



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 #8

July 2, 2008

Members Attending:

Members	Affiliation
Janet Bowman	The Nature Conservancy
Suzanne Cook	Florida Green Building Coalition
Coleman Edmunds	Auto Nation, Inc.
Howard Glassman	Florida Metropolitan Planning Organization Advisory Council
Robert "Buzz" Hoover	Gate Petroleum Company
Dr. Lonnie Ingram	University of Florida Institute of Food and Agricultural Sciences
Terry Joseph	West Florida Regional Planning Council
Dave Mica	Florida Petroleum Council
Charles Pattison	1000 Friends of Florida
Larry Peterson	Kitson & Partners
Preston Robertson	Florida Wildlife Federation
Ted Smith	Florida Automobile Dealers Association

Florida Department of Environmental Protection (DEP): Kelley Smith

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

Members of the Public: Mr. Barry (Florida Trucking Association), David Blodgett (Florida Department of Transportation), Doug Buck (Florida Home Builders Association), Mary Gutierrez (Bay Area Resource Council), Kathy Neal (Florida Department of Transportation), Daniel Parker (Florida Department of Health), Bruce Ritchie (Tallahassee Democrat), Lisa Scoles (Radey Thomas Yon & Clark), Timothy Smith (Department of Community Affairs)

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

Lewison Lem took attendance and stated that the purpose of the meeting is to discuss the draft language that was developed by some members of the group and try to come to a consensus on some draft language to recommend.



Governor's Action Team on Energy and Climate Change

State of Florida

www.flclimatechange.us

Agenda Item #3: Approval of Prior Call Summary

Suzanne Cook pointed out that on page 2, in the paragraph that starts Janet Bowman, item 1 has a grammatical error, it should be “discourage urban sprawl and support energy efficient land use patterns.” The meeting summary will be corrected to reflect that change.

Suzanne Cook questioned whether the group was recreating language smart growth language because there are already programs that have done that. She wanted to know whether the group wants to reference policies that are already in place. Lewison Lem responded that the policies are generally new actions that are a change from the existing situation, but that there is a section in the templates to reference items that are already occurring. Suzanne Cook pointed out that the Urban Land Institute and National Association of Home Builders already have growth policies and that she didn't expect that the group would spend time drafting language when there are already policies that have been developed.

Larry Peterson stated that he helped to draft the background document on TLU-3 and that it references smart growth language that was in an MOU drafted by some of the state agencies. The proposed language he included is stronger. Dave Mica asked who else was involved in preparing the document. Larry Peterson responded that he had spoken with Jim Quinn and Kathy Neal. Janet Bowman added that she worked with Kathy and Jim Quinn and Charlie Gautier on the piece that she drafted.

Janet Bowman moved to approve the meeting summary and Lonnie Ingram seconded the motion. The meeting summary was approved by unanimous consent.

Agenda Item #4: Development of Straw Proposals

Larry Peterson stated that the background document that he worked on was part of e-mail to Lewison Lem in which he was trying to describe things that have been recently passed or have been put in motion. There is statement that was approved that was provided by Kathy which is a smart growth statement, it does not explicitly state climate change or GHG reductions, but Larry had added his on emphasis to the following quote “better coordination of transportation land use planning and reduces vehicle miles traveled”.

Larry Peterson reviewed the policy document he drafted. He discussed that the description tries to link the three things that he thinks that we need to pay attention to: energy of buildings and communities (LEED programs, green globes, Florida green building coalition address these),



Governor's Action Team on Energy and Climate Change

State of Florida

www.flclimatechange.us

other issue is vehicle miles generation, and the third issue is looking at the intent of the Florida Forever language. That includes the notion that when we do development we are changing the land use from carbon sequestration to carbon releasing. Larry Peterson pointed out that the policy design piece talks about goal levels and he had Jim Quinn's assistance. The policy suggests that development proposals submitted for review would be approved by some entity or some other certification. The other suggestion was to establish a consortium of universities to provide the research and training for local government officials. Governments will need that to implement these ideas on a development scale. Larry Peterson then reviewed the policy timing. He would like to see this move forward with the Florida building code standards on their triennial review, a 50 % reduction in energy use in construction by 2019, which is also embedded in House Bill 7135.

