



**SUMMARY OF TELECONFERENCE MEETING #7  
CROSS-CUTTING (CC) ISSUES TECHNICAL WORKING GROUP (TWG)  
June 13, 2007**

**Attendance:**

1. TWG Members:  
Nadine Barnicle, Canter Barnicle Communications  
Alan Betts, Vermont Academy of Science & Engineering  
Paul Comey, Green Mountain Coffee Roasters  
Edward Mahoney, St. Michaels College  
Deb Sachs, Alliance for Climate Action
2. VT Department of Environmental Conservation (DEC):  
Jeff Merrell
3. Center for Climate Strategies (CCS):  
Ken Colburn, TWG Co-Facilitator  
Randy Strait, TWG Co-Facilitator  
Katie Pasko, TWG Assistant

**Background documents:**

(all posted at: [http://www.vtclimatechange.us/Cross\\_Cutting.cfm](http://www.vtclimatechange.us/Cross_Cutting.cfm).)

1. Meeting Notice & Agenda (including provisions for public access)
2. Draft Summary of Call #6
3. PowerPoint© presentation for meeting
4. Draft Policy Option Descriptions

**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. He stated that the meeting would be brief as the data necessary to flesh out the two remaining options had not yet been submitted by the other TWGs. This data should be available, however, by the June 21 GCCC-PG meeting.
2. Members of the CC TWG approved without objection the summary for Call #6, subject to review by the rest of the TWG. Members are asked to submit any additional comments they may have concerning Call #6 prior to the next meeting of the TWG.

3. Dates and Times for Remaining TWG Calls: See item #1 under “Action Items” at the end of this summary.
4. Discussion regarding development of straw proposals for remaining policy options: Five of the seven proposed measures have already been approved by the Plenary Group (PG), with only CC-6 *Options for Statewide GHG Goals or Targets* and CC-7 *The State’s Own GHG Emissions (Lead by Example)* remaining for the PG to consider.

Colburn suggested that, since the data needed to finalize these policy option proposals is not yet complete, the TWG keep the discussion more general for this meeting; the numbers will be finalized later. Colburn provided an update of the statewide GHG reduction goals for several other states, including some (e.g., North Carolina) that are also currently reviewing potential goals or targets.

Colburn reiterated the comments of some TWG members that Vermont would likely find it difficult to meet its 2012 goals, primarily because of the short time period remaining between now and then.

The framework planned for the quantified policy options is to ultimately translate their cumulative reductions into graphs, similar to those in the Inventory and Forecast (I&F) report. The results can then be compared to the goals set by the Governor and the legislature.

Data for GHG reductions from ESD policy options have been made available, but reductions from RCI and TLU are not available yet. TWG members asked that these be provided as soon as they are available. The TLU TWG met on June 4 to determine the quantification parameters, but has not yet released the results of the subsequent quantification. To date, the AFW TWG has worked from the “top down,” i.e., used the targeted goals to determine policy options that would fulfill them against current I&F numbers.

A TWG member raised the question of goal selection strategy. Should the State set a goal it knows can be achieved, or an aspirational goal. Colburn reminded the TWG that a key guideline in this regard is that any options proposed must be able to be actually implemented.

Colburn and Strait noted that there are several ways in which goals can be framed:

- a. Net vs. Gross - “Net” is net of carbon storage, sequestration, or “sinks” where “Gross” simply reflects absolute GHGs emitted without regard to sinks. VT has much biomass, so using a net basis of measurement would result in significantly lower values than using the gross basis.
- b. Production vs. Consumption basis – “Production” emissions reflect GHGs emitted within the borders of the state, even if the products produced are consumed by others elsewhere (and vice versa). “Consumption” emissions recognize as attributable to Vermont GHG emissions associated with products used within the state, even if they were produced elsewhere. Due to the extremely complex nature of this dynamic for all products, this differentiation is typically limited to GHG emissions associated with

electricity generated within Vermont (production) or consumed within the state (consumption). VT is a very low electricity producer, and is a net importer of electricity as a result. Accordingly, a consumption-based goal would include producers (or the average of them) from outside the state.

- c. For the meeting on July 12, graphs outlining these options for framing the goal will be provided.

A discussion of the May 17 meeting of the GCCC-PG highlighted the fact that many policy options had not yet been approved, particularly in the TLU TWG. This situation was considered at the June 4 meeting of the TLU TWG and most of the underlying issues were resolved, so significant progress has been made.

One TWG member expressed a feeling of urgency believed to be shared by many members of the community. There are many opportunities to begin work on the areas under the PG's influence.

The TWG reiterated, by consensus, that clearly worded goals are needed. Glossing over issues will not solve problems. If the TWG can't reach a decision on a specific goal, then that must be stated along with the underlying positions on the goal.

Colburn reminded the TWG that in any group, barriers to consensus can exist. If this occurs with any PG recommendations, reasons can be detailed and included in the final report as part of the template for the policy option. Such barriers, however, reflect only the opinions of the PG, since they approve the policy options. Members of the TWG who are not also PG members can voice objections, of course, but not vote on final recommendations.

For CC-7, constructive comments that the TWG had received from Deb Baslow will be incorporated in the proposed version.

5. Call to the Public: There were no public participants.
6. Announcements: The GCCC-PG Meeting #6 will be held on June 21, 2007.

**Next steps:**

1. The next CC TWG call (#8) is scheduled to be held on Thursday, July 12, 2007, from 9:00 to 11:00 am Eastern time. Note the two hour length of the call, which will allow additional time to discuss the remaining CC Policy Options prior to the next GCCC-PG meeting on July 26 in Montpelier. Should another meeting be required, it will be held on July 17 from 10:30 to noon.
  - a. For the meeting on July 12, graphs framing the PG's policy options and the Governor's and legislature's goals will be provided.
2. Prior to the GCCC-PG meeting on July 26, 2007, CCS will revise the straw proposals for CC-7 to incorporate revisions discussed during Call #7.