www.scclimatechange.us

Meeting #7 Summary
Climate, Energy and Commerce Advisory Committee (CECAC)

Columbia, South Carolina
May 9, 2008

ATTENDEES

CECAC Members

Representative Ben Hagood—South Carolina House of Representatives, CECAC Vice Chair
Dana Beach, Executive Director—South Carolina Coastal Conservation League
Jim Byrd, Deputy Director—Market Services Division, South Carolina Department of Insurance
Lonnie Carter—President and CEO, Santee Cooper
John Clark—Director, South Carolina Energy Office
Giff Daughtridge—Nucor Steel
Barry Falin—Vice President and General Manager of Carolina Operations, Voridian
Bob Fledderman Manager—Environment and Regulatory Assurance, MeadWestvaco
John Frampton—Director, South Carolina Department of Natural Resources
Dr. Paul Gayes—Director, Center for Marine and Wetlands Studies, Coastal Carolina Univ.
Joe James—CEO, Corporation for Economic Opportunity
Bob King—Deputy Commissioner, South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Control
Kevin Marsh, President, South Carolina Electric and Gas
E. Bruce Morgan—Mayor, City of Union
Dr. Marcus Newberry—Former Dean, Medical University of South Carolina College of Medicine
Mike Olbrich—Plant Manager, BP Chemical
James E. Rogers, Chairman, President, and CEO, Duke Energy Corporation
Bob Scott—President, South Carolina Forestry Association
Lanneau Siegling—Past Chairman, Hospitality Association of South Carolina
David Smalls President, Walterboro-Colleton Chamber of Commerce
John Tiencken—Electric Cooperatives of South Carolina
Mitch Williams (for Emerson Gower—Vice President, Southern Region, Progress Energy Carolinas)
John Wilson (for Steve Smith—Executive Director, Southern Alliance for Clean Energy)
Brad Wyche—Executive Director, Upstate Forever

South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Control

Michael Juras, Agency Liaison

Center for Climate Strategies (CCS)

Tom Peterson, Ezra Hausman, Joan O'Callaghan, and Randy Strait; and by telephone, Alice Napoleon and Will Schroeer

Others: See Attachment for Members of the Public Who Attended CECAC Meeting #7.

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS (*all posted at www.scclimatechange.us*)

1. Notice and Agenda
2. Draft Summary of CECAC Meeting #6
3. PowerPoint Presentation
4. CCS Memo to CECAC on Preparation for Meeting #7
5. Policy Option Descriptions for Analysis

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

1. Welcome and Introductions

Chairman Ben Hagood opened the meeting and welcomed the members of the CECAC and the public. Tom Peterson of CCS then reviewed the agenda for the meeting.

2. Approval of Draft Summary of CECAC Meeting #6

The meeting summary was approved with the following revisions on pages 11 and 12:

Page 11

- First paragraph, delete the last sentence.
- Second paragraph, first sentence: Change "A TWG member" to "A CECAC member."
- Second paragraph, second sentence: Before "He suggested," insert the following: "As a compromise alternative,".
- Third paragraph, revise third sentence as follows: "Others responded that renewable energy is still unproven, which may make state legislators uncomfortable; that nuclear energy provides stability in baseload generation and produces no GHG emissions; and that this option is a clean energy supply portfolio, not just a renewable energy portfolio."
- Third paragraph, last sentence: Change "A TWG member" to "A CECAC member."

Page 12

- Under AFW-5, clarify that the cost numbers reflect incremental changes rather than the absolute price of biomass and coal.
- Under AFW-6(b)(iii), add a statement that new development should ensure the maintenance and/or expansion of urban/suburban cover and reduction of loss of existing cover.

