



## MARYLAND WIND WORKING GROUP

### Conference Call Notes

January 31, 2007

#### Attendees

- Kathy Magruder, DBED
- Kevin Porter, Exeter Associates
- Harry Warren, Washington Gas Energy Services
- Jerry Redden, Worcester County Department of Economic Development
- Ron Stimmel, AWEA
- John Sherwell, DNR/PPRP
- Roger Satin, DBED
- Ira Albert, Baltimore County Community College
- Michael Dolan, US Windforce
- Kevin Rackstraw, Clipper
- Eric Coffman, Montgomery County, MD
- Crissy Godfrey, Maryland Energy Administration
- Mary Fischer, SENTECH, Inc.

#### Discussion

- 1) Maryland legislation and incentives
  - a) Maryland's incentives are limited to reduce impact on the PTC.
  - b) Property tax revenues and local tax revenues are among the primary benefits of wind power development.
  - c) A bullet to the one-pager should be added in the background section that highlights job creation, local tax benefits, and other positive economic effects of wind development.
  - d) Wind potential in Maryland is much higher than 338 MW (as noted on the AWEA website). Kevin Porter will check with NREL to determine the correct data.
  - e) The three wind projects proposed in Maryland could start construction immediately based on their permit status. The potential reason they haven't broken ground is because of litigation -- Pennsylvania has taken resettlement funds from various mergers and applied this to projects. Maryland does not do this.
  - f) The RPS allows landfill gas and hydro, which keeps prices down and makes wind less attractive financially
- 2) Edits to one-pager
  - a) Barriers section
    - i) The handout should not say that Maryland is a relatively high cost state in which to do business.
    - ii) The enterprise zone tax credit gives a discount on property taxes for the first five years.

- iii) Pilot program to redirect taxes: The group discussed whether this would be an option to encourage wind development in Maryland. Garrett County does not have such a program established.
- iv) The best outcome for wind tax incentives in Maryland is parity with other forms of generation incentives so that prices are the same as other forms of power.
- v) The tax topic is too contentious to include in the one-pager.
- vi) Siting
  - (1) There is no confusion over the siting process
  - (2) Every developer goes to the same process
  - (3) Other states have set up specific, streamlined regulatory structures to handle these types of processes
  - (4) The permitting process is complicated and can be drawn out through court appeals
  - (5) Clipper and Windpower got their project permits in nine months
  - (6) It would be beneficial to have a regulation in Maryland specific to renewable energy projects that is tightly defined and has definite endpoints.
    - (a) The process including the notice provisions needs to be tightened up
    - (b) The problem with the notice provision is that PSC has made exceptions
  - (7) No consensus was reached regarding how to reword the bullet on the permitting process
- b) The lack of interconnection agreements only applies to small facilities. The one-pager needs to reflect that.

### **Next steps/responsibilities**

- 1) Crissy Godfrey will look at comments to finalize one pager and collect comments via e-mail about next discussion topics.
- 2) Kevin Porter will check with NREL to determine the correct data for wind potential in MD.