

NYSERDA 116TH Program Planning Committee Meeting
June 28, 2022
Clean Copy of Transcript

Sara LeCain:

Shere. We're all ready to start.

Sherburne Abbott:

Okay, great. Good afternoon and welcome. I call this meeting to order notice and agenda for the meeting was provided to the Committee members in June 16, 2022 and to the Press on June 17, 2022. This meeting is being conducted by video conference. The Authority will post a video and a transcript of this meeting on the web to confirm that we have a quorum. I would like each of the Committee members to introduce themselves. I am Shere Abbott Chair of the Committee.

The Chair:

Richard Kaufman, Chair of the Authority.

Frances Resheske:

Frances Resheske, Committee member and Board member,

Rory Christian:

Rory Christian, Committee member and Board member.

Arturo Garcia-Costas:

Arturo Garcia-Costas, Committee, member and Board member.

Vice Chair Bell:

Chuck Bell Committee, member and Board member.

Sherburne Abbott:

Thank you. The first item on the agenda is the approval of the minutes of the hundred and 15th Committee meeting held on April 26, 2022. Are there any comments on the minutes? Hearing none. May I have a motion to approving the minutes?

Arturo Garcia-Costas:

So moved.

Sherburne Abbott:

Second.

Sadie McKeown:

Second, second.

Sherburne Abbott:

Okay, great. Oppose all in favor.

Members of the Committee:

Aye.

Sherburne Abbott:

Opposed? The minutes have been approved. Thank you. The next item on the agenda is the review and approval over the program. Planning Committee Charter. This item will be presented by Peter Costello, Peter.

Peter Costello:

Thank you chair. Pursuant to the public Authority's accountability act of 2005, each of the Authority's Committees adopted Charters, setting forth each Committee's responsibilities. One of those responsibilities is to periodic periodically review its Charter and determine what if any amendments need be made. These recommendations are then presented to the full Board for consideration and approval. Copy of the current Program Planning Committee Charter was included in your meeting package Council's office, continually monitors, relevant guidance from the Authority's Budget Office, the Comptroller's Office, legislation and other Authority practices to determine whether the re modifications other Authority's reviewed include New York Power Authority, Long Island Power Authority, Dormitory Authority, and the Environmental Facilities Corporation. At this time management is not recommending any changes to the Program Planning Committee Charters. Happy to take any questions.

Sherburne Abbott:

Thank you, Peter. Are there any questions or recommended changes to the Charter?

Sherburne Abbott:

Hearing none. I may have a motion recommending approval of the Program Planning Committee Charter?

Frances Resheske:

Motion.

Arturo Garcia-Costas:

Second.

Sherburne Abbott:

All in favor.

Members of the Committee:

Aye. Aye. Aye. Aye.

Sherburne Abbott:

Opposed? Great. The Program Planning Committee Charter has been recommended for approval. The next item on the agenda is proposed change updates to the RGGI operating plan. John Williams, Vice President for Policy and Regulatory Affairs will present this item. John.

John Williams:

Thank you chair. The members are asked to approve today an amendment to the operating plan for investments in New York under the CO2 budget trading program and the CO2 allowance auction program. Also known as the RGGI operating plan. This amendment is offered for consideration as a result of two material changes since the Board's approval of the current plan this past January 1st, the fiscal year 2022, 2023, New York State budget did not direct NYSERDA to allocate funds to support environmental tax credits as had been previously anticipated as such those funds are available to be reprogrammed to the program portfolio. Second CO2 allowance prices from the recent options are currently at a level above the approved projection of revenue. And this allows for utilization of the previously approved opportunities for other allocation section, which is located in the RGGI operating plan proposal that is before the Board has presented to interested stakeholders and was presented at a webinar on May 13th.

And that was a joint effort with DEC supporting NYSERDA staff presentations. The proposal was also issued for receipt of written comments, which was made available through the NYSERDA website and comments were able to be submitted through May 27th. The proposal before the Board accounted for the comments received through both the webinar and the written process revenue projections remain unchanged at this time. And the three year plan is still based on an \$8 per allowance value. As stated previously, we will continue to monitor the market for any price volatility. And if recommendations to the projection are advised we will certainly come back to the Board with any recommended changes with respect to the reprogramming of funds previously approved for the environmental tax credits that had been previously budgeted at a level of \$23 million annually or \$69 million over the three year term of the plan.

