

RTF PAC Meeting Notes

November 24, 2014

Attendees: Jim West (PAC Co-Chair), Pat Smith (PAC Co-Chair), Lauren Gage (BPA), Charlie Grist (Council Staff), Jennifer Anziano (RTF Manager), Greg Kelleher (EWEB), Jeff Harris (NEEA), Pete Pengilly (Idaho Power), Wendy Gerlitz (NWECA), Richard Genece (BPA), Bob Stolarski (PSE), Stacy Donahue (Idaho PUC), Fred Gordon (ETO), Robin Arnold (Montana Public Service Commission)

Anziano gave the PAC members highlights from the previous RTF PAC meeting and recommendations of the RTF to the Council referring to this [presentation](#) and [memo to the Council](#)

RTF members consensus and non-consensus areas.

- RTF agrees there is a causal link between ductless heat pumps and wood use. Evidence shows introduction of ductless heat pump offsets some supplemental use.
- Wood use changes can be quantified.
- The monetized value of health impacts, for at least some measures can be significant.
- RTF notes that the methodology used by EPA to quantify and monetize impacts from wood smoke is accepted as best practice but a more sophisticated dispersion model would be required to be consistent with EPA methodology that accounts for locational impacts of emissions and partial-year effects.
- The RTF was not consensus whether today's numbers are good enough and more resources would be required.

West: On the RTF meeting, was there a specific reason for causal relationship instead of direct attribution?

Anziano: The RTF wanted to leave the direct attribution question to the Council.

West: Do we have a sense of how large the total value might be or are we risking spending more in understanding the benefit than there is in total benefit?

Grist: On page 43 of the report, table 22 summarize that if all of the known baseboard heated houses in the region switched to ductless heat pumps (DHP), it will save around 1255 GWh of electricity, and the low and high of the health benefit ranges between \$30M to \$300M . This equates to \$0.02 to \$0.30 per kw from the reduction on wood smoke.

West: On number for heating zones (page 2 memo), which heating zone are we talking about?

Grist: The NW heating zones. Climate zone 1, where we have the best data, is from Everett down to the coast of Oregon, to Bend in Oregon and up to north to the Cascades, includes Seattle and few rural counties. Zone 2 is the middle zone, and Zone 3 the colder areas of Idaho, Montana, and the mountains. We do the energy analysis by climate zone because the effects of ductless heat pump are

climate related. The wood smoke effect within the zone is not homogeneous, as the health effect is largely related to the population exposure. Some of the RTF members felt this was an issue.

West: RTF recommended a shift of the voice of the report to staff report, rather than the RTF. I feel the RTF is trying to distance itself from the work. What is the thinking behind this and is there a reason the work of the Wood Smoke Subcommittee is not referred in anything we see here?

Anziano: For the subcommittee work, we did not have a robust group for the discussion. We used the subcommittee and the Operations subcommittee to review the draft memo. As for the RTF distancing itself from the report, there is a lot of detail and depth in the report, and some expressed that they did not have enough of a chance to dig into it to understand it all. It is outside of their comfort zone and not in the charter or main scope of what the RTF does.

Grist: In my opinion, there is a real mix of opinion within the body of the RTF. Some want to distance themselves and their companies from the work because it is a danger zone.

Genece: On the memo, for the question of whether the health impact resulting from the conservation measure should be included in the cost and benefit estimate, if the Council were to ask for that recommendation is the RTF unified in making the recommendation or is RTF expecting this from the PAC?

Grist: It is not in the realm of the RTF's policy guidance and wouldn't be part of this report.

West: The charter for the PAC defines our scope on advising the Council on the operation of the RTF including the scope of the work plan. Our role is limited to advising the Council on how the stakeholders react to recommendations coming from the RTF. For the PAC to take independent action to recommend to the Council is out of our scope.

Genece: This is a precedent setting, and it makes me nervous on what direction the Council takes with this information.

Grist: This will be an example of another potential emission type benefit that could fall in the Council's environmental methodology consideration for the Seventh Power Plan.

Genece: I prefer to include cost benefit as it relate to energy without incorporating health benefit in that equation. I will feel comfortable in sending a unified voice from the PAC around the concern of work scope, budget, and potential distraction that it could bring to the Seventh Plan and other activities that are going on.

Gerlitz: We recognize budgetary constraints, but the quantification of the health benefit is important and gaining ground in the field. We feel this work is very important and is ground breaking.

West: What did the Council decide in the last meeting?

Smith: The much bigger issue on environmental methodology is the carbon issue. Residual environmental effect with wood smoke was coming as a concrete example. We didn't get into much discussion and are aware it will come back in December meeting.

Genece: How reliable does the Council need it to be 80%, 100% enough?

Grist: It is not a question we tried to answer RTF had a variety of opinion; most argued point was the micro aversion, small increase of the chance of dying.

West: I am thinking that we can craft a statement along the lines of: the PAC believes RTF has operated in open and transparent way and DHP is the best available measure to undertake this study. The RTF has spent \$100K to do the study, but we don't have a consensus in the RTF. We also see similar range of opinion in the PAC. We will monitor impacts of scope of work on RTF as it could be a significant investment.

Genece: I support this and would add greater emphasis on quantifying the costs.

Stolarski: Agree with Genece, on priority of what the RTF spends on and the effect it could have on number of measures.

Gordon: Any significant increase in the budget should be incremental and not distract to the core work the RTF has to do which is challenging and crucial.

West: Pat and I will draft a brief memo to accompany the RTF memo and staff memo.

Gerlitz, Patton, and Pengilly requested to see the draft memo before it is presented to the Council.

Meeting ended at 9:00 am after West informed the members the draft memo to the Council will be circulated to the group.