



MEETING SUMMARY
Alaska Climate Change Mitigation Advisory Group
Transportation & Land Use Technical Work Group (TLU TWG)
Meeting #9, February 24, 2009, 10:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.

Attendance:

1. Technical Working Group Members: Emerson Kruger, Curt Stoner, Alison Bird, Lance Wilber, Chip Treinen, Aves Thompson
2. Center for Climate Strategies (CCS) staff: Jeff Ang-Olson, Frank Gallivan
3. Alaska State Agency Liaison and Attendees: none

Background documents:

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

1. Meeting notice and agenda
2. Call #8 Summary
3. Powerpoint presentation (including agenda) for meeting
4. TLU Straw Proposals

Discussion items and key issues:

1. CCS reported on the Feb 5 MAG meeting. There were several comments on the transportation options from the MAG. All options were approved, mostly unanimously. Only T-4 and T-10 will require changes. See the powerpoint presentation for today for more details.
2. CCS gave an update on the progress of the action the plan. The whole process is to be wrapped up by May or early June. Next MAG meeting on April 2 will review all quantification of options' impacts and cost effectiveness. There will probably be one final MAG meeting in mid- to late May. After that the report will be produced.
3. CCS discussed quantification of policies:
 - a. T-9: This option will not be quantified.
 - i. A TWG member suggested that the option description should state how aircraft emissions are allocated between states. Alaska has high aviation fuel sales. CCS will add language to the policy option.

- ii. CCS asked whether there is any way to quantify the operational measures within T-9. A TWG member suggested making establishing a goal or an assumption for the extent of measure adoption. Measures at pilots' discretion would be very difficult to quantify. Measures related to technology/equipment are probably easier to quantify.
- b. T-8: CCS explained the quantification of this option.
 - i. A TWG member expressed surprise at how small fishing vessel emissions are. CCS responded that the emissions inventory is based on the best available data. A TWG member questioned whether 4% fuel efficiency improvement is a reasonable figure.
 - ii. A TWG member suggested adding language requiring information on engine age recorded in permitting
- c. T-7: This option is not quantified yet. CCS is requesting data through DEC. Implementation mechanisms are needed for this option.
- d. T-6: A TWG member asked that the quantification of this option be expanded to include Juneau. CCS will draft implementation mechanisms for this option.
- e. T-5: CCS discussed the approach taken. CCS asked whether the quantification should be left in terms of the three scenarios.
 - i. A TWG member suggested that we leave it as scenarios, not propose some specific mix. CCS suggested adding to the goal that the alternative fuel used produces some minimum reduction in lifecycle GHG reductions. There was general support from the TWG.
 - ii. A TWG member asked what is meant by "tax incentives for public sector" under implementation mechanisms. This should be stated as a grant or voucher program for local governments. Language about developing the incentive program to maximize cost effectiveness should be added.
- f. T-4: CCS will tweak the language of the goals.
 - i. The group discussed the data needs for this option. A TWG member asked what approach other states have taken to quantifying this option. CCS explained that some regions in the U.S. have already conducted their own in-depth analyses of the impacts of smart growth policies. Other areas have estimate the impact based on values from a literature review.
 - ii. Implementation mechanisms are needed for this policy.
 - iii. A TWG member stated that FMATS and AMATS are working with the University of Fairbanks to improve their travel models to include GHG emissions. This should be stated under related policies and programs, also under T-6
- g. T-3: CCS explained the quantification of the policy. A TWG member stated that it is reasonable to expect that 25% of vehicles would reduce their speeds if the speed limit were lowered.

- h. T-2: CCS explained the quantification of the policy. There is a need to distinguish between discretionary and non-discretionary idling in this policy. A TWG member offered to look into the current assumptions.
- i. T-1: CCS explained the quantification. A TWG will check on mode shift assumptions used in Anchorage. Implementation mechanisms are needed for this policy.

Next steps and agreements:

1. The next call is tentatively schedule for Thursday March 19, 10 am – 12 pm. For the next call, CCS will complete quantification for T-4 and T-7 and add figures for cost effectiveness where possible.
2. CCS will send out a list of key action items to the group and follow up individually as necessary.