Transportation Consortium of South-Central States

Tran-SET

Solving Emerging Transportation Resiliency, Sustainability, and Economic Challenges through the Use of Innovative Materials and Construction Methods: From Research to Implementation

Lifecycle Environmental Impact of High-Speed Rail System in the I-45 Corridor

Project No. 18PPPVU01

Lead University: Prairie View A&M University

Final Report
August 2019

Disclaimer

The contents of this report reflect the views of the authors, who are responsible for the facts and the accuracy of the information presented herein. This document is disseminated in the interest of information exchange. The report is funded, partially or entirely, by a grant from the U.S. Department of Transportation's University Transportation Centers Program. However, the U.S. Government assumes no liability for the contents or use thereof.

Acknowledgements

The PIs would like to acknowledge the contribution of Jesuina Chipindula, Research Assistant, Center for Energy & Environmental Sustainability, Prairie View A&M University, in conducting Life Cycle Assessment with SimaPro; and also acknowledge the critical review provided by Dr. Hongbo Du, Post-Doctoral Researcher, Center for Energy & Environmental Sustainability, Prairie View A&M University.

TECHNICAL DOCUMENTATION PAGE

1. Project No.	2. Government Accession No.	3. Recipient's Catalog No.
18PPPVU01		

4. Title and Subtitle **Lifecycle Environmental Impact of High-Speed Rail System in the I-45 Corridor**	**5. Report Date** August 2019 **6. Performing Organization Code: PP**
7. Author(s) PI: Raghava Kommalapati https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3267-6684 Co-PI: Venkata Botlaguduru https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8146-0620 Co-PI: Doeun Choe https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3618-1312	**8. Performing Organization Report No.**
9. Performing Organization Name and Address Transportation Consortium of South-Central States (Tran-SET) University Transportation Center for Region 6 3319 Patrick F. Taylor Hall, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, LA 70803	**10. Work Unit No. (TRAIS)** **11. Contract or Grant No.** 69A3551747106
12. Sponsoring Agency Name and Address United States of America Department of Transportation Research and Innovative Technology Administration	**13. Type of Report and Period Covered** Final Research Report Mar. 2018 – Mar. 2019 **14. Sponsoring Agency Code**

15. Supplementary Notes

Report uploaded and accessible at Tran-SET's website (http://transet.lsu.edu/).

16. Abstract

Abstract: The Houston-Dallas (I-45) corridor is the busiest route among 18 traffic corridors in Texas. The expected population growth and the surge in passenger mobility could result in a significant impact on the regional environment. This study uses a life cycle framework to estimate the net change in environmental impact with the development of a high speed rail (HSR) System along the I-45 corridor. The study follows ISO 14040 principles and standards of life cycle assessment, and uses SimaPro 8.5® software and the Ecoinvent 3.3 inventory database. Infrastructure construction, vehicle manufacturing, system operation and end of life phases are included in the life cycle assessment. The energy and emissions of the system are evaluated per vehicle/passenger-kilometers traveled and compared with the existing transportation modes. Vehicle component accounts for 14.50 kgCO_2eq/VKT, of which fossil-fuel usage during operation is the primary contributor with 98% of the greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. For the infrastructure component, 56.76% of GHG emissions result from the material extraction and processing phase (23.75kgCO_2eq/VKT). Life cycle CO_2 emissions of this system are 40% lower than comparable systems in Europe, Asia and North America. The minimum ridership levels required to offset the environmental impact from conventional modes of transport are around 12% and 27% for GHG emissions and NOx emissions respectively. For the stakeholders, policy makers and community leaders, this study recommends the construction of HSR system between Dallas –Houston since it does not only save time, reduces traffic jam, and improve passengers' mobility, but it also saves energy, which benefits the regional environment. In addition, we developed a presentation to share with the stakeholders along with the report.

17. Key Words	18. Distribution Statement
Environmental Impact; CO_2 Emissions; Life Cycle Impact Assessment	No restrictions. This document is available through the National Technical Information Service, Springfield, VA 22161.

19. Security Classif. (of this report)	20. Security Classif. (of this page)	21. No. of Pages	22. Price
Unclassified	Unclassified	41	

Form DOT F 1700.7 (8-72) **Reproduction of completed page authorized.**

SI* (MODERN METRIC) CONVERSION FACTORS				
APPROXIMATE CONVERSIONS TO SI UNITS				
Symbol	**When You Know**	**Multiply By**	**To Find**	**Symbol**
		LENGTH		
in	inches	25.4	millimeters	mm
ft	feet	0.305	meters	m
yd	yards	0.914	meters	m
mi	miles	1.61	kilometers	km
		AREA		
in^2	square inches	645.2	square millimeters	mm^2
ft^2	square feet	0.093	square meters	m^2
yd^2	square yard	0.836	square meters	m^2
ac	acres	0.405	hectares	ha
mi^2	square miles	2.59	square kilometers	km^2
		VOLUME		
fl oz	fluid ounces	29.57	milliliters	mL
gal	gallons	3.785	liters	L
ft^3	cubic feet	0.028	cubic meters	m^3
yd^3	cubic yards	0.765	cubic meters	m^3
		NOTE: volumes greater than 1000 L shall be shown in m^3		
		MASS		
oz	ounces	28.35	grams	g
lb	pounds	0.454	kilograms	kg
T	short tons (2000 lb)	0.907	megagrams (or "metric ton")	Mg (or "t")
		TEMPERATURE (exact degrees)		
^oF	Fahrenheit	5 (F-32)/9 or (F-32)/1.8	Celsius	^oC
		ILLUMINATION		
fc	foot-candles	10.76	lux	lx
fl	foot-Lamberts	3.426	candela/m^2	cd/m^2
		FORCE and PRESSURE or STRESS		
lbf	poundforce	4.45	newtons	N
lbf/in^2	poundforce per square inch	6.89	kilopascals	kPa
APPROXIMATE CONVERSIONS FROM SI UNITS				
Symbol	**When You Know**	**Multiply By**	**To Find**	**Symbol**
		LENGTH		
mm	millimeters	0.039	inches	in
m	meters	3.28	feet	ft
m	meters	1.09	yards	yd
km	kilometers	0.621	miles	mi
		AREA		
mm^2	square millimeters	0.0016	square inches	in^2
m^2	square meters	10.764	square feet	ft^2
m^2	square meters	1.195	square yards	yd^2
ha	hectares	2.47	acres	ac
km^2	square kilometers	0.386	square miles	mi^2
		VOLUME		
mL	milliliters	0.034	fluid ounces	fl oz
L	liters	0.264	gallons	gal
m^3	cubic meters	35.314	cubic feet	ft^3
m^3	cubic meters	1.307	cubic yards	yd^3
		MASS		
g	grams	0.035	ounces	oz
kg	kilograms	2.202	pounds	lb
Mg (or "t")	megagrams (or "metric ton")	1.103	short tons (2000 lb)	T
		TEMPERATURE (exact degrees)		
^oC	Celsius	1.8C+32	Fahrenheit	^oF
		ILLUMINATION		
lx	lux	0.0929	foot-candles	fc
cd/m^2	candela/m^2	0.2919	foot-Lamberts	fl
		FORCE and PRESSURE or STRESS		
N	newtons	0.225	poundforce	lbf
kPa	kilopascals	0.145	poundforce per square inch	lbf/in^2

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF FIGURES

LIST OF TABLES

ACRONYMS, ABBREVIATIONS, AND SYMBOLS

Becquerel	Bq
Carbon dioxide equivalent	$CO_{2\ eq}$
Carbon Monoxide	CO
Ethene	C_2H_4
Nitrogen Oxides	NOx
Phosphate ion	PO_4
Radioactive isotope	C-14
Square meter organic	m^2org.
Sulfur dioxide	SO_2
Triethylene glycol	TEG
Vinyl chloride	C_2H_3Cl
Annual Average Daily Traffic	AADT
Criteria Air Pollutants	CAP
Dallas Fort Worth Arlington	DFWA
Dallas Forth Worth	DFW
Departments of Transportation	DOTs
Environmental Protection Agency	EPA
Environmental Impact Assessment	EIA
Electric Reliability Council of Texas	ERCOT
Federal Highway Administration	FHWA
Greenhouse gases	GHG
Houston Sugar Land Baytown	HSLB
High Speed Rail	HSR
Interstate 45	I-45
International Panel of Climate Change	IPCC
International Organization for Standardization	ISO
Life Cycle Assessment	LCA
Life Cycle Impact	LCI
Life Cycle Impact Assessment	LCIA

