

CHAIRPERSONS: Senator Christine Cohen,  
Representative Joseph Gresko

SENATORS: Haskell, Kasser, Miner, Slap

REPRESENTATIVES: Berger-Girvalo, Betts, Borer,  
Callahan, Chafee, Demicco,  
Dillon, Dubitsky, Gucker,  
Harding, Harrison, Hennessy,  
Horn, Michel, Mushinsky,  
O'Dea, Palm, Parker, Piscopo,  
Reyes, Ryan, Smith, Wilson,  
Young

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Good Monday morning,  
everybody. Welcome to the Environment Committee  
Members. And welcome to all of those who are  
attending today to testify. Looks like we are  
heading to a long hearing today with about 140 folks  
signed up to testify with us today.

We will be limiting once we get through the  
Commissioners of the agencies, we'll be limiting  
testimony as usual to three minutes per testifier.  
And so, you'll hear a bell and then a polite  
warning. And I will remind everybody of this as we  
go on use of the chat is prohibited during these  
hearings.

So be mindful of that. And with that just want to  
see if my Co-Chair Representative Gresko, which I  
should mention for those of you who missed the end  
of the hearing last week, there has been a change in  
leadership. We are excited to announce that Vice-  
Chair Representative Gresko is now Co-Chair, Gresko.

Representative Borer has moved on and she will now  
be heading up. She'll be the House Chair of the  
Bonding Subcommittee. So welcome Representative  
Gresko, any words?

REP. GRESKO (121ST): Thank you, Senator. Well, it's been a whirlwind of a week as you said, we have a lengthy day, so I will continue to try to do my best to catch up, but enough set and let's get to it.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Perfect. And any words from Ranking Members, Senator Miner?

SENATOR MINER (30TH): Good morning. Thank you, Madam Chairman, just for the record I'm aware that there are at least three other meetings going on, hearings going on at the very same time.

So, the public may see some of us kind of electronically dash in and out of this hearing. Like most of you, I've got two different pieces of equipment going, so I can listen to one and watch the other and go back and forth. But I look forward to the testimony. Thank you.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Yeah. Thank you, Senator Miner. Good point, sir. There are a lot of hearings in progress this morning, as well as other Committee meetings going on. So, folks will be in and out of this Zoom room. Representative Harding, any comments?

REP. HARDING (107TH): Yeah. Yes. I just saw Representative Gresko, or I should say, Representative Gresko, is raising his hand. So, excuse me, I don't know if he wants to say anything?

So, but anyway I do welcome him into this Committee as being Chair. He's been a strong Vice-Chair along with Chair Borer, who we wish her all the best and love serving with her, but also look forward to the opportunity to serve with Representative Gresko.

So, congratulations, and look forward to working with you in the bipartisan manner that we always have and looking forward to hearing from all the

individuals testifying today. So, thank you so much.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Thank you, Representative. Co-Chair Gresko.

REP. GRESKO (121ST): Madam Chair, I would be remiss if I did not also introduce the new Vice-Chair of the Environment Committee Representative Christine Palm, who has been on the Committee for her tenure here and we look forward to working together.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Yes. Welcome Representative Palm. And Senator Slap is the Senate Vice-Chair. And today in such a lengthy hearing, you're likely to see them take over here and there as Joe and I, maybe take a quick coffee break or a restroom break as appropriate.

So, thank you to you both for your leadership and help on the Committee. So, with that, let's get started. I know we have Commissioner Dykes and some other folks from DEEP that I will leave to Commissioner to introduce welcome. Dykes I think you're on mute, Commissioner.

COMMR. KATIE DYKES: Good morning. Yeah. Thank you so much, Senator. It's great to be with everyone this morning. My name is Katie Dykes. I'm the Commissioner at DEEP. And I just want to say thank you, Senator Cohen, Representative Gresko, Senator Miner, and Representative Harding, and all the Distinguished Members of the Environment Committee for having us on today to provide testimony on Bills before you.

I think that the agenda that you're-- the Bills that you're going to be hearing testimony on are really landmark proposals that will move our state forward in so many important ways. And I applaud the Committee for providing us the time to testify on these.

I want to also note we have of course, a strong cast from DEEP that is here to help assist with answering questions, our Deputy Commissioner, Betsey Wingfield, Deputy Commissioner for Environmental Quality as well as our director of our office on Climate Change Planning Rebecca French and many others are with us today.

I also want to note that I will be testifying on Senate Bill 884, which is AN ACT REDUCING TRANSPORTATION RELATED EMISSIONS. And on that particular proposal, DEEP has been working in a close partnership with the Department of Transportation.

And so, with the Committee's indulgence, I also will want to introduce our-- the DOT Deputy Commissioner Garrett Eucalitto who will provide a testimony just immediately following mine, if that's okay with the Committee. And then we're prepared to respond to any questions that the Committee may have on that proposal jointly if that works. I know you have a long agenda and many folks signed up to testify, so we're trying to achieve some efficiencies here, if that proposal works for the Committee.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Definitely, it sounds good.

COMMR. KATIE DYKES: That's great. Okay. So, I just want to note I'm first off, we are delighted that the Committee is hearing testimony today on House Bill 6441, which is AN ACT CONCERNING CLIMATE CHANGE ADAPTATION proposed by Governor Lamont.

As noted in our written testimony, we believe that this Bill will really expand the ability of Connecticut's communities to fund and finance climate adaptation and resilience projects.

The Bill includes proposals that will authorize the creation of municipal stormwater authority, statewide expanding a successful pilot to statewide opportunity that municipalities can opt into. It

will enable municipalities to have the option to adopt a buyers' conveyance fee which can help fund climate resilience and adaptation projects at the community level. It will add flood prevention and climate resilience to the purview of municipal flood and erosion control boards, and clarifying that those boards can use funds to cover operations and maintenance costs for resilience projects.

And finally, it will expand the purview of the Green Bank to include an environmental infrastructure fund to finance adaptation and resilience projects. We've had great success in the state and with the Green Bank being able to leverage limited public dollars to attract more and facilitate more private investment in clean energy and climate mitigation strategies.

This Bill well ensuring that the Green Bank would not be tapping rate pair, or RGGI climate mitigation funds for resilience would expand the Green Bank scope to be able to apply that successful model to get more dollars to work on supporting climate resilience and adaptation projects across the state.

All four of these different proposals came from, or were recommended by the Governor's council on climate change, which for the first time, including this working group specifically focused on financing climate resilience and adaptation. And these four proposals we think are extremely timely as we want to ensure that Connecticut is positioned competitively to attract federal investment and federal grants or resilience projects, which can ensure we can better protect our Connecticut communities from the impacts of climate change at-- while minimizing and trying to minimize and conserve state funds for that purpose.

So, the more, you know, we know that these four proposals look greatly enhance our ability, both at the municipal level and at the state level to attract private and federal dollars to put those

dollars to work alongside our state and community investments to help protect our communities. It is especially important for us to take action on this.

Now we know that climate change is accelerating and we have significant vulnerability in our state with respect to rising seas, frequent flooding, heat waves, and drought that is accelerating and will greatly increase between now and 2050. And so, and this is especially important for us to have these tools, to protect our frontline vulnerable communities who are going to feel these effects first and worst.

So, advancing common sense solutions to invest in climate resilience and adaptation is important for public safety, for public health and for ensuring our competitive and thriving economy as we adapt to a changing environment.

I want to next turn to comments on Senate Bill 884, which is AN ACT REDUCING TRANSPORTATION-RELATED EMISSIONS. The Transportation Sector is the largest source of greenhouse gas emissions in our economy about 38%. It is also the major contributor to air pollution generated in our state contributing to 67% of harmful NOx emissions that contribute to respiratory high rates of respiratory illness in our communities here in Connecticut.

The overwhelming source of these transportation sector emissions is the combustion of petroleum-based fuels in passenger vehicles and medium and heavy-duty vehicles. These emissions are harming our communities, and these harms are disproportionately falling on communities of color and lower income residents who live alongside the major transportation quarters in our state.

New Haven and Hartford are ranked in the top 20 most challenging places to live with asthma in the country. These same communities are also more vulnerable to the impacts of climate change

flooding, increased high heat days. And we know that climate change is accelerating because of the emissions that are already in the atmosphere, we're going to see 20 inches of sea level rise by 2050. We're going to see a fivefold increase in days where temperatures are exceed 90 degrees Fahrenheit. We're going to see more intense rainfall events, more intense droughts. We have to take urgent action to reduce greenhouse gas emissions as quickly as we can in order to prevent these already locked in climate trends from accelerating uncontrollably, after the middle of the century.

This Bill, Senate Bill 884, offers an unprecedented opportunity for Connecticut to improve Public Health and invest in clean transportation solutions. It accomplishes this in a very simple way by requiring polluters to pay for the pollution that they are causing in our state.

In this case, the polluters I'm referring to are fuel suppliers who sell gasoline and on-road diesel at wholesale. This program will require those fuel suppliers to pay for the greenhouse gas emissions that are caused by selling their product in our state, by purchasing emissions allowances at quarterly auctions. And then the program takes those payments, the auction revenue, and reinvest it in clean transportation solutions to drive down greenhouse gas emissions. That's how it works.

The program leverages regional cooperation. It will enable us to set a cap on greenhouse gas emissions across four jurisdictions, Connecticut, Massachusetts, Rhode Island Washington DC. And through this cap, we will lower greenhouse gas emissions, 26% by 2032.

I want to say that Connecticut, Massachusetts, and Rhode Island alone represent an about 80% of the GDP in New England. And this about the same equivalent in terms of transportation emissions in the New England region. So, this program will achieve major

reductions. And we'll also leverage that cooperation to achieve that across many, many States.

I do want to specify that this program works just as effectively to achieve the emissions reductions here in Connecticut, whether it's implemented with four States or with 14 States or with just one state. But by moving forward with this program today and authorizing DEEP to implement this program we will be able to essentially bring other jurisdictions along. And so, our leadership will catalyze this leadership and commitment in other States as well which is a great benefit for the climate.

Enacted the program will generate approximately \$1 Billion in revenue over the decade between 2023 and 2032 in Connecticut, which, and Connecticut alone will determine how to invest in these dollars in clean transportation solutions that will reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Again, these revenues are up to Connecticut to determine how to spend them and the revenues that will be received by this program are irrespective of how many other States participate ultimately in the regional program.

Enacting this program will enable Connecticut to cap-- enable us to cap and reduce emissions, and importantly, to drive down emissions in a way that promotes equity and environmental justice. The Bill before you commits to invest a minimum of 35% of the program dollars received in solutions that support communities that are overburdened by transportation pollution, while also benefiting communities that have been underserved by the transportation system.

The TCI program is something that we have been discussing with our other States in the Northeast for some time. Since over the last two years, we have been engaged in hours and hours and hours of discussions and dialogue in stakeholder engagement on the design of this program and the TCI program has been strengthened by the Frank dialogue we have

had with environmental justice advocates about the need to, right, the wrongs that have contributed to a transportation system that is disproportionately impacting communities of color and low-income communities.

And I'm proud to say that we in Connecticut have been listening. The program that we're proposing is much stronger because of these discussions. And we are continuing to engage with environmental justice and community leaders on ways to strengthen the commitments to environmental justice and equity in this program, which includes, as I mentioned commitment to invest a minimum of 35% of the program revenues in these communities, as well as to establish an equity advisory body, to provide direct engagement from the effected communities on how these investments should be allocated.

My colleague Deputy Commissioner Eucalitto, will talk about how these solutions can transform our transportation system. And before I pass over to him, I do want to make this request respectfully of the Committee. I know you have many folks who are signed up to testify this morning, and to provide their views on this proposal. I anticipate that you're going to hear from today from many people who are strong supporters of the TCI program these include companies like British petroleum who are committed to making a transition to a cleaner, more competitive model that is in line with climate leadership.

You're going to hear from ANU auto manufacturers from local Connecticut companies that are providing EV charging solutions. You're going to hear from environmental groups, from our electric utilities who are leading on supporting the integration of more electric vehicles onto the grid. You're going to hear from community leaders from so many folks on who we have been talking with, and you've been engaging with us in the design and the development of this pathbreaking program.

I expect your-- you may also be hearing from some folks who are not supportive of this Bill and some of them who may want to mischaracterize what this Bill is about. And so, I just want to speak, frankly you know, you may hear from some folks who will tell you that this Bill is essentially a 17-cent gas tax, and that characterization is completely false and is based on misinformation. This is not a gas tax. This is an environmental program that will cap greenhouse gas emissions and require the oil industry to pay for the damage it is causing to Public Health and the climate.

We have spent several years carefully modeling this program to assess its impacts in terms of reducing emissions and potentially on increasing consumer gas prices. Our modeling projects that the impacts on gas prices will be approximately 5 cents when the program begins in 2023 and will increase to 10 cents by 2032 as the cap tightens and emissions reduce on the trajectory that, that we need to address climate change.

The program that we have designed also includes consumer protection mechanisms, including a cost containment reserve. The cost containment reserve is something that acts like a guard rail to prevent prices from exceeding 9 cents in the early years of the program. Increasing over time, the CCR operates like the airbags in your car. If we hit the CCR, we don't just keep driving. Instead, we go into a program review to adjust the parameters of the program so that we can ensure that the consumer impacts are not staying at that CCR level.

We have experienced with implementing a program like this with the regional greenhouse gas initiative, and we have borrowed these successful mechanisms like the CCR from RGGI from that program. The 17th cent talking point is based on specious studies. It's based on studies that exaggerate assumptions about ed battery costs, fuel economy. The 17-cent

talking point is based on studies that also assume no cost containment reserve.

So essentially, it's like modeling that, you know, this program is going to be wildly more costly than what our assumptions have determined and that there are no consumer mechanism-- consumer benefit or sorry, protection mechanisms to prevent the program from exceeding those 9-cent costs.

And so, I just urge I want to speak frankly, about you know, how we have-- the modeling that we've done for the program that's in front of you anticipating some of these questions that will be coming in. Opponents will also tell you that this program will give other States control over how we spend the funds on that are generated. That is not true. Connecticut will control these investments, just as we control the investment of proceeds from RGGI opponents will tell you that we don't need to take action because the federal government will enact fuel economy standards that will take care of this.

And the good news is that if the federal government enacts or any other changes come in place that reduce emissions faster than what we anticipate in this program just like in the RGGI program, the cost of allowances will be minimal. And this, we will have the benefit of having a cap that ensures progress. And we will, but we will not be paying high prices as a result of it. Opponents will also tell you that we shouldn't do this now because communities are struggling with economic and economic downturn and the COVID crisis. And that this is just not the right time.

First, I want to point out that this program does not-- if we get the authorization for it in this session, it would not begin to be implemented in it or affect consumer costs until RGGIS are adopted and approved. And the first quarterly auctions occur in 2023. So, starting now, if we get authorization to this program, consumers would not experience any

impact from the program until 2023, but at the same time as folks say, this is not the time I just have to underscore for the Committee that we are in the midst of a climate crisis.

And then the impacts that I mentioned already, 20 inches of sea level rise of fivefold increase in days above 90 degrees. You know increased intensity of storm events, flooding drought. These are all impacts that are already locked in and unavoidable because of emissions that have occurred over the last several decades while so many oil industry have successfully promoted misinformation campaigns, undermining climate science, and deploying scare tactics about the costs of taking action.

Today, I say to you that the costs of inaction far, far exceed the modest costs of programs like TCI that will take action to address greenhouse gas emissions. So, I believe that the Environment Committee is going to do a great service to the people of Connecticut, by ensuring the today's hearing is focused on the Bill, that's actually in front of you, a proposal to address climate change and improve public health and not a fictitious proposal that the fossil fuel industry has dreamed up.

We have requirements in statute to achieve a 45% reduction in greenhouse gas emissions by 2030, but we do not have all of the tools that we need to meet those goals, especially in the transportation sector. So, with Governor Lamont's leadership, working with these other States, we have an unprecedented opportunity to make progress in our transportation system. It, through this program in a way that will leverage impacts in other States as well. It's hard to understate how carefully vetted and developed this program is I'm very, very proud that we have the ability to bring this forward to the Committee. I think it will make a dramatic change in improving public health and addressing

climate change and transform our clean transportation sector.

And I appreciate the indulgence, this Committee for these lengthy comments, but I think it just reflects how enthusiastic we are about this proposal at deacon and the Lamont administration. And with that, I want to turn to deputy Commissioner Eucalitto to share a few points from the DOT perspective.

GARRETT EUCALITTO: Thanks for Commissioner Dykes and good morning, Senator Cohen, Representative Gresko, Senator Miner, Representative Harding, and Members of the Environment Committee. My name is Garrett Eucalitto and I serve as the Deputy Commissioner at the DOT. I also am here to support SB 884, AN ACT PRODUCING TRANSPORTATION-RELATED CARBON EMISSIONS.

I submitted written testimony. I just want to briefly summarize why the DOT is here today, testifying in this proposal in front of your Committee. At the DOT, you know, we are really proud of the work we do every day to keep our state moving and our transportation system in this country has done so much good. It's created enormous economic growth. It's allowed for freedom of mobility. It's accelerated the transport of goods and create a true interstate commerce system. And it's opened up opportunities that, you know, our ancestors never could have imagined.

However, you know, we have to, as a transportation industry, admit the damage done by our nations and our state's past decisions from cutting off communities through the building of a highway through an urban center or isolating rural areas. And we have to acknowledge the disproportionate impact on the health and environment of marginalized communities as a result of those decisions. Transportation-- with transportation responsible for 38% of greenhouse gas emissions, those of us in the

transportation sector need to confront our, that responsibility. And we need to move from being the largest source of climate change causing emissions to being the most powerful solution to combat and climate change. And that's why we're proud to be here with our colleagues at DEEP today.

Commissioner Dykes talked about the structure of the program and the auction and how the proceeds are estimated to be 89 million in 2023 and rising to 117 million in 2032. And those proceeds can be invested in a broad range of transformative transportation greenhouse gas reduction projects and programs, and upgrading our infrastructure. You know, some investments could include things like improving our existing public transit system and expanding and building improved bus shelter, facilities, and features so that those individuals dependent on the public transit system do not need to wait in the dark or in the rain.

We can develop new transit options in suburban and rural communities as our populations aging, we need to make sure that those individuals have the freedom of mobility that they enjoyed when they can drive their own vehicle. So, deploying micro transit solutions in those communities are a real possibility.

We can electrify buses, trucks, and commercial vehicle fleets. It can reduce expenditures for those individuals who own their own commercial vehicle fleet or, and drive trucks and help us at DOT convert our state system entirely to electric buses expanding protected bike lanes, building safe and accessible bike paths, walking trails, sidewalks, and ADA accessible crosswalks are key for us and to ensure that our state is livable for all residents expanding bike-share programs, improving high-speed wireless internet in rural and low-income areas, expanding the installation of EV charging infrastructure in rural and urban communities that currently don't have that.

And we can invest in local air quality monitoring programs, and that's just some ideas. There's a whole host of other options we can do to invest these proceeds, to benefit Connecticut. So, over the past few months, you know, along with Commissioner Dykes, I've spent a considerable amount of time doing information sessions on TCI, answering questions about why DOT is involved why we're interested and participating. And many of the questions come up about some confusion what the intent of the program is.

So, you know, the Commissioner Dykes touched on some of those, but one thing I do want to touch on is the idea that this is designed to place people out of driving or force them into electric vehicles and that's could not be further from the truth. The program works from the top down by putting a cap and decreasing emissions that way, and then accelerating investments in bottom-up emissions reduction strategies, how we invest.

So, it's also going to encourage innovation in the fuel sector. Suppliers will blend lower carbon content into their fuels. In all the evidence shows that consumer behavior will not be impacted by this program. At the end of this long hearing day. I hope that you may see this as this, the way that we at the DOT see it. TCI is the most powerful and effective tool at our disposal to address emissions from the transportation sector.

In Connecticut families and businesses can continue to thrive if we keep moving towards a safer, cleaner, and greener transportation system and building more livable communities. And we at the DOT believe TCI will take us there. Thank you.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Thank you both for that testimony. I have a bunch of questions myself, but I will first move on to Representative Harding followed by Representative Gresko.

REP. HARDING (107TH): Thank you, Madam Chair and thank you to both Commissioner Dykes and Commissioner Eucalitto for providing your testimony and these are really important issues. And I do agree that you know, we do need to make changes here in this state to address climate change and to make sure that we're providing a clean positive environment for everybody here in our state. So, these are extremely important initiatives. And I thank you for your work and your testimony on all of that.

My question is in terms of you know, Commissioner Dykes, I think you had mentioned some of the discussion around you know, the additional costs related to fuel. Can you just explain how that's all going to operate, why? How we're projecting those costs and what's going to cause those costs and things like that, just a little bit of the operations behind how those fees are going to work and everything else?

COMMR. KATIE DYKES: Sure. I'd be delighted to. Thank you so much Representative. And so, the way that the TCI program works is identical to how the Regional Greenhouse Gas Initiative program works. It's essentially applying that same type of model that applies to power plants over to the transportation sector.

So here, what we do is we will set a cap on the amount of greenhouse gas emissions that will be allowable from the sale associated with the sale of petroleum and on-road diesel fuels. And then DEEP, if this Bill passes DEEP would develop regulations that would put a regulatory requirement on those who sell those fuels at wholesale, that they would need to purchase an allowance which is essentially like a permission to pollute, right? One allowance for one-- for each ton of greenhouse gas emissions associated with the sale of those fuels in the state of Connecticut. And the fuel suppliers would then

be able to purchase those allowances in auctions that would be held jointly with other States that would be participating in the program on each four times a year.

And so, then the revenue from those the sale of those allowances would produce the that's the investments that we're talking about, the Billion dollars of the proceeds from the allowances within up to the state to determine how to invest those dollars in a way that reduces emissions through the various clean transportation solutions that deputy Commissioner Eucalitto mentioned. we do as-- we have done extensive modeling of the transportation sector factoring in what we expect to be the cost of electric vehicles, how much we expect fuel economy standards to change over time. What we anticipate in terms of fuel prices for petroleum and on diesel, all of these different and assumptions around vehicle miles, traveled trends and how those will change. We factored done kind of a base case analysis of what those look like and then apply the TCI cap to that.

And we have essentially through that, been able to determine a projection of what the allowance prices will be in each year of the program. Remember this, we expect those prices to change over time because the amount of allowances that we offer for sale will reduce each year based on as we look to reduce emissions over time, and that's goal of the program.

And so, we've estimated what the allowance prices will be. And then we have made the assumption that the fuel suppliers, the wholesalers who have this regulatory requirement to purchase these allowances, right to pay for this pollution that they're causing, that they will likely pass on some of the costs of that environmental compliance requirement to consumers. And so, through that, we have estimated that the impacts of this or the compliance cost once it's passed along to consumers would cause gasoline prices to increase by 5 cents in the

beginning of the program, which would be 2023. That would be the first the first quarterly auction would be held in the first quarter of 2023. So that's when we anticipate that this program compliance would be reflected into consumer gas prices, so that that impact would be about 5 cents in 2023. And then as the cap tightens over time, and the allowance prices become higher, we would expect that price will increase up to about 10 cents by 2032.

So that's how we kind of arrived at those. That's a bit of the planning of TCI and how we arrived at these projections, but I'll stop there in case you have -

REP. HARDING (107TH): Thank you, Commissioner. And I appreciate the detailed analysis and the hard work that you put into cause crunching those numbers is not an easy formula. And I do appreciate your hard work in calculating those numbers, because it is beneficial for all of us to know that. Now is this going to impact heating oil as well, or is this strictly related to just transportation related gases? Okay.

COMMR. KATIE DYKES: Correct.

REP. HARDING (107TH): Okay.

COMMR. KATIE DYKES: Yep. This would be a compliance requirement just for gasoline and on-road diesel fuels.

REP. HARDING (107TH): Okay. And that's good to know, and I appreciate that answer. Thank you, Commissioner. So just following up by that, if I may, Madam Chair. I'm obviously, as I'm sure your office is, and I'm sure everybody is concerned about increased fees in any way upon consumers of the state and how aggressive it can be, particularly at the gas pump. There's not a lot of things more aggressive than gas can, but you have to, you have to use it to get to back and forth to work and

everything else, obviously. Is there any other formulas you can see that are practical right now that could address some of these issues without, you know, passing on this, this fee potentially? It's an open-ended question and I apologize for that, but is there any other, is there anything else out there that we could possibly address this without having this fee potentially passed down to consumers here in the state?

COMMR. KATIE DYKES: It's a wonderful question. I think that this is something that we have thought very carefully about as we've been working on this program design, because ensuring that we can reduce greenhouse gas emissions, reduce the burden of air pollution on communities in a way that is consistent with supporting economic competitiveness is absolutely, you know, the focus of, for Governor Lamont and for our team in terms of the different approaches that we have vetted on this.

The TCI program we believe is the most compatible with achieving those greenhouse gas emissions in a way-- the reductions in a way that that puts the least burden on consumers. And I'll explain some reasons why, number one, the program will ensure first off, it's a market-based program. So, it doesn't, it's not like DEEP is just as assessing like a fixed carbon fee on all wholesalers. So, these fuel suppliers by participating in a regional market will have options available to them, to compete, to reduce their compliance costs. For example, by blending in bio-diesel or cleaner blends into their fuel, it'll lessen the amount of allowances that they have to hold for each gallon that they're selling into the state. And by the way, that can be a really great boost for, you know, for bio-diesel companies here in the state, who we've had some great dialogue with.

The program also because we are implementing it with our neighboring States unlike a gas tax where, you know, we set that on a state-by-state basis, the

consumer impact from this the gas price impact. For example, for consumers that we would see from this program will be uniform across all of the participating States.

And so, Rhode Island, Massachusetts, Connecticut we will not see Connecticut, you know, prices raising out of step with those States. It would be uniform. I would say also note that this 5-cent increase is still lower than what the gas price is in New York, given they're much higher gas taxes, for example. So thinking about our Western border, that's also important for consumer for economic competitiveness.

And then of course you know, the way that this program works is it doesn't just put a fee on the polluters, but it gives us the proceeds, these investments these dollars that then we can with working with the legislature through the agency's informed by the equity advisory body, put those dollars to work to support consumers and help make for, you know, more, a more responsive transportation system and that our access to low emission or zero emission vehicles that, you know, a really powerful way that we can reduce the impacts of the transportation sector pollution on consumers, which is imposing real costs.

When you think about the cost of, you know for families that are struggling with asthma, you know, having to take off work to go to the emergency room, you know, for when your kid has an asthma attack. You know, we know that the cost of climate in action are driving costs for consumers, looking at the costs that consumers are paying as a result of storm restoration or impacts on other parts of our economy, or increase in costs from our infrastructure as we have to address, you know, make more investments in adaptation and resilience because of an action. So, when we've done the macro economic analysis the benefits of this program far far exceed the costs.

REP. HARDING (107TH): Thank you, Commissioner. I do appreciate that answer. And you mentioned some things that, you know, I frankly did not think of in comparing some of the costs related and potentially this program, being able to mitigate those costs, which is helpful to know. So, thank you for that.

One last question, if I may, Madam Chair. And this is related to 6441 and the conveyance tax. So, my experience and I do as an attorney do real estate transactions quite a lot. And you know, my experience related to that is as a lot of times, particularly first-time home buyers have a very difficult time coming up with the large amount of sums that are necessary to close out a transaction. You know, the closing costs. Generally, for, you know, first time home buyers we're talking 10 or \$11,000 sometimes needed to be provided at closing to buy their first home.

And my concern here is, is putting a buyers' conveyance tax that could potentially be upwards of a thousand dollars or more on a buyer that's trying to buy their first home is really-- I don't know if this is the best way to fund this need. There was no question there's a need. I totally understand that. And I agree that we should be finding, you know, potential revenue sources to address this. But really the question here I have for yourself Commissioner or anyone that you feel maybe best to answer this is, is the revenue itself, is the funding mechanism, is this really the best idea for the funding mechanism for this? Because I'm really having doubts about that.

COMMR. KATIE DYKES: Well, thanks for that question. And obviously we know how important this is you know, have to weigh really the considerations for, you know, not just at the macroeconomic level, but for families, you know across the state for individuals who are going to be paying these fees.

First, I would say that this is optional for municipalities to implement this. The Bill simply creates that possibility for municipalities to adopt this, that it makes sense for their community. Second, the fee only applies for purchases exceeding \$150,000, and then only on the amount that exceeds \$150,000. So, in terms of thinking about disproportionate impacts that could occur for lower income or middle-class families. So, you know, we think that that helps to address in some part of that, that consideration.

And then third, you know, I think going back to kind of the fundamentals of why we're proposing this in the first place, you know, we know we learned from through the Governor's council on climate change process that Connecticut is second, only to Florida in the percentage of insured property value that is along our coasts and vulnerable to climate change impacts.

And so, when you think about the value that that homeowner has and the equity in their home, when you think about what that means in terms of the sustainability of our property tax base, that supports municipal budgets and so on and you compare that to the vulnerability of all of that equity and all of that investment to climate change impacts. We have a major gap in, you know, in the funding that's available to support community level climate resilience investments whether it's, you know, improving a DOT cover to be able to handle more storm water coming through during an intense rainfall event tide gates, farms all kinds of, you know, rain gardens and swales that can absorb intense rainstorms.

There's an enormous amount of infrastructure investment that we can make that will help protect and protect the value that people have in their homes. We just don't have funding mechanisms available to support that type of shared infrastructure. And so that's really what

municipalities will be able to way as they look at whether this is a good fit to adopt in their communities is what those exposures are and whether this is the right way to raise revenue, to invest in those types of things that will protect people's assets.

REP. HARDING (107TH): Well, Commissioner, thank you so much for your answers and for your detailed work and your leadership on all these proposals. You know, I'll just leave it, I look forward to the conversation and hopefully, you know, the department will continue working with us and potentially addressing some, maybe different ways we could fund it. Again, I see the need absolutely a hundred percent. I just think there may be some more creative ways we can address funding other than a buyers' conveyance tax, but this will be discussed further in the hearing today. And I appreciate your time Commissioner. Thank you very much. Thank you, Madam Chair.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Thank you, Representative. Next, we have my Co-Chair Representative Gresko followed by Representative Hennessy.

REP. GRESKO (121ST): Thank you, Madam Chair, and Katie, thank you and Garrett as well. I'm trying to be quick here. So, you had mentioned the state's greenhouse gas numbers and asthma numbers being high. And I'm wondering how you can, how do you differentiate between what is generated here in the state of Connecticut and what is what blows over from power plants in the Midwest in differentiating that, you know, when you say Connecticut has some of the worst air figuring that if we do this and you say 26% reduction. We're still going to get air pollution blowing in that's not going to help us.

COMMR. KATIE DYKES: Thank you for that. So, yes, that's correct, Representative. We've set the proverbial tailpipe of the United States. The wind that blows in, you know, from upwind states

associated with traffic in the New York Metro area or with fossil power plants in the Midwest. You know, that air is already heavily laden with air pollution. That said we are also contributing to air pollution from, as I mentioned, two thirds of the NOx emissions that contribute to ground level ozone that harms respiratory health. You know, as far as within our economy two thirds of those emissions are coming from the transportation sector.

So, we are out of a team in we are in violation essentially of EPA standards for ozone. And we have to show reasonable further progress to the EPA that we are pulling on all the levers that we can to get ourselves back into a team with the standards that other states are meeting across the country. And so doing that in is a multi-pronged approach. Obviously, we've made some good strides in the power sector in part because of programs like RGGI.

But the transportation sector remains is the sector that we just haven't been able to really tackle in a significant way, because up until, you know, proposing this program, we haven't had substantial dollars to invest. At the same time, we are also advocating very strenuously with EPA and with those upwind states for actions to reduce the transport of air pollution into our state. So, we're pushing on every front. But it's going to require progress on all of those fronts in order for us to be able to meet the EPA standards.

REP. GRESKO (121ST): So, a good follow up to that would be, I know you're in negotiations with several other states and why haven't they agreed with you in Rhode Island and Massachusetts, as far as joining this compact?

COMMR. KATIE DYKES: Great. So, we had over a dozen jurisdictions that have been part of the discussions and the design of the TCI program over the last several years, the Governor, Lamont signed an MOU in December that committed Connecticut to move forward,

to seek, to implement this program along with Massachusetts Rhode Island and DC. But the other states continued signed on at the same time to say that they are continuing to be part of the dialogue and part of the discussion and development of this program.

And I believe that, you know, the reasons for other states to not have committed to move forward with the program, you know, there, there various in some cases I think a lot of it comes down to timing, but I am very confident that if the four jurisdictions that are seeking to implement now are able to successfully move forward to launch the program.

I fully expect more of those other jurisdictions to join in. That's the experience that we've had with the Regional Greenhouse Gas Initiative program which started off with just a small cluster of states. Connecticut was a charter member. Now we have Virginia, Pennsylvania joining into that program. Something that would have been unheard of even just four or five years ago. So, I believe that we will get benefits in terms of those up when states, as we launched this program and we'll see more jurisdictions joining.

I will say again, the benefits that we get in terms of reductions in our state, from our in-state air pollution that we're generating will go down, whether we have you know, just the four jurisdictions starting off or whether we have more if and the same with the amount of proceeds that will yield from this program, it's irrespective of more states joining. But if we don't launch this program, I can guarantee you, we won't see other jurisdictions joining and this climate leadership and further pollution reduction expanding over time. So, the opportunity that the general assembly has in this session is not only to achieve reductions here in Connecticut, but really start the chain reaction going that I am very confident will ensure we have

more jurisdictions joining and more reductions occurring across the Northeast over time.

REP. GRESKO (121ST): Thank you, Commissioner. And in the interest of time, my last well, I'd like to hear what you said about the bio-diesel personally, but next is in my last question is how is it, I'm a capital invest newbie. So how do you determine the cap, in other words, I understand where the cap is, but how do you determine that specific emissions are going over that cap in subsequently initiating the investment program-

COMMR. KATIE DYKES: So, the -

REP. GRESKO (121ST): In the Bill that we're going over.

COMMR. KATIE DYKES: Sorry, is your question, is how did we develop how do we develop the particular cap stringency?

REP. GRESKO (121ST): Yes. And how do you determine whether they were being reached at any given time in 2023?

COMMR. KATIE DYKES: So again, we conducted extensive modeling of the transportation sector just before even applying the cap, just taking, you know, getting the best estimate forecast of trends over a decade long period based on what's known and knowable many different assumptions and inputs related to vehicle miles, traveled trends, fuel prices, the cost of electric vehicles over time fuel economy standards and so on.

So, we built out that model. We vetted that with stakeholders through public meetings over the last two years, we refined it. And then we looked at our various carbon goals that we need to meet across the participating jurisdictions. We modeled different cap stringencies and then with that modeling also looked at you know, as you apply a cap and

essentially that cap produces a compliance cost for the field suppliers. What does that, how does end generates the revenue right to invest in the clean transportation solutions.

That's really where we're getting the reductions is from the investments, right? And so, through as we've run that model through, and it also gives us an estimate of what the consumer price impacts are, you know, that's how we landed on this cap stringency. It is a balance of, we need something that will meet our goals that is achievable within the known unknowable, you know transportation sector changes that we're going to see over the next decade that has a modest, you know, where the impact on consumer prices is modest, but we get enough investment to make a sizeable reduction in emissions, through clean transportation investment. That's really how we developed this cap.

I will say that while the cap is modeled for a 10-year right, program life. We will do regular program reviews during that time. That's what we've done with RGGI. So, you want to project out the cap long enough to give your-- far enough in it out into the future, to give the regulated community some predictability. But as we go through that decade, we will regularly come back to review the program, assess how it's going, see if the cap should be strengthened or tweaked in any different way. Those program review decisions have to go through regulations. So that would come back to the RGGI's review Committee for example, but I'll say that the experience from RGGI is that the cap has dropped or the emissions have dropped in the power sector much faster than we modeled at the beginning of the RGGI program. And so, you know, I expect that may be the case for TCI as well.

REP. GRESKO (121ST): Thank you, Commissioner. You know, my line of questioning was, you know, with the \$90 million figure, I'm thinking, well, if you push the cap up, the \$90 million goes down and we don't

have enough for investment in the programs. But if you lower the cap, so it's really unattainable by anyone, then you're generating, you know, quite a bit of money. And I just wanted to hear how you reached that balance. That was all my questions Madam Chair. Thank you.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Thank you, Representative. Next, we have Representative Hennessy followed by Representative Horn.

REP. HENNESSY (127TH): Thank you, Madam Chair. Thank you, Commissioner Dykes and Garrett for your testimony. So, I have a question actually, two. What other options are there to achieve the same level of emissions reductions from the transportation sector?

COMMR. KATIE DYKES: So, I suppose there are a variety of different options that one could consider. Many of them fall more into the command and control in terms of taking different elements of the TCI program and just mandating certain elements. You know, you could just try to raise revenues somehow to support the level of investments needed. You could somehow come in and just set a hard cap on emissions without requiring the reinvestment of proceeds.

Our view is that the TCI program enables us to you know, provides a lot of flexibility it's market-based and adaptive to changes in circumstances and progress in transportation emissions reduction. So, for that reason, we have really centered on this as the optimal proposal.

REP. HENNESSY (127TH): Thank you. And my last question is you had mentioned BP and Shell to historic oil companies are supporting this program. So how is it that they're interested in this?

COMMR. KATIE DYKES: Yeah. Well, it's been great to, you know, I think some of the most creative and

exciting dialogue that we've had through the TCI program development has been with folks like BP and Shell. I think you're going to be hearing from a Representative from BP later today. You know, these are companies that see where we need to go. They recognize the responsibility and the leadership that they can provide to help reduce, you know, reduce planet warming emissions.

And I think that you know, we are-- and they see that how important shifting to clean transportation solutions is to maximizing shareholder value and positioning their companies competitively over you know, the coming years. I think it's also been really exciting to be in dialogue with them because they also you know, work with many of the you know, the businesses here in our state, whether it's gas stations, or others who are prior to the supply chain for delivering these fuels.

It's very important that we have a plan for adjust transition to ensure that any companies that are also at, more at the retail level will be being-- that are going to be affected by these trends of shifting from you know, shifting to cleaner transportation solutions can be part of the solution, can be part of the dialogue just as BP has been. With investments and proceeds that we would have from the TCI program that will enable us to have resources, work directly with affected businesses, to help them transform their business models and maintain their competitiveness as we make this transition just as BP is doing. And so, we're glad to, for the dialogue that we've had in, in working with companies like that. And I know you'll be hearing from them later today.

REP. HENNESSY (127TH): Thank you, Commissioner.  
Thank you, Madam Chair.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Thank you, Representative.  
Representative Horn followed by Senator Miner.

REP. HORN (64TH): Thank you, Madam Chair, and please excuse my lonely dog singing in the background. Thank you, Commissioner Dykes and Deputy Commissioner Eucalitto for all of your testimony on this, it's extremely helpful. My question focuses on the investments from the program, the TCI program, and particularly it going to, you know, communities that are overburdened by air pollution and those who are underserved by that transportation system.

And I wondered, first of all, how you make that assessment of who is underserved by the transportation system, and then the kinds of investments, you know that you're anticipating. So obviously I hail from the same part of the state that Deputy Commissioner Eucalitto comes from, which is definitely underserved in my view, by the transportation system. And I'm trying to grapple with what those investments might look like in my community and how you know, we can be part of the solution because we are very dependent on our cars in the Northwest corner. Thank you.

GARRETT EUCALITTO: Thanks Representative Horn. And I'll jump in Katie if you okay with that. So, with respect to the first question about how to make the determination of overburden underserved, that's something that in a lot of our discussions that we've been having lately the equity advisory board is going to be critical in helping us make that determination. I think we at the DOT know what we believe to be areas underserved by transportation Northwest corner, for sure. But we also know that there are in areas that I may think are served adequately. The individuals living in those communities may feel that's not the case.

And so when we, if this legislation were to pass creating the equity advisory board immediately will help us prepare for that program to be launched in 2023, to have the input of those individuals living in communities with high air pollution and terrible

air quality having Representatives of rural communities in suburban communities, Representatives representing the youth of our state representing the senior citizens and the aging population who could no longer drive having them at the table to help craft that definition will allow us to determine where those are.

I think for, you know, for me, when I think about a lot of the rural areas or areas that are detached and don't have easy access to transportation you know, I think about my family, my brother lives in Cornwall and you know, Litchfield and New Hartford and Winston and Torrington. So, you know, what's lacking up there?

We have Northwest Connecticut transit district, but it's fixed route. And then we have the striper with some on-call there's a lot more as technology is progressing that we could be doing in those parts of the state, that lack real public transit we can have on demand things called micro transit with the short buses, and they go to pick up individuals and take them where they need to go. And it's being replicated across the country in a lot of rural areas because they're seeing their population age and they need to be able to get to the senior center get to the supermarket, get their prescriptions.

