



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

**SUMMARY OF TELECONFERENCE MEETING #1  
CROSS-CUTTING (CC) ISSUES TECHNICAL WORKING GROUP (TWG)  
September 8, 2006**

**Attendance:**

1. TWG Members:
  - Peggy Beltrone, Cascade County Commission
  - Rep. Sue Dickenson, House District 25
  - Mary Fitzpatrick, Self-Employed
  - Chuck McGraw, Natural Resources Defense Council
  - Shane Mogenson, Nance Petroleum
  - Cheryl Reichert, M.D., Citizens for Clean Energy
  - Diego Rivas, Montanans for a Healthy Climate
2. MT Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ):
  - Jeff Blend
  - Jim Boyer
  - Lisa Peterson
3. Center for Climate Strategies (CCS):
  - Ken Colburn, TWG Co-Facilitator
  - Randy Strait, TWG Co-Facilitator
4. Other Attendees:
  - None

**Background documents:**

(all posted at: [http://www.mtclimatechange.us/Cross\\_Cutting.cfm](http://www.mtclimatechange.us/Cross_Cutting.cfm).)

1. Meeting Notice & Agenda (including provisions for public access)
2. PowerPoint© presentation for meeting
3. Draft Catalog of State-Level GHG Reduction Policy Options

**Discussion items and key issues:**

This was the first conference call of the CC TWG.

1. Ken Colburn called the meeting to order, completed the roll call and reviewed the agenda and plans for the call.
2. Colburn provided an initial overview of the process, roles, and responsibilities of the CCAC and the CC TWG. Whereas most TWGs are focused on particular options within specific sectors (e.g., energy; residential, commercial, and industrial fuel use; transportation and land use; agriculture, forestry, and waste), the CC TWG will discuss and develop recommendations that cut across all sectors. The CC TWG will be primarily examining the options provided in the

draft “catalog” for this meeting, along with any additional options that the TWG members wish to add, and other issues or options may be suggested by other TWGs. Colburn also provided an overview of the timing for TWG meetings relative to CCAC meetings, and the work products to be developed by the CC TWG.

3. Inventory and Forecast: Colburn provided an overview of the draft GHG inventory and forecast noting that this work is helpful for assessing GHG emissions and trends, but it is not intended to be a compliance baseline. Some TWG members noted concerns with growth assumptions for some sectors (e.g., transportation and residential, commercial, and industrial fuel use) and that the use of regional growth assumptions may not be applicable to MT. It was acknowledged that the sector-specific TWGs will be responsible for reviewing the inventory and forecast and identifying opportunities for improving the inventory and forecast in this and other respects.
4. Draft Catalog of State-Level GHG Reduction Policy Options (Handout): CCS provided the TWG with a catalog of CC policy options that have been reviewed and/or undertaken in other states regarding GHG emissions inventories and forecasting, reporting, registries, public education and outreach, adaptation, GHG reduction goals and targets, and states’ own GHG emissions. The catalog is a starting place that the CC TWG can add to, modify, or delete from as it deliberates policy options most appropriate for MT. Colburn provided a brief overview of each option. It was noted that the catalog should focus on the policy options to be considered by the TWG, and a separate “design options template” will be developed to help the TWG define the attributes of individual policy options. The following provides a brief summary of items noted as Colburn explained the options:

GHG Registry: Colburn provided a brief introduction to GHG registries in the U.S. noting that (1) registries require a viable GHG reporting framework and that reporting and registries are often considered jointly when developing design characteristics, and (2) the importance of registries for “baseline protection” in order to encourage sources to undertake early reductions. The following efforts in the U.S. were briefly discussed:

- Eastern Climate Registry (formerly RGGR) – CO2 cap and trade program for electric power sources;
- California Climate Action Registry (CCAR) – voluntary but likely to be mandatory as a result of California’s recent legislation (AB-32) committing the state to mandatory GHG reductions; participation is open to all sources for which GHG emissions protocols are available;
- Chicago Climate Exchange (CCX) – requires members to commit to a GHG reduction; CCX is marketing states and municipalities to join but also available to any entity including private sector entities;
- Initiatives by the WRAP and LADCO to develop or join a regional GHG registry; and

- Registry quantification protocols typically follow those developed by the World Resources Institute and the World Business Council for Sustainable Development, collectively called the *GHG Protocol*.

Goals and Targets: The CC TWG may wish to recommend that Montana establish a GHG reduction target or goal. (It was noted that for the purpose of the CC TWG, these terms may be used interchangeably.)

State GHG Emissions: This option recognizes that the State itself is a GHG emitter, and can “lead by example” in reducing its GHG emissions. Many TWG members felt it is important for the State to do so because it will encourage the private sector to reduce its own GHG emissions. It will be important to note energy (money) savings associated with reducing GHG emissions.

Education and Outreach: While this option in the catalog is organized by audience, the TWG is free to re-organize it as it wishes. Some TWG members agreed with the audience-based approach. The TWG noted that information on what MT is already doing to address climate change issues should be added to the website. It will also be important to determine best methods for connecting (networking) citizens who are addressing climate change issues. The TWG also discussed providing bios of each member on the website. Other education and outreach opportunities were also mentioned, including “Green Labeling” of products and methods in order to enhance opportunities for MT farmers (e.g., increase bio-diesel production and use; use of state or locally produced goods and services).

5. Timing and coordination for analysis of policy options: Timing for analysis of policy options in the catalog was briefly discussed. The TWG could proceed with analyzing the options either sequentially or in parallel. Some members of the TWG indicated a preference for the entire TWG to work on developing each option rather than breaking into sub-groups.
6. Call to the Public: There were no public participants.
7. Announcements: Lisa Peterson relayed a message from Richard Oppen (MT DEQ) thanking the TWG members for their participation.

#### **Next steps:**

1. The next CC TWG call (#2) will be **Tuesday, October 10, from 9:00–10:30 AM Mountain time**. CCS will notify the full TWG of the date and time for call #2 and send a reminder out several days before the call.
2. Draft Catalog of State-Level GHG Reduction Policy Options: TWG members should review the catalog items carefully and be prepared to discuss revisions and/or additions to the catalog during the next call. During the next call CCS will review the catalog items with the TWG in detail.
3. Design Template and Matrix. CCS will develop and circulate a file containing a template and matrix for each option for the CC TWG to use as a starting point in

developing the design characteristics of each option. During the next meeting, CCS will review this information with the TWG. CCS can provide draft language based on what other states have developed, but it will be important for the CC TWG to develop its own language. A matrix will be provided in the file for each option for the TWG to consider using in defining the design elements for each option.