

				Kate Lamal Comments	Greg Peters Comments	Steve Colt Comments	Jim Pfeiffer Comments
Policy No.	Policy Recommendation	Level of support	Text in body of Chapter and Appendix Describing What Was Approved by the MAG	Does this text capture the intent of your vote?	Does this text capture the intent of your vote?	Does this text capture the intent of your vote?	Does this text capture the intent of your vote?
	<u>Cross-Cutting Issues</u>			If no, Please provide comments	If no, Please provide comments	If no, Please provide comments	If no, Please provide comments
CC-1	Establish an Alaska Greenhouse Gas Emission Reporting Program	Unanimous, but on hold	<p>CC-1, the TWG recommended that Alaska create a mandatory GHG reporting program, but the MAG has put the policy on hold until the federal rule is released in its final form.</p> <p>Later text states:--The TWG recommended the establishment of an Alaska GHG reporting program, along with the associated administrative, reporting, and database needs. The MAG forwards this recommendation to the Climate Change Sub-Cabinet , with the caveat that any further action on it be held until more information on timing and implementation of the recent federal proposal is available.</p> <p>The MAG unanimously approved this policy, but also recommended that implementation be delayed until the proposed federal program is resolved.</p>			YES	No. There is no need for an Alaska program given the federal program. I asked for clear language in last MAG meeting to indicate this option is no longer on the table, and received acknowledgement that it would be eliminated. Yet it keeps coming back, often in statements that indicate it is an unqualified recommendation, which it is not.
CC-2	Establish Goals for Statewide GHG Emission Reduction	Majority	<p>CC-2, the MAG concurred with the TWG's recommendation that Alaska adopt aspirational GHG emission reduction goals.</p> <p>--Later text states and presents in table 3-2: The MAG recommends that Alaska adopt a GHG emission reduction goal, by starting now to reduce GHG emissions, with reductions of 20% below 1990 GHG emissions levels by 2020, and 80% below 1990 levels by 2050. The 2050 goal is consistent with the IPCC recommendation to keep atmospheric CO2 levels at 450 parts per million or lower to avoid major irreversible damage to the planet's ecosystems. In addition, Alaska should establish a baseline of emissions that will help measure progress toward these goals.</p> <p>These goals were developed in the context of federal actions, other states' efforts, and Alaska's GHG footprint.</p>		No. My recollection is that after we reviewed the effect on GHG even if we implement every recommendation we wouldn't be close to meeting this goal. So, the MAG voted and recommended on a 8 to 6 vote that some aspirational goal be set, but not the one stated. Also, that it should be set by the Sub-Cabinet and not the MAG. My dissenting opinion for not setting an aspirational goal: Even though the proposed goals are supposedly aspirational, the statutes, regulations, and policies developed to meet the aspirational goals will likely be mandatory. Alaska is a relatively young state and dramatic greenhouse gas cutbacks would stifle economic growth and make large potential projects such as a gas pipeline more difficult, if not impossible. Additionally, a significant portion of the greenhouse gas emissions attributable to Alaska, such as emissions from air traffic, is outside our direct control. Thus, items within control of Alaskans would need to be even more drastically cut to compensate. While we should strive to minimize emissions of greenhouse gases, there should be no discrete numerical goal. Maybe something more like "Wherever feasible and prudent, we should avoid, minimize, or mitigate the emissions of greenhouse gas." Or else, have no policy	YES	No. Most intent is captured, with significant errors. My recollection is that the majority indicated that goals should be established . I personally believe the IPCC goals are appropriate, but as I recall the MAG felt that specific goals should be left to the subcabinet. Also, not sure how the "baseline of emissions" fits in, do not recall that being part of the goals consensus discussion.

