

Transportation & Land Use Meeting #12
March 13, 2007, 12:00-1:30 PM

Attendance:

TWG Members:

Darren Baskt
David Farren
Scott Lane
Carolyn McCormick
Anne Tazewell
Skip Yeakel

NCDAQ Staff:

Phyllis D. Jones
Brock Nicholson

CCS Staff:

Karl Hausker
Will Schroeer
Wendy Messenger

Public Members:

None

“Housekeeping” Items

- Call to order, roll call, and overview of the purpose of the meeting.
- The next steps for the TWG are to record the barriers to consensus and begin balloting
 - Balloting will register the TWG’s recommendations to the CAPAG, based on unanimity, super-majority, or majority voting results. The TWG is advisory; the CAPAG will make the final decisions. It will be important to include the level of support of the TWG’s recommendations as well as the barriers to consensus to give the CAPAG information.
- The next deliverable is due to the CAPAG in May, and there is one more meeting of the TWG to complete the tasks.
- TWG members unable to attend next meeting can register votes beforehand.
- It will be up to NCDAQ leadership as to whether TWG members who have not been participating will be contacted to encourage voting.
 - **ACTION ITEM:** Phyllis Jones will confer with NCDAQ leadership
- Comments on the Call #11 Summary:
 - Add discussion about recommend early consensus items to CAPAG, although no conclusion was reached.
- **ACTION ITEM:** CCS will ask Jim Southerland to share the summary from the LCGCC meeting with the group.

Review of the policy options analysis

- The field “status of option” means that it is pending at TWG level. Level of support also refers to also in the TWG.
- The summary list of mitigation options has been updated, as have the GHG reduction numbers.
- Biofuel analysis has been tuned up, and the increase in reductions results from new standards.
- Cost effectiveness and net present value are new calculations
 - Remember that the TLU figures may look different than those from other TWGs. For example, unlike the power sector, TLU options are typically broader and can be implemented in a variety of ways, which makes cost-effectiveness harder to calculate. Until one knows the actual state, regional, and local actions that will be taken as a result of the policy, more precise costs cannot be estimated.
 - Many of the numbers presented are based in a survey of literature, and note whether the strategy will produce net costs or cost savings. The precise numbers in net savings is less important; the net present value (NPV) of savings is also difficult to calculate, and is only quantified in a stream of benefits in one case.
 - Biofuels and tail pipe cost-effectiveness are still in progress.
 - A negative cost-effectiveness value indicates a net savings. For example, TLU3a, for every ton reduction, is estimated to save additional \$40 in other costs. A positive cost-effectiveness number means estimate net total costs.
 - An increased fee – such as a vehicle registration fee – is considered a transfer, not a net loss.
 - TLU-3a, for example – the 2 to 14 dollar fee in the revenue-raising scenario is used to fund transit. We estimate that society will see a net savings from the transit investment, but the 2-14 dollar fee is not taken into account explicitly, because it is a transfer. The real costs are incurred when the transfer is spent on a new piece of infrastructure, for example.

TLU-1a

- Again, until one knows the actual state, regional, and local actions that will be taken as a result of the policy, more precise costs cannot be estimated.
- Numbers presented are based on TRB report “Cost of Sprawl revisited.” Note clipped table that summarizes a variety of studies in that report, which essentially show net savings across a variety of states. Figures include housing costs, which is useful since it accounts for the fact it can cost more to build up than out.
- Since the TWG can’t go out city by city in NC and ask their costs, it is reasonable to apply experience from other studies.
- The numbers do incorporate real costs.
- The kind of policies called for will not necessarily cost less in every instance, but empirically they produce overall net savings.

- David Farren reminded the TWG that he was concerned over the timeframe, presented, which he had brought up before and asked where it stands to look at a longer timeframe. If reductions are large in short term, might be informative to see how they grow by 2030.
 - **ACTION ITEM** – being up issue of timeframe for calculations at next CAPAG meeting
- Objections/Concerns:
 - Darren Baskt, regarding the parties involved – homeowners are not included, concern over implications on the costs of homes, and property rights issues not addressed in language
 - **ACTION ITEM:** Darren Baskt will email CCS his concerns
 - Carolyn McCormick - Does this complement current policies along CAMA? Is this a catalyst for this policy?
 - **ACTION ITEM:** Carolyn McCormick will look to see if policy language is compatible with CAMA, which requires the 22 counties along the coast have to have land use policies.

TLU1b

- Builds off of TLU-1a, and has the same cost effectiveness as TLU-1a
- Trying to balance the need to be succinct but provide enough information
- Pg 15 includes an excerpt to address concerns heard about policy. The example shows findings from Silicon Valley on parking cost savings from transit passes, even with limited availability of transit.
- CCS is open to suggestion from TWG regarding policy language to ensure investments are well made.
- The 2007-2013 TIP is out for NC, and the new investment numbers are \$12.3 billion to highway and \$1.8 billion to public transportation, which places the public transit breakdown around 13 percent, which is higher than TWG proposal.
- TWG proposal was based on current NC allocation of 3.9 percent with a recommended future investment of 5.8 percent.
- TWG should consider exploring the allocation of resources on new investments vs. fleet expansion, etc./ increasing capacity vs. maintenance.
- Might be useful to reference LED standards for neighborhood design in policy language.
- **ACTION ITEM:** Scott Lane, with assistance from David Farren, will examine the language.

TLU3a

- Would spend money raised from the policy on programs recommended in TLU1b, so it is essentially the same calculation.
- Objections/Concerns:
 - Darren Baskt – parties involved – consumers should be included as affected parties. Problem that tax changes with vehicle.
 - No objections

- **ACTION ITEM:** CCS will raise the “Parties involved” suggested change to the CAPAG.

TLU3b

- Fees between -\$500 to \$500 have been shown to change choices.
- TLU-3b is revenue neutral
- No clarification if commercial vehicles are excluded
 - The TWG discussed. It was suggested that the CAPAG could make determination. There was no consensus to change language to exclude commercial vehicles.
- Objections/Concerns
 - Skip Yeakel requested that vehicles over 10,000 lbs be excluded
- **ACTION ITEM:** CCS will clarify the language in 3b to reflect application to light duty vehicles.

ACTION ITEM: Darren Baskt will send out information to the TWG via the email list to clarify his concerns

Next Steps:

- The TWG members will need to educate themselves on the policy options in preparation for balloting
- The TWG requested a follow-up call, prior to the next scheduled call on April 10th
- Call 12b was scheduled for Tuesday, March 27 from 12-1:30 PM

Call to the public:

No public present

Upcoming meetings:

March 27, 2007 from 12:00-1:30 PM

April 10, 2007 from 12:00-1:30 PM

May 22, 2007 from 12:00-1:30 PM