

Climate Leaders Partner Meeting Notes, October 5-6, 2004

Farmington, Connecticut

The following is a summary of the EPA Climate Leaders Workshop. We have attempted to capture the presentations, questions, and comments. Presentation slides are available on the Climate Leaders website (www.epa.gov/climateleaders). The following is not a recorded transcript.

Tuesday, October 5th, 2004

Overview of Agenda and Climate Leaders Update, Cynthia Cummis, U.S. EPA

Of the 58 partners, 27 have announced the GHG reduction targets. The program design has been finalized, and all cross-sector protocols have been finalized, as well as waste landfilling. EPA is currently working with WRI and specific sectors to finalize additional sector specific protocols.

The reporting requirements have also been finalized. Some onsite IMP reviews have been conducted.

Various efforts have been in place to document Partner's success. The public service announcement (PSA) was placed in six magazines from March-July 2004. A new PSA campaign may be started next year. Case studies are being developed; 2 sets are completed. A new Carbon Copy newsletter, "Featuring Clean Energy" was completed. There will also be additional information on Partners' efforts on the EPA Climate Leaders website, as Partners offer information for presentation. Technical papers will also be developed for trade publications; a media firm is now part of the team, and will help in this regard.

Update on Corporate Climate Change Activities

European Union Emissions Trading Scheme Update: Denny Ellerman, Massachusetts Institute of Technology

Notes on comments not captured in presentation materials:

This will be first large-scale mandatory CO₂ cap and trade system in the world, and the largest trading scheme, as well. It is part of the EU implementation of the Kyoto Protocol. It applies to electrical utilities and large stationary sources (app. 45% of emissions). There is a two-phase implementation (2005-2007 is the preparatory period, and 2008-2012 is the first commitment period).

Question: Will US companies be able to sell into that system, and what is the impact of Russia's ratification on the global environment?

No, US cannot sell into the system (currently). Russian ratification is a political event – would create and shape the future with respect to the Kyoto protocol. Could complicate the US coming in. The immediate environmental effect would be zero.

Questions: Some say there is not enough guidance available for companies to calculate emissions, which would not result in an apples-to-apples comparisons. Comments?

The first period will be a legally important period to work this out, and it will be a Herculean task. The commission is aware of this problem, and the first period (2005-2007) is designed just to work this out before the second “real-time” period (expected to be worked out by 2008).

World Economic Forum International Greenhouse Gas Registry Update: *Robert Casamento, Deloitte & Touche LLP*

Notes on comments not captured in presentation materials:

The WEF brings together politicians, NGOs, and corporations (CEO level) to discuss issues from a global perspective every year.

Cross recognition is accepted; companies can provide data that has already been submitted to and accepted by another program (i.e. Climate Leaders). Concluded discussions with Climate Leaders and CA registry, and are the final stages with CCX. For example, the data submitted to Climate Leaders is already consistent with the requirement of the Global GHG Register. However, WEF Partners would need to also provide data from operations in jurisdictions not included in the Climate Leaders program, and verification under Climate Leaders is sufficient, provided that it covers 75% (by volume) of the company’s global GHG emissions.

Question: Where are some of the areas of data and baseline contention at this point, from a technical standpoint?

Key issues include boundaries around emissions reductions (corporate or wider), additionality, cash flow, what gases to include/exclude (currently all six Kyoto gases need to be included), and minimal verification requirements. The next few workshops will focus on these key issues.

Question: Are you looking for companies to consolidate emissions numbers in the same manner as for financial reporting? How will outsourcing be taken into account?

The basis for the accounting is the WRI/WBCSD protocol (a choice between equity share vs. operational control), which will dictate how emissions are reported. Once a company decides which method to use, they will disclose it to their shareholders. In relation to financial reporting, the International Accounting Standards Board issued guidance on accounting. Once a company gets allowances, they have a new asset on their balance sheet that will be offset as liabilities emerge.

Northeast Regional Greenhouse Gas Initiative (RGGI) Update: *Franz Litz, New York Department of Environmental Conservation*

Presentation materials not provided at the meeting.

Website (www.rggi.org).

The goal of RGGI is to design a regional cap-and-trade program initially covering CO₂ emissions from power plants by May 2005. There are 9 participating northeast/mid-Atlantic states (ME, NH, VT, NY, MA, CT, NJ, DE, and RI). Others include PA and DC.

