

MEMORANDUM

TO: Members of the Governor's Global Warming Task Force

FROM: Co-Chairs Tia Nelson and Roy Thilly

DATE: April 11, 2008

SUBJECT: *Work Plan in Process to Conclude our Assignment*

At our meeting on April 4, we discussed the Task Force Co-Chairs proposal on how we should proceed to complete our work. No objections were raised. This memo memorializes this proposal and provides clarification, so that all Task Force members are fully informed. Please note we will meet on April 25 as well as May 1.

1. **Template Clean-Up.** We have asked the PSC and DNR staff to review and edit all of our templates for grammar, consistency, etc., to eliminate unnecessary duplication and, where appropriate, to clarify the templates. They also will add a new section to each template that provides cross-references to other templates that address related issues. For instance, there is a policy proposal from the Conservation and Energy Efficiency work group that deals with efficiency standards for new boilers. The Industry work group has policy proposals that deal with existing boilers. In addition, proposed funding sources for policies will be placed in a separate new section. Where a source has not been identified, the editors will identify that fact and discuss with the work group co-chairs.

All proposed edits to templates will be redlined (formatting changes will not) and reviewed by the work group co-chairs to be sure that the changes are not, in fact, substantive and that they will not interfere with agreements that have been reached in resolving issues. Staff will proceed through the process by work group and will contact co-chairs as they begin to work on their templates. Staff will also work with the co-chairs to clarify the intended funding source(s) for the new section in each policy proposal. Finally, where ambiguities have been identified that are substantive, or staff believes that a particular policy can be streamlined or should be combined with another template because of overlap, they will consult with the co-chairs to resolve these issues. Co-chairs can expect to see 1) templates which have consistent formatting, 2) editing changes redlined for their review and approval and 3) substantive issues which require further review identified via Word's 'comment' feature. The object is to have all of the policy templates that are attached to our Final Report be as clear as possible, to avoid duplication and to combine proposals that are best considered as a unit. No changes will be made without vetting them with the work group co-chairs and the Task Force Co-Chairs. In addition, redlines of all changes will be posted on the Web for review by all Task Force members and the

public (The files will be included on the Policy Templates page, arranged by Work Group, in consolidated files, similar to the way that previous versions of policy templates have been archived). However, we will not schedule editing changes for discussion by the Task Force unless a Task Force member requests that a particular change be discussed by the full group.

2. **Work Plan.** We have asked the work group co-chairs to identify those policies, or portions of policies, as to which the work groups have had differences of opinion and not reached consensus. We will be scheduling these issues for discussion by the full Task Force over the next several meetings. The objective will be to explain the policy, or issue within a policy, as to which there are differences of opinion to be sure that everyone understands the policy, identify exactly what the differences are and the reasons for those differences, and explore what alternative resolutions may exist. We will work with the work group co-chairs to have these matters presented in an organized fashion, with an opportunity for questions and discussion by the Task Force. In some instances, we will invite a guest to provide additional information that may help our deliberations. For instance, in connection with the renewable energy portfolio issue, we have invited Manitoba Hydro to our April 17 meeting to explain exactly what new hydro projects are planned, the status of those projects, any participation by indigenous groups in the projects and the environmental issues that relate to the projects and how Manitoba intends to address them. There may be other policies, such as the nuclear moratorium, where some further explication of the facts may aid our discussions. We are open to suggestions in this regard from Task Force members. The object should be to get the facts on the table as clearly as possible. We will not structure these discussions as debates, but we do want to clearly identify where the differences are, the reasons supporting positions and to keep our focus as fact-based as possible.

In this regard, we ask that any Task Force member who will not be part of the formal presentation organized for a particular policy where differences exist, but who wishes an opportunity to present additional information to the Task Force in some detail, to notify the Task Force Co-chairs at least two days in advance of the meeting, so that they can appropriately organize the discussion. All Task Force members, of course, will be able to ask questions and express opinions in the discussion, so we are seeking advance notice only from those who would like to make a brief presentation on their position.

