



Transportation & Land Use Technical Work Group
Meeting Summary, Call #5
February 6, 2007, 3:00PM-4:30 PM

Attendance

• TWG Members

Gina Campoli
Eleni Churchill
Scott Johnstone
David Lewis
Charlie Marks
Polly McMurty
James Moore
TJ Poor

• VT DEC Staff

Jeff Merrell

• CCS Staff

Will Schroeer
Wendy Messenger

• Public

None

Introductions

- Will Schroeer conducted roll call.
- Will Schroeer reviewed the agenda and purpose of the call.

Review of draft Minutes from TLU TWG Meeting #4

- No comments were provided. Will Schroeer will accept comments on the notes via email.

Review of Plenary Group Meeting #3

Will Schroerer summarized the Plenary Group's (PG's) actions relevant to the TLU TWG.

- Because the TLU discussion came first, a significant portion of it focused on process questions, such as how best to bundle options.
- The PG discussed adding a gas tax to the list of "High priority for analysis" options forwarded by the TLU TWG. A gas tax option received substantial discussion, with some dissent. Arguments in favor included that a meaningful examination of emissions reductions strategies needed to include a gas tax. The PG debated a gas tax as a mechanism to raise funds for other programs and strategies (following the utility DSM model), versus inducing significant behavior change. The final vote was to add a gas tax as a revenue-raising/funding mechanism, and not as a direct behavior change mechanism, to the list of options receiving high priority for analysis.
- The Plenary Group has been asked to look for early consensus options to present to the legislative commission. As of now, it looks like a majority of these will be pulled from the cross-cutting issues.
- Results for the TLU TWG from the Plenary Group meeting:
 - TLU-7: The GCCC-PG bundled 2.29 (telecommuting) into this option.
 - Final decision on recommended priorities for analysis (seeking a super-majority, i.e., fewer than 5 objections):
 - TLU-1: no objections.
 - TLU-2: no objections.
 - TLU-3: no objections.
 - TLU-4: no objections.
 - TLU-5: no objections.
 - TLU-6: no objections.
 - TLU-7: no objections. (including 2.29)
 - Add Plug-in hybrids: no objections.
 - Add Fuel tax as a funding instrument (with an eye toward avoiding possible regressivity): 4 objections.

Review and discussion of Catalog of State Actions

- TLU-1 – Compact and Transit Oriented Development
 - Options 2.1.1 through 2.1.4 were combined by the Plenary Group.
 - Analysis years will be 2010 and 2020. Goal is point estimates, but first round impacts estimates may be a range.
- TLU 2 – Alternatives to Single Occupancy Vehicles
 - Question was raised about ability to develop and present benefits from individual options under TLU-2, so options can be presented as a menu to choose from. Conclusion was that

because options are bundled, their impacts will be estimated in the aggregate. As analysis is completed, the TWG can revisit this, but the goal was to simplify and bundle. This is also a dialogue to have with the Plenary Group, and the TWG can present options and adjust as the process moves forward.

- TLU 5 – Alternative Fuels and Infrastructure
 - The TLU TWG will be focusing on consumption-based aspects of alternative fuels, while working with the Agriculture and Forestry TWG to ensure correlation with their production analysis.
- TLU-8: Plug-in hybrids was added
- TLU-9: Fuel tax funding system was added

Discussion of moving forward on Catalog of State Actions

- Two related questions were raised with respect to mitigation across the options and the supporting language: first, what does the term “mitigation” really mean, and second, is it the primary criterion for evaluation? Will Schroer:
 1. Acknowledged that “mitigation” has more of an ameliorative connotation in everyday language, but that in climate policy, it has become a term of art meaning “reducing emissions” as opposed to “adaptation” meaning responding to the effects of climate change.
 2. Explained that the Plenary Group has asked for *ambitious* emissions reductions as the main focus of policy options. Cost-effectiveness and additional public benefits are additional considerations.

ACTION ITEM: The term “mitigation” would be clarified in documentation.
- The TWG will work to suggest policy language to submit to the Plenary Group. CCS is responsible for filling in any holes.
- In other states, CCS has not provided detailed analysis at the programmatic level, but rather analysis based in the literature, tailored to a given state. Partially as a result, previous state climate action plans have not made recommendations at the programmatic level. However, other CCS states have not had the same level of statewide modeling available that VT has. The general goal of the PG / GCCC process is to provide actionable recommendations supported by analysis, so to the extent that the TWG can make detailed programmatic recommendation to the PG, it is not only free to do so, but encouraged to do so.
 - Schroer gave the example of transportation oriented design (TOD). In other states that have not done much yet on TOD, a general policy recommendation is enough to move the state forward; in VT, it would not be. Thus in VT programmatic case studies and analysis would likely prove more useful, if supplied by TWG.
- Will Schroer clarified the distinction between goals and design in the suggested template to move the policy language forward.

- Concern was raised by TWG members that the group lacks land use or regional growth expertise. Jeff Merrell has previously addressed this with the State Assembly group and added Polly McMurty. To address issues of representation of expertise, the TWG should feel free to reach out to experts regarding specific policy options.

Next Steps for VT TLU Working Group

- Future TLU TWG meetings:

February 27, 2007: 3:00 pm–4:30 pm

April 10, 2007: 3:00 pm–4:30 pm

April 24, 2007: 3:00 pm–4:30 pm

June 5, 2007: 3:00 pm–4:30 pm

June 26, 2007: 3:00 pm–4:30 pm

- The TWG will advance policy options in working groups. Each group will have a designated lead to coordinate efforts. A schedule for development will follow, with a first draft end date of March 22nd anticipated.

- Working groups were created through volunteers/nominations. A copy of the working group memberships and contact info is being provided to TWG members, with leads noted.

Public Input

- None