				Kate Lamal Comments	Greg Peters Comments	Steve Colt Comments	Jim Pfeiffer Comments
Policy No.	Policy Recommendation	Level of support	Text in body of Chapter and Appendix Describing What Was Approved by the MAG	Does this text capture the intent of your vote?	Does this text capture the intent of your vote?	Does this text capture the intent of your vote?	Does this text capture the intent of your vote?
	<u>Cross-Cutting Issues</u>			If no, Please provide comments	If no, Please provide comments	If no, Please provide comments	If no, Please provide comments
CC-3	Identify and Implement State Government Mitigation Actions	Unanimous	<p>The MAG recommends that Alaska “lead by example” by identifying and implementing no-cost and low-cost “early actions” that can be taken without new funding or legislative approval in the immediate future to reduce the state’s GHG emissions footprint.</p> <p>--This policy recommends that DEC initially take the lead to communicate and implement the immediate actions, using ideas and feedback from other state climate offices and relevant non-governmental organizations. In the future, if any state climate change program or coordinating body is established, it would take over the function of implementing and coordinating state lead-by-example actions, including identifying, tracking, and implementing more complex and expensive actions.</p> <p>-- This policy was unanimously approved by The MAG</p>		Yes	YES, however, could we also agree that "leading by example" is something for all state agencies and employees to embrace and adopt. Perhaps: "This policy recommends that lead-by-example can and should be embraced and adopted by all agencies. DEC should initially take the lead to communicate and help implement the immediate actions..."	no. Any exploration of market-based programs needs to be focused on how a federal program would work in Alaska, rather than exploring how to set up a different system in Alaska. Scope of policy recommendation needs to be narrowed significantly.
CC-4	Integrate Alaska’s Climate Change Mitigation Strategy With the Alaska Energy Plan	Unanimous	<p>The MAG recommends that the state develop Alaska’s 10-year “Climate Protection & Energy Plan” immediately, to commence in 2010. This plan will provide the structure to achieve Alaska’s Climate Change Mitigation Strategy objectives and energy consumption goals through the year 2020. Both the Alaska Energy Plan and the strategic direction of Alaska’s energy and climate goals incorporated in the Alaska Climate Change Strategy should be incorporated.</p> <p>--To support this effort of tracking and managing Alaska’s energy use and resultant climate effects, this policy also recommends the development of an energy database that will track emissions, and climate change mitigation actions throughout Alaska.</p> <p>This policy was unanimously approved by the MAG.</p>		Yes	YES	

				Kate Lamal Comments	Greg Peters Comments	Steve Colt Comments	Jim Pfeiffer Comments
Policy No.	Policy Recommendation	Level of support	Text in body of Chapter and Appendix Describing What Was Approved by the MAG	Does this text capture the intent of your vote?	Does this text capture the intent of your vote?	Does this text capture the intent of your vote?	Does this text capture the intent of your vote?
	<u>Cross-Cutting Issues</u>			If no, Please provide comments	If no, Please provide comments	If no, Please provide comments	If no, Please provide comments
CC-5	Explore Various Market-Based Systems to Manage GHG Emissions	Unanimous	<p>....the MAG, in policy CC-5, recommends the commission of a study to understand the potential impacts of different market-based programs on Alaska</p> <p>--The MAG recommends that a study be commissioned to explore the implications to Alaska of participating in the various market-based approaches for managing GHG emissions, including cap-and-trade programs, carbon taxes, and cap-and-dividend programs.</p> <p>This study would focus on the following pieces related to market-based climate programs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •How a market-based program interacts with existing and proposed emission reduction measures, including regulations, performance-based standards, price subsidies, tax credits, and other technology promoting initiatives. •How to oversee and manage revenues generated by any future market-based program and determine whether changes to existing laws will be needed. <p>This policy was unanimously approved by the MAG.</p>		Yes	YES, provided that the study includes interaction of state program options with impending or likely federal policies.	

				Kate Lamal Comments	Greg Peters Comments	Steve Colt Comments	Jim Pfeiffer Comments
Policy No.	Policy Recommendation	Level of support	Text in body of Chapter and Appendix Describing What Was Approved by the MAG	Does this text capture the intent of your vote?	Does this text capture the intent of your vote?	Does this text capture the intent of your vote?	Does this text capture the intent of your vote?
	<u>Cross-Cutting Issues</u>			If no, Please provide comments	If no, Please provide comments	If no, Please provide comments	If no, Please provide comments
CC-6	Coordinate Implementation of Alaska's Efforts to Address Climate Change	Super-majority	<p>The MAG recommends the establishment of a coordinating entity that could track climate change efforts across state agencies in Alaska; communicate between Alaska and other efforts (e.g., federal activities); provide focus to state agency efforts as recommendations from the Climate Change Sub-Cabinet are implemented; proactively engage with and respond to expected federal initiatives on climate change; provide access to information and education resources; and improve outreach to citizens and businesses on climate change. At a minimum, to accomplish this coordination, an individual would be designated at a high level within state government (e.g., within the Governor's office).</p> <p>The MAG approved this policy by a supermajority. Members objecting to this policy noted that more government agencies are not needed, and that it could duplicate existing efforts.</p>		Yes	YES	
						YES	
	<u>Energy Supply and Demand</u>					YES	

