



## **MEETING SUMMARY**

### **Alaska Climate Change Mitigation Advisory Group Transportation & Land Use Technical Work Group (TLU TWG) Meeting #6, November 18, 2008, 2:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.**

#### **Attendance:**

1. Technical Working Group Members: Luke Hopkins, Curt Stoner, Alison Bird, Lance Wilber, Scott Dickinson, Emerson Kruger (for John Duffy)
2. Center for Climate Strategies (CCS) staff: Jeff Ang-Olson, Lisa McNally
3. Alaska State Agency Liaison and Attendees: None

#### **Background documents:**

(All posted at [http://www.akclimatechange.us/Transportation\\_Land\\_Use.cfm](http://www.akclimatechange.us/Transportation_Land_Use.cfm) )

1. Meeting notice and agenda
2. Call #5 Summary
3. Powerpoint presentation (including agenda) for meeting
4. TLU Draft Straw Proposals

#### **Discussion items and key issues:**

1. CCS gave an overview of the last MAG meeting held on November 6, 2008. The meeting agenda was for the MAG to review the TLU TWG's recommended list of priority options. In general, the MAG was concerned about number of options that the TLU TWG has set forth. The TWG may want to consider consolidating some of the options. Furthermore, some options may remain as policy recommendations without GHG costs and benefits attached to them. The MAG recommended that the TLU TWG do the following:
  - a. TLU-1: Consider carsharing as a rideshare strategy.
  - b. TLU-2: There was a question from MAG whether this option focused only on heavy-duty vehicles, or whether it could potentially include light-duty vehicles. The MAG also wants the TWG to consider engine block heaters for light-duty vehicles.
  - c. TLU-3: Consider whether traffic signal synchronization could improve arterial flow.
  - d. TLU4: Coordinate smart growth efforts with Alaska Municipal League efforts.

- e. TLU 5: Consider biodiesel and review academic research on cold-weather applications for alternative fuels.
  - f. TLU-6 and TLU-7: No MAG recommendations.
  - g. TLU-8: Coordinate with the state's commercial marine revolving loan fund.
  - h. TLU-9: The MAG discussed the phasing out of less fuel-efficient aircraft.
  - i. The next MAG meeting will be in early February when the MAG will be reviewing and "blessing" the straw proposals (i.e., description and design sections). CCS expects to begin quantification of GHG impacts (benefits and costs) based on the TWG's proposed goals for each option.
2. The TWG discussed the draft straw proposals.
- a. TLU-1: The TWG lead for this option noted that the existing draft is a quick slice at describing the approach. Another TWG member mentioned that Alaska is the only state in the nation that does not provide state funding support for transit services. Barrow has the highest ridership in the state, with the highest per capita use of transit. This statistic evidences that transit is a highly-used system in rural communities. CCS therefore suggested that the TWG note in this option the different needs in rural communities and rural systems versus city systems. A TWG member suggested adding an "explicit" statement that Alaska should provide public support to transit. For the mitigation option design section, CCS suggested adding numeric goals in terms of current and future ridership, or perhaps expansion of transit fleet by 2020. Regarding rail transit (Northern Rail Corridor), a TWG member noted that the Alaska Railroad Corporation would conduct the studies and improve tracks for quick transit operations, but that there would probably be another entity operating the system. Therefore, perhaps the TWG should propose creating a statewide transit authority. Another TWG member mentioned that an important component to this option would be public awareness campaigns, education, and incentives focused on "choice riders" (people who are not dependent on transit). TWG members in this option subgroup volunteered to add goals and objectives to this option, including a statement that Alaska should support transit and consider rural opportunities.
  - b. TLU-2: Option not available for discussion.
  - c. TLU-3: This option is based off the Montana TLU document regarding transportation system management. A TWG member noted that a lot of the design options in this version are already underway in Alaska (e.g., roundabout installation). The implementation of maximum speed limits could be potentially controversial. Furthermore, if there is no speed enforcement, then there may be no benefit. Regarding the conversion of traffic lights to LED, the option should also reflect efficient alternatives for luminaries, such as induction lighting. Regarding a congestion management plan for high traffic volumes, a TWG member noted that there is already a federal requirement that the DOT apply this strategy to any highway project that carries over 30,000 vehicles per day. Alaska's municipality has a similar rule for local streets. TWG members suggested that the key will be

determining the definition of high-volume traffic while also considering seasonal and special events in this definition.

