months when water is in higher demand;

---

<sup>5</sup> Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. Fourth Assessment Report, Working Group I. 2007. Climate Change 2007: The Physical Science Basis, Summary for Policy Makers.

<sup>6</sup> California Natural Resources Agency. 2009 California Climate Adaptation Strategy Discussion Draft. August 2009.

<sup>7</sup> California Climate Change Center. Our Changing Climate: Assessing the Risks to California (2006), [www.climatechange.ca.gov](http://www.climatechange.ca.gov)

<sup>8</sup> Governor’s Office of Planning and Research (OPR). Proposed CEQA Guideline Amendments for Greenhouse Gas Emissions. April 2009.

# BASELINE GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS INVENTORY

- Agriculture: Climate change could cause a shift in the type and location of agriculture in the area. As saltwater intrudes into coastal aquifers and groundwater resources decrease, it is possible that some crops will be forced out of the area, which affects the local economy and food supply. Water supplies to agriculture may be 20 -23% below demand targets between 2020 and 2050;
- Public Health: Climate change could potentially threaten the health of residents of Morro Bay. Heat waves, a decrease in air quality and an increase in mosquito breeding and mosquito-borne diseases are expected to have a major impact on public health. There is also expected to be an increase in allergenic plant pollen and an increase in the frequency of wildfires. The elderly, young, and other vulnerable populations will need assistance as they will not have the resources to deal with the costs and adapt to the expected changes.

Although one city cannot resolve the issue of climate change, local governments can make a positive impact through cumulative local action. Cities and counties have the ability to reduce greenhouse gas emissions through effective land use and transportation planning, wise waste management, and the efficient use of energy. The City can achieve multiple benefits including lower energy bills, improved air quality, economic development, reduced emissions, and better quality of life through:

- Energy efficiency in City facilities and vehicle fleet;
- Sustainable purchasing and waste reduction efforts;
- Land use and transportation planning; and
- Efficient management of water resources.

This Inventory serves as a baseline measurement for implementing and tracking the effectiveness of these efforts.

## 1.2 CLIMATE CHANGE – LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

California continues to be a leader in addressing climate change in the United States and in the world. In June of 2005, Governor Schwarzenegger issued a landmark Executive Order establishing progressive greenhouse gas emissions targets for the entire state. [Executive Order \(EO\) S-3-05](#) makes the following goals:


- By 2010, reduce greenhouse gas emissions to 2000 levels;

# COMMUNITY-WIDE AND GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS 2005

- By 2020, reduce greenhouse gas emissions to 1990 levels;
- By 2050, reduce greenhouse gas emissions to 80% below 1990 levels.

To support these reduction targets, the California legislature adopted the [California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006, also known as Assembly Bill \(AB\) 32](#). The law requires the California Air Resources Board (CARB) to develop regulatory and market mechanisms that will reduce greenhouse gas emissions to 1990 levels by 2020 as shown in **Figure 1-2** below. To achieve this goal, CARB developed a set of early action measures in 2007 for priority implementation in 2010. These early action measures became part of the AB 32 implementation plan, or Scoping Plan, approved in December 2008. The Scoping Plan identifies a variety of GHG reduction activities including direct regulations, monetary and non-monetary incentives, voluntary actions, market-based mechanisms such as a cap-and-trade, and an implementation fee regulation to fund the program. The Scoping Plan also identifies local governments as “essential partners” and calls for cities and counties to adopt GHG reduction targets consistent with AB 32.

**FIGURE 1-2: CALIFORNIA CLIMATE CHANGE EMISSIONS AND TARGETS**



# BASELINE GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS INVENTORY

In support of the AB 32 reduction targets, California adopted [Senate Bill \(SB\) 97](#) in August 2007, which formally acknowledges that climate change is an important environmental issue that requires analysis under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). In response to SB 97, the [Governor's Office of Planning and Research \(OPR\)](#) submitted their proposed amendments to the CEQA Guidelines for greenhouse gas emissions in April 2009. The Guidelines were formally adopted in February 2010. These revised CEQA Guidelines provide guidance to public agencies regarding the analysis of climate change and GHG emissions in CEQA documents.<sup>9</sup>

Although EO S-3-05 and SB 97 have made California a national leader in climate change policy, there is much more to come. The California legislature passed numerous bills in recent years concerning energy use, land use, transportation, and other climate change topics. These bills will result in the guidance and funding necessary for local governments to move forward with climate action efforts.

At the same time, the State is working to form regional approaches to reducing greenhouse gas emissions in response to the passage of [Senate Bill 375](#). SB 375 aims to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by linking transportation funding to land use planning. It also requires Metropolitan Planning Organizations, including the San Luis Obispo Council of Governments, to include a Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) in their Regional Transportation Plans (RTPs) for reducing suburban sprawl. The bill also creates incentives for implementation of sustainable communities strategies and sustainable transportation plans.

Additional efforts are under way to affect the overall transportation sector by mandating fewer emissions from vehicles, including [Assembly Bill 1493](#), signed into law in 2002, which will require carmakers to reduce emissions from new passenger cars and light trucks beginning in 2009. US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) approved the new emissions standards in June 2009.

The State is also preparing for climate change resiliency in order to adapt to the inevitable effects of climate change. In November 2008, Governor Schwarzenegger signed Executive Order S-13-08 which asked the Natural Resources Agency to identify how state agencies can respond to rising temperature, changing precipitation patterns, sea level rise, and extreme natural events. The order requires the Natural Resources Agency to develop a Climate Adaptation Strategy (CAS) to analyze climate change impacts to the state and recommend

---

<sup>9</sup> Governor's Office of Planning and Research (OPR). CEQA Guideline Amendments for Greenhouse Gas Emissions. February 2010.

strategies to manage those threats. The Natural Resources Agency released a discussion draft of the CAS in August 2009.

The scale and pace at which the State of California is addressing this issue necessitates that local governments accelerate efforts to combat climate change.

**1.3 THE CITIES FOR CLIMATE PROTECTION CAMPAIGN**

By adopting a resolution to join [ICLEI – Local Governments for Sustainability](#), the City of Morro Bay is now part of an international movement of local governments. More than 1,000 local governments, including over 500 in the United States, have joined ICLEI’s Cities for Climate Protection (CCP) campaign.

The CCP campaign provides a framework for local communities to identify and reduce greenhouse gas emissions, organized along [five milestones](#) as represented in **Figure 1-3** below:

**FIGURE 1-3: THE ICLEI FIVE-MILESTONE PROCESS**



This report represents the completion of the first CCP milestone, and provides a foundation for future work to reduce greenhouse gas emissions in the City of Morro Bay.

## **1.4 LOCAL SUSTAINABILITY AND CLIMATE CHANGE MITIGATION ACTIVITIES**

Many of the air pollution programs already in place throughout San Luis Obispo County reduce ozone forming pollutants and toxic emissions, but they also have ancillary benefits and reduce greenhouse gas emissions. The County, cities, and the Air Pollution Control District (APCD) implement rules and regulations, clean fuels programs, CEQA mitigation measures, grants, the Transportation Choices Program, pollution prevention activities, energy efficiency and conservation measures, water conservation programs, partnerships, and general public outreach that directly or indirectly address climate change and reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

The APCD Board approved the first report or plan to address climate change in the county. The plan, ([Options for Addressing Climate Change in San Luis Obispo County \(2005\)](#)) identifies the following seven actions that could be implemented to specifically address greenhouse gases (GHG) at the local level:

- 1) Prepare a countywide inventory of greenhouse gas emissions;
- 2) Target a percentage of mitigation grant funds for greenhouse gas emission reductions;
- 3) Evaluate and quantify the GHG reduction benefits from existing district programs;
- 4) Develop public education and outreach campaigns on climate change;
- 5) Encourage and provide support for local governments to join the Cities for Climate Protection program;
- 6) Develop partnership with Cal Poly for addressing climate change; and
- 7) Join the California Climate Registry and encourage local industry participation.

As of November 2008, the APCD has initiated, promoted, or supported all of the implementation actions to address climate change and reduction of greenhouse gas emissions in the county. The APCD joined the California Climate Registry and conducted its greenhouse gas emissions inventory in the fall of 2008. The APCD facilitates regular meetings of Climate Change Stakeholders, a local group of city and county representatives that shares resources to address climate change. To encourage and support local greenhouse gas emissions inventories, the

APCD is providing technical assistance to all of the incorporated cities to assist or perform GHG government operations and community-wide emissions inventories, similar to this Inventory, for all of the incorporated cities in San Luis Obispo County.

The APCD also coordinates the [Central Coast Clean Cities Coalition](#) (C5). C5 is a partnership of public/private entities whose goal is to promote the use of alternative fuels vehicles (AFV) on the Central Coast. By working with area fleet operators, C5 sponsors training seminars, public events, and grant funding workshops related to use of alternative fuels.

The City of Morro Bay has been pursuing energy efficiencies through such measures as:

- Implementation of a green building incentive program and partnership with SLO Green Build to promote energy efficiency in new development;
- Appliance rebate programs;
- Toilet retrofit program;
- Water conservation rebate program;
- Home Investment Partnership Program to promote home energy efficiency and retrofits;
- Implementation of construction and demolition recycling program;
- Implementation of green waste/composting program and curbside recycling program to reduce waste sent to landfills;
- Construction of new and improvement of existing bike lanes and sidewalks along the harbor and North Main Street;
- Participation in the San Luis Obispo County Energy Watch Partnership;
- Tree planting and maintenance program; and
- Energy recovery projects at the desalination plant.

## 2. Community and Government Operations Inventory Methodology

The first step toward reducing greenhouse gas emissions is to identify baseline levels and sources of emissions in the city. This information can later inform the selection of a reduction target and possible reduction measures to be included in a climate action plan.

This section outlines the methodology used to calculate the community and City government operations<sup>10</sup> inventories, including the difference between the two inventories, and the data collection process, data sources, GHG emission scopes, data limitations, and means of calculation.

### 2.1 BASELINE AND FORECAST YEARS

The year 2005 was selected as the baseline year for the Inventory due to the availability of reliable data and consistency with other cities in San Luis Obispo County. The State of California uses 1990 as a reference year to remain consistent with the Kyoto Protocol, and also because it has well-kept records of transportation trends and energy consumption in that year. However, cities and counties throughout California typically elect to use 2005 or 2006 as a baseline year because of the more reliable recordkeeping from those years and because of the large amount of growth that has occurred since 1990.

This Inventory uses a forecast year of 2020 to be consistent with the State of California GHG Inventory<sup>11</sup> forecast year and AB 32 target, both of which reference 2020. In addition, it is likely that any forecast beyond 2020 would have a significant margin of error because of unknown population growth rates and new technology. The business-as-usual forecast has also been extended to 2025 in consideration of the City's General Plan Horizon.

### 2.2 THE TWO INVENTORIES: COMMUNITY-WIDE AND CITY GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

This Inventory is separated into two sections, community-wide and City government operations. [Per ICLEI protocol](#), the City has completed an assessment of activities throughout the community and a more detailed analysis of City government operations including streetlights,

---

<sup>10</sup> In this report, the term "city" refers to the incorporated area (the jurisdictional boundary of the City of Morro Bay), whereas "City" refers to those activities that are under the operational control of City agencies. "Community-wide" or "community" refers to all activities within the city (as defined above), including those from businesses, industrial processes, residents, vehicles, and City government operations.


<sup>11</sup> California Greenhouse Gas Inventory, <http://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/inventory/inventory.htm>

# COMMUNITY-WIDE AND GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS 2005

building energy use, fleet vehicles, and more. The City government operations inventory was conducted consistent with the [Local Government Operations Protocol](#) developed by the California Air Resources Board (CARB), ICLEI, The Climate Registry, and the California Climate Action Registry (CCAR).

It is important to note that the City government operations inventory is a subset of the community inventory, meaning that all City government operations are included in the commercial/industrial, transportation, waste, or “other” categories of the community-wide inventory. The City’s government operations inventory should not be added to the community analysis; rather it should be looked at as a slice of the complete picture as illustrated in **Figure 2-1**. Although City operations are a small contributor to the community’s overall emissions levels, an inventory allows the City to track its individual facilities and vehicles and to evaluate the effectiveness of its emissions reduction efforts at a more detailed level.

**FIGURE 2-1: THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN COMMUNITY-WIDE AND CITY GOVERNMENT INVENTORIES**



Once completed, these inventories provide the basis for policy development, the quantification of emissions reductions associated with proposed measures, the creation of an emissions forecast, and the establishment of an informed emissions reduction target.

## 2.3 DATA COLLECTION AND METHODOLOGY


Creating the community and City government operations emissions inventories required the collection of information from a variety of sources. Sources for community data included the Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E), the Southern California Gas Company, Caltrans, the California Air Resources Board, the California Integrated Waste Management Board, and the County of San Luis Obispo. City government operations data sources included PG&E, the Southern California Gas Company, Morro Bay Garbage Service, and documentation from multiple City departments including Administration Services, Fire and Police Departments, Public Services, and more. Data from the year 2005 were used in both inventories, with the following exceptions:

- A subset of waste data by type was not available for 2005, therefore this study utilizes a California statewide waste characterization study conducted in 2003-2004;
- City employee commuting trips were calculated using an employee survey conducted in 2009; and
- Propane, wind and solar power used in the within the City's geographic boundary.

For community activities and City operations, emissions sources are categorized by scope. Scopes help us identify where emissions originate from and what entity retains regulatory control and the ability to implement efficiency measures. The scopes are illustrated in **Figure 2-2** and defined as follows:

- **Scope 1.** Direct emissions sources located within the community, mostly from the combustion of fuels. Examples of Scope 1 sources include use of fuels such as gasoline and natural gas.
- **Scope 2.** Indirect emissions that result because of activities within the community, limited to electricity, district heating, steam and cooling consumption. An example of a Scope 2 source is purchased electricity used within the community. These emissions should be included in the community-wide analysis, as they are the result of the community's electricity consumption.
- **Scope 3.** All other indirect emissions that occur as a result of activity within the community. Examples of Scope 3 emissions include methane emissions from solid waste generated within the community which decomposes at landfills either inside or outside of the community.

## FIGURE 2-2: GHG EMISSIONS SCOPES



Source: NZBCSD (2002), The Challenge of GHG Emissions: the “why” and “how” of accounting and reporting for GHG emissions: An Industry Guide, New Zealand Business Council for Sustainable Development, Auckland.

**Appendices A and B** of this report separate the community and City government operations emissions by scope. Each sector is labeled with a 1, 2, or 3 that corresponds to the scopes above.

### 2.4 DATA SOURCES

The data used to complete this Inventory came from multiple sources, as summarized in **Tables 2-1** and **2-2**. Utility providers supplied electricity and natural gas consumption data associated with commercial, industrial, residential, and City government buildings in 2005. Vehicle miles traveled (VMT) information was obtained from the 2005 Highway Performance Maintenance System (HPMS) developed by Caltrans and refined with County Geographic Information System (GIS) data. These data sources are further explained in the sector-specific discussions of this document.

# BASELINE GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS INVENTORY

**TABLE 2-1: DATA SOURCES FOR COMMUNITY ANALYSIS, 2005**

Sector	Information	Unit of Measurement	Data Source
Residential	Electricity consumption	kWh	PG&E
	Natural gas consumption	Therms	Southern California Gas
Commercial/Industrial	Electricity consumption	kWh	PG&E
	Natural gas consumption	Therms	Southern California Gas
Transportation	Local road VMT for unincorporated areas	Annual average VMT	Cal Trans HPMS data
	Highway and interstate VMT for SLO County	Annual average VMT	Cal Trans HPMS data
	Portion of highways and interstates within City of Morro Bay	Highway miles	County GIS shape files
Solid Waste	Solid waste tonnage sent to landfill from activities in City of Morro Bay	Short tons	San Luis Obispo Integrated Waste Management Board
Other - Off-Road Agricultural Equipment	Emissions from off-road agricultural equipment	Tons/year of N <sub>2</sub> O, CO <sub>2</sub> , and CH <sub>4</sub>	California Air Resources Board OFFROAD2007 model
	Portion of agricultural land within the City of Morro Bay	Square feet	County GIS shape files

**TABLE 2-2: DATA SOURCES FOR CITY GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS  
ANALYSIS, 2005**

<b>Sector</b>	<b>Information</b>	<b>Unit of Measurement</b>	<b>Data Source</b>
Buildings & Facilities	Electricity consumption	kWh	PG&E Data Records
	Natural gas consumption	Therms	Southern California Gas Company Data Records
Vehicle Fleet	Diesel consumption and corresponding vehicle type	Gallons	Billing Records
	Gasoline consumption and corresponding vehicle type	Gallons	Billing Records
Employee Commute	Sample of employee commuting patterns	Annual VMT	Commuter Survey (June 2010)
Streetlights	Electricity consumption	kWh	PG&E Data Records
Water/Sewage	Electricity consumption	kWh	PG&E Data Records
	Methane and nitrous oxide released in the wastewater treatment process	Tonnes	Public Works Department Data Records
Waste	Annual waste tonnage sent to landfill	Tons	Billing Records

## 2.5 DATA LIMITATIONS

It is important to note that calculating community-wide greenhouse gas emissions with precision is a complicated task. The ICLEI Clean Air and Climate Protection (CACP2009) software relies on numerous assumptions and is limited by the quantity and quality of available data. Because of these limitations it is useful to think of any specific number generated by the model as an approximation of reality, rather than an exact value. The city's actual 2005 greenhouse gas emissions are likely to be *slightly* greater than what are reported in this document due to three main factors: (1) data limitations, (2) privacy laws, and (3) a lack of a reasonable methodology to collect or model emissions data. The following paragraphs highlight emissions that cannot be included in a GHG Inventory under current science and policy direction, or due to lack of reliable data.

