



**Connecticut Equity and Environmental Justice Advisory Council (CEEJAC)
Energy & Technology and Air & Transportation Subcommittee Meeting**

Meeting Recording Link:

https://ctdeep.zoom.us/rec/share/mN2bI5VhR1LmDzQEDfShMg-mK7lxVHZ6HdwkJaRN9wgDuegF5_u4mfy0Y13urBsR.aNExwFpi5agH84T6

**Wednesday, May 6, 2026
1:00 – 3:00 PM**

Description

Connecticut Equity and Environmental Justice Advisory Council (CEEJAC) Air & Transportation and Energy & Technology Subcommittees will be holding a joint meeting on the [state's Comprehensive Climate Action Plan \(CCAP\)](#) Low-Income and Disadvantaged Communities (LIDAC) benefits analysis. CCAP identifies mitigation measures to reduce emissions to meet CT's targets. During this session, DEEP and ICF, the consultant helping develop the CCAP, will discuss the effects of the state's greenhouse gas emission (GHG) reduction measures on EJ Communities. Join us for an exciting discussion about health, climate change measures, and potential benefits associated with state efforts to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

Meeting Notes, Presentation by ICF International

Fiona Wissell, *Decarbonization Strategy and Planning Senior Manager at ICF International*
Seth Hartley, *Senior Air Quality Consultant at ICF International*

The purpose of the Comprehensive Climate Action Plan (CCAP) for CT is to set the foundation of state-wide action and to help the state see what it would take to reach the [state's greenhouse gas \(GHG\) reduction goals](#)¹. We're looking at what each sector needs to do to achieve these targets. This action plan is not looking at specific policies, but more high-level actions that are needed.

2001 is the first year of GHG tracking and 2023 was the last time we did scenario modeling as a state. The three big movers, or largest decarbonization drivers are power, transportation, and buildings. Slide indicated the types of consumer-level changes that are needed to meet our goals.

Health Benefits: Now shifting to what are some of the health benefits if the state were to make these changes to GHG reductions. Currently, the state sees health impacts from

¹ Per CGS 22a-200a, the state shall reduce greenhouse gas emissions by 65% from 2001 levels by 2040 and net-zero by 2050.

criteria air pollution – fuel combustion emits air pollution (Carbon dioxide, Nitrous oxide, Particulate Matter, Volatile Organic Compounds). We are mostly concerned with ground level ozone and particulate matter. Breathing particulate matter can lead to respiratory issues. CT is non-attainment for ozone, which means that CT doesn't meet EPA's standard for healthy air. However, CT is in attainment for PM 2.5. There are three sectors that contribute the most to these negative health impacts: mobile on and off-road sources, residential buildings and commercial buildings, and industry and power sector sources.

[EPA Co-benefits Risk Assessment Health Impacts Screening Tool \(COBRA\)](#)

This tool calculates how much health benefit you could get by implementing different pollution scenarios. "Co-benefit" refers to the two-fold benefits of (1) reducing criteria pollutants and (2) the corresponding health benefits from the reduction of pollutants. The tool is only able to calculate changes in emission at the county-scale and estimates the amount of change in emissions and then changes in health-outcome. The tool includes underlying health conditions, age distribution and monetizes the avoided outcomes of certain health outcomes (using 2025 dollar amount). Hartford and Fairfield counties show the largest cumulative reduction of certain criteria air pollutants.

This analysis does not include Waste, Agriculture, and Natural and Working Lands sectors because these sectors are not involving combustion, which is where we see the largest amounts of criteria air pollutants. Note here that the Waste sector that we are referring to for this analysis does not include waste combustion, such as waste incineration.

PCAP Disbenefits

"Disbenefits" refers to the barriers to emission reduction. Some of those barriers, that were identified in the state's [Priority Climate Action Plan \(PCAP\)](#) include:

- High upfront costs like building upgrades or adapting new clean energy technologies
- Short-term increases in traffic, noise and localized air quality impacts
- Limited workforce and contractor availability
- Increased electrification may load the electric system, which requires upgrades to maintain reliability and control peak demand
- Uncertainty in what emergent technologies will be created; and there are scalability risks
- Careful targeting of benefits to low-income communities
- Overall total air pollution emissions decrease for all pollutants, but some strategies might see small or temporary increases in some air pollutants
 - Eg. Aviation alternative fuels might have different types of co-pollutants than jetfuel

PCAP Identified Benefits

- Generally, there are more benefits than just GHG emission reductions
- Reduction of combustion = improvement in public health
- Lower energy costs

- Improved indoor air quality, job creation

Notes from Discussion

Poll Question: If we wanted to build on prospective programs, where should the state prioritize investment to deliver the greatest climate and health benefits?

Poll Result: Poll indicated buildings sector, transportation, electric power and grid modernization

What should be the key messages around LIDAC benefits and disbenefits?

