

Climate Change Action Plan- Meeting Notes
GHG CEQA Technical Workgroup
January 14, 2009

Questions/Concerns

- Will the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District's (District) effort possibly be pre-empted by what the State is doing?
- Has any data or research been used on the life cycle?
- Is the District aware of double counting; for example, vehicle trips for residential & commercial projects, and electricity use at the source and its generation? Is there a mechanism to prevent double-counting?
- Was there any use of solar power in the characterization of the project presented here?
- What emission factors were used in characterizing the mixed-use project & industrial project?
- Interest has been shown towards the mega watt hours used and not so much the emissions. For example, for a plant, the GHG emissions footprint can be looked at, but the only thing in terms of mitigation that can be done is to look at the energy efficiency. So, it would be more important to look at the megawatt consumption by the facility. The power plant will have to accommodate for any increase. (It was suggested that written comment will be provided to clarify this topic).
- An extra analysis step for the comment above would be to look at the fuel use.
- It is necessary to provide quantification on energy consumption upfront because that's where we can get mitigations.
- As part of the District's Ozone Plan, one project is to look at energy usage.
- Who is addressing existing commercial/residential/industrial developments? OPR? AB32?
- Greenhouse gas from sprawl and energy (Title 22 for building energy efficiency) will need to be addressed. If there's construction on the outskirts of town, then travel can potentially offset the benefit from energy efficiency. On the other hand, cars are cleaner than before.
- Sprawl is addressed under SB375.
- Did the analyses take into account the period of time the emissions were attributed to (e.g. construction emissions being short term vs. operational emissions being long term)?
- Are the life cycle emissions for the mixed-up project scenario characterized similarly to the industrial project scenario?
- The document presented here says that the energy consumption is speculative but the Climate Action Registry breaks it down to how

January 20, 2009

Climate Change Action Plan- Meeting Notes
GHG CEQA Technical Workgroup
January 14, 2009

much emission is emitted from California energy consumption. So, why would this be speculative?

- If there's a reasonable estimate for energy consumption, then that's what should be used.
- Regarding energy consumption, the question is how do we capture it rather than how much is coming from which source?
- Utility companies have a matrix on emissions information for energy from solar, water, combustion, etc.

Recommendations

- The terms "Indirect" and "Direct" are driven by CEQA. However, the term "life cycle" goes beyond the CEQA context. Therefore, it'd be helpful to put the term "life cycle" in context. Is it AB32 driven?
- It was recommended that the emission factor values from the California Climate Action Registry (CCAR) be used for power consumption instead of making assumptions.
- Based on the recommendations the District has provided in the report, broader recommendations would be needed based on what has already been presented.
- District should clarify the recommendations listed in the document presented today. There could be confusion and it seems that the energy issue will be an ongoing topic of discussion.

Climate Change Action Plan- Meeting Notes

GHG Emissions Banking Technical Workgroup

January 14, 2009

Questions/Concerns

- The revised document presented here addressed the concerns that were brought up before.
- Because many types of air pollutant are being dealt with, it would be good to have all calculations handled under one banking program.
- The term “voluntary exchange” is preferable. The term “bank” has a different meaning. It relates to existing criteria pollutants under an emission reduction program which can be limited for GHG.
- How would the District decide on how emission reduction be considered a mitigation or what would the approval process is?
- In term of mitigations, there’s a risk of having different level of stringency.
- If the District decides to develop its own protocol, it can’t emphasize enough how much work that effort will take.
- In the report section that discusses “potential use”, it is stated that if the District adopts this banking program, it wouldn’t preclude the use of credits from other agencies. It is necessary to clarify that it doesn’t necessarily mean that those credits will be approved, but it shouldn’t also preclude others from approaching this San Joaquin Valley Carbon Exchange (SJVCE Program).
- There are many protocols already developed by South Coast Air Quality Management District and other agencies. There’s no lack of protocols addressing major industries, and therefore there is no concern for the need for the District to develop protocols.
- Is there any involvement/dialoguing with ARB and other agencies? How are others kept informed?
- As a FYI, The Climate Registry will supersede CCAR.
- What does District’s term “retire” mean?
- The report should clarify the terms “surplus’ and “additionality”. The term “surplus” is an existing term and is a familiar one in the permitting arena.
- Regarding District’s role in this proposed banking program, what are the cost and benefits to the District? Are other air districts going to have a banking program as well? This is not to suggest that the District become a verifier.
- In regards to the District wanting to take advantage of a technique that would reduce criteria pollutant and greenhouse gas pollutants, it should also make sure that the criteria pollutants don’t decrease while greenhouse gas increase.
- This year, there will be a statewide greenhouse gas emission inventory (e.g. mandatory emissions reporting).
- How would the administration of this SJVCE Program be paid for? If there will be a fee, then it would be beneficial to make it all on one application.

January 20, 2009