



Governor's Action Team on Energy and Climate Change

State of Florida

www.flclimatechange.us

DRAFT TELECONFERENCE MEETING SUMMARY

Transportation and Land Use

Technical Working Group Call #5

May 14, 2008

Members Attending:

Members	Affiliation
Janet Bowman	The Nature Conservancy
Peter Calvert	EarthFirst Americas
Tim Chapin	Florida State University Department of Urban and Regional Planning
Suzanne Cook	Florida Green Building Coalition
Jeff Day	Publix Supermarkets, Inc.
Coleman Edmunds	Auto Nation, Inc.
Dr. Lonnie Ingram	University of Florida Institute of Food and Agricultural Sciences
Dave Mica (and Eric Hamilton)	Florida Petroleum Council
David Peebles	ETH Bioenergy-Odebrecht Construction, Inc.
Larry Peterson	Kitson & Partners

Florida Department of Environmental Protection (DEP): Kelley Smith

Center for Climate Strategies (CCS): Lewison Lem, Jason Miles, Jessica Wade

Members of the Public: Sarah Doar (Hopping, Green, and Sams), Jason Lichstein, Kathy Neil (Florida DOT), T. Sage (Johnson Engineering), Bob Shaumbert (Florida Power & Light), Timothy Smith (Department of Community Affairs), Dianne Quigley (Florida DOT)

Agenda Item#1 and 2: Introductions, Meeting Purpose and Goals

Jason Miles took attendance and Lewison Lem reviewed the purpose and goals for the meeting. The main goal is to review the balloting results and discuss and agree upon a set of priorities to be recommended to the Action Team at their next meeting on May 29-30. CCS sent a balloting results summary document via e-mail yesterday with a tally of the balloting results.

Agenda Item #3: Approval of Prior Call Summary

Call #4 summary was reviewed and approved without changes.



Governor's Action Team on Energy and Climate Change

State of Florida

www.flclimatechange.us

Tim Chapin made the motion to approve.

Larry Peterson seconded the motion.

Agenda Item #4: Status Update on Action Items

Kelley Smith from the Florida DEP reviewed the new State Energy Bill, House Bill (HB) 7135, which passed in the last week of session. The bill included little related to transportation and land use. The bill encouraged MPO's to consider GHG emissions in their planning process. Additionally, the bill created a renewable fuel standard that by and on December 31, 2010 all gas must include a minimum 10% of ethanol in its blend. Also included in the bill was a provision relating to DEP and the process of rule making for adopting the California emission standards. Once DEP has completed that final rule making, it will need to go to the legislature for ratification. DEP will be sending out a document by the end of the week that summarizes the bill by each working group.

Lewison Lem commented that there are existing actions, recent actions and future actions (the focus of this process), and that the group needs to keep up to date to establish the baseline.

Diane Quigley commented that there is similar language in another bill, HB 697, which dealt with MPO's and transportation and land use. It is a building code bill that requires that local comprehensive plans take into consideration energy use. Tim Smith added that the bill required that energy conservation, energy efficient land use patterns and GHG emissions be addressed in the comprehensive plans.

Larry Peterson questioned if this meant to include GHG emissions and energy efficiency within existing transportation elements or if it adds new elements.

Tim Smith answered that the new requirements within the existing elements in future land use plans, traffic circulation (transportation strategies must address GHG emissions), transportation, conservation, housing will require energy efficiency in the design and construction of new housing. The next step will be rewriting 9J5 to address these issues.

Lewison Lem requested an update on VMT issues. The forecast of VMT is incorporated into the GHG emissions forecast. He asked if VMT is expected to grow in the future at the high percentage rate as there has been in the past. The group is looking at data from regional MPO's,



Governor's Action Team on Energy and Climate Change

State of Florida

www.flclimatechange.us

and he wonders if it will be in the same ball park with high VMT growth rates. We want to make sure that we are using the correct numbers for forecasting.

Diane Quigley will check on it, FDOT is still working on the data. Kathy Neil will address VMT when she joins the call later.

Agenda Item #5: Discussion of Balloting Results

Lewison Lem reviewed the balloting results; items arranged by the ones that received the most votes, then go in descending order. Twelve ballots were received which means that a majority of the group voted. There are three groups of priorities (Top, Medium and Low) based on number of votes. The goal is to get to around 10 priority items. The document shows overall summary of the votes and also shows suggestions for bundling. The balloting summary does not show names (for confidentiality). Items can be moved around and there can be other bundling based on input from the group.

Jeff Day asked how will it be determined which bundling is most appropriate? Lewison Lem responded that it will be based on the discussion of the group and will rely on the wisdom of the group.

David Peebles stated that he would like a summary of what the policy options are beside the items in the summary table. Lewison Lem reminded the group that there is a policy catalog and a policy description document that would provide the descriptions for each item.

