



**DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY
COLORADO CLIMATE ACTION PANEL**

Meeting #5

American Mountaineering Center, Golden, Colorado
August 1, 2007

Attendance:

Climate Action Panel (CAP) Members:

- Katherine Archuleta (alternate for Bill Vidal)
- Dr. Susan Avery
- Mike Bowman
- Dr. Joe Broz (Co-chair)
- Ray Clifton (alternate for Tom Compton)
- Chris Crosby
- Judy Dorsey
- Michael Dowling
- Bruce Driver (alternate for John Nielsen)
- Jack Ihle (alternate for Frank Prager)
- Helen Klanderud
- Eric Kuhn
- Dr. Chuck Kutscher
- Laurie Mathews
- Dan McClendon
- Brian Moeck
- Dag Nummedal (alternate for John Poate)
- Dianna Orf (alternate for Stuart Sanderson)
- Frank Prager
- Jennifer Schaufele (alternate for Nancy Sharpe)
- Auden Schendler
- Nancy Sharpe
- Isaac Silverman
- Jim Spehar
- Tim Sullivan (alternate for Will Shafroth)
- Brad Udall (alternate for Susan Avery)
- Randy Udall
- Chris Williams
- Stan Zemler

Governmental agency liaisons: Heidi Van Genderen (Governors' Climate Change Advisor)

Rocky Mountain Climate Organization: Stephen Saunders, Tom Easley, Sue Damour, Charlie Montgomery

Center for Climate Strategies: Tom Peterson, Ken Colburn, Ezra Hausman, Alice Napoleon, Jeff-Ang-Olson, Kenji Takahashi, Randy Strait, Katie Bickel, Stephen Roe, Lewison Lem, Tiffany Batac, Jennifer Kallay

Public: Allen Best, Lisa Dator Hhoeff, Bryan Martin, Tom McKinnon, Jim Schrack, Michael Shear

Background Documents: (all posted at www.coloradoclimate.org)

- Notice and Agenda
- CAP Meeting #4 Summary
- Power Point Presentation
- Policy Workgroup Straw Proposal Templates
 - Agriculture, Forestry, and Waste Management
 - Energy Supply
 - Residential, Commercial, and Industrial
 - Transportation and Land Use
 - Cross-Cutting Issues
 - Water Adaptation

Discussions and conclusions:

1. Welcome, Introductions, and Review of Agenda

- Stephen Saunders of the Rocky Mountain Climate Organization called the meeting to order and welcomed the panel members and members of the public. Attendees went around the room doing introductions.
- Tom Peterson reviewed the agenda in the context of the 10-Step Work Plan. The objective of today's meeting is to review the policy options and their initial quantification and, where there is unanimous consent, to approve options. Peterson indicated that where unanimous consent does not exist, options will go back to the PWGs with the CAP's direction for further development and/or modification.
- Peterson also reviewed the initial cumulative compilation of the results of policy options being considered by the CAP. Four approaches were indicated, reflecting both consumption and production based approaches and gross vs. net GHG emissions. Several members asked clarifying questions about schedule, process, voting, and final products which were addressed by Peterson and Saunders.
- The Summary from CAP Meeting #4 was adopted without objection.

2. Review and Vote on Draft Policy Options

The CCS facilitator for each PWG briefly reviewed the description and design characteristics for the 56 draft policy options, asked for clarifying questions or comments, and then asked if any CAP members objected to each option. The following provides a brief summary of the discussion on each option.

- **Residential, Commercial & Industrial**

- Summary of Comments and Responses to Questions:

- RCI-1:

- i. Frank Prager (Xcel) asked about how the demand-side management (DSM) that is “already in the pipeline” is handled in the analysis. Xcel is currently achieving 0.3%; is the demand reduction from RCI-1 over and above this, i.e., 1.3% total? CCS responded that the 1% is “new” DSM, incremental to the DSM in the inventory and forecast (I&F). Xcel’s program that started in 2006 would not be included in the I&F. Jack Ihle (Xcel) asked why not put the 0.3% in the forecast and go up from there? CCS can incorporate recent actions at the bottom of the table.
- ii. Frank Prager expressed concern about the feasibility of achieving 1% per year, pointing to the distinction between technical, economic, and market potential. CCS responded that some areas are achieving more than 1%, and that the 4-year ramp-in was added in response to PWG concerns. Jack Ihle noted that the track record on DSM program performance is short and thin; also, there is more potential in high-cost electricity markets.
- iii. Frank Prager asked whether CCS used a cost curve (showing higher cost as more DSM is procured) in the analysis. Kenji Takahashi responded that it is a flat \$25/MWh of saved energy, from the WGA report and consistent with assumptions used in other states. Also he mentioned that it is a conservative estimate for Colorado given that City of Fort Collins and Colorado Springs Utilities implement DSM at costs ranging from \$10 to \$17/MWh of saved energy.
- iv. It clarified that DSM includes EE.
- v. It was asked whether recommendations will address jurisdictional issues, and will this program be voluntary, mandatory, or something else? The PWG will discuss implementation issues during its next meeting.