The recommendation is to provide additional funding of \$45 million over the three years, which is \$15 million annually to support continuation of current and additional charge New York strategies, which are looking at electric vehicle support and electric vehicle infrastructure support designed to build the market and build scale to ensure alignment with other transition transportation transition initiatives. In addition, \$24 million or \$8 million annually will fund high efficiency, electrification upgrades for low and moderate income consumers using electric resistance heating or delivered fuels through the empower and assisted home performance with energy star programs. This addition of funds to this program will augment the program budgeted budget to \$48 million over the three year term with respect to exercising opportunities for other allocations. And this is again utilizing the additional revenues that have been realized. The proposal is to fund \$20 million for New York City based retail storage projects.

These would be projects estimated to total between 70 and 100 megawatts. It would also be an allocation of \$600,000 to the equity and climate transformation research program, which will be utilized for continued support of the Climate Action Council's climate justice working group process. And well, as based on feedback that we had heard from the stakeholder advisory process will be looking to add \$2 million to our Climate Action, consumer awareness and education program to augment education and outreach campaigns on climate policy and action members have detailed information on the amendment to the operating plan. And I'm happy to take any questions.

Sherburne Abbott:

Thank you, John. Are there any questions for John? I actually, I can open with a one that is probably way outside of my disciplinary lane, but can you can, so when we talked about the allowance price in I don't know, January at, at eight, \$8, it was based partly based on a low inflationary rate, which has gone up, you know, toward it out from two to eight by May. So does it, is, is there any indication that the, that, that, you know, that this is gonna translate into that, that the revenue planned is, is ambitious at best?

John Williams:

Maybe I would answer that Shere and just saying, I think that the dynamics that we are seeing in the allowance market to date are really more based on the supply and the demand of the amount of allowances, right. And the allowances needed for compliance. And we haven't really seen you know, kind of, I would say macroeconomic impacts affecting that allowance price at this point in time.

Sherburne Abbott:

So the inflationary rate is, is a, is a low consideration in the.

John Williams:

At, at current time.

Sherburne Abbott:

Okay. Okay.

The Chair:

Even though you have a two and a half percent inflation adjustment in the

Sherburne Abbott:

Yeah.

John Williams:

Right, yeah.

The Chair:

So what about Virginia, what's Virginia gonna do?

John Williams:

So there have been discussions among the RGGI group with Virginia, and we're still awaiting to hear what their formal plan of exit will be. I think they still are planning to exit the program. You know, what we wanna make sure that we are doing with Virginia is working with them so that the, the nature of the way that they exit, you know, really does maintain the integrity of the market on a going forward basis. They have put a significant amount of allowances in the market. They have significant size compliance entities, and we just need to make sure that as Virginia exits that they are you know, ensuring the validity of those allowances market based on the compliance that they or otherwise projected.

The Chair:

And that impact of, of Virginia withdrawing on prices is

John Williams:

Assuming that, you know, we have the same withdrawal of allowances and the same withdrawal of the compliance demand. It should be done. It could be handled on a very kind of no impact to the market basis. And we've seen this before with the way that New Jersey was exiting the market in, in in a previous iteration, there's certainly ways to do it without affecting the entire lens.

Arturo Garcia-Costas:

Can I have a follow up question to that situation with Virginia deciding to, frankly, deciding to, to be reasons is there continued conversations about not taking such a regional approach, even though it's called a regional greenhouse gas initiative and looking at States outside of the Northeast and Mid-Atlantic for potential on membership.

John Williams:

So there has been, you know varying times, you know, conversations with say the Western climate initiative and, and looking at you know, the nature of the, like architecture of the different programmatic approaches and, you know, is there you know, at minimum, what we might call linkage between those allowance markets based on, you know, the expectations of you know, the commodities that are being created from those markets or is there you know, thought about you know, more formal kind of engagement programs? You know, I think the way that the RGGI States are looking at it, and certainly we have a new entrant to the program that's coming very soon in Pennsylvania. I think the RGGI program in and of itself is actually quite successful at, you know, establishing our market, which, you know, in the Northeast, a lot of that power flow is on a regional basis.

