



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

**MEETING SUMMARY**  
**MARYLAND GREENHOUSE GAS & CARBON**  
**MITIGATION WORK GROUP**  
**Meeting #9, April 22, 2008**  
**10:00 AM – 4:00 PM**

**Attendance:**

1. MWG Members:

Tad Aburn, *MDE/ARMA*, Chair  
  
Paul Chan, *Citizen*  
Drew Cobbs, *MD Petroleum*  
Frank Heintz, *Citizen (phone)*  
George Kelly, *(phone)*  
Brad Heavner, *Environment Maryland*  
Mark Heishman, *Veolia Transportation*  
Michael Li, *MEA*  
Bill Livingston, *W.L. Gore*  
Mike Malinoff, *City of Annapolis (by phone)*  
Cindy Parker, *JHU*  
John Quinn, *Constellation Energy*  
Michael Replogle, *Environmental Defense Fund*  
Mathias Ruth, *Univ of MD*  
Dr. Lise Van Susteren, *The Climate Project*

2. **MD Department of Environment (MDE):**

Liz Entwisle  
Renee Fizer  
Diane Franks  
Brian Hug  
Paul Lang  
Katy Perry  
Mary Jane Rutkowski  
Marcia Ways  
Jim Wilkinson

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

Ken Colburn, *Facilitator*  
Gloria Flora, *Facilitator*  
Christopher James, *Facilitator*  
Jeff Wennberg, *Facilitator*  
Jim Wilson, *Facilitator*

Katie Pasko, *Assistant*

**Public and others in attendance:**

Jim Frazier, *Michael Baker Jr Inc.*  
Caitlin Rayman, *MDOT*  
Colleen Turner, *Michael Baker Jr Inc.*

**Background documents:**

All posted at: [http://www.mdclimatechange.us/GHG\\_Carbon\\_Mitigation\\_WG.cfm](http://www.mdclimatechange.us/GHG_Carbon_Mitigation_WG.cfm).

1. Agenda
2. Overview Presentation
3. Draft Policy Option Catalogs and Descriptions
  - a. Agriculture, Forestry and Waste Management
  - b. Energy Supply
  - c. Residential, Commercial and Industrial
  - d. Transportation and Land Use
  - e. Cross Cutting Issues

**Discussion items and key issues:**

Tad Aburn welcomed the members of the MWG and asked them to introduce themselves. He asked the members to save time on their schedules for a possible social gathering after the meeting on June 15<sup>th</sup>.

All PODs will be reviewed, and if complete, the MWG will vote on approval of the option.

The MCCC will meet next on Friday, April 25<sup>th</sup> and get an update of progress by all working groups at that time.

The Final Report will resemble the Interim Report in style. It will include all the PODs as Technical Appendices. Each sector will also include a summary of the policy options and results for that sector.

An additional chapter on the “Cost of Inaction” as analyzed by Mattias Ruth will be included.

**Legislative Review**

Aburn reported that the Interim Report has been very well received and is being referenced by many parties. He stated that the Global Warming bill simply ran out of time in the session.

Michael Li reported on several bills before the Assembly this session. Details are available on the website, [www.energy.md.gov](http://www.energy.md.gov). He provided highlights on several bills that passed: EmPowerMD will aid in the reduction of emissions and electric consumption. The goal of 15% reduction by 2015 will be achieved through a 10% reduction in usage and 5% through MEA reduction programs.

The Energy Efficiency Fund created in this session will be allocated as: 23% to consumer rate relief, which will help offset the surcharge/rate increase on bills for energy efficiency programs; 17% to low income assistance; 60% to state energy efficiency programs.

The RPS standard was raised to 20% from 9.5%. A non-compliance charge of \$20/MWh was instituted. This remains less than surrounding states, but is significant. Incentives for conversions to solar and geothermal energy were also instituted.

All new state buildings, including schools, will be required to meet LEED-Ag standards.

It was noted that the presidents of the University of Maryland system agreed that all UMD buildings will be GHG neutral by 2020.

### **Goals for this Meeting**

Ken Colburn reviewed the agenda and meeting schedule. The upcoming consolidated schedule is at the end of this summary.