- RCI-2: No comments or questions.

- RCI-3:

- i. It was clarified that the existing authority would retain jurisdiction, but would have more/better funds and resources under this policy.
- ii. It was clarified that this policy is not presenting an upgrade in codes, just enforcing existing standards better. This is a good companion policy to, e.g., HB07-1146 and RCI-4.
- iii. It was asked that the write-up clarify that the policy applies to commercial buildings as well as residential.

- RCI-4:

- i. It was noted that the LEED standard is just a design certification; why use this standard for the policy goal, when other standards focus more on energy? Isaac Silverman suggested matching up the analysis and assumptions with the description. The goals can be changed to be numerical standards, meant to represent the standards.

- ii. It was clarified that the Architecture 2030 targets are % reductions in energy use for different kinds of buildings, and are not specific about the types of measures that can be used to meet that target. The Architecture 2030 website has many examples of how the reductions have been achieved.
 - iii. Randy Udall emphasized the need to mandate that everything new meet the highest standard. There was general discussion of a vision statement, a roadmap, etc. to frame what kind of a wall all of these bricks are building.
 - iv. Questions were raised about the cost for “all of this”: what is the economic impact of all of these things together? What do these do to consumers and to the economy of the state? CCS will present up-front gross costs as well as NPV costs.
- RCI-5:
 - i. It was asked why this policy does not apply to natural gas, only to consumption of electricity. “Is this the right way to go?”
 - ii. Brian Moeck asked about the kWh range to which the 2 and 5 cent surcharges are applied. CCS used the Architecture 2030 percentage goals in order to set the baseline consumption above which extra rates are applied. The baseline for residential customers is consumption per capita. 50% of average consumption per capita is the baseline consumption, to increase to 60% below in 2010. The baseline for commercial customers is consumption per square foot.
 - iii. Jack Ihle expressed concern about taking Architecture 2030 structure for new buildings and applying it to all buildings. Randy Udall commented that the policy is punitive to residents of Colorado’s million old, high-carbon buildings; if you really want to fundamentally change the performance of buildings, it is big money.
 - iv. CCS noted that RCI-5 is intended to provide incentives for reduced energy consumption and funding energy efficiency, and that the target (i.e., Architecture 2030) can be adjusted. A participant noted that the concern is not with inverted block rates (IBR) in general. IBRs make sense because energy in Colorado is too cheap. However, the structure may be counterproductive and discourage getting the highest benefit, e.g., by discouraging plug-in hybrid cars.
 - v. Frank Prager inquired about the relative impact of the pieces (i.e., the inverted block rate versus the funds put into energy efficiency). He thought that the analysis is inadequate and needs to be sent back. CCS said the PWG would welcome help from Xcel, which had previously refused to give assistance for this policy.
 - vi. Dianna Orf commented that the policy hits the middle class; if it requires legislation, it will likely die.
 - vii. Comment: Anything that would require cooperatives to come under PUC regulations will be a non-starter for coops.
 - viii. It was noted that inclining block rates work well for water utilities.

- ix. Brian Moeck recommended that the PWG take a look at California increasing block rates. In CA, upper blocks are 35-40 cents higher. Are they achieving the results that are shown here? CCS noted that the level at which the rate starts increasing is different.
- x. Judy Dorsey noted that the PWG wanted to do the right thing and start stringent, but needs advice on how to proceed. Randy Udall recommended starting out at a more moderate level and later getting stringent.
- RCI-6: There was some discussion about whether voluntary loans could achieve the target of 5% by 2017, whether it should be funded by grants, and whether it might be mandatory on renovation, consistent with the way local governments work. Concern was expressed that a mandate would kill the housing market.
- RCI-7: How are emissions reductions calculated based on reductions in energy use? CCS will provide the lbs/MWh emission factor for each policy.
- RCI-8: No comments or questions.
- RCI-9: Xcel mentioned that 500 MW of CHP by 2015 is very aggressive; the PWG should take another look at the penetration assumption.
- RCI-10:
 - i. Judy Dorsey pointed out that “SME” (small and medium enterprises, the current targets of the policy) was vestigial from some early version of the catalog, and that Climate Wise’s success has owed to largely larger enterprises. CCS suggested renaming the policy to “Expanding Climate Wise Statewide” & asking the group how to interpret the data (i.e., regarding components that have nothing to do with energy efficiency and renewable energy).
 - ii. Jim Spehar suggested that CCS contact Fort Collins schools.
 - iii. Should this policy be cross-cutting? CCS responded that the policy would just go back to RCI for analysis.

