Maryland Commission on Climate Change
Mitigation Work Group Meeting Minutes
May 6, 2015 from 10:00 am – 12:00 pm
Maryland Department of the Environment, Baltimore, MD 21230 – Aqua Conference Room

Please note there is now a Commission website:
http://www.mde.state.md.us/programs/Marylander/Pages/mccc.aspx

In Attendance: Stuart Clarke, Town Creek Foundation; Mike Powell, Private Sector Representative; George Aburn, MDE; Lynn Heller, Abell Foundation; Anne Lindner, Exelon; Mike Remsberg, Trinity Consultants; R. Daniel Wallace, Bith Energy; Drew Cobbs, API; Tom Ballentine, NAIOP Real Estate Development; Tom Dennison, SMECO; Tom Weissinger, Raven Power; Jana Davis, Chesapeake Bay Trust; Mike Tidwell, Chesapeake Climate Action Network; Representative for Gerrit Knaap, National Center for Smart Growth; Arjun Makhijani, Institute for Energy and Environmental Research; Rebecca Ruggles, Maryland Environmental Health Network; Jim Strong, United Steelworkers; Alice Kennedy, Maryland Municipal League; Don Halligan, MDOT; Kevin Lucas, MEA; Jason Dubow, MDP; Susan Payne, MDA; Mia Davis, MWCOG; Howard Simons, MDOT; Luke Wisniewski, MDE; K. Christopher Clark, DBED; Kate Zyla, GCC; Rob McCord, MDP; Arkeen Turner, MBE; Charles Baber, Baltimore Metro; David Costello; Pam Kasemeyer, SMWPA; Dan Engelberg, NCSG; James McGarry, CCAN; Brian Hug, MDE; Tim Shepard, MDE; Kaley Laleker, MDE; Mark Schaffer, MDE; Liz Entwisle, MDE; Ben Hobbs, John Hopkins University; Cindy Parker, Bloomberg School of Public Health (phone)

I. Introduction
Meeting was called to order at 10:05 am. Tad Aburn opened the meeting by inviting each person at the table to identify themselves and offer a brief summary of why they are participating in the MWG. He then asked if anyone had any questions, additions, amendments to add to the agenda.

II. Overview of the Process

Tad opened the discussion with a few points and then proceeded with presentation titled **"**Where We Are and What Has Already Been Accomplished" (Handout #6)

- Tad emphasized the need to "bridge the gap" between the cost of implementation and the cost if inaction
- Environmental Justice Issues
- What the science is telling us and how it will inform future goal setting

Tad/Stuart: We'll need outside resources to answer these questions and we'll need endorsement from the group

- David Costello's consulting services will not be passed through CCAN, and instead will pass through University of Maryland

Tad referenced Handout #4 and #5 and discussed meeting schedules, programmatic issues and a general overview of the process.

Following Tad's Presentation: "Where We Are and What Has Already Been Accomplished" there were a few questions/comments

Question 1: What format should the MWG use to provide input?

Discussion: The MWG is an open forum, we'll receive input in and out of WG meetings, and also the process is open to public comment. There is a website available to access agendas, meeting notes, documents, and handouts.

Question 2: How good are the StateStat estimates and are the enhancements included in the 2020 goal as it appears in the Plan?

Discussion: The StateStat estimates are "quick and dirty" and the enhancements are included as part of the 2020 goal. Without enhancements, meeting the 2020 goal is unlikely.

Comment 1: Adaption vs. Mitigation: we need to focus on the over-lap.

Discussion: There are many economic benefits that we might be overlooking. DNR and MDE need to keep the conversation moving. Cost of inaction is part of the dialogue.

Question 3: Were historical weather conditions taken into account during goal setting?

Discussion: The data are not normalized for weather conditions

Question 4: How have market forces, particularly the NG price decrease affected progress towards 2020 goal?

Discussion: We don't know how it has affected the actual reductions attributable to the programs, but we do know that we missed the mark a bit.

Question 5: Is the MWG going to prioritize programs that have a greater positive impact on the economy?

Discussion: We need to look at both reduction potential and economic benefit. It's in the law. It's part of the dialogue. It has to be.

III. Overview of MDE's Programs

Brian Hug gave a presentation on the progress of MDE's GGRA Programs (Handout #7)

- Snapshot of all programs assigned to MDE (15)
- Detailed Explanation of Top 3 programs
- Program Enhancements Short-Term (2020) and Long-Term (2030 to 2050)

Question 1: How will 111(d) impact Maryland?

Discussion: the 111(d) rule is not final, but based on what we know; 111(d) could reduce CO_2 emissions in states where we import power. This fits into Maryland's larger planning process.

Question 2: Does the RGGI program mandate lowering the cap from 91Mton/yr or to 91Mton/yr.

Discussion: the rule states that the RGGI cap be reduced 2.5% each year from 91Mton/yr starting in 2015.

Comment 1: Clean Cars is an example of a program that <u>could</u> over-perform. Theoretically, if the economy continues to improve, consumers will be buying new cars sooner. Most new cars are considered "clean cars" and will start to replace the dirtier cars faster than originally predicted. This kind of analysis has to be done for all of the GGRA programs by all of the respective agencies.

Comment 2: The Zero Waste Program could under-perform. This assumption is based on the fact that waste generation in MD continues to be lower than projected. With less waste generation (and less recycling) MD will see fewer GHG reductions.

> Discussion: This program is a good example of the need for cross-agency cooperation. LMA and ARMA work closely to analyze program status. Availability of data is key to the success of this time-sensitive analysis.

Question 3: Is the Zero Waste goal calculated by county, taking into consideration the increased opportunity to improve recycling where population density is greatest?

> Discussion: The goal is set state-wide but the Maryland Recycling Act has requirements for minimum recycling rates for all counties and certain municipalities (Baltimore city).

Question 4: Does the Clean Cars program include incentives to buy Clean Cars in Maryland?

> Discussion: Yes, but the incentives are for plug-in hybrid vehicles and for LEV infrastructure.

> There are hurdles to the success of LEV and ELEVs. Cost, fear of infrastructure inadequacy, and cost of energy. We need partners at the local level to push this initiative forward.

Question 5: Does meeting the 2020 goal depend on implementation of enhancements?

> Discussion: We aren't 100% sure yet, but it's likely that we'll need the reductions from the program enhancements

Question 6: Is the life-cycle of certain fuels considered in the analysis?

Question 7: Has the issue of methane "leakage" been addressed?

> Discussion: No, the analysis is incomplete. But the discussion of the science should occur at a later meeting. This conversation was outside the scope of the meeting.

IV. Data Collection Deadlines and Expectations

Brian summarized the data needs memo (handout #8) that will be sent to State agencies

July is the deadline for receiving program status update and data from all State Agencies with reporting requirements included in the GGRA. – We know it's challenging.

V. Wrap-up

- Homework Assignments
- Potential for MDE to facilitate webinars for sub-groups who may need to collaborate
- MDOT/ MEA will need to provide detailed update on program status at the next MWG meeting

- There is limited opportunity to discuss these issues. Recommendation: Could each agency provide (3) problem areas they foresee being a challenge in getting the program summary by the deadline?

VI. Adjourn

Meeting was adjourned at 12:04 pm by MWG co-chairs