Mega joule	MJ
Maintenance-of-Way	MOW
Megawatt-hour	MWh
National Environmental Policy Act	NEPA
National Renewable Energy Laboratory	NREL
National Energy Technology Laboratory	NETL
Operation and Maintenance	O&M
Passenger Kilometers Travelled	PKT
Particulate Matter	PM
Person (seat)	P
Respiratory Inorganics	RI
Sport Utility Vehicles	SUV
Transient Maintenance Facility	TMF
Texas Commission on Environmental Quality	TCEQ
Texas A&M Transportation Institute	TTI
Texas Department of Transportation	TxDOT
Total lifetime emission of a given pollutant	Q
Vehicle and infrastructure lifetime emission of a given pollutant	$Q_{V/INFRA}$
Vehicle emissions per Person Kilometers Traveled	E
Vehicle utilization rate	R
Volatile Organic Compounds	VOC

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Increased urbanization rates inflict stresses on transportation infrastructure and Texas has three of the ten largest metro areas in the U.S. (Houston, San Antonio and Dallas), with an estimated population growth of 70% by 2050 (*1*). With the increase in population, the total mobility in passenger kilometers traveled (PKT) is projected to be four times greater than the national average level. Therefore, it is pertinent to consider the development of a high speed rail (HSR) system to accommodate the travel demand and mitigate the environmental impact of the transportation sector in this region. One of the most successful strategies often used in Japan, Europe and China is the migration of road traffic to railway system which is generally more environmentally beneficial. Studies comparing the environmental impact of car and HSR transportation show considerable benefits toward reducing the energy used and pollutants. In an effort to develop sustainable transportation modes, legislators initiated significant steps toward the implementation of an HSR system using Shinkansen N700 series trains.

However, the construction phase requires a significant amount of energy and material, consequently resulting in an increase in the environmental impact. A cumulative assessment of the overall environmental impact from the proposed HSR system requires a life cycle assessment (LCA) study that accounts for all emissions generated over its lifetime, including phases such as raw material extraction and processing, manufacturing and construction, operation & maintenance and end of life. LCA is one of the most effective methods that estimate the environmental impact and evaluate mitigation methods and technologies. The environmental impact of infrastructure construction may not contribute to sustainable mobility. Studies comparing road, air and railway systems conducted in Europe, Asia and the U.S., indicate rail transportation as one of the most sustainable modes that have significantly lower releases of criteria air pollutants (CAPs) and greenhouse gases (GHGs). It is of vital importance that quantitative environmental analysis with a life-cycle perspective that includes all phases (raw material extraction, manufacturing, transportation, construction, operation & maintenance, and end-of-life) be conducted for the HSR system in Texas. The current project conducts an environmental LCA as per the framework and procedures of ISO 14040 and ISO 14041. Data collections for the input and output were consistent with similar studies in the U.S., Europe and Asia. The HSR system analysis was divided into two main sub-systems (Vehicle and infrastructure), in which, each subsystem accounts for various phase life cycle processes including raw material extraction and processing, vehicle manufacturing, material distribution, construction, operation & maintenance and end-life. In addition, the system boundary also accounts for phase study of facilities and auxiliary equipment used during the operation and maintenance of the HSR system. The inventory base case begins with Ecoinvent v3 process for transportation services, adjusted to reflect the actual conditions of the Dallas-Houston HSR system.

The estimated energy and emissions are evaluated per passenger-kilometers traveled (PKT) and compared with the existing transportation modes. Vehicle component accounts for 0.19 kgCO2eqPKT, of which fossil-fuel usage during operation is the primary contributor with 97% of the greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. For the infrastructure component, 94% of GHG emissions are contributed by the construction phase (0.21 kgCO2eq/PKT). The minimum ridership levels required to offset the environmental impact from conventional modes of transport, such as personal cars, bus and aircraft, are around 12% and 27% for GHG emissions and NOx emissions respectively.

To the stakeholders, policy makers, community leaders, and Texas Central, this study recommends the implementation of a continue education program to increase public awareness on the environmental benefits of HSR, at the same time they maximize the use of renewable energy for HSR system operation. It is expected that, the increase in awareness, will reduce the population of passengers traveling by car, maximize the percentage of train occupancy, improve mobility and air quality. In addition, this study also found that, the use of renewable energy can significantly reduce the total environmental impact generated by construction of the HSR system.

1. INTRODUCTION

Interstate 45 (I-45) highway (**Error! Reference source not found.**) connects the 4th and 5th largest metropolitan areas of the U.S., Houston and Dallas, respectively, and has an annual average daily traffic (AADT) volume as high as 314,000 in 2016 (*2*). The I-45 corridor connects the Gulf Coast, a major port area, to domestic markets in Texas, and it is of crucial importance to the economy of the State of Texas. The combined GDP of the two metropolitan areas of Dallas-Fort Worth-Arlington (DFWA) and Houston-Sugar Land-Baytown (HSLB), is estimated to be close to $ 1 trillion in 2016 (*3*). A recent report from the Texas Department of Transportation (TxDOT) estimated that half of total truck freight in Texas traverses through the 11 counties comprising the I-45 freight corridor (*4*). The 276 mile I-45 highway also gained strategic significance in terms of public safety, with the national disasters associated with Hurricanes, Rita (2005), Ike (2008) and Harvey (2017) (*5*). Considering the economic and public safety significance of the I-45 corridor, Texas A&M Transportation Institute (TTI) studied the potential for the development of Intercity Passenger Transit System in 18 corridors of Texas and ranked the Houston to Dallas corridor as the highest priority route in the state of Texas (*6*). The construction of an alternative mass transit HSR system in this route would alleviate stress on I-45 and improve the efficiency of commodity transport by truck.



Figure 1. Dallas-Houston HSR utility corridor (1; 2**)**

The city councils of Dallas and Houston have recently taken legislative steps toward the construction of a 386.24-kilometers HSR system to connect Dallas and Houston; the system will have a top speed of 200 mph (*7*). The estimated traveling was calculated using a highway centerline geographic data from the TxDOT, measured from city center to city-center. The geographic limits are the delineated counties, which represents the project limit of disturbance for construction, material storage and disposal.

The utility corridor with high-voltage electric transmission lines between the DFW and HSLB regions is shown in Figure 1 (*8*). Although the rationale for a mass transit system on this route is unquestionable, there is an *imperative to examine the life cycle environmental impacts of this proposed HSR system* and compare it with the environmental impact associated with existing modes of transportation. HSR systems, typically powered by electricity, have significant environmental benefits during the operation stage in comparison to conventional transportation by road/air fueled by petroleum products. During the operation stage, HSR systems have a minimal release of regulated (criteria air pollutants) CAPs and greenhouse gases GHGs (*9-13*). This could immensely benefit air quality in the nonattainment areas of Houston and Dallas. However, consideration of the total life cycle of an HSR system includes stages such as raw material extraction, infrastructure development, vehicle manufacturing, and electricity generation for powering the high-speed trains (*14*). A holistic study exploring the potential environmental impact and the role of the HSR system in improving the durability of existing I-45 highway is key to understanding the net socio-economic benefit due to the HSR system. In this context, this project conducted an environmental LCA of the 240-mile corridor between Houston and Dallas, to estimate the potential improvements across four end-point impact categories of Human Health, Ecosystem Quality, Climate Change and Resources.

2. OBJECTIVES

The overall goal of this study is to provide an estimate of the environmental impact resulting from the total life cycle of the Houston-Dallas HSR system. Following are the major objectives to realize the overall goal:

1. Develop the framework for methodological environmental LCA of current/proposed HSR corridors in the south-central US
2. Estimate the net change in GHG emissions and global warming potential ($CO_{2,\ eq}$) due to the Houston-Dallas HSR system from a lifecycle perspective
3. Evaluate the effect of the HSR system in improving the regional air quality of Texas with emphasis on Houston-Galveston-Brazoria area
4. Compare the improvements in sustainability resulting from the HSR system under varying degrees of traffic migration/passenger adoption from existing transportation modes
5. Analyze the effect of source electricity mix scenarios on the environmental impacts from the operation phase of the proposed HSR system
6. Provide guidance to stakeholders, policy makers and community leaders on the potential environmental benefits/costs of HSR mode of transportation in the U.S.