				Kate Lamal Comments	Greg Peters Comments	Steve Colt Comments	Jim Pfeiffer Comments
Policy No.	Policy Recommendation	Level of support	Text in body of Chapter and Appendix Describing What Was Approved by the MAG	Does this text capture the intent of your vote?	Does this text capture the intent of your vote?	Does this text capture the intent of your vote?	Does this text capture the intent of your vote?
	<u>Cross-Cutting Issues</u>			If no, Please provide comments	If no, Please provide comments	If no, Please provide comments	If no, Please provide comments
ESD-1a	Rural Village-to-Village Transmission	Unanimous	<p>ESD-1 will offset sources of GHGs by linking load centers with existing and new renewable energy, and improving the efficiency of rural generators by increasing capacity-sharing capabilities. This policy was unanimously approved by the MAG</p> <p>While no specific funding mechanism is currently proposed to implement either transmission expansion or optimization projects, a number of mechanisms could be used in part or in whole:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •A revolving-door mechanism financed by the state via either the AEA revolving loan fund or the Power Cost Equalization (PCE) Endowment Fund for project development; •A public benefit fund (PBF) in concert with ESD-2, used to fund generator efficiency via village-to-village transmission upgrades; •State revenues generated by auctioning carbon allowances under a national cap-and-trade policy (or alternately, funding from a carbon tax under a similar framework); •Power project loans from the AEA to qualified entities for constructing, improving, and expanding transmission and distribution (T&D) facilities; •Department of Revenue Permanent Fund or other state tax revenues; •Utilities including transmission operation and maintenance (O&M) in rates. 		Yes	YES	
ESD-1b	Renewable Energy Grants for Transmission Upgrades	Unanimous			Yes	YES	no. The term "policy recommendation" is inappropriate to use. The options considered by the O&G TWG were never anything more than "technology options" which are not directly implementable by the State of Alaska. The actual "policy options" developed by the O&G TWG are contained in the "key challenges and opportunities" section of Chapter 6 of the overall report.
ESD-1	Transmission Optimization and Expansion (Total a & b)	Unanimous			Yes	YES	No, for reasons described in OG-2
ESD-2	Energy Efficiency for Residential and Commercial Customers	Quantified with ESD-2/4/6 - See below				YES	No, for reasons described in OG-2

Policy No.	Policy Recommendation	Level of support	Text in body of Chapter and Appendix Describing What Was Approved by the MAG	Kate Lamal Comments	Greg Peters Comments	Steve Colt Comments	Jim Pfeiffer Comments
	<u>Cross-Cutting Issues</u>			If no, Please provide comments	If no, Please provide comments	If no, Please provide comments	If no, Please provide comments
ESD-2/4/6	Energy Efficiency for Residential, Commercial, and Industrial Customers, 2% per year	Unanimous	<p>These policies were designed to reduce electricity, natural gas, and fuel oil consumption in the RCI sectors through energy efficiency and demand-side management measures using a variety of programs and policies, including state and utility efficiency programs, appliances standards, and building codes.</p> <p>This policy was unanimously approved by the MAG, using scenario (b), 2% energy efficiency per year.</p>		Yes	YES	No, for reasons described in OG-2
ESD-3	Implementation of Renewable Energy	Unanimous	<p>ESD-3 focuses on encouraging renewable energy development through implementation of legislation passed by the Alaska legislature in 2008, and the recent Alaska Energy Authority report on energy independence.</p> <p>To reach the 50% goal by 2025, additional renewable resources are assumed to be provided by large-scale hydroelectric projects that are currently under discussion.</p> <p>This policy was unanimously approved by the MAG. To achieve the policy goals, the State of Alaska will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Aggressively publicize, pursue, and monitor progress toward the target of 50% of electricity generation from renewable sources by 2025. •Set benchmark targets for renewable energy use until 2025. •Follow through with the existing Renewable Energy Fund process and consider additional funding to support more projects. •Shift priorities in the PCE Endowment Fund to reward utility, co-op, and village investment in renewable systems; transfer funds from reimbursements to infrastructure. •Remove or reduce existing legal barriers to renewable energy systems, such as land use laws, land leasing requirements, or school funding formulas that might reduce reimbursements if a school or community invests in a wind turbine to reduce utility bills. •Change the utility regulatory system—by statute if necessary—to provide for reasonable and predictable returns on utility investments in cost- 		Yes	YES	No, for reasons described in OG-2
ESD-4	Building Standards/Incentives	<i>Quantified with ESD-2/4/6 - See above</i>				YES	No, for reasons described in OG-2
ESD-5	Efficiency Improvements for Generators	<i>Moved to Research Needs Work Group</i>				YES	No, for reasons described in OG-2

