



www.mnclimatechange.us

DRAFT TELECONFERENCE MEETING SUMMARY

TLU Technical Working Group

Call/Meeting #4, July 24, 2007

Attendance:

1. Technical Working Group members:
Barb Thoman; Jim Erkel; Eric Hyland; Greg Langford; Gregory Dana; Jan Callison; Jon Anderson; Julie Ketchum
2. Center for Climate Strategies (CCS) staff:
Will Schroeer; Wendy Messenger
3. Other:
Rep. Melissa Hortman; Amber Backaus; Doug Carnival; numerous State staff

Background documents:

(all posted at http://www.mnclimatechange.us/Transportation_Land_Use.cfm)

Agenda Item #1: Review of summary from Call #3

Agenda Item #2: Review of balloting and bundling

Agenda Item #3: Review and discussion of catalog

The methods of grouping individual options into bundles varied, depending on the balloting patterns. Some sets of options were submitted as bundles by multiple members and some options would not be as effective as stand-alone options.

The bundles of policies now give a broader definition of a policy direction, with some specifically named items. Additional detail or necessary components can be added to the policy as the development and analysis processes move forward.

In order to quickly summarize the policy option, descriptive titles were added for each option that has multiple options bundled:

1. Improved Planning and Development Strategies
2. Single Occupancy Vehicle (SOV) Alternatives
3. Biofuels
4. Infrastructure Management

5. Climate-Friendly Transportation Fees

Discussion about specific options and bundles:

Transportation System Management (Policy 4 / Option 1.2.3) was not bundled into a transit package because the analysis of impacts is significantly different.

Climate Friendly Transportation Fees (Policy Bundle 5) could also encompass congestion pricing (currently Policy 10); this was not initially bundled because voting indicated it as a stand-alone option. Each fee options in this bundle will be analyzed individually for impacts.

There was extensive discussion about how to communicate to the MCCAG the various levels of support in the TWG for recommending different options, and about the cutoff level for “High priority” for analysis. The agreed-on process was that the TWG forward / recommend approximately 10 policies to the MCCAG. Discussion centered around whether this meant 10 options from the original list, or 10 options, counting each bundle as one option. A portion of the group felt that if each original item is counted, then the top four policy bundles contain 13 options, and the top eleven policy bundles contain 23 options. A majority of the group had understood the agreed-on process to count bundles as one option. CCS also pointed out that if the list was to the shorter interpretation, there would likely be time and resources available to continue analysis to the other options.

The process discuss concluded with an agreement to characterize the different views to the MCCAG. The group then agreed to forward to the MCCAG the list of “high priority” options as revised during the discussion.

Comments from the public:

Doug Carnival from the Building and Management Association shared a comment regarding the bundling, having followed other TWGs. They were required to come up to top 10 items – 23 items. In the top 4 bundles you have 11 options. I think it is important that you mention to the MCCAG that the rest of the options would not have made it into the analysis.

Next meeting:

August 16, 2007 from 12:00 PM to 2:00 PM CST