



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

**MEETING SUMMARY  
MARYLAND ADAPTATION & RESPONSE  
WORK GROUP (ARWG)  
Meeting #9, March 7, 2008  
10:00 AM – 4:00 PM**

**Attendance:**

**ARWG Members:**

Don Halligan, *MDP*  
Zoe Johnson, *DNR*

Ron Bowen, *Anne Arundel County*  
Sherwood “Duke” Brooks, *MD Assoc. of Realtors*  
Phillip Connor, *Marine Trade Association of Maryland*  
Mark Feinroth, *MD Assoc. of Realtors*  
Bill Giese, *USFWS*  
Jason Holstine, *Amicas Green Building Center*  
Dennis King, *UMCES (by phone)*  
Joe Maheady, *USGBC*  
Clifford Mitchell, *Department of Health and Hygiene*  
Robert Pace, *US Army*  
Court Stevenson, *UMCES*

**MD Department of Natural Resources (DNR):**

Gwen Shaughnessy

**Other Maryland Departments:**

Warren Campbell, *MEMA*  
Ruth Mascari, *MEMA*

**Center for Climate Strategies (CCS):**

Ken Colburn, *Project Leader*  
Gloria Flora, *Project Leader*  
Bill Dougherty, *Facilitator*  
Kirsten Dow, *Facilitator (by phone)*  
Kris Ebi, *Facilitator*  
Brian Joyce, *Facilitator*  
Katie Pasko, *Assistant*

**Members of the Public:**

**Background documents:**

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

1. Meeting Agenda
2. ARWG PowerPoint presentation
3. Revised Master List of Policy Options
4. Policy Option Descriptions

**Discussion and Key Issues**

Zoe Johnson opened the meeting and asked for introductions.

Ken Colburn reviewed the agenda for the meeting and the overall process being followed to develop the policy options. The TWGs are meeting in small groups and as TWGs to complete the Policy Option Templates for each policy option. At present, the focus is on completing the *Option Description* and *Option Design* sections and developing the *Implementation Mechanisms* and *Related Policies and Programs in Place* sections.

**General Notes**

Members are reminded to review Mitigation Working Group proposed policy options to identify overlap of focus. All PODs are available on the website.

**Future Built Environment Infrastructure****Common Option: Integrated Planning for Sea Level Rise, Coastal Storms and Coastal Erosion**

Under Option Design, last bullet- Define “vulnerable areas”.

As noted in the Implementation Mechanisms, the State Finance & Procurement Article establishes authority for the Department of Planning to define “areas of critical state concern.” It is recommended that MDP, DNT, MDE, county and local governments work together to define areas subject to SLR, coastal erosion and storm inundation. Once these areas are defined and designated by the state, NOAA funding would become available to assist in efforts to protect these areas.

**FBEI-2 AdaptationStat**

The TWG recommended that the name of the policy be changed to ‘State Agency Reporting on Response to CCC Findings’ to emphasize a comprehensive approach to planning. Linking the policy design to the BayStat model puts administrative limits on any proposals. The goals of this proposed policy option and BayStat are quite similar, however, and should not be completely ignored.

**FBEI-5 Create a Climate Change and Insurance Advisory Committee****FBEI-8 Economic Development Initiative****Common Option: Integrated GIS, Monitoring, and Modeling**



**FBEI-5 Create a Climate Change and Insurance Commission**

**OK to move forward with no objections**

**EBEI-10 Disclosure**

**OK to move forward with no objections**

- Insurers

**Human Health, Safety and Welfare**

**HHSW-1 Health Impacts Assessments of the Climate Change Action Plan**

**OK to move forward with no objections**

This is designed to review impacts of climate change on health issues as well as environmental factors. Health Impact Assessments are based on the Environmental Impact Statement model. The purpose is to determine overall needs and underlying details.

**HHSW-2 Coordination Across Agencies Responsible for Human Health and Safety**

**OK to move forward with no objections**

The goal of this policy option is to insure that health issues are considered in all planning scenarios. Include research groups working in these areas.

Include the use of private labs for use during emergencies. Utilization of non-governmental organizations to assist in filling needs should be assessed.

**HHSW- 5 Public Health Response Plans for Large Scale Floods, Storms and Storm Surges**

**Unanimous agreement to move to Hazard Preparedness And Emergency Planning**

**HHSW-9 Vector-borne Surveillance and Control Programs**

**OK to move forward with no objections**

The range of health related vectors is changing, generally increasing. In addition, surveillance of new diseases must be accomplished.

Largely due to funding systems, surveillance tends to be vector specific, with staffing assigned to specific insects, rather than regional studies.

**Hazard Preparedness and Emergency Planning**

**OK to move forward with no objections, including HHSW-5 in this option development.**

New members from other TWGs are needed.

## **Public Awareness and Capacity Building**

**OK to move forward with no objections, including FBEI-9 in this option development.**

Infrastructure related to public health is taxed, with inadequate staffing and lab facilities to address emergencies.

Care should be taken in choosing the language used in documents, as many terms have specific meanings in framing legislations and regulations.

## **Existing Built Environment and Infrastructure**

### **EBEI - 2 Observation System for Changes in Coastal Zones**

**OK to move forward with no objections**

MEMA-style facilities would be ideal for this approach.

### **EBEI - 3 Adaptation of Vulnerable Coastal Infrastructure**

**OK to move forward with no objections**

This policy option will require the coordination with several agencies, government bodies and other entities. For example, the PUC should be consulted regarding new source and building capacity to meet future demand. Due to regulatory structure and demand, most producers will avoid new source review, which will limit the relocation of production facilities to lower risk areas.

**EBEI – 10 Disclosure** *See discussion above*

## **Coastal Protection Evaluation**

**OK to move forward with no objections the proviso that the TWG should review adding RRI-7/9 to this option.**

More definition is needed to clarify the Targets section. Define the term “detailed assessment” as it pertains to an inventory of existing assets.

