



www.arclimatechange.us

Meeting #5 Summary
Governor's Commission on Global Warming
Little Rock, Arkansas
April 9, 2008

Attendees:

GCGW: Aubra Anthony, Representative Joan Cash, Steve Cousins, Jerry Farris, PhD, Rob Fisher, Richard Ford, PhD, Art Hobson, PhD, Kevan Inboden, Elizabeth Martin, PhD, Robert McAfee, Hugh McDonald, Bill Reed, Pearlie Reed, Dina Nash (for Cindy Sagers, PhD), Jeffrey Short, Kevin Smith, Gary Voigt, Representative Kathy Webb

Advisory Body: Karen Bassett, Lawrence Bengal, John Bethel, Jenny Ahlen (for Maria Haley), Nancy Ledbetter, Lynn Malbrough, Teresa Marks, John Shannon

Governor's Office: Marc Harrison, Jillian Hicks, Kathy Holt

Arkansas Bureau of Legislative Research: Gina Mercer, Carol Stapleton

Center for Climate Strategies: Tom Peterson, Bill Dougherty, Randy Strait, Joan O'Callaghan, and by phone Donna Boysen, Lewison Lem, Kathy Leotta

Others: See attachment for Members of the Public who attended GCGW Meeting #5.

Background Documents: (all posted at www.arclimatechange.us)

1. Notice and Agenda
2. PowerPoint Presentation
3. Draft Summary of Meeting #4
4. CCS Memo to GCGW on Preparation for Meeting #5
5. Catalogs of State Actions and Policy Options

Discussion and Conclusions:

1. Welcome and Introductions

The Governor's Commission on Global Warming (GCGW) Co-chair Pearlie Reed opened the meeting.

2. GCGW Voting Procedures

A GCGW member recommended using the same voting procedures that the Arkansas state legislature uses, instead of the voting procedures recommended by the Center for Climate Strategies (CCS). Another GCGW member seconded the motion. Chairman Reed ruled that the GCGW should take this recommendation under advisement and put it at the top of the agenda for voting at GCGW Meeting #6.

3. Meeting Purpose and Goals

Tom Peterson of CCS reviewed the agenda for the meeting, noting that a key milestone for the day will be to review and approve or revise the list of Technical Work Group (TWG)-recommended priorities for analysis.

4. Public Input and Announcements

Jim Shirrell of FTN Associates, Ltd., was pleased to note that the Agriculture, Forestry, and Waste Management TWG is considering including the beneficial use of landfill methane gas in its policy options. He suggested that the Residential, Commercial, and Industrial (RCI) TWG also consider adding landfill methane gas to its RCI-1 renewable energy option.

5. Approval of Draft Summary of GCGW Meeting #4

The GCGW approved the draft summary of GCGW Meeting #4 without revision.

6. Review and Approval of the Draft Priorities for Analysis

Peterson explained that today the GCGW will be reviewing and approving, with modifications as needed, priority policy options for analysis. The Tier I (high-priority) list of options that each TWG is recommending to the GCGW as priorities for analysis received the most ballots among the members of the TWG, and the Tier II (medium-priority) list of options received as few as one ballot. If the GCGW thinks an option on the Tier II list should be considered a high priority, it can be moved to the Tier I group of options. The GCGW can also decide not to approve a Tier I option as a priority for analysis.

Some GCGW members thought more Tier II items could be bundled into Tier I options, while others questioned whether too much bundling is taking place. It was agreed that as the TWGs move forward with the analysis of the priority options approved by the GCGW today but to clearly define the subcomponents of the options as they proceed with their work. Also, if related options show up within a TWG or in different TWGs, they can be integrated.

AGRICULTURE, FORESTRY, AND WASTE MANAGEMENT (AFW)

Joe Pryor (CCS) provided a brief overview of the AFW options that the TWG is recommending to the GCGW as priorities for analysis. AFW TWG members provided additional information in responding to the GCGW's questions and comments.