And we do wanna make sure that, you know, we are establishing, you know, a certain degree of equilibrium across those power markets with this program. And I think that at this current time, I think people are seeing that it has been quite successful at doing that. That's not to say that, you know, we, we wouldn't, you know, still think of RGGI as a model for a much larger type program. And certainly if we do see the appropriate opportunities with States outside of the Northeast region, that, but something that, that the program would always be open competitive tickets.

Sherburne Abbott:

I mean, are there any other questions for John? Okay, thank you. May I please have a motion to approving the what are we out here, but the amendments, right? No, we don't need that. The amendment approving the minutes. Yes. A move. This is not correct. The, are we are the, for the, are we motion approving the amendments? Correct? Not the

Arturo Garcia-Costas:

Moved.

Sherburne Abbott:

Okay. Okay.

Vice Chair Bell:

Second.

Sherburne Abbott:

Second. Okay. The amendments to the RGGI operating planner are recommended for approval. The next item on the agenda is an update on the Climate Action Council. The Council's Executive Director, Sarah Osgood will discuss this item. Sarah.

Sarah Osgood:

Thank you, Shere. Can you hear me okay?

Sherburne Abbott:

Yes.

Sarah Osgood:

Great. Thank you. We could go to the next slide, please. Thank you for having me back. I presented to you about a year ago on the climate leadership and community protection act or Climate Act, and I'm back here now to provide an update on our progress including the release of the draft scoping plan at the end of last year and to discuss the next steps before the council, as it works to finalize the scoping plan by the end of the year for the draft plan itself, I'll discuss some of the key that are central to meeting the Climate Act requirements. The scenario modeling that informed the draft as well as key cost benefit findings. Next slide please.

So this first slide is just a refresher on the requirements of the Climate Act. I'm not gonna spend a whole lot of time on this other than to remind you that the law contains overarching goals for the entire economy in terms of greenhouse gas, emissions reductions, as well as technology specific goals related to renewable energy and energy efficiency and critical commitments to climate justice and just transition as well. Next slide. It can also be helpful to see visually what the Climate Act requires for emission reductions over time. So here on the left, we see our current greenhouse gas emissions by sector and on the right we see for our overall emissions need to get to over time. So it's quite a dramatic reduction over the next two decades. But if we go back to the image on the left here using the new emissions account under the Climate Act, you can see that buildings, which is shown here as the yellow wedges and transportation, which is shown in blue are now the greatest contributor to the greenhouse gas emissions in the State.

And the amount over 50% of the State's emissions. The next piece here you see is, is electricity shown in green which is now a smaller piece of the pie as a result of the new emissions accounting and the waste sector in orange has increased slightly next slide, please. And so to, to get onto the actual draft scoping plan I mentioned to you about a year ago that the council would take the recommendations that had just then been advanced from the advisory panels and working groups. They would perform an integration analysis to show the overall impact of all the recommendations across sectors and ultimately release the draft scoping plan, showing how the State could reach, reach its ambitious goals. So the draft scoping plan takes a holistic economy

wide view of New York, greenhouse gas emissions, really touching on every sector of the economy.

And it also includes as is required in the law key factors and impacts for the council to consider including climate justice, job creation, health benefits, and a benefit cost analysis. I will get into the scenarios in just a moment, but if we go to the next slide here, I wanna start with a summary of the strategies that are in the, in the draft plan. Because really one of the interesting things we found is, you know, regardless of a scenario that we, you know, that we could choose there several key strategies that are gonna be fundamental to achieving the greenhouse gas reduction limits and net zero emissions requirements. And so what we're seeing across all scenarios are, you know, energy efficiency is going to be key to achieving the Climate Act goals. We need to see a significant transition from fossil fuels to electrification in buildings.