				Kate Lamal Comments	Greg Peters Comments	Steve Colt Comments	Jim Pfeiffer Comments
Policy No.	Policy Recommendation	Level of support	Text in body of Chapter and Appendix Describing What Was Approved by the MAG	Does this text capture the intent of your vote?	Does this text capture the intent of your vote?	Does this text capture the intent of your vote?	Does this text capture the intent of your vote?
	<u>Cross-Cutting Issues</u>			If no, Please provide comments	If no, Please provide comments	If no, Please provide comments	If no, Please provide comments
ESD-6	Energy Efficiency for Industrial Installations	Quantified with ESD-2/4/6 - See above				YES	
ESD-7	Implementation of Small-Scale Nuclear Power	Moved to Research Needs Work Group				YES	
ESD-8	Research and Development for Cold-Climate Renewable Technologies	Moved to Research Needs Work Group				YES	No. Alaska should be part of any federal anti-idling regulation development, but not develop its own. Ability to enforce regulation would be dubious and climate would require a convoluted set of regulations to address life safety and vehicle protection issues. Voluntary programs OK.
ESD-9	Implementation of Advanced Supply Side Technologies	Moved to Research Needs Work Group				YES	
	<u>Forestry, Agriculture, and Waste Management</u>						
FAW-1A	Coastal Forest Management Pre-Commercial Thinning	Unanimous	<p>Forest management for carbon sequestration: One of the ways in which the state's coastal forests could be managed to increase the potential for long-term carbon sequestration would be through conducting more PCT and commercial thinning (CT) projects (FAW-1A).⁴ Over time, these projects shift the carbon in biomass from smaller-diameter to larger-diameter trees that can be harvested for use in durable wood products. The carbon in durable wood products is stored over long periods in the form of structures, furniture, and other products. At the time of harvest, a forest stand that has received management via PCT will yield more timber for durable wood products than a similar stand that has not been thinned. As indicated in Table 5-2 below, the MAG opted not to report the future incremental carbon sequestered as a result of forest thinning projects, since the reductions are not assured until harvest, which would occur outside of the policy period (i.e., beyond 2025).</p>		Yes	YES	

				Kate Lamal Comments	Greg Peters Comments	Steve Colt Comments	Jim Pfeiffer Comments
Policy No.	Policy Recommendation	Level of support	Text in body of Chapter and Appendix Describing What Was Approved by the MAG	Does this text capture the intent of your vote?	Does this text capture the intent of your vote?	Does this text capture the intent of your vote?	Does this text capture the intent of your vote?
	<u>Cross-Cutting Issues</u>			If no, Please provide comments	If no, Please provide comments	If no, Please provide comments	If no, Please provide comments
FAW-1B	Boreal Forest Mechanical Fuels Treatment Projects	Unanimous	Enhancement/protection of forest carbon sinks: Through a variety of programs, enhanced levels of CO2 sequestration can be achieved and carbon can be stored in the state's forest biomass. These include reforestation programs, particularly in the boreal forest in areas impacted by severe wildfire (FAW-1D). These tend to be areas that might not regenerate and come back under forest cover for many decades. While the cost-effectiveness was estimated at the higher end of the range of all quantified options (~\$92/tCO2), achieving the goals of FAW-1D was estimated to produce 150,000 tCO2 reductions annually by 2025 (see Table 5-2).		Yes	YES	
FAW-1C	Community Wildfire Risk Reduction Plans	Unanimous	Wildfire Fuel Treatment Programs: Forest protection can be achieved through fuel treatment programs that reduce the risk of catastrophic (stand-replacement) wildfires (FAW-1B and 1C). These programs protect existing carbon stocks, along with their annual potential for continued carbon sequestration. Due to a current lack of information to quantitatively assess the GHG reductions for reduced wildfire risk achieved by fuel treatment programs, the MAG approved FAW-1 elements B and C as non-quantified policies (as shown in Table 5-2).		Yes	YES	
FAW-1D	Boreal Forest Reforestation After Fire or Insect and Disease Mortality	Unanimous	complete boreal forest reforestation projects on 25% of high-site-class lands by 2025.		Yes	YES	

				Kate Lamal Comments	Greg Peters Comments	Steve Colt Comments	Jim Pfeiffer Comments
Policy No.	Policy Recommendation	Level of support	Text in body of Chapter and Appendix Describing What Was Approved by the MAG	Does this text capture the intent of your vote?	Does this text capture the intent of your vote?	Does this text capture the intent of your vote?	Does this text capture the intent of your vote?
	<u>Cross-Cutting Issues</u>			If no, Please provide comments	If no, Please provide comments	If no, Please provide comments	If no, Please provide comments
FAW-2A	Biomass Feedstocks to Offset Heating Oil Use	Unanimous	Expanded use of biomass feedstocks to produce energy: Expanded use of renewable energy from biomass removed from forests during wildfire risk reduction programs, mill residues, lawn and garden waste, or MSW can achieve GHG benefits by offsetting fossil fuel consumption (to produce either electricity or heat/steam). FAW-2A and 2B offer two recommendations for achieving GHG reductions in this area. Combined, these two elements would produce 220,000 tCO2e in reductions annually in 2025. Production of renewable fuels, such as ethanol from forestry biomass or MSW, can produce significant reductions when they are used to offset consumption of fossil fuels (e.g., gasoline in transportation). --FAW-2A is a goal to use biomass feedstocks to offset 10% of the state's heating oil use in commercial and residential applications by 2025.		Yes	YES	
FAW-2B	Biomass Feedstocks for Electricity Use	Unanimous	FAW-2B is a goal to use biomass feedstocks to produce 5% of the state's electricity by 2025.		Yes	YES	
FAW-2C	Biomass Feedstocks to Offset Fossil Transportation Fuels	Unanimous	FAW-2C is a goal to use biomass feedstocks to produce sufficient biofuels to offset 5% of the state's fossil transportation fuels.		Yes	YES	