Summary of Comments and Responses to Questions

Co-chair Reed asked where in the process the GCGW should consult such experts as the Secretary of Agriculture and members of the Natural Resources Commission. GCGW Advisory Body member John Shannon of the Forestry Commission noted he has been participating in the TWG conference calls. As recommended during the previous GCGW meeting, all of the TWGs were advised to identify outside experts, invite them to review their lists of priorities for analysis, and ask them to point out whether the TWGs are

missing key expertise or input. Co-chair Reed will consult Richard Bell and Randy Young regarding the AFW priority options.

AFW-1 (Expanded Use of Agriculture and Forestry Biomass Feedstocks for Electricity, Heat, or Steam Production)—A GCGW member noted that this option will reduce carbon dioxide (CO₂), but may result in higher costs than benefits because it will require boiler redesign, different U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) permitting requirements, biomass handling equipment, etc. He suggested the TWG design a mechanism to recover the capital investments necessary for implementing this option.

It was clarified that the TWG will work out the details of what constitutes eligible sources of biomass, such as hurricane debris and municipal solid waste.

The GCGW agreed to add AFW-1.4 (Encourage Cogeneration at Ag-Biomass Energy Sites) to this policy option, and the TWG will decide at its next meeting whether AFW-1.4 should be a stand-alone option instead.

Bill Dougherty (CCS) noted that the Energy Supply (ES) TWG has recommended combined heat and power as a stand-alone, high-priority policy option that has a very high potential for reducing greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. He noted that the AFW and ES TWG facilitators will coordinate potential overlap issues like this for the options that the GCGW approves as priorities for analysis.

AFW-2 (Advanced Recovery and Recycling)—No clarifying questions or comments.

AFW-3 (Forest Management and Establishment for Carbon Sequestration)—Of the three components of this option, AFW-7.3 (Afforestation/Reforestation) received the most ballots. No further clarifying questions or comments.

AFW-4 (Expanded Use of In-State Liquid Biofuels)—This policy option is closely tied to AFW-1. A GCGW member noted that the GHG benefits from producing cellulosic ethanol are more certain and larger than those from corn-based ethanol, but said that producing cellulosic ethanol is much too expensive now.

Peterson noted that the TWG should identify the timing of developing and scaling up different technologies. For example, the U.S. Department of Energy has recently awarded large grants to North Carolina and Pennsylvania for research and development (R&D) of cellulosic ethanol.

Another GCGW member suggested that the TWG consult Mike Ross and Milo Shult of the University of Arkansas. They also noted that biofuels are being developed from switchgrass and chicken fat and new enzymes are being developed.

A member suggested that the GCGW consider a caveat in the recommendations that if better science proves any of the recommendations to be misguided, those recommendations would be revised to reflect the underlying science. Peterson added that the policy option template that will be used going forward to develop the details for each policy option includes a section to note the key assumptions (which could change over time), data sources, and uncertainties that will address these issues.

Jenny Ahlen of the Arkansas Energy Office offered to provide information on this option and added that though the science is uncertain, cellulosic ethanol may be brought to market as soon as two years from now. The technology is proven, and investors are lined up (e.g., technology owned by a Nevada-based company will be demonstrated in Colorado before a facility in Arkansas is built). Market penetration mechanisms and distribution networks need to be set up and ready when the technology comes to market.

Another TWG member suggested that the GCGW keep all options open, including corn-based ethanol, being mindful of Arkansas' extensive natural resources. What may seem not viable economically today may become viable in the future.

AFW-5 (Manure Management)—The TWG wanted to focus on the even distribution of nutrients within Arkansas and noted the potential disproportion between areas that currently have high or low concentrations of nutrients. No further clarifying questions or comments.

AFW-6 (Promotion of Farming Practices That Achieve GHG Benefits)—The focus of this option could be improved energy efficiency and/or the promotion of renewable energy within the farming sector. No further clarifying questions or comments.

AFW-7 (End-of-Use Waste Management Practices)— Of the two components of this option, AFW-9.7 (Promotion of New and Existing Technologies for Waste Energy Conversion) received the most ballots. No further clarifying questions or comments.