The current status of all remaining policy options will be reviewed. Areas of overlapping GHG reductions have been eliminated and will be outlined as the PODs are reviewed.

The primary goal of this meeting is to reach consensus on the remaining policies wherever possible, steps 7-10 of the process. Any objections will be recorded. The section “Barriers to Feasibility” can be completed as a ‘minority report’ to outline specific objections.

### **Approval of Meeting #8 Summary**

The summary for meeting #8 was approved with one correction: The title of TLU-4 is: Low GHG Fuel Standard.

### **General Recommendations**

Consideration should be given to extending the MWG structure and responsibilities under the Commission.

There is no expiration date to the work of the Commission. It is charged to issue a report every November. The MWG recommends the creation of an advisory panel managed by the commission to develop specific actions for agencies and the legislature to address.

A comprehensive discussion of the resolution of GHG reduction overlap is to be included in the Final Report. Using the biomass discussion as an example, the inclusion of charts showing the quantifications based on the policy assumptions would be helpful. AFW options overlap with TLU in the use of biomass. There are not sufficient quantities to meet all desired uses. For the purposes of the MWG, a Maryland-wide calculation is necessary. TLU will use all the biomass

it needs, and AFW will use what is left. The actual implementation will likely be some mix of usage, but the actual figure is unknown and unable to be predicted. The chart should show the maximum potential savings for each option separately. Aggregation shows the total potential GHG savings for the combination of all policies. In the case of TLU policies, the medium scenario was used for overlap resolution.

## **Policy Option Draft Review**

All TWGs have included a summary chart of GHG reductions and estimated costs for the PODs from that TWG. Negative costs equate to actual dollar savings from implementation.

GHG reduction overlaps have been resolved in this version of the PODs. Some quantifications, however, still need refinement. A full discussion will be included in the Final Report.

## **Agriculture, Forestry and Waste**

The discussion of AFW policy options was led by Gloria Flora.

### ***AFW-1 - Forest Management for Enhanced Carbon Sequestration with Mitigation of Forest Loss Due to Insects, Disease, Pests and Invasive Species***

#### **Unanimous Consent by MWG**

Flora reported that no-till agricultural practices do provide significant carbon retention.

### ***AFW-2 - Managing Urban Trees and Forests for Greenhouse Gas Benefits with Mitigation of Forest Loss Due to Insects, Disease, Pests and Invasive Species***

#### **Unanimous Consent by MWG**

There is overlap of this policy option with RCI reforestation policies. This POD assumes a 30% overlap in the benefits of Alternative 2, as this option only addresses the urban environment and the option does not dictate that all trees be planted on the proper side of buildings for maximum GHG reductions. RCI options did not take into account the carbon sequestration benefits of tree planting but the AFW option did.

### ***AFW-3 - Afforestation, Reforestation and Restoration of Forests and Wetlands***

#### **Unanimous Consent by MWG**

The TWG adjusted the riparian figures down by 40%. The original figures used were for the entire Chesapeake Bay, not just the Maryland portion.

Ensure that the implementation mechanism from Sen. Frosh's bill is included.

Add language to ensure that utility right-of-way issues are included in implementation mechanisms. Currently utilities are exempt from most laws and regulations.

***AFW-4 - Protection and Conservation of Agricultural Land, Coastal Wetlands and Forested Land*****Unanimous Consent by MWG**

This option was re-written for clarity but the substance was not changed.

***AFW-5 - “Buy Local” Programs for Sustainable Agriculture, Wood and Wood Products*****Unanimous Consent by MWG**

The TWG added language detailing the advantages of “Buy Local” programs. Additional programs were added to the section.

***AFW-6 - Expanded Use of Forest and Farm Feedstocks and Bi-Products for Energy Production*****Unanimous Consent by MWG**

The overlap with the utilization of biomass with Energy Supply was resolved. All biomass required by Energy Supply was utilized by those policy options, with the minor remaining amount used in AFW-7 quantifications.

There is not sufficient biomass in Maryland to ‘fund’ all the possible uses for it in the full complement of the policy options.

All biomass was assigned to the “highest and best” use in quantifications.

A member noted that TLU reduced the use of biomass in 2020 from 10% to 5%. Ensure that this is included in AFW and ES calculations.