Larry Peterson then stated that the LEED and Green Globe programs are probably the closest to one another. The difference is that LEED is more focused on resource use and recycling and Green Globe is more focused on energy efficiency issues, there is approximately an 80-85% overlap between the two programs. Larry Peterson added that the Florida Green Building Coalition has a number of certification programs, including one that covers at horizontal development, but doesn't address vertical construction. Suzanne Cook pointed out that the FDBC land development certification program addresses horizontal, FDBC green homes, commercial and high-rise standard address vertical, and there is one that addresses city and county operations. She added that FDBC is specifically written to address Florida climates; other programs are national in scope.

Jane Bowman questioned what would the certification would look like. Charles Pattison then asked if this is the point in the development to adopt a policy and then come back later and determine how best to implement it or are we supposed to include implementation ideas as part of this policy discussion. Lewison Lem stated that at this point in the process the point is to try to get consensus on the policy description as a general concept with general goals and general timing.

Dr. Lonnie Ingram commented that there is a general feeling that all land is sequestering carbon and that if we change land from green to something else we are disturbing something that; land that is unimproved is in a carbon balance.

Terry Joseph questioned whether the intent is to have this be all community development including redevelopment, would if there would be any size limitations. Larry Peterson answered that he would like it to include both. Terry Joseph commented that she could see push back from



Governor's Action Team on Energy and Climate Change

State of Florida

www.flclimatechange.us

some local governments on the issue. Terry Joseph expressed her support of the language, but added that the last part that includes parties should include regional governments and agencies. Larry Peterson agreed with the suggested edit.

Suzanne Cook commented that in policy design, goal levels, community development and land development there isn't anything that addresses how a local government can be involved in the development of their community. She questioned whether there was a need for a wider perspective on this goal because for example, there are operations such as commercial building that wouldn't be involved with the current policies. Larry Peterson answered that it was a good suggestion and he suggested that Suzanne Cook add language on that issue.

Janet Bowman asked about whether there would be the opportunity to make changes between now and next week. Lewison Lem responded that if someone wants to confer with people that are not members of the TWG and send language in, he can add it to the language and recirculate the document. It would be noted for the presentation to the full climate action team that the language was added

Janet Bowman reviewed the language that she prepared for TLU-6, Factoring GHG Emissions into Transportation and Land Use Processes. She stated that she was looking at the specific planning processes and trying to integrate the consideration of GHG emissions into the process. Janet Bowman received help from Kathy Neal and Jim Quinn. She also received input from Charlie Gautier, but his comments have not been incorporated yet. Janet Bowman stated that HB 697 is specifically directed at GHG production policy considerations to be included in local government comprehensive plans in the land use element, the traffic circulation element, and she pointed out that it is law right now.

Janet Bowman reviewed the goals for TLU-6. She pointed out that she tried to be specific. She picked a date of December 31, 2009 for local government comprehensive plans to address the GHG reductions objectives that are in the bill that passed. Janet Bowman stated that a statutory change would be necessary for some of these requirements to be effective.

Howard Glassman commented on the MPO and DOT recommendation that the group should keep in mind there are other factors that they are required to take into account. Janet stated that it should be listed as a priority in statutes, not that it trumps other factors. She also had some goals regarding reduction of VMT that it is important to have some targets, and that 10% seems very doable given gas prices.



Governor's Action Team on Energy and Climate Change

State of Florida

www.flclimatechange.us

The question was raised whether the 10% number took into account growth. Janet responded that it didn't. Lewison Lem added that some states try to standardize for growth by using per capita measurements. Janet agreed with that approach.

Janet Bowman stated she limited the draft policy to within urban service areas. Although urban areas are more measureable the policy could include statewide targets.

