



[www.sccclimatechange.us](http://www.sccclimatechange.us)

**MEETING SUMMARY**  
**SOUTH CAROLINA CLIMATE, ENERGY AND COMMERCE ADVISORY**  
**COMMITTEE**

**Transportation and Land Use (TLU) Technical Work Group (TWG)**

Call #1, May 29, 2007, 9:00 AM -10:30 AM

**Attendance:**

1. Technical Working Group members:  
Lanneau Siegling; David Smalls; Susan Richards; John Hartz; Brian Barnes; Dell Isham; Barry Beasley; John (Jack) Simon
2. Center for Climate Strategies (CCS) staff:  
Will Schroeer; Wendy Messenger
3. South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Control (DHEC)  
Michael Juras, Agency Liaison
4. South Carolina Agency Observers: None.
5. Public Attendees: None.

**Background documents:**

(all posted at [http://www.sccclimatechange.us/Transportation\\_Land\\_Use.cfm](http://www.sccclimatechange.us/Transportation_Land_Use.cfm))

1. Meeting Notice and Agenda
2. PowerPoint for Teleconference
3. CC Draft Catalog of State Actions

**Discussion items and key issues:**

This was the first conference call of the TLU TWG.

Will Schroeer called the meeting to order, completed the roll call and reviewed the agenda and plans for the call.

CCS provided an overview of the process:

- Purpose
  - Achievement of Executive Order 2007-04
- Goals
  - Review and approval of a current and comprehensive inventory and forecast of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions in South Carolina from 1990 to 2020;

- Development and recommendation of a comprehensive set of specific policy recommendations and associated analyses to reduce GHG emissions and enhance energy and economic policy in South Carolina by 2020 and beyond;
- Development and recommendation of a set of recommended statewide GHG reduction goals and targets for implementation of these actions; and
- Issuance of recommendations in the form of a final report to the Governor by March 2008.

The CECAC will rely on the TWGs to support them by making policy recommendations, but only the CECAC can act on those recommendations. The TWG aims to reach consensus on policy options to forward to the CECAG; if the group cannot agree, we will forward alternatives that the CECAC can choose between. The public has a role and can participate in meetings, and access to meeting materials is available through the website. This is a transparent process.

CCS has a three-fold role: CCS facilitates process; provides technical support as subject matter experts and provide resources for you to use; and also scores out and evaluates GHG potential impacts of policy options you consider, as well as cost and benefits.

SC DHEC can help seek out additional experts, though members were selected because of the important contribution than can make. As seen in the NC climate change process, the participation level makes an impact on the outcome and recommendations.

CCS provided an overview of all the TWGs supporting the CECAC. TLU has a wide range of policy options compared to the other groups because of the wide spectrum of issues, which is a challenge the group should be aware of.

Four cities within SC have signed the mayor's agreement:

Q. Have you integrated what the cities are doing at the state level?

A. No, trying to find state-wide policies. One of the things we'll need to pay attention to – look at any barriers the cities are running into at the state level that we could address and what the state can do to support these local efforts.

TWG process in assisting CECAC

- Begin with large catalog of potential policy options
- Narrow down TLU options to explore in more details
- Analyze briefly the potential impacts
- Develop policy option in more detail
- May eventual become part of CECAG report

The TWG will analyze options to 2020, but also “and beyond”, so we may look beyond that in broader thinking. The CECAC focuses more on political feasibility, and the technical work group should focus on more technical aspects. However, you don't want to waste time, but err on side of focusing on policy options, set ambitious goals and let CECAC decide on political feasibility. Political feasibility may change a year out when these are actually recommended out. Discussion around these issues also ensures public transparency as to why issues may not be implemented.