Vote/Objections/Modifications from the CAP:

- RCI-1: Sent back to PWG for revisions, but no objections.
- RCI-2: Approve pending implementation mechanisms.
- RCI-3: May also need implementation mechanisms. Is there a need to identify funding source, as well? No, not really. Approve subject to touch-up.
- RCI-4: Back to PWG .
- RCI-5: Back to the PWG with comments.
- RCI-6: Back to PWG.
- RCI-7: Approve subject to touch-up. CCS is to produce gross and net cost. This comes down to cost for munis. Implementation mechanism is needed.
- RCI-8: Needs implementation mechanism.
- RCI-9: Level of penetration, implementation mechanism, back to PWG.
- RCI-10: Need modifications outlined by Ezra, back to the PWG.

- **Energy Supply:**

Summary of Comments and Responses to Questions:

- ES-1: Frank Prager asked how ES-2 and ES-1 differ; Ezra indicated the former is a mandate, while ES-1 is an incentive. ES1 could be independent of ES2.
- ES-2:
 - i. Ray Clifton suggested it would be ill-advised to adopt this policy while the co-ops are just coming under new state law jurisdiction (1281 statute), and that 30% mechanically cannot be handled by the system. Several members (from mining association and utilities) expressed similar concerns. Ezra clarified that under the policy, no more than 85% of the Renewable Energy Credits (RECs) can come from big wind, and that RECs can be purchased from anywhere in state and from outside the State.
 - ii. A member asked about the justification for the cut-off on wind. Also, Frank Prager asked for more clarity in the policy; he thought that the 85% ceiling for wind was just for analysis purposes.
 - iii. Integration costs for renewables, especially into the geographically isolated Denver load pocket, were discussed. Xcel noted that at 20% renewable (wind) capacity, and roughly 12% energy, costs increase by \$8/MWh. Chuck Kutscher noted that the costs assumed for renewable energy technologies are too high, e.g., solar thermal should be half of what was assumed in the analysis.
 - iv. Xcel questions whether the 30% can be achieved, especially at the costs indicated. Xcel suggested that 40% capacity is necessary to meet 20% energy requirements, for example. Storage will materially assist with integration costs when it becomes commercially available. Capacity to bank RECs also comes into play.
- ES-2a: New reference materials were suggested [Williams, Robert H. and Hawkins, David G. 28 July 2005. "Coal Low-Carbon Generation Obligation for US Electricity" available at <http://phys4.harvard.edu/~wilson/energypmp/Hawkins&Williams.doc>]
- ES-3: Only minor questions were raised.
- ES-4: Some concern was expressed about not quantifying the benefits and costs of this option. Ezra explained that the PWG thought that this policy was important to include in balloting process, but the group couldn't come up with a proposal and asked CCS to do a literature review. The CAP raised and discussed many design and feasibility issues, but the CAP gave no clear direction to the PWG. Dag Nummndal recommended that the ES PWG should read a University of CO study. Another participant expressed desire to wait until an Electricity Institute study was released, because he was told that "the cost will be huge."
- ES-5: Ezra Hausman noted that this policy needs to be worked through with the PWG.

