

**Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments  
Climate and Energy Policy Committee (CEEPC)**

**Meeting Summary: July 23, 2014**

**Attendees:**

Roger Berliner, Montgomery County, Chair\*

Jonathan Way, City of Manassas, Vice Chair\*

Amy Tarce, National Capital Planning Commission

Lawrence Friedl, Director, NASA Applied Sciences Program, Earth Science Division

Calvin Williams, Assistant Administrator, Office of Strategic Infrastructure, NASA

Christina Hudson, Leidos (for NASA)

Anya Schoolman, Community Power Network

Francis Hodsoll, VA Advanced Energy Industries Coalition

Kate Johnson, District Department of the Environment (DDOE)

Nicole Rentz, DC Council (Mary Cheh's Office)

Erica Bannerman, Prince George's County

Matthew Dernoga, Prince George's County

Michelle Vigen, Montgomery County

Erica Shingara, City of Rockville

Denise Mitchell, City of College Park

Conrad Spangler, VA Department of Mines, Minerals and Energy (DMME)

Kanti Srikanth, VA Department of Transportation

Jay Fiset, Arlington County

Chris Somers, Arlington County

Penny Gross, Fairfax County Board of Supervisors

Kambiz Agazi, Fairfax County

Del Pepper, City of Alexandria

Michael Barancewicz, Loudoun County Public Schools

John Lord, Loudoun County Public Schools

John Andreoni, Institute for Market Transformation

Scott Sklar, Stella Group & GW University

Dr. Dann Sklarew, George Mason University

Bjorn Frogner, UMBC

Ray Bourland, Pepco

Robert Grow, Greater Washington Board of Trade

Gina Mathais, Ecobeco

Brian Toll, Ecobeco & Maryland Clean Energy Center

Tim Stevens, Sierra Club

Claude Willis, Greater Washington Clean Cities Coalition

Gregg Jones, DOD Contingency and Mission Assurance

Emily Stiever, Community Power Network

Chris Yeazel, MD SUN  
Ken Stadlin, MDV-SEIA  
Robin Dutta, Skyline Innovations, MDV-SEIA  
Jazmine Tucker, National Capital Planning Commission  
Chris Van Horn, Boland  
Nicolas Ruiz, Coalition for Smarter Growth  
Bob Riley, Firm of William Mullen  
Toba Pearlman, SolarCity

**Phone/Webinar Attendees:**

Luke Wisniewski, Maryland Department of the Environment (MDE)  
Devan Willemsen, Maryland Energy Administration (MEA)  
Dyan Backe, Gaithersburg  
Julie Palakovich Carr, City of Rockville  
Alan Brewer, Loudoun County  
Rachel Healy, WMATA  
Maureen Holman, DC Water  
Melissa Adams, Washington Gas  
Bucky Green, US Environmental Protection Agency  
Andrew Kambour, National Governor's Association, COG ACPAC

**COG Staff:**

Steve Walz, COG DEP  
Jeff King, COG DEP  
Maia Davis, COG DEP  
Leah Boggs, COG DEP  
Amanda Davis, COG DEP  
Isabel Ricker, COG DEP

**1. Call to Order/Introductions/Chair Remarks**

---

The Chair welcomed the committee and asked for a motion to approve the previous meeting's minutes. The minutes were approved.

**2. Building Resilience in the National Capital Region**

---

***Amy Tarce**, National Capital Planning Commission; **Lawrence Friedl**, Applied Sciences Program Associate Director, Earth Science Division; **Calvin Williams**, Assistant Administrator, Office of Strategic Infrastructure, NASA*

COG DEP Staff Amanda Campbell introduced the panel discussion. She noted that while reducing greenhouse gas emissions (mitigation) is a priority for preventing or reducing climate change impacts, building resilience (adaptation) is also critically important to reduce the risks imposed on human and

natural systems by future climate change impacts. The CEEPC Action Plan includes several measures related to adaptation and resilience.

To help build resilience in critical areas for NASA facilities, NASA's Earth Science Division and Office of Strategic Infrastructure (OSI) formed a collaborative in the region that led to a workshop series called *Building a Climate Resilient National Capital Region*. The workshops brought together federal, regional, and local organizations (including COG) to use climate data and projections NASA-GISS provided in order to develop adaptation strategies tailored to the National Capital Region (NCR). The National Capital Planning Commission (NCPC), General Services Administration (GSA), Smithsonian, and U.S. Global Change Research Program (USGCRP) worked with NASA to produce the webinars and workshops conducted in 2013 and 2014. Calvin Williams and Lawrence Friedl, will share how NASA became involved in this activity. Amy Tarce will describe the project and its results.