Statistics on this area- 3rd largest world economy, represents 14% of US GHG emissions and 3.2% of world emissions

The most aggressive state reduction targets: 5% below 1990 levels by 2010, 10% below by 2020, lead by example measures- state government to reduce energy consumption, among others.

RGGI progress to date includes stakeholder process, technical groundwork (energy modeling, economic modeling, and data assembly), a resource panel (WRI, RFF, and Pew, among others), policy consultation and decision making (applicability, internal flexibility mechanisms, offset credits – external to cap, regional greenhouse gas registry, and model rule drafting.

Can accept currency in the RGGI market from the EU program.

RGGI home stretch to show that an extension of the NO_x emission trading program to a CO₂ emission trading program in the US can be successful – will include a completion of the modeling, determine GHG cap size and mechanics, determine state budgets and allocation questions, etc.

Question: Have all states agreed to implement the design that you have come up with?

There will be various process endpoints (the first is in 2005 with release of model legislation). They are keeping the door open during individual states' public rulemaking process. Individual state proposals originating from the public rulemaking process could lead to changes that other states may object to. May lead to small variations state by state.

Question: Is there is a community that is doing outreach to corporations (including recruiting to Climate Leaders), and secondly, there are so many people in New England that have no idea of the leadership on Climate Change in this region – why isn't education a part of the process (general public)?

Governor Pataki made the choice to move to a mandatory program vs. a voluntary program; however we also recognize and commend all the early movers. They welcome suggestions for how to spur additional companies to join. Public education is a part of the process – a lot of time is being spent on this. Although a lot has been done, it is not surprising that some people do not currently know about RGGI. Maybe we need to do more.

Question: The RGGI program has been very good in cultivating corporate participation, however is interim information going to be provided to observers so that companies can move forward with the program?

Have to have a very good sense for “business as usual”, which is coming out of the model runs. The modeling effort needs the time for stakeholders to have input on every aspect of the modeling, which has slowed down the process a bit.

The Connection Between Climate Change and Corporate Social Responsibility, *Andrew Logan, Coalition for Environmentally Responsible Economies (CERES)*

Notes on comments not captured in presentation materials:

CERES is engaged with the heaviest-emitting sectors.

Recent investor actions on climate change include Global Warming Shareholder Campaign, environmental investing, CERES Investor-Electric Power Dialogue, SEC Climate Risk Campaign, client engagement with consultants and money managers, Carbon Disclosure Project, and building a global investor network on climate risk (linkages already with EU, Canada, UNEP-FI).

A lot of investor concern on climate change. 240 investors met at UN Headquarters in November 2003 (\$3 trillion represented), just to talk about how climate change will affect their business/financial assets.

Ten point checklist that outlines what steps companies can take to manage climate change, including board oversight, disclosure, taking action (targets), trading, etc. The checklist will be revised to add depth and report on audit findings will be published in a few months.

Question: Can you expand who represented the 240 investors?

Included 15 state treasurer pension funds from across the country, every major Wall Street Bank (i.e. Goldman Sachs), Wall Street clients, Fidelity, Vanguard, Merrill Lynch, JP Morgan, etc. Goldman Sachs indicated Climate Change is a key factor now in evaluating companies.

Question: If the SEC agrees to go ahead with disclosure requirements, what impact will it have on US companies?

The companies would have to disclose in their annual report how climate change will affect the companies’ bottom line, and what they are doing to manage those risks. If the company is an electric utility, auto manufacturer, etc., a more in-depth discussion will be needed. AEP’s annual report was a good example of a write-up on risks and how the company is managing them.

U.S. Department of Energy’s 1605(b) Voluntary GHG Registry Update: *Mark Friedrichs, U.S. Department of Energy*

Presentation materials not provided at the meeting.

1605(b) was established in 1994; have over 200 participants; a record of emissions inventories and emission reduction projects.

In February 2002, the President initiated a number of climate initiatives, including a reduction goal of US GHG emissions intensity by 18% (by 2012), challenged businesses to take action via Climate Leaders and Climate Vision, and a revision of 1605(b).

The revision process has included the establishment of interagency working groups, a public notice of inquiry (May 2002), and various workshops. DOE is close to re-issuing the General Guidelines.

