

**Vermont Climate Council
June 9, 2025, Meeting Agenda
11am-2pm**

Join Zoom Meeting

<https://us06web.zoom.us/j/85285701509?pwd=GsvUot2NqIWphHiovwVTqYwabg5P8Y.1>

Meeting ID: 852 8570 1509

Passcode: 578693

Meeting objectives:

- Review and agree on edits to recommendations chapters in the updated Climate Action Plan, building off suggested edits from the Steering Committee
- Confirm edits to Priority Actions and Top-10 List, as discussed during the June 2, 2025 meeting
- Receive a briefing on the Scenarios Analysis

Councilors present:

- Jared Duval
- Kerrick Johnson
- Brian Dunkiel
- David Mears
- Dr. Lesley-Ann Dupigny-Giroux
- Eric Forand
- Jaiel Pulskamp
- Kelly Klein
- Lindsay Kurrle
- Matt Cota
- Ryan Patch
- Secretary Sarah Clark
- Shayla Livingston
- Stephanie Moffett-Hynds
- Will Eberle
- Michele Boomhower
- Rich Cowart
- Liz Miller
- Billy Coster (for Secretary Julie Moore)
- Andrea Wright

Agenda:

10:55 AM Climate Council Members Gather

11:00 AM Convene/Welcome/Overview/[Minutes](#)
Secretary Sarah Clark and David Plumb, Consensus Building Institute

The Council approved the minutes from June 2nd.

11:05 AM Reviewing [written public input](#)
Liz Amler, Climate Action Office

Liz Amler summarized the two comments received:

- The first comment advocates for explicitly integrating agroforestry and traditional ecological knowledge (TEK) into the climate plan to diversify crops, increase food and income sources, and enhance tree cover. It stresses respectful, specific inclusion of TEK through partnerships with knowledgeable collaborators who are involved throughout and compensated. The comment also notes that the draft is thorough.
- The second comment described Vermont's Climate Plan as unwieldy and unlikely to be implemented effectively, citing a missed opportunity with the EPA's climate pollution reduction grant. It recommends a simpler approach, like focusing on heat pump programs, and calls for practical solutions given the state's limited budget, population, and resources.

11:10 AM Discuss and agree on [edits to chapters](#)
David Plumb, CBI

Councilors discussed edits to chapters:

- *Reducing Emissions that Drive Climate Change*
 - Lines 42-51: Leave in or remove a paragraph on how to finance reductions
 - **Keep it**
 - Lines 55-58: Leave in or remove sentence about “tyranny of the status quo”
 - **Keep it**
 - Line 78: Provide greater emphasis on goal of cap and invest rebates – “to hold low- and moderate-income household financially harmless”?
 - **Add “to prevent cost of living increases for those households from the program.”**
 - **And keep language, “while also supporting investments...”**
- Sentence on 113:
 - **Remove it because it lacks nuance**

- *Buildings and Thermal*
 - Line 17: Add more example years for fossil fuel price volatility?
 - **Yes, Rich to add**
 - Lines 30-31: Leave in or remove sentence about fuel switching stimulating the VT economy.
 - **Leave it in**
 - Lines 38-42: Choose between two versions of the introductory sentence.
 - **Kerrick and Rich to draft this for Council review**
 - Line 44-46: Leave in or remove line about current fossil costs being part of today's affordability problems.
 - **Change emphasis so it doesn't oversell. Rich and David P., to bring back to Billy**
 - Line 199: Change language around PUC proceeding to examine performance metrics of regulated utilities.
 - **Let's check our recommendations, Rich and Kerrick review**
 - Line 69-70: Add in a mention of how this increases the heavy lift of reaching the GWSA targets.
 - **Yes, use preamble language about gradual implementation**
- *Electricity*
 - Line 41: "may" or "will" regarding future
 - **Change to "will likely"**
- *Transportation*
 - Lines 22-24: Leave in or remove sentences referencing the cost of fossil fuels.
 - **Make it more factual - something like: Vermont families spend more than \$1 bln on transportation fuels per year.**
 - Lines 41-47: New language around barriers for low- and moderate-income Vermonters for electric vehicles
 - **Ensure it's clear this does not refer to aviation**
 - **Change "relatively high cost of EVs" to "often higher up-front cost of EVs"**
 - **Ensure it's clear we are talking about light-duty vehicles**
 - Lines 53-55: New language around funding and tradeoffs
 - **Michele, Jared, and David P. to finalize**
 - Lines 60-62: New language around design of Cap-and-Invest
 - **Leave it in**
 - Lines 75-83: Leave in or remove text around clean cars/trucks being "important but insufficient" to meet emissions reduction goals. And Vermont "must advance a primary regulatory or policy tool to reduce emissions..."
 - **Leave it in**

- **Add footnote about status of Cap-and-Invest opportunities for Vermont to join currently**
 - Lines 98-104: Leave in or remove statement from the 2022 VCC addendum on transportation... “the only known policy options....”
 - **Add statement: “Since this statement, the state of Vermont has done a number of studies to look at Cap-and- Invest. Two important studies the Council points to are the Technical Work that was shown in February/March and the Treasurer's Analysis.” Add links to those studies.**
 - *Issues that feel resolved/ are being resolved by the Steering Committee*
 - Ag & Eco
 - “fewest equity considerations in Vermont”
 - **Remove**
 - Should biomass and renewable energy siting be moved to the electricity generation chapter?
 - **No, just change their location in the text and turn the bullets into a narrative and make the connection to electricity in the text**

12:20 PM Break

12:30 PM Public Comment

Annette Smith and offered public comment:

- Has the Department of Public Service ever ground-truthed the data on how much fossil fuel leaves the state? Green Mountain Power is Canadian, contracts with Hydro-Québec and Seabrook send money out of state, and most solar and wind projects are owned by out-of-state companies. Even many installation workers appear to be from out of state. Has the department analyzed the underlying data?
- Please be realistic. The 2030 requirements in the Global Warming Solutions Act are not achievable, and the report should state that clearly and honestly. The Council should recommend that the legislature revise the targets based on what we’ve learned.

12:40 PM Presentation of Scenarios Model
Consultants

Jason Veysey, Silvia Ulloa, and Guillaume Bouchard from Stockholm Environment Institute (SEI) provided an update on the baseline scenario models and results from the mitigation scenarios. See the presentation and Q&A [here](#).

1:35 PM Confirming Final Priority Actions and Top-10
David Plumb, CBI

Councilors shared the following comments about the top priority actions:

- Weatherization doesn't do well in the modeling. What should we do about that? Why does it show up as more costly?
- There are a number of big questions that could have effects on the model results. Still reading this as in a draft state that is not yet delivering final modeled results.
- The way it's currently bucketed up doesn't clearly convey the role of electrification in buildings.
- Health costs and benefits are not included in the modeling. Can these be included?

1:55 PM

Next Steps

Jane Lazorchak, Climate Action Office

The Council agreed on the following next steps for the upcoming virtual Council meetings:

- June 16th:
 - Review new chapters
- June 23th:
 - Legislative updates
 - Adopt plan

2:00 PM

Adjourn

##