



WWW.MNCLIMATECHANGE.US

Meeting #4 Summary
Minnesota Climate Change Advisory Group (MCCAG)
St. Paul, Minnesota
September 27, 2007

Attendees:

MCCAG: Jon Anderson, Leith Anderson, Staci Bohlen (for Willis Anthony), Daniel Bartholomay, Alexander Bascom, Jan Callison, Rick Carter, Mitch Davis, Chuck Dayton, Barbara Freese, Bill Grant, J. Drake Hamilton, Scott Harrison, Bill Heaney, Robert Jagusch, Greg Jason, Boise Jones, John Kelly, Julie Ketchum, Scott Lambert, Amber Backhaus (for Greg Langford), Will Lee, Chuck MacFarlane, Daron Van Helden (for Jim Marchessault), Tim McGraw, Dave McMillan, Greg Miller, Heather Tansey (for Jeffrey Muffat), Eric Solsen, Doug Peterson, Steve Raukar, Mike Robertson, Rick Evans (for David Sparby), Nicole Rom (for Will Steger), Peter Sullivan, Barb Thoman, Nim Traeger, Jeff Wilkes, Bruno Zagar

Department of Commerce (DOC): Edward Garvey, Linda Limback, Bill Sierks, Janet Streff

Pollution Control Agency (PCA): Brad Moore, David Thornton, Todd Biewen, Peter Ciborowski, Anne Claflin, Colleen Coyne, Lisa Herschberger, Jeff Ledermann, John Seltz, Rebecca Walter

Center for Climate Strategies (CCS): Ken Colburn, Bill Dougherty, Franz Litz, Will Schroeer, and by telephone, Steve Roe, Randy Strait, and Brad Strode

Others: See Attachment for Members of the Public that Attended MCCAG Meeting #4.

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

1. Notice and Agenda
2. Draft Summary for MCCAG Meeting #3
3. Powerpoint Presentation
4. Memo to MCCAG on Preparation for 4th Meeting
5. Policy Option Descriptions for Analysis for each TWG

Discussion and Conclusions:

1. Welcome and Introductions by Edward Garvey and David Thornton.

2. Approval of Summary of Prior Meeting; Other Logistics

The MCCAG approved the summary for Meeting #3 without objection.

3. Review of the MCCAG Process Status and Next Steps

Ken Colburn (CCS) reviewed the agenda. He noted that after the prior meeting some members of the public requested that they be given an opportunity to speak earlier in the meeting rather than waiting until the end of the meeting. Therefore, the agenda for today's meeting has been arranged to provide for public input at the beginning. Ken then reviewed the procedure, which is for anyone member of the public that would like to speak to out a card at the check-in desk for today's meeting.

Ken reviewed the next steps for the MCCAG noting that today we will focus on review and approval of draft "straw proposals" from Technical Work Groups (TWGs) for each of the priority policy options approved by the MCCAG during its August 2 meeting. The MCCAG will also review progress and recommended updates to the statewide inventory and forecast of emissions. Going forward the TWGs will begin work to quantify and further develop policy options based on this discussion and any adjustments made by the MCCAG during today's meeting. Final consideration of these options will begin at the next MCCAG meeting on November 8, 2007.

David Thornton (PCA) identified the individuals and their affiliation for which MCCAG members requested that they serve as alternates for today's meeting.

Ken noted that for today's meeting, were asked to have public input earlier in process so we have schedule time early today. Any one who would like to speak, please fill out a card at the check-in desk.

4. Public Input and Announcements

Jerry Hinderman, a retired scientist, noted that he has been attending many of the MCCAG meetings. This is a very important process. He provided the following three comments on the process:

- a. When various policy options are discussed, it is important to identify and indirect costs. For example, biomass from food crops – not cellulosic – may increase the price of food and these indirect impacts need to be taken into account during the analysis.
- b. Fuel cycle analysis or life-cycle analysis should be done on all options so that comparisons can be consistent.
- c. The Renewable Energy Objective (RES) is already law. It would be an excellent baseline to estimate the costs of the RES. That analysis would then be consistent with analysis of other options. This should prepare us for the other approaches.

