

MINUTES OF THE CLIMATE ACTION COUNCIL MEETING

HELD ON SEPTEMBER 13, 2021

Pursuant to Notice and Agenda, a copy of which is annexed hereto, a meeting of the Climate Action Council (“Council”) was convened at 2:00 p.m. on Monday, September 13, 2021.

The following Members attended, and a quorum was present throughout the meeting:

Council Co-Chairs

- Doreen Harris, President and CEO, New York State Energy Research and Development Authority
- Basil Seggos, Commissioner, New York State Department of Environmental Conservation

Council Members

- Richard Ball, Commissioner, New York State Department of Agriculture and Markets
- Donna L. DeCarolis, President, National Fuel Gas Distribution Corporation
- Marie Therese Dominguez, Commissioner, New York State Department of Transportation
- Gavin Donohue, President and CEO, Independent Power Producers of New York
- Dennis Elsenbeck, President, Viridi Parente, Inc.
- Thomas Falcone, CEO, Long Island Power Authority
- Vacant, Commissioner and President and CEO-designate of Empire State Development (Vincent Ravaschiere, Designee)
- Rose Harvey, Senior Fellow for Parks and Open Space, Regional Plan Association
- John Howard, Interim Chair and CEO, New York State Public Service Commission (Commissioner John Maggiore, Designee)
- Dr. Bob Howarth, Professor, Ecology and Environmental Biology at Cornell University
- Peter Iwanowicz, Executive Director, Environmental Advocates of NY
- Jim Malatras, Chancellor, State University of New York
- Gil C. Quiniones, President and Chief Executive Officer, New York Power Authority
- Roberta Reardon, Commissioner, New York State Department of Labor
- Anne Reynolds, Executive Director, Alliance for Clean Energy New York
- Rossana Rosado, Secretary of State, New York State Department of State (Sarah Crowell, Designee)
- Raya Salter
- Dr. Paul Shepson, Dean, School of Marine and Atmospheric Sciences at Stony Brook University
- RuthAnne Visnauskas, Commissioner and CEO, New York State Homes and Community Renewal
- Howard A. Zucker, Commissioner, New York State Department of Health (Henry Spliethoff, Designee)

Also present were various State agency staff and members of the public. Mr. Seggos and Ms. Harris, Co-Chairs of the Council, welcomed all in attendance.

Consideration of the Minutes of the July 22, 2021 Meeting

The next item on the Agenda was to advance the minutes from the July 22, 2021 Meeting. Upon hearing no further changes or objections, upon motion duly made and seconded, the minutes were adopted.

Co-Chair Remarks and Reflections

Co-Chair Seggos provided opening remarks regarding the ascension of New York State's first female Governor, Kathy Hochul, and her support for the work of the Council. Co-Chair Seggos also provided preliminary highlights regarding the *2021 Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) Assessment Report 6 on Climate Activity*, which is relevant to the work of the Council and will be discussed in more detail at the next Council meeting. He stated that while the Report established a clear link between climate change and human activity, it also shows that strong and sustained action on greenhouse gas emissions has the ability to limit climate changes. Co-Chair Seggos addressed the devastation caused by Hurricanes Fred, Henri, and Ida, particularly Downstate and in the Southern Tier, underscoring the continuing need to focus on disproportionate impacts on disadvantaged communities.

Co-Chair Seggos highlighted recent announcements by Governor Hochul, including her meeting with the U.S. Environmental Protection Administrator Michael Regan and the signing of legislation establishing a 2035 goal for the sale of zero emission passenger cars and trucks in New York, the regulatory work for which NYS Department of Environmental Conservation has already begun.

Co-Chair Harris provided information on recent announcements highlighting the investments being made in clean energy and the environment, including:

- The approval by the NYS Public Service Commission of NYSERDA's Clean Energy Fund Petition to continue and improve the \$6 billion investment, with 40% of benefits targeted to disadvantaged communities;
- The launch of a \$6 million Climate Justice Fellowship effort benefitting disadvantaged communities and priority populations;
- An agreement with New York City Department of Housing Preservation and Development establishing a \$24 million pilot to decarbonize affordable housing;
- A \$7.5 million effort with the NYS Division of Homes and Community Renewal to create energy-efficient, all-electric affordable homes; and
- A \$5 million effort for the Just Transition Site Reuse Planning Program to provide community resources for fossil fuel power plant site reuse planning studies.