***Calvin Williams, Assistant Administrator, Office of Strategic Infrastructure, NASA***

NASA's mission is to conduct aeronautics, Earth, and space exploration and research. NASA has Centers around the country designed for these specific purposes, many of which have started to experience climate change impacts. The agency recognized that climate change would impact the ability to perform its mission, and saw the need to identify and manage climate change risks for each of its facilities.

NASA is one of the few agencies in the federal government that has in-house climate capabilities with its scientists around the country, including at the Goddard Institute of Space Studies (GISS) in New York City. GISS has been working on an initiative under former Mayor Mike Bloomberg to build a more resilient city, a need which became ever more apparent after Hurricane Sandy. Recognizing GISS's experience, NASA asked for their support in addressing the agency's own needs by adapting the planning process used in New York City.

Now, most of NASA's Centers have completed a process to review their risks, including conducting a vulnerability assessment and identifying adaptation strategies. Through these workshops, NASA had refined the process, brought together stakeholders, and integrated climate considerations into existing management plans. NASA also developed Center-specific climate data and projections that have become an integral part of the process. They are interested in working with the surrounding communities on this effort, as the risks, impacts and solutions to mitigate these risks affect the community as well. NASA is building a communication tool to demonstrate the current and future impacts of climate change for NASA centers and the surrounding communities.

***Lawrence Friedl, Director, NASA Applied Sciences Program, Earth Science Division***

NASA is really interested in the question of how to convert NASA data and modeling into information that organizations and communities can use to make informed decisions. They have been working with MWCOG, NCPC, GSA, USGCRP, and Smithsonian to figure out how to do this.

NASA has a fleet of 18 satellites that look at the Earth and its environmental conditions in the atmosphere, the oceans and lakes, the land, and the polar regions to understand from an Earth system

science view what is going on and how the climate and Earth surface are changing. Part of NASA's mission is to enable partners and other federal agencies to use this data and analysis. Therefore, NASA has been identifying ways to share knowledge and information so that organizations can make more informed decisions. For example, NASA has worked with the U.S. Agency for International Development around the world to help local agencies use satellites to track malaria and identify famine relief needs, and with the Environmental Protection Agency to supplement air quality networks where gaps existed. In California, NASA is looking at drought issues and using data to improve irrigation techniques.

The Earth Sciences Division is also working with OSI to apply climate information for NASA's own needs. Specifically, they are applying satellite data and projections to a focused area, in this case to NASA's Centers around the U.S. This works for cities to, as shown by the project GISS is doing in New York City. NCPD and MWCOG have been working with NASA to undertake the process here in Washington, DC, and provide data at the relevant decision scale.

The "Adapting to a Changing Climate" brochure reveals how local average temperature is projected to increase over the next 50 years. More importantly, NASA converted that into the number of days over a certain temperature threshold. By 2050, NASA expects an increase of 3 degrees. Today, we have 10 days per year over 95 degrees, which could double or triple by the 2050s. This is the type of data that managers can actually use to inform decisions, such as on staff working outside, tourism planning, or systems that can be put in place now to prepare for the future.

As the brochure conveys, it helped tremendously to work with facility managers at NASA to translate the science into information that managers and decision-makers can utilize. Scientists could not have understood this data conversion and communication process without working with people on the facilities and strategic infrastructure side. Through this process, NASA learned what issues federal, state, and local managers are dealing with, which enables their scientists to better understand which research questions to pursue, to incorporate new instruments into future satellites and information systems, and to improve the overall value of investments in Earth science activities.

***Amy Tarce, National Capital Planning Commission***

The Federal Government uses the definition of "climate resilience" established by Executive Order 13653: the ability to anticipate, prepare, and adapt to changing conditions without disruption. MWCOG has been a forerunner at working with partners on this issue. The Building a Climate Resilient National Capital Region program was an eight-month partnership from September 2013 - April 2014. It was a bit unique in that it included many Federal Agencies, as well as MWCOG. This partnership focused on the Federal Triangle Facilities, and their Supply Chain.

For the federal government, part of being a good steward of our nation's capital is ensuring that facilities, operations, and workforce can endure for the next hundreds of years going forward. In June 2006, intense rainfall and subsequent flooding crippled the transportation system and shut down facilities. These impacts were not even due to a hurricane but the losses were significant.