But we also have an issue where, you know, if you drive up to the Northwest or the Northeast, there's no fast chargers for electric vehicles. So, for tourism an individual maybe coming through the state with an electric vehicle, they have those fast chargers along the main highway quarters. But if they want to go up into the corners of the state they have to stop and charge at one of those slow chargers.

We need to make sure that there's enough coverage up there for people who live there to feel comfortable, they can move to a low-cost electric vehicle, which will reduce their household expenditures and to

allow the tourism industry to continue with people who have the EVs already and want to come up there and feel comfortable that they can, they can come up there, spend the weekend leave, and they're not going to get stranded.

And then there's just, you know other states, we're talking with a lot of the other states, things like-- I'm talking about expansion of broadband and high-speed wireless internet in communities that are underserved by that today. And then the last thing I'll point out is, you know, a lot of investing in the downtown areas, the underserved-- the areas that you want to have more foot traffic. If you want more people downtown in Salisbury or Litchfield patronizing those businesses, making sure the sidewalks are safe, they're wide, they're accessible, they're ADA compliant. That's where this money can be invested in.

And we have the DOT, we've had so much demand for those local investments. We have our community conductivity grant program. We've awarded 85 grants, so far \$30 million. The last round we only gave out \$5 million but we had a \$43 million in demands. So, we know the appetite is there for local governments to make bike paths, sidewalks investments, and that's where you can increase the livability and activity on in those villages.

REP. HORN (64TH): Thank you. That's very helpful. Thank you, Madam Chair.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Sorry. I couldn't get myself off mute. Thank you, Representative. Senator Miner followed by Representative Mushinsky.

SENATOR MINER (30TH): Thank you. Thank you both for being here. So, I'm trying to get my-- wrap my head around the amount of money that be generated in the first year of the auction. What is the estimate for that?

GARRETT EUCALITTO: So, the first year, so calendar year 23 the estimates are \$88.5 million for Connecticut.

SENATOR MINER (30TH): And then subsequent years is there any anticipated that that remains flat?

GARRETT EUCALITTO: No, it's anticipated that it will grow each year because the cap, the carbon on the greenhouse gas emissions will decline thereby making the allowance prices going up. So as the allowance prices go up the amount of proceeds for Connecticut will go up. So, by the law, by 2032, the estimates are \$117 million for Connecticut, and we can share the table with all of this information to the Committee.

SENATOR MINER (30TH): Thank you. And my last question is I think it's 6441. There's a reference in the Bill to affordable housing if, either of, you know what impact does the report on 8-30G have in terms of being able to utilize revenues raised at the municipal level by the buyer's pack?

COMMR. KATIE DYKES: So, thank you, Senator Mine. So, the Bill provides that municipalities that meet the state's affordable housing requirements can use the fee for land conservation and stewardship for climate resilience projects, urban forestry, planting of trees and other environmental projects matching of community investment act funded programs including for affordable housing and other state and federal grants and repayment of municipal bonds obtained for any of these purposes. Municipalities that do not meet the state's affordable housing requirements may use the fee for any of these, any of the above purposes with the exception of land acquisition.

SENATOR MINER (30TH): Thank you.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): All right. Represented Mushinsky followed by Representative Michel.

REP. MUSHINSKY (85TH): Thanks, Madam Chair. Commissioner, I wanted to ask you about displaying how we are collecting this fee for TCI. And we used to have at OPM. They used to be entered energy analysts that could break that out. They could say, well, this portion of the gas taxes for this, this portion of the gas price is due to increased driving or lack of supply.

You know, some place shuts down in Texas and we have a lack of supply, whatever, but they used to be able to explain the price breakdown to the public. And there's nobody that does that anymore. Would DEEP consider a disclosure of where the costs are in the gas tax or in the gas prices so that the public would know what is TCI and what is supply and demand or other causes.

And the reason I'm asking that I don't want to see the program fail because somebody demagogues on a price of gas and attributes supply, and demand issues to TCI when it's actually a supply and demand. So, I'm asking for disclosure and if DEEP would help with that with disclosure. So, the public really understands why gas prices go up and down.

COMMR. KATIE DYKES: Well, thank you for that Representative. And so, I'll say that first of all, it may be helpful. I appreciate your interest in that transparency aspect. We do have you know, all of the modeling that we've done for TCI is public. And we've isolated out in our modeling of what the projected TCI impacts are independent of other trends.

I will note that in the consumer price impact range, that we've-- where we've designed this program between the five and 10 cents. For example, you know, we see I mean, 5 cents can be frequently the difference between gas prices, you know, for two different gas stations on the same street. So, in

there, you know, there is a lot of fluctuation in gas prices that occurs as well, you know, far exceeding the range or the price that, the impact that we're talking about for this program, because it's a market-based program, I'll say that, you know, we don't know if the compliance requirement is not placed on gas stations or on individual drivers.

We designed the program to have the regulatory, you know, the environmental compliance requirement, on those who are selling these fuels at wholesale. We did that on purpose because we want to help to minimize the administrative costs associated with this program, not put a lot of administrative burden on, you know on our gas stations, across the state. We don't fully know though, because this is a market-based program, whether producer those wholesalers will choose to pass on all of the costs of the compliance to customers, but we certainly you know, we are going to be, we're committed to transparency through the annual reports that we will commit to providing in terms of how the transfer, how the investments are made.

We do extensive evaluation of the RGGI investments and the benefits that they're providing through annual reports. And we'll look to do something similar here for TCI. Also, through the program views that we will do for this program, we'll have the ability to continue to, you know, update our modeling, and continue to project out what we expect the cost of the program to be. So, I think those are additional vehicles that we have to give the public more visibility into how these, the program is functioning and the benefits that is providing and any consumer impacts that we are seeing, or we expect to occur as a result of the program. So, I think hopefully that answers your question.

REP. MUSHINSKY (85TH): I guess I'm looking for something that would be visible to the public. So, any reporter or citizen could look at a website or a sticker on the gas pump or somewhere where it would

be visible and have a real idea of, for example, some of the constituents right now are saying, why are prices going up right now? And the reason is it's a springtime and people are starting to drive more and people are getting vaccinated and they're driving more and the price is going up, but the legislature and the Congress have not done anything to change the price recently, it is strictly supply and demand right now, but people are asking that question, well, what did Congress do? Or what did the state do to change the price? We didn't do anything. Congress didn't do anything it's a strictly spring driving. And it would be helpful when we're rolling out this new program to have transparency and explanation visible to the public. And then I think it Bill support for the program. And I certainly think RGGI has been very successful and I want this to be as successful as RGGI.

COMMR. KATIE DYKES: I really appreciate that. And I'll say that we do DEEP does provide for reporting of energy price and supply information both for heating oil and propane for retail, natural gas prices, transportation, field prices. We track a number of different websites as well as the energy information administration at the national level to provide information on that, those trends.

And I think we'd be happy to, to think more about how we can ensure that, that information and those broader trends are more accessible to folks who may be wondering about these fluctuations in prices, which as you note are not a result of anything that we've the state has done. But you know, in reason we expect more just you know, broader trends in terms of commodity prices and other things that are happening in the market.

REP. MUSHINSKY (85TH): Thank you. Appreciate it.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Thank you, Representative. Next, we have Representative Michel followed by Representative Chafee.

REP. MICHEL (146TH): Thank you, Madam Chair. And thank you, Madam Commissioner for testifying today, as well as your team on Bills, Senate Bill 884. I have some questions, but I'll just try to limit myself. Could we remove the conditional in terms of the on lines 39 and 40 for the fiscal year ending June 30th, 2022 and each year thereafter DOT and DEEP with the approval of the secretary of OPM. Can you elaborate on why are, I mean, it sounds like a conditional, is it necessary, or I just would like to understand a little bit more about that part and then I'll have something else after. Thank you.

GARRETT EUCALITTO: Thanks Representative Michel. So that is-- it's standard practice for all state agencies where all allotments and payments are essentially approved by OPM. So, we at the DOT and I believe my colleagues at DEEP they don't make any spending. We don't make any spending decisions without some level of approval from OPM as the state budget office.

REP. MICHEL (146TH): Right. But so like, what if it was not approved? That's what I mean, like, could there be maybe more detailed information on the conditions because if there are funds coming in and 35% is going to be at a minimum of 35% is going to be used in, and then that, that brings my second question in that 35% investment for clarification will be not only to bring more transportation in case there's like a lack of transportation options, but I think it's also to expand the strategies. And can you elaborate more on the word strategies? I would imagine it might, maybe some area might not be underserved in transportation, but might be more impacted in transportation pollution.

And so, I mean and I think earlier there was only one direction, so I just wanted to bring it to both of those areas and maybe get some more clarification on it, spending strategies and still, I still have a question regarding line 39 and 40. I'm just

wondering if there might be another way to phrase that and just to make sure that the Bill really guarantees that 35% is going to be spent there?

GARRETT EUCALITTO: Yeah. So, line 39 to 40, doesn't just apply to, it applies to all the funds, not just the 35, but with respect to the 35%, which is focused on communities overburdened by air pollution and underserved by transportation. So it is, you know, it's twofold. It's both aimed at those who are historically, as I mentioned in my testimony, historically impacted, and overly impacted by the air pollution caused by the transportation sector.

So, along the I95 corridor, along the route, 8491, where you have heavy traffic volumes spewing tailpipe emissions into those communities and in communities that have heavy transit systems today on road diesel buses that we at the DOT support, because it provides that freedom of mobility to get people to their jobs, to healthcare, to school. Those have emissions impacts and health impacts on those communities.

So those are where you know, but we need to work with the equity advisory board to better define what those communities determine what overburdened means. I mean, the types of investments you know touched on a lot about public transit, converting the electric - converting our entire fleet over to electric, which is our goal at the DOT you know, investing in bike paths, sidewalks that is not just a rural or suburban effort. That is something where we need to invest in our urban centers that have high pedestrian deaths, high deaths of individuals on bikes being hit by cars, and we need to make it safer for them to get around their communities. And same thing with broadband and high-speed wireless internet rural and urban communities need that. So, I think a lot of the things I talked about with the Representative Horn can also benefit urban communities.

REP. MICHEL (146TH): And do you, when you mentioned the 95 corridor and all those different areas, are you basing that on the air quality study that, or the air quality program that you've had with, I think it was under 20 air quality readers across the state, I believe, correct? Is that what you're basing those areas on? Could there be areas that we're missing?

GARRETT EUCALITTO: But I definitely think it could be areas where we're missing. I know Commissioner Dykes has the air bureau under I'm basing on just, you know, I live in New Haven right now. I live almost adjacent to the highway. I see the particulate matter and materials collecting on my window cell and my car every single day. Commissioner Dykes can talk about the air quality monitoring.

COMMR. KATIE DYKES: Yeah, I think that one of the things that we've talked about as part of this process is that it's not just about, you know, having the proceeds and investing them. It's also being able to invest them in ways that can, that can help ensure that we're getting more getting the benefits that we want from these proceeds and especially to support equity and environmental justice. So that means we could use these dollars in part to support better air quality monitoring, or more targeted, or granular monitoring.

I think that's part of the transparency that's inherit and how this program works. We are committed, you know, because these investments are our intended vehicle for achieving the reductions. We are, we are going to be assuring that the investments are achieving those emissions reductions and those air pollution benefits. And so that's the goal of this program. Again, it's a climate program, but it's a public health program. It's an equity environmental justice program. It is, you know, one of the things that we've always known

about addressing climate change in the transportation sector particularly is that it will have the added benefit of making our air healthier to breathe and reducing medical costs and loss impacts to our economy associated with poor public health and respiratory illness that we've suffered because of our gas dependent, you know, our emission producing transportation sector.

Nowhere, I mean, this linkage has become especially visible to folks because of the pandemic frankly, to understand how, you know, essential workers, vulnerable communities, because of these emissions related respiratory health challenges are especially vulnerable to viruses like COVID and so, you know, and the association of that with transportation sector emissions.

So, we're excited about what this program will do, not only to help us reduce greenhouse gas emissions, but provide better monitoring and inventory data on air quality monitoring things that are more targeted in terms of point sources in communities, so that we can ensure that the measures that we deploy are going to provide those direct benefits in terms of cleaner air and addressing climate change.

REP. MICHEL (146TH): So, following that, I would imagine that both probably DEEP and DOT would be in favor of expanded air quality language, maybe to target communities that could be not considered part of the areas currently, but that could help compliment where you are targeting particularly in some urban settings where there's more, of course, transportation pollution.

And then I just have a quick question on 6441. And of course, I'm looking forward to more discussion on 884 past the Public Hearing. But so, for 6441, I was looking at I've several questions, but I'll keep it to one line 493 page 16. There's a mention of 50% of the total amount of such lines, 498, 499 of

search reserve fund shall be invested in equity securities. Can you elaborate on that part please?

COMMR. KATIE DYKES: Sorry, I'm just pulling up the sections, but if my team wants to jump in-

REP. MICHEL (146TH): Yeah, I'm really looking at the equity securities. I just want to learn more about that. I'm trying to figure that out. So, in line 499, it's a section 18.

COMMR. KATIE DYKES: Yeah.

REP. MICHEL (146TH): And subjects in subsection C and-

COMMR. KATIE DYKES: I know we have, so your question, I'm sorry, I'm, here now. So, this is in terms of the-- can you repeat your question?

REP. MICHEL (146TH): Sure, and basically just would like to learn more about-- so it says point number one, not more than 40% over with respect to such a reserve fund for which the budget making authority has adopted in an asset allocation and investment policy. 50% of the total amount of such reserve fund shall be invested in equity securities. And I'm just trying to grasp more of what that signifies?

COMMR. KATIE DYKES: You know, it really stems from discussions that we've had in the Governor's council on climate change in particular, the financing adaptation, working group around the importance of ensuring that there's commitments to supporting resilience and adaptation investment in vulnerable communities who are going to be, who are on the frontline of experiencing impacts from climate change. So that's where this language really reflects that, that commitment, but we'd be happy to work with the Committee or with the Members offline on, in terms of refinement.

REP. MICHEL (146TH): All right. That will do for now. Thank you very much, Madam Commissioner. And thank you, Madam Chair.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Thank you, Representative. Okay, next we have Representative Chafee followed by Representative Betts.

REP. CHAFEE (33RD): Thank you. Madam Chair. Thank you, Commissioners for speaking with us today and all the work you've put together on the policies. I have a few questions regarding 6441. One of my concerns with this Bill is that basing this at the municipal level. I think it's just going to kind of create inequities with what municipalities can't afford to either implement or set aside more land for open space purposes.

I was wondering if you could just speak to that a little bit, and I was curious if any research was done as to whether we could implement this time more of a statewide basis. I know that it gives municipalities-- it gives them the ability to opt in or out of the program, which I think many people will like. My main concern is just, you know, wealthier towns are more likely to already setting land aside for open space. And is this going to kind of exacerbate that.

COMMR. KATIE DYKES: So, Whether I think it's-- I just didn't understand your question is whether this proposal will expand wealthy communities. I'm sorry, if you could just restate the question, I just want to make sure I'm responsive to it.

REP. CHAFEE (33RD): Yeah. Sorry. It was probably a little convoluted at the end there. Basically, my concern is like the wealthier towns are going to be-- they're going raise much more money off these fees just by the basis of the value of every real estate at the town. And then also recognizing the wealthier towns, palliate already have money they're setting aside to preserve open space. So, is this

going to have meaningful impact, I guess, in lower income or less wealthy communities?

COMMR. KATIE DYKES: So, I think I appreciate the questions and thank you for clarifying. The goal of, you know, if you look at the Bill as a whole, it addresses, or it provides for a number of tools at the local level to support resilience investment, both the expansion of the stormwater authority, you know, expansion of their remit of the Green Bank as well as the updates to the scope of flood and erosion control boards.

I will say, you know, we are really thinking about this as, how do we put more tools in the toolkit for community level municipal level or even regional level investment in resilience projects, because we recognize that many times there are resilience projects that cross jurisdictions, right? When you think about their footprint or especially the part, the communities that a particular project will benefit. And so, we're really with these proposals, trying to put more tools into the toolkit to support community level investment.

But I think that at the same time, the more that we can fund some of these resilience projects at the community level, the better we can preserve state, you know, dollars in terms of bonding and so on that we'll be able to support resilient or and federal dollars that we can invest in resilience projects for that are provide benefits across the state and help to protect vulnerable communities, especially in communities that may not have the local tax base or resources to support those investments. And so that's kind of one of the drivers of this multi-pronged approach.

I'll also say that the 10% affordable housing requirement for open space acquisition is one of those things that is trying to help address inequities by, you know, helping to ensure that there is broader equity across all communities. And

so, I hope that's responsive to your question, but would be happy to follow up offline on those topics.

REP. CHAFEE (33RD): Yeah, sure. That would be great. Thank you. And then I have some questions just about the language of the Bill on line 752, let me pull it, sorry. So, it's talking about giving Quasi-public agency privileged immunity tax exemptions, and then it looks like there's additional language on saying unless such subsidiary is a single member, LLC. It is disregarded as an entity separate from its owner. I've just wondered if you could explain exactly what that language means?

COMMR. KATIE DYKES: Let me turn to Rebecca French from client planning office or Betsey Wingfield, our deputy Commissioner from HQ to assist with that question.

REP. CHAFEE (33RD): We could probably follow up offline with that too. I don't want to get too bogged down by details. That's no one can answer it in a moment.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Representative that would be great to hear if they're able to answer.

REP. CHAFEE (33RD): Sorry, what was that?

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): I was just saying that I think it would be great to hear the answer if they're able to provide one today.

REBECCA FRENCH: So, this is the section pertaining to the Connecticut Green Bank. And I do believe they're testifying later this morning. And so, I apologize, but there's a very specific issue related to, to banking. And so, I would defer to the Connecticut Green Bank for a specific answer on this issue.

REP. CHAFEE (33RD): All right, thanks. My next question might also be better answered by the Green Bank, but line 855 says that the Green Bank can't apply for grants without DEEP as a treasurer's approval, as scary as is that the current setup or what's the reason they can't apply for grants without prior authorization.

COMMR. KATIE DYKES: So, and I think Betsey you can supplement this answer, but to the extent that this is specifically for grants that are under the clean water act or under the safe drinking water act. It recognizes the benefit of coordination there for those particular dollars. But let me, Betsey, could you add to that response?

BETSEY WINGFIELD: Actually, Commissioner Dykes, that was right on target. These are locks and ending grant programs that we have worked cooperatively with EPA on. And this keeps that in our purview, unless there's a specific agreement that the Green Bank share.

REP. CHAFEE (33RD): Okay. Thank you. Thank you. Madam Chair.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Thank you, Representative. Okay, we have Representative Betts, actually, Rep. Piscopo was having a little bit of trouble with the hand-raising and followed by Representative Dillon. Representative Betts.

REP. BETTS (78TH): Thank you, Madam Chair. And thank you everybody for spending the time to educate us about these programs. I know in my area, some of them are going to have a very difficult time. Not only economically because we've really not recovered from the 2008, very serious recession, but they're pretty conservative and they don't understand why they should be shouldering the burden to try and make this area clean, have clean air. And yet you have places like New York, Pennsylvania, New Jersey,

and certainly from the Midwest having not agreed to participate in this program is a hard sell.

I mean, it's almost like the situation, China's the number one polluter in the world yet they're very resistive to helping or become a member of a worldwide effort to improve the climate. So, I wonder if you could give me some kind of explanation that might change their thinking about this because it's in a very simple way it's pretty easy to understand.

COMMR. KATIE DYKES: Well, as I-- you know, we've talked about two different types of emissions that are-- our communities are burdened by from the transportation system. One are air pollutants and the other are greenhouse gas emissions. And as you know, and we talked about earlier with Representative Gresko, there are-- there's air pollution that is coming from upwind States. That's correct. But we have to take responsibility. We're required to take responsibility for all the air pollution that we are contributing inn our state. This program will help address that.

And we have a requirement under statute under the global warming solutions act to take responsibility for the greenhouse gas emissions associated with the economy here in the state of Connecticut. We have to reduce those emissions 45% by 2030. And we don't have any tools available to us to meet that target at, at scale, at the scale needed to comply by 2030.

I'll also say that, you know, there has been for decades as we've known about climate change there has been a kind of, you know, this do loop of, you know kind of rhetoric around, you know, well, we'll wait to do something until other jurisdictions or other countries take action and let's let them lead as if leadership is something that is damaging or you know, detrimental to our state.

But in fact, I believe that, you know, Connecticut being leader on addressing climate and air pollution is going to provide significant benefits to our communities in terms of a better transportation system. I know did the Deputy Commissioner-- Deputy Commissioner Eucalitto mentioned many of them that are kind of very relevant to Litchfield County, for example as well as helping to reduce air pollution impacts on our communities. And the leadership that we're providing here, you know, the program that the Lamont administration is advancing for your consideration today is one that will ensure that Connecticut takes action. And by doing that, we're going to get we're going to have Rhode Island, Massachusetts and Washington DC also take action.

And I am very confident that if we if we do move this program forward, that we will see more States joining in, I believe that the program is, you know, it also provides significant economic benefits in terms of more investment, I mean, you know, here in our state and stimulating our local economies. So, for those reasons, I think, you know, the leadership that we can take here is going to provide very direct benefits to our communities at the same time as ensuring that others, other jurisdictions are more likely to take action in the coming years.

REP. BETTS (78TH): And then with-- thank you for that answer. And with those other States of Massachusetts and Rhode Island did they propose having a buyers' conveyance fee as a way raising money?

COMMR. KATIE DYKES: So, I know that other States, you know, Rhode Island, Massachusetts, for example is really, you know, providing a lot of leadership and innovative program designs that are helping to fund resilience at the community level. I will turn to my team or in case we are familiar, if they've done the-- let me turn to Rebecca French in case she can speak to Massachusetts specifically.

REP. BETTS (78TH): Well if you need more time that's fine too.

REBECCA FRENCH: Hi, good morning. I do think that there'll be other organizations testifying today providing some more details on what other States have done, but to my knowledge, yes, there have been individual municipalities in Massachusetts that have done something very similar to the buyers' conveyance fee as one way to raise funds.

I can't speak to Rhode Island, but yes, as the Commissioner said, multiple surrounding States have invested in and raise funds in multiple ways to invest in resilience projects, recognizing the same issues that we have here in Connecticut, that we need ways to provide cost share, matching funds fund projects standalone projects at a multitude of ways.

COMMR. KATIE DYKES: And I think one thing I would also add Representative is that we are already hearing from ratings agencies who are asking us questions around about how much investment and planning the state has doing in climate resilience as their rating, our state bonds at the state level. We know that municipalities are getting asked the same kinds of questions.

And so, by being able to put programs like this in place, even just enabling of municipalities to opt in to raise these funds, to support these projects, I think that is providing some you know, that can provide for some real time, near term relief in terms of better ratings of our debt and liabilities. So, I think that's another thing I would just notice. It was very interesting that we started being asked those questions just in the last year or two. And so, I think that's another really critical piece.

And then finally I'll say federal dollars and there are, you know, we're already missing opportunities today to be able to enroll in federal grants for

resilience. And we need, you know, the ability to have these kinds of funding mechanisms in order for us to tap into more federal money for these projects, many of the federal programs require some level of local match. And so, having this piece in place we'll have a compounding, you know, we'll be able to leverage these various funding streams to be able to attract federal dollars to pay for the lion's share of these programs.

Also, I will note that many times when we have those federal funds available, they come in terms of a grant to offset the capital costs, but you need to have some kind of entity at the municipal or the local, or regional level that we'll be able to manage to continue to do the take care of the continuing operation and maintenance of a resilience project once it's been established.

So that's another really important benefit of this adaptation legislative proposal is that it will ensure that we have those types of institutional models available to municipalities so that we will be able to compete for federal money. We need the local match and we need the operation and maintenance capabilities to, you know, with some level of funding for that. And with those pieces in place, we will be able to grab hold of lots more of the federal dollars to help keep our community safe.

REP. BETTS (78TH): Okay. Thank you very much, Commissioner. And I'll continue to listen to this and thank you, Madam Chair.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Thank you, Representative. Next, Representative Piscopo, are available?

REP. PISCOPO (76TH): Yes.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): There you go.

REP. PISCOPO (76TH): Thank you, Madam Chair. I'll figure it out. Thank you, Commissioner for your

testimony. I appreciate it. My question goes to the, this fund, this fee you mentioned that it would raise gas prices by 5 cents, basically. And you put it like a stock gap up to 9 cents. If goes to 9 cents, there is an automatic stop gap. That seems to be a pretty widespread, you know, like it seems to be a pretty good hit on the consumers of gasoline. If it goes up that much, you could go up to 8 cents a gallon without any stock gap. The first year basically is how I read the Bill. Is that, am I reading that right?

COMMR. KATIE DYKES: Right. So, the program we've modeled the program, we've done extensive modeling of the transportation sector, and then we've applied to that, the cap that will achieve the 26% reduction in greenhouse gas emissions. In designing the program and projecting that cap, our goal has been to design a program that gets us the ambitions that we want while keeping consumer cost impacts around the 5-cent range.

The consumer, the cost containment reserve or CCR that's that guardrail that we talked about earlier. That's a consumer protection mechanism that we have applied to this market. It's like a color that releases more allowances in you know, it dumps a big supply of allowances into the auction. If prices get up to that 9-cent range in the first year. And so, you know, that is intended to again, provide for a safety valve to protect against prices going too high.

We have-- So, while it's true that that the prices could be within that range of 5 to 9 cents. We have designed this program carefully with extensive modeling to focus on you know a cap that will have the consumer price impact be at the 5 cent levels, not at the 8 cents or 9 cents. And I will say that if we hit the consumer, the cost-containment reserve hit the CCR. We don't just come along and say, Oh, that's great. The CCR is the signal to then come into a program review and adjust the cap or adjust

the parameters of the program so we can restore the price impacts back to that, you know, within that 5-cent range at the beginning of the program that we've talked about.

So, the RGGI program has a cost-containment reserve in place. So, we're not, you know, kind of coming up with this as an untested kind of hypothetical but we're actually borrowing a mechanism that has been proven to work on in the RGGI program in the course of 12 years and 50 quarterly auctions that we've conducted in the RGGI program. The CCR has been triggered only twice. And, you know, we have conducted two program reviews are about to go into our third for RGGI you know, every single time we have tightened our cap and RGGI we've seen emissions fall faster than what we anticipated.

So, you know, with General Motors Volvo, you know, about three weeks ago, they announced that they're going to be phasing out internal combustion engines from their manufacturing by 2035, Volvo just announced a 2030 that they're going to stop producing those types of vehicles. You know, I have a feeling that we're going to see in the transportation sector, something similar to what we've seen in the power sector, which is once this clean transportation revolution starts, it will progress much faster than we anticipated.

REP. PISCOPO (76TH): And you're going to set up a special fund, at transportation climate account, or something with the revenue you get from this allowance?

GARRETT EUCALITTO: Yes, Representative Piscopo. So, it would be within the special transportation fund. We already have a restricted grants account within the STF. And this would be a part of that.

REP. PISCOPO (76TH): Is that overseen by a board, an equity I read in the Bill an equity board or something, an equity advisory board?

GARRETT EUCALITTO: Yeah. So, the legislation and this corresponds with what the States, the Governors, and the Mayor of district of Columbia indicated in their MOU to create an equity advisory board, which will provide advice and input on the portion of the proceeds that are intended to be invested to directly benefit those overburdened by air pollution and underserved by transportation. So, the EAB, the board, they, in the language, it's clear that their job is to help advise the agencies on how to invest those proceeds to directly benefit those communities and those individuals overburdened and underserved by transportation.

REP. PISCOPO (76TH): Thank you. And you could see how I know Commissioner, you tried to fend off that criticism where other States will be kind of having a word saying what, how Connecticut's going to spend its money. You could see where that criticism comes in. If members of this board are made up by people from Washington DC and Rhode Island, Massachusetts, etcetera.

GARRETT EUCALITTO: Yeah. And Representative Piscopo. So, and the board, I think we can clarify the language. You know, the intent is to have them represent residents of Connecticut, residents of those of the communities, overburdened and underserved. So, it won't be made up of people from DC, Massachusetts, Rhode Island they'll have no input whatsoever and how we spend our funds.

REP. PISCOPO (76TH): Thank you-

COMMR. KATIE DYKES: I appreciate that question. Because it's been a little confusing for us to understand where that concern was coming from and now you've just eliminated for us. Each state will have its own equity advisory board to give input on each dates, portion of the revenues. But the only part of this, you know, we will-- we participate in a regional auction because that makes it easier for

the fuel suppliers to, you know to do this. They don't have to comply individually with each different state's little program. You can have one regional auction.

We get a lot of benefits in doing, collaborating on the auction, but the proceeds go into each individual state's account. And here in Connecticut equity advisory board will be Connecticut and individuals. And it will be up to Connecticut determine how to spend the proceeds that come to Connecticut from this program.

REP. PISCOPO (76TH): Thank you and just a final question. I assume the initiative is to convert our bus system into electric vehicles. The big part of what you're striving to do to convert from diesel to electric vehicles, with our bus systems. And have you considered, now they're going to be carrying these batteries. There's got to be a responsible disposal of these batteries and that will open up a whole another big environmental issue for the state?

COMMR. KATIE DYKES: Yeah, do you want to take that one?

GARRETT EUCALITTO: Yeah, with respect to like the recycling of the batteries?

REP. PISCOPO (76TH): Yeah.

GARRETT EUCALITTO: I think honestly, if Connecticut is on the cutting edge of the conversion, it sets us up with an opportunity to be a place where that those jobs can be placed to do a lot of that recycling similar to what we hope to see with the as we accelerate EV charging infrastructure in the state, we'll have more manufacturing jobs here. We already have some companies here in Connecticut who manufacture EV charging infrastructure, if we can attract more of them because they view us as being the place for the recycling, for the manufacturing

of that EV chargers, we can create more manufacturing jobs here.

COMMR. KATIE DYKES: And I'll just note like one of the other great benefits of doing this now, you know having the opportunity to implement a program that's regional and scale is that our near neighbors, Rhode Island, Massachusetts, are also going to have these revenues that they're going to be able to invest in clean transportation solutions.

So, it really sends a strong signal that all of, you know, you'll have the market of all of Southern New England that will be very attractive for these types of businesses that currently exist. I know you'll be hearing from a couple of EV charging companies based here in Connecticut to see a great opportunity here. I think we're going to attract even more.

We share transportation corridors with Rhode Island and Massachusetts as well. So, when you think about that each jurisdiction will now have the resources to end range anxiety on our shared transportation corridors. Again, it's like, I just see this as such a great opportunity because we're presenting you with something that's going to help us meet our in-state goals. But in a way that we're going to get so much benefit because other States are doing it with us at the same time.

REP. PISCOPO (76TH): Thank you both. Thank you, Madam Chair.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Thank you, Representative. Representative Dillon.

REP. DILLON (92ND): Thank you, Madam Chair. And like many other people I've been in another meeting Commissioner. So, if I'm behind the curve, I do apologize. So, I have a question on the climate Bill and I'd like to walk through section 3, which has appeared before us in other iterations, but in

it the state confers new powers on municipalities to pay for open to acquire open space. Yes?

COMMR. KATIE DYKES: Yes, that's right. So, if referring to the-- this is 6441. So yes, this would authorize municipalities to be able to establish conveyance fee, which they could be utilizing those revenues for a number of different purposes.

REP. DILLON (92ND): Right. And as I said, this has been before the legislature in the past, under other-- in another clause. So, I'm concerned and it's an open space designated at the local level, is the state process for being designated open space?

COMMR. KATIE DYKES: So, we do provide for grant for supporting with local match preservation of lands for open space. So, you know, that is something that we do at the state level--

REP. DILLON (92ND): Right. But the designation, as I understood it, when it was before it's before, and I may not be up to speed. The statutory definition of open space is it's designated by the locality, not by that, not by the state that is, is there a state plan for open space that it has a specific set of rules that define the definition of what open space is?

COMMR. KATIE DYKES: We do have a green plan that we developed at the state level. And we have definitions of open space associated with that. This provision is specifically for using the dollars for land acquisition, not necessarily for, you know, designating open space. It doesn't prohibit municipalities from designating open space, under whatever designation they may come up with. It's just specifically with respect to using the dollars from this provision from the section 3 for procurement of open space, but happy to follow up, you know, if there's further concerns or questions around how this would operate.

REP. DILLON (92ND): I'm actually thinking of specific cases over the years. And so, some of which were very positive and for the public good and some of which were not even borderline good. So, some of that, so like there has been that the state, if I say on its own in commission has designated this area as the open space, does participation in this program required that the state looked behind the local decision or does it except the local decision?

COMMR. KATIE DYKES: Right. I see your question. I think we'd be happy to, you know, look at the language in that light to think about whatever, you know, how this would play out in practice, or whether there would be some-- I think your question goes to like the oversight with respect to the utilization of these funds where it's and I take the question and perhaps yeah.

REP. DILLON (92ND): Well, it does. And it gets to Connecticut being a land poor state. And I remember being in dispute two years ago over not my own, I didn't really have a position on people who are concerned about farmland versus people who were concerned about open space versus the people who were concerned about affordable housing. And so, I don't know how much of that carries forward into this discussion, but I am concerned about exactly what kind of oversight there would be. I mean, what, is a golf cot eligible here? If my town wants to buy a golf cot.

COMMR. KATIE DYKES: Right. I see the question. I think that it's one that we want to think through, and I'm happy to follow up with you, but I take the point.

REP. DILLON (92ND): Okay. I appreciate that. Thank you very much. We can talk about it.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Thank you, Representative. And that's all the questions, but I actually have

some, the benefit of going last is that many of my questions answered already, but starting with 6441, on climate adaptation. You talked a little bit about the housing space in here. You mentioned basically that could be used for anything other than the purchase of open space. It's not exactly worded in that way in the Bill. So, I just wonder if you could clarify if it's saying instead that it shall only be used for the funding of a climate change and consumers' resilience fund if the requirements under 8-3756H. But I guess it's 832 [sic] requirements. So, could you expand upon that a little bit?

COMMR. KATIE DYKES: Sure. Let me turn to Rebecca French to explain this, respond to your question.

REBECCA FRENCH: Thank you, Commissioner. So, we are you know, intention to clarify this, but the intent of the Bill is to allow the funds to be able to be used for all of the purposes listed in that section for those who have not met the exemption under 830G except for land acquisition. So, we're going to be further clarifying the intent. But what the Commissioner stated earlier on all the different uses of the funds with the exception of land acquisition is the intent of the Bill.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Okay. Thank you for that. Also, in this Bill you mentioned that actually, the terms of engaging with them, perhaps some of these activities that would allow them, given the ability financially to do more resiliency planning, that they may consult with CIRCA.

I'm just wondering if what your thoughts are on the needs. And we don't currently have a line item unless I'm mistaken in the budget for CIRCA. And I'm wondering if need in that municipalities would pay for consultation or how, what funding mechanism would they use the funds in the cost of resilience[sic] fund and pay for CIRCA? How do you envision that working?

REBECCA FRENCH: Thank you for the question. So yeah, the consultation with CIRCA is included because we want municipalities to continue to have their coastal resilience planning and project implementation be informed by the best available climate science. And CIRCA has proved an invaluable resource in that area. So, we fully agree with your comments that you know, it can be very helpful to continue that Institute.

In terms of available funding going forward. So, I know the CIRCA was you know, originally funded through some partnership between the DEEP and university of Connecticut, both organizations contributing funds. They've been extremely successful in receiving federal grants and from multiple federal agencies, NOAA, EPA and most probably through the Department of Housing, National Disaster Resilience Program, that's funding resilient, Connecticut. And that's an \$8 million planning program that they're instituting in the counties of Fairfield and New Haven counties.

Unfortunately, it was limited to those counties because they had to be spent the funds in areas that were considered still recovering from Sandy. So, we know that there's a need to expand-- continue expanding the resource so they can work with communities statewide. I think one of the options we have outside of this Bill, but I'm still on another Governor's proposal is through the Governor's bond Bill expands the-- in line with public act 20-5, that was passed in a special session, the expansion of the micro grid program to be the micro grid and resilience projects.

The Governor's bond Bill includes an additional 5 million per year for the next two years to that program. And that program authorizes DEEP to you know, work with a consultant to help with that community capacity building related to resilience projects. So that is one potential option for local funding. But I think CIRCA has proven itself to be

extremely competitive nationally for federal funds as well.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Okay. Thanks for that. Moving on, I do have some Green Bank questions. I will ask those of the Green Bank when they come on. So, moving on to 884 with TCI, could you give us a little background Commissioner on when we actually sort of joining this consortium or so? I know that the Governor signed the MOU in December, but wondering what went into the planning process and how long we've really been a part of this and talking about this?

COMMR. KATIE DYKES: Great. So, the Transportation Climate Initiative is, you know, a multi-state sort of planning coalition I suppose, that got its start in 2010. I think this was after the success that the Northeast States had as launching RGGI. There was a desire to continue that momentum and that progress and apply you know, look at more efforts to collaborate on multi-state market-based programs to reduce emissions cost effectively in the transportation sector.

There were, you know, there've been discussions since 2010, you know, thousands of hours of meeting, meetings and planning and engagement with stakeholders on the refinement of different solutions and mechanisms to achieve our goals. In December of 2018, I believe it was the Governor is including Governor Malloy signed on to a commit to work together on developing a program and designing a program that would reduce emissions on you know, through a market-based regional program.

And that really launched a more intensive phase of our work in developing and refining the TCI program, including developing the modeling that I've mentioned, developing the specific guidelines how the program would work. We've held listening sessions and onsite comments on there, you know, through this regional planning process over the last

two years from stakeholders across in Connecticut and across the participating jurisdictions.

And so, it was last December. After two years of that planning that the Lamont administration was very engaged in both the DOT and DEEP at the table with our counterparts in the other States. It was last December that Governor Lamont joined the two other Governors and Mayor Bowser in committing to seek to implement the TCI program, which in Connecticut requires us to obtain authorization for DEEP to be able to move forward with the regulations.

But you know, those other jurisdictions continue to be part of our dialogue and discussions. And but, you know, it's been quite a process to, you know, get to the point where we are today to be able to bring a very thoroughly vetted proposal to the general assembly for consideration.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Thank you for that. And so, you mentioned before that these States really have you know, not much to do at all or have nothing to do at all with the decisions with respect to, how to spend the funds that go into the special transportation fund and sort of this and these climate reserves, do all the jurisdictions, or is there any necessity for agreement or understanding between Massachusetts, Rhode Island and DC, if in fact, we need to tap into the reserve allowance in order to, you know implement the cost containment system.

COMMR. KATIE DYKES: It's a great question. So, the cost containment-- so, this program, it's a multi-state program, but importantly, it's not overseen by sort of a super state or regional authority. Each state individually it's like synchronized swimming. We've agreed through our discussions about the parameters of the program, each state implements within its own jurisdictions program elements in

regulation that are identical for each of the participating States.

And then the program retains great flexibility for each state around the investment decisions, for example, and how to allocate those, the cost containment reserve, right, that mechanism is self-executing and self-implementing. And so, it actually functions, you know, automatically in the auction. So as this, through the design of the program we've identified the collective cap that we want to implement across each participating States. And that that cap stringency is identical.

And we will participate in one regional auction that will occur, you know, each quarter. If the allowance price goes up above, you know, up to the level of 9 cents in the first year, for example the auction-- a quantity of allowances, large quantity of allowances will automatically be injected or offered for supply, offered for sale into that quarterly auction to dump in any impacts on allowance prices. So that is not something that is the States have to get together and agree on. It's actually, that's actually wired into the auction rules from the beginning.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Okay. Thank you so much. And can you speak to these other States that obviously you require legislative action here? What about the other States? Are they able to move forward without their Legislators? How, how does that work?

COMMR. KATIE DYKES: So, I will say Massachusetts has broader authority in statute to implement programs needed to meet their global warming solutions act targets than we do here in Connecticut. But I believe that Massachusetts may be pursuing some legislative proposals that will further refine how the investments are spent in their state, or I believe may also be strengthening the commitments around the transparency and engaging

from equity and environmental justice communities in their equity advisory body construct, for example, I believe. Rhode Island does need a legislative authority in order to implement the program. And I believe that DC will need their city council to approval on some aspects of the program design.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): And is there any signing from when authority may be given, if it all goes smoothly with the process?

COMMR. KATIE DYKES: So, we have developed a time schedule with milestones for RGGI adoption and across each jurisdiction that will ensure that we can collectively start this program. First, with the first auction in the first quarter of 2023, that schedule factors in the legislative and or RGGI adoption timelines and processes in each of the participating jurisdictions.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Okay, thank you for that. And with the Committee we do you have a couple of questions on 6551, the air quality Bill and we're talking obviously very broadly about air quality today and the reason, you know, the climate initiative, you mentioned the national ambient air quality standards where I'm not a team in.

