Governor’s Council on Climate Change (GC3)
MEETING MINUTES

Meeting Date: March 7, 2017
Meeting Time: 3:00-5:00 p.m.
Meeting Location: CT DEEP
Gina McCarthy Auditorium
79 Elm Street, Hartford, CT
# ATTENDANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Council Member</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Present</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kate Boucher (on behalf of</td>
<td></td>
<td>Public Utilities Regulatory Authority</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairperson Katie Dykes)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Robinson</td>
<td>General Counsel</td>
<td>The Hartford</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melody Currey</td>
<td>Commissioner</td>
<td>Department of Administrative Services</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garrett Eucalitto</td>
<td>Undersec. For Trans.</td>
<td>Office of Policy and Management</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Policy &amp; Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryan Garcia</td>
<td>President and Chief</td>
<td>Connecticut Green Bank</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Officer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.J. Hanson</td>
<td>Product Director</td>
<td>Thule, Inc.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Humphries</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>CT Round Table for Climate &amp; Jobs</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rob Klee (chair)</td>
<td>Commissioner</td>
<td>Department of Energy &amp; Environmental Protection</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Kooris</td>
<td>Director of Rebuild by De-sign and National</td>
<td>Department of Housing</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disaster Resilience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Redeker</td>
<td>Commissioner</td>
<td>Department of Transportation</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James O’Donnell</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>Connecticut Institute for Resilience and Climate Adaptation</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catherine Smith</td>
<td>Commissioner</td>
<td>Department of Economic &amp; Community Development</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynn Stoddard</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Institute for Sustainable Energy</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Strait</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Connecticut Fund for the Environment</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katharine Wade</td>
<td>Commissioner</td>
<td>Connecticut Insurance Dept., Property &amp; Casualty Division</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Associated Staff</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Present</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mary Sotos</td>
<td>Deputy Commissioner</td>
<td>CT DEEP</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracy Babbidge</td>
<td>Chief</td>
<td>Bureau of Energy &amp; Technology Policy, DEEP</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keri Enright-Kato</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>DEEP Office of Climate Change, Technology &amp; Research</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Howard</td>
<td>Environmental Analyst</td>
<td>DEEP Office of Climate Change, Technology &amp; Research</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Maziarz</td>
<td>Chief</td>
<td>DOT, Bureau of Policy &amp; Planning</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Morley</td>
<td></td>
<td>Office of Policy Management</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben McMillan</td>
<td>Research Analyst</td>
<td>DEEP Office of Climate Change, Technology &amp; Research</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Miller</td>
<td>Deputy Director &amp; Chief Scientist</td>
<td>Northeast States for Coordinated Air Use Management</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jason Rudokas</td>
<td>Policy Analyst</td>
<td>Northeast States for Coordinated Air Use Management</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**AGENDA & NOTES**

**Welcome and Announcements**

*Rob Klee*

- Introduction of Mary Sotos as DEEP’s new Deputy Commissioner of Energy.
- In our next “Exploring Climate Solutions” webinar series, Diane Duva, Director of our Energy Demand office will be the guest presenter. She will provide an overview of Connecticut’s Lead by Example program and milestone achievements to date. The webinar is scheduled for noon on Thursday March 9th.
- Due to a scheduling conflict, we need to reschedule the March 28th GC3 meeting to Thursday, April 13th.

**Addressing equity concerns in climate planning efforts**

*John Humphries*

- The Leadership, Accountability, and Engagement working group reviewed Portland, Oregon’s equity principles and suggested that the GC3 should explore incorporating similar principles into the final report.
- Outreach to stakeholders in environmental justice communities to provide input on these principles has begun.
- Review the draft provided and provide feedback directly to John Humphries.

**REMI transportation analysis update**

*Stanley McMillen, Consultant*

- Review of updated and corrected vehicle electrification penetration rates. Updates include correction of the implication that EV purchases would be relaxed after 2030.
- REMI transportation inputs include:
  - Fiscal deficit due to declining fuel consumption relative to DOT revenue requirements as EVs deploy
  - Increased EV charging and hydrogen filling station deployment
  - Reduced number of gas stations and increased remediation cost
  - Increased demand for electricity
- REMI transportation inputs not included:
  - Increased emissions due to increased electricity consumption
  - Decreased emissions due to deployment of ZEVs
  - Let’s Go CT! transportation network improvements
- Discussion of how to analyze revenue loss from EV electrification and charging station investment:
  - Include in economic analysis or not to include?
  - Should review when all sectors have been built into REMI analysis. Other sector policy decisions may fill some of the associated revenue gaps.
A Review of the Literature: Transportation Best Practices for Emissions Reductions

Keri Enright-Kato

- **Primary Target** — consensus in the literature suggests that there are three primary means to reduce GHG emissions from the transportation sector: VMT reduction, increase fuel economy, and fuel switching to lower carbon content.

- **Approach** — approaches to achieve the primary targets fall upon a continuum from mandatory actions to voluntary actions. For example, if one wishes to reduce vehicle travel, a range of options exists. A mandatory “no drive days” policy could be implemented, requiring that vehicles with certain license plate numbers not be used on certain days of the week. Alternatively, the program could be voluntary, relying on economic incentives, private sector partnerships aimed at employee driving, or general education to encourage individuals not to drive in single occupancy vehicles.

- **Timing** — some strategies, such as road pricing, have an immediate impact on travel behavior. Others, like land use planning measures, may not have observable impacts for many decades. It’s important to consider and assess whether a strategy could reach its full effectiveness in the near-term (under 5 years), mid-term (5-15 years), or long-term (more than 15 years) as we think about a mid-term target and the 2050 target.