3. Review and final approval of South Carolina's Revised Draft Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Inventory and Forecast (I&F)

Randy Strait of CCS explained that the I&F report has been revised to incorporate the revisions approved by the CECAC during its 6th meeting, and the revised report is available on the CECAC's project website (posted on the "Inventory & Forecast Report" page). Since the 6th meeting CCS developed an I&F to estimate carbon sinks associated with urban forestry based on methods recently developed by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. The CECAC policy that addresses urban forestry includes the I&F estimates in the baseline for quantifying potential impacts associated with the policy. Tom Peterson noted that the carbon sink estimates prepared for landscape forests using U.S. Forest Service (USFS) methods do not cover urban forests. Therefore, the estimates for urban forest fill a gap in the I&F. The CECAC had no objections to incorporating the estimates for urban forestry in the final I&F report.

Strait then presented chart showing incremental GHG emission reductions associated with recent federal requirements contained in the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 to increase corporate average fuel economy (CAFE) in the transportation sector and energy efficiency for new appliances and lighting in the RCI sectors. Peterson explained that the standard operating procedure would be to incorporate the effects of this recent legislation that reduces GHG emissions into the reference case, but show the reductions as wedges relative to the business-as-usual forecast. The CECAC policy options have been adjusted to incorporate these federal requirements into their baseline for quantification. The CECAC had no objections to incorporating the estimates for these federal requirements into the reference case projections.

4. Review of CECAC Progress and Results

Strait and Peterson presented the latest results of the quantification of GHG emission reductions and costs or cost savings. The results were presented graphically and numerically on a cumulative basis meaning that overlaps between policies were addressed to remove double counting of emission reductions and costs or cost savings. The results were presented based on the following four frameworks: gross emissions consumption, gross emissions production, net emissions consumption, and net emissions production basis. When compared to the reference case incorporating reductions from the recent federal actions previously discussed, the cumulative results indicate that the CECAC policies (assuming that all of the policies are fully implemented) could reduce South Carolina's GHG emissions to 5% below 1990 emissions by 2020. On a gross emissions consumption basis over the analysis period (2008-2020), total cumulative GHG reductions are estimated to be about 349 million metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent ($MMtCO_2e$), with a net present value cost of about $1.89 billion, and a cost-effectiveness of $5.4 per metric ton of CO_2e ($/t CO_2e) reduced. Strait noted that these results may change some depending on the results of the CECAC meeting today; however, the results are not expected to change significantly.

A CECAC member asked about extending the forecast from 2020 to 2050. CCS responded that though this is possible, there will not be enough time to complete this

work since the process is nearing completion. In addition, there would be considerable uncertainty associated with extending the forest this far in the future because it would be difficult to anticipate technological innovations that will likely occur over the extended forecast period.

Some of the CECAC members requested that in the final report it be noted that even though the quantification of impacts associated with the policies were developed using the best information that could be identified during the CECAC process, the results are uncertain and subject to change as better information becomes available in the future.

5. Review and Final Approval of the Draft Policy Options

In order to use today's time efficiently, the CECAC reviewed the remaining pending policy options that Chairman Hagood sent to the CECAC prior to the meeting to identify those options that the CECAC could approve without further discussion. The CECAC approved by block vote (without any objections) the following policy options:

- RCI-3 (Incentives and Regulatory Reform To Promote Implementation of Renewable Energy Systems, Including Solar Hot Water [Residential, Commercial, and Industrial])
- RCI-8 (Participation in Voluntary Industry–Government Partnerships [Including Incentives])
- ES-8 (Distributed Renewable Energy Incentives and/or Barrier Removal (Including Interconnection Rules)
- TLU-5 (Transit & Bike-Pedestrian)
- AFW-6biii (*Urban Forestry)*—This option was approved without objection with a revision to the policy stating that development should ensure the maintenance and/or expansion of urban/suburban cover and reduction of loss of existing cover.

TRANSPORTATION AND LAND USE (TLU)

For each of the TLU policy options pending approval by the CECAC, Will Schroeer of CCS provided a brief summary of the draft quantification results, and TLU Technical Work Group (TWG) members assisted in responding to the CECAC's questions and comments.

