



[www.mdclimatechange.us](http://www.mdclimatechange.us)

**SUMMARY OF TELECONFERENCE MEETING #3  
MARYLAND CROSS-CUTTING ISSUES TECHNICAL WORK GROUP (TWG)  
September 21, 2007**

**Attendance:**

1. TWG Members: Paul Chan, Mike Mallinoff, Cindy Parker, John Quinn, Jerry Hughes for Ray Bourland, PSC
2. Maryland Department of Environment (MDE): Tad Auburn, Renee Fizer, Liz Enstwisle, Molla Sarros
3. Center for Climate Strategies: Ken Colburn, Tom Looby, Katie Pasko
4. Other Attendees: Jeffrey King, Metro Washington COG
5. Public:

**Background Documents:**

(Posted at [http://www.mdclimatechange.us/cross\\_cutting.cfm](http://www.mdclimatechange.us/cross_cutting.cfm))

1. Meeting notice and agenda (including provisions for public access)
2. Summary of MD CC TWG Call #2
3. PowerPoint Presentation for Cross-Cutting Issues (CC) TWG Call #3
4. Draft Maryland CC TWG Catalog of State Actions
5. Draft Descriptions of State Actions Catalog for CC TWG
6. State GHG Reduction Targets Table

**Discussion Items and Issues:**

This was the second call of the MD CC TWG.

1. Ken Colburn of CCS called the meeting to order, completed the roll call, and reviewed the agenda and purpose of the call.
2. The 9-14-07 Call Summary was approved w/ one clarification to item 5 of the discussion. That is that the policy option identified for inclusion in the Interim Report may simply be what is ready to move forward and it may , or may not be, one of the highest priorities.
3. Power Point slides were used to cover topics on the agenda, starting with the goals for the upcoming MWG meeting on September 28. Included in the MWG meeting will be a request to identify key goals to fast-track for the Interim Report to the Governor by mid- November. A slide reviewing the overall schedule for the process was summarized, including a new date of November 14 for the MCCC to review and approve the Interim Report.
4. Mr. Colburn then walked call participants through additional Power Point slides. By the September 28 MWG meeting the TWGs should complete their lists of potential policy options to consider. By the MWG meeting at the end of October

the goal is to identify the highest priority options to evaluate further and to choose one policy option to include in the Interim Report.

5. Participants reviewed slide #7 listing some of the key elements involved in setting state GHG Reduction goals and targets, including but not limited to: growth rates, establishing baselines, levels of reduction, short and long-term target dates, consumption vs. production estimates, gross vs. net emissions, aspirational vs. ground up goals, and periodic updates. CCS also provided a table of GHG reduction goals and targets being utilized in other states. Mr. Colburn noted that most states use a combination of short and long-term goals. Participants wanted to consider both consumption and production estimates, and both aspirational and achievable goals. Several members voiced concern about melting of arctic sea ice on a faster pace than predicted and indicated that aggressive short and as well as long-term goals are needed. Discussion occurred about the possibility of establishing a carbon neutral goal, by 2100 or sooner. Another member cautioned that we need to concurrently consider broader societal impacts to both implementing and not implementing the aggressive goals. They also noted the importance of pushing the federal government to take strong affirmative action on GHG emissions. Participants agreed that periodic adjustments to the goals will also be important. The next call should focus extensively on the goals discussion.
6. Mr. Colburn summarized slides 8-11 addressing recent findings and studies about current and future projections of GHG emissions, carbon levels and temperature rises.
7. The participants then reviewed the Catalog of State Policy Options and the following key points were made:
  - The overall catalog of state policy options was approved for consideration by the MWG on its 9/28/07 call w/ two additions noted below:
  - New Option 13- Peak Oil- A member recommended that we add a new option to address GHG emissions in the “After Peak Oil” scenario. The group agreed to propose an advisory committee to further investigate the nexus between climate change and “after peak oil” production scenarios.
  - New Option 14- Health Benefits and Risks- One of the participants suggested that a policy option be added to address public health risks, costs and benefits. The members agreed that adding option #14 was warranted so that mechanisms could be created to address these impacts, as well as to assure that they are used as a metric on a broader scale in the process.
  - Options 5, sub-item 5.1- One member asked if we should go beyond 2010. Another noted that the MEA is looking at the Empower MD initiative and will likely be offering additional suggestions on it. Therefore, no changes were made, at this time.

8. Public Input: None was offered on the call but Jeffrey King of Metro Washington COG sent an e-mail after the call containing the following input:

For the record, I was on the TWG call today, September 21. Glad to hear the group tackling tough issues such as goal setting. Understand the time constraints, I am emailing my public input instead of verbally on the call:

- 1) The Washington region's Climate Change Steering Committee (CCSC) has formed a GHG Emissions Workgroup to develop a regional projection inventory. As your TWG encountered today, the COG workgroup has also been dealing with the issue of carbon footprint. To date, the recommendation, at least for the electricity sector, is to count both production and net imports.
- 2) In the DC region process, we may need two things: a) better understanding of electricity markets, specifically net imports and how to attribute the production from nuclear plants; and b) local activity data. For certain sources we estimate our regional emissions by scaling down from the state level. In order for local governments to track their own progress, it may be important that local/regional activity data, particularly for fuels consumption, be made available. This concept would fit nicely in your Item 6.1 ID state role in promoting local GHG reductions. States could possibly assist the regions/locals by providing disaggregated information on fuels and electricity markets.
- 3) The DC region hasn't yet tackled goal setting. We do however have a set of recommendations on a) interim years of 2020 and 2030, and b) aspiration year of 2050. Reduction targets will be considered by the CCSC in November.

#### **Next Steps:**

1. The next MWG meetings will occur on September 28 and October 26. The next MCCC meetings will occur on October 17 and November 14.
2. In preparation for the October 17 MCCC meeting the Cross-Cutting TWG will focus extensively on options for the MD GHG goals during its next call on October 12. This should include the levels of reduction to target, the nature and frequency of periodic updates, and the other elements discussed above. They will also discuss which of the CC options might be considered as a high priority to fast track for the Interim Report.