

**SUMMARY OF TELECONFERENCE MEETING #7  
CROSS-CUTTING (CC) ISSUES TECHNICAL WORKING GROUP (TWG)**

March 14, 2007

**Attendance:**

1. TWG Members:
  - Rep. Sue Dickenson, House District 25
  - Ted Dodge, National Carbon Offset Coalition
  - Mary Fitzpatrick, Self-Employed
  - Chuck McGraw, Natural Resources Defense Council
  - Cheryl Reichert, Citizens for Clean Energy
  - Diego Rivas, Montanans for a Healthy Climate
2. MT Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ):
  - 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](http://www.mtclimatechange.us/Cross_Cutting.cfm).)

1. Meeting Notice & Agenda (including provisions for public access)
2. Draft Summary for Call #6
3. PowerPoint© presentation for meeting
4. Catalog of State GHG Reduction Policy Options
5. Draft Policy Option Descriptions
6. Draft Policy Option Descriptions - Matrices

**Discussion items and key issues:**

This was the seventh 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. The TWG did not have any changes to the summary for Call #6. One member noted a concern with including the voluntary reporting of emissions by individuals and communities in the straw proposal. The small group agreed that this was still under consideration and the TWG agreed that no revisions were needed to the summary for Call #6.

3. Dates and Times for Remaining TWG Calls: See item #1 under “Action Items” at the end of this summary.
4. Review of results of CCAC meeting #4: Colburn noted that during its fourth meeting on March 1, the CCAC approved further development of the six CC policy options in the catalog. Members of the CCAC provided the following recommendations for the straw proposals:
  - Enlist expertise and resources of Montana’s colleges and universities in developing inventories and forecasts (CC-1) and GHG reporting (CC-2)
  - Address funding and staffing resources needed to implement GHG registry (CC-3) and public education and outreach (CC-4)
  - Include Environmental Assessments as a part of the straw proposal for Require GHG Emissions Assessments as Part of Environmental Impact Statements (CC-7.3).

Colburn noted that CCS revised the straw proposals to address these comments, and the revised text is identified in the “Draft Policy Option Descriptions” file distributed to the TWG members before today’s call.

5. Review goals for CCAC Meeting #5: Colburn noted that the next CCAC meeting will be held on April 26, 2007. The assignment for the CC TWG going into this meeting is to further develop the draft straw proposals for each of the priority policy options for review and approval by the CCAC.
6. Next Steps for the TWG: Colburn noted that in the call today the TWG will review and discuss the revisions that CCS made to each policy option to incorporate the CCAC’s comments, and note any concerns with the revisions. The full TWG should also discuss any concerns it has with the current design of each policy option and should provide guidance to the small groups for the further development of the policy options.

The TWG will need to complete the remaining elements of the template for each policy option. The elements of the template that are of most importance to the CC options include the following: Implementation Mechanisms, Related Policies/Programs in Place, Additional Benefits and Costs, and Feasibility Issues. The other elements of the template are not as relevant to the CC options since we do not quantify GHG reductions and estimated GHG savings or costs.

The following provides a brief summary of the discussion on each of the options.

- Inventories and Forecasting (CC-1): The TWG approved the revision to the straw proposal to address a CCAC comment that development of GHG emissions inventory and forecasting systems for Montana should take advantage of substantial related expertise found in the state’s colleges and universities. The small group noted that it is preparing a sample survey of Montana residents on how people react to climate change over time for review by the full TWG. The small group will provide sample survey text for review by the TWG during the next TWG call. The small group is amenable to placing this survey under the Education and Outreach (CC-4) option.

Diego Rivas noted that Montanans for a Healthy Climate completed a survey last summer and finished a follow-up survey two weeks ago to assess the opinion of Montana citizens on a range of environmental issues including climate change. He will send the survey to CCS for distribution to the TWG.

- GHG Reporting (CC-2): The TWG approved of the revision to the straw proposal to address a CCAC comment that development of GHG emissions reporting systems for Montana should take advantage of substantial related expertise found in the state's colleges and universities.
- GHG Registry (CC-3): The TWG approved of the revision to the straw proposal to address a CCAC comment that the straw proposal needs to address incremental staffing and resource requirements. The small group for this option agreed to develop and estimate incremental staffing and resource requirements.

Colburn noted that states are developing a national reporting and registry system that will, over time, combine the California Climate Action Registry and the Eastern Climate Registry effort. It is being called "*The Climate Registry*". It is designed to be a multi-purpose registry in order to accommodate the variety of state policies that are being adopted. It may not, however, cover all sources such as forestry and agricultural carbon sinks, at least not initially. The TWG's straw proposal is in line with "*The Climate Registry*" design.

- Education and Outreach (CC-4): The TWG approved of the revision to the straw proposal to respond a CCAC comment about the need to address incremental staffing and resource requirements. The small group for this option agreed to develop an estimate of incremental staffing and resource requirements. A TWG member noted that the state should provide staff to train educators and local community leaders on climate change issues and methods for managing their own GHG emissions. The TWG thought that the state should provide at least one full-time person to coordinate and implement training programs.
- Establish a Target for Reducing the State's Own GHG Emissions (CC-7.1): Colburn noted that the straw proposal currently recommends that the state set a goal for itself but does not recommend a numerical goal. The question is if the CC TWG wants to recommend a numerical goal in the straw proposal.

