

Arlington County C2E2 Energy Committee

Meeting Agenda

Wednesday, February 17, 2021

7:30 am – 9:30 am

Agenda Items

1. Greetings and introductions. **(7:30)**
 - Doug Snoeyenbos joined from the Arlington Democrats
2. Review/approve agenda and January meeting summary. **(7:35)**
 - The meeting agenda and the January meeting summary were both unanimously approved
3. Public Comment on General Topics. **(7:40)**
 - None
4. *CEPIF feedback next steps* **(7:45) – Jonathan Morgenstein**
 - a. Recap of C2E2 discussion
 - b. Next steps on compiling top level & detailed concerns
 - C2E2 directed the EC to retool the draft letter and bring it back to the C2E2 for review
 - C2E2 did not think the draft letter was focused enough and C2E2 did not want to send it in its current state to the CB
 - C2E2 wanted a more concise document with the specific concerns about the draft CEPIF process and explain how the draft CEPIF does not meet the community needs
 - A true roadmap is needed
 - Claire notes that the CEP has six, equally-weighted goal areas
 - Scott S. thought *climate* was a primary driver behind the CEP
 - John B. did not think all CEP Goal Areas were equally weighted
 - Scott B. reminded everyone that the wedge graph in the CEP shows how each of the CEP Goal Areas lead to reduced greenhouse gas emissions. One can read into the document that the wedge graph pieces can allude to the weighting or importance of each wedge graph piece toward getting the community to the overarching 2050 CEP GHGe goal.
 - Demetra noted that equity and resilience plays a role in how we look at the CEP implementation and County staff are charged with keeping those concepts in mind as we weight actions.
 - Claire is concerned that the overarching GHGe 2050 goal being the sole and main target in the EC letter will not allow the EC to raise all of the community's concerns.

- Jonathan and Scott S point to item #4 in the letter that does take into account the four lenses through which the CEP should be viewed.
- Jonathan asked: Item #1 – do we agree that the overall draft CEPIF needs a major overhaul and should be wholly restructured
- Rick K. needs time to review the letter. He notes the CEPIF does what it was designed to do. However, it does not provide a roadmap. So, the EC needs to determine if a roadmap is indeed what the EC wants and needs moving forward.
- John B.: There was a collective failure after the CEP passed to take a fresh look at what implementation planning should look like. We're really having the conversation now that we should have had then . .
- Joan M: Make sure we acknowledge in the letter that the draft CEPIF provides a good amount of information. The document structure can be improved.
 - We should explain what we want and don't simply tell the County staff to start over without explaining what the EC wants to see in an eventual CEP Roadmap.
 - The goal is to move this along sooner rather than later.
- Demetra: Notes that there is an AIRE Work Plan and those activities tie directly to the CEP and its implementation. She noted that we could share that with the EC this week. It shows how the AIRE Team is actively implementing the CEP while staff go back to restructure the CEP Roadmap.
- Jonathan: Thinks a CEP Roadmap is needed and would be a much more useful tool for the community. There is no need to use the current CEPIF structure and simply revise the wording of the currently formatted document.
- Claire: Agrees the framework needs to be revised. However, the current draft letter mixes the "draft CEPIF" with the "Roadmap."
 - She suggests the letter pivot from the "CEPIF" early on to a "CEP Roadmap," and then use the "CEP Roadmap" as what the rest of the suggestions should focus on from then onward in the letter.
 - Jonathan: Asked whether we should directly and explicitly state that a "CEPIF" is not we want or need, rather, we should spend resources moving forward to step back and create a "CEP Roadmap" which would generally look different and provide information in a different way than the current CEPIF.
 - Stephanie: Offered a comment in the chat: She thinks it makes sense to request a Roadmap from the CB, rather than throw away the CEPIF [contents]. Let's make sure the CEPIF is as strong as it can be within its current structure, and let's make a case that we also need a Roadmap.
- Rick: He thinks we can still offer suggestions on the CEPIF individual strategies, while we can still recognize the overall CEPIF structure needs to be revised.
- Demetra: Does the EC want to say that the contents in the 100+ page draft CEPIF is useless? That may be the interpretation of the current EC letter.
- Joan thinks the eventual document structure needs to be improved to draw a direct and logical relationship to the CEP, i.e., a CEP Roadmap.

- Stephanie: It is hard imagining how a Roadmap can be woven into the current CEPIF structure. She does want to give AIRE staff the chance to draw up a new document structure and show how the new document addresses the comments submitted in the two-month draft CEPIF comment period. Perhaps the letter could include that suggestion.
 - Michael H: Agrees with Stephanie that we ask AIRE staff to come back to the EC with a draft document structure that meets the need of the community, based on EC and other community comments on the draft CEPIF.
 - Jonathan noted the letter would not go from the EC to the CB. Rather, it would go to the C2E2, with revisions, for C2E2 to consider sending to the CB.
 - Joan M: Letter can be improved by noting the importance of energy efficiency in buildings and enhance the transportation portion. That can be updated at the C2E2 meeting.
 - Vote: 1) Sending the letter to the C2E2 to consider, with revisions as discussed above. [Aye: 9, Nay: 1]

5. *FY 2022 Budget (8:15) – Claire Noakes*

- a. Upcoming schedule and overall fiscal picture
- b. Request for volunteer to compile EC feedback on budget

- There is a budget gap. However, the gap is not as large as was originally forecasted or anticipated.
- Please tune in to the upcoming County Board budget deliberation.
 - Clarendon “porkchop” street reconfiguration: \$4M to address that issue. Compare that to the \$130,000 the EC asked the County Manager for to address CEP implementation.
 - Do we want to provide County Board meeting testimony to showcase such issues when it comes to how the available money is being spent?
 - Any EC member willing to take that on?
 - Jonathan will follow up with EC members.