And, you know, we're trying to develop this legislation that helps both with fascination, and also obviously addresses some of our environmental justice community that are also addressing the other two Bills that are before us today. We recently as the legislature passed a Bill on data centers and incentivizing these data centers to come in. I know that you know, you and I have had conversations about the impact to air quality on from these data centers that use diesel backup generation and also use you know, excessive amounts of electricity massive amounts of electricity in order to keep their systems powered.

And I just wondered what your thoughts are, you know, as we're trying to take these steps forward with TCI and air quality standards you know, the global warming solutions act and get our knocks in line, you know, how are we balancing that out with what we just saw a passage up in the legislature?

COMMR. KATIE DYKES: Great. So, thank you for your question Senator. And first I want to say I really applaud the Committee's leadership and raising this Bill on air quality. And we have a strong commitment to advancing environmental justice at the department. You know, we recognize just as we've been talking about the transportation sector today, that the you know, the burdens of environmental impacts are disproportionately distributed across our state and communities that of color and lower-income communities have been suffering disproportionate impacts associated with NOx emissions among other things.

Not to mention the disproportionate impact on our children who are suffering from, you know, respiratory illness and asthma. We really owe it to them to make progress in this space. And I'm excited about how programs like TCI will help us to do that. As I know was noted in terms of the passage of the Data Center Bill. There was a commitment from the Lamont administration and working with leadership in the House and Senate to advanced legislative proposals that will help to strengthen some of the environmental considerations associated with deployment of data centers that can be compatible with our leadership on addressing air quality issues across the state.

We have the opportunity, you know to include certain, you know, I think this Bill highlights some of the opportunities that we have, or are willing to work with proponents of this Bill to come up with language can work. And I think that the working group process, you know, described and in section 1 will be very valuable to highlight any improvements

that can be incorporated as new permitting standards are considered.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): I appreciate that. And do you think that there's an action that we will be looking on in the working group right now, you know as we consider this new companies coming in with these emissions that could mitigate some of the impact that they may have?

COMMR. KATIE DYKES: Certainly, I think that there are things that we can do in order to, in terms of strengthening legislative language or statutory language that will ensure that there's are strict controls applied for any backup diesel generators that would be proposed to operate in a peak shaving capacity. So, I think that that's something where we think there's some real opportunities to make some progress that will benefit air quality in the state.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Okay. Thank you, Commissioner. I see Representative Dubitsky has his hand raised.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH): Thank you, Madam Chair. And thank you Commissioner for coming in. I have a quick question for you about 6441. It appears to me on my reading that this Bill would eliminate the municipalities authority to reduce or defer Stormwater fees on farms. Is that correct? I'm looking specifically at lines 46 through 50.

COMMR. KATIE DYKES: Let me turn to Deputy Commissioner Wingfield or Rebecca French to respond to your question. Thank you, Representative. I think we're looking at line numbers, make sure we're zeroed in on that correct section.

REBECCA FRENCH: That's correct, Commissioner. I was looking for the exact section. So yeah, reading the section, it says in the case of land classifies as, or consisting of farm forest or open-space land,

or Stormwater Authority may only levy such fees on areas of such land that contain impervious services from which storm water runoff is generated. So, I definitely let me know if I'm answering your question, but you know, I think the intent of this program is to tie you know, to tie storm water fees to impervious surface. And so, this section is clarifying that, you know, for those types of lands the program would be tied to impervious surface there.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH): Okay. So, right now under current law, a town can wave essentially reduce or defer which my interpretation is waive stormwater fees for farms, and this Bill would prevent them from doing that and require them if there is a stormwater authority that is levying fees, it would require them to include farms for the first time. Am I-- is that correct?

BETSEY WINGFIELD: If I may, I'm Betsey Wingfield, Deputy Commissioner for environmental quality. This language is permissive for them to include basically impervious cover and pervious cover being those circumstances where storm water can't get into the ground. The majority of farmland and open space and others and forest would be pervious and would allow storm water to seep in. So, this is really trying to focus the storm ready utilities and any fees that might result on those areas where it's impervious and where it runs off rather than it goes in. So, I see it as permissive, and it would be a small portion of farmland rather than significant amounts.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH): Well, when you look at your average dairy farm has significant amounts of barns and concrete pads and things like that fall on a decent size dairy farm. Those surfaces would be in many, many times what most residences have. So, it appears that it may, while it may be permissive to levy on impervious surfaces, once a decision is made to levy on impervious surfaces, the municipality no

longer has discretion to waive those fees on farms. Isn't that, right? I, my interpreting that wrong?

BETSEY WINGFIELD: Representative, I interpreted as a may in terms of imposing the fees in terms of what could be covered.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH): So, is it your feeling that they, that farm still can be essentially exempt from these stormwater fees, even if they decide even if the town decides to levy on impervious surfaces?

BETSEY WINGFIELD: Representative, that is my read of it. It very clearly States that they can only levy it on those surfaces on a farm or other types of forest land or open space that is impervious. I believe it is permissive, but we'd be glad to look into that and get back to you.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH): Okay. Yeah, I'm a little concerned about that because it appears that that language eliminates the discretion and that once the decision is made to levy on impervious services, farms are included and farms have in many instances, very large areas of impervious surfaces, even though they may be surrounded by hundreds of acres of pervious surface. They certainly many farms have a significant impervious surface as well.

I'm also concerned that with regard to lines 135 through 141 combined with the previous section, we just discussed lines 46 through 50. It appears that lines 135 through 141 allow a municipality to essentially offset the PA 490 by imposing stormwater fees on farms. So, it seems to me that this section would encourage municipalities to levy on farms in order to essentially recover the money that the tax revenues that PA 490 is designed to keep in the farmer's pocket. Do you have any comment on that one?

REBECCA FRENCH: I want to clarify that the lines you're referring to are under section three, which

is a part of the buyers' conveyance fee program. It's not part of the storm water authority section of the Bill.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH): Oh, okay. Thank you for clarifying that, that makes a big difference. So, and the conveyance, okay. And the conveyance tax would be on all farm land? I'm sorry, all properties that are conveyed, right? Without regard to any type of farm land, except with regard to 142 through 144, is that right?

REBECCA FRENCH: Yes, I do believe that is the case, but I'm reviewing again to make sure. But I also want to note that those funds can be used for the preservation and stewardship of farmland. So, it's very important use of the buyer, the optional municipal buyers' conveyance fee.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH): Okay. Well, I appreciate the clarification. I believe those are my only questions just running through my notes. Yeah. I think that was my only questions. Thank you for your responses. And if you wouldn't mind you know, taking a look and seeing, you know, if there's any way in, and maybe you know, our Committee can do this as well, any way to clarify lines 46 through 50, to make it clear that you know, this is not something that is mandatory if a town decides to put a levy on impervious surface because it sure, you know, my reading of it looks like it's mandatory.

REBECCA FRENCH: Thank you. And Representative Doug, to your just previous question, I just want to note lines 142 to 144 that the any-- the conveyance, any real estate conveyance that is for the preservation and perpetuity of open-space land forest land or farm land is exempted from the buyers' conveyance fee.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH): Yeah. I saw that.

REBECCA FRENCH: Okay. Thank you.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH): Okay. thank you very much. Appreciate it. Thank you, Madam Chair.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Thank you, Representative. Representative Michel.

REP. MICHEL (146TH): Thank you, Madam Chair. I'll be brief. Just a quick question to Commissioner Dykes. I was wondering when you, the position of if there was added language to the storm water, part of the Bill that would be to reduce, the percentage of impermeable construction in new construction since it would encourage green roof. So, I was just curious what's your position on that?

BETSEY WINGFIELD: Representative Michel, this is Betsey Wingfield. Would you please repeat your question? I think I understood it, but I want to make sure I'm asking I'm answering it.

REP. MICHEL (146TH): Sure. Deputy Commissioner. I was just wondering if the DEEP headed position or potentially added language that would encourage green roofs, meaning in terms of language, I would propose to reduce the percentage of impermeable surfaces on your construction.

BETSEY WINGFIELD: So, yes, Representative clearly, we would like to see as much pervious coverage as we can such as green roofs and other things. And we really think it's at the local level in complying with their MS4 permits that it's appropriate for municipalities to do that planning and figure out how they want to get those pervious surfaces and how they want to disconnect from runoff. So, we really think that this Bill gives municipality tools that they can use to set up their storm water utility, but that planning really should be done at the local level.

REP. MICHEL (146TH): So, if then local zoning ordinance that would include that can be supported by this.

BETSEY WINGFIELD: Yes.

REP. MICHEL (146TH): Thank you both. And thank you, Madam Chair.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Thank you, Representative. Well, I don't see any other hands raised, so after two and a half hours, you are off the hook. Nicely done.

COMMR. KATIE DYKES: Thank you-

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): I appreciate your time with us today.

COMMR. KATIE DYKES: Thank you for the indulgence of so much time on these incredibly important issues. And I appreciate our collaboration with the Department of Transportation in sitting with us today. So, thank you so much.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Absolutely. All right. Next, we have Ben Florsheim, Mayor of the city of Middletown welcome Mayor. I'm sorry for the lengthy wait and I appreciate your patience. Glad to have you with us.

BEN FLORSHEIM: No problem. Thank you, Senator. Can you hear me, okay?

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Yes.

BEN FLORSHEIM: Great. Well Senator Cohen, Representative Gresko, Senator Miner, Representative Harding, Distinguished Members of the Committee. Thank you very much for the opportunity to testify. I also thank Commissioner Dykes and her team as well as the folks DOT for their great information that they provided.

My name is Ben Florsheim. I have had the honor as Senator Cohen mentioned to serve as mayor of Middletown since 2019. And for the sake of my constituents that you are as I am here to urge you to support Senate Bill 884. A few weeks ago, the city of Middletown had the opportunity to become the first community in Connecticut to add an all-electric school bus to our fleet.

The bus, which is now in service at Middletown public schools was acquired through a unique partnership between government, the private sector, and the advocacy community. Local and statewide environmental organizations, including Save the Sound and the league of conservation voters saw an opportunity to use funding from the Volkswagen diesel settlements to pilot an electric school bus in Connecticut and the city, and our schools jumped at the opportunity to be the partner.

Thanks to the generosity and the partnership of DECO who operates our buses in Middletown and other private sector partners, including, excuse me, the Middlesex chamber of commerce. The bus was brought into service at no cost to taxpayers. We hope to add more electric buses to the Middletown fleet suit.

Middletown's electric bus is an example of a successful pilot initiative on bringing sustainable transportation options to Connecticut, but it is only that a pilot, a starting point. Senate Bill 884, would accomplish the critical task of scaling up this model by making possible much new to the investments in sustainable transportation infrastructure, from expanding public transportation options to EV charging networks to conversion of fleet vehicles Like we have begun here in Middletown.

Not only are these steps urgently needed to meaningfully address climate change. They're also

full of opportunity for Connecticut's economy with the potential to create huge numbers of good-paying green jobs and create a public transportation network that works for the 21st century. The prospective of major federal infrastructure spending package just around the corner makes this all the more important and all the more ripe with opportunity for Connecticut, to lead the way and sustainable transportation.

The oil lobby, or at least segments of it has been opposing this Bill in predictable fashion, because it invests in alternatives to fossil fuels. Dating back to the dawn of the old oil depletion allowance, and beyond it's been standard operating procedure for the fossil fuel industry. Whenever they're worried about not getting their way avail dock, they're concerned about profits is looking out for the little guy. Such is the case here, which is why interest groups have been lobbying you and your colleagues and bankrolling a misleading advertising campaign to bring our constituents.

The claim more or less is that the Bill is actually an attack on working people because of the emissions fee levies on fossil fuel distributors. The polluters would thus have no choice that they say we're going to pass this fee on to consumers in the form of increased gas prices. This is a silly line of argument for many reasons, not least of which is the fact that lower income and middle-class people are and will continue to be the demographics hit hardest by the economic impacts of climate change.

Expanding public transportation and reducing harmful emissions on the other hand, we'll provide outside benefits to these same demographics. This Bill does both of these things. And should you and your colleagues wants to do even more to help working people in Connecticut. The good news is that you have many opportunities during this legislative session to do so without caving into the oil industry on this incredibly important initiative.

You know, I'm close to my time. So, thank you for your consideration. I hope that you all have the opportunity in the future to welcome new sustainable transportation options to your districts just as we have done here in Middletown. Passage of this Bill would help make that possible. Thank you so much.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Thank you so much, Mr. Mayor. I really appreciate your testimony. And congratulations on that electric school bus. That's really exciting. What opportunities do municipalities have currently to electrify say their public works fleets or their school bus fleets?

You know, is it you know, is it all on the backs of the towns or, I mean, you mentioned this particular electric school bus team probably from FCC funds. What other resources are available to towns and cities?

BEN FLORSHEIM: That's a great question. You know, this wouldn't have been possible without the settlement but from the Volkswagen lawsuit. And I know that there were future rounds of funding that are going to make projects like this possible in the future.

There are other, you know, there are grants-- there are grants from private institutions and organizations that are available, but really this was made possible because DECO stepped up as the private provider to help cover the costs the rest of the cost of the school bus that wasn't covered by the grant that DEEP helped us with and that came through that settlement.

And one of the things that we really talked about at the unveiling of that project, of the unveiling of the bus is the need to sort of build economies of scale around these electric fleet vehicles and that similarly to how electric passenger vehicles, 10 years ago were prohibitively expensive for most

buyers and for most manufacturers to produce, thanks to incentives, thanks to subsidies, thanks to economies of scale. All of these things, some of them provided directly in the form of government assistance at the state and federal level. Some of it coming on the manufacturer side that what has made it been possible for electric passenger vehicles to become commercially viable.

A similar trend line is projected for fleet vehicles and this Bill would move us significantly in that direction. These are the vehicles more so than passenger vehicles that it's really, really important to start converting to electric because of the idling time, because of the routes that they're used for, we're talking about school buses, but also public works vehicles, plow, trucks, that sort of thing. And of course, all sorts of other commercial fleet vehicles.

So right now, the opportunities that are available to municipalities as far as I know, are mostly for what we've done in Middletown, which is to sort of pilot these things before the costs become viable. And the only way to do that, just like with passenger vehicles is to make the investment that this Bill make possible.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Thank you for that. So, I mean, it would be your desire. It sounds like to electrify fleet if possible. But you did mention that you really needed the matching funds from the private entity. Do you foresee see a situation where, and I know this is sort of looking into your crystal ball, right.

But do you foresee a situation where if the state provided out of the funds from TCI out of the special transportation fund, the viability of a grant, a matching grant program where the municipalities would pick up a portion in order to move forward. I mean, do you think that's something that would be feasible for municipalities? Do you

think that they will receive widespread support necessary to include the line items in their budget?

BEN FLORSHEIM: I can speak-- I'll speak for Middletown and say that I think that that would be very well received in our community. I think that there are, as we look to new fleet purchases in general, we are already going to try to make those as, as sustainable as we can.

We have a fleet of shared electric vehicles, for instance, that are serving as sort of a replacement though, as we move existing fleet vehicles and city cars out of service those employees are going to be shifting towards using these shared electric vehicles in order to conduct city business at the same as going to, we're going to try to apply the same litmus tests to replacement of other city fleet vehicles, whether that's police vehicles and there's hybrid options becoming available for police vehicles. Like I said, in my testimony, we are intending to purchase another school bus at the first opportunity.

And I think that, again, as we scale up the production of these types of vehicles the cost is going to start to become much more sustainable for municipality to any help that the state can provide is certainly always going to be appreciated. But as we move in this direction, it's going to start to become possible for us to actually budget for these types of vehicles in our local budgets, without having to get the matching funds from a private provider, from an operator or even having to get a special grant.

Again, as we scale up production there's going to be more and more opportunity for municipalities to be able to afford to make this investment on the front end. Because we know that it is a long-term money saver for municipalities in on the backend thanks to fuel efficiencies and other factors.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): All right, well, I appreciate that. I don't see any hands raised, so, Mayor Florsheim, thank you for your testimony and being with us today.

BEN FLORSHEIM: Thank you very much for having me.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Okay. Next on the list we have, Shubhada Kampli from the city of Hartford. Welcome.

SHUBHADA KAMBLI: Thank you. Co-Chairs Cohen and Gresko, Vice-Chair, Slap and Palm, Ranking Members, Miner and Harding and Honorable Members of the Environment Committee. My name is Shubhada Kampli and I'm Sustainability Director for the city of Hartford. Thank you for the opportunity to provide testimony for SB 884, an ACT REDUCING TRANSPORTATION-RELATED CARBON EMISSIONS.

As a city, that's taken a leadership role on climate action in the state, and we urge you to strongly support this Bill and join other Northeast States in taking decisive action on emissions reductions and agreeing economic recovery. This Bill supports urgent climate action, as well as increased revenue for critical infrastructure and traffic safety projects. This is particularly important in the wake of a pandemic that's decimated our community's economy and ability to make infrastructure investments statewide.

Assuming that TCI substantially supports our state's most vulnerable communities. The proposed initiative represents a solid path forward. We are able to achieve guaranteed emissions reductions of 26% while also generating revenue of \$1 Billion for the entire state between 2023 and 2032.

The provisions in this Bill that drive funds towards overburdened communities are essential. Given that 35% of the revenue will be allocated for environmental justice communities like ours. This

is a strong effort to improve air quality for our community, which has the highest asthma emergency department visits in the state.

We advocate for a higher allocation to reflect the true distribution of environmental burdens in Connecticut. It is important that the program design maintains consumer safeguards as has been discussed the protections such as adding additional allowances to the auction to prevent excellent excessive increases and be periodic program reviews by stakeholders are critical to contain any costs passed to the consumer.

We understand that these costs are far less than projected market fluctuations. We also support the recommendations of advocates to improve environmental justice provisions, including incorporating fair labor standards, workforce development programs, and diverse hiring and contracting to ensure access to quality jobs.

In addition, we support requiring that the equity advisory body have diverse representation, clear responsibilities, and significant agency to shape the program. Finally, this is not the first program in Connecticut of its kind. There has been mentioned previously in existing precedent in the Regional Greenhouse Gas Initiative, which returns to Billions in life time energy savings, while also improving air quality and providing directed Bill assistance.

The lifetime impact of RGGI investments in 2018 alone are estimated to be about \$2 Billion in energy bill savings, and more than formerly in short, tons of avoided carbon pollution. This Bill also helps the state to take decisive action on climate change and environmental justice, and we respectfully request your support for it. Thank you for your time today.

REP. GRESKO (121ST): Thank you, Shubhada good seeing you. I don't see any hands raised, so thank you for taking the time and for your patience and giving us your testimony.

SHUBHADA KAMBLI: Thank you very much.

REP. GRESKO (121ST): Next on the list we have Amit Patel followed by Angel Saquinaula. Okay, what happened?

GAIA MCDERMOTT: I'm not sure Representative. He is in the room. I have Amit Patel and we can move on possibly then to ID number 13 is in the room.

REP. GRESKO (121ST): Okay. Shiva Lamichhane. Shiva Lamichhane? Okay.

GAIA MCDERMOTT: Our next person is number 15, which is Robert LaFrance.

REP. GRESKO (121ST): Robert LaFrance. Yeah, there we go.

ROBERT LAFRANCE: Hey, folks? Good afternoon, Chair Cohen, and the new Chair of Gresko, congratulations. I'm very happy for you and Representative Palm, congratulations to you on your appointment to Vice-Chair. I also want to make certain, I recognize our Ranking Members Miner and Harding, as well as other Vice-Chair Senator Slap.

My name's Robert LaFrance and I'm the policy director for Audubon Connecticut. And I'm here today, I've submitted written testimony on House Bill 6551 and 6441. I don't know if they've actually gotten up on screen yet, but I know there's a lot of testimony coming in on these and hopefully there'll be put forward relatively soon. But what I want to speak on my little bit of time today is to talk a little bit about 6441, and the buyers' conveyance fee that's included in that it's Section 3 of the Bill.

The point of this, and I think folks are aware of it. It's something that we worked through the Governor's climate change. The council on climate change, worked through a lot of issues to try and establish a toolbox for municipalities to be able to use when they were doing resiliency, planning, and planning for climate change adaptation.

The purpose of the section 3 allows municipality, and this is really important. This is a voluntary opportunity for a town to begin and put in a buyers' conveyance fee in order for them to do that. They'd have to go through their town structure and determine what they would or wouldn't want to do. And then there are structures in there about how much the fee can be depending upon the transactional value. So, there are limitations on how much can actually be done. These are ceilings as opposed to you know, as opposed to something else. And it's important that you note that because it's up to the towns to decide exactly how they want to fit that from their particular aspect.

The other thing that this does, it also allows for another-- a number of other factors for the town to be able to consider not just the purchase of open space, but a series of other opportunities which would allow them to do things like resilience planning to be able to do things like open space, actually not open space, but other things like land stewardship, climate adaptation, resilience, and other community investment projects, such as urban forestry and planting.

The distinction- And I think this was mentioned earlier in the Bill that's in the way that the Bill is written versus how I think the Governor had intended it to be is that there would be a limitation on the towns that are not in compliance with the affordable housing provisions, but that limitation would only be with respect to the ability to be able to purchase open space.

We've worked with the Governor on this. We've worked with the department staff on this and I, I just want to say that we've had a great experience on all of those levels. The GC3 was a great opportunity for us to talk about a number of different ways to finance coastal resiliency and adaptation. So, we're really pleased at this package, this sort of whole package of opportunities, a toolbox, I think is the Commissioner referred to it earlier is something that we really support.

Again, bottom line on this is that it's a voluntary program. The towns could opt in if they're interested. And we've seen success in this in other States, notably in New York has used this to their advantage and have actually been able to and this is my testimony says state shows that people in businesses are attracted to communities that have healthier air and water recreation, recreation options, local food sources, and protected open space for its natural beauty. We believe all that would be helpful. I'll take questions if there are any?

REP. GRESKO (121ST): Thank you, Rob. I don't see any hands raised, so we appreciate your, Oh, wait a minute. I see Christine Palm's, Palm raised, as they say. Christine?

REP. PALM (36TH): That is the first and hopefully the last time I will hear that. Mr. LaFrance, thank you for your testimony. Do you see this Bill as furthering the concept and the practice of environmental justice?

ROBERT LAFRANCE: I do. I think this is a really great opportunity for some of the cities and towns, particularly to be able to use this opportunity to do things. I'll just take a look at something like urban forestry. I think what we've seen in many cities and towns is the desire to be able to go into

places where there isn't green space and create green space. And my hope would be that this buyers' conveyance would allow towns, particularly the larger cities and other or urban areas to actually find and create open space and create green spaces in the urban areas.

I think that's particularly important that we recognize that that's available. The other thing this does for the larger cities it allows for leverage, right? So, if a municipality were to create this type of a fund, they will be able to leverage it, to get other state and federal monies to bring more money to the city. So, I'm really encouraged that this would be helpful in the way of environmental justice, certainly in the way of being able to support open space purchases, as well as stewardship, as well as other green initiatives within cities.

REP. PALM (36TH): Thank you. I think you've raised some really important points. I appreciate it. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

REP. GRESKO (121ST): Thank you. Thank you, Robert, I don't see any other hands raised, so thanks for your testimony and for your patience.

ROBERT LAFRANCE: Thanks everybody.

REP. GRESKO (121ST): Next on our list we're going to go back to Amit Patel?

GAIA MCDERMOTT: We can certainly ask to see if he's in the room.

REP. GRESKO (121ST): Okay. Amit Patel? I'm not seeing Amit let's try Shiva Lamichhane, who I see in the room.

GAIA MCDERMOTT: And I do see now Nathan is in the room, so he's number 14.

REP. GRESKO (121ST): Okay. Let's shoot for Nathan Frohling.

NATHAN FROHLING: Thank you, Senator Cohen, Representative Gresko, Senator Miner, Representative Harding, and Honorable Members of the Environment Committee for this opportunity to express our strong support for House Bill 6441 concerning climate change adaptation. And just quickly checking, can you hear me, okay?

REP. GRESKO (121ST): Yes. Thank you.

NATHAN FROHLING: Great. Thank you. So, our support extends to all sections of the Bill and we urge its passage assuming the missing paragraph to finding municipalities that you heard in your earlier hearing about Storm Water Authorities. We trust that we'll get added. Also want to mention my colleague Cary Lynch will be testifying later on Senate Bill 884.

The nature conservancy has been actively engaged with towns to enhance climate resilience. And over the past decade, we've provided community resilience building workshops to over 425 communities across nine States with over 12,000 participants. And we see firsthand that towns are on the front lines of this issue of climate adaptation.

And so indeed climate resilience must be enabled at the local level, which is what these Bills in fact do. We also note that the Bill of course, as you know, enhances the role of the Connecticut Green Bank and the forms of support, they can provide more broadly for climate adaptation work.

Another key benefit of the proposed Bill is the potential it opens for accessing or accessing federal funding. Typically, the greatest constraint in accessing federal funds is the lack of non-federal match. The programs that this Bill will

provide such mechanisms and do so in ways that are not burdensome or unfair to taxpayers and consumers.

So, we strongly support sections one and two enabling municipal Storm Water Authorities. This Bill enables towns to set up Storm Water Authorities, but not the obligation to do so. We believe stormwater authorities are a fair and effective tool for helping address the serious issue of storm water management and issue. That's only going to become more urgent with the changing climate.

We provided written oral testimony on March 3rd, before you in support of the Storm Water Authorities measure there. We also strongly support section 3, enabling the establishment of a municipal buyers' conveyance fee. The proposed Bill would expand the uses. A town could make of such funds to include climate resilience among many other uses that we've heard about earlier. This is consistent with the GC3 through recommendations and we strongly support it.

We would note that exemption of portions of sales up to 150,000 wouldn't it would help ensure that lower income purchasers of property would not be significantly affected. We strongly support sections 4 through 18 enhancing the municipality's ability to address climate resilience by expanding the role of flood and erosion control boards and expanding the measures in projects, municipalities can undertake.

Finally, we support, strongly support sections 19 through 23, enhancing the role of the Connecticut Green Bank in helping the state enable an environmental infrastructure, quote unquote those types of projects, among others. So again, very supportive of all sections of the Bill. Happy to answer any questions you might have. Thank you.

REP. GRESKO (121ST): Nathan, thank you for your testimony and your patience and for the good work you do. I don't see any hands raised. So again, thanks for your patience. And we'll be talking about the specifics of the Bill as far as language changes, go in the future.

NATHAN FROHLING: Thank you so much for allowing me to be here today.

REP. GRESKO (121ST): Great. We're going to try Amit Patel. One last time. Okay, we're not seeing him, so we're going to try Shiva Lamichhane.

SHIVA LAMICHHANE: That's me, I'm here, sir.

REP. GRESKO (121ST): Okay, there we go. The floor is yours.

SHIVA LAMICHHANE: Okay. My name is Shiva Lamichhane I run the couple businesses in lower Fairfield County. And I've been on the business for the last 25 years. I thank you for giving me an opportunity, but I'll testified first.

I'm running these two stores for a long time, and we're having the toughest time in the history right now. And I'm going to make my testimony very simple. The business has been down. The gasoline business has been down for like 25 to 30% since the pandemic started some somewhere like some places like even 40% of the gasoline is down.

And lately the price has been gone up like a 25% in the last couple of months. And on top of that, you guys thinking about raising the tax into the gas, it's going to be a really tough time for the small business owner like me and the plan that DEEP had to increase tax to funding to the electrifying, the vehicle.

I mean, in my opinion if you guys should do that to the private sector. So that way the small business

owner like me and for the consumer, won't be paying that much. And the list of electric vehicle owner, I mean, maker or the sellers deliver upon the funding for the electrifying their vehicles.

I personally disagree with the plan to penalize us for the-- who has been supporting stayed in the community for years to help the electric vehicle maker and the sellers. It's a real impact on our community. As Commissioner Dykes talked about protecting people's assets along the coastline, but not thinking about helping us, the gasoline owners and the small business owner selling the gas throughout this year on supporting the state and community for throughout the years. That's it for me for right now. Thank you very much.

REP. GRESKO (121ST): Mr. Shiva, thank you for taking the time to out of your busy day, I'm assuming-

SHIVA LAMICHHANE: Thank you very much.

REP. GRESKO (121ST): To testify. And there is a question if you can hang on. My Co-Chair, Senator Cohen.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman and thank you Shiva for providing your testimony today. I really appreciate that.

SHIVA LAMICHHANE: You're welcome.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): I have a new nephew that dons the same name as you. Good name. What I wanted to ask you is given the fact that we heard that auto manufacturers are moving in the direction, are moving away from combustible engines. What are service stations like yours gas stations like yours doing to make that transition with them? Or is there a plan in place to transition yourself you know, for a future with more electric vehicles?

SHIVA LAMICHHANE: Yeah, that's going to be a tough one. Thank you-

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Is there any plan in place or not at this point?

SHIVA LAMICHHANE: Not at this point, but everything lately is happening is like we're losing the business and you know, the other favored planning coming into the electronic vehicles and everything. All the revenue, we get it through. It's all been going down and cut back and everything looks like it's hurting the business really bad. So, many on the way coming that's going to affect, you know, yes, just the one.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Okay. All right. Well, I appreciate that. Thank you for your answer and thank you for your testimony today.

SHIVA LAMICHHANE: Thank you.

REP. GRESKO (121ST): Thank you, Senator. Seeing no other questions Shiva, we appreciate you taking the time out of your day to give us your thoughts and what you experience on a daily basis running your business.

SHIVA LAMICHHANE: Thank you very much Representative.

REP. GRESKO (121ST): Yes. Next did I-

GAIA MCDERMOTT: Yes, I have number 17 and number 18 are the room.

REP. GRESKO (121ST): Got it. Okay. So next is Benjamin Oko.

BENJAMIN OKO: Hi, I'm Benjamin Oko, and I want to thank you for allowing me to speak in favor of a House Bill 6441. And thank you for all the work you're doing to improve Connecticut's environment as

a Committee. I've lived in Richfield for more than 25 years. I'm a member of the board of Audubon Connecticut. I also serve as a member of several environmental groups, both regional and local, including the Hudson subtonic regional conservation partnership, the Richfield action Committee for the environment, the Richfield energy task force. I was a long-time member of the conservation commission chair for 10 years, and also on the board of land Conservancy of Richfield.

I point to all of my connections, not to tell you how wonderful I am like to tell you what they share. They share three things. One is the dedication to our environment, and that's a concern about climate change. Two great ideas about what needs to be done. And three, a lack of funds. House Bill 6441 offers much to localities to help deal with climate adaptation, expanding the duties of the flood and erosion control board to include climate resilience allows for an easy path for communities to have our government entity given responsibility, to look at climate issues, expanding the Green Bank funding to resiliency projects provides a pathway for financing projects. And most importantly, conveyance fee section 3 is the way in which funding can flow to climate adaptation and resiliency at the local level.

Hopefully, Richfield will be an adopter of this option. Then the Conservation Commission could embark on much open space, forest management to encourage carbon storage. It could do right Parry and buffer work to reduce flooding. The Hudson subtonic could enlarge its newly introduced green Carter's program into Richfield with monies, for tree planting. The Richfield action Committee could apply money to the robust pollinator pathway programs that are ongoing in this town and throughout the state. And the town would be able to do more robust flood control and tree planting projects.

And beyond Richfield, but cumulative actions of other towns would allow work on critical problems of coastal sea rise and coastal erosion. And this work would be a direct benefit, not only to property and infrastructure, but birds as well by preserving nesting habitat of seaside species.

It might be of interest that I have a cottage on Cape Cod, the town Mayor has partaking in the Massachusetts version of this Bill. I've seen over the years, wonderful additions to the towns open spaces, and also to affordable housing. Although this Bill is excluding open space purchases to some towns because they lack formal housing, it does allow the money to be used for housing, which I believe should reviewed with that concern.

And in the long run may allow more towns to have full use of the funds raised by the program. Thank you for looking bravely on the Bill. I'm Benjamin Oko from Richfield.

REP. GRESKO (121ST): Thank you, Benjamin. Thank you again for taking the time today to join us. And if you have a moment, Representative Berger-Girvalo has a question for you.

REP. BERGER-GIRVALO (111TH): Thank you, Mr. Chair, actually, it's just a comment. Mr. Oko, I want to thank you for all of the help that you have given me in understanding some of the issues and how they impact our own community of Richfield. And I look forward to working with you more and connect with more of the groups that you have shared with us because of their breadth of knowledge, not just for Richfield, but for the state of Connecticut. So, thank you.

BENJAMIN OKO: Okay. Thank you. I look forward to working with you as well.

REP. BERGER-GIRVALO (111TH): Thank you, Mr. Chair.

REP. GRESKO (121ST): Seeing no other hands raised, Benjamin, thank you again. Next on our list is Pete O'Connor.

PETE O'CONNOR: Thank you for the opportunity to speak today. I'm the senior policy manager with Plug In America. We are a 501 C3 that represents the voice of the electric vehicle consumer. On behalf of these EV drivers and passengers, we support SB 884 to implement the transportation and climate initiative program.

We believe that EVs can help Connecticut achieve the emission reductions required under the TCI program. We also note that the greenhouse gas emissions from the electricity sector, which provide the fuel for electric vehicles all are currently capped by the Regional Greenhouse Gas Initiative. All petroleum emissions are not, is appropriate and reasonable to similarly cap the emissions from petroleum fuels.

The requirement of 30% reductions in emissions by 2032 are achievable responsible, and we'll have numerous co-benefits and air quality. As a market-based carbon invest program, it will use pricing those to spur innovation or providing state agencies with the revenue to address priority concerns, including criteria, air pollutants, and overburdened communities or transportation deficiencies, in underserved communities.

Electric vehicle charge with grid electricity in Connecticut is equivalent in greenhouse gas emissions to an internal combustion vehicle getting 114 miles per gallon. This is improved even further if the owner buys green power. Additionally, the nature of the vehicles as a flexible load, particularly for workplace or home charging can help the grid accommodate larger volumes of wind and solar power and EVs can also reduce electricity rates for all rate payers with off-peak charging by improving asset utilization.

The growing EV market is mobilizing private capital to manufacturers, enabling them to develop manufacturing improvements and achieve economies of scale. These economies of scale, as well as development of robust used EV market will continue to lower costs making EVs available and affordable to more and more kind of get drivers.

Plug In America supports SB 884, and sees electric vehicles as a key enabling technology for achieving the required emission reductions. Look forward to being engaged on the specific implementing policies as well.

REP. GRESKO (121ST): Thank you, Mr. O'Connor. Thank you for your testimony and for your patience today. I do not see any hands raised in the room, so again, thank you for your testimony. Next on our list is Karen Petersen.

KAREN PETERSEN: Hello? I'm Karen Petersen Mera. Can you hear me? Am I live?

REP. GRESKO (121ST): Yes, go ahead.

KAREN PETERSEN: Okay. Thank you. So, I am a board member of the Nature Conservancy of Connecticut. I am also a board member of the CLCC, which is the Connecticut Land Conservation Council. So, I am a volunteer and I represent volunteers who put their time and resources into trying to do the right thing for the planet. I have no financial incentive to be involved in this other than I really think that these are opportunities to do the right things for my children, for my children's children, and to see to the that anyway-

So specifically, what I'm interested in is HB 6441, and section 3, which is the municipal funding option, which we've worked for to give local communities a way to fund environmental and ecological projects. And the beauty of this is it's very local. So rather than being dictated from

above people who really know their land, their resources can take these precious funds that can be raised and put them into what matters to that community, which makes it optimal for social justice, but it really is also extremely good for the environment. And we have a lot of projects throughout Connecticut that could use this funding.

So, I am a big fan of the entire policy and hope it all passes, but I have a special spot in my heart for section 3 and the local municipal funding option. So, thank you for letting me speak.

REP. GRESKO (121ST): Well, thank you, Karen. And thank you for taking the time out of your day. I don't see any hands raised from Members. So we appreciate your patience and your testimony today. Next on our list is Daniel Shanahan.

DANIEL SHANAHAN: Can everybody see me good afternoon?

REP. GRESKO (121ST): We can hear you not necessarily see you, but you can proceed.

DANIEL SHANAHAN: Okay. Good afternoon, everyone, and especially Senator Cohen, Representative Gresko, and all the Distinguished Members of the Environment Committee. My name is Daniel Shanahan and I'm the director of sales and marketing for EVSE LLC of Infield, Connecticut, where we've manufactured charging stations here since 2009.

We're a subsidiary of Control Module Inc, which was founded in 1969, a small company, but we provide products and systems and technologies to Fortune 500 companies around the globe. I'm here to support Senate Bill 884. Our company supports Governor Lamont timely proposal to join other states and District of Columbia to implement this innovative transportation and climb and initiative program to reduce greenhouse gas emissions in the state and to

assist those communities that are adversely affected by carbon emissions.

We have a large base of chargers here in the state. We have thousands across the country where we work extensively with utilities and we're an innovator having implemented smart grid charging station integration as early as 2015. Regarding environmental justice communities and those communities affected by climate change, excessively our recent development was a light pole utility pole charging station that reduces 80% of the time and money to install a charging station, which has a real benefit for communities because primarily the more charges we put in the ground, the more emissions we can reduce and climate change does not take any days off.

We've been manufacturing here since 2009, and it's part of a long tradition in the history of the state. This supply chain culture that dates back to the early days of the Republic when George Washington made frequent comments about his dependency upon thrumble for local provisions.

So, we don't need to go to Europe or China or California for charging stations when we're making them here. We're also faced with another great challenge related to transportation related pollution. And more accurately, this is really called heart and lung pollution and affects the very hearts and lungs of the most vulnerable families, children, seniors, and friends across the state. In 2020 Harvard university school of public health study of 3000 US communities directly ties the toxic tailpipe emission of particulate matter to the accelerated deaths of COVID-19.

The Senate Bill 884 is I do not see it as a gas tax. I find it difficult to weigh human lives in the state of Connecticut to 9 cents a gallon, a gas rate. The Senate Bill in my view is Governor Lamont's and Connecticut DEEPs and DOT strategic,

compassionate, and courageous offensive, and shield to protect and enhance the health of the people of Connecticut.

GAIA MCDERMOTT: I just wanted to interrupt because the timer went off. I know it goes off softly, but just want you to note that.

DANIEL SHANAHAN: Yeah. Okay. Thank you. Thank you for your time.

REP. GRESKO (121ST): Daniel, thank you for your time today to give us your testimony. I do not see any hands raised in the room, but thank you for your continued work here in the state of Connecticut on behalf of electric vehicles.

DANIEL SHANAHAN: Thank you.

REP. GRESKO (121ST): Okay. Next on our list is Eric Hammerling.

ERIC HAMMERLING: Good afternoon. Co-Chairs Ranking Members, Vice-Chairs and Members of the Environment Committee. My name is Eric Hammerling and I'm the executive director of the Connecticut Forest and Purpose Association. I'm here today to testify in strong support of Governor's Bills, 6441. As you know the Governor's council on climate change report taking action on climate change and building a more resilient Connecticut for all, highlights the most urgent short-term actions for Connecticut to respond to the existential threat of climate change.

6441 addresses many of these challenges, increased storm water and flooding, inadequate environmental infrastructure, compromise, coastal resiliency and amplified racial and socioeconomic inequities. All of these challenges will continue to worsen and get more expensive over time. Unless you provide significant resources and tools for communities to respond right now.

Section 3 and 6441 would enable a limited buyers' conveyance fee to generate local revenues for land stewardship, climate adaptation and resiliency, and other locally determined environmental priorities, including tree planting and care and invasive species control.

These funds can match state or federal grants or repaying municipal bonds that were dedicated for environmental investments or help offset local tax exemptions given to farmland and other protected lands or fund critical coastal resiliency projects. Whether your community is urban, suburban, or rural, there's something for your constituents in 6441. This is not a heavy-handed mandate, but an option that would benefit communities that determine locally whether they wish to use it.

And it's worth noting that the Bill sets ceilings for what the conveyance fee percentage could be, but it doesn't set a floor. So, communities could determine to implement a lesser fee if they wish to. This conveyance, the concept is well-tested and has been implemented successfully in all three states border in Connecticut, as well as several others outside our region.

This Bill has no state fiscal impact, nor does it impact local mill rates or require increased municipal bonding. In fact, it stretches state funds helps keep mill rates in check and offsets municipal bonds. And there are significant local economic public health, quality of life and ecosystem benefits that would be sustained by investments in these environmental priorities.

Governor's Bill 6441, should be a no-brainer and I hope you will strongly support it. Thank you for the opportunity to testify, and I'd be glad to respond to, if you have any questions?