We're talking on the order of 2 million efficient homes, electric electrified by heat with heat pumps by 2030 all scenarios have zero emissions, electricity all have a significant electrification of the transportation sector here. We're looking at on the order of 90% of new car sales in 2030 being zero emission. There's also enhancement of transit and smart growth and reduction in vehicle miles traveled a transition to low global warming potential refrigerants and enhanced refrigerant management, maximizing carbon sequestration in New York's lands and forests eliminating fugitive methane emissions across the waste agriculture and energy sectors, and finally a diverse portfolio of solutions in the industry sector, which would include efficiency, electrification, and limited and strategic use of low carbon fuels and carbon capture technologies for certain industrial applications. Next slide please.

So, as I mentioned, this, the scenarios were built based on the recommendations that were advanced to the council from the advisory panels and working groups. What you might pick up on here is that we list scenarios two, three, and four, but we don't talk about scenario one that's scenario one was taking all of the recommendations from the panels as they were provided putting 'em into the, into the integration analysis and seeing where did that lend us in terms of meeting our goals. And unfortunately, what we saw is that the, the strategies put forth were not aggressive enough to meet the requirements of the law when you looked at interactions across sectors. And so what we then did is work kind of from, from the back end and said, okay, so assuming we, we must meet these goals because it's required what needs to be done, how, how can we put additional pressure or levels of ambition on the policies that are, that were put forth by the advisory channels and working groups.

And so again, you're gonna see a lot of similarities in, in these scenarios. So again, they reach zero mission power sector by 2040. We're talking about enhancement of, of transit and reduction of vehicle miles traveled, significant levels of electrification and energy efficiency. But to highlight where they scenario two, which we name the strategic use of low carbon fuels, this scenario includes the use of bioenergy that's derived from Biogen waste, agriculture and forest residues and limited purpose grown biomass, as well as green hydrogen for difficult to electrify applications, scenario three instead has a very limited role for bioenergy and hydrogen combustion and instead push pushes more on acceleration of electrification and buildings and transportation. And then finally, scenario four has a little bit of, of the fur of the flavor of, of

scenario two and three. And it, it has, so it has both the accelerated electrification and more targeted use of low carbon and fuels you go to the next slide.

We can see some of the results of, of a comprehensive cost benefit analysis that was, that was performed. So there's a lot of information on the slide, but I would say kind of the, the number one takeaway, I would say from the integration analysis is that the cost of inaction exceeds the cost of action by more than \$90 billion. So that means that all of the actions that are described within the scoping plan will offer significant benefit to New York when accounting for the avoided greenhouse gas emissions and improvement to public health as is called for in the Climate Act. And it's also important to note that with this, with this net cost benefit analysis, what this, what we're finding that it's a positive impact. This doesn't actually quantify this significant benefits as a result of the opportunity to create hundreds of thousands of jobs. And we're seeing on the order of 200,000 in jobs in the area by 2030. So next slide please.

So, as I mentioned at the beginning of this presentation, the, the drafting plan was released at the end of last year. And a public comment period was open from was open on January 1st. We've actually extended it two times and it is now set to close this Friday, July 1st. The council has also held a series of hearings across the State combination of virtual and in person where we've received testimony from over 700 individuals. And so we're, we're very happy with the turnout for the hearings. We've also seen a lot of interest in the written comment period. We've got over 25,000 comments that are in so far, and we would expect that to increase in terms of themes from the comments. I'll speak to the themes from, from the hearings since we don't have all of the comments, the written comments in yet, I'm not yet going to attempt to summarize those, but in terms of the public hearings, some of the, some of the things that we heard were you know, there was a significant emphasis that was placed on the importance of environmental justice and equity.

Some commenters expressed interest in, in more financial incentives. How are we gonna pay for this, right? Is it gonna be required? Is it, is, are there going to be incentives others made comments about the lack of detailed implementation detailed information on the implementation of the actions as well as well as clear milestones and timelines. And I would say one of the most significant things that I think we heard that was a little bit, you know, maybe somewhat of a surprise to a number of the council members. And, and, you know, certainly to me, there was there was a lot of concern over potential job loss which I think clearly makes sense, but there's you know, there was, there were questions about kind of, what does this mean for me if I'm working in an industry, if I'm working in the fossil fuel industry currently.