				Kate Lamal Comments	Greg Peters Comments	Steve Colt Comments	Jim Pfeiffer Comments
Policy No.	Policy Recommendation	Level of support	Text in body of Chapter and Appendix Describing What Was Approved by the MAG	Does this text capture the intent of your vote?	Does this text capture the intent of your vote?	Does this text capture the intent of your vote?	Does this text capture the intent of your vote?
	<u>Cross-Cutting Issues</u>			If no, Please provide comments	If no, Please provide comments	If no, Please provide comments	If no, Please provide comments
FAW-3	Advanced Waste Reduction and Recycling	Unanimous	Changes in MSW management practices: By promoting source reduction, advanced MSW recycling practices, and improved organics management, the overall GHG emissions associated managing MSW can be reduced. The reductions come from lower landfill methane emissions and lower CO2, CH4, and N2O emissions from waste combustion in the state. Even larger reductions are achieved when product life-cycle emissions are considered. By generating less waste in the first place or recycling waste that is generated, the emissions associated with product/packaging production and transport are reduced. It is important to note that these life-cycle emission reductions occur both within and outside Alaska, depending on where the product/packaging originated. When the life-cycle GHG reductions of source reduction/recycling/organics management are considered, these programs yield 650,000 tCO2e/yr in reductions by 2025. An overall cost savings was estimated for this policy (-\$8/tCO2e), primarily through avoided landfill costs. M-5-		Yes	YES	
	<u>Oil and Gas</u>						
OG-1	Best Conservation Practices	Unanimous	This policy recommends the state via communication efforts enhance companies' ongoing efforts to reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions using common-sense measures that minimize fuel consumption. Goals include encouraging the O&G workforce in continued energy conservation efforts and ensuring that companies' ongoing efforts are creditable under any future GHG regulatory programs. The MAG was unanimous is recommending this policy.		Yes	YES, although "via communication efforts" seems restrictive and maybe could be stricken. Perhaps: "the state encourage and support companies' ongoing efforts...."	

				Kate Lamal Comments	Greg Peters Comments	Steve Colt Comments	Jim Pfeiffer Comments
Policy No.	Policy Recommendation	Level of support	Text in body of Chapter and Appendix Describing What Was Approved by the MAG	Does this text capture the intent of your vote?	Does this text capture the intent of your vote?	Does this text capture the intent of your vote?	Does this text capture the intent of your vote?
	<u>Cross-Cutting Issues</u>			If no, Please provide comments	If no, Please provide comments	If no, Please provide comments	If no, Please provide comments
OG-2	Reductions in Fugitive Methane Emissions	Unanimous	This policy recommends studies on both types of emissions. The quantification modeling covers both fugitives and emissions related to wet seals on the North Slope. This policy relates to the technical and economic feasibility of reducing fugitive and wet seal emissions by first determining where leaks occur, and then planning the optimal corrections. Steps for this determination are to begin official refinements to fugitive methane inventories and assess potential reductions and associated costs to reduce fugitive methane emissions. The MAG was unanimous is recommending this policy.		Yes	YES	
OG-3	Electrification of North Slope Oil and Gas Operations, With Centralized Power Production and Distribution	Unanimous	This policy recommends that the State of Alaska and the OG stakeholders commission a detailed study of the economics and technical feasibility of electrification of North Slope OG operations with centralized power production and distribution. The focus of the study should be to develop, through various means, incentive programs to promote capital investment in GHG reduction projects. The MAG was unanimous is recommending this policy.		Yes	YES	
OG-4	Improved Efficiency Upgrades for Oil and Gas Fuel-Burning Equipment	Unanimous	This policy recommends that Alaska and the O&G stakeholders commission a detailed study of the economics and technical feasibility of replacing older-technology equipment with newer high-efficiency equipment to improve overall thermal efficiency. The focus of the study should be to develop, through various means, incentive programs to promote capital investment in GHG reduction projects. The MAG was unanimous is recommending this policy.		Yes	YES	
OG-5	Renewable Energy Sources in Oil and Gas Operations	Unanimous	This policy is a recommendation that Alaska and O&G stakeholders commission a detailed study of the economics and technical feasibility of developing renewable energy sources to improve overall thermal efficiency, especially in North Slope oil fields. The MAG was unanimous is recommending this policy.		Yes	YES	

