



[WWW.NMCLIMATECHANGE.US](http://WWW.NMCLIMATECHANGE.US)

**SUMMARY OF TRANSPORTATION AND LAND USE TWG CALL #2  
OCTOBER 5, 2005, 8:00 – 9:30 AM**

Attendance:

1. TWG members:
  - Charles Besinger, Sunbelt Biofuels
  - Neal Butt, Albuquerque Environmental Health Department
  - Richard (Skip) Dunn, Los Alamos Sustainability Group
  - Patricia Hoffman, New Mexico State University
  - Ken Hughes, Department of Finance Administration
  - JW Madison, New Mexico Rails
  - Sally McCarthy, ABQ Environmental Planning Commission
  - Regina Romero, New Mexico Municipal League
  - Eva Thaddeus, Sierra Club
  - De Anza Valencia, Regional Development Corp.
  - Bob Czerniak (sitting in for Mike Martin), New Mexico State University
2. NMED staff:
  - Mary Uhl
3. CCS staff: Karl Hausker, Maureen Mullen
4. Other attendees:
  - Susan Garrett
  - Gary McFarland
  - Tom Singer, Natural Resources Defense Council

Background documents:

*(unless noted, all posted at <http://www.nmclimatechange.us/documents.cfm#DocsTLU>)*

1. Meeting Notice and Agenda (distributed by e-mail)
2. Powerpoint Presentation for Call #2
3. Draft Summary of TLU TWG Call #1
4. Matrix of GHG Reduction Policy Options in the Transportation and Land Use (TLU) Sector
5. New Mexico 2025 Statewide Multimodal Transportation Plan

Discussion items and key issues:

1. Summary of TLU TWG Call #1
  - a. Add Eva Thaddeus to Call #1 attendance list.
  
2. Discussion of NM GHG Emissions Inventory and Forecast
  - a. Several members had questions about the units used in the emissions inventory and the relationship between these units and fuel consumption. Karl indicated that all of the GHG emission inventory data for NM will be reported units of MMTCO<sub>2</sub>e (million metric tons CO<sub>2</sub> equivalent). CCS will provide information on converting these units to gallons of fuel.
  - b. A member raised the issue that the inventory presented only is only projected through 2020, while the governor requires information through 2050. This is an issue that affects all sectors. CCS will discuss this issue in the next CCAG meeting.
  - c. The fuel economy assumptions in the emissions forecast were discussed. Maureen Mullen of CCS reported that EPA's MOBILE6 model assumes no change in fuel economy after 2001. This is consistent with the assumption used in the NM GHG inventory for TLU sector. A comment was made that sticking with the current fuel economy in the base projections would show the maximum impact of new policies. A member questioned whether 2 fuel economy scenarios could be produced—one with flat fuel economy and one with reduced fuel economy. Karl noted that the NMED guidance is to work with point estimates rather than ranges or multiple scenarios; however, potential variance in key assumptions, such as fuel economy, could be described in the text of the report. Mary Uhl of NMED commented that since there are no significant changes to fuel economy on the books in either State or Federal regulations that it makes sense to move forward with assumption of constant fuel economy in base projections.
  - d. Karl noted that no members had provided information on freight growth. Bob Zerniak suggested looking at growth from neighboring States, since much of NM's freight traffic is through traffic.
  - e. The group agreed to move forward with no recommended changes to the inventory or forecast at this point in time.
  
3. Policy matrix discussion.
  - a. The discussion covered Section 1.1 Passenger Sector—Vehicle Technology on the Policy Options Matrix, as well as options that should be added to the matrix.
  - b. Karl noted that New Mexico is not eligible to implement the California GHG emission standards since there are no nonattainment areas in New Mexico.
  - c. The group's priority ratings and rationale for these rating for the options discussed on this call are summarized in the revised Policy Options Matrix.

- d. The group recommended bundling options 1.1.6, 1.1.7, and 1.1.8, all of which are related to fees, taxes, or incentives for passenger cars.
- e. Several members indicated that options with low cost or potential savings should be pursued, even if benefits are minimal, as public relations for getting the public involved in the process.
- f. Under the feasibility header of the matrix, Pat Hoffman expressed interest in learning what options surrounding States have implemented that NM might coordinate efforts with.
- g. De Anza Valencia asked to add support for state funding of public transportation (e.g., a dedicated revenue to subsidize operations) under heading 1.5 (Demand—Transit Alternatives) on the Policy Options Matrix.
- h. Sally McCarthy asked whether Land Use options should be a separate header (currently listed under 1.4 of Policy Options Matrix). Karl indicated that since the location within the matrix has no impact on the importance or priority of options, it would be preferable to leave it as is.
- i. Richard Dunn questioned where commercial vehicles fall in the matrix, particularly in relation to fees, taxes, and feebates.
- j. Susan Garrett asked about adding an option for localizing agriculture so that food doesn't need to be transported so far. Karl replied that this option is included in the Agriculture and Forestry (AF) TWG (option 5.2 in the AF policy matrix).
- k. Richard Dunn asked that an option be added to include low speed vehicles. These are mostly electric vehicles with very high fuel efficiency and about 25 mph maximum speed. These are permitted on roads with speed limits of up to 35 mph. Richard Dunn will provide CCS with more information on this option.

Next steps and agreements:

1. CCS will post summary listing States that are eligible to implement California's GHG standards.
2. CCS will provide information for converting TLU sector emissions from MMTCO<sub>2e</sub> to gallons of fuel
3. In preparation for the third call, all TLU TWG members were asked to review the remaining options in the policy option matrix and mark the Priority column with their ranking prior to the next call so that we can complete the initial ranking of options during the third call.
4. CCS will update matrix with priority rankings discussed in Call #2.
5. Next TWG call: Wednesday, October 19, 2005, 8:30-10:00 am.