- People want to know what the benefits are. They want to know what it means for me individually vs the higher-level data at the county-level. You need to get more granular because it must be more specific at the town level. When you talk about health impacts and the benefits, people want to know if this will impact their community.
- Pollution isn't evenly distributed around the state. Is there a way to show that and the benefits of pollution reduction? There was an implication that greenhouse gas reductions and pollution reductions are well known, but people don't know what greenhouse gas is, but they do identify with pollution. Need to make that link stronger.
 - (From ICF) This analysis is limited to county scale outcomes. There are other modeling approaches that are higher resolution that could be leveraged in future assessments.
- One-pagers are very helpful to break the topic down. State data and county data are good for policy makers, but not really for community members. But the legislature says that a half page to a page would be helpful.
- People want to see what the cost burden is vs how much money can be saved based on action or inaction.
 - (From ICF) We did not include climate change's impact on health directly in this analysis. Other approaches, including the Social Cost (SC) of GHGs, may address this. The EPA's 2023 report on the social cost of GHGs is still available [from EPA's website](#). Human health damages of climate change are one of the biggest damages included in the SC-GHG framework. This includes heat- and cold-related mortality from changes in temperature. However, EPA noted that their SC-GHG estimates do underestimate climate-related health impacts, by either omitting or only partially representing climate impacts on morbidity, extreme events (wildfires, floods, hurricanes), air quality-related health effects (e.g., climate-driven ozone and PM_{2.5} changes), infectious diseases (e.g., vector-borne and water-borne disease), nutrition and malnutrition effects, mental health impacts, and health impacts from displacement and migration. President Trump's [Executive Order 14154](#), "Unleashing American Energy" explicitly rejected use of the SC-GHG in federal decision-making. Office of Management and Budget's later Guidance ([M-25-27](#)) explicitly disallowed use of monetized

GHG damage assessment. We did not include or monetize any impacts of climate change on public health (or welfare) in our analysis.

- It would be helpful to identify what the state's return on investment for investing in clean energy programs is. Job growth is something that decision-makers need to be aware of to encourage and incentivize state decision-makers to understand the importance and need for these investments.

Questions

Question: How can we turn outcomes from CCAP into actions? We set strong climate action targets based on data, but those goals are not in alignment with where municipalities or communities are at in terms of access to technical support or community buy in. Are there any best practices from other states?

Response from ICF: There are a lot of states made goals for 2030, but not a lot of states are on target. Some states set up programs up early in order to get them closer to their goal. Port Authority in NJ/NY almost have complete fleet electrification with large investment in charging infrastructure. They started this 10 years ago, so they began on the early side. At state level, MA, NY and CA have aggressive policies in place – without programs to raise funds or provide incentives to participate in these markets, you won't get accelerated transition. CA put policies in place a decade ago. There are two programs that are in place to help move CT forward and were funded as an Implementation Grant for Climate Pollution Reduction Grant from EPA: [New England Heat Pump Accelerator](#) and [Clean Corridor Coalition](#).

Question: Could you speak in more detail about how you determine the appropriate discount rate for projecting mortality and morbidity costs of pollution?

Response from ICF: Discount rate is a way to convert future economic values to current terms. We used 2% discount rate because it's the default value in the latest version of COBRA. There is a lot of research as to what that discount rate could be, but we went with the default rate used in COBRA.

Question: Were landscaping equipment and construction equipment also considered in the on/off road sector?

Response from ICF (provided after meeting): Yes, offroad equipment (e.g., construction equipment, landscaping equipment, etc.) was not a sector included in the benefit analysis, because no specific GHG mitigation actions were modeled.

Question: Legislature has been asking for these numbers for a couple of years; are those going into a report. This doesn't include the cost of health effects of climate change, so was wondering if you've looked at that?

Response from ICF: Not explicitly included in here, but the CCAP report is being worked on by CT DEEP and will be submitted by July 1, 2026 to EPA. We're still thinking about how we can distill and share this data.

Question: How did you assess vulnerability?

Response from ICF: There is no demographic background. We have underlying health conditions, like age which talks about vulnerability in terms of exposure. But this model can't look at disparity in outcomes from age or ethnicity. There are other approaches that can look at those types of outcomes. [EPA's Environmental Benefits Mapping and Analysis Program \(BenMAP\)](#) model includes national database of population and underlying health conditions resolved at county scale. We used that dataset everywhere. We didn't get any local data to override that.

Question: How recent is the data?

Response from ICF (provided after meeting): This analysis used 2010 census data grown with Woods & Poole.

Question: Is this using data values prior to 2025?

Response from ICF: Yes, in some of the more recent regulatory actions, they are removing benefits. Value of statistical life is zero; they are only counting cost of regulation.

Resources

- Priority Climate Action Plan: [deep pcap report 8-24.pdf](#)
- Our public meeting recordings and slides as well as a PDF version of our survey for viewing can be found on our CCAP website: [Comprehensive Climate Action Plan](#)