



## **DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY**

### **IOWA CLIMATE CHANGE ADVISORY COUNCIL Cross-Cutting (CC) Issues Subcommittee Call #9, June 25, 2008**

#### **Attendance**

##### **ICCAC Cross-Cutting Subcommittee Members:**

- Jerry Schnoor, UI
- Nile Lanning, IBEW
- Dr. Bill Stigliani, UNI–Center for Energy and Environmental Education
- Teresa Galluzzo, Public Member
- Richard Ney, Renewable Fuels Association

##### **ICCAC Cross-Cutting Technical Expert Members:**

- Father Bud Grant

##### **State Agency Participants:**

- Marnie Stein, Iowa Department of Natural Resources, Air Quality Bureau

##### **Public Participants:**

- None

##### **Center for Climate Strategies**

- Tom Looby and Linda Schade

#### **Background Documents**

- Notice and Agenda
- PowerPoint for Call #9
- Call #8 Meeting Draft Summary
- Draft Cross-Cutting Issues Policy Option Document

#### **Discussion Items**

1. Bill Stigliani found a discrepancy in the CCS Inventory & Forecast based on his earlier studies. Agricultural soils appear to be missing as a carbon sink. Bill will follow-up with the AFW SC.
2. Tom Looby: The main task of today's call is to continue development of the Draft Policy Options Document (POD) for the upcoming ICCAC meeting.

3. There was one change to the last meeting summary: (Change 5 to 4.2 for the environmental ethics initiative.)
4. Tom Looby reviewed the goals for the upcoming ICCAC meeting on slide #5: review and approval of Straw Proposals from Subcommittees (Policy Descriptions and Policy Designs, Implementation Mechanisms, Related Policies, and Programs/Policies in Place elements), review of Subcommittee recommendations on draft Iowa Emissions Inventory & Forecast, and review of the quantification process.

## Discussion of Options

5. **CC-1. GHG Inventories, Forecasting, Reporting, and Registry.** TWG suggestions for the Key Uncertainties section include costs and adequacy of funding resources, impacts resulting from development of regional and/or national programs, and accuracy in reporting. In the implementation section, add an additional Goal bullet for protocols for reporting information. Consider adding language for an accountability program and add Midwest Governor's GHG Accord (Marnie thinks it will follow the Climate Registry's protocol.) Feasibility: No issues at this time. Additional Benefits and Costs: Need to identify the costs associated with implementation of this option in terms of staff and program costs.
6. **CC-2. Statewide GHG Reduction Goals and Targets.** TWG suggestions for the Key Uncertainties section include whether there will be legislative or executive action and effectiveness of enforcement, i.e., add a paragraph in Design incentives and disincentives that includes an accountability mechanism. Implementation Mechanisms: Legislative and/or Executive enactment. Feasibility: No issues identified at this time. Additional Benefits and Costs: New technologies are expected to emerge that will affect these factors—cleaner air, less pollution, and improved public health.
7. **CC-3. State and Local Government GHG Emissions (Lead-by-Example).** TWG suggestions for the Key Uncertainties section include adequacy of funding resources and program costs and continued commitment of leadership. (Tom will pull context language from CC-2 on Executive Action.) Feasibility: Staff capacity and funding. Additional Benefits and Costs: Improved energy efficiency, lower relative energy costs, improved development, and widespread practice of renewables and energy efficiency.
8. **CC-4. Education and Outreach.** TWG suggestions for the Key Uncertainties section include adequacy of funding resources and program costs and interest and receptivity of the public. Feasibility: Jerry—strong resources in the state. Additional Benefits and Costs: None identified at this time.
9. Discussion of **CC-4.2:** Tom Looby and Jerry Schnoor conveyed the ICCAC's reservations about 4.2 which was in part because Father Bud was not able to be present to answer questions. Father Bud has done the exercise in his classes and is pleased that the ICCAC discussed it. It was decided that Jerry and Bill would work with Father Bud to include it in future iterations of the funding proposal

10. **CC-6. Seek Funding for Implementation of ICCAC Recommendations.** Build a 2009 timeframe for funding and implementation into the Timing section. Discussion occurred on The Power Fund and its sunset in four years. The SC could recommend that the State continue The Power Fund beyond four years, but the SC did not approve a possible recommendation to remove the sunset at this time.
  - Issue of geographic coverage and whether or not we count emission reduction outside our state. Discussion of production vs. consumption basis for GHG Emissions Forecast. Tom Looby noted that this is typically addressed in alternative quantification scenarios closer to the end of the process and is addressed as part of setting final goals.

### **Next Steps**

1. Follow up with feedback on Inventory and Forecast.
2. The other TWGs are moving into quantification of the policy options.
3. The CC SC is tasked with developing suggestions regarding proposed GHG reduction goals and targets as the information from the quantification process becomes available.
4. Next call is scheduled for Tuesday, July 22 at 12:00 p.m. CDT.

### **Public Comment and Announcements**

No comments were offered from the public. There were no announcements.