

GWSA Implementation Advisory Committee (IAC)
February 15, 2018, 2:30PM – 4:00PM
100 Cambridge St., 2nd floor, Conference Rooms C/D

Draft Meeting Summary

Welcome

Assistant Secretary of Climate Change, Katie Theoharides, welcomed the IAC members and began the meeting at 2:38PM.

Updates

Sharon Weber of MassDEP updated the IAC members on scheduled stakeholder meetings seeking input on how the Commonwealth should use the Volkswagen environmental mitigation fund to electrify the transportation system, serve environmental justice populations, and distribute projects geographically across the state. MassDEP will issue a Request For Information and submit a Beneficiary Mitigation Plan. The agency will re-engage with the IAC later in the year to report on the stakeholder process.

Will Space of MassDEP also updated the IAC members on the status of auction design and management for 310 CMR 7.74 (*Reducing CO2 Emissions from Electricity Generating Facilities*) and implementation progress of 310 CMR 7.75 (*Clean Energy Standard*).

Ian Finlayson of DOER notified the IAC members about upcoming listening sessions on the 2019-2021 Three Year Energy Efficiency Plan.

Transportation Listening Sessions Feedbacks (see slides 3-5)

Assistant Secretary Theoharides provided an overview of responses received and next steps. The GWSA Team is coding the responses and will publish a summary paper on the results this spring. EEA continues to work with TCI-member states on a regional approach to address transportation emissions. The other states have in-state listening sessions this summer, and regional listening sessions are scheduled for late fall of 2018. EEA will also coordinate with the Commission on the Future of Transportation. Assistant Secretary Theoharides is the staff working group lead on climate and resiliency, while the Assistant Secretaries of Energy and for Environment are the co-staff leads for electric vehicles. EEA will look into how the IAC can provide input on the Commission's outputs given overlapping interest.

Modeling Reference Case for Transportation Sector (see slides 6-19)

Hong-Hanh Chu of EEA provided an overview of the GWSA Team's analytical approach to see where the 2030 emissions limit could be set. The approach includes scenario analysis to 2050 in the LEAP modeling tool, sector-specific modeling and analyses to feed into LEAP, and a cost study of potential policies or strategies. The Team is building a reference case—a scenario assuming minimum compliance with existing policies—in LEAP, and will gather IAC input on assumptions and data sources at each IAC meeting, with the focus on transportation vehicles and fuels at this meeting, on transportation land use and development at the IAC meeting in June, on the electric and non-energy sectors in August, and on the building sector in October.

IAC feedback on the approach includes (1) the need for EEA to analyze both costs and benefits (e.g. economic benefits, social cost of carbon, air pollution mitigation, and co-benefits) of potential policies and strategies, and (2) the need for an IAC data working group that coordinates the assumptions, inputs, and scenarios used in the GWSA Team's analyses with those that are used on relevant studies by other entities.

Ben Miller of EEA then presented on the transportation vehicle and fuel assumptions, data sources, and preliminary results for the reference case in LEAP. IAC feedback on the reference case for transportation vehicles and fuels includes (1) using a more conservative ZEV deployment projection to account for auto manufacturers pooling compliance or buying credits and (2) possibly factoring in market forces and/or impact of autonomous vehicles. IAC feedback on the potential policy scenarios includes adopting California's proposed policies for both light-duty and medium/heavy-duty vehicles.

Draft Policy Framework (see page 4 and slides 20-22)

Hong-Hanh Chu provided a brief overview of the draft policy framework for evaluating which policies get included in the 2030 Plan. IAC feedback on the preliminary framework includes (1) give negative points to policies that negatively impact environmental justice communities or low income residents; (2) factor in adoption rates, (3) evaluate potential policies and strategies on their potential revenue, net benefits, and co-benefits; (4) change the structure of the framework to rank policies and strategies on costs; and (5) expand the framework to be more transformative (i.e. beyond a scoring system) and include criteria not spelled out in the GWSA and Executive Order 569.

Adjournment

Subcommittee report out was tabled for the next IAC meeting in April. The meeting was adjourned at 4:10PM.

Meeting Attendance

IAC Members/Delegates:

Eric Wilkinson, ELM
Ken Kimmell, UCS
Kathryn Carlson, ABC
Peter Rothstein, NECEC
Steve Long, TNC
Amy Laura Cahn, CLF
Sandy Taft, National Grid
Jack Clarke, Mass Audubon
Austin Blackmon, City of Boston
Steven Barrett, MIT
Berl Hartman, E2
Rebecca Davis, MAPC
Christian Hoepfner, Fraunhofer CSE

Others:

Katie Theoharides, Assistant Secretary of Environmental, EEA
Hong-Hanh Chu, EEA
Ben Miller, EEA
Kurt Gaertner, EEA
Sharon Weber, MassDEP
Will Space, MassDEP
Joanna Troy, DOER
Ian Finlayson, DOER
Mariel Marchand, DOER
Megan Wu, DPU
Dan Licata, DPU
Daniel Gatti, UCS
Cammy Peterson, MAPC
Miriam Posner, ABC
Sarah Jackson, TNC
Roxanne Zak, TNC
Sarah Jackson, TNC
Rory Cuddyer, City of Boston
Adam Hasz, MIT

DRAFT Policy Framework for 2030 Plan (version: 02/08/18)

	Criteria	Action			Rationale
Step 1	1. Technologically feasible within desired timeframe	Yes	Maybe	Not w/o significant resources	Potential policies/strategies deemed by experts to lack sufficient technological resources to be implemented within the desired timeframe will not be considered.
		Policy in consideration	Policy in consideration	Policy no longer in consideration	

	Criteria	Points			Rationale	
Step 2	2. GHG reduction estimates	(Points equal to estimated GHG savings, rounded to 10th of a number)			Section 5 of the GWSA requires the EEA Secretary to "consider the significance of the contribution of each source or category of sources to statewide emissions of greenhouse gases."	
	3. Cost	Low	Medium	High	Section 4(b) of GWSA requires that GHG reduction measures be cost-effective.	
		2	0	-1		
	4. Equitable distribution of impacts	Benefits specifically for EJ communities or low income residents	Yes	No/Maybe		Section 5 of the GWSA requires the EEA Secretary to evaluate whether GHG reduction measures are equitable or "disproportionately impact low income communities."
		2	1	0		
	5. Diversify energy sources		Yes	No/Maybe		Section 5 of the GWSA requires the EEA Secretary to consider diversification of energy sources in evaluating GHG reduction measures.
			1	0		
	6. Consider minimizing leakage of GHG emissions outside of MA		Yes	No/Maybe		Section 5 of the GWSA requires the EEA Secretary to consider whether "state actions minimize leakage."
			1	0		
	7. Improve adaptive capacity of built and natural environments		Yes	No/Maybe		Section 1 of E.O. 569 requires the EEA Secretary to "coordinate and make consistent new and existing efforts to mitigate and reduce greenhouse gas emissions and to build resilience and adapt to the impacts of climate change."
		1	0			
8. State influence on implementation	Direct	Indirect	None		GHG reduction measures directly implemented by the state are preferred over measures by international, federal, regional, or local entities because risks of non- or partial implementation are minimized.	
	1	0.5	0			
9. Policy feasibility	Easy	Moderate	Difficult		Impact on businesses and residents, legal authority, implementation issues, and uncertainties are considered in qualifying a GHG reduction measure's feasibility level.	
	1	0	-1			