Presentation and Discussion: Climate Justice Working Group

Co-Chair Seggos welcomed the members of the Climate Justice Working Group to provide feedback and discuss the recommendations advanced by the Agriculture and Forestry and Land Use and Local Government Advisory Panels. He also stated that the dialogue with the Climate Justice Working Group will continue beyond this meeting as the Draft Scoping Plan is developed over the next months.

Advisory Panel Recommendations Feedback: Agriculture and Forestry and Land Use & Local Government

Sonal Jessel, Director of Policy, WE ACT for Environmental Justice, began the presentation by reiterating a request for feedback from the Council on the provided recommendations, stating their belief that two-way communication is an important part of the process. Ms. Jessel began with an overall impression of the Land Use and Local Government recommendations on adaptation and resilience, stating that they were found by the Group to be, overall, a well done set of recommendations. Additional specificity was suggested regarding the creation of the State Resilience Officer in that it should incorporate Just Transition principles and be an appointment supported by disadvantaged communities, as well as where this appointee would reside within the State government infrastructure. Additionally, it was suggested that the resilient infrastructure fund prioritize frontline communities and that adverse impacts in disadvantaged communities be mitigated with regard to proposals for insurance premium surcharges, strategies to address under-insurance, and managed retreats and buyouts of properties.

Standardizing climate projections across State agencies, an expansion of the New York City assessment of the local long-term health impacts of extreme temperatures to become Statewide and supporting air quality monitoring efforts through the heat warning system were all recommended. It was suggested that the weatherization program recommendations should be enhanced by being combined with solar to better protect against extreme weather, and that the NYS Department of State Coastal Management Program should require diesel emission reductions from land and water-based vehicles. Making online tools that support vulnerability assessments available in multiple languages, directly funding nature-based infrastructure, and including electric vehicle charging as part of resilience plans were also suggested.

Regarding the land use Smart Growth recommendations, it was suggested that better acknowledgement of the difference in rural, urban, suburban, and mixed-use developments were needed. The Group provided recommended language for the definition of priority development and priority

conservation areas toward the goal of avoiding over-burdening disadvantaged communities in the prioritization of conservation areas. Meaningful engagement of disadvantaged communities in the planning and implementation of projects was also recommended, with specific emphasis on transit-oriented development and high-density, transit-underserved and high pollution burden areas. It is believed that the Regional Economic Development Councils are in need of more diverse representation and that more explicit land use strategies to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and co-pollutants in disadvantaged communities are also needed.

Regarding Clean Energy, the Climate Justice Working Group was largely supportive of the recommendation and highlighted the importance of:

- Providing technical support to local governments to enhance abilities to undertake new opportunities;
- Limiting methane recovery projects to onsite only and not to expand pipelines;
- Developing a Statewide dashboard of community greenhouse gas emission inventories;
- Decreasing waste and increase recycling and to electrify municipal and school bus fleets;
- Defining qualifications for TVIP funds to ensure equitable participation;
- An increased role for NYPA in working with communities on renewables deployment; and
- Focusing on removing barriers to entry and safeguards for Community Choice Aggregation for disadvantaged communities.

Mr. Jerrod Bley, Clean Energy Program Director, Adirondack North Country Association, presented additional thoughts on the Land Use and Local Government recommendations and listed several recommendations of which the Climate Justice Working Group was supportive. In focusing on carbon sequestration through conservation, he emphasized that disadvantaged communities must be prioritized. Investments to restore and protect aquatic habitats and avoiding land conversion is critical for carbon sequestration, vehicle miles travelled reductions, enhanced farms and food security.

Mr. Bley continued with overall impressions of the Agriculture and Forestry panel recommendations, stating that the Climate Justice Working Group found them insufficient with regard to:

- Achieving the goals of the Climate Act, the emissions reductions from the panel recommendations were not large enough;
- More thoroughly eliminating systemic racism;
- Continuing to enable harmful, large-scale farm operations;
- The reliance on biogas and biomass;
- The maintenance of the use of fracked gas in fertilizers;
- The lack of emphasis in spurring robust organic farming; and
- The outnumbering of mandatory actions with voluntary incentives.