# BASELINE GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS INVENTORY

## ***Data Limitations***

Lack of available data prevented the calculation of emissions from community-wide freight and passenger trains, off-road vehicles and equipment, propane use, and City government operations refrigerants. For rail, port, and other off-road vehicles, as well as equipment emissions, the [California Air Resources Board OFFROAD](#) 2007 software provides emissions from rail activities; however, these numbers are aggregated for the entire San Luis Obispo County area, including incorporated, unincorporated, and state or federally owned land.

Lack of data availability also prevents the calculation of emissions from [propane](#) (liquefied petroleum gas, or LPG) created within the city's boundaries. Propane is basically an unregulated fuel in California (except for storage and safety issues which are regulated). Because it is an unregulated commodity, no data is collected by the state on propane sales or usage. Another sector that was excluded from the inventory is City government operations refrigerants.

The City of Morro Bay made a best effort to gather data on the amount of refrigerants consumed by fleet vehicles, HVAC systems, and City government operations facilities; however City records were not suited to this purpose. It is recommended that the City look into amending its record keeping so that the amount of refrigerants purchased and consumed within a year is recorded.

## ***Privacy Laws***

This Inventory does not separately analyze site-level emissions from specific sources such as refineries or large industrial emitters. The emissions from industrial energy consumption and related transportation are included under the commercial/industrial category, but will not be analyzed independently as part of this Inventory for two reasons:

- 1) State privacy laws prevent us from obtaining site-level energy consumption data from utility providers. Notably the California Public Utilities Commission 15/15 rule,<sup>12</sup> prevents us from analyzing industrial emissions separately from commercial emissions.
- 2) It is the responsibility of the emitter, whether it is a large refinery or household, to perform their own energy audit and subsequent reduction process. Efforts to require site-level energy audits and greenhouse gas emissions reporting are being continually

---

<sup>12</sup> Commercial and Industrial Electricity and Natural Gas were combined into one section due to the California 15/15 rule. The 15/15 rule was adopted by the California Public Utilities Commission in the Direct Access Proceeding (CPUC Decision 97-10-031) to protect customer confidentiality.

expanded and required by the California Climate Action Registry, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, and California Air Resources Board.

### ***Lack of a Reasonable Methodology***

There is a lack of reasonable methodology for estimating life cycle emissions for the community and, therefore, emissions associated with the production and disposal of items consumed by a community are not included in the Inventory. For instance, a life cycle assessment would estimate the emissions associated with the planning, production, delivery, and disposal of each car currently in the city. In contrast, this analysis only captures how much that car drives within the city.

Despite these limitations, the Clean Air and Climate Protection (CACP) software 2009<sup>13</sup> and ICLEI methodology provide the best-available snapshot of the city's greenhouse gas emissions. Additionally, the CACP2009 tool is utilized to promote consistency among municipalities throughout the country and the world. Sector-specific data limitations or methodological issues are explained thoroughly in **Appendices C and D**.

However, it is important to note that the emissions identified in this report are primarily greenhouse gases that the community has directly caused and has the ability to reduce through implementation of conservation actions, a Climate Action Plan, or corresponding efforts.

## **2.6 CLEAN AIR AND CLIMATE PROTECTION SOFTWARE 2009**

The City government operations and community-wide inventories use the [Clean Air and Climate Protection 2009](#) (CACP2009) software package developed by ICLEI in partnership with the National Association of Clean Air Agencies (NACAA) and Torrie Smith Associates. This software calculates emissions resulting from energy consumption, vehicle miles traveled, and waste generation. The CACP2009 software calculates emissions using specific factors (or coefficients) according to the type of fuel used.

CACP2009 aggregates and reports the three main greenhouse gas emissions (CO<sub>2</sub>, CH<sub>4</sub>, and N<sub>2</sub>O) and converts them to equivalent carbon dioxide units, or CO<sub>2</sub>e. Equalizing the three main greenhouse gas emissions as CO<sub>2</sub>e allows for the consideration of different greenhouse gases in comparable terms. For example, methane (CH<sub>4</sub>) is 21 times more powerful than carbon

---

<sup>13</sup> The Clean Air and Climate Protection (CACP2009) software 2009 was developed by the State and Territorial Air Pollution Program Administrators and the Association of Local Air Pollution Control Officials (SAPPA/ALAPCO), the International Council for Local Environmental Issues (ICLEI), and Torrie Smith Associates.

# BASELINE GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS INVENTORY

dioxide on a per weight basis in its capacity to trap heat, so the CACP2009 software converts one metric ton of methane emissions to 21 metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalents.<sup>14</sup>

The emissions coefficients and quantification method employed by the CACP2009 software are consistent with national and international inventory standards established by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (1996 Revised IPCC Guidelines for the Preparation of National Inventories) and the U.S. Voluntary Greenhouse Gas Reporting Guidelines (EIA form1605).

---

<sup>14</sup> The potency of a given gas in heating the atmosphere is defined as its Global Warming Potential, or GWP. For more information on GWP see: IPCC Fourth Assessment Report, Working Group I, Chapter 2, Section 2.10.

### 3. Community GHG Inventory Results

The City of Morro Bay contains primarily residential and commercial land uses. In the 2005 baseline year, there were approximately 10,511 people, 3,390 jobs, and 2,770 households in the city.<sup>15</sup> The following section provides an overview of the emissions caused by activities within the jurisdictional boundary of the city and analyzes the emissions in terms of scope, sector, source, and population.

#### 3.1 COMMUNITY-WIDE EMISSIONS BY SCOPE

Although there are countless items that can be included in a community-wide emissions inventory, as discussed in Chapter 2, this Inventory includes Scope 1, Scope 2, and Scope 3 sources from the following sectors, consistent with the ICLEI protocol:

- Residential
- Commercial / Industrial
- Transportation
- Waste
- Other – Off-Road Agricultural Equipment Emissions.

**What are Scopes?**

The key principles to remember are that Scope 1 emissions are caused by activities within the city and emitted within the city (fuel combustion), while Scope 2 emissions are caused by activities within the city, but most likely are emitted outside of the city (electricity). Scope 3 emissions are indirect emissions, such as waste decomposition.

**Table 3-1** summarizes the scopes of each sector in this analysis.


**TABLE 3-1: GHG EMISSIONS SOURCES INCLUDED IN 2005  
COMMUNITY INVENTORY BY SCOPE AND SECTOR**

Sector	Scope 1	Scope 2	Scope 3
Residential	Natural Gas	Electricity	---
Commercial/Industrial	Natural Gas	Electricity	---
Transportation	Gasoline & Diesel	---	---
Waste	---	---	Methane from Decomposition
Other	Off-Road Agricultural Equipment	---	---

<sup>15</sup> Population and job data calculated from the ERA Report prepared for the San Luis Obispo Council of Governments, July 2006 revision. Household data calculated through US census data.

# BASELINE GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS INVENTORY

**FIGURE 3-1: 2005 COMMUNITY GHG EMISSIONS BY SCOPE**



Including all sectors and scopes, the community emitted approximately 67,936 metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub>e in 2005. As shown in **Figure 3-1** and **Table 3-2**, the majority of community GHG emissions were Scope 1 (78.3%), with Scope 2 (17.4%) and Scope 3 (4.3%) constituting the remainder.

The largest portion of Scope 1 emissions came from the transportation sector (refer to **Table 3-2** and **Figure 3-1**). These emissions qualify as Scope 1 because they involve the direct combustion of fuel within the jurisdictional boundary of the city. The second largest source of Scope 1 emissions was residential natural gas use.

Commercial and Industrial uses generated the largest percentage of Scope 2 emissions. Emissions from waste operations account for the majority of Scope 3 emissions, with inventoried off-road emissions contributing a minor portion.

**TABLE 3-2: COMMUNITY GHG EMISSIONS PER SECTOR PER SCOPE (METRIC TONS OF CO<sub>2</sub>E)**

Sector	Scope 1	Scope 2	Scope 3	Total
Residential	9,888	5,384	---	15,272
Commercial/Industrial	4,613	6,459	---	11,072
Transportation	38,690	---	---	38,690
Waste	---	---	2,695	2,695
Other <sup>16</sup>	---	---	207	207
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>53,191</b>	<b>11,843</b>	<b>2,902</b>	<b>67,936</b>
Percentage of Total CO <sub>2</sub> e	78.3%	17.4%	4.3%	100.0%

<sup>16</sup> The “other” category includes emissions from off-road agricultural equipment. These sources are categorized as ‘other’ to correspond with the ICLEI CACP2009 software.

## 3.2 ALL SCOPE EMISSIONS BY SECTOR

As noted above, the community emitted approximately 67,936 metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub>e in calendar year 2005. In addition to analyzing the data by scope, it can also be aggregated by sector. As depicted in **Figure 3-2** and **Table 3-3** below, the transportation sector was the largest emitter (57.0%) in 2005. Emissions from the residential sector were the next largest contributor (22.5%), while the commercial and industrial sectors accounted for a combined 16.3% of the total. Emissions from solid waste comprised 4.0% of the total, and emissions from other sources such as agricultural equipment comprised less than 1.0% of the total. The majority of emissions from the transportation sector were the result of gasoline consumption in private vehicles traveling on local roads, Highway 1, and other state highways. GHG emissions from the waste sector are the estimated future emissions that will result from the decomposition of waste generated by city residents and businesses in the base year 2005, with a weighted average methane capture factor of 60%.




### What is 67,936 Metric Tons of CO<sub>2</sub>e equivalent to?

67,936 Metric Tons of CO<sub>2</sub>e is equivalent to the air volume of about 13,920 hot air balloons under standard conditions of pressure and temperature. The same amount of emissions is also equivalent to one year of electricity use in 13,112 California residences!

*Source: California Air Resources Board, "Conversion of 1 MMT CO<sub>2</sub> to Familiar Equivalents," Oct. 2007.*

**FIGURE 3-2: 2005 COMMUNITY GHG EMISSIONS BY SECTOR**



# BASELINE GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS INVENTORY


**TABLE 3-3: COMMUNITY GHG EMISSIONS BY SECTOR (METRIC TONS OF CO<sub>2</sub>E)**

2005 Community Emissions by Sector	Residential	Commercial/Industrial	Transportation	Waste	Other <sup>17</sup>	TOTAL
CO <sub>2</sub> e (metric tons)	15,272	11,072	38,690	2,695	207	67,936
Percentage of Total CO <sub>2</sub> e	22.5%	16.3%	57.0%	4.0%	0.3%	100.0%
Energy Use (MMBtu)	267,005	184,817	550,844	n/a	n/a	1,002,666

### 3.3 TRANSPORTATION

As with the majority of California municipalities,<sup>18</sup> travel by on-road motorized vehicle constitutes the greatest percentage of greenhouse gas emissions in the city (57.0%). The Inventory does not include off-road recreational vehicles or watercraft as there is no feasible methodology for calculating emissions from these sources. The majority of the emissions in the transportation sector came from travel on local roads (63.5%) in the city (Table 3-4). Approximately 36.5% of the greenhouse gas emissions in the transportation sector resulted from travel on state highways. Of the total emissions in the transportation sector, an estimated 86.0% was due to gasoline consumption, with the remaining 14.0% coming from diesel use (see Figure 3-3 and Table 3-5).

**FIGURE 3-3: COMMUNITY GHG EMISSIONS BY FUEL SOURCE**



<sup>17</sup> The “other” category includes emissions from off-road agricultural equipment. This source is categorized as ‘other’ to correspond with the ICLEI CACP2009 software.

<sup>18</sup> For a list of California cities and counties that have developed GHG Inventories, refer to the California Office of Planning and Research’s website: <http://www.opr.ca.gov>.

# COMMUNITY-WIDE AND GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS 2005

**TABLE 3-4: TRANSPORTATION GHG EMISSIONS BY ROAD TYPE**

Transportation Road Type Emissions Sources 2005	Local Roads	State Highways	TOTAL
CO <sub>2</sub> e (metric tons)	24,570	14,120	38,690
Percentage of Total CO <sub>2</sub> e	63.5%	36.5%	100%
Energy Use (MMBtu)	350,097	200,747	550,844

**TABLE 3-5: TRANSPORTATION GHG EMISSIONS BY FUEL SOURCE**

Transportation Fuel Emissions Sources 2005	Gasoline	Diesel	TOTAL
CO <sub>2</sub> e (metric tons)	33,258	5,432	38,690
Percentage of Total CO <sub>2</sub> e	86.0%	14.0%	100%
Energy Use (MMBtu)	412,368	56,811	469,179

These emissions result from the gasoline and diesel consumption of vehicles traveling within the city, including those that are just passing through. As a result, it is likely that the City does not have jurisdictional control to reduce the transportation emissions from the majority of this sector. However ICLEI and State protocol require that these emissions be included in a local inventory in order to capture all emissions within the area and calculate their effect on the local community. The Inventories for all San Luis Obispo cities and the county use this methodology for consistency and to avoid double-counting of transportation emissions.

This analysis of highway transportation emissions assumes constant levels of travel along all highways in the county. The Caltrans data includes aggregated vehicle miles traveled (VMT) along highways for the whole county, including incorporated and unincorporated areas. This data was allocated to municipal jurisdictions using the proportion of highway miles in the city and other incorporated and unincorporated areas; traffic counts were not used to measure actual traffic levels at specific locations. This could mean that the community-wide transportation emissions are slightly inflated or understated; however, there is currently no feasible methodology to calculate emissions for individual jurisdictions with traffic data levels. Further discussion of the transportation sector methodology is included in **Appendix C**.

Emissions that resulted from the air, rail, and boat travel of city residents were not included in the transportation sector analysis. As science and data collection methodology develop it is

# BASELINE GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS INVENTORY


likely that the greenhouse gas emissions from air, rail and boat travel could be estimated as a Scope 3 items. Please see **Appendix C** for more detail on methods and emissions factors used in calculating emissions from the transportation sector.

## 3.4 THE BUILT ENVIRONMENT (RESIDENTIAL, COMMERCIAL, INDUSTRIAL)


With all scopes aggregated, 38.8% of total community-wide emissions in the year 2005 came from the “built environment.” The built environment is comprised of the residential, commercial, and industrial natural gas and electricity consumption. This analysis does not include emissions from other types of energy such as propane, solar, and wind due to lack of reliable sales, construction, or consumption data. The commercial and industrial sectors are combined in this Inventory due to the mandatory aggregating of commercial and industrial data by PG&E previously referenced.

In 2005, emissions from the residential sector accounted for more than half (58%) of the total emissions in the built environment. The commercial/industrial sector accounted for 42% of the built environment’s emissions (see **Figure 3-4**). All of the emissions calculated from the built environment were the result of local natural gas consumption (Scope 1) and local consumption of electricity generated outside of the city (Scope 2). Overall, electricity consumption and natural gas consumption were split roughly 45-55% as the cause of emissions from the built environment in 2005 as shown in **Figure 3-5**.

**FIGURE 3-4: BUILT ENVIRONMENT GHG EMISSIONS BY SECTOR**



**FIGURE 3-5: BUILT ENVIRONMENT GHG EMISSIONS BY SOURCE**




# COMMUNITY-WIDE AND GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS 2005


Approximately 64.7% of emissions in the residential sector resulted from combustion of natural gas for heating and cooking (see **Figure 3-6** and **Table 3-6**), while 58.3% of emissions in the commercial/industrial sector came from electricity usage (see **Figure 3-7** and **Table 3-7**).

It is useful to consider the causes behind significant variations in data when developing policies and programs to reduce emissions from each sector. For example, the policies that would aim to reduce emissions from the commercial/industrial sector may differ from those aiming to reduce emissions from the residential sector based upon the information above (and in the figures and tables below).

**FIGURE 3-6: RESIDENTIAL GHG EMISSIONS BY SOURCE**



**FIGURE 3-7: COMMERCIAL/ INDUSTRIAL GHG EMISSIONS BY SOURCE**



**TABLE 3-6: RESIDENTIAL GHG EMISSIONS BY SOURCE**

<b>Residential Emissions Sources 2005</b>	<b>Electricity</b>	<b>Natural Gas</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
CO <sub>2</sub> e (metric tons)	5,384	9,888	15,272
Percentage of Total CO <sub>2</sub> e	35.3%	64.7%	100%
Energy Use (MMBtu)	82,170	184,835	267,005

# BASELINE GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS INVENTORY

**TABLE 3-7: COMMERCIAL/INDUSTRIAL GHG EMISSIONS SOURCES**

Commercial/Industrial Emissions Sources 2005	Electricity	Natural Gas	TOTAL
CO <sub>2</sub> e (metric tons)	6,459	4,613	11,072
Percentage of Total CO <sub>2</sub> e	58.3%	41.7%	100%
Energy Use (MMBtu)	98,574	86,234	184,817

### 3.5 WASTE


Solid waste disposed of at managed landfills was responsible for 4.0% of total emissions for the community. The CACP2009 software calculates methane generation from waste sent to landfill in 2005, and accounts for the reported methane recovery factors among the two utilized landfills (Cold Canyon and Chicago Grade), which have a 60% weighted average. The Cold Canyon Landfill accepted approximately 92% of the community's solid waste, while 8% went to Chicago Grade. The methane recovery factors of the landfills are well documented by the San Luis Obispo Air Pollution Control District based on the system operations at that time. For more information, please see detailed methodology in **Appendix C**.

Waste emissions are considered Scope 3 emissions because they are not generated in the base year, but will result from the decomposition of waste generated in 2005 over the full 100-year+ cycle of its decomposition. In 2005, the community sent approximately 9,235 tons of waste to landfill. The 2004 California Statewide Waste Characterization Study provides standard waste composition for the State of California.<sup>19</sup> Identifying the different types of waste in the general mix is necessary because decomposition of some materials generate methane within the anaerobic environment of landfills whereas others do not. Carbonaceous materials such as paper and wood actually sequester<sup>20</sup> the methane released in managed landfills, therefore offsetting some or all of the emissions from food and plant waste. **Figure 3-8** and **Table 3-8** show the estimated percentage of emissions coming from the various types of organic, methanogenic waste.