5. Review and Approval of the Draft Straw Design Proposals for Policy Options

The CCS facilitator for each TWG briefly reviewed the description and design characteristics for each priority policy option, asked for clarifying questions or comments, and then asked if any MCCAG members objected to further development and analysis of each option. The following provides a brief summary of the discussion on each option.

Residential, Commercial, and Industrial

Summary of Comments and Responses to Questions:

RCI-1 (Maximize Savings from CIP) – The version under review does not have the most current language. Paragraph 1, sentence 2 should read: “These savings would come through energy conservation improvement programs and rate design, through improved energy codes and appliance efficiency standards, programs designed to transform the market or change consumer behavior, energy savings resulting from efficiency improvements to the utility infrastructure and system, and other activities to promote energy efficiency and energy conservation.” The web version of this option needs to be updated with this correct language.

RCI-2 (Improved Uniform Statewide Building Codes) – There was a question about structural integrity and a directive for the TWG to consider adding some additional language. It was noted that building codes may be poorly enforced in some places and some seem to minimize importance of energy code and that it will be needed to strengthen these aspects for inspectors. Incorporating training for realtors and contractors on energy efficiency standards will be needed.

RCI-3 (Green Building Guidelines and Standards Based on Architecture 2030) – There was concern that schools will not be able to meet the targets proposed and a suggestion to limit the option to state buildings only. The response from TWG members in attendance was that a 50% reduction isn’t really that big but that the issue will be examined in future meetings to see how this would affect building new and better schools.

RCI-4 (Incentives & Resources to Promote Combined Heat and Power (CHP)) – It was noticed that the policy design questions on the straw proposal and on many of the others were left blank and will need to be subsequently addressed by the RCI TWG, which was agreed to by the TWG members in attendance.

RCI-5 (Reducing High GWP Emissions) – It was noted that there are potential redundancies in the options across TWGs, some of which have quantifiable goals while others do not. A memo will need to be prepared that discusses an approach for resolving this point. Within the RCI TWG, it will be important to first eliminate overlap of the options and then to coordinate with the ES TWG.

RCI-6 (Non-utility Strategies and Incentives to Encourage Energy Efficiency and Reduce GHG Emissions) – This is only option that addresses carbon reduction in industry and it appears there has been a loss of some text in the straw proposal that was posted. There are some real important high fuel using industries to target like ethanol, petroleum refineries, and mining and it will be important to not lose potential for a GHG mitigation

approach to industry. Others thought the posted language was correct. This will need to be reviewed by the RCI TWG.

RCI-7 (Conservation Improvement-type Program for Propane and fuel oil efficiency) – There is a more current version of the goals that will need to be posted.

RCI-8 (Energy Performance Disclosure) – There was a comment that it will be important to clarify whether the option applies to appliances or structures.

RCI-9 (Promote Technology-Specific Applications to Reduce GHG Emissions) – No comments.

RCI-10 (Support Strong Federal Appliance Standards and Require High State Standards in the Absence of Federal Standards) – Discussion focused on the option for people switching to new appliance when current appliances reach 15 years.

Objections/Modifications from the MCCAG:

RCI-1 – No objections

RCI-2 – No objections

RCI-3 – No objections

RCI-4 – No objections

RCI-5 – No objections

RCI-6 – No objections

RCI-7 – No objections

RCI-8 – No objections

RCI-9 – No objections

RCI-10 – No objections

Energy Supply

Summary of Comments and Responses to Questions:

ES-1 (Generation Performance Standard) – There was a comment that all load-serving entities should be considered even if they didn't have retail customers and a clarification that load-serving entities would be covered even if located out-of-state and serving MN customers. The standard was clarified as 1,110 lbs CO₂/MWh which is based on gas-fired combined-cycle units; for CHP 1,300 lbs CO₂/MWh.

