

**CLIMATE CHANGE ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
MEETING MINUTES**

**December 14, 2021**

**9 a.m. – 12 p.m.**

**Rachel Carson State Office Building,  
and via WebEx**

**MEMBERS/ALTERNATES PRESENT:**

Chairperson Steve Krug	Kimberly Kipin-McDonald
Vice-Chairperson Marc Mondor	Patrick Henderson
Greg Czarnecki (for Cindy Dunn)	Luke Brubaker
Stephen McCarter	Cristy Sweeney (for Jaret Gibbons)
Robert Graff	Jason Kelso (for Gary Merritt)
Glendon King (for Representative Metcalfe)	Terry Bossert
Joe Sherrick (for Gladys Brown Dutrieuille)	Lindsay Baxter
Adam Walters (for Dennis Davin)	

**MEMBERS ABSENT:**

Zakia Elliot, Jim Felmler, Representative Sara Innamorato, Zachery Smith, Paul Morris, Alissa Burger

**PA DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION (DEP) STAFF:**

Kerry Campbell, Lindsay Byron, Dave Althoff, Darek Jagiela, Sarah Pinter, Andrew Hansrote, Robert Young, Lawrence Holley, Mark Hammond, Heidi Kunsch, Allen Landis, Stephen Hepler

**INVITED GUESTS:**

Bill DiCroce, Vicinity Energy

**MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC:**

John Bell, Haley Bova, Eli Brill, Benjamin Dannels, Gearoid Foley, Jim Freihaut, Megan Gahring, Rory Gaunt, Chad Heister, David Hess, Mike Krancer, Melissa Laffen, Linda Lohner, Josephine Martin, Melissa Muroff, Keith Naughton, Andrew Ritter Jr., Robert Routh, Curtis Schreffler, Brian Smiley, Bill Valentine, Erin Baker, Jaclyn Bliss, Sara DeMille, Jessica Hartley, Jeannie Morris

**MEETING:**

The December 14, 2021 meeting of the Climate Change Advisory Committee (CCAC) was called to order at 9:05 a.m. by Chairperson Steve Krug. With 11 of 21 seated members present at the start of the meeting, a quorum was established.

**MINUTES:**

The minutes of the October 26, 2021 CCAC meeting were presented to the committee for approval. A motion to approve the minutes was made by Mr. Sherrick and seconded by Mr. Graff. There were no requests to edit the minutes by any members. The motion to approve the minutes carried by a voice vote and passed.

**MEETING SUMMARY: (This narrative provides a summary of the discussions that took place during the meeting. It is not a transcript of the proceedings.)**

**DEP Food Waste Report Presentation**

Mr. Holley of DEP's Bureau of Waste Management and Mr. Young of DEP's Energy Programs Office gave a presentation on the Food Waste to Renewable Energy Assessment Report. Mr. Holley started the presentation by discussing the purpose of the report and its goals. Mr. Holley also talked about the EPA Food Recovery Hierarchy and the US Food Waste Management Pathways. Mr. Young continued the presentation, describing the scope of the Food Waste Assessment and the quantification methodology. He shared charts showing industrial, commercial, and institutional (ICI) food waste generation in Pennsylvania, along with key findings. He also discussed organics processors, covering anaerobic digestion (AD) and compost facilities currently processing ICI food waste, and their performance. He also described existing ICI food waste processing capacity and the capacity of AD facilities not currently processing food waste to upgrade operations. Mr. Young then discussed greenhouse gas emission reductions and energy generation through food waste processing. Mr. Holley concluded the presentation with recommendations and next steps.

Mr. Bell asked if there has been recent analysis on waste reduction programs, such as the PA Agricultural Surplus System. Mr. Holley replied that he was not sure who performed the analysis, but when the food infrastructure grants were implemented, work was done cooperatively with the PA Department of Agriculture. Mr. Young added that in working groups and webinars with partners around the country, the idea of maximizing existing agricultural output is a common theme and a significant challenge that other states face. Mr. Young identified it as a priority for source reduction, and emphasized the importance of using the existing food already being grown.

Mr. Mondor asked to what extent technology, mechanization, automation, and logistics are incorporated once food becomes food waste. Mr. Holley responded that when working with food banks and those supplying food, they identify the logistics around timing of pickups and method of transportation as a primary challenge, since most in-demand food products require refrigeration or freezing. The facilities identified that they were getting food from large generators, but they were limited in the amount that they could take, and emphasized that the recovery of edible food would be improved if they could pick it up on a regular schedule established by the producer. Often, larger entities provide transportation and logistical support for smaller units. Mr. Young added that case studies included in this report touch upon this subject. He also added that there is currently ongoing, innovative work in both the private and nonprofit sectors to address these challenges.

Mr. Graff asked if the report exclusively included edible food waste or if it also accounts for organic byproducts like processing waste. Mr. Young answered that all wastes are intermingled in the metrics, so it is not all edible food waste. Mr. Graff also asked what portion is edible food waste that could be used by food banks. Mr. Young answered they would need to review data at the individual facility level. Mr. Graff also asked what the slides on greenhouse gas reductions meant. Mr. Holley replied that they used the EPA Waste Reduction Model (WARM), which determines if the food is disposed of or diverted, and what it equates to in reductions to greenhouse gas emissions if otherwise managed by landfilling. Mr. Graff also asked how anaerobic digestion is better than methane recovered from landfills. Mr. Holley answered that the efficiency associated with a landfill is not comparable to anaerobic digestion.