Summary of Comments and Responses to Questions

TLU-1 (Adopt California Clean Car Standards)—To date, about 13 states have adopted similar standards, and 2–3 more intend to adopt them. The 13 states account for about 40% of the U.S. auto and truck market. Schroeer noted that the benefits of this option are incremental to the new federal CAFE requirements.

A CECAC member noted that while clean car standards may be feasible for a state the size of California, they aren't cost-effective for a much smaller state like South Carolina. This led to discussion about the benefits of adopting regional clean car standards, rather than a single-state standard, to create a sufficiently broad market for the new cars. Several

CECAC members didn't like the option's suggestion that South Carolina was following in California's footsteps, rather than charting its own course.

The CECAC approved without objections the following revisions to the text of this policy:

- Change the title of this option to Adopt a South Carolina Clean Car Standard.
- Under the Goals section, replace "Adopt California's Clean Car standards" with "Enact legislation for a South Carolina clean car standard."
- Replace the text currently under the Timing section with: "If adopted, the standard would be implemented if and when other states in the region adopt similar standards that both create better economies of scale for manufacturing and distributing clean cars throughout the Southeast, and reduce the cost per vehicle for South Carolina consumers."
- Under the Implementation Mechanisms section, insert: "Work with the Southern Growth Policies Board to encourage participation in a regional clean car initiative." Insert other text as appropriate under Implementation Mechanisms.
- Make it clear in the text that this initiative is not in response to the California Clean Car standards.
- Revise the text throughout the policy option to reflect these changes, and fill in the blank Feasibility Issues section.

TLU-3 (Tax Credits for Efficient Vehicles)—There were no questions or comments regarding this policy option.

TLU-4 (Improve Development Patterns)—There was some discussion about setting a higher standard by basing the goal on total vehicle miles traveled (VMT), rather than per-capita VMT. The CECAC approved without objections the following revisions in the goal language in the Policy Design section:

- Delete "per capita" in the first line of the Goals section.
- At the state level, set a quantitative statewide goal to reduce total VMT.
- At the local level, allow municipalities to reduce their VMT more qualitatively on a place-by-place basis.

TLU-6 (Alternative-Fuel Infrastructure)—There were no questions or comments regarding this policy option.

TLU-7 (Diesel Engine Emission Reductions and Fuel Efficiency Improvements)

TLU-7a (Efficiency Improvements)—There were no questions or comments regarding this policy option.

TLU-7b (Biodiesel)—There was some discussion about whether the percentages under the Goals section are targets or mandates. The CECAC agreed they should not be mandates. The economic development benefits of in-state biodiesel production were mentioned briefly. A CECAC member expressed concern that this option might lead to large imports of nonpetroleum-based fuels. Another member suggested that a procedure be developed

to help the CECAC understand the linkage between the various policy options within the different TWGs. Two members pointed out that the targets are aimed at grants and incentives, but no specific information about the grants and incentives is provided.

The following revisions to the text were approved without objections:

- At the end of the fourth bullet under the Goals section, replace "low-carbon fuels" with "low-carbon, cost-effective fuels produced in South Carolina or in the Southeastern U.S."
- The Goals section needs to be tempered with language along the lines of "subject to availability and price."
- The Implementation Mechanisms section and other sections of this policy option need to be filled in. Under Implementation Mechanisms, insert: "Set strong goals and targets short of a fuel mandate, and provide grants and incentives."
- Under the Feasibility Issues or the Benefits and Costs section, qualify concerns about incentives that may be detrimental to other markets, resulting in secondary costs.

TLU-10 (Commuter Choice and Commuter Benefits Programs)—There was some discussion about whether this should be a voluntary policy, rather than a mandate. The TWG crafted the policy's language to be a compromise between the two. The CECAC approved without objections the following revisions to the text:

- Several sections of this policy option need to be filled in.
- The first bullet under the Implementation Mechanisms section should read: "Enact legislation to encourage, where feasible…."

