

Draft Meeting Summary
COG Climate Energy and Environment Policy Committee (CEEPC)
September 22, 2010

Members and Alternates

Hon. Roger Berliner, Montgomery County
Hon. Robert Catlin, College Park City Council
Hon. "J" Davis, City of Greenbelt
Hon. Jay Fissette, Chair, Arlington County
Hon. Penelope Gross, Fairfax County
Hon. Andrea McGimsey, Loudoun County
Hon. Jonathan Way, Manassas City

Tad Aburn, Maryland Department of the Environment
Mark Rawlings, District Department of Transportation
Howard Simons, Maryland Department of Transportation
Harriet Tregoning, District Office of Planning
Luke Wisniewski, Maryland Department of the Environment
Kanti Srikanth, Virginia Department of Transportation

Nat Bottigheimer, WMATA
Allison Bishins, WRI
Bucky Green, EPA, Sustainability FAC Branch
Robert Grow, Greater Washington Board of Trade
Mark Lowham, West Group
Tom Moir, DC Council
Jeff Platenberg, Loudoun County Public Schools
Dr. Dan Sklarew, George Washington University
Lindsay Smith, M-NCPPC- Prince George's County
Dr. Mark Starik, George Washington University
Dr. Lise Van Susteren, Chesapeake Climate Action Network

Others Present

Kambiz Agazi, Fairfax County
Monica Backmon, PWC DOT
Erica Bannerman, City of Alexandria
Dan Barry, District Department of the Environment
Dana Dolan, George Mason University
Noelle Dominguez, Fairfax County DOT
Rich Dooley, Arlington County
Stan Edwards, Montgomery County
Laine Cidlowski, District Office of Planning
Joan Kelsch, Arlington County
Saadat Khan, District Department of Transportation, PPSA
John Lord, Loudon County Public Schools
Dave Molchany, Fairfax County
Bob Owolabi, Fairfax County DOT

Tim Stevens, Falls Church
Angela Vincent, ICLEI USA

COG Staff Present

Jeannine Altavilla, Climate and Energy Intern, Department of Environmental Programs
Monica Bansal, Transportation Planner, Department of Transportation Planning
Maia Davis, Environmental Planner, Department of Environmental Programs
Paul DesJardin, Director, Department of Community Planning and Services
Stuart Freudberg, Director, Department of Environmental Programs
Jeff King, Principal Environmental Planner, Department of Environmental Programs
Sunil Kumar, Air Quality Planner, Department of Environmental Programs
Anne Mariani, Environmental Planner, Department of Environmental Programs
Joan Rohlfs, Environmental Resources Program Director, Department of Environmental Programs

1. Call to Order

Chair Fissette called the meeting of the Climate, Energy, and Environment Policy Committee (CEEPC) to order at 9:50 a.m. He announced that Stuart Freudberg, Dr. Lise Van Susteren, and Dr. Dan Sklarew were joining the meeting via teleconference.

2. Approval of Meeting Summary for July 21, 2010 and Amendments to the Agenda

The meeting summary and agenda were approved without changes.

3. Energy Efficiency Outreach Campaign: Update

Joan Rohlfs presented an update on the energy efficiency outreach campaign: WE CAN, Wi\$e Energy by Capital Area Neighbors. In January, CEEPC adopted its work program with energy outreach as a high priority; in April an ad hoc energy outreach workgroup was appointed. The workgroup identified similar programs and drivers for behavior change and proposed a program concept. WE CAN is an online platform, powered by Earth Aid, with a grassroots effort in each of three pilot communities: Greenbelt, MD; Cascades in Loudoun County, VA; Brookland, DC. Earth Aid was selected for the website development and reward program through an RFP. Maia Davis will be working with Greenbelt, Jeff King will be working with Cascades, and Leah Boggs and Anne Mariani will be working with Brookland. The pilot will run from now through March 2011, with recognition of the best individuals and teams around Earth Day 2011. The goal is to have 50 households sign up in each community by mid-October. Energy kits have been sponsored by Dominion and Washington Gas for the first 50 households in each community. Businesses and community groups are also encouraged to become partners. There is an interim webpage up now using Earth Aid's platform and the completed website is expected to launch in mid-October: www.WeCanSaveEnergy.org. The program will continue with outreach and participation in local events, meetings, and publications. The program is geared towards regional expansion in 2011. COG has funded the pilot program, but will require additional funding for program expansion. An application for the EPA Climate Showcase Communities program was submitted. A status update is expected from EPA on Oct 15.

