

CLIMATE CHANGE ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MEETING MINUTES
December 20, 2013
10:00 a.m. – 1:24 p.m.
2nd Floor Training Room
Rachel Carson State Office Building

MEMBERS/ALTERNATES PRESENT:

Rebecca Oyler, Christina Simeone (telephone), Robert Bear, Mark Hammond, Steve Krug, George Ellis, Rep. Greg Vitali/Sarah Clarke, Brooks Norris, Laureen Boles (telephone), Robert Graff (telephone), Darren Gill, J. Scott Roberts

MEMBERS/ALTERNATES ABSENT:

Ed Yankovich, Luke Brubaker, Paul Opiyo, J. Scott Roberts, Mike Winek

PROXY VOTING:

(none)

PA DEP AND COMMONWEALTH AGENCY STAFF:

Dean Van Orden (DEP), Mark Brojakowski (DEP), Hayley Book (DEP), Jessica Shirley (DEP), Vince Brisini (DEP), Marge Hughes (DEP, CAC), Bo Reilly (DEP)

MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC:

Marie Cusick (StateImpact/WITF), David Hess (Crisci Associates), Gina Myers (Buchanan, Ingersoll & Rooney), Karen Melton (Sierra Club)

MINUTES:

There were no minutes presented to the committee for approval at this meeting.

SPECIAL MEETING: (There was no action taken by the committee during this meeting; this narrative provides a summary of the discussions that took place during the meeting.)

The December 20, 2013, special meeting of the Climate Change Advisory Committee (CCAC) was called to order at 10:00 a.m. by Committee Vice-Chairperson Mark Hammond. Members and guests introduced themselves. With the seven members present and four attending by telephone, a quorum was established.

Mr. Brisini briefed the committee members on the purpose of the meeting, which was to provide the CCAC with an opportunity to submit comments on the final draft version of the Pennsylvania Climate Change Action Plan Update (Plan). The committee was asked if all of their edits to the final 11 work plans noted during the December 18, 2013, conference call had been incorporated into the work plans. The committee had no remarks on the edits except for Mr. Graff, who responded that he did not have time to review the work plans.

Mr. Hammond opened the floor for discussion, suggesting that the committee start with page one of the draft Plan and go page by page through the document. Rep. Vitali opened the discussion with his comments to the Plan in general. (See attached comments from Rep. Vitali.)

Rep. Vitali's comments focused on the lack of a clearly defined greenhouse gas (GHG) reduction goal, the absence of alternative energy programs, and lack of an annual emissions inventory. He stated that it is necessary for any plan to have a goal, and the lack of a clear-cut reduction goal is no help to legislators and policymakers.

Mr. Brisini responded to Rep. Vitali's comments by stating that the Department believes that all of the requirements of the Pennsylvania Climate Change Act, Act 70 of 2008, (Act) have been addressed in this Plan update. Mr. Brisini also stated that he appreciates Rep. Vitali's perspective on what a plan should include, but the Department believes that the Plan is completely consistent with the Act. Mr. Hammond also commented that the Act does not require a specific reduction goal and that it was too late to be discussing this at this late juncture. He said that he has been to every CCAC meeting over the past four years and this is the first time that the subject of a goal has been brought up. In addition, he stated that the comments about the absence of alternative energy work plans are not true and that the committee has done its job of offering advice on alternative energy in the work plans. In addition, concerning the reduction goal in the 2009 Plan, Mr. Ellis stated that the 30 percent reduction goal in the 2009 Plan was controversial, was not a specific target and eventually was included in the report with carefully worded language to justify it. Mr. Hammond stated that the discussion on this topic was thorough, and he suggested moving on. He offered a final comment that he was very pleased with the work of the committee on preparing better work plans than in the 2009 Plan, stating that the work plans provide better advice to policymakers and legislators.

OTHER COMMITTEE COMMENTS ON THE PLAN:

Executive Summary: Minor editorial comments and word phrasing.

Chp.1: Previous comments of conference call were addressed; no further comments.

Chp.2: Mr. Krug had questions/comments on the cost effectiveness of coal and natural gas and on well sites and Exemption 38; his comments and questions were addressed by Mr. Brisini, Mr. Hammond and Ms. Shirley. There was also a comment about the AEPS not being mentioned in Chapter 4 as noted in this chapter write-up. All the comments will be addressed and added to the Plan.

Chp.3: Rep. Vitali once again commented on the data used in the inventory and the source of the data. He feels that the requirements of Act 70 cannot be met using 2010 EPA data. His concerns were addressed by Mr. Brisini and Mr. Brojakowski. Mr. Hammond commented that the data used to prepare the inventory provided in the 2009 Plan was 2005 data and that it is important to use the same methodology in establishing the GHG inventory. He gave an example of how data was different with landfill gas reporting using the EPA method and the PA AIMS accounting, even though emissions had not changed. Mr. Vitali commented that, according to the inventory tables, Pennsylvania was not accomplishing a goal of 30% GHG reduction by 2020, and he would like to see a graph as to where the emissions are and where they should be to attain the goal. Mr. Brisini explained again that Act 70 does not require an emissions goal and that there was no reduction goal established in this report. Mr. Roberts asked why Figures 3.1 and E1, which are both tables of inventory emissions, are presented differently. Mr. Brojakowski explained that the data is the same, but it is not expanded in E1 and fewer categories are

listed. A key will be provided in the final version identifying what sources are incorporated into each category. All of the comments noted on the conference call had been incorporated into Chapter 3.

