

Hawaii Energy Policy Forum

Hawaii Energy Policy Forum - Energy Efficient Transportation Strategies

Act 254 Working Group Kick-Off Meeting – Summary Notes

- Wednesday, August 29, 2007 - 10:00 am – 1:30 pm - Outrigger Canoe Club

Attendance:

Bob Arrigoni, Tom Brown, James Burke, Mitch Ewan, Francis Keeno, Kal Kobayashi, Jim Maskrey, Sharon Miyashiro, Clyde Omija, Tom Quinn, David Rolf, Glenn Sato, Glenn Soma, Lance Tanaka, Maria Tome, Richard Torres, Marilyn Yasuda

HEPF staff: Chelsea Phlegar, Kim Suman

HEPF Consultant: Susan Char

Welcome & Introductions

After each person introduced himself/herself, Sharon Miyashiro, the co-chair of the Hawaii Energy Policy Forum (Forum) gave a brief background on the history and directives of Act 254 and explained that the Forum, in partnership with DBEDT, is looking at Hawaii's transportation system from an energy efficiency perspective. The working group was formed to gather information and ideas from the key players in Hawaii's transportation sector and will collectively develop recommendations to submit to the 2008 Legislature as required by the provisions of Act 254.

Presentation

Maria Tome, Alternative Energy Engineer from DBEDT's Strategic Industries Division, gave a presentation on the background and historical information on energy in Hawaii's transportation sector.

Vision Statement

Hawaii Energy Policy Forum

The draft of the vision statement for the working group was presented for discussion. The draft vision statement as presented to the working group was as follows: “Our vision is an energy efficient transportation system that offers people of all ages and walks of life flexible options including mass transit, private and public vehicles and self-powered conveyance in alternative combinations that provide mobility at reasonable cost.”

Concerns were raised regarding the term “reasonable” as it relates to cost.

Comment: “In the beginning, (an energy efficient transportation system) won’t be at a reasonable cost since the alternative fuels will probably be expensive. Maybe ‘acceptable’ is a more realistic word to use as we transition to alternative fuels.”

Comment: “Leave in ‘reasonable’ – it gives discretion and flexibility; we need to consider cost in the solution.”

Comment: “I like the word ‘acceptable’ – it references a threshold of paying, ie market perspective that people make the decision to accept”

The group decided to replace “reasonable” with “acceptable” in the vision statement.

Concerns were also raised regarding the integration of existing community development plans into this vision.

The vision adopted by the working group is:

“Our vision is an energy efficient transportation system that integrates effective community input and planning (demand), and offers people of all ages and walks of life flexible options (supply) including mass transit, private and public vehicles and self-powered conveyance in alternative combinations that provide mobility at acceptable cost.”

Goals of the Working Group

Hawaii Energy Policy Forum

Goals and benchmarks of the working group were discussed. It was suggested that other jurisdictions be examined for their transportation plans before specific goals and benchmarks are determined. Suggested countries & cities included Singapore, San Antonio, Portland and Dallas.

BTUs per passenger mile was suggested as a possible baseline for the group to use. In response to whether the group should be considering environmental concerns (i.e. greenhouse gas emissions) in our deliberations, it was suggested that it may be too complicated to include pollution since it has to be quantified first.

As a next step, members were asked to consult with their staff and colleagues to determine which jurisdictions have transportation plans that would be beneficial for the working group's consultant to examine. The plans should focus on mobility and efficiency. The group will set goals and benchmarks at the next meeting. The project team will follow up with comment sheets and possibly inviting county land use planners to join the Working Group. Also, members were asked to submit their department's transit plans to Sharon—does the plan have an energy component? If not, what would it take to get it?

Project Timetable

The project timetable and meeting schedule was presented and discussed. Consultant RFQs will be going out shortly, and will be sent to Working Group members for their input. We plan to have a consultant on board by the September meeting. A report from the group must be presented to the Legislature by the end of the 2007 calendar year.

Next meeting:

September 28, 2007