

Priority Actions Temperature Check

Jan 13, 2025

**Thank you for
your input!**

- **10 Councilors provided input**
- **No priority action received more than 3 “This needs further discussion (I have serious concerns)”**
- **Many thoughtful comments offered**

Areas to focus discussion

- **Buildings and thermal (several)**
- **Transportation (cap & invest)**
- **Update GHG Emissions inventory for Agriculture**
- **Ag & Eco - redesign state education funding model**
- **Biomass**

Additional areas

Ag & Eco

- **Support robust funding for supply chain resilience and state food security**
- **Ensure that the Vermont food supply is sufficient to withstand global or national food supply chain disruptions...**

Public health

- **Develop community resilience hubs..**

Today's suggested approach

First Discussion Block

- **Buildings & Thermal, and related
Transportation cap & invest**
 - **Are we clear about the concerns?
What inputs will help us have this
conversation?**

Today's suggested approach - 2

Second Discussion Block

- **Several Ag & Eco Actions**
 - **GHG emissions accounting**
 - **Redesign of state education funding**
 - **Biomass**
- **Are we clear about the concerns?
What would help us have this
conversation?**

Comments on Buildings & Thermal (and related Trans)

Collectively, a cap and invest (economy-wide as seems to be suggested here, or transpo only as recommended previously) and clean fuel standard are both complicated and expensive, particularly if designed to achieve 2030 - and may be untenable absent an ability to join with other states, namely NY. I am increasingly concerned that absent a hard conversation about the GHG reduction requirements in the GWSA - these policies will all be unacceptable to the broad public because of their cost.

[Sector-wide mechanism] this should be examined in light of the AOT/ANR/Treasurer's report to the Legislature and legislative discussion regarding the clean heat standard. [Clean fuels standard] - is there current information regarding what the scale of funding needed would be - have we piloted the ability to scale up in terms of staffing, contractor resources.

The recommendation around cap and invest cannot be blind to cost/affordability concerns.

Comments on Ag & Eco Actions

Given myriad challenges and all of the attention currently being given to state education funding - I do not think it should be a priority of the Climate Council to wade into this space.

Recommendation #2 seems outside of the realm of the influence of the Climate Council. Perhaps removing the "Redesign" sentence and focus on "restructuring" of the funding for technical education.

Going to net accounting for agriculture will have impacts for other sectors. This change requires a more fulsome conversation about not just what this change would mean for the agriculture sector, but other sectors as well. We may want to consider going to a net basis for all sectors.

If this isn't already in the plan, I think it would be good to revisit how we calculate emissions and sequestration from agriculture. There are big differences between conventional agriculture and regenerative agriculture practices.

Comments on Biomass

I'm confused by the biomass recommendation b/c it is unclear and appears to be two contradictory recommendations (one is about new facilities, one implicates existing facilities). This is an important topic. We need to grapple with it further.

I agree with this approach: "Fund and undertake the study as soon as possible, the study recommended by the Council, along with the guidance to the Public Utilities Commission contained in the Council biomass addendum"

I continue to be concerned that the discussion about biomass is taking up outsized space in the work of the Climate Council. I support the alternative language "Fund and undertake the study as soon as possible, the study recommended by the Council, along with the guidance to the Public Utilities Commission contained in the Council biomass addendum."