- ES-6: Frank Prager noted that “there’s a lot to like” about the policy, but that he could use more time to review the analysis. Tim Sullivan recommended that CCS make sure that ES-6 and AFW’s policy using biogas are connected.
- ES-7: None
- ES-9: Joe Broz suggested expanding this option to creating R&D jobs, and noted that the Governor’s office has data. Chuck Kutscher recommended that CCS look into studies by UCS and the American Solar Energy Society (www.ases.org) for the analysis of job impact through R&D investment, and he volunteered to send language.
- ES-10: None
- ES-11: Some hydro issues, and caution about water issues in Colorado (e.g., the availability of environmentally benign hydro), were raised. A participant thought the assumption of \$69/kW for upgrades was believable. Chuck Kutscher noted an inconsistency in the policy template: the description mentions the use of impoundments, but they are not mentioned in the policy design. Hydro storage might be leveraged to address utilities’ concerns about RES.
- ES-12: Judy Dorsey thought that this option was to be analyzed; should it be taken off table since it has no numbers behind it? It was suggested that the CAP recommend further inquiry into ES-12 (as well as into ES-4)
- ES-13: Frank Prager asked about where the 10% definition of “peaking plant” came from, and about the implications of not allowing offsets for compliance.
- ES-14: Some potential conflicts with the Clean Air Act regulations on ozone and volatile organic compounds were raised. Lisa Dator Hhoeff of BP suggested the term “operators” instead of “permittees” and asked about baseline so as to be sure that early reductions aren’t penalized. Ken Colburn noted that reductions could be registered.
- ES-15: Frank Prager asked about the impact of not allowing use of offsets, emphasized the importance of natural gas prices and of using dynamic modeling for these analyses, and asked for clarification on the definition of peaking (<10% capacity factor) used in the analysis. Brian Moeck expressed concern about the availability of hydro and natural gas, and that California will have an energy crisis from implementing a similar standard.

Vote/Objections/Modifications from the CAP:

- ES-1: No objections; final.
- ES-2: No objections to handing back to PWG; need to reexamine integration costs and feasibility of 30% level, reconsider 85% wind cap, check the baseline (20% or 30%?), PTC assumptions, and how not having a price cap effects results. A comprehensive re-look. Chuck Kutscher offered to help with the analysis.
- ES-2a: No objection to sending back to PWG.
- ES-3: No objection; final.
- ES-4: No objection to moving ahead with a policy briefing.
- ES-5: No objection to sending back to PWG.

- ES-6: No objection to sending back to PWG to get costs correct.
 - ES-7: No objection; final.
 - ES-9: No objection; final.
 - ES-10: No objection; final.
 - ES-11: No objection; final.
 - ES-12: No objection pending a statement to be developed by Randy Udall, et al. Information regarding the cost of nuclear and uranium availability needs to be presented.
 - ES-13: No objection; but CAP requested emission reduction estimate.
 - **ES-14:** No objections; final.
 - ES-15: No objections to returning to PWG for offsets and other substantial re-look and re-work.
- **Transportation & Land Use:**

Summary of Comments and Responses to Questions:

 - TLU-1: Tim Sullivan suggested specifying that the reduction indicated is from a BAU baseline, and that additional land conservation may require additional money beyond a revolving fund. Frank Prager recommended that there be a better description of how NPV was assessed if in fact it wasn't calculated directly. Dianna Orf CMA said this policy option might be underestimating the costs and overestimating the benefits. Tim Sullivan noted that concern about cost probably goes the other way; we may be understating savings by not actually quantifying the likely net savings that would accrue from these actions. Ezra Hausman noted that many indirect social costs and benefits (e.g., health, community, adverse climate impacts, etc.) are not being quantified in this process, but do exist. Michael Shear, a member of the public, noted that telecommuting and other connectivity options can and should play into this option explicitly as well; smart growth often addresses access through attention to proximity and mobility, but omits consideration of connectivity, which will be increasingly important in the information economy.
 - TLU-2: A member asked about flex-fuel vehicles; they haven't been included because they are principally fueled with gasoline and thus have little to no impact.
 - TLU-3: Chuck Kutscher noted that incentives should be added that improve transit quality and attractiveness, e.g., amenities like wireless internet access so that people can work in public transit. A member noted that mention should be made of the inadequate state of existing state and federal financial commitment to transit.
 - TLU-4: Frank Prager requested clarification of the cost calculations. CCS noted that fuel savings is the benefit.
 - TLU-5: Dianna Orf asked if an LCFS could lead to fuel shortages. CCS indicated that no change to vehicles would be required; the key regarding availability would be feedstock and lifecycle issues. Dianna Orf asked if tourists and long-distance trucks are affected by this policy and also asked if biodiesel cars are included.

CCS says biodiesel cars are not considered in this policy. Tim Sullivan noted that land conversion for fuel feedstocks and its associated impact should be at least noted if not accounted for. Isaac Silverman also cautioned about criteria pollutant impacts from some potential fuel-carbon reduction measures. He mentioned about California's case on this subject.