Stewardship extends beyond buildings and physical assets and workforce; the federal government also must be stewards of cultural artifacts and records. The 2006 Federal Triangle flooding threatened resources in the National Archives, the Smithsonian and other museums in the National Mall. Prior to the partnership created for the workshop series, federal agencies had not paid much attention to heat waves and sea level rise affecting their own operations.

This partnership was an opportunity for the federal government to look more comprehensively at all our climate risks in the region and to demonstrate how federal agencies can coordinate with local and regional counterparts. Two Obama administration executive orders (13514 and 13653) require coordination with local and regional counterparts, and a GAO report on high-risk areas noted how important coordination was across federal, regional, and local jurisdictions.

The Building a Climate Resilient National Capital Region:

- Vision: Climate resilient National Mall and National Capital Region (NCR) for future generations.
- Objectives: Build capacity, capability and confidence; Create networks and partnerships; and Encourage proactive adaptation planning.
- Phase 1: the Built System (2013)
- Phase 2: Workforce, Communities and Natural Systems (2014)
- Structure: A series of webinars and workshops to build participant capacity to conduct their own vulnerability assessment and identify adaptation strategies.

The partnership asked participants to identify the top risks to their agency's mission and the associated climate variables creating vulnerability. Participants rated the risks for three time periods, described critical thresholds, and identified planned responses. NASA also trained participants to translate climate variables into something meaningful as they completed workshop-specific homework. Climate variables were divided into gradual and extreme events. They chose an 18-foot storm surge to estimate flood impacts and 90 degrees as an extreme temperature threshold.

Through the workshops, participants gained a better understanding of their agency's vulnerability to climate risks, their neighbor's vulnerabilities, and the synergies that can reduce or exacerbate those vulnerabilities. For the adaptation workshops, participants developed adaptation strategies that identified a goal, a funding strategy, implementation steps, barriers, and partners. The final report, available on the MWCOG website, highlights the strategies developed.

Take-aways and key actions for creating climate resiliency in the national capital region:

- Educate and inform our communities and leaders;
- Coordinate individual adaptation efforts to maximize benefits and minimize negative impacts;
- Agree and decide on a shared risk tolerance;
- Commit to priority actions;
- Integrate/mainstream adaptation strategies into our various policies using a risk management model;

- Find system-wide adaptation actions through innovative partnerships; and
- Encourage more grassroots actions.

Looking ahead, Partners will share the information and knowledge gained with agency heads, elected officials and other stakeholders. NCPC and MWCOG staff will facilitate discussions on adaptation strategies through MWCOG (Climate, Energy and Environment Policy Committee) and NCPC (Monumental Core Climate Adaptation working group). We hope to apply short-term actions and long-term solutions to help the region move toward climate resiliency.

**Discussion:**

Kate Johnson, DDOE: DC launched its Adaptation effort in May, which is intended to inform capital planning going forward. The District is planning to develop an Adaptation Plan by next summer. This will include a vulnerability and risk assessment of potential climate impacts, and will identify priority measures and strategies for reaching these goals.

Chair Berliner asked, with all the risks assessed, what risks do you think we need to attend to the most (three to five most significant ones)? Amy responded that the most obvious one is flooding, which can be caused by extreme weather, storm surge, plus sea level rise. The Chair also asked what was assessed as the most critical facilities. Amy explained that the transportation, power, and water systems are critical. Power and water often are interconnected; if one fails so does the other (e.g., underground power lines relying on pump stations to remain dry). In terms of a specific locale, the Federal Triangle is most vulnerable because it is at the bottom of water draining basin and that is where we store our cherished national treasures. The monuments and Mall area also are vulnerable, especially as sea level rise is factored in to the risk.

Ms. Penelope Gross commented that the brochure is good and succinct, and other localities, such as Fairfax County would like to see something similar for a larger area around the city. Amy pointed out that the observed and projected changes in climate do cover the entire DC metropolitan area, but some of the pictures and images represent only the DC area. Ms. Gross also noted that grassroots groups are way ahead of government and prepared to move faster. She also asked whether there is a workgroup looking at costs of implementing climate resilience, as this is an important consideration for local governments.

Amy responded that NCPC has looked at how we can characterize risk based on cost, but it is challenging. First, we must understand how much of our region will be impacted, at what stage, and at what time so we can map that. NCPC is currently in the mapping stage, and will then be able to look at GIS data to assess property values, which will provide some cost figures. There are other factors that we must consider in terms of costs. There are some positive steps, but it is very complicated.

