



MEETING SUMMARY

Alaska Climate Change Mitigation Advisory Group Transportation & Land Use Technical Work Group (TLU TWG) Meeting #5, October 24, 2008, 9:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.

Attendance:

1. Technical Working Group Members: Luke Hopkins, Chip Treinen, Rob Bosworth, Liz Glooschenko (for Aves Thompson), Curt Stoner, Karen Ellis, Alison Byrd
2. Center for Climate Strategies (CCS) staff: Jeff Ang-Olson, Frank Gallivan
3. Alaska State Agency Liaison and Attendees: Jackie Poston

Background documents:

(All posted at http://www.akclimatechange.us/Transportation_Land_Use.cfm)

1. Meeting notice and agenda
2. Call #4 Summary
3. Powerpoint presentation (including agenda) for meeting
4. TLU Ballot Priorities

Discussion items and key issues:

1. CCS gave an overview of the last MAG meeting: The MAG met last month. TLU options were presented and there was positive feedback, but the MAG wasn't ready to approve them. Approval will happen at the next meeting in November.
2. CCS asked for any further input on the priority options:
 - a. A TWG member asked about TLU-2: Vehicle Idling Regulations and/or Alternatives. There is some confusion about whether this would include light-duty trucks. CCS responded that it potentially could, but would probably focus on heavy-duty.
 - b. A TWG member asked whether the numbering of options reflects any relative priority. CCS responded that it does not.
 - c. A TWG member asked about TLU-8: Diesel Engine Efficiency Improvements. The policy may be less effective if on-road and marine engines are combined in this policy. CCS explained that a single policy option can cover a broad range of emissions mitigation elements.

- d. A TWG member asked about the impact of the California Clean Car Standards. Perhaps there is not enough impact in addition to the federal CAFE standards to justify pursuing this option.
 - e. CCS asked whether members would like to drop TLU-5: California Clean Car Program and split TLU-8 into on-road and marine policies. There were no objections from the TWG members present at the meeting.
 - f. A TWG member asked about the possible impact of a change in speed limits. CCS agreed that this is an important policy option, which can be addressed under the existing TLU-3: Transportation System Management.
 - g. A TWG member asked whether TLU-6 needs to be limited to passenger vehicles. The group agreed that this option can be expanded beyond passenger vehicles for now.
3. CCS proposed to postpone discussion of the aircraft emissions options until representatives from the air transportation industry and air force are present.
 4. CCS reviewed the policy option template that will provide the basis for development of options. TWG members will be asked to lead the development of the policy description, design, implementation mechanisms, and related programs. CCS will lead the development of GHG quantification and additional benefits and costs, with TWG input.
 5. A TWG member asked about the timeline for option development. CCS responded that by February we should have the straw proposals fleshed out for all options. After the February MAG meeting, quantification can begin more fully. Quantification has to be completed by April.
 6. A TWG member asked about using reference materials from other state processes. CCS said that appropriate materials would be distributed.
 7. CCS returned to the discussion of aircraft emissions, after some representatives from the air transportation industry arrived. Some options for the TWG to consider include:
 - a. Air traffic management improvements
 - i. Minimize circuitous routing
 - b. Continuous descent approach
 - c. Change landing fee structure (flat fees)
 - i. Could encourage use of larger aircraft
 - ii. Requires act of Congress; airlines opposed; impacts uncertain
 - d. Ground operations (voluntary program)
 - i. Reduce APU use, single engine taxi, use of tractors, etc.
 - e. Government support for R&D
 8. CCS asked for feedback on these options:

- a. A TWG member stated that air traffic management improvements have been slated for federal action for a long time. The federal government needs to update the system. There would be benefits all around including shorter queue times. Alaska could pressure the federal government to do this, and the airlines would be amenable.
 - b. A TWG member stated that descent approach patterns can't be influenced by state policies. Descent patterns are determined between the pilot and air traffic control. Maybe traffic management improvements would affect descent patterns though.
 - c. A TWG member stated that FedEx doesn't like the possibility of changing landing fee structures. This option probably wouldn't have any effect on aircraft size and flight patterns, because other economic factors are more important than landing fees. Fee structure changes at a single airport don't consider the broader system operation. An aircraft is a large capital investment. Fee structures will not change the economics substantially.
 - d. CCS stated that the current structure doesn't incentivize the use of larger aircraft.
 - e. A TWG member stated that measures to affect ground support equipment don't work well in Alaska because of the climate. There are a number of other voluntary programs that might be effective. FedEx has implemented a variety of maintenance, operational, and planning procedures to reduce fuel use. These measures should be transferable to other airlines.
 - f. A TWG member asked whether there is really a role for the MAG here, or whether market pressures might not bring about the kinds of changes discussed.
 - g. CCS responded that large capital investments and ingrained habits can be barriers to change even in the face of market pressures.
 - h. A TWG member suggested that the government provide R&D and outreach on these types of measures.
 - i. A TWG member asked what particular benefit Alaska would receive from promoting nationwide air system upgrades. Another TWG member replied that airline emissions are a larger share of total emissions in Alaska than in other states. Therefore Alaska stands to reduce a greater share of emissions from national system upgrades.
 - j. A TWG member suggested that the group look at the current actions of some prominent world airports.
9. CCS proposed an initial division of labor to develop the policy options and asked for volunteers. CCS asked that everyone in the group be involved in at least one option. Before the next meeting, members should try to develop the description and design of their policy options, and include numeric goals in the design if possible.
 10. Preliminary discussion of option design followed:
 - a. TLU-4: A TWG member referenced smart development principles. CCS pointed out that the state cannot directly regulate development patterns. The TWG

member stated that zoning laws need to be amended and that procedures for the sale of municipal land can be amended. The Anchorage 2020 plan may inform this option.

- b. The TWG discussed the feasibility of a program for early retirement of older/polluting vehicles. These vehicles do not make up a large share of the Alaska fleet. CCS asked if there were potential for a program to incentivize purchase of new, cleaner vehicle types.
- c. Marine Efficiency: A TWG member stated that there will be plenty of older engines operating. There are already some programs in place to encourage replacement of older engines. The group discussed the possibility of including fishing vessels in this option.
- d. A state government representative stated that government “lead by example” measures will have a specific placeholder.

Next steps and agreements:

- 1. The next call is tentatively schedule for Tuesday November 18, 2-4 pm.
- 2. For the next call TWG members should develop the first two sections for each policy.
- 3. CCS will send out final policy assignments and resources to use in drafting policies.