AFW-8 (Improved Water Management)—This option was added after the balloting process. No further clarifying questions or comments.

AFW-9 (Expanded Use of Locally Produced Farm and Forest Products)—This option was also added after the balloting process, and is particularly applicable to Arkansas. No further clarifying questions or comments.

AFW Voting on Priorities for Analysis

AFW-1 (Expanded Use of Agriculture and Forestry Biomass Feedstocks for Electricity, Heat, or Steam Production)—Approved as a priority for further study, with the revisions as noted above.

AFW-2 (Advanced Recovery and Recycling)—Approved as a priority for further study.

AFW-3 (Forest Management and Establishment for Carbon Sequestration)—Approved as a priority for further study.

AFW-4 (Expanded Use of In-State Liquid Biofuels)—Approved as a priority for further study.

AFW-5 (Manure Management)—Approved as a priority for further study.

AFW-6 (Promotion of Farming Practices That Achieve GHG Benefits)—Approved as a priority for further study.

AFW-7 (End-of-Use Waste Management Practices)—Approved as a priority for further study.

AFW-8 (Improved Water Management)—Approved as a priority for further study.

AFW-9 (Expanded Use of Locally Produced Farm and Forest Products)—Approved as a priority for further study.

TRANSPORTATION AND LAND USE (TLU)

Tom Peterson and Lewison Lem (CCS) provided a brief overview of the TLU options that the TWG is recommending to the GCGW as priorities for analysis. TLU TWG members provided additional information in responding to the GCGW's questions and comments.

Summary of Comments and Responses to Questions

TLU-1 (Infrastructure for Plug-In Vehicles)—A GCGW member asked how this policy option reduces GHG emissions. A TWG member responded that large electrical plants use energy more efficiently than automobiles burning fossil fuels, and that power plants can generate electricity using renewable energy. He believes an analysis would show that plug-in hybrids use about 25% less fossil energy. Another TWG member noted that reducing the state's dependence on fossil fuels and its GHG emissions from transportation would result in the most significant benefits. It was further explained that while this option received the most TWG ballots, its placement as TLU-1 doesn't indicate that the TWG considers it to be a higher priority than other AFW Tier I options.

There was some discussion of merging TLU-1 and TLU-6. It was explained that TLU-1 focuses on passenger vehicles and the transition of technology to plug-in vehicles. In contrast, TLU-6 focuses on mass transit or conversion from passenger vehicles to mass transit. The GCGW decided to keep them separate for the purposes of analysis.

TLU-2 (Research and Development for Renewable Transportation Fuels)—No clarifying questions or comments.

TLU-3 (Smart Growth Bundle) and TLU-4 (Bicycle and Pedestrian Infrastructure)—The GCGW noted an overlap of TLU-3 with TLU-4. It agreed to merge the two options; add 2.1.5 (Land Use, Zoning, Tax, and Building Code Reform) and 2.1.13 Smart Growth Planning, Modeling, and Tools); and 1.3.9 (Provide a Tax Incentive for Adult Bicycles) and add other Tier I and II components related to energy efficiency and smart growth, as appropriate. It was also noted that RCI-1 needs to coordinate with TLU-3.

A GCGW member asked why the TWG recommended TLU-4 as a Tier I priority. A TWG member responded that a major component of a sustainability program is building more compact cities with mass transit and enhanced options for biking and walking.

TLU-5 (Promote and Facilitate Freight Efficiency Bundle)—The GCGW agreed to add 3.2.7 (Enforce Anti-Idling Ordinances/Encourage Idling Alternatives) and 5.10 ("Shore Power" at Port Sites) to this policy option.

TLU-6 (Improve and Expand Transit Service and Infrastructure)—See discussion of TLU-6 under the discussion for TLU-1.

TLU-7 (School and University Transportation Bundle)—A TWG member explained that of the three strategies for reducing GHG emissions—improving the operation of

vehicles, reducing the carbon content of fuel, and reducing travel demand—the TWG decided that significant GHG reductions could be achieved by reducing vehicle miles traveled.