REP. GRESKO (121ST): Thank you, Eric. Well, you basically responded to the question or I was going

to pose, which was, you know, some of the testimony that I've read in opposition to this says that the municipality has the ability to either raise the mill rate or issue a bond to buy the property. But what, how come we're not going down that road?

ERIC HAMMERLING: Yeah, well, that's one of the wonderful things about this Bill. It allows municipalities to really locally make the decision on what they might need to be able to address a full range of environmental priorities. There is no need to raise the mill rate, obviously if you're able to tap into additional funding outside of the property tax realm, to be able to work on priorities. And it's a great provision of the Bill that allows municipalities to actually pay down bonds that they may have voted on previously to do this type of work. So, I see a full range of ways that this can support just about any municipality. And I hope it is deserving of your support.

REP. GRESKO (121ST): Thank you, Eric. I don't see any other hands raised in the room. Oh, wait a minute. We have our distinguished Representative Mike Demicco ready for a question?

REP. DEMICCO (21ST): I'm not sure about distinguished Mr. Chair, but you're very kind. So, Eric we're at this-- first of all, thank you for testifying. We're at this again for another year, I'm talking specifically about the conveyance fee. You know, we've done this, you know, we've tried to, you know institute this or had proposals to institute this in the past.

So, one of the big problems in the past has been that the realtor community you know, the real estate agents, who, you know, have been insisting that this is going to affect the real estate market. Do you see any evidence of that in the other states where this this type of legislation has been enacted?

ERIC HAMMERLING: No, I believe quite the contrary. And in fact, I know that this is something that'll be in the CLCC testimony a little bit later, but a study was done this last year on how many of the listings that realtors put forward on various properties tout the importance of having nearby protected land.

Over 400 listings talk about that community amenity, is they're talking about the value of properties, and there are many studies that have been done that actually show how protected land near a property helps to keep its value up. And that's a support both to a realtor who is involved with selling the property and with the municipality that gets the benefit of having you know additional property tax associated with more valuable properties.

So, there are so many positives associated with this. And I would say it all depends who you speak to. There are many realtors who are providing testimony that is, are supportive of this concept. And even if there are some who are opposed, I would say a lot of that can be addressed by the individual communities and their choice on whether they wish to implement this or not.

REP. DEMICCO (21ST): Thanks, Eric. I appreciate that. I just wanted to give you the opportunity to say it and my colleagues on the Committee, the opportunity to hear that, but I appreciate that perspective, thank you. Thank you very much. Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

REP. GRESKO (121ST): Thank you Representative Demicco and seeing other hands raised, Eric, thank you for your patience and your testimony.

ERIC HAMMERLING: Thanks so much.

REP. GRESKO (121ST): We're going to circle back now to Michael Fox, who was on the list previously higher up on the list and he's been able to get back

into the room now. And then after Michael Fox, it will be Wayne Weikel, and following him it's Manny Rutinel. So Michael, you have the floor.

MICHAEL FOX: Thank you. Good morning Committee Chairs and Members of the Environment Committee. My name is Michael Fox, executive director of the Gasoline and Automotive Service Dealers of America. We are the trade association representing Mom and Pop gasoline retailers in Connecticut. Our members are responsible for selling over 51% of all the fuels sold in Connecticut. We come before you today to oppose Senate Bill 884. I have submitted additional written testimony with reports and studies that clearly dispute DEEP and DOT testimony put forth here today.

I would like to address some of the testimony discussed earlier. First TCI is a gas tax called by a different name. The cost of the carbon credits will be passed on as higher fuel costs to Connecticut consumers. TCI perfectly fits the definition of what a tax is or is not. Second, the fact that BP and Shell support this legislation is not hard to believe no major oil company or manufacturer of gasoline or diesel fuel has a corporate presence in Connecticut as they have no company operated service stations and have not for many years.

So, the very industry that created and profited from causing Connecticut's environmental issues, escapes any responsibility for the problems created by their products. The cost under TCI are shifted to middlemen wholesalers who sell their products and to small Mom and Pop service stations offer that our association represents.

DOT testified early that is the cost of the carbon credits go up in price, the manufacturers of gasoline and diesel fuel we'll switch to creating a product that produces less emissions or go out of business. We all know these products exist today,

so I'm not sure why Connecticut and surrounding states do not go in that direction by forcing cleaner burning fuel combined with vehicles that produce less emissions.

In that vein major car manufacturers have committed by as early as 2021 to electric vehicles a full two years before TCI would take effect. At this point, a reminder of how we got here seems very appropriate over the past 15 to 20 years, over 2 Billion with a B in tax revenue collected through our industry and paid by the taxpayers of Connecticut, have been rated from the special transportation fund.

TCI is nothing more than a fourth gas tax. And as the facts of TCI become more public, the opposition grows louder. Why? That's really easy. The Governor says that models show TCI will not add more than 5 cents per gallon to the retail price of gasoline. He also says that now is the time because retail gas prices are low. The facts tell a different story, from January 2020 to March 2021, retail gas prices have increased across the state by as much as 24 cents a gallon. And right now, the future looks like more increases in fuel costs are to come. Studies in other States and California, who've had TCI since 2018 have shown price increases due to their TCI as high as 20 to 61 cents per gallon. It's these disparities—

REP. GRESKO (121ST): Mr. Michael, you're going to have to wrap it up.

MICHAEL FOX: It's these disparities that go a long way of creating trust by our industry and taxpayers, I look forward to answering any questions you may have.

REP. GRESKO (121ST): Thank you for your testimony. I would start with my distinguished Co-Chair Senator Cohen.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And thank you, Mr. Fox for your testimony. Can you walk me through a little bit about how gas prices are determined? So, if there were in fact allowances sold and purchased by wholesalers, how they would pass along that cost to the consumer?

MICHAEL FOX: This is-- Madam Chair, thank you very much for your question. This is very similar to the Connecticut grocery sales tax, which the intended purpose of that tax was to punish the major oil companies for their high prices. Way, way back when mobile oil took that grocery sales tax all the way up to the Connecticut State Supreme Court. And it was ruled by the Supreme Court that anything imposed upon the manufacturer or a wholesaler could easily be passed on to the buyers of their products.

So, if you force these distributors to purchase these carbon tax credits, they're just going to pass those additional cost on to us in higher costs. I think something no one has addressed and really needs to think about, remember they keep saying these carbon tax credits will be sold at auction.

Auctions are not designed for the lowest price they're designed to bring in the highest price that would allow the big distributors to just keep bidding up the price of these carbon credits. And then the smaller distributors wouldn't be able to afford them verified putting in that of business and eliminating competition. That is a huge problem under TCI.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): So, is it your assertion that the margins are in fact so low at the wholesale level that you do in fact need to pass them on, you know, that price to your customer?

MICHAEL FOX: Well, here's what I can tell you through about 30 years of experience on a little levy note. I started coming for the legislature trying to adjust this problem. When I was about 35

years old, I just turned 65 in February. And we're here with the same problem, the same issue in the same discussion because the legislature changes hands.

Yes, the distributors of product in Connecticut are going to pass on whatever additional cost you put on them to maintain their margin. As competition decreases such as through the auction crisis, there's an incentive to not only increase that margin, but in some cases double the margin. We've presented facts before the many Committees in the state in the past 20 years of these facts and many independent studies by OLR and other Committees have verified what we've said before these Committees.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): And Mr. Fox, can you see, is there any transparency into what those margins are currently?

MICHAEL FOX: Absolutely, not. In fact, if you look at the gouging laws, which we've worked with former Attorney General Richard Blumenthal, current Attorney General, William Todd, we have worked to strengthen and support any gas gouging legislation. And only until this year does new gas gouging legislation address those wholesalers, that double and triple our costs, but we're the front line. So, all you do is you see it in our signs at the local gas station that we went up 20 cents a gallon with no knowledge at all that really what happened, our cost was increased by 25 cents a gallon. And that is a huge problem.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): So, Mr. Fox, I apologize. I missed at the beginning of your testimony and perhaps you didn't say I'm unsure, I, who do you represent? Do you represent Pop's station owners or do a gas station owner yourself?

MICHAEL FOX: I was a former gas station owner in Stamford, Connecticut until some development was done in Washington Boulevard, the Royal Bank of

Scotland put up a 600,000 square foot building. And that's when I went out of business. I was the 41st highest volume mobile gas station in the entire United States. I was number four or five in Connecticut.

So, I represent the small Mom and Pop owners of those stations who may fly an Exxon, a Mobile, a Shell, or a BP flag. We are nothing more than the point of putting the nozzle in your car, but we're selling the products of those major oil companies.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Okay. And can you tell me what those small Mom and Pops are doing right now in terms of it? You know, I asked this question before, but you know, as auto manufacturers are starting to transition, we're hearing a lot about movement away from combustible engines. What are you anticipating this trend to look like? And how are you beginning to, or is the group of these gas station owners beginning to transition with the market?

MICHAEL FOX: So, couple of things that we've tried to do, we need to be able to participate in the new infrastructure as part of a system for charging electric vehicles. Somehow are going to need to generate revenue from that. More importantly, what is the major issue of an electric vehicle? Right now, you and any Member of this Committee can basically jump in your car, drive from Connecticut to Florida, and you have to stop for somewhere between five and ten minutes for rest refreshment or fuel your car.

In an electric vehicle, you're going to have to stop after about 300 miles for 24 hours or longer to recharge your vehicle before you can continue that trip. So of course, the hope is high-speed rail or airlines will replace you having to use your car. And until it's there, we shouldn't be moving any faster than we already are. With that said, our

industry recognizes that electric vehicles are on their way.

Coincidentally, the cost for and I represent independent repair shops of servicing electric vehicles is somewhere around \$300,000 of an initial investment, similar to the \$150,000 investment repair shops had to make to meet emissions standards. When we had emission testing here in Connecticut. You should also know that already 250 Cadillac dealers have opted out of servicing or being a Cadillac brand dealer and taking on electric vehicles solely because of the cost.

What I'm clearly trying to say to you is you're moving way too fast in an industry that's changing. And the natural changes that will take effect. We'll take care of this problem. Gas powered vehicles, aren't going away. Just use some logic. There still are 1936, 46 and 56 vehicles on the road today. We're going to have to have fuel for those vehicles. They've adapted that those vehicles required leaded gas, and we now sell unleaded gas.

So, adaptation works. You guys are just going way too fast and more importantly, I understand the reasons you're going too fast, but look at the study out of California, that TCI in California, which has been affect since 2018 has actually increased the amount of emissions because it's simply they buy the credits and they pollute more and it's not working. So, I think you guys really need to take a look at that.

Here's another thing the whole purpose of TCI was that by creating a region that everybody opted into this program would not create any advantages or disadvantages for one state. We saw that when Connecticut had the highest gas tax in the nation and that our consumers and others started buying in Massachusetts and New York, because we were such a small state, nine states have now opted out the

Sierra club on Friday, opted out of its support of TCI.

Certainly, the Sierra Club is no friend of the gasoline service station industry, but they saw the flaws in TCI, have no guarantee of where the funds are being spent, no guarantee that funds would not be rated. And those are the same old problems I've been talking about since I was in my mid-thirties.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Well, thank you for that. I know we have the Sierra Club testifying later. I'll be looking forward to hearing their responses. You mentioned charging with EV that people would have to stay overnight or 24 hours to charge. I think that those days have gone by the wayside and the advent of supercharges that charge cars and a half hour to an hour's time.

I will just bring you back though to my question, which was how has the industry adapting and transitioning as we move to more and more electric vehicles. You started to answer that question and I just wonder Mr. Fox do you believe that government assistance will be necessary to help healthy Mom and Pop and gas stations as they begin to make this transition?

MICHAEL FOX: Absolutely. Government assistance will be necessary because you're talking about right now for our industry, we're under attack on a dual front, on the profits on gasoline, through taxes and on the elimination of selling of cigarettes with a flavored product. Those are two huge profit points for our service station industry, and also a big reason why the customer or consumer comes to us.

So, if you eliminate the reason they come to us and you eliminate the products, as another reason they come to us, we either go out of business are totally dependent on government assistance.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Well, and what I'm talking about is specific to the transition, you know, to provide charging and the like, and it would seem to me that TCI would represent an excellent opportunity for these Shell station and gas stations that would need government insistence in order to make that decision. But I thank the Committee for its indulgence of my questions. And thank you for your testimony, Mr. Fox.

MICHAEL FOX: Thank you.

REP. GRESKO (121ST): Next we have Representative Piscopo with questions followed by Representative Mushinsky.

REP. PISCOPO (76TH): Thank you, Mr. Chairman, thank you, Michael, for your testimony. Appreciate it. It was brought up earlier in this hearing that the price of gas has gone up 7 cents since January. It was brought up that maybe it was because of springtime driving or that can you shed some light on the reasons for those increase we've seen over the last couple of months or?

MICHAEL FOX: Absolutely. And I will be on WTC tomorrow on that exact issue, but major oil companies, when it comes to gasoline prices, they look out five to ten-- eight to ten years. Here's what we have that has happened already. Not blaming it on Republicans or Democrats. I'm just merely giving you the facts.

A pipeline has been canceled. It is clear that drilling on federal lands has been halted by the current administration in Washington. So, it is crystal clear to the oil companies that we are now going to have to start importing crude oil again. And the cost of that importing is going to skyrocket that's what's driving the increase in prices.

When you hear the talk about, oh no, it's demand. It's demand. Look at the facts. Look at where

inventory levels are. That's something that we track every day and look at where demand is. We're nowhere back to where we were prior to pandemic. It's up a little, but nowhere near justifying the price increases that we're seeing.

More importantly, every single time they tried to increase prices before the pipeline was canceled and drilling on federal land was halted. We saw it go up in two or three days and in fact went down even more than it went up because they couldn't pull.

So, it's a recognition that we're going to have to start bringing in crude oil from countries that aren't friendly to us Venezuela, South America, and Saudi Arabia. And it's going to cost more to do that. They're just looking at the future costs and charging us now.

REP. PISCOPO (76TH): Thank you, Michael. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

REP. GRESKO (121ST): Thank you, Representative Piscopo. Next is Representative Mushinsky followed by Representative Callahan.

REP. MUSHINSKY (85TH): Okay. I want to ask again about the charging stations. My understanding is for week because we have two of them in Wallingford, there actually we have four, but we have them at the train station. We have them at Stop and Shop and at Honda dealership. the ones that Stop and Shop are fast charge, they're half hour.

So, a person comes in, they put their car in the charger. They go in and they do some shopping and then they come out to half-hour later. Why couldn't your stores be the place where a person could stop for their snacks and coffee while their car is charging for a half hour. And why couldn't we use TCI funds to help you purchase a charging station?

MICHAEL FOX: I think you can. That is where we as an industry, see the need that we're going to go. But I think you are really missing a huge point. If tomorrow, every car manufacturer said we're only going to produce electric vehicles. You still have millions and millions and millions of vehicles on the road that are gasoline powered. We are going to need to provide product for those people for many years to come.

So, service stations are going to have to be dual use. We're going to have to be charging stations and we're going to have to provide that fuel. Do we recognize that that fuel is probably going to be at a higher cost? Yes. And that's just the way it's going to be. So, we're, we're going to need your help in the state legislature is loosening up zoning regulations that say, I can use a parking space for dual purpose to charge an electric vehicle while the consumer is in shopping because otherwise a lot of service stations just are, we're not the size of a stop and shop.

REP. MUSHINSKY (85TH): That is true, but I'm trying to get you to look at the opportunities for your business. I think you can get people to stop, do a charge if they are on electric and buy something from your store. And that's how they occupy their time waiting for the charge.

So, and I hope that TCI can be used to help you make that transition because over time we'll have more people on electric vehicles and fewer people on fossil fuels until finally one completely supplants the other. And as you said, it's going to take several years, but I'm trying to encourage you to not just block the transition, but to figure out how your business can work with the transition and figure out how the TCI program can help you with the transition so that you'll still be in business serving a public need, but we're still making our transition away from fossil fuels.

MICHAEL FOX: I think I would like to say to you so that it is crystal clear to this Committee and I'm 100% on the record. We are not against transitioning. We realize it's coming. What we're saying to you is, TCI is not the right mechanism. It does not have the stop gaps in place needed to ensure we're all going to be helped. And as such it's the wrong mechanism because look at states that already have TCI, it's not doing what it said it was supposed to do.

The other issue, the grid, our electric grid is not going to handle in its present form. And you're talking about five or six years of major investments by the electric companies before the grid will handle. Do you want to be California where the transformers are blowing and no one can charge their vehicle anywhere? Not at home, not at a service station, not at Stop and Shop and not at a dealership. Why? Because the grid is down and that's what's happening in California right now.

REP. MUSHINSKY (85TH): Thank you Madam Chair or Mr. Chairman. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

REP. GRESKO (121ST): Thank you, Mary. Next on the list is Representative Callahan followed by Senator Miner.

REP. CALLAHAN (108TH): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Fox, thanks for coming in and talking with us today. I had a couple of questions, one of the major statement than a question, one of the major concerns of my constituents that I continue to hear from, and I am a new Legislator and I am spending a lot of time responding to constituents, is the high cost of fuel. The high cost of electricity.

The way I understand it is we have on natural gas lines that come into Connecticut, that to generate electricity, for the most part, they only have a certain capacity. So, in January we all saw our electricity delivery rates go through the roof

because we have to turn to other fuels to generate electricity.

So, a couple of questions. Number one question to you is where do you see in the next three, four, five years, the price of a consumer's fuel at the pump going to, with this new program?

MICHAEL FOX: Well, okay. I was laughed at about ten, 12 years ago when I said the real price of gasoline in the state of Connecticut due to its tax structure should be somewhere around \$2 and \$2 and 25 cents a gallon. And I think at that time we were around \$3.70, \$3.80 everybody laughed at me and we quickly got there.

We got there because we became energy independent in America. We did not have to import foreign crude oil, which costs more money. Do I see gasoline prices continuing to increase over the long-term, long-term being ten years? Yes. I think if I was accurately able to predict where it's going to go as a whole, I'd be a multimillionaire.

The problem is the complexities at a Washington. The complexities on a state-by-state basis have a huge impact on the final price of gasoline. Gasoline is priced on a state-by-state basis. And you would think that in states that have refineries like Texas, right in the state, they have the cheapest price of gasoline, they don't.

There's a lot of reasons for that, but basically, it's because the oil companies take their total cost of operating within the United States and what it costs to bring in product locally, internationally from Canada, from Mexico. And then they push that all together and they want to make a profit.

I would say to you that right now with the current administration in Washington, in current proposals that I see in our state, I see prices going up at least another 50 cents a gallon over, I would say 12

to 18 months. And that's just due to the normal market conditions that we're seeing based upon current government regulations and changes.

REP. CALLAHAN (108TH): Thank you, Mr. Fox. It's certainly become a burden on the middle-class to get to work with all these the recent increases in price and the skyrocketing electricity rates in Connecticut. So, I thank you for your insight. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MICHAEL FOX: One thing I would like to point out that I want you to consider. So, when you look at the average consumer in Connecticut and the burden on them, the average Phillip in Connecticut is about 12 gallons. So, if gas goes up 10 cents a gallon, that's an increase of a dollar 20. We buy gasoline by the tanker load, 8,500 gallons. So, an increase for us and we pay COD, there's no, we don't get any time to load-- The tanker truck pulls into the local service station and the money is electronically transferred. If it's not there, the load doesn't get dropped.

So, when a load of gasoline goes up from \$12,000 to \$20,000 to \$25,000 to \$35,000, and you're buying a load of gas every single day, like I was, that is a huge burden on me, the business owner, to be able to even provide the product to you, the consumer.

REP. CALLAHAN (108TH): Thank you. And thank you, Mr. Chairman for indulging.

REP. GRESKO (121ST): Thank you. And next we have Senator Miner.

SENATOR MINER (30TH): You've done a great job at the helm there, Mr. Chairman. So, Mr. Fox, I'm imagining at every one of the gas stations that are in the 30th district how this process will work. And I couldn't agree with you more that this is not an either-or situation. No matter how you look at transitioning, there will be tens of thousands of

automobiles and heavy and light duty trucks in the state of Connecticut, probably hundreds of thousands that will be going through some transition.

So, to imagine that gasoline and diesel fuel are going to go away completely in my lifetime, it's hard to imagine, but if it were, then I have to imagine how and any of the three local gas stations in Litchfield how the charging stations would work and how people would still gain access to the store during even if it's a 10-minute charge. How real is that in terms of being a problem statewide, if you thought about it that far, and what is the mechanism in place right now to allow a gas station filling station to charge for the electricity that's dispensed from a charging station.

MICHAEL FOX: So, we have been approached as long as eight years ago with the charging station industry on working with groups, associations like myself and SEMA, Chris Herb's group that would quickly ramp up the charging station industry because the fastest way to do it is through the already existing network of service stations. Not only along I95, major roadways parkways, things like that, but your local service station operates.

So, it's there, it's the cost prohibitiveness of having a charging station and also having to pump gasoline or diesel fuel, because I can't just do one or the other. I have to be able to do both in order to maximize my profits and stay there. Do I see a thinning of our industry because of that? Yes. Just like when we did underground tank legislation and we created the environment-- the gas grocery seats tax to help for underground leaks, we thinned out the number of service stations because the smaller ones that only pumped 10,000, 15,000, 20,000 gallons of fuel a month, it just wasn't economical for them to do it, but they can do a charging station now.

So that's something that, again, I think there's going to be many, many charging stations. Again, we don't see charging stations as the problem. The grid is not going to handle when everybody gets at home between five and 7:00 PM and everyone plugs in their car at the same time, the grid is going to explode. Like it has been in California. Transformers are literally exploding on the polls and it happens pretty much all about the same time. In the evening when people get home and that's going to happen here on a mass level, our grid is in much poor shape than the grids are in California, way poor.

So, we need to look at that first electric cars are coming. We're not going to stop them. They are the future. They will be here, but we need to do better planning on how we slowly move into that. Not overnight move into it. It sounds good. It's not going to happen.

SENATOR MINER (30TH): And so, I my last question, Mr. Chairman, so has there been any discussion on rates that a station would be allowed to charge those that want to refill, so to speak their electric batteries?

MICHAEL FOX: I don't think there has been a substantive discussion. I think I see where you're going. You don't want to see gouging on rates for consumers. And I think similar to how we retail gasoline now competition would be requiring service stations. And I would support that.

And our industry would probably support it where we have to have a big sign on our charging stations saying what that upcharge is or what you're going to be charged per kilowatt so that the consumer can make the choice. I'm all about consumer choice. I'm not about price controls, even though I would love to regulate those big major oil companies that make Billions, it's just not the way to go here in America.

SENATOR MINER (30TH): Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

REP. GRESKO (121ST): Thank you, Senator. And seeing no other hands raised Michael, thank you for your testimony and for your information and point of view. That will certainly draw some questions. So, thanks again.

MICHAEL FOX: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

REP. GRESKO (121ST): Next, we're going to go to Wayne Weikel followed by Manny Rutinel. Wayne, thanks for your patience.

WAYNE WEIKEL: No, no problem. That's an interesting conversation. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee. My name is Wayne Weikel. I'm here today on behalf of the Alliance for Automotive Innovation formed last year. The Alliance for Automotive Innovation represents the auto manufacturers who produce nearly 99% of all new light duty vehicles in the US each year. As well as major tier one suppliers and other automotive technology companies.

I'm here today in support of Senate Bill 884 to allow Connecticut to participate in the transportation climate initiative program. I have provided written testimony, small, tried to just hit on a couple of points here today. Just to be respectful of your time.

A lot of the objections that I've heard so far essentially boils down in reading some of the objections that have been, have been filed boiled down to people saying, well, I opposed this because I can't afford a Tesla. And I get that. I, you know, neither can I. But it's important to remember as the Commissioner said at the outset that even if Senate Bill 884 was passed this year, the transmission climate initiative program will not

start this year. It won't start until 2023. And there's the reason why that's important at least from the auto manufacturer perspective.

Today there are about 40 battery electric plug-in hybrid and hydrogen vehicles available to sale to consumers. By 2025, I remember sub committed to over 130 new models that is essentially tripling the number of consumer choices that will be available in the marketplace. That means there'll be more selection of vehicle size and body type. They'll be pickup options and SUV options. They'll be all wheel drive options, and there'll be options with even more range. And you know with each year that passes more lightly used vehicles will find their way into the used vehicle marketplace place.

Today, if you were to look for a used EV, you could find a Chevy bolt for about \$15,000 in a Nissan leaf for about \$10,000. You know, in the years ahead, there will be more consumer options for new and used vehicles in each segment and in each price points. And I think that is important to think of how this industry is progressing into the future.

The other objection I've heard focuses solely on the cap side of the TCI cap and invest program. People who are only looking at the possibility that it may cost them more to refill their gas tank in the future and that's understandable, but you have to look at the TCI in totality, you know, it's the invest side where a lot of the benefits come in. As I said, our members are working hard to give consumers more options, but with the invest side of the TCI program, Connecticut can target monies at the other obstacles that are keeping consumers from going electric today.

Perhaps it's, it's a more targeted charging infrastructure. It has been discussed for people to charge when they're away from home or you know, a big segment of people, myself included, who aren't able to charge at home, where are they going to

charge? the range anxiety continues to be the number one obstacle cited by consumers.

Done correctly, the TCI has the opportunity to really accelerate the de-carbonization of the transportation sector. Done correctly, the TCI has the opportunity to let people realize that refilling that gas tank is no longer their only option. I thank you for your time and we encouraged passage of 884.

REP. GRESKO (121ST): Thank you, Wayne. Thank you for your patience. I don't see any hands raised in the room, so thank you for your testimony.

WAYNE WEIKEL: Great. I appreciate it. Thank you.

REP. GRESKO (121ST): Okay. Next on our list is a Manny Rutinel.

MANNY RUTINEL: Thank you so much, Chair. My name is Manny Rutinel and I'm a law student at Yale law school and co-chair of the Yale environmental law association. I just want to thank each of the Representatives, Senators and Chairs in advance for hearing my testimony inspires me so much public engagement and testimony on these issues. I'm here testifying that you amend SB 884, to include climate friendly food procurement language, which is the language that the Committee originally considered as HB 5030.

Climate friendly food procurement is an efficient way to further current law that requires the state to procure green products and the electric building and transportation sectors by expanding considerations to food. Inefficient foods create an enormous strain on our environment. Reducing the impacts of our food system is absolutely necessary to reach international goals of maintaining temperature increases below two degrees Celsius. With the growing population, this issue requires our urgent attention.

The ITCC recently concluded the agricultural emissions would increase by 40% by 2050, without strong interventions simply put achieving the goals of the Paris agreement, will not be possible without a substantial transition in the global food system from environmentally damaging foods, to more sustainable choices. To address the critical environmental problems with agriculture, a team of leading scientists, very scientific backgrounds and nations created a report known as the planetary health diet, which outlines the ideal food production levels that optimize both health and sustainability.

With their goals, nutrition, sleep feeding 10 Billion people in 2050 while maintaining the environmental objectives of the Paris agreement. The report concludes that the globe must dramatically shift away from animal products and towards fruits, vegetables, legumes, whole grains, and nuts. This environmental shift will also have tremendous health benefits for consumers, which reduces the risk of heart disease, cancer, and diabetes, which according to the Center for Disease Control with the leading causes of death and Connecticut.

Codifying climate friendly food procurement would position Connecticut as a leader in greenhouse gas emission reductions. Several cities across the nation are and states who are either considering or have already passed similar Bills.

Similar legislation at the local level has not only lowered greenhouse gas emissions, but it saved valuable taxpayer dollars. For instance, the Oakland unified school district lowered its carbon footprint by 14% while saving 42,000 per year by procuring fewer carbon intensive foods. Plus, there's a substantial amount of support for this idea as of now, 22 groups have signed on and supported the language originally in HB 5030,

including greater Hartford, environmental coalition, the Sierra club center for biological diversity in Connecticut.

Connecticut, and the environment's Committee have a large role to play in these efforts. I ask that you please amend SB 884 to include climate friendly food language, the same language previously considered as HB 5030, thank you so much.

REP. GRESKO (121ST): Manny, thank you. Thank you for your patience. I do not see any hands raised in the room, so thank you for your testimony. Next on our list is Lucian Pugliaresi.

LUCIAN PUGLIARESI: Thank you so much. So my name is Lucian Pugliaresi, I'm president of the energy policy research foundation. We're a non-partisan public policy think tank founded in 1944. We do a lot of research in the intersection of energy and public policy. Much of that on fuels policy, our research programs have received supports both DOE and DOD from the Obama initiatives in previous administration.

The first thing I'd like to point out is TCI will have no measurable impact on global climate and its impact is highly regressive. It's a very regressive program. The people who will most suffer from this program are members of the minority community and low-income communities. And this is especially difficult in a period as many of these communities are emerging from the pandemic.

In order to really make a difference in the climate sphere, we're going to need cooperation on a global scale. And I submitted written testimony. I hope you will take a look at some of the charts. I think this is the most serious problem because we're really in danger of just turning this into virtue signaling.

And one of the problems, another problem is I heard a lot about today is the confounding of climate with local air pollution. These are two different programs. We have criteria pollutants. We have programs to deal with criteria pollutants. Climate is a global problem unless we get global cooperation, we're not going to make any progress. And in order to get global cooperation, we're going to have an international standards. The administration is going to have to go into the global community and negotiate reductions worldwide. Otherwise, all of this effort will be all costs and no gain.

By the way, I don't know if you, there's a lot of discussion about gasoline prices, prices are up. I believe they're going to continue to rise for a bit, and this is, and the TCI is going to add to this. The other thing I might-- the other thing I want to point out is that the communities involved in these programs of transition need to have a careful understanding of what we do about what we call magical thinking.

We're going to have to mine 300 to 800% more cobalt for batteries. We're going to need massive commitments to lithium mining. All of these things will result in supply chain, risk, and energy security risks for our country. So, as we proceed with this, I would hope that the Committee and the legislation will take these things under consideration. Thank you.

REP. GRESKO (121ST): Thank you, Lucian. Thank you for the information. I don't see any hands raised in the room. So again, thank you for your testimony and your point of view. Next, on our list. If correct me if I'm wrong, but it's Mike Morrissey.

GAIA MCDERMOTT: That's who I have as well.

REP. GRESKO (121ST): Okay. And then followed by Bert Hunter.

GAIA MCDERMOTT: Yeah. So, we'll have several will differ, because we have three, that'll be talking for the Connecticut Green Banks.

REP. GRESKO (121ST): Understood. But first Mike Morrissey.

GAIA MCDERMOTT: Yes.

MIKE MORRISSEY: Good afternoon, Senator Cohen and Representative Gresko, Ranking Members Miner and Harding and Distinguished Members of your Committee. I'm Mike Morrissey representing the Alternate Fuels Coalition of Connecticut. Our coalition is an active member in our state's three clean cities, coalitions, and I'm here to support Senate Bill 884, AN ACT REDUCING TRANSPORTATION RELATED CARBON EMISSIONS.

Our organization, along with our state's clean cities organizations have played a key role in facilitating the adoption of over 700 propane powered school buses in Connecticut, impact there are over 22,000 propane buses operating throughout the United States and in a COVID free environment transporting over 1.2 million children a day.

A propane powered school buses are 96% cleaner compared to their clean diesel counterpart. And today's propane produced buses meet the most stringent ARB medium to heavy duty emissions standards. The backbone of this legislation implements the transportation climate initiative program, which is squarely designed to reduce harmful emissions in the transportation sector by promoting the broader use of cleaner transportation fuels.

Propane is the third leading transportation fuel in the world with over 27 million vehicles in operations today. In fact, based on life cycle and

Walter wheel analysis, propane powered vehicles are cleaner than ones operating on electricity.

Going forward, renewable propane, which is just emerging will allow propane to maintain its edge over electricity when it comes to reduced emissions. One important component of TCI is the 35% carve out. It offers to our environmental justice communities. The city of Hartford is one of these communities and propane is ideally positioned to assist the city of Hartford in reducing its transportation emissions with a very little, if not any financial assistance from TCI funding.

Hook on gas, now maintains a publicly available and scalable propane dispenser at the recently opened pride travel center at 10 Jennings road in Hartford. This same location offers Tesla pass chargers, conventional fast charges, and a hydrogen dispenser, about in this facility, the city of Hartford maintains a school bus parking yard and just across route 91, the city of Hartford to maintain school bus parking for the balance of its fleet with no increase in infrastructure costs.

The city of Hartford now has the ability to operate the buses on propane versus dirty or dirty or diesel ones. We hope the city of Hartford will join the city of Boston and Waterbury, which are respectively operate 250 and 149 propane powered school buses.

The reason we have unacceptable air quality in our state is because we simply use too much gasoline and diesel fuel. Senate Bill 884, promises to bring clean appeals like electricity, propane and hydrogen and natural gas-powered vehicles store state. We encourage your Committee to move this legislation so we can breathe a little better in our state. Thank you very much for this opportunity to express our view.

REP. GRESKO (121ST): Mr. Morrissey, thank you for your time and for your patients. I don't see any

hands raised in the room at the moment. So again, thank you for your testimony.

MIKE MORRISSEY: Thank you very much.

REP. GRESKO (121ST): Next on our list is the-- well the Green Bank trifecta. It seems--

BRYAN GARCIA: Good afternoon. Co-Chairs Cohen and Gresko, Vice-Chairs Palm and Slap and Ranking Members, Harding and Miner and Members of the Environment Committee, good afternoon. My name is Bryan Garcia. I am president and CEO of the Connecticut Green Bank. I'm joined today by Bert Hunter, our executive vice president and chief investment officer and Brian Farman, our general counsel and chief legal officer. We've signed up for two other speaking slots, so you can cancel those slots for us here today.

We're here today to express our support of Governor Bills 884 and 6441. Governor's Bill 884 as written would create a regulatory mechanism to reduce greenhouse gas emissions from transportation. As you are aware, the transportation sector is the largest emitter of greenhouse gases in Connecticut and throughout the Northeast.

Transportation-related air pollution of SOx and NOx and particulate matter adversely impact vulnerable communities causing respiratory ailments, which translates into loss days at work in school, higher medical expenditures and lost economic output resulting from these impacts.

TCI is modeled after the successful Regional Greenhouse Gas Initiative or RGGI, which reduces emissions from the power generation sector. For RGGI, the Green Bank receives about one fourth of allowance proceeds, which we invest to help finance clean energy improvements through the commercial property assessed clean energy program otherwise known as CPACE.

Since 2013, 135 of Connecticut cities and towns have enabled the Green Bank to invest \$60 million in RGGI allowance proceeds and \$120 million from the private sector in total, over \$180 million in over 330 projects for commercial, industrial, and nonprofit end use customers saving them an estimated \$300 million over the life of the projects through CPACE.

TCI, like RGGI will be a catalyst for private investment in the modernization and decarbonization of Connecticut and the region's transportation infrastructure and improve the lives of all Connecticut residents. But in particular, those residents living in communities that are overburdened and underserved by the transportation system and directly impacted by the pollutants are noted.

Consequently, we support Governor Bill 884. Governor's Bill 6441 includes an expansion of the scope of the Connecticut Green Bank beyond clean energy to also include environmental infrastructure. The Green Bank would use its existing bonding authority to raise capital as well as access federal funds were available and appropriate without additional cost to the rate payer. To support our bonding authority, we are seeking to increase our access to the special capital reserve fund or scarf from \$100 million to \$250 million.

And we're looking to be able to issue bonds for clean energy with the maturity of up to 25 years, which is the expected life of a solar PV project and for environmental infrastructure for up to 50 years. But in both cases, bonds wouldn't be permitted to have a maturity longer than the useful life of the projects, to which the bond proceeds will be invested.

Alongside institutional investors, insurance companies, and pension funds. We expect Connecticut residents and Americans across the country will be

interested in purchasing bonds from the Connecticut Green Bank that will provide us with the low cost and long-term capital. We would need to finance clean energy and environmental infrastructure projects.

The Green Bank issued its inaugural green Liberty bond, a bond with a much lower denomination, a thousand dollars than the typical municipal bond. This bond was highly successful and attracted investment, not only from Connecticut residents, but from investors across the nation. We're planning to issue our next green Liberty bond on earth day. This coming April 22nd, and we hope that many of you will consider buying one.

Governor's Bills, 884 and 6441, where recommendations from the Governor's council on climate change, otherwise known as the GC3, which includes 23 members who receive feedback and guidance from a hundred contributing organizations and over 230 working group members. As the lead on climate change for Governor Rowland and Governor Rell from 2002 through 2007, I can attest to the extensiveness and transparency of the stakeholder process leading to the support of these well-reasoned recommendations by the GC3, and now brought forth by Governor Lamont through these Bills.

The Green Bank can't express it enough by attracting more and more private investment into the infrastructure of our growing green economy. We will create jobs in our communities, help our growing businesses thrive and improve the lives of our families. We'd be happy to take any questions that you might have. Thank you.

REP. GRESKO (121ST): Thank you, Bryan. And there we go. We're going to start off with my Senate Co-Chair, Senator Cohen.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Thank you, to my Co-Chair. I'm great to see you, Bryan as always, and thank you

for your testimony. Can you walk me through a little bit about how this will work in terms of funding, some of these environmental infrastructure projects, do they, you know, for folks who aren't as familiar with the Green Bank, is it the contractors that seek the funding? Is it the municipalities that seek the funding from the Green Bank? How does that work?

BRYAN GARCIA: Great. Thank you for the question Senator Cohen, and it's great to be with the Environment Committee really for the first time we spend a lot of our time in the energy and technology Committee. Let me take a first crack at the question, and then I'll invite a Bert Hunter to weigh in.

The way the Green Bank model works. In this case through clean energy, we are provided a system benefit fund. It has a one mil surcharge on ratepayer Bills. It comes to about seven to \$10 per family per year that aggregates to about \$25 million. We turn that \$25 million into \$300 million of investment in Connecticut.

We do that through a variety of different tools that we use. One is a credit enhancement where our goal is to utilize local community banks and credit unions to provide Connecticut families with the capital, they need to make clean energy improvements on their homes. So, what we do is we provide a second loss to those loop, local community banks and credit unions. They take the first one and a half percent of losses on the principal value of those loans. We take the next 7% of losses utilizing our balance sheet as the form of a repayment.

We have those community banks and credit unions have provided over \$75 million of loans to Connecticut families. And the Green Bank has only had to incur \$75,000 of losses. So, what we're doing here is we're helping our local community banks and credit unions recognize that Connecticut families seek

financing to make clean energy improvements to their properties and when they do that, they lower their energy costs and they are backed by the Green Bank in the form of losses. So, we are helping them think through how they might utilize their own capital in the future.

So, this is one example of a credit enhancement. The second program I'd suggest is CPACE. I did refer to a Commercial Property Assessed Clean Energy. So, this is a program that allows municipalities to voluntarily opt in to CPACE. So, I mentioned 138 of Connecticut's, 169 municipalities have done this which then allows end use customers like commercial, industrial, and nonprofit organizations to put a benefit assessment on their property.

Think of this as you know, when we our municipalities want to fund things that have a public benefit, like a sidewalk a municipal wastewater treatment facility. Those get put on as an assessment on that property owners Bill in this case, clean energy is treated as a benefit assessment. It provides a number of benefits to society. So that benefit assessment essentially provides capital. We provide capital as well as private investors to those property owners, to finance clean energy improvements on their properties.

As they do that, we've provided \$60 million of our RGGI funds. There are other private lenders in the market like Greenworks lending from Darien and a number of other private capital providers who provide those end-use consumers with the capital that they need to finance those improvements. And from those improvements, again, like families clean energy reduces the burden of energy costs on their businesses.

So that is a direct loan product for us. So, it sits on our balance sheet as a loan or a benefit

assessment in the context of the policy parlance. But those are two examples. One is a credit enhancement. The other one is alone benefit assessment. But let me turn it to Bert to expand on that and maybe apply it to environmental infrastructure of the clean energy model.

BERT HUNTER: Yes. Thanks Bryan. And good to be with you, Senator Cohen, and the entire Committee. The Green Bank could finance a number of these projects by issuing what are known as revenue bonds. They would look to the revenues of the underlying project and that could be with a contractor, or it could be with the municipality.

An example of this might be, and we all know that we have a tremendous waste problem in the state. And we do not utilize organic waste as efficiently as we could and deal with some of that waste problem. We could establish a number of anaerobic digesters, which could be sponsored by municipality or a group of municipalities and that project could be paid back financed by the bonds that the Green Bank can issue and paid back by the revenues that would come from that project. For example, with tip fees for the organics brought to the digester as well as revenues from say the electricity that could be generated from the gas that would come from the organics that are processed in the digester.