3. LITERATURE REVIEW

Considering the complexity of life cycle data acquisition, the research team conducted an extensive peer-reviewed investigation of existing publications, technical reports, documents and databases to gather the necessary information to build a LCA process that reflects the conditions of the HSR systems in the U.S. The literature review data sources considered Journals from different reputed publications, Transportation Research Records, Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) records, and projects of departments of transportation (DOTs) U.S government agency such as Environmental Protection, National Renewable Energy Laboratory (NREL), National Energy Technology Laboratory (NETL) and Argonne National Laboratory, environmental/energy assessment studies for life cycle processes of HSR systems and Shinkansen train-based HSR systems. The data was used to ascertain the extent and quality of information available for the LCA study proposed in this project. Additionally, the current and historic AADT data for various highway segments between Dallas and Houston was obtained from TxDOT to estimate the peak usage and trends of traffic statistics for the I-45 corridor. The comprehensive database of literature along with the Ecoinvent 3.3 databases enabled the development of vehicle and infrastructure processes of I-45 HSR LCA system.

According to the 2014 International Panel of Climate Change (IPCC) report, the transportation sector contributed 14% of the global GHG emissions (*13*). The U.S Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) report on *U.S. Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Sinks,* shows that transportation leads the total U.S GHG emissions, with 28% share (*14*). Transportation accounts for 10% of gross domestic product, 70% of all petroleum use and 27% of GHG emissions, and 58% of the total transportation emissions are from light-duty vehicles (*15*). The Texas Commission of Environmental Quality (TCEQ) report shows that mobile sources contributed 67% of nitrogen oxide (NOx) emissions, and 23% of volatile organic (VOC) emissions in the Greater Houston Area (*16*). This is directly linked to an increase in population and the use of medium and heavy-duty vehicle in this region. Texas has the highest Energy-related carbon dioxide emissions by state (*17*). The increase in criteria pollutants, particularly nitrogen oxide (NOx), carbon monoxide (CO), and particulate matter (PM), originate from regional population growth and increased fossil (fuel) used by the transportation sector.

Increased urbanization rates inflict stresses on transportation infrastructure and Texas has three of the ten largest metro areas in U.S. (Houston, San Antonio and Dallas), with an estimated population growth of 70% by 2050 (*1*). With the increase in population, the total mobility in PKT is projected to be four times greater than the national average level (*18*). Therefore, it is pertinent to consider the development of an HSR system to accommodate the travel demand and mitigate the environmental impact of the transportation sector in this region. One of the most successful strategies often used in Japan, Europe and China is the migration of road traffic to railway system which is generally more environmentally beneficial (*19*). Studies comparing the environmental impact of vehicle and high-speed rail transportation show considerable benefits toward reducing the energy used and pollutants. In the effort to develop sustainable transportation modes, legislators initiated significant steps toward the implementation of an HSR system using Shinkansen N700 series trains. However, the construction phase requires a significant amount of energy, material and consequently results in an increase in environmental impact (*19*). A cumulative assessment of the overall environmental impact from the proposed HSR system requires an LCA study that accounts for all emissions generated over its lifetime, including phases such as raw material extraction and processing, manufacturing and construction, operation &

maintenance and end of life. LCA is one of the most effective methods that estimating the environmental impact and evaluate the mitigation methods and technologies (*20*).

Table 1 summarizes the main reference studies used. In addition to the ones listed below, other studies were also considered for literature review. However, it was observed that researchers compared HSR with other transportation modes using non-LCA approaches.

Table 1. List of reference studies using SimaPro software.

Reference	Objective	Methodology	Approach	Normalized unit	Summary of findings
(*10*)	Evaluate the environmental impacts of China's HSR system between Beijing and Shanghai.	Impact 2002+ IPCC and other default methods.	End-point and mid-point	PKT	Operation stage is the major contributor due to the use of coal during the electricity generation process.
(*21*)	Assess the LCA ecological screening of the German high-speed passenger train system	Single score-Cumulative Energy Demand (CO_2)	Energy and CO_2		Energy consumption dominate the total impact.
(*14; 22*)	Identifies the critical environmental characteristics of several major urban transport networks and the influence that these parameters have on overall performance	Mid-point and single score	Energy, GHG and CAP emissions	Passenger and Vehicle Miles Traveled	Increase in train occupancy reduces the environmental impact at all stages.
(*19*)	Total life cycle environmental impact of the planned high-speed rail line Lisbon- Porto	Mid-point and single score	CO_2, PM_{10} and SO_2 emissions	Km and PKT	Train operation process contributes the most to total environmental emissions

4. METHODOLOGY

The methodology of this LCA results are strictly based framework and procedures of the ISO standards and SimaPro®. Modeling life cycle using the SimaPro® software helps estimate emissions based on the application of ISO 14040 standard and the ecoivent3 methodology. ISO 14040-44 provides guidelines to conduct a cradle to grave evaluation of a product or process.

The international environmental management defines the ISO Standards for LCA. It frames the LCA principles through the definition of goal and scope, life cycle inventory analysis (LCI) phase, the life cycle impact assessment (LCIA) phase, and the life cycle interpretation phase; the reporting and critical review of the LCA iterative processes and phases are described in Figure 2 below. In additions, the standard also provides established cutoff criteria guidelines that eliminate minor impacts and help set up boundaries for the total system inventory.



Figure 2. Four phases of LCA

There are a number of LCA software database and methods, some of which have a similar data set. However, selecting the adequate tool/method requires a systematic evaluation of data credibility, and processes that accounts for the conditions and the specificity of a particular study area and objectives.

Some of the most used methods include:

- Cumulative Energy Demand: Non-renewable and renewable impact category
- Greenhouse gas protocol: GHG emissions
- IPPC 2013: Global warming potential
- USEtox: Human and eco-toxicological impact.
- Ecological footprint: Nuclear energy use, CO_2 emissions, Land occupation
- CML-IA: Mid-point approach

- Impact 2002+: Combination of mi-point/end-point approach.
- ReCipe: Combination mid-point/damage yet oriented to end-point approach.
- EPS 2000: Damage oriented approach.
- Environmental product Declaration: Essentially for a good.
- EI99: Damage oriented approach.

The *Evaluation of Life-Cycle Assessment Tools* (*23*) report provides a list of common LCA software tools used in U.S. and Europe. Out of thirty-seven software, SimaPro is one of the most popular for LCA analyses, in the world. One study found that over a period of 4 –years, there were 71 more published article using SimaPro than all the other software combined (*24*). The increase in the number of users reflects the software's ability to help users minimize the complexity between industrial and ecological systems providing science based methods that identify and analyze environmental results. In addition, the software comes with extensive inventory database (Ecoinvent 3.3) and a diverse impact assessment method that specifically select the data region and the environmental output for each study. Over the years, SimaPro has expanded its assessment boundaries by incorporating new methods and conduct a frequent update on the database to accounts for conditions in Europe, U.S. and other parts of the globe. Method selection depends the study objectives. This study goals is to evaluate the cause to the increase/decrease in emissions with the implementation of Dallas – Houston HSR system. SimaPro methods allows users to perform a cause and effect evaluation of a process/product. Out of many existing methods, Impact 2002+ was selected to account for all emissions, at different scenarios. This methodology provides viability process that associates the input data with mid-point (cause) and endpoint (effect). Table 2 describes the framework of impact 2002+ linking LCI results via the mid-point categories to damage categories. However, considering that the scope of this study is centered on substances/pollutants that ultimately results in damage to human health, ecosystem quality, climate change and resources, all result were presented mid-point (cause).

Data collections for the input and output and the potential environmental impact of the HSR system throughout its life cycle, were consistent with similar studies in the U.S., Europe and Asia. In addition, the life cycle inventory (LCI) databases (Ecoinvent v3) was consulted for each material used. Life Cycle Assessment is one of the most used tools /techniques used to assess the overall environmental impact of a product/process from its cradle to grave. It is distinguished from an environmental impact assessment (EIA) which analyzes and documents potential environmental effects from the construction and operation of a proposed project. EIA, as required by the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), is essentially site-specific and evaluates potential impacts on the local environment from a point-source orientation, considering temporal and spatial situations and existing background environmental quality (*13; 14*). Whereas, the key feature of LCA studies is the inclusion of focus on the product supply chain level and the global environmental implications including degradation of resources (*13*).

Table 2. Schematic of the IMPACT 2002+ framework.