ES-2 – (Fuel Standard) – There was a comment that this is supposed to be a low-carbon standard for transportation. After discussion, it was agreed that the TLU TWG would address this option as one of their priority options.

ES-3 (Efficiency Improvements, Repowering and other Upgrades to Existing Plants) – No comments

ES-4 (Transmission System Upgrading, including reducing transmission line and distribution system loss) – Natural gas pipelines should also be included here.

ES-5 (Renewable and/or Environmental Portfolio Standard) – There was a comment that one approach to this option would be to consider increasing the RES standard. Another comment questioned whether it makes sense to look beyond 25 by 25 given the uncertainty in being able to meet that target. Another comment focused on the timeline of 2007 being too soon and that there will not be sufficient information about the RES for awhile yet.

ES-6 (Nuclear Power Support and Incentives) – It was clarified that this option is about life extension, upgrades, etc, and full fuel cycle of existing nuclear stations, as opposed to building new units.

ES-7 (Advanced Fossil Fuel Technology Incentives, Support or Requirements) – The TWG had crafted language that would make this option less technology-specific and this will be important to emphasize.

ES-8 (Carbon Capture and Storage and/or Reuse Policies) – Comments combined with comments for ES-7.

ES-9 (Large-scale, Supply-oriented Combined Heat and Power (CHP) and Geothermal Incentives and/or Barrier Removal) – Small CHP had been deleted from the straw proposal but the language does not reflect that.

ES-10 (Voluntary Reduction Targets) – No comments

ES-11 (Carbon Tax) – The analysis of the option should consider revenue neutrality and impacts on low income (safety valve). There was a discussion about what is meant by revenue neutral and whether it is from the government's perspective. The sense of the group was that it was from the state's perspective and it would be important to build a safety valve in this system as tax revenue windfalls should be avoided. It was noted that the carbon tax option and the Cap and Trade option have similarities and it may be beneficial to consider them together - need to think about how to approach, possibly in the same newly convened cap-and-trade TWG. After discussion, it was agreed that the carbon tax would be taken up in the cap-and-trade TWG.

ES-12 (Distributed Renewable Energy Generation) – There was a question about the current fleet of plants and how they fit in.

ES-13 (Technology-based Approaches) – No comments

ES-X (Cap-and-Trade) – This was not given a number because state law mandates that it be evaluated. Three policy design options on geographic scope: 1) MN alone, 2) MN with another region, and 3) national. These three are as far as the TWG went right now, but eight different options are being considered by the TWG. There could be others. There was a question about how cap and trade would work in the transport sector? One response was that transportation would go through its own sector. Another question focused on which regions to consider, to which the reply was that it is still an open question.

Objections/Modifications from the MCCAG:

ES-1 – No Objections

- ES-2 – No Objections. Note the MCCAG decided that this option should be analyzed by the TLU TWG, with review by other TWGs on an as-needed basis
- ES-3 – No Objections. Note that MCCAG proposed to include a reference to GHG in the policy name to emphasize the need to achieve GHG reductions
- ES-4 – No Objections
- ES-5 – One objection: Should not consider the option until after the year 2025
- ES-6 – No Objections
- ES-7 – No Objections
- ES-8 – No Objections
- ES-9 – No Objections
- ES-10 – No Objections
- ES-11 – No Objections. Note the MCCAG decided that this option should be analyzed by the Cap-and-Trade TWG
- ES-12 – No Objections
- ES-13 – No Objections
- ES-X – No Objections. Note the MCCAG decided that this option should be analyzed by the Cap-and-Trade TWG

Transportation and Land Use

Summary of Comments and Responses to Questions:

TLU-1 (Improved Land Use Planning and Development Strategies) – There was extensive discussion of this option. One comment suggested that the goals are very ambitious. A minority recommendation resulted that the goals in this option should be established on a per capita basis.

It was asked if MnDOT has been involved to date on the development of these goals. The response was that MnDOT has a representative on the TWG, and that the TWG will work with them as we go forward to get their input.