So that's just one example of how it could work, but it could work either by funding, contractors for these environmental infrastructure projects, or it could be through financing municipalities themselves.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): So-- and thank you for both of your in-depth answers there because I am specifically looking at the environmental infrastructure fund now is laid out in the Bill 6441. And I'm just sort of thinking through this in terms of resiliency projects you know, a town has saved up a certain amount of money and these climate

change and coastal resiliency reserves doesn't have quite what they need, or perhaps doesn't want to drain the fund completely. Do you envision a sort of application process through the Connecticut Green Bank for these municipalities to you know, receive bonding through this infrastructure fund?

BERT HUNTER: Yes, I would say that the Green Bank has over the years issued a number of RFPs for projects. It would be, it would be a good process to bring forward. We actually have an open RFP process right now but that's for clean energy projects. We could certainly expand those to include environmental infrastructure.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Okay. I think that was it for me. Thank you, to my Co-Chair.

REP. GRESKO (121ST): Thank you, Senator. Next with questions is Representative Chafee.

REP. CHAFEE (33RD): Thank you, Mr. Chair. Thank you for speaking with us today and all the work you do with the Green Bank. I had a question some of the language in 6441, on line 752, it talks about Quasi-Public establish some of the Green Bank [inaudible] so let's start subsidy or upset bank shall be deemed a closet public and less sub subsidiary is a single member, LLC. I was just curious, what exactly is that language saying?

BERT HUNTER: What Representative Chafee with that is getting to the statutory perspective on that, and then there's the actual transaction. So, from a statutory history perspective of public back 16 to 12, which overhauled the Green Bank statute. So, it's established its independence from Connecticut innovations, also added that the green bay could establish some city areas in its own right.

In essence, the language that was adopted replicated Connecticut innovations subsidiary powers with one important change, as it relates to tax treatment.

The Green Bank did forego the traditional tax-exempt status that subsidiaries of Quasi-public agencies enjoy to ensure that the Green Bank would be able to access the federal investment tax credit. So, it could offer Connecticut residents, businesses, and municipalities, a low cost on solar offer. It was that actual adjustment really wasn't needed because there are ways that we can incorporate corporations instead of LLCs under the Green Bank umbrella that actually protect the federal EITC.

So, the current proposal would offer the Green Bank subsidiaries in SPV, Special Purpose Vehicles the same benefit of tax-exempt status that all other Quasi-public entities enjoy for their subsidiaries. If such subsidiary is a disregarded entity. And that basically means that the subsidiary is totally disregarded and from a taxation and other purposes is collapsed into the structure of the Green Bank.

So, there's no distinguishing the subsidiary from the Green Bank, and that's special way that you have to establish these the single-- they're called single member LLCs because the only member owning the LLC is in fact, the Green Bank.

REP. CHAFEE (33RD): Okay. Thank you for your explanation. I appreciate that. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

REP. GRESKO (121ST): Thank you. I do not see any other hands up in the room, but I had one question. You were in the waiting room and you heard Michael Fox saying multiple boots on the ground type of a commentary. Do you think that the Green Bank in this expanded role, if this Bill goes through, would be willing-- not willing-- to be able to assist the existing station owners with a transition or an adaptation? Is that something within the purview?

BRYAN GARCIA: Great, question. Representative Gresko, we were kind of going back and forth as some of the conversation was being raised. There's

actually a current docket in the equitable modern grid proceeding over at Pura docket number 17, 1203 REO4 that has to deal with electric vehicles where Pura is setting a conversation around the electric vehicle infrastructure.

We can envision the opportunity of identifying small businesses and potentially creating opportunities for them to build out the EV recharging infrastructure, the fast-charging station infrastructure that they would need to create additional revenue streams and the like you know, we effectively are a resource for businesses, right? So as like on the CPACE, the commercial property assessed clean energy policy, those are end-use customers who are trying to manage their energy costs and making improvements in their building to lower their energy costs. So, they're being very active in voluntarily addressing the opportunity.

We can envision ourselves with this new authority and our existing programs to help those small businesses who are trying to recognize new revenue opportunities develop a financing for their structure. But let me see if Bert or Brian have anything additional to add.

BERT HUNTER: Thank you, Bryan. In fact, we have already commenced discussions with the two utilities Eversource, and Avangrid about providing such assistance, not only to service stations but to small and medium businesses more broadly. And they are supportive of the concepts. We do not have a program as of yet because we're still working together under REO4 as Bryan Garcia mentioned, but we hope to bring forward a proposal soon.

BRYAN GARCIA: The only other thing, sorry, the only other thing I would add is we frequently talk about something called the just transition, right? I think we all realize that the future in the modernization of our nation's infrastructure is going to move ourselves towards a low carbon future

that is more resilient to the impacts of climate change. And there are going to be businesses who are going to be displaced by this future.

So, I think the basis of your question Representative Gresko is can the Green Bank provide the tools to those small businesses to transition justly to the new future. And the short answer is yes. It, you know, the Green Bank is also looking at how we move residential and commercial customers to better ways to heat and cool our buildings. So, to move away from propane and heating oil and towards renewable heating and cooling there again, we're going to have to work with local families and businesses to help them transition to new technologies.

So, it is incumbent upon government and others, you know, if we can enable the private sector to invest in these families and businesses, that is what we will attempt to do, but it will help all of us to help these small businesses do this transition as well.

REP. GRESKO (121ST): Gentlemen, that-- oh, here we go. Representative Demicco with a quick hand raise with a quick question.

REP. DEMICCO (21ST): Great. So, thank you for indulging me, Mr. Chair sorry to jump in late. I'm listening to the discussion Bryan and Bert. Thank you both for your testimony. I'm not quite understanding. Could you be more and I don't want to take up a lot of time, but could you be more specific with regards to what kind of products and services is the Green Bank through this environmental infrastructure fund going to be able to offer to, you know that private concerns cannot already offer to the market. If you could give me some specific examples, I would understand it better, I think.

BRYAN GARCIA: Great, let me give you a couple of examples, but, you know, recognizing that a couple of things, when the legislature passed the Green Bank in the creation of the Green Bank, back in July of 2011 public act 1180, I don't think we envisioned then what the Green Bank would become today. So, that's all to say that we start from a foundation of what we're trying to mobilize private capital too.

And then, you know, we all have to sharpen our pencils, do some strategic planning, and develop a comprehensive plan with respect to environmental infrastructure. So that will immediately be our first task is to develop that comprehensive plan, but there are a couple of things that could happen, like at the outset.

You know, I talked earlier about the smarty loan for local families to access capital from community banks and credit unions to support clean energy. One could immediately see those local community banks and credit unions supporting things like a well for a household, right? We can't do that today, but that is a vital source of water two homes and maybe an option for certain families that need things like that.

So, there are some things we can kind of let the market, tell us, and immediately kind of push our balance sheet towards and let the market do what it's going to do. In other instances, you know, we got a call last week from a local agriculture customer who said you know, we need to lower our energy prices. We're considering a solar PV system. And also, we want to increase our growing capacity to bring about more locally grown agriculture.

My response was okay, we can help you on the first and completely connected this business to our programs, to support clean energy on their properties, to lower energy costs. The second thing I can't help you with just yet, but maybe down the road, we can provide you with access to low-cost

financing through a USDA low-cost capital program where we can help finance you know, greenhouses to increase your locally grown agriculture.

So that could be a whole line where the revenue's coming from locally produced agriculture into our food ecosystem, to the comment that was raised earlier, reducing embedded carbon within transportation could be of impact. So, agriculture is defined within our products. Bert was talking about waste anaerobic digesters, specifically you all may know, you know, Representative Demicco from the EMT Committee that we've been very actively supporting the Southern food waste to energy project where not only are we producing anaerobic digester gas, but we are also utilizing that gas in a combined heat and power and renewable energy context.

We're doing the same for farm waste to energy digesters, where we're taking cow manure, and we're turning that into usable methane gas. So, one could envision in the waste area, us getting more involved in anaerobic digesters specifically, there may not be an energy element to it. One can see a waste sorting and separation. We were at the Southington facility and they have an amazing facility there.

So, Bert was alluding to the waste area and on resiliency, you know, I think there's going to be a lot of thinking that has to happen there. We do have CIRCA in Connecticut as Dr. French from DEEP mentioned earlier, CIRCA has identified has worked with towns across the state to identify a number of different resiliency and adaptation measures. We would like to take a look at that, but again, we are a financier, we're not a grant provider, so we need to figure out a way to provide capital to those projects that are repaid back so that we can pay bond holders over time for those proceeds.

So, that's going to take us a bit to look at, but in the event, you know, of a national policy

infrastructure policy, getting to nature-based solutions, as other presenters were talking about, if there is a National Climate Bank created and we've been working with the advocates of the National Climate Bank there is a specific section around nature-based solutions that we could access whereby one could envision us preserving and conserving lands that would serve as protection to our coastal or inland communities.

Now the structure to that financing it may be a grant in this context, we're asking the federal government for right in terms of those resources, but we'd be protecting habitats that provide a number of different ecosystem services, including helping us helping protect ourselves from the impact of climate.

So that's all to say, there are a myriad of things that could come with environmental infrastructure other Green Banks around the country and around the world have taken the Green Bank model and adapted it to a broader environmental mandate. And you know, we need to do our due diligence at the outset, understand what the strategy is and build programs around that so that we can eventually realize its promise.

REP. DEMICCO (21ST): All right. Thank you. I appreciate that explanation, thanks, Brian. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

REP. GRESKO (121ST): Thank you, Representative Demicco and gentlemen, thank you for your time and expertise and patience. Next individual on our list is Kevin Hussain followed by Michaela Barratt.

KEVIN HUSSAIN: Thank you. I'm only on one fact that's hopefully I won't be as long. Good afternoon Representative Gresko, Senator Cohen, Vice-Chair Slap and Palm, Ranking Members, Miner and Harding and Distinguished Members of the Environment Committee. For the record, my name is Kevin Hussein

and I'm here today on behalf of the American Council of Engineering Companies of Connecticut to speak in SB 884. Just a little brief background, ACEC Connecticut. American Council of Engineering Companies of Connecticut represents almost 2000 highly skilled engineers employed by 60 member companies located throughout Connecticut.

And the significant goal of our organization is to educate and promote a better understanding of the infrastructure needs of our state and our residents. Our testimony today centers on the fact that the lumen challenge for Connecticut transportation system is the insufficient funding. And the DCI proposed revenue would be generated through an auction system and deposit into a transportation in the climate account.

This is a critical conversation because it also needs to be a part of a bigger discussion on the state's transportation infrastructure funding. The SDF, as we all know, the special transportation fund has been headed towards a cliff. And that cliff is now only a year away. So, we need to rehabilitate and improve the state's transportation infrastructure. And if nothing changes, the SDF will require operating at 21st century transportation within a 20th century budget.

So, Connecticut needs a long-term sustainable stream of revenue solely dedicated to the special transportation fund. The solution to this challenge brings into it, lots of jobs and economic expansion, the design construction, and maintenance of transportation infrastructure in Connecticut supports approximately 40,000 full-time jobs across all sectors of the state. Roughly 731,000 full-time jobs in Connecticut in key industries, also like tourism, retail, sales, agriculture, and manufacturing are heavily dependent on the state's transportation network.

The better the infrastructure system, the more industries will flourish in Connecticut. There was federal help into COVID package that is soon to be signed, but we need more substantial and recurrent stream of revenue to fix that problem locally.

Proposals from the TCI program and the truck mileage tax initiatives may provide to be positive opportunities for badly needed additional transportation revenue. And especially during this COVID pandemic Connecticut has seen a surge of population of people that's moved from metropolitan areas, such as Boston and New York. And with more than 16,000 already been-- has already been moving into Connecticut.

This increase in demand of our state's aging infrastructure will only make it tougher for a infrastructure report card and it was rated mediocre by the Connecticut society of civil engineers. And lastly, as part of, as we start to come out of the pandemic and we need to turn our attention towards the state economic recovery. A sustainable investment infrastructure specifically in transportation is a benefit for the immediate and long-term creation job an overall economic growth.

Multiple studies included by one, one by the national transplants or research nonprofit have concluded that investing on our nation's surface transportation system and making needed highway improvements, improve safety creates good paying jobs and fosters economic recovery and growth.

Further investments into the surface, transportation systems will enhance the state's economic competitiveness stimulate growth, job growth, and improve access and mobility. And lastly improves this traffic safeties and reduce travel delays and improve road and bridge conditions. ACEC Connecticut is willing to work closely with you and develop ideas and bring our state's transportation needs to fruition.

Our goal, as it as is yours is to make Connecticut a leader in transportation and to drive our great state forward. There was additional information in our submitted testimony that supports funding for the SDF. And I just want to take this off and I'll be happy to take any questions.

REP. GRESKO (121ST): Good timing, Kevin, and thank you for the information. It was very educational. I do not see any hands up in the room. So again, thank you for your testimony.

KEVIN HUSSAIN: No problem. Thank you, guys.

REP. GRESKO (121ST): Next on the list is Michaela Barratt followed by Mark Krauchick. Michaela?

MICHAELA BARRATT: Yep. Sorry. Can everyone hear me?

REP. GRESKO (121ST): Yes.

MICHAELA BARRATT: Thank you. Good afternoon, Co-Chairs Christine Cohen, Joseph Gresko, Vice-Chairs Christine Palm and Derek Slap, Ranking Members, Craig Miner and Stephen Harding and Members of the Environment Committee. Thank you all for allowing me to opportunities to speak here with you.

My name is Michaela Barratt. I am a youth organizer with MACE, which stands for Medical Advocates for Cross-Cultural Education. We are located in Waterbury, Connecticut, and as a team, we strongly encourage an amendment to Connecticut SB 884 AN ACT REDUCING TRANSPORTATION RELATED CARBON EMISSIONS before it has passed so that it directly benefits communities impacted the most by poverty pollution and COVID-19 this Bill can reduce emissions from our transportation system and invest in solutions that focus on expanding mass transit, air quality monitoring, affordable housing, near transit and safe walking and biking lanes.

I'm here today to ask you guys to prioritize significant funds to work communities who are overburdened and underserved and ensure these communities have a seat at a table to meaningfully shape the program. This Bill should at least explicitly address neighborhood level pollution, where communities of color and low-income communities are often breathe the dirtiest air. It should support workers by ensuring greater amounts of fair labor standards, workforce development programs, and diverse hiring and contracting requirements.

It should also ensure communities who are most impacted by our transportation system to have a strong say in directing how investments are spent. This means creating an equity board composed of people who directly come from these communities that are disproportionately affected by pollution. This is a fair opportunity to provide aid to communicate to the communities in Connecticut, to have this proportionally suffered from pollution refusing to make the necessary amendments to this Bill, to ensure that undeserved and overburdened communities get the aid they deserve would indicate that the state of Connecticut is content with the environmental injustice that is prevalent in its inner cities.

Black and Brown communities, especially in Waterbury, suffered immensely from the pollution in the city. I lived in Waterbury for over a decade, and I can attest to the lack of adequate public transportation, safe walking pathways, sidewalks, and these are all things that can be fixed if amendments are made to the current Bill. Thank you so much for your time and thank you for listening.

REP. GRESKO (121ST): Michaela, we thank you for your patience and for your advocacy. I'm looking to see our distinguished Vice-Chair of the Committee. Representative Palm has a question for you.

REP. PALM (36TH): Thank you, Mr. Chair. Hi Michaela. Thank you for being here today. Did you have specific recommendations? I agree with you a hundred percent that we need to be very concerned about the disproportionate effect of climate chaos on underserved communities and environmental justice is very, very important. To many, if not all of us on this Committee, I'm just wondering if you had specific areas of the Bill to which you objected or which you think could be strengthened or any suggestions for us. Thank you.

MICHAELA BARRATT: No problem. So, it's not specified which communities exactly are undeserved and overburdened. I think that is the first step we have to look into the cities, see where, you know, communities, the most part impacted. And one of the ways that we can do this is by working with people that come directly from the cities, people who are in these organizing nonprofit groups that go into community-- go into the community, see what the people want, and actually listen, I don't think it does any justice for people who do not come from this community to be on the equity board.

REP. PALM (36TH): So, you're saying that the specific towns or neighborhoods should be mentioned in the language rather than the composition of the board.

MICHAELA BARRATT: Yes. It should be mentioned in the language. And also, it should, we should have more research on what exactly are the obstacles to overcome how these people are suffering. I don't think we have a lot of that information and that is also the issue we need to specify rather than make an overall general statement, because what the statement like over undeserved and overburden, that can mean anyone. And it can mean anyone in the people in the inner cities may not get the help that they deserve.

REP. PALM (36TH): I see. Okay. Thank you very much.

MICHAELA BARRATT: Thank you.

REP. PALM (36TH): Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

REP. GRESKO (121ST): Thank you. Seeing no other hands raised Michaela. Thank you for your testimony.

MICHAELA BARRATT: Thank you so much. Have a great day.

REP. GRESKO (121ST): You as well. Next-

GAIA MCDERMOTT: Representative Gresko, I noticed that Lori has come into the room as well. So just wanted to let you know. She is number 31.

REP. GRESKO (121ST): We're going to-- okay. Now, we're going to go to Mark Krauchick and then we'll go back to Lori. I promised Mark that he is next.

GAIA MCDERMOTT: Okay. Thank you.

REP. GRESKO (121ST): We'll go to Mark Krauchick and then followed by Lori Vitagliano.

MARK KRAUCHICK: Good afternoon. My name is Mark Krauchick. I work with Standard Petroleum. Thank you for taking the time today to listen to my concerns against Senate Bill 884. For the last 16 years, I've worked in the petroleum industry. I started out pumping gas, worked as a dispatcher, and now I have the opportunity to manage stations throughout Connecticut, even though the majority of my life has revolved around oil and gasoline, by no means, am I against creating an electric infrastructure.

Honestly, I would love to install charging stations at all of our locations. I've researched multiple

companies and spoken with ChargePoint and Gilbarco about installing charging stations. Unfortunately, what I've learned is the technology is not worth the investment right now. Currently the cost of installing one DC fast charger is close to \$100,000. Right now, there isn't a demand to warrant that kind of investment.

In the US there were 250,000 EV sales and only 3% globally. Also, the host of there are a host of technological issues that need to be improved. Right now, it takes far too long to fully charge a vehicle, with the limited battery life. The charge the cars do have, sorry. Studies have shown that they begin to deteriorate immediately. In a recent car and driver article. They noted the Tesla three has shown signs of roughly 3% deterioration after just 10,000 miles.

However, the EV industry's evolving without the need of a new gas tax. Every major car manufacturer is investing Billions of dollars into the EV industry, not only for their cars, but also the companies that help create the necessary infrastructure.

Tesla innovate and Store door are all close to creating a battery that will be capable of charging fully in five minutes. Store door has created a battery that is not only capable of charging in five minutes, but also replaces materials like graphite for silicone, allowing the battery to be much more cost-effective, with this technology, the cars will become a lot more affordable. Thus, driving the demand for charging stations.

BP has already invested \$20 million in Store door with the hopes of using this technology to help keep their storefronts relevant. With companies like Tesla, GM, BP, and Volkswagen investing Billions of dollars. Why do we need to create another gas tax to burden the people of Connecticut? These investments will make the cars and infrastructure affordable for everyone and not just the upper

class. To penalize everyone with another gas tax in my opinion would be irresponsible and unnecessary. Thank you.

REP. GRESKO (121ST): Mark, thank you. Thank you for taking the time to give us your thoughts. I'm looking to see if there's anyone with their hand raised Representative Palm as the floor.

REP. PALM (36th): Thank you, Mr. Chair. Mr. Krauchick, can you comment on the fact that there is often a lot of variation among gas prices? I know certainly in my lifetime, I've remembered long, long gas lines from shortages and fluctuations as much as a dollar 50 you know, a gallon or more. So, you know, I think most of the variations some of them are market-driven and some of them are not.

And so, your opposition to this what you call a tax would you not agree that sometimes there are market-driven reasons for gas companies and individual pumping stations to vary widely?

MARK KRAUCHICK: I don't necessarily think especially right now that they actually vary widely, especially throughout the state of Connecticut. I think the prices are going up drastically since the beginning of the year because Mr. Fox said earlier that he thinks it's due to the pipeline and certain reasons like that. But I actually think it's solely on Russia and Saudi Arabia actually keeping the supply down right now. So, it's driving the cost of the barrel up.

Do I see that changing in the near future? No, I kind of agree with them that I do see the prices continuing to rise to the 350 range in the near future. I don't necessarily see that taking another 12 months. I think it could be a lot sooner than that, but I think the prices companies have been trying to keep the prices as low on the street as they possibly can, but unfortunately, they have no

choice, but to continue to raise them right now under the times that we're in.

REP. PALM (36th): So, are you disputing the 5 cents, you know, a gallon approximately amount that this might go up? Is that, are you saying you, you think it would be more than that?

MARK KRAUCHICK: I don't necessarily know. That's really tough to tell at this point in time. I would like to think that it would only be 5 cents, but it could range up to the 9 cents and potentially more like Mr. Fox said out in California, it's up to 61 cents right now. So how do we really know if it's only going to be 5 cents?

REP. PALM (36th): Okay. Because I think, you know, 5 cents on a ten gallon is 50 cents. You know, when you fill up, which doesn't really seem to me to be a huge burden to try to help our planet. So, I guess I'm, I'm concerned about some of the pushback from people in the petroleum industry, just based on, I guess, I'm questioning what is the concern based on?

MARK KRAUCHICK: So, I also I mean the way that I, in my concern, I feel as if the technology is going to come around to actually drive the price of the cars down, you've already seen that the cars are coming down drastically. Volkswagen has their new SUV that's only \$38,000 as of right now. I personally don't think it's necessary to create a statewide tax on everyone when the costs are already continuing to go down.

REP. PALM (36th): Okay. I see. Thank you very much. Thanks for your time.

REP. PALM (36th): Thank you.

REP. GRESKO (121ST): Thank you, Representative. And thank you Mark for your testimony. And I don't see any other hands raised, so we'll, we'll go on to

the next person, which is Lori Vitagliano followed by Kevin and Larry Ancker

LORI VITAGLIANO: Good afternoon, Chairman Gresko, Chairman, Senator Cohen, and Members of the Environment Committee. I'm Lori Vitagliano from the South-Central Connecticut Regional Water Authority in New Haven. The RWA appreciates the opportunity to provide comments in support of section 19 of House Bill 6441.

We applaud the Environment Committee for taking up this very important issue. The Regional Water Authority is a non-profit political subdivision of the state. We provide water to some 430,000 consumers in 15 communities in our region. The source of this water is a system of watershed and aquifer areas that cover about 120 square miles within 24 municipalities. The distribution system includes approximately 1700 miles of pipe. Annually, we invest millions of dollars in infrastructure improvement projects to upgrade our water system.

Sound infrastructure is the foundation that ensures the delivery of this natural resource. And the water industry faces significant challenges posed by aging and deteriorating infrastructure, section 19 of House Bill 6441 addresses this concern by creating an environmental infrastructure fund within the Connecticut Green Bank. It will also create a mechanism that positions utilities through the Connecticut Green Bank to be ready to receive potential federal environmental infrastructure funding.

So, failing to invest in water infrastructure also affects businesses that are reliant on water. Further, the infrastructure investment also supports the manufacturing as well as creating jobs. So, in closing, please support section 19 House Bill 6441 because this investment is needed to better prepare

Connecticut's infrastructure for the future. Thank you for your time and consideration.

REP. GRESKO (121ST): Lori, thank you. And thank you for the regional authority perspective on that looking at the room and seeing no hands raised. Thank you for your testimony.

LORI VITAGLIANO: Thank you again for your work. Have a good afternoon.

REP. GRESKO (121ST): Thank you. Next on the list is Kevin and Larry Ancker followed by Angel Serrano and I don't see them picking up Gaia. So, we're, can we move right onto Angel Serrano?

GAIA MCDERMOTT: Yes. And I'll leave them in the room. I haven't seen them on mute, but I will leave them in the room and hopefully they can be around for the next time.

REP. GRESKO (121ST): Oh, here we go. They just told me they're not speaking today so we can move on to Angel.

GAIA MCDERMOTT: Okay.

ANGEL SERRANO: Hi. Thank you for having me. My name is Angel Serrano. I am from Hartford. I'm an organizer with Connecticut Citizen Action Group and you know, thank you for, to Chair Cohen and Gresko and the Vice-Chairs and Ranking Members and all Members of the Environment Committee for having me today. Today, I'm here in support of 6551, AN ACT CONCERNING ENVIRONMENTAL AIR QUALITY. Excuse me.

I first want to say that save the sound, submitted a written testimony of some recommendations for environmental justice amendments. And I want to say that I really agree with everything that Save the Sound submitted in that written testimony. We would also like to add that there's another Bill that no language has been drafted yet, but it was a proposed

Bill establishing green justice zones, number 5817, and we submitted language to, for a pilot program to--

REP. GRESKO (121ST): You got to keep your-- you got to keep your comments to the 6551, because that's what's on the agenda for today.

ANGEL SERRANO: Right. I'm just saying that green justice zones should be added to this Bill to strengthen the Bill, things that would prevent or get rid of poor polluting sources in a certain location, a pilot to be picked and to reduce the pollution there and also provide for remediation projects. You know, where Quasi-public meetings would be held in, the people would decide what kind of remediation projects would take place in there in that green justice zones.

So, I just brought it up to say, to add, if you can just add it to this, it would strengthen it so much better. You know, I won't go too much into detail, but we believe that this is a good opportunity for municipalities and the state to work together, to get rid of these pollution sources that pollute the air so much and our detriment to the public health of these certain communities. So basically, just to start off as a starting point with a pilot, doing that, to see how it works and that's all I'll speak about today. Thank you very much.

REP. GRESKO (121ST): Angel, thank you for your time and for your testimony and for your advocacy. We have a question from a Representative, Michel.

REP. MICHEL (146TH): Thank you, Mr. Chair. And thank you Angel for this time today. Thank you for all your great advocacy work. Can you elaborate a little bit, how will the green justice zone help the community improve their health by adding to 6551?

ANGEL SERRANO: Yeah. So, if, once you designate a zone, an area, a city or an area of a city, or the

whole city as a green justice zones, you can stop those sources of pollution that are affecting the community the most. So, people won't be breathing those particular matters, the ozone, the NOx, the whatever pollutants that exacerbate asthma and respiratory problems to the people.

You know, also by, in choosing what remediation projects they have for that zone, you know, they can get rid of do things like get rid of-- getting rid of lets service pipes you know, energy efficiency and weatherization, retrofits, energy efficient heating system for their homes, such as things like that. Solar panels that could be invested in those communities that are usually left behind. We can you know, serve them first because it will be you know, a pilot. So, it will, the resources can get to those communities first, rather than last.

REP. MICHEL (146TH): Thank you for that. And then you did mention some of the language that is suggested by Save The Sound or edits, I guess. And so, it seems to me that there's touch-ups to the environmental justice Bill, related to air, and also just that needed some corrections. Is that correct?

ANGEL SERRANO: Right. you know, one of the main things we wanted to point out where that Bill is, or those recommendations is no new sources of new pollution. If we make that statement, no new sources of pollution, we give them, you know, make a big stride in this climate change fight, because if we keep adding to the load, we're never going to get ahead of it.

REP. MICHEL (146TH): Right. I appreciate it, thank you for testifying today. Thank you, Mr. Chair. Thank you, Angel.

REP. MICHEL (146TH): All right. Thank you.

REP. GRESKO (121ST): Thank you, Representative. Angel, thank you for the testimony and we're going

to move on to our next individual who is Benjamin Martin. And he'll be followed by Charles Rothenberger.

GAIA MCDERMOTT: I'm sorry. I have number 36. I have Angel as well.

REP. GRESKO (121ST): Last that was just Angel.

GAIA MCDERMOTT: It was Angel, I apologize.

REP. GRESKO (121ST): Okay. All right. And so, Benjamin Martin, who should be next, followed by Charles.

BENJAMIN MARTIN: Can you hear me?

REP. GRESKO (121ST): Yes, sir.

BENJAMIN MARTIN: All right. Thank you. I want to thank all the environmental advocates and the former bench who came out today to testify in favor of the Bills that are on the agenda today. I would like also support all three Bills on the agenda today. Specifically, the 6551, I believe is the number, but I sent in a written comment. I just want to respond to some things I heard today.

When talking about pollution coming from other States, it seems to be the question that they're asking is why should we do anything if it doesn't fix everything? And the point is that we have to be a leader and do what we can in order for other people to start to act on their own. And in regards to the transportation climate initiative, raising short-term costs, it needs to be noted that the goal and what will happen if we initiate the transportation kind of initiatives, that cost will go down in the long run.

It's basically saying, like saying I shouldn't bike to work and save \$5 on gas per day in fuel costs, because it would cost me a dollar more in energy

bars per day. So, it's a specious argument and the TCI program will eliminate costs for low in income-, low- and middle-income people, because the money that is spent will be on programs, they can use to transport themselves to work cheaper.

And I just want to respond to the blaming of California problems on TCI. California's energy problems with their grid are due to the corporation, the private corporation that was deregulated lack of investment in their infrastructure. And that has been deemed the truth in court. So, we cannot blame this on government regulations, except for the fact that they're not regulating the utility enough.

The other comments that I have on HB 6441-

GAIA MCDERMOTT: I'm sorry, I just muted number 37. I was trying to mute someone else who is whoever's going off mute to create, create a noise at the back.

REP. GRESKO (121ST): Can we bring Benjamin back?

GAIA MCDERMOTT: He's here? It's just that I just muted him. Benjamin, would you please unmute yourself?

BENJAMIN MARTIN: I did. Where was I when I was muted?

REP. GRESKO (121ST): You just said that the California TCI alleged problems was caused by the lack of the companies out there investing in the grid.

BENJAMIN MARTIN: Thank you. And second that point that I said on. I would have two suggestions for improvements for HB 6441. First would be the inclusion of the language from SB 718, AN ACT CONCERNING MORATORIUM ON CONSTRUCTION OF NEW FOSSIL FUEL PLANTS. The best adaptation for climate change

that we have to stop producing emissions that are causing it.

And this moratorium on construction is new fighting fossil fuel plants, which was brought up by the Chair Cohen, and was co-sponsored by several Members of this Committee. It would be great addition to this adaptation Bill so that we cannot cause more problems that we have to build more adaptations too.

And the second suggestion I would have the list Bill, is that a great adaptation for the state of Connecticut, would you put as much as our utility lines and infrastructure underground, as soon as possible, we seem to constantly have this fight in between how much tree cover we have to cut for these lines and replacing poles and windstorm is bringing down this, and by putting this under a ground it would actually solve this problem instead of just having a constant cost come up.

And while the costs for doing this would be initial investment, it would save money in the long run because we wouldn't have having to have repairs as much and replace our infrastructure must because it would be protected underground from the increasing climate change, storms, and conditions. So, I'll just review that I am in favor of all three of these things that are on the agenda today. And I believe there a couple improvements that can be done two 6441, as I mentioned. And I am here if you want to talk to me, more.

REP. GRESKO (121ST): Benjamin, thank you much for the testimony and for your advocacy. I don't see any hands raised in the room right now. So again, thanks for the testimony.

BENJAMIN MARTIN: Thank you.

REP. GRESKO (121ST): Next we're going to go on to Charles Rothenberger followed by Brenda Watson.

CHARLES ROTHENBERGER: Great. Thank you. So, Chairs, Gresko and Cohen, Ranking Members, Miner and Harding and Members of the Environment Committee. My name's Charles Rothenberger. I am the climate and energy attorney with Save The Sound and I'm happy to be here to testify in support of both SB 884 AN ACT REDUCING TRANSPORTATION AND CARBON RELATED EMISSIONS, as well as 6551 with amendments. And that's THE ACT CONCERNING ENVIRONMENTAL AIR QUALITY.

I don't want to address a lot of the opposition points one by one that have been raised. I think that both Commissioner Dykes and Eucalitto laid out the facts when it comes to the transportation and climate initiative. You know, I will point out for what it's worth that the program has been and continues to be supported by a coalition of bipartisan States in the region and across the Eastern seaboard and happy to address any questions that Members may have on that program. But you do have my written testimony before you, and I will rely on that.

With respect to and that concerning environmental air quality while we support the elements of the Bill, as far as they go additional language should be added. One of my colleagues, Chris Kelly will be speaking to a number of those amendments that we're suggesting I'll speak to just two. One, the Bill should establish clear accountability for state agency decision-making that supports the state's greenhouse gas reduction obligations under our groundbreaking global warming solutions act. And two, it should provide for citizen enforcement of those goals pursuant to our long-standing Connecticut environmental protection act.

As we strengthen the foundational elements of the laws that are designed to protect our most vulnerable citizens from pollution, it's critical to ensure that the state's progress towards meeting our greenhouse gas reduction and environmental health

goals is not hindered, or I'm done by the individual decisions made by various state agencies.

Despite the clear climate, environmental health, and clean energy goals that we have adopted as law. As a state, we continue to permit new sources of localized polluting emissions in our communities, adding to the burden of already poor air quality, as you heard from them. Rather than moving us closer to our goals, such actions merely add to the urgency and difficulty of the choices that we will face that in the future and the cost of addressing those it's worth saying.

And I think we have two really clear examples of why these changes are really important. Both in the ongoing controversy around the killing the natural gas plant as well. The most recent approval of incentives for data centers here in Connecticut. And data centers are huge energy hogs. Many times, they use diesel engines as backup sources of power. They really are quite problematic from the environmental perspective.

So, we really need to ensure that all the arms of our government are supporting our climate environmental goals to achieve the healthy and prosperous future that we all want. And when government agencies fail to do so, the citizen should be able to hold them accountable. And I'll note that New York, Vermont, Massachusetts, and Rhode Island you know, our neighbors have all recently taken steps to strengthen their climate legislation in a manner that enhances accountability and increases the likelihood of successfully achieving the goals that science tells us are essential, and that we have adopted for ourselves in law. And the Connecticut mitigation strategies working group of the Governor's CG3 also recommended statutory requirements in line with these recommendations. Thank you.

REP. GRESKO (121ST): Thank you, Charles. Thank you for your good work. Scanning the room here. I do not see any hands up. Here we go. I have Senator, my Co-Chair, Senator Cohen.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Hi, Charles, and thank you for your testimony. I just wanted to ask you, you know, you mentioned my favorite topic as of late data centers, currently, we obviously have a Bill before us specific to air quality. If you and I, heard from the Commissioner earlier, I believe that this Bill in terms of a working group goes far enough. And I'm going to guess that your answer is going to be no.

And how could we get language that goes further and get that, you know, how do we balance you know, incentivizing of new industry you know, to generate you know, a better economy for Connecticut and meeting these air quality standards that we're desperate to achieve and mitigate some of the impacts of climate change?

CHARLES ROTHENBERGER: Yeah, no, that's a great question. And I think it really goes to the heart of one of the items that I suggested in terms of, you know, really clearly aligning our agency decision-making and permitting goals with our climate and pollution goals. You know, data centers are incredibly energy intensive. You know, worldwide data centers consume as much energy as some countries just on their own.

There are ways to address that. I mentioned the fact that some of them use a diesel generation as a backup power source. That's something that we're even trying to discourage in our local residences as we moved to a clean energy economy and there has been some work done on this, you know, obviously the data centers support our internet and all of the technological marvels that we have.

And as a result, some of the companies such as Google have really done some groundbreaking work in terms of cleaning them up. Google's data centers have achieved a hundred percent renewable energy in terms of their operations. They have increased the energy efficiency of their data centers, such that there are about 50% of what a typical data center might be.

And then looking at innovative ways to maybe use some of the waste heat that might otherwise be generated for other purposes. So, you know powering them with clean energy and increasing the energy efficiency as much as possible, I think are really two of the clear things, and those should be established standards. You know, if you want to do business in the state of Connecticut you have to meet our environmental and air quality goals.

You know, I think as written that data center Bill you know, is going to provide a huge benefit to somebody who comes in and establishes those data centers. And I think it's not at all untoured or beyond the realm of common sense to, to require them to be good citizens once they're here. And not be at another source of polluting emissions in our neighborhoods.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): So, we're, I mean, we're still, you know, with all of these things and including you know, some of the what's laid out in 6551 in terms of some of our environmental justice communities, you know, we're already meeting to meet you know, greenhouse gas goals and standards, according to the global pollution act, global warming solutions act.

And we seem to be on track, right. Is it so much so that the Governor issued an executive order moving up by a decade or, you know, zero carbon goal. But what would you, I mean, obviously we have issues with NOx and the ambient air quality, because we're in non-attainment.

So how, I mean is your thought that we should not be permitting or permitting any of these new facilities at all, that may have a negative impact on carbon or ambient air quality or as your position that we should create offsets in order to allow them to come into the state?

CHARLES ROTHENBERGER: So, I heard, I think at least two questions in there. So first, first I'll just point out that you're absolutely right, that according to the latest greenhouse gas inventory, we do appear to be on track to meet our current 2020 target that the inventory tracks about three years behind, just because of the data collection and number crunching issues.

So, we are right about there. But one has to realize when looking at that, you know, the last ten years of our climate work was really the easy work. I mean, if you look at the trend line, it's pretty much flat, you know, it's 10% below, 1990 levels, and that's just a very tiny dip. So, achieving that was really the easy, easy part when we look forward to what our goals are in 2030 and 2050, that trend line tips down quite sharply.

So, we have a lot of work to do much more quickly moving forward. So, we, you know, I think the low hanging fruit has been plucked as it were. With respect to your second question, you know, my perspective is, and certainly my vision as I was crafting the language that we submitted was, you know, there may well be circumstances in which a particular permit needs to be issued. There may be overwhelming state interests, whether it's grid reliability, what have you, right? These are the arguments that we hear.

So, it would not prohibit the permitting of any new facilities, at least from my perspective. What I would do though, is one would require a clear declaration that in fact, this permit is contrary to

us meeting our greenhouse gas reduction goals. And then that would then trigger a requirement that there be some offsetting mitigation measures.

And I wouldn't use the term offset necessarily because I don't envision it as necessarily being just an accounting thing where you plant some trees in Brazil. But you know, there could be requirements for them to voluntarily quote unquote ramp down emissions. There may be simply a declaration of what else the agency envisions doing as part of their plan to compensate for the fact that under in their determination this is a needed resource for the state of Connecticut.

So, you know, it's not meant to necessarily tie the agency's hands, but what it is meant to do is to ensure that we have a holistic planning process that is designed to address emissions in a way that gets us where we need to go.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Okay. Thank you so much. I look forward to working with you and DEEP, you know, getting this language, right. Thank you.

CHARLES ROTHENBERGER: Thank you.

REP. GRESKO (121ST): Thank you, Senator. Next, we have Representative Michel.

REP. MICHEL (146TH): Thank you, Mr. Chair. Thank you, Mr. Rothenberger for your testimony and great work. Just wanted to ask and I know you mentioned your colleague, but I see you colleague is way down the list, and that will be later tonight. And I was just wondering if you can maybe comment a little bit on the 6551. But section 2 and I believe Save the Sound support the language that when it expands, because there's still communities throughout the state and in rural communities, parts of urban communities as well, that are not really protected are encountered in the environmental justice on the side. I just was wondering what were some of the

suggestions Save the Sound that had to fix that in the language?

CHARLES ROTHENBERGER: So, I know that, again, my colleague, Chris Kelly is really the experts on those sections of the Bill. And I know he is very far down in the order. But you know, I think we have laid out a number of specific recommendations in the testimony that Chris submitted. So, you know, I think there's certainly, you know, requiring more meaningful public participation and dialogue as these permitted facilities are contemplated.

You know, and I think that that dialogue and that communication really has to start early, right. It can't be an afterthought. When, you know, and I think this is something that you're seeing you know, a lot of industries start to take up in certain sectors, like, right. So, I think the Offshore Wind industry has been doing a fairly good job of this in terms of community outreach, engaging early hearing what community concerns are and working hard to address them.

But it doesn't have to be meaningful. It does have to be early, it can't be an afterthought. And again, you know, similar to what we recommended for the global warming solutions act a citizen suit provision to actually enforce our environmental justice laws is really critical. Connecticut is one of a handful of States that has had a strong law that basically allows individuals to operate as private attorney generals to protect the public trust in air, land water. And applying that to our environmental justice laws is critical, right. Because these are the communities that are impacted. These are the communities that, that know the facts. And these are the communities that should be empowered to take that-- to take action and to force action in compliance.

REP. MICHEL (146TH): And I also want to say, I think it was some work in terms of language, too,

for example, just like the sentence parts of the city and that necessity analyzed in terms of everything from financed, wage, living wage, and et cetera, that it's not necessarily calculated on the part of these municipalities so that I know this was some language issues, and we're trying to fix, keep those questions then for Mr. Kelly later tonight. And thank you, Mr. Rothenberger again.

CHARLES ROTHENBERGER: Well, I know your dedication to these issues, so I know you will still be here when his number rolls around.