Lewison Lem noted that now all we are doing is tabulating the results and that during the next steps there will be more descriptions. The best descriptive language now is available by referring back to the catalog items.

Peter Calvert suggested that there needs to be more analysis and that what we see here is a general preference. His preference is based on the assumption that you can't tell people what to do with their cars and where to go with them. He believes that people will make a lot of decisions that you cannot influence (like where they live), but that you can influence what they burn and that maybe that is why the alternative fuels option rose to the top. He feels that if you are telling people how to spend their money that you also need to tell them what they will get for it and that means that you need to do some type of quantitative analysis. He believes that people won't react to it without more analysis. His position is that the group only received 12 votes because there wasn't enough analytical analysis leading up to the voting. He stated that if the



Governor's Action Team on Energy and Climate Change

State of Florida

www.flclimatechange.us

group is making recommendations they have to be coupled with some quantitative analysis. He noted that there are federal and state analyses for mandates for goals, for substitution, for tax holidays or explicit subsidies.

Lewis Lem pointed out that there is agreement about being analytical, but is intended to be a later stage. The catalog is too large to analyze each item at this point.

Tim Chapin noted that the important message for the group that is going to take in the recommendations is that there are many approaches for getting at climate change through transportation and land use. The first option is about diversifying fuel sources which involves investing money or incentivising the investment of money. The second item is about vehicle improvement which can take the form of public investment, incentives, or regulation. The third item is about the location and form and development - where the development goes, what it looks like, the density - it is a regulatory solution. The fourth item is systems management, an efficiency approach. It involves accomplishing more with the transportation systems that already exist. It is a process solution. The fifth item is to invest in transit by putting money behind transit in a meaningful way. The last item involves bringing climate change into the planning process. There are regulatory, investment and process based solutions. There are different ways to approach this, there is not one solution.

Peter Calvert questioned that if there are goals to achieve a certain amount of reduction by a certain amount of time, isn't that part of the choice? Tim Chapin agreed, but stated that we're not there yet. The group should evaluate our major choices first and then later determine what gives us our biggest bang for the buck.

Peter Calvert asked about the first milestone/goal that Florida needs to get to for a percentage reduction. He wanted to know if there a 2010 or 2015 percentage reduction goal. Lewis Lem responded that the information will be obtained, but the process is designed and intended to be a bottoms up process. He stated that this is a portfolio review and other work groups are looking at portfolios of options in each of their areas. The portfolios will be put together in a bottoms up process. He referred the group to look at the stepwise planning process. Peter Calvert stated that he wants a vote on the planning process to see if everyone agrees with the steps. Lewis Lem noted that the work plan has been worked out with the DEP. The working group makes recommendations to the full climate action team. This part of the process is straw balloting. The next steps are policy design proposals and quantification. Then there will be language and quantification. He expressed that the group is hitting milestones in a reasonable and step by step way. Following this initial set of priorities, language will be developed to be presented to the



Governor's Action Team on Energy and Climate Change

State of Florida

www.flclimatechange.us

full climate action team and then we'll move into the quantification step. Lewison Lem stated that this document does reflect the ballots received, and asked if it is this a fair representation of what the group thinks should be a set of options to consider.

David Peebles stated that he liked the language used by Tim Chapin and thought it was an appropriate way of summarizing what came to the top.

Eric Hamilton asked that once the group reaches the quantification step, what would happen if some of the options don't pan out as well as anticipated. He wanted to know if they would all be carried forward or if they would be narrowed down now and not changed in the future. Lewison Lem responded that it is a priority process that can be added to later. The group will start with certain priorities now, but if some don't work out there is room in the process to add some back in.

Eric Hamilton questioned whether some of the priorities were going to be removed now. He stated that the Florida Petroleum Council knows some areas very well and that others are better able to be answered by other specialties. He raised the issue that maybe some of the items voted were miscast, that the group is making guesses until there is quantification. He wants to ensure that there is sufficient flexibility in the future.

Lewison Lem stated that the items need to be narrowed down and that it would be possible to re-tailor the priorities and wording. He made the point that it is a learning process that the group is going through and that the group is composed of individuals who have expertise in a variety of areas.

Dave Peebles expressed interest in seeing Tim Chapin's language in the meeting minutes. He stated that it brings the different items into a more general perspective. Lewison Lem asked Tim Chapin if he could write something that could be circulated to the group via e-mail. Tim Chapin agreed. It will be sent to all of the TWG members to comment and edit.

Lewison Lem stated that the list of priorities can be communicated to the full working group in different ways. He asked the group that for the items that received 4 votes are there any that should be bundled with any of the items above.