And so I think that, you know, based on what we heard, there's a lot of opportunity for increased awareness about what the Climate Act is, what's in the scoping plan and how it will be implemented. Also assuring folks that these aren't requirements that will just be placed on individuals at, you know, when the plan is finalized on day one, this isn't like you're not gonna, you know, be able to go out and, and purchase the products and services that you're, that you're accustomed to. The plan really does work to, to phase these in. And I think we need to do a little bit of a better job to communicate some of that. Now you can see that we have a timeline here on the slide in front of you. You can also see in addition to the public comments that the council has formed a series of subgroups that are currently working to really to, to dig in on several key

topics to try to advance some of the thinking there and bring those recommendations back to the full council to for consideration and the subgroups.

There are the, the key topics that they're focused on is, are, are the gas system transition, the use of alternative fuels and economy wide policies, which are looking at the merits of, of different carbon pricing approaches. So all of the public input and the work from the subgroups will be considered by the full council, as it works to refine the scoping plan and issue a final by the 1st of January, 2023. And while, you know, the slide here might make it seem pretty straightforward of how we get from here to there. There's it's a lot of work both to complete by the end of the year. And, I would say the, the work isn't, you know, it's not easy. The level of transformation that we're talking about is unprecedented. We're reliant on consumer decision making to, to a large extent, primarily in the initial years, as we're talking about adoption of, of heat pumps and buildings and electric vehicles for transportation.

And so really there's, there's a lot of work that's gonna come from this and to, to help raise awareness, to help get buy in and to help to help convince folks to act. And I would also just say, you know, it's not just, it doesn't just come down to individuals. I think we're also talking about needing to work with other levels of government. So, first and foremost, I would say at the federal level to establish national policies and markets that that can kind of create the space for these new technologies to come into existence and, and to thrive and, and to work for not just New Yorkers, but, you know, for, for all Americans and also working at the local level to ensure that decision making as, as some of these policies are implemented, that they're, that they're done consistent with the Climate Act and with the recommendations within what will be the finalized scoping plan. And with that that concludes my presentation, but I'm happy to answer any questions that you might have.

Sherburne Abbott:

So thank you, re thank you, Sarah. Well, we, I think all of us really appreciate the extraordinary amount of work that goes into this process, let alone the ambition of the of the outcomes. And so it's, it's a challenging, challenging environment. I, I've one question about the, when you think when you, when you look at your, you know, the, the integrated issues, the semi surprise, but not entirely about questions from the public about jobs, the, the larger sort of issues on people's pocketbook and, and you know, how, how we get the demand side equation to work out. Do you see, and have you discussed in the, in the council, any, any specific strategies that might be, might make some change the incentives on the consumer side? I mean, so we spend a lot of time over the thinking about the transformation in terms of technology, but what are the small, the, what are some of the low hanging fruits that can get, get us across the threshold from here to not to, to the, the scoping strategy, but also across the long haul to keep people, you know, in a period of severe economic distress to, to, to think that the, about this seriously on a daily basis, not just on a decadal, I realize that's a long question, but

Sarah Osgood:

I'll do my best. I would say that it's certainly a topic that has come up at the council of kind of, you know, how do we, how do we pay for all of this, frankly? How do we, and it, and I think it's, it's not about well, I think it's, it's not, we shouldn't just look at it as how does the State pay for this price tag, right. Like, I think the bigger question, no.

Sherburne Abbott:

It's about what, what do we do? What are the actions that are gonna make a to people along the, along the way it's not just overall paying for it?

Sarah Osgood:

I agree. And I think a lot, a lot, sorry, can you hear me?

Sherburne Abbott:

Yes. Yeah. Sorry.

