



[WWW.NMCLIMATECHANGE.US](http://WWW.NMCLIMATECHANGE.US)

**CROSS CUTTING ISSUES TECHNICAL WORK GROUP**

**DRAFT CONTRIBUTING ISSUES CHECKLIST**

**JULY 10, 2006**

THIS DOCUMENT WAS CONSTRUCTED IN KEEPING WITH A REQUEST OF THE CCAG AT ITS JANUARY 11, 2006 MEETING. THE CCAG ASKED THAT AN AD HOC GROUP DEVELOP A CHECKLIST OR OTHER MEANS BY WHICH TWGs COULD BE REMINDED OF IMPORTANT HUMAN, SOCIAL, ECONOMIC, ENVIRONMENTAL, AND OTHER FACTORS THAT SHOULD BE CONSIDERED WHEN EVALUATING GHG EMISSION REDUCTION STRATEGIES.

#	ISSUE	SUGGESTED DEFINITION OR DESCRIPTION	SUGGESTIONS FOR USE IN EVALUATING POLICY OPTIONS
<b><i>A. HUMAN AND SOCIAL ISSUES</i></b>			
1.	Environmental Justice	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “Affording all of its residents, including communities of color and low-income communities, fair treatment and meaningful involvement in the development, implementation, and enforcement of environmental laws, regulations, and policies regardless of race, color, ethnicity, religion, income or education level.”- EJ Executive Order</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would the policy option create disproportionate impact to any racial, ethnic, or socioeconomic group?</li> <li>• Would the policy option fairly treat and meaningfully involve all affected groups?</li> </ul>
2.	Cultural Responsibility and Heritage		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would the policy option be sensitive to how populations utilize the land and water.</li> </ul>

#	ISSUE	SUGGESTED DEFINITION OR DESCRIPTION	SUGGESTIONS FOR USE IN EVALUATING POLICY OPTIONS
3.	Livable Communities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Livable communities are those where local governments and community leaders are proactive in their land use and transportation planning, and adopt programs and policies that lead to more livable and resource-efficient land use patterns. They provide transportation alternatives, build safer streets, encourage routine physical activity, foster civic engagement, reduce infrastructure costs, create more affordable housing, improve air and water quality, preserve natural resources, conserve agricultural land and open space, and restore local economic and social vitality.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Would the policy option create undue social impacts, cumulative impacts, secondary impacts, nuisance impacts (e.g., noise, odor), impacts to cultural and traditional uses, or impacts to sacred sites?</li> <li>Would the policy option create impacts to vulnerable populations, such the ill, children and the elderly?</li> <li>Would the policy option affect known future land uses?</li> </ul>
4.	Environmental Health	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Environmental health comprises those aspects of human health, including quality of life, that are determined by interactions with physical, chemical, biological and social factors.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Would the policy option contribute negatively to cumulative health effects?</li> </ul>
5.	Precautionary Principle	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As a decision-making tool to select the alternative that presents the least potential threat to human health and ecosystems.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Would the policy option affect anticipatory actions to prevent harm?</li> <li>Would the policy option adequately adhere to transparency and right to know principles?</li> <li>Would the policy option reflect least harmful impacts on human health and the environment?</li> </ul>
6.	Human Health		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does the policy option increase risks to human health; if so, are they adequately addressed?</li> </ul>

#	ISSUE	SUGGESTED DEFINITION OR DESCRIPTION	SUGGESTIONS FOR USE IN EVALUATING POLICY OPTIONS
<b><i>B. Environmental Issues</i></b>			
7.	Water Quality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Contaminants levels and other properties acceptable for intended use (human consumption, industrial use, agriculture, recreation, and wildlife habitat)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does the policy option consider impacts to drinking water, surface water, and groundwater quality?</li> </ul>
8.	Water Quantity		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does the policy option avoid representations to new entrants that water is readily available?</li> </ul>
9.	Air Quality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concentrations of air contaminants that may affect human health and welfare (including scenic vistas and ecosystem effects)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does the policy option consider cumulative impacts to air pollutant concentrations and visibility?</li> </ul>
10.	Solid Waste	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Collection and environmentally safe disposal of discarded material</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does the policy option minimize landfill burdens, assist in recovery of waste energy and materials, and address improper disposal?</li> </ul>
11.	Hazardous Waste		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does the policy option have significant hazardous waste impacts; if so, are they adequately addressed?</li> </ul>
12.	Visual Impacts		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does the policy option create undue visual impacts?</li> </ul>
13.	Wildlife and Vegetative Impacts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Valued for biodiversity, recreational opportunities, watershed functions, sustainable supply of forest products and forage for livestock</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does the policy option consider impacts on ecosystem goods and services, and on potential ecosystem-related hazards such as wildfire?</li> </ul>
14.	Disease Vector Control		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does the policy option exacerbate known or potential disease vectors?</li> </ul>
<b><i>C. ECONOMIC ISSUES</i></b>			
15.	Distributional Impacts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No single part of any community should bear the brunt of environmental impacts.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Would the policy option create disproportionate economic impacts to any racial, ethnic, or socioeconomic group?</li> </ul>

#	ISSUE	SUGGESTED DEFINITION OR DESCRIPTION	SUGGESTIONS FOR USE IN EVALUATING POLICY OPTIONS
16.	Impacts to the New Mexico Economy		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would the policy option affect NM's GDP and NM's competitiveness and attractiveness to new business?</li> </ul>
17.	Impacts to the Regional Economy		
18.	Energy Prices		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would the policy option affect what consumers and businesses pay for energy in NM (i.e., rates times usage)?</li> </ul>
<b><i>D. OTHER ISSUES</i></b>			
19.	Energy Security		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would the policy option contribute to NM's energy security and stability?</li> </ul>
20.	Political and Regulatory		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does the policy option adequately consider political feasibility and differences in regulatory oversight?</li> </ul>