Ms. Gross suggested that when she served on Governor Kaine's climate committee they used lidar data as a planning tool. Most local governments in the area do not have enough funding to use it, but it is a technique that shows very clearly where challenges lie. Lawrence explained that NASA uses a variety of

technologies, but their satellites look at global conditions so the resolution and scale might not be appropriate for city applications. That is one of the reasons they downscaling climate projections. There are also commercial efforts focused on downscaling images and data, plus airborne companies that have advanced lidar (the light equivalent of radar) and radar that fly over a region to obtain detailed models of elevation and other information. This data does come with a cost. While NASA's data is free, it is not at the exact resolution needed for a city.

COG DEP Director Stephen Walz made the following comments: COG wants to set up a resiliency task force for the region and we would look at the Norfolk Naval base study, which entailed detailed modeling of the facilities and land to show what is at risk of flooding. We would like to see if something similar can be done for DC using lidar as one of the tools.

A question was asked regarding the recent IPCC publications, and whether they provide more relevant information. Lawrence replied that many NASA scientists are involved in the IPCC working groups, as well as with the National Climate Assessment (NCA). The NCA provides more detailed impacts for the mid-Atlantic region, including some economic impacts. With each new IPCC and NCA release, there are model advancements made. The scientists at NASA-GISS are re-running the projections for NASA Centers with the latest models and the same could be done for the DC area. Dann Sklarew was interested in having revised DC area projections. Amy added that for this project they preferred to use the NASA data because the NCA divided DC into two different 'regions', and the NASA data is focused on a more localized scale.

Dr. Scott Sklar asked the following: How does this effort tie into other risk initiatives going on in parallel with climate-related threats like NERC's utility degradation, cyber security initiatives, new bugs in the southern US that are eating wires, and other geological changes? While not all may be directly linked to climate, how do you link all of these risks so that when funds are put forth, we can address these big issues in a comprehensive manner?

Calvin explained that NASA uses a risk-based approach for its facilities and we try to look at the effects of climate change by reviewing policies and assessing facilities at risk. This approach is factored into new designs, relocations, or other actions. In general, NASA is planning ahead and then making decisions about those risks and the potential economic impacts. While NASA does a comprehensive risk-based assessment of considerations that could come into play, it is challenging to include everything. Amy added that NCPC is involved in a climate adaptation working-group with the Department of Homeland Security. This group is looking from a national scale at our security and the risks and climate change is one of those risks.

### **3. Solar Energy: Regulatory, Program, and Market Status**

---

*Anya Schoolman, Community Power Network; Francis Hodsoll, Virginia Advanced Energy Industries Coalition*

Isabel Ricker, COG DEP staff, introduced the panel topic and speakers. Anya Schoolman, the Executive Director of Community Power Network, has started a regional movement toward local solar co-ops – community and residential groups that purchase solar together to receive discounted bulk pricing. This method allows participants to be active in choosing the installer and the purchase criteria, and tends to bring more people into the solar buying group because it is a community activity and limited time offer. Francis Hodsoll is the Director of the Virginia Advanced Energy Industries Coalition (VAEIC), and is very active in Virginia policy-making and advocacy for renewable energy and other clean and advanced energy technology.

Solar power deployment is increasing tremendously within COG's footprint: at the end of last year, the region had 4,600 installed net-metered solar systems, with near 50 MW of capacity, and industry experts estimate that this number has grown significantly in the first half of 2014. This is over 1000% growth!

However, the growth is not spread evenly across the region. Montgomery and Prince George's counties are far ahead of the other jurisdictions, but Frederick & the District of Columbia are significant markets as well. The District has 10 times the amount of installed solar as the Virginia localities, and COG's Maryland members have 30 times the amount of solar installed as the Virginia localities. This disparity across states is caused by policy choices. Legislative and regulatory actions, financial incentives and the availability of various market mechanisms are very important drivers of the market, and vary tremendously across the three states.