The process is threefold: measure what exists, predict future assets using models and conduct the inventory. All three parts can remain separate or be combined. The TWG will work with FBEI on the modeling component.

The MEMA facilities model can be utilized for current inventory.

Property owners should be given guidelines and options for coastal protection. Soft coastal options are great but owners will try to save their land whenever possible.

## **Development Standards**

**OK to move forward with no objections**

Building standards and codes are becoming more environmentally friendly. As a result, all standards and codes should be integrated and improved. In Maryland, building codes are local, an issue which should also be considered by the TWG.

Review healthy building standards with HHSW TWG. Note that as buildings become more energy efficient, they tend to become 'sicker'.

The TWG should consider intermodal transportation models, not just roads, in efforts to modernize existing infrastructures.

Building codes and standards should include survivability standards, so that occupants can shelter in place for 'x' period of time.

The useful life expectancy of coastal infrastructure should also be considered, allowing for erosion, sea level rise and storm surge in design aspects.

In the Targets section, add a bullet point to highlight that energy building codes are related to Mitigation issues as well. These options can be used to prevent adaptation problems.

Linking water supply issues and smart growth options is essential.

### **Future Built Environment and Infrastructure**

#### **FBEI-2 Mandate Integration of Findings and Recommendations into All Appropriate State and Local Programs**

**OK to move forward with no objections**

#### **FBEI-4 Preserve Underdeveloped, Vulnerable Lands**

**OK to move forward with no objections. Combine this into RRI Common Option 0 New Criteria for Priority Protection Areas.**

*A small group leader is needed for this option.*

#### **FBEI-5 Create a Climate Change and Insurance Commission** *See discussion above*

#### **FBEI-8 Economic Development Initiative**

**OK to move forward with no objections**

Add language such as "Consider sea level rise effects on water quality, tourism, watermen, seafood, poultry and other vulnerable industries."

Develop metrics to assess success in this area.

Address two major issues: the encouragement of new, green, salt tolerant industries; and the evolution of carbon heavy industries in new directions. Existing industries should be assigned to RRI.

Priority funding should address smart growth areas.

Under 'Timing', note the need for resources to inventory green industries. County business patterns and trends in other states should be reviewed and assessed. For example, solar panels manufactured in Maryland are sold in Europe.

### **FBEI-9 Training and Capacity Building**

**OK to move forward with no objections**

**Combine with HHSW Preparedness and Planning, including a mandatory land use component.**

### **Integrated Planning for SLR and Associated Coastal Hazards**

**OK to move forward with no objections**

**Combine with HHSW Preparedness and Planning, including a mandatory land use component.**

Implementation will require fundamental changes in land use. Political questions will need to be answered.

Leadership will probably need to originate at the state level to require counties to address this issue.

### **Integrated GIS, Monitoring, and Modeling**

**OK to move forward with no objections with inclusion of FBEI-4**

Cliff Mitchell volunteered to work on this group.

### **Resources and Resource-based Industries**

#### **RRI-1 New Criteria for Identifying Priority Protection Areas**

**OK to move forward with no objections**

Utilize green and blue assessments

#### **RRI-4 Forest and Wetland Protection**

**OK to move forward with no objections**

The stated goal in the proposed policy option is 70% of the state's riparian areas to be

#### **RRI-7 Modify Environmental Protection Regulations and RRI-9 Promote Sustainable Shorelines**

**OK to move forward with no objections**

These two should be combined with EBEI-6, as there is a hierarchical structure between all of them that requires addressing EBEI-6 first.

#### **RRI-8 Resource-Based Industry Economic Impacts Assessments and/or Initiative**

**OK to move forward with no objections**

If a new policy regarding existing industries is added, then move some of the sections pertaining to job creation, etc. to the “assist existing industry in transition” policy option. Integrate this with the new Chesapeake Bay Agreement.

Funding for this option could also be found by using RGGI allowances. The use of RGGI allowances also touches upon Mitigation issues. Ensure that this is included in the POD so that recognition is given to the need for the RGGI allowances to be spread over all areas of concern.

### **General Comments**

Many changes are due to the climate impact on coastal habitats. A timeline for addressing Adaptation issues should be developed in conjunction with the Science and Technology group.

Colburn briefly explained the structure of the Final Report. Each TWG facilitator will write a summary of the PODs developed by the TWG. All summaries will be attached, with the PODs, to the Final Report as a Technical Appendix. There will also be an overall summary report from Adaptation included in the report.

A similar process will be followed for Mitigation and Science & Technology.

A member stated that climate change is generally viewed negatively by the public. The report is a good forum to focus on positive aspects.

### **Next Steps**

The ARWG stated that a section of the ARWG final report summary should include a chapter addressing “Themes That Emerged”. This will recognize that the assignment of most of the ARWG policy options can not be the focus of only one TWG, but must cross the boundaries between them.

### **Next Steps**

The TWG leaders will address final Policy Option List and costing issues for the policy options. They will bring a recommendation to the TWGs and the next ARWG meeting.

The TWGs are to complete the Additional Benefits & Costs and the Feasibility Issues sections of the PODs for the next meeting.

State liasons have been assigned to each policy option to provide resources for the TWG.

### **Public Input**

There was no public comment.

### **Announcements**

A request for any relevant photos, to be used in the Final Report, was made.

World Health Day is on April 7<sup>th</sup>. There will be a focus on climate change.

**Next ARWG Meeting**

The next meeting of the ARWG will be held on April 11<sup>th</sup>, 2008 from 10 am to 4 pm at MDE, 1800 Washington Boulevard, Baltimore.

A subsequent meeting is scheduled for May 8, 2008.