There were no further major comments on this chapter.

Chp.4: Mr. Vitali had a comment on a statement about the support of the AEPS in this section. Confusion about what was intended to be said about supporting or not supporting AEPS will be eliminated. Other than minor editorial comments, no other major comments were introduced by the committee. All of the comments noted on the conference call had been incorporated into Chapter 4.

Chp.5: No other comments were noted in this chapter. Mr. Hammond pointed out that a footnote was added to clarify that the committee did not review the Macroeconomic Analysis.

Chp.6: Mr. Hammond commented that the statement in the beginning of the chapter that the CCAC was consulted about the legislative recommendations is not true and should be edited. The statement was edited in the final version of the Plan. There were comments made by Rep. Vitali and Ms. Simeone about specific recommendations and how they were developed. The comments were on recommendations 1, 7 and 9. Mr. Brisini responded to the committee comments and said that the appropriate edits, where applicable, will be made. Mr. Hammond suggested that it should be noted that further recommendations are also noted in the individual work plans.

COMMENTS ON THE 11 WORK PLANS VOTED ON AT THE DECEMBER 13, 2013, MEETING:

Mr. Brisini and Mr. Hammond explained to the committee the purpose of reviewing these work plans. It is the Department's desire to ensure that all of the comments of the committee that were submitted at the December 13, 2013, meeting have been incorporated into the final versions of the work plans.

Reducing Methane Leakage from Natural Gas Infrastructure – no further comments were received other than minor editorial/typo corrections.

Enhanced Municipal Solid Waste (MSW) Beneficial Use – no further comments.

Demand-Side-Management (Water) - no further comments.

Industrial Electric Best Management Practices - no further comments.

Heating Oil Conservation and Fuel Switching - no further comments.

Improved Efficiency at Wastewater Treatment Facilities - no further comments.

Cutting Emissions from Freight Transportation – (not addressed at this meeting).

Demand-Side-Management (Natural Gas) - no further comments, it will be noted that this is not the Plan on which the committee voted.

APPENDICES:

Appendix A- Act 70, skipped.

Appendix B - Voting record and committee membership information, no comments.

Appendix C - Action Plan individual work plans, comments already addressed.

Appendix D - Macroeconomic Assessment, the committee did not comment on the assessment.

Appendix E – Greenhouse Gas Inventory, no further comments.

In other discussion, Ms. Simeone stated that she had submitted comments to the Department that were not incorporated into the individual work plan comment section; she was asked to resubmit them for inclusion. Ms. Simeone also had questions concerning work plans that did not require action by the committee, in particular the AEPS work plan. Mr. Brisini and Ms. Shirley addressed this question stating that the spirit of the AEPS work plan was captured in the write-ups for Chapters 2 and 4.

In addition, during this meeting a discussion ensued about the identification of commentators to the individual work plans and the Plan in general. It was decided that the default for identification would be no identification of the author unless otherwise specified.

PUBLIC COMMENT(S):

Ms. Melton of the Sierra Club read a written statement. (See attached statement.)

ADJOURNMENT:

A motion to adjourn was made by Mr. Ellis and seconded. The motion carried.

Ms. Melton's Comments

Statement to the DEP Advisory Committee on Climate Change **December 20, 2013**

My name is Karen Melton from Philadelphia and I am speaking today as a member of the Sierra Club in response to the Draft Report on Climate Change.

A few high level comments today, with more specific feedback forthcoming.

- Since it does not contain actual targets for carbon pollution reductions, it does not really constitute an actionable or measurable plan.
- The report ignores the most obvious method for reducing carbon pollution which is ramping up renewable energy. Although recognizing that the Alternative Energy Portfolio Standard (AEPS) has played a role, it does not propose an increase in these standards. Likewise, it is silent on the potential to reduce emissions by ramping up successful and cost-effective energy efficiency programs.
- The report focuses on natural gas, as if that in itself is a solution to global warming. Although switching from coal to gas does offer some immediate emissions reductions, long term it is still a fossil-fuel economy continuing to drive up global warming.
- The plan does not adequately address the issue of methane leakage, nor try to quantify the impacts of increased natural gas use on methane leakage, despite acknowledging that accounting for life cycle emissions is important.
- The report recommends making new incinerators eligible for AEPS credits. This would actually increase emissions by allowing polluting incinerators to displace emission-free sources of energy such as wind, solar, and low-impact hydro.

I would also like to make a comment as a citizen. I believe because Pennsylvania emits approximately 1% of greenhouse gas emissions globally, and as the third highest emitter of greenhouse gases in the U.S., we have an enormous obligation to take significant actions to address climate change.

I am disappointed that the CCAC report makes it sound like Pennsylvania is doing a great job on this, citing AEPS, even though Pennsylvania's 8% Tier 1 target is significantly lower than those of surrounding states with Delaware targeting 25%; Maryland 20%; and New Jersey 22%; I am disappointed that you cite building efficiency improvements as a positive even while Pennsylvania is refusing to adopt the 2012 standards updates; but mostly I am disappointed that you do not appear to be taking advantage of the unique opportunity afforded by this advisory board to show leadership on climate change. You seem more concerned not to cause any controversy than with protecting our future.