COG staff made a demo of the campaign web site and answered questions.

Mr. Grow asked what benefits there were for participants who are already efficient. He noted that the program does not seem to be designed for the overachiever. COG staff answered that another way to earn points for households that are already very energy-efficient is to invite friends to participate.

Mr. Starik suggested that a goal for a minimum amount of savings be set. Ms. Rohlfs responded that there are other incentives. Ms. Mariani responded that potential savings have been estimated for the EPA Climate Showcase Communities grant application and can be shared with CEEPC members upon request.

Mr. Way asked about the number of hits of the web site and the number who sign up. COG staff will confirm with Earth Aid that it's possible to track the number of hits on the web site. As of Oct 6, 78 households have signed up through wecansaveenergy.org. This number doesn't consider the households in the pilot communities that had previously signed up through Earth Aid. According to Earth Aid, about 80% of the people who sign up come back to the web site at least once, which demonstrates that people find an interest in the capabilities offered by the platform.

Mr. Edwards asked who reserved the right to bundle and sell carbon offset credits from these savings. COG staff answered that this right is reserved to Earth Aid so far, although COG staff was told by Earth Aid that it is not something they plan to pursue.

Mr. Agazi asked if water utilities are also included. COG staff confirmed. A list of the water utilities compatible with the online platform is available upon request.

Mr. Sklarew asked if localities could join. He also suggested that universities could be utilized to help with implementation. Staff responded that, although COG grassroot effort is focused on the three pilot communities, anyone can sign up on WE CAN. Other jurisdictions and organizations elsewhere are nevertheless welcome to promote WE CAN if they want to.

Mr. Grow commented said that once smart meters are deployed, the program could provide more frequent information on energy consumption.

Chair Fisetta requested that staff draft an outreach plan.

4a. District's Draft Climate Action Plan, Comments

The District's discussion draft of the Climate Action Plan was released September 10, 2010 and was presented to CEEPC by Dan Barry, DDOE. Public comments on the draft Government Operations Plan are due November 15. Public engagement will be used to set community-wide greenhouse gas emission reduction targets and draft an Implementation Plan in the fall/winter of 2010-11. The report refers to the regional targets established by MWCOG as a possible goal for the District. The Climate Action Plan was developed with assistance of ICLEI as part of the Green DC Agenda. The 2006 baseline established a CO2 emissions inventory and found that the District has eighteen (18) tons of emissions per capita, which is surprisingly close to the US average and quite high. In the Government Operations Plan the proposed targets are a 20% reduction by 2012, 30% reduction by 2020 and an 80% reduction by 2050. These targets are among the nation's most aggressive. There are seventeen (17) proposed emissions reduction measures to achieve these targets. Government emissions are equal to only 6% of the City's total emissions, which is why broader public engagement is needed to set up goals and recommendations to reduce community-wide emissions.

Chair Fisetta asked about the process to develop the community plan. Mr. Barry responded that the District has been working with ICLEI since 2008 for a government plan. The District is hoping to engage the private sector and the community, which represents 94% of emissions, in the coming months through one to one meetings with sector leaders and public meetings. Chair Fisetta asked if this plan was adopted by the Council. Mr. Barry responded that because of executive privilege the adoption did not require Council approval.

Mr. Way asked about the cost factor. Mr. Barry responded that cost is not included in the draft plan for public comment but that ICLEI identified costs.

Ms. Gross asked about the fleet rightsizing for police vehicles, and the number or size. Mr. Barry responded that the Metropolitan Police Department is already phasing out low efficiency vehicles but that other emergency vehicles such as fire and rescue are more challenging.