Q: how the goals will be reached; by reduction in vehicles? A: The goal is for a reduction in miles driven, not in vehicles. The drivers of transportation emissions are: technical efficiency, fuel carbon content, and miles driven (or other activity, such as miles flown). The TWG's goal in this option was to reach the activities driver, not the other factors. A question was asked whether this option applied to anything that burns gasoline, and the response was to anything that moves, including electric. A TWG member commented that this option is about reducing the number of trips, and reorienting our land use policies, like location of schools, so that there is less driving and shorter trips.

It was commented that there was a lot about freight that could be included in this option. It was noted that the intent is not to reduce commerce. It was suggested to use a different metric, like reducing CO₂ use per mile. It was reiterated that this option is about land use.

Land use is mostly applicable to cities. If the state adopts a mileage goal, then land use will be looked at.

Q: What is the implementation on this? Land use or mandates? A: A land-use-based need to drive propels much VMT. Oregon adopted a VMT target and has successfully used land use policies to help meet its goal.

Discussion concluded with the observation that the TWG had taken the MCCAG's direction to develop a stretch goal, and also felt that changes of this magnitude were likely to be necessary to achieve the Governor's goals.

There was a suggestion to encourage rail service in the state. CCS said that they will add that back in.

TLU-2 (Expand Transit, Bicycle, and Pedestrian Infrastructure) – A TWG member noted that this option should include transport links from rural community areas to the airport. CCS reported that this will be included in the next round.

TLU-3 (Low GHG Fuel Standard) – A TWG member asked if this option included biofuels. CCS replied that this was not specified, as the TWG is thinking of more than just ethanol and biofuels. The goal is to reduce GHG intensity of fuels overall.

An extensive discussion followed about the role of a low-carbon fuel standard (LCFS) in TLU-3. The TWG was uncomfortable with recommending LCFS, in part because of the implied parallel with the California LCFS, and there were potential issues with the CA LCFS and Minnesota's existing ethanol goals. The MCCAG reminded the TWG that it had been directed to develop an LCFS. Q: about the baseline? CCS replied that it is over current use and that it will knock existing policy out. Someone else commented that it has not been decided.

Q: Is this reducing carbon through lifecycle or just adding more ethanol to gasoline? The latter does not make much sense. We need to look at lifecycle of fuels. A: CCS responded that the LCFS would examine full life cycle (“well-to-wheels”).

TLU-4 (Infrastructure Management) – No comments

TLU-5 (Climate-Friendly Transportation Pricing) – A hard goal has not yet been set. One suggestion is a mileage tax, on which MnDOT is currently working. The TWG needs to check with them before this gets put in as a goal. CCS commented that there is a consideration about potential negative distributional impact from this. It should be added in. A TWG member asked if an insurance company would have to offer Pay As You Drive insurance, and if it would be mandatory, then they object. Someone else asked if insurance companies could offer breaks to low mileage, but questionable to penalize others. Low mileage insurance was questioned. It was requested that the TWG look at how much to change behavior and then do analysis from there. CCS responded that there are pilot programs and associated data that can be reviewed to guide the team. These programs discuss prices and behavior change. It was asked whether all segment of the society can afford this. CCS said that it could look at utilities programs that have lifelines and bring those ideas to the table.

TLU-6 (Adopt California Clean Car Standards) – A question was posed about the relation of California's Clean Car standard to MN's existing biofuels mandates, as there is a

possible conflict. California has approved a 10% fuel blend. A comment was made that this bar is high. It was requested that language be changed so that it is not dependent on staying in MN ethanol mandate. A comment was made about there being a paper on CA standards that suggests it may make it easier for car manufacturing to make it. The language for this option needs to be more open and make the most sense for MN's situation. Another comment was made that potential reductions should be considered if CA standard was adopted, but the new standard does not have to be linked to the ethanol mandate.

