



**MEETING SUMMARY
MICHIGAN CLIMATE ACTION COUNCIL**

**Transportation and Land Use Technical Work Group
(TLU TWG)**

Teleconference Call #7, June 4, 2008

Attendance:

Technical Working Group: Brad Garmon, Charles Griffith, Chuck Hersey, Curt Magleby, Amy Spray, Fred Science (sitting in for Al Weverstad), George Heartwell, George Mozurkewich, Tim Lundgren, Dana Debel, John Griffin, Brad Markell, Dave Lyons (sitting in for Reginald Modlin),

Michigan Department of Environmental Quality: Jim Goodheart, Marcia Horan, Donna Davis,

Michigan Department of Transportation: Polly Kent, Niles Annelin

Michigan Public Service Commission: Jesse Harlow

Center for Climate Strategies (CCS): Jim Wilson, Wick Havens, Jackson Schreiber, Bill Cowart

Public Attendees: Joan Weidner (SEMCOG), Mike Lisner (Marathon Petroleum), Bob Elbert (Exxon Mobil), Margaret Parker (Consumer's Energy)

Background documents: (<http://www.miclimatechange.us/TLU.cfm>)

- [Meeting Notice and Agenda](#)
- [Summary of Call #6](#)
- [PowerPoint for Meeting](#)
- [TLU Draft Policy Options](#)
- [Michigan CAFE Analysis](#)

Agenda:

1. Introductions
2. Approval of Summary of Prior Call/ Meeting
3. Discuss and develop Straw Proposals – Policy Description and Policy Design /Goal
4. Discussion of MI GHG Inventory and Forecast
5. Review of Next Steps
6. Agenda, Date and Time for Next Meetings

- 7. Public Comments
- 8. Announcements

Discussion and Key Items:

Roll Call and Introductions

Review of Agenda

No Comments

Approval of Prior Call Summary

The Call Summary was approved.

Discuss and Develop Straw Proposals – Policy Description and Policy Design /Goal

This meeting is intended to provide each policy option with a reasonable goal to allow quantification to proceed. Goals can be changed later in the process after quantification has occurred; these goals will be used for the preliminary analysis. The baseline year for all quantification is 2002.

- TLU 1 - Transit and Travel Options
 - a. There is some difficulty in quantifying this many different goals into one option. The goals are in many respects less concrete than they could be, just so that they remain open to different implementation mechanisms.
 - b. The analysis going forward will inform the TWG on the value of doubling transit ridership relative to other options on the table.
 - c. There was some concern that quadrupling the transit ridership by 2025 may be overly optimistic. Transit ridership in Grand Rapids has been increasing at 11% annually over the last six years. However, since doubling by 2015 would be measured from 2002 levels, then this goal is likely to be realistic.
 - d. Change the word “mass transit” to “public transit”. “Non-motorist travel” will be changed to “bicycle and pedestrian travel”.
 - e. The goal is designed to be aggressive so that we can see what the GHG benefits could be of significantly increasing transit ridership. The goal can then be scaled up or down accordingly.
 - f. We are adding “schools” as one of the Parties Involved to encourage walking to school and discourage driving children to school in cars.
- TLU 2 – Eco-Driver Initiative
 - a. This policy is designed to consider a variety of methods to encourage more fuel efficient driving habits. These include improved vehicle maintenance, technology, driver education.
 - b. The goal is to be far reaching enough to actually change driver behavior (personal accountability). We need to spell out parties involved in this.
 - c. Some recent European/Canadian studies have found fuel savings of 15-25% to be possible with this type of program.
 - d. There are also likely to be safety benefits from a program like this, because driving/accelerating more slowly will reduce serious accidents.
 - e. Include rest stops as a place where people could inflate their tires.

- TLU 3 – Promote Low-Carbon Fuel Use in Transportation
 - a. There remains significant disagreement on the best method of achieving GHG reductions through low-carbon fuels.
 - b. The Potential Parties involved include: Michigan Legislature, Michigan DNR, DEQ, DOT, Department of Ag, fuel providers, utilities, auto manufacturers.
 - c. The point was raised that state-level fuel standards often have unintended consequences, this would seem to be something that would need to be addressed at a national/global level. Some TWG members felt that a low-carbon standard in Michigan would help pressure federal action on the issue. Other TWG members felt this was full of uncertainties and could have serious unintended consequences.
 - d. This policy option can be implemented in a variety of ways at a state level to encourage low-carbon fuel use. It is likely that many of the concerns about a low-carbon standard would be significantly reduced if the implementation mechanism is designed to be less intrusive.
 - e. One phrasing for the Policy Description was proposed: “reduce the total carbon life cycle emissions including those recommended by the renewable fuels commission” of all types of fuel. There was discussion of whether this should be on a total consumption basis or a per BTU basis. In the end, no specific changes were recommended for the Policy Description.
 - f. The Lamar Alexander Amendment, which is part of the Lieberman-Warner bill, is a low-carbon standard proposed at the federal level.
 - g. Michigan should work to encourage a federal low-carbon fuel standard, particularly one that would be beneficial to Michigan’s renewable fuels industry.
 - h. There was a question about what the costs of a low-carbon fuel standard would be, and how those costs can be estimated. There is a great deal of uncertainty in predicting long term fuel prices and costs of low-carbon fuels. There were also concerns raised as to whether high renewable fuel blends can be used by most vehicles in this country.
 - i. This policy option will be revised in the subgroup based on recommendations of the TWG to make this goal more quantifiable.
- TLU 4 – Increase Rail Capacity, and Address Rail Freight System Bottlenecks
 - a. Since Michigan is a peninsula, it is less profitable to have rail freight going deep into the state (to the north).
 - b. Integrating truck and rail lines makes coordination between the two more profitable, and this is essential to increase overall rail traffic.
 - c. Rail lines have been in decline in Michigan because of lack of profitability. There isn’t a great deal of need to expand the rail infrastructure, the important thing is increasing rail efficiency and profitability.
 - d. MDOT will provide some language to show the relationship between passenger and freight rail (i.e. actions that affect one also affect the other).
- TLU 5 – Truck Idling Policies
 - a. There is unavoidable idling and avoidable idling; this policy is designed to prevent the second type. This includes running the engine to heat, cool and power the vehicle. Both trucks and buses should be included in this policy.

