



[www.coloradoclimate.org](http://www.coloradoclimate.org)

**DRAFT TELECONFERENCE MEETING SUMMARY**  
**Cross-Cutting Issues Policy Working Group**  
**Meeting/Call #6, July 12, 2007**

**Members Attending:**

Chris Crosby, Amy Keegan (for Matt Baker), Tom Moore, Isaac Silverman, Lucinda Smith

**Rocky Mountain Climate Organization (RMCO):**

Tom Easley, Stephen Saunders

**Center for Climate Strategies (CCS):**

Ken Colburn, Randy Strait, Katie Pasko

**Agenda Item #1: Introductions and Review of Agenda.** Attendees did introductions and CCS reviewed the agenda items for the call.

**Agenda Item #2: Review of Meeting #5 Summary.** The CC PWG approved the summary for Call #5 with changes noted by Colburn, as follows:

Page 2, Second paragraph under Statewide GHG Reduction Goals and Targets (CC-4): Change last sentence of paragraph to read: *Colburn responded that this question should ultimately be addressed by the CAP but the PWG can and should comment upon and address this issue, if desired.*

Page 3, last paragraph, Adaptation & Vulnerability (CC-10): Change ‘adjective’ to ‘word’ in referencing vulnerability.

**Agenda Item #3: Review of Results of Climate Action Panel (CAP) Meeting #4.** CAP affirmed the “Design” and “Description” sections of all straw proposals presented for the priority policy options.

**Agenda Item #4: Review Goals for CAP Meeting #5 (scheduled for August 1, 2007).** Next meeting of CAP is scheduled for all day August 1, 2007 beginning at 9:00 am at the American Mountaineering Center in Golden.

The goal for all of the PWGs prior to CAP meeting is to pursue the quantification of all straw proposals. The CC PWG has completed much of the work, with discussion primarily still

remaining on the Goals proposal. Otherwise, only minor revisions are necessary.

**Agenda Item #5: Review and Discussion of Next Steps for the PWG.** Concentration to date has been on design and description sections of the proposals. The PWG will concentrate on completing the remaining sections of the template. Sections referring to costs and benefits don't generally apply directly to CC issues, but the PWG may wish to comment on some of these values as quantified by other PWGs. Other PWGs typically address the Key Uncertainties section in the course of quantification. However, other uncertainties can also be included in this section of the template. Other benefits, in addition to GHG reductions, may also arise too, and should be noted.

**Agenda Item #6: Discussion Regarding Development of Straw Proposals for Draft Policy Options.**

Inventories and Forecasting (CC-1): This option does not currently contain language under the Implementation Mechanisms section. Language will be crafted to reflect the assignment of GHG inventory and forecast functions to DPHE.

- *Implementation Mechanisms* – “Propose Colorado DPHE collect and project GHG gas emissions data from regulated sources already providing criteria pollutions emissions data as a permit requirement and to estimate current and project future GHG emissions from source categories without permits using methods and source data available to the public.”
- *Related Policies/Programs in place* – Prioritize GHG reporting requirements over time.

GHG Reporting (CC-2): No Changes.

GHG Registry (CC-3): No Changes.

Comprehensive Local Government Climate Action Plans (CC-6):

- *Policy Design* - Add “Waste Management” to list including Urban Management, etc. near the end of the first paragraph.
- *Policy Design* – In the second paragraph, add the language, as a separate bullet, “The CC PWG recommends that all local governments in Colorado adopt Climate Action Plans and that the State of Colorado encourage, promote and assist the adoption of those plans.”
- Stephen Saunders will draft a new sentence for this section. Delete second existing sentence as it implies only local government emissions are to be considered, not all entities, public and private, in the community. Replace it with “The state government and RMCO, and local government associations promote, encourage, and assist the local governments in doing so.”
- Emphasize the economic benefits of local action plans.
- *Implementation Mechanism* – Add the language, “The state and others, in particular relevant non-profit organizations such as RMCO and ICLEI (International

Conference on Local Environmental Initiatives), should provide, in a coordinated fashion, information and technical assistance to local governments, etc. in developing action plans.” to the second sentence. Stephen Saunders will complete the sentence and send to Randy.

