



[www.coloradoclimate.org](http://www.coloradoclimate.org)

**DRAFT TELECONFERENCE MEETING SUMMARY**  
**TLU Policy Working Group**  
**Call #4, April 4, 2007**

**Members Attending:**

Kelli Kammerer	Gregg Thomas
Laurie Mathews	Nancy Sharpe
Jennifer Schaufele	Tim Gagen
Brian Woodruff	Don Parsons
Will Toor	John Tayer
Penfield Tate	

**Governmental Agency Liaisons:** None

**Rocky Mountain Climate Organization:** Tom Easley

**Center for Climate Strategies:** Jeff Ang-Olson, Tiffany Batac, Lewison Lem

**Agenda Item#1: Introductions and Roll Call.** CCS took roll call and reviewed the agenda for the meeting.

**Agenda Item#2: Review and Approval of Draft Meeting Summary #3.** Call Summary of Meeting #3 was reviewed and approved. There were no comments or suggestions for revisions.

**Agenda Item#3: Discussion of Balloting Results and Policy Priority Setting.**

The group reviewed the balloting results and bundling processes. Based on ballots, CCS suggested policy options grouped into high, medium, and low priority. The high priority options are those top ten that will be recommended to the CAP for approval. It was clarified that these ten will each be given equal consideration. In other words, the order in which the options are listed (option no. 1 – 10) does not affect the level of attention or analysis given to an option.

The group then discussed each of the top priority policy options and suggested bundles, as summarized below.

4.3 Smart Growth Planning, Modeling, and Tools

4.2 Transit-Oriented Development

4.1 Infill, Brownfield Re-Development

4.4 Targeted Open Space Protection

Although option 4.4 received fewer votes than the other three in the bundle, it was agreed that this option should be included. The group later agreed to add to this bundle option 4.11 GHG

Conformity for Transportation Plans, which will be henceforth described as the quantification of GHG emissions from transportation plans rather than a conformity process.

### 1.8 GHG-linked Registration Fees

### 1.9 Tax Credits for Low-GHG Vehicles

### 1.10 Incentives for Low-GHG Vehicles

Members of the PWG agreed to add 1.7 Feebates to this bundle. The group discussed the fact that in designing this policy, it is unlikely that both feebates *and* GHG-linked registration fees would both be included, since they are similar. The group will need to decide in the future how to frame this policy.

Some members of the PWG expressed equity concerns with measures such as 1.8, since lower-income residents may be more likely to have older and less fuel efficient vehicles. It was agreed that equity concerns could be addressed when the group develops the policy design.

### 5.5 Improve Transit Service

### 5.4 Expand Transit Infrastructure

### 5.6 Transit Prioritization

The group discussed the fact that option 5.4 could have costs that are several orders of magnitude larger than 5.5 or 5.6. There was some concern that by including 5.4 in the bundle, it would overshadow 5.5 and 5.6, which might be much more cost-effective strategies for reducing GHGs. CCS noted that when the group develops the policy design, an emphasis can be placed on lower cost transit improvements over large capital projects.

### 2.4 Truck Stop Electrification

### 2.3 Anti-Idling Regulations

There were no comments or objections to this bundle.

### 3.1 Renewable Fuel Standard

There were no comments or objections to this option.

### 1.1 Clean Car Program (“Pavley” GHG Emissions Standards)

There were no comments or objections to this option.

### 5.7 Transit Marketing, Promotion, and Pricing Incentives

There were no comments or objections to this option.

### 5.15 VMT Tax

### 5.14 Fuel Tax

Members of the PWG discussed whether this policy option may have to be put to a state ballot because of Colorado’s TABOR law. It was clarified for the group that even if a new tax is a revenue neutral and not generating new funds but solely reallocating, it would still require approval by the state’s voters. Equity issues would also need to be addressed in this option to ensure that it will not be implemented in a regressive fashion. The VMT tax could be based on

an annual (or more frequent) odometer audit, or could involve tracking vehicle usage with GPS devices, similar to the pilot programs underway in Portland and Seattle.