				Kate Lamal Comments	Greg Peters Comments	Steve Colt Comments	Jim Pfeiffer Comments
Policy No.	Policy Recommendation	Level of support	Text in body of Chapter and Appendix Describing What Was Approved by the MAG	Does this text capture the intent of your vote?	Does this text capture the intent of your vote?	Does this text capture the intent of your vote?	Does this text capture the intent of your vote?
	<u>Cross-Cutting Issues</u>			If no, Please provide comments	If no, Please provide comments	If no, Please provide comments	If no, Please provide comments
OG-6	Carbon Capture (From North Slope High-CO2 Fuel Gas) and Geologic Sequestration With Enhanced Oil Recovery	Unanimous	This policy relates to the technical feasibility and economics of CO2 separation from produced gas, transport, and geologic sequestration (carbon capture and storage and re-use [CCSR]) from gas used for fuel in and around Prudhoe Bay. Goals include initiating studies on the technical and economic aspects of implementation. The economic analysis should include design of appropriate financial incentives to responsibly encourage capital investments. The technical analysis should be conducted to choose an appropriate CO2 capture technology and the best reservoir for CO2 injection to maximize economics, especially relating to EOR benefits. The MAG was unanimous is recommending this policy.		Yes	YES	
OG-7	Carbon Capture (From Exhaust Gas at a Centralized Facility) and Geologic Sequestration With Enhanced Oil Recovery	Unanimous	This policy relates to the technical feasibility and economics of post-combustion CO2 capture, transport, and geologic sequestration in or near existing Alaska O&G fields, including the upside of initial EOR. Goals include initiating studies on the technical and economic aspects of implementation. The economic analysis should include design of appropriate financial incentives to responsibly encourage capital investments. The technical analysis should include the size and type of facilities modifications, choice of appropriate combustion CO2 capture technology, and choice of best reservoir for CO2 injection to maximize economics, especially relating to EOR benefits. The MAG was unanimous is recommending this policy.		Yes	YES	

				Kate Lamal Comments	Greg Peters Comments	Steve Colt Comments	Jim Pfeiffer Comments
Policy No.	Policy Recommendation	Level of support	Text in body of Chapter and Appendix Describing What Was Approved by the MAG	Does this text capture the intent of your vote?	Does this text capture the intent of your vote?	Does this text capture the intent of your vote?	Does this text capture the intent of your vote?
	<u>Cross-Cutting Issues</u>			If no, Please provide comments	If no, Please provide comments	If no, Please provide comments	If no, Please provide comments
OG-8	Carbon Capture (From Exhaust Gas) and Geologic Sequestration Away From Known Geologic Traps	Unanimous	This policy relates to the technical and economic feasibility of CO ₂ capture, transport, and geologic sequestration far from O&G infrastructure, in areas where a nearby storage reservoir is not proven. Goals include initiating studies on the technical and economic aspects of implementation. The economic analysis should include design of appropriate financial incentives to responsibly encourage capital investments. The technical analysis should include the size and type of facilities modifications and the choice of appropriate combustion CO ₂ capture technology, and should either search for nearby sequestration opportunities or plan for a pipeline to known reservoirs with proven seals. The MAG was unanimous is recommending this policy.		Yes	YES	
	<u>Transportation and Land Use</u>						
TLU-1	Transit, Ridesharing, and Commuter Choice Programs	Unanimous	The MAG recommends that Alaska provide the leadership and resources necessary to help expand Alaska's public transit and ridesharing system. This policy would develop park-and-ride systems that are coupled in increased urban transit schedules, develop outlying collector routes with buses or vans to high-employment destinations, provide funding support to expand the current transit systems' operations to increase the frequency of in-town schedules, develop rail tie-in along existing track, and also support the development of a Regional Transportation Authority in Anchorage and Fairbanks to integrate all alternatives into one coordinated regional system.		Yes	YES	