TLU-12 (Low-GHG Fuel Standard)—The costs of this policy option are based on U.S. Department of Energy estimates, which Schroeer observed may be low. There was some discussion about the numbers used to calculate this and other policy options. A CECAC member objected to this option because they think its costs are significantly underestimated, particularly with regard to separate storage tanks and pumps at every gas station and separate distribution systems for each type of alternative fuel, which will result in higher consumer costs. They believe the costs aren't realistic unless a very large region, like the entire East Coast, adopts a low-GHG fuel standard. The CECAC member agreed to assist in crafting language to the "Barriers to Consensus" section of this option.

Another CECAC member commented that the $1/tCO_2e to $183/tCO_2e cost-effectiveness range is too broad and not specific enough to move forward as a recommendation. They suggested improving the focus of this option, for example, to concentrate on fleets.

There was some discussion about incentives for the infrastructure needed to produce and distribute alternative fuels. For example, a tax incentive of 5 cents per gallon for installing separate tanks for B20 and E85 blended fuels will become effective in a year or two in the state.

Some environmental sustainability issues regarding alternative fuels were discussed, such as the detrimental effects of corn ethanol production. The supplemental secondary costs of alternative-fuel production, such as the rising cost of food, need to be analyzed as well.

The following revisions to the text were approved without objections:

- Insert language saying South Carolina should promote an active discussion among states in the region regarding a regional adoption of a low-GHG fuel standard. A multistate approach would result in greater benefits and lower costs than would be achieved with a single-state adoption of a low-GHG fuel standard.
- Insert language regarding the economic benefits (e.g., job creation) of producing alternative fuels within the state and encouraging further in-state production of these fuels as much as possible. For example, the biodiesel the state consumes is produced in South Carolina, but the petroleum products consumed come from out-of-state.
- Insert information about existing incentives to facilitating the production of alternative fuels and the need to be mindful of reviewing and adjusting those incentives in the future to reflect future costs.

TLU Voting on Draft Policy Options

TLU-1—Approved with two objections, with the revisions noted above. Two CECAC members objected to this option over concerns with the increased costs per vehicle for South Carolina consumers.

TLU-3—Approved without any objections.

TLU-4—Approved without any objections, with the revisions noted above.

TLU-5—Approved without any objections.

TLU-6—Approved without any objections.

TLU-7a—Approved without any objections.

TLU-7b—Approved with two objections, with the revisions noted above. Two CECAC members objected to this option expressing concerns with the secondary costs and detrimental effects on the petroleum market.

TLU-10—Approved without any objections, with the revisions noted above.

TLU-12—Approved with two objections, with the revisions noted above. Two CECAC members objected to this option expressing concerns with environmental sustainability issues regarding the production of alternative fuels, including the detrimental effects of corn ethanol production and supplemental secondary costs of alternative-fuel productions, such as the rising cost of food.

RESIDENTIAL, COMMERCIAL AND INDUSTRIAL (RCI)

For each of the RCI policy options pending approval by the CECAC, Ezra Hausman, (with assistance from Alice Napoleon by phone) of CCS provided a brief summary of the work that the TWG completed on each option and the draft quantification results. RCI TWG members provided additional information and assisted Hausman and Napoleon in responding to the CECAC's questions and comments.

Summary of Comments and Responses to Questions

RCI-1 (Demand-Side Management/Energy Efficiency Programs, Funds, or Goals for Electricity [Including Expansion of Same] [Residential, Commercial, and Industrial])—There was some discussion about reductions in peak demand versus reductions in kilowatt-hours (kWh). A CECAC member noted that a 2% reduction in electricity use is very aggressive if only kWh are being targeted, but is reasonable if both kWh and peak demand are being targeted. Reducing kWh reduces the use of power plants that are on the margin. Consistently reducing peak demand can forestall the construction of new plants.

A CECAC member expressed concern about the rollout of the energy efficiency programs, noting that some may come to fruition in 3, 5, or 7 years, and some may never by implemented. Chairman Hagood read a statement from Crandall Close Bowles, recommending that the CECAC approve a more aggressive 10% goal, noting that other states have more aggressive programs.

