Introduction

Meeting was called to order at 12:04 pm. Secretary Grumbles opened the meeting with a discussion of the consensus-based decision making in the context of the MCCC process:

- MCCC has been consensus based since 2007
- Never had formal votes
- 2014 Executive Order reshaped the Commission by adding more players but does not require majority voting
- Compressed timeline might not allow for full consensus - but it should to be the goal
- Delegate Stein: majority vote should be required
- Commission needs to get a consensus on the process to gain a consensus
- Sue Briggum: Consensus has value
  - End product is more valuable when parties compromise
  - Presenting opposing views in final product is informative
- Dick D’Amato: The message that opposing parties reached a consensus is important
- Report should be greatly consistent with views of the major players and also include the views of each player (as an Appendix or footnote)
- Majority vote would be more important if Commission wasn’t on-going.
- Consensus based approach is more appropriate given the iterative nature of the annual Commission report
- Action: set up a small group of diverse stakeholders with MDE representation to compile all suggestions to Steering Committee with process to be used to establish protocol.
- No new by-laws
- Can’t risk splintering the Commission

Tad presented “The 2015 Update to the Greenhouse Gas Emission Reduction Act (GGRA) Plan”

Comments following Presentation

- Stuart: Does the Commission intend to include recommendations about emerging issues in the November report?
  - Recommendations about emerging issues will be incorporated into October.
  - Need Commission support.
- Stuart: What were the lessons learned from the previous legislation?
  - Linking jobs and GHG reductions was key
- Stuart: What will be included in November report about rationale for recommendations on emerging issues?
– Use Commission and Working groups to analyze programs and enhancements to ensure that programs perform

- Does the Commission need more authority to meet 2020 goal?
  - No but we will for beyond 2020 goal
  - Federal rules and fleet turnover will help – but not enough

- 40% reduction is actually conservative. 3% wage growth is too aggressive.
  - STWG findings support aggressive goal
  - Messaging is key
  - Why not 45%?
  - Needs to be data driven
  - Calculation depends on which baseline was used (MD uses 2006)
  - 1/2/3/40 is a MDE draft concept
  - Will need Commission feedback

- Near-term vs. Long-term Strategy
  - Eventually short-term programs stop working well
  - State agencies can’t make big structural changes easily
  - Keep doing short-term work but look long-term
  - Not incremental. Together w/ structural is best approach

- Equity Issues
  - Applaud incorporating economics into GGRA goal
  - How can benefits be distributed through state?
  - Vulnerable populations need to considered – need to go further
  - Next step is access to benefits work

- Timeline for future plan
  - Nothing magic about 2019 date as Tad mentioned
  - MDE needed 3 years last time (2009-2012). We probably will again.
  - 3-year planning process worked, but open to discussion

**Updates on Working Groups**

- Science and Technology Working Group
  - No update

- Adaptation Working Group
  - Held 1 meeting and scheduled another
  - Discussions going on about how to transition and focus group on work plan
  - Resilience is still a priority
  - Who replaced Zoe on MCCC?

- Education, Communication, Outreach Working Group
  - Public meetings well attended (30-75 people)
  - Not balanced enough
  - Needed MCCC constituents to attend
  - Should ECO get feedback on Future goal?
  - Proposal: 2nd round of listening sessions
• Report Writing Group
  – Report Writing group took input from public meetings, MWG members (email), and AWG members (email) and made a list of emerging issues
  – Consensus was to focus on process instead of emerging issues list
  – What will the MCCC want to recommend in November report?
  – What does the MCCC want to include in 2016 work plan?
  – How does MCCC want to approach November report?
    ▪ There has been consensus on the report outline
    ▪ Chapter designated as: response to MDE report and other recommendations
    ▪ These will make up the 2016 work plan

• Proposal: Charge a small separate group of Commissioners to develop protocol and sequencing to handle issues where a consensus isn’t reached – can’t neglect the hard issues
  – MWG would make recommendations and those would be approved by Steering Committee for consensus
  – Remember: the Commission reports annually. Not our only chance on some issues
  – MWG has a important role – make recommendations to MCCC
  – But MWG can’t be circumvented

• Closing Statements:
  – Steering Committee to form small group to handle consensus issue
  – Working Groups should provide list of recommendations for 2016 work plan to show Steering Committee prior to 10/9 meeting
  – MDE staff is working hard to get MDE report to Commission ASAP
  – Secretary Grumbles needs to review prior to sharing with Commission

Meeting adjourned at 2:00 pm.