
Governor's Council on Climate Change (GC3)

MEETING MINUTES

Meeting Date: November 27, 2017

Meeting Time: 3:00 — 5:00 p.m.

Meeting Location: CT DEEP,
Gina McCarthy Auditorium,
79 Elm Street, 5th Floor, Hartford

ATTENDANCE

Council Member	Title	Organization	Present
George Bradner on behalf of Commissioner Katherine Wade	Director, Property & Casualty Division	Connecticut Department of Insurance	Y
Patrick Brown	AVP, Chief Technology Architect	The Hartford	Y
Claire Coleman	Climate and Energy Attorney	Connecticut Fund for the Environment	Y
Melody Currey	Commissioner	Department of Administrative Services	Y
Katie Dykes	Chairperson	Public Utilities Regulatory Authority	Y
T.J. Hanson	Product Director	Thule, Inc.	N
John Humphries	Organizer	CT Round Table for Climate & Jobs	Y
Rob Klee (chair)	Commissioner	Department of Energy & Environmental Protection	Y
David Kooris	Director of Rebuild by De-sign and National Disaster Resilience	Department of Housing	Y
Bryan Garcia	President and Chief Executive Officer	Connecticut Green Bank	Y
Tom Maziarz on behalf of Commissioner James Redeker	Bureau Chief, Bureau of Policy and Planning	Department of Transportation	Y
James O'Donnell	Executive Director	Connecticut Institute for Resilience and Climate Adaptation	Y
Catherine Smith	Commissioner	Department of Economic & Community Development	Y
Lynn Stoddard	Director	Institute for Sustainable Energy	Y
Michael Sullivan	Acting Undersecretary for Comprehensive Planning and Intergovernmental Policy	Office of Policy and Management	Y

Associated Staff	Title	Organization	Present
Tracy Babbidge	Chief	Bureau of Energy & Technology Policy, DEEP	Y
Keri Enright-Kato	Director	DEEP Office of Climate Change, Technology & Research	Y
Jeff Howard	Environmental Analyst	DEEP Office of Climate Change, Technology & Research	Y
Stanley McMillen	Consultant		Y
Paul Miller	Deputy Director & Chief Scientist	Northeast States for Coordinated Air Use Management	Y
Jason Rudokas	Policy Analyst	Northeast States for Coordinated Air Use Management	Y (phone)
Mary Sotos	Deputy Commissioner	Bureau of Energy & Technology Policy, DEEP	Y

AGENDA & NOTES

Welcome & Announcements

Rob Klee, Commissioner DEEP

- *Transportation Climate Initiative* – Eight jurisdictions, including CT, announced that they are seeking public input on potential policy approaches to bring about cleaner, more resilient transportation systems in the Northeast and Mid-Atlantic. States have committed to launching a series of listening sessions starting in the fall of 2017 and continuing into 2018. Additional details and information on the process will be forthcoming.
- *EV funding* – Gov. Malloy has announced an additional \$2 million in funding to continue incentives under the Connecticut Hydrogen and Electric Automobile Purchase Rebate (CHEAPR) program.
- *Joint Commissioners EV Tax Credit letter* – CT DEEP along with environmental and energy agency officials from seven other states submitted a joint letter to U.S. House of Representatives strongly objecting to a provision of the House tax bill that would repeal the federal EV tax credit.
- *Clean Power Plan* – Commissioner Klee will testify at a U.S. EPA hearing in West Virginia on repeal of the Clean Power Plan.
- In the recently passed state budget, substantial clean energy funds were swept to help fill the general funds deficit. These include:
 - RGGI – \$10 million per fiscal year for two years
 - Energy Efficiency Funds – \$63.5 million per fiscal year for two years
 - CT Green Bank sweeps of \$14 million a year for \$28 million total.
- Loss of these funds will have a significant impact on Connecticut's ability to maintain the current level of emissions reductions, much less achieve the deeper reductions necessary to meet the 80 percent GHG reduction goal required by the Global Warming Solutions Act.