It was agreed that the current avoided costs in all likelihood will not reflect future avoided costs. The latter are likely to be higher than the former, which would increase the value of energy efficiency programs to the state.

This CECAC approved without any objections the following text revisions:

- Delete "Demand-Side Management/" (DSM) from the title and all references to DSM in the policy option, and replace with "energy efficiency."
- Under the Policy Description section:
    - Insert an opening statement defining energy efficiency (as used in this policy option), noting that gains in productivity deliver the same results but use less electricity.
    - At the end of the second-to-last sentence insert (after "10-year time frame"): "assuming an 80% penetration rate."
    - In the first sentence of the fourth paragraph, replace "demand" with "energy use, including reductions in kilowatt-hours."
    - In the second sentence of the fifth paragraph, insert after "support": "and to provide incentives."
- Under the Implementation Mechanisms section: (1) delete from the first paragraph "and without special congressional appropriations to pay for the improvements," (2) delete "Regulator-" from the first bullet, and (3) delete "Subsidized" from the eighth bullet.
- Under the Key Uncertainties section: (1) insert "Current" as the first word of the first paragraph, (2) delete "planned in South Carolina" from the end of the first sentence, (3) delete the last three sentences of the first paragraph, starting with "For example," (4) insert the following: "Future avoided costs are likely to be higher than they are today, which would improve the attractiveness of energy efficiency." and (5) insert the following as the last sentence: "Consumer response is also uncertain."

RCI Voting

RCI-1—Approved without any objections, with the revisions noted above.

RCI-3—Approved without any objections.

RCI-8—Approved without any objections.

ENERGY SUPPLY (ES)

For each of the ES policy options pending approval by the CECAC, Ezra Hausman, (with assistance from Alice Napoleon by phone) of CCS provided a brief summary of the work that the TWG completed on each option and the draft quantification results. ES TWG members provided additional information and assisted Hausman and Napoleon in responding to the CECAC's questions and comments.

Summary of Comments and Responses to Questions

ES-1 (Develop Efficiency and Renewable Portfolio Standard and Statement of Support for New Nuclear Energy)—Chairman Hagood explained that although the CECAC voted during Meeting #6 to rename this policy option "Energy Portfolio Standard," after the meeting the TWG revised both the treatment of the three components of this policy and the title to reflect the revised structure. A TWG member suggested revising the title to a carbon-free or low-carbon portfolio standard, noting that decarbonizing electricity generation is at the heart of this policy option. However, the CECAC agreed to leave the revised title as it is currently worded.

A CECAC member asked whether ES-1(a) is identical to RCI-1 in its implementation, but only 50% of RCI-1 in its targets. It was clarified that this option focuses on utility programs, while RCI-1 may cover a number of other programs not operated by utilities, such a tax incentives. ES-1 requires every public or private utility generating electricity in South Carolina to meet the 5% energy efficiency requirement. Everything in ES-1 is included in RCI-1, but not vice versa. Given this information, a CECAC member asked whether ES-1 is redundant. A TWG member offered that ES-1 is a mandated target utilities must meet; if they don't meet it, they'll have to pay a penalty. In contrast, RCI-1 is more of an aspirational policy. A number of members disagreed that RCI-1 is aspirational in nature but agreed that ES-1 is a utility mandate. Hausman confirmed that no double counting is taking place between ES-1 and RCI-1 in the cumulative analysis of impacts. The CECAC agreed to keep the two options separate, and to reference ES-1 under the Implementation Measures section of RCI-1.

The discussion then turned to the built-in flexibility for utilities to buy and sell renewable energy credits to meet the renewable portfolio standard under ES-1. A TWG member questioned whether this created the potential to use renewable energy credits to satisfy the 6% nuclear energy and efficiency requirements. He added that a state effort is needed to propel energy efficiency initiatives and renewable energy, but not nuclear power. Chairman Hagood emphasized that the 5% renewable and energy efficiency requirements were never intended to be met through nuclear energy, and that renewable energy credits would not be used for this purpose.

