



www.coloradoclimate.org

DRAFT TELECONFERENCE MEETING SUMMARY
Cross-Cutting Issues Policy Working Group
Meeting/Call #5, May 15, 2007

Members Attending:

Chris Crosby, Jack Ihle, Tom Looby, Tom Moore, Isaac Silverman, Jim Spehar

Rocky Mountain Climate Organization (RMCO):

Tom Easley, Stephen Saunders

Center for Climate Strategies (CCS):

Ken Colburn, Randy Strait

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 #4 Summary. The PWG approved the summary for Call #4 without change.

Agenda Item #3: Goals for Climate Action Panel (CAP) Meeting #4. Colburn noted that the PWG's goal in preparing for the next CAP meeting is to provide the CAP with the opportunity to understand and approve PWG's direction in developing the design characteristics of each option.

Agenda Item #4: Review and Discussion of Next Steps for PWG. Colburn described the remaining steps in the CAP process and noted that during this call, the PWG will need to complete drafts of its straw proposals in order for the CAP to review them at its May 22, 2007 meeting. The CC PWG should focus on developing the policy description and policy design for each option, but may also develop draft language for other elements of the straw proposal template. A PWG member asked if the CC PWG should be prioritizing options. CCS indicated that prioritization was not warranted because the CAP had approved all ten of the CC options for further development by the PWG, and as such, all options have equal priority for consideration. A member also asked how development of CC-4 (Statewide GHG Reduction Goals and Targets) would proceed; this is addressed below in the discussion for CC-4.

Agenda Item #5: Discussion Regarding Development of Straw Proposals for Draft Policy Options. Prior to the meeting, RMCO and CCS provided the PWG with draft straw proposals for each of the CC policy options that incorporated revisions approved by the PWG during Call #4. During the meeting, the CC PWG reviewed and discussed these and other revisions to the

straw proposals. The following provides a brief summary of the key points discussed during the meeting.

Inventories and Forecasting (CC-1): The PWG agreed with the revisions. The small group for this option agreed to prepare the text for the “Related Policies and Programs” section to document related inventory and forecast functions within Colorado state agencies.

GHG Reporting (CC-2): The PWG agreed with the revisions. The small group for this option agreed to review and revise, if necessary, the draft text for the “Related Policies and Programs” section to document related GHG emissions reporting functions within Colorado state agencies.

GHG Registry (CC-3): The PWG agreed with the revisions made to the straw proposal prior to the call. Colburn noted that Colorado joined *The Climate Registry* as a charter member in early May. A total of 31 states, one tribal authority, and two Canadian provinces joined *The Climate Registry* as charter members. The text under “Related Policies and Programs” will be revised to note this. A PWG member asked that the text under “Additional Benefits and Costs” be revised to acknowledge that there may be additional GHG accounting costs to Colorado businesses and other entities that choose to participate in the registry. The PWG agreed to make this revision.

Statewide GHG Reduction Goals and Targets (CC-4): At the beginning of the call, PWG members asked for clarification on next steps for addressing this policy option. Colburn noted that during future CC PWG calls, the CC PWG can begin considering what form of goals (e.g., based on production- or consumption-based emissions; gross or net GHG emissions, etc.). The PWG can deliberate this, but will not be able to work on evaluating numerical goals or targets until initial quantification results are presented by the PWGs to the CAP during its fifth meeting (note: this meeting is now scheduled for August 1 in the Denver Metro area). Colburn noted that CCS can provide a summary of goals and targets adopted by other states for discussion by the CC PWG during its next meeting.

A PWG member asked if the CC PWG can consider goals or targets that go beyond the reductions that are estimated to be achieved by the options being quantified by the other PWGs. Colburn responded that this question should be addressed by the CAP, but the PWG can and should comment upon and address this issue, if desired.

State and Local Government GHG Emissions (Lead by Example) (CC-5): The PWG agreed with the revisions, including the three options to consider in assessing goals under the “Policy Design” section of the template. The PWG decided not to make any other revisions to the “Policy Description” or “Policy Design” sections at this time, but will address goals and other items for this policy option after the CAP’s meeting on May 22. Colburn noted that the PWG may also consider other items for this option such as climate-neutral bonding and incorporating assessment of GHG emissions into environmental studies (e.g., environmental assessments and/or environmental impact statements). Colburn noted that another state has elected to include these under an option similar to CC-5, but also noted that climate-neutral bonding was moved to the RCI work group for quantification.

Comprehensive Local Government Climate Action Plans (CC-6): The PWG agreed with the revisions. The PWG agreed to add language at the end of the first paragraph under the “Policy Design” section to identify local planning activities (e.g., urban planning processes, transportation management planning, management of local power and water utilities, etc.) that should include consideration of approaches that mitigate GHG emissions.

The PWG also agreed that under the “Implementation Mechanisms” section, text should be added indicating that the development of a model climate action plan by a consortium of state and local agencies / districts could help to facilitate implementation of this option as well as promote consistency and reduce costs to local agencies / districts. The state should also provide technical assistance to local agencies / districts and help local agencies / districts secure funding (e.g., grants) to develop their climate action plans.

The PWG also agreed to two edits to the first paragraph of the “Policy Description” to (1) remove “clear” before carbon reduction goals in the second sentence, and (2) remove the phrase “and/or become a member of RMCO” at the end of the fourth sentence.

Public Education and Outreach (CC-7): The PWG agreed with the revisions made to incorporate comments from the previous PWG call. In addition, the PWG agreed to add a recommendation under the “Policy Design” section that a proactive speaker’s bureau be added.

Under “Coverage of Parties,” the PWG agreed to include “water districts, metropolitan districts, fire protection districts, regional Councils of Governments (COGs)” to reflect additional parties that should be included under CC-6.

Seek Funding for Implementation of Climate Action Panel Recommendations (CC-9): The PWG agreed to revise the title of this option to “Establish a Pro-active Public-Private Partnership to Seek Investment Capital and Philanthropic Funding for Reducing GHG Emissions and Supporting Development of the New Energy Economy in Colorado.” It was noted that this option should not only recommend establishment of an entity, such as a clearinghouse, to provide a mechanism for channeling funding, but also should have the responsibility and authority to proactively seek out funding. In addition, a question was asked if the “Policy Description” and “Policy Design” text implied that the funding be used to implement options other than those ultimately included by the CAP in the Climate Action Plan, or if the funding could also be used to implement options included in the Climate Action Plan? The PWG agreed that some funding should be targeted to implement some options recommended in the Climate Action Plan. The “Policy Description” and “Policy Design” sections will be revised to provide these clarifying points discussed by the PWG members.

Adaptation & Vulnerability (CC-10): It was noted that during the meeting of the RMCO Water Adaptation group on May 14, 2007, that “vulnerability” was a key word used many times to describe the effects of climate change on the future of Colorado’s water resources. Stephen

Saunders agreed to develop text for this straw proposal (with assistance from Tom Easley) to identify and address adaptation issues other than those associated with water resources.

Agenda Item #6: Agenda, Time and Date for Next Meeting. The agenda for the sixth meeting of the PWG will include (1) review of PWG Meeting #5 Summary; (2) review of results of CAP Meeting #4, (3) review next steps for CAP meeting #5; and (4) discussion regarding further development of straw proposals for CC PWG policy options.

The date and time for the sixth meeting of the CC PWG will be set following clarification of the date of the next CAP meeting. RMCO and CCS will coordinate schedules and notice the full PWG as to when the next CC PWG meeting will be held.

Agenda Item #7: Public Input and Announcements. There were no other announcements. There were no public participants.