Variations to technology penetration rates by sector, focusing on 45% mid-term scenario

Jason Rudokas, NESCAUM

- Review updated electric sector scenarios and technology penetration rates.
- 2030 reference case for the electric sector: 51% zero carbon and 49% fossil fuels.
- 45% mid-term target, baseline electric sector: 60% zero carbon and 40% fossil fuels.
- 45% mid-term target, electric sector sensitivities: 70% and 80% zero-carbon.
- Two variations for RTT and ZEV penetration rates for each scenario:
 - Variation 1 – increase zero carbon electricity generation (above sensitives), back off RTT and increase ZEV penetration.
 - Variation 2 – increase zero carbon electricity generation (above sensitives), equal reductions from RTT and ZEVs.
- Three main levers to achieve 2030 and 2050 targets: zero-carbon electricity, zero-emission vehicles, zero or low-emissions thermal.
- Using experience as an indicator of conversion success, we have achieved approximately 10,000 conversions from oil to NG per year; with over a million households in CT, this is less than 1% turnover per year. The RTT conversion envisioned here would be substantially more rapid: 2.5-3% per year in order to achieve 29% reduction in GHG emissions.

Discussion on mid-term GHG reduction target

Rob Klee, Commissioner DEEP

- Review linear reduction and comparison of 35-55% reduction by 2030.
- Peer state mid-term targets. A 40-45% mid-term target is in line with other states' commitments (e.g., CA).
- Review results of GC3 Survey Monkey. General consensus that goal should be between 40-50%, survey results indicated a leaning slightly more in the direction of 40-45% range.
- Achievable, stretch, ambitious, and equitable all important to survey respondents.
- Support for both a range and an absolute target, with a range receiving slightly more support.
- Discussion:
 - Suggestion that CA and NY target — 40% below 1990 levels — can be viewed as ambitious.
 - Concern that anything below 45% would not put the state on a path to actually achieve the long-term target of 80% reduction by 2050.
 - What does *leadership* mean to GC3? What kind of *legacy* does GC3 want to leave? What does *realism* mean to GC3?
 - In most cases, general tension between setting “achievable” target and setting “meaningful” target.

- Reiteration that REMI analysis shows economic benefits increase as penetration of EVs, RTTs, etc. increases. Though, there is a recognition that there could be additional costs to incentivize adoption of EVs and RTTs that have not been incorporated into the REMI analysis.
 - Suggestion that we have a responsibility to be aggressive to lessen the burden for future generations. Concern that achieving a weak interim target would mean leaving progressively harder work for later years.
 - Suggestion that a more stringent target would put pressure on next governor and on the legislature — and that CT agencies need aggressive target in order to drive internal change.
 - Lingering concern that aggressive climate action would undermine economic growth, would scare business community, and would not be cost-effective.
 - REMI analysis does not take into account: Public health costs of climate change; difficulty of changing human behavior; ratepayer impacts.
 - Concern that a more aggressive target might be legally hazardous, i.e., would put state in position to be legally obligated to meet a more aggressive target.
 - Concern about the effects of CT's struggling economy and budgetary difficulties.
 - Recognition that the current U.S. administration is rolling back federal efforts to reduce carbon emissions.
 - Recognition of the difficulty of siting renewable energy in CT.
 - Concern that state agencies would regard an overly ambitious target as unrealistic and simply ignore it.
 - Reminder that uncertainty is inherent in the analyses and in policy outcomes.
 - Reminder that the 2030 target needs to be implemented and effective within 12 years.
 - Pros and cons of adopting a target range rather than a single target:
 - Pros: facilitates consensus and follows NEG/ECP model.
 - Cons: likely tendency to regard lower end of any range as the de facto target.
 - Acknowledgement of the relationship between target and what would be required to achieve the target. For instance, need to propose implementable policies that would act as “levers” to bring about the corresponding penetration rates for EVs, RTTs, and renewables.
 - There inevitably will be lag time for: formulating policies, securing legislative action, implementing policies, and producing the needed degree of effect in the markets. All of this will need to happen in the context of tight budgets and the legislature demonstrating it is willing to divert energy-efficiency funds for other purposes.
- Council requests NESCAUM to develop a scenario analysis based on midterm target of 45% below 2001 levels by 2030 for review at next GC3 meeting. Council also requests a REMI analysis of this scenario to better understand economic impacts.

- Council requests DEEP staff to develop a resource document that summarizes potential sector specific policy options for the council to consider when determining the mid-term target.

Public comments

Henry Link, EEC

- Despite raid of Green Bank and EE funds, there is a serious need to fund Lead by Example.

NOTE: Slides are available on GC3 web page: www.ct.gov/deep/gc3