TLU-7 (“Fix-it-First” Transportation Investment Policy and Practice) – No comments

TLU-8 (Update Road Standards—Now part of TLU 4) – No comments

TLU-9 (Workplace Tools to Encourage Carpooling, Bicycling, and Transit Ridership) – No comments

TLU-10 (Congestion Pricing (or Tolls) With Targeted Use of Revenue Toward Travel Alternatives—Now Part of TLU-5) – No comments

TLU-11 (Truck Stop Electrification) – A comment was made that a goal needs to be set for truck stop electrification. It was asked whether this option should apply to rail yards as well. CCS reported that there was an initial recommendation about reducing idling that did not move forward. A TWG member agreed that all idling should be considered. It was commented that the option should not be limited to electrification, as there are other technologies out there to consider.

TLU-12 (Mobile Source Emissions Reduction) – This option was introduced as additional policy. State should try to double over existing.

TLU-13 (Reduce Maximum Speed Limits) – The TWG thinks there will need to be some exemptions for this option.

Objections/Modifications from the MCCAG:

TLU-1 – A comment was made that this option has to do with land use. Q: Why is there no stratification that differentiates a hybrid from other vehicles? A: Are you saying that you would like to see a low-emission vehicle be able to be driven more? Clarification: Yes; they should be able to. We need to adjust according to their carbon emissions.

Objection: The relationship between the land use and VMT needs to be made obvious. Some people have to drive far distances to get to work. This option could restrict freedom and hurt the economy.

TLU-2 – No objections.

TLU-3 – It was advised to include a LCFS and life-cycle emissions in the strategy approach. It was also commented that the discussion and consideration of renewables and alternative fuels are important; however, there may not be enough information yet on performance, availability, etc. It was also requested that modeling on a LCFS be provided.

TLU-4 – No objections.

TLU-5 – Requested to make pay-as-you-drive insurance voluntary instead of required.

TLU-6 – Request for less restrictive language and to explore concerns with MN’s biofuels standard.

TLU-7 – No objections.

TLU-8 – No objections.

TLU-9 – No objections.

TLU-10 – No objections.

TLU-11 – Request to broaden beyond electrification. Q. Why target smaller companies?

A. Large companies have the financing to move ahead where as small companies do not. There was a comment that the TWG should grapple with expanding truck stop electrification to all vehicles such as buses.

TLU-12 – No objections.

TLU-13 – No objections.

Agriculture, Forestry, and Waste Management

Summary of Comments and Responses to Questions:

AFW-1 (Agricultural Crop Management) – TWG members questioned the targets under this and other ag option (% objectives); wanted to see baseline data. CCS explained that this type of information is still under development and will be presented as part of the quantification of benefits and costs during the next phase of development. Another member questioned the current levels of no-till practiced on the state’s agricultural lands. CCS will provide this type of information in the quantification of benefits and costs. The Conservation Tillage Information Center (CTIC) at Purdue University should have data on no-till practices in MN.

Another member had concerns about the “GPS goal” for nutrient management (reducing fertilizer application and associated emissions). Global Positioning System (GPS) based technology is just one example of methods that farmers could use to reduce fertilizer application. It is just provided as an example. The policy option is not meant to be prescriptive as to the technology to be employed.

TWG members had general concerns about the levels of goals and baseline information and the lack of sufficient information to determine whether the goals were being set too high or low. CCS explained that once a goal structure is in place an analysis can be performed and the stringency of the goal will become clearer. The MCCAG will have the ability to make the goals more or less stringent, if needed, and the TWG will notify the MCCAG where it is felt that the goals should be refined.

AFW-2 (Land Use Management Approaches for Protection and Enrichment of Soil Carbon) – see discussion under #1 above.

AFW-3 (In-State Liquid Biofuels Production) – There was concern from one member about the goals of the first policy element to use 80% biomass energy in MN’s ethanol plants. CCS explained that the TWG’s goal was that the heat input and electricity used by

these plants would be 80% from renewable sources, not just biomass. One member felt that the goals supported the direction that the MN ethanol industry should be headed.