<sup>19</sup> <http://www.ciwmb.ca.gov/Publications/default.asp?pubid=1097>

<sup>20</sup> Sequestration involves the storage of carbon dioxide in a solid material through biological or physical processes.

**FIGURE 3-8: WASTE GHG EMISSIONS BY TYPE**



**TABLE 3-8: WASTE GHG EMISSIONS BY WASTE TYPE**

Waste Emissions Sources 2005	Paper Products	Food Waste	Plant Debris	Wood / Textiles	TOTAL
CO <sub>2</sub> e (metric tons)	1,505	590	158	442	2,695
Percentage of Total CO <sub>2</sub> e	55.8%	21.9%	5.9%	16.4%	100%
Energy Use (MMBtu)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

**3.6 OTHER – OFF-ROAD AGRICULTURAL EQUIPMENT**

Off-road agricultural equipment including tractors, mowers, balers, combines, tillers, and other equipment produced less than 1.0% of emissions in 2005, or 207 metric tons CO<sub>2</sub>e. This calculation was performed using the California Air Resources Board OFFROAD2007 model and inputted into the ‘other’ category in CACP2009. The OFFROAD model generates emission inventories by equipment type, accounting for age within a given year (2005).

The OFFROAD software has the ability to calculate emissions from other types of off-road machinery such as recreational vehicles, motor boats, and more. However, since data is aggregated by county, this information is only usable if it can be divided by jurisdiction within the county in a reasonable manner. As a reminder, this emissions inventory is a snapshot of emissions caused by activities within the city in the year 2005. Therefore, absent a methodology for estimating the portion of off-road vehicles driven or used within various jurisdictions,

# BASELINE GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS INVENTORY

OFFROAD data cannot be allocated to different jurisdictions. As current practice and methodology stands, population data is not an acceptable measure of emissions per jurisdiction.

To complete the analysis of impacts associated with agriculture activities, the Inventory allocated total agricultural emissions by the percentage of agricultural and open space land contained in each jurisdiction. For consistency, county agriculture and crop GIS data from 2007 was utilized to determine acreage within each jurisdiction. The city held a very minor part of agricultural land (0.32%) and therefore only a small portion associated off-road agricultural equipment emissions.

### 3.7 OTHER – COMMERCIAL AND RECREATIONAL BOATING

This report recognizes there are emissions associated with commercial and recreational boating activities in and around Morro Bay Harbor; however, due to a lack of reasonable methodology and available data, these emissions cannot be quantified at this time. It is likely that as data become more available, emissions from commercial and recreational watercraft in the harbor can be quantified. It is unlikely emissions from commercial and recreational boating activities are a large source of Morro Bay's greenhouse gas emissions.

The California Air Resources Board (ARB), California Environmental Protection Agency (Cal EPA), and the Commission for Environmental Cooperation in North America conducted a [baseline emissions inventory](#) (2006) of commercial marine shipping along the California coastline; however, the inventory's primary focus is on large commercial marine shipping activity and major ports. Due to Morro Bay Harbor's status as a small commercial fishing and recreational port, the ARB emissions inventory does not capture commercial marine activity occurring in and around the Morro Bay Harbor.

### Off-Road Emissions in San Luis Obispo County


According to a report by the Center for Biological Diversity, off-road vehicle use in California releases as much GHG as burning 500,000 barrels of oil each year, which is equivalent to more than 1.5 million car trips from San Francisco to Los Angeles. Despite this fact, there is no current methodology to calculate GHGs from off-road vehicles at the local level. The California Air Resources Board OFFROAD2007 model produces countywide figures for San Luis Obispo County which cannot be separated by jurisdiction. This is for two main reasons: 1) Many off-road vehicles, such as motor boats and recreational vehicles, are operated outside of County jurisdiction in State-owned parks or waters, and 2) There are wide degrees of variability in off-road vehicle use and fuel consumption. For instance, if we allocated the emissions from off-road agricultural equipment by population and not by portion of agricultural land, cities that have minimal agricultural lands, would receive an equal portion of agricultural emissions per person as the county, which has 98% of agricultural land in the county. This approach would misrepresent emissions.

Source: [Center for Biological Diversity](#)

**3.8 COMMUNITY EMISSIONS BY SOURCE**

In addition to viewing emissions by sector and by scope, policy and programs development can benefit from an analysis of emissions according to their raw fuel or waste source. **Figure 3-9** and **Table 3-9** below demonstrates that almost half (49.0%) of all community emissions come from the consumption of gasoline on local roads and highways. Natural gas (21.3%) and electricity (17.4%) consumption from the built environment are the next most significant figures, with the remainder coming from diesel, off-road equipment and various waste products.

**FIGURE 3-9: COMMUNITY GHG EMISSIONS BY SOURCE**



# BASELINE GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS INVENTORY

**TABLE 3-9: COMMUNITY GHG EMISSIONS BY SOURCE**

<b>Community GHG Emissions 2005 by Source</b>	<b>CO<sub>2</sub>e (metric tons)</b>	<b>CO<sub>2</sub>e (percent of total)</b>
Electricity	11,843	17.4%
Natural Gas	14,501	21.3%
Gasoline	33,258	49.0%
Diesel	5,432	8.0%
Off-Road Equipment	207	0.3%
Food Waste	590	0.9%
Paper Products	1,505	2.2%
Plant Debris	158	0.2%
Wood/Textiles	442	0.7%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>67,936</b>	<b>100%</b>

### 3.9 PER CAPITA EMISSIONS

Per capita emissions can be a useful metric for measuring progress in reducing greenhouse gases and for comparing one community's emissions with neighboring cities and against regional and national averages. Currently it is difficult to make meaningful comparisons between local inventories because of variations in the scope of inventories conducted. For instance, this Inventory takes in to account emissions from off-road vehicles, which many inventories like the Sonoma County GHG Inventory do not. Only when ICLEI, the California Air Resources Board, and other organizations adopt universal reporting standards will local inventories be prepared in a consistent manner and therefore be comparable.

#### **What's the difference between an emissions inventory and a carbon footprint?**

An emissions inventory incorporates emissions directly caused by actions taken within the city that we know how to calculate. A carbon footprint, on the other hand, encompasses greenhouse gas emissions from the entire life cycle of a product or service. This could include the emissions from raising beef for sale at the supermarket or the fuel consumption associated with residents' flights out of SBP for vacation. At this time, it is difficult to accurately estimate the community's carbon footprint. However, individuals may reduce their carbon footprint by buying locally produced foods and goods, reducing packaging, and other behavioral changes.

Simply dividing total community greenhouse gas emissions by city population in 2005 (10,511) yields a result of 6.46 metric tons CO<sub>2</sub>e per capita.<sup>21</sup> It is important to understand that this number is not the same as the carbon footprint of the average individual living in the City of Morro Bay. It is also important to note that the per capita emissions number for the city is not directly comparable to every per capita number produced by other emissions studies because of differences in emission inventory methods.

---

<sup>21</sup> Population in 2005 derived from the San Luis Obispo Council of Governments Long Range Socio-Economic Projections (Year 2025); July 2009 Revision.

## 4. City Government Operations GHG Emissions Inventory Results

The City of Morro Bay government is comprised of seven departments: City Administration, Administration Services, Fire and Police Departments, Harbor, Public Services, and Recreation and Parks Department.

This Inventory accounts for the 110 people employed by the City and City-owned and/or – operated buildings and facilities in 2005.

This chapter reviews the results of the City government operations inventory by sector, including employee commuting emissions.


### 4.1 CITY GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS INVENTORY RESULTS

City government operations and facilities produced approximately 1,765 metric tons of greenhouse gas emissions in 2005. As displayed in **Figure 4-1**, this approximately 2.5% of total community-wide emissions. City government emissions result from waste, energy consumption from wastewater facilities, buildings, streetlights and other facilities, fuel consumption by the vehicle fleet and employee commutes, wastewater treatment processes, and miscellaneous equipment. Employees commuting to and from work contributed the largest portion of the City emissions (23.5%) with 414 metric tons CO<sub>2</sub>e. The wastewater facilities and processes were the second largest contributor to the City's emissions (23.1%) with 407 metric tons CO<sub>2</sub>e. The vehicle fleet and buildings and facilities were the next largest contributors to the City's emissions (20.1% and 10.1%), contributing 355 and 178 metric tons CO<sub>2</sub>e, respectively. The transit fleet was responsible for 6.4 percent of the City's emissions, or, 113 metric tons CO<sub>2</sub>e. The City's water delivery infrastructure and amount of solid waste sent to the landfill resulted in a combined 12% of the City's total and streetlights and traffic signals contributed 4.9% of the City's total, respectively. (Refer to **Figure 4-2** and **Table 4-1** below)


As mentioned in the Introduction, these emissions are a subset of the community emissions inventory discussed in **Chapter 3**. The City's government operations emissions are separately analyzed in this section in a manner that is similar to how an industry or business would produce a facility-scale greenhouse gas audit. The Local Government Greenhouse Gas Inventory Protocol developed by the California Air Resources Board, The Climate Registry, the California Climate Action Registry, and ICLEI guides the methodology for estimating emissions from local government operations. Local government emissions reporting is deemed significant in order to establish local governments as climate leaders in the community so that they can lead by example and pave the way for energy efficiency improvements.

# COMMUNITY-WIDE AND GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS 2005

**FIGURE 4-1: CITY GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS CONTRIBUTION TO COMMUNITY-WIDE GHG EMISSIONS**



**FIGURE 4-2: CITY GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS GHG EMISSIONS BY SECTOR**



**TABLE 4-1: 2005 CITY GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS GHG EMISSIONS BY SECTOR**

2005 Emissions by Sector	Buildings & Facilities	Vehicle Fleet	Transit Fleet	Employee Commute	Street Lights & Traffic Signals	Water Delivery	Waste-water Facilities	Solid Waste	TOTAL
CO <sub>2</sub> e (metric tons)	178	355	113	414	86	106	407	106	1,765
Percentage of CO <sub>2</sub> e	10.1%	20.1%	6.4%	23.5%	4.9%	6.0%	23.1%	6.0%	100%
Energy Use (MMBtu)	2,836	5,083	1,626	5,920	1,319	1,627	6,603	n/a	25,014


# BASELINE GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS INVENTORY

## 4.2 BUILDING SECTOR

The building sector includes greenhouse gas emissions from energy consumption in facilities owned and operated by a municipality. The facilities included in this analysis include City Hall, Public Services Department, fire and police stations, recreation facilities, Chamber of Commerce, parks, and numerous other facilities. As depicted in **Figure 4-3** and **Table 4-2**, the majority of emissions resulted from electricity consumption (73.0%).

These emissions and associated consumption data will be useful in determining significant sources of energy consumption from City facilities. This will allow for the City to designate priority facilities for energy efficiency retrofits and conservation outreach.

**FIGURE 4-3: BUILDING GHG EMISSIONS BY SOURCE**




**TABLE 4-2: BUILDING SECTOR GHG EMISSIONS BY SOURCE, 2005**

2005 City Government Operations Emissions by Sector	Electricity	Natural Gas	Total
CO <sub>2</sub> e (metric tons)	130	48	178
Percentage of Total CO <sub>2</sub> e	73.0%	27.0%	100.0%
Energy Use (MMBtu)	1,985	851	2,836

## 4.3 VEHICLE FLEET AND TRANSIT FLEET

City-owned and -operated vehicles emitted approximately 468 metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub>e, or 26.5% of total City government emissions. This sector includes gasoline and diesel consumption from all departments in the City operating vehicles. This estimate is based on 2005 fuel billing record data provided by the Finance Department. The City does own several watercraft; however, fuel billing records did not specifically identify fuel purchases for the City's boats and; therefore, emissions from watercraft were not quantified. Minor modifications to the City's recordkeeping can allow future analysis of the emissions related to the City's watercraft.

**FIGURE 4-4: VEHICLE FLEET FUEL CONSUMPTION PER YEAR BY TYPE**



The majority of fuel used by the City is gasoline (89%), with the remainder diesel (11%) (see **Figure 4-4**). When compared to the total emissions per fuel type, diesel emissions actually produce less CO<sub>2</sub>e for the vehicle types used by the City. However, there are other, non-CO<sub>2</sub>e emissions from diesel-like particulate matter that make such a comparison misleading to the reader. The trend for diesel to emit less CO<sub>2</sub>e in this case does not necessarily mean that the City should aim to convert more vehicles to conventional diesel. There are multiple clean and alternative fuel options available,

including biodiesel conversion, electric vehicles, hybrid vehicles, smaller vehicles, and shared vehicles.

#### **4.4 EMPLOYEE COMMUTE**

This sector estimates greenhouse gas emissions from City employees traveling to and from work in 2005. The estimate is based on a June 2010 online survey conducted by the City, a blank version of which is included as **Appendix F**. Approximately 63 employees responded to the survey with usable information, meaning that all essential questions were answered. This results in approximately a 62% response rate, the results of which were applied to the City employment total for 2005.

The online survey found that most City employees travel to and from work by car. Employees were asked how many days of the week they travel by each commute mode, including driving alone (which includes motorcycles), carpooling, vanpooling, public transit, bicycling, walking, telecommuting, and other. The results show that employees get to and from 88.0% of their workdays by personal vehicle. The second most popular mode of transportation was bicycling and walking with a combined 5.3% of the total. Carpooling accounted for 1.7% of workday commutes. Employees were very unlikely take public transportation to work, accounting for 0.0% of workday commutes. Approximately 5.0% of employees responded with other forms of transportation or did not commute. This is likely the result of flexible working schedules.

# BASELINE GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS INVENTORY

**TABLE 4-3: DAYS OF CITY EMPLOYEE TRAVEL BY COMMUTE MODE**

Mode of Travel	Days traveled by Commute mode	% of Total
Drive Alone	13,828	88.0%
Carpool	261	1.7%
Vanpool	0	0.0%
Public transit	0	0.0%
Bicycle	365	2.3%
Walk	470	3.0%
Other	783	5.0%
Total	15,707	100%

These figures for commute mode were combined with each respondent's travel distance to work, car model (if any), and fuel type (if any). The results show vehicle miles traveled (VMT) annually per vehicle type and fuel type (see **Table 4-4**). These VMT numbers were then adjusted for the total employee population in 2005 and entered into the CACP2009 software to obtain CO<sub>2</sub>e.

Driving patterns were assumed to be constant for the purposes of this study; therefore, the 2010 sample was applied directly to the 2005 employee population. Only two modifications to the sample data was made in order to account for the large increase in hybrid car sales and consumption of biodiesel between 2005 and 2010. The proportion of hybrid to traditional vehicles was roughly two-thirds less in 2005 than in 2009, according to State sales data.<sup>22</sup> According to national sales data, 30% of the biodiesel consumed in 2008 was consumed in 2005.<sup>23</sup>

The 2010 survey results, adjusted for 2005 employee totals, resulted in an estimate of 414 metric tons CO<sub>2</sub>e in 2005 from commuter travel to and from work. This figure comprises 23.5% of total greenhouse gas emissions released from City government operations. The calculation does not include employee business travel or travel during lunchtime hours.

<sup>22</sup> [www.hybridcars.com](http://www.hybridcars.com)

<sup>23</sup> Biodiesel Supply and Consumption. Supplement to the Short-Term Energy Outlook. Energy Information Administration. April 2009. Accessed at [http://www.eia.doe.gov/emeu/steo/pub/special/2009\\_sp\\_01.pdf](http://www.eia.doe.gov/emeu/steo/pub/special/2009_sp_01.pdf) on May 6, 2009.

**TABLE 4-4: EMPLOYEE COMMUTE VMT BY VEHICLE AND FUEL TYPE**

Vehicle Group	2010 Survey results		Adjusted for 2005	
	Annual VMT	Fuel Type	Annual VMT	Fuel Type
Light Truck/SUV/Pickup	66,341.65	Gasoline	116,097.89	Gasoline
	0.00	Diesel	0.00	Diesel
Large Truck	29,732.16	Gasoline	52,031.29	Gasoline
	36,891.26	Diesel	64,559.71	Diesel
Passenger Vehicle	223,627.83	Gasoline	387,459.99	Gasoline
	0.00	Diesel	0.00	Diesel
	0.00	Biodiesel	0.00	Biodiesel
Motorcycle	0.00	Gasoline	0.00	Gasoline
Total	356,592.90		620,148.88	

Employee business travel is usually included in a City government GHG Inventory per protocol; however, we could not include it in this baseline analysis due to data limitations. The City maintains financial records of when employees travel by air or vehicle to conferences and other events; however, it does not keep records of business travel destinations. As such, this Inventory could not accurately account for GHG emissions from employee business travel. A minor adjustment to City recordkeeping would allow the data to be included in the next City government operations GHG inventory.

**4.5 STREETLIGHTS AND TRAFFIC SIGNALS**

The electricity consumed by City streetlights and traffic signals in calendar year 2005 resulted in approximately 86 metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub>e, or approximately 4.9% of total City government emissions. This Inventory accounts for two traffic signals and an unknown number of streetlights.

**4.6 WATER AND SEWAGE**


In 2005, the wastewater treatment plant emitted approximately 407 metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub>e, or 23.1% of the City's total emissions. This category includes energy use in the Wastewater Treatment Plant buildings and the numerous lift stations and pumps necessary to convey effluent to the treatment plant. The City of Morro Bay and Cayucos Community Services District (CSD) co-own the wastewater treatment plant to serve the residents and businesses of Morro Bay and Cayucos. Because the wastewater treatment plant serves residents and businesses

# BASELINE GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS INVENTORY

outside the City, not all the emissions occurring at the plant should be attributed to the City of Morro Bay under the Local Government Operations Protocol. Emissions at the treatment plant were attributed to the City based on the percent of ownership (60%) outlined in the recorded agreement between the City of Morro Bay and Cayucos CSD (October 1982).