- d. TLU-4: The TWG discussed this option's success as being dependent on the extent to which it can be coupled with other programs. A TWG member noted that in some sense, this option is referring to a lifestyle change, as well as a need for sustained investment in infrastructure. It was suggested that the TWG review the Alaska Municipal League's thoughts on smart growth, as the AML may have some approaches that could be added to this option. Another TWG member noted that in terms of future residential development, there is a social application to consider in terms of where people want to live versus how far they will have to drive. A lot of detail may need to go into developing implementation mechanisms for this option (e.g., incentives; zoning). CCS noted that it is difficult to quantify impacts for this option. A TWG member suggested that because Alaska is not densely populated, incentivizing (volunteer) or requiring (regulation) compact development could actually result in negative environmental impacts. A TWG member brought up building efficiency and CCS confirmed that this is already being covered by the Energy Supply and Demand technical group.
- e. TLU-5: CCS reviewed the goals for this option and asked for member input. A TWG member noted that biofuels may not necessarily lead to benefits unless the users are reasonably close to refineries. If an area is not well suited (e.g., geographically or climate-wise) for biofuel use, it would be difficult to incentivize its use more broadly. The option should clarify in the second sentence that "hybrids" are considered AFVs. Another TWG member suggested that this option might be a good cross-reference with TLU-7. The TWG agreed that the TLU-5 should be focused on light duty vehicles and TLU-7 focused on the heavy-duty fleet. Also, FedEx as an affected party should be taken out of TLU-5 and placed in Option 7. The TWG discussed elevating CNG to a higher priority, reflecting the abundant natural gas reserves in Alaska. There should also be life-cycle analyses to determine which alternative fuels would be best suited for application taking into consideration the specific aspects of Alaska. CCS requested assumptions about types of alternative fuel vehicles (fleet mix) being proposed in this option. A TWG member pointed out that in the goals section, the word "public" needs to be changed to "private" ("state legislation authorizing tax incentives for public sector fleet conversions..."). Since public fleets are chartered, they cannot take advantage of tax incentives. CCS suggested changing the text to: "tax incentives for fleet conversion." To include public fleets, a TWG member suggested offering a "fee-bate." A tax credit doesn't help public agencies. A feebate would act as an incentive for the purchase of AFVs, and for every AFV a manufacturer sells, they receive money from the state that they are then required to pass to the buyer. This allows public agencies to potentially buy more vehicles than they otherwise would. It was also noted that the Federal Executive Order 13423 sets goals for AFVs and reducing petroleum usage for federal agencies.

- f. TLU-6: The TWG discussed the state's goal of reducing per capita VMT by 1% in communities that offer transit service. A TWG member suggested that the opportunities to reduce VMT should be focused on the peak period, since that's when most travel occurs. Another TWG member suggested that TLU-6 and TLU-4 could be linked, but it should be noted that TLU-6 is focused on VMT, not land use patterns (VMT can be reduced irrespective of land use strategies). CCS reiterated that this option helps establish a target for reducing VMT, whereas some of the other options provide specific strategies for achieving those goals. CCS also noted that the benefits accrued from this option cannot be double-counted in the reduction benefits of the other VMT-reducing options.
- g. TLU-7: The sub-group lead for this option noted that this is specifically focused on heavy-duty vehicles. The three primary options are incentive based, and thus may be less likely to achieve the goals. A TWG member suggested that regulatory requirements seem to be much more successful in achieving goals. A TWG member suggested that there will be impending regulation for diesel vehicles, so if this option remains voluntary, then that could allow greater latitude to try to make everyone happy in achieving the goals. On the flip side, if regulation is coming from all angles, then there will be a lot of contention. A TWG member noted that heavy-duty vehicles are already heavily regulated for NOx and PM emissions. The TWG suggested leaving this an incentive-based strategy. CCS requested that vehicle make and model year be specified in the goals. It was also suggested to include a statement about the percentage of trucks already participating in SmartWay (voluntary program) when considering reduction goals. The goal for SmartWay participation could be higher, if targeting medium and large fleets. The TWG agreed to reword the goal as a percentage of trucks rather than a percentage of fleets.
- h. TLU-8: The TWG did not discuss this option.
- i. TLU-9: The sub-group lead for this option gave an overview, and noted that the quantifying measures are not that far advanced. Until there is a widely accepted way of accounting for where international emissions will be attributed, any mandatory strategy to reduce aviation emissions is likely to run into a lot of problems (both in implementation, as well as resistance from a regulated community). The current option is an attempt to harmonize national and international efforts. The TWG member noted that with aviation, if one does not have broad coordination, reduction strategies likely will not work. There should also be a consideration of criteria pollutants effects in any GHG reduction approach. It was suggested that if each locality is allowed to decide individual approaches, then the discordant efforts might negate net benefits. The TWG sub-group lead therefore proposes a modernization of air traffic control system (NextGen) as a top approach for coordinating efforts, which has been on the state agenda for a long time, but has not yet been funded. There was a question if the military's Digital Airport Surveillance Radar (DASR) System is similar to NextGen. Another TWG member voiced concerns that this approach may not be sufficient as a strategy, and that Alaska might subsequently be tagged as not doing

