



North Carolina
Climate Action Plan Advisory Group

WWW.NCCLIMATECHANGE.US

To: Technical Work Group (TWG) members of the North Carolina Climate Action Planning Advisory Group (CAPAG)

From: The Center for Climate Strategies (CCS)

CC: North Carolina Department of Environment and Natural Resources (DENR)

Re: Evaluation of Potential Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Mitigation Options – Guidance for Coordination with States and Consideration of Additional Issues

Date: July 31, 2006

During its May 23, 2006 meeting, the CAPAG requested that the Cross Cutting Issues Technical Work Group (CC TWG) discuss and suggest an approach for addressing two process issues during the evaluation of options. These issues were: (1) coordination with other states, and (2) terminology for characterizing non-GHG impacts. This memo provides guidance to the TWGs concerning these issues. This guidance is based on discussions held by the CC TWG as well as conferral between NCDENR/DAQ and CCS staff. Note that this guidance is provided within the framework of the overall CAPAG process and should not delay progress in the evaluation of priority options in the TWGs.

Coordination with Other States: Some options selected as priorities may require or benefit from coordination with other states. In such cases, interstate coordination issues and opportunities should be identified and considered in the course of fleshing out the implementation mechanisms of the individual priority options (i.e., after the TWGs have selected, and the CAPAG has approved, priority options). In its September 2005 Clean Smokestacks Act report, DAQ recommended coordinating climate actions with other states whenever possible, so TWGs are encouraged to keep regional coordination in mind in the selection and development of priority mitigation options.

Terminology for the Evaluation of Non-GHG Options: The CAPAG requested additional discussion and potential modification of the terms “indirect” and “ancillary” with respect to considering non-GHG impacts associated with mitigation options (once the TWGs have selected, and the CAPAG has approved, priority mitigation options). “Indirect” impacts and other technical terms are outlined and defined in the CCS memo, *Methods for quantification of draft greenhouse gas (GHG) mitigation option benefits and costs*, distributed at the May 23, 2006 CAPAG meeting regarding quantification of potential mitigation options. This memo is also posted on the project website at: www.ncclimatechange.us.

The term "ancillary issues," also known as "non-GHG issues," should be referred to as "additional issues" hereafter in the catalog and on the template that will be used to flesh out selected priority mitigation options. For example, human health and social issues, environmental and natural resource issues including those related to sustainability, etc. can be applied to the catalog column denoting "ancillary and feasibility issues" (to be revised to "additional issues") and or the column for "special notes." The following list provides examples of "additional issues" that TWGs may wish to consider. This list is not intended to be exhaustive; it merely provides examples of potential additional issues that TWG members may consider during the options evaluation process.

Examples of Additional Issues

- **Human and Social Issues**
 - Environmental Justice
 - Cultural Responsibility and Heritage
 - Livable Communities
 - Environmental Health
 - Human Health

 - **Environmental and Natural Resource Issues**
 - Sustainability
 - Water Quality
 - Water Quantity
 - Air Quality
 - Solid Waste
 - Hazardous Waste
 - Visual Impacts
 - Wildlife and Vegetative Impacts
 - Disease Vectors & Control

 - **Economic Issues**
 - Distributional Impacts
 - Impacts to the North Carolina Economy
 - Impacts to the Regional Economy
 - Energy Prices

 - **Other Issues**
 - Political and Regulatory
-