Electricity consumption from water facilities operated by the City emitted approximately 106 metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub>e, or 6.0% of total emissions. This category includes energy use at the various wells and pumps to convey water to City residents as well as irrigation at City parks and facilities. The City owns a desalination plant to supply potable water during the period of every year when the state water project is offline. The process to remove salt and other minerals from seawater to make it potable is generally energy intensive. Because the City only relies on the desalination plant for a few months each year and primarily serves as the last resource for potable water, the energy consumption at the desalination plant varies from year to year. In 2005 use of the plant was minimal. However, since 2005 energy use at the plant has increased significantly due additional processing that is occurring to correct for anthropogenic nitrate contamination that is now present in the Morro Ground Water Basin. It is anticipated that these processes will continue to be necessary indefinitely. Energy use at the plant in the baseline year (2005) and since is provided in **Figure 4-5**. This operational change will result in significantly higher emissions than projected based on 2005 baseline data. Additionally, as climate change impacts water resources throughout California, the City may be required to rely on the desalination plant more frequently.

**FIGURE 4-5: DESALINATION PLANT OPERATION**



## 4.7 WASTE

Similar to the Community-Wide analysis, waste produced by City facilities was calculated using the methane commitment method. The CACP2009 calculates the methane expected to be released from this landfilled waste over the course of its lifetime. In 2005, Morro Bay Garbage Service estimates City facilities sent a total of 298.3 metric tons of waste to landfill, producing 106 metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub>e, or 6.0% of total emissions. Unlike other sectors analyzed, the emissions from waste disposed of in 2005 will occur over multiple years as the waste breaks down over time. This category includes only those emissions generated by waste produced at City facilities and does not include the total emissions released from the landfill.

## 4.8 OTHER – MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT

Emissions from miscellaneous equipment such as general service equipment and equipment used at park facilities would be included in the 'other' category of the Inventory. Due to data limitations, emissions from these 'other' sources could not be quantified. The City keeps record of miscellaneous equipment; however, fuel billing records do not identify fuel purchased for miscellaneous equipment versus fleet vehicles. A minor adjustment in City recordkeeping will allow for future inventories to quantify these emissions.

## 4.9 CITY EMISSIONS BY SOURCE


It can also be helpful to view overall City government emissions by source. As shown in **Table 4.5** and **Figure 4.6**, the majority of emissions result from the combustion of gasoline from the vehicle fleet, transit busses, and employee commute (44.5%). Electricity consumption in City-owned buildings, streetlights, and water/sewage facilities was the next largest source of emissions (32.5%). Natural gas was the third largest source of emissions (11.1%) while the remaining emissions resulted from solid waste, diesel consumption, and methane from the wastewater treatment process.

# BASELINE GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS INVENTORY

**TABLE 4-5: CITY GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS GHG EMISSIONS BY SOURCE**

City Emissions 2005 by Source	CO <sub>2</sub> e (metric tons)	CO <sub>2</sub> e (percent of total)
Electricity	573	32.5%
Natural Gas	196	11.1%
Gasoline	786	44.5%
Diesel	96	5.4%
Solid Waste Decomposition	106	6.0%
Wastewater Treatment Processes	8	0.5%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1,765</b>	<b>100%</b>


**FIGURE 4-6: CITY GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS GHG EMISSIONS BY SOURCE**



## 5. Forecast

The emissions forecast for the City of Morro Bay represents a business-as-usual prediction of how community-wide GHG levels will change over time if consumption trends and behavior continue as they did in 2005. These predictions are based on the community inventory results included in this report and statistics on job, household, and population growth in the city. The analysis shows that if behavior and consumption trends continue as business-as-usual, emissions will reach 86,589 metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub>e by 2020, or a 27.5% increase over 2005 baseline levels (see **Figure 5-1**). By 2025 emissions will reach 93,012 metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub>e, or a 36.9% increase over 2005 baseline levels.

**FIGURE 5-1: 2020 AND 2025 BUSINESS-AS-USUAL PROJECTED GROWTH IN COMMUNITY-WIDE GHG EMISSIONS**



The forecast does not quantify emissions reductions from State or federal activities including AB 32, the renewable portfolio standard, and SB 375. Additionally, it does not take into account reduction activities already underway or completed since 2005, the results of which likely put the community's emissions on a track well below the business-as-usual linear projection.

# **BASELINE GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS INVENTORY**

Forecasts were performed by applying household, job, and population growth rates to 2005 community-wide greenhouse gas emissions levels. Baseline data and estimated growth were obtained from a long-range projections report developed by the San Luis Obispo Council of Governments in 2006, as revised in June 2009. The “mid-range” cases for population, job, and household growth were used in this forecast estimation.

City government operations emissions are not separately analyzed as part of this forecast due to a lack of reasonable growth indicators for the City government sector. However, an increase in emissions is not expected for existing facilities and operations in the City government operations sector. If anything, the City expects that emissions within the scope of the 2005 City government operations inventory will decrease because of energy efficiency improvements and fleet upgrades. At the same time, it is likely the City will have to expand services and infrastructure to accommodate the expected growth in the region, which could add new sources of emissions to the City government operations inventory that did not exist in 2005.

## 6. Conclusion and Next Steps

The City of Morro Bay has made a formal commitment to reduce its greenhouse gas emissions. This report lays the groundwork for those efforts by estimating baseline emission levels against which future progress can be demonstrated.

This analysis found that the community was responsible for emitting 67,936 metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub>e in the base year 2005, with the transportation sector contributing the most (57.0%) to this total. As a component of the community-wide analysis, City government operations produced 1,765 metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub>e, or 2.5% of the total. In addition to establishing the baseline for tracking progress over time, this report serves to identify the major sources of city emissions, and therefore the greatest opportunities for emission reductions. In this regard, the emissions inventory ought to inform the focus of the City's Climate Action Plan. If no action is taken, this report found that business-as-usual emissions will likely rise by 27.5% by 2020 and 36.9% by 2025.

It is important to note that in order to remain consistent with greenhouse gas reduction methodology, all future quantifications of reduction activities must be subtracted from this 'business-as-usual' line. Not doing so would be assuming that emissions remain at constant 2005 levels while reduction activities are underway. In reality, the City's climate action efforts will be working against a rising emissions level due to job, population, and household growth. **Figure 6-1** below shows the business-as-usual emissions forecast in relation to 2005 baseline levels and the 15% reduction below 2005 levels recommended by the State Attorney General and Air Resources Board.<sup>24</sup>

The difference between the business-as-usual forecast and the reduction targets is actually 42.5% in 2020 and 62.7% in 2025, which makes the State's recommended reduction goal challenging, but still feasible. As noted in the Forecast section, it is likely that the City's sustainability efforts have already caused emissions to fall

**If the community reduced GHG emissions by 28,844 metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub>e, what would that be equivalent to?**

- 6,230 passenger cars not driven for one year
- 66,340 barrels of oil saved
- 749,935 tree seedlings grown over 10 years
- 374,968 compact fluorescent bulbs used instead of standard light bulbs for one year.


Source: [California Air Resources Board, "Conversion of 1 MMT CO<sub>2</sub> to Familiar Equivalents," Oct. 2007.](#)

<sup>24</sup> The [AB 32 Climate Change Scoping Plan](#) Document prepared by the Air Resources Board calls for reducing greenhouse gas emissions to 1990 levels by cutting approximately 30 percent from business-as-usual emission levels projected for 2020, or about 15 percent from today's levels.

# BASELINE GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS INVENTORY

below the business-as-usual linear projection line, thus making the 28,844 metric tons CO<sub>2</sub>e reduction by 2020 achievable.

**FIGURE 6-1: GHG FORECAST IN RELATION TO REDUCTION TARGETS**



As the City moves forward to the next milestones in the process, including designation of emission reduction targets and development of a climate action plan, the City should identify and quantify the emission reduction benefits of projects that have already been implemented since 2005, as well as the emissions reduction benefits of existing General Plan policies. The benefits of both existing strategies can be tallied against the baseline established in this report to determine the appropriate set of strategies that will deliver the City to its chosen emissions reduction goal.





**APPENDIX A:  
CACP2009 DETAILED REPORT FOR  
COMMUNITY-WIDE EMISSIONS, 2005**





# Community Greenhouse Gas Emissions in 2005

## Detailed Report

	CO <sub>2</sub> (tonnes)	N <sub>2</sub> O (kg)	CH <sub>4</sub> (kg)	Equiv CO <sub>2</sub> (tonnes)	(%)	Energy (MMBtu)
<b>Residential</b>						
<b>San Luis Obsipo APCD, CA</b>						
<i>1 SoCal Gas Company Natural Gas - Residential</i>						
Natural Gas	9,807	185	1,091	9,888	14.6	184,835
<i>Subtotal 1 SoCal Gas Compar</i>	9,807	185	1,091	9,888	14.6	184,835
Source(s):						
Southern California Gas Co. data provided by Colby Morrow, Air Quality Manager, Customer Programs Environmental Affairs; office:559.324.0109 or email CLMorrow@semprautilities.com.						
Notes:						
1. Conversion of 1MCF=10 therms was used.						
2. Default Fuel CO2 Set.						
3. CEC Emission Factor for Natural Gas - RCI Average Set						
<i>2 PG&amp;E Electricity - Residential</i>						
Electricity	5,340	120	317	5,384	7.9	82,170
<i>Subtotal 2 PG&amp;E Electricity - F</i>	5,340	120	317	5,384	7.9	82,170
Source(s):						
All PG&E data was provided by John Bohman, Pacific Gas and Electric Company Green Communities and Innovator Pilots; 415-973-0040 or jzbx@PGE.com.						
Notes:						
The "PG&E California" electricity coefficient set is based on the 2005 PG&E eCO2 emission factor of 0.489 lbs/kWh of delivered electricity. This emissions factor is certified by the California Climate Action Registry. Criteria air pollutant emission factors for electricity are derived from the NERC Region 13-Western Systems Coordinating Council/CNV Average Grid.						
<b>Subtotal Residential</b>	15,147	305	1,407	15,272	22.5	267,005

### Commercial

#### San Luis Obsipo APCD, CA

##### *1 SoCal Gas Company Natural Gas - Commercial + Industrial*

Natural Gas	4,576	86	509	4,613	6.8	86,243
<i>Subtotal 1 SoCal Gas Compar</i>	4,576	86	509	4,613	6.8	86,243

Source(s):

Southern California Gas Co. data provided by Colby Morrow, Air Quality Manager, Customer Programs Environmental Affairs; office:559.324.0109 or email CLMorrow@semprautilities.com.

Notes:

# Community Greenhouse Gas Emissions in 2005

## Detailed Report

CO <sub>2</sub> (tonnes)	N <sub>2</sub> O (kg)	CH <sub>4</sub> (kg)	Equiv CO <sub>2</sub> (tonnes) (%)	Energy (MMBtu)
-----------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------	---------------------------------------	-------------------

1. Conversion of 1MCF=10 therms was used.
2. Default Fuel CO2 Set.
3. CEC Emission Factor for Natural Gas - RCI Average Set
4. Southern California Gas Co.was only able to provide aggregated Commercial/Industrial usage data.

### 2 PG&E Electricity - Commercial + Industrial

Electricity	6,406	144	380	6,459	9.5	98,574
<b>Subtotal 2 PG&amp;E Electricity - C</b>	<b>6,406</b>	<b>144</b>	<b>380</b>	<b>6,459</b>	<b>9.5</b>	<b>98,574</b>

Source(s):

All PG&E data was provided by John Bohman, Pacific Gas and Electric Company Green Communities and Innovator Pilots; 415-973-0040 or jzbx@PGE.com.

Notes:

1. The "PG&E California" electricity coefficient set is based on the 2005 PG&E eCO2 emission factor of 0.489 lbs/kWh of delivered electricity. This emissions factor is certified by the California Climate Action Registry. Criteria air pollutant emission factors for electricity are derived from the NERC Region 13-Western Systems Coordinating Council/CNV Average Grid.

2. Commercial and Industrial electricity are combined due to the 15/15 Rule, which was adopted by the CPUC in the Direct Access Proceeding (CPUC Decision 97-10-031) to protect customer confidentiality. The 15/15 rule requires that any aggregated information provided by the Utilities must be made up of at least 15 customers and a single customer'

<b>Subtotal Commercial</b>	10,982	230	889	11,072	16.3	184,817
----------------------------	--------	-----	-----	--------	------	---------

### Transportation

#### San Luis Obsipo APCD, CA

##### 1 Highway VMT - Community

Diesel	1,395	8	390	1,405	2.1	19,128
Gasoline	12,339	1,079	1,998	12,715	18.7	181,619
<b>Subtotal 1 Highway VMT - Cor</b>	<b>13,734</b>	<b>1,087</b>	<b>2,388</b>	<b>14,121</b>	<b>20.8</b>	<b>200,747</b>

Source(s):

1. Emissions factors for gas and diesel per vehicle class provided by EMFAC 2007 v2.3 run by Tom Scheffelin, California Air Resources Board Planning and Technical Support Division, Tscheffe@arb.ca.gov. Manipulated by Jaime Hill, PMC, jhill@PMCworld.com to convert EMFAC vehicle classes to those used in CACP.
2. Highway road segments derived from San Luis Obispo County GIS shapefiles for roads and political boundaries, provided by Bobby Jo Close, Mapping Systems Specialist at the County of San Luis Obispo. Manipulated by John DeMartino, PMC, jdemartino@PMCworld.com.

Notes:

1. Diesel Heavy Duty Vehicles includes Transit Buses, based on a weighted average of Trucks representing 98.7% of the category

## Community Greenhouse Gas Emissions in 2005 Detailed Report

CO <sub>2</sub> (tonnes)	N <sub>2</sub> O (kg)	CH <sub>4</sub> (kg)	Equiv CO <sub>2</sub> (tonnes) (%)	Energy (MMBtu)
-----------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------	---------------------------------------	-------------------

and Transit Buses representing 3.3%.

2. Gasoline Passenger Vehicles includes Motorcycles, based on a weighted average of Passenger Vehicles representing 98.7% of the category and Motorcycles representing 1.3%.
3. Highway maintained miles differ slightly from HPMS data. It is likely that the County's GIS I23shapefile is more detailed than Caltrans figures. B26 2. The City's highway VMT was calculated by using GIS to find the portion of highway road segments in unincorporated County land and multiplying it by total County highway VMT.

### 1 On-Road VMT Community

Diesel	4,022	12	60	4,027	5.9	55,172
Gasoline	20,037	1,550	1,238	20,543	30.2	294,925
<b>Subtotal 1 On-Road VMT Corr.</b>	<b>24,059</b>	<b>1,562</b>	<b>1,298</b>	<b>24,571</b>	<b>36.2</b>	<b>350,096</b>

Source(s):

1. Emissions factors for gas and diesel per vehicle class provided by EMFAC 2007 v2.3 run by Tom Scheffelin, California Air Resources Board Planning and Technical Support Division, Tscheffe@arb.ca.gov. Manipulated by Jaime Hill, PMC, jhill@PMCworld.com to convert EMFAC vehicle classes to those used in CACP.

Notes:

1. Diesel Heavy Duty Vehicles includes Transit Buses, based on a weighted average of Trucks representing 98.7% of the category and Transit Buses representing 3.3%.
2. Gasoline Passenger Vehicles includes Motorcycles, based on a weighted average of Passenger Vehicles representing 98.7% of the category and Motorcycles representing 1.3%.

<b>Subtotal Transportation</b>	37,793	2,648	3,685	38,691	57.0	550,844
--------------------------------	--------	-------	-------	--------	------	---------

### Waste

#### San Luis Obsipo APCD, CA

#### 3 Solid Waste - Chicago Grade

*Disposal Method - Managed Landfill*

Paper Products	0	0	5,866	123	0.2	
Food Waste	0	0	2,301	48	0.1	
Plant Debris	0	0	617	13	0.0	
Wood or Textiles	0	0	1,723	36	0.1	
<b>Subtotal 3 Solid Waste - Chica</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>10,507</b>	<b>221</b>	<b>0.3</b>	

Source(s):

1. Total waste tonnage for the City in 2005 provided by the 2005 Disposal Quarterly Reports prepared by San Luis Obispo County Integrated Waste Management Authority on 6/17/05, 9/27/05, 12/27/05 and 3/6/06, provided by Peter Cron, pcron@iwma.com.
2. Percentages of waste share by type for landfill tonnage provided by CIWMB 2004 Statewide Waste Characterization Study. <http://www.ciwmb.ca.gov/Publications/default.asp?pubid=1097>

## Community Greenhouse Gas Emissions in 2005 Detailed Report

CO <sub>2</sub> (tonnes)	N <sub>2</sub> O (kg)	CH <sub>4</sub> (kg)	Equiv CO <sub>2</sub> (tonnes)	(%)	Energy (MMBtu)
-----------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------	-----------------------------------	-----	-------------------

## Notes:

1. Waste Type data not collected by landfill. State average waste characterization data is used for residential, commercial and self haul waste.
2. Chicago Grade landfill reports a methane recovery factor of 60%. Chicago Grade total gas generated = 157.47 mmcf/yr. Total gas transferred = 94.48 mmcf/yr.
3. Cold Canyon landfill reports a methane recovery factor of 60%. Cold Canyon total gas generated = 700 mmcf/yr. Total gas transferred = 400 mmcf/yr.

*3 Solid Waste - Cold Canyon Landfill**Disposal Method - Managed Landfill*

Paper Products	0	0	65,790	1,382	2.0
Food Waste	0	0	25,802	542	0.8
Plant Debris	0	0	6,924	145	0.2
Wood or Textiles	0	0	19,320	406	0.6
<i>Subtotal 3 Solid Waste - Cold</i>	0	0	117,836	2,475	3.6

## Source(s):

1. Total waste tonnage for the City in 2005 provided by the 2005 Disposal Quarterly Reports prepared by San Luis Obispo County Integrated Waste Management Authority on 6/17/05, 9/27/05, 12/27/05 and 3/6/06, provided by Peter Cron, pcron@iwma.com.
2. Percentages of waste share by type for landfill tonnage provided by CIWMB 2004 Statewide Waste Characterization Study. <http://www.ciwmb.ca.gov/Publications/default.asp?pubid=1097>

## Notes:

1. Waste Type data not collected by landfill. State average waste characterization data is used for residential, commercial and self haul waste.
2. Chicago Grade landfill reports a methane recovery factor of 60%. Chicago Grade total gas generated = 157.47 mmcf/yr. Total gas transferred = 94.48 mmcf/yr.
3. Cold Canyon landfill reports a methane recovery factor of 60%. Cold Canyon total gas generated = 700 mmcf/yr. Total gas transferred = 400 mmcf/yr.