AFW-4 (Expanded Use of Biomass Feedstocks for Electricity, Heat, or Steam Production) – One member felt that the biomass from this option should be directed toward thermal energy and not electricity. Another member saw the importance of maintaining adequate ag residue to maintain soil carbon for that portion of the feedstock stream. Another member said that biomass availability is a big concern for being able to move forward on a current biomass project that he is working on (forest resources are uncertain). Another member mentioned the importance of monitoring land that might be taken out of food production to produce biomass for energy. CCS and the TWG will keep these issues in mind during the next steps in policy option development.

AFW-5 (Forestry Management Programs to Enhance GHG Benefits) – A member mentioned the need to revise the wording of one of the goals to increase sustainable harvest over current levels “consistent with environmental objectives”. Also increases in forest products output should be toward durable goods, as these sequester carbon over a long period of time. Another member asked about the metric for the wildfires policy element – CCS explained that the goal is to treat a certain number of acres to reduce wildfire risk.

AFW-6 (Forest Protection—Reduced Clearing and Conversion to Non-Forest Cover) – No questions.

AFW-7 (Integrated Waste Management) – No questions. It was noted that source reduction needed to be addressed. CCS and the TWG will do that.

AFW-8 (End of Use Waste Management Practices) – A member pointed out an overlap in the first two policy elements. CCS will address this with the TWG and revise the language.

Objections/Modifications from the MCCAG:

AFW-1 – One member objected about language suggesting that carbon sequestered in agricultural soils had GHG benefits due to the issue of permanence. The TWG will need to address this in the policy write-up. Otherwise, no objections.

AFW-2 – No objections.

AFW-3 – One member mentioned the need to address the impacts of fuel production versus food/feed. Otherwise, no objections.

AFW-4 – One member felt that biomass for electricity was not feasible. Otherwise, no objections.

AFW-5 – No objections.

AFW-6 – No objections.

AFW-7 – No objections.

AFW-8 – No objections.

Cross-Cutting Issues

Summary of Comments and Responses to Questions:

CC-1 (GHG Inventories, Forecasting, Reporting, and Registry) – David Thornton noted that MN has joined *The Climate Registry*. There will be an information session at end of October or early November on the *The Climate Registry*.

A MCCAG member noted that there will likely be a lot of information on reporting requirements from a cap and trade program. While it is important to be aware that reporting is driven by policy, there is also the reality that MN could find some holes in the reporting requirements and take on itself a more thorough approach.

CC-2 (Statewide GHG Reduction Goals and Targets) – Work on this option is on hold until the quantification results for the priority policy options being analyzed by the other sectors become available. The emission reductions associated with all of the priority policy options will then be considered to support the development of this option.

CC-3 (State and Local Government GHG Emissions (Lead-by-Example)) – No comments

CC-4 (Public Education and Outreach) – Questions arose about during what phase of development of education fits in and what are the subject matters. For example, the need for general education on idle reductions was raised. The idea of outreach to alternative schools in addition to public schools was suggested.

CC-5 (Tax and Cap Policies) – This option is being moved to the new Cap and Trade TWG.

CC-7 (Participate in Regional and Multi-State GHG Reduction Efforts) – Ken noted that the TWG is looking at Western States, which have several initiatives, and the Northeast Governors' Regional Greenhouse Gas Initiative (RGGI), which is the furthest along.

CC-8 (Encourage the Creation of a Business-Oriented Organization to Share Information and Strategies, Recognize successes, and Support Aggressive GHG Reduction Goals) – No comments

CC-9 (Dedicate Greater Public Investment to Climate Data and Analysis) – A question was raised about whether this option missed looking at the climate impact associated with new development. Ken pointed out that this can be included in this option or included in CC-3 (other states have addressed this issue under an option similar to CC-3 – lead-by-example). The consensus was this is a cross cutting issue, and it will be part of this analysis.