CCS went over expectations of TWG members and ground rules for the TWG:

- Supportive of the process
- Attendance at meetings
- Equal footing among members
- Stay current with information
- No backsliding
- Do not represent the CECAC or the TWG to the press, etc. (State staff will handle public outreach)
- Make objective contributions

Stepwise planning process:

(CECAC gives approval to continue to each step)

1. Develop inventory and forecast of emissions (completed)
2. Identify a full range of possible actions (in process)
3. Identify initial priorities for analysis (TWG narrows to 10 options)
4. Develop straw proposals
5. Quantify GHG reductions and costs/savings
6. Evaluate externalities, feasibility issues
7. Develop alternatives to address barriers
8. Aggregate results
9. Iterate to final agreements
10. Finalize and report recommendations

The TWG discussed the process of identifying priorities. CCS recommends narrowing the list initially through multi-voting of 10 options. The continued process of forwarding options to the CECAG will continue through discussion rather than strict voting.

TWG member suggested the group meet in person in the beginning phases of the process. CCS suggested that meeting face-to-face might be best served when dealing with harder issues. It is up to the TWG to decide the appropriate point.

CCS discussed the coverage of issues. Most TLU policy options will focus on CO<sub>2</sub>, but also some general discussion of carbon black. TWG member raised point that multi-state actions are very relevant for the TLU group.

Decision criteria for TWG:

- GHG Reduction Potential (MMTCO<sub>2</sub>e)
- Cost or Cost Saved Per Ton GHG Removed
- Co-benefits
- Feasibility Issues

These are not weighted or prioritized formally; members do this as they see fit.

CCS discussed the table that will organize the policy options, as well as the supporting text, which the TWG will be developing over the next year.

- Policy Description (Concept)

- Policy Design (Goals, Timing, Coverage)
- Implementation Methods
- Related Programs and Policies (BAU)
- Estimated GHG Savings and Costs Per MMTCO<sub>2e</sub>
  - Data Sources, Methods and Assumptions
  - Key Uncertainties
- Additional (non-GHG) Benefits and Costs, as Needed
- Feasibility Issues, if Needed
- Status Of Group Approval
- Level of Group Support
- Barriers to Consensus, if any

Final reports for AZ and NM, similar to this process, can be found online at:

<http://www.azclimatechange.us>

<http://www.nmclimatechange.us>

NC is also in progress:

<http://www.ncclimatechange.us>

**Discussion of SC preliminary draft inventory and forecast:**

Emissions inventory approach:

- Standard US EPA and UN methodologies, guidelines, and tools
- Emphasis on transparency, consistency, and significance
- Preference for South Carolina or regional data, where available
- Consumption and production-basis emissions from electricity generation
  - Very simplified approach used for initial analysis

The reference case for business as usual, which we will be using as the emissions baseline, means that SC implements the projects and policies already in the books.

CECAC does not necessarily assume the reductions from the TLU TWG in proportion to the TLU emissions contributions. They will decide the contributions necessary after reviewing the policy options presented.

Questions regarding “Ind.” of slide 29 – what specifically does that stand for?

**ACTION ITEM:** This is in reference to the fossil fuel industry that covers oil and gas extraction, processing, transmission, and distribution on the US graph. For SC, this category accounts for fugitive methane emission leaks from the transmission and distribution of natural gas. SC does not have any oil or gas extraction and processing operations.

The CECAC will defer to TWG on inventory and forecast. If you feel there are discrepancies, please contribute a recommendation for revision.

Transportation calculations

- Key Assumptions
  - Available VMT projections are accurate (statewide 2002-2020 = 2.0%/yr)

- Key Uncertainties
  - Future vehicle mix – based on national estimates
  - No data on future consumption of biofuels
  - Consumption of international bunker fuels in the aircraft sector

TWG member suggested CCS create a glossary to ensure members understand acronyms.

**ACTION ITEM:** The report for the draft inventory and forecast will provide a list of acronyms and abbreviations. The draft report is under development and should be available to the CECAC and TWGs before the end of June.

**Public Input:** None

Process of notifying public began with the Governor's announcement, as well as posting of information on the website.

**Next Meeting:**

- June 12, 2007 from 11:00 AM -12:30 PM  
Meeting to discuss catalog of policy options, as well as those that may be missing from the catalog.