#### 4.7 Parking Pricing or Supply Restrictions

Members of the PWG would like to see this option renamed as it moves forward. A suggestion was made to rename this to “parking management.”

#### 1.7 “Feebates.”

As discussed above, this option is now bundled with 1.8 – 1.10.

#### 5.11 Commuter Choice/Parking Cash Out

Members of the PWG agreed to bundle 5.11 with 5.9 Telecommute and Live-Near-Your-Work

#### 4.11 GHG Conformity for Transportation Plans

Members agreed to include this option with the Smart Growth bundle (4.1 – 4.4). This strategy would not necessarily involve a conformity determination; it could involve just quantifying and reporting the GHG emissions from transportation plans. Thus, this strategy will be renamed going forward.

#### 1.2 Fuel-Efficient Tires

#### 2.2 Vehicle Maintenance, Driver Education

Members of the PWG agreed to bundle these two options as a final (11<sup>th</sup>) policy priority to recommend to the CAP. The bundled option will generally focus on “Efficient Vehicle Purchasing and Efficient Vehicle Operations” program to educate drivers and consumers.

The consolidated list of priority options is shown below.

**Agenda Item#4: Final Questions and Comments on Colorado GHG Inventory and Forecast.** None.

**Agenda Item#5: Review and Discussion of Policy Template and Call for Volunteers.**

CCS reviewed the next steps in the process after balloting. CCS described a sample policy template. PWG volunteer groups will first draft text on the policy option description and policy option design, which includes goal levels. CCS explained that goals in the policy design should be stated numerically so that the actual costs and benefits can be directly estimated. The rest of the template will be completed later. CCS will take the lead on quantifying the benefits and costs of the policies.

CCS noted that policy options drafted in other state processes can provide a starting point for drafting the policy option description and policy option design for Colorado. For more information on what other states are doing, CCS recommends that the PWG review the policy designs in the following state processes: Arizona ([www.azclimatechange.us](http://www.azclimatechange.us)); New Mexico ([www.nmclimatechange.us](http://www.nmclimatechange.us)); North Carolina ([www.ncclimatechange.us](http://www.ncclimatechange.us)); and MT

([www.mtclimatechange.us](http://www.mtclimatechange.us)). Contact CCS if you need more assistance locating specific documents. The TLU web pages on these websites will have text on policy design drafted by these other state processes.

PWG members volunteered for working on specific options. CCS would like each option to have a single “Lead” volunteer and one or two assistants. Group assignments and contact information are provided at the end of the call notes. **PWG members that have not yet volunteered for one or more options or missed the call are asked to do so** (please consider volunteering for 2 or more options if possible and ask to lead a volunteer subgroup, if possible, so that work is distributed evenly throughout the PWG). Contact Jeff Ang-Olson to sign up for a volunteer group. In a small number of cases, PWG members nominated another PWG member who was not on the call to be a volunteer on a policy subgroup (please contact Jeff Ang-Olson if you are not willing to act as a volunteer).

#### **Agenda Item#6: Agenda, Time and Date for Next Meeting.**

RMCO gave a quick update on changes in the process. Principals from the Ritter Administration would like to complete the process by Oct. 1 instead of Nov 1. RMCO explained that the Ritter Administration would like to have a clear-cut plan before the next legislative session. This will mean a tighter process for preparing the policy options, which is why CCS is encouraging PWG members to take early initiative and begin drafting text even though the CAP has not given final approval on the priority options.

The next CAP meeting is May 3, where the list of 11 priority options will be reviewed for approval. In the meantime, PWG members can begin working on the straw proposals by drafting policy descriptions and mitigation option design (volunteer groups should self organize for this but contact CCS for assistance, as needed). CCS requested draft text on mitigation option descriptions and design by April 27<sup>th</sup>. CCS will consolidate and post in preparation for the next PWG meeting.