Sarah Osgood:

Okay. I think there's significantly, there's an awareness gap. I, I think that not all New Yorkers are aware of the Climate Act of this process that's going on of the changes that will be coming. And so in, in my personal opinion, I think it's, you know, I think kind of first and foremost, it's about raising awareness and making folks understand kind of what's on the horizon so that they can make better informed decisions in real time. So for instance, if I have an appliance that breaks and I go out to replace it, if I know nothing about what's going on in the Climate Act, I might be looking at, you know fossil fuel appliances, electric appliances, you know, depending on what that is now, if you then say, but you know, the State is kind of on this path to decarbonize and you could instead invest in, you know, a different type of technology that maybe has that's a little bit newer to the market. You don't have as much familiarity with. It would be hard for you to kind of make that choice and say, well, I'm go with that. Especially if you don't even know that it's consistent with State policy or that it's, it's helping kind of a global initiative like this. And so I think you know, it's about raising the awareness, making folks aware about, you know, kind of how their decisions impact their tomorrow's and what are the advantages that you can, you know, have in some of these new appliances.

Sherburne Abbott:

Right. But, and I, I guess the, what I'm getting at is, you know, what is, what is NYSERDA's role gonna be in that space? And then I'll move to a different someone else's questions.

Sarah Osgood:

Yeah. So this actually goes to some degree to, to touch on the item that John Williams mentioned about the, about the, the RGGI operating plan

Sherburne Abbott:

RGGI. Right, exactly.

Sarah Osgood:

Right. So some of the feedback that was received from the public on the RGGI operating plan was the need for increased awareness about kind of all of these activities. And so, as I understand it, and, and John could correct me if I'm wrong, you know, additional funding from RGGI was, was put into this to this initiative. And so, as I understand it, it's on the order of \$10 million total that we're looking at from to, to fund outreach and awareness campaigns associated with not specifically the scoping plan, but the strategies and the recommendations within it.

Sherburne Abbott:

Any other questions?

Arturo Garcia-Costas:

Yeah, sure. This is Arturo. I have I have actually two questions, but I'll, I'll do the first one with respect to the solid waste and the growing portion of solid waste, that account, or the solid waste sectors accounting of Southwest sector is accounting for our greenhouse gas emissions in the State. It's an area at the near community trust that I have been following relatively closely since essentially when China stopped accepting our waste across the, the country, the entire solid waste and recycling industry has been in a State of flux with many cities and counties and towns across the country and in New York basically abandoning their programs. So I'm just wondering to what extent of that reality was of the focus of the solid waste groups discussions and what role my might have in improving the efficiency of that sector, or in some way supporting how that sector unfolds in New York as part of the CLCPA implementation.

Sarah Osgood:

No. So I wasn't directly involved with the advisory panel on waste, so I'm not sure I can answer this fully. I, I do believe that it's in, it's something that was significant, that was looked at. And there, as I recall, there are a number of incentive type programs that were recommended in the waste center. And also I'm forgetting the term I think it's supplier responsibility or, or I'm forgetting the term about.

Arturo Garcia-Costas:

Extended producer, extended producer responsibility extend, produce the responsibility. Yeah.

Sarah Osgood:

Yes. and so there were a number of recommendations on that. I think there was feedback that was received from I would say the climate justice working group in particular, on, on the waste panel discussion on the waste panel recommendations, where they expressed a desire for I would say a heavier regulatory hand rather than you know, having it be focused more on the incentive side. But I would say that a, you know, the recommendations that were put forth in that area, I, I think have a mix of, of both of those.

Arturo Garcia-Costas:

Thank you.

Sadie McKeown:

I had a question

Arturo Garcia-Costas:

There's no other question. I have one other question. Go ahead.

Frances Resheske:

I have a question. You, you mentioned the usefulness of federal regulations in helping move the State's goals. Do you think if the Supreme court backs up the climate goals, that that's gonna significantly impact our ability to meet goals?

Sarah Osgood:

I don't know if I'm qualified to, to comment on, on kind of the impact of the Supreme court will, but I, I, I guess I would say any federal action has gotta be helpful. Right now the States are somewhat going it alone and that we need to see additional federal action, so that States aren't disadvantaged you know, in comparison to others. So for instance, if New York is implementing some of these policies, you could imagine that it could, it could have an impact on the economics of a business, for instance. If we, if we're really looking, which we are looking at changing our economy to decarbonize it while also growing our economy, I think we've gotta be careful that we're not you know, basically encouraging leakage, you know, pushing economies outside of our State borders where they're not necessarily changing their actions, but they're just not counting towards New York's carbon emissions because they're not within New York. So I, I think any federal action would be helpful to help level the playing field across States as, as they try to lead on Climate Action.

