



www.mdclimatechange.us

MEETING SUMMARY
MARYLAND CLIMATE CHANGE ADVISORY GROUP
Residential, Commercial and Industrial Technical Work Group
(RCI TWG)

Call #4, October 10, 2007

Attendance: (*new members)

Technical Working Group: Paul Chan, Willam Chandler, Brad Heavner, William Livingston, and Matthias Ruth

Maryland State Department Representatives: Tad Aburn, Renee Fizer, Brian Hug, Liz Entwisle, Katy Perry, Jim Lewis, Walt Auburn, Michael Li, and Robert Howatt

Center for Climate Strategies (CCS): Christopher James, Alice Napoleon

Public Attendees: Unknown

Background documents:

(http://www.mdclimatechange.us/GHG_Residential_Commercial_Industrial.cfm)

- Meeting Notice and Agenda
- Call #3 Summary
- Powerpoint for Teleconference
- Revised RCI Draft Catalog of State's Actions, 10/10/07
- RCI Descriptions of Catalog Actions

Discussion items and key issues:

1. CCS called the meeting to order, completed the roll call, and reviewed the agenda and plans for the call.
2. There were no questions or comments on the draft summary of Call #3. The meeting notes were approved.
3. CCS reviewed where we are in the process. Following the meeting, the TWG will conduct balloting to identify initial priorities for analysis. Ballots will be distributed after this meeting via e-mail. Each TWG member can select ten options. TWG members are asked to return completed ballots by October 18 at the latest. CCS will compile and present the results of the balloting at the next TWG meeting on 10/22/07. On 10/26, these results will also be presented to the MWG, which may accept or reject and modify the TWG's recommended priorities for analysis. By the middle of November, the TWG will

begin developing straw proposals for the priority policy options moved forward by the MWG.

4. Chris briefed the TWG on the 9/28 MWG meeting. The MWG discussed mitigation goals for Maryland. Also, it added new options to the RCI Catalog, and modified some of the existing options. (These changes are shown in bold in the version of the catalog posted for this meeting.) Finally, it highlighted potential Early Action options.
5. The TWG reviewed the early action items suggested by the MWG (2.1 and 2.2). There was some discussion of whether the MWG intended to flag these catalog items as potential early action items. It was noted that conservation and education also came up at the MWG meeting, and that there was discussion on the shortcomings of LEED (applies to 2.1). A participant observed that both 2.1 and 2.2 apply to new construction and thus will have little impact in the short term; 1.1 and 1.3 should be higher priorities, because they will reduce emissions soon. Renee Fizer clarified that the early action items should reflect what legislators or other policymakers are already doing and should already have undergone preliminary study or development—“early action” does not entail a higher priority, just a faster track for review.
6. The TWG discussed other potential early action items.
 - a. A suggestion was raised that the TWG consider costs to the economy when recommending early action items.
 - b. The MEA has been developing a white paper on an energy efficiency resource standard (EERS), which would require that some percent of load (2%) must come from demand reduction. Utilities would get full cost recovery for the demand reduction investments. The proposal includes a carve-out for market transformation.
 - c. It was suggested that part of the state’s building budget be tied to energy efficiency. Renee Fizer noted that most agency buildings are leased, but a policy might focus on procurement. Liz Entwisle commented that the Empower MD initiative captures some leased buildings (those over 20,000 ft.); whatever the RCI TWG recommends should dovetail with Empower MD. The goal is to reduce energy use by 15% across all sectors, but it has “teeth” for state buildings. This idea needs more thought from the TWG.
 - d. There was general support for a policy on education (4.2, school curricula).
 - e. Building codes - there was some discussion of standards above ASHRAE for state buildings. Can we go further? This idea needs more thought from the TWG.
 - f. The TWG recommends four policies to go forward – 2.1, 2.2, 4.2 + EERS
7. Notional ratings – the group is preparing to identify initial priorities for analysis. Alice Napoleon and Chris James provided approximate notional rankings (high, medium and low) as to the potential GHG emissions reductions and potential cost or cost savings to society for each policy option, as shown in the 3rd and 4th columns of the 10-10-07 version of the catalog. Definitions of the notional rankings are provided in the key on the first page of the catalog. (Negative costs indicate a positive benefit.) Notional rankings are just one resource TWG members can draw on for completing ballots—members

might consider issues other than GHG and cost when selecting options, for example economic development. Feedback on these rough assessments was solicited in the meeting. There were no suggested changes to the notional ratings provided by CCS.

8. Catalog consolidation – Alice and Chris explained that the TWG might want to consolidate policies if they are substantially similar, so as to not split the ballots between them. On the other hand, over-consolidating makes it difficult to analyze and quantify benefits; the risk is that the information product may not be as useful to policymakers.
 - a. The TWG discussed combining 1.1 and 1.2, but oil & propane would have different implementation mechanisms. Matthias suggested breaking it out even further (i.e., 1.2 would be split for each of the fuels). 1.1 and 1.2 will be left as they are.
 - b. There were no objections to the following suggested consolidations. These catalog items have been bundled for the ballot:
 - i. 1.4 + 2.6
 - ii. 3.1 + 3.2
 - iii. 1.1 + 1.3
 - iv. 10.3 + 10.9
 - v. 9.4, 10.6, and 10.10 are included in 1.1
 - vi. 10.11 is included in 1.1 and 1.3. Change 1.1 & 1.3 to specifically include home energy audits.
 - c. It was noted that 10.2 (State/ Municipal Energy Management (including aggregation and for demand response)) and 10.13 (financing/banking (role of private v. public, performance terms)) might fit better in cross-cutting.
9. Public input or announcements: none

Next steps and agreements:

1. Following the meeting, the TWG will conduct balloting. Ballots will be distributed via e-mail on October 11. Ballots must be returned 10/18. The results of the balloting will be discussed at the next TWG meeting on 10/22, and forwarded to the MWG for its review on 10/26. By the middle of November, the TWG will begin developing straw proposals for the priority policy options moved forward by the MWG.
2. The next TWG meeting will be held on **October 22th, 2007 from 1:00 to 3:00 PM EST.**
3. Materials for each call will be posted at the Maryland Climate Change website (see address above). CCS will notify the TWG members when the materials are available for review.