The next PWG meeting is tentatively set for May 4, in person at the NREL headquarters, from 9:00 AM – 12:00 PM. The PWG will discuss in detail the design of straw proposals with the aim of developing nearly final drafts. This will include identifying quantitative goals. CCS encouraged PWG volunteers to consider before the meeting their potential data needs for setting goal levels, and to come prepared with the necessary data (or ask CCS to help gather the information).

#### **Agenda Item#7: Public Input and Announcements.** None.

**Transportation and Land Use (TLU) Policy Working Group:  
Priority Options with Volunteers**

<b>TLU</b>	<b>Original Option No.</b>	<b>Volunteers</b>	<b>Lead</b>
1	4.3 Smart Growth Planning, Modeling, Tools	Jennifer Schaufele	TBD
	4.2 Transit-Oriented Development		
	4.1 Infill, Brownfield Re-Development		
	4.4 Targeted Open Space Protection		
	4.11 Quantification of GHGs from Transportation Plans		
2	1.8 GHG-linked Registration Fees	Kelli Kammerer Brian Woodruff Gregg Thomas	TBD
	1.9 Tax Credits for Low-GHG Vehicles		
	1.10 Incentives for Low-GHG Vehicles		
	1.7 "Feebates"		
3	5.5 Improve Transit Service	John Tayer Penfield Tate	TBD
	5.4 Expand Transit Infrastructure		
	5.6 Transit Prioritization		
4	2.4 Truck Stop Electrification	Don Parsons Tim Gagen	TBD
	2.3 Adopt and/or Enforce Anti-Idling Regulations for Buses/Trucks		
5	3.1 Renewable Fuel Standard	Gregg Thomas	TBD
6	1.1 Clean Car Program (Pavley GHG Emission Standards)		TBD
7	5.7 Transit Marketing, Promotion, and Pricing Incentives	John Tayer	TBD
8	5.15 VMT Tax	Penfield Tate (as reviewer), Brian Woodruff (as reviewer)	TBD
	5.14 Fuel Tax		
9	4.7 Parking Management	Gregg Thomas	TBD
10	5.11 Commuter Choice/Parking Cash Out	Gregg Thomas	TBD
	5.9 Telecommute and Live-Near-Your-Work		
11	1.2 Fuel-Efficient Tires	Kelli Kammerer Penfield Tate	TBD
	2.2 Vehicle Maintenance, Driver Education		

**TLU PWG Contact List**

Tim	Gagen	Town of Breckenridge	(303) 453-3161	timg@townofbreckenridge.com
Kelli	Kammerer	American Honda	(801) 554-9788	kellikammerer@msn.com
Laurie	Mathews	former Director, Colorado State Parks		holmath@earthlink.net
Scott	McCarey	Charlier Associates	(303) 543-7277 x 106	scott@charlier.org
Don	Parsons	Town of Dillon	(970) 406-1341	parsondo@hotmail.com
Mark	Ruzzin	Mayor, City of Boulder		mruzzin@swenergy.org
Jennifer	Schaufele	Denver Regional Council of Governments	(303) 455-1000	jschaufele@drcog.org
Nancy	Sharpe	Mayor, Greenwood Village	(303) 773-0252	nsharpe@greenwoodvillage.com
Jim	Spehar	Grand Junction City Council	(970) 263-9635	jspehar@sonoran.org
Penfield	Tate III	Greenberg Traurig, LLP	(303) 572-6500	tatep@gtlaw.com
John	Tayer	Roche Colorado Corporation	(303) 938-6414	john.tayer@roche.com
Kimberly	Taylor	Alternative Fuel Vehicle Institute	(702) 203-4982	ktaylor@afvi.org
Gregg	Thomas	Denver Environmental Health	(720) 865-5413	gregg.thomas@ci.denver.co.us
Will	Toor	Boulder County Commissioner	(303) 441-3500	wtoor@co.boulder.co.us
Bill	Vidal	City and County of Denver		bill.vidal@ci.denver.co.us
Mike	Whitaker	University of CO Denver Health Sciences Center	(303) 579-4198	michael.whitaker@colorado.edu
Brian	Woodruff	City of Fort Collins	(970) 221-6604	bwoodruff@fcgov.com