



www.arclimatechange.us

**MEETING SUMMARY
ARKANSAS CLIMATE CHANGE ADVISORY COUNCIL
Transportation and Land Use Technical Work Group
Call #10, August 20, 2008**

Attendees:

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

Advisory Body Members: Lynn Malbrough, (Steve Cousins, guest commission member)

Governor's Office: Jillian Hicks

Center for Climate Strategies: Lewison Lem, Jason Miles

Members of the Public: Jenny Ahlen (Arkansas Energy Office)

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

- Meeting Notice and Agenda
- Summary of Call # 9
- AR TLU Policy Memo
- PowerPoint for Teleconference
- Policy Option Document

Discussion and Conclusions:

Introductions

Lewison Lem welcomed the group and roll call was taken.

Review and Approval of Prior Call Summary

Call #8 and Call #9 – Summary review –

Art put forth the motion to approve both sets of minutes and this was seconded by Gary Voigt.

Review of Next Steps for TWG

An issue was raised from the last full council meeting for the DOT to review all materials. Lynn Malbrough indicated that the DOT will be reviewing these materials.

POLICY OPTIONS DOCUMENT REVIEW

TLU-1 – Study the Feasibility of Plug-In vehicles

No comments received on TLU-1

TLU-1 will be recommended by the TWG to the full commission

TLU-2 – Research and Development of Renewable Transportation Fuels

No comments received on TLU-2

TLU-2 will be recommended by the TWG to the full commission

TLU-3

Betty – Requested to add something describing Algae as a biofuel right above policy design section in 3b, to be sure that algae is included in the different types of biofuels. Would also like to include biodiesel that is produced from algae. People at University of Arkansas are working turning algae into biofuel. Where it says biomass based diesel – “biobased lipid harvested from feedstocks such as algae, biogass, etc...”

Lewison – In determining which of the two options are under consideration, Lewison clarified that the group would end up with just one option between 3a and 3b.

Steve – This is the only place where the Fed Govt has made sweeping changes as part of the energy policy act including aggressive advanced biofuels goals by 2015. Steve estimated the nation would need about 700 plants in operation to meet these goals, to which he acknowledged that the federal goals do not look feasible, and that to push beyond the federal standard would not likely be achievable. The group may need to change the time tables to meet the federal goals in a feasible manner. It’s not so much the biofuels component, but it’s more the advanced biofuels portion that will be difficult to predict how quickly these goals will be able to be achieved.

Jenny - Biofuels plants in Arkansas alone are currently able to produce 30 million gallons this year.

Steve - You need 14 billion gallons to the federal goal, nationwide in 2015.

Jenny – Arkansas portion of fuel use is about 1.2 percent compared nationally. So meeting 1.2% of the 14 billion gallon requirements is not an unreasonable goal.

Steve – Agricultural states by necessity are going to be producing more than their share. Similarly, biodiesel plants will ship nationally by barge and truck, where they are currently limited by the location of oil pipelines.

Lewison – The group needs to consider what a state can do? How far should a state go? Should they go beyond the national goals? From a GHG perspective, there is no requirement or guarantee that the fuels which are replacing current fuels have a lower GHG content throughout their lifecycle.

Steve – It will be a requirement that advanced biofuels have a lower carbon content, producing less GHG emissions in a lifecycle analysis.

Lewison – if the state only uses federal policy instead of instituting their own policy, the federal government will get credit for these actions and the state will not be able to claim credit for any additional GHG emission savings.

Steve – If it is the will of the commission to put something in the policy that exceeds the federal standard, I would push for something that is as reasonable as possible. The important component is the goal for the advanced biofuels which is approximately 3.9%.

Lewison – The policy doesn't necessarily have to be pushing the numbers beyond the federal goals, but the characteristics of the fuel, which could have a lower carbon content could still reduce GHG emissions.

Steve – Believes that the nation will fail to reach the federal goal. Suggests a small increase over the federal standard, if any. Rather than set the goal for 2015, set the goal for 2020 or 2025 to allow for more time for the production side to catch up. But the federal standard is pretty high for 2025 as well. The federal standard all the way out is a very challenging goal to meet.

Art – By 2025 you're going to see a lot of cellulosic fuels available.

Steve – The biggest downside on cellulosic fuels is the funding. EIA predicts the ethanol fuel will be twice as big as it is now by 2025.

Betty – One of the worries in meeting these goals is not production, but trying to get sufficient feedstock to meet these goals.

Steve – Renewable fuel stocks people believe that there is sufficient feedstock available to meet the needs of the nation. Even if there is, we still have to have the infrastructure to get the feedstock to the plants.

Betty – What about the competition for land between food crops and biofuels.

Art – Agreed with extending the timeline out to 2025. Is optimistic about cellulosic biofuels by 2025, but there is the question on how optimistic you want to be.

Betty – Agreed with Art.

Gary – Agrees with Art's assessment as far as timing. Changing it out to 2025.

Looking for a scenario that is more focused on the out years, for cellulosic fuels out to 2025.

Cindy – Questioned if these suggestions were forwarded at the last commission meeting.

There was discussion by the full commission at their last meeting but none of the options were formally approved.

It was agreed that for TLU-3, a new scenario will be developed, extending the timeline out to 2025. Additionally, only one scenario will be shown for TLU-3 instead of the current 3a and 3b

TLU-4 Smart Growth, Pedestrian, and Bicycle

Aubra Anthony – Tell Art Hobson, I want him to come to El Dorado to explain to my 15 year old daughter why she should ride a bike across town in a torrential downpour.

Art suggested getting a bicycle rainsuit or a ride with someone, such as he gets from his wife occasionally.

Art – feedback was received by many city planning people, including those in Fayetteville, who provided a lot of specific information on implementation mechanisms.

