



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

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

**Cross Cutting (CC) Issues Technical Work Group (TWG) Call #2**

June 13, 2007 – 9:30–11:00 AM

**Attendance:**

1. Technical Work Group Members:

- Lynn Barnes, Emissions Inventory Section Manager, South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Control (DHEC)
- Greg Carbone, Climate Scientist, University of South Carolina
- Braxton Davis, Director of Science and Policy, Office of Coastal Resources Management
- Kirstin Dow, Geography Professor, University of South Carolina
- Carol Ervin, Young, Clement, Rivers Law Firm
- Dr. Paul Gayes, Director, Center for Marine and Wetlands Studies, Coastal Carolina University
- Trish Jerman, Policy and Programs Manager, South Carolina Energy Office
- Hope Mizzell, Climatologist, South Carolina Department of Natural Resources
- Frank Powell, Environment Director, Furman University
- David Stoney, Citizen

2. Center for Climate Strategies (CCS) Staff:

- Ken Colburn – Co-facilitator
- Randy Strait– Co-facilitator
- Katie Pasko – TWG Assistant

3. South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Control (DHEC):

- Michael Juras – Agency Liaison

4. South Carolina Agency Observers

- Leslie Coolidge – DHEC

5. Public Attendees:

- None

6. Technical Work Group Members not attending:

- Jim Byrd, Deputy Director, Market Services Division, South Carolina Department of Insurance
- Elizabeth Hagood, Coastal Conservation League

- Rep. Bill Herbkersman, South Carolina House of Representatives
- Bion Howard, Principal Consultant, Building Environmental Science and Technology
- Dr. Marcus Newberry, Former Dean, Medical University of South Carolina (MUSC) College of Medicine

**Background documents:**

(all posted at [http://www.scclimatechange.us/Cross\\_Cutting.cfm](http://www.scclimatechange.us/Cross_Cutting.cfm))

1. Meeting Notice and Agenda
2. Draft Summary of Call #1
3. PowerPoint for Teleconference.
4. CC Draft Catalog of State Actions.
5. CC State Actions Descriptions.

**Discussion items and key issues:**

This was the second conference call of the CC TWG.

1. Ken Colburn called the meeting to order, completed the roll call and reviewed the agenda and plans for the call.
2. Summary for Call #1 Summary: Kirstin Dow noted that she was omitted from the attendance list. With this correction, the TWG approved the summary.
3. Dates and Times for Next TWG Call: See “Next Steps” section at end of this summary.
4. Review of Goals for CECAC Meeting #2: Colburn explained the importance of each TWG beginning with a comprehensive catalog of policy options as a “starting point” before identifying and recommending priority policy options for the CECAC’s consideration. A primary focus of the CECAC’s June 27<sup>th</sup> meeting is to approve a comprehensive catalog of policy options for each TWG for this purpose. The ideal for which we are striving is to compile a list so comprehensive that CECAC can’t think of anything else to add to it. Colburn also noted that the CECAC will review the draft inventory and forecast.
5. Next Steps for TWG: During today’s call, the TWG will review the catalog, with a focus on ensuring that all options are presented to the CECAC. After the CECAC provides its approval of the catalog for each TWG, the TWGs will identify and prioritize options for further development and quantification. Typically, ten to twelve options are identified as priorities by each TWG. The CC TWG usually has fewer options as compared to other TWGs, and therefore can recommend to the CECAC that all of the CC options be approved for development. Colburn also noted that while cross-cutting actions generally apply across multiple sectors, the CC TWG is not a place for complex, “catch-all” concepts such as “Smart Growth.”

A member asked if the TWG could add options considered by the United States and other countries if they felt that the options could also be applied in South Carolina. Colburn responded that any source of information is useful and can be utilized by the TWGs. He also asked members to inform the TWG of any efforts in South Carolina that are not recorded in the “Notes” column of the catalog so that they can be captured in the reports of the group.