<table>
<tr><th></th><th>Mid-point category</th><th>Damage category</th></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="14">LCI results</td><td>Human toxicity (carcinogens + non-carcinogens)</td><td rowspan="5">Human health</td></tr>
<tr><td>Respiratory (inorganics)</td></tr>
<tr><td>Ionizing radiations</td></tr>
<tr><td>Ozone layer depletion</td></tr>
<tr><td>Respiratory organics</td></tr>
<tr><td>Aquatic ecotoxicity</td><td rowspan="6">Ecosystem quality</td></tr>
<tr><td>Terrestrial ecotoxicity</td></tr>
<tr><td>Acidification/nutrific ation</td></tr>
<tr><td>Aquatic acidification</td></tr>
<tr><td>Aquatic eutrophication</td></tr>
<tr><td>Land occupation</td></tr>
<tr><td>Global warming</td><td>Climate change</td></tr>
<tr><td>Non-renewable energy</td><td rowspan="2">Resources</td></tr>
<tr><td>Mineral extraction</td></tr>
</table>

Source: Owen compilation with reference to impact 2002+ guideline (*24*)

4.1 Definition of Goals and Scope

Under the ISO-standardized LCA, the goal and scope phase establishes the details of the product system being studied which centers in three essential features: the reason for study, intended use and audience. The framework of this study was essential for the development of an environmental assessment impact of a future HSR System across the mid-point impact of human health, climate change, ecosystem quality and resources damage category. Therefore, the environmental scope of this project incorporates the evaluation of selected criteria air pollutants (nitrous, particulate matter, sulfur dioxide and ozone) greenhouse gases (carbon dioxide and methane) and the energy consumption associated with the HSR system and conventional road/air transportation modes. The study includes all the mid-point category and the pollutants associated with them. Yet the special attention was given to those with a high percentage. According to AECOM's report the first operation phase will take place in 2024, with the prior four –years allocated to construction. The geographic area includes the surrounding counties along the I-45 corridor as shown in Figure **1**.

4.1.1 *System Boundaries and Function unit*

In LCA studies the delimitation of system boundaries and function unit are key to interpret the impact assessment results. Figure 3 below depicts the system boundary for both vehicle and infrastructure including the analyses of alternative transportation mode (air and road). The HSR system analysis was divided into three main sub-systems (Vehicle, infrastructure and a combination of both), in which, each subsystem accounts for various phase life cycle processes including raw material extraction and processing, vehicle manufacturing, material distribution, construction, operation & maintenance and end-life. This project selected a function unit of Passenger Kilometer Traveled (PKT) that normalize the energy consumption and allow comparison across transportation modes. In addition, the system boundary also accounts for phase study of facilities and auxiliary equipment used during the operation and maintenance of the HSR system. The complete framework addresses the requirement of objective on (i) proposed for the LCA study of HSR system in Dallas –Houston area.



Figure 3. System boundary and unit processes for the LCA study of HSR system in Texas.

4.2 Life Cycle Inventory Analyses and Assumptions

This project's inventory is based on material balances between input and output. Therefore, the energy and raw materials used and the emissions are quantified for each step in the process. The products and processes can be compared and evaluated using Life Cycle Inventory (LCI) results. A complete list of input for vehicle and infrastructure modeling in listed in Table 3.

Table 3. Description of HSR system life cycle processes by phase

Project Components	LCA Modeling	Major Materials	Energy Production /Resources
Vehicle	Material extraction/Processing (Locomotive and railcars under Japanese conditions).	Steel, aluminum, polyethylene, glass and resin	Electricity medium voltage, heat, light fuel oil, heat, natural gas.
	Transportation (vehicle material during manufacturing phase).	The Shinkansen 700 vehicles being transported by boat from manufacturing company in Osaka, Japan to Galveston bay area in Houston.	Light and heavy fuel oil, heat, natural gas for material Transport using heavy trucks and existing rail
	Manufacturing (parts and assembling)	Reinforced steel, steel, aluminum, copper, polyethylene, tempering flat glass, flat glass, alkyd paint,	Electricity medium voltage, heat, fuel, heat, natural gas, heat.
	Operations/Maintenance (vehicle running and maintenance)	Diesel, lubricant oil, Paraffin and Electricity from Texas Electricity Mix.	Local average electric (448.87MWh/daily) network mix, Light and heavy fuel and lubricants
	Waste Disposal/Recycling	Steel, plastic, copper, glass, lubricants, resins diesel (heavy truck transportation and rail).	Electricity, light and heavy fuel
Infrastructure (Rail track, bridges, culvert, stations, power generation system, Trainset Maintenance Facilities (TMF), & Maintenance-of-Way (MOW) facilities	Material extraction/Processing	Concrete, cement, aggregate sand, steel, aluminum, copper	Electricity medium voltage, light fuel oil and natural gas.
	Construction(Rail track, bridges, culvert, stations and power generation system)	Electricity and diesel for steel rail, railway fasteners.	Electricity medium voltage, light fuel oil and natural gas and heat (Electricity for lightning and power tools, fuel for heavy trucks, and power required for stations, signaling, substations and maintenance facilities)
	Operations/Maintenance	Diesel, gasoline, fuel oil, and Electricity	Electricity, Light and heavy fuel
	Transportation of personnel and material (heavy truck, passenger's truck existing rail light commercial trucks, single-unit short-haul and long-haul diesel trucks).	Tire for tracks, lubricant and diesel.	Light and heavy fuel for heavy track and rail (passenger trucks, light commercial trucks and single-unit short-haul and long-haul diesel trucks).
	Disposal and recycling (runway material) and decommission of terminals under US condition	Steel, concrete, hydraulic fluids and cleaning products.	Electricity, light and heavy fuel,

For each component, the inventory base case begins with Ecoinvent v3 process for transportation services, adjusted to reflect the actual conditions of the Dallas-Houston HSR system. Other specific data such as electricity mix for operation phase, distance, material and energy were also included to reflect the number of maintenance services along the Dallas-Houston corridor. The project accounts for Shinkansen vehicles and infrastructure. The Shinkansen car consists of eight cars and a seating capacity of about 400 passengers. The infrastructure includes Rail track, bridges, culvert, stations, Trainset Maintenance Facilities (TMF), & Maintenance-of-Way (MOW). The alternative model (road and air freight transportation) includes vehicle/aircraft lifetime correspondent to fuel amount in passenger kilometer traveled. All modules account for emissions during manufacturing, operation and maintenance, and the infrastructure constructions of each system. The module process is consistent with LCA studies on HSR system across Europe, Asia and U.S. The material input for vehicle and infrastructure construction is listed Table 3, Table 4 and Table 5.

Table 4**.** Description of the material and average kilometers traveled per mode.

	Truck		**Rail**	
Material	**Average (miles)**	**Amount (tons)**	**Average (miles)**	**Amount (tons)**
Sub-Ballast	5	87953	20	521805
Ballast	5	206925	20	1227642
Concrete Rail Ties (each)	5	699	-	-
Total Concert	8	767661	-	-
Rail	7	53266	20	14679
Excavation	3	667392		-
Fill	5	2249949		-
Structural Steel	8	6732	20	1683
Reinforcing Steel	8	1084372	20	271093
Waste Concrete	5	5261	-	-
Waste-rebar	3	16266	-	-
Sand	5	1861159	20	393085
Cement	5	784254	20	165638
Gravel	5	2053693	20	433749

Table 5. Description of kilometers traveled for passenger transportation

Total passengers transportation (miles)		
Construction Phase	**Vehicle Type**	**Average miles**
Track	Pickup Truck (1/2 - 3/4 tons)	18720000
Station		
TMF		
MOV		

Ecoinvent database is not always categorized in a way that directly reflects input-output of product/process. Therefore, we make assumptions to allocate aggregated data to the most appropriate sector. Many of these assumptions are used to create the impact vectors, the values for the environmental effects and materials consumption. The set of data, are allocated as weighted averages, information from data sources or other publications, that represents industry sectors in North American, Europe, and in some cases, the globe.

Table 6 list the main assumptions associated with the HSR model. However, most of this study input are actual project information retrieved from the *Dallas Houston High-Speed Rail Draft Environmental Impact Assessment* conducted by the U.S. Department of Transportation.