- Emphasize the relationship in CC-6 to other options.
- Highlight the unity of CC-6 issues with the clearinghouse concept outlined in CC-9.
- Make explicit the linkage to other options in the document.
- *Related Policies/Programs in Place* – add “Denver, Telluride and others”
- *Feasibility Issues* - Grants are referenced under Implementation Mechanisms, but technical assistance and resources are needed for local governments to begin the process. Emphasize the clearinghouse concept throughout the document.

Public Education and Outreach (CC-7): Policy Design – The first sentence implies a presupposition that the State will implement a statewide program.

- In order to clarify that there is a difference between state-run and state-wide programs, the language should be changed to reflect that RMCO or other entities can implement these types of programs. Accountability for implementation must also be addressed.
- Add new bullet to section: “Particular sectors such as users of public lands, farmers, ranchers and others.” Tom Moore will draft language for this item.

*Implementation Mechanisms* – Coordinate statewide initiatives with emerging local efforts for climate change. Include above referenced issue in this section.

General note: pictures and diagrams may be able to visually clarify the relationships for some members of the target audience.

Statewide GHG Reduction Goals and Targets (CC-4) and State and Local Government GHG Emissions (Lead by Example) (CC-5): - Discussion of approaches for framing GHG reduction goals/targets:

**Review of Other State GHG Reduction Goals** – Colburn reviewed goals established by several other states. He highlighted that Montana is not included, as the goals were set only a few days before.

Montana is projected to see an increase of 34% in GHG emissions from 1990 to 2020. They did set a goal to return to 1990 levels by 2020 and a reduction to 80% of 1990 levels by 2050.

California goals are 10% below 1990 levels by 2020.

Colorado is projected to show about 81% growth from 1990 levels by 2020.

The basis for setting GHG reduction goals and targets involve different assumptions. The first is gross vs. net GHG emissions and the second is production vs. consumption, as defined:

**Gross vs. Net GHG emissions** – Gross emissions include generally recognized GHG emissions, smokestacks, tailpipes, natural emissions within the borders of the state. These can be offset by increasing carbon sequestration, i.e., plant growth, agricultural practices, etc. There is a lot of uncertainty in using carbon sequestration figures. Forest soils do not sequester as much carbon as has been thought. In addition, politically, it is difficult to make change when nature is included. As a result, most states use Gross GHG emissions as their basis for goal setting.

**Production vs. Consumption** – Addresses the level of responsibility of the residents of a state. This comparison is typically limited to the emissions associated with the generation of electricity because data are readily available to quantify emissions associated with in-state generation as well as the amount of electricity imported or exported by a State. Consumption is calculated specifically based on the usage of electricity by the residents and industries of the state. Production values are based solely on the amount of electricity produced within the state. Colorado is a net importer of electricity, but not by a significant amount.

The role of the PWGs is to research each of the four scenarios and provide that data to the CAP, with recommendations and analysis as desired. The PWGs could review the ramifications of each basis for analysis against each policy option or institute general guidelines before beginning the quantification process.

Seek Funding for Implementation of Climate Action Panel Recommendations (CC-9):  
*Implementation Mechanisms* - Encourage the legislature to create financial incentives to achieve the goal. List possible suggestions, such as tax code modifications, etc. Include existing initiatives such as the Governor's Energy Office, which already has a \$7 million fund to encourage new energy development, energy efficiency projects, etc. This fund came about through legislative action. Private foundations, if any, should also be listed. Any other examples that PWG members are aware of should be forwarded to CCS for inclusion.

Adaptation & Vulnerability (CC-10): *Related Policies/Programs in Place* - Fort Collins is one of four pilot cities around the country to participate in an ICLEI program to review vulnerability to climate change and to create an adaptation plan.

*Policy Descriptions* – Strike the comparatives 'urgent' and 'essential' in last sentence.

Before reports are issued, all data are reviewed in an effort to eliminate double-counting of reductions.

**Agenda Item #7: Agenda, Time and Date for Next Meeting.** The next meeting is scheduled for Thursday, August 16<sup>th</sup>, 10-12 Mtn time and Monday, August 27<sup>th</sup> 10-12 Mtn time.

**Agenda Item #8: Public Input and Announcements.** The administration is considering the establishment of state emission reduction goals by executive order or otherwise. These goals could possibly be set before the work of the Colorado Climate Project is completed, however, the group's analysis is being considered in the administration's efforts.