Mr. Sherrick asked if each of the subject facilities that were included in the study were contacted

directly, or if the data used was available from other sources. Mr. Young answered that the data was all based on publicly-available information. Mr. Sherrick also asked why Allegheny County generated significantly more food waste than other counties. Mr. Young answered that he believed there is more food processing in Allegheny County compared to the rest of the state, but would need to review the data to confirm.

### **Vicinity Energy Presentation**

Mr. DiCroce of Vicinity Energy gave a presentation on Vicinity Energy's Decarbonization Plan. He started the presentation by describing how Vicinity district energy works. He then went into specific details on the Philadelphia district energy network. Mr. DiCroce discussed how Vicinity leverages existing infrastructure, new technologies and renewable energy sources to decarbonize the building-energy sector. He also shared Vicinity Energy's four pillars of their net zero carbon roadmap.

Mr. McCarter asked if Vicinity's infrastructure has been impacted by recent flooding. Mr. DiCroce answered that about ten years ago in the Baltimore area there was a surge up the Chesapeake Bay that caused some inundation lasting two tides. Vicinity also dealt with inundation in the Schuylkill River after Hurricane Ida. Vicinity plans to generally keep equipment above the floodplain moving forward.

Ms. Kunsch asked what policies need to change to enable electrification of the district energy system in Philadelphia, like the policies in Boston described by Mr. DiCroce. Mr. DiCroce answered that at the state level, the development permitting process should be improved.

Mr. Graff asked why the system burns 1-2% oil. Mr. DiCroce replied that comes from one of their older plants that is only used in the winter. Mr. Graff also asked what happens to the waste heat during the cooling season. Mr. DiCroce answered that the University of Pennsylvania uses steam in the summer with steam-driven chillers.

Mr. Mondor asked if there is a rule of thumb regarding development density for district energy and when it becomes feasible. Mr. DiCroce responded that there is not a policy directive and any campus will work, although developing district energy for residential areas is more difficult.

Mr. Sherrick asked if Vicinity is transitioning from natural gas and if so, are they are transiting to 100% LR100. Mr. DiCroce answered that first they are going to eliminate heating oil. Then, supplementing natural gas with LR100 depends on prices.

### **Public Comment(s)**

There were no public comments provided at this meeting.

### **DEP ZEV Rulemaking**

Mr. Hammond of DEP gave a presentation on DEP's proposed rulemaking to amend the Pennsylvania Clean Vehicles Program (PCV) and develop a Zero Emission Vehicle (ZEV) Program by incorporating the California Air Resource Board's ZEV Program. He started his presentation by describing the rulemaking's goals, and ZEV and low emission vehicles (LEV) requirements. He continued by discussing the status of LEV and ZEV states. Mr. Hammond provided background on the PCV Program as well as the proposed amendments. He also gave a summary of the environmental benefits, national ZEV trends, economic benefits, and social and economic effects of

the proposed rulemaking. He finished his presentation by providing the proposed rulemaking schedule.

Mr. Bossert asked whether the Build Back Better Bill, if passed, will change this rulemaking. Mr. Hammond answered that it will not, but the Bill promotes infrastructure for ZEVs.

Mr. Henderson commented that ZEVs should be called “zero tailpipe emission vehicles” because there are emissions associated with the electricity to power the vehicles. Mr. Hammond replied that Mr. Henderson is correct about electricity sector emissions, but that the widely-used definition “ZEV” only considers direct vehicle emissions. Mr. Henderson also asked if vehicles need to be titled and registered in Pennsylvania to receive a credit. Mr. Hammond answered that the credit goes to the state in which the dealer is located.

Mr. Graff asked if the rulemaking does not pass in this administration, whether a new administration would be able to continue the process, or need start completely over. Mr. Hammond answered that this regulatory process provides groundwork, but if the rulemaking does not pass that a new regulatory process would be necessary.

Mr. King asked if California is considering amending its rule and making changes to the existing program. Mr. Hammond replied that California is in the process of amending its program to enact new standards effective in 2026. Mr. King also asked how long would Pennsylvania have to update regulations, if enacted, should California amend its program. Mr. Hammond answered that the date would depend on when California requires compliance.

It was also asked how the current backlog and delay in ordering new vehicles factors into planning and expectations for this proposed rulemaking. Mr. Hammond answered that manufacturers would have greater incentive to deliver vehicles for sale in Pennsylvania due to the statutory requirements implemented by this proposed rulemaking should it be published as a final-form regulation.

### **2022 CCAC Meeting Plan and DEP Updates**

Ms. Byron of DEP went over meeting planning for 2022 including agenda outline and proposed themes. She also provided updates on DEP’s climate outreach efforts. Chairperson Krug then reviewed the CCAC bylaws.

### **New Business/Next Steps**

The next meeting is Tuesday, February 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2022 and will be held both in person in room 105 of the Rachel Carson State Office Building, and via WebEx.

### **Adjournment**

A motion to adjourn was made by Mr. Bossert and seconded by Mr. Sherrick. The motion carried, and the meeting was adjourned at 12:09 PM.