The Climate Justice Working Group suggested a holistic approach to the agriculture sector would not only reduce greenhouse gas emissions but would improve crop yields and protect drinking water, while citing examples of recent successful efforts such as a recent Genesee Valley of New York study that improved soil management, grants offered by the Watershed Agricultural Council and New York City that enhanced drinking water and climate mitigation and resilience, and the recent federally-enacted Soil Health and Climate Resiliency Act.

Additional recommendations included increasing policies designed to reduce greenhouse gas emissions that decrease the use of harmful toxic pesticides; ensuring that disproportionate barriers for small-to-mid-sized farms and for socially disadvantaged farmers are not created; and ensuring that Black, Indigenous, and People of Color (BIPOC) farmers are able to participate in design and implementation of recommendations.

Abigail McHugh-Grifa, Executive Director, Climate Solutions Accelerator of the Genesee and Finger Lakes Region, provided additional details on how the Climate Justice Working Group believes the Panel recommendations of a 30 percent net greenhouse gas reduction from present day levels by 2050 could be improved upon. Actions include:

- Adopting the climate goals set in the Federal Agriculture Resilience Act, which requires cutting greenhouse gases in half from 2010 levels by 2030 and to net zero by 2040;
- Reforming the method of distributing the State funds more equitably, rather than disproportionately benefitting more greenhouse gas intensive operations, such as large-scale dairy farms;
- Including safeguards to enable equitable workforce training and compensation; and
- Imposing a fee on fertilizers that funds a transition to organic farming as a means of meaningfully reducing greenhouse gas and protect public and private waters from runoff.
- Avoiding the use of biomass;
- Not supporting the installation of biodigesters at Concentrated Animal Feeding Operations (CAFOs), and focusing more on pasture-based and smaller farming operations;
- Creating a pathway for 100 percent zero emissions farm vehicles and equipment;
- Funding transformative practices upstream of manure storage toward practices that smaller producers can adopt;
- Meaningfully involving BIPOC farmers in the creation of incentive programs and consider an Advisory Board to make recommendations on program design;
- Offering incentives in the form of grants, rather than loans, and eliminate match requirements for grants;
- Supporting community gardens and protecting them from development; and
- Providing land to BIPOC farmers and farmer workers that have been historically excluded from farming opportunities.

Commissioner Ball thanked the Climate Justice Working Group for their detailed presentation and feedback and agreed with the recommendations on issues related to BIPOC farming. He stated that the

State recently released a report, *Diversity and Racial Equity Working Group Report*, containing 21 recommendations, which began in 2017 in response to reported trends, including the disappointing trends regarding BIPOC farmers. He stated that the effort was extremely interesting, informative, and rewarding regarding the access to land, capital and training under the current systems. He noted several positive farm-related activities and the progress that has been made over more than four decades. He is particularly encouraged by the attention now paid to soil management and health and the work of the Watershed Agricultural Council and the Agriculture Environmental Management effort, which highlights the efforts of the small farms.

In response to an inquiry by Anne Reynolds regarding the reference of a 30 percent emissions reduction in this sector during the presentation, Commissioner Ball clarified that the panel started with a goal of a 30% reduction based on previous analyses for the sector, noting that there are larger challenges in housing, transportation and waste. Although, he did note the likely need for more dramatic attempts, or a faster pace, for achievements to meet the reduction targets.

In response to an inquiry by Dennis Elsenbeck regarding more granularity for the desired actions, a reference to a recent NYS Public Service Commission Order calling for utility transmission and distribution proposals to address generation “pockets”, and how much thought the Working Group may have put into electrical infrastructure needs that would encourage local economic development, the Climate Justice Working Group planned to take the inquiry back to the full group for consideration. Ms. Jessup did offer that one goal would be to expand renewable energy dramatically in the context of all opportunities for Smart Growth, whether it be rural or municipal, and for all sectors. She added that to avoid unintended consequences, constant tracking and monitoring is necessary.