Ms. McGimsey complimented the graphics and asked if the impact of the climate action plan on economic development had been analyzed. Mr. Barry responded that there was no specific number in the plan for this, but that creating opportunity for economic development and creating jobs is for sure one of the goals of the plan, along with energy and

climate goals. The District is expanding programs that are already in place because they are concrete actions that have already been identified as economic development opportunities.

Ms. Bishins suggested that specifications for government fleet vehicles be based on the jobs they are required to fulfill. Transform (an NGO) released a report about the cost of CA regulation SB 375 that calls for reduced vehicle miles traveled (VMT). The report shows that there are demonstrated long term savings for households.

Ms. Tregoning discussed economic resilience and the government's ability to increase adaptability to be flexible when gas prices increase. This also allows money spent locally to stay local. She added that the private sector has started understanding the economic benefits of some actions included in the Climate Action Plan. For instance, EPA energy star benchmark is a tool that is being used already by 2/3 of the Apartment and Office Building Association (ABOA).

Ms. Smith noted that Prince George's County and the Maryland National Capital Parks and Planning Commission are about to do a plan for the county. Ms. Smith asked for advice on how to package it and whether to focus on climate or energy. Mr. Barry responded that a combination of climate and energy and economic development creates a full package so that it can be sold broadly.

Mr. Aburn congratulated the District on the plan. He noted that the city consumes more energy than it generates and asked if the greenhouse gas emissions inventory was consumption based. Mr. Barry responded that yes, it was consumption based. Mr. Aburn noted that RGGI program may help the District achieve goals through reductions occurring at power plants that provide energy to the District. Mr. Barry noted that Blue Plains wastewater treatment plant is serving the whole region but all of the emissions are counted in the DC inventory. The influx of workers also adds energy emissions in the workplace. Remote coal power plants provide power to DC. All of these result in higher per capita emissions.

Mr. Starik noted that there was no climate neutrality date in plan. He suggested that DC needs to share information with universities who have established a target date for zero net emissions. George Washington University has set 2040. American University has set a goal of climate neutrality by 2020. Catholic University has installed solar energy. Mr. Barry asked if it was realistic for a city to set a target of zero emissions, but noted that it is an important question to consider.

Chair Fisette reminded members that the District is looking for comments. He added that Arlington expects to release their community energy plan in Arlington spring 2011 on Arlington Day. They are using discussion of greenhouse gas as a surrogate for energy. Chair Fisette noted that Peter Garforth is helping Arlington with their community energy plan and that he will be speaking at the Committee's November meeting.

4b. EECBG Projects and EECBG Advocacy

Jeff King presented on Energy Efficiency and Conservation Block Grant (EECBG) projects in the region. The metropolitan Washington region has received approximately \$46 million in EECBG funding that has been applied to nearly 90 projects across the regions. The majority of projects are for energy efficiency and renewable energy in buildings, with over half of the total funding going towards government buildings. An Office of the Inspector General (OIG) report, released in August, concluded that the program had not spent funds at a rate fast enough to meet targets and that the program also has not met its targets for job creation. President Obama has not included funding to continue this program in his FY 2012 budget proposal. Climate Communities has launched a campaign to add funding for the EECBG program to his budget. Staff is presenting a proposed letter to support the continuation of this program, to be voted on by members. The letter would be sent by COG Board Chair Kwame Brown to President Obama.

Mr. Edwards commented on the results of the OIG report. He noted that EECBG grantees were asked to establish three year spending programs. Counties and municipalities have been carefully designing their programs according to their plans, but recently the DOE has been pushing for the money to be spent faster. Local regulations and laws exist to make

sure public money is spent correctly and carefully. Skipping parts of the process to spend the money more quickly would not be acceptable.

Ms. Davis voiced concerned that the letter's language is too soft. She suggested not to say thank you up front in the letter, but to explain that the proper procedure was being followed to ensure due diligence.