All calculations have included the use of poultry litter, which is now considered a Tier 1 economic material. This will affect the economic calculations, but not GHG quantities.

A question was raised about the GHG impact of spraying farm waste over farms, as this practice results in excess terrestrial and atmospheric nitrogen. In Maryland, this especially affects the health of the Bay and its fish population. Note in Co-Benefits section that this practice is reduced under this policy option.

The TWG will review both aspects of the economics; that it is cheaper to spray, and that farm waste needs to be mixed with other materials in order to burn effectively. It will not be quantified at this time, just generally outlined.

Review this option in conjunction with AFW-8, Nutrient Trading.

***AFW-7 - In-State Liquid Biofuels Production*****Unanimous Consent by MWG**

Note that the figure of \$95/bbl crude oil was used.

After balancing the ethanol production values, it was determined that ethanol based biofuels provide little benefit to AFW options. As a result, 100% of ethanol production was assigned to TLU options.

The remaining available biomass after the presumption of use by TLU options, a small percentage was left in the AFW option.

### ***AFW-8 - Nutrient Trading with Carbon Benefits***

#### **Unanimous Consent by MWG**

Point and non-point reductions definitions have now been prepared by engaged agencies and organizations.

Add a statement that the benefits of this policy are understated, as nutrient trading encourages the practices promoted by other policy options.

The implementation schedule is difficult to predict as this type of program does not have a long history or experience.

### ***AFW-9 - Waste Management through Source Reduction & Advanced Recycling***

#### **Unanimous Consent by MWG**

In response to a question was raised about the reasons for the large GHG reduction indicated in the policy option, Flora explained that it is a result of coupling recycling efforts with a reduced demand for goods produced. Recycling reduces the materials in landfills, which reduces methane production as well.

The TWG is asked to specify the reductions by discrete action: recycling, reduced production, methane emissions, etc. Since this is a data rich option, the possibilities are extensive. However the depth of technical skills on the TWG was limited so specific recommendations were limited.

The MWG recommends that the primary emphasis be on a “blue ribbon commission” to further explore the opportunities and make recommendations on specific action.

A member suggested that ‘talking points’ be highlighted, to assist with public education efforts. Actions that are easily understood and adopted by individuals will lead to early GHG reductions. The theme could be “Oh, I can do this”.

## **Cross Cutting Issues**

No discussion or changes were made to these policy options. All were unanimously approved at the last meeting.

### ***CC-1 - GHG Inventory and Forecasting***

#### **Unanimous Consent by MWG**

***CC-2 - GHG Reporting and Registry***

**Unanimous Consent by MWG**

***CC-3 - Statewide GHG Reduction Goals and Targets***

**Unanimous Consent by MWG**

***CC-4 - State and Local Government GHG Emissions (Lead-by-Example)***

**Unanimous Consent by MWG**

***CC-5 - Public Education and Outreach***

**Unanimous Consent by MWG**

***CC-6 – Tax and Cap Policies***

**Unanimous Consent by MWG**

***CC-7 – Review Institutional Capacity to Address Climate Issues Including Seeking Funding for Implementation of MWG Recommendations***

**Unanimous Consent by MWG**

***CC-8 – Promote and Participate in Regional, Multi-State and National GHG Reduction Efforts***

**Unanimous Consent by MWG**

***CC-9 - Promote Economic Development Opportunities Associated with Reducing GHG Emissions in Maryland***

**Unanimous Consent by MWG**

***CC-10 - Develop Tools to Explicitly Address Policy Issues in an “After Peak Oil” Context***

**Unanimous Consent by MWG**

***CC-11 - Evaluate Climate Change Policy Options to Determine Projected Public Health Risks, Costs, and Benefits***

**Unanimous Consent by MWG**

***CC-12 – Review Institutional Capacity to Address Climate Issues, especially Leadership Development.***

**Unanimous Consent by MWG**

## Energy Supply

It was noted that all market based values in these policy options were new to the TWG at its last call, because of recently completed calculations by RCI. Because of the timing, the TWG will not vote on these issues until after the MWG meeting.