REP. MICHEL (146TH): Oh, yes, you bet. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

REP. GRESKO (121ST): Thank you. That being said Charles, thank you for your testimony and we'll go on to the next Brenda Watson followed by Samantha Dynowski.

BRENDA WATSON: Good afternoon. Thank you, Chairs. Senator Cohen, Representative Borer, and Representative Gresko. Operation Fuel supports House Bill 6441, as a means to further move Connecticut towards establishing tools, such as private investments to support the next step implementation of climate change adaptation and resiliency and supporting municipal environmental infrastructure maintenance.

With the current success of the nation's first Green Bank Connecticut continues to serve as a model for other jurisdictions, amplifying energy affordability, and now will expand its ability to address our water and wastewater infrastructure resulting in more private and federal investment.

Operation Fuel, also partners with municipal governments across the state, and also supports the municipal funding options for climate change resiliency. Sadly, I've seen, sorry for the sirens behind me. We're on the same route to the hospital.

So sadly, I've seen the tough decisions that municipal governments have to make during their budget processes.

Unfortunately, social human services and senior services are usually the first to get cut to the detriment of local citizens. So, any effort that will support local municipalities abilities to set aside funds for additional tree plantings and environmental infrastructure and maintenance can aid in other areas of local government. So, thank you for the opportunity to testify today. You have my written testimony submitted electronically, and thank you all for your hard work today.

REP. GRESKO (121ST): Brenda, thank you for your patience and for your advocacy. Scanning the room, do not see any hands raised at this point. So, thank you for your testimony.

BRENDA WATSON: Thank you.

REP. GRESKO (121ST): Okay, next we're going to move on to Samantha Dynowski followed by Syed Sami.

SAMANTHA DYNOWSKI: Thank you, Representative Gresko and congratulations on your new role in the Committee. Chairs, Vice Chairs, Ranking Members and Members of the Committee. My name is Samantha Dynowski. I'm the state director of Sierra Club. On behalf of the Sierra Club in our more than 40,000 members and supporters in Connecticut. We are pleased to be here to testify today in support of two Bills.

Let's start with our support of House Bill 6551, AN ACT CONCERNING ENVIRONMENTAL AIR QUALITY with some suggested amendments. Everyone in our state should have the right to clean air and a healthy environment. Yet environmental justice communities bear the disproportionate burden of air pollution in our state. 23 of the state's largest fossil fuel powering jet power generating units are located in

environmental justice communities emitting more than 372 tons of NOx. That's greater than 46% of the NOx from all fossil fuel power generation. Some of these communities also host trash incinerators, which produce significant quantities of air pollution.

And pollution from other industries like incoming data centers also impacts these communities as well as exposure to transportation pollution from highways, transit, hubs, ports, and more. As we know the impact on health is significant and also, disproportionate.

We applaud the Committee for recognizing that this injustice is not acceptable. And for leading our state to take action to address this issue. Last year, New Jersey took similar action and passed one of the strongest environmental justice laws in the nation. As you can continue to consider this Bill, we do recommend some amendments in our written testimony, which will be coming soon. It's not quite done to further strengthen the Bill and protect impacted communities.

They include aligning agency decisions to our greenhouse gas reduction targets similar to what Charles Rothenberger from Save the Sound was just discussing as well as strengthening public notice and public meeting process and community involvement, allowing citizens the right to appeal and to sue giving DEEP tools they need to deny applications should they just cause further harm to communities and collecting and reporting on data on air quality disparity.

And as was mentioned previously the Green Justice Zone concept raise in House Bill 5817 would be an excellent complement to this Bill to create a pilot program for community led environmental remediation and clean energy deployment projects. Including Green Justice Zones, along with the suggested amendments will result in a Bill that prevents new

polluting sources, addresses legacy pollution, and provides benefits to vulnerable communities.

The other Bill we're supporting today is House Bill 6441, AN ACT CONCERNING CLIMATE CHANGE ADAPTATION, although the worst effects of climate change can still be mitigated. We must be prepared for the ones that cannot, and we support all the provisions in the Bill, including creating new storm water management boards and a voluntary municipal conveyance fee on real estate transactions. And that concludes my testimony. Thank you.

REP. GRESKO (121ST): Okay, here we go. Take two. Good timing, Samantha. Thank you for your time and your patience today. And of course, your advocacy. Representative Michel has a question.

REP. MICHEL (146TH): Thank you, Mr. Chair. Thank you, Samantha, for testifying today and for your amazing work that you do for the state and the environment. Just wanted to ask you a little bit more about the Green Justice Zone the idea of supporting advocates what's the process to designate the Green Justice Zone, like who handles that? Can you go over that part?

SAMANTHA DYNOWSKI: Sure. So, the Green Justice Zone concept is one that's you know, comes out of California. There's some very strong Green Justice Zone work happening in Providence, Rhode Island. And the idea is not necessarily to for decision-makers at the state level to decide who would get a pilot, but to build a framework and think about kind of what communities need to have are disproportionately burdened by pollution are underserved.

And so, we imagine that there would be, but we'd be looking for guidance from the legislature. Similar to House Bill 6551, the working group that would identify specific locations that could pull together some possible locations for a pilot. And then the

community of course, itself would have to want to participate. But once pilots are launched it's the concept is to have a real community driven process on deciding what kind of environmental remediation and what kind of investment the community actually wants. So, it's a community led community driven process.

REP. MICHEL (146TH): Which is a process have learnt today. So, thank you. Thank you very much. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

REP. GRESKO (121ST): Thank you Representative next with some questions is Representative Chafee.

REP. CHAFEE (33RD): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thanks, Samantha, for speaking to us today. I was just curious one of the people who testified earlier had problems against TCI. Now, I noticed that's not what you're supporting. I was wondering if you, you would elaborate on why that is?

SAMANTHA DYNOWSKI: Sure. I'd be happy to. Sierra Club in December. So not last Friday, but in December as the regional process on TCI was wrapping up did decide to it would not be supporting the final regional MOU and it, that decision was made because the process led to the final MOU was not centered in environmental justice communities, the way that we felt it should be. For a policy that would want it to focus so deeply on investing in vulnerable communities to not have vulnerable communities there at the decision-making table was really problematic.

But the process has now moved to the state level. And so state chapters are want to make sure that the voices of environmental justice communities and equity organizations and individuals interested in equity drive the policy development at our state level. And so, I know you're going to be hearing from a number of organizations and individuals today that represent environmental justice and equity

groups. And we encourage that their voices be centered in the decision-making on both on the legislation and on how the policy develops here in Connecticut.

We as you may imagine, are very supportive of driving down greenhouse gas emissions in the transportation sector. We're very supportive of investment in vulnerable communities. But we want to make sure that those are the voices that are centered in the decision-making.

REP. CHAFEE (33RD): Thank you for that clarification. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

REP. GRESKO (121ST): Thank you, Representative. And thank you, Samantha, for your testimony. Next on the list is Syed Sami followed by Alex Kragie.

SYED SAMI: Can you see me? Can you hear me all right?

REP. GRESKO (121ST): Yes. On both off. There you go.

SYED SAMI: Hi, good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen, my name is Syed Sami and I'm speaking in opposition to SB 884. We all know, and have seen the consistent rise in the price of gas, which has gradually made it way just under \$3 a gallon for regular gas when paying cash. And often over \$2 a gallon when paying with a credit card, especially in Fairfield County.

At the moment, the highest price tax in New England is gasoline. This is a very difficult, this is a very difficult for business like mine, which are already suffering from COVID-19 cripple economy, increasing rent rates for commercial leases, and most important. The customer who are no longer traveling for leisure and fun, but because they have no other choice to go out and work in order to support their family.

We as a citizen and consumer in the state of Connecticut have done our best during this pandemic. I kept all my employees on duty on during a time where business letting go at high rates allowed and did not contest the decision of any employees whom did not want to work or did not feel comfortable working when it comes to unemployment benefit.

This is because I know as a father, uncle, and a friend and a brother of many people whom lived in Connecticut, how hard times were. We have seen many individuals whom are business owners set up for the goods of their fellow humans yet this year, more than any other year, consumers, and tax paying citizen of the state of Connecticut are being faced with more and more taxes and prices increased during an already difficult financial time for every day, working people.

To make it worse there is, there is no alternative or assistance offered to help ease the mental and financial strain. These taxes are holding on hardworking people. If it's not the task or activity, which is going up in price is the cost of getting there. The cost of compromise and the cost of protecting one's health. We are being faced with.

At the moment, TCI tax is capped at 5% cents 10 cents. This Bill is to avoid the language that remove the limit of how high it can go. Don't you believe as a Representative of the people of the state of Connecticut, we desire and deserve the right to know, and what we expect when it comes to personal planning and financial, not only are the business of the state of Connecticut struggling and trying to recover from the pandemic, but now the cost of nearly every consumer product will increase and end user will be the bank end user will be the one paying the cost.

TCI has zero regards for people from low income and communities and hardship the already faced with when making ends meet, which is already hard to make ends meet and how we'll keep it even more difficult. I asked this Bill be reconsider and design with an alternative to ease the burden of the financial offset. It will cost to business and the financial increase it will bring to the people of Connecticut without prior consideration alternatives being put into the place for thank you for your time. If there's anyone who has any questions, I'm more than happy to answer.

REP. GRESKO (121ST): Mr. Sami, I appreciate your point of view and your observations I'm looking to see in the room. If there was anyone with any questions, I do not see any. So again, thank you for your time and for your testimony.

SYED SAMI: Thank you.

REP. GRESKO (121ST): Next, we're going to move on to Alex Kragie.

ALEX KRAGIE: Good afternoon. Co-Chair Cohen, Co-Chair Gresko Ranking Member, Miner, Ranking Member Harding, Vice Chair Slap and Vice Chair, Palm, and the Members of the Environment Committee. So delighted to be speaking with here today, and thank you for the opportunity to offer this testimony in support of House Bills 6441, sections 19 through 23, specifically regarding the authority of the Connecticut Green Bank.

So by way of introduction, I currently am the director of the American Green Bank consortium, which is a project of the Coalition For Green Capital. The nonprofit that I work for. The consortium represents 20 different Green Banks from across the United States, including the Connecticut Green Bank, of course. And we had drawn members from 15 different States in the district. I also have DEEP Connecticut ties as well. I served as a

Commissioner Esty and then Commissioner Claire's, deputy chief of staff and played-- worked very closely with Legislators during the creation of public act 1180 in 2011. The Bill that among other things created the Connecticut Green Bank.

So, I see some friendly faces on this call here today, which is a wonderful to see. So, I'm bringing somewhat of a unique perspective on this Bill for, because I have a view that lets me see, Connecticut Green Bank and Green Banks around the country and the world. And let me start by saying that none of this would have really happened. This consortium wouldn't really exist if it weren't for the leadership of Connecticut and many of you on this call that created the Connecticut Green Bank.

So, we express the strongest possible support for, for House Bill 6441. And the new authorities that provides the Connecticut Green Bank, Connecticut is the pioneer and model of innovative, clean energy finance that all other States in the country look to. I can attest to that personally.

Connecticut Green Bank is an award-winning organization developing truly innovative financial models, deployment strategies, and marketing campaigns to dramatically increase investment and access to clean energy. Every state that I work with in the consortium looks up to the Connecticut Green Bank and its work. We believe that the Connecticut general assembly should continue its track record of national leadership by providing the Connecticut Green Bank with the tools it needs to address environmental infrastructure projects. And I'll give it just a little bit of context about why we think this is particularly important at this time.

As a one portion of our Greenbank consortium's annual report that we put out every year we focus to trends of the future. And recently there has just, there's been a tremendous shift towards focus on

many different types of activities that are covered under the definition of environmental infrastructure in this Bill.

The Green Banks around the country, we tackle the toughest problems in the financing markets. And so many of those toughest problems provide reside in this environmental infrastructure category. So, in conclusion, I offer my strong support and my organization strong support for this Bill to expand the capacity of the Connecticut Green Bank. And I thank you for your time and attention.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Thank you so much, Mr. Kragie, appreciate your input on kind of how the Green Bank infrastructure and Green Banks can work to help with infrastructure projects like that. Any questions? I don't see any from the Committee right now, so thank you for your time and testimony. Appreciate your patience.

ALEX KRAGIE: Thank you very much.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Okay. I believe we are going to number 54 Joe Cummins, but I will just say I don't see them in the room. Mary Chen would have been next followed by Brian Farnen, Allam Hafeez, Cal Ahmad, Robert Bolduc, when you come in.

JOE CUMMINS: Hey, good afternoon. My name is Joe Cummins and I'm here to voice my opposition to proposed state Senate Bill 884. Connecticut has one of the highest taxes on gasoline and diesel in the nation. As we all have seen in recent weeks, the price at the pump has jumped nearly to \$3, at many locations. Passing this transport and climate initiative, Bill would further add to these prices, ultimately hurting all of our wallets.

While the push for greener energy is admirable. The proposed TCI Bill would further price increases of gasoline and hurt low-income families the most. These families often do not have the luxury of

affording the electric vehicle nor hybrid vehicle at current market prices and this challenging and stressful time with the COVID pandemic. Many are out of work and many feel a lack of job security funds are tight. Mom and pop businesses are closing left, and right.

Increasingly the gas taxes with the TCI would further burden these persons in businesses with higher Bills and even low and even lower revenues virtually every product and service would be affected as this Bill constitutes a fourth tax on gasoline and diesel. I asked that you reject this legislation. Thank you for your time.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Thank you. Mr. Cummins, I would just ask when you mentioned about the in affordability of electric vehicles, I think that legislation among other things talks about putting dollars into funding to subsidize some of these electric vehicles in various ways and incentivize them purchase among our lower income earners. What are your thoughts on that?

JOE CUMMINS: Well, it's not only the price. I live in an apartment building. I know a lot of people that do, and when it comes to charging at night, I don't understand how I would be able to charge a vehicle with a rapid charge or anything like that because our landlord is not getting paid for most of our tenants. I don't see the initiative from them to putting these types of charging stations end.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Okay. Thank you for that. I don't see any questions from the rest of our Committees. Thank you, Mr. Cummins for your testimony.

JOE CUMMINS: Thank you very much.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Thank you. I see Mary Chen has entered the room as she'd be followed by Allam

Hafeez followed by Cal Ahmad followed by Robert Bolduc. Mary, welcome.

MARY CHEN: Thank you to the Co-Chairs and Vice-Chairs and the rest of the Members of the Environmental Committee. My name is Mary Chen and I'm a first-generation low-income undergraduate student here at Yale university. And I worked on climate and energy policy from a scientific perspective and a policy perspective. And climate change is the most pressing issue that's facing my generation and those future ones, the aftermath of environmental disasters like hurricanes and heat waves are often linked to climate change.

And while tropical storms like the one that we witnessed this past Fall swept through cities, indiscriminately, not everyone is impacted in the same way, these storms kill power lines, but we cannot talk about these natural disasters and climate change in an equal manner because not everyone can afford to let their refrigerator foods go to waste. And low-income households and families like mine often buy our groceries and stock and buy them in bulk.

And not everyone has a car to go out and buy more food. And so, during these storms, certain communities do not have reliable transportation and that pinpoints and uncertainly reality. Climate change disproportionately impacts low-income communities. And we need to invest in these communities that have been overburdened by climate-- by the climate crisis and the legislation that I'm here. Speaking in support of transportation and climate initiative program specifically promotes and prioritizes vulnerable communities it'll expand and provide public transportation.

And I work with public school students and the New Haven community, both middle school students and high school students. And many of them depend on buses and public transportation to get to Yale's

campus for our debate tournaments. And the buses are never, always reliable and many can't depend on their parents to drive into these extracurricular activities and without reliable transportation and clean energy and clean transportation, we're limiting the opportunities for the next generation and allowing them to have access to certain activities.

And so, this Bill will prioritize the communities that don't have reliable public transportation. And while the Bill suggests that at least 35% of the TCI proceeds will be allocated to those communities that need them most, I encourage the Committee to look at a higher minimum, for example, in Massachusetts they're proposing a 70% minimum. So, I would encourage the Committee to propose something of equivalent manner or something even higher.

And while we talk about, when we talk about climate change, and when we talk about transportation, we really do need to prioritize these low-income communities and Communities of Color. And I've been listening to testimony is all morning and all day, and everyone has made great points. And several people have argued that this Bill is not the one that will create the necessary impacts to combat climate change.

But I believe the goal of this Bill isn't to make these large-scale impacts that the Paris Climate Agreement, for example, might need rather, it makes measurable changes on the local level, on the level that affects you and me directly. And so, when we talk about climate policy, we should look at it and see how it impacts. And for these reasons I highly encourage everyone to support SB 884 thank you.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Thank you so much, Mary, for your testimony and for all of your advocacy, if your generation that is sure to make a difference that you're raising your voices up, as you have done and will continue with you. And I'm very appreciative

of that. I don't see any hands raised from Committee Members. So again, thank you for your time and patience and your testimony today. All right. Next, we have Allam Hafeez, is Allam in the room?

GAIA MCDERMOTT: I'm sorry, Senator I think I have for number 53, that they had left the room or had come in later. But it was, it would be Robert, who'd be on number 53 who we skipped over.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Okay. Yep. And I think we haven't gotten to Allam Hafeez yet or Cal Ahmad and I see they're not in the room, so we'll go back to them in case they join us. So, Robert welcome. There you go.

ROBERT BOLDUC: Okay, good. Thank you. Thank you very much. I own a-- I am main street. We own a, or my company owns a small chain of gasoline stations and truck stops. We have several in Connecticut. And so, I can speak to you from the perspective of a business owner who has to live with these customers and who sees the effect of gasoline taxes.

Now, I also happen to have a boot in both camps because we strongly believe in environmental issues and clean energy. And in fact, I would invite all of you to our newest location in Hartford, on Jennings road, where we have the most newest, most advanced alternative fuels facility. And this is not an ad when you, when you really hear the rest of this in the world, because we sell gasoline and diesel fuel, but we also sell propane. We have hydrogen fueling. We have chargers for Tesla and we have fast chargers for the motoring public.

And that's right in your backyard, maybe less than five miles from the state house. So clearly, we have a boot in both camps. And one of the issues we see that I'd like to bring to your attention is the effect of a higher gas tax, because in effect,

that's what this is. And it's going to drive business out of this state. We have facilities in Massachusetts and I'll tell you, our Massachusetts stores will boom, because of this, because people do cross the line. And I'm sure you're aware of the whole cross border issue that's, which is a national issue.

So, you have to watch out that you don't lose funds in the long run. The other issue that I'd like to bring is that electric-- it's a bigger problem that I think should be addressed that you should think about because electrical vehicle-- electric vehicles don't pay any road tax. And so here we are giving charging motorists in autos and trucks. And the flip is not going to come to electric overnight, but we're all motorists who pay the fuel tax will, are now everyone who drives an electric vehicle right now is getting a free ride on the roads. And I really think you'd get more income if you thought about some more of an equitable means of charging the taxes, other than just adding more burden to fossil fuel people.

We clearly agree that fossil fuel is a problem, but you would also get as much benefit by pushing the automakers to make more fuel-efficient engines, because there's a long way before we've, before we switched to total energy efficiency. It's self-sufficiency I should say, and get rid of fossil fuels the industry-

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Robert, that's your timer if you could wrap up your testimony.

ROBERT BOLDUC: I'm very sorry. I didn't hear that.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Your three minutes is up if you could wrap up your testimony.

ROBERT BOLDUC: All right. Well, that's it. I just wish you should look at the big picture and not stick it all on the backs of a motorist. Thank you.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Thank you for your testimony. And [inaudible] can you talk a little bit about transition-

GAIA MCDERMOTT: Senator, we're hearing a lot of echo. I don't know what's going on?

ROBERT BOLDUC: Is it a costly transition? It's extremely expensive. We didn't put up the hydrogen fueling. That's a joint venture between Toyota and the Air Liquid from Canada, and but they're on our site and they tell me that they have an investment there of \$3 million. I can tell you for the infrastructure and the power needed to put up the fast chargers that we have. I would guess that that investment is probably \$400,000. And for propane I would guess we're looking at maybe \$150,000, so there's a lot of money being spent. We're all working for the same goal, but I think it's counterproductive to now put all those charges onto the backs of motorists and the motoring public, who actually have no choice right now, but to pay those bills.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): [Inaudible]

ROBERT BOLDUC: I'm going to mute you for a second.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Robert, you've muted yourself. So, we can't hear your response.

ROBERT BOLDUC: Could you repeat the question? Because there's feedback from something and I didn't hear everything you said, so I can't answer it.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Sure. You didn't hear you were on mute when I was asking the question. So, I was asking if there is any assistance that is provided to the gas stations who do make these transitions to alternative fuels as well as electric vehicle charging stations. And I'll take that question one step further, as I've asked some other

gas station owners and service station owners, is there the possibility of needing more assistance and perhaps government assistance in making these transitions. And so, wouldn't TCI provide a benefit in providing some of that financial assistance to gas stations as they look to transition?

ROBERT BOLDUC: Yes, TCI would help, but all you're doing, but you're making the motorist and the truck driver pay that Bill. I think there needs to be other ways to come up with the funding for it, Massachusetts, where we have more locations does provide funding. The electric company Ever Source provides funding, DEEP provides funding and there-- so there are three different sources that you can get grants from if you prove, if you, you know, if you can justify it. But they're not making the motorist pay the Bill, that's the difference. Okay.

There's plenty of extra money out there. I know, for example, hydrogen that \$3 million all came from the VW settlement, the Volkswagen settlement. Okay. keep this in mind also, we have some chargers now and in environmentally challenged neighborhoods, because the people in those neighborhoods maybe would like to get electric vehicles, but you can't drop an electric cord out of your third story window.

And so, Massachusetts has looked at a total package and just providing chargers for those so that now those people can take advantage of the savings and the tax credits of buying an electric vehicle, and they have a place to charge. It's a total package.

And right now, for TCI, just to come along and say, we're going to charge the motorist, I think, is not looking at the whole problem. And remember the other thing I said, and that is the automobile manufacturers can make cars more efficient if they are forced to. So, I think you're going after the wrong thing here, just by slapping on this additional fee.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): [inaudible] you mentioned Massachusetts several times and I just want to be clear that Massachusetts is in fact part of this consortium. So, they will, they have signed the MOU for TCI. And so, we would be doing this in partnership with Massachusetts and Rhode Island and Washington DC. So, it's important to make that point their gas prices wouldn't necessarily our gas prices wouldn't necessarily send folks over the border to Massachusetts.

I also want to just make the point that we are not the state of Connecticut is not imposing a fee on the consumer. We are selling we would be with the passage of this legislation selling allowances at auction. It would be up to the wholesalers and distributors of that gasoline to then raise the prices on the consumer. Of course, again you know, written in this Bill, there is a price cap on that. And so, we would be providing some protections in place, hopefully, perhaps your belief is that that is not sufficient enough.

But I would also just point out that we're trying to incentivize electric vehicle purchase right now, which is quite expensive. So, I'm putting additional fees on electric vehicles at this point, might defeat the purpose of reducing emissions. I do see one of my colleagues has her hand up that Representative Palm do you have a question for Mr. Bolduc.

REP. PALM (36TH): Thank you, Senator. Mr. Bolduc. Good afternoon. I have I'm interested in what you said about the incentive for the car industry. You know, we had a rather robust beginning to electric vehicles as far back as the sixties with general motors, EV one, you know, essentially the petroleum industry put the kibosh on that.

I know there were other state of California, there were other concerns that conspired to kind of derail

that industry, which when we look back on it now is two generations ago. So I'm interested in, when you say about incentives for the industry to do better, what is it going to take, do you think for all car manufacturers and suppliers of fossil fuels to get up to speed with this, this galloping problem that we have of climate change?

I mean, I feel as though we've had the technology for a really long time what do you think it will take, if not what you're calling attacks? We could argue about whether that's accurate or not. What do you think it would take to really incentivize them to get serious about this?

ROBERT BOLDUC: Well, the laws were in effect until President Trump came along and rolled them back AS you know. The standards were there. They were much higher mileage and efficiency standards that were set and the last administration took them away. All you have to do is put those back. The automakers can do it. I'm certainly when I say incentives, I meant certainly not giving them any breaks or letting them off the hook. It was a nice way of saying they needed to be forced to do it.

And so, Washington could clearly put back those higher standards for fuel efficiency. Okay. whether or not in my work with the major oil companies, I can tell you, they're all looking at electrification now and always have it. The current administration is clearly committed to this and those of us who believe in this effort or applaud that. I think there's other ways to, and there are those other ways that I would suggest doing it.

As for you say, well, you're not really adding it onto a tax for mileage. Let me tell you, we only make enough because we're a very competitive industry. There is no way I can absorb a penny more tax or a penny more fee on the price of our fuel without passing it onto customers. So, take it from me, whatever you do will immediately be passed on

the next day, because what we pay for in product, what I pay in product today has to be paid into paid for it tomorrow by somebody, or I'm not going to be around the day after that.

There is no fair in the system because we're an extremely competitive business. And just to prove that, just go down the street and look at all the big signs we have, where we advertise our price to the penny and think about what other-- what other retail business puts the price of their main product up on the big street for people to see down to the penny. We do because we've just that something had happened and now, we do, but we live on the pennies and I assure you, it will be passed on.

REP. PALM (36TH): Well, if that's the case, sir. And I do appreciate and admire that you, as you said in your opening statement that you have sort of one foot in, in both or you straddle this issue, I forget exactly how you said it.

ROBERT BOLDUC: I certainly, yes, I do.

REP. PALM (36TH): Have you and your colleagues pushed back on the fossil fuel industry suppliers, because if the margin is so narrow by the time it gets to your distribution, I mean, we all know about exorbitant executive compensation. Who's holding, who's holding mobile oil's feet to the fire about how much they're charging you?

ROBERT BOLDUC: Their stockholders. We have no cloud over them, in our case because we're independent, I have a little more cloud and that I can tell you, we buy from the lowest, the lowest producer every day. To the quarter, we go down two basis points to the quarter, penny that's how close we cut it. And that's my only, our only incentive is by working with that fee. Okay. If you want to put pressure on them, I think you go to Washington and you asked for help at the under national level.

REP. PALM (36TH): Well, I think that an important piece of this conversation has to be accountability on the part of the fossil fuel suppliers, because by the time it gets down to the consumer you know, we blame the guy who's next up in the pecking order from us. And that sounds like that might be you-

ROBERT BOLDUC: Yes, it is.

REP. PALM (36TH): But real the rule and I sympathize. And the real issue is if it's true that that large corporations are beholden to their shareholders as government, I believe the shareholders of our business is the people of Connecticut. It's the residents of the state of Connecticut whose future has been barreled. And I believe that government is responsible for them. So, I'm just, I'm just hoping that in your future discussions, with the people from home, you get your product, you might push back and resist the inevitability that they have to pass this inflation onto you.

ROBERT BOLDUC: I would be talking to a Stonewall. I mean, the people that I talked to as they just don't care. I mean, that's it, it's got to come on, come on down from high. They're not going to get it from.

REP. PALM (36TH): Yeah, that's discouraging, but I'm not at all surprised. And I do thank you for your candor, sir and for your testimony. That's it, Madam Chair.

ROBERT BOLDUC: If, let me add, let me end by saying that if you ever want to see this brand-new alternative fuel facility, I'd love to give you a tour and continue to conversation because we do have a foot in both camps, we'd like to see it soft. I just don't think that this current idea is it. And I'll go back and check with Massachusetts. And I apologize if I was wrong, but it was my understanding that the Governor did not sign the

Bill and that it's still on it, that it had has died there. But if I'm wrong, I stand corrected.

REP. PALM (36TH): Thank you, that's it for me Madam Chair.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Thank you. Yeah, the Governor has signed the memorandum of understanding with our Governor as well as Gina Raimondo of Rhode Islas as well as the mayor of Washington DC. Massachusetts may be making some legislative changes as we heard from Commissioner Dykes this morning. But they are prepared to move forward. Senator Miner, please.

SENATOR MINER (30TH): Thank you Madam Chairman. I don't know what's going on in Massachusetts. I understand that memorandums of understanding are merely that they're not a legislative procedure, so maybe we should find out where they are in terms of a Bill. I did not get a chance to hear your whole testimony sir, but I had a question.

I did hear the part about the build-out process with respect to making sure there are charging stations in communities that really would have a hard time trying to recharge an electric automobile. And do you know what is the lowest cost rechargeable automobile on the market?

ROBERT BOLDUC: I don't know that, but I understand they're getting cheaper every day that the cost of the automobile itself is not going to be an issue anymore. I read just the other day that I believe China has come out with a very good electric vehicle that will just very much less than the Tesla. And you say, well, Tesla is high priced. Well, no Tesla has got some starting level cars now, too. And so, they're about to hit us. This is-- it's about to boom without TCI. I mean, the EV industry is about to boot blossom without TCI.

SENATOR MINER (30TH): I'm not arguing whether there aren't vehicles that are assumed to be, or are already on the market place. I've already had a conversation with a Ford dealer who's told me that they have a vehicle on their showroom floor. It's intended to compete with the other EVs vehicles that are out there. Also, there's a light duty truck that is due soon. There's some question as to what its capacity and capabilities are.

So, I'm not trying to say that wasn't really-- I wasn't trying to kind of pigeonhole your answer. I just didn't know when we talk about trying to build out and make things work. I think we just as someone who's not familiar with every vehicle it's available, I just didn't know if you knew something. I didn't know. That's all.

ROBERT BOLDUC: No, I don't.

SENATOR MINER (30TH): So, it's conceivable that we'd have vehicles in the \$30,000 range anyway?

ROBERT BOLDUC: Oh, absolutely. No question about it.

SENATOR MINER (30TH): Okay. Thank you.

ROBERT BOLDUC: You're welcome.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Thank you Senator Miner and thank you, Mr. Bolduc. I don't see any other questions, so thank you so much for your time testimony and your patience today.

ROBERT BOLDUC: It's my pleasure. Thank you.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Okay. Again, I don't see Allam Hafeez or Cal Ahmad, so we'll move on to number 55 Christopher Algoo followed by Rajen Shelat followed by Sammy Olabi. Welcome Mr. Algoo. I think you're on mute still.

CHRISTOPHER ALGOO: Sorry. They kicked me out. I got back in there, so-

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Oh, no problem. Sorry about that. Now this technology welcome to the Environment Committee.

CHRISTOPHER ALGOO: My name is Christopher Algoo. I am a gas station owner in Fairfield, Connecticut. I have been a station owner for 14 years. To me, the implication of the TCI tax would be a devastating, not only to my business, but my customers. Currently, Connecticut currently, has one of the highest gas taxes in the country. We have a fixed gas tax and a gross receipts tax. We have, and now we would add a TCI tax.

Connecticut residents are being taxed to death and the famous Supreme Court case, McCulloch V Maryland, Chief Justice Marshall couldn't have put it better when he stated that the decision, the power to tax involves the power to destroy. That is exactly what yet another TCI tax and gasoline would do destroy us. Although it states that it's only five to 10 cents, do not be fooled. There will be no cap on this Bill.

And before you know it, the TCI tax will keep going up like California gas tax is regressive tax, and it tends to impact the low-income. And middle-class more than the rich. The tax will increase the burden of getting to work school and even the grocery store. This will hit struggling Connecticut residents, right where it hurts their pockets.

Make no mistake, gas prices are rising and we cannot afford yet another tax. Current prices for regular gasoline have already hit \$3. This is not the right time for us to increase the cost of gasoline even more. The fact that this Bill is even being considered during a world, pandemic is unconscionable. It shows just how out of tune the government is with reality.

People can't pay their mortgage or rent. They're struggling to feed their family. Many business people whose businesses have been devastated by COVID. The reality is we are struggling as a community to recover from COVID. Passing this Bill will only increase the burden on the average hardworking individual.

The promise that funds from TCI will help transition existing stations to electric charging stations. I can only say this. The average person does not drive 300 miles in one day, and if they're plugging their cars in at home, then when are they coming to the charging stations? In addition, if the average charge currently takes around 30 minutes and there's three cars in line, are you willing to wait one and a half hours for a charge? This does not seem sensible.

Lastly, electricity in a Connecticut is among the most expensive in the nation is transitioning everyone to electric cars. The smartest idea, not to mention how is electricity being produced is not through fossil fuels. In summary, the TCI tax will create yet another tax burden on the poor and the middle-class. As a solution, I offer this the current gross receipts tax on gasoline increases as wholesale cost of gas increases. So, if that's going up, why not take the TCI out of the gross receipts tax it's already up and Connecticut is already making more tax per gallon based on the wholesale cost of gasoline. Let's not create yet another tax burden on the poor, and middle-class, let's be sensitive, sensible, and let's always remember that the power to tax involves the power to destroy. Thank you.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Thank you, Mr. Algoo, I appreciate your testimony and appreciate hearing from some of the small business owners and how this might impact you. You mentioned some of the costs

associated with this, and certainly the pandemic. Are you aware of when this program would begin?

CHRISTOPHER ALGOO: I believe it starts at the end of you know, in a year or so or whatever, but right now we're recovering like a lot of people and a lot of business owners have gone into a lot of debt. I mean, to keep their businesses open. Like I'm also a restaurant owner. My restaurant's been closed for six months in Connecticut, nobody us done anything to help me in Connecticut with that.

And now I'm going to be basically trying to get myself out of debt in that business. So, I can only compare myself to the average person. And the average person is acquiring so much debt during this pandemic that they're not going to know where to start figuring out is it going to be, as soon as they dig out or as they're digging out, it's going to be smart to tax them again, or, you know, make fuel more expensive. This is a necessity, you know.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Yeah. I appreciate that. As a fellow restaurant owner, I hear what you're saying. I'm sorry. You weren't able to take advantage of some of the programs that the state and hopefully the federal government had to offer you, you were able to take advantage of what I would say is that, that this program would not even begin to auction allowances until the beginning of 2023. So that's important to recognize because it was a consideration I know from the Governor's office as well as DEEP that we are in the midst of a pandemic and it will take some time for economic recovery. And so, I think that was in mind.

And I also just want to ask is, do you believe that this program would transition folks to electric vehicles? And because I think the intention is not to really transition every single person to electric vehicles. So certainly, I think we're seeing that transition happens more and more right to sort of put a, you know, a market-based system and sort of

taking, taking over here and we're seeing that transition, but as many before you have testified, you know, the combustible engines are on the roads and we'll be here to stay for a long time. And we'll still see the sale of gasoline.

I wonder if you could talk a little bit about that, but that part of your testimony, because you did mention transitioning to electric vehicles and how it may not make sense just from a convenience standpoint in particular. But I also wonder you know, the gentlemen before you also a gas station owner mentioned getting into some of these alternative fuels, and I'm wondering what your take is on that. And have you started to look into any transition?

CHRISTOPHER ALGOO: So, I think, I mean, currently, this is what I can say. Everybody wants a better environment, you know, I mean, that's a given, right? But we have to be sensible. And when we look at these charging stations going in, there's a cost that's associated with it, which like you said, and like, lots of people have said most like station owners that are individual owners cannot afford that.

So, they're obviously going to need some help from the state or government or federal government or whatever the case to put in these charging systems. All I'm saying is, is looking look at it from a sensible point of view in the sense that if it does take 30 minutes to get charged, I mean, if there's a line, do you really see people waiting, you know, an hour and a half to get gas to get charged up for their battery, because you're only going to have so many charging stations, you know what I mean?

So that's number one. And number two, most of these people are going to charge their cars at home. So, they're not coming to our stores anymore. They're not going to be coming to buy their regular stuff. And, you know, we get a lot of people coming in just

for gasoline. They pick up a coffee, they buy some snacks, you know, and they're on their way, but now they're not even coming into our location because they're charging their car at home. How does that, I mean, it's just not sensible for us in our industry. And that just the time that it takes to charge is not sensible for the consumer.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Thank you. And have you looked into any other alternative fuels?

CHRISTOPHER ALGOO: I mean, we've looked into electric as well. I mean, and we've also looked into hydrogen, but the cost to put those types of things in, as well as the fact that there's not enough cars on the road that use hydrogen fuel or electric, I mean, it's less than what, 3% of the market, you know what I mean? So, and where are those cars located? You know, you know what I mean?

So, I think it's not just about looking into it. It's just, there has to be a slow progression towards it. And the market will do that. You know, as all these car makers are saying, Hey, you know, we're going to make electric vehicles. You're going to see the slow progression of putting these things in because the people who buy these cars are going to need to get the charge, you know, whether it'd be their house or wherever.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Right. Yeah. And I think, you know, as technology improves the amount of time that you spend charging will improve as well seeing that happen. Yeah. I see. Senator Miner has a question for you.

CHRISTOPHER ALGOO: Sure.

SENATOR MINOR (30TH): Thank you for being here. So, I'm trying to think back to my gas station days. And I know when you look at a pump now, there seems to be three or four different blends of unleaded gasoline. Is there is there a blending system now

that would allow the blending of different percentages of some kind of methanol or alcohol-based additives that might improve the environmental footprint of gasoline?

CHRISTOPHER ALGOO: I mean, personally, I'm not an expert in that area and I don't know. Yeah, I know it's mixed with ethanol right now, currently. But again the combustible engine would have to be able to work with that type of fuel. So if the cars aren't able to work with whatever you just said, benzene or, or some other fuel, I mean then it's kind of defeats the purpose. Putting this stuff in is, is, is one thing, but we don't have cars that are going to be using it and it's not going to return on investment, then it kind of is pointless. You know, we're still in business to make money as well. You know what I mean? We are here to help the environment, but also help you know, make a profit.

SENATOR MINER (30TH): Right, I know. I appreciate that. I guess I heard the Commissioner this morning talk about trying to mitigate some of this by different blends of gasoline that might be more environmentally friendly. And as she was saying it, I was trying to imagine a blending system that might go beyond 10%. Because like you, I believe that auto manufacturers given a timeframe of 10, 15, 20 years from today back, because that's really what we have to talk about, right?

CHRISTOPHER ALGOO: Right.

SENATOR MINER (30TH): Is that vehicles that are maybe 15 years old, won't even run maybe on 10%. They, they may cause problems, let me put it to you that way. And so from an emission standpoint, I'm not sure that gasoline blend of one kind or another is the same for all kinds. And then I was trying to imagine how you would actually blend fuel to get around this additional surcharge on gasoline at the wholesale level, right. So it's the intention here

is to build a fee into the tax before it comes to you, and the only way around it is if the gas is cleaner as you dispense it into the automobile. And it sounds, I guess I was trying to figure out whether you, whether you were aware of the technology in a blended pump that would allow a consumer to choose three or four or five different buttons to even do what the Commissioner was talking about.

CHRISTOPHER ALGOO: I've, I've never seen a machine like that. I mean, I've seen blended gasoline and ethanol. Obviously, you have your regular grades of gasoline at the pump. But I don't even know of another chemical that can be blended with gasoline to reduce emissions. I, you know, I can't speak to that, you know, I don't want to mislead you.

SENATOR MINER (30TH): But you're not aware of a machine that actually would allow it to be dispensed?

CHRISTOPHER ALGOO: No.

SENATOR MINER (30TH): And then how about that in the case of diesel fuel. I haven't really paid an awful lot of attention because I don't drive a diesel automobile, but I know for some time the notion of blending it with a biofuel, I had some problems because of jelly. So you can, you can blend biofuel for heating oil, but when you start to put it in a vehicle, especially in the northern tier of the country, it develops jelling problems. Do you, are you aware of whether or not that's been fixed?

CHRISTOPHER ALGOO: As far as I know, I mean, the, the diesel will gel if you know it gets too low or there is, you know, any kind of water evaporation occurring as well. But I, I don't know, I can't speak specifically to jelling. I don't see that happening in, at my stations. You know what I mean.

SENATOR MINER (30TH): But, but do you know if it is a biodiesel at this point?

CHRISTOPHER ALGOO: I believe it is a biodiesel.

SENATOR MINER (30TH): Okay, that's good.

CHRISTOPHER ALGOO: We put things in our tanks as well to take care of, because the biodiesel creates like an algae in your tank. So you have to get rid of that. So you got to put another supplement into your tank to make sure that it's cleaned out as well.

SENATOR MINER (30TH): Okay. Thank you.

CHRISTOPHER ALGOO: Thank you.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Thank you, Senator. And thank you, Mr. Algoo for your testimony today. Okay, looks like I don't see them in the room, but I will say their names just in case they're in wait. And then we'll go on to Wayne Cobleigh. But first would be Rajen Shelat, followed by Sammy Olabi, followed by Firas Alrawabdeh, followed by Betsy Gara. And I don't see any of them in here. So, Mr. Cobleigh, you are up and if those others don't enter the room, it would be Kevin Miller.