A CECAC member stressed the need to make nuclear energy a separate policy option, rather than combine it with a renewable portfolio standard. Chairman Hagood agreed with him in theory, but noted that a compromise appeared to be necessary. A TWG member added that combining the three components brings the state closer to decarbonizing the state's electricity generation and will attract businesses to the state.

A CECAC member stated that they do not want to go on record as agreeing with all the numbers in the analysis, but that they are willing to accept them in the interest of moving forward with the process. Another CECAC member noted that their support for this policy option is based on their interpretation of what ES-1 says and not what it does not say.

This option was approved with objections from three CECAC members based on the following concerns:

- Objection 1—Nuclear energy represents 50% of South Carolina's electricity production, while renewable energy is just getting started. A policy supporting development of new nuclear power should be a stand-alone policy, and should not be mixed with renewables.
- Objection 2—Objects to structuring these components as mandates, as opposed to strong targets.
- Objection 3—Prefers a strong mandate, but the nuclear costs are too high.

The CECAC approved without any objections the following text revisions:

- Insert a general statement noting that, in the interest of advancing the recommended policies, the CECAC members are accepting the best available numbers as being reasonable, though they may disagree with them. This could also be an overall statement for the entire final report.
- Insert the following new bullet at the end of the Implementation Mechanisms section: "Provisions should be made for utilities to recover all costs of demand-side management/energy efficiency and renewable energy through an annual recovery clause consistent with policy option ES-4."

ES-3 (Renewable Energy Financing, Tax Incentives, Loans)—The CECAC approved without any objections the following text revisions:

- Under the Policy Design section, third bullet—Change "a federal, state, or voluntary renewable energy standard" to "a federal or state renewable energy standard."
- Under the Implementation Mechanisms section, fourth bullet—Change "customers of investor-owned utilities" to "customers of electricity suppliers."

ES-4 (Regulatory Model To Equalize Utility Earnings on Energy Efficiency With Earnings on Traditional Power Supply)—A TWG member noted that in the third bullet under the Key Uncertainties section, the revenues should be calculable. Another TWG member objected to this policy option, noting it's difficult to say utilities wouldn't achieve the same energy savings without the additional incentives recommended in this policy and that, therefore, South Carolina would be footing a higher energy bill without any incremental benefit. A TWG member responded that this option is intended to

provide electric utilities the same incentives they would reap from investing in energy efficiency as they would from building new power plants.

ES-5 (Nuclear Fuel Reprocessing)—Some members expressed concern that South Carolina may again become "ground zero" for all reprocessing waste, and emphasized the need for a guaranteed final disposal site for the waste before supporting reprocessing in the state. The CECAC approved without any objections the following text revisions:

- In the last paragraph of the Policy Description section, add language that addresses the implications of additional nuclear reprocessing waste for South Carolina, along the lines of: "Compared to other states, South Carolina bears an inordinate burden for the environmental and health risks associated with the disposal of nuclear reprocessing waste. The state currently has a significant amount of nuclear waste that has no designated disposal site. South Carolina's support for in-state nuclear reprocessing is contingent on a plan for the out-of-state shipment of the waste to an operating facility that is actively receiving nuclear waste for long-term disposal."
- At the end of the last paragraph of the Policy Description section, change "technically and economically feasible" to "technically, economically, and environmentally feasible."
- Under the Policy Design's Goals section, change the beginning of the second bullet from "If reprocessing and recycling . . ." to "If this evaluation shows that reprocessing and recycling...."

ES Voting

ES-1—Approved with three objections (previously noted), with the text revisions noted above.

ES-3—Approved without any objections, with the text revisions noted above.

ES-4—Approved with one objection (previously noted), with the text revisions noted above.

ES-5—Approved without any objections, with the text revisions noted above.

ES-8—Approved without any objections.