<b>Subtotal Waste</b>	0	0	128,343	2,695	4.0
-----------------------	---	---	---------	-------	-----

## Community Greenhouse Gas Emissions in 2005 Detailed Report

	CO <sub>2</sub> (tonnes)	N <sub>2</sub> O (kg)	CH <sub>4</sub> (kg)	Equiv CO <sub>2</sub> (tonnes)	(%)	Energy (MMBtu)
<b>Other</b>						
<b>San Luis Obsipo APCD, CA</b>						
<i>1 Agricultural Equipment</i>						
Carbon Dioxide	207	0	0	207	0.3	
Methane	0	0	5	0	0.0	
Nitrous Oxide	0	0	0	0	0.0	
<i>Subtotal 1 Agricultural Equipm</i>	207	0	5	207	0.3	
Source(s):						
1. CO <sub>2</sub> , CH <sub>4</sub> and N <sub>2</sub> O emissions calculated using the California Air Resources Board OFFROAD2007 modeling tool.						
2. The portion of agricultural land per jurisdiction in SLO County calculated by John DeMartino, PMC, <a href="mailto:jdemartino@PMCworld.com">jdemartino@PMCworld.com</a> < <a href="mailto:jdemartino@PMCworld.com">mailto:jdemartino@PMCworld.com</a> > using County GIS shape files.						
Notes:						
1. OFFROAD aggregates off-road agricultural equipment emissions for the entire county. Emissions were separated by jurisdiction based on the proportion of agricultural land per jurisdiction. This analysis was completed using GIS shapefiles of land use patterns in the county.						
2. OFFROAD includes the following agricultural equipment: 2-wheel tractors, agricultural mowers, agricultural tractors, balers, combines, hydro power units, other agricultural equipment, sprayers, swathers and tillers.						
<b>Subtotal Other</b>	207	0	5	207	0.3	
<b>Total</b>	64,130	3,184	134,330	67,937	100.0	1,002,665





**APPENDIX B:  
CACP2009 DETAILED REPORT FOR CITY  
GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS EMISSIONS,  
2005**





# Government Greenhouse Gas Emissions in 2005

## Detailed Report

	CO <sub>2</sub> (tonnes)	N <sub>2</sub> O (kg)	CH <sub>4</sub> (kg)	Equiv CO <sub>2</sub> (tonnes) (%)		Energy (MMBtu)	Cost (\$)
<b>Buildings and Facilities</b>							
<b>San Luis Obsipo APCD, CA</b>							
<i>1 &amp; 2 City Corporation Yard</i>							
Electricity	5	0	0	5	0.3	72	3,221
Natural Gas	3	0	0	3	0.2	58	0
<i>Subtotal 1 &amp; 2 City Corporatio</i>	8	0	1	8	0.4	130	3,221
Electricity data received from PG&E (ghgdatarequests@pge.com). Natural gas data received from Colby Morrow, The Gas Company, CLMorrow@seprautilities.com.							
<i>1 &amp; 2 City Hall</i>							
Electricity	9	0	1	10	0.5	145	6,390
Natural Gas	4	0	0	4	0.2	78	0
<i>Subtotal 1 &amp; 2 City Hall</i>	14	0	1	14	0.8	223	6,390
Electricity data received from PG&E (ghgdatarequests@pge.com). Natural gas data received from Colby Morrow, The Gas Company, CLMorrow@seprautilities.com.							
<i>1 &amp; 2 Community Center</i>							
Electricity	0	0	0	0	0.0	7	242
Natural Gas	17	0	2	18	1.0	329	0
<i>Subtotal 1 &amp; 2 Community Cer</i>	18	0	2	18	1.0	336	242
Electricity data received from PG&E (ghgdatarequests@pge.com). Natural gas data received from Colby Morrow, The Gas Company, CLMorrow@seprautilities.com.							
<i>1 &amp; 2 Dial-A-Ride</i>							
Electricity	1	0	0	1	0.1	18	794
Natural Gas	2	0	0	2	0.1	30	0
<i>Subtotal 1 &amp; 2 Dial-A-Ride</i>	3	0	0	3	0.2	48	794
Electricity data received from PG&E (ghgdatarequests@pge.com). Natural gas data received from Colby Morrow, The Gas Company, CLMorrow@seprautilities.com.							
<i>1 &amp; 2 Empty Building</i>							
Electricity	0	0	0	0	0.0	1	71
Natural Gas	0	0	0	0	0.0	0	0
<i>Subtotal 1 &amp; 2 Empty Building</i>	0	0	0	0	0.0	1	71
Electricity data received from PG&E (ghgdatarequests@pge.com). Natural gas data received from Colby Morrow, The Gas Company, CLMorrow@seprautilities.com.							

# Government Greenhouse Gas Emissions in 2005

## Detailed Report

	CO <sub>2</sub> (tonnes)	N <sub>2</sub> O (kg)	CH <sub>4</sub> (kg)	Equiv CO <sub>2</sub>		Energy (MMBtu)	Cost (\$)
				(tonnes)	(%)		
<i>1 &amp; 2 Fire Station</i>							
Electricity	6	0	0	7	0.4	100	3,637
Natural Gas	3	0	0	3	0.2	51	0
<i>Subtotal 1 &amp; 2 Fire Station</i>	9	0	1	9	0.5	151	3,637

Electricity data received from PG&E (ghgdatarequests@pge.com). Natural gas data received from Colby Morrow, The Gas Company, CLMorrow@seprautilities.com.

<i>1 &amp; 2 Harbor Patrol</i>							
Electricity	2	0	0	2	0.1	26	1,244
Natural Gas	1	0	0	1	0.0	14	0
<i>Subtotal 1 &amp; 2 Harbor Patrol</i>	2	0	0	2	0.1	41	1,244

Electricity data received from PG&E (ghgdatarequests@pge.com). Natural gas data received from Colby Morrow, The Gas Company, CLMorrow@seprautilities.com.

<i>1 &amp; 2 MBRP Community Center</i>							
Electricity	20	0	1	20	1.2	313	13,131
Natural Gas	0	0	0	0	0.0	2	0
<i>Subtotal 1 &amp; 2 MBRP Commu</i>	20	0	1	21	1.2	314	13,131

Electricity data received from PG&E (ghgdatarequests@pge.com). Natural gas data received from Colby Morrow, The Gas Company, CLMorrow@seprautilities.com.

<i>1 &amp; 2 Police Department (New)</i>							
Electricity	2	0	0	2	0.1	28	1,310
Natural Gas	1	0	0	1	0.0	16	0
<i>Subtotal 1 &amp; 2 Police Departm</i>	3	0	0	3	0.2	44	1,310

Electricity data received from PG&E (ghgdatarequests@pge.com). Natural gas data received from Colby Morrow, The Gas Company, CLMorrow@seprautilities.com.

<i>1 &amp; 2 Police Department (Old)</i>							
Electricity	15	0	1	15	0.9	231	8,285
Natural Gas	2	0	0	2	0.1	36	0
<i>Subtotal 1 &amp; 2 Police Departm</i>	17	0	1	17	1.0	267	8,285

Electricity data received from PG&E (ghgdatarequests@pge.com). Natural gas data received from Colby Morrow, The Gas Company, CLMorrow@seprautilities.com.

## Government Greenhouse Gas Emissions in 2005 Detailed Report

	CO <sub>2</sub> (tonnes)	N <sub>2</sub> O (kg)	CH <sub>4</sub> (kg)	Equiv CO <sub>2</sub>		Energy (MMBtu)	Cost (\$)
				(tonnes)	(%)		
<i>1 &amp; 2 Public Services</i>							
Electricity	6	0	0	6	0.4	94	1,310
Natural Gas	2	0	0	2	0.1	42	0
<b>Subtotal 1 &amp; 2 Public Services</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>0.5</b>	<b>137</b>	<b>1,310</b>

Electricity data received from PG&E (ghgdatarequests@pge.com). Natural gas data received from Colby Morrow, The Gas Company, CLMorrow@seprautilities.com.

### *1 & 2 Restrooms (S. Embarcadero)*

Electricity	0	0	0	0	0.0	4	270
Natural Gas	3	0	0	3	0.2	56	0
<b>Subtotal 1 &amp; 2 Restrooms (S. I</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0.2</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>270</b>

Electricity data received from PG&E (ghgdatarequests@pge.com). Natural gas data received from Colby Morrow, The Gas Company, CLMorrow@seprautilities.com.

### *1 & 2 Teen Center*

Electricity	3	0	0	3	0.2	41	1,894
Natural Gas	1	0	0	1	0.0	10	0
<b>Subtotal 1 &amp; 2 Teen Center</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0.2</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>1,894</b>

Electricity data received from PG&E (ghgdatarequests@pge.com). Natural gas data received from Colby Morrow, The Gas Company, CLMorrow@seprautilities.com.

### *1 & 2 Veterans Hall*

Electricity	5	0	0	5	0.3	83	3,656
Natural Gas	5	0	1	5	0.3	91	0
<b>Subtotal 1 &amp; 2 Veterans Hall</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0.6</b>	<b>173</b>	<b>3,656</b>

Electricity data received from PG&E (ghgdatarequests@pge.com). Natural gas data received from Colby Morrow, The Gas Company, CLMorrow@seprautilities.com.

### *2 561 Blanca Street*

Electricity	0	0	0	0	0.0	1	103
<b>Subtotal 2 561 Blanca Street</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>103</b>

Electricity data received from PG&E (ghgdatarequests@pge.com).

### *2 Bayshore Bluff*

Electricity	1	0	0	1	0.1	17	829
<b>Subtotal 2 Bayshore Bluff</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0.1</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>829</b>

## Government Greenhouse Gas Emissions in 2005 Detailed Report

	CO <sub>2</sub> (tonnes)	N <sub>2</sub> O (kg)	CH <sub>4</sub> (kg)	Equiv CO <sub>2</sub> (tonnes) (%)	Energy (MMBtu)	Cost (\$)
Electricity data received from PG&E (ghgdatarequests@pge.com).						
<i>2 Centennial Park</i>						
Electricity	2	0	0	2 0.1	26	908
<i>Subtotal 2 Centennial Park</i>	2	0	0	2 0.1	26	908
Electricity data received from PG&E (ghgdatarequests@pge.com).						
<i>2 Centennial Stairway</i>						
Electricity	1	0	0	1 0.1	18	618
<i>Subtotal 2 Centennial Stairway</i>	1	0	0	1 0.1	18	618
Electricity data received from PG&E (ghgdatarequests@pge.com).						
<i>2 City Park</i>						
Electricity	0	0	0	0 0.0	2	163
<i>Subtotal 2 City Park</i>	0	0	0	0 0.0	2	163
Electricity data received from PG&E (ghgdatarequests@pge.com).						
<i>2 City Rental House</i>						
Electricity	1	0	0	1 0.0	10	337
<i>Subtotal 2 City Rental House</i>	1	0	0	1 0.0	10	337
Electricity data received from PG&E (ghgdatarequests@pge.com).						
<i>2 City Sign Lights #1</i>						
Electricity	0	0	0	0 0.0	6	349
<i>Subtotal 2 City Sign Lights #1</i>	0	0	0	0 0.0	6	349
Electricity data received from PG&E (ghgdatarequests@pge.com).						
<i>2 City Sign Lights #2</i>						
Electricity	1	0	0	1 0.0	12	610
<i>Subtotal 2 City Sign Lights #2</i>	1	0	0	1 0.0	12	610
Electricity data received from PG&E (ghgdatarequests@pge.com).						
<i>2 Coleman Park</i>						
Electricity	0	0	0	0 0.0	0	91
<i>Subtotal 2 Coleman Park</i>	0	0	0	0 0.0	0	91
Electricity data received from PG&E (ghgdatarequests@pge.com).						

## Government Greenhouse Gas Emissions in 2005 Detailed Report

	CO <sub>2</sub> (tonnes)	N <sub>2</sub> O (kg)	CH <sub>4</sub> (kg)	Equiv CO <sub>2</sub> (tonnes)	(%)	Energy (MMBtu)	Cost (\$)
<i>2 Del Mar Park</i>							
Electricity	1	0	0	1	0.1	14	707
<i>Subtotal 2 Del Mar Park</i>	1	0	0	1	0.1	14	707
Electricity data received from PG&E (ghgdatarequests@pge.com).							
<i>2 Harbor Anchor Park</i>							
Electricity	1	0	0	2	0.1	23	1,057
<i>Subtotal 2 Harbor Anchor Park</i>	1	0	0	2	0.1	23	1,057
Electricity data received from PG&E (ghgdatarequests@pge.com).							
<i>2 Harbor Boat Slips</i>							
Electricity	2	0	0	2	0.1	33	1,533
<i>Subtotal 2 Harbor Boat Slips</i>	2	0	0	2	0.1	33	1,533
Electricity data received from PG&E (ghgdatarequests@pge.com).							
<i>2 Harbor Centennial Pier</i>							
Electricity	0	0	0	0	0.0	2	190
<i>Subtotal 2 Harbor Centennial Pier</i>	0	0	0	0	0.0	2	190
Electricity data received from PG&E (ghgdatarequests@pge.com).							
<i>2 Harbor Fisherman's Gear</i>							
Electricity	2	0	0	2	0.1	28	1,421
<i>Subtotal 2 Harbor Fisherman's</i>	2	0	0	2	0.1	28	1,421
Electricity data received from PG&E (ghgdatarequests@pge.com).							
<i>2 Harbor Restroom</i>							
Electricity	2	0	0	2	0.1	30	1,410
<i>Subtotal 2 Harbor Restroom</i>	2	0	0	2	0.1	30	1,410
Electricity data received from PG&E (ghgdatarequests@pge.com).							
<i>2 Harbor Storage Yard</i>							
Electricity	0	0	0	0	0.0	4	237
<i>Subtotal 2 Harbor Storage Yard</i>	0	0	0	0	0.0	4	237
Electricity data received from PG&E (ghgdatarequests@pge.com).							

## Government Greenhouse Gas Emissions in 2005 Detailed Report

	CO <sub>2</sub> (tonnes)	N <sub>2</sub> O (kg)	CH <sub>4</sub> (kg)	Equiv CO <sub>2</sub> (tonnes) (%)	Energy (MMBtu)	Cost (\$)
<i>2 Harbor T-Pier North</i>						
Electricity	11	0	1	11 0.6	168	5,655
<i>Subtotal 2 Harbor T-Pier North</i>	11	0	1	11 0.6	168	5,655
Electricity data received from PG&E (ghgdatarequests@pge.com).						
<i>2 Harbor T-Pier South</i>						
Electricity	7	0	0	7 0.4	101	3,497
<i>Subtotal 2 Harbor T-Pier South</i>	7	0	0	7 0.4	101	3,497
Electricity data received from PG&E (ghgdatarequests@pge.com).						
<i>2 Harbor Tidelands Park</i>						
Electricity	0	0	0	0 0.0	0	96
<i>Subtotal 2 Harbor Tidelands P.</i>	0	0	0	0 0.0	0	96
Electricity data received from PG&E (ghgdatarequests@pge.com).						
<i>2 Harbor Tidelands Pier</i>						
Electricity	4	0	0	4 0.2	67	2,732
<i>Subtotal 2 Harbor Tidelands P.</i>	4	0	0	4 0.2	67	2,732
Electricity data received from PG&E (ghgdatarequests@pge.com).						
<i>2 Harbor Tidelands RR</i>						
Electricity	5	0	0	5 0.3	81	3,629
<i>Subtotal 2 Harbor Tidelands R</i>	5	0	0	5 0.3	81	3,629
Electricity data received from PG&E (ghgdatarequests@pge.com).						
<i>2 Lila Keiser West</i>						
Electricity	3	0	0	3 0.2	47	2,321
<i>Subtotal 2 Lila Keiser West</i>	3	0	0	3 0.2	47	2,321
Electricity data received from PG&E (ghgdatarequests@pge.com).						
<i>2 MBRP Cliosters #3</i>						
Electricity	1	0	0	1 0.0	11	511
<i>Subtotal 2 MBRP Cliosters #3</i>	1	0	0	1 0.0	11	511
Electricity data received from PG&E (ghgdatarequests@pge.com).						