TLU-8 (Alternative Fuel Development and Expansion)—There was some discussion of the relationship of this policy option to TLU-1 (Infrastructure for Plug-In Vehicles). The TWG chose to keep the focus on fuel, rather than on vehicles.

TLU-9 (Public Education)—The GCGW agreed to add 1.2.2 (Vehicle Maintenance and Driver Training) to this policy option.

TLU-10 (New Vehicle Standards: Tailpipe GHG and Fuel Economy)— The GCGW agreed to move what was formerly 1.1.1 (New Vehicle Standards: Tailpipe GHG and Fuel Economy) from the medium-priority (Tier II) list to the high-priority (Tier I) list, and to bundle 1.3.2 (Feebates [State-Specific or Regional]) here.

TLU-11—(Procurement of Efficient Vehicles)— The GCGW agreed to merge and move what was formerly 1.3.1 (Procurement of Efficient Fleet Vehicles) and 3.4.1 (Procurement of Efficient Fleet Vehicles [Public, Private, or Other]) from the medium-priority (Tier II) list to the high-priority (Tier I) list.

TLU Voting on Priorities for Analysis

TLU-1 (Infrastructure for Plug-In Vehicles)—Approved as a priority for further study.

TLU-2 (Research and Development for Renewable Transportation Fuels)— Approved as a priority for further study.

TLU-3 (Smart Growth Bundle) and TLU-4 (Bicycle and Pedestrian Infrastructure)—Approved as priorities for further study, with the revisions as noted above.

TLU-5 (Promote and Facilitate Freight Efficiency Bundle)—Approved as a priority for further study, with the additions as noted above.

TLU-6 (Improve and Expand Transit Service and Infrastructure)—Approved as a priority for further study.

TLU-7 (School and University Transportation Bundle)—Approved as a priority for further study.

TLU-8 (Alternative Fuel Development and Expansion)—Approved as a priority for further study.

TLU-9 (Public Education)—Approved as a priority for further study, with the addition as noted above.

TLU-10 (New Vehicle Standards: Tailpipe GHG and Fuel Economy)—Add by the GCGW as a priority for further study.

TLU-11—(Procurement of Efficient Vehicles)— Add by the GCGW as a priority for further study.

ENERGY SUPPLY (ES)

Bill Dougherty and Donna Boysen (CCS) provided a brief overview of the ES options that the TWG is recommending to the GCGW as priorities for analysis. ES TWG members provided additional information in responding to the GCGW's questions and comments.

Summary of Comments and Responses to Questions

ES-1 (Green Power Purchases and Marketing)—No clarifying questions or comments.

ES-2 (Technology Research & Development)—A TWG member representing the utility industry strongly supports this option and recommends directing funding first to R&D and establishing mandates later based on the R&D results.

ES-3 (Renewable and/or Environmental Portfolio Standard [RPS/EPS])—A TWG member opposing this policy noted that raising energy prices will drive manufacturing out of Arkansas and won't reduce GHG reductions. He added that incentives are very effective, and mandates are counterproductive, leaving no room for choice. He recommended that the GCGW focus on the problem—finding a long-term solution for reducing CO₂ emissions from coal—and let the market determine which technology best addresses the problem, rather than choosing an economically inefficient solution. He suggested that the TWG consider dropping the word "standard" from the title of this policy option, or changing it to something that doesn't sound like a mandate, such as "incentives."

A GCGW member supporting this policy noted that an RPS could force utilities to adopt less polluting approaches to producing electricity. Another TWG member noted that 22 states already have an RPS in place.

Another TWG member commented that the TWG and the GCGW need to discuss the cost-effectiveness of nuclear power, which comprises a significant share of the cost of utility operations and produces no GHG emissions.

The GCGW agreed to keep all options open for study purposes, and determine later on how to move forward.

ES-4 (Grid-Based Renewable Energy Incentives and/or Barrier Removal)—A GCGW member noted that Arkansas is simultaneously exporting and importing gas. They suggested that the TWG give some consideration to how the state can distribute gas more efficiently.