The TWG had no objections to any other issues contained in all the policy options, except for a few concerns regarding ES-4.

The TWG is asking for the MWG to approve the assumptions used for quantification. Final approval will be sought at the next meeting.

### ***ES-1 - Promotion of Renewable Energy Sources, including Zoning, Siting, Incentives to Promote Centralized Facilities, Long-term Contracting and Performance-based Contracting***

#### **Approved to proceed with objections as noted.**

There were no changes to this policy option. The figure of \$27/t was used in cost effectiveness calculations.

The MWG feels that more detail is needed in this policy option. Include GHG reductions and costs in the table, delineate the assumptions used, and state the goals of the policy clearly.

The MWG approved the concept, but, as one member noted, without data there is no real means to truly analyze and assess this option.

### ***ES-2 - Technology-focused Initiatives for Electricity Supply (Biomass Co-firing, Energy Storage, Fuel Cells, Landfill Gas, Clean Energy Incentives)***

#### **Unanimous Consent by MWG**

### ***ES-3 - GHG Cap and Trade***

#### **Approved to proceed with no objections.**

This policy option is modeled on the RGGI program, with two mutually exclusive variations described in the estimated GHG reduction section. The TWG feels that the second option, which eliminated overlaps of reductions, is the more accurate.

Modeling used the set rate of \$9/MMtCO<sub>2</sub>e. It is possible to derive this figure, but was not in this case. The value of state RGGI auction funds is not included, making this a conservative estimate.

The TWG recommends adoption of this type of program if a credible national program is not created by 2009. Credibility is defined on pg. 10 of the POD.

The MWG supports this policy option as an affirmation of the RGGI program with a suggestion to expand it in the future. The basic underlying theory is that RGGI would derive its funds from utility profits, without a corresponding price increase. In actuality,

some increase in pricing would be seen. However, this impact is accounted for in the program structure. A RRGi program would generate real revenue, even accounting for the costs, whether to consumers or utilities.

A MWG member asked that a statement be added to the policy description section indicating that 100% of the cost of the program is being passed on to consumers.

Another member stated that reducing demand will lead to cost reductions as well. The RRGi permit prices will be settled by the market.

It was noted that the calculations are not iterated multiple times and does not recycle the revenue stream.

Currently 100% of the auction costs are passed to consumers. A member suggested that the cost be assumed to be zero.

The model does not factor in price issues in a deregulated market such as exists in Maryland, however, it is recognized that most costs are passed on to consumers, not borne by shareholders.

The MWG asked that a general statement to this effect be included in the text. The TWG is also asked to review the data sources to determine if better values are available.

#### ***ES-4 - CCSR Incentives, Requirements and/or Enabling Policies including Administration, Regulation, Liability and Incentives***

##### **Approved to proceed with no objections**

The TWG indicated that it assumed this program would come online in 2013 for quantification.

The MWG supported the cessation of new plant construction until a CCSR program is in place. Modify the language to include incentives as well as requirements.

In the quantification, it is assumed that one 600MWh unit/yr will go online from 2013 until 2020. All the GHG savings from those new units replace old coal units.

The MWG asks that new units be removed from the quantification, providing some of this information with necessary caveats. Do not include this data in the summary table, but do provide an explanation in the text.

Assume CCSR for all plants after 2020, which requires the retrofitting of old plants beginning in 2013 with completion by 2020.

A discussion of the costs associated with new source review should be added to the POD. The TWG will decide the placement.

#### ***ES-5 - Clean Distributed Generation Standards, Incentives and Barrier Removal, including Combined Heat and Power (CHP), District Heating and Cooling, Landfill Gas, Solar, Fuel Cells and others***

**Approved to proceed with no objections**

The MWG noted that the goal is not narrowly defined.

***ES-6 - Integrated Resource Planning (IRP) including Re-Regulation, if necessary, and/or a State Energy Plan*****Unanimous Consent by MWG as an unquantified option*****ES-7 - Renewable Portfolio Standard*****Unanimous Consent by MWG**

The data was updated to adjust for recent legislation.

***ES-8 - Efficiency Improvements and Repowering Existing Plants*****Approved to proceed with no objections**

The goal section was clarified by the TWG.