its part to reduce emissions. There was concern that a modernized traffic system cannot be linked directly or indirectly to an approach for reducing GHG emissions. CCS suggested that the TWG consider additional voluntary strategies that could be individualized, such as pilots improving flight planning to reduce the amount of fuel boarded and used.

**Next steps and agreements:**

1. The next TLU TWG call is scheduled for Tuesday, December 16, 10 am – 12 noon.
2. Before the next call, TWG members should continue developing straw proposals (see summary of next steps below).

Draft Mitigation Option Name	TWG Volunteers (Lead in Bold)	Straw Proposal Next Steps (by Dec 9, 2008) (not a comprehensive list)
TLU-1: Transit, Ridesharing, and Commuter Choice Programs	<b>Luke Hopkins</b> , Lance Wilbur, Bruce Carr	<b>Luke et al:</b> revise straw proposal in accordance with TWG discussion (see notes) <b>Lance:</b> send transit goals for Anc. <b>Bruce:</b> send studies/info on rail goals, feasibility <b>Luke et al:</b> develop transit ridership or service goals for 2020 – include in Goals section
TLU-2: Vehicle Idling Regulations and/or Alternatives	<b>Aves Thompson</b> , Jeff Ottesen	<b>Aves:</b> send straw proposal, for review at next TWG meeting
TLU-3: Transportation System Management	<b>Curt Stoner</b> , Jeff Ottesen, Lance Wilbur	<b>Curt et al:</b> revise straw proposal in accordance with TWG discussion (see notes) <b>Lance:</b> send info on LED signals and induction street lights
TLU-4: Promote Efficient Development Patterns (Smart Growth)	<b>Luke Hopkins</b> , John Duffy, Lance Wilbur	<b>Luke et al:</b> revise straw proposal in accordance with TWG discussion (see notes)
TLU-5: Promotion of Alternative Fuel Vehicles	<b>John Duffy</b> , Rob Bosworth	<b>John et al:</b> revise straw proposal in accordance with TWG discussion (see notes). Issues include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Option should be focused on light-duty (TLU-7 will focus on heavy-duty)</li> <li>• Inclusion of hybrids</li> <li>• Focus on CNG; pumps to access home heating fuel</li> <li>• Need for life-cycle analysis of GHG benefits</li> <li>• Tax incentives for public vs. private fleets</li> <li>• Fee-bate</li> <li>• EO 13423</li> </ul>
TLU-6: VMT and GHG Reduction Goals in Planning	<b>Jeff Ottesen</b>	No changes needed.

<b>Draft Mitigation Option Name</b>	<b>TWG Volunteers (Lead in Bold)</b>	<b>Straw Proposal Next Steps (by Dec 9, 2008) (not a comprehensive list)</b>
TLU-7: On-Road Diesel Engine Efficiency Improvements	Aves Thompson, <b>Curt Stoner</b>	<b>Curt et al:</b> Revise straw proposal in accordance with TWG discussion (see notes). Issues include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Definition of “old” truck</li> <li>• Incentives vs. regulation?</li> <li>• Higher target for SmartWay penetration?</li> <li>• Goals in terms of % of trucks, not % of fleets</li> </ul>
TLU-8: Marine Vessel Efficiency Improvements	<b>Chip Treinen,</b> Stan Stephens	<b>Chip:</b> Develop numeric goals for Option Design, such as % of vessels targeted, or size of state incentive program
TLU-9: Aviation Emission Reductions	<b>Alison Bird</b>	<b>Alison:</b> revise straw proposal in accordance with TWG discussion (see notes). Issues include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mention of limited state control</li> <li>• Alt fuels in the Air Force</li> <li>• Reference to CAAFI</li> <li>• Promoting voluntary pilot-controlled strategies (fuel planning, single engine taxi, etc).</li> </ul>