There was a question as to whether this option should be considered as a part of ES-8. A question was also raised about whether the TWG discussed natural gas distribution, and whether it should be combined with ES-8. The TWG will examine these questions during its next meeting.

ES-5 (Approaches Benefiting From Regional Application) and ES-10 (Carbon Tax)—There was much discussion about the different geographic applications of a cap-and-trade (C&T) program and a carbon tax: single-state application; multistate (regional) application (such as the Regional Greenhouse Gas Initiative in the Northeast, the

Midwestern Governors' Agreement, and the Western Climate Initiative); and a national application.

A GCGW member supporting a regional application said the Southeast should do everything possible to influence federal legislation. A TWG member added that a C&T program and a carbon tax could provide the R&D funding needed for developing technologies and markets for reducing the state's GHG emissions and improving its energy efficiency.

Two GCGW members who oppose single-state or multistate approaches support a C&T program and a carbon tax only at the national level. They noted that a significant amount of capital has been invested in national programs. They believe that the price of carbon will drive incentives to reduce CO₂ emissions, that participating in state or regional efforts will be economically inefficient, and that ratepayers shouldn't be taxed.

Another GCGW member noted that a carbon tax should be a state-only tax, because R&D funding is needed and the tax would provide an incentive for reducing GHG emissions. They also noted that Arkansas taxes tobacco to lower Medicaid costs, and that the U.S. Congress isn't proactive on these issues. Another GCGW member observed that if Arkansas takes proactive steps on these issues, it will benefit as national programs are developed later.

The GCGW agreed to keep all options open for study purposes and to determine later on how to move forward.

ES-6 (Combined Heat and Power)—No clarifying questions or comments.

ES-7 (Geological Underground Sequestration for New Plants)—No clarifying questions or comments.

ES-8 (Transmission System Upgrades)— See discussion of ES-8 under the discussion for TLU-4.

ES-9 (Nuclear Power)—No clarifying questions or comments.

ES-11 (Efficiency Improvements and Repowering of Existing Plants)—No clarifying questions or comments.

ES Voting on Priorities for Analysis

ES-1 (Green Power Purchases and Marketing)—Approved as a priority for further study.

ES-2 (Technology Research & Development)—Approved as a priority for further study.

ES-3 (Renewable and/or Environmental Portfolio Standard [RPS/EPS])—Approved as a priority for further study, with the considerations noted above.

ES-4 (Grid-Based Renewable Energy Incentives and/or Barrier Removal)—Approved as a priority for further study, with the considerations noted above.

ES-5 (Approaches Benefiting From Regional Application) and ES-10 (Carbon Tax)—Approved as priorities for further study, with the considerations noted above.

ES-6 (Combined Heat and Power)—Approved as a priority for further study.

ES-7 (Geological Underground Sequestration for New Plants)—Approved as a priority for further study.

ES-8 (Transmission System Upgrades)—Approved as a priority for further study, with the considerations noted above.

ES-9 (Nuclear Power)—Approved as a priority for further study.

ES-11 (Efficiency Improvements and Repowering of Existing Plants)—Approved as a priority for further study.

RESIDENTIAL, COMMERCIAL AND INDUSTRIAL (RCI)

Donna Boysen and Bill Dougherty (CCS) provided a brief overview of the RCI options that the TWG is recommending to the GCGW as priorities for analysis. RCI TWG members provided additional information in responding to the GCGW's questions and comments.

Summary of Comments and Responses to Questions

RCI-1 (Improved Building Codes)—RCI-1 needs to coordinate with TLU-3. No additional clarifying questions or comments.

RCI-2 (Utility and Non-Utility DSM for Electricity and Natural Gas)—No clarifying questions or comments.

RCI-3 (Reduced Energy Use in State-Owned Buildings: Government "Lead by Example")—No clarifying questions or comments.