John Williams:

Yeah. Maybe just to add onto that. I mean, I think that big trick that hopefully we don't lose sight on whether it's the federal government, whether it's national action is really ensuring that the movement towards building and expanding markets for clean energy technologies and new clean energy service does not get sort of disrupted in the path of some of these regulatory decision makings. You know, I, I, I think that maintaining and growing those markets is, is really what the key is going to be. It will be frus, it could frustrate certain actions. I think some of the, the decision making and it may, you know, provide degrees of signals to some parts of the country, but I think that there's too much momentum and, and market kind of commitment in too big of a market in the United States for it really, to for some of these decision makings to, to sort of overly disrupt that. But I, I think we can't lose sight of the fact that you know, we do need to ensure that success in New York or that people understand success in New York really does depend on the broadest success throughout the country. And, and so that is part of what we're integrated, you know, in, in the way that we approach a lot of our activities, I think.

Arturo Garcia-Costas:

Well, my follow up question was actually along these lines, because it was focusing on social cost of carbon, which happens to be one of the things that is before the Supreme court right now. To what extent do we in New York State have essentially our own version of the social cost of carbon that is using that is being used as the assumptions for a lot of these work and a lot of the scoping plan.

John Williams:

So part of the Climate Act required DEC to develop its own social cost of carbon approach, which they did I wanna say was December of 20, December of 20 that has been provided as guidance to all agency decision making, you know, to integrate that and to cost benefit analysis as they're making relative decisions across, you know, whatever kind of programmatic activity that they're doing, you know, we did integrate that social cost of carbon in our own integration analysis benefit cost analysis here. So you see some of the effect benefit. So yes, New York does have certainly an established approach to, to social cost of carbon, which is getting utilized.

Sadie McKeown:

So I had one found, yeah, I had one, one question relative to the awareness and the \$10 million from RGGI. Do you have strategy about how to spend that money or how to use the resource to try and drive awareness? Cause it's such an enormous undertaking and it's not a lot of money.

Sarah Osgood:

Yep, we're working on developing that right now. I don't know if Kate Muller is there and maybe has anything more to say on, on the specifics of that. We're, we're kind of working through a lot of it. It's I expect it to be kind of a multifaceted campaign. But right now we're working with a vendor on, on messaging to find kind of what would, what, what do we think that would resonate with the folks, essentially the folks that are kind of undecided or not aware too, not, you know, trying to target, not the folks that, you know, maybe are already kind of where we want them to be that are informed and that are trying to make decisions that are consistent with the Climate Act, but looking to really broaden the base of folks so that more folks are aware and are looking to, you know, they can make decisions that, you know, doesn't have to be, you, you know, electrify your house completely and you go to an electric vehicle, but maybe there are steps that folks can start to take to, to help bring their actions more in line.

Doreen Harris:

Sadie. This is Doreen. And I would agree with your assessment that it is not sufficient, but it's a start as to raising awareness that came through that and clear in the meeting, the hearings themselves, it was a fairly common point in feedback that, that there just weren't enough people aware of the law itself or even the implementation, you know, sort of what that even means as to, as to, you know, the impacts that they, it may have on their lives. So certainly I would also say as a, and as I said, you know, this money isn't going to go all the way by a long shot. And what that means is there's many other entities with whom we need to collaborate to share that, right. It's not only the State of New York that needs to carry that message. It's, it's everyone from citizens to local communities to interested stakeholders and beyond. And that's really the movement that we're talking about and the scale that is needed to communicate this effectively,

Arturo Garcia-Costas:

If I may respond to that. Yeah. Cause it's friends of the earth are serving the Board friends of the earth. They have an ongoing climate and environmental disinformation effort basically to combat climate disinformation particularly. And one of the, the, the vulnerabilities, frankly, with the CLCPA a that I can perceive is there's a lot of room for disinformation to be injected into the conversations at this moment in order to stop some of the things that interests interest groups might find to be overly disruptive or threatened. So I do think this is an important conversation to be aware of that possibility for disinformation to be deployed quite strategically in New York over the next couple of years. And, and perhaps think through how respond program I wanted to ask is aviation considered to be part of the transportation sector. I, I appreciate that. It'd be a hard thing for New York State to reach with the regulatory reach that we have or legislative reach. But it also seems like it's probably not a significant emitter of carbon. Can anybody address that question?