Ms. McGimsey asked that the letter discuss the economic stimulus issue and how the money is benefiting counties and municipalities. The ARRA has transformed Loudoun County and gotten the government to discuss topics that were never addressed before. Loudoun County has created jobs and saved money. She suggested that a book of local stories be developed and included in the letter, like the Climate Communities stories. She noted that the program is creating private jobs, too, not just government jobs.

Ms. Gross asked that the fourth paragraph be moved to the second paragraph. She asked that in the first paragraph the word community be changed to region.

Kambiz Agazi asked that the fourth paragraph recognize the administrative and government hurdles that had to be overcome. Since the hurdles have been passed, the process is moving forward much more quickly. Fairfax County will spend fifty percent of its money in the next 2 months. Now is not the time to stop the program. Fairfax developed fifty programs but only received funding for nineteen. The remaining projects are sitting on the shelf and require more funding.

Chair Fisette noted that it is a challenge to create new infrastructure and ensure that money is spend effectively with proper insight. Developing a sustainable funding stream is critical for success.

Mr. Edwards noted that with the infrastructure for the program now in place there would not be the same delays in another round of the program.

Mr. Berliner commented that the letter should include language saying that the program structure slowed down the disbursement of funds, and that the federal, state, and local jurisdictions should not be punished for this.

Ms. Bishins noted that if only nineteen of fifty projects in Fairfax County were funded that counties and municipalities should be able to get more funding. There is continued need in this region.

Chair Fisette asked that a revised letter be sent to himself and the Vice Chairs. Ms. Gross asked that the letter also be sent to the COG Board, since the letter is coming from them. Staff agreed and noted that the Board was not voting on the letter because their next meeting is after the letter should be sent. Executive Director David Robertson said that because it is consistent with the COG Board actions and it would implement actions in their report they do not have to vote on the letter. Ms. Gross asked that it be sent to the COG Board vice chairs, and that it also be copied to all members of CEEPC. Ms. Smith asked that a table of all of the local projects be made available for members.

5. Annual Progress Report

Maia Davis presented an update on the Annual Progress Report. The final report will be about 15 pages total and will highlight that every jurisdiction is doing something. The report will track progress on the workplan to report to the COG Board of Directors and to advertise to the public. The report will include key accomplishments, sections by topic with summaries, visuals, and case studies, as well as financials and project highlights. Finally, the report will include a detailed summary chart of progress towards action plan goals. Several sample charts with illustrative data were provided to show possible ways of reporting data including regional, state, and jurisdictional reporting. Examples of other COG reports that include data by jurisdiction were provided.

Chair Fisette likes how this will show the work being done related to the work plan. Mr. Way noted that it improves the method for showing jurisdictions. The dot completion is better than the red, yellow, and green lights, but it still seems

like it could become a report labeling good guys and bad guys. He asked if the committee had decided at an earlier meeting to not include reporting by individual jurisdiction in the final report.

Discussion continued on whether or not the report would include reporting on individual jurisdictions. Mr. Berliner noted that it is very important to break it down. He recalled a discussion on the issue, but not a decision about what would be done. COG reports the break down for murder and for rape, so then why not greenhouse gas emissions? Ms. McGimsey noted that reporting by jurisdiction will increase competition and that peer pressure will help the region to improve. She also noted that it will be very helpful for jurisdictions to examine their progress over time. Ms. Gross recalled an early discussion on internal numbers. She noted that individual reporting is standard at COG and allows comparison over the years, giving value to the numbers. Chair Fisetta noted that separating jurisdictions by population is helpful in the comparison. J. Davis noted that this is an issue with Region Forward, as well. She appreciates separating counties and cities, and asked if city data is included in any of the county data. Greenbelt does not mind being compared, but wants to ensure that certain information will be available to make informed comparisons, such as areas where cities cannot act, but counties can.

Ms. Bishins likes the changes that were made. She asked if the report would only include what is in the work plan. She thought that per capita emissions by jurisdiction and progress towards the region's GHG reduction goals would also be useful.