The key objectives of the revised program include improving the accuracy, consistency, completeness, and transparency of emissions and emission reductions. Also includes providing a consistent framework for reporting, and have worked closely with Climate Leaders and other federal agencies to ensure a common framework, that a broad range of different entities can partake in (both large and small, across sectors).

Key elements of 1605(b) reports under the proposed guidelines include entity statements, annual reporting of complete emission inventories and complete assessments of net, entity-wide reductions. Offset reductions will be possible, and small emitters are exempted from entity-wide requirements. These revisions will accommodate many comments received (i.e. allowing reporting of non-U.S. emissions, consistency across programs, maintaining balance between flexibility and rigor).

The General and Technical Guidelines will likely be issued in November 2004, and will be in the Federal Register. Another public workshop will likely be held in the December 2004 timeframe. The intent is to issue the final guidelines by early 2005, and issue the new forms and instructions by Spring 2005.

Question: Is DOE looking at their own emissions inventory criteria, using the Climate Leaders protocol, etc? Can you comment on the reporting requirements?

Once the proposal is out, you will see a lot of commonality between the programs. We have tried to design an inventory process that is very rigorous, along with a rating system as far as which methods are the best to use to establish a complete, entity-wide inventory (i.e. with a high-level of reliability for the bulk of the emissions, and simpler methods for those sources that have a small footprint on the overall emissions). Also covering agricultural and forestry practices, which Climate Leaders does not cover (full-range of sequestration activities).

As far as reporting, the programs will be consistent, such that companies can meet the Climate Leaders reporting requirements and then report to 1605(b). Keep in mind that 1605(b) is a public reporting process that will be maintained in a public database.

Question: When the technical guidelines come out, will they include the guidelines for soils, etc. (in parallel with USDA)?

Yes, and workshops will be conducted just for these sectors.

Wrap-up of Corporate Climate Change Activities: *Vincent Camobreco, U.S. EPA*

ISO 14064 GHG accounting and verification standard– the USEPA was on the working group to help develop these standards. All three parts of the standards will be advanced from Committee Draft to Draft International Standard in early September. In addition, ISO has begun work on a new standard for verifying the verifiers.

There are various corporate GHG developments, both national (Climate Leaders, 1605(b), Climate VISION, Chicago Climate Exchange, State GHG registries - CA, NH, WI, New England, and State GHG reduction mandates (MA, NH, RGGI), and international (EU, Canada, and Japan emissions trading schemes, ISO process, WRI/WBCSD corporate and project GHG inventory protocols, and World Economic Forum GHG registry).

There are efforts within the Climate Leaders program to harmonize with other programs, for example using the WRI/WBCSD GHG Protocol (widely accepted, credible standard) adapting several sector-specific developed protocols, providing input to 1605(b) in an effort to harmonize, EPA is active in the ISO process, and EPA is coordinating with the Chicago Climate Exchange.

Site visits were then conducted at UTC and Pfizer.

Wednesday, October 6th, 2004

Welcome, *Ira Leighton, Deputy Regional Administrator, U.S. EPA New England*

The notion of U.S. EPA as simply a regulatory agency has passed with this and other collaborative networks/efforts to protect the environment. New England has the highest fuel costs in the nation and power plants emit a high percentage of GHG pollutants in New England. There are also concerns about the reliability of electricity and natural gas supply. Energy conservation and efficiency makes the most sense. 42 cities and towns in CT have developed climate protection programs (highest number of any other state in the country). The Performance Track program recognizes companies that develop environmental management systems (currently 35 companies).

Other examples:

- Fairfield, CT saved \$1M thanks to energy efficiency improvements at municipal buildings
- Bracton- Brightfields Initiative- redevelop brownfield properties and use innovative energy technologies
- Over 100 colleges and universities pledged to reduce energy usage- lighting changes, control system upgrades, and provide informational programs
- Regional industrial leaders include Shaw Supermarket, Raytheon, Interface

Climate Change in Connecticut, Jane Stahl, Deputy Commissioner, Connecticut Department of Environmental Protection

Presentation materials not provided at the meeting.

Connecticut has been a State that looks to the challenges that face it, and tries to accomplish all that they can to address issues with respect to environmental protection. Thanked Connecticut companies Pfizer, UTC, Unilever, and GE Transportation for their corporate responsibility and leadership.

