



MEETING SUMMARY
NORTH CAROLINA CLIMATE ACTION PLAN TECHNICAL WORK GROUP

Energy Supply TWG Call #11, April 19, 2007, 9:00-11:00 pm

Prepared by Kimberly Garnett and Bill Dougherty

The meeting was called to order by Bill Dougherty of CCS staff a few minutes after 9:00 am. In attendance were the following TWG Members

- Deerhake, Marion – Environmental Management Commission
- Ericson, Roy – NC Utilities Commission
- Hobbs, Alex – NC Solar Center
- Kanes, Matthew – Piedmont Natural Gas
- Kennedy, Michael – Progress Energy
- Lam, Thomas – Public Staff on NCUC
- Lenz, Ward – NC Greenpower
- MacDowell, Pete – NC Waste Awareness and Reduction
- Nixon, Marily – Southern Environmental Law Center
- Shirley, Larry – State Energy Office (or Len Hoey in substitution)
- Shore, Michael – Environmental Defense
- Toben, Tim – Carolina Green Energy
- Urlaub, Ivan – NC Sustainable Energy
- John Wilson – Southern Alliance for Clean Energy (substituting for Smith, Stephen)

From DENR staff, the following were in attendance:

- Garnett, Kim – NCDENR/DAQ Liaison with Energy Sector TWG
- Nicholson, Brock – NCDENR/DAQ
- Southerland, Jim – NCDENR/DAQ

From the public, no one was in attendance.

From CCS staff, the following was in attendance:

- Bill Dougherty

TWG members not in attendances were:

- DeRosa, James - Global Warming Initiatives
- Everett, George, PhD – Duke Power
- Howard, Preston – Manufacturer Chemical Industry Council

- Koger, Robert Dr. – Advanced Energy (or as represented by Ward Lenz)
- Rich, Simon – Energy industry

The background documents that were used as the basis for the discussions had been posted on the website in advance of the meeting (http://www.ncclimatechange.us/Energy_Supply.cfm). These included the following documents:

- Meeting notice and agenda
- Draft summary of ES TWG Call #10
- PowerPoint presentation for TWG Call #11
- Results of the sensitivity analysis of energy supply options

The agenda of this meeting was as follows:

1. Call to order
2. Roll call of TWG members and public
3. Review and approval of summary of TWG call #10 (March 22, 2007) (on website)
4. Review of results of all mitigation option sensitivity analyses
5. Call for any public comments/input
6. Proposed agenda items and date/times for next meeting
7. Announcements

Bill Dougherty called the meeting to order and took the roll call (as summarized above). The summary of TWG call #10 was adopted without comment.

Then began a discussion regarding the results present in the slide presentation. The following detailed comments were offered by the TWG:

- *Costs for hydroelectric installations in NC:* The question was raised regarding whether cost and performance assumptions in the analysis include the cost of impoundment. In the view of some members of the TWG, it was important to consider adding an electricity production capability to dams that already had an impounded water body. It was decided to conduct more research on this topic.
- *Costs for hog wastes:* Some TWG members questioned the value of the cost and performance of hog waste systems. The facilitator was requested to check with the agriculture and waste TWG to ensure that consistent numbers are being used. Another TWG member offered to send an EPA study for comparison.
- *Solar thermal analysis:* Some TWG members questioned why only solar PV was being considered in the analysis. When informed that the division of labor that was approved by the CAPAG early in the process (i.e., that solar thermal would be handled as an option in the RCI TWG), they urged that it instead be considered in the electric supply TWG. After further discussion and then approval of the notion by Brock Nicholson, it was agreed to consider solar thermal in the ES TWG.
- *Energy Information Administration assumptions about renewable energy.* It was decided to not rely in the EIA's renewable energy mix for the SERC region as a potential sensitivity in the analysis. Their assumptions were considered too far off from state-

specific estimates. These assumptions regarding the renewable energy mix in the analysis will now be eliminated.

- *Rate impacts:* Due to the constraint of time, discussion centered on the the EPS, the most GHG-reducing of all the ES options. The rate impacts were reviewed for the three sensitivities considered (i.e., original targets, 20% combined energy efficiency/renewable energy target, and a load growth offset target). The TWG concluded that the rate impacts seemed reasonable.

During the course of the discussions, it was requested of the facilitator to try and resolve the issues identified by the TWG through a series of emails prior to the next CAPAG meeting, which is to be held on 8 May 2007. The facilitator agreed to send emails to the entire TWG with new information and results as they become available.

It was decided to not schedule another ES TWG Meeting. A potential future meeting is possible though it would be determined after the upcoming CAPAG meeting.

There were no members of the public in attendance, and hence no comments from the public.

The meeting concluded shortly after 11:00 AM.