

Science and Data Subcommittee of the Vermont Climate Council
1:30 PM August 11, 2021 – Minutes

Physical Location: Agency of Natural Resources, One National Life Drive, Montpelier, VT 05602 in Catamount NL D215

Join Virtual Zoom Meeting: Meeting was recorded and [posted online](#).

Subcommittee members present: TJ Poor, Richard Hopkins, Jared Duval, Julie Moore, Dr. Lesley-Ann Dupigny-Giroux, Lou Cecere

Staff present: David Hill (EFG), Liz Bourguet (EFG), Jane Lazorchak, Marian Wolz, Catherine Morris (CBI), Megan O’Toole, Claire McIlvennie, Collin Smythe, Brian Woods

Minutes by: Marian Wolz

1:30 Welcome/ Agenda Overview (S&D Co-Chair(s))

- Review and approval of August 4th minutes: comment to correct the spelling of Dr. Lesley-Ann Dupigny-Giroux’s name.
- [August 4th minutes](#) approved with that correction.

1:35 Greenhouse Gas Inventory Review – Overview of feedback received, discussion of updated draft and next steps (David Hill, EFG)

- [Task 1: GHG Inventory: Comments from Science & Data Subcommittee Recommended Decision Points](#) - Presentation
- [GHG Inventory Report](#)
- Intent of presentation is to summarize comments received on the Greenhouse Gas Inventory report and to discuss recommended decision points from EFG for consideration by the subcommittee and recommendation to the full Climate Council.
- Concern raised that the inventory is not using the most up-to-date science possible . David Hill responded that relying on the EPA and IPCC guidance is relying on the best science available for the inventory.
- Request to Cadmus and EFG to include recommendations around how reduction targets categorize the relative contribution in each category of emissions.
- Comment that including lifecycle analysis is fundamentally incompatible with an in-boundary inventory because it leads to double counting of emissions that occur in other jurisdictions and lifecycle timelines do not align with annual reporting timelines; putting lifecycle figures in our Inventory would not allow Vermont to compare our Inventory with other states or countries (and would be out of line with EPA and IPCC guidance).

- However, a key task/ recommendation included in the CAP should be sensitivity analysis of the existing Inventory as well as, in a separate report, full upstream analysis of all energy related emissions, or a full lifecycle analysis.
- Important to understand the timeline, process, and resources needed for upstream emissions analysis.
- Clarification that maintaining the REC accounting is regarding the regulatory and legal requirements for REC accounting, and that RECs would be assigned a different value when considering an upstream emissions analysis.
- Next steps: the task group will put forward a plan for how and what the subcommittee does with the report for discussion next week and further recommendation to the full Climate Council.
 - If subcommittee members have recommended ideas on how to phrase or present next steps on the report, Jared Duval will receive those comments.

2:45 Public Comment

- Public comments were received by Steve Crowley, Judson Peck, Mark Whitworth, and George Gross. Full comments can be viewed in the video recording posted online.

3:00 Social Cost of Carbon – Presentation & discussion of draft report (David Hill, EFG)

- [Task 3: Social Cost of Carbon and Cost of Carbon Reduction Model Review – Presentation](#)
- [Social Cost of Carbon and Cost of Carbon Model Review Report](#)
- Question raised on if it is still appropriate to have the Cost of Carbon spreadsheet if PSD will be equipped with licenses and training for the LEAP model that incorporates the cost of carbon. EFG responded that the LEAP model will benefit from the continued cross referencing with the Cost of Carbon models that are being used by the state. LEAP will not become the only tool used by the State.
- Results from survey on social cost of carbon for subcommittee members was consistent. Results from the five subcommittee members who responded: 3%, 2%, 2%, 1%, *no answer*.
- There may be places where the discount rate applied to the social cost of carbon is different than the discount rate applied to the economic analysis. This item should be discussed further. David Hill acknowledged that consistency is important, but there are further details to be discussed on that point.
- Next steps: Written comments (in track changes) on Social Cost of Carbon report should be sent to the Social Cost of Carbon task group (Jared, TJ, Ken) and David and Liz from EFG. Comments are due by Friday 8/13.
- Recommendation to use a 2% Social Cost of Carbon discount rate but to also recommend that this should be updated at a minimum with the federal effort and then other check-ins regularly.

3:40 Public comment

- Public comment was received by George Gross. Full comments can be viewed in the video recording posted online.

3:50 Task Group Updates (Task Leads)

- LEAP Modeling Task update – on Friday (8/13), task group is expected to receive draft mitigation pathways for review next week. Within that, update to business-as-usual reference case, mitigation pathways, and variants with a bio heavy approach and an in-state/out of state electric generation approaches. Team managing work with SEI will see those on Friday; will be presented in two weeks at the Cross-Sector Mitigation subcommittee. May make sense to take a different approach rather than having SEI present to CSM. Contract for SEI for VCC work will go out to SEI next week.

Economic modeling will kick off this week as well.

4:00 Wrap-up/ Next Steps (S&D Co-Chair(s))

- Reserve time at next week's meetings for wrapping up the Social Cost of Carbon recommendations and Greenhouse Gas Inventory review and recommendations; leave the LEAP modeling to the Cross-Sector Mitigation Subcommittee and the smaller task group.

###