Connecticut looked at many sectors, smart growth, and the broad range of actions to address, both in large and small parts, GHG reductions. Climate change cannot be sold on environmental benefits alone. They took this approach with the governor to discuss co-benefits, economic benefits in real financial terms, and corporate goodwill benefits, as environmental managers need to when talking with their corporate management.

The governor called for 20% of energy to be obtained from renewable sources by 2010, 50% by 2020, and 100% by 2050. This was sold to the governor because they were able to show that this can work, by the work done by UTC and other local companies. This will get them the equivalent of removing 45,000 cars from the road by 2020!

Connecticut is also establishing higher standards for heating/cooling systems, passed clean car legislation, engaged in aggressive demand/response programs, enhanced forest management, and are strengthening building codes and implementation to include greening.

A bit further out, the Connecticut Energy Advisory Board (CEAB), which has been recently reformed, will be creating preferential standards (will need corporations to help in reviewing these standards). They also have, and will continue to have strong brownfields and open space programs, resulting in smart growth, which is connected to the overall umbrella of climate change.

Information Sessions on other EPA Voluntary Programs

Kim Crossman, US EPA; Mark Buckley Staples; Don Neal, Calpine.

No additional notes to the presentation materials.

Question: What are common reasons folks may have not looked at CHP?

Kim replied that factors that make CHP successful has changed over the years, controls have changed, business cases are variable.

Don indicated there is a lot of hesitation on the part of hosts to enter into an agreement given uncertainty in fuel prices.

Question: Part of the reason why companies are reluctant for CHP is the price of natural gas. Don, can you discuss further?

Don indicated that Calpine uses more natural gas than any other company, they are concerned about price. Calpine supports establishment of LNG facilities around the country and promotes exploration of new sources. Still, it affects their ability to offer competitive price to customers. Depending on region of CHP, the price of natural gas can be a huge issue.

Kim added- don't see indications that price will decrease. Need to determine if electricity prices track with natural gas prices. Can the cost of electricity be offset with our own CHP system? Need to look at economics from all sides.

Question: Proper support from EPA but resistance from states. What is EPA doing to somehow provide an incentive (less permitting requirements or time) to replace old company boilers with respect to increasing efficiency using CHP?

Kim replied that is a function of the difference between federal and state processes. State basis- we are educating state entities on the benefits of CHP.

Question: How many tons of CO2 are actually saved?

Mark indicated it varies from location to location, he does not have actual numbers at hand.

Question- What's the average cost of Renewable Energy Credits (RECs)?

Mark does not know in general, and chose not to share the average cost paid by Staples.

Question: Describe the process for calculating emissions and reporting?

Mark indicated they use primarily utility bills and the EPA contractor is helping them calculate.

Question: Is your renewable energy all purchased from one company? Where are your operations?

Mark replied there are operations all over the world (not just in US), they have many suppliers

ENERGY STAR PROGRAM

Betsy Dutrow, U.S. EPA, EnergyStar Programs for Buildings & Industry

Comments not captured in presentation materials:

The object that bears the Energy Star logo means it is an energy efficient product (www.energystar.com). Based on the successful practices of over 1,600 major U.S. organizations.

The bottom line is that EnergyStar supplies the systems and information you need to make decisions and set goals. Work with EnergyStar now to meet your climate commitment!

Steve Schultz, 3M, Managing Energy is Good Business, 3M's Energy Management Partnership with Energy Star

Comments not captured in presentation materials:

In the energy management program, need to engage the plants (operations), engineering (during adding/remodeling – doing it right the first time with respect to energy management), sourcing (purchasing/suppliers), environmental (emissions and leveraging relationships within the company), and research and development.

3M has energy efficiency standards for electric motors, copiers, etc., and suppliers come into play in this arena.

3M has been contacted by key customers to learn from them and implement their best practices, making energy efficiency a competitive advantage for 3M.

3M was the “Partner of the Year” in 2004 under the EnergyStar program. 3M used the Energy Star guidelines to help manage their program – can even be extended beyond energy management.

Dave Chamberlain, Raytheon, Raytheon's Energy Star Partnership

Comments not captured in presentation materials:

The facilities leadership council (FLC) and the environmental, health, and safety (EHS) organization work as a partnership toward energy management, with an objective of reducing greenhouse gas emissions.

