Maryland Commission on Climate Change
Mitigation Working Group
July 20, 2015 from 10 am. - 12 p.m.

Maryland Department of the Environment, Baltimore, MD 21230 – Aqua Conference Room

In Attendance: Secretary Grumbles – MDE; Tad Aburn – MDE; Stuart Clarke – Town Creek Foundation; Mike Powell – Private Sector Representative; Ian Ullman – Senator Pinsky, Fred Ducca – U of MD; Susan Payne – MDA; David Costello – UMCES; James McGarry – UMCES; Arjun Makhijani – Institute for Energy and Environmental Research; Betsy Atkinson and Rebecca Rehr for Rebecca Ruggles – MD EHN; Kevin Lucas – Maryland Energy Administration; Marissa Gillett – MD PSC; Lynn Heller – Abell Foundation; Don Halligan – MDOT; Tom Wessinger – Raven Power; Colleen Turner – Michael Baker for MDOT; Liz Entwisle – MDE; Jim Doyle – Attorney; Anna Zahn – Excelon; and Anne Linder – Exelon; Audrey Vogel – UMD

On Phone: Les Knapp – MACO; Gabriel Pacyniak **–** GCC**;** Melanie Santiago-Mosier – Sun Edison; and Tom Ballantine – NAIOP

I. Introduction

Meeting was called to order at 10:08 when Tad asked participants to provide comment and feedback on the post-2020 goal MDE "Straw-man" and reiterated that it was intended to generate discussion. The 40% GHG reduction by 2030 from 2006 baseline is the proposed goal.

Tad invited each attendee to introduce themselves.

- Some discussion questions about the MDE Straw Man Post-2020 Goal Setting:

  - Is MDE using the appropriate baseline?
  - How does the MD goal and baseline compare to other states?
  - Should a post-2020 goal be "hard" or aspirational?
  - How are federal programs included?
  - Should the Commission set economic goals and GHG goals?
  - How will short-term programs be tracked?
  - When will long-term programs start to stimulate reductions?

II. Further Discussion: Comments, Questions, Topics, and Proposals

- Is there a compliance mechanism if MD does not meet 2020 GHG reduction goal?
  - Yes, for certain programs. Some are in statute (RPS, RGGI, etc)
  - Others do not have any compliance mechanism
  - MCCC needs to be sure not to pressure General Assembly with constraints
  - Political realities of compliance mechanisms need further discussion

- How will 2015 GGRA interim review impact the GGRA when it goes in front of General Assembly?

- If the post-2020 goal setting is a strategic issue, should the Commission just recommend an extension of the GGRA and include goal setting recommendation in the 2016 MCCC report?

  - A hard and or aspirational goal in the extended GGRA will help MDE get cooperation and continue to make progress
  - Planners are pragmatic and a goal would be beneficial
  - MDE needs legislative mandate in order to make progress
  - MDE can't direct other State Agencies

- Should the Commission focus be on evaluating current programs or proposing new programs?
  - The 2016 review will serve to evaluate current GGRA programs
  - The Commission is tasked with evaluating current and new programs and making a long-term plan
  - Language in Executive Order outlines these Commission requirements
  - More time to evaluate current programs will be beneficial

- How does current goal-setting exercise compare to 2009 when MDE developed 2012 GGRA Plan?
  - In 2008, the Climate Action Plan provide some valuable background information to set goal
  - In 2009, MDE set a goal first and then made a plan. It worked well, but it was challenging

- Transportation Projects need to be evaluated differently based on the time required to get meaningful reductions

- What is MCCC role in evaluating, tracking, and enhancing to MDOT projects?

- Should MCCC have a role in Maryland EVIC (Electric Vehicle Infrastructure Council)?
- How can MCCC and MDE use EVIC more effectively as a resource?
- Should MCCC review EVIC plan?
  - EVIC is already in place doing good work
  - EVIC is legislatively created

- When the Commission refers to job creation, is it limited to MD jobs or should Regional jobs be quantified?

- Is leading by example still one of MD's priorities in the region/country/global community?
  - Can expose MD to excessive scrutiny

- MCCC is charged with evaluating Adaptation and Resilience. How can Commission discuss co-benefits of programs on health, economy, etc

- The environmental community is "goal-focused" but adaptation and resilience need be a Commission priority

- Could an extension of the 2020 goal undermine the authority of the Commission to renew the GGRA?

- Does the Commission need more time to conduct a deeper analysis of current and potential programs for goal setting?

- What is the deadline for the MWG to make a recommendation to the full Commission about goals?

- Perhaps the Commission should vote on the following:
  - MDE Straw-man
  - Wait 1 year and set a goal then

- Set a goal (i.e. 40% by 2030), but recommend that it not be included in statute until additional research and planning can occur

- Proposal: The Commission analyze the current GGRA "Top-10" programs to determine short-comings and ways to enhance
  - Current analysis indicates that Maryland will be close to meeting 2020 goal – but "declaring victory" could lead to excessive scrutinizing of individual programs
  - When the programs were designed, the agencies knew some might under-perform. They aren't failing.
  - Looking at programs in aggregate is more appropriate
  - "Other" category should be included and should outline market influences on 2020 goal progress
  - Future goal will be based on a better baseline (more current)
  - Reminder: MDE took a 30% discount to account for overlap and to be conservative
  - Using metrics is a potentially better way to track individual programs
  - Metrics work well in some sectors (CEMs in energy sector) but less effectively in others (forestry)

- Proposal: Should the Commission recommend using an absolute CO2 target rather than a percent reduction?

- Proposal: The Commission review Arjun's report on expenditures on energy efficiency

- Proposal: MWG chairs send email to Commissioners soliciting feedback on:
  - Existing GHG programs
  - Metrics to track progress (accounting)
  - New GHG programs
  - Future goals
  - Need consensus on these issues

VI. Adjourn

Meeting was adjourned at 12: 04 pm.