

DRAFT

**Accounting for Growth Work Group Summary
Meeting #5: 5/10/2013**

In Attendance:

Work Group Members: Tom Ballentine, Yates Clagett, Sandy Coyman, Cathy Drzyzgula, Lynne Hoot, Pat Langenfelder, Jon Laria, Mary Ann Lisanti, Katie Maloney, Erik Michelson, Julie Pippel*, Mike Powell, Alison Prost, Dru Schmidt-Perkins, Josh Tulkin

*for Shannon Moore

Support Team: Meg Andrews, Darrell Brown, George Chmael, David Costello, Kate Culzoni, Lee Currey, Dave Goshorn, George Kelley, Betty Kelley*, Brigid Kenney, Susan Payne, John Rhoderick, Dusty Rood, Helen Stewart, Joe Tassone

*for Steve Stewart

Absent:

Work Group Members: Bevin Buchheister, Stephen Harper, Shannon Moore

Support Team: Dan Baldwin, Jeff Corbin, Candace Donoho, George Kelly, Les Knapp, Doug Lashley, Dave Nemazie, Steve Stewart, Roger Venezia

Public Attendees:

Vimal Amin (MDE), Valerie Connelly (MDFB), Brenda Dime (Carroll County Government), Erin Gray (WRI), James Hearn (WSSC), Steve Johnson (MDE), Amanda Mock MLIS), Hannah Murray (Rodgers Consulting), Susan Payne (MDA), Michael Sanderson (MaCo), Jay Sakai (MDE), Craig Ward (Frederick Ward Associates)

Welcome and Overview

Facilitator George Chmael welcomed everyone to the fifth Accounting for Growth (AfG) Work Group meeting and reminded the WG that there are three more scheduled meetings remaining after this one. The WG agreed to change the meeting time to 9AM to 1PM, keeping the four-hour meeting duration but discarding the current afternoon schedule. The meeting dates and location were not changed.

Mr. Chmael presented the day's agenda: a review and discussion of the subcommittee's work on the development of comprehensive alternatives that narrow the field of choices and demonstrate the common interests of all the stakeholders as well as the interplay of specific policy points. He noted that it is unlikely that a specific, complete alternative will be adopted, however, the WG should consider how to build upon the three alternatives developed by the subcommittee. All Work Group constituencies were represented at the subcommittee meetings and influenced the alternatives created. However, each alternative does not solely reflect one stakeholder group. Instead, the three alternatives are representative of the most likely options under consideration by the WG.

Mr. Chmael also reminded the WG of the Calculator tool that was developed to assess the impact of choosing specific options. This tool can be used under various development scenarios to assess the impact of varying combinations that the WG comes up with.

After the subcommittee reviews the three alternatives, Mr. Chmael will guide the WG through the options selected in all three alternatives in order to gain group consensus.

Subcommittee Presentation of Alternatives

The subcommittee was composed of all five Work Group constituencies: developers, agricultural community, environmental non-governmental organizations, public interest and local government. Three subcommittee members volunteered to present the alternatives developed by the subcommittee to the Work Group on an issue basis and provided background on their choices. This was at times accompanied by a switch in an alternative's selection to better represent the intention or purpose. The [table was updated](#) with these small changes and other clarifications. During the subcommittee presentation the WG asked clarifying questions including:

Q: If there is no opposition to the narrowed choices, are the other choices no longer under discussion?

A: The WG can revisit the narrowed down list if need be, otherwise the WG is moving forward on other issues and options.

As other concepts were reviewed, specific options were determined that needed further discussion, such as:

- The language in I.A.2. Brigid Kenney (MDE) will offer alternate language for the option.
- II. Effective Date/Transitioning, especially with regard to the effective date versus the compliance date.
- VI.A. What allocation, if any, should be given to the stormwater post-development load (the difference between the post-development load and the allocation for the post-development load equals the offset needed)? It was requested that all options remain on the table, despite the three alternatives selected.
- VI.C. What allocation, if any, should be given to the atmospheric deposition post-development load (the difference between the post-development load and the allocation for the post-development load equals the offset needed)?
- IX.A.3. Definition of infill, is required by the local government in order to choose an option.
- IX.E.2. Credit Stacking - need more information. Aggregators on the support team will provide additional information at the next meeting.

ACTION: Discuss the concepts and options listed above. It was requested that a presentation on trading occur at a future meeting and/or an economist come. Mr. Chmael and the support team will identify an economist to attend. Invitations were also requested for potential investors and brokers.

Discussion and Elimination of Decision Options

Overall 14 of 31 options in the [AfG Matrix](#) were generally agreed upon among work group members. These issues were discussed in the subcommittee first and agreed upon among the three alternatives. The Work Group also discussed these options and generally agreed with the selections, however, the option of going back and revisiting options at a later date remains open.

I.A.2. was revisited and revised through group consensus, but there is further language to be addressed and clarified. A Support Team member will propose any amendment at a future meeting.

Environmental stakeholders remarked on the importance of determining the same baseline for triggers and offsets. The offset equation will determine the offset requirement.

III.B.3. was revised through group consensus.

III.C.1. was revised and agreed upon except for one Environmental stakeholder, who will revisit this at a future meeting.

V.A.ii. was agreed upon by the WG after revision.

V.B.i.2. was agreed upon by the WG after revision.

V.B.iv.2. and VI.C.3.: the WG agreed to recommend that atmosphere deposition be noted as one component accounted for in the margin of safety and not be a concept included in the Accounting for Growth policy.

VI.B.2. was agreed.

During discussion of VII., it was agreed to add a new concept (a new XII.) to account for the identification of the number of offsets needed in the developer's proposal at an early stage in the process.

X.A.i.7. and X.A.ii.10 were agreed upon as revised.

X.B.1-4 were agreed upon as revised.

X.C.2. and 3. were agreed upon, as was X.E.2.

ACTION: Gather more information on credit stacking. Revisit setting the cost of the Fee-in-Lieu (III.C.1.) and the language of the applicability trigger for the overall policy (I.A.2.).

Next Steps

The next meeting will be held on May 31, 2013 at 9:00 a.m. at MDE.

Public Comment:

None