A big goal of Energy Star is to allow partners to benchmark facilities against themselves over time, as well as against best practices among others in the industry (i.e. workspace specific lighting, retrocommissioning/building remodeling). There are many ways to keep up with the competition.

Question: What do you feel about selling Energy Star programs to your investors (do you do that)?

Steve indicated that 3M has a sustainability website that is available to the public (including the Energy Star programs), and they have the EPA's approval to put the Energy Star logo on certain products.

Dave indicated their corporate EH&S group is looking into that. Nancy indicated that they got a questionnaire that they completed (had the 2 largest investors as signatories on it), which was a first in communication.

Betsy indicated that Kristen Zimmerman, GM, has gotten questions around this from their investors/shareholders.

EPA also does a regular e-mail to investment managers (top 300) on their awards distribution.

Question: What support is available for pharmaceutical labs through the Energy Star program?

Betsy indicated that they currently do not have a benchmark or rating system for laboratories, however they are working through this. Dave (Raytheon) indicated that they want to partner with sites similar to theirs (including pharmaceuticals with Labs 21), and highly encouraged participation in the Energy Star program.

Working With Suppliers to Reduce Greenhouse Gas Emissions: Chris Powell, United Technologies Corporation

Comments not captured in presentation materials:

UTC had a “head start” in retrieving data from the facilities; once they joined Climate Leaders, all they really had to do was present that data in a different form at the corporate level.

UTC is buying billions of dollars of equipment from their suppliers (have in excess of 100,000 different suppliers), therefore this is where the biggest impact could be with respect to air emissions and climate change. Needed to determine which suppliers make the most sense to target, since they couldn't target over 100,000 suppliers. UTC is currently in the process of narrowing down that list. They will be sending “encouragement letters” to these suppliers to encourage them to share in the vision of EH&S stewardship and to join the Climate Leaders program.

UTC also plans to share their other programs and tools with interested suppliers, such as their policy/goals, quarterly tracking system (minimal LOE involved), project tracking, energy assessments (over 40 plants audited, savings averaged 20%, over \$3 million in savings opportunities), awareness (lighting guidelines), training (regional and virtual), tools (“shut-it-off”, leak mitigation programs), and recognition/reward.

All staff at UTC are aware of and have bought off on the company's goals, and take pride in the recognition/reward program. The key is that it is also a global program. In summary, supplier partnerships are a win-win situation.

Question: What is the initial response from your suppliers?

So far, about 20% responded positively, and others have said they already have programs in place, etc. Although some indicate that they may already be managing GHG emissions, UTC recognizes that they need to do more by helping them recognize that they need to document their baselines, achievements, etc.

Cynthia encouraged other Partners to consider whether UTC's worth with suppliers can be a model for them. It will be discussed further in the breakout session today.

Breakout Groups: Brainstorming the Expansion of Climate Leaders

What additional recognition can this program provide to Partners (in addition to the PSA, workshops at Partner sites, etc.)?

Participants indicated a desire to target the following audiences:

- Investor community (Wall Street Journal, Dow Jones Sustainability Index, Innovest, etc.)
- Industry-specific audiences (Power Engineering Magazine, etc.)
- Insurance Underwriters and Analysts
- CSR Community (Ethical Corporation Magazine, Green Business)
- Local Press
- TV Ads (suggestions included the History Channel, Public Access Stations, the Weather Channel)

Comments on the Climate Leaders PSA Campaign:

- General positive feedback on the PSA
- Desire to include partners who haven't yet set goals in some way
- Provide advance notice to the Partners regarding where and when the PSA will be placed
- Continue sending a copy of the PSA to Partners for internal use
- Continue publication in the types of magazines we have had the PSA placed
- Include Partner Company logos
- Tailor PSA to demonstrate that voluntary programs work. Include metrics on reductions

Other Ideas for Recognition

- Climate Leaders "stuff" – a coin, a flag, mugs, pens, a full page ad in the NY Times on Earth Day
- EPA should provide boiler plate language for general press releases which could be modified by Partners
- Desire for regional recognition with EPA regional offices and state environmental agencies
- Offer Climate leaders activities in conjunction with corporate Earth Day and/or other sustainability events
- Have the Administrator or other high-level officials visit select Partner sites
- Increase exposure to the website by making sure it comes up in more searches and links to Partner websites

- Tap into Partner's marketing resources by setting up a conference call between Partners' communications staff and EPA to brainstorm ideas
- Provide guidance on how Partners can use the Climate Leaders logo to show that they are part of the program. Some Partners have added information on their Climate Leaders Partnership to their annual environmental reports
- Recognition for Partners bringing in other Partners
- More regular meetings to exchange best practices, linkages to other programs such as EnergyStar.
- Reciprocity under EPA programs (i.e., if you join Climate Leaders you are automatically a part of x other programs)
- Continue to harmonize GHG requirements across federal programs

Has the IMP review and inventory desktop review provided useful feedback?