Larry Peterson commended Janet Bowman for her effort and specificity. He then asked whether it is conceivable in 6.8 and 6.9 reduce VMT and have an increase in GHG emissions. Janet Bowman responded that her assumption was that decreasing VMT would also decrease GHG emissions. Larry Peterson brought up the point that people could be driving more with better mileage. Janet Bowman stated that she felt that effect would flatten out over time

Dr. Lonnie Ingram brought up the issue of travel to schools. He questioned whether this draft policy would cover the schools. He pointed out that the siting and size of schools, has a really big impact on the amount of travel. Janet Bowman stated that it could be a consideration for the comprehensive planning process. She added that there is a school siting review process in 163, but it doesn't address GHG emissions. Dr. Lonnie Ingram pointed out that there has been a tendency to build larger schools farther away from the population so that everyone is bussed. Janet Bowman stated that it would be appropriate to add that to 6.1.

Larry Peterson asked how the numbers in 6.8 and 6.9 relate to things going on in other states. Lewison Lem responded that the initial goal is to talk about language and that Janet has laid out some very specific performance goals. He added that there is a growing discussion and awareness of this travel diet and it does depend on patterns of land use. The 10% goal is in discussion in quite a few places, for example, Washington State did codify a goal related to per capita VMT reduction.

Charles Pattison asked whether the Florida Climate and Energy Commission, to be established in the energy bill, would be the party that has the exclusive authority to set these types of policies. Janet Bowman responded that some of these items could be in statutes.

Janet Bowman stated that she didn't think the 10% goal is hard to reach with gas prices, but that she just wants to have a target for reducing VMT. Buzz Hoover commented that the vast majority of travel is work and school related, and that demand is off only about 1% this year. He stated that 10% by 2009 would be difficult if not impossible. Janet Bowman suggested changing the date. Buzz Hoover added that it takes about 12 years for our fleet to turn over and have any



Governor's Action Team on Energy and Climate Change

State of Florida

www.flclimatechange.us

measurable impact on overall economy so that at least 2012 or 2015 should be the date for the 10% goal.

Larry Peterson asked whether the intent was really to reduce GHG or VMT. He pointed out that VMT is more a function of land use and he felt that it is hard to reduce the miles if you live where you live. Janet Bowman pointed out that better planning is a way to address that

Suzanne Cook asked where vehicle efficiency is addressed. She wanted to know if the group had decided to give incentives for fuel efficient vehicles. That information is in a different section.

Howard Glassman contributed that he worked with Cutter, who gave him some numbers. Cutter is suggesting that vehicle hours traveled are considered in addition to VMT.

Janet Bowman suggested the elimination of 6.9, and that 6.8 to be left in with 10% per capita goal but move the date out to 2015. Howard Glassman shared Cutter's preliminary numbers for VMT and VHT reduction where they were reduced by 7-10% by 2020 and by 9-12% by 2050. Janet asked if this information is something that the group can site. It is in draft papers for discussion. Lewison Lem commented that those numbers are in the ball park, there is some researched basis, for example the Growing Cooler report, other states have discussed numbers between 3 and 11%, urban and rural are important to make distinctions. Janet stated that she was fine with the numbers from Cutter and that the language could say 2020 or it could establish a target date for reducing VMT in urban areas per capita by 10%.

Suzanne Cook pointed out that in House Bill 7135 the section motor vehicle emission standards specifically prohibits DEP from adopting California standards until it is ratified by the legislature. She questioned that with that language should the group even be moving towards developing a specific goal. Janet stated that was a good point

Dave Mica commented that he was unsure about a goal of reducing VMT. He would like to have greater miles traveled with less of a footprint. He added that the availability and freedom of movement is a great asset to a quality life cycle and that he doesn't know whether he can support a goal for just VMT, but appreciates fully the discussion to impact the footprint. Janet Bowman stated that the intent was to be about efficiency, not a quality of life issue.



