

DRAFT TELECONFERENCE MEETING SUMMARY
TLU Subcommittee
Call #12, July 18, 2008

Members Attending:

Participant	Organization
Michelle Orfields-Koranda (for Brad Miller)	Des Moines Area Regional Transit
Stephanie Weisenbach	1000 Friends of Iowa

Iowa Department of Natural Resources: Marnie Stein Iowa DNR

Center for Climate Strategies: Lewison Lem, Bill Cowart, Jason Miles

Other Attendees:

Members of the Public: Steve Falk, Andrew Snow

Agenda Item#1: Introductions and Review of Agenda.

CCS did roll call and a quick review of the agenda

Marnie raised the concern that there was only one TLU-SC member on the call.

It was determined that this would be a “working call” as opposed to a “decisional call” as there is only one SC member and another TLU-SC member being represented. (Michelle Orfields-Koranda sitting in for Brad Miller)

It was determined the group would work their way through the POD.

Agenda Item#2: Approval of Summary of Prior Call / Meeting [Decision Item]

Approving the previous meeting’s summary would be delayed until the next call.

Agenda Item#3: Review and Discuss Policy Options Document (TLU-5 – TLU-10)

TLU-1

Bill has made a change to TLU-1 to identify that there are net savings instead of saying that the savings were not estimated.

Stephanie felt there was more work to do on TLU-1 with “implementation mechanisms” and “related policies.” She has attempted to engage different people in between meetings, but has not been able to get sufficient response from other members and experts. Has received some input from other land use planning experts in the state.

Bill – suggested the team taking a more active role in reaching out to other members.

Lewison – Some items could be moved around – there are some items in “policy descriptions” that could be moved into implementation.

Stephanie – Indicated she is anticipating about two pages of outlined material to be added to the implementation mechanisms portion. Felt that these materials should be ready for the meetings which have been proposed for August.

TLU-2

Stephanie performed research on implementation mechanisms on this policy option. Feels good about progress, but would like to meet with other members to get their thoughts in writing.

TLU-3

Bill – Ran through some of the numbers for transit. The goal is to double the ridership while doing this more efficiently. The cost does drop significantly under this aggressive assumption of doubling ridership, but is still a substantial cost per ton of reduction. The assumption is that Iowa transit is going to match the best transit results for ridership that has been done in any other states or cities. Ridership vs. Cost. Research indicates we could hit the target of doubling ridership without a significant increase in cost. 50% – 75% increase in ridership would be from BRT best practices, and not simply increasing existing services. There is a higher elasticity in new BRT services than there would be in just adding existing services. It was assumed that the BRT best practices would be implemented in the four existing transit agencies of most significant size – Iowa City, Des Moines, Ames, and Cedar Rapids. This estimate ignores paratransit because it is not cost effective and only has a mobility goal and not an emissions goal, so it would not be appropriate to include in this analysis. Looking at the BRT best practices services we only looking at the incremental cost for the improved ridership. There was also a reduction in lag time, but with the goal of doubling ridership, this lag time can’t decrease much further.

Stephanie – would like to include the commuter rail study from Cedar Rapids. Stephanie has the numbers available but needs to incorporate them into the policy. Would also like to examine other ridership goals, making them a bit more aggressive and examining how they are phased in.

Lewison – in order to get transit into more places, it has to become more cost effective. The best practices through BRT seems to accomplish this.

Stephanie – Could we reduce operating cost by exploring hybrid vehicles and other options?

Bill – Hybrid buses would reduce operating cost, but would increase capital costs. However, in ten year, these numbers could be very different. It must be acknowledged that the transit agencies are not going to cut service to reduce a few tons of emissions by purchasing a hybrid vehicle.

TLU -4 Passenger Rail Service

Bill – we’re trying to get the numbers for Illinois to properly determine the numbers for Iowa, so there hasn’t been any progress on the quantification of this policy option.

Lewison – does commuter rail belong in this category or in the transit category. It was agreed that it should be included in the transit category.

ATTENTION ITEM: Be sure that commuter rail is moved from TLU-4 and into TLU-3 “Expand and Improve Transit Infrastructure.

Bill – Numbers from New York identify that commuter rail is one of the more cost effective modes of public transit.

Stephanie – Iowa studies identify commuter rail as being very cost effective. Will look into getting these studies and sharing these numbers.

Lewison – we are trying to wrap up the policy options so that they can be moved forward to the ICCAC level. Still needs to provide numbers for TLU-6 & TLU-8. However, other suggestions or comments are welcome. The cost side is very much a moving target as the auto industry is changing rapidly.

TLU-7 Tires and 7.2 on consumer information

Stephanie – The Cross Cutting SC was looking at many issues of education and marketing. Suggested including some of this work on consumer information into their group.

TLU-8

The goal levels were the same as in TLU-6. Still estimating tons reductions and cost effectiveness.