6. Draft Catalog of State-Level GHG Reduction Policy Options (Handout): The following provides a brief summary of the questions and comments that the TWG provided on the catalog:

- Inventories and Forecasting (CC-1): The two suboptions suggest that the inventory and forecast function be carried out by a South Carolina state agency. The TWG asked if it needed to decide what state agency or agencies should be responsible for preparing the inventory and forecast, and if these functions need to reside with a state agency or could be some other organization? Colburn noted that the CECAC would be responsible for making recommendations on what organization (state or otherwise) should implement these functions. These functions do not necessarily need to be carried out by a state agency. The TWG agreed to remove reference to "...at state agency" from the title of the two suboptions. In addition, clarification was provided indicating that the note for Suboption 2.2 referencing DHEC's assistance to the cities of Greenville and Columbia in generating base year emissions is more appropriately associated with CC-1.1 (Establish & fund a GHG emission inventory function); the TWG agreed with moving the note to CC-1.1.
- GHG Reporting (CC-2) and GHG Registry (CC-3): Colburn noted that South Carolina has joined 30 other states to develop a national GHG registry through *The Climate Registry*. Being a charter state in this effort should help ensure that South Carolina's needs and priorities are addressed in the course of *The Climate Registry's* development. *The Climate Registry* will be developing protocols to ensure consistent reporting of emissions and emission reductions for the registry. Thus, reporting and registries could be combined as one option. However, keeping separate options for reporting and registries will retain flexibility for the state to pursue other options for categories of emissions sources or sinks that may not be adequately covered by *The Climate Registry*. He noted that reporting can be required without a registry, but a registry can't exist without some kind of reporting. The TWG agreed to keep separate options for reporting and registries.

For Suboption 2.2 under reporting, the TWG agreed that assistance should not be limited to just facilities, and agreed to remove "...to facilities..." from this suboption. In addition, the TWG agreed to move this suboption under the GHG Registry option since it also includes assistance for registering GHG emissions reductions.

For the GHG Registry option, Michael Juras of DHEC provided background information on the state's commitments associated with joining *The Climate Registry*. Each state that joins the registry must pay a fee; however, *The Climate Registry* includes a sliding-scale of membership fees to encourage emission sources to join the registry (who also must pay a fee). Thus, higher membership participation by entities in South Carolina will reduce costs to the state and possibly to members themselves. As a result, the state is trying to recruit as many entities (emission sources) as possible to voluntarily join *The Climate Registry* to lower South Carolina's fee. The TWG agreed to add Suboption 3.3 (Recruit members for *The Climate Registry*) to the catalog to support this effort.

A TWG member asked about the verification of data under voluntary reporting systems. Colburn noted that *The Climate Registry* is developing protocols for

consistent and rigorous quantification of emissions and emission reductions and that it will also require third-party verification of the emissions and emission reductions. These requirements are designed to ensure accurate quantification and reporting of GHG emissions and reductions.

- **Statewide GHG Reduction Goals and Targets (CC-4):** Colburn noted that since Governor Sanford did not include GHG reduction goals or targets in Executive Order 2007-04, the CECAC's decisions on goals or targets will be based on the quantification of emission reductions for priority policy options that it approves for analysis. A TWG member asked for clarification of the purpose for Suboption 4.2 (Institute an accountability program to measure and report progress in reducing GHG emissions.). Colburn responded that the purpose of this suboption is to ensure that a mechanism was developed to monitor progress toward meeting statewide goals or targets. A TWG member noted that it will be important to address any data quality issues that may arise to ensure consistent quantification and reporting of emission reductions. *The Climate Registry* will address data quality issues for those that choose to participate in the registry. If CC-4 is approved by the CECAC for development, the TWG would address data quality and implementation issues associated with this option.

In addition, the TWG agreed that South Carolina should confer with other states to avoid duplication of effort, create uniformity in approach, and to benefit from other states' expertise with respect to developing an accountability program.

- **State and Local Government GHG Emissions (Lead-by-Example) (CC-5):** A TWG member noted that South Carolina has a state-owned utility that potentially would be covered by this option. There will need to be a clear delineation between state- and locally-owned utilities. The TWG also agreed that as a part of this option, state and local agencies should evaluate renewable energy sources as a method for reducing their GHG emissions. Colburn noted that it was very appropriate for the CC TWG to consider a multi-sector approach for this option. However, some of the suboptions may be ultimately addressed by one of the other TWGs where the options would be quantified. For example, building codes and climate neutral bonding may be ideas to include under this option for controlling state government emissions; however, quantification of these options would be conducted by the RCI TWG if approved by the CECAC. Similarly, ideas for reducing emissions associated with state- or locally-owned power sources would be addressed by the ES TWG if approved by the CECAC.

A member asked for a description of climate neutral bonding. Colburn explained that climate neutral bonding means that there is no net increase in GHG emissions associated with state-bonded construction projects. These include construction utilizing state bonds, such as schools, additions, etc. and all state buildings. A policy can be recommended that requires that all buildings are climate neutral by, for example, purchasing offsets and/or increasing energy efficiency.