***ES-9 – Carbon (GHG) Tax*****Approved to proceed with no objections**

It was determined by the TWG that this policy option is not required in order for Maryland to reach its GHG reduction goals. Calculations were done using increments of \$1/MMtCO<sub>2e</sub>, up to \$4/t. The result is a finding that 0.1 MMtCO<sub>2e</sub> reduction is realized for every \$1/ MMtCO<sub>2e</sub> tax. The net cost is \$35.5M/0.1MMtCO<sub>2e</sub>

The TWG determined that a carbon tax was not cost effective, because the GHG reductions are so low. It does recognize, however, that there are other reasons to have such a tax in place.

A carbon tax is the reverse of a Cap and Trade program. The carbon tax adds to the cost in order to drive usage reductions. A C&T program is modeled the same but only targets the power sector. A carbon tax encompasses many other sectors. These programs are complementary, as the tax covers all areas not covered by a C&T program.

This policy option includes a tax on fuels, as do similar policy options in RCI and TLU. The TWG is asked to ensure that the same basis is used for quantifying all these options.

***ES-10 – Generation Performance Standards and/or Mitigation Requirements for Electricity*****Approved to proceed with no objections**

The TWG has not yet decided its position on this option, as the entire policy must be updated. It will be completed by the May 9<sup>th</sup> meeting of the MWG.

**Residential, Commercial, Industrial Policy Options**

Chris James and Alice Napoleon presented an overview of all RCI policy options.

***RCI-1 - Improved Building and Trade Codes for Energy Efficiency***

**Unanimous Consent by MWG**

***RCI-2 - Demand-Side Management (DSM)/Energy Efficiency Programs, Funds, or Goals for Electricity and Natural Gas (Including Expansion of Existing Programs and Peak Load Reduction)***

**Unanimous Consent by MWG**

***RCI-3 - Low-cost Loans for Energy Efficiency***

**Unanimous Consent by MWG**

The level of funding is a placeholder amount agreed upon by the TWG to be used for quantification purposes.

The Pay-As-You-Save program is included in the Implementation Mechanism section. There are still some uncertainties over the recipients of this program.

***RCI-4 - Improved Design, Construction, Appliances, and Lighting in New and Existing State and Local Government Buildings: “Government Lead-by-Example”***

**Unanimous Consent by MWG**

The TWG recommends moving to LEED-Pt standards as soon as possible, but has not set a timeline. The MWG decided that all permit applications from 2009 to 2013, including school buildings, should meet the LEED-Ag standards, at a minimum. From 2013-2020, LEED-Pt standards should be used.

***RCI-5 - Energy Efficiency and Environmental Impacts Awareness and Instruction in School Curriculum***

Assigned to CC-5

***RCI-6 - Promotion and Incentives for Improved Design and Construction (e.g., LEED, Green Buildings, or Minimum % Improvement Beyond Code) in the Private Sector***

Assigned to RCI-1

***RCI-7 - More Stringent Appliance/Equipment Efficiency Standards (State-level, or Advocacy for Regional or Federal-level Standards)***

**Unanimous Consent by MWG**

***RCI-8 - Rate structures and Technologies to Promote Reduced GHG Emissions (Including Peak Pricing and Inverted Block Rates)***

**Unanimous Consent by MWG**

The cost/benefit analysis shows a cost of \$116/MMtCO<sub>2</sub>e. A member asked why this option should not be eliminated, as it is the only RCI policy option with a net cost. The high cost is due to the cost of new equipment. The implementation schedule is aggressive as the TWG decided this was a realistic and necessary schedule.

The TWG reviewed a range of assumptions, with the costs fixed and the schedule changing.

The MWG noted that this is a very complicated policy.

***RCI-9 - GHG or Carbon Tax***

Assigned to ES-3

***RCI-10 – White Roofs, Rooftop Gardens, and Landscaping (including Shade Tree Programs) and Solar Electric Panels*****Unanimous Consent by MWG**

The description was rewritten to include references to the recently enacted EmPowerMD legislation. The quantification was not changed, however, since the bill was just enacted. The values in the Recent Actions section will be adjusted to incorporate this.