John Williams:

Yeah, I, I'll take it Sarah. So, so aviation emissions are counted in the pie chart that, that Sarah had shown you. And part of the part of the transportation wedge does represent aviation fuel. You know, we're utilizing the calculation of like the flights over New York, what gets originated in New York. The, the difficult aspect there is like how much, you know, kind of control and direction can New York really set you know, in this national international market. I do think that in the plan we identify that we could look to, you know, alternative fuels and New York can work with other jurisdictions to introduce some of those alternative fuels. I think the real key that we're seeing with aviation is new technology that needs to be brought to bear and you know, how New York can I think play a role in that is, is something we haven't really fully figured out, but considering the really, actually significant wedge that, that aviation transportation really does provide it is going to be a challenge for us to have yeah. You know, make sure you're taking.

Vice Chair Bell:

Yeah. I mean, it seems that we have airports that are major transportation hubs, you know, for the country. Right. So it does seem like an important thing. And just one other thing is I, you know, I, I appreciate the outreach to consumers and I think voluntaristic actions by consumers to buy electric vehicles or adopt other green technologies are really important, but it's consumers by themselves are not sovereign in the marketplace. And we're really dependent on what's developed it market development what, what the producers themselves do and perhaps other entities that government that can procure fleets of green vehicles or other businesses that can join in to this plan. I think that they're an important target as well because without them making production changes on their side, there won't be enough green products for consumers to buy. So I just think we should always bear that in mind that consumers can lead to some extent, but they don't always have the choices that would enable them to lead as much as they would want to.

Arturo Garcia-Costas:

Did wanna point out one thing about back to Chuck's aviation point believe it or not, EPA just did a termination of harm for lead aviation. So whatever general aviation airports are base of New York State, it, the CLC implementation does open an opportunity for conversation with them, cuz they're gonna have to restructure eventually when the FAA does the regulations on getting rid of lead aviation gas, they're gonna have to do some major investments to, to basically eliminate those storage tanks and, and the other, the hoses. And, but basically everything they use to refuel a plane to shift away to something else. So it does, it is I think over the next couple of years, gonna open up an opportunity for us to talk at least with the owners of those general aviation airports in New York State.

Sadie McKeown:

I, I just wanna go back to awareness again and one, and I wonder if, if we do disclosure, so at the point of purchase, if someone is going to buy a, a gas stove or a, a gas fired you know, clients do, is there a disclosure that comes with that purchase that says at X point in time that the link code will change or New York State is requiring electrification something, because I think that's where a lot of awareness is generated is at the point of purchase. And if, if the sales force of people are not out there disclosing those, those changes and recommending electric appliances or, or choices that are consistent with the Climate Act, then they maybe need to be, and that's something that can be, can be implemented without real costs it just becomes a, a regulatory, you

know, a requirement through government and could compliment an awareness campaign like a broader general awareness campaign. So thoughts. That's great. Thank you.

Sherburne Abbott:

Anything else?

Sherburne Abbott:

Hearing nothing else, Sarah, thank you so much. I mean, it's really, really, really insightful. And again, thank you so much for all the work that you're doing, cuz it's we know that it's really challenging. It's it's a, a new world for NYSERDA, but, but it's so important over the long term and you're doing it's, it's a great it's a great effort. So thank you very much for, for appearing today and also for your hard work. No formal action is required on this item. The last item on the agenda as usual is other business. Is there any other business to come before the Committee? None. may I have a motion to adjourn?

Vice Chair Bell:

So moved

Sherburne Abbott:

Second. Is there a second?

Arturo Garcia-Costas:

Second.

Sadie McKewon:

Second.

Sherburn Abbott:

All in favor.

Members of the Committee:

Aye.

Sherburne Abbott:

Alrighty. Bye. Bye. Adjourn.