



www.arclimatechange.us

MEETING SUMMARY
ARKANSAS GOVERNOR'S COMMISSION ON GLOBAL WARMING
Transportation and Land Use (TLU) Technical Work Group (TWG)
Call #1, February 19, 2008

Attendees:

TWG Members: Aubra Anthony, Richard Ford, PhD, Miles Goggans, Art Hobson, PhD, Elizabeth Martin, PhD, Bill Reed, Cindy Sagers, PhD

Advisory Body Members: Lynn Malbrough

Governor's Office: Jillian Hicks

Arkansas Bureau of Legislative Research: Gina Mercer, Carol Stapleton

Center for Climate Strategies: Lewison Lem, Kathy Leotta, Bill Cowart, Tara Cok

Members of the Public: Carmie Henry, Edward Hejtmanek; Stanley Hill, Arkansas Farm Bureau; Jenny Ahlen, Arkansas Energy Office; Mark Allison

Background Documents: (all posted at www.arclimatechange.us/TLU.cfm)

1. Meeting Notice and Agenda
2. PowerPoint for Teleconference
3. Catalog of State Actions
4. Descriptions of State Actions

Discussion and Conclusions:

Introductions and Review of Agenda

Lewison Lem welcomed the TWG members, made introductions and reviewed the agenda for the meeting. Technical working group members present were noted as well as representatives from the Arkansas Governor's Office, Center for Climate Strategies, and members of the public.

Purpose and Goals

Lewison Lem reviewed the purpose and goals of the TWG and GCGW. Lewison Lem noted that the purpose and goals of the GCGW have been presented at previous full commission meetings and asked whether there were any questions on the overall process.

A question was asked whether the door was closed on the February 28th meeting for further changes.

A TWG member asked for clarification on whether the catalog was being approved for consideration and that there is not anything yet being moved forward.

Lewison Lem gave an overview of the GHG inventory and baseline, noting that generally we see an increase in GHG emissions.

A TWG member asked when those documents be available for review.

Lewison Lem replied that the GHG inventory is expected to be available some time in March.

Review of TWG Goals to Prepare for GCGW Meeting #4

Lewison opened discussion of the TWG goals in preparation of GCGW Meeting #4.

A TWG member asked whether the prioritization of measures can be changed once more information on the associated costs of measures is gathered or made available.

Lewison responded that the prioritization can be changed and that the process is iterative and refinements are made as the process continues. For instance, some states have commissions that have added measures to the catalog.

A TWG member asked whether outside experts can be brought into the process.

Lewison responded that information from outside experts can be passed along to TWG members and disseminated to the other members.

A TWG member stated it might be helpful to know the source of information and data as well as where measures have worked. This participant stated that right now we don't know where the measures in the catalog have been implemented and if they have worked in other places.

Lewison Lem stated that other state, city and country climate change action plans are often available online. Lewison added that they have worked with a number of other states on climate change strategies and can bring that expertise to inform the group. Lewison indicated the CCS team will follow up with an email to the group with links to related information.

A TWG member added that you can Google the name of acts and that that such information is often accessible that way.

The question was asked whether members are individually responsible for researching actions on their own and discussing them during the conference calls.

Lewison Lem stated that members are welcome to research on their own and talk to outside experts. Lewison stated that after the full list of measures are approved, nominal rankings (high,

medium, low) will be provided for the potential cost effectiveness and potential ton reductions for each measure..

Review of Catalog of State Actions

Lewison asked the group to look at the Catalog of State Actions and Options Descriptions documents and noted that both are organized into the following broad categories: Passenger Vehicles, Location and Land Use Efficiency, Heavy Duty Vehicles, Intercity Passenger Travel, Off-Road Vehicles. Lewison also noted that fuel policies will be added once the information is sorted out and finalized. Lewison walked the group through the different categories.

Bill Cowart of CCS described the Land Use and Location Efficiency category. He noted that many of the measures offer a “co-benefit” and are beneficial in more than one respect.