Mr. Elsenbeck further highlighted the need to proactively account for electric grid considerations in planning for and addressing local economic development issues, rather than a more reactive approach. Rahwa Ghirmatzion, Executive Director, PUSH Buffalo, reiterated the need to take some issues back to the Working Group for full consideration and suggested that a one-size-fits-all would not be possible to meet the needs of all regions. She suggested a closer, more regional look at place-based interventions so that Smart Growth will be as intelligent as possible, as some interventions may greatly benefit rural and suburban areas and may not benefit high-density areas, highlighting the need for input directly from those residing in the community. Sarah Crowell, chair of the Land Use and Local Government Advisory Panel, agreed with the notion that Smart Growth does not apply only to new development and requires consideration in ways that benefit and are desired by the community in which it is occurring. She also agrees with a regional approach to overcome the challenge and that no single solution exists.

Dr. Howarth thanked the Climate Justice Working Group for their detailed feedback and agreed with most of what was put forth. However, he suggested continued dialogue with the Agriculture and Forestry and Land Use and Local Government Advisory Panels, particularly regarding issues surrounding nitrogen and whether manure may be the larger of the two issues, although both need to be addressed. He suggested that anaerobic digestion is likely the best available option for the handling of manure. Dr. Howarth also suggested that no-till agriculture might aggravate nitrogen issues downstream but using less synthetic nitrogen fertilizer is likely possible. In response to Dr. Howarth's request of the Working Group for a recommendation on an appropriate fee structure for fertilizer, Ms. McHugh-Grifa stated that others would need to be consulted in order to put forth a recommendation.

In response to an inquiry by Donna DeCarolis regarding whether the Working Group had considered soil carbon sequestration, particularly as a potential for further economic development benefit, Ms. McHugh-Grifa stated that it had not discussed specifically, but the Working Group did thoroughly discuss ways that the smaller farmer can remain competitive while also pursuing carbon sequestering soil practices. She offered to bring further information back to the Council on this issue.

Peter Iwanowicz thanked the Working Group for its input and asked if a ban on, or further limits on, anaerobic digesters was considered. Ms. McHugh-Grifa stated that the Working Group did not have a consensus view on that specific issue but stressed that consideration of the broader framing and consideration of the science and expertise, including both the hard sciences and the social sciences, as raised by Mr. Elsenbeck, was warranted. Ms. Ghirmatzion offered to take these issues back to the Working Group for further consideration and analysis. She stated the importance of seeking consensus, increasing learning and understanding, and ensuring that the Working Group is bringing forth a holistic framework that considers the science. She added that the approach should be one of "lifting all boats or providing a boat to someone that never had one" and that the lens by which new strategies are viewed with is one of assessing the potential unintended harms of each proposed solution.

In response to an inquiry by Raya Salter regarding the mechanisms for a substantive integration of the Climate Justice Working Group recommendations and feedback to the Council, Ms. Osgood explained that the Staff Team is including all of the Advisory Panel recommendations into a draft Scoping Plan that is intended to explain how they work toward achieving the goals, and will also be informed by the Integration Analysis and by the Climate Justice Working Group feedback. The draft Scoping Plan document will note where Climate Justice Working Group input was provided and areas that may contradict what the Advisory Panels put forth for recommendations so that the Council will have all of the information before it as it reviews the Draft Scoping Plan. Small group sessions aligned by topic area

with Council Members are being considered as a means of receiving input on any potential modifications as to how the material is presented. Co-Chair Harris offered that a great example of this approach in action will be exemplified by the next presentation on the Integration Analysis, adding that to some extent it is an analytical exercise, and to another extent, it is a policy-making and more qualitative exercise.

Presentation and Discussion: Integration Analysis Scenario Planning

Co-Chair Harris introduced Carl Mas, Director, Energy and Environmental Analysis, NYSERDA to present further information on the Integration Analysis scenario planning as informed by initial feedback from the Council Members. This presentation builds upon the previous where initial outputs were presented along with a comparison of the Climate Act accounting requirements against the Pathways Analysis accounting, as well as a test run of the analytical methodology. Co-Chair Harris stressed that the Integration Analysis is not synonymous with the Scoping Plan but one tool that feeds into it to assess greenhouse gas reductions, benefits, and costs.