- TLU-6: Saunders noted that Colorado contemplates a 2011 phase-in rather than CA's 2009 timeframe. Frank Prager sought clarification regarding how the CA lawsuit and the requirement for an EPA waiver were accounted for (i.e., that Colorado can't act unilaterally to adopt this measure) and whether dynamics like fleet turnover were included. CCS indicated that they were factored in. NOTE: Numbers here are reversed; should be NPV of -\$1880 and cost effectiveness of negative \$100 per ton. Frank Prager suggested including upfront costs as well as NPV.
- TLU-7: No comments or questions.
- TLU-8a: Frank Prager asked about the political feasibility issue. CCS indicated that that was why there is a feasibility section on the template, and why a stakeholder process is so important. Prager also noted concerns that the policy option numbers will overwhelm the policies themselves in the eyes of policymakers and the public, and that he for one didn't believe that the cumulative reductions would turn out to be free. Chuck Kutscher noted that the appropriate cost comparison should be the difference between the cost of acting and not acting, not the cost of acting alone. Peterson noted that that is why cost effectiveness is the metric used here. Tim Sullivan noted that we should use economic costs, not social costs. Eric Kuhn and others suggested that the fuel tax be incorporated into a comprehensive exploration of meeting revenue needs for transportation in the future, inasmuch as Taxpayer Bill of Rights (TABOR) issues are likely to arise and there is already a Blue Ribbon Panel meeting on this issue. Jim Spehar suggested that policy options should reflect "if implemented" data compiled by the CAP, not a "how to implement" responsibility it has; other members suggested that the more information that the CAP can provide – including regarding political viability – the better.
- TLU-8b: Dianna Orf commented that this option may be heading toward changing the nature of insurance from a risk approach to a social incentive approach. She also said the level of insurance for regular drivers and reckless drivers should be different. A member noted that Texas and Washington State have implemented this type of insurance policy. Discussion followed regarding pilot efforts currently underway. Saunders noted that implementation would need to be expanded beyond a pilot program in order to achieve the 2020 goals.
- TLU-9: No comments or questions.
- TLU-10: Tim Sullivan noted overlap between this and TLU-7 and then to TLU-3. CCS elaborated and will double check for double counting, but noted that it would be very small overlap. There may also be a financing mechanism that should not be in TLU-10. Chuck Kutscher suggested that the option should

include state initiatives on vehicle charging stations, etc. Randy Udall noted that analysts suggest that ultimately transportation needs to be electrified due to the far greater efficiency of electric motors. CCS suggested that charging stations should be under TLU-9, not TLU-10.

- TLU-11: No comments or questions.

Vote/Objections/Modifications from the CAP:

- General: Round numbers to reflect less imputed accuracy; fill out “Implementation Mechanisms” were not already done so; and provide gross as well as net costs (i.e., upfront costs).
- TLU-1: One objection Prager seeking better cost analysis than just a literature review, or that costs be listed as “not quantified.”
- TLU-2: No objections.
- TLU-3: Add amenities. Include financing issues/aspects per Tim Sullivan. No objections.
- TLU-4: No objections. Gross cost of the policy will be provided.
- TLU-5: Three objections; Diana Orf, philosophy against mandates; (a person from a municipal utility) objection to applying a tax if a mandate falls, burden on rural residents, and also seeks additional info, and Udall because of fuzzy logic/reasoning of fuel vs. vehicle efficiency emphasis. Coal-to-liquids was also raised. Tim Sullivan noted carbon benefit of biofuels should be quantified.
- TLU-6: One objection Diana Orf – premature while litigation and waiver issues are open.
- TLU-7: No objections; needs implementation mechanisms.
- TLU-8a: Five objections; Re-look at this in the PWG through the lens of the Blue Ribbon Commission, i.e., as a funding mechanism, not simply an elasticity mechanism to get drivers out of cars. Prager noted this policy is politically infeasible. Kutscher noted parking tax might be more cost-effective and feasible. CCS mentioned that a parking tax is covered in another policy. Members will propose alternative options by the next meeting. A member said it is not a good idea to use the fund to reduce carbon.
- TLU-8b: No objections.
- TLU-9: One objection (Diana Orf) over concerns for retailers, etc.; return to PWG for consideration.
- TLU-10: No objections.
- TLU-11: No objections; consider adding a tire pressure measure (e.g., mandate tire pressure sensor valve stems) and improved vehicle maintenance.

