www.mdclimatechange.us

MEETING SUMMARY
MARYLAND
ADAPTATION AND RESPONSE WORKING GROUP
Meeting #3, October 1, 2007
1:00 PM – 4:00 PM

Attendance:

ARWG Members:

Don Halligan
Zoe Johnson

Carl Bruch
David Burke
Christine Conn
Philip Conner
Carrie Decker
Anthony Davis (for Sherwood Brooks)
Gil Dissen
Bill Giese
Lara Hansen (by phone)
Lynn Heller
Jesse Houston (by phone)
Joan Kean (by phone)
Dennis King
John Kostyack
Bill Miles
Ellen Moyer
Joy Oakes
Court Stevenson
Dru Schmidt Perkins
Gwynne Schultz
Sue Veith

Center for Climate Strategies (CCS):

Ken Colburn, *Facilitator*
Bill Dougherty, *Facilitator*
Kirsten Dow, *Facilitator*
Kris Ebi, *Facilitator*
Amy Luers, *Facilitator*
Katie Pasko, *Assistant*

Background documents:

All posted at: http://www.mdclimatechange.us/twg.cfm

1. Agenda
2. Overview of the ARWG PowerPoint presentation
3. Draft Maryland Adaptation Synthesis Report
4. Draft Catalog of State Adaptation Options

Discussion items and key issues

This was the third meeting of the ARWG.

Introductions

The meeting was called to order at 1 pm and roundtable introductions of all ARWG members present were made. Colburn reviewed the agenda for the meeting. He explained that the Technical Working Groups (TWGs) were reorganized during the previous week, so there was not sufficient time to schedule teleconference meetings. Time would be dedicated at this meeting for each TWG to meet.

The facilitators for each TWG were introduced:

- Existing Built Environment and Infrastructure (Existing) – For this meeting, Bill Dougherty act as Lead Facilitator. Kirsten Dow is co-facilitator.
- Future Built Environment and Infrastructure (Future) - Kirsten Dow
- Human Health, Safety & Welfare – Kris Ebi
- Resources and Resource-Based Industries – Amy Luers

DNR is working to provide a staff liason for each TWG.

Review of Process

Colburn reviewed the process to be followed by the ARWG. The current draft of the Synthesis Report has been distributed to the members and posted on the website. There are approximately 100-200 options identified to date.

Each TWG must review this catalog to ensure all possible options are included. At the same time, the TWGs must identify initial priority options for the MCCC meeting on 17 October. TWG reports will be made directly to the MCC as the next meeting of the ARWG is not until 19 October.

As part of the 14 November Interim Report by the Maryland Commission on Climate Change (MCCC), the ARWG will identify four or five 'fast track' options. These options should be easily implemented, not necessarily the highest priority options. This will enable the ARWG and MCCC to bring them to the attention of the legislature this session. Prior to the next ARWG meeting, each TWG is expected to identify one or two 'fast track' options that can be acted upon during this legislative session.

The TWGs will develop straw proposals for all priority options for the 7 December ARWG meeting. These straw proposals are designed to take the best, most important ideas from the catalog and provide a framework for the implementation of that policy. The framework includes items 5-9 on Slide 5 of the PowerPoint presentation. These action items do not need to be done one step at a time, but all must be completed by the beginning of April. Note that the dates on Slide 5 are ARWG meeting dates.

Throughout this process, CCS will provide a baseline for the TWGs to provide the analysis of each priority option. The facilitators will assist by providing expertise in the analysis and ensuring that the schedule is followed.

The 'fast track' items will also be reviewed for implementation strategies, which can include executive orders, legislation, regulatory guidelines, etc.

Draft Maryland Adaptation Synthesis Report and Catalog of State Options

Dougherty presented an overview of the Synthesis Report and the Catalog. The members are asked to read and review both documents which have been distributed and are posted on the website. The catalog is a collection of all possible ideas for policy options. The catalog is then reviewed to identify priority options and create straw proposals as outlined above.

Presentation by STWG

Don Boesch, co-Chair, gave a presentation from the MCCC Scientific and Technical Working Group regarding "Climate Impacts Facing Maryland". The slides are available on the website at http://www.mdclimatechange.us/ewebeditpro/items/O40F13683.pdf. The charge to the STWG is threefold: advise the Commission about the scientific and technical aspects of climate change; investigate the dynamics of climate change; and evaluate the consequences of climate change to the many natural resource based industries in Maryland.

The STWG has utilized the Northeast Climate Impacts Assessment, www.northeastclimateimpacts.org, for its models. Unfortunately, the Assessment ends at the Mason-Dixon Line and, therefore, does not include Maryland. There are many variables in modeling emission scenarios, resulting in a wide swing of predictions (Slide 5). The STWG has decided to use Models A2 as the higher limit and Model B1 as the lower, as shown on the Emission Scenarios graph on Slide 5.

The Working Subgroups of the STWG are listed on Slide 6.

A major effort of the STWG is to address long range sea-level rise projections (Slide 7). This subgroup will work extensively with the ARWG to achieve consistent projections. All calculations will be adjusted for the known subsidence of the coastal lands in Maryland.

The primary message of the STWG to both the MWG and ARWG is that it is far more beneficial to reduce GHG emissions in the near term than to wait until later to achieve concentration goals. (Slide 9) GHG stabilization targets are 450-500 ppm CO_2e. The more quickly the total $MMTCO_2e$ is reduced, the more positive the effect will be to reach this stabilization goal. The IPCC is recommending a 30-60% reduction from 2000 levels of CO_2e by the year 2050 to reach this goal.

Hansen's metrics for "dangerous change" are outlined on Slide 11. His point is that work must be done in the 21st century to prevent unavoidable 6 – 25 m sea-level rises within a few centuries.

General Discussion

The members discussed the impact of this presentation and the GHG reduction goals on the Adaptation and Response tasks. Several members felt that the ARWG should plan for the worst case scenario. Others felt that an assessment of realistic impacts would be more beneficial. All agreed that this topic would be raised again at a near future meeting.

The work of the ARWG and future groups will be very localized. Maryland has over 6000 miles of coastline, therefore catalog options will not apply equally to all areas. The group must decide how much it can accomplish and how much should be left to localities to address with state guidance.

There was general agreement that this group, perhaps under a different format, would need to continue its work and regenerate its membership into the future in order to address changing concerns and issues.

TWG Breakout Session

Dougherty suggested that the members use three qualitative metrics to assess the policy options: Capital intensity, flexibility and adaptive capacity. (Slide 9)

Each TWG met separately to plan future meetings and begin assessing the policy options.

Next Meetings

The next meeting of the ARWG will be on 19 October from 10 am – 4 pm, which is after the MCCC meets on 17 October. The members agreed that the TWGs would meet in the morning and the entire ARWG would meet in the afternoon after lunch. The room locations will be confirmed.

TWG Action Items:

- Review Catalog and Synthesis reports for completeness and possible omissions or errors.
- Identify 1-2 solid ‘fast track’ options for legislative action.
- Identify initial priority options for analysis.
- Report results prior to 17 October.
- Add clarifying notes to the Catalog, indicating current programs in Maryland and/or any other relevant information.