Mr. Mas began by presenting a closer look at the required effort to achieve the Climate Act requirements of a 40% emission reduction by 2030 and 85% reduction by 2050 and that under initial modeling, emissions decline deeply but fall short of the limits, even with ambitious actions included. He presented a summary of feedback on scenario design from the Council Members received since the last meeting, which includes the following:

Regarding buildings and the natural gas system, examine:

- the use of natural gas infrastructure and delivery systems as a method of decarbonization;
- a future without bioenergy as a method of decarbonization and also excludes hydrogen blending as a space heating option;
- cross-cutting solutions and timing for decommissioning the natural gas system during the transition to electrified buildings; and
- end-of-life replacement for smaller customer equipment and accelerated replacement for large customer equipment.

Regarding methane, examine:

- various levels for reducing methane leakage from waste facilities, including landfills, sewage treatment plants and abandoned oil and gas wells.

Regarding transportation, examine:

- various scenarios for reducing vehicle miles traveled; and
- expanding public transit to reduce personal miles traveled during electrification;

Regarding power generation, examine:

- the implementation of 8+ gigawatts of energy storage;

- conducting sensitivities on the build out of offshore wind beyond 9 gigawatts as discussed in the Zero Emissions Study for 2040;
- the advantages and disadvantages of interchange with neighboring regional transmission organizations through new or existing ties; and
- a scenario where zero-emissions electricity is met five years earlier.

Regarding energy system dynamics, examine:

- increased focus on demand solutions to meet load, rather than increased supply and transmission upgrades;
- benefits and opportunities offered by micro-grids as a distributed energy resource;
- a holistic look at energy storage, including distributed battery storage and thermal storage in buildings and the energy storage potential of electric vehicles;
- ground source heat pumps versus air source heat pumps in terms of energy generation, storage and grid needs; and
- the source of electricity used to produce hydrogen given upstream impact.

Regarding federal policies and other jurisdictions, examine:

- carbon reduction measures being pursued by other states, regions, localities, and nations; and
- the proposed Federal Clean Electricity Standard.

In response to an inquiry by Raya Salter regarding the importance of only including other research and jurisdictional efforts that comply with Climate Act requirements, Mr. Mas confirmed that every aspect of the analysis will include new thinking and findings including total fuel cycle analysis of all fossil fuels, including upstream emissions. Ms. Salter expressed her opinion that the analysis should not include renewable natural gas or the existing natural gas infrastructure, for health and other reasons and she strongly desires a “do no harm” approach. Mr. Mas stated that an accounting of carbon and co-pollutants will be conducted whenever a scenario includes combustion. Ms. Salter stated that co-pollutants are an important indicator but should not be the only one.

In response to an inquiry by Dr. Paul Shepson regarding the consideration of economic levers, such as carbon taxes, Mr. Mas deferred to a later planned portion of the presentation.

Dennis Elsenbeck thanked Mr. Mas and his team for soliciting feedback from the Council. In response to his inquiry regarding the demand side and economic development aspects of the analysis, specifically load pockets, Mr. Mas stated that, in addition to having considered this aspect early on, he is cognizant that future scenarios should not be developed in a way that creates unintended consequences that prevent electricity from being delivered where it is needed, and that grid building is undertaken holistically.

Dr. Bob Howarth suggested that examining hydrogen production from 100 percent renewable resources, and the subsequent combustion of it, is not an efficient use of the renewable energy and the analytical team should focus elsewhere. Regarding renewable natural gas, Dr. Howarth believes that

methane emanating from existing landfills should be used, although future methane from landfills should be minimized. He urged caution regarding anaerobic digestion in the context of wastewater treatment plants owing to nitrogen load concerns and that anaerobic digestion of manure should only be considered when used close to the source. Mr. Mas responded by stating the analysis will explore the opportunity space for all technologies by clearly showing how certain assumptions will drive certain outcomes and the realities and degrees of freedom of what a 2050 carbon footprint will allow with regard to certain technologies.

Peter Iwanowicz expressed his agreement with the points made by Ms. Salter and Dr. Howarth.

Donna DeCarolis expressed her gratitude to Mr. Mas and his team and thanked them for including a broad range of views, opinions, and scenario options in the Integration Analysis.

CEO Quiniones stated that he believes the team has appropriately framed the analysis to look at both the cumulative and interactive effects of energy production. He urged focus on issues of reliability, such as how the system performs under normal conditions and under stress or abnormal conditions. He underscored other emergent issues, such as cyber and physical security, and encouraged focus and dialogue on these issues with the New York Independent System Operator, the New York Reliability Council, New York's utilities, and the Northeast Power Coordinating Council to ensure that while achieving climate goals, the system remains reliable and resilient for the future. Mr. Mas confirmed that reliability protocols will be incorporated into the analysis, as well as the most current thinking on resiliency and risk management.