WAYNE COBLEIGH: Hi, it's Wayne Cobleigh. Can you hear me okay.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Yeah, sorry about butchering your name a little bit there, I'm sorry.

WAYNE COBLEIGH: Hey, you're not the first one. Don't, don't worry about it. Yes, I'm Wayne Cobleigh. I'm a Vice President with GZA. I'm also representing the Connecticut Green Building Council, where I am the Finance Chair. And the Connecticut Green Building Council had several people involved in the Governor's Climate Change Council working groups. I personally was helping the finance and

funding of Climate Adaptation. So I am here to really support strongly the, the House Bill 6441. And I want to thank the Committee for their time today.

I've submitted written testimony. So I don't really want to go over the particulars of the written testimony. It's, it's from the Connecticut Green Building Council. And I just want to hit some of the highlights of that, but because I am on the working group for Finance and Climate Adaptation and I've been involved with working on that subject since 2013 with the state of Connecticut, I would welcome any questions from the Committee that they haven't received an answer from yet or something that's come up that they would want some, some insight on, on these funding programs.

So firstly, the programs do need to address vulnerable communities, and you'll see in the legislation that it was mentioned twice where the definition in Section 16-2243Y is defining what a vulnerable community is in Connecticut and why they should be prioritized for funding under these municipal programs that are being set up. Connecticut Green Building Council is strongly in favor of that. As far as the work on the working groups, we had a lot of a liaison work with the environmental justice working group of the GC free and we made sure that a lot of our recommendations were pointing out the disparities that are created now by a lot of the resilience funding programs at the federal government level.

We're trying to focus Connecticut's funding programs at the local level and make sure that at the local level they know where the local needs are. They should be including those vulnerable communities in the committees that are working on Climate Adaptation Resilience, so that the Representative, but they should also be putting their priority projects in those areas because those are the areas of the community that need the most help.

The second item is that we want to see projects move from the planning stage into the prioritizing stage, and then to the project design and permitting stage. Right now in Connecticut, most of the work has been funded because of Irene and Sandy disaster recovery funds. The company I am in GZA has done some of these climate resilience plans. The primary concern we see at the municipal level is the capacity to take on this work. And they need to be able to find the resources to apply for the federal funding, and they need to match the funding.

This statute would allow the, the matching funds to be created and that tends to be the biggest concern for advancing projects beyond the plan.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Thank you, Mr. Cobleigh. I think you've exhausted your time. Is there anything you want to say to wrap up?

WAYNE COBLEIGH: Well, in final the, the biggest funding program that's out there right now for Connecticut municipalities is the brick funding and that is FEMA. It just started on the first set of applications for due January 29th and we did work with several communities to get applications in, but every community in Connecticut will qualify for that funding for the next seven years. And they really need to start putting in the, the matching funding now if they're going to apply to these funds over the next seven years, so that they can take a project out of planning and into permitting and design and construction. That's been the biggest slowdown right now. It's a lot of plans get written, completed, and they don't get acted on.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): So, do you, thank you so much for that. Are you envisioning that municipalities will be able to use some of these funds to put towards, I mean, obviously infrastructure use it. Do you work with municipalities frequently and, you know, coming up with plans to, to make these

structures resilient against storm surges and flooding and alike?

WAYNE COBLEIGH: Yes, we do. And often in the planning stage, the municipalities request us to help them pick five conceptual projects that kind of meet their priority concerns, and you, you, there's a cost estimate that's developed a timetable and that's the first step usually to saying okay, now that we know order of magnitude what we need to invest, how are we going to find the money to actually move the project forward? We've had several communities in Connecticut begin that process usually with FEMA funds or with funds they get from the State of Connecticut that comes through HUD. But each funding source comes with its own requirements, and I think, you know, the, one of the, one of the main issues we found in the working groups was, there's a need to build that capacity at the municipal level. I think that's probably why you didn't see a lot of municipalities taking advantage of the pilot program for stormwater utility fees, because they're like how do we get this started, how are we going to do this. I think to the extent the state and CIRCA and consulting firms can collaborate to, to kind of create some guidance, more towns will adopt these funding programs that we're asking you to enable through this legislation.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Okay. Well, thank you so much for your testimony today. I don't see any questions. So thanks for your patience for being with us.

WAYNE COBLEIGH: Thank you very much.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Okay. I see, I believe our next testifier is Number 64, Chelsea Gazillo, but I'm just going to run down this list again because we haven't heard from Rajen Shelat, Sammy Olabi, Firas Alrawabdeh, Betsy Gara, Kevin George Miller, Monica Rodriguez, Nick Jamal, and of course then

Chelsea, followed by Jay Gandhi. So if any of those folks are listening, I'll give it a couple of tries and, and repeat that list and we can return back to you. Welcome Chelsea. Good to see you. Oh, it's not Chelsea. You're tricking me Amy.

AMY BLAYMORE PATERSON: Just trying to wake everybody up. It's so late in the day.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): You [crosstalk]

AMY BLAYMORE PATERSON: Chelsea graciously swapped spots with me, which I owe her for that. So for the record, good afternoon Co-Chairs Cohen and Glasgow Vice Chair Slap and Palm, Ranking Members Miner and Harding and Members of the Environment Committee. For the record, my name is Amy Blaymore Paterson, and I am the Executive Director of the Connecticut Land Conservation Council.

I want to start out by saying congrats to Representative Gresko on his new position as well as to Representative Palm. Thank you for this opportunity to present testimony on behalf of CLCC in strong support of Governor's Bill 6441, AN ACT CONCERNING CLIMATE ADAPTATION. We support the Bill in its entirety. This Bill implements the recommendations from the GC3 phase 1 report including identifying and generating revenue sources to pay for resilience projects and programs. It also underscores the critical role that municipalities have in response to climate change that was really interested in the, in the previous testimony and recognize certainly, recognize him from the, the working groups as I was on the floor subgroup as well.

We are especially supportive of Section 3 giving communities the option to establish a limited buyer's conveyance fee program, which I'll call the municipal funding option to generate revenue for climate resilience in other local environmental

projects. We did submit written testimony, so I'll highlight a few points.

When it comes to climate change, and again, this, this was really just emphasized. Connecticut communities are ready to take action with a multitude of projects on their respective wish lists from planting trees to installing green infrastructure like Bioswale, to living shorelines, to battling invasives, to matching funds, and that Brick fund is really one that we are paying a lot of attention to now as well, for grants to implement and maintain these projects and others.

There is no shortage of ideas and projects coming from our communities. What there is, is a shortage of funding. Hence, Section 3 and the municipal funding option which by the way is listed as a recommendation in three sections of the GC3 report. And why is that? Well, as emphasized by Commissioner Dykes this morning, it makes sense especially now. The program is voluntary. Section 3 is clearly enabling. The municipal funding option has been implemented successfully in other states, and I would direct you to our written testimony just to get some links on case statements in that regard.

Representative Demicco asked the question this morning regarding concerns raised by realtors, that the fee may deter buyers and investors. Well, that's just not contrary, that is contrary, not only to the experiences and studies from other states, but from our own state as well. As underscored by the pandemic, people are attracted to communities that invest in local land conservation and other green spaces. They also see communities that protect property values by addressing flooding, sea level rise and the other impacts of climate change. This trend is playing out all over the state. The real estate market is booming, a direction that is expected to continue and again, I would direct you to our written testimony for links to recent articles, which I'm sure you have seen and digested.

When it comes to property values, realtors recognize the importance of investing in amenities in our communities. To quickly close, CLCC has researched over 400 real estate listing since late 2019. This pandemic which has proximity to land trust preserves and other open spaces as a selling point. I will stop there, I did want to address Representative Palm's question if I'm able to in the question and answer, but thank you so much for all you do, and for this opportunity, and I do hope you'll support this Bill.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Really, thank you Amy for all of your advocacy on urban space preservation and acquisition, and forest management and alike. You know, we hear a lot about the arguments that we should rely on sort of wealthy philanthropy to help us purchase open space and, and we do see that that tends to be the case, right; and some of the wealthier towns, municipalities across the state, they seem to be rich in open space and very actively entrust. I just wonder if you could speak to that a little bit.

AMY BLAYMORE PATERSON: Sure, I'd be happy to. You know, CLCC works with communities all across the state, there are 130 Land Trusts in Connecticut, they range from our most world to our most urban communities. So we see that they run the gamut in terms of socioeconomic and availability and access to funding. So while some communities can rely upon private philanthropy to fund projects and even, even receive their open spaces through donation, I would tell you that most do not. We have a highly competitive grant program, the open space and watershed land acquisition grant program offered through deep. And what I was going to respond to for Representative Palm was another example of the urban green and community garden program, which is specifically for targeted and or distressed communities. Both of those programs are matched fund programs and grants, and so the communities and

the Land Trusts and, and in the case of the open space grant program, water companies as well, they have to raise that match money and oftentimes, delays in closing projects are, are specifically because that much match money is so difficult to find.

So for those communities that do qualify to use the funds for open space acquisition, then this can be a source of match money for them. But for the communities that don't, this is all the more reason to institute a fee like this, because there are all these other types of projects that go to stewardship, and some of the other, that laundry list of projects that I started to rattle off with respect to resilience, and other projects in towns, whether it's management plans, etcetera; all the other things that go along with open space, that there is just not enough funding for. This program will give all communities access to those funds, and it will help really to equalize the plain field quite a bit.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Thank you for that. And I, I do see some questions from my colleagues. I just wanted to quickly ask you, are there other states that have exercised similar legislation or optional, you know, meaningful to them?

AMY BLAYMORE PATERSON: Yes, I am. Yes, there are, excuse me, I'm sorry to interrupt that. Yes. In our testimony, we rattle off a few of those, and there are links to more information through case statements about them. But earlier, there was a question about Massachusetts and I believe Ben Oko had testified as to the, the land bank program, which is funded through a buyer's conveyance fee on Nantucket, but Rhode Island. Let's see, I'm blanking here, but, but many of our; Rhode Island and Massachusetts and in New York, that's the one I was thinking of. But there is a number of case statements from New York.

In our testimony, we have a testimonial from the first Assemblyman from New York about that program, saying it was really one of the best things that they ever did. And it's optional, it's optional. So towns can opt in and they can use it or, or they may choose not to, but there are success stories. And we also link to a report that is across the, that shows programs like this across the country as well, so not just our neighboring states, but others nationally.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Thank you, Amy. I see my Co-Chair, Representative Gresko has his hand up, followed by Representative Palm.

REP. GRESKO (121ST): Thank you, Madam Chair. And I'm going to probably steal Representative Dillon's question from a while back in that. Is there anything in the legislation or would you be open to anything in the legislation that would specify what open space is? For example, let's say, New Haven passes something like this and collects money from, from homebuyers, assembles a fund, then buys a golf course. You know, is that open space? Is there any kind of parameters with which, you know, an open space parcel would be defined?

AMY BLAYMORE PATERSON: The Bill is not drafted in that way at all. And I think one of the purposes for that is that this is very much and this comes so much out of the GC3 process where there was a strong push for local input and local decision making around these types of programs. And so what, so, no, the answer would be that there is nothing in the Bill that would prohibit the use of the funds for golf, a golf course; that would be up to the community if it chooses to adopt this program, if it considers golf courses open space for their purposes.

REP. GRESKO (121ST): And then my last question is, is the same as the, you know, I've read some of the opposing testimony, and it's basically, why don't

you just bond out for the funds or, or raise the mill rate, but you think different.

AMY BLAYMORE PATERSON: Well yeah, and I think many residents would feel differently as well. I think the beauty of this program is that it does allow towns through an optional means to put another tool in their toolbox, which would generate revenue for certain types of projects without raising the mill rate, without having to go to bond. And so this would be something that would be a one-time fee paid by buyers coming into the community who are attracted to the community for the types of amenities that these funds could pay for, and for the types of projects that will protect property values in that community. And it doesn't fall upon the residents that have been there and have been paying their taxes for these types of projects and amenities that again are attracting people to the community. And so it really is a way of shifting that burden off of people who are paying their taxes day in and day out for, for things like this.

And I'll also say this, that, you know, what we see is that when because towns are struggling with their budgets, that if it comes to, I'll give you an example. Let's say they need to do a management plan for one of their open spaces and they don't have the funds in their budget, it's not a line item, it's not in their budget. Well, that's the kind of thing that's going to fall off the table. You know, when they have to start may cut it, or when they have to start cutting, those are the types of things whether it be, again, baseline reports, management plans, environmental assessments, things that are associated with these types of projects, planning. Now they're ready to implement, but they don't have the funds. So these are the types of things that often get cut when budgets get tight. And now they will have this, this optional, again, this optional form of funding that will give them some revenue to put towards the projects that they

really need, that often have to cut because of budget constraints.

REP. GRESKO (121ST): Thank you, Amy. And thank you, Madam Chair.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Thank you. Representative Palm, followed by Representative Dillon.

REP. PALM (36TH): Thank you, Madam Chair. And yes, Amy, you did answer the question I was going to ask you. So I simply wanted to just say thank you for all your wonderful advocacy and for pointing out the environmental justice and also the optional nature of this. And certainly this is not a, a mandate on any town, and I think people need to remember that as well. Thank you.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Thank you, Representative Palm. Representative Dillon.

REP. DILLON (92ND): Thank you, Madam Chair. I do want to thank the House here for listening early. But, I want to make it very clear. There is no potential right now for the City of New Haven to purchase a golf course. And the, I was, because we're conferred, we would be conferring, the state would be conferring new powers on the towns, was trying to think of guidelines and my years, in my early years in the legislature were spent on the Finance Committee, where we spent a lot of time debating what golf courses were or were not and whether there was public access. But I do appreciate the work that you do Amy, and you know very well, because you came to, we were together at, at a, a down on Grand Avenue at a, at a, an opening that a lot of the space that I would be interested in. You know, it's, it's difficult to use. It has a lot of lead in it. You know, so I'm, I'm very interested in, in, in guidelines, but I'll keep listening. And I, and I do appreciate your advocacy and thank you very much.

AMY BLAYMORE PATERSON: Thank you Representative Dillon. That, that project was with at the time in New Haven Land Trust, which is now as you know, Garden New Haven and that community garden was funded through the urban green in part through the urban greening community garden program funded through the Community Investment Act. And just to your point about lead in the soils, I mean, this is exactly the type of programming that in projects that this type of fund could go for, which would be doing an assessment on the property, getting a handle on what kind of contamination there might be, and then having the funds to maybe do that clean up and convert that property into a community garden or other local green space.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Thank you, Representative Dillon. And thank you Amy, and I just have one more question. And, and this sort of was prompted by you going through some of the places that have this option and, and mentioning Nantucket and that sort of prompt a, a thought now. Are these, are these happening, these options being acted upon in, in wealthier and more affluent communities in, in states where they do have this option, or you're seeing them being inactive as an option and not as an option as an ordinance in some, in urban areas, or, you know, I just worry a little bit about, is this only happening in the communities that are already able to get the philanthropy necessary to produce the matching funds or is there something that you first see, you know, happening statewide and communities of all different socioeconomics?

AMY BLAYMORE PATERSON: So I would direct you to the study that we have linked in our testimony, and it's called the wet study, and it talks about towns throughout the country that have done this. The Nantucket example is really, you know, in that regard is not the best example for exactly the reason that you stay. And I think, one of the reasons, I think one of the ways that our Bill, this Bill, the 6441 is different than the past versions

of this Bill, is that the Governor's Office has made sure that the fee structure is very progressive. And they also added, as you know, the affordable housing provision in there. So that it, it is meant to encourage communities across the board to be able to take advantage of this. The percentages are again, it's a progressive fee structure, and they're all ceilings. And so a community that feels that it is, you know, let's say the 0.5% in the lowest category of purchase prices is too high, they can lower that. They can lower that as, as low down as they want, as far down if they want, I should say.

So I think that this Bill is different than most of the, most of the programs that you're going to see in other parts of the country because it's newer. The old, those programs are older and they went for farmland and open space almost exclusively. I think, in New York, you can use it for some different, you know, more expansive uses like park development. But in this case, this is, this is a pretty progressive Bill, because it's looking to use the funding and focusing on climate adaptation, resilience, and mitigation projects in communities.

So I think we have an opportunity to really model what can be done with something like this. Again, being an optional Bill, one town might choose to do it, the neighboring town might not. But we will be able to see it play out and hopefully see the positive impacts of it.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Alright, so it sounds like maybe there was that recognition and we've made some modifications to entice other communities, and.

AMY BLAYMORE PATERSON: Absolutely. I, I believe so, and I believe that that was the intent of the Governor's Office in, in the language that they had suggested here.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Okay. Thanks so much, I mean, again for your testimony and your time today.

AMY BLAYMORE PATERSON: Thank you all so much.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Okay. I do not see any of the others that I mentioned before in the room, so I'm going to move right on 65, would be Jay Gandhi, who I also do not see, followed by Kate Childs. We'll go to next and then Sena Wazer followed by Jon Shaer. So Kate, welcome.

KATE CHILDS: Hi, good evening. I'm sure you guys have had a long day and I think you have a long way to go. So thank you for your time and effort for our state. So I'm here to, today to oppose SB 884. I own both a trucking company and diesel fuel truck stop, actually in New Haven, actually spent quite a bit of money cleaning up a not so pretty sight to put in my truck stop there just a few years ago hoping that I mean, New Haven look a little better and did my part there too. But, you know, my, my issue with this is that as much as we're refraining from calling it a tax, it's a hidden tax that's affecting the people of Connecticut. And, you know, you may remember my daughter testified in front of you guys on the PFAS Bill.

We, we had an accident and we spilled our gasoline, but like our industry has done for years, we do our part to be responsible environmentally, clean up every gallon we spill. It's, it's, it's important to us, it's important to our future. And, you know, I, I want to leave this place a better, this world a better place for my daughter too and when she heard about the PFAS and the unnecessary need for it, you know, she took kind of hard to that. She sees how hard we work to, to do the right thing, so just a little background there.

You know, it always seems like we're here fighting you and well, it would be nice one time to be on the right side of this but, or what feels like we're in support of things. But, you know, batteries are not the cleanest thing in the world, you're refining

precious metals to get them just like we refined petroleum products and, and down the road, we're going to find the same problems going on with batteries that you feel are the problems today. I mean, there is an article I read that said that the, the battery contributes 74% more CO2 than a conventional vehicle, the process, and the lifecycle of the battery.

So I just implore you to think about keeping things in balance, a little bit of everything is a good thing. And to put all our eggs in this basket and electrify the state and, and tax us in order to do it is just doesn't make sense to me. I mean, the free markets moving, people are buying electric vehicles, we don't need to charge more money on the products we use in order to get that because innately we want to leave a better place than we found it.

So, again, it's just a tax that I just don't think is necessary, and, and I hope you feel the same way.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Thank you, Ms. Childs. And I could not forget your daughter's testimony as she was terrific, and certainly we were on the same side of the issue there.

KATE CHILDS: Sure.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): So I appreciate your testimony. I don't see any hands raised. So thank you for your time.

KATE CHILDS: Thank you.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): All right. We have Sena Wazer is next, followed by Jon Shaer, followed by Anne Hulick. Welcome Sena.

SENA WAZER: Thank you. Good evening, Senator Cohen, Representative Gresko, and Distinguished Members of the Environment Committee. Thank you for

allowing me to deliver my public testimony. My name is Sena Wazer. I'm a 17-year-old climate activist from Mansfield, Connecticut, the Co-Director of Sunrise Connecticut, and a junior at UConn.

I'm here today to testify on a few Bills. First is SB 884, AN ACT REDUCING TRANSPORTATION-RELATED CARBON EMISSIONS. As I'm sure you're aware, the transportation sector is one of the biggest contributors of climate change. And as a young person, I can't help but worry about what those emissions mean for my generations future, as well as for current communities which are struggling with asthma as well as many other climate change and emission related issues.

I'm also excited that this Bill takes into account equity disparities and ensures that at least 35% of the proceeds from this program go towards underserved and overburdened communities. I hope that the legislature and the Connecticut DEEP will ensure that these funds truly go back to expanding clean transportation in these communities, and don't get diverted to other areas.

Additionally, I would like to voice my support for HB 6551, AN ACT CONCERNING ENVIRONMENTAL AIR QUALITY. This Bill is a huge step forward and that it allows DEEP to deny permit applications if they would result in an environmental or public health cumulative effect that is higher than those born in other Connecticut communities.

However, there are a couple issues in this Bill that should be addressed to make it stronger and ensure that more fully protects communities from environmental injustices. First, it is critical that the definition of affecting facilities should include all facilities that affect public health or the environment, including data centers, power plants, sewage treatment plants, incinerators, gas plants, and more.

Secondly, it is important that the residents of Connecticut and specifically members of environmental justice communities have a way to hold the state government accountable for its actions as Charles Rothenberger explained. Specifically, accountability measures in this Bill should be expanded to include a citizen suit provision which would allow for citizens to sue the government should they not comply with environmental justice laws.

Additionally, there should be a fee for certain permit applications to cover the cost of providing environmental justice or technical assistance to overburdened communities.

And finally, this Bill should be strengthened to ensure that there is a meaningful public participation and dialogue, as well as adequate notice given to the community in an easily available format.

The last Bill that I'd like to voice my support for is HB 6441, AN ACT CONCERNING CLIMATE CHANGE ADAPTATION. Although I focus primarily on the mitigation side of climate change, it is absolutely essential that we recognize the effects that climate change will have on our state and prepare for those effects.

In closing, I hope that the Committee will support these Bills and do your best to ensure they pass the state legislature. I believe it is high time for Connecticut to be a leader on acting against the climate crisis and these Bills along with the suggested amendments have the opportunity to help make us such. Thank you.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Thank you very much Sena for that testimony. I see Representative Palm has a question for you.

REP. PALM (36TH): Sena, how old were you when you started worrying about the environment?

SENA WAZER: I was very young, I was about five when I first got into environmental activism. But like 14 when I started working specifically on climate change.

REP. PALM (36TH): Do you, do you remember what happened when you were five that, that triggered your awareness; was it your parents who?

SENA WAZER: It was a book that my parents read to me about a whale and the whale go kind of fishing that but she got rescued. And I found out that, that most whales don't get rescued and that was very concerning to me. So that was when I first got into environmental activism.

REP. PALM (36TH): The power of literature, huh?

SENA WAZER: Yeah.

REP. PALM (36TH): Well, I, you know, you're, you're one of our preeminent activists and I, I just wanted to hear from you. We've heard a lot of testimony today, and it's been very informative. Some of it has been very, you know, skewing a little bit to the dry side, the technical side. I think this is a chance for us to hear from somebody whose future is, well, let's put it this way, who's motivated by something other than an economic interest pro or con. So my last question to you is really very open. And that's I would just like you to take a minute to talk to us about the fear that you have or the concern that you have about your future, starting when you were five and then getting, you know, kind of solidified when you were 14 as an activist. What do you see ahead of you, personally in your own life?

SENA WAZER: Yeah. Well, so, so when I was 14, I, you know, read about the Intergovernmental Panel on

Climate Change report that really released a very startling timeline in terms of climate change. And for me that, like, that was the thing that really prompted me to get into climate activism because like I said, I'm 17, you know, my sister's 15, and so knowing that, you know, we'll be 26 and 24 when our, you know, carbon timeline, like runs out. If we want to call it, that is very alarming.

You know, I'm someone who wants to go into public service and I want to, I want to go into politics, but it's hard to even know, like, will I have that chance? You know, how, like, how is this going to, how is climate change going to play out, what does that mean for my future; how are, you know, communities around Connecticut, where I hope to stay going to be impacted. And so all of that is, it's, it's really, you know, scary and hard to think about and sometimes honestly, it's easy to shut that out for a minute and just focus on, you know, the actions that I can take now. But I think that there is just a lot of uncertainty, and not just for me, but you know, I work with students on a very regular basis. And I see those same fears reflected in, in them and their concerns for the future as well as their concerns at the lack of action that we're seeing from, you know, many levels of government.

REP. PALM (36TH): Another young woman who testified a couple of hours ago talked about this as the most important or I think she may even have said existential question of, of your generation. Do you agree with that?

SENA WAZER: Yes, I do agree with that.

REP. PALM (36TH): Do you think most people of my age understand that?

SENA WAZER: Well, it's hard for me to make that judgment because I do work mostly with young people. But I, I do think that, you know, my generation students, my age may have a better grasp of the

timeline, and of just how shocking that is, because it does seem like sometimes decisions are being made where our voices are rarely heard. But yet, they will affect our generation disproportionately.

REP. PALM (36TH): Thank you. I, I can assure you that the people on this Committee hear your voice. Thank you. Thank you Madam.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Thank you, Representative. Representative Reyes, followed by Representative Michel.

REP. REYES (75TH): Thank you, Madam Chair. Just thank you, just following up on the Co-Chair's line of questioning, because I really do believe that the environment is, that the young is, the young is really going to be able to help us with the environmental gains that we're going to achieve over the next few years. And I, I want to compliment Ms. Wazer for her, for her testimony. And somebody so young and I, and I have a, even a simple question for you. So in the environment that you come from, do you see many people of color involved in this in this, in this arena, African Americans and Hispanic in your arena? And I'll tell you why after you answer.

SENA WAZER: Yeah. So I think it, it very much depends on which meeting I'm in. And so there are some meetings that are definitely predominantly white of very, very much that way. But there are also other groups. You know, I work specifically with the Sunrise movement and a lot of these youth organizations do have a very strong focus on environmental justice, and having youth of color leading and at the front of the movement, because they are most of the time the ones who are, who are affected the most out of you know, our generation.

And so, yes, and no, I guess. It depends where, where you are, which room you're in.

REP. REYES (75TH): And, and thank you for that. And then the reason I, and the reason I even ask is simply because I'll take myself as a case study. I'm late to the table. You know, I'm five generations here, but, but I'm late to the table on the environmental justice. And in the last 10 years, I've been advocating and, and, and talking about environmental justice, environmental justice needs, affecting communities of color, air, land, and water. And, but I'm late to the table and I really applaud to you as a 14-year-old for what you're bringing to the table, and I didn't learn any of this until I was after 50. So I really, and, and my point being, I believe that we need to be teaching this younger and more often, and actually expanding this to schools, especially public schools where these young children don't have the opportunities and maybe some of the opportunities that you've had. So I thank you for your advocacy and, and I thank the Chair for the opportunity.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Thank you, Representative. Representative Michel.

REP. MICHEL (146TH): Thank you, Madam Chair. I just wanted to briefly thank to Sena for all her amazing advocacy and work. Senior the Capitol, we're looking forward to see you again at the Capitol under better circumstances, but thank you for your advocacy and, and your loud voice. It's well needed, and, and well heard. Thank you. Thank you, Madam Chair.

SENA WAZER: Thank you.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Thank you, Representative. And I don't see any other questions. So Sena, thanks again for being with us today. All right, we've got Jon Shaer, followed by Anne Hulick, followed by William Lucey. Welcome, Jon.

JON SHAER: Thank you. Chairman Cohen and Chairman Gresko, Vice Chairs, Ranking Members and Members of

the Committee; I'm Jon Shaer, I'm the Executive Director of the New England Convenience Store and Energy Marketers Association. Our organization represents convenience stores and transportation fuel distributors, the regulated community under TCI.

I'm speaking in opposition to Senate Bill 884. TCI is an unnecessarily burdensome and potentially dangerous way to raise revenue for bottom up emission reduction projects.

You may have strong opinions on gas and diesel as they relate to greenhouse gas emissions, but as the life blood of our economic and social existence, we should be very careful about manipulating this complex and hyper competitive distribution network. The TCI risks just that by constructing a system that creates allowance allocations and authorizes in state and out of state regulators to determine how those allowances are priced.

It has been reported the initial cost of allowances will be five to nine cents for a 26% emissions reduction. But that contradicts the MOU, which promises a 30% reduction by 2032. As well as the 2019 projections of 25% reduction with the 17 cent allowance fee. So which is it? In spite of DEEP's earlier testimony of a nine cent cap, there isn't anything in writing to commemorate that. And let's not forget, this is just the first 10 years we're talking about.

The purpose of the allowances is to drive down emissions. So the cost of those allowances over the next 10 years and beyond will be driven by auction values, emission reductions, and vehicle miles traveled, not promises. The truth is there isn't any way to know what the cost of the allowances will be over time. You can call it a fee, you can call it a tax, it really doesn't matter. The bottom line is people are willing to pay, is people will be paying more for the fuel they put into their cars

and raising the cost of operating the vehicle in Connecticut via through tolls or a gas tax increases, always hotly debated and generally unpopular because Connecticut already has the highest gas tax rate in the country at 60 cents per gallon.

TCI is an unencumbered license to increase the cost of gasoline and diesel beyond that 60 cents. And to reiterate what Mr. Bolduc said earlier, just like every other stick tax and fee imposed on motor fuels, the cost of allowances, no matter if it's five, nine or 59 cents will be passed through at the pump to the motorist. Anything else is just not, just not reality. So if the legislature wants to create a funding source for bottom up emission reduction programs, I suggest a new tax, specifically for these programs. I realize this may not be easy to pass, but at least it will create a transparent conversation about how much your constituents are willing to pay for transportation related carbon reductions, and you won't see your ability to influence future gas taxes.

When you have done, what you have before you today is just the opposite. Avail tax, very few understand, and jeopardizes a critical distribution network that will raise the price of fuel in perpetuity. Thank you.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Thank you, Mr. Shaer. You mentioned that, that, that it is an unencumbered way of raising prices. I might argue that with the cost containment reserved, it is in fact encumbered by a cap. Do you have any thoughts on that?

JON SHAER: Yeah, I, I have very little confidence in the cost containment reserve for a variety of reasons. Number one, there are, the purpose of this so that the, the, the top down part of this is to reduce emissions over time. And if those goals are not achieved, so take the 2030, and I'm, I'm not sure if it's a 45, but I think it's around a 45%

target. Just say, we're not get into that 45% target by 2030. TCI is just one of many levers that can be pulled to, to get us closer to that. So if that's the case, then I have little doubt that those allowances will either be restricted or the price will go up to encourage further or to encourage less vehicles mile travel. I guess I just don't have a lot of competence in the cost containment reserve for that reason.

The other reason is it's the revenue source. So if we get a little drunk on this revenue, there is really nothing to say going forward that this tax or fee, if you, if you will, won't be increased.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Right. Well, it is written in the legislation. So we would have to legislate that, but what, you know, in the past, and we've heard from the Commissioner a little bit earlier on the Regional Greenhouse Gas initiative, which has worked very well and they, they too have a cost containment reserve. It has been used twice as we heard, and it has in fact worked. Are you suggesting that it wouldn't work here, but it works in that instance?

JON SHAER: I think Reggie is very different from this in that. You've got utilities that are regulated, you've got a, you've got a few quasi-governmental agencies versus a, versus what we have in this industry is a widely competitive, highly competitive open market system. So I really don't think its apples to apples. I know, I know as though their proponents are trying to make it a true apples to apples, but I, I really don't see it that way.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Okay. And you mentioned that, that we should instead think about taxing, you know, just come out and, and say that we're going to tax something. What, what would you suggest that we tax in order to come up with these dollars?

JON SHAER: Yeah, the reason I suggest that is because TCI takes it out of your hands. It, you, you literally, the legislature will literally cede its ability, well unless of course you do want to raise taxes on top of TCI, of course. But in terms of raising revenue, you really do see, you cede your ability to influence TCI because it does, it turns it over to Georgetown. And it turns it over not just to Connecticut regulators, but a consortium of regional regulators. So what may be good for Connecticut may not be good for Massachusetts or any other jurisdiction.

So I, I worry about, I worry about how the legislature will be able to influence that going forward. Whereas while attacks is never an easy thing to debate or to pass, if, if the, if the, if the constituents of Connecticut want to generate carbon reduction programs, and the money will flow directly to it, then I think that that is probably a cleaner way to do it. Certainly, certainly more transparent, far less burdensome; there's no bureaucracy needed other than the one that already exists. And you can pick and choose what that number is going to be based on what the, what the need of the day is. It's just cleaner, it's less bureaucratic, and you, and you retain control. That's, that's why I suggest that versus a program that is very hard to understand, requires a lot of bureaucracy and sees a lot of the control that you currently have today.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): So what, what is it that you would tax though in certainty?

JON SHAER: Oh, I'm sorry. A gas tax, or a carbon tax.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Okay. So you --

JON SHAER: You add it to the existing, the existing the existing taxes.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Okay, okay. I appreciate that. I don't, I believe Representative Michel, is your hand up from before or did you have a question? I have a feeling that his hand never went down, so I don't see any other hands up Mr. Shaer. Thank you for your testimony.

JON SHAER: Thank you for your questions.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Alright. We have Anne Hulick followed by William Lucey, followed by Kevin Grigg, followed by Zell Steever. Welcome here Ms. Hulick.

ANNE HULICK: Hi Senator. Senator Cohen, Representative Gresko, Vice Chairs, Senator Slap, Representative Palm, Ranking Members Miner and Harding, and Esteemed Members of the Environment Committee. My name is Anne Hulick, I'm the Connecticut Director of Clean Water Action. And I'm here today to just make a few comments on two Bills which we are in full support; Senate Bill 884 and also Raised Bill 6551.

You've heard a lot of testimony on both those today. So I'll just make a few comments, regarding Senate Bill 884 first. Again, we thank you, as a Committee for raising both Bills. We support both and hope that they passed. We've participated in the TCI meetings right along for many years, these have been regional and, and statewide meetings. And while we support the concept of the plan, which is critical to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by our transportation sector, which contribute to 38% of emissions; we want to add a few comments with respect to the environmental justice portion of the Bill. So again, we fully support the Bill, just want to make a few recommendations.

As written, the plan currently calls for no less than 35% of the revenues to go to environmental justice communities that have been overburdened by pollution and those underserved by our current transportation system. We support other comments by

other groups previously and suggest that a greater percentage be prioritized and invested in those communities that need it the most.

We have provided certain examples in our testimony, but green jobs, electrification of public transit, and school buses, garbage, and other municipal trucks in those communities should be a real priority. And also, solutions like green infrastructure, planting of trees, improving mass transit and transit stations should be again prioritized as part of the revenues going into those communities.

With respect to House Bill 6551, again we fully support this Bill, and we, we appreciate the good work of this Committee in raising this Bill. Connecticut was the leader when we passed an EJ law in 2008, thanks to my mentor and friend, Dr. Mark Mitchell and many other EJ leaders, yet the historic patterns of racial segregation and harms to these residents in these communities have continued.

So we, while we appreciate and support both aspects of this Bills, we want to just recommend a couple of suggestions. I think that's my time.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Yes, that is your time. So you just try to wrap up.

ANNE HULICK: Okay. One, one comment. We believe that folks on the Equity Committee should be from those communities and should be compensated for their time. And we support that all of those members should have the opportunity for true meaningful participation. And with the last Section, we also agree with my allies that save the sound and others, that we must align agency permitting business growth with our climate reduction goals. We've worked together collaboratively to, on those comments, and we fully support and hope that the Environment Committee will consider those thoroughly as to move the Bill

forward. In general, we fully support both Bills and we thank you so much for your leadership in raising them.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Thank you Anne, for your testimony. Representative Michel if you have a question?

REP. MICHEL (146TH): Thank you, Madam Chair. Yes, thank you Anne for testifying today. Can you elaborate a little bit more in details on what changes you'd like to see in the environmental justice in piece of 6551?

ANNE HULICK: Yeah. You know, we'd really like to see that more than 35% of the, of the monies go to environmental justice communities and that the leaders on that group are residents from those communities, and empowered and compensated to serve in leadership positions.

And then secondarily, we really would like to see and we would support real investment in those communities as a top priority. So again, green jobs, green infrastructure; all of the things that are going to address the harms that those residents and those communities have dealt with for, for so many years, those should be the top of the list. So we'd like to see those leaders in those communities, you know, really serving as leaders to make sure that those issues are, are addressed and prioritized.

REP. MICHEL (146TH): Right, and I appreciate it because for example, an effort in an area where we have the biggest, one of the biggest sites, if not the biggest construction site there's obviously a lot of air pollution for construction as well. There're existing industries. But as the construction builds and new buildings fill up with people from the city are, it's like a transit community that rents for a while and then move to another place. But as they fill up and, and the

City of Stamford keeps getting more and more high wage or high income people come into the city, one of the problems is the city is not part of the communities in distress. So that was one of the problems and I, I really thank you and also the other groups for working on suggesting amendments to get rid of that catch 22 and to expand the criteria for them. That's why they're still not a vulnerable means that have not been covered, but appreciate everything and victory gets this fight. Thank you, Madam Chair.

ANNE HULICK: Thank you, Representative. I will say we all have been working collaboratively on those suggestions. And, you know, it's been a really thoughtful and productive and, and important conversation, and we want to make sure that we're addressing the EJ concerns that have been raised frankly, by our partners, so that we do the best job we can going forward.

REP. MICHEL (146TH): Thank you.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Thank you Representative. And thank you Anne for your testimony and your time today.

ANNE HULICK: Thank you Senator.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Okay. Next, we have William Lucey, followed by Kevin Grigg, followed by Zell Steever. Hi, Bill, welcome.

WILLIAM LUCEY: Alright. Hello, and thank you for the opportunity to testify to the leadership, the Environment Committee, and all the Members. I know you have a long evening ahead of you. So I will be brief.

I want to speak to 6441, the ability for municipalities to get tools so they can adapt to climate change. All these municipal options are simply that they're just tools. For 12 years, I

worked for a home rule borough, and we had a number of tools at our disposal to come up with solutions and revenue for our problems. That's not the case in Connecticut nor am I suggesting that here. But these are very reasonable, common sense ways for communities to figure out how they want to adapt to all the changes that are happening, especially the stormwater authority, I, I testified to that earlier. And then this seems to be the best chance we've had at a conveyance fee, and it's been described not just as an open space Bill, but also those dollars could be utilized to address a lot of this climate change. So I just want to express support for that.

And then on the, the air quality and the environmental justice, I'll just mention that. We had a fire in Waterbury last month and it dumped oil into the Naugatuck River which we're trying to restore, and it also put a toxic haze over the entire town. Now I'm in Killingworth. We get in trouble if we burn our leaves. So it just, it's a case and point that when these industries are, are concentrated, it's a greater likelihood that you're going to have those types of events. And it's the people who live in those communities surrounded by those types of industries that are going to be at greatest risk.

So I will close with that. Thank you.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Thank you, Bill. I appreciate your testimony. I don't see any hands raised. So thank you, have a good night.

WILLIAM LUCEY: Good night.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Alright. We've got Kevin Grigg, followed by Zell Steever, followed by Digvijay Bansal. Is Kevin with us? I don't see Kevin, so let's move on to Zell, welcome.

ZELL STEEVER: Co-Chairs Cohen and Gresko and Vice Chairs Slap and Palm, Ranking Members Miner and Harding and Distinguished Members of the Environment Committee. I'm Zell Steever, and I'm Chairman of the Groton Resiliency and Sustainability Task Force for Town of Groton. And I'm, like to thank you for the opportunity to come in, in support of House Bill 6441. We believe that this Bill will benefit our town and cities in Connecticut by providing new authorities and innovative tools to organize and to fund the climate adaptation and resiliency activities across the state.

The impact of climate change will only become more severe affecting our economic, social, and quality of life in the future unless we take, unless we take action now.

Section 3 of the Bill gives the local communities the option to establish the buyers to advance fee and to fund a number of activities centered around climates, climate resiliency and for matching state and federally funded grants and other opportunities. The Bill establishes the opportunity for towns and cities to create long-term sustainable funding streams to help manage the impact of climate change and to protect our air, water, and land resources for future generations.

Now to be clear, this Bill is just a start and what we ultimately need in Connecticut and in our local communities to effectively manage the impacts of climate change. This Bill addresses climate adaptation by making our communities more resilient. This Bill also benefits by addressing climate mitigation ways to reduce greenhouse gases that include energy efficiency and conservation activities and on local communities. To be effective, both adaptation and mitigation must be considered together.

Ultimately, for local communities to be successful responding to climate change, we will need to

develop a vision, establish a capacity to have the resources available to be effective. Confronting climate change will be a challenge as it will require federal, state, and local cooperation leadership and long-term commitment. I urge you to support House Bill 6441 and authorize local communities to choose the tools and processes best suited to meet local needs and opportunities. I'd be delighted to answer any questions you might have. Thank you very much.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Thank you so much, Mr. Steever for your testimony. It's really great to hear from municipalities, and it's great to hear that Groton has the resiliency and sustainability task force. Could I ask you about Groton set up any climate change and cluster resiliency funds under the passage of legislation that we did in 2019, do you have a separate funding for these purposes?