TLU-4 will be recommended by the TWG to the full commission, with changes from this meeting, identifying the participation of many city planning people from around the state.

TLU-5 Improve and Expand Transit Service and Infrastructure

Gary – TLU-5 is one of the more expensive options as far as cost effectiveness. Do we have a location where this is applicable.

Art – Fayetteville and Bentonville, Rodgers, West Fork, and northwest Arkansas are all in discussion light rail and what to do about I-40. Also exploring busses and other options about relieving congestion. Currently doing an informal study of light rail in NW Arkansas. Currently pursuing federal funding for a feasibility study of light rail in NW Arkansas.

Gary – Doesn't feel that there is sufficient economics in place to make a light rail system in Arkansas work.

Art – There has been a lot of talk about the need for more financing from the city governments for mass transit (buses).

Referring to page 29 of the policy options document, there is a 20% figure for funding requirements dedicated to mass transit, doesn't know how the group can justify how a certain percentage of funding should be devoted to that option. TLU-5 should be dedicated to the review of these options.

Art – Couldn't justify a specific 20% figure, but from the regional mobility authority there has been push back on their studies that it is focusing too much on automotive travel and not enough emphasis on mass transit options. Art would like to have some specific number so that mobility authorities are aware that it's not about just cars, but it's also about mass transit.

Lynn – Part of the funding could be used to determine if those transit options are feasible or prudent.

Art – Wants to mandate that regional mobility authorities do pay attention to mass transit. Not sure how to get to that without mandating a figure.

Gary – does not like arbitrary numbers for dedicating funding to mass transit.

Art – would be open to alternative wording, suggested possibly identifying a range of funding.

Gary – suggested just identifying that mobility authorities must evaluate mass transit options.

Art – suggested a wide range of 5% - 50% along with Gary's statement stating that mass transit must be considered.

Betty agreed with these changes.

Art – Provided the language to be incorporated into the policy option:

“In addition, regional mobility authorities (RMAs) should always include mass transit options in their considerations and should devote something in the range of 5% - 50% of their funding to mass transit options.”

No other comments were received on TLU-5

TLU-5 will be recommended to the full council with identified changes, incorporating the language that Art put forth.

TLU-6

No comments were received on TLU-6

TLU-6 will be recommended by the TWG to the full council

TLU-7

Art – under policy design, it just talks about rail, on the second bullet after the word “rail” add “*and river shipping*” and then at the end of the sentence change from “rail” to “*either rail or ships.*” Pg 38.

Lewis – At the last full council meeting, it was suggested that the TWG look into freight via barge and other waterways shipping.

Art – Joan Cash had previously suggested deleting the 7th bullet. Does not like the idea of larger trucks. Pointed out that Aubra Anthony was likely opposed to this idea and that he was not on this call. Art was not convinced that the larger trucks would be a more efficient means of moving freight.

Lewison – From the last full council meeting, some GCGW members expressed concern that this option because increasing the weight of trucks could affect the condition of the roads, and increasing their length would exacerbate already dangerous driving conditions, especially at night. Another GCGW member noted that the focus of the policy option should be to encourage mode switching from shipping freight by train rather than truck. Another GCGW member suggested including incentives for increasing truck incentives.

Art and Gary suggested having the full council vote on this seventh bullet.

No additional comments received on TLU-7

TLU-7 will be recommended to the full council with the caveat that the full council must vote on the inclusion or deletion of the 7th bullet point.

TLU-8

Numbers are still in process for TLU-8

No comments for changes to the text on TLU-8

TLU-8 will be recommended to the full council as is, with quantification numbers still to be developed

TLU-9

No additional comments were received

TLU-9 will be recommended to the full council as is.

TLU-10

No comments

TLU-10 will be recommended to the full council as is.

TLU-11

GCGW comments – A member said they are concerned about the estimated cost savings of this policy option and TLU-11b.

Art – the scenario’s original suggestion was 60mph. The consensus seems to be that 60mph would strike a good balance.

There was a consensus among the group to remove the 55mph scenario

Gary – was there any effort to access the cost of increased travel times.

Lewison – generally there is not a full cost-benefit analysis –the calculation that’s done is a dollar per ton cost analysis. More of a cost effectiveness analysis and not a cost benefit analysis. There are safety issues with increased speed and economic issues associated with increased travel time for slower speeds. This requires a much more complex set of data to truly incorporate all of these factors.

Art – time lost due to slower speed is just one of the indirect costs. Higher speed causes increased deaths, injuries, pollution, disease from pollution, etc...

Gary – favors listing the pros and cons listed with the decreased speed that were mentioned during the call.

Agree by Betty and Art.

Lewison will add the pros and cons to TLU-11 as well as TLU-7 in considering freight efficiency.

TLU-11 will be recommended to the full council with the changes of adding the indirect costs of:

- *With increased speed comes*
 - *Safety concerns, death, injuries, increased pollution, and disease associated with the pollution, as well as the costs associated in dealing with these issues*
- *With decreased speed comes*
 - *Increased travel time and the economic impact this would have*

General Discussion

Betty – questioned the details on how the quantification was completed.

Lewison – The policy memo was provided on the Ark TLU-TWG meeting website. Typically these documents are not reviewed, but questions on the approach are always welcome.

Lynn – questioned the summary table on page one of the policy option document under TLU-1.

Lewison – It was a typo, and for TLU-11, both cost effectiveness should be negative \$45.

Lewison will change TLU-11 so that the cost effectiveness for both columns reads “-\$45”

Agenda, Date and Time for Next Meetings

The next meeting is scheduled for:

- September 16, 2008, 10:30am – 1:30pm.

Public Comments and Announcements

No public comments or announcements.