This option is approved with the understanding that the changes due to EmPowerMD are incorporated as outlined above.

***RCI-11 – Energy Efficiency Resource Standard (EERS)*****Unanimous Consent by MWG****Transportation and Land Use Policy Options**

Will Schroeer and Jim Wilson presented an overview of all TLU policy options. There are three main areas of focus:

- Miles driven (VMT)
- Cleaner fuels
- Improved vehicle efficiencies

There are two major areas yet to be decided: a gas tax and VMT reductions.

Extensive comments from one MWG member had been distributed via e-mail to the members. Comments from MDOT were also distributed to the members prior to the meeting. In crafting his comments, the MWG member incorporated many of the MDOT comments along with his sense of the TWG opinions.

The comments can be highlighted as:

- The introduction is intended to be reflective of all the TLU goals

- VMT is a subset of the overall GHG reduction goal
- Any specific monetary recommendation has been removed from the gas tax policy option
- TLU-2 and TLU-7 have been combined with one new title and an aspirational goal of a 30% reduction in VMT, which equates to the VMT levels found in 2000.
- The goals have been changed, with the approval of the TWG, to be reflective of those developed by Washington State.

MDOT representation expressed concern that this approach would be extremely burdensome to rural residents. Through traffic, especially truck traffic, add VMT and GHG but can't be regulated by Maryland. In addition, land use can't be changed quickly, resulting in a significant population unable to utilize GHG reducing practices. When these populations are removed, the net result is a 75% reduction goal in VMT.

MWG members pointed out that VMT is only one of three approaches to these policy options. It was noted that the VMT correlation to GHG levels will reduce over time as vehicles get cleaner.

MWG members responded that shipping and rail infrastructure can and should be improved, which will lead to incentives to shift freight movement away from trucking.

In general, the recent changes in fuel prices should be recognized throughout TLU policies.

The MWG supports the retention of a carbon tax to generate funding to support other programs. Ambitious goals are necessary to achieve GHG reductions that will reverse global warming trends.

### ***TLU-1- Increased Fuel Tax***

#### **Approved to proceed with no objections**

The MWG referenced the discussion from the last meeting, which is included here:

This policy option is designed to be revenue neutral, as the primary goal is to reduce fuel usage. Revenues generated would be used to fund other climate change initiatives.

A member noted that proposing a \$2/gallon gasoline tax is an extremely controversial suggestion, and will generate immediate and vocal opposition. Members agreed that, while a significant tax is an easily quantified cost to consumers, there is also an actual cost to climate change through continuing GHG emissions and also to the "business as usual" model. These facts need to be widely publicized.

The MWG members agreed to strike the \$2/gallon figure and let the legislative process determine the actual fuel tax ceiling to be imposed.

The POD should include reference to exploration of transportation systems options, including examples from other states. With an introduction such as, "If, for example, you choose to implement a gas tax, the estimated costs and benefits are outlined in the following tables.", the estimated costs and benefits tables should be included in the final draft of the POD.

A specific reference was made to South Carolina proposals.

This discussion was expanded to encompass specific data, using the format:

If a fuel tax of  $x$  is implemented, then the results are  $y$  t reduction in GHG levels and  $\$z$  revenue.

This “if, then” language should be inserted in the policy option description. Gas tax values of \$0.15-\$2.00 were discussed, but not included in the quantifications. A paragraph explaining this should be added.

It was suggested that “implement the highest possible politically feasible fuel tax” be inserted in the POD. The MWG did not agree to add this phrase, as this is unquantifiable.

It was noted that GHG reductions are not seen quickly from an increase in fuel taxes, as people do not have immediately accessible alternatives. Ultimately, options such as the purchase of new efficient vehicles, changing commutes through moving or carpooling and creation of public transportation options will occur, leading to the desired reductions.

A member suggested that a tax of \$0.5 should be implemented in two years, with equal increases every two years until a \$2.00 ceiling is reached. This limit should be reached before 2020 under all circumstances. No agreement was reached on this proposal.

### ***TLU-2 Land Use and Location Efficiency***

#### **Approved to proceed with no objections**

No changes were made to this policy option by the TWG.

As a result of discussion by MWG members, it was unanimously decided to combine TLU-7 with TLU-2 as the implementation is closely linked.