## Government Greenhouse Gas Emissions in 2005 Detailed Report

	CO <sub>2</sub> (tonnes)	N <sub>2</sub> O (kg)	CH <sub>4</sub> (kg)	Equiv CO <sub>2</sub> (tonnes) (%)		Energy (MMBtu)	Cost (\$)
<i>2 MBRP Cloisters #1</i>							
Electricity	0	0	0	0	0.0	0	88
<i>Subtotal 2 MBRP Cloisters #1</i>	0	0	0	0	0.0	0	88
Electricity data received from PG&E (ghgdatarequests@pge.com).							
<i>2 MBRP Cloisters #2</i>							
Electricity	0	0	0	0	0.0	0	88
<i>Subtotal 2 MBRP Cloisters #2</i>	0	0	0	0	0.0	0	88
Electricity data received from PG&E (ghgdatarequests@pge.com).							
<i>2 MBRP Lila Keiser East</i>							
Electricity	7	0	0	7	0.4	112	5,272
<i>Subtotal 2 MBRP Lila Keiser E</i>	7	0	0	7	0.4	112	5,272
Electricity data received from PG&E (ghgdatarequests@pge.com).							
<i>2 MBRP Monte Young</i>							
Electricity	0	0	0	0	0.0	0	88
<i>Subtotal 2 MBRP Monte Young</i>	0	0	0	0	0.0	0	88
Electricity data received from PG&E (ghgdatarequests@pge.com).							
<i>2 Morro Rock</i>							
Electricity	1	0	0	1	0.0	9	495
<i>Subtotal 2 Morro Rock</i>	1	0	0	1	0.0	9	495
Electricity data received from PG&E (ghgdatarequests@pge.com).							
<i>2 Restrooms (Coleman &amp; Embarcadero)</i>							
Electricity	0	0	0	0	0.0	0	24
<i>Subtotal 2 Restrooms (Coleman &amp; Embarcadero)</i>	0	0	0	0	0.0	0	24
Electricity data received from PG&E (ghgdatarequests@pge.com).							
<i>2 Shop @ 170 Atascadero Rd</i>							
Natural Gas	2	0	0	2	0.1	38	0
<i>Subtotal 2 Shop @ 170 Atascadero Rd</i>	2	0	0	2	0.1	38	0

## Government Greenhouse Gas Emissions in 2005 Detailed Report

	CO <sub>2</sub> (tonnes)	N <sub>2</sub> O (kg)	CH <sub>4</sub> (kg)	Equiv CO <sub>2</sub> (tonnes)	(%)	Energy (MMBtu)	Cost (\$)
<i>2 Vacant Building</i>							
Electricity	0	0	0	0	0.0	0	31
<i>Subtotal 2 Vacant Building</i>	0	0	0	0	0.0	0	31
Electricity data received from PG&E (ghgdatarequests@pge.com).							
<b>Subtotal Buildings and Facilities</b>	174	4	13	176	10.0	2,840	80,545
<b>Streetlights &amp; Traffic Signals</b>							
<b>San Luis Obsipo APCD, CA</b>							
<i>2 277 Morro Blvd</i>							
Electricity	1	0	0	1	0.0	8	441
<i>Subtotal 2 277 Morro Blvd</i>	1	0	0	1	0.0	8	441
Electricity data received from PG&E (ghgdatarequests@pge.com).							
<i>2 409 Morro Bay Blvd</i>							
Electricity	1	0	0	1	0.1	20	929
<i>Subtotal 2 409 Morro Bay Blvd</i>	1	0	0	1	0.1	20	929
Electricity data received from PG&E (ghgdatarequests@pge.com).							
<i>2 595 Harbor St #1</i>							
Electricity	48	1	3	49	2.8	746	50,014
<i>Subtotal 2 595 Harbor St #1</i>	48	1	3	49	2.8	746	50,014
Electricity data received from PG&E (ghgdatarequests@pge.com).							
<i>2 595 Harbor St #3</i>							
Electricity	6	0	0	6	0.4	96	11,091
<i>Subtotal 2 595 Harbor St #3</i>	6	0	0	6	0.4	96	11,091
Electricity data received from PG&E (ghgdatarequests@pge.com).							
<i>2 595 Harbor St #5</i>							
Electricity	7	0	0	7	0.4	104	11,861
<i>Subtotal 2 595 Harbor St #5</i>	7	0	0	7	0.4	104	11,861
Electricity data received from PG&E (ghgdatarequests@pge.com).							

## Government Greenhouse Gas Emissions in 2005 Detailed Report

	CO <sub>2</sub> (tonnes)	N <sub>2</sub> O (kg)	CH <sub>4</sub> (kg)	Equiv CO <sub>2</sub> (tonnes)	(%)	Energy (MMBtu)	Cost (\$)
<i>2 595 Harbor St #6</i>							
Electricity	0	0	0	0	0.0	6	702
<i>Subtotal 2 595 Harbor St #6</i>	0	0	0	0	0.0	6	702
Electricity dat received from PG&E (ghgdatarequests@pge.com).							
<i>2 896 Main St</i>							
Electricity	1	0	0	1	0.0	12	603
<i>Subtotal 2 896 Main St</i>	1	0	0	1	0.0	12	603
Electricity dat received from PG&E (ghgdatarequests@pge.com).							
<i>2 Harbor St #2</i>							
Electricity	7	0	0	7	0.4	108	5,585
<i>Subtotal 2 Harbor St #2</i>	7	0	0	7	0.4	108	5,585
Electricity dat received from PG&E (ghgdatarequests@pge.com).							
<i>2 Harbor St #4</i>							
Electricity	5	0	0	5	0.3	77	6,890
<i>Subtotal 2 Harbor St #4</i>	5	0	0	5	0.3	77	6,890
Electricity dat received from PG&E (ghgdatarequests@pge.com).							
<i>2 Tract 2285</i>							
Electricity	6	0	0	6	0.4	95	7,055
<i>Subtotal 2 Tract 2285</i>	6	0	0	6	0.4	95	7,055
Electricity dat received from PG&E (ghgdatarequests@pge.com).							
<i>2 Traffic Signal (HWY1 &amp; Yerba Buena)</i>							
Electricity	1	0	0	1	0.1	20	929
<i>Subtotal 2 Traffic Signal (HWY)</i>	1	0	0	1	0.1	20	929
Electricity dat received from PG&E (ghgdatarequests@pge.com).							
<i>2 Traffic Signal (Main &amp; Quintana)</i>							
Electricity	2	0	0	2	0.1	27	1,122
<i>Subtotal 2 Traffic Signal (Main</i>	2	0	0	2	0.1	27	1,122
Electricity dat received from PG&E (ghgdatarequests@pge.com).							

# Government Greenhouse Gas Emissions in 2005

## Detailed Report

	CO <sub>2</sub> (tonnes)	N <sub>2</sub> O (kg)	CH <sub>4</sub> (kg)	Equiv CO <sub>2</sub> (tonnes) (%)		Energy (MMBtu)	Cost (\$)
<b>Subtotal Streetlights &amp; Traffic Si</b>	86	2	5	86	4.9	1,320	97,222
<b>Water Delivery Facilities</b>							
<b>San Luis Obsipo APCD, CA</b>							
<i>2 Booster Station</i>							
Electricity	20	0	1	21	1.2	315	11,072
<i>Subtotal 2 Booster Station</i>	20	0	1	21	1.2	315	11,072
Electricity data received from PG&E (ghgdatarequests@pge.com).							
<i>2 Booster Station #2</i>							
Electricity	13	0	1	13	0.7	195	7,144
<i>Subtotal 2 Booster Station #2</i>	13	0	1	13	0.7	195	7,144
Electricity data received from PG&E (ghgdatarequests@pge.com).							
<i>2 Booster Station #3</i>							
Electricity	7	0	0	7	0.4	105	3,744
<i>Subtotal 2 Booster Station #3</i>	7	0	0	7	0.4	105	3,744
Electricity data received from PG&E (ghgdatarequests@pge.com).							
<i>2 Telemetry Transmitter</i>							
Electricity	0	0	0	0	0.0	0	3
<i>Subtotal 2 Telemetry Transmit</i>	0	0	0	0	0.0	0	3
Electricity data received from PG&E (ghgdatarequests@pge.com).							
<i>2 Water CL2 Station</i>							
Electricity	0	0	0	0	0.0	0	88
<i>Subtotal 2 Water CL2 Station</i>	0	0	0	0	0.0	0	88
Electricity data received from PG&E (ghgdatarequests@pge.com).							
<i>2 Water Desalination Plant</i>							
Electricity	0	0	0	0	0.0	6	357
<i>Subtotal 2 Water Desalination</i>	0	0	0	0	0.0	6	357
Electricity data received from PG&E (ghgdatarequests@pge.com).							

## Government Greenhouse Gas Emissions in 2005 Detailed Report

	CO <sub>2</sub> (tonnes)	N <sub>2</sub> O (kg)	CH <sub>4</sub> (kg)	Equiv CO <sub>2</sub> (tonnes) (%)		Energy (MMBtu)	Cost (\$)
<i>2 Water Telemetry</i>							
Electricity	0	0	0	0	0.0	1	143
<i>Subtotal 2 Water Telemetry</i>	0	0	0	0	0.0	1	143
Electricity data received from PG&E (ghgdatarequests@pge.com).							
<i>2 Water Telemetry #2</i>							
Electricity	1	0	0	1	0.1	14	688
<i>Subtotal 2 Water Telemetry #2</i>	1	0	0	1	0.1	14	688
Electricity data received from PG&E (ghgdatarequests@pge.com).							
<i>2 Water Telemetry #3</i>							
Electricity	0	0	0	0	0.0	0	54
<i>Subtotal 2 Water Telemetry #3</i>	0	0	0	0	0.0	0	54
Electricity data received from PG&E (ghgdatarequests@pge.com).							
<i>2 Well #11A</i>							
Electricity	23	1	1	23	1.3	353	13,925
<i>Subtotal 2 Well #11A</i>	23	1	1	23	1.3	353	13,925
Electricity data received from PG&E (ghgdatarequests@pge.com).							
<i>2 Well #3</i>							
Electricity	1	0	0	1	0.1	15	810
<i>Subtotal 2 Well #3</i>	1	0	0	1	0.1	15	810
Electricity data received from PG&E (ghgdatarequests@pge.com).							
<i>2 Wells #1-5</i>							
Electricity	0	0	0	0	0.0	0	130
<i>Subtotal 2 Wells #1-5</i>	0	0	0	0	0.0	0	130
Electricity data received from PG&E (ghgdatarequests@pge.com).							
<i>2 Wells #4, 14, &amp; 15</i>							
Electricity	18	0	1	18	1.0	280	11,271
<i>Subtotal 2 Wells #4, 14, &amp; 15</i>	18	0	1	18	1.0	280	11,271
Electricity data received from PG&E (ghgdatarequests@pge.com).							

## Government Greenhouse Gas Emissions in 2005 Detailed Report

	CO <sub>2</sub> (tonnes)	N <sub>2</sub> O (kg)	CH <sub>4</sub> (kg)	Equiv CO <sub>2</sub> (tonnes)	(%)	Energy (MMBtu)	Cost (\$)
<b>2 Wells #5 &amp; 13</b>							
Electricity	0	0	0	0	0.0	0	130
<b>Subtotal 2 Wells #5 &amp; 13</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>130</b>
Electricity data received from PG&E (ghgdatarequests@pge.com).							
<b>2 Wells #9, 9A, 10, 10A</b>							
Electricity	22	1	1	22	1.3	343	11,596
<b>Subtotal 2 Wells #9, 9A, 10, 10A</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>1.3</b>	<b>343</b>	<b>11,596</b>
Electricity data received from PG&E (ghgdatarequests@pge.com).							
<b>Subtotal Water Delivery Facilities:</b>	<b>106</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>107</b>	<b>6.0</b>	<b>1,627</b>	<b>61,155</b>
<b>Wastewater Facilities</b>							
<b>San Luis Obsipo APCD, CA</b>							
<b>1 &amp; 2 WWTP</b>							
Electricity	231	5	14	233	13.2	3,558	101,099
Natural Gas	147	3	16	148	8.4	2,775	0
<b>Subtotal 1 &amp; 2 WWTP</b>	<b>378</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>382</b>	<b>21.6</b>	<b>6,333</b>	<b>101,099</b>
Electricity data received from PG&E (ghgdatarequests@pge.com). Natural gas data received from Colby Morrow, The Gas Company, CLMorrow@seprautilities.com.							
<b>2 Lift Station #1</b>							
Electricity	2	0	0	2	0.1	30	2,149
<b>Subtotal 2 Lift Station #1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0.1</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>2,149</b>
Electricity data received from PG&E (ghgdatarequests@pge.com).							
<b>2 Lift Station #2</b>							
Electricity	9	0	1	9	0.5	133	4,850
<b>Subtotal 2 Lift Station #2</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>0.5</b>	<b>133</b>	<b>4,850</b>
Electricity data received from PG&E (ghgdatarequests@pge.com).							
<b>2 Lift Station #3</b>							
Electricity	7	0	0	7	0.4	107	3,887
<b>Subtotal 2 Lift Station #3</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>0.4</b>	<b>107</b>	<b>3,887</b>
Electricity data received from PG&E (ghgdatarequests@pge.com).							

## Government Greenhouse Gas Emissions in 2005 Detailed Report

	CO <sub>2</sub> (tonnes)	N <sub>2</sub> O (kg)	CH <sub>4</sub> (kg)	Equiv CO <sub>2</sub>		Energy (MMBtu)	Cost (\$)
				(tonnes)	(%)		
<i>3 Wastewater Treatment Processes</i>							
Methane	0	0	362	8	0.4	0	0
<i>Subtotal 3 Wastewater Treatm</i>	0	0	362	8	0.4	0	0

Operational data was provided by Bruce Keogh, Wastewater Treatment Plant Manager, (805) 772-6272. Population served by the wastewater treatment plant was provided by SLOCOG;s Long Range Socio-Economic Projections for San Luis Obispo County, May 2006, Revised in June 2006. Emissions from the WWTP are attributed to the City of Morro Bay in porportion to the percentage of ownership of the Plant (60%) per the JPA between the City of Morro Bay and the Cayucos Community Services District (CSD) recorded October 1982.

<b>Subtotal Wastewater Facilities</b>	396	8	394	407	23.1	6,603	111,985
---------------------------------------	-----	---	-----	-----	------	-------	---------

### Solid Waste Facilities

#### San Luis Obsipo APCD, CA

##### All City Facilities

Carbon Dioxide	106	0	0	106	6.0	0	0
<i>Subtotal All City Facilities</i>	106	0	0	106	6.0	0	0

Information obtained from Municipal Solid Waste billing statements. Assumed 325 pounds of Municipal Solid Waste per cubic yard.

<b>Subtotal Solid Waste Facilities</b>	106	0	0	106	6.0	0	0
--	-----	---	---	-----	-----	---	---

### Vehicle Fleet

#### San Luis Obsipo APCD, CA

##### 1 Administration

Gasoline	4	0	0	4	0.2	56	1,036
<i>Subtotal 1 Administration</i>	4	0	0	4	0.2	56	1,036

Fuel records were provided by Cindy Jacinth (cjacinth@morro-bay.ca.us). Fuel records provided total fuel consumption by department. Fuel consumption was spread evenly between all vehicles in each department. Light Trucks MY 2000 includes - 1 Jeep Cherokee. Passenger Cars MY 2001 includes - 1 Ford Taurus.

##### 1 Cloisters

Diesel	0	0	0	0	0.0	1	20
Gasoline	5	0	0	5	0.3	73	1,459
<i>Subtotal 1 Cloisters</i>	5	0	0	5	0.3	74	1,479

Fuel records were provided by Cindy Jacinth (cjacinth@morro-bay.ca.us). Fuel records provided total fuel consumption by department. Fuel consumption was spread evenly between all vehicles in each department. Heavy Duty Vehicles Alt. Method includes - Unknown. Light Trucks MY 1999 includes - 1 GMC C1500.

# Government Greenhouse Gas Emissions in 2005

## Detailed Report

	CO <sub>2</sub> (tonnes)	N <sub>2</sub> O (kg)	CH <sub>4</sub> (kg)	Equiv CO <sub>2</sub> (tonnes) (%)		Energy (MMBtu)	Cost (\$)
<i>1 Collections</i>							
Diesel	13	0	0	13	0.7	181	3,088
Gasoline	11	1	1	11	0.6	156	3,047
<b>Subtotal 1 Collections</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>1.4</b>	<b>337</b>	<b>6,135</b>

Fuel records were provided by Cindy Jacinth (cjacinth@morro-bay.ca.us). Fuel records provided total fuel consumption by department. Fuel consumption was spread evenly between all vehicles in each department. Light Trucks MY 1996 to 2004 includes - GMC C-3500. Light Trucks MY 2000 includes - 1 GMC Sierra 1500 and 1 GMC 2500.

<i>1 Facilities</i>							
Gasoline	11	1	1	12	0.7	166	3,246
<b>Subtotal 1 Facilities</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>0.7</b>	<b>166</b>	<b>3,246</b>

Fuel records were provided by Cindy Jacinth (cjacinth@morro-bay.ca.us). Fuel records provided total fuel consumption by department. Fuel consumption was spread evenly between all vehicles in each department. Light Trucks MY 1987 to 1993 includes - 2 Ford Explorer and 1 GMC Savana Cargo Van.

<i>1 Fire</i>							
Diesel	31	0	0	31	1.7	422	6,397
Gasoline	22	1	1	22	1.3	320	6,264
<b>Subtotal 1 Fire</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>3.0</b>	<b>743</b>	<b>12,661</b>

Fuel records were provided by Cindy Jacinth (cjacinth@morro-bay.ca.us). Fuel records provided total fuel consumption by department. Fuel consumption was spread evenly between all vehicles in each department. Heavy Duty Vehicles All MYs include - 1 1982 Pierce Fire Engine, 1 1983 Pierce Fire Engine, and 1 1994 Pierce Fire Engine. Light Trucks MY 1995 include - 1 GMC 3500. Light Trucks MY 2000 include - 1 Ford Expedition. Light Trucks MY 2001 include - Ford F250. Light Trucks MY 2003 include - Ford F250.

<i>1 Harbor</i>							
Diesel	0	0	0	0	0.0	1	21
Gasoline	19	1	1	20	1.1	282	5,532
<b>Subtotal 1 Harbor</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>1.1</b>	<b>284</b>	<b>5,553</b>

Fuel records were provided by Cindy Jacinth (cjacinth@morro-bay.ca.us). Fuel records provided total fuel consumption by department. Fuel consumption was spread evenly between all vehicles in each department. Heavy Duty Vehicles Alt. Method include - Unknown. Light Trucks MY 1994 include - 1 Ford F350. Light Trucks MY 2001 include - 1 Dodge Ram 2500 (3/4 Ton). Light Trucks MY 2003 include - 1 Dodge 1/2 Ton.