RCI-4 (Promotion and Incentives for Improved Building Design and Construction)—A GCGW member suggested making 2.6 (Promotion and incentives for improved design and construction (e.g., LEED) in the private sector) more inclusive by changing "(e.g., LEED)" to "(e.g., LEED and other qualified standards)." The TWG will decide whether to add innovative loan programs to help homeowners improve energy efficiency.

RCI-5 (Consumer Education for Consumers and Industry Trades, Professions)—No clarifying questions or comments.

RCI-6 (Incentives To Promote Energy Efficiency) and RCI-9 (Energy Efficiency Funds)—A GCGW member asked whether the TWG considered incentives for increased energy efficiency in low-income federal housing. It was agreed the TWG will include such incentives as part of RCI-6 or RCI-9.

Another GCGW member asked for an explanation of the difference between these two options. Boysen explained that RCI-6 is a broader, more inclusive option that focuses on technologies, as opposed to the RCI-9 funding mechanisms. The TWG will consider merging the two options.

RCI-7 (Green Power Purchasing for Consumers)—No clarifying questions or comments.

RCI-8 (Nonresidential Energy Efficiency)—No clarifying questions or comments.

RCI-10 (Support for Energy-Efficient Communities, Including Smart Growth)—No clarifying questions or comments.

RCI-11 (Energy-Savings Sales Tax)—No clarifying questions or comments.

RCI Voting on Priorities for Analysis

RCI-1 (Improved Building Codes)—Approved as a priority for further study.

RCI-2 (Utility and Non-Utility DSM for Electricity and Natural Gas)—Approved as a priority for further study.

RCI-3 (Reduced Energy Use in State-Owned Buildings: Government “Lead by Example”)—Approved as a priority for further study.

RCI-4 (Promotion and Incentives for Improved Building Design and Construction)—Approved as a priority for further study, with the revisions and considerations noted above.

RCI-5 (Consumer Education for Consumers and Industry Trades, Professions)—Approved as a priority for further study.

RCI-6 (Incentives To Promote Energy Efficiency) and RCI-9 (Energy Efficiency Funds)—Approved as priorities for further study, with the considerations noted above.

RCI-7 (Green Power Purchasing for Consumers)—Approved as a priority for further study.

RCI-8 (Nonresidential Energy Efficiency)—Approved as a priority for further study.

RCI-10 (Support for Energy-Efficient Communities, Including Smart Growth)—Approved as a priority for further study.

RCI-11 (Energy-Savings Sales Tax)—Approved as a priority for further study.

CROSS-CUTTING ISSUES (CC)

Randy Strait (CCS) provided a brief overview of the CC options that the TWG is recommending to the GCGW as priorities for analysis. A GCGW member asked what specific goals have been set for 2012, 2020, and 2050, and recommended that the TWG report on the goals Arkansas needs to achieve to do its part to save the planet, what other states are doing toward this end, and where Arkansas will stand in 2020. Strait responded that the typical approach is to set these questions aside until the other TWGs complete the quantification of emission reductions and costs/savings of the pending priority policy options toward the end of the process so that the CC TWG can consider the aggregated results (adjusted to remove double-counting associated with overlaps between options) in developing its recommendations on goals and targets to the GCGW.

Summary of Comments and Responses to Questions

CC-1 (Greenhouse Gas Inventories and Forecasts)—No clarifying questions or comments.

CC-2 (State Greenhouse Gas Reporting and Registry)—No clarifying questions or comments.

CC-3 (Statewide Greenhouse Gas Reduction Goals or Targets)—A GCGW member asked the TWG to provide short- and long-term goals for this option—i.e., for 2012, 2020, and 2050.

CC-4 (The State’s Own Greenhouse Gas Emissions [Lead by Example])—No clarifying questions or comments.

CC-5 (Comprehensive Local Government Climate Action Plans)—A GCGW member asked the TWG to consider adopting sustainability as a broad state goal for this option. Another GCGW member commented that although sustainability goals are consistent with economic growth goals, many of the CC priority options seem to have an institutional bias toward what the government or industry will do. He asked the TWG to encourage positive individual actions to achieve sustainability goals.