Also on April 17, we plan to present a list of all policy templates that have been posted, indicating those that will not be scheduled for discussion by the full Task Force because they have come forward on a consensus basis. We will ask any member of the Task Force who believes that we should discuss any of these policies, or any element of such a policy, to identify it for us not later than April 25.

Finally, at our meeting on April 4, a few new, possible policy recommendations were identified, with a request was made that the Task Force

consider them in light of the fact that our modeling results are likely to indicate that it will be quite difficult to reach any goals that the Task Force may set, without a very stringent cap-and-trade system. Some of these policies may not be controversial among Task Force members. An example may be water conservation measures that could have a significant impact on emissions, which the Energy Conservation and Efficiency work group did not discuss in detail, but recognizes that it should have. Others, such as changes to WEPA, may be quite controversial. We will discuss how we should handle these possible, additional policies, which were not fully vetted at the work groups level, on April 17 and make a final decision as to whether any will be scheduled for further review and, if so, how.

Accompanying this memo is the agenda for the April 17 meeting. At the bottom of the agenda is a brief description of the issues we currently intend to include on the April 25 and May 1 agendas for people's review, so that we can discuss these proposed agendas on April 17.

3. **Process for Decision.** We do not intend to ask for votes from the Task Force members on particular issues after they are presented during the next several meetings. Instead, we will ask people to reflect on the issues and to continue to think about ways in which differences can be resolved. After the presentations are completed, the Co-Chairs of the Task Force intend to present a strawman proposal that addresses all of the policy issues that the Task Force has discussed as a package. We believe that this will be a more productive way of reaching as much consensus as we can than proceeding issue by issue, since people are likely to be reluctant to resolve a particular issue without understanding how other issues will be resolved. The Co-Chair strawman proposal may include options for particular issues where we believe that there are several approaches that might be appropriate, or where the Co-Chairs themselves have a difference of opinion. We will discuss the Co-Chairs package, including goals, in May, with the objective to issue our Final Report in June.
4. **Modeling.** The significant concerns of TAG and others with modeling progress have been communicated to the top management of the modeling entities. We intend to continue to exert as much pressure as we can to get the best results possible for our deliberations in a timely fashion. However, we believe that we can and should continue to discuss issues without final numbers, since we will not be asking for votes or final positions until the modeling is complete. We all need to recognize that the modeling results, while important, will be indicative only, not definitive, and common sense and experience must guide our decisions.

In finalizing our work, the Co-Chairs will welcome any suggestions from members of the Task Force on ways to resolve their own concerns and those of other Task Force members, so that we can have as clear and unified set of recommendations as possible.

6. **Voting Procedures.** Members of the Task Force were carefully selected and appointed by the Governor as individuals. While we have permitted substitutes to

participate in our meetings because of scheduling constraints, we also have encouraged Task Force members to attend meetings themselves to the maximum extent possible. This is increasingly important as we move to conclusion. We very much appreciate the substantial time that people have devoted to this effort and recognize that it has been a more intensive process than many expected.

Final votes for the Task Force recommendations to the Governor should be cast by the members of the Task Force, not substitutes. Therefore, it will be quite important for Task Force members to attend the remainder of our meetings whenever possible. When final votes are taken, we will accept proxy votes on the Task Force's report, if the absence of a Task Force member is unavoidable. We wish to limit proxies to a minimum. If a Task Force member intends to dissent on any item in the Final Report, or to vote against the Report as a whole, we strongly urge that Task Force member attend in person to explain his or her position for consideration by the Task Force as a whole, so that if a resolution is possible through compromise, it can be reached. If it is not possible for such a member to attend, any substitute must have full authority to discuss and agree to a compromise, if one can be reached. Finally, we should note that a failure to be present may result in compromises that an absent member may wish he or she had been present to discuss.