



www.arclimatechange.us

MEETING SUMMARY
ARKANSAS CLIMATE CHANGE ADVISORY COUNCIL
Transportation and Land Use Technical Work Group
Call #2, March 12, 2008

Attendees:

TWG Members: Art Hobson, PhD, Elizabeth Martin, PhD, Bill Reed, Cindy Sagers, PhD, Gary Voigt

Advisory Body Members: Lynn Malbrough, Michael Borengasser, Arkansas Natural Resources Commission (on behalf of Randy Young)

Governor's Office: Jon Moran

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

Members of the Public: Edward Hejtmanek

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

Meeting Notice and Agenda
Summary of Call #1
PowerPoint for Teleconference
Catalog of State Actions
Descriptions of State Actions

Discussion and Conclusions:

Introductions and Review of Agenda

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. Lewison Lem welcomed the TWG meetings and directed members to the website (www.arclimatechange.us/TLU.cfm) for meeting materials. Lewison noted that members have about 1.5 hours and a full agenda and that the goal is to try to get the group ready to ballot. Lewison stated that the group would look at the catalog some more today and cover some administrative items as well.

Review and Approval of Prior Call Summary

Lewison Lem asked if there were any corrections to be made to the previous meeting minutes.

A TWG member made a motion to accept the Meeting #1 Minutes. A second TWG member seconded the motion and Lewison stated that the minutes were accepted without objection.

Review Goals for GCGW Meeting #5 (April 9, 2008)

Lewison Lem reminded the members that we are trying to get ready for the April 9th full commission meeting and that the group is at step 3 of a 10-step process. Lewison said the group is aiming to complete the catalog and make recommendations for priorities.

Development of Catalog of State Actions with Ratings

Lewison Lem noted that CSS has incorporated changes to the catalog since the last meeting. Kathy Leotta added that items in blue show changes made based on the last full commission meeting and that slide 5 and 6 of the presentation summarize changes.

Lewison stated that the website has summary notes from the full GCGW meeting (#4). He said that on the first page, there are two columns with three categories with ratings. People in other states have found it useful to think about which have high, medium or low potential, and develop a qualitative rating because a quantitative rating doesn't occur until after the balloting and prioritization. Lewison said that today the group will look at the catalog to get to the point where we can ballot.

Lewison asked the members in other work groups how the groups have handled this process and whether they had any useful advice.

TWG members discussed that on other calls for other TWGs they have considered notional ratings from other states. Lewison asked the TWG what would be most helpful for the TWG in going through the catalog. TWG members agreed they would prefer to go through the catalog on their own without considering ratings from other states. A TWG member suggested the group could focus on strategies they were most interested in as a way of getting through the entire catalog over the course of the call.

The group discussed how to approach the rating process and agreed to proceed by going through and discussing which topics are most important. The group began with TLU catalog item 1.

A TWG member asked if there's anything that the group can do about vehicle technology in Arkansas.

Another TWG member said that new vehicle purchases would have to comply with set standards and that the item would have high potential.

The group then discussed whether states have authority to regulate emissions standards and whether the authority applies to new or used vehicles. It was stated that most regulations do focus on new vehicle purchases and that states can regulate based on emissions. Issues were raised on federal versus states standards and that with existing federal policy, credit for emissions reduction would not go to the state. A TWG member said item 1.1.1 could have a

large potential if emissions standards could be changed or met. A TWG member suggested putting a check by items 1.1.1 and 1.1.6 and moving on to the next section.

A TWG member stated that all the 1.2 items have a high potential cost effectiveness and potential GHG emission reduction.

TWG members stated that they like items 1.2.9 and 1.2.3.

A TWG member stated that he would argue all of the 1.2 items have high potential and that except for 1.2.1 they are all about education. Members agreed that 1.2.1 through 1.2.9 have high cost effectiveness and high emissions reduction potential.

Lewis Lem stated that for these measures the number of vehicles makes a difference. He also stated that they are about incentives and disincentives and have to do with carrot and stick approaches.

A TWG member stated preference for 1.3.1.

A TWG member stated that feebates have proved successful all over the country and that the rebate and fee balances out so there is no net tax increase.

Another TWG member stated that she worries about poor people who can't afford those. Discussion about the issue of poverty and how it should be handled followed. A TWG member indicated the group could put a clause in that assistance could be provided to low income people.