Mr. Mas presented additional, general input received from Council Members, including requests to:

- analyze the impact of carbon pricing on decreasing fossil fuel consumption (both investment impacts and behavior changes), such as carbon tax levels and alternatives to carbon pricing;
- explore distributed energy resource ownership options, including community ownership and utilities;
- plan for distribution system upgrade costs as electric load increases;
- reform building codes and improve energy efficiency standards to expedite electrification and reduce hydrofluorocarbons;
- examine the role of state and local government in advancing climate solutions, such as accelerating electric space heating and cooking in public housing;
- elevate economic development as a pathway to achieve Climate Act goals, while promoting community self-determination, including economic development of preferred sites;
- assess resiliency of New York's energy system and economy to the changing climate and adaptation needs;
- provide all materials and input used to develop the Integration Analysis scenarios to the Council; and
- make available all insights and recommendations from Working Groups, and Advisory Panels to

the Council.

In response to an inquiry from Dr. Shepson regarding whether the team is examining the full array of, as well as ways to enhance the palatability of, carbon price approaches given the large body of work that exists in this area, Mr. Mas confirmed that a literature review as well as engaging with others that have undertaken this analysis are underway.

Raya Salter suggested assessing the impacts of carbon pricing, particularly in the context of community-owned and community-driven projects, as well as developing ways to ensure that the investment and build out of the distribution system is done in an equitable manner, given that a roadmap does not currently exist. She would like to see community-based inputs and oversight on these different pieces.

In response to an inquiry by Donna DeCarolis regarding how consumer bill impacts and affordability will be assessed, Mr. Mas stated that the analysis will include assessing overarching costs and benefits, as well as incremental costs above a business-as-usual scenario. The analysis will also assess how a potential fee structure might ripple through the economy, which will require different analytical tools.

In response to an inquiry by Dennis Elsenbeck regarding how job impacts and supply chain development within the State will be assessed, Mr. Mas confirmed that the Climate Act requires this type of analysis which will specifically examine the opportunity space for these types of jobs and benefits, as well as several sensitivities focused on these aspects. The Just Transition Working Group is leading this work and a separate consulting team will be taking the Integration Analysis as their input and then analyzing the job creation, potential risk and benefits, to ensure that no one sector is left behind. Mr. Mas stated that there is a specific job study that is being layered on top of the work described today. If certain trends develop during the analysis that increase opportunity and lessen hardship, that will likely be folded back into the Scoping Plan.

Mr. Mas began framing the mitigation scenarios to be used in the planning that reflect the input received thus far, not just from Council Members but also from the Climate Justice Working Group. He stated that the Integration Analysis will assess three core mitigation scenarios that achieve greenhouse gas limits: a strategic use of low-carbon fuels (meets 40% reduction by 2030); an accelerated transition away from fuel combustion (meets 85% reduction by 2050); and a beyond 85% reduction in 2050 (which combines elements of other scenarios). Common key assumptions across all mitigation scenarios include:

- a zero emission power sector by 2040;
- additional transit and vehicle miles traveled reduction;
- more rapid and widespread end-use electrification and efficiency;
- higher methane mitigation in agriculture and waste; and

- end-use electric load flexibility reflective of high customer engagement and advanced technologies.

Sensitivity analyses include examining a range of fuel and technology costs to capture uncertainty; innovation making new technologies available sooner and at a lower cost; electric and transportation sector sensitivities; a mix of heat pump system configurations and flexible load options to test peak impacts; and a range of upstream emissions from natural gas, including a higher upper bound. Mr. Mas provided additional details on the proposed core scenarios in the context of the buildings and industry, transportation, and waste and agriculture sectors, as well as the power sector sensitivities predicated on an increased electric grid make-up of wind, water, and sunlight, as well as demand-side flexibility and storage.