Dave Peebles cautioned about messing around with voting. He was concerned that voting would start all over again. He is fine if there is a discretionary process, but he doesn't want to randomly trying to re-rank without voting. Suzanne Cook stated a little over 50% of the group voted; 12



Governor's Action Team on Energy and Climate Change

State of Florida

www.flclimatechange.us

ballots were cast and there are 21 members. She asked what the group thought about this list representing what the group thinks is appropriate. Lewison Lem made the point that some people may not think that they have enough information to vote and that others were concerned that information on what they voted on would become public, which is part of the reason why the confidentiality of the votes was kept in the document. He stated that the objective is to convey a consensus, not get a 100% vote.

Jeff Day asked how the group is going to determine what to bundle and what not to. He stated that he finds it difficult to make a recommendation without knowing what will be grouped together and what needs to stand alone. If you bundle, the top priorities change. Coleman Edmunds expressed concern about his bundling options. Now that it's being discussed he finds that other bundles are becoming more apparent. Lewison Lem stated that it is common to group together smart growth items. Individually some of the options may not have a great effect, but together they could be potentially significant at a state-wide level. Coleman Edmunds stated that he didn't include certain numbers together, 1.4.3 and 1.4.4, but now that he sees what other people have bundled, he does think that it makes sense to combine some of the items.

Tim Chapin noted that people are looking for certainty in a process that is messy. He added that the group could work towards more consensus by asking people to vote again, encouraging everyone to participate. He feels that another round of voting might narrow things down more successfully than before. Lewison Lem said that there is the option to continue to take ballots. The new votes could be incorporated into an update or a new document. He noted that the credibility increases with the number of votes and more discussions. He asked if it is alright with the group if more ballots are accepted. Dave Peebles stated that he would prefer to move on. He is not opposed to other people sending in their votes, but would not like to see an entire "re-vote."

Lewison Lem noted that he will send a follow up e-mail after the call asking if others have bundling options that they would consider. He stated that this is the information that is helpful to the full climate action team. The Action Team, at their meeting at the end of May, will be making decisions on the priorities for analysis. He encouraged the group to be more decisive in how to move forward. Dave Peebles stated that he is ready to move to the next step with the summary from Tim Chapin. Tim Chapin said that he will complete his write up sometime tomorrow (May 15th) and will send it along to Lewison Lem. Lewison Lem said that he will circulate it to the rest of the group. He also mentioned that the group is now starting the work with language and is looking for volunteers.



Governor's Action Team on Energy and Climate Change

State of Florida

www.flclimatechange.us

Dave Mica stated that he just recently joined the call. He asked that with respect to alternative fuels, how much thought went into alternative fuels as the high priority with regards to how much has already been done by the federal and state governments. He said that not that we shouldn't be adding more, but wondering if those that voted are aware of what's already happening. He noted that they were getting ready to require 10% ethanol blends in the next 18 months across the state. He questioned if the group would be sending a message to the full commission that they should be doing more about this since it is number one on the list. He stated that he understands that there could be continued research and development, and grants proposed in facilitating some of the research and the prospects for other things. Dave Peebles stated that he understands Dave Mica's perspective. He pointed out that he views the results as a portfolio rather than a ranking.

Peter Calvert stated that a lot of the efforts that have gone on in the Federal level that are supposed to deliver GHG benefits, don't and that there is a lot of room in a generally stated preference to do things that don't deliver. He noted his observation of the federal preference for ethanol. Peter Calvert stated that his company was the first to import biodiesel to Florida or the U.S. He stated that his opinion is if you are trying to address climate change, biodiesel is better than ethanol. He acknowledged that analyses do vary. He stated that big fuel users like Publix don't use biodiesel because of warranty issues and that can't be dealt with at the state level. Publix goes out for bids; they don't buy fuel directly from a terminal. They hire an intermediate to shop fuels and the problem is if you are trying to introduce an alternate fuel to the process you need to establish blending capabilities in variable amounts and different terminals at once. He stated that if you are trying to introduce a fuel into your mix you can't do it unless everyone offers it. He stated that the cheapest thing a government entity can do is to give tax incentives for creating blending capacity so that it is offered universally. There are Midwestern states that have cushy tax advantages for biodiesel, but he says that does not deliver.

Dave Peebles prompted Peter Calvert for an affirmative position on an issue. Peter Calvert stated that the single best thing that you can do is to create tax incentives for blending infrastructure for biodiesel. He noted that the price per gallon doesn't get you that much unless you can deliver it. He believes that the smartest investment is in the infrastructure. He noted that people need blending racks where they can dial in the blend that you want (the percentage). Dave Mica questioned whether this meant to offer incentives to put in the infrastructure in the terminals. He asked whether there would ultimately be a greenhouse gas savings when you are chasing the existing quantities around from one subsidy to a higher subsidy place.