A TWG member asked how have other states operated and stated that Arkansas is growing quickly and that while light rail and HOV lanes seem far in the future for a rural state like Arkansas, this participant asked if other states like the Carolinas have adopted measures like these.

Lewison responded that the presence of big cities in a state makes more of a difference than its geography, particularly for issues like transit ridership. In smaller cities, bus options might be more of an option, or extending and connecting rail systems. Whether these measures are appropriate for each state depends on a number of factors and that explains why there is such a large catalog.

A TWG member asked that since there is a big catalog and some overlap, could some measures that are similar be eliminated?

Members should let Lewison know if they feel that some options should be eliminated. Lewison encouraged members to focus on priorities and reminded members that eventually there will be a formal balloting process. In future meetings, members will also be asked to combine measures as appropriate.

Lewison stated that they have received emails with ideas for additions to the catalog and that the CCS team will be adding these items. If anyone has any remaining additions to the catalog, members are encouraged to also send them via email.

A TWG member stated items this member would like to add to the catalog:

- 1) Encourage Arkansas colleges to restrict student driving. This TWG member has been checking around the country and that you have to go campus by campus to get such information. This participant has come up with seven campuses, one of which is UC Berkeley. That university does not allow freshmen or sophomores to bring their cars on campus.

A TWG member indicated understanding where the other TWG member is coming from for limiting campus driving, but thinks that when the group is calculating, they should also calculate

how many students would not go to school because of that measure. If we don't look at that, the discussion will be skewed. This TWG member wonders what costs were included and not included as other states have gone through the process and added that if significant things are left out, you can make it look like a good deal.

A TWG member added that if one state does it and others don't, it won't make a difference. Another participant added that a full life cycle analysis should be performed and another added that as an example, enforcing speed limits has benefits but also has a cost of increased time spent on the road.

Bill added that this will be included in the analysis they do.

A TWG member continued with catalog additions:

- 2) Encourage high schools to discourage students from driving to school or encourage schools to restrict parking.

A TWG member asked how much of a difference do motor boat and lawn mower engines make and is this a minor issue or something that members do need to think about?

Lewison Lem responded that this issue came up in Montana and usually comes under the TLU 5-Off Road Recreational Vehicles category. This subject comes up often even though the bulk of emissions usually comes from light duty vehicles.

A TWG member raised the issue about local pollutants. This participant suggested that if the motor boat and lawn mower emissions is a small item, maybe the TWG does not need to think about it and should skip it as it would not be a popular measure.

A TWG member responded that it [the small measures] might be a cost effective way to go. Another member agreed comparing it to "low hanging fruit."

Lewison Lem continued to walk through sections 3, 4 and 5 and stated that in general there are different levels of stringency, and that some measures are carrots and some are sticks. Lewison stated that if members have questions they can email or call CCS. Also, suggestions for catalog additions can be sent to Lewison to be included in the final catalog.

Lewison Lem replied that this idea will be added to the list and noted that other cities have done that. Lewison reminded participants that they can bring ideas to the full commission meeting as well.

A TWG member stated that the original projections for emissions on slide 33 (from the last meeting) says there is no growth presumed for rail but that the 2025 Plan mentions investment in a light rail option for the 540 Corridor. This participant wondered if the TWG is supposed to be thinking of problems we currently have or that we might have?

Lewison Lem replied that the baseline is what goes into the inventory, or “business as usual.” The climate change plans will have new or incremental actions--a change off the baseline or business as usual. If it says that, we can consider a change to light rail.

Agenda, Date and Time for Next Meetings

The next TWG meetings will be scheduled for:

- Meeting #2, March 4, 2008, 10:00 AM – 11:30 PM CST
- Meeting #3, March 18, 2008, 10:30 AM – 12:00 PM CST

Public Input and Announcements

A member of the public stated that there was a meeting about on street parking in downtown Fayetteville that presented the idea of parking tags for free downtown parking for cars getting over 40 mpg or so.

Lewison announced that the GCGW’s 4th meeting will be held on February 28, 2008.