Governor's Action Team on Energy and Climate Change

State of Florida

www.flclimatechange.us

Charles Pattison brought up that to some extent there is a question between VMT and GHG emissions as to whether they are linked depending on the technology. Today we know that they are directly related.

Daniel Parker with the Department of Health expressed appreciation of the goals and the use of the VMT, but expressed concern that the entire policy is written to the existing transportation land use framework. He suggested that 6.1 could be a place to insert items that include state agency practices. Daniel Parker will send in language to Lewison Lem.

Howard Glassman reviewed TLU-4 which Kathy at the Department of Transportation and Cutter were involved with. He stated that the approach is to look at supply and demand. The policy design recommendation within urban areas is to reduce VMT by 7-10% by 2020 9-12% by 2050 and similar factor for VHT.

Howard Glassman then stated that for the demand issue, to reduce trip lengths, can be achieved by aggressive implementation strategies. The 2nd way of addressing demand is looking at trips in terms of time and geography. He pointed out that many merchants are trying to use evening delivery, thereby reducing peak hour flow and having a better distribution of traffic. He pointed out that some argue that there is an undeveloped secondary road system in the state, and that there is an abundance of traffic on principal arterials. He stated that there is Reason to look at expanding the local system. Other items to be considered are system operational improvements, signals, traveler information, value pricing, intersection improvements, and importance of having incident management. Dave Mica stated that this is a huge area in which the group could make some recommendations that could have profound effects. He added that lights being timed appropriately makes a huge difference and it is a simple thing. Dave Mica then stated that the oil and gas industry doesn't derive any benefit from people sitting in traffic. Larry Peterson agreed with Dave Mica, that this is a very important section. He commented that Howard Glassman did a good job of laying out the important issues

Someone asked if anyone has figured out how to get a GPS system to work in real time with traffic information.

Janet Bowman suggested taking VMT off of the policy that she drafted and that it would then be addressed in the draft that Howard Glassman prepared.



Governor's Action Team on Energy and Climate Change

State of Florida

www.flclimatechange.us

Kathy Neal contributed that there are a number of publications that have recently come out for example, AASHTO primer on climate change and transportation. She suggested that the group could find information from existing publications.

Howard Glassman reviewed TLU-5 titled increasing choices in modes of transportation. The goal is to reduce VMT and provide alternative modes of transportation. He pointed out that bus and rail only account for 2% of trips in the US, which lags behind Canada and Western Europe. The recommendation is to double transit ridership to at least the levels found in Canada. Howard Glassman reviewed some of the categories including: improve availability and accessibility of service, create new rail systems for passenger and freight, increase competitiveness of alternative modes, make transit more cost competitive, simplify the transfer requirements of transit, preferred and discounted parking spaces to car and van pools, safety and security, educate and make the consumer aware of transit services and the marketing of the product itself.

Daniel Parker pointed out that a lot of the implementation mechanisms already exist and that one of the issues is getting the state agencies more assertive in using and promoting them. He suggested that on top of Page 7, state agencies be included in the parties involved.

Dr. Lonnie Ingram reviewed TLU-1. He feels that it needs to be a market driven approach. He suggested that there should be requirements such as the purchase of fuel ethanol from residues and energy crops that aren't food crops and that full value is paid based on a volume basis. He added that there needs private investment to commercialize the plants, need to find market driven approach to developing alternative fuels. Dave Mica stated that he doesn't agree with all of Dr. Ingram's comments, and that he would like the opportunity to make some proposals on this, but since there isn't much time; pick it up at the next meeting. Buzz Hoover stated that he doesn't disagree with the general objectives of Dr. Ingram's comments, but he thinks some of the ideas are costly and difficult to implement. It was agreed that there will be more discussion on this topic at the beginning of the next call.

Agenda Item #5: Agenda, Date and Time for Next Meetings

The next call scheduled for July 16th. Lewison Lem reminded that everyone is welcome to attend the Full Climate Action Team meeting.

Agenda Item #6: Public Comments and Announcements

There were no additional public comments.