

Arlington County C2E2 Energy Committee

Meeting Agenda

Wednesday, January 27, 2021

7:30 am – 9:30 am

Agenda Items

1. Greetings and introductions. (7:30)

- Claire will be running the meeting today.
- Rich noted that he needed to step away briefly for part of this meeting to present to NAIOP members. Charles Njoku on the AIRE Team will take over EC Liaison duties. Charles introduced himself to the EC members.
 - Charles as an Energy Management Specialist manages numerous data projects in the AIRE Team.
 - Rich explained that NAIOP is a group of property developers and developer team members that meets monthly with County staff, primarily CPHD staff.
 - Rich will check whether the NAIOP meeting can be attended by anyone in the public.

2. Review/approve agenda and December meeting summary. (7:35)

- Members approved today's meeting agenda and the December meeting summary

3. Public Comment on General Topics. (7:40)

- None

4. CEPIF feedback (7:45)

a. High Level Overview – Jonathan Morgenstein & Claire Noakes (7:45)

b. Discuss sending draft letter on high level feedback (8:00)

- Overview
 - A link was added to the meeting chat regarding the document that people were making comments on:
<https://docs.google.com/document/d/17T1cZCViuSHZfQ4UVEb24wT5hyL9yLpr/edit?pli=1> and the letter was e-mailed to EC members
 - The CEPIF strategies came up short of empowering the County to the finish line
- The draft letter from the EC to the CMO was discussed.
 - Claire noted that the letter was intended to be an overarching document, discussing more general direction comments about the draft CEPIF. The letter is intended to be sent to the County Manager.

- Asking the County Manager for a designation of one of the CMO's personnel to focus on CEP implementation from a whole-government perspective.
 - Someone in a position of power needs to be able to talk with Department Directors
 - The person would oversee an interdepartmental working group that oversees overall CEP implementation
 - County staff noted that there are OSEM staff that already coordinate on budget and related CEP implementation activities
- There is also a concern that given the current draft CEPIF and how the County is organized, we will not meet our CEP goals and reach the finish line.
- The EC wants someone high enough in the County government organization who would have the authority to direct and guide multiple County departments on how to effectively address energy and CEP implementation matters.
- Tim: For the letter, he agrees we should have a whole-of-government approach. Should we make comments on the draft CEPIF in this letter, too?
 - We can reference in this overarching letter that a separate letter will address specific draft CEPIF comments. A brief letter including the EC members' comments has been produced and shared with County staff.
 - Scott S. noted that keeping this overarching letter simple and concise is a good strategy.
 - We should then remove the "For example..." paragraph on the second page.
- John B: Supports the gist of the letter. Wondered how to best coordinate with C2E2 on this matter. Perhaps we should coordinate with C2E2 before the EC sends the letter directly to the CMO.
 - Issue not covered in the draft CEPIF now is how to structure government to effectively implement the CEP
 - Suggestion is to share a draft with C2E2. Discuss whether two letters should be sent – one from EC to the CMO and another from C2E2 to the CB.
 - Wonders if the message to the CMO would be more powerful if it came from the CB instead of from the EC. Or, we should at least talk with the CB to see if there is buy-in from the CB. Think about Montgomery County and how Fairfax County Supervisors are driving changes to County organization there.
 - Concern that letter to the CMO is a nonstarter and that such a letter may detract from CEPIF implementation effort due to personnel changes & budget crunch issues.
- Kevin: Concerned most with substantive issues on the draft CEPIF.
 - He is worried that diving into County government organization matters could derail our efforts to address the actual draft CEPIF.
 - We could alternatively suggest that there needs to be an improvement in the whole-of-government approach and we should let the CMO and CB determine *how* that should be done.
 - Scott S.: Hears' Kevin's alternative approach to be an incremental approach and not a major shift. Scott thinks a major shift is needed, not an incremental one.

- Jonathan: This reminds him of the National Defense Council. He thinks the Arlington County Manager needs in his Cabinet a person in charge of energy and CEP matters. That could be a current Deputy County Manager who takes on that role, or it could be a new person.
- Rick: Not sure the letter currently strikes the right tone.
 - It would be good to see in the CEPIF a commitment to a whole-of-government approach, and we'd like to hear how the CMO plans to meet that commitment. One option could be a new position in the CMO.
 - The EC simply asking the County Manager now for a new position on his cabinet might not be the best approach.
- Claire: The CEPIF was drafted prior to Covid-19.
 - The concern, as noted in the letter, is that given Covid-19 and how it has impacted the County government and will impact us, the status quo approach to CEP implementation will not be enough to get our community to its CEP goals.
 - The letter offers a new position option and adding CEP implementation oversight to an existing person's portfolio at the CMO level.
- John B: This letter at least starts a conversation about various ways to reach an end.
- Scott S: The County Manager realizes that our group is interested in CEP implementation and we are doing what we think is needed to shine a bright light on this important topic.
- Joan: As the C2E2 Chair, she looks to the EC for suggestions, recognizing the CEPIF is slated to go the CB this Spring.
 - Believes the time to do this is now, planning and getting ready for how CEP implementation will be part of the post-Covid reality and recovery is key.
 - Also, be ready for the new Biden admin and plenty of possibilities for funding.
 - There's a need to have a sustainability POC at the table to give priority to CEPIF implementation
 - She sees it as a courtesy of the EC going to the CMO, noting what the C2E2 will be asking the CB to respond to a similar matter.
- Vote: Motion: Send the letter, with some revisions to the paragraph that begins, "For example...", to the County Manager and forward it to the C2E2, advising C2E2 to follow up with the County Board [9 Yays, 2 Nays]
 - For people who want revisions, please send Claire those revisions as soon as possible.

c. Discuss specific EC member feedback on various CEPIF strategies (8:20)

- Best way to offer our feedback on specific draft CEPIF items?
- Jonathan created a letter, similar to the one EC sent in August 2020, to reiterate concerns with the draft CEPIF.
 - EC believes that none of the four main issues from August 2020 have been addressed.
 - The letter includes Attachment 2, the draft CEPIF with Track Changes and comments provided within the draft CEPIF document.

