

Transportation & Land Use Meeting #13
April 10, 2007, 12:00-1:30 PM

Attendance:

TWG members:

Denise Choy
Daren Bakst
Lisa Riegel
Paul Sherman (for Anne Coan)
Dan Besse
David Farren (Marilee Nixon)
Skip Yeakel

NCDAQ Staff:

Brock Nicholson
Jim Sutherlin
Charles Davis
Kathy Kaufman
Phyllis Jones

CCS Staff:

William Schroeer
Wendy Messenger

Public:

Michael Juras

Discussion of purpose and process:

The purpose of today's call is to go through all policy options and record any objections today as they stand. It is important to remember that the TWG's purpose is to advise the CAPAG on the individual policy options. The TWG does not take a formal vote; the CAPAG goes through the formal voting process.

Any objection to the current options should highlight the technical basis of the objection and suggest an alternative for overcoming the objection. CCS will forward all objections, rationale, and suggested alternatives to the CAPAG to help them with their decision making. It is not necessary to record who made an objection, unless the member requests it.

All TWG members are encouraged to participate as much as possible over this last stretch.

Daren Bakst: Still have problem with votes done through email, because of lack of dialogue, particularly regarding alternatives. As the process began, we looked at policy

options that we thought needed further analysis, but this did not mean that we supported them. Now we are in a situation where those are the only ones going forward.

In response, CCS reminded the TWG that TWG members participated in option development all along.

The objective of the TWG is a consensus building process, but not unanimous consensus. However, objections are reported to the CAPAG so that they are aware of the TWG's view, so that they may make their decisions with full knowledge.

Discussion of policy options:

Daren Bakst recorded a blanket objection for all the policy options that the cost information is not complete

TLU1a

Paul Sherman / NC Farm Bureau objects. Basis of objection is that the option includes state mandates on local land use authorities. Suggests alternative: voluntary approach. CCS notes that the voluntary approach is the current approach and thus in the baseline; would produce no new reductions. For the policy to show any emissions reductions over the baseline, it needs to be different than the status quo.

Daren Bakst expressed concerned with net savings and the fact that the policy option does not clarify underlying costs. As a result, the TWG cannot have a clear idea of what the policy option really is. For example, would like to know impacts on low-income residents, home owners, etc.

David Farren expressed concern with identifying homeowners as impacted, because it implies an increase in costs, which is inconsistent with the language and studies. CCS clarified that previous notes show that that the TWG decided to let CAPAG decide if homeowners should be included. Inclusion would not necessarily imply price increases.

The TWG discussed if it would be appropriate to note that the acceleration of benefits will occur on this option, and extend benefit calculations. It was determined that the CAPAG had given the go-ahead, so it should, at minimum, be included in the text

ACTION ITEM: CCS to note benefits of longer-term implementation

TLU1b

The TWG asked how the group should address the DOT's new plan for funding. CCS suggested the TWG could suggest a new target, drawing on the opinion of everyone on the phone, or for those TWG members on the CAPAG to propose language directly to the CAPAG. Suggested language: support seeing State 13% allocation through which is currently in the state transportation, and encourage even more aggressive investment funding above that.

ACTION ITEM: CCS will add a note to CPAG: TWG recommends continuing to look at percentage numbers in light of recent transportation plan allocation of 13%.

TLU3

TWG discussed clarification of this policy option and whether it is proposing new fee or adjustments to existing fee. Concern was expressed regarding the title (and use of word Feebate),

ACTION ITEMS: change language to

1. Surcharge (in all instances of 3a) and then
2. rebate/feebate

Paul Sherman registered objections for both TLU3 options. Objection concerns tax on farmers' vehicles used in the daily course of business. Alternative would be to exclude farmers from charge.

Daren Bakst also expressed concern that it would function as a penalty on some industries that have no choice but to utilize larger vehicles. Additionally, it acts as a regressive tax. Registered an objection, with no alternative.

TLU4

The additional information submitted by Anne Tazewell was passed along to the TWG for consideration, but a little late to go in to the policy option itself.

ACTION ITEM: Change title to a single word - Truckstop

TLU5

Daren Bakst registered an additional objection that the option may impact safety.

Paul Sherman registered an objection.

TLU6

No additional objections

TLU7

No additional objections

TLU8

No additional objections

TLU9

The TWG discussed the distinction between the current policy option and the revised language provided by Anne Tazewell. The revised version sharpens the language, adds DOCs detail, adds language about diesel particular filters, and includes cost estimates.

A suggestion was made to merge the two; since it is voluntary, it makes sense to give the full range of options available. However, the TWG decided to discuss both versions independently.

On the revised version, Skip Yeakel registered an objection based on feasibility and unrealistic costs estimates. TWG members expressed hesitancy to move forward without more time.

CCS suggested that TWG members on the CAPAG can raise this discussion of further detail when it comes up in session.

Denise Choy stated that the CAPAG should know there are other alternatives. Since the state is also looking for retirement of vehicles, even if the option is based on cost-effectiveness, than if a school bus can be retired instead of fitted with a DPF, it is all the better.

The TWG decided that since all the various technologies and retirement are mentioned in the current policy option design, to move forward with TLU9 as it stands.

No additional objections

TLU10

Dan Besse registered an objection to 10A & B, because they will be dead on arrival at legislature; it is not a good idea to include them as recommendations if the TWG is wasting its time and providing lightning rods for public attention, which would likely interfere with positive attention for other recommendations

4 additional objections were raised, for 6 objections total

Denise Choy raised to the TWG that it is hard to deny the emission reduction benefits of TLU10b, and posed the questions as to whether the TWG is in a position to look at politics behind recommendations.

Dan Besse responded that he thought the TWG does have responsibility to look at politics.

TLU11

Daren Bakst registered his blanket objection; also objects to mandate because could impact premiums for other consumers. No alternative suggested.

Paul Sherman registered an objection, with no suggestion for an alternative.

TLU12

Daren Bakst stated that since no analysis has been done, would not make sense to support.

Paul Sherman did not object, but did express opinion that it is difficult to compare to other policy options

TLU13

Daren Bakst stated that since no analysis has been done, would not make sense to support

Call to the public:

None

Upcoming meetings:

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