				Kate Lamal Comments	Greg Peters Comments	Steve Colt Comments	Jim Pfeiffer Comments
Policy No.	Policy Recommendation	Level of support	Text in body of Chapter and Appendix Describing What Was Approved by the MAG	Does this text capture the intent of your vote?	Does this text capture the intent of your vote?	Does this text capture the intent of your vote?	Does this text capture the intent of your vote?
	<u>Cross-Cutting Issues</u>			If no, Please provide comments	If no, Please provide comments	If no, Please provide comments	If no, Please provide comments
TLU-2	Heavy-Duty Vehicle Idling Regulations and/or Alternatives	Unanimous	The MAG recommends that Alaska focus on reducing idling times for diesel and gasoline heavy-duty vehicles, buses and other vehicles through a combination of statewide anti-idling regulations and by promoting and expanding the use of technologies that reduce heavy-duty vehicle idling. Below-zero arctic and subarctic winter conditions will be accommodated. Through this policy the state would also provide additional incentives to fleet or individual heavy-duty truck owners to purchase and install idle-regduction technologies on their vehicles. Alaska may also provide incentives to assist the private fleets to convert some of their vehicles to hybrid operation. Alaska DOT&PF will lead by example with the installation of idle-reduction technology and/or idle-reduction policies/procedures for its fleet of heavy-duty vehicles. Target is the end of 2011 for creation and implementation of anti-idle regulations, and 2012 for 20% implementation, and 2020 for full implementation of idle reduction technologies by all parties.		Yes	YES	
TLU-3	Transportation System Management	Unanimous	The MAG recommends that Alaska seek to reduce GHG emissions through focusing on the improvement, management, and operation of the transporation infrastructure, especially of the road and highway systems. Some of the specific policies include ADOT&PF encouragement of roundabout installation, reduction of some speed limits, investment in transit, bike and pedstrian facilities, improvement of traffic signal synchronization, conversion to LED traffic and roadway luminary lighting under their jurisdiction, and other traffic, congestion, and access management plans.		Yes	YES	

				Kate Lamal Comments	Greg Peters Comments	Steve Colt Comments	Jim Pfeiffer Comments
Policy No.	Policy Recommendation	Level of support	Text in body of Chapter and Appendix Describing What Was Approved by the MAG	Does this text capture the intent of your vote?	Does this text capture the intent of your vote?	Does this text capture the intent of your vote?	Does this text capture the intent of your vote?
	<u>Cross-Cutting Issues</u>			If no, Please provide comments	If no, Please provide comments	If no, Please provide comments	If no, Please provide comments
TLU-4	Promote Efficient Development Patterns (Smart Growth)	Unanimous	The MAG recommends Alaska promote efficient, sustainable (smart growth) land development patterns to complement transit improvements, and sustained implementation of multimodal links to facilitate biking, walking, and winter trail use in residential and urban areas. This policy promotes land-use changes that result in higher densities in developed, urban areas, and on incorporating retail zones and small limited commercial nodes in residential developments. The goal is to reduce driving needs by facilitating walking or bicycling, and reducing the length of driving trips. DOE will require school boards to favor sites for new schools that can be reached by walking and biking for the majority of the school population, to benefit both reduced driving and a more fit youth population.		Yes	YES	
TLU-5	Promotion of Alternative-Fuel Vehicles	Unanimous	The MAG recommends that Alaska promote the use of alternative-fuel vehicles (AFVs) in the light-duty fleet. The policy provides goals to increase the use of light-duty AFV's by the public sector agencies and private-sector firms to 25% of on-road fuel consumption by 2020 and 35% by 2030, and by consumers to 10% for on-road fuel consumption by 2020 and 25% by 2030, as well as ensure that the AFC technologies chosen produce a minimum 15% life-cycle reduction in GHG emissions per mile, compared to conventional fuels. The policy would be implemented through a series of federal-and state-supported low-cost loans, grants, attractive financing of trade-in vehicles, tax incentives, and other incentives and subsidies to promote the use of AFVs.		Yes	YES	