- Claire wondered if the EC should insert the EC comments into the Konveio website document that is designed to capture the public's comments on the draft CEPIF.
- Kevin: Is the eventual CEPIF going to be a dynamic or static document?
 - Charles noted it is designed to be a dynamic document, even after it is accepted.
 - Demetra noted the CEP is part of the Comprehensive Plan and is updated every five years. The CEPIF would be updated every five years.
 - Claire: The CEPIF includes activities already being done and provides information on work to be done in the future. It seems odd to include both.
- Tim: Should we send up to the CMO a multi-page document that provides specific items within the draft CEPIF?
 - Suggests we send general comments – not the Attachment – to the County Board
 - We need to get EC's comments on the draft CEPIF to someone above and outside the AIRE Team to provide our perspective.
 - Claire:
 - Tim: Thinks EC's comments advises the County Board and EC's comments should carry more weight than the general public's comments.
- Jonathan: The reason for not adding EC comments directly into the Konveio page is because the August EC letter did not yield changes to the draft CEPIF.
- Amy: Is it valuable, beneficial to have each of us offer individual comments on the Konveio page?
 - Charles noted that yes, that would be valuable.
 - Tim noted that the EC is in a different position than the general public. Regardless what staff suggest the EC should do, Tim thinks the EC should go ahead and provide specific comments per the marked-up draft CEPIF that is separate from the Konveio website.
- John B.: Encourages everyone to comment on the Konveio website AND to provide comments in the separate EC document.
 - Asking for reprioritization
 - Asking for a roadmap and show chronologically how we plan to reach our CEP goals.
 - A consultant may be needed to do the above.
 - Are we asking for a pause in the overall CEPIF process?
- Kevin: There are technical things to consider in the draft CEPIF. Do we need to duplicate our past efforts by adding EC comments to the Konveio website?
 - Charles: No, you do not need to duplicate those commenting efforts.
- Joan: C2E2 is looking for a letter where the ultimate target is the CB.
 - We want a better roadmap.
 - What activities will impact buildings and transportation and make the most impact in helping the community reach CEP goals?
 - Example: We need financial incentives to move us forward
 - Example: Transportation planning needs to be updated to match with CEP goals.
 - We do not want to slow down the process or press the pause button on CEP implementation.

- Jonathan: EC role is to address the 1) general public, 2) CMO & AIRE Team, and 3) C2E2.
 - This letter reiterates overarching draft CEPIF concerns, and it provides specific comments on the 100+ page draft CEPIF.
 - While the CMO will not look at the 100+ page document and comments, but AIRE Team members will do so. He expects the CMO would look at the overarching draft CEPIF concerns.
 - Next steps: Shall we send the letter with the attachment to the CMO and AIRE Team, or do we want to send the Attachment solely to the AIRE Team? Also, do we want to summarize the 100+ page document and revise the August 2020 letter and send that to the CMO?
- Demetra: Perhaps a letter can highlight the main issues with the draft CEPIF and recommend the top activities the County and community should do to continue implementation while addressing the roadmap development issue.
- John B.: For the CEP, the EC created a detailed list of comments for AIRE, and prepared a higher-level document for the CMO.
 - The August 2020 letter is still valid, but the EC thinking has evolved since August 2020.
 - Jonathan wants to show that the EC did try to improve the draft CEPIF before, but that improvement has not yet taken place.
- Tim suggests we vote on us sending the letter up to the C2E2
- Joan: Even if we do not develop a top-ten list in time for the C2E2 meeting, at least the C2E2 can discuss items that could be included in such a top-ten list of implementation activities.
 - We need to make clear to the CB our recommendations on how to move forward, e.g., have a more detailed CEP roadmap; the County committing to a whole-of-government approach.

d. Determine follow-up on strategy feedback (8:50)

- Vote on Motion: We will send up to C2E2 the current letter and attachment for C2E2 to discuss. Then, the EC can develop a top-ten list of things that should be done to implement the most important activities to help the community reach its CEP goals. The prioritized list is something the EC can develop in its February meeting for C2E2 to consider at its February meeting. [Unanimously approved]
 - C2E2 will talk on Monday, and EC could then help shape in the Feb. EC meeting items for C2E2 to take up at the C2E2 February meeting

5. Discussion of draft Comparative Transportation Electrification Analysis

a. Overview and discussion – Kevin Vincent (9:00)

- Kevin can provide a brief summary now, and provide a longer update at the February EC meeting
- See Kevin's Dec. 9 e-mail for his summary of the report

- There are conclusions in the draft report that the County should be acting on today. The County should not be waiting for implementation.
 - The County will make money by implementing this change for sedans.
- The Federal government is looking to purchase EVs from now on for Federal fleet.
 - The County should prepare to make itself available for Federal funding for more EVs and EVSE.
- The County purchased 9 EVs recently and installed EV chargers to support those vehicles.
 - How many IC sedans or other light-duty vehicles, if any, did the County purchase at the same time?
 - Kevin does not think there is a substantial price differential between IC sedans and EV sedans.
 - Demetra noted county activities to write more reports and plans, including the Transportation Grid Master Plan.

6. New business/ Other member updates **(9:25)**

- Next EC meeting is on the morning of Feb. 17.
- Please let Rich know if you do not have the EC meetings on your calendars for all of 2021.
 - Rich will add Joan McIntyre to the invitation list as the C2E2 Chair.

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

- Meeting adjourned at 9:31 am