In response to an inquiry by Dr. Howarth regarding the sensitivity analysis for biofuels, given the wide range of sources in this category, Mr. Mas stated that based on good dialogue on this topic by the advisory panels, the analytical assumptions surrounding this topic will be presented in more detail at the upcoming Council meeting. In response to Dr. Howarth's suggestion to examine the greater use of rail transit, particularly the potential for light rail to be a good investment for State's larger upstate cities, Mr. Mas confirmed that the analytical team is exploring this area, which is very location-specific and requires land acquisition, to look at marginal costs and benefits and lessons learned in other jurisdictions.

CEO Quiniones suggested inclusion of the transmission, sub-transmission and distribution system evolution in the power sector sensitivities, given that the electric grid will provide the platform for achieving the other strategies. He further suggested consulting with the utility group, and perhaps national laboratories, and others that model the changing electric grid. Mr. Mas confirmed receipt of much substantive input from the utility group, as well as national laboratory experts who performed the Power Grid Study. CEO Quiniones also suggested EPRI as an additional consultant in this effort.

Raya Salter expressed concern about low carbon fuels and looks forward to more discrete and specific analyses in order to evaluate what is actually on the table. She also thanked CEO Quiniones for making the point that the electric grid should be assessed down to the distribution level as a means of ensuring equity.

Next Steps

Sarah Osgood, Executive Director, Climate Action Council, presented the next steps, noting that it will take some time to get through the Integration Analysis modeling runs, but the intention is to present and discuss the initial scenario results at the October 1, 2021 Council meeting, with revised results to be

presented at the October 14, 2021 meeting. Continued engagement with the Climate Justice Working Group is also planned at those meetings.

The initial Draft Scoping Plan will be provided to Council Members in late October, spending the remainder of 2021 preparing the Draft Scoping Plan for public release. In acknowledging the complexities of the modeling work, Ms. Osgood also stated that the multiple scenarios developed in the integration analysis should provide good context for resolution of several issues, and that the draft Scoping Plan will also include the full costs and benefits of the different scenarios. She reminded the Council that calendar year 2022 will provide the Council with time to settle on a final Scoping Plan, with the benefit of a full public input process, as well as continued conference with the Climate Justice Working Group.

In response to an inquiry by Dr. Bob Howarth regarding the intent of holding future Council meetings remotely, Ms. Osgood confirmed that virtual meetings are planned for the near future, given current COVID-19 statistics.

Ms. Osgood further clarified the Council deliverables in terms of the draft Scoping Plan (due by January 1, 2022) and the final Scoping Plan (due by January 1, 2023) in response to an inquiry by Dr. Bob Howarth. In terms of implementation, she added that NYS Department of Environmental Conservation is required by statute to issue formal and binding regulations to effectuate the achievement of the emission limits.

In response to an inquiry by Dr. Paul Shepson regarding how the relative effectiveness of the formulated pathways, or scenarios, will be assessed, Ms. Osgood is confident that the Integration Analysis will be important in informing the ability of the scenarios to achieve the goals and level of realism in the underlying assumptions. Job impacts, equity, social justice, costs, co-benefits and other axes will all be options for assessing the achievement of goals. The identification of evaluation criteria is also an option for the Council, as well as other options. Dr. Shepson agreed that impact analysis would be necessary across several dimensions and presents an interesting challenge, but one that could have historical value. Co-Chair Harris added her expectation that many of the trade-offs of different scenarios will likely need to be analyzed, as well as some of the sub-components. She also emphasized the critical component of the public input process.

Peter Iwanowicz underscored his belief of the importance of the public process and sought confirmation as to the fact that several pathways would be presented to the public.

In response to Donna DeCarolis regarding whether initiating actions would be included in the draft Scoping Plan, Ms. Osgood provided some examples of what she would consider to be the next layer of actions that would be necessary to achieve certain Council recommendations, some of which, particularly if considered “no regrets” actions, could begin before the release of a final Scoping Plan.

With that, the meeting was adjourned.



Climate Action Council

KATHY HOCHUL
GOVERNOR

DOREEN HARRIS
CO-CHAIR

BASIL SEGGOS
CO-CHAIR

Meeting Agenda

September 13, 2021

- Welcome
- Consideration of July 22, 2021 Minutes
- Presentation and Discussion: Climate Justice Working Group
 - Advisory Panel Recommendations Feedback – Agriculture & Forestry and Land Use & Local Government
- Presentation and Discussion: Integration Analysis Scenario Planning
- Next Steps