- **Agriculture, Forestry & Waste Management:**

Summary of Comments and Responses to Questions:

- AFW-1: A member commented that a conflict may exist between the goals in AFW-1 and the biofuels options (AFW-4,5). It was noted by another member that AFW-1 would not reduce the amount of land producing crops; rather, this option would motivate changes in production methods..
- AFW-2: No Comments.
- AFW-3: A comment was raised that a reasonable rate of return needs to be determined to fully consider the option.
- AFW-4: A question regarding this and the next option as to whether land-use changes are assumed under the business as usual scenario. Another question was raised regarding the difference in results between AFW-4 and AFW-5. CCS replied that there are different assumptions and business-as-usual scenarios that lead to vast differences in the quantitative results.
- AFW-5: See comments for AFW-4.
- AFW-6: A member commented that AFW-6 and AFW-8 are also adaptation strategies, as well as mitigation strategies. The member expressed that AFW-6 will be difficult to quantify.
- AFW-7: A member commented that crop residues and energy crops need to be brought into the analysis and that a carbon sequestration (post-combustion) element should also be considered. CCS agreed to consider these comments and discuss them with the PWG going forward, although quantification of the benefits and costs may be difficult.
- AFW-8: A member asked whether the transportation emissions were included in the quantitative analyses for AFW-7 and AFW-8. It was stated that the life-cycle emissions for biomass are taken into account, although currently the emission factors only consider the incremental life-cycle benefits of biomass, with regards to natural gas.
- AFW-9: No Comments.
- AFW-10: Answering a question from a member, CCS stated that the analysis of this option does incorporate the energy produced by the methane capture projects.

Vote/Objections/Modifications from the CAP:

- AFW-1: No objection
- AFW-2: Goal is to achieve 80% of animal feeding operation. There is a significant gap between the goal and the suggestion for developing a pilot program in the policy description.
- AFW-3: Sent back to PWG for further consideration.
- AFW-4: Sent back to PWG for further consideration.
- AFW-5: Sent back to PWG for further consideration.
- AFW-6: Sent back to PWG for further consideration.
- AFW-7: Sent back to PWG for further consideration.
- AFW-8: Sent back to PWG for further consideration.

- AFW-9: Sent back to PWG for further consideration.
- AFW-10: Sent back to PWG for further consideration.
- **Cross-Cutting Issues:**
Summary of Comments and Responses to Questions:
 - CC-1: No questions or comments.
 - CC-2: No questions or comments.
 - CC-3: No questions or comments.
 - CC-4: Not yet ready for CAP consideration as it hinges on quantification just accomplished.
 - CC-5: Not yet ready for CAP consideration as it hinges on CC-4.
 - CC-6: No questions or comments.
 - CC-7: No questions or comments.
 - CC-9: R&D and entrepreneurial transition (through the so-called “valley of death” bringing new products through to successful commercialization) should be added and included in the purposes of the clearinghouse/partnership.
 - CC-10: No questions or comments.

Vote/Objections/Modifications from the CAP:

The CAP did not officially vote to approve any of the ten CC options during the meeting. Therefore, all of the options will be considered by the CAP for approval during the next CAP meeting.

- **Water Adaptation**
Stephen Saunders presented each of the PWG’s options, however, CAP member attendance had declined by the end of the day and the remaining CAP members agreed to consider the PWG’s recommendations during the next CAP meeting.

3. Update on Colorado GHG Inventory and Forecast

Randy Strait briefly reviewed the revisions detailed in the PowerPoint presentation that the PWGs recommended for improving the inventory and forecast for the ES, RCI, solid waste management, and forestry sectors. The CAP approved the revisions for all four sectors.

A CAP member asked if House Bill 07-1037 (Gas DSM) had been included in the baseline. Randy responded that he did not know but would check on this. [Note: subsequent to the CAP meeting the CCS facilitators for the RCI sector indicated that the PUC had not issued a rulemaking on how the law will be implemented. Thus, the RCI PWG did not feel that it had enough information to decide on recommendations for incorporating this bill into the reference case projections.]

4. Next Steps for PWGs

Tom Peterson covered the next steps that the PWGs will take toward completing develop and quantification of policy options which are to: (1) complete alternative policy design, analysis and

implementation mechanisms, as needed, to address CAP decisions, and (2) complete quantification of stand-alone and cumulative GHG reductions and benefits & costs for remaining options.

5. Agenda, Time and Date for Next Meeting

The agenda for the next CAP meeting will be for the CAP to review and approve the quantification of all remaining policy options. CAP members were reminded that the next meeting will be held in mid-September 2007. RMCO staff will inform the CAP members of the time and location of the next meeting.

6. Public Input and Announcements

Members of the public were invited to make comments and raise questions, but there were none.

The meeting was adjourned.