

**First ESSB 6001 Rule Stakeholder Meeting Notes**  
*SeaTac Airport, August 30, 2007, 9:00 am to 1:00 pm*

Following is the agenda that guided the group's discussion:

**Overall Goal of the Committee's Work:**

To provide input to the Department of Ecology (DOE) about issues, concerns and recommendations related to ESSB 6001. The input will inform the writing of rules that DOE will then propose for adoption.

**Overall Outcome:**

A report of stakeholder recommendations and noted concerns about how the rules will deal with:

- ◆ The implementation and enforcement of the Emission Performance Standard (EPS)
- ◆ Criteria for evaluating carbon sequestration plans
- ◆ An output-based methodology for calculating emissions of greenhouse gases (GHGs) for cogeneration facility.

**Today's Meeting Objectives:**

- ◆ Clarify the purpose, issues and expected outcomes of the group's work together;
- ◆ Clarify the roles of Committee members, DOE staff, the facilitator and to become acquainted with each other;
- ◆ Agree on meeting protocols;
- ◆ Identify and prioritize issues, and agree on topics for the Committee's next meeting; and
- ◆ Determine future meeting dates and times, and next steps.

<i>Time</i>	<i>Topic</i>
<b>9:00</b>	<b>Welcome, Context Setting</b>
<b>9:10</b>	<b>Overall Purpose, Agenda Review</b>
<b>9:20</b>	<b>Introductions – Who is here?</b>
<b>10:00</b>	<b>Roles</b>
<b>10:15</b>	<b>Our Meeting Protocols - Guidelines for Meetings</b>
<b>11:15</b>	<b>Break</b>
<b>11:30</b>	<b>Guidelines for Decision Making</b>
<b>12:15</b>	<b>Identification of Issues, Prioritization</b>
<b>12:45</b>	<b>Summary, Next Meeting(s)</b>
<b>1:00</b>	<b>Adjourn</b>

***Welcome, Context Setting***

Tom Todd from the Department of Ecology gave us a brief history of ESSB 6001 and the tight timeline facing DOE.

***Introductions – Who is Here?*****Stakeholder Members Present:**

Dave Arbaugh, Marcia Baker, Don Brookhyser, Jessica Coven, Peter Contreras (for Thor Cutler), Kyle Davis, Carrie Dolwick, Keith Faretra, Liz Thomas (for Tom Krueger), Mo McBroom, Pete McGrail, Dave Norman, Chris Smith Towne, Rob Swedo, John Talbott, Mike Tribble, Tony Usibelli, and Dave Warren

**Staff Members Present:**

Tom Todd, Nancy Pritchett, Alan Newman, Tami Weiler.

**Facilitator:**

Debbie Rough-Mack

***Roles***

The group discussed what their expectations were for each of the following:

***Expectations for Facilitator***

- ◆ Allow discussion & move it forward, so that DOE can move
- ◆ Stick to agenda that was published
- ◆ Recognize when there may be an impasse, and we need to move
- ◆ Ensure that different opinions are recognized
- ◆ Topics identified on the agenda are the ones discussed
- ◆ Traffic cop
- ◆ (see other identified responsibilities in Meeting Guidelines section)

***Expectations for Department of Ecology staff***

- ◆ Tom Todd is Stakeholder meeting sponsor/primary decision-maker
- ◆ Nancy Pritchett is primary communication coordinator
- ◆ Will “get it done,” so that we can move process
- ◆ Publish drafted rule
- ◆ “Voice” at the table – Nancy Pritchett or John Stormon will represent DOE, depending on the issue

***Expectations for Meeting Participants (Invited Stakeholders)***

(The following questions were asked & answered about expectations for each other)

***1. How will we balance “air time”?***

1. Facilitator manager air time, takes “temperature” of group to assess whether we can move on

**2. Stick to an agenda/managing time well?**

2. Possible subcommittees if topic warrants; if we are not “done” with a topic, group assessment of what adjustment to do to other agenda items and timing.

**3. What will we do when distracting side conversations occur?**

3. Facilitator manages it

**4. What expectations do we have about our interactions with each other?**

4. Respectful of other opinions, listen; facilitator helps restate with collaborative language; ask questions if you don’t understand what someone is talking about; assume positive intent

**5. When will we meet? Times?**

5. The next meeting will be September 18, 9:00 to 4:00 pm, probably at SeaTac. Future meetings are scheduled for October 2, October 23, November 13, and December 4, though the December 4 meeting will probably need to be rescheduled. Nancy will be in contact about alternative dates. We expect future meetings to be six hours in length, and will probably be held at either SeaTac or in Lacey. Specific details will be announced as they are determined.

The group reviewed a general plan for how participant can provide additional input once rules are drafted. (These are working dates.)

Scheduled Dates for Meeting Dates	Committee’s Input completes Issues Matrix for Topic	Rules are drafted & emailed to Committee	Committee feedback via email; revisions may be made	(Revised) rules published to Committee via email
Aug 30, 2007				
Sep 18, 2007	Topic A			
Oct 2, 2007	Topic B	Topic A		
Oct 23, 2007		Topic B	Topic A	
Nov 13, 2007			Topic B	Topic A
Dec 4, 2007				Topic B

**6. How firm are we regarding beginning and ending times?**

6. Start times are firm. Whatever end times the group agrees to ahead of time are firm.

**7. Attendance at meetings?**

7. Come when interested.

**8. *Allowing others to join the meeting discussion?***

8. Yes, subject to group's guidelines.

**9. *Will we allow members to send representatives in their absence?***

9. Alternates are OK and should be fully briefed.

**10. *What expectations do we have about preparation for meetings?***

10. Come prepared to discuss materials sent out (one week ahead). Nancy (DOE) is point person for coordinating details for meetings. Draft rules will be sent out via email by Nancy and feedback about those should be sent to Nancy via email (may not be revisited at meetings).

