



www.arclimatechange.us

**MEETING SUMMARY
ARKANSAS CLIMATE CHANGE ADVISORY COUNCIL
Transportation and Land Use Technical Work Group
Call #3, March 24, 2008**

Attendees:

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

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

Governor's Office: Marc Harrison

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

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

Meeting Notice and Agenda
Summary of Call #2
PowerPoint for Teleconference
TLU Interim Straw Ballot Results

Discussion and Conclusions:

Introductions and Review of Agenda

Lewison Lem greeted the group and roll call was taken. Lewison gave introductions and noted that a number of documents for the meeting were posted on the website and an additional document was sent via email. He stated that ballot results will be posted and emailed after the review process that includes review by the Governor's office. He asked if there were any comments or additions to the agenda and thanked everyone for their ballot responses, which will be the bulk of the conversation.

Review and Approval of Prior Call Summary

Lewison Lem asked if there were any additions or corrections for the meeting summary on Call #2 from March 12, 2008.

Group members had no corrections or additions to the meeting summary.

TLU member made a motion to approve the summary. A second TLU member seconded the motion.

Lewison Lem asked if there were any objections. No objections were stated and Lewison approved the meeting summary.

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

Lewison Lem reminded the group that today's meeting's purpose is to identify initial priorities for analysis and to make policy recommendations for the full commission meeting.

Review and Discussion of Balloting Results

Lewison Lem began discussion on the ballot results. Lewison stated that the ballot document shows the tabulated results and that where there was bundling, those were put together. Items were grouped according to top priority (those with three votes), middle (those with two votes) and low (those with one vote). CCS received seven responses from the members including one letter and six completed ballots.

The group discussed the general content of the letter. The group decided that that member would not mind if discussion proceeded and decided to begin looking at the balloting results together.

The group discussed bundling and whether more options could be proposed if some of the options were bundled.

Lewison Lem responded that there is not a strict number of priorities that can be selected and that the group can bundle to try to capture more items.

A member suggested that the group come up with five more priorities and stated that he hopes the group comes up with more than just five policies.

A member stated a bundling preference for options 1.3.2 and 1.3.4.

A member commented that she was surprised by the balloting results since many important issues were lower in priority than less important issues.

A member said he was not surprised by rail priorities.

The group discussed rail efficiency and truck industry economics. A member stated that the rising cost of diesel fuel encourages rail and the group should do what it can to encourage that growth.

Another member added that 'promote' is the key word.

Lewison Lem replied that there are elements of implementation later in the process.

A member asked how the group's priorities compare to those of other states.

Lewison Lem said that other states were similar on the issue of freight and are looking to make rail more efficient and that other states are looking at freight efficiency. He said that the group's balloting result is not a surprise. Also, the bundle for the number three options, a "smart growth bundle," is another one other states are looking at.

A member brought up plug-in vehicles, and that he thinks the plug-in hybrid will be the car of the future in about five years. He thinks it'll be a very big deal, but wonders how much the group can do for that.

Another member responded that infrastructure has to be in place for new technologies in order to support them. He would like to see plug in infrastructure on the list for commercial building standards requirements. The member added a comment on the bundling of freight options: if railroads aren't regulated, small shippers have almost no rights. The key component is to change federal policy on control of the railroad. He believes when the group bundles truck and rail, there is no incentive for railroad companies that are focusing on big shipments.

Lewison Lem said there are other elements in the middle that have to do with trucking such as 3.1.1 and 3.2.6 (electrification). Discussion followed about private sector decisions and what can happen at the state level versus the federal level and bundling electrification options. The group agreed on the logic of bundling the five 3.0 options that received two votes or more and adding truck and freight efficiency to 3.1.1 and 3.2.6.

A member added that he would like to bundle of 2.3.15, 2.3.16 and 2.2.23 that relate to driving to school. He said he thinks it would make a big difference because changes in lifestyles at an early age can change things in a big way.

Another member stated that to rule out cars without having the infrastructure is short-sighted.

Lewison Lem stated that there is room for additions and asked if people would be in favor of adding those measures relating to driving to school.

Discussion among the group followed on bundling school driving options (2.3.15, 2.3.16 and 2.2.23) and also transit items (2.2.2, 2.2.5, 4.5 and 4.6).

Lewison Lem confirmed that there was agreement on adding sixth and seventh policies to the list.

A member asked if freight efficiency should be bundled.

Lewison Lem suggested it could be called a transportation bundle.

Another member suggested an eighth bundle: 1.4.3 and 1.4.4.

The group had no objections to the proposed bundle.

A member suggested bundling 1.3.2 and 1.3.4 and calling the bundle Incentives for More Efficient Vehicles. No objections to the bundling were raised.

A member stated that the policy option of reducing cars on campus involves education but that education should also be a part of many of the other policies as well.

A member stated that policy 1.2.7 is odd and that 1.2.9 captured the idea best. The group favored adding 1.2.9 as a separate item.

Unbundling 1.3.2 was raised.

The group discussed how many measures there were after discussion and agreed there were now nine.

Agenda, Date and Time for Next Meetings

Lewison Lem stated that at the next full commission meeting the group will give their priorities, and at the next TLU meeting the group will talk about policy descriptions. He stated that volunteers will be needed to draft language for the selected policies.

A member raised a question about the Freedom of Information Act and whether members could communicate between each other as they worked on drafting the policy descriptions.

Lewison Lem said that this is a good question that should be raised at a full commission meeting.

Kathy Leotta said she could bring up the issue at the weekly commission meeting and let the group know what she hears.

Lewison asked the members to think about which policies they might like to work on before the next meeting. There were no other comments by the group.

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

Public Comments and Announcements

No comments or announcements were made.