<i>1 Parks &amp; Recreation</i>							
Diesel	6	0	0	6	0.3	75	1,142
Gasoline	16	1	0	16	0.9	234	4,640
<b>Subtotal 1 Parks &amp; Recreation</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>1.2</b>	<b>309</b>	<b>5,782</b>

Fuel records were provided by Cindy Jacinth (cjacinth@morro-bay.ca.us). Fuel records provided total fuel consumption by department. Fuel consumption was spread evenly between all vehicles in each department. Light Trucks MY 1996 to 2004 include - 1 Dodge Ram Van 2500. Light Trucks MY 1999 include - 1 GMC Savana Cargo Van. Light Trucks MY 2001 include - 1 Chevy Silverado. Light Trucks MY 2002 include - 1 Chevy Silverado. Light Trucks MY 2003 include - 1 Chevy Silverado.

## Government Greenhouse Gas Emissions in 2005

### Detailed Report

	CO <sub>2</sub> (tonnes)	N <sub>2</sub> O (kg)	CH <sub>4</sub> (kg)	Equiv CO <sub>2</sub> (tonnes) (%)		Energy (MMBtu)	Cost (\$)
<i>1 Police</i>							
Gasoline	119	4	8	120	6.8	1,747	34,029
<i>Subtotal 1 Police</i>	119	4	8	120	6.8	1,747	34,029

Fuel records were provided by Cindy Jacinth (cjacinth@morro-bay.ca.us). Fuel records provided total fuel consumption by department. Fuel consumption was spread evenly between all vehicles in each department. Light Trucks MY 2001 include - 1 Dodge Durango and 1 Jeep Cherokee. Light Trucks MY 2004 include - 2 Dodge 1/2 Ton. Passenger Cars MY 1999 include - 2 Ford Crown Victoria. Passenger Cars MY 2005 include - 2 Ford Crown Victoria and 1 Toyota Camry LE.

<i>1 Public Services</i>							
Gasoline	14	0	0	14	0.8	202	3,923
<i>Subtotal 1 Public Services</i>	14	0	0	14	0.8	202	3,923

Fuel records were provided by Cindy Jacinth (cjacinth@morro-bay.ca.us). Fuel records provided total fuel consumption by department. Fuel consumption was spread evenly between all vehicles in each department. Passenger Cars MY 2003 include - 1 Ford Taurus.

<i>1 Streets</i>							
Diesel	5	0	0	5	0.3	71	1,068
Gasoline	25	2	2	26	1.5	373	7,325
<i>Subtotal 1 Streets</i>	31	2	2	31	1.8	444	8,393

Fuel records were provided by Cindy Jacinth (cjacinth@morro-bay.ca.us). Fuel records provided total fuel consumption by department. Fuel consumption was spread evenly between all vehicles in each department. Heavy Duty Vehicles All MYs include - 1 Pac Roller and 1 Caterpillar Grader. Light Trucks MY 1987 to 1993 include - 1 1990 GMC 2 1/2 Ton and 1 1991 GMC 2 1/2 Ton. Light Trucks MY 2000 include - GMC C-6500. Light Trucks MY 2003 include - 1 John Deere Tractor. Light Trucks MY 2004 include - 1 Chevrolet C-3500.

<i>1 Vehicle Maintenance</i>							
Diesel	0	0	0	0	0.0	1	11
Gasoline	1	0	0	1	0.1	17	333
<i>Subtotal 1 Vehicle Maintenan</i>	1	0	0	1	0.1	18	344

Fuel records were provided by Cindy Jacinth (cjacinth@morro-bay.ca.us). Fuel records provided total fuel consumption by department. Fuel consumption was spread evenly between all vehicles in each department. Heavy Duty Vehicles Alt. Method include - Unknown. Light Trucks MY 2000 include - GMC 1500.

<i>1 Water</i>							
Diesel	1	0	0	1	0.1	15	229
Gasoline	38	2	2	39	2.2	561	11,055
<i>Subtotal 1 Water</i>	39	2	2	40	2.3	576	11,284

Fuel records were provided by Cindy Jacinth (cjacinth@morro-bay.ca.us). Fuel records provided total fuel consumption by department. Fuel consumption was spread evenly between all vehicles in each department. Light Trucks MY 1996 to 2004 include - 1 Dodge Ram 2500 (3/4 Ton). Light Trucks MY 1995 include - 1 GMC C-3500. Light Trucks MY 2004 include - 2 Chevrolet C-3500.

## Government Greenhouse Gas Emissions in 2005 Detailed Report

	CO <sub>2</sub> (tonnes)	N <sub>2</sub> O (kg)	CH <sub>4</sub> (kg)	Equiv CO <sub>2</sub> (tonnes)	(%)	Energy (MMBtu)	Cost (\$)
<b>1 WWTP</b>							
Diesel	5	0	0	5	0.3	67	1,021
Gasoline	4	1	0	4	0.2	62	1,191
<b>Subtotal 1 WWTP</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>0.5</b>	<b>129</b>	<b>2,212</b>
Fuel records were provided by Cindy Jacinth (cjacinth@morro-bay.ca.us). Fuel records provided total fuel consumption by department. Fuel consumption was spread evenly between all vehicles in each department. Light Trucks MY 1996 to 2004 include - 1 Dodge Ram 2500 (3/4 Ton). Light Trucks MY 1994 include - 1 Ford F150.							
<b>Subtotal Vehicle Fleet</b>	<b>350</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>355</b>	<b>20.1</b>	<b>5,085</b>	<b>96,077</b>
<b>Employee Commute</b>							
<b>San Luis Obsipo APCD, CA</b>							
<b>3 Employee Commute</b>							
Diesel	35	0	0	35	2.0	476	0
Gasoline	370	27	31	379	21.5	5,444	0
<b>Subtotal 3 Employee Commute</b>	<b>405</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>414</b>	<b>23.5</b>	<b>5,919</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Subtotal Employee Commute</b>	<b>405</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>414</b>	<b>23.5</b>	<b>5,919</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Transit Fleet</b>							
<b>San Luis Obsipo APCD, CA</b>							
<b>1 Dial-A-Ride</b>							
Gasoline	93	6	16	95	5.4	1,362	26,763
<b>Subtotal 1 Dial-A-Ride</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>5.4</b>	<b>1,362</b>	<b>26,763</b>
Fuel records were provided by Cindy Jacinth (cjacinth@morro-bay.ca.us). Fuel records provided total fuel consumption by department. Fuel consumption was spread evenly between all vehicles in each department. Heavy Duty Vehicles MY 2005 includes - 1 Ford E-450 (Eldorado Aerotech).							
<b>1 Trolley</b>							
Gasoline	18	1	2	18	1.0	264	5,436
<b>Subtotal 1 Trolley</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>1.0</b>	<b>264</b>	<b>5,436</b>
Fuel records were provided by Cindy Jacinth (cjacinth@morro-bay.ca.us). Fuel records provided total fuel consumption by department. Fuel consumption was spread evenly between all vehicles in each department. Heavy Duty Vehicles MY 1985 to 1986 include - 1 1985 P-30. Heavy Duty Vehicles MY 1999 include - 1 Ford Molly Trolley. Heavy Duty Vehicles MY 2003 include - 1 Ford F-53 (Molly Trolley).							
<b>Subtotal Transit Fleet</b>	<b>110</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>113</b>	<b>6.4</b>	<b>1,626</b>	<b>32,199</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,733</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>484</b>	<b>1,763</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>25,020</b>	<b>479,183</b>



**APPENDIX C:  
DETAILED METHODOLOGY FOR  
COMMUNITY-WIDE INVENTORY**





# APPENDIX C: DETAILED METHODOLOGY FOR COMMUNITY-WIDE INVENTORY

## Detailed Methodology for Community-Wide Inventory

The following is a detailed explanation of data sources and methodology for calculating greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions in each sector of the community-wide analysis. The purpose of this appendix is to provide transparency of this Inventory, outline data limitations, and give guidance for future City inventories to maintain methodological consistency.

### ELECTRICITY AND NATURAL GAS

**Note:** We attempted to collect energy production/consumption data besides that from natural gas and electricity such as propane, solar, and wind; however the data was not available in the level of detail necessary to meet the protocol for this Inventory.

#### *Residential*

Pacific Gas and Electric (PG&E) and Southern California Gas Company (SoCal Gas Co.) provided residential electricity and natural gas consumption data. Specifically, data was provided by:

- John Bohman, Analyst with PG&E Green Communities and Innovator Pilots ([jzbx@pge.com](mailto:jzbx@pge.com))
- Colby Morrow, Southern California Gas Company & San Diego Gas and Electric Company Air Quality Manager, Customer Programs Environmental Affairs ([clmorrow@semprautilities.com](mailto:clmorrow@semprautilities.com))

The raw data received from PG&E and SoCal Gas Co. is summarized in the chart below. This raw data was inputted into the CACP2009 software in kWh and therms. CACP2009 Average Grid Electricity, RCI Average, and Fuel CO<sub>2</sub> coefficient sets were amended per PG&E and State guidance (see 'electricity and natural gas coefficients' section).

**TABLE 1: RESIDENTIAL ENERGY USE**

2005 Residential Energy Emissions	Scope	Input Data Metric Tons	Metric Tons CO <sub>2</sub> e per year
PG&E Electricity	2	24,075,811 kWh	5,384
SoCal Gas Co. Natural Gas	1	1,848,335 Therms	9,888

## APPENDIX C: DETAILED METHODOLOGY FOR COMMUNITY-WIDE INVENTORY

### ***Commercial / Industrial***

Commercial and industrial electricity were combined into one section by PG&E due to the California 15/15 Rule. The 15/15 Rule was adopted by the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) in the Direct Access Proceeding (CPUC Decision 97-10-031) to protect customer confidentiality. The 15/15 Rule requires that any aggregated information provided by the utilities must be made up of at least 15 customers. A single customer's load must be less than 15 percent of an assigned category. If the number of customers in the compiled data is below 15, or if a single customer's load is more than 15 percent of the total data, categories must be combined before the information is released. The Rule further requires that if the 15/15 Rule is triggered for a second time after the data has been screened already using the 15/15 Rule, the customer must be dropped from the information provided.

As a result, PG&E aggregated commercial and industrial energy consumption in Morro Bay into one report. SoCal Gas Co. separated commercial and industrial gas usage (shown in the chart below) into two reports. It would have been misleading to present an 'Industrial' for only natural gas emissions; therefore, the SoCal Gas Co. emissions were aggregated with commercial as well.

Data for this sector was provided by:

- John Bohman, Analyst with PG&E Green Communities and Innovator Pilots ([izbx@pge.com](mailto:izbx@pge.com))
- Colby Morrow, Southern California Gas Company & San Diego Gas and Electric Company Air Quality Manager, Customer Programs Environmental Affairs ([clmorrow@semprautilities.com](mailto:clmorrow@semprautilities.com))

Raw data received from these sources is reflected in the table below. CACP2009 Average Grid Electricity, RCI Average, and Fuel CO<sub>2</sub> Coefficient Sets were amended to reflect California standards (See 'electricity and natural gas coefficients' section).

# APPENDIX C: DETAILED METHODOLOGY FOR COMMUNITY-WIDE INVENTORY

**TABLE 2: COMMERCIAL/INDUSTRIAL ENERGY USE**

2005 Commercial / Industrial Energy Emissions	Scope	Input Data	Metric Tons CO <sub>2</sub> e per year
PG&E Commercial + Industrial Electricity	2	28,882,234 kWh	6,459
SoCal Gas Co. Commercial + Industrial Natural Gas	1	862,432 Therms	4,613

### ***Electricity and Natural Gas Coefficients***

Electricity and natural gas coefficients are defaulted to national averages in the CACP2009 software. To make the Inventory more accurate and representative of the city’s real impact on climate change, tailored coefficient sets for California were obtained. Sources and coefficient values are summarized in the table below.

**TABLE 3: PG&E COEFFICIENT SETS**

Coefficient Set	Unit	Value	Source
Average Grid Electricity Set	Lbs / MWh	489 CO <sub>2</sub>	John Bohman, Analyst with PG&E Green Communities and Innovator Pilots ( <a href="mailto:izbx@pge.com">izbx@pge.com</a> )
Marginal Grid Electricity Set	Lbs / MWh	489.16 CO <sub>2</sub> 0.00808 N <sub>2</sub> O 0.03024 CH <sub>4</sub>	Utility Pacific Gas and Electric Coefficient set provided by CACP2009

# APPENDIX C: DETAILED METHODOLOGY FOR COMMUNITY-WIDE INVENTORY

**TABLE 4: SOCAL GAS CO COEFFICIENT SETS**

<b>Coefficient Set</b>	<b>Unit</b>	<b>Value</b>	<b>Source</b>
Fuel CO <sub>2</sub> Set	kg/MMBtu	53.060	Coefficient set provided by CACP2009
RCI Average Set - Residential	kg/MMBtu	0.001 N <sub>2</sub> O 0.0059 CH <sub>4</sub>	Coefficient set created by the CEC and provided by SoCal Gas Co.
RCI Average Set - Commercial	kg/MMBtu	0.001 N <sub>2</sub> O 0.0059 CH <sub>4</sub>	Coefficient set created by the CEC and provided by SoCal Gas Co.
RCI Average Set - Industrial	kg/MMBtu	0.001 N <sub>2</sub> O 0.0059 CH <sub>4</sub>	Coefficient set created by the CEC and provided by SoCal Gas Co.

## TRANSPORTATION

### ***Community On-Road VMT***

Community on-road vehicle miles traveled (VMT) are miles traveled on locally maintained roads within the City of Morro Bay. State roads, highways, and interstate routes are not included in this calculation. Local VMT data was obtained from the Caltrans Highway Performance Maintenance System (HPMS) 2005 Report. The raw data obtained from this report is reflected in the table below.

# APPENDIX C: DETAILED METHODOLOGY FOR COMMUNITY-WIDE INVENTORY

**TABLE 5: CALTRANS HPMS DATA FOR  
SAN LUIS OBISPO COUNTY, 2005**

San Luis Obispo County	Jurisdiction	Maintained Miles			Daily Vehicle Miles of Travel (DVMT) (1,000)		
		Rural	Urban	Total	Rural	Urban	Total
Cities:	Arroyo Grande	0	58.52	58.52	0	199.7	199.70
	Atascadero	4.36	146.03	150.39	1.86	285.52	287.37
	Grover Beach	0	40.87	40.87	0	98.81	98.81
	Morro Bay	0	49.51	49.51	0	115.77	115.77
	Paso Robles	6.55	112.82	119.37	3.89	253.29	257.19
	Pismo Beach	0	45.47	45.47	0	64.25	64.25
	San Luis Obispo	0	121.08	121.08	0	443.81	443.81
Other:	County (unincorporated)	1073.65	240.16	1,313.81	767.21	399.72	1,166.93
	State Highway	278.41	85.47	363.88	2,432.14	2,849.85	5,281.98
	State Park Service	20.56	1.7	22.26	1.85	5.78	7.63
	US Fish & Wildlife Service	19.19	0	19.19	6.72	0	6.72
	US Forest Service	42.5	0	42.5	1.28	0	1.28
<b>SAN LUIS OBISPO Total</b>		<b>1445.22</b>	<b>901.63</b>	<b>2,342.71</b>	<b>3214.95</b>	<b>4716.5</b>	<b>7931.44</b>

The rural and urban daily vehicle miles of travel (DVMT) were then converted to annual VMT by multiplying by 365 days/year. The HPMS DVMT average includes lessened travel on weekends, which means this methodology is appropriate.

# APPENDIX C: DETAILED METHODOLOGY FOR COMMUNITY-WIDE INVENTORY

**TABLE 6: CALTRANS HPMS DATA ADJUSTED  
FOR ANNUAL VMT PER JURISDICTION, 2005**

City	Community On-Road Annual VMT
Arroyo Grande	72,890,500
Atascadero	104,890,050
Grover Beach	36,065,650
Morro Bay	42,256,050
Paso Robles	93,847,350
Pismo Beach	23,451,250
San Luis Obispo	161,990,650
Unincorporated County	425,929,450
Total	961,347,950

### ***Highway VMT***

Highway VMT are miles traveled on highways and interstate routes. Highway VMT data was also given in the Caltrans HPMS report; however, it is aggregated by county rather than by city. As such, we calculated the city's VMT by determining the portion of total highway road segments within the incorporated area. This was done using Geographic Information Systems (GIS) to 'clip' a map of highway roads in the San Luis Obispo County by jurisdictional boundary. The analysis concluded that 1.6% of total state and federal highways and roads are included in the city. Using this as an indicator of VMT, we concluded that approximately 30.847 million VMT occurred in the city in 2005. This methodology of distributing VMT by road segment length is supported by ICLEI; however, it does assume constant levels of traffic along all roads within the county. The levels of traffic along each road segment in each jurisdiction are unavailable, therefore this methodology is the best available at this time.

This analysis includes the following State Routes:

- US 1
- State Route 41

# APPENDIX C: DETAILED METHODOLOGY FOR COMMUNITY-WIDE INVENTORY

**TABLE 7: STATE HIGHWAY VMT PER JURISDICTION, 2005**

City	Highway maintained miles	Percentage of total maintained highway miles	Highway VMT Annual Totals per jurisdiction
Arroyo Grande	4.3683	1.2147%	23,419,197.36
Atascadero	15.4372	4.2927%	82,760,872.61
Grover Beach	0.9577	0.2663%	5,134,376.99
Morro Bay	5.7539	1.6000%	30,847,605.74
Paso Robles	10.6936	2.9737%	57,329,868.21
Pismo Beach	7.8788	2.1909%	42,239,547.18
San Luis Obispo	10.3831	2.8873%	55,665,080.01
Unincorporated County	304.1360	84.5739%	1,630,518,574.64
Total	359.61	99.9996%	1,927,915,122.74

### ***Transportation Coefficients***

By default, the CACP 2009 software uses a national average distribution of vehicles by type (passenger vehicle, light truck, heavy truck, etc), national average fuel economies per vehicle type (miles per gallon), and national average emissions coefficients. In order to provide an accurate assessment of the emissions within the city, we obtained county-specific emissions data from the California Air Resources Board Emissions FACTors (EMFAC) software. The EMFAC2007 model calculates emission rates from all motor vehicles, such as passenger cars to heavy-duty trucks, operating on highways, freeways and local roads in California. In the EMFAC model, the emission rates are multiplied with vehicle activity data provided by the regional transportation agencies to calculate the statewide or regional emission inventories.