CROSS-CUTTING ISSUES (CC)

For each of the CC policy options pending approval by the CECAC, Randy Strait of CCS provided a brief summary of the work that the TWG completed on each option. CC TWG members provided additional information and assisted Strait in responding to the CECAC's questions and comments.

Summary of Comments and Responses to Questions

CC-3 (Statewide GHG Reduction Goals and Targets)—There was some discussion about why 1990 is used as a benchmark for the goals of this policy option, and 2020 and 2050 are used as targets for GHG emissions. It was also noted that the Lieberman-Warner bill doesn't use 1990 as a benchmark. The TWG based the 2050 goal on modeling results

that the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change published in its Fourth Assessment Report.

A CECAC member commented that, compared to other states, South Carolina is in a favorable position to meet these goals and targets, since 50% of the state's energy production is carbon-free. However, he noted that the CECAC needs to make sure it's not requiring the state to achieve higher GHG reduction levels than will be required under future federal regulation. He added the need to clarify how some of the policy options link and overlap.

A CECAC member also noted a preference for using the term "goal" rather than "target" reflecting that this policy is to recommend an aspirational goal for the state.

It was clarified that this option is a way to set an aspirational goal for the state if it is going to adopt a climate action plan, and that the Governor charged the CECAC with developing recommendations for a statewide GHG reduction goal. Discussions followed regarding (1) the different accounting systems used to quantify the effects of this policy option; (2) no credit will be provided to the state for taking early action; and (3) South Carolina's inability to participate in the potentially profitable worldwide carbon trading market unless (and until) the United States becomes a party to the Kyoto Treaty.

The following revisions to the policy option text were approved without objections:

- Under the Policy Design section:
    - Delete first paragraph, along with footnote #4.
    - In first sentence of second paragraph: (1) delete "Consistent with these scientific conclusions"; (2) delete "for both consumption-based and production-based emissions, and further, to reduce emissions to 80% below 1990 levels by 2050"; and (3) after "2020," insert "based on successful implementation of the CECAC's policy recommendations."
    - At the end of the third paragraph, insert: "The CECAC further recommends that South Carolina consider reviewing at least once every 5 years realistic GHG reduction goals for years beyond 2020."

CC-4 (State Government GHG Emissions [Lead by Example])—The CECAC agreed that the 2020 goal for this policy should be the same as the 2020 goal for CC-3, and to remove the 2050 goal.

CC Voting

CC-3— Approved with one objection, with the text revisions noted above. One CECAC member objected on the grounds that they did not think it was necessary to have a GHG reduction goal because of the significant GHG emission reductions estimated to be achieved by all of the CECAC's policy recommendations.

The CECAC also approved without any objections to move discussion of its recommendation on a statewide GHG reduction goal to the Executive Summary and Chapter 1 of its report to highlight its response to the Governor's charge to the CECAC.

CC-4—Approved without any objections, with the text revisions noted above.

6. Review of Final Report Process

This was not covered before the meeting ended late in the day.

Note that CCS will coordinate with Chairman Hagood in developing an outline for the report, and a schedule that provides for the CECAC to review and comment on the draft report. The final report will incorporate the comments that the CECAC provides on the draft report.

7. Public Input and Announcements

There were no comments from the public during the meeting.

Attachment

Members of the Public Attending CECAC Meeting #7
Columbia, South Carolina
May 9, 2008

Name	Company
Jason Allard	South Carolina Department of Natural Resources, Climate Office
Schipp Ames	South Carolina Realtors
Henry Barton	SCANA Corp.
Ray Benson	Santee Cooper
Scotty Griffin	Piedmont Municipal Power Agency
John Hartz	South Carolina Sierra Club
Mark Hollis	Duke Energy
Trish Jerman	South Carolina Energy Office
Jeanelle McCain	Progress Energy
John Monk	*The State* (newspaper)
Ben Moore	Coastal Conservation League
John Ramsburgh	South Carolina Sierra Club
Ben Twilley	South Carolina Chamber of Commerce
Catherine Vander Houten	South Carolina Energy Office