

Science and Data Subcommittee of the Vermont Climate Council Meeting

March 17, 2021 Meeting – Minutes

Date/Time:	Wednesday March 17, 2021; 1:30 – 3:00 PM
Location:	Microsoft Teams: Meeting recorded and posted publicly
Subcommittee Members Present:	TJ Poor, Dr. Lesley-Ann Dupigny-Giroux, Julie Moore, Brian Gray, Jared Duval, Richard Hopkins, Lou Cecere, Jason Shafer
State Agency Staff Present:	Jane Lazorchak, Bennet Leon, John Adams, Andrea Wright, Brian Woods
Minutes Recorded by:	Andrea Wright

1. Welcome/Agenda Approval

- TJ reviewed the agenda, recognizing invited guests, and asking if anyone had any objections or additions. None were received.

2. Governance Training Questions for Agency of Natural Resources General Counsel

- Richard Hopkins – Conflict of Interest – with one of the RFI responders and will recuse himself from related discussion. Julie suggested that Matt provide clarification for when it makes sense for Richard to recuse himself because others on the subcommittee participated in submitting information for the RFI. Matt referenced the Open Meeting Law (Public Records Act) and State Code of Ethics. State Code of Ethics is where this situation comes into play. If you or member of family participated, you should recuse yourself from any committee deliberations on the specific matter. Julie offered a point of clarity that it doesn't prevent discussion of the technical substance but comes into play when we receive the RFPs back. Matt cautioned that if you fall within the conflicts and if you are going to be bidding on a proposal you should separate yourself from the formulation of an RFP in addition to discussions on who gets selected. Matt further offered to answer questions now or offline.
- TJ asked question regarding e-mail of document and how it pertains to the open meeting law prior to an open meeting. Ok as long as it is posted to shared publicly prior to committee discussion and the discussion on it happens at the open meeting.
- Jane asked about posting of documents that are shared between subcommittee members to create a sound and consistent knowledgebase between members. Matt said yes, they need to be posted.
- Lesley-Ann recalled from video, and Matt reiterated, that handwritten notes, tracked changes comments, etc. all should be public records whether they are produced in your work or personal accounts. Preference is to use state accounts as soon as possible.
- Conflict of interest should be funneled through chairs and Jane to counsel.

3. Approval of [3-5-21](#) and [3-10-21](#) Meeting Minutes

- Any comments – no; Any objections – no; Hearing none – minutes approved.

4. Co-chairs Meetings Update (if any)

- TJ – Co-Chairs of Science & Data met with Co-Chairs of Cross Sector Subcommittee. Jared Duval also there as he is on both committees. First, they welcomed Catherine Morris from CBI to help with facilitation at subcommittee level with agendas, tools for decision making and facilitation of those areas; particularly when consensus is not met initially. Discussed CEP and CAP overlap and implications on timeline as it relates to the RFI, the CEP modeling and the CAP. Trying to drive to a recommendation to address the overlap. How subcommittees may interact with recommendation with iterations between the two. Jared added that the discussion was not really concluded but they discussed also the RFI review process and building towards an RFP and what role S&D plays in support of the Cross-Sector subcommittee in that. Jared encouraged others to participate in other subcommittee meetings.
- Lesley-Ann – Just Transitions, Rural Resilience, and Ag and Forest Lands – looking at ways to collaborate across 4 subcommittees and ways in which the workload is evolving. Concerns from Ag with regards to workload. Lesley-Ann to share when she has more concrete info.

5. Discussion: Subcommittee Scope

- TJ noted the interaction and collaboration to date and stressed the urgency of getting this wrapped so it can be submitted to the full council for March 22 meeting.
- Hopkins submitted two small edits to include not only statewide gaps but also regional and he described those edits. Julie mentioned that she struggled with the edit. Conversation resulted in clarification and was further edited such that the language should be “state and sub-state”.
- TJ proposed adoption of the charge or scope of the work as #1-4 of the document and that beyond that; the Major Milestones being the Work Plan. Any objections? None and upon accepted changes this will be put forth the Steering Committee and full council on Monday.

6. Department of Public Service Presentation of Comprehensive Energy Plan Scope & Timeline, Including Modeling Expectations

- TJ shared [presentation](#) regarding the above. Shared what the PSD responsibilities are for the CEP and overlap with Climate Action Plan.
- Questions/Comments – Jared clarifying question - single scenario being modeled in May - scenario means what? TJ answered it is a grouping of technologies with their own shares that contribute to meet the targets and is hopeful it is a cost optimization scenario.
- Jay Shafer – bridging gap between CEP and CAP - primary points of contact serving that role – TJ leading modeling work for DPS; Ed McNamara from DPS also coordinating this overlap and is on the cross-sector subcommittee and Jane is doing a lot of that coordinating as well.
- Lou Cecere -given various energy & technologies forecasting happening let’s keep in mind that we have some way of translating this for comparison to other forecasts – key indices.
- TJ raised the point that the data going into each plan needs to be the same data.

- Richard – logic models of public health world vs. quantitative model and wondering if different types of models are being considered? Helpful to measure progress at intermediate points. Point is to think about different ways to think about modeling. Conversation of types of modeling ensued.
- Jane said we need to proceed to be intentional of how the plans overlap and connect to each other in different ways and at different times.

7. Discussion: Responses to Request for Input

- Urgency to advance RFIs to RFP to think about the role of this subcommittee in that. This subcommittee plays an important role in providing recommendations for how to pursue the technical expertise needed for the CAP.
- Jared asked Jane to set additional context for timeline. Jane provided a “draft” timeline for the RFP with goal of having Tech Services contracts in place by the end of April.
- TJ could climate council give us the authority to further shape the RFP in our next meeting – next week agenda devoted to this. Jane will pose this at council meeting.
- Jane to rework spreadsheet with summary for next week which will lead to the drafting of the RFP.
- Timeline: RFI feedback deadline – Monday the 22nd; Subcommittee meeting 24th – present synthesis of RFI for final consideration to advance the RFP; meeting on 31st RFP for Review; Steering committee on the 1st and approval for posting for Friday on the 2nd.
- Who should commit to the review – Jared, TJ, others can review and provide comments as able. Jane mentioned an ANR DEC Rep commit as well. Bennet agreed. Jared will help Jane in framing questions by the end of the week that will help to inform the review. Jared – economic and transportation modeling and having reps from those agencies also have chance to provide feedback before RFP goes live. Lesley-Ann is still unclear of her potential conflict of interest moving forward at this point in time and will touch base with Jane off-line on that.
- Robust discussion on RFI will come next week. TJ also mentioned that we need to carve out some time to address the workplan and will put some time into framing that between now and next week.

8. Next Meeting

- To be held Wednesday 3/24 via Teams
- Potentially invite a member from cross sector subcommittee to next week’s meeting

9. Public Comment

- Public Comments were accepted. See [meeting recording](#) for details.

10. Adjourn (3:09)

###