CC-6 (State Climate Public Education and Outreach)—A GCGW member asked whether this option includes education and outreach programs covering kindergarten through college. Strait confirmed it does.

CC-7 (Optimizing Best-Scale of Reduction Policies)—No clarifying questions or comments.

CC-8 (Creative Financial Mechanisms)—No clarifying questions or comments.

CC-9 (Adaptation and Vulnerability)—No clarifying questions or comments.

CC-10 (Climate Change-Related Economic Development)—No clarifying questions or comments.

CC-11 (Regulatory Realignment in Government to Encourage Constructive Climate Action)—No clarifying questions or comments.

CC Voting on Priorities for Analysis

CC-1 (Greenhouse Gas Inventories and Forecasts)—Approved as a priority for further study.

CC-2 (State Greenhouse Gas Reporting and Registry)—Approved as a priority for further study, with the considerations noted above.

CC-3 (Statewide Greenhouse Gas Reduction Goals or Targets)—Approved as a priority for further study.

CC-4 (The State’s Own Greenhouse Gas Emissions [Lead by Example])—Approved as a priority for further study.

CC-5 (Comprehensive Local Government Climate Action Plans)—Approved as a priority for further study, with the considerations noted above.

CC-6 (State Climate Public Education and Outreach)—Approved as a priority for further study.

CC-7 (Optimizing Best-Scale of Reduction Policies)—Approved as a priority for further study.

CC-8 (Creative Financial Mechanisms)—Approved as a priority for further study.

CC-9 (Adaptation and Vulnerability)—Approved as a priority for further study.

CC-10 (Climate Change-Related Economic Development)—Approved as a priority for further study.

CC-11 (Regulatory Realignment in Government to Encourage Constructive Climate Action)—Approved as a priority for further study.

INVENTORY & FORECAST

Randy Strait of CCS updated the GCGW on progress on the Inventory & Forecast for Arkansas, and clarified that the inventory takes carbon sequestration into account.

7. Next Steps

At Meeting #6, the TWGs will present straw proposals for the GCGW's consideration, which will be fleshed out with the basic elements of the policy design (goals, timing, parties involved), policy description, and related policies already in place in Arkansas.

Ultimately, the potential environmental impacts, GHG emission reductions and costs or cost savings resulting from implementing these options will be quantified, externality and feasibility issues will be evaluated; barriers to consensus will be addressed; and results will be aggregated for final recommendations.

Regarding implementation mechanisms, a GCGW member suggested involving agency heads and counsel early in the process on policy options that may require legislation, and being as specific as possible regarding the details of these potential legislative actions. The ultimate goal of this recommendation is to act early on policies that may require legislation, which can be time consuming.

8. Times and Dates for Next GCGW Meetings

The GCGW agreed to hold Meeting #6 on May 19, 2008; Meeting #7 on July 31, 2008; and Meeting #8 (the final meeting) on September 25, 2008—all from 9:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m.

Attachment

Members of the Public Attending Arkansas GCGW Meeting #5
Little Rock, Arkansas
April 9, 2008

Name	Organization
Mark Allison	Dover Dixon Horner
Rep. Nancy Blount	Arkansas House of Representatives
Sammie Cox	Southwestern Electric Power Company
Don Erbach	Entegra Power Group
Ellen Fennell	Audubon Arkansas
John Harriman	Mitchell Williams
Mark Hicks	Zachary D. Wilson, P.A.
Bobby Hogue	Alliance of Automobile Manufacturers
Glen Hooks	Sierra Club
Rep. Allen Maxwell	Arkansas House of Representatives
Paul Means	Entergy Arkansas
Jeff Nash	Sierra Club
Crystal Phelps	Arkansas Natural Resources Commission
Robert Phelps	Keep Arkansas Beautiful Commission
Grace Ellen Rice	Arkansas Attorney General's Office
Don Richardson	Arkansas Climate Awareness Project
Courtney Sheppard	Wind Coalition
Jim Shirrell	FTN Associates, Inc
Danny Traynor	Arkansas Valley Energy
Stacy William	Electric Cooperatives of Arkansas