A TWG member indicated that often the smaller more fuel efficient cars are less expensive anyway. The group discussed the need to include used cars in the program.

A TWG member asked if the group should keep 1.3.1 and keep for later 1.3.2 since there are problems with penalizing people.

TWG members discussed carrot and stick approaches. A TWG member asked if the group was supposed to be talking about the merits of the measures or whether they are cost effective and have potential to reduce emissions.

A TWG member said he thinks the first four measures in 1.3 have high potential emission reductions.

The group decided to move to item 1.4. A TWG member stated the group could talk about 1.3 later if it comes to the top since it deserves more discussion.

A TWG member stated she liked 1.4.3.

A TWG member said there is already some legislation on the books similar to 1.4.3.

The group discussed biofuels and that cellulosic ethanol may have more promise than biofuels from food crops or imported biofuels that result in increased greenhouse gas emissions from land clearing. The group discussed there may be more research needed on biofuels from switchgrass or cellulosic ethanol.

The group moved on to TLU item 2.

A TWG member stated preference for 2.1.15 and added that there is some overlap and that a lot of 2.1 could be bundled.

Lewis Lem stated that sometimes people do bundle these.

A TWG member said they like 2.1.5.

Another TWG member said he likes all the measures in 2.1.

TWG members stated their approval of carpooling, buses, telecommuting and measures 2.2.1, 2.2.4, 2.2.21 and 2.2.11.

The group moved on to 2.3 and stated that there are two new items in the catalog (2.3.15 and 2.3.16) that go with other items in 2.2 and are about students not driving to school.

TWG members discussed the issues of school parking policy and where schools are built. A TWG member supported restrictions on driving to schools because it has potential to change culture.

The group moved to TLU item 3. A TWG member stated that big businesses should like many of the measures in 3.

TWG members expressed support for 3.3.1 and 3.3.4. and that some large businesses are already doing these for their own economic interests.

After discussion on the pros and cons of 3.2.4, the group indicated they want to keep the measure.

A TWG member stated that for 3.3, the measures that do point to rail seem like they have a high potential because of the cost of fuel and suggested the group bundle 3.3.3, 3.3.4, 3.3.5 since they all have to do with truck to rail.

A TWG member that moving more freight to rail would only work for long-haul freight. Another member wondered what distance is a minimum requirement to move some portion of a freight trip from truck to rail. A member indicated that expanding the freight rail network is a very slow improvement.

Members discussed 3.2.4 and whether increasing truck size would be helpful or not. A member indicated it may reduce fuel consumption and greenhouse gas emissions but cause damage to highway pavements not designed for higher loads.

A member indicated that in section 3.4 business doing these things already should get some kind of a pat on the back, even if they are doing it for their own economic interests.

A TWG member stated that 4.5 (innercity bus passenger travel) is something that could be done pretty quickly.

A TWG member said 4.1 and 4.6 could be combined and it may be possible to have commuter or intercity rail although perhaps not high speed rail between cities.

A TWG member said that all measures in TLU 5 are great ideas although one wondered if 5.11 would have much impact.

A TWG member raised an issue with 5.5 since Arkansas doesn't have a port.

A TWG member said he thinks 5.1 is the most appropriate option for Arkansas.

Lewison Lem asked if there were any final comments on catalog.

Public Comments

A member from the public added a comment about the catalog and felt that some measures should get more priority than others. Two examples given were speed limits and the carrot and stick approach. He stated that carrot approaches have a tendency to only affect those people who would already be doing those things anyway. He brought up an example of university events where cars idle for hours at a time and that this could be solved by having parking lots further out and shuttling people to the events.

A TWG member agreed that speed limits are another important issue and that the current 75mph in some areas is too high.

Review of Next Steps

Lewison Lem said CSS will send members a ballot and notes of the meeting. He reminded members they are free to bundle items, and to please take notes. These will be reflected in the document at next meeting. CSS will send out ballots and prepare a summary document.

Agenda, Date and Time for Next Meeting

The next meeting (#3) is Tuesday, March 18 at 10-11:30am. CSS will bring back the balloting results to that meeting.

The next GCGW meeting is on April 9.

The next scheduled TWG meetings are as follows:

- Meeting #4, April 22, 2008, 10:30AM-12PM CST
- Meeting #5, May 6, 10:30AM-12PM CST