

Chester County GHGRTF Information Committee Minutes

April 7, 2008

Attending: Mike Bullard, Vic Laubach, Victoria Webb, Gene Wilson, Joel Kauffamn, and Sarah Caspar

Heath Eddy and Gerry Bricks emailed prior to the meeting that they would be absent.

The meeting was called to order at 5:45 PM at the CC GSB.

A brief summary of previous meetings was given. Gene recapped the "Greenprint Denver" Climate Action Plan and Report.

Sarah presented her preliminary review of Montgomery County's action plan. The plan points out the fact that Merck currently has cut energy costs by 16%, saving over \$11 million. Great set of recommendations in Energy, Transportation, Land Use, Agriculture, Transportation, Forestry, and Waste Management. Tree planting program, protect farmland, protect open space. County has entered long term purchase agreement for 100% renewable electricity. Goal of 80% reduction of GHG by 2050 (1990 baseline) through a series of short term goals. This represents a nearly 90% reduction in GHG emissions per capita over 1990, because of population growth. Details will be available as the benchmarking process continues.

Victoria presented her preliminary review for the Marin County CA action plan. Marin County began its planning process with a GHG inventory which determined that the county has seen an increase of 15% from 1990 to 2000, and that county operation increased by 8% during the same time period. Targets for GHG reduction by 2020 set are 15%-20% for county operations and 15% for the rest of the county. Plan has strong public relations component. UC Berkeley participation; utilized ICLEI process. 100 GHG reduction measures gathered as part of benchmarking process--also benchmarked other municipalities' plans. Details will be available as the benchmarking process continues.

Discussion returned to the Denver plan's emphasis on Action/Goals. Ideas on how combine the various plans into a useful template were developed. A near term goal is to create a two to four page summary of other countys' GHG reduction plans.

Joel explained that he was having trouble accessing the Portland GHG plan, and hoped to have a review ready for the next meeting. Joel provided the committee with a report he had prepared (see attached pdf) on the relative cost of nuclear energy versus wind, solar, and hydro in the UK, with the conclusion that nuclear energy is less expensive than renewable energy. The committee compared this with somewhat contradictory information from RMI, MIT and NREL showing that currently wind, biomass, and

efficiency are competitive now and solar will be competitive in the five to ten year time frame. A suggestion was made to invite in Tom Tuffey to brief the committee on some of these issues.

Gene presented his preliminary review of the Sarasota FL plan. The plan's goals are not very specific, cites DOE standards, and is concerned principally with building.

Meeting was adjourned at 7:30 PM. Next meeting April 21, 2008 room 237