- Comprehensive Local Government Climate Action Plans (Counties, Cities, etc.) (CC-6): The TWG agreed to add “adaptation” to Suboption 6.1 to ensure it is included at the local government level. TWG members noted efforts already underway to help local governments identify and address issues associated with adapting to the effects of climate change. Members noted that the International Council for Local Environmental Initiatives (ICLEI) has started a “Climate Resilient Communities” program to help local governments address adaptation issues through support from the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration’s (NOAA) National Sea Grant Office. It was also noted that the Sierra Club has began webcasts on this topic.
- Public Education and Outreach (CC-7): CCS noted that this option has many suboptions and tends to overwhelm the catalog. CCS offered to move the third-level detail for the suboptions to an appendix, keeping just the first-level suboptions in the main body of the catalog. The TWG agreed with this change.

A TWG member noted that suboption CC-7.5.8 addressed adaptation and suggested moving this option to CC-10 (Adaptation). The TWG agreed with this change.  
 [Note: After the call CCS reviewed CC-10 and decided that CC-10.1 already covered CC-7.5.8; therefore, CC-7.5.8 was removed from the catalog to avoid duplication.]

The TWG agreed to add a comment to the notes column for suboption for 7.1.3 to identify the “Shoreline Coastal Initiative;” NOAA has created a full-time staff position to support a regional climate change extension service for the Southeast.

A TWG member asked for clarification of the objective for 7.2 (Target Audience: Policymakers (legislators, regulators, executive branch, agencies)). Colburn noted that the goal for this suboption would be to provide an educational function to legislatures and policymakers on the CECAC’s recommendations to assist them in determining what legislation or policies would be needed to implement the options approved by the CECAC. He noted that implementation issues will be addressed by the TWGs during future meetings for the priority policy options approved for development by the CECAC.

A member noted that there is a need for a central clearinghouse for data. The catalog should include a reference to a web-based state climate change data clearinghouse. The programs instituted by Florida, Washington and Connecticut are good examples of this. This is addressed under suboption 7.6 (Target Audience: General Public), suboption 7.5.6 (Develop & maintain a state climate change website for the public including a clearinghouse of climate change information and resources); however, the TWG may want to expand the audience for the website. It was noted that if the CECAC approves this option for development by the TWG, the TWG can further develop the audiences, goals and uses for a web-based application.

It was noted that reference to “CAP” in suboption 7.2.1 is a typo and CCS will change this to CECAC.

- Tax and Cap Policies (CC-8): Colburn noted that this option is focused on determining if South Carolina should consider tax incentives and disincentives or cap and trade policies for reducing GHG emissions economy-wide or at a regional level as opposed to recommending consideration of these policies for individual sectors.

Development and quantification of sector-specific cap and trade options would be considered by the other TWGs. The TWG agreed that suboption 8.3 should be reworded to recommend that South Carolina consider joining other regional initiatives as an observer, and consider joining as a full state partner, rather than identify specific regional efforts. Reference to the Western Climate Initiative and Regional Greenhouse Gas Initiative could be cited in the notes column of the catalog as examples of existing regional efforts. In addition, the TWG agreed to add Suboption 8.4 to explore launching a Southeast regional climate effort.

- Clearinghouse to Facilitate Investment in Climate-Related Business Opportunities (CC-9): Colburn noted that this option is concerned with identifying funding and investment opportunities to support business opportunities (e.g., development of new technologies) for addressing climate change.
- Adaptation and Vulnerability (CC-10): Colburn noted that for the CECAC process, this option would be focused at the “macro” level such as developing the framework for the state to address adaptation and vulnerability. The TWG could also develop this option to recommend that the state undertake a process much like the CECAC process to address adaptation and vulnerability at a greater level of detail. Either way, one goal would be to emphasize win-win situations, for example, where mitigation efforts also address adaptation and vulnerability issues. The TWG suggested adding a note to the catalog that this option should include, for example, attention to adaptive responses to building, residential and infrastructure siting issues.

#### **Next steps and agreements:**

1. The next CC TWG call (#3) will be held on **Tuesday, July 24, from 1:00 – 2:30 pm**. CCS will notify the full TWG of the date and time for call #3 and send a reminder out several days before the call.
2. The fourth CC TWG call will be held **Tuesday, August 7, from 1:00 – 2:30 pm**. CCS will notify the full TWG of the date and time for call #4 and send a reminder out several days before the call.
3. TWG members should review the report of the CECAC meeting before the next meeting and be prepared to discuss potential policy option priorities.
4. CCS will revise the summary for Call #1 to include Kirstin Dow as in attendance and post the revised summary on the website.

#### **Public Input and Announcements**

There was no public comment.