The EMFAC analysis was performed by the California Air Resources Board for San Luis Obispo County. Specifically, the data was provided by:

- Tom Scheffelin, California Air Resources Board Planning and Technical Support Division, [Tscheffe@arb.ca.gov](mailto:Tscheffe@arb.ca.gov)

This data was then manipulated to fit the format of CACP2009, which uses different vehicle classification categories than EMFAC. For instance, CACP2009 defines “heavy duty truck” as

## APPENDIX C: DETAILED METHODOLOGY FOR COMMUNITY-WIDE INVENTORY

trucks with a gross vehicle weight of over 8,000 pounds, which includes EMFAC classifications for Light Heavy-Duty Trucks (LHDT) 1, LDHT 2, Medium Heavy-Duty Trucks (MHDT), and Heavy Heavy-Duty Trucks (HHDT). Additionally, CACP2009 does not include categories for transit buses or motorcycles. To account for these vehicle types the fuel efficiency for the Diesel Heavy Duty Vehicles was manipulated to include Transit Buses, based on a weighted average of Trucks representing 98.7% of the category and Transit Buses representing 3.3%. Similarly, the emission factors for Gasoline Passenger Cars was manipulated to include Motorcycles, based on a weighted average of Passenger Vehicles representing 98.7% of the category and Motorcycles representing 1.3%. For simplicity in re-running this analysis for future Inventories, tailored coefficients and VMT distributions were only applied to five vehicle types, which included the following EMFAC vehicle classifications:

- 1) **Heavy truck:** LHDT1, LHDT2, HHDT, OB, MHDT
- 2) **Light truck/SUV/Pickup:** MDT
- 3) **Passenger Vehicle:** Passenger Car, LDT1, LDT2
- 4) **Transit Bus:** Urban Bus (UB), School Bus (SB)
- 5) **Motorcycle:** Motorcycle (MC)

For each of the five vehicle classes above, a weighted average was calculated using the EMFAC coefficients and their portion of total vehicle miles traveled.

### WASTE

The methane commitment method embedded in CACP2009 is based on the EPA's WASTE Reduction Model (WARM) for calculating lifecycle emissions from waste generated within the jurisdictional boundary of the city in 2005. The analysis does not use the waste-in-place method, which calculates emissions from all waste generated in 2005 and all waste already existing in the landfill before the baseline year.

The waste sector takes into account the waste sent to landfill from city residents, businesses, and institutions. It does not calculate emissions from the total amount of waste sent to county landfills (Cold Canyon and Chicago Grade) in 2005 since those landfills accept waste from the unincorporated county and incorporated cities.

# APPENDIX C: DETAILED METHODOLOGY FOR COMMUNITY-WIDE INVENTORY

Solid waste tonnage data per jurisdiction was provided by:

- “2005 Disposal Report” by quarter, prepared by the San Luis Obispo Integrated Waste Management Board on 3/6/06. Document provided by Peter Cron, San Luis Obispo County Integrated Waste Management Authority ([pcron@iwma.com](mailto:pcron@iwma.com)).

Since the composition of waste sent to landfill in 2005 is unknown for the city, the following statewide average waste composition study was utilized:

- CIWMB 2004 Statewide Waste Characterization Study, <http://www.ciwmb.ca.gov/Publications/default.asp?pubid=1097>.

The Waste Characterization Study’s distribution of waste by type was then converted into the five categories included in the CACP2009 software, which resulted in the following waste characterization:

- Paper Products: 20.5%
- Food Waste: 12%
- Plant Debris: 9.3%
- Wood/Textiles: 19.2%
- All other waste: 39%

The CACP2009 software does not have the ability to assign an individual methane recovery factor to each landfill; therefore, we took a weighted average (60%) based on the portion of waste in each landfill. The methane recovery factors of the landfills are well documented by the San Luis Obispo Air Pollution Control District based on the system operations at that time. **Table 8** includes methane recovery factors for the Chicago Grade and Cold Canyon landfills.

# APPENDIX C: DETAILED METHODOLOGY FOR COMMUNITY-WIDE INVENTORY

**TABLE 8: COMMUNITY GENERATED WASTE, 2005**

<b>Methane recovery and indicator inputs, 2005</b>	<b>Methane Recovery</b>	<b>Total gas generated (mmcf/yr)</b>	<b>Total gas transferred (mmcf/yr)</b>	<b>Data Source</b>	<b>Waste Tonnage from city, 2005 (tons)</b>
Chicago Grade	60%	157.47	94.48	Data from APCD 2005 Inventory	31,097
Cold Canyon	60%	700.00	400.00	Data from APCD 2005 Inventory	26

***Other – Off-road agricultural equipment***

Off-road agricultural equipment emissions were calculated using the OFFROAD2007 modeling software developed by the California Air Resources Board. The tool calculates total emissions per off-road category per emission type (CH<sub>4</sub>, N<sub>2</sub>O, CO<sub>2</sub>, etc) for the entire county, including incorporated and unincorporated areas.

To separate the aggregate 2005 emissions outputs for off-road agricultural equipment in the city, we used agriculture and crop GIS shape files provided by San Luis Obispo County. These shape files were clipped with the jurisdictional boundaries within the county by PMC to yield the following results:

# APPENDIX C: DETAILED METHODOLOGY FOR COMMUNITY-WIDE INVENTORY

**TABLE 9: OFF-ROAD AG EMISSIONS PER JURISDICTION, 2005**

<b>Ag land and off-road ag equipment emissions per jurisdiction, 2005</b>	<b>Ag/OS<sup>1</sup> (acres)</b>	<b>% of total</b>	<b>N<sub>2</sub>O (tons/yr)</b>	<b>CH<sub>4</sub> (tons/yr)</b>	<b>CO<sub>2</sub> (tons/yr)</b>
Arroyo Grande	365.10	0.11%	0.0010	0.0164	79.9719
Atascadero	740.20	0.23%	0.0019	0.0333	162.1341
Grover Beach	287.10	0.09%	0.0008	0.0129	62.8867
Morro Bay	1,040.80	0.32%	0.0027	0.0469	227.9778
Paso Robles	2,517.50	0.78%	0.0066	0.1134	551.4356
Pismo Beach	119.90	0.04%	0.0003	0.0054	26.2630
San Luis Obispo	311.20	0.10%	0.0008	0.0140	68.1655
Unincorporated County	317,226.40	98.33%	0.8356	14.2859	69,485.5771
Total	322,608.20	100.00%	0.849826062	14.5283	70,664.41178

The OFFROAD software calculates emissions from other sources of off-road equipment as well, including recreational vehicles and watercrafts; however, these emissions were not included because there was no feasible methodology for separating these emissions per jurisdiction within the county. Population is proven to not be an accurate indicator of consumption rates. To remain consistent with protocol and practice, emissions must be separated in a spatial manner, similar to how highway emissions are determined by road segment length within each jurisdiction. It should also be noted that many location-sources of off-road emissions, such as recreational vehicle emissions, occur in State Parks or Beaches outside of the jurisdiction of each city or the county.

---

<sup>1</sup> Land identified as agricultural or open space uses provided by San Luis Obispo County.

# APPENDIX C: DETAILED METHODOLOGY FOR COMMUNITY-WIDE INVENTORY

## 2020 AND 2025 FORECAST

The 2020 and 2025 forecasts calculate business-as-usual growth based on population, job, and household growth rates. Employment and population baseline data was obtained from the San Luis Obispo Council of Governments report, "Long Range Socio-Economic Projections (Year 2030)" prepared by Economic Research Associates (ERA) in May 2006, Revised July 2006. Employment and population projections were obtained from the May 2009 Revision. Mid-range estimates of growth were used in both instances. It should be noted that these forecasts do not take into consideration any planned or actual efficiency or conservation measures after 2005. For example, the State Renewable Energy portfolio has advanced significantly since 2005, but the forecast calculates 2020 energy emissions by assuming constant emissions factors.



**APPENDIX D:  
DETAILED METHODOLOGY FOR CITY  
GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS INVENTORY**





# APPENDIX D: DETAILED METHODOLOGY FOR CITY GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS INVENTORY

## Detailed Methodology for Government Operations GHG Emissions Inventory

The detailed methodology for government operations is much less complex than the community-wide methodology explanation. Since the government operations GHG emissions inventory is a facility-scale study, data records are much more reliable and consistent. In addition, the Local Government Operations Protocol provides us a verified guide for calculating emissions in each sector.

### BUILDING

The building sector includes all emissions from natural gas and electricity consumed in City-owned and - operated facilities. The kWh of electricity and therms of natural gas were then entered into the CACP2009 software where they were converted to CO<sub>2</sub>e. For a complete list of buildings included in this sector, please see the detailed CACP2009 report in **Appendix B**.

The building sector used the PG&E verified Average Grid Electricity Set and the CEC Emission Factor for Natural Gas RCI Average Set, as defined in **Appendix C**. The analysis did not use the PG&E natural gas coefficient for the fuel CO<sub>2</sub> set because natural gas comes entirely from the Southern California Gas Company.

### VEHICLE FLEET

The vehicle fleet sector includes gasoline and diesel vehicles from the following City departments:

- Public Services
- Fire
- Parks
- Police
- Administration
- Harbor
- Water
- Wastewater

Gasoline and diesel consumption for calendar year 2005 was obtained from fuel billing statements provided by the Cindy Jacinth, Public Services ([CJacinth@morro-bay.ca.us](mailto:CJacinth@morro-bay.ca.us)). Specific sources of data within each organization are outlined in the notes of **Appendix B**.

# APPENDIX D: DETAILED METHODOLOGY FOR CITY GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS INVENTORY

For the vehicle fleet, we used the County EMFAC coefficients for gasoline and diesel described in **Appendix C**. These are weighted averages per multiple vehicle types in San Luis Obispo County.

## EMPLOYEE COMMUTE

Employees were surveyed in June 2010 using an online survey instrument. The questions, attached as **Appendix E**, asked employees about their current commuting patterns. Of those questions, we used the following for our analysis:

- What is your approximate one-way distance to work (in miles)? Please indicate the most direct distance to work, discounting midway destinations that would be taken whether or not you drove to work each day (i.e. dropping off children at school).
- Please indicate the type of transportation you take to work each day in your average work week. Please note that there are two types of carpooling.
  - ◇ Drive alone
  - ◇ Carpool with fellow City employees
  - ◇ Carpool with drivers not employed by the City
  - ◇ Vanpool
  - ◇ Public transit
  - ◇ Motorcycle
  - ◇ Bicycle
  - ◇ Walk
  - ◇ Telecommute
  - ◇ Other
- What type of vehicle do you drive?
- What type of fuel does your vehicle use?
- If you carpool with fellow City employees, how many City employees ride with you? If you carpool with a different number each day, please indicate the average.

Approximately 63 employees responded to the survey with usable information, meaning that all essential questions were answered. Answers with mileage left blank or with highly inconsistent data (ex: saying they walked three days to work, biked two, and drove five) were omitted. In

# APPENDIX D: DETAILED METHODOLOGY FOR CITY GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS INVENTORY

addition, if a respondent did not describe their 'other' category of transportation, the entry was omitted.

To perform this analysis, we took the following steps:

- 1) Separate entries by what type of vehicle they own and operate (compact, midsize car, full-size car, small truck, medium-small truck, large truck, motorcycle or "don't drive"). Within each new group, separate the entries by diesel, gasoline or hybrid.
- 2) For each group of entries with the same vehicle type and technology, multiply the number of miles to work by 2 (to get round-trip estimate) and then by the number of 'drive alone' days for each entry. Multiply the number of miles to work by the number of 'carpool' days (half of the 'drive alone' emissions). Note: If a respondent entered that they motorcycle to work, but own a car as well, the motorcycle miles were moved to the motorcycle category). Adjust for hybrids (see below).
- 3) Add all miles per vehicle type and technology and multiply by 52.18 work weeks/year.
- 4) Calculate the multiplier to adjust survey response data to the entire 2005 employee population. In 2005, there were 110 employees. This, divided by the 63 survey entries, gives us our multiplier of 1.75.
- 5) Multiply the mileage per vehicle per technology type by the multiplier.
- 6) Divide the number of hybrid miles by three and add the difference to the 'passenger car' category. This is to account for the large increase in hybrid sales between 2005 and 2009 (Source: Hybridcars.com sales statistics).
- 7) Multiply the number of biodiesel by 30% and add the remainder to the 'passenger car' diesel category. This is to account for the increase in biodiesel consumption between 2005 and 2009 (Source: DOE sales statistics).
- 8) Manipulate the vehicle classes to fit the CACP2009 software categories.
- 9) Enter final miles into the CACP2009 software per vehicle type and fuel.

# APPENDIX D: DETAILED METHODOLOGY FOR CITY GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS INVENTORY

**TABLE 1: 2010 EMPLOYEE COMMUTE SURVEY**

Vehicle Group	2009 Survey results		Adjusted for 2005	
	Annual VMT	Fuel Type	Annual VMT	Fuel Type
Light Truck/SUV/Pickup	66,341.65	Gasoline	116,097.89	Gasoline
	0.00	Diesel	0.00	Diesel
Large Truck	29,732.16	Gasoline	52,031.29	Gasoline
	36,891.26	Diesel	64,559.71	Diesel
Passenger Vehicle	223,627.83	Gasoline	387,459.99	Gasoline
	0.00	Diesel	0.00	Diesel
	0.00	Biodiesel	0.00	Biodiesel
Motorcycle	0.00	Gasoline	0.00	Gasoline
Total	356,592.90		620,148.88	

The CACP2009 software does not provide a method of calculating emissions from hybrid cars. As a result, these emissions were divided by 2.20 based on the difference between average fuel economy of a 2005 Toyota Prius and the average fuel economy included in the 2005 SLO EMFAC data and then entered into the CACP2009 software under 'passenger vehicle' (Source: [www.fueleconomy.gov](http://www.fueleconomy.gov)).

## **STREETLIGHTS**

The City's Finance Department provided billing information for the electricity used to operate City streetlights and traffic signals. The total kWh were entered into the CACP2009 software using the verified PG&E Average Grid Electricity Set outlined in **Appendix C**.

## **WATER / SEWAGE**

This sector calculates emissions from energy consumption at City-owned and operated wastewater facilities and point-source emissions that arise from wastewater treatment processes. The Finance Department provided the electricity consumption for each of the water facilities. Operational data provided by the Wastewater Treatment Plant Manager was utilized to determine total methane and nitrous oxide emissions using ICLEI's Wastewater Emissions Data tool. Both of these sources are outlined in **Appendix B**. The City of Morro Bay and the Cayucos

# APPENDIX D: DETAILED METHODOLOGY FOR CITY GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS INVENTORY

Community Services District (CSD) co-own the wastewater treatment plant. Because the treatment plant serves residents and businesses outside the City of Morro Bay all emissions should not be attributed to the City per the Local Government Operations Protocol. Emissions were attributed in proportion to the percentage of ownership. The City of Morro Bay owns 60% of the treatment plant and; therefore, 60% of the emissions associated with the treatment of wastewater were attributed to the City. These totals were entered into the CACP2009 software with the PG&E Average Grid Electricity Set outlined in **Appendix C**.

## **WASTE**

Morro Bay Garbage Service reported solid waste tonnage produced by City operations. The City produced 298.3 metric tons of waste in 2005 that was sent to managed landfill. The waste composition was unknown for the city; therefore, the California averages provided by the 2004 California Integrated Waste Management Board Waste Characterization Report were used. A weighted average methane recovery factor of 60% was used in this analysis, as outlined in **Appendix C**.





**APPENDIX E:  
CITY EMPLOYEE COMMUTE SURVEY, 2010**



# APPENDIX E: CITY EMPLOYEE COMMUTE SURVEY, 2010

## City Employee Commute Survey, 2010

- 1) What is your approximate on-way distance to work (in miles)? Please indicate the most direct distance to work, discounting midway destinations that would be taken whether or not you drove to work each day (i.e. dropping off children at school).

\_\_\_\_\_

- 2) Please indicate the type of transportation you take to work each day in your average work week. Please note that there are two types of carpooling.

	Day 1	Day 2	Day 3	Day 4	Day 5
Drive Alone	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Carpool with fellow City employees	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Carpool with other drivers not employed by the City	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Vanpool	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Public transit	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Motorcycle	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Bicycle	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Walk	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Telecommute	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

- 3) What type of vehicle do you drive?

- Compact/Sub-Compact car (Civic, Corolla, Focus, Neon, Cavalier, Jetta or similar)
- Mid-size car (Accord, Camry, Passat, Monte Carlo, Sable, Sebring or similar)
- Full-size car (Impala, Intrepid, Taurus, Crown Victoria, Bonneville, Town Car or similar)
- Small Truck/SUV/Pickup (RAV4, Chev S10, Pickup (4 cylinder), PT Cruiser or similar)
- Medium-Small Truck/SUV/Pickup (Minivan, Sonoma Pickup Truck or similar)
- Medium-Large Truck/SUV/Pickup (Durango, Safari Cargo Van, Ford F150 or similar)
- Large Truck/SUV/Pickup (Suburban, Expedition, Navigator, Ford E250/350/450 or similar)
- Motorcycle
- I don't drive alone or drive a carpool

## APPENDIX E: CITY EMPLOYEE COMMUTE SURVEY, 2008

4) What type of fuel does your vehicle from question 3 use?

- Gasoline
- Diesel
- Biodiesel
- Hybrid
- Electric
- I don't drive to work or drive a carpool
- Other (Specify): \_\_\_\_\_

5) If you carpool or vanpool with fellow City employees, how many City employees ride with you? If you carpool with a different number each day, please indicate the average. If 'not applicable', please enter "0".

Enter # of people: \_\_\_\_\_