



WWW.MTCLIMATECHANGE.US

**SUMMARY OF TELECONFERENCE MEETING #3
CROSS-CUTTING (CC) ISSUES TECHNICAL WORKING GROUP (TWG)**

November 30, 2006

Attendance:

1. TWG Members:
 - Ted Dodge, National Carbon Offset Coalition
 - Mary Fitzpatrick, Self-Employed
 - Gloria Flora, Sustainable Obtainable Solutions
 - Pat Judge, MT Environmental Information Center
 - Chuck McGraw, Natural Resources Defense Council
 - 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
 - Lou Moore
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.)

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

Discussion items and key issues:

This was the third 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. Review of Results of CCAC Meeting: Colburn noted that the CCAC approved the CC TWG's suggested catalog of options at its September 15, 2006 meeting.
3. Next Steps for the TWG: Colburn reviewed for the TWG the steps through which TWGs are proceeding in developing policy option recommendations for the CCAC. The steps include (1) identification of a full range of state-level GHG

policy options (“catalog”); (2) selection of initial priority for analysis options from the catalog; (3) development of the design elements and characteristics of priority policy options (i.e., “straw proposals”) by small groups within the TWGs; and (4) full TWG approval of the policy options for recommendation to the CCAC.

4. Draft Catalog of State GHG Reduction Policy Options (Handout): Colburn provided a brief overview of each policy option in the draft “Catalog”. The TWG discussed each option. The following provides a brief summary of the key points and decisions made on the options:

- State GHG Emissions (CC-7): The TWG discussed each option and agreed without any objections to revise the catalog as follows:
 - Renumber 7.1 to 7.1.1 (Establish targets for reductions in the State’s own GHG emissions);
 - Add 7.1 (Lead by Example);
 - Renumber 7.2 to 7.1.2 (Disaggregate the State’s own GHG emissions to the agency level and require annual agency-specific reports on GHG reduction progress);
 - Renumber 7.3 to 7.1.3 (Create a multi-agency body to oversee on-going state climate efforts);
 - Add 7.2 (Institute climate-neutral bonding for government construction projects); and
 - Add 7.3 (Require GHG Emissions Assessments as part of Environmental Impact Statements).
- GHG Registry (CC-3): Some of the TWG members noted registry development efforts at the multi-state and national levels and that the TWG should consider participating in one of these registries rather than developing its own registry. It was noted that the majority of the registries do not adequately provide for registering of GHG emission sinks (e.g., carbon sequestration associated with reforestation), and that this is a limitation that should be considered in designing the straw proposal for this option if the option is approved for further analysis by the CCAC.
- Education and Outreach: It was noted that other TWG’s have options related to education and outreach and are interested in having these options included in the considerations of the CC TWG. Jeff Blend noted that he will check with the other TWG’s to obtain clarification on what the options are. Colburn noted that the CCS facilitators for each TWG will discuss such potential overlaps as well.
- Adaptation: The TWG agreed that although this is an important issue and should be addressed by the state, the Governor has given the CCAC the responsibility to evaluate and recommend options for reducing GHG emissions. The TWG felt that the Adaptation option did not fall within the responsibility of the CCAC because it is concerned with addressing issues

associated with adapting to the effects of climate change rather than reducing GHG emissions.

5. Recommendation for Priority for Analysis of Options to CCAC: The CC TWG members agreed without objection to the following priority rankings for the options in the catalog (as revised based on the TWG's recommendations during Call #3):

High Priority:

- GHG Inventories and Forecasting (CC-1);
- GHG Reporting (CC-2);
- GHG Registry (CC-3);
- Public Education and Outreach (CC-4);
- GHG Reduction Goals and Targets (CC-6); and
- State GHG Emissions (CC-7).

Low Priority: Adaptation (CC-5)

6. Timing and coordination for development of policy options: The TWG agreed to dividing into small groups for preparing straw proposals for individual policy options so that work on each option would proceed in parallel. The small groups would report back to the full CC TWG.
7. Call to the Public: There were no public participants.
8. Announcements: None.

Next steps:

1. The next CC TWG call (#4) will be **Thursday, January 4, from 9:00–10:30 AM Mountain time**. CCS will notify the full TWG of the date and time for each call and will send a reminder out several days before each call. The CC TWG also set Call #5 for **Friday, January 19, from 9:00–10:30 AM Mountain time**. However, this date is likely to change because of the change in the date for the next CCAC meeting. The time is also likely to be changed to 11:00 AM – 12:30 PM Mountain time to accommodate TWG member schedules. CCS will coordinate arrangement of Call #5 as well as all future calls with the TWG members during Call #4.
2. Draft Catalog of State GHG Reduction Policy Options: CCS will revise the draft "Catalog" based on comments received from TWG members during Call #3.
3. CCAC Meeting #3: CCS will report the CC TWG's recommended priorities for analysis of options at the CCAC's December 14 meeting. During Call #4 of the CC TWG, CCS will provide a summary of the CCAC's decisions on the CC TWG's recommended priorities for analysis.
4. Small groups: Following approval of suggested priorities for analysis by the CCAC, TWG members will indicate to CCS which options they would prefer to

focus on in the development of policy option straw proposals. CCS will coordinate with the CC TWG members via e-mail to determine the member's preferences for participating in small groups, and will provide examples of similar efforts in other states.