- b. The policy can be implemented to include electric plug-ins at public and private rest stops. The goals were designed to encourage a significant electrification effort while still remaining realistic.
- c. The policy recommends that the TWG look into an anti-idling law for the state of Michigan or at the local level. Such laws have been implemented successfully in other areas.
- d. Some trucking companies (such as Penske), may keep track of fuel consumption, miles travelled and idling. This would help provide the TWG with the information needed to make the best analysis. However, this might not be an accurate representation of trucking as a whole, because smaller operators are often less efficient. Michigan specific information on truck idling practices in the state would help make the goals of this policy more realistic and effective.
- e. The Energy Policy Act of 2005 helps to finance electrification modifications in some cases. It might be effective for Michigan to provide financial incentives to trucking companies/truckers to make electrification more feasible.
- f. Because there is a significant amount of data available on this option nationally, it should be possible to still use a 2002 baseline. The Policy Option will be amended to exclude the reference to a 2009 baseline.
- TLU 6 – Land Use Planning and Incentives
 - a. The 2003 Land Use Leadership Council recommendations are very helpful on this policy option. Many of the recommendations made there are still quite applicable to the state.
 - b. Any GHG reductions from this policy are often less direct and/or not easily measurable, but nonetheless may be significant.
 - c. MDOT provided significant information to help in planning this policy option and that information was quite useful in moving this policy forward.
 - d. There are two sets of goals for this option. The intention is to quantify both of the goals, with one set mostly based on Vehicle Miles of Travel (VMT) reductions and the other based on land use planning. This will allow for comparison between the two different methodologies.
 - e. There are some numbers from Census based research that can help to quantify the GHG benefits of improved land use planning. *Growing Cooler* is a publication that analyzed the environmental benefits of a VMT reduction policy. CCS will do quantification (“what if” scenarios) of what happens with improved land use planning and VMT reductions so that the TWG can review the outcome data.
 - f. It is possible that total VMT in the goal needs to be broken down further, based on trip type and length. This information might be difficult to get, because that information is not currently available at MDOT.
 - g. This option goes hand in hand with several of the AFW options, because this is working to make growth more centralized, which will help protect farmland and other natural resources.
 - h. The TWG should consider the cost of reducing VMT and the marginal benefit of reducing VMT, both in terms of GHG benefits and economics.
 - i. It was agreed to proceed with quantification of the goals as they stand now, and the policy implications of that quantification will be discussed further later in the process.

- TLU 7 – Congestion Mitigation
 - a. Parties Involved should be expanded to include Metropolitan Planning Organizations.
 - b. There was a proposal to add a telecommuting initiative for the state, which would potentially reduce congestion and VMT. A telecommunication option would allow policymakers to understand the costs and benefits of reducing VMT through telecommuting. It was decided not to make any changes for telecommuting at this time.
 - TLU 8 – Advanced Vehicle Technology
 - a. Policy #2 of this option has been expanded from garbage trucks to include all various types of municipality fleets, including school buses.
 - b. “Lithium Ion” will be replaced with “high energy density” so that the policy is not specific towards an individual technology.
 - c. It was agreed to clarify the goal to be “5% of new vehicles sold in 2025 have high energy density batteries”.
 - TLU 9 – Great Lakes Shipping
 - a. The TWG lacks expertise on this issue, which has made goal-setting more difficult for this policy option.
 - b. There is a group at Rochester Institute of Technology that is working on the issue of reducing the GHG emissions from Great Lakes Shipping, which could be a valuable resource for this policy item.
 - c. Seaway standard depths is a term that may need to be better defined or reconsidered, given the problems that come from declining lake levels.
 - d. There was a suggestion to consider/investigate the potential for biofuels/biodiesel use in marine diesel engines to reduce the GHG emissions on the Great Lakes although the group wants to make certain this is feasible before including it as a goal of this straw proposal.
- There was a general suggestion to renumber the policy options in a more logical fashion.

Discussion of the MI GHG Inventory and Forecast

The discussion of the revised Inventory and Forecast will occur at the next meeting. There is a common assumptions memo that will be going out to the group soon to show the assumptions being made in quantification.

Next TWG Meeting

The next TWG meeting is Thursday, July 24th, from 9:00 to 11:00am, EST.

The next MCAC meeting will take place on June 27, 2008. Any TWG revisions to the straw proposals will need to be completed by June 16.

Thanks to all members for your meaningful contributions and discussion.