Electric Vehicle Infrastructure Council

Meeting Summary

November 7th, 2011

2:00 PM – 4:00 PM

1. Welcome & Announcements:

Chairman Mobley made a few introductory comments and announced a change in the Council's make up:

- Fred Hoover, Council Member for the environmental community, has taken a position with the Maryland Energy Administration (MEA). As a result he will no longer be able to serve on the Council in that capacity, though he will remain involved in his capacity as Director of Clean Energy at MEA. A new member representing the environmental community will be appointed by the Governor's Office.

- Steve Arabia has graciously agreed to take over the duties of Chair of the Market Development Work Group from Mr. Hoover.

2. Public Comment & Discussion:

The floor was opened for public comments: Mr. Bruninga reiterated his written comments (October 20, 2011) on the subject of whether some form of tax or fee should be levied on EV drivers to compensate the Transportation Trust Fund, since PUVs will not be paying the gas tax. He raised the question of an existing disparity in that gasoline users do not pay for their emissions.

3. Proposed Legislation:

- Fred Hoover walked the Council through the proposed language for a bill to add a provision to the Public Utilities Article, § 1-101, Definitions, that would exempt the owners and operators of electric vehicle supply equipment, electric vehicle charging station service companies and electric vehicle charging station service providers from the definition of "Electricity Supplier", as well as exempting them from the definition of "Public Service Company".

<u>Discussion:</u>
Robert Sklar (DBED) asked for clarification that the exception applied to the activity itself, not to the company, noting that Public Utilities could also choose to become charging station operators. Fred Hoover noted that Public Utilities are regulated specifically under other portions of the law. Chris Rice (MEA) then asked if it would be necessary include other definitions, such as electric vehicle supply equipment, noting that the Workgroup for PSC Case #9261 used a different term for that type of equipment. Kathy Kinsey (MDE) had the same

question. Jill suggested a definition that referenced other terms as "also known as." There was discussion of agreeing to a concept for legislation rather than exact wording, since it was likely to be further edited by sponsors both before and after introduction.

Chairman Mobley asked that the Council members send in comments by Thursday after which an updated draft will be sent out.

There was also some discussion of how voting should occur. Chris Rice suggested that the Council should receive notification when there will be a vote at the next meeting. Ralph DeGeeter (PSC rep for Greg Carmean) noted that in any case the PSC staff cannot vote or comment on legislation.

- Fred Hoover walked the Council through the proposed language for a bill to amend the State Government Article, Title 10, Subtitle 6, Part III, Paragraph "p" to allow the Motor Vehicle Administration to provide data on Electric Vehicle purchasers directly to their Public Utility. The proposed language was drafted by MVA and contained revisions by other members of the Market Development Work Group.

<u>Discussion:</u>
Gary Skulnik – Asked why "used to contact the individual" was removed from the prohibited uses in the original draft. John Murach responded that he had requested the words be removed because utilities may need to contact the individual to inform him/her that the utility is coming to their house/neighborhood to check out the charging station. Jill Sorensen brought up that data might be inaccurate for those who lease vs. buy because the lessor is listed as the owner, not the lessee. The data in question is address where charging would occur. Phil Dacey (MVA) stated that the Lessee would be considered the "registered owner" in this situation.

William Gausman questioned whether the caveats in paragraph 3 of the proposed language would provide sufficient confidentiality to owners. John Murach said that the data would only be used by the utilities for distribution planning and liability assessment. Chris Rice asked if the Council would have the opportunity to review changes to the proposed legislation before they are submitted. Mr. Hoover and Mr. Murach said they wouldn't be surprised if the legislature required more protection for the consumer.

4. Interim Report:

The draft Interim report was distributed with a suggested schedule for review and comment between this meeting and the December 5th meeting.

Chairman Mobley asked if the Council had any other suggestions at this time for immediate actions to be recommended in the Interim Report, in addition to the proposed legislation.

Jill Sorensen proposed a recommendation from a Governor's report of six months ago to convert government fleets to Electric Vehicles, especially if the conversion would save the agency money. Kathy Kinsey suggested using the existing agency replacement schedules for

fleet vehicles as a vehicle for such a change (vehicles would be replaced with EV's as they reached the end of their useful life). This would avoid the large up-front cost of replacing relatively new vehicles.

Chris Rice said that we should at least make sure EV's are on the state procurement list of eligible vehicles. Kathy Kinsey suggested that the Council include this concept in the interim report and provide background to provide some context. Holly Russell commented that if this were extended to local governments it would likely be perceived as an unfunded mandate. Robert Rollins agreed that the purchase price of EVs compared to other vehicles made them cost prohibitive for state agencies. Fred Hoover suggested that government purchasers could bargain with the manufacturer for a lower price for fleets. So far the Work Group covering incentives has been focused on incentives for the private sector fleets.

There was then general discussion on other topics. Jill Sorensen suggested that perhaps we could configure a different type of stimulus/tax rebate since tax rebates on EV's only apply to those who are taxed (not the government). There was discussion of whether or not non-profits paid excise taxes. Kathy Kinsey mentioned that MDE had looked at the idea of bundling different types of offset benefits for inter-sector trading, but it's not meaningful in the context of government fleets since the emissions per car are so small. Bihui Xu suggested that linking solar charging to EVs would strengthen the potential credit.

Andrew Farkas handed out a paper on user fees for future discussion with the Council. John Murach requested that it be distributed electronically. He also asked if anyone was aware of other reports or pilots on this topic that the Council could look at. Dr. Farkas mentioned an Oregon pilot, while Ms. Sorensen mentioned Washington State, Denmark and Israel as places that had examined this idea. There was discussion of some of the issues around VMT tracking. Dr. Farkas suggested possibilities such as charging a fee when the odometer is read at emissions testing, or varying registration fees based on the vehicles emission level.

Mr. Bruninga (audience member) added that any road use tax, applied to EVs should equally be applied to an environmental usage tax on fossil fuel vehicles. EVs reduce pollution and, therefore, provide environmental benefit. Transportation infrastructure maintenance should also encourage CMAQ, congestion mitigation and air quality, improvements. EVs should have a reduced emissions credit to be offset against any road tax."

5. Next Steps:

There was some additional discussion of how voting on the proposed legislation would be handled. After which the meeting was adjourned.

Next Meeting: December 5th, 2:00 PM to 4:00 PM