



[www.scclimatechange.us](http://www.scclimatechange.us)

**MEETING SUMMARY  
SOUTH CAROLINA CLIMATE, ENERGY AND COMMERCE ADVISORY  
COMMITTEE**

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

Call #11, March 14, 2008, 10:00 AM -12:00 NOON

**Attendance:**

1. Technical Working Group members attending:  
Rep Ben Hagood, Brad Wyche, Brian Barnes, Barry Beasley, Kay Clamp, Kim Diana Connolly, Erika Hartwig, John Hartz, and Dr. Arlene Prince (represented by Doug Fraite of SC DOT).
2. Technical Working Group members not attending:  
E. Bruce Morgan, Lanneau H. Siegling, Hugh Weathers, Wendy Bell, Rusty DePass, John Gardner, Dell Isham, Mark L. Robertson, and Rick Todd.
3. Center for Climate Strategies (CCS) staff:  
Frank Gallivan, Will Schroeer, and Theresa Silla
4. South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Control (DHEC):  
Michael Juras, Agency Liaison
5. South Carolina Agency Observers:
6. Public Attendees:

**Background documents:**

(all posted at [http://www.scclimatechange.us/Transportation\\_Land\\_Use.cfm](http://www.scclimatechange.us/Transportation_Land_Use.cfm))

1. Meeting Notice and Agenda
2. Draft Summary for Call #10
3. PowerPoint for Teleconference
4. Updated Policy Option Description Document

**Discussion items and key issues:**

CCS welcomed the group.  
Roll call was conducted.

**Future Meeting Dates:**

Call 11: April meeting date set for April 18, 2008

**Summary of Call #10 was presented:**

There were no questions from the TLU TWG regarding the summary.

**Discussion of Policy Option Descriptions:**

• **TLU Option 01 (adopt CA Clean Car standards):**

Cost benefit analysis was presented. The adoption of the new CAFE standards has to be incorporated into the cost benefit analysis. At this time, it is still too early to determine how manufacturers will respond to the CAFE standards. Without understanding how manufacturers will respond to the new CAFE standards, it will not be possible to estimate the cost of adapting from the new CAFE standards to the CA Clean Car standards. The CCS facilitator was asked to present his professional opinion on the subject of whether it is likely to be cost effective. He explained that it was likely to be cost effective measure to adopt for the following reasons:

1. CA Clean Car standards gives points for reducing emissions form the AC system
2. AC systems have not been subject to extensive regulations
3. Working from hypothesis that there should be easy and relatively cheap ways to tighten a system that has not been subject to extensive regulations, it should be cost effective to get additional increment of GHG emissions reductions mandated by the CA Clean Car standards.

TLU TWG requested that the POD be revised to include this opinion with the caveat that the while manufacturer costs might be cost effective, customers will probably face higher costs to replace the new AC systems should they malfunction.

• **TLU Option 03 (tax credit for efficient vehicles), 06 (alternative fuel infrastructure) & 12 (low GHG fuel standards):**

TLU TWG member Erika Hartwig indicated that additional data on beneficiaries of tax credits for efficient vehicles, alternative fuel infrastructure, and low GHG fuel standard was available and should be used to revise the quantification analysis.

TLU TWG member Brad Wyche requested deletion of language on page 16 of the POD under review. The language used to specify that Fee Bates, if used, would be an undue burden to the state.

TLU TWG member Kim Connolly reported that a bill to link sales tax to a highway trust fund is currently under consideration.

- **TLU Option 04(improve development patterns):**  
Discussion centered on using the conformity process as a model for the implementation of a VMT goal. TLU TWG member Rep Ben Hagood noted that this would be a timely and relevant adoption based on the new Ozone standards. The new standards are likely to affect areas in South Carolina that were previously in attainment. References to Quality of Life also discussed. Finally, the TLU TWG members discussed input from Municipal and County Associations. Decision was to distribute TLU 04 for final round of comments and then send a revised TLU 04 to the Municipal and County Associations.

- **TLU 05 (transit and bike-pedestrian)**  
TLU TWG members noted that the SC multi-modal plan has been posted by the DOT and is not available to public review and comments

- **TLU 07 (diesel engine emissions and efficiency) and TLU 13 (freight vehicle technology improvements):**  
Cost effectiveness analysis was presented for fuel efficiency related savings. In particular, the implementation costs for the anti-idling and rolling resistance measures were discussed. With respect to anti-idling, the \$/tCO<sub>2</sub>e was developed using estimates of the hours that long haul trucks spend idling, the CO<sub>2</sub> emissions related to the idling time, and the cost of the simple technologies that could be used to reduce idling times. With respect to rolling resistance, the EPA fleet model was used to estimate fuel efficiency and resulting reduction in CO<sub>2</sub> that would be achieved by implementing the technology. Cost effectiveness was not presented for biofuel use because that depends on the differential between biodiesel and regular diesel. While the two are at parity at this time, the market is very volatile. Cost effectiveness of port cargo handling equipment related measures could not be determined at this time and will not be quantified.

Finally, Rep Ben Hagood noted that he has received a request to sponsor an anti-idling bill. TLU TWG members were pleased to note that the SC Trucking Association is moving to address some of the concerns related with freight transportation and making a good faith effort to facilitate the changes sought for by the TLU TWG and the CECAC.

- **TLU 08 (stricter enforcement of speed limits):**  
New quantification results presented. Based on new information provided after Call 10, the percentage of vehicles traveling above 60 miles per hour was quite high. Estimated that 50 percent of vehicles could reduce their speeds which is a 5 fold increase in vehicles from previous analysis.
- **TLU 09 (CMAQ funds):**  
Will not be quantified.
- **TLU 10 (commuter choice):**  
CCS presented findings. Both employers and commuters save from this policy options and the savings are very large. The savings of \$516/ton may not look credible but is consistent with studies. TLU TWG members confirmed that large savings are in line with their expectations and experience and should be presented as such to the CECAC.

- **TLU 11 (funding road maintenance):**  
The cost effectiveness cannot be quantified until the funds are used so this has not been quantified. There was a brief discussion regarding the title of the policy option.
- **TLU 14 (rail):**  
Cost effectiveness cannot be quantified because the goals for this policy option cannot be quantified.

**Next Steps:**

CCS will present quantification results to the CECAC at the April 04, 2008 meeting. Additionally, revisions to policy option language itemized above will be undertaken prior to the April 04, 2008 meeting and submitted to the CECAC for their review and consideration. The results of the CECAC April 04 meeting will be reviewed and addressed in the next call, call 12.

**Public Input:**

None