### ***TLU-3 Transit***

#### **Approved to proceed with no objections**

No changes were made to this policy option by the TWG. Minor language changes were recommended at the meeting.

### ***TLU-4 Low Greenhouse Gas Fuel Standard***

#### **Unanimous Consent by MWG**

There were no changes.

The MWG asked that a reference to regional issues be included in the feasibility section, emphasizing its preference for a regional approach.

### ***TLU-5 Intercity Travel: Aviation, High Speed Rail, Bus***

#### **Approved to proceed with no objections**

AASHTO recommendations will be used as a starting point to develop this as a straw proposal. A member asked that Washington State goals be adopted for this policy option as well. Members were concerned that adoption of another state’s goals would blur the

distinction of Maryland's goals. Recommending ambitious but realistic, both politically and scientifically, goals is desired.

The MWG decided to pursue AASHTO standards in developing TLU policies, especially TLU-5.

The TWG is asked to review Washington State goals and incorporate them as appropriate. The recommendations should include the reasons for the recommendations and/or the decision not to use these goals.

The MWG asked the TWG to incorporate the concept of "Auto-free Tourism" into this policy option. Innovation and infrastructure creation will be necessary to implement the concept, as there is currently no means to visit Ocean City without a car.

The TWG is asked to review high speed rail again. Comments were made that high speed rail is significantly more expensive than regular commuter rail. Relatively small investments in commuter rail can increase trips and ridership.

### ***TLU-6 Pay-as-you-Drive Insurance***

#### **Unanimous Consent by MWG**

The TWG is asked to add information from recent new studies, such as the Brookings study.

Drivers should be encouraged to drive less and more calmly to reduce GHGs. The creation of a pilot program(s) to encourage such actions should be included in the POD.

Change the reference to Secretary of the Environment to Transportation and insert MDOT instead of agencies.

### ***TLU-7 VMT Reductions***

#### **Unanimously approved to combine with TLU-2**

### ***TLU-8 Bike and Pedestrian Infrastructure***

#### **Approved to proceed with no objections**

The language included is unquantified in this option. The quantification is included with TLU-3.

The MWG asks that the calculations be included with this option, or to include the language in TLU-3. The quantification should be based on specific assumptions regarding trips, miles, etc. rather than reviewing all other cities and/or states.

### ***TLU-9 Pricing Measures***

#### **Approved to proceed with no objections**

The changes recommended by MWG members will be considered at upcoming meetings.

### ***TLU-10 Total Emission Reduction***

**Approved to proceed with no objections**

Clarifications were made to the language in this POD.

The MWG asked the TWG to revise its calculations to adjust for the cost effectiveness of the proposal.

***TLU-11 Evaluate the GHG Emissions Impacts of Major Projects***

**Unanimous Consent by MWG**

**Comprehensive Overview:**

Ken Colburn again reviewed the preliminary aggregation of GHG reductions due to all the proposed policy options. These graphs must be updated to include the final versions of ES and TLU policy options.

**Next Steps:**

All remaining policy options will be finalized and voted upon at the next meeting.

**Future Meetings and Schedule:**

The final meeting of the MWG is scheduled for May 9<sup>th</sup>. At these meetings, all policy options will be finalized and voted upon. Any changes to the Inventory and Forecast will be accomplished during this time. Should time permit, Mattias Ruth will present his study on the “Cost of Inaction”.

An additional meeting will be held via teleconference prior to May 9<sup>th</sup>. At this meeting, the remaining ES and TLU policy options will be reviewed.

The tentative schedule for completion of the MWG section of the Final Reports is:

- April 25 – MCCC meeting
- May 6-8 – MWG Teleconference
- May 9 – Final MWG meeting
- May 16 – Draft Final Report – all sections delivered to MWG for review
- May 23 – Comments due from MWG members
- May 29 – MCCC Meeting to receive draft Final Report
- June 6 – MCCC comments and revisions due
- June 13 – MCCC meeting (Teleconference?)
- June 15 – MCCC Final Vote

**Public Input and Announcements:**

The next MCCC meeting will be held on April 25<sup>th</sup> in Baltimore.