The major policies drivers of a robust solar industry and market are:

- Renewable Portfolio Standards – the minimum amount of renewable energy electric utilities must supply, and whether there is a Solar Carve Out (minimum amount of solar utilities must supply).
  - RPS and solar carve outs determine the renewable energy credit (REC) price, which can be a huge financial benefit for installing solar
- Net Metering – whether solar can be grid-connected and how much each kW produced is credited toward a customer's utility bill
  - System caps can hamper the industry by only allowing very small systems to be net-metered, while aggregate caps limit the total amount of solar on a state's grid.
  - Standby charges reduce the per kW bill credit for solar by charging customers for the convenience of having a grid-tied system
- Rebates and Tax Credits – in addition to the federal 30% investment tax credit (ITC) there are several state and local incentives available in some markets.
  - DC and MD both have rebates for residential and commercial scale solar, and some localities have property and/or sales tax exemptions.
  - Virginia's General Assembly passed a law that will go into effect in January 2015 that will exempt solar equipment from the local manufacturing and tools tax, which in some localities had been extremely burdensome.



- Financing Options – states generally have to pass legislation enabling ownership and/or financing models other than single-owner-consumer.
  - Third Party Ownership models like power purchase agreements (PPAs) and leases have become very popular across the country because they allow consumers to install solar for zero money down, and to pay for the system over time, or to only pay for the energy it generates. PPAs are technically legal in all three states, but no PPAs have been executed in Virginia to date.
  - PACE Financing – property assessed clean energy (PACE) financing is an old finance mechanism but is newly being applied to solar. Essentially PACE is a special property tax district, but applies only to one house. A customer can make energy improvements paid entirely by the government, or a government-designated entity. The customer then repays the loan through a special fee on their property bill, which allows the loan to transfer with the property rather than the owner. DC recently implemented their PACE program and several MD counties are developing them.

More information about the status of each of these policy drivers across the three states is available in the factsheet provided online and in the meeting packet “[National Capital Region Solar Market Comparison Chart.](#)”

All of these differences result in very different economics for solar across the region: after one year, an average residential system costs approximately \$3725 in DC, \$7,225 in MD and \$9,990 in VA. The estimated payback is even more revealing: 5.8 years in DC, 10.3 years in MD and 20.5 years in VA (though this can vary a lot depending on local tax credits available).

The main drivers of change in the solar market are:

- Community Solar / Virtual Net Metering – allows one solar energy system to be shared by multiple meters
- Bulk Purchasing - makes going solar easier & cheaper
- New Financing Models - PACE, crowdfunding, securitization
- Low Income solar – residential incentives, job training opportunities
- New business models and battery back-up

Community solar is available to some degree across the region, but is called several different names, which has caused some confusion.

- Washington, DC: Community Solar (Community Renewable Energy Act)
  - Anyone can participate (renters, people with shaded roofs, non-contiguous property)
  - Regulations coming this fall?
- Maryland: Aggregate or Virtual Net Metering
  - Agricultural, non-profit and municipal customers only
- Virginia: Aggregate Net Metering or “Totalization”
  - Agricultural customers, for adjoining properties only
  - (May soon see municipalities? VEPGA is negotiating with Dominion on this issue)

Solar bulk purchasing is also called “Aggregate” or “Cooperative” Solar Purchasing

- Save 20-30% on install & price of system
- Assistance assessing installers & bids
- May include multiple financing options, or discounts on other energy improvements (roofing, efficiency, energy audits)
- Common Models: Solarize and Solar Co-ops (Community Power Network has Solar United Neighborhoods “SUN” entities in each of the states that help organize solar co-ops)

Exciting new developments in the region include:

- Municipal Bulk Purchases: Recent RFPs from Montgomery County & Washington DC
- Water Utilities Developing Large Solar Arrays: WSSC and DC Water
- Community-wide solar co-ops: Baltimore, Hyattsville, University of Maryland, Blacksburg, Roanoke
- University Joint Purchase: GW University, GW Hospital and American University purchasing 52 MW solar from Duke Energy

Local governments can be extremely effective and important players in creating a solar market. Some ideas for local governments to get involved include:

- Participate in the Rooftop Solar Challenge – work to reduce the cost to install solar through permitting & inspections, planning & zoning and financing improvements. This will also help save County staff time & money on processing solar applications
- Support community solar co-ops and community bulk purchases
- Support new policy developments such as community solar / virtual net metering
- Explore municipal aggregation opportunities, either with neighboring jurisdictions or over a large footprint of public facilities
- Help implement new financing models, such as joint investment in large commercial arrays or PACE financing

For more information on regulations, policies and incentives the DOE’s Database of State Renewable Energy Incentives (DSIRE): [www.dsireusa.org](http://www.dsireusa.org) is a good resource. Also: [DCSUN.org](http://DCSUN.org), [MDSUN.org](http://MDSUN.org) and [VASUN.org](http://VASUN.org) and Community Power Network: <http://communitypowernetwork.com>