ZELL STEEVER: No, we do not right now. We recommended that the town set up such a, a facility back in 2011, that did not happen. And just recently, the task force, the new task force, the one I'm Chairman, Chairman of, has recommended the town that they do that again. And we're hoping that that will happen. We believe a dedicated long-term fund will be absolutely necessary. We hope that in the case of things like energy efficiency that the efficiency that we gain from reducing our energy needs, those extra funds that are there then could be used to, to, to start other projects and to deal with the whole issue of resiliency.

Later in the, your program, another member of our task force, Jessie Stratton will explain this in some, some more detail, and will also describe one of the recent resolutions the town council has passed, which we think if we can fully implement will be a terrific start and are really dealing with climate change in our own community.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Terrific. And so I'm assuming that you have a coastal resiliency plan then, is that laid out already that you have created through your task force or is that something you're actively working on?

ZELL STEEVER: Typical of a number of communities were at taskforce and so we have virtually no staff to do, do this sort of thing. However, I did have the honor to serve on an earlier taskforce where we did come up with a series of plans that were a result of the funding that came through the federal programs back in 2009 when we had the big downturn in the economy and there were a number of plans that were developed in terms of what we would do.

And I think our observation is that often these plans are, are put together, and then, then they're unfortunately put on the shelves. And until those plans are actually acted upon, we have made little progress. And so we're hoping that one of our recommendations has been to get a full time person at a senior level to work on climate change, resiliency, and sustainability in our community so that this can be fully coordinated because many of these activities go across multiple lines for example, planning and zoning, the building inspector, the public works people, the finance people will all have to work together in these things and classically that does not happen. They tend to work on their own, stovepipes is they call them.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Could, could I ask Mr. Steever, is your task force an appointed task force by the, the CEO of your task?

ZELL STEEVER: The way this works in Groton is that the town produced an ordinance or a resolution appointing a task force, and then we were appointed through the Town Council and so we're a group of five regulators and two alternates who serve on this task force.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Thank you so much. Thanks for your testimony tonight. I don't see any hands raised, but I really appreciate you being here.

ZELL STEEVER: Well, thank you very much. And thank you for holding this Public Hearing.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Yeah, be well. Alright. I see Kevin Grigg has joined us and he'll be followed by Digvijay Bansal followed by Uchenna Bright. Hi Kevin, welcome. I think you're still on new Kevin. Are you there?

KEVIN GRIGG: You're correct, thank you.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Yes, welcome.

KEVIN GRIGG: How many times, how many times do we say that nowadays, huh? First of all, good evening, both to our Chair, Senator Cohen and Republican or Representative Gresko, sorry, as well as all the other Esteemed Members of the Committee. My name is Kevin Grigg. I currently serve as the President and Chief Executive Officer of Fuss & O'Neill, which is the state's largest consulting engineering firm. I also serve on the Governor's Council on climate change, the GC3, as well as on the Executive Committee of the Connecticut Business and Industry Association or as most of you know what CBIA, and I appreciate the opportunity to offer my testimony in support of the Transportation Climate Initiative program.

Virtually since our inception, businesses throughout our state, in our region, in our country, and even worldwide have too often in unwittingly contributed to the acceleration of climate change. Businesses must therefore be an active part of both mitigating and adapting to the adverse impacts of climate change on virtually all aspects of our society and our lives.

The transportation sector, which is so essential to both our state's economic health and to our social mobility, has been and continues to be as Commissioner Dykes mentioned earlier this morning, one of the primary generators of greenhouse gases, and as you all know, those gases are those that create and maintain and accelerate climate change. And of course, most of them are due to automobile and truck emissions.

There is no question that the cost to private business including my own, the cost of addressing so many years of unintended environmental degradation is and will continue to be sufficient, particularly in the near to midterm. However, the funds that we invest now in my opinion will reduce the rate of investment required in the future. And in the process, as the number of speakers have mentioned, help create and maintain a healthier environment for us and for our children and for their children.

Both DEEP and the Connecticut DOT estimate that the Transportation and Climate Initiative program will reduce greenhouse gas pollution from motor vehicles throughout the region by an estimated 26% from 2022 to 2032. And at the same time, will generate a total of more than \$3 billion over 10 years for participating in jurisdictions to invest in equitable and less polluting transportation options, while helping to energize our economy.

In closing, I'm often asked what we do at Fuss and O'Neill, we employ engineers and scientists primarily and I, I often tell people in response that our engineers and scientists are the doctors and nurses of the net and they build environments. As such, we recognize and support the need for environmental triage in the form of initiatives such as the multistate transportation and Climate Initiative program.

With that in mind, I respectfully request your recognition and support as well through the passage

of Senate Bill 884. Thank you again for your time and for your consideration.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Thank you, Mr. Grigg, for your testimony and for your service on the GC3 and for all your work and activism and, and working to shore up our community with your engineering firm there. I don't see any questions from the Committee, so thanks again for your time and testimony.

KEVIN GRIGG: Thank you very much.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): All right. I don't see our next speaker in the room that would be Digvijay Bansal, so I'll call that name for the last time and oh, no, that's Uchenna. And then Uchenna Bright is next, followed by James Unterreiner, followed by Diane Lauricella, and I'm probably butchering your names, sorry, I apologize. Welcome Uchenna, hopefully, I'm not butchering yours?

UCHENNA BRIGHT: No, you did great. Thank you so much, and I want to say good evening to all of you. And thank you for staying on and listening to a full day of testimony here and for providing this opportunity for public input. So my name is Uchenna Bright, I am the Eastern States Advocate for a national nonpartisan organization called E2, which stands for Environmental Entrepreneurs. And E2 has over 9000 members and supporters across the country who work or do business in every state in the nation. E2 members are business leaders, they are business owners, they are investors and farmers, engineers, and other professionals who come together to advocate for policies that are good for the economy and good for the environment.

So I'm testifying today on behalf of E2 members and supporters who work or do business in Connecticut, and in support of SB 844, AN ACT REDUCING TRANSPORTATION-RELATED CARBON EMISSIONS. So SB 844, which would authorize Connecticut's participation in

the regional Transportation and Climate Initiative program, comes at a critical time. The transportation sector is the largest source of carbon pollution in the state, and at a time when health concerns and the devastating impacts, economic impacts of COVID-19 are being felt across the country and around the world.

Participation in the TCI program would not only provide emissions reductions for healthier communities through cleaner transportation, it would also generate the funds needed to drive investment and stimulate Connecticut's economy. With the \$1 billion in proceeds that Connecticut can expect over the 10-year period from TCI participation, the state can invest an increased access to public transportation to help people get conveniently to and from work, equitable transit oriented development to create transportation hubs where businesses can thrive and safer streets that promote active transportation like walking and biking to improve the health and quality of life for all Connecticut residents.

The jobs created from investing in clean equitable transportation will be good paying jobs with that support, sort of a wide variety of, of occupations including blue and white collar occupations. Investments will support electricians and construction workers and factory workers and engineers, and people who work in advanced technology. These investments will support new charging infrastructure, better land use planning, and new Made in America businesses that employ local Connecticut residents.

Adopting SB 844, and enabling Connecticut to move forward with the Transportation and Climate Initiative program will drive innovation, investment, and job growth at a time when Connecticut and the country are looking to recover from economic losses caused by COVID-19, the COVID-

19 pandemic and as we look to build a cleaner, healthier, more resilient economy.

And that is my testimony and thank you so much for your time and consideration. And I'm open to questions.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Thank you Miss Bright. I appreciate your testimony today. I don't see any hands raised. So thank you for your patience and for sticking with us. Alright, I don't see Digvijay. Then there is James Unterreiner, I don't see James. Diane Lauricella, I see, followed by Jagruti Patel, followed by Dan Bosley. Welcome, Diane.

DIANE LAURICELLA: Welcome. You did very well with my last name, my answer to anything. Good, good day. I have attempted to listen to all of the important discussion, and I wanted to thank both Co-Chairs as well as Vice Chairs and Ranking Members and the Committee Members of the Environment Committee. Thank you for your dedication. This has been a long day. You have many, many important things I've listened to over the past few weeks.

I'm here today in support of, of all three Bills that are on your purview. Senate Bill 884, House Bill 6441, and I want to focus on Raised Bill 6551. So I'm going to speak quickly because I keep amending my comments because others have very well gainfully expressed what I would have expressed to you today. I am so blessed and we are blessed to have such wonderful groups like Save the Sound, Anne Hulick's group, Clean Water Action, the League of Conservation Voters and coming up will be other groups, CCEJ, etc., Wayne Cobleigh and Connecticut Green Building Council, Sena Wazer.

I agree with almost everything they've said, I stand in solidarity with them. But I just want to focus on a few things for each of those Bills as quickly as possible. The first is with, with the House Bill

6441. Well, first of all, my background is I'm an Environmental Consultant. I used to be a regulator in hazardous materials management, and I try to green up my clients now as a private self-employed person. And I've worked on many, many not volunteered on boards and commissions related to green infrastructure and, and elevating and cleaning up pollution and making communities aware of how they can make government work better for them.

So I want to focus on 6441 Section 3, the Municipal Funding Option. There has to be that sense of urgency and that conveyance fee is not a tax. I just ask that this Committee ask that you amend this to actually make a list of innovative tools and projects that a municipality can choose from so that we will not have more time wasting on projects that may be nice, but aren't going to properly put forth the important issue of green infrastructure, and the municipality should have some accountability so that we don't just have things like has happened with some EMT projects, where some towns just kept giving out LED bulbs instead of looking at energy efficiency and other important projects.

Senate Bill 884, the takeaway from that is to ensure that community residents that are affected by the pollution are at the table. And actually I would like to see us actually list the communities as defined in your overburden and, and underserved community possibly following the EJ laws distressed community guidelines.

Lastly, Raised Bill 651, I just wanted to especially focus on Section 2 under definitions, number, Section 2A2 affecting facility. I will wrap up now. I ask that you please include not just new sources, but existing sources. Include renewals of permits, the actual facility should include contractor yards or at least construction yards where piles of silica sand are in place. I have asked and tried to get this to be at the table for several years now. Silica dust is a human carcinogen. And I agree with

everything that's been said about the community environmental benefits agreement. I do think we need more public input and make sure that the community benefit projects actually benefit the community's environmental health and safety. Thank you for all the work you do.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Thank you so much, Miss Lauricella, for your testimony. I don't see any hands or, hands raised right now. So thank you again for your time.

DIANE LAURICELLA: Thank you.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): All right. Let's see here, where we're at. I don't see James Unterreiner, Jagruti Patel, I do not see. I think they are listening, they can log on and I will call their names again. Dan Bosley I see, followed by Matthew Mitchell, followed by Hawar Ramadhan, followed by Mark Mitchell, two Mr. Mitchell. Dan, you're up, welcome.

DAN BOSLEY: Thank you, Chair Cohen, and through you to the Members of your Committee. I appreciate your, I appreciate your hanging in there. And I appreciate your taking my testimony. For the record, my name is Dan Bosley. I represent the Northeast Clean Energy Council. We are a, we are a business association, dealing with clean energy that are in all of the six New England states as well as somewhat in New York State.

We are here to testify today on 884 in enthusiastic favor of your entry into TCI. Chair Cohen you, you have the testimony, I'm not going to, I'm not going to read the testimony. I would like to however make a few points. I too have been here since 10 o'clock this morning, and I have listened to what people have to say, and it's all been very interesting. And there are people who are far more eloquent than I would be in reiterating the same points again and

again. But I would like to react to a few things that were said.

You had a gentleman here earlier who said for 30 years, he's been up here testifying on Bills and I, I would assume that mostly what he's done is testify in opposition to Bills that impact his business. But he said two things that I want to correct. The first is that we need to wait, because this market will evolve and will evolve by itself. I, I don't know, I was going to give you some examples, but I think the best example is the 17-year-old student who just testified. How much longer do we have to tell her to wait, how much can we wait, how can we wait for my 33- year-old daughter? We need to act now to, to preserve our future and to reverse the, and reverse the threats of climate change.

And the second thing that he said was he inferred that California's TCI tax or cap and trade tax was 61 cents. Their entire tax burden for gas tax is the highest in the nation, its 61 cents. I think last year it was 14.5 cents is what, is what their cap and trade class. So and that's not, that's not outrageous when you consider that California has tremendous problems with ozone and greenhouse gas.

I also listened to, I listened to Mr. Bolduc, and I was very impressed with him, and I was very impressed with his testimony. And I think that's something that you're going to need to address as to what you do to replace the gas tax, what you're going to do, yet, there's a whole series of things, zoning and parking lots versus zoning and handicap spaces. How we deal with, with Charge stations. The way we deal with that is by putting money into that program. Everyone is, is concerned about people that are going to pay this, this increased, what they say is an increase fee, I would, I would dispute that. The, the way to make the changes are to do what we did with Reggie. Since 2005, Reggie has lowered emissions from the power sector by 40%. It has increased economic activity by 8% in this

area, so I think there are some lessons to be learned. And I do thank you for your time and I thank you for hanging in there for this hearing.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Thank you, Mr. Bosley. Can you talk a little bit more about how, you know, we've, we've heard others allude to this as well. You know, I think it was, he has been a little bit earlier and we, we've heard other testimony to this effect. How something like this could impact the economy positively?

DAN BOSLEY: Well, I'll give you two examples of how it could. This is an excellent question by the way, and I, and I give you two examples of how this, of how this has happened in the past that I think we can take lessons from.

The first is, is the early 90s when they broke up the bells. We had telephones that were hardwired in our homes and we had rotary dials on them. Now, I, I could run my local hospital on the, on the computer power that I have on this phone. The reason that happened is because we gave people an opportunity to innovate, we gave people an opportunity to change the world at any use, some of, and, and we let them into a market, and that's what we need to do with this. We need to let people into the market.

The other is, is 1997 when we, we restructured electricity. We went from having a very few generators in, in New England and 56 plants to where we now have hundreds of thousands of generators. Every time somebody puts up the solar, a solar panel, it's a generator. That happened because we allowed people to participate in the market and we allowed innovation, and the innovation has, has led to a precipitous drop of clean energy costs, it has led to an increase in jobs. And all of that can happen if you give people an opportunity.

I listened to Katie Dykes talk today and I listened to her talk about, we're going to take the \$85 to \$89 million depending on who you talk to, and reinvest that. And when you reinvest that, you're going to reinvest it in creating a new program and creating new ways of doing things. And that's going to spur, that by nature that just spurs new jobs and new, and new opportunities.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Thank you for that. I don't see any other hands raised. So thank you so much, Mr. Bosley for your testimony and for your time today. Sounds like you've been in here in the long haul.

DAN BOSLEY: Thank you very much. Thank you.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Okay. I don't see the other names that I've called, so I'm going to move on. We've got Matthew Mitchell, followed by Hawar Ramadhan, followed by Mark Mitchell, followed by Anil Patel. Welcome, Matthew.

MATTHEW MITCHELL: Hi, my name is Matthew Mitchell, President of Norbert Mitchell Company located in Danbury, Connecticut. Good afternoon to the Members of the Committee and thank you for your time today. I'm here to speak in opposition of SB No.884, the TCI tax Bill.

Our family business employs 212 Danbury area residents and was started by my grandfather in 1945. We provide gasoline and diesel at our service stations and we deliver gasoline and diesel heating oil and propane throughout Western Connecticut. It has been made clear by the Commissioner Dykes and Governor Lamont that the TCI Bill is part of an effort to help fund and encourage the electrification of the transportation sector. TCI in the electrification policies will put businesses like ours out of business and put the good people that work with us out of a job.

According to a survey conducted by JD Power, about 80% of EV charging takes place at home. According to [transportationandenvironment.org](http://transportationandenvironment.org), only about 5% of charging takes place at public charging stations. Both surveys point out the simple reality that people like to charge at home. So there will be a little demand in the future for charging stations at gas stations. And that's regardless of a lot of the technical hurdles that we've talked about today.

As a resident of Connecticut, I am most concerned by the lack of honest communication about the cost to modernize our grid and weatherproof our transmission system so it can accommodate and EV infrastructure. So the basic questions that I have for policymakers to consider are, was August so long ago that we all forgot the dangerous, dangerous situation that our electric grid left us, why our Governor Lamont and Commissioner Dykes pushing policies that will hand our transportation sector over to the very same electric utilities and grid that have led us down repeatedly in recent years. Why should we support policies that move a massive sector like transportation to our electric grid without first modernizing our grid and weather proofing our transmission system?

I have not forgotten early August. Our company and its 200 plus employees were working around the clock to deliver propane and diesel fuel to thousands of generators and hospitals, retirement facilities, essential businesses, and residences all across western Connecticut. Losses of power happened because our grid is weak, and our transmission system which relies on above ground poles, surrounded by heavy tree covers even weaker. When do we start talking about the real costs that our state will need to invest in order to modernize our fragile electric grid and make it more storm resistant? Isn't it common sense to make those investments before we start the transition of our transportation sector over to this fragile grid.

The TCI Bill is a regressive tax that will fall on those that can least afford it, with no clear statutory limit to be spent in an undefined manner with no results required. So over the next few years, they will take a billion dollars out of the pockets of Connecticut drivers with no guarantee that any reduction of carbon emissions will be achieved. However, there are two guarantees that we can all count on, and I'll wrap up. Guarantee number one, the cost of gasoline will increase. Guarantee number two, if a significant level of transportation electrification is achieved, businesses like ours while they're gone out of business will be forced to dramatically shrink our operations.

So when the power goes out, companies like us will not be here to make the emergency deliveries necessary to keep our communities running. All those electric cars and electric heated homes will sit cold and idle, and there will be no generators to power them because there will be no fuel companies like us to keep those generator tanks full. Please do not support policies that put the cart before the horse when it comes to the energy that Connecticut residents rely on every day.

Please oppose SB 884. Thank you for your time, and I'll take any questions.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Thank you so much, Mr. Mitchell for your testimony. I appreciate it. You mentioned about the bulk of your testimony, sort of insinuated that we would be moving completely to electric vehicles. You know, certainly the market is headed in that direction, though the proceeds at that line and that they'll, they'll just say that they will go directly towards, you know, putting an electric vehicle in the hands of every resident of the State of Connecticut, and I, and heard some testimony earlier from Mr. Fox, saying that we're always going to need gasoline, right. There is combustible engines on the road, and even if

automakers stop producing them at, at some point in the near future, you still have those cars on the road. Is it your position that these cars, you know, eventually won't need your gasoline or you know, you mentioned about this putting you out of business? So I just want to understand that a little bit better.

MATTHEW MITCHELL: Well, every petroleum car that's replaced with an electric car will cut into petroleum demand. I think that's the, I mean, that's the overall vision of the, of the of DEEPs plan that it's, that it laid out the climate initiatives that it laid out was to move that, was to transition the transportation sector to electricity, to electrify the sector. And I know that doesn't happen tomorrow, you know that obviously, but it's, but it'll take time. But the ultimate goal is, is fairly clear. It's the transition. New car sells to electrification over time and to electrify the transportation sector. And that's a, that's an infrastructure change that the State of Connecticut in its current form and probably in its former 10 or 30 years, unless it makes serious investment in its grid and in, in transmission infrastructure cannot withstand.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Thank you for that. There was also some testimony a little bit earlier about the, I think it was Mr. Shaer who also was representing a bunch of convenience stores and saying that this is, you know, a bit disingenuous of the state that we're imposing, you know, what he believes is a tax and that we should just tax some, you know, something outright, rather than saying that this isn't a tax, which, you know, arguably from my standpoint is not, right, where we're selling allowances to a wholesaler who then makes the choice to pass those, those costs down. Mr. Shaer had said that he would suggest a gas tax, a straight out gas tax. Is that, is it your belief that that would be better than implementing TCI?

MATTHEW MITCHELL: No, a gas tax wouldn't, we have plenty of gas taxes, we don't need more. An earlier suggestion to use some of the existing gas taxes if there is particular policies that the, that the State of Connecticut would like to, would like to invest in might be a better approach but coming up with a new gas tax, I think we've gone down that road plenty in the State of Connecticut.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Okay. I, I know you did mention that, but there's no guarantee in a reduction in emissions. But that the program is uniquely a guarantee by capping the number of allowances that go out and similar to their Regional Greenhouse Gas initiative. So I, I don't know, how, how would you envision a mission staying at the same rate under a cap and trade program?

MATTHEW MITCHELL: Well, I, I think there is a, there is an argument to me, to be made that the driving, that the driving public, there's not at elasticity of, of demand and people need to drive. So there are, there are, there are, certainly studies have shown in the past that people drive regardless of, of what kind of cost you, you try to pass along to them or, or, or, you know, or, or what's, you know, what the government tries to do to, to curb demand. So I'm, I'm not --.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Well if that's the case, hopefully, you won't go out of business.

MATTHEW MITCHELL: Yes.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Okay. Representative Callahan, I see you've have your hand up.

REP. CALLAHAN (108TH): Matthew, thank you. I am from 108th District, which is part of Danbury, and I'm quite familiar with your business and the wonderful job you've done to, to deliver fuel to the people of the Danbury area for many, many years. So I appreciate you coming in today. I have great

concerns about the environment, but I also had great concerns about continuing to bump up the cost of energy for the middle class, and those of us who have to commute. And I, I do appreciate your point of view and I just want to relate to you and to the Committee that is a major concern of mine. Any of you who have gotten your, got your January electric bills saw your delivery costs skyrocket as well. And as far as gas, gas outlay from your, from your paycheck and for electricity rates is, is a major concern of my constituents. So I thank you for coming in today.

MATTHEW MITCHELL: Thank you.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Thank you, Representative, and I don't see any other hands raised. So thank you Mr. Mitchell for your time and testimony.

MATTHEW MITCHELL: Thank you.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Okay. I don't see these folks that I'm about to name on the list, but I'm going to call out their names and hopefully they'll hear it and, and come on. That is Hawar Ramadhan, Mark Mitchell is here. Okay, so he'll be next. Anil Patel, Sami Jamal, Eyad Jamal, Robert Goodrich, and Lauren Bailey. So Mr. Mitchell, you are up. Welcome.

MARK MITCHELL: Thank you and good afternoon, Senator Cohen, Representative Gresko, and Members of the Committee. My name is Dr. Mark Mitchell. I'm a Public Health and Environmental Health Physician. I'm also an Associate Professor of Climate Change Energy and Environmental Health Equity at George Mason University although I work remotely from my home here in Hartford, Connecticut. I'm also the Founder and a Senior Policy Advisor for the Connecticut Coalition for Environmental Justice, and I was one of the main authors of Connecticut's Environmental Justice Bill, along with

Representative Jack Hennessy, who I see is on, on the Committee today. It's good to see Jack.

I'm, I'm here to testify in favor of SB 884 and HB 6551. As again one of the authors of the 2009 Environmental Justice Bill, I think that it's really important that we strengthen that, that Bill. I think that that was the first step, but we need to move forward and, and to actually reduce the overburden in environmental hazards in communities. The greatest predictor of where environmental hazards are located in Connecticut, like in most states is the percentage of people of color in that community. So we support Charles Rothenberg's and Save the Sounds changes, suggested changes for the Bill.

In addition, we want to change the terms from environmental equity to environmental justice as used throughout the Bill. The participants on the working group should also be compensated for their work.

With regard to SB 884, the TCI Bill, it will reduce greenhouse gases, improve health, and address racial justice all at the same time, which, which is an opportunity that I think that we should take advantage of here in Connecticut. So I'm working with DEEP and the Department of Transportation as well as other environmental health and environmental justice organizations on, on improving the language. And I think that we will be able to come to consensus on some improvements to strengthen the language that's, that's already there. For example, I think that we want to increase the amount of the revenues that are going to those most impacted communities to at least 50%.

Air pollution in Connecticut, as you heard has high levels of air pollution, and this, not at least, I, I'll wrap up given my time. So according to the census, Harford ranks 8th in the US for percentage of households without vehicles, and New Haven ranks

11th. So we, people should not be paying for their, for what their health and what their lives, we all pay financially, because of this problem. If TCIP is well constructed, Connecticut taxpayers could reasonably expect to save at least \$12 million per year from decreased asthma hospitalizations alone. So again, I strongly support both of these Bills.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Thank you so much, Mr. Mitchell, Dr. Mitchell, for your testimony. And I appreciate all of your hard work, obviously with the legislature for many years on environmental justice. I see a question from Representative Dillon. Representative, please.

REP. DILLON (92ND): Thank you, Madam Chair. I really just wanted to say hello to Mark, who has an outstanding record not only in environmental justice, but we work together on lead, on gun prevention when we were both very young. I, so I give your words a lot of weight and I'm pleased that you're supporting the legislation. Thank you.

MARK MITCHELL: Yes, it's good to see you again Representative Dillon. Yeah, when we were both children, we were here at the legislature, yes.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Thank you. And Representative Mushinsky.

REP. MUSHINSKY (85TH): Hey, Dr. Mitchell. I just wanted to say hi.

MARK MITCHELL: Hi.

REP. MUSHINSKY (85TH): Nice that you have a teaching gig now, that's wonderful.

MARK MITCHELL: Yes.

REP. MUSHINSKY (85TH): And I appreciate that you put some suburban towns like mine into environmental justice too, because there are some environmental

justice neighborhoods in some of our town. They're small towns, but nonetheless, there is issues there, and I appreciate that. But I do want to ask you, that we've got a whole series of speakers today saying don't change the price of fuel, period. And, you know, when your experience working here as a, as an advocate, are we ever going to get changed that will get us to prevention or amelioration of climate change if we don't change the cost of fossil fuels in your opinion?

MARK MITCHELL: Yeah, I think that, that in order to; again, I'm an Associate Professor of Climate Change. In order to address climate change, we have to reduce carbon, and the most equitable way to do that is to put a price on carbon, and to make sure that, that those who are most impacted are the first communities to, that they're guaranteed at least a minimum amount of reduction in air pollution, because air pollution leads to so many health problems in our communities. And again, like I said before, if we can reduce the diseases from asthma of the air, from traffic related air pollution of the state should see a substantial decrease in costs, because over 70% of the cost for asthma, hospitalization is paid for by taxpayers.

REP. MUSHINSKY (85TH): Okay. So if we leave things the way they are now, which is what many of the speakers had asked us to do, we are probably unlikely to see any change in terms of effect on the public who lives with this threat in your view?

MARK MITCHELL: Right, yes, and we're going to continue to have the health disparities, we're going to continue to, to have the climate change, and the weather is going to get even worse and more unpredictable than it is now.

REP. MUSHINSKY (85TH): Okay. Well, thank you, and it's good to see you again. I'm happy you're teaching, that's wonderful; educating the next

generation of advocates. That's really wonderful thing.

MARK MITCHELL: Thank you.

REP. MUSHINSKY (85TH): So thanks for coming in.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Thank you, Representative. And thank you Dr. Mitchell for your time and testimony. So I see that Lauren Bailey is next up, and I will just call the, the few names before her and since they can join us is Anil Patel, Sami and Eyad Jamal, and Robert Goodrich. Following Lauren Bailey will be Zaki Sedda, Lior Trestman, and Allison Evans. Welcome Lauren.

LAUREN BAILEY: Thank you so much. Good evening. Thank you, Senator Cohen, Representative Gresko, and to all of your esteemed colleagues from the Environment Committee for sticking with us and continuing to hear our testimony this, this evening. I'm here to testify before you today on Senate Bill No.884.

I'm Lauren Bailey, Director of Climate Policy for Tri-State Transportation Campaign, which is a 27-year-old organization dedicated to improving peoples' lives by expanding access to transit and clean transportation options in New York, New Jersey and most importantly Connecticut. Tri-State would like to express our strong support for Senate Bill 884, which would allow Connecticut to join the Transportation and Climate Initiative Program or TCIP.

Despite the massive disruption to the daily patterns of our lives over the past year, transportation continues to be Connecticut's highest greenhouse gas emitting sector. The air pollution that our transportation system of cars, buses and trucks sends into the air each day is also now proven to worsen the effects and lethality of COVID-19, adding yet another threat to communities that have been

historically and consistently harmed by these emissions. Our transportation system is to be completely clear, killing us. The TCIP would begin to help us protect and expand public transit and accelerate vehicle electrification as just the first steps to eliminate these harmful emissions.

I would like to echo some points from fellow supporters earlier today, in particular the opportunity to invest these proceeds in environmental justice communities. Auction proceeds are estimated to be approximately \$89 million in 2023 and go up to as much as \$117 million per year by 2032. That's a significant amount of financing and with a 35% floor for investments in disadvantaged communities are committed to the MOU in December, I truly urge Connecticut to commit to a higher percentage to help our residents that need these investments most.

Transitioning our transportation system away from fossil fuels is an expensive but necessary endeavor. Providing that financial assistance to transition to zero emission vehicles overall by making polluters pay is a part of a comprehensive, larger solution that we can get to, to meet our state's climate goals. These brought proceeds would also give Connecticut a unique opportunity to transform the transportation system into one that is accessible, safe and community for all of our residents regardless of whether they live in a rural community, one of our cities or their suburbs. All of our residents deserve to have transportation options, in particular as we continue to strive for our older residents to age in place, and for individuals with disabilities to have equal access to all points in Connecticut.

I know electric vehicles have been talked about a lot today, and this is not just about electric vehicles. We want to see a safe bike network, sidewalks in every community and bus lanes just to name a few transportation options that would make

our roads safer, and make our society less reliant on cars.

The discussion I'm hearing today around the cost of electrification and the potential financial impacts of the transition away from fossil fuels have truly only further made the case to me that the proceeds from TCIP could have a transformative, phenomenal impact on the resiliency, health, and overall economy of Connecticut. Thank you so much.

REP. PALM (36TH): Thank you so much, Miss Bailey for that. I appreciate your testimony very, very much. Do I have any questions from our Committee? Seeing none, thank you very much for being here and we're going to move on.

LAUREN BAILEY: Thank you.

REP. PALM (36TH): Next up is Robert Goodrich. Mr. Goodrich, are you with us?

ROBERT GOODRICH: I'm having some technical difficulties.

REP. PALM (36TH): Join the club. That's perfectly okay. We can see you and hear you.

ROBERT GOODRICH: Okay, you can see me? I can't see you all.

REP. PALM (36TH): Well, you, you're on the screen, sir, so go right ahead. You've three minutes. Mr. Goodrich, you seem to be muted now.

ROBERT GOODRICH: Yes. My name is Robbie Goodrich. I'm the Co-Founder of Radical Advocates for Cross Culture Education in Waterbury, Connecticut. Co-Chairs Cohen and Gresko, I appreciate the opportunity to testify in, in front of you all as well as Vice Chairs Palm and Derek Slap. Now you may be asking why an education advocacy organization may be testifying in the Environmental Committee on

TCIP? Well, the, the fact is, is that we've been part of this coalition here in Connecticut, working to promote and to organize our communities around supporting TCIP.

Now we support SB 884 with amendments. So we wanted to go over like my colleague, Michaela Barratt did earlier today about some of the amendments that will ensure racial justice is achieved through this Bill. So we want to make sure that this, the legislative language reflects and ensures a strong and independent equity advisory board that TCIP and the benefits are the proceeds from the auction, more than 50% of those proceeds from the auction for overburdened and underserved communities, and that, so that they can have access to those remedies to remediate some of the harm that they've experienced for decades here in Connecticut.

We want the language to explicitly address neighborhood level pollution where communities of color and low income communities often breathe air, and the dirtiest air in certain parts of Waterbury, as you may know that, and as Representative Reyes can, can testify too that our south end contributes almost 10% of the total air pollution in the State of Connecticut.

Now, the Bill should also support workers by ensuring greater amounts of fair labor standards and workforce development programs that ensure diverse hiring and contracting requirements. We also know that the Bill should reflect language that ensures communities who are impacted the most by our transportation system have a strong say in directing how the investments are made.

Now, with, with all that said, we encourage the Committee to embrace the Equity Advisory Board principles that we've been working with both of the agencies on. Now we've, we've been able to come to an agreement that the agencies are experts in racial equity, but some of us like myself and the people

that have been pushing for strong equity advisory board are. So we would like to invite the Co-Chairs to actually have a sit down with us that there needs to be clarification around some of the equity advisory board language as well as the commitments to provide power over the proceeds and how the solutions are directed in impacted communities. I really appreciate your time today, and I'm open for questions.

REP. PALM (36TH): Thank you, Robbie, very much. So I gather from your testimony that you think we need more specificity in this Bill, is that correct?

ROBERT GOODRICH: Yes. I think largely that despite the best efforts of the agencies that we think that the Equity Advisory Board should be completely independent of any type of political appointee or agency heads, that, that will ensure that the communities that are impacted most, that the overburden and underserved communities can be free of that political persuasion and be able to operate independently.

The other thing is, is that though the Equity Advisory Board needs to be resourced properly, meaning that the people that come from the community that contribute on that Board need to be resourced with tools, technology, and even stipend so that they can participate fully as members of a professional body when in fact if we just take them as they are, they won't be able to contribute at the same level, and the pseudo experts about environmental justice will be able to dominate those conversations and persuade where the money is actually going to end up.

REP. PALM (36TH): Thank you. It's clear you've done some deep thinking on this Bill. I see a question for Representative Reyes. Sir, you have the floor.

REP. REYES (75TH): Thank you, Madam Chair. Good evening Mr. Goodrich and thank you for your testimony. And I was reading your testimony over last night, and well written, well thought out. And I, I wanted to ask you, I, I too agree that the equity piece is a little light when it comes to how it's going to be managed and, and, and how it's going to be outfitted. And I'm glad that you came with some conversation on, on that piece as well. My question for you is what do you see, what do you think when, when you start thinking about these boards and what are your thoughts on, what the diversity of those boards should look like?

ROBERT GOODRICH: Well, I think that diversity is two or three folds. One, its diversity of thought, right, and then it's diversity of identity, and then it's the diversity in, in which they can contribute to the equity advisory boards. So the communities that, there's two things also to add here, Representative Reyes; that this needs to be, these boards need to be enabled to participate in what they call Participatory Action Research so that they get to control the research that is used to make these decisions and create the own data from their own perspective.

So that means communities like in the south end of Waterbury should have preference and eligibility to participate over the folks in the west end is the town, which is less impacted by pollution and lack of transportation and economic opportunity. And the same goes for rural communities. So those folks that are in rural communities that don't have access to transportation, but are impacted by pollution should have more access over folks that live in wealthier areas that are impacted by as much pollution and have access to cleaner transportation.

REP. REYES (75TH): Well, I want to thank you for testifying tonight and it's a good agenda. Like I said, you really gave this really deep thoughts and I, I thank you for your advocacy and supporting our

districts down there in the south end of Waterbury.  
Thank you, Madam Chair.

REP. PALM (36TH): Thank you, Representative. Any other questions from Committee Members? Seeing none, we're going to move on to Lior Trestman. Thank you, Robbie. Lior Trestman, you are up if you are here.

LIOR TRESTMAN: Hi, can you hear me?

REP. PALM (36TH): Yes, go right ahead. You have three minutes.

LIOR TRESTMAN: Thank you so much Members of the Environmental Committee for the opportunity to speak. My name is Lior Trestman. I'm a resident of New Haven, and I'm writing this statement to communicate my strong support for the Senate Bill 884.

For the past 150 some odd years, we've enjoyed the pleasure of burning oil into the atmosphere with abandon, and our history would look very different if we hadn't. However, it is now past time for this blip and the timeline of humanity to slowly come to an end. We can continue to put our head in the sand or we can walk into the future. The arguments against this Bill that I've heard today have centered first around the increased cost to consumers. To this point, I'm much younger than many of you, but can, but even I can remember when for many years, gas prices were well above \$3 a gallon. So forgive me for thinking that using the word skyrocket, which I've heard to refer to the prices of gas three times tonight to describe a few cents of price increase to be a bit dramatic.

The environment can't directly exert market forces on the price of gas. So TCI is doing this in a small way and gas stations, obviously, as they've said, will pass these few cents onto consumer, like the cost was extensively passed on to them. So I'm

not really sure why they're complaining if they're passing this cost right along. If the gas stations can't afford to exist on the flavored cigarettes sales and gas sales when nearly everyone is driving a gas car already, I think they need to significantly re-imagine their business models. As far as this being a regressive tax, I think that having such inadequate public transportation that forces people to drive cars, not even having sidewalks and incurring massive health costs and shortened life spans on lower income people from emissions are more aggressive. TCI helps to address those.

And other argument I've heard a few times tonight is that our grid can't handle a full transition to EV right now or that the cost to install charging stations is prohibitive. So in fact, reasons why we need TCI all the more, and so it's a pretty bad red herring argument in my opinion. Last is the argument that we will only remediate climate change as a global effort. That is true and it's simultaneously a terrible excuse to not act now.

I understand that this is easy to say and hard to do, but leadership isn't always easy. In this case, leadership means hearing people's concerns and yet stepping forward for the sake of everyone's long-term gain and in this case, survival. We are so, so far behind, and we are already paying deeply for our inaction thus far. However, we need to continue to give our dream deeper.

With this proposal, we can at least give ourselves the beginning of a fighting chance. This proposal should have been passed 20 years ago, but the second best time to pass it is now. I strongly support SB 884, and I urge you to vote in favor. Thank you.

REP. PALM (36TH): Thank you, Mr. Trestman very much. Are you here representing MakeHaven, can you explain to us what that is if that's in fact what

you're representing, or you just speaking as a citizen?

LIOR TRESTMAN: I am speaking as a citizen. MakeHaven is a membership based organization in New Haven, Connecticut, where we have all the tools in the world and for 50 bucks a month, we offer 24x7 access to that space for over 400 members to start companies, build businesses, and pursue creative hobbies of all varieties.

REP. PALM (36TH): Great. Thank you very much. Do we have any questions from the Committee Members? I don't see any. Thank you very much, Mr. Trestman for your time and for sticking this out with us. I appreciate it very much.

LIOR TRESTMAN: Thank you, have a good night.

REP. PALM (36TH): Next up is Denise Savageau. Hi Denise, we see you. Unmute yourself please ma'am.

DENISE SAVAGEAU: Can you hear me now?

REP. PALM (36TH): Yes, we can. Go right ahead.

DENISE SAVAGEAU: All right, thank you. Again, my name is Denise Savageau. I am the Chair of the Connecticut Council on Soil and Water Conservation. And I'm here to testify in support of House Bill 6441.

I want to thank the Committee for allowing me to testify, and I know it's been a long day, so I will try to keep it brief. I have provided written testimony that you can refer to and if you have any questions or concerns, don't hesitate to reach out to me.

As a member of the Connecticut Council on Soil and Water Conservation, I did serve on the Governor's Council on Climate Change and the working in natural lands groups on the Ag in soils and also on the

wetlands work group. And I also participated in many of the meetings and a couple of the subgroups involved with environmental justice.

In my work history, I worked with the Hartford County Soil and Water Conservation District for many years which serves the 29 municipalities in Harford County. And when I was there, I actually served on the first environmental justice task force. So I was very pleased to see such a focus on environmental justice in the Governor's Council on Climate Change, and in full disclosure, so that you know my whole history, after working with Harford County and dealing with the municipalities there, I actually took the job as the Conservation Director for the Town of Greenwich. So I've worked with some of the poorest communities, and I worked for one of the richest communities in our state. So I have a full understanding of municipalities in general, and I also served on the Town Council for the Town of Coventry, Connecticut, was kind of one of the communities probably in the middle of that, not, not necessarily very, as affluent as Greenwich, but certainly doesn't have the, the challenges that some of our other communities have.

So it's what those contexts that I'm going to be talking today. And I laid out a few things in my, in my comments, my written comments, they have to deal with this. Soil and Water Conservation districts do a lot of work with municipalities, and that's like I said that I worked with the 29 municipalities when I worked for one of the conservation districts. And one of the, couple of the different programs we worked with are involved federal funding, one in particular is the 319 program, which is an EPA funded program. And it's, a lot of the work we do is for watershed management, looking at different ways that you can protect water quality, different ways you can protect flooding, and all of those types of issues.

And one of the major things missing from that is the leverage match. So this particular Bill provides that leverage that is missing from, you know, when we're trying to work with municipalities, the, and we've been looking at how we can work more with some of our disadvantaged communities. And one of the challenges is this match.

REP. PALM (36TH): Miss Savageau --

DENISE SAVAGEAU: I'm going to wrap it up here. I know, you know, I heard the buzzer, so I'll, I'll wrap it up. I just want to say one last thing and that is there is a relationship that I just want to make sure people understand in watersheds, that is between distressed communities and non-distressed communities. And that has to do with that watershed boundaries don't understand, you know, where these political boundaries we deal with. So for example, some of the benefits that we see from, let's say, protecting public, open space in a public drinking water supply. It's not the community where the public drinking water supply watershed is that gets those benefits. So for example, the City of Hartford, their reservoir is in the small towns of Hartland and Barkhamsted.

So I just want to make sure that people when they're talking about, you know, a lot of times the ecosystem services are what we want to do, which open space we want to protect, that we're looking at that.

REP. PALM (36TH): Yes