CC-10 (Facilitate the Development of an Effective Carbon Credit System for MN) – This could include other sectors that are harder to get at than electric generators and major industrial sources. Ken suggested we continue it here and see if new TWG wants to deal with it later.

CC-11 (Create a Market Advisory Group) – There was a recommendation to move this option to the Cap and Trade TWG. There were no objections.

Objections/Modifications from the MCCAG:

CC-1 – No Objections

CC-2 – No Objections

CC-3 – No Objections

CC-4 – No Objections

CC-5 – No Objections

CC-7 – No Objections

CC-8 – No Objections

CC-9 – No Objections, but with modification to address potential effects of new development on climate change.

CC-10 – No Objections

CC-11 – Recommendation to move CC 11 to new Cap and Trade TWG. No Objections

6. Review and Discussion of the Draft Minnesota Inventory and Forecast

The next steps for improving the draft inventory and forecast include the following:

- The forecast will be extended to 2025 to comport with the goals in the Next Generation Energy Act of 2007.
- The TWGs will be reviewing the methods, data sources, and assumptions to develop recommendations to the MCCAG for updating the inventory and forecast. The recommended updates will be implemented if approved by the MCCAG. The TWGs should develop its recommendations for presentation at the next MCCAG meeting. The TWGs will need to develop recommendations for addressing emission reductions associated with existing actions in MN as well as the requirements of the Next Generation Energy Act of 2007 in the inventory and forecast. It was noted that emission reductions associated with requirements of the existing actions and the Next Generation Energy Act of 2007 may be estimated as wedges relative to the baseline inventory and forecast representing business-as-usual (“upper jaw of the alligator”).

7. Next Steps for MCCAG and TWGs

Ken Colburn reviewed the next steps that the MCCAG and the TWGs. For the MCCAG, final consideration of the priority policy options will begin at the next meeting on November 8, 2007. At that time the MCCAG will be asked to identify an initial set of options as final recommendations that do not have objections. Remaining (not yet fully approved) options will be the subject of the final MCCAG meeting.

The MCCAG agreed to add a meeting to the schedule. The sixth meeting will be moved to December 5 and the date for the final meeting (currently scheduled for January 10) may be moved to later in January. Addition of the meeting in December will provide further opportunity for the MCCAG to review the quantification of the priority policy options.

8. Agenda, Time, and Date for Next Meetings

The next MCCAG meeting will be held on November 8, 2007 in a location to be announced. The agenda will include review and consideration for approval of the draft policy options prepared by the TWGs and the TWG's recommended updates to the draft inventory and forecast.

The sixth meeting will be held December 5, 2007 (rather than in January) in a location to be announced. This is an addition of a meeting rather than a change to the final meeting which will be held in January.

David Thornton closed the meeting by thanking the MCCAG members for their time and talents.

Attachment

Members of the Public Attending MCCAG Meeting #4
St. Paul, Minnesota
September 27, 2007

Name	Company
Bailly, John	GMHF
Birgen, Deb	MRES
Blankenship, Jeanette	EQB
Carninal, Doug	D. Carninal
Chelseth, Andrew	A. Chelseth
DiMano, Theresa	Dakota County
Fujii, Stacey	GRE
Geier, Tom	3M
Haincult, Tony	Hennepin County
Hamun, Jake	Cargill
Hemphill, Stephanie	MPR
Hinderman, Jerry	
Jorovsky, Don	Sen Ellen Anderson's Office
Kenow, Rebecca	FHR
MacLaury, Kyle	MN CEE
Magnuson, Gina	St Gerad's Env Stewardship Comm.
McBeth, Daryn	MN Ag Council
Micheleth, Kathi	Excelsior Energy
Newmark, Richard	
Oxley, Greg	MN Municipal Utilities Association
Pasko, Brian	Sierra Club
Pomroy, Andy	MN House
Reinhardt, Jay	FHR
Roth, Mary Jo	CRE
Skoog, Carin	Fresh Energy
Smith, Brett	Sierra Club
Sullivan, Joe	