Table 6. Summary of the modeling assumptions

Uncertain variables	Approaches
Train Specification	A typical trainset consists of eight cars carrying up to 400-seated passengers. Vehicle technology was based on that of the central Japan Railway Company We assumed a 25 years lifetime. Hour traveled retrieved from Texas Central website, a private railroad company proposing an HSR rail line between Dallas-Houston. Vehicle inventory: assessed using Ecoinvent's database as per Chester et al., 2013. Electricity and other operation inputs retrieved from the Dallas to Houston High-Speed Rail Draft Environmental impact statement prepared by the U.S. Department of Transportation. Vehicle manufacturing location assumed based on the existing manufacturing companies in Japan. Energy for operation includes Train, stations, TMFs and MOW facilities. Centerline geospatial data, from TxDOT, was used to calculate a city center-to-city center distance of 384.63 kilometers between Houston and Dallas .
Train Operation	Calculated based on the expected operation hours (18h/day), the number of trips a day (68) and trip duration. At the initial phase, the project will have seven trains performing five round trips a day.

Infrastructure	Construction emissions account for emissions from construction equipment, employee trips to the construction site and delivery of construction materials (hauling by both trucks and rail) to the material storage yards and to the construction sites and emissions from other on-road vehicles used during construction activities. This technical memorandum also provided information for: - Construction material quantities used in the emissions calculations. - Equipment lists by construction activity. - Detailed construction phase equipment quantities. - Track, stations, TMFs, and MOWs. - The route will be elevated viaducts (W/ bridges and no tunnels) The track choice is a non- ballasted. Appropriate for high-speed with lifetime 50-60. Therefore, the chosen lifetime for infrastructure is 60 years. All stations have a total area of 60 acres. Excavation and fill material transported by heavy trucks along the build alternatives. Aggregates for concrete would come from quarries from within Texas.

References: (*2; 8; 10; 21; 25*)

The evaluation in transportation migration was performed taking into consideration the yearly average percentage of people traveling between I-45 corridors (4,400,000 passengers/year). Currently, I-45 highway is shared between car and bus with 89% and 2% of total passenger volume share respectively (*25*). Car input reflects the manufacturing and road network for an average size gasoline cars in Texas. For this reason, this study selected module was a large size passenger car with engine capacity greater than two litter to account for the sport utility vehicles (SUV's) and Trucks, common cars used in the region. A rate of 1.2 passengers per car, was selected; a rate that influences the total overall emissions per passenger kilometer traveled. For bus, the module is a low sulfur diesel vehicle, with manufacturing and operation conditions of a bus engine in Europe. Aircraft transportation accounts for the remaining 9% of population modeled for the average capacity of 320 passengers. For HSR emissions, the calculation of pollutant accounts for a lifetime of 20 years of vehicle operation and 60 years of infrastructure operation.

To evaluate the net change in criteria air pollutants (CAPs) CO_2 and global warming impact, results were analyzed in vehicle kilometers traveled (VKT) and passenger kilometers traveled (PKT). Equation 1 expresses the calculation for individual system's emissions, where E is the emissions of pollutant in VKT per year; Te_i is total lifetime emission of a given pollutant; and Dt the total lifetime distance traveled (km/years).

$$E(VKT) = \frac{TE_i}{D_t} \qquad [1]$$

Equation 1 and 2 expresses the calculation for individual system's emissions, where E is total emissions allocated for material and energy use in PKT. (Q) is the total lifetime emission of a given pollutant for vehicle and infrastructure respectively, (p) is 400 which represents the number of seats per vehicle, (d) is 386.243, the distance traveled between Dallas-Houston (R) the vehicle utilization rate, and (Y) the service lifetime for vehicle and infrastructure . In addition, the study also examines the three most relevant categories for both vehicle and infrastructure. Out of the 15 mid-point categories in Impact 2002+ assessment method, the three most impacted areas include Global Warming (GW), Respiratory Inorganic (RI) and Energy demand (E). The selected categories assess the significance of CAPs, GHG emissions and the energy use per passenger kilometers traveled with focus on pollutants like Carbone Dioxide (CO_2), Nitrox Oxide (NOx), Sulfur Dioxide (SO_2) and Particulate Matter (PM).

To evaluate the different stages of vehicle and infrastructure and analyze the cause and effect chain of each pollutant, the results were obtained using the mid-point methodology of Impact 2002+. This method allows the trace of source contribution for individual pollutants, offering more detail to the study. Equations [2] and [3] represents the baseline to calculate mid-point emission in passenger per kilometers traveled.

$$E_{Vehicle} = \frac{Q_{Vehicle}}{p.d.R.Y_{Vehicle}} \qquad [2]$$

$$E_{Infrastructure} = \frac{Q_{Infrastructure}}{p.d.R.Y_{Infrastructure}} \qquad [3]$$

Where:

$E_{vehicle}$ (PKT) = Vehicle emissions per Person Kilometers Traveled;

$E_{infrastructure}$ (PKT) = Infrastructure emissions per Person Kilometers Traveled;

Q= Vehicle lifetime emission of a given pollutant;

p = person (seat);

R= vehicle utilization rate;

$Y_{Vehicle}$ = Years of operation and;

$Y_{Infrastructure}$ = Years of operation.

The total distance traveled reflects the initial operating condition of two HSR vehicles with 8 cars and a seating capacity of 400 passengers. The vehicles are scheduled to operate 18 hours a day, leaving the other 6 hours of system maintenance and inspection. Considering that the HRS uses electricity as an energy source, the source of electricity mix scenarios on the environmental impact from the operation phase will also be analyzed during the vehicle's lifetime (20 years). Generally, the train operation does not generate direct emissions. However, the electricity generation and transition produce pollutants that can be minimized with the change in the electricity mix. Emissions for light-duty vehicles traveling to and from the station are not part of this study. The complete life cycle evaluation will account all emissions generated over the vehicle and infrastructure lifetime.

4.2.1 *Material Extraction and Processing*

Material extraction and processing are one of the most critical phases of any product life. Therefore most of the product's emissions are determined by decisions made during the design phase of a product. Similarly, passenger vehicles are made of different materials, some of which are not always recyclable, increasing the total environmental burden of any product. This LCA inventory includes reliable data for all natural resources used, the processing and transportation phase referencing previous lifecycle study data and the inventory on the Ecoinvent v3 database. The HSR vehicle used in this study is the Shinkansen N700 trains, manufactured in Japan. Due to lack of information on Japan's vehicle inventory this assessment considers similar size train manufactured in Germany, which inventory is available in the Ecoinvent database, as per the approach used by (*10*). Most of the energy and material data reference the information on the Dallas -Houston HSR Environmental Impact Statement Report sponsored by the Department of Transportation and by the Texas Central Railroad (TCRR) engineers, which also provide the values for energy used during extraction and processing phase. The infrastructure data is a mix of previous studies and quantities of material used in the track, stations, maintenance, equipment and service facilities.

The SimaPro processing module includes inputs of raw materials, energy and on-site transportation of the product. A minor impact is allocated to transportation in the processing zone, because the route takes place in a very small distance, compared to the other transport processes. The HSR track choice is a non-ballast, with viaducts and bridges, above the threshold level, avoiding interference with the existing transportation system. For this reason, concrete and steel are the predominant materials in the railway infrastructure. The track selection was based on infrastructure lifetime (50-60yrs), safety, security and reliability. Moreover, it has been reported that fixed track construction consumes 89% less energy than the ballast track (*26*). This project does not include tunnels because of the flat surface along the Dallas - Houston region.

4.2.2 *Manufacturing /Construction*

The manufacturing of vehicle parts and infrastructure materials require carbon-based energy which is associated with the release of CO_2, NO_x, SO_x, O_3 and PM emissions. For this study, the two Shinkansen vehicles are assumed to be manufactured in Germany using the available energy in the region. Impute used for vehicle manufacturing were primarily electricity and the processed aluminum, steel, organic and non-organic material such as glass, plastic and resign, which represents vehicle main material and the manufacturing module from SimaPro®. The decision to import the vehicle outside the U.S was due to the fact that, at the moment, there is no Shinkansen vehicle manufacturing in the region. Infrastructure accounts for the total material and energy used during the 4 years of construction. The railway infrastructure, include track, bridges, culvert, stations, Trainset Maintenance Facilities (TMF) and Maintenance-of-Way facilities. Signal housings that monitor train traffic, signaling cables and power supply for equipment are also part of the infrastructure system. Vehicle manufacture emissions are mostly originated from the energy used in the manufacturing process.