6. *Energy Burden (8:30) – [Demetra McBride]*

- a. Overview of the concept of energy burden as a factor of energy equity
- b. Discussion, including EC members’ thoughts on energy equity metrics

- Demetra is willing to provide written comments on the topic of energy equity to the EC.
- Staff are already incorporating equity into the CEP implementation.
 - Mapping disadvantaged communities
 - Looking at Federal grants and State RGGI money usage
 - The Green Building Density Incentive Program includes an equity component, showing how we are adding an equity lens to AIRE activities in real time.
- AIRE staff will continue to look for opportunities to include energy equity into our work, including in the development of metrics.

7. Discussion of draft Comparative Transportation Electrification Analysis (8:45) – Kevin Vincent

- Kevin sent on Dec. 9th an analysis of the draft report. He will explain here what he noted in his Dec. 9th e-mail.
 - He will also ask Demetra to provide an update on the report.
- There are some holes in the draft report:
 - The analysis includes only those vehicles currently in production. There is no analysis including projections for vehicles forecasted to be produced, even though that is somewhat speculative.
 - There is no discussion of current or forecasted incentives, Federal and State, and how the County could use that money. Current VA legislation could make money available to local jurisdictions.
 - Trucks: Within the past year, electric trucks could be available for County use. There is a price premium, but there is not a lack of technology.
- Demetra: noted the document will be finalized in another week or two.
 - Staff were asked to produce a report that looked at the near-term on light-duty vehicles and show what subsequent reports will provide more detail, as is sought by the EC and others regarding EVs and EVSE.
 - Eventually the County website will provide additional information and tools to provide links to information and opportunities.
 - ART buses: The current buses use natural gas, not diesel fuel. The ART bus study SOW is drafted and County staff are working to finalize that SOW. It is expected to have a draft report toward the end of CY 2021.

Discussion:

- Does the report note that the life-cycle costs for EVs are better than ICE vehicles?
 - If so, then the County should not buy any more light-duty vehicles that are not EVs.
- How will EC comments on the report be reported to County staff, CMO, CB?
- How far out does the report look?
 - It looks out to 2050, but the report does not talk about what the County should actually do to address the topic in the near-, mid-, and long-term.
 - Rick mentioned that at a recent Chamber Sustainability Committee meeting, Dominion Energy representatives explained how electric trucks would be used by Dominion.
- Rick asked if the WPCP Solid Waste Plan and the use of gas produced from that process would be included in the ART bus report and other County plans? Rick thought he read somewhere that the WPCP gas output could be used by the ART bus fleet, but would not be of high-enough quality for other uses.
 - Demetra: Noted that the WPCP Solid Master plan effort is relatively new, and staff will coordinate to ensure that plan's assumptions and recommendations are considered as part of the ART bus report.

- Kevin: Regarding Federal incentives, he looks forward to seeing how the EC comments will be addressed in the final report. The Biden Administration is striving to provide localities money to support EVs and EVSE expansion.
 - Demetra: The final report will not focus on heavy-duty vehicles as that discussion is beyond the scope of the report as designed.
 - Kevin hopes future reports will address that segment of vehicles. Also, the current report to be finalized in the next week or so deletes the negative language regarding the use of heavy-duty EVs.
- John B: Linking this discussion with the budget discussion from before.
 - We should look at the County budget and ensure that the County budget plans to commit to purchasing EVs in future vehicle purchases.
- Should EC send C2E2 a letter about the draft report, to be sent up to the CB?
 - Kevin will need help to draft such a letter in time for the next C2E2 meeting.
 - Jonathan will coordinate to find an EC member to help.

8. New business/ Other member updates **(9:10)**

- Does Arlington have the authority to require in real estate listings a home's energy efficiency values? Jonathan recently found it very difficult to find such information when he was buying a new home in Arlington.
 - Claire notes that benchmarking, a related topic, is a non-starter at the State legislative session
 - Helen noted that AIRE staff have worked with the Northern VA Realtors Association to try to get a home's energy efficiency information into a real estate listing.
 - Staff have received pushback from the realtors.
 - This further highlights the voluntary nature of the CEP.
- Claire noted the importance of resilience in the CEP and its implementation.
 - We should look at what is happening in TX now and ensure our grid is resilient as is Arlington's energy infrastructure.
 - Demetra noted the County is launching an Energy Assurance Plan effort, and we hope Claire's comments and other issues are addressed in the eventual EAP report.
- Monday is the C2E2 meeting. That group will look at the draft EC letter the EC would like to go to the CB.
- The next EC meeting is at 7:30 am on Wednesday, March 10.

9. Adjourn. **(9:30)**

- Meeting adjourned at 9:26 am