				Kate Lamal Comments	Greg Peters Comments	Steve Colt Comments	Jim Pfeiffer Comments
Policy No.	Policy Recommendation	Level of support	Text in body of Chapter and Appendix Describing What Was Approved by the MAG	Does this text capture the intent of your vote?	Does this text capture the intent of your vote?	Does this text capture the intent of your vote?	Does this text capture the intent of your vote?
	<u>Cross-Cutting Issues</u>			If no, Please provide comments	If no, Please provide comments	If no, Please provide comments	If no, Please provide comments
TLU-6	VMT and GHG Reduction Goals in Planning	Unanimous	The MAG recommends that Alaska require all significant transportation system plans at the state and MPO levels, and all actions that would change or provide a new mode of transportation or enlarge capacity, to have an evaluation of their contributions to GHG emissions. The goal is to reduce the per-capita light-duty VMT in communities that offer transit services by 1% by 2015, and 3% by 2025. To implement the policy, FMATS and AMATS would work with ADOT&PF to develop consistent evaluation methods by the end of 2010, and the state legislature would enact a policy that requires per-capita reductions in VMT in communities that offer transit services.		Yes	YES, fix the typos	
TLU-7	On-Road Heavy-Duty Vehicle Efficiency Improvements	Unanimous	The MAG recommends that Alaska create new services and provide additional support to existing voluntary and incentive-based programs that help public and private on-road heavy-duty diesel-powered fleets reduce GHG emissions. This policy has three primary strategies, 1) Develop incentive to encourage participation in the EPA SmartWay Transport Partnership Program, 2) Provide incentives to phase out 1988 and older high-GHG-emitting on-road heavy-duty diesel engines, and replace with lower-GHG emitting engines is appropriate. Vehicles replaced by the program must be permanently scrapped. 3) Develop incentive for government-managed fleets to reduce GHG emissions.		Yes	YES	
TLU-7A	On-Road Heavy-Duty Vehicle Efficiency Improvements - SmartWay	Unanimous	merged into TLU-7			YES	
TLU-7B	On-Road Heavy-Duty Vehicle Efficiency Improvements - Phase Out	Unanimous	merged into TLU-7			YES	
TLU-7C	On-Road Heavy-Duty Vehicle Efficiency Improvements - Public Fleets	Unanimous	merged into TLU-7			YES	

				Kate Lamal Comments	Greg Peters Comments	Steve Colt Comments	Jim Pfeiffer Comments
Policy No.	Policy Recommendation	Level of support	Text in body of Chapter and Appendix Describing What Was Approved by the MAG	Does this text capture the intent of your vote?	Does this text capture the intent of your vote?	Does this text capture the intent of your vote?	Does this text capture the intent of your vote?
	<u>Cross-Cutting Issues</u>			If no, Please provide comments	If no, Please provide comments	If no, Please provide comments	If no, Please provide comments
TLU-8	Marine Vessel Efficiency Improvements	Unanimous	The MAG recommends that Alaska promote efficiencies and conservation options for commercial and recreational fishing, marine tourism and other forms of marine transportation by 1) Providing financial incentives, such as low-cost loans to encourage vessel owners to implement changes, and 2) Encouraging federal and state agencies that regulate commercial fishing to consider GHG emissions when making policy decisions.		Yes	YES	
TLU-9	Aviation Emission Reductions	Unanimous	The MAG recommends that Alaska 1) Support the FAA in the redesign and improvement of the current outdated air traffic management system through the implementation of the Next Generation Air Transportation project. 2) Identify existing and new operational best practices for maximizing fuel efficiency in the aviation sector, facilitate (including through financial incentives) voluntary implementation of such practices and evaluate resulting emission benefits where possible, and 3) Adopt a clear statement that it is the policy of the State of Alaska to facilitate the rapid introduction of alternative fuels for aviation that both are economically viable and have a reduced emissions profile on a life-cycle basis.		Yes	YES	
TLU-10	Alternative Fuels Research and Development	Unanimous	The MAG recommends that Alaska support research and development of alternative transportation fuels that are feasible in the Alaska climate, result in significant life-cycle GHG reductions when used in Alaska, and can benefit Alaska's economy. Research should focus on existing alternative propulsion technologies and methods to make existing technologies more viable in Alaska, rather than on development of new propulsion technologies.		Yes	YES	
	<u>General Comments</u>			I was under the impression we were identifying options, not making recommendations.			

				Kate Lamal Comments	Greg Peters Comments	Steve Colt Comments	Jim Pfeiffer Comments
Policy No.	Policy Recommendation	Level of support	Text in body of Chapter and Appendix Describing What Was Approved by the MAG	Does this text capture the intent of your vote?	Does this text capture the intent of your vote?	Does this text capture the intent of your vote?	Does this text capture the intent of your vote?
	<u>Cross-Cutting Issues</u>			If no, Please provide comments	If no, Please provide comments	If no, Please provide comments	If no, Please provide comments
			M-EX-5	Expand the discussion on page M-EX-5 on the high per capita GHG basis in Alaska. Explain it is because of the NS O&G industry and the cargo industry in Anchorage.			
			M-EX-6	The mention of volcanic dust and "black carnion" from fossil fuel in the same paragraph is confusing. It would be of interest to include a discussion on the GHG contribution from volcanic activity since we have no control over the volcanoes in Alaska but have frequent eruptions. We should discuss that contribution - and that of forest fires.			
			Figure EX-5	This graph really needs to be looked at in light of my comments under CC-2 below.			
			Figure EX-6	This figure is confusing and misleading. Why don't you simply state that if all options were implemented, the GHG would be reduced 32 MMT.			