4.2.3 *Transportation*

Materials for track, stations and other support facilities are transported to the construction sites by diesel heavy pickup trucks and the Houston railroad connection system. Given the required materials, the extension of the track and the miles per passenger, it is expected high consumption of energy (diesel and gasoline) and consequently a high percentage of fossil fuel emissions.

Therefore, this study assumes that construction materials are obtained within the proximity of track. On the other hand, the two Shinkansen vehicles were considered to be transported by boat from the Kinkisharyo manufacturing in Osaka, Japan to Galveston port via Panama Canal. Rail, reinforcement steel, structural steel, and aggregate are transported to the sites via rail. SimaPro calculates transportation emissions by multiplying the distance traveled by the weight of the materials. The average miles passengers and material used in the infrastructure construction and vehicle transport are as shown in Table 4 and Table 5.

4.2.4 *Operation and Maintenance*

This phase was modeled considering all the energy and material required to operate and maintain the railway system during the initial phase. Figure 4 shows the different modeling phases of train in SimaPro, and the cascade compilation of train operation and maintenance phase.



Figure 4. Illustrations of SimaPro cascade compilation of each process

The end-to-end route distance was estimated to be approximately 384.63 kilometers operated at the speed of 329.91 Km/h along most of the route, except in the vicinity of the stations. Initially, the trip is expected to take 1.7 hours with 10 minutes stop at Brazos Valley station for a total of 18 hours of operations and 6 hours of system maintenance and inspection which will result in an average of 68, one way, trips per day and an annual ridership of 6,155,360 passengers per year. The electricity consumption demand for the train is assumed to be a single phase running through a wiring installation above the track and distributed to each train using a catenaries distribution system. At the initial phase, the total electricity consumption is estimated to be 448.87 MWh. Electricity for the entire facility operation including maintenance is estimated to be 538.9 MWh, resulting in total power consumption of 998 MWh, assuming 5% loss. Three stations of 60 acres each are projected along the Dallas – Houston route. The stations are projected to give easy access to the city center of Dallas/Fort Worth, the Brazos Valley, and Houston (*25*). Though this phase uses mostly electricity, during the 20 years, other products such as lubricates, diesel, paint, water and metals were also used, on a smaller scale.

4.2.5 *End-of-life*

The end-life assessment model was established considering the disposal and recycling mode of material and energy used throughout the life cycle phase. Considering the type of material used in vehicle construction, only a small amount of vehicle material was recycled. Most of the materials are scrapped and disposed of, in the end-life phase. Materials which are part of stations and catenaries (steel and aluminum), are among the ones with the highest percentage of recycling rate. Energy consumption in vehicle scrapping and recycling process was retrieved from Ecoinvent3 database. Railway track, and road infrastructure are considered to be unutilized which results in zero end life effect. Since there is no data inventory for truck dismantling, the process suggests that the infrastructure is left on sight, at the end of life (*27*).

4.3 Life Cycle Impact Assessment

There are many methods that characterize the magnitude and significance of the potential environmental impacts for a product system throughout the life cycle of the product. Thus, for this study, the environmental impact was conducted using impact 2002+ method of different transportation modes in comparison to the HSR system. Impact 2002+ provides viability process that associates the input emission inventory with 15-mid-point impact categories (Human toxicity, Respiratory inorganics, Respiratory organics, Ionizing radiation, Ozone layer depletion, Global warming, Terrestrial ecotoxicity, Aquatic acidification, Aquatic ecotoxicity, Acidification/nitrification, Aquatic eutrophication, and Land Occupation. Analyses of mid-point categories allow the research team to identify several exposure pathways and link concentrations of pollutants to possible tradeoffs in construction activities.

4.4 Interpretation of LCI and LCIA Results

This phase evaluates LCA results in relation to the defined goal and scope in order to reach conclusions and recommendations. The interpretation includes identification of any technical/methodological issues associated with inventory data and impact category selection. At this phase, limitations are analyzed and key assumptions documented with appropriate justification. Any missing emissions data for unit processes in the life cycle of the HSR system is substituted with appropriate data from HSR systems globally, subject to guidelines provided as per ISO 14040 standard.

5. ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

5.1 Life Cycle Impact Assessment

This section outlines the life cycle impacts of the Dallas-Houston HSR system in terms of Impact 2002+, and mid-point categories (Table 7.). By doing so, this study addresses the estimation of net change in GHG emissions and global warming potential as a result of HSR implementation. The resulting impacts across the 15 categories are based on defined boundaries and required inventory information established at the goal and scoping phase. Evaluating the total HSR system, the characterization assessment indicates that vehicle is the largest contributor to the overall impact, accounting for more than 50% in 12 out of 15 mid-point categories. The significance of vehicle emissions results echoes the amount of electricity used from fossil fuel generation (hard coal, lignite and natural). For infrastructure material, such as copper, concrete, steel, rebar, and energy (electricity, fuel and lubricants) used during the four years of track and facility construction are the main contributor to the increase in emission. The increase in particulate matter, mostly from anthropogenic sources resulted in a high impact on human health and environmental damage potential. Global warming was impacted by hard coal/lignite mining operation, electricity and fuel consumption from heavy equipment and the transportation of material to the construction site.

Table 7. Mid-point Impacts and relative contribution of vehicle and infrastructure in PKT.

	Impact category	Unit	Total Quantity	Vehicle[1]	Infrastructure[2]
a	Carcinogens	kg C_2H_3Cl eq	1.49E+08	62.64%	37.36%
b	Non-carcinogens	kg C_2H_3Cl eq	4.66E+08	40.22%	59.78%
c	Respiratory inorganics	kg $PM_{2.5}$ eq	17056764	95.85%	4.15%
d	Ionizing radiation	Bq C-14 eq	5.53E+10	97.99%	2.01%
e	Ozone layer depletion	kg CFC-11 eq	1250.64	51.69%	48.31%
f	Respiratory organics	kg C_2H_4 eq	1990505.20	66.26%	33.74%
g	Aquatic ecotoxicity	kg TEG water	1.09E+12	65.52%	34.48%
h	Terrestrial ecotoxicity	kg TEG soil	3.77E+11	56.09%	43.91%
i	Terrestrial acid/nutri	kg SO_2 eq	1.17E+08	83.77%	16.23%
j	Land occupation	m2org.arable	2.07E+08	34.48%	65.52%
k	Aquatic acidification	kg SO_2 eq	40190998	84.13%	15.87%
l	Aquatic eutrophication	kg PO_4 P-lim	9049321.90	74.63%	25.37%
m	Global warming	kg CO_2 eq	5.66E+09	92.77%	7.23%
n	Non-renewable energy	MJ primary	7.87E+10	92.83%	7.17%
o	Mineral extraction	MJ surplus	4.02E+09	18.63%	81.37%

Notes: [1]emissions were estimated for 20 years of vehicle lifetime, and; [2] Infrastructure at 60 years lifetime.

Figure 5 below illustrates the cascade structure of basic scenario used to calculate environmental impact, with SimPro. As observed, the desired process (total emissions for the HSR system) is a result of train and infrastructure inputs. Moreover, each subsection has been analyzed separately to better assess the impact relative to vehicle and infrastructure. In all scenarios, the consumption of material and energy used is during the years of vehicle and infrastructure operation, is contemplated. The values in percentage represents the process contribution to the final process.

These results can also be translated in terms of mid-point category or as end-point (effect to human health, ecosystem etc.).



Figure 5. Illustration of HSR LCA process tree with SimaPro

With respect to phase, distribution of mid-point impacts for the infrastructure is shown in Figure 6. Except for ionizing radiation and ozone layer depletion categories, the material extraction and processing phase is the leading contributor to environmental impact by a large margin. Operation & maintenance (O&M) phase comes second, due to the large quantities of oil and gas products consumed during the 20 years of operation.



Figure 6. Distribution of phase wise mid-point impact for infrastructure.

Apart from the pollutants originated from mining, material processing and construction, the power source also, influence the total system emission. Rail is frequently powered by electricity and depending on the source, low or high emission electrical generation system, the long term impact may be significant. A previous environmental assessment conducted in a nonrenewable source, such as coal power plant, has revealed higher emissions values than those from the renewable sources, like wind or hydroelectric(*28; 29*). Therefore, even though HSR has proven to be more efficient than other transportation modes (cars, plane) its long term operation may be compromised by the available energy source in the region. Like on the other energy-related studies, the assessment of electricity and a higher average ridership are the main factors to minimize the GHG emissions per PKT**.** Figure 7 shows the cumulative energy demand for vehicle and infrastructure per PKT in the I-45 corridor.