Lou Moore (MT DEQ) noted that the state has developed good GHG information for about 200 buildings, and the state is working to develop similar information for another 200-250 this year. The state has 1,500 buildings in its inventory.

A TWG member noted that there are two questions to address: (1) what is a reasonable numerical goal for reducing the state's own emissions; and (2) should the TWG set an aspirational goal for the state to work towards meeting but which it may not attain? TWG members felt that there is value in setting a goal to keep the state agencies focused on reducing GHG emissions from their

buildings and fleets. The state should initially focus efforts on reducing emissions from the sources where it is easy to achieve reductions. It was also noted that the state should include carbon sinks associated with state owned lands in the straw proposal.

A TWG member suggested that it might be appropriate to include a requirement for the state to benchmark emissions for all state government buildings. One approach is to conduct such benchmarking through the US EPA's state building benchmark program. Colburn noted that some of these calculations may be done under the RCI TWG; CCS will check with the RCI TWG facilitators on this.

The small group will work on revising the straw proposal to address the emission reduction potential from existing buildings and how the state might approach setting and reaching a GHG reduction goal.

The TWG asked if there are examples of goals that other states have set for themselves. Colburn noted that CCS can provide goals adopted by other states, but to date, these have been statewide goals for reducing emissions from all sources, not goals for reducing the state's own emissions.

- Require GHG Emissions Assessments as Part of Environmental Impact Statements (CC-7.3): The TWG approved of the revision to the straw proposal to address a CCAC comment that Environmental Assessments be included. A TWG member suggested that the word "development" be removed from the first sentence under "Policy Description" (see draft policy option description file) and the full TWG approved of this revision.
- Consider Joining CCX (CC-7.4): Prior to the TWG call, CCS distributed information to the TWG members provided by Ted Dodge and Pat Judge. Ted provided information on CCX to help TWG members develop a better understanding of CCX. Pat provided a letter prepared by several environmental organizations citing reasons why they believe states and cities should not join CCX. The following provides a summary of the TWG's discussion of this information:

Ted Dodge noted the following points on CCX:

- CCX was started to create a pilot market with the objective to help shape national policy.
- CCX membership includes over 250 corporations and three states (i.e., NM, IL, or MN).
- CCX protocols are certified by the National Association of Security Dealers.
- Carbon reductions or sinks must be 3<sup>rd</sup> party verified to register with CCX.
- Over 15 million tons of carbon offsets have been traded on CCX.
- The sale of offsets under CCX could provide Montana with an opportunity to generate revenue to fund other programs like education and outreach.

- States must meet sustainable forestry requirements to participate.
- Participation in CCX should promote land-use change to support carbon sequestration.
- Signatories of the letter citing reasons for opposing membership in CCX have been supporting other registry efforts (e.g., CCAR, RGGI) so there may be a conflict of interest from their perspective.

A TWG member noted that they feel that the flaws and loopholes identified in the letter opposing membership in CCX are significant. Part of the problem is that CCX is a pilot program, and, if the state joins CCX, it would be committed to CCX methods that ultimately may not be consistent with forthcoming regional or national carbon sink protocols and verification systems.

It was noted that the straw proposal recommends that Montana consider joining CCX; it does not recommend that the state join CCX. The recommendation in the straw proposal would leave the decision to the state after the state investigates further the pros and cons of joining CCX. A TWG member noted that they do not think that making a recommendation of this nature is a good idea. The member recommended that the CC TWG analyze the options and then recommend either that the state join CCX or not join CCX.

The full TWG agreed that the small group should work further on the straw proposal to decide if the recommendation should be for the state to join CCX or to consider joining CCX.

- GHG Reduction Goals and Targets (CC-6): Colburn noted that this option should remain as a CC policy option, but that detailed work on it would await the results of the quantification analysis for each policy option to be conducted by the other TWGs. That way, quantitative results from the other TWGs can be used to help determine what goals may be appropriate for Montana.
7. Early Consensus Options: Colburn asked the TWG members if they would want to consider identifying some options (e.g., inventories and forecasting, reporting, and registries) as “early consensus” options that the TWG would complete and recommend to the CCAC for approval at the next CCAC meeting. These “early consensus” options could then be provided to the State Legislature. The TWG did not object to this approach; however, DEQ will discuss this question internally to determine if it is too late or not to introduce bills into the State Legislature. A TWG member noted that if there are opportunities to respond to legislative requests and it does not risk interference with the overall process, then this could be something beneficial to consider.

8. Call to the Public: There were no public participants.

Announcements:

Diego Rivas noted the “National Day of Climate Action Step-It-Up” rallies that will be held across the county on April 14th, 2007, and that he and others are organizing a rally to be held at Glacier National Park.

A TWG member asked if there is collaborative effort on preparing a fact sheet that provides scientific-based responses to arguments that climate change is not occurring.

**Next steps:**

1. The next CC TWG call (#7) will be **Thursday, April 5, 2007, from 11:00 AM – 12:30 PM Mountain time.**
2. Draft Policy Option Descriptions: CCS will coordinate revisions to the draft straw proposals for each policy, and will distribute the revised straw proposals to the CC TWG prior to its April 5 meeting.
3. Distribution of other information: CCS will coordinate with the small groups to distribute information provided by TWG members relevant to the further development of the policy options.