Governor's Action Team on Energy and Climate Change

State of Florida

www.flclimatechange.us

Peter Calvert stated that at last year's vegetable oil prices, people are making a lot of money on those crops. He noted that whether you are planting palm oil or soy, if you thought that vegetable oil prices would continue at these levels then you would plant as much as you could. He feels that in the U.S. they put their thumb on the scale for ethanol way too much; incentives are overwhelming in favor in corn, but that may or may not last.

David Mica brought up the point that there are biofuels issues associated with the environment. These are related to the GHG emissions of farming the biofuels such as the amount of land mass, water, fertilizer, and displacement of food crops. He stated his belief that this issue needs more examination and a fresh perspective

Lewis Lem noted that on slides 10 and 11, there is an outline of a policy template. He stated that it is not too early for people to be writing things down in areas that they are experts on. The next call is June 13th.

Dave Peebles noted that he received a copy of Rockefeller foundation seminar held 30 days ago, that has some summary language, which he can send. It contains a number of issues that need to be looked at seriously in terms of sustainability. There are a lot of options and he doesn't want to block some off. He suggested that there might be some text in that report that could be included in the groups write up.

Peter Calvert noted that his personal belief is that corn ethanol doesn't do much. He stated that you can't come forward with a policy recommendation without having incorporated this type of thinking into it. Dave Peebles noted that there are other stocks for ethanol, so don't have to limit yourself to corn, but you also don't need to write corn off. Peter Calvert stated that a lot of the criticisms that people make are well founded, but a lot of the analysis are not that good. He summarized a critique on using soy for biodiesel that found if you are using soy beans in the U.S. you are displacing farmlands into Brazil. Dr. Lonnie Ingram expressed that he is not widely supportive of corn to ethanol. He stated that the major problem is that fossil fuel burning boilers are being used and if fuel sources were switched, possibly to waste wood, it could be as good as sugar cane. He suggested an incentive to the corn ethanol producers to change their boilers.

Lewis Lem repeated that he is looking for language and hoping that people in the group can help draft some. He noted that the language will be discussed on the June 13th call, and the discussion would be picked up with alternative fuels issues then.

Agenda Item #6: Identify Initial Priorities for Analysis to Recommend to the Action Team



Governor's Action Team on Energy and Climate Change

State of Florida

www.flclimatechange.us

Dr. Lonnie Ingram asked if the group could reach general agreement that the first six areas are important and to proceed with those (but not exclusively), then could rethink the bundling within these subject categories. Larry Peterson asked if he was proposing a revote. Dr. Lonnie Ingram stated that he is proposing to see if there is consensus to accept the first six areas and that there might be a benefit from rethinking the bundling. He also stated that having new titles would be helpful to guide the thinking. Lewison Lem asked if the group was comfortable with this proposal, and working with the first six suggested policy options. This was agreed to by some members of the call. There was no dissent.

Larry Peterson added that he likes the idea of examining the items in the bundles. He stated that if the group can reach some consensus on what would be in the core bundles that would be a great help in putting together the policy recommendations. He noted that there are a lot of similarities on many of them and that there are some items below 6 that people could make cases for to be included without redundancy.

Agenda Item#7: Review of Next Steps

Covered previously under Agenda Item#5 by Lewison Lem.

Agenda Item#8: Agenda, Date and Time for Next Meetings

Lewison Lem encouraged anyone who is interested to come to the Action Team meeting at the end of the month, on May 29th and 30th, which is open to the public. Kelley Smith noted that both meetings are in room 412 of the Knot Building in the Capitol Complex. The meeting Thursday the 29th is from 10 am to 5 pm and from 8:30 am to 2:30 pm on Friday the 30th. The Rockefeller study was forwarded to Lewison Lem. He stated that he will send it out to the entire membership of the group.

Larry Peterson noted that because he is not in the transportation or alternative fuels sector he appreciates the discussion between Dave and Peter and feels that others have the same expertise in their own areas. He thanked the group for the conversation to bring the knowledge of the individuals to the group.

Dave Mica noted that he has a lot of information in response to the comments made today that would be beneficial for the group to know, but there is not sufficient time in this meeting.



Governor's Action Team on Energy and Climate Change *State of Florida*

www.flclimatechange.us

Lewison Lem noted that there are VMT assumptions in the inventory and forecast document, and asked if the numbers on the website are the right numbers. Kathy Neill stated that she has not had the time to review the numbers that were produced in detail for VMT provided. The forecast numbers that were provided are considered to be a mid-range forecast, a continuation of the current trend, and she would expect that the population and visitors growth to continue to grow at a fast rate. Lewison Lem opened the floor for any questions on VMT to pose to Kathy, but the group did not have any questions.

The next call is scheduled for Friday, June 13, 2008.

Agenda Item#9: Public Comments and Announcements

There were no comments from members of the public.