I-45 high-speed rail system shows that the increase in global warming (carbon-related emissions) is strictly related to increasing in the fossil fuel use which suggests that the emissions by vehicle operation can be reduced by introducing a more sustainable energy source. The use of a carbon-intense mix, will result in reduction proportion reduction in terms of emissions. Finding addresses the objective (v) which assesses the effect of source electricity mix scenarios on the environmental impact, resulting from HSR system operation phase.

At the end-point, the environmental impact results show that most of the contribution is allocated in the Human Heath category. The amount of particulate matter from infrastructure construction (excavation and mining) in addition to the use of electricity originated from fossil fuel such as coal are the main factors contributing to the increase in human health impact.



Figure 7. Cumulative Energy Demand for Vehicle and Infrastructure at 70% ridership.

5.2 Effect of Ridership Ratio

The effects on ridership and passenger migration to the HSR system control the environmental efficacy of developing the system. This analysis is depicted in Figure **8**, which shows the cutoff levels for various transportation modes, addressing the requirement of objective (iv). From figure 6(a) the minimum ridership ratio that is required for the HSR system to overcome the global warming potential compared to cars is around 12%. This cutoff point indicates that even at a low ridership level HSR system can outperform passenger cars in the HSR corridor. The principal reason for the low occupancy rate of 1.2 passengers/car in Texas. However, for the HSR system to be effective in comparison to bus and air transport the ridership level needs to increase to at least 25%. Regional air quality with the adoption of the HSR system can be improved at low ridership levels of 25% by outperforming NOx levels generated from cars and air travel. This would be a major boost to alleviating ozone problems in the nonattainment regions of Houston and Dallas. This study considers that all passenger cars used in the corridor are already fitted with the selective catalyst reduction technology for NOx control. Thereby resulting in a major advantage for the HSR system. However, the HSR system performs very poorly in terms of $PM_{2.5}$ emission in comparison to cars and air travel, as observed in Figure 6(c). This anomaly is due to the heavy reliance on electricity produced from fossil fuels in the default SimaPro grid data. If the source electricity is shifted to the more renewable mixture, the problem of PM2.5 emissions could be negated. The highest quantitative input is from electricity production, so unless renewables are used in producing the electricity used to power the trains, PM2.5 emissions will not decrease. Although in terms of total energy consumed, the HSR system will be efficient at all ridership levels, as in Figure 6(d).





b)
Car (1.2 Passengers)
Bus
Aircraft
HSR
NOx(g PM2.5 eq/pkt)
0.14
0.12
0.10
0.08
0.06
0.04
0.02
0.00
0.0%
5.0%
10.0%
15.0%
20.0%
25.0%
30.0%
35.0%



c)
Car (1.2 Passengers)
Bus
Aircraft
HSR
PM (g $PM_{2.5}$ eq/pkt)
3.00
2.50
2.00
1.50
1.00
0.50
0.00
0.0%
5.0%
10.0%
15.0%
20.0%
25.0%
30.0%
35.0%



Figure 8. Effect of ridership levels on environmental efficacy of various categories (a) Global Warming Potential (b) NOx; (c) PM2.5; (d) Total Energy

5.3 Sensitivity Analysis

This analysis was conducted to evaluate the environmental benefits resulting from the change in the source electricity mix. Operation and maintenance contribute the most in the overall vehicle emissions, and electricity mix is the main driver that increases pollutant emissions. Electricity mix varies by country and region.

The current U.S. and Texas electricity mix do not reflect the actual SimaPro® inventory. The U.S SimaPro electricity mix has the highest share for electricity from coal and lignite which increase significantly the impact of vehicle and HSR system, in general. Whereas, the U.S. Electric Reliability Council of Texas (ERCOT) mix is mostly originated from gas sources, that have a much lower impact that the electricity generated by coal or lignite. To evaluate the actual contribution of main pollutants, the main vehicle emissions were assessed using the actual share of each fossil fuel source in Texas and the U.S. Results show that the actual emissions for the HSR system will be much lower than the one calculated with Ecoinventv3 database. Results show that the actual emissions for the HSR system will be much lower than the one calculated with Ecoinventv3 database.

Table 8 shows the difference in electricity mix for the base case (U.S. electricity mix) and the 2017 Texas Mix. Results show that the actual emissions for the HSR system will be much lower than the one calculated with Ecoinventv3 database. Results show that the actual emissions for the HSR system will be much lower than the one calculated with Ecoinventv3 database.

Table 8. Ecoinventv3 electricity mix and the 2017 Texas Mix

Energy Source	Base Case	Texas (ERCOT)
Hard coal	30.04%	19.33%
Hydro, Reservoir	1.09%	0.24%
Hydro, run-of-river	4.37%	0.00%
Lignite	33.01%	12.89%
Natural gas	0.32%	38.85%
Nuclear, boiling water reactor	5.42%	0.00%
Nuclear, pressure water reactor	10.63%	10.77%
Solar	0.00%	0.63%
Wind, <1MW turbine, onshore	1.11%	0.00%
Wind, >3MW turbine, onshore	0.11%	0.00%
Wind, 1-3MW turbine, onshore	13.18%	17.40%
Biomass	0.00%	0.15%
Net DC/BLT	0.00%	-0.27%
Biogas	0.72%	0.00%
Others	2.56%	0.01%
Total	100	100

Table 9 shows that vehicle operation will potentially reduce the CO_2 contribution by 64%, SO_2 by 78%, NO_x by 60% and the N_2O emissions by 57%. Considering that the electricity mix is the main driver to the increase in vehicle emissions, by switching the Ecoinventv3 data with mix with the Electric Reliability Council of Texas (ERCOT), it expected an improvement in overall vehicle emissions. Reduction in vehicle emissions by changing the electricity mix to the less impacted source, has previously been proven by other HSR/train environmental impact assessment conducted in Europe and North America, demonstrating to be one of the efficient ways to reduce the long term impact of the electricity mix. At the endpoint, the major reduction is observed in climate change (62%) and human health (44%). This result reflects the reduction in respiratory inorganic emissions (NO_x and SO_2) which normally coal electricity sources and fossil fuel use.

Table 9**.** Percentage of air emissions reduction with the change in electricity mix*

Pollutant	Unit/PKT	Base Case	U.S. 17	ERCOT 17	% Reduction (ERCOT 17)
CO_2	kg $CO_{2\ eq}$	12.68	8.03	8.08	36.3
SO_2	kg $PM_{2.5\ eq}$	0.002	0.002	0.002	21.7
$PM_{<2.5}$	kg $PM_{2.5\ eq}$	0.05	0.02	0.02	62.8
NO_X	kg $PM_{2.5\ eq}$	0.00	0.001	0.001	40.0
N_2O	kg $CO_{2\ eq}$	0.14	0.08	0.08	43.6

* The base case corresponded to the data in the Ecoinventv3 database for U.S. electricity mix. ERCORT (Electric Reliability Council of Texas); Base case (U.S. Electricity Mix- Ecoinventv3; % Reduction (Decrease in emission due to change from base case to Texas mix).

5.4 Implementation Plan

To provide guidance to the stakeholders, policy makers and community leaders, we have developed a presentation listing the potential environmental benefit of HSR system in I-45 corridor. The presentation was developed as part of the implementation plan. Research team will make the presentation, final report available online and will make attempts to reachout to all the stakeholders.

Some of the recommendation include education to the public relative to the environmental benefits of HSR and the use of renewable energy for HSR system operation. Results from this study show that by reducing the population of passengers traveling by car we can improve air quality along the I-45 corridor. Moreover, the increase of the occupancy rate can significantly reduce the total environmental impact generated by construction of the HSR system.

6. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATION

Net changes in environmental impact with the development of an HSR System along the I-45 corridor with Shinkansen N700 series trains were conducted to estimate that vehicle is the single largest contributory phase across 12 of the 15- mid-point impact categories, expect non-carcinogenic, land occupation and mineral extraction. With the methodology described above, our research met the overall requirement of the proposed objectives by:

- Developing a systematic framework of Dallas-Houston HSR system. The framework defines all essential elements, in agreement with the standards, methods and guidelines established by the International Organization for Standardization (ISO 14040) of environmental life cycle assessment system.
- Estimation of the net change in GHG emissions and global warming potential (CO_2, eq) was realized by evaluating the energy and emissions per passenger-kilometers. This study found that vehicle component accounts for 14.50 $kgCO_2eq/PKT$, of which fossil-fuel usage during operation is the primary contributor with 98% of the GHG emissions. For the infrastructure component, 56.76% of GHG emissions are contributed by the construction phase (23.75 $kgCO_2eq/PKT$).
- Evaluating the benefits of air quality, by conduction a sensitivity and comparative analyze between HSR system and other transportation modes, we can conclude that the I-45 corridor (Houston – Galveston-Dallas region) will benefit from the reduction of CAPs and GHS emissions which will consequently contribute to the air quality improvement in the region.
- Accessing the relevance of CAPs and GHGs emissions of the HSR system, relative to other modes of transportation. Based on these analyses, it was found that the minimum ridership levels required offsetting the environmental impact from conventional modes of transport, such as personal cars, bus and aircraft, are around 12% and 27% for GHG emissions and NOx emissions respectively.
- Analyzing the effect of source electricity mix on the environmental impacts from the operation phase. The results suggest that by increasing the percentage of renewable energy, in the train operation phase, will significantly reduce the impact of pollutants and GHGs emissions, in the region.
- The interaction process with stakeholders, policy makers and community leaders on the potential environmental benefits/costs of HSR mode of transportation in the U.S. is in progress yet. The PI intent to request a meeting with the Dallas –Houston Operation Company to present this study's findings and recombination.

Recommendations for stakeholders:

The I-45 corridor is the busiest route among 18 traffic corridors in Texas. The implementation of the HSR system, in the region, provides benefits in are of environmental, safety, time, and commodity of passengers traveling between Dallas –Houston. However, for a better environmental performance, this study recommends the following:

- Educate the public to increase the awareness of the environmental benefits of HSR. Increase of the occupancy rate will reduce the total environmental impact generated by construction of the HSR system. In addition, it will:
    - Reduce the population of passengers traveling by car and plane because more people would choose high speed trains, which consequently improves air quality.
    - Passengers will save time because of the use of efficient transportation, especially during rush hour and peak travel times.
- Improve mobility in the face of growth to mitigate population increase by 2050.
- Increase the use of renewable energy for HSR system operation.

REFERENCES

[1] 2050, A. *Texas Triangle* http://www.america2050.org/texas_triangle.html. Accessed September 17 2017.
[2] TxDOT. 2016 Houston District Traffic Map.In, Texas Department of Transportation, Austin, TX, 2017.
[3] Bureau of Economic Analysis, U. S. *Regional Data - GDP by Metropolitan Area*. https://www.bea.gov/itable/iTable.cfm?ReqID=70&step=1#reqid=70&step=1&isuri=1. Accessed September, 2017.
[4] TxDOT. I-45 Freight Corridor Plan: Final Report.In, Austin, TX, 2016.
[5] Songchitruksa, P., R. Henk, S. Venglar, and X. Zeng. Dynamic Traffic Assignment Evaluation of Hurricane Evacuation Strategies for the Houston-Galveston, Texas, Region. *Transportation Research Record: Journal of the Transportation Research Board,* Vol. 2312, 2012, pp. 108-119.
[6] C.A. Morgan, B. R. S., J.E. Warner, A.A. Protopapas, J.D. Borowiec, L.L. Higgins, T.B. Carlson. Potential Development of an Intercity Passenger Transit System in Texas-Report on Tasks 1-5.In, Texas A&M Transportation Institute 2009.
[7] Houston, C. o. Agreement on development of high-speed train, passenger station connections.In, Houston, TX, 2017.
[8] DOT, U. S. Dallas to Houston High-Speed Rail Project: Alignment Alternatives Analysis Report.In, Washington, D.C, 2015.
[9] Åkerman, J. The role of high-speed rail in mitigating climate change – The Swedish case Europabanan from a life cycle perspective. *Transportation Research Part D: Transport and Environment,* Vol. 16, No. 3, 2011, pp. 208-217.
[10] Yue, Y., T. Wang, S. Liang, J. Yang, P. Hou, S. Qu, J. Zhou, X. Jia, H. Wang, and M. Xu. Life cycle assessment of High Speed Rail in China. *Transportation Research Part D: Transport and Environment,* Vol. 41, No. Supplement C, 2015, pp. 367-376.
[11] Robertson, S. The potential mitigation of CO2 emissions via modal substitution of high-speed rail for short-haul air travel from a life cycle perspective – An Australian case study. *Transportation Research Part D: Transport and Environment,* Vol. 46, No. Supplement C, 2016, pp. 365-380.
[12] Bueno, G., D. Hoyos, and I. Capellán-Pérez. Evaluating the environmental performance of the high speed rail project in the Basque Country, Spain. *Research in Transportation Economics,* Vol. 62, No. Supplement C, 2017, pp. 44-56.
[13] Dalkic, G., O. Balaban, H. Tuydes-Yaman, and T. Celikkol-Kocak. An assessment of the CO2 emissions reduction in high speed rail lines: Two case studies from Turkey. *Journal of Cleaner Production,* Vol. 165, No. Supplement C, 2017, pp. 746-761.
[14] Mikhail, V. C., and H. Arpad. Environmental assessment of passenger transportation should include infrastructure and supply chains. *Environmental Research Letters,* Vol. 4, No. 2, 2009, p. 024008.
[15] Edenhofer, O. *Climate change 2014: mitigation of climate change*. Cambridge University Press, 2015.
[16] TCEQ. *Texas Emission Sources - A Graphical Representation*. https://www.tceq.texas.gov/airquality/areasource/texas-emissions-graphical-representation.
[17] Conti, J. J. Annual Energy Outlook 2018.In, 2019.

[18] Zhang, M., and B. Chen. Future travel demand and its implications for transportation infrastructure investments in the Texas Triangle.In, University of Texas at Austin. Center for Transportation Research, 2009.
[19] Jones, H., F. Moura, and T. Domingos. Life cycle assessment of high-speed rail: a case study in Portugal. *International Journal of Life Cycle Assessment,* Vol. 22, No. 3, 2017, pp. 410-422.
[20] Feng, K. L., W. Z. Lu, T. Olofsson, S. W. Chen, H. Yan, and Y. W. Wang. A Predictive Environmental Assessment Method for Construction Operations: Application to a Northeast China Case Study. *Sustainability,* Vol. 10, No. 11, 2018.
[21] Von Rozycki, C., H. Koeser, and H. Schwarz. Ecology profile of the German high-speed rail passenger transport system, ICE. *The International Journal of Life Cycle Assessment,* Vol. 8, No. 2, 2003, pp. 83-91.
[22] Chester, M., and A. Horvath. Life-cycle assessment of high-speed rail: the case of California. *Environmental Research Letters,* Vol. 5, No. 1, 2010.
[23] Menke, D. M., G. A. Davis, and B. W. Vigon. *Evaluation of life-cycle assessment tools*. Environment Canada Gatineau, Canada, 1996.
[24] Humbert, S., M. Margni, and O. Jolliet. IMPACT 2002+: user guide. *Draft for version,* Vol. 2, 2005.
[25] Sepulveda, C. DALLAS TO HOUSTON HSR – AIR QUALITY TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM AND CONSTRUCTION EMISSIONS AIR QUALITY ANAYSIS.In, U.S. Departament of Transportation 2017. pp. 1-275.
[26] Thiebault, V., G. Du, and R. Karoumi. Design of railway bridges considering life-cycle assessment.In *Proceedings of the Institution of Civil Engineers: Bridge Engineering, No. 166*, 2013. pp. 240-251.
[27] Lee, C., J. Lee, and Y. Kim. Comparison of environmental loads with rail track systems using simplified life cycle assessment (LCA). *WIT transactions on the Built Environment,* Vol. 101, 2008, pp. 367-372.
[28] Laboratory, N. R. E. Life Cycle Greenhouse Gas Emissions from Electricity Generation.In, 2013. p. 2.
[29] Burchart-Korol, D., P. Pustejovska, A. Blaut, S. Jursova, and J. Korol. Comparative life cycle assessment of current and future electricity generation systems in the Czech Republic and Poland. *The International Journal of Life Cycle Assessment,* Vol. 23, No. 11, 2018, pp. 2165-2177.