

**CLIMATE CHANGE ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
DRAFT CONFERENCE CALL MEETING MINUTES  
December 14, 2012  
8:00 a.m. – 10:00 a.m.**

**MEMBERS/ALTERNATES PRESENT:**

Christina Simeone, Paul Roth, Robert Bear, George Ellis, Mark Hammond, Robert Graff, Darren Gill, J. Scott Roberts, Steve Krug, Paul Opiyo, Mike Winek

**MEMBERS/ALTERNATES ABSENT:**

Lauren Boles, Luke Brubaker, Sarah Hetzner, Greg Vitali, Ed Yancovich

**PA DEP AND COMMONWEALTH AGENCY STAFF:**

Joe Sherrick (DEP), Mark Brojakowski (DEP)

**WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS:**

Mr. Sherrick facilitated the meeting and welcomed everyone as they joined the call. Mr. Sherrick asked if there were any stakeholders or members of the public on the call, but none announced themselves. The specific purpose of the call was to discuss comments and possible edits to the remaining work plans of the Residential, Commercial and Industrial Subcommittee but without any formal actions requiring voting.

**WORK PLAN DISCUSSION:**

Mr. Krug walked the committee through discussions of the “Demand Side Management - Water” and “Industrial Natural Gas and Electricity BMPs” work plans that had not previously been discussed. Mr. Krug had to leave the call, so Mr. Sherrick reviewed the “Re-Light Pennsylvania” work plan that previously had only received cursory review and discussion. Mr. Sherrick then briefed the committee on changes to work plans that had been discussed at the November 29, 2012, committee meeting. Specific comments for each work plan follow.

**Demand Side Management – Water** – The statement in the work plan that concludes that most homeowners have water bills that exceed their electric bills was questioned and a citation was requested. There was a question about the 25% value for potable water conservation in the summary section with the listed goals that state a per-capita reduction of 20% in water use by 2020. If these values are not the same, a clarification was requested to avoid confusion. Included in the assumptions section is a value of 10,000 buildings in 2020 identified as undergoing irrigation retrofits annually. This value was requested to be verified and a citation was suggested. In addition to identifying and listing values for the assumptions used in the cost and GHG calculations, it was requested that additional text be included that would also include the emission rate. CCAC members noted that the implementation steps for this work plan need additional refinement to make them more clear.

**Industrial Natural Gas and Electricity BMPs** – The practicality of accounting for GHG savings being realized in 2013 was called into question, since the climate action plan would not be completed until mid-way through 2013. A few formatting comments were raised that also included errors in linkages to dates and data within the document (ex. 2009 – 2020 should read 2013 – 2020). It was requested that the ACEEE data, cited in the report for illustration purposes only, was not included in the quantifications for Table 3. It was also requested that citations for ACEEE be provided beneath each of the tables. It was suggested that there was some confusion in the discussion of how emission reductions are quantified. Reference to EPA’s e-GRID database was made and how they calculate emissions and/or emission reductions. Mr. Gill offered that the PUC could perform some sensitivity analysis. It was also noted that there is no discussion of financing the available measures suggested in the work plan, and a sensitivity analysis for various levels of penetration was suggested as well as a request to provide more transparency about cost calculations.

**Re-Light Pennsylvania** – It was requested that some analysis and statement as to how the federal standards for lights (incandescent bulbs only?) might impact the outcomes of this work plan. Within the data provided for assumptions and calculations, the values for the number of lamps replaced annually were called into question because it does not vary between 2013 and 2020. In addition to identifying and listing values for the assumptions used in the calculations, it was requested that additional text be included that would also include the emission rate. It was noted that the work plan does not contain any implementation steps.

**Building Commissioning** – There were very few comments on this revised draft, but it was requested that the data assumption for eligibility statistic for 68.9% of all commercial buildings be clarified as to what this actually means.

**Demand Side Management – Natural Gas** – Mr. Sherrick noted that all of the committee's comments were incorporated except for removal of the implementation step that new legislation modeled after Act 129 of 2008 be considered to achieve the reductions quantified in the plan. There was strong disagreement by several of the members with the department's exclusion of this recommended change in light of the committee's vote to specifically remove that implementation step and include an implementation step recommending that the PUC evaluate mechanisms to reduce natural gas demand. The role of the committee, particularly as it relates to drafting of the work plans, was discussed at length. At least one member suggested that the department did not have the authority to modify the document after the committee has taken action on it. Mr. Sherrick disagreed with that position and clarified that the role of the committee is to provide input into the many documents prepared by the department, that the department may or may not always agree with the committee, and that where disagreements occur, the department is not bound by the committee's recommendations. Mr. Sherrick added that the "Subcommittee Comments" section of the work plans will be broadened to also include committee comments as a means of capturing differences between committee recommendations and the department's decisions. Members then requested that further clarification of the role of the committee be added to the agenda for the January 8, 2013, meeting and that a member of DEP's senior management be present for that discussion. Mr. Sherrick noted this certainly can be an agenda item but couldn't guarantee that a senior member of management would be available. He also noted that Dean Van Orden, the Acting Bureau Director for Air Quality, attends all of the CCAC meetings but was not present on this call.

**NEXT STEPS:**

Prior to the conclusion of the conference call meeting, Mr. Sherrick stated that there will be an attempt to schedule at least one more conference call prior to the meeting on January 8, 2013, to discuss work plans. One or more members expressed a lack of interest in participating in future conference calls and called into question the value of holding additional calls. Mr. Sherrick replied that the department will continue to provide opportunities for the committee to discuss and comment on the work plans, and encouraged member participation in the calls.

**ADJOURN:**

The conference call ended at 9:55 a.m.