For more information on Bulk Purchasing/Community Solar:

- NREL Solarize Guidebook: [www.nrel.gov/docs/fy12osti/54738.pdf](http://www.nrel.gov/docs/fy12osti/54738.pdf)
- NREL Community Solar Guidebook: [www.nrel.gov/docs/fy11osti/49930.pdf](http://www.nrel.gov/docs/fy11osti/49930.pdf)

For more information on how to get involved you can contact staff:

- Isabel Ricker, COG DEP: [iricker@mwkog.org](mailto:iricker@mwkog.org)
- Jeff King, COG DEP: [jking@mwkog.org](mailto:jking@mwkog.org)

#### 4. Virginia Energy Plan & Virginia Energy Council,

---

*Steve Walz, Director of Department of Environmental Programs, COG*

COG DEP Director Steven Walz introduced the presentation on the Virginia Energy Plan update process. This update is required by the VA code every 4 years; this is the 3<sup>rd</sup> update. The final report is due October 1, 2014. Statute also requires an interim update in the third year of the administration this time around, which will be done Oct 1, 2016.

The Virginia Department of Mines, Minerals and Energy (DMME) is tasked with preparing the plan. They work with VA Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) and the State Corporation Commission (SCC).

Broad goals of the new energy plan:

- Accelerate the use of renewable energy resources
  - Research and development in advanced energy technologies
  - The administration sees an opportunity to have VA lead on new technologies that do not yet exist on the east coast (such as offshore gas, oil, wind)
- Promote Energy Productivity and Efficiency
- Promote a Diverse Energy Mix
- Grow Jobs in the Energy Sector
  - a. Encourage higher education to prepare the next generation of leaders in energy

As a first step toward updating the plan, the governor created the VA Energy Council, which is the advisory council on plan development. The Council includes representatives from the non-profit, private sector, higher education sectors, and exists for the duration of the administration to assist with subsequent updates.

In the 2014 VA Legislative session the General Assembly passed a resolution requiring a study of potential EPA regulations, the impact of these regulations on the state economy, cost of electricity, and energy system. The state is conducting a study to assess the impacts of proposed EPA rule, which will be released October 1 as part of the Virginia Energy Plan.

DMME is soliciting input and comment on the plan update. Hearings have been held around the state, and all materials are available on the DMME website:

[http://www.dmme.virginia.gov/DE/2014\\_VEP\\_Update.shtml](http://www.dmme.virginia.gov/DE/2014_VEP_Update.shtml)

#### **Discussion:**

Penny Gross made the following comment: As Steve is on the Council, when can we anticipate a report on the work of the Council and results of the plan update process? How can MWCOG members get updates on the plan? Chair Berliner asked if there was interest among the CEEPC members in sending a comment letter.

Steve Walz responded that the VA Energy Council will get a draft plan on August 18, after which there will be 10 days to comment, as they are due by August 8. COG and NVRC have already reached out to the northern Virginia localities to solicit input on items to include in the plan and their comments for the Council. If the committee is interested, it would be conceivable to use the CEEPC Climate & Energy Action Plan as a framework for making recommendations to the VA Energy Plan. Ms. Gross proposed a motion to submit a comment letter; the motion was seconded and approved.

Francis Hodson commented that the VA Advanced Energy Industries Coalition has submitted comments developed through a convening of energy industry stakeholders. Their recommendations will be shared with COG staff for reference in developing comments on behalf of CEEPC.

## **5. Climate and Energy Progress Report and Work Program**

---

Due to the previous sessions running behind schedule, the committee deemed there was not sufficient time for the Progress Report and work program update. Members were asked to take a look at the [Climate and Energy Progress Report](#) either on the COG website or the paper copies provided, and to send comments to Maia Davis at [mdavis@mwkog.org](mailto:mdavis@mwkog.org). The update will be provided at the next meeting.

## **6. Staff and Project Updates**

---

There was not sufficient time for project updates. Members were asked to contact staff with any specific interests or questions. Updates will be provided at the next meeting.

## **7. Next Meeting Dates and Adjournment**

---

The next meeting will be joint meeting with MWAQC on October 2, where the committees will hear from DTP staff about the current process for integration of environmental and air quality considerations into the regions transportation planning process, as well as the challenges and potential opportunities for improved integration.

Members are also encouraged to contact Maia Davis if they are interested in attending the EcoDistricts Practitioners Training at COG on September 24. COG has the ability to cover the attendance fee for this training for 30 members.