**11. *What should happen when we have to miss a meeting?***

11. Let Nancy know of your expected absence, send well-informed representative in your stead, read notes.

**12. *What shall we do when any of these things become a problem for us?***

12. Check in with group if there are problems or issues (participants raise issues if they arise). Tom & Debbie will propose alternatives for moving forward. DOE will be the decision maker as to when a topic's discussion needs to end.

**13. *How should conflict among Committee members be handled?***

13. Facilitator manages it.

**14. *How will information from these meetings be shared with other interested parties?***

14. Nancy will manage information and can provide it to any interested parties. Also much information is available on the DOE website.

**15. *Will we allow participation by phone?***

Phone participation is OK for listeners, but the listener will not be given a "voice" when we are gauging opinions. The group can decide to modify this depending on the circumstances.

***Guidelines for Making Recommendations***

(Language changed from agenda's listing this section as Guidelines for Decision Making)

**1. *How shall we discuss and consider alternative viewpoints?*****2. *How shall we make decisions?*****3. *Who gets a "voice?"***

1,2,3. The group decided they preferred the language of "gauging the group's temperature" instead of saying "vote". All participants will discuss the issues, and designated stakeholders may

suggest straw motions or proposals. The group will be asked for a visual gauge to illustrate where they stand on the proposal. Options for responding to the request for a visual gauge, and the reflected opinion:

- ◆ Thumb Up – I agree
- ◆ Thumb to the Side – I’m uncertain or don’t know
- ◆ Thumb Down – I disagree
- ◆ Thumbless – I abstain

For others’ understanding, participants may be asked to explain their visual response.

**4. How should we manage disagreements?**

4. See Expectations for Meeting Participants.

**5. What do we want to do about other interested parties who are not present?**

5. Representative “voice” is OK.

**6. What if you disagree with a decision the Committee has made? Do we want to have any guidelines about how we talk about the decisions or discussions of this group (outside of the meetings)?**

6. Be respectful!

**7. Use of discussion matrix**

7. Participants were shown a draft matrix that is intended to be a discussion guide so that DOE has an organized method of collecting data about concerns, potential recommendations, and where stakeholders are closest together and farthest apart (see below). Tom will be reviewing the draft matrix in your binder, and if appropriate, will send out a new one so that participants are prepared to discuss the group’s issues using the matrix as a discussion guide.

6001 Stakeholder Committee Issues Matrix – Fall 2007

The following matrix represents the main points of discussion and opinions shared at the Stakeholder Committee meetings.

Issue	What concerns are there (e.g. with current law)?	What approaches should be considered?	What is the reflected opinion (recommendation) of the committee?	What complicating factors (or minority opinions) are there?
<u>This is where major topic would be and any explanation needed</u>				
Subtopic				
Subtopic				

### ***Identification of Issues, Prioritization***

Participants received a document entitled Proposed Agenda Items for Discussion at the meeting. This document listed issues identified by Ecology staff for future discussion by the Committee and will be available on the rule website.

An additional issue was added to the list as #12:

- ◆ Upgrade/ownership change (WUTC or DOE or public power commissions?)

Since it was the first time participants had seen the Issues list, they didn't feel comfortable attempting to prioritize the issues right away. Debbie asked the group to select a topic for the next meeting's discussion. The group determined that they wanted to discuss Issue #8 (as below, except excluding the third question, in bold italic)

What does "permanent" and "safe, reliable, and permanent protection" mean, as they relate to geological and other sequestration?

How do you determine whether the sequestration or the plan for sequestration is providing safe, reliable, and permanent protection?

#### ***How do we address forms of sequestration other than geologic within the rule?***

Discuss sequestration plan criteria included in Sec. 5(11) of ESSB 6001.

Identify additional requirements that should be included in the rule, such as:

Specific criteria for Geologic Sequestration:

- Site Selection/Characterization standards,
- Environmental protection
- well construction
- required monitoring
- Closure/Post-Closure Requirements & Financial Assurance

### ***Actions, Next Steps***

Next meeting is September 18, 2007, location TBD. Issue # 8 (see above) will be discussed. Nancy will coordinate and notify participant of a number of resources for participants to prepare for the meeting, which may include:

- John Stormon's white paper (DOE website)
- New Mexico study?
- IPCC report
- Report from Union of Concerned Scientists

DOE (Tom?) will draft a straw proposal/outline of issues for discussion and will prepare and send out the outline and a matrix that we will use as a discussion guide at the September meeting. In addition, near the beginning of the meeting, we will devote 1 hour to a presentation from committee members Pete McGrail, Laboratory Fellow with Pacific Northwest National Laboratory and John Talbott, Project Manager for Big Sky Carbon Sequestration Partnership. There will be 35-45 minutes of presentation and 15 - 25 minutes of question & answer time (or thereabouts).

These notes are not intended to be all inclusive, but rather to share what the facilitator captured through group discussion and flipchart notations. Additional notes may be available.