- **Level of Authority** — some strategies, such as land use planning, have been historically reserved for local decision-making authorities, while other decisions, such as fuel economy mandates on vehicle manufacturers, are more naturally suited to national authorities. Many strategies may see involvement at multiple levels, as is the case of gasoline taxes, which are imposed by federal and state governments.

- **Effectiveness Factors** — the effectiveness of strategies depends on factors that can be altered by policy design. For instance, the level of taxes set or factors that cannot be controlled, such as consumer responses to price increases.

- **Implementation Issues** — political feasibility, equity, and financial concerns can greatly impact the ability of decision-makers to implement a strategy. On the other hand, non-greenhouse gas emissions benefits, such as congestion relief, air quality improvement, and economic benefits, may encourage policy acceptance and adoption.

- Review of example policies to reduce GHG emissions within three primary target areas: VMT reductions, fuel economy, fuel switching.

Plan of Conservation and Development (POCD), Transit Oriented Development (TOD)

Garrett Eucalitto & Dan Morley (OPM)

*State Plan for Conservation and Development*

- The State Plan for Conservation and Development is the state’s comprehensive plan. It sets forth the vision for land use development and natural resource protection priorities.

- It is developed by OPM but is adopted by General Assembly and is implemented by each state agency.

- Updates for 2018-2023 now underway. It’s an 18-month process with a 5-year lifespan.
It includes 6 growth management principles that provide the vision and each principle has a series of policies. The document includes a list of priority funding areas.

Regional Council of Governments and municipalities are providing input through regional workshops.

CT state agencies are also providing feedback and guidance on the plan.

Transit Oriented Development

- Several funding streams available for municipalities (e.g., infrastructure improvements near Fasttrak stations – mixed use building near Elmwood);
- OPM has executed a few rounds of funding already to encourage TOD adoptions by municipalities.
- Some municipalities don’t want mixed use development but OPM is trying to educate municipalities on benefits of TOD.
- Working with DECD and DOT to coordinate with businesses and transportation planning.

General discussion on VMT reduction opportunities

Rob Klee

- Is there a disconnect between the State Plan for Conservation and Development and municipalities? How do you align very local level land-use decisions around statewide principles? Or how do we encourage municipal land-use planning to orient around transit corridors/nodes?
- Regional coordination is extremely important.
- Finding the right way to incentivize TOD is critical as well.
- Focus on existing town centers and build transit out of these because it supports existing infrastructure at the community center.
- Local planning that includes mixed-use development and walking and biking paths are desirable aspects that people want in their community.
- SustainableCT is looking at all of these key themes. Discussions on the development of a community rating system have included conversations about liveable communities that incorporate mixed-use development, walking and biking paths, and opportunities to interact with others daily.
- How do we build these types of measures into the model? How do we ensure that emission reduction associated with these measures are achieved? A lot of them depend on individual behavior changes.
- We can look at case studies and draw from the studies that analyzed high and moderate VMT reductions. This would likely be a 2.5-3% VMT reduction.
- The largest emission reductions will be accomplished through technology/fuel switching, not strategies to reduce VMTs. However, pursuing VMT reductions will have several co-benefits that make our communities more desirable and livable.
• How can voluntary strategies move the needle? Education and voluntary actions will be needed as the dollars aren’t always available for incentives.

• Workplace voluntary actions – lead by example initiatives in private and public workplaces – will help to socialize concepts such as rideshare, electric vehicles purchases, etc. This will help set up future regulatory actions.

• Target and reward local actions that support the adoption of policies and programs that lead to VMT and GHG reductions.

• Can the POCD include VMT impacts as a concept?

• Congestion pricing as an effective tool to reduce VMTs

• Impact of state funding cuts to transit projects could have a negative impact on VMT reduction, thus the GC3 should serve as a counter weight to proposed funding cuts.

Public Comments

Joe Sculley, Motor Transport Association of CT
Urge that all federal rules are accounted for in reference case. “Phase 2 Rule” is not in reference case but should be. Significant GHG emissions reductions anticipated from both large national carriers as well as large pickups, and RVs. It is believed that the current administration has no immediate plans to undo this rule.

Ray Albrecht
Want to underscore equity concerns. Need to pay attention to kinds of jobs being created. Should prefer local, distributed development, including biodiesel. VMT reductions are challenging due to the current design of our communities, but we should still look to further VMT reduction goals. Fuel efficiency improvements can help bring down cost of adopting renewable fuels. Despite challenges the future can be bright.

Leticia Colon de Mejias
Rebates and other financial incentives are powerful in reaching state goals. Encouraging voluntary actions coupled with incentives will help encourage communities to engage and act. Be mindful of equity concerns and impact of energy choices now and into the future. Ethics is a crucial consideration for all GC3 decisions. Four “Es” — energy, environment, equity and ethics. Health impacts will hit low-lying communities so we really need to think about how best to assist these communities.

Mike Morrissey
Alternate Fuels Training Workshop being held in Hamden to talk about alternative fuels and VW settlement. DEEP and DOT staff participating in the workshop. In a growing economy, VMT reduction might not be realistic objective for trucks and buses, but these vehicles can be updated/converted to alternative fuels such as propane to reduce GHG emissions in the near term.
Mike Papa
Must get beyond narratives and regulations to “execution.” We suffer the consequences of drought, but no actionable plan to deal with severe and long-term drought. Too much regulation and not enough execution. Need to fund local government to teach citizens in communities about these issues.

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