Stephanie – The second paragraph that in the policy description discusses the Jalopy effect. Does this need to be kept in the policy description or could this be moved to another segment of the policy option. *This comment / change will be tabled until the next meeting as there is not a quorum present to make decisions for this meeting.* The concern is that as the policy option gets media attention, we want to be strong about what we’re asking for and discuss pros and cons later in the option. Does not want to present the wrong image in the beginning of the policy option.

TLU-9 Freight Strategies

Bill has been working with the numbers and they are looking positive with as much as .16 reduction in 2012 and .58 reduction in 2020. The numbers are a combination of 4 sets of measures being implemented: (1) anti-idling, (2) highway and truck terminal bottlenecks, (3) investment in intermodal rail & intermodal freight, (4) incentives for purchase of hybrid trucks for class 7 & class 8 trucks – the largest trucks and tractor trailer trucks. The anti-idling measures

are identified as being the most powerful of these four choices, but difficult to quantify as there is a national program in place and it becomes difficult to determine how much of the reduction Iowa's state program would be responsible for.

Lewison – If Iowa doesn't already have a state anti-idling rule, Iowa should get credit for the incremental impact.

Bill – The federal legislation is going to attempt to take credit for all of the reductions.

Lewison – The EPA program is voluntary

Bill – There are two types of programs – one is installed at truck stops, so the truck does not have to run while parked there. The second option is that trucks can install auxiliary power units so their trucks do not have to run. Many of the smaller companies and independent truckers don't have the funding for these systems. The feds have been providing funding for these auxiliary units while the states have been focusing on providing anti-idling programs at truck stops throughout the state. There may not be a clear number as to which policy is providing how much of a reduction. However, it is clear that both programs are cost effective.

Marnie – There is currently no Iowa state program for anti-idling.

Stephanie – Input from other TLU-SC members who are not on the call would be beneficial.

Lewison – Understanding the context of the numbers would be beneficial.

Bill – Derived the four categories from the policy description, distilled it down to do quantification.

TLU-10 – Fuel Strategies

Decided to go with a 20% reduction. There may be some changes in the language, but we'll be continuing with the 20% reduction number, based upon what was said at the most recent ICCAC meeting.

Stephanie – has been in contact with someone who works with biodiesel policy & she has asked them to review this policy.

Steve Falk – member of the public, dropped off of the call, but Lewison suggested to Marnie to contact him and inform him that he can offer the group comments in writing through email.

Stephanie – Concerning the MGA (Midwestern Governor's Association) goals – which of these policy options would we like to work on or what's the most necessary in Iowa. It would be helpful for other group to look at these policy options. There should be more of an analysis.

Jason – Informed the group of the status of the MGA and forwarded the link to Stephanie referencing the upcoming MGA meeting in Chicago on July 21st.

Lewison – Taking the numbers from the summary table which will go into a spreadsheet, and these numbers will be combined and to provide an estimate of the total amount of GHG reductions. Cost effectiveness is not added. Individual cost effectiveness is more important as it can guide the policy as to how it is implemented in what form. Later on at ICCAC, there will be a wedge graphic identifying the potential for reduction for each of the subcommittees as well as overall potential reduction.

Stephanie – would be interested in seeing the wedge chart, to see how it is organized.

Lewison suggested reviewing the policies of states that already have completed their plans as this might identify the graphic.

Agenda Item#4: Next Steps

There was some discussion of the need to schedule additional meetings. Two dates have been proposed (Friday, August 8, 2008) and (Friday, August 29, 2009). It was determined that www.meetingwizard.com will be utilized in attempting to get better attendance for the upcoming meetings.

Agenda Item#5: Agenda, Date and Time for Next Meeting

TLU SC Meeting #13 (Proposed)
Friday, August 8th, 2008, 9:00 – 10:30AM CDT
Friday, August 29th, 2008, 9:00 – 10:30AM CDT

Next ICCAC Full Council Meeting #6
September 3 & 4 2008 from 9am – 4pm

Agenda Item#6: Public Comments

Andrew Snow – would like to provide some written comments after this call and prior to next meeting.

Steve Falk – Concerned about TLU-10 as the models being examined by CARB (California Air Resources Board) although strongly in support of LCFS sees need for new research, particularly in looking at indirect land use. Looks like CARB will delay their implementation while they look at indirect land use issues. Steve would like for the group to proceed with an LCFS policy, but feels the group should take indirect land use into consideration.

Lewison – We don't have the ability to do something as analytically advanced as CARB. We take the fuel lifecycle, GHG emissions on the basis of estimates created by other models, for lifecycle GHG emissions, which is what is under discussion.

Steve - National Biodiesel board will be looking at the research that is out there & examining how we can improve upon what is out there.

Steve is working with other groups in putting together these numbers, including the North Central Bioeconomy Consortium. A resolution was reached that supported the LCFS but wants to be sure there is an even playing field amongst bio-fuels to be sure the entire lifecycle is examined. It also identifies that indirect land use must be examined in more detail.

Agenda Item#7: Announcements

There were no announcements