Chair Fisetta asked for specific comments on the types of charts presented. Mr. Agazi thought that the bar chart was too academic for the intended audience. He thought that the bar chart on page eight (8) of the presentation was too busy and confusing for the general public and that the table on page twelve (12) was a much better approach. Footnotes could be used to note where jurisdictions did not have authority to implement certain measures. Howard Simons felt that there were too many reasons why things would not be done, and that it would be better to only report regionally or by state. Maia Davis noted that the same charts do not have to be used for all of the measures reported.

Ms. McGimsey strongly supports comparison, stating that it is needed for advocacy efforts. Mr. Grow noted that the report would be very useful as an informational and marketing piece. It is important to be transparent.

Mr. Lowham said that the report should feature private sector initiatives as well, because they add great benefits for the region.

Mr. Agazi cautioned against only including only a few measures. There are some jurisdictions that may have completed many of these, and it would be incorrect to send the message that they are perfect or near perfect when there is much more that they could be doing.

6. Complete Communities Proposal

Paul DesJardin, COG Director of Community Planning and Services, presented an update on the HUD EPA DOT Complete Communities grant proposal. Notice of the \$100 million national program was announced in June and COG submitted a proposal on August 23. The COG proposal promotes development of a network of complete communities building on the already established regional activity centers. The program would be a three year process to free up big projects and help the region embrace new policy ideas. There was a 20% match requirement among stakeholders and project partners. COG reached out to nontraditional stakeholders to be included. The maximum grant amount is \$5 million. COG has thirty (30) entities as part of the application and got a 44% match. Grants can be awarded for scaled down projects. Grant recipients are expected to be announced around the 1st of the year. There was also a call for \$40 million for local challenge grants. The District, Prince George's County, Montgomery County, Arlington County, Prince William County and others in the region applied for these grants. All of these projects would support the regional proposal.

Ms. McGimsey asked about the Livable Communities Act. Mr. DesJardin noted that COG is tracking the act. Ms. McGimsey suggested that COG could send a letter. Jay said that it will be considered for the November agenda.

7. Discussion of Future Agenda Topics

There was no discussion of future agenda items given time constraints of the meeting.

8. Other Business

- a. **Street Lights Work Group Update (J. Davis)** - The group met Monday and heard an update on Dominions' LED pilot. The group also heard about the Pepco Maryland Public Service Commission rate case which included a section on street lights. At the next meeting the group will discuss barriers to purchasing and what to do after power company pilots are done.
- b. **30% solution, Energy Building Code Update (Jeff King for Leah Boggs)** - The International Code Council Final Action Hearings will be held October 25-31 in Charlotte, North Carolina. COG received \$30,000 in funds from the Energy Foundation, and is receiving an additional \$50,000-60,000 more to send jurisdiction staff. Ten (10) jurisdictions have applied to send forty-eight (48) staff. Chair Fisetta reminded members that building codes represent a major opportunity for improvement. Other parts of the world are much farther ahead with their codes which results in lower operating costs and lower greenhouse gas emissions. Please make sure that if your jurisdiction is an ICC member you get them to attend the hearing. He asked that the announcement be sent to all CEEPC members.
- c. **EPA Smart Growth Technical Assistance Grant (Anne Mariani)** - COG has received a an award through EPA's Smart Growth Technical Assistance program. The EPA will work with COG on a project about using smart growth for climate adaptation in the region. The EPA will provide a team of consultants to help with the project. MWCOG project is one of the four projects selected by PEA this year among 150+ applications. Montgomery County received this award last year.
- d. **Utility Data Request (Jeff King)** - COG received Pepco's 2009 data this week, organized by zip code. The data has been forwarded to energy managers. Per company policy, Dominion will send their completed data report to the counties, which should then be forwarded to COG staff.

9. Adjourn

Chair Fisetta reminded the committee that there will be a special program at the November meeting. There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 12:00.

*The next meeting will be held on **November 17, 2010 from 9:30am to 11:30am.***