- Partners desire a sample IMP to help with the process
- Desire to keep flexibility of IMP to accommodate current company policies.
- Site visits provide a good opportunity to identify calculation/assumption mistakes
- Should be made clear that the IMP is really for internal use to the Partner.

Is there additional assistance that EPA could provide to help improve your GHG inventory management process? Clarification on reporting requirements needed?

- Flexibility is key as a number of issues such as third-party verification, other federal programs such as 1605(b) and other voluntary programs continue to evolve. Climate Leaders needs to stay ahead of the curve.
- Having contractors is the most valuable part of the assistance provided. Contractors help Partners understand what is required.
- Climate Leaders should develop fact sheets or hold a session to clarify the role of the contractors and how they help with the inventory data and IMPs.
- Climate Leaders should develop a checklist for EPA and/or contractors to review with Partners during the kick-off call and subsequent calls.
- Partners would like more clarification on third-party verification
- Suggest improvements to current documents regarding how to obtain data, get facilities to report, and educate employees on the importance of participating
- Might be helpful for Climate Leaders to develop materials to facilitate internal data collection
- Develop a table of inventory data needs and provide recommendations on sources where that information might be found
- EPA should develop fact sheets with most important talking points by industry sector and/or white papers on the GHG inventory management process

Regional Workshops/Peer Exchange

- Suggest coordinating with other programs' conferences (such as Energy Star monthly web conferences or BRT) rather than adding more conferences to the calendar.
- Have conference calls which are subject driven, like compressed air and partner experiences
- Forum for companies operating in both U.S. and Kyoto countries

- Industry Specific calls
- Add a half day session to already planned events
- Suggested topics: benchmarking, green power, RECs, offsets, goal-setting
- Would be useful to have a reference base of information provided by Climate Leaders (more user-friendly website)
- Partners agreed the Climate Leaders Partner Meetins are helpful

Are EPA contractors providing valuable assistance?

- All responded positively.

How can Climate Leader Partners help EPA recruit more partners and interact with suppliers?

- Look at supply chain models
- Some concern about ensuring the program does not get overloaded with companies
- Advertise the dollar value of technical assistance per partner
- The Administration should leverage the program
- Focus on organizations that deal with driving sustainability into supply chain
- Reach out to contractors and suppliers through letters, RFP specifications, face-to-face meetings
- Bring up Partnership at trade association meetings
- Advertise the harmonization between Climate Leaders and other programs.

How can EPA help Partners Justify their Joining Climate Leaders?

- Help develop the business case, as EnergyStar has done
- Develop a document showing the correlation between GHG reduction and Climate Leaders participation
- Present concrete cost savings through case studies and other documents
- Address data security/confidentiality concerns
- Develop a return on investment calculation tool for the Climate Leaders program

Partner Experiences with GHG Inventory Management Plans and Inventories

Heather Tansey, 3M and Adam Costanza, International Paper

Heather Tansey, 3M

No additional notes to the presentation materials.

Adam Costanza, International Paper

Comments not captured in presentation materials:

Encouraged Partners to contact either Adam or Karen Risse for additional information or help needed, so that they don't have to re-invent the wheel!

CLIMATE LEADERS

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

Question: pointed out that the IMP for 3M is very different from that of IPs, and stressed the value of the uniqueness. Asked Adam and Heather for suggestions for companies to create an IMP that works for their operations uniquely.

Adam: The most important thing is to determine what needs to be reported and go from there. Heather added that it is important to utilize the systems in place as much as possible, that the company has already bought-into.

Cynthia thanked everyone for being here for the workshop and for everyone's enthusiasm for the program. The next meeting will be back in Washington D.C. in 6 months or so (April-May 2005 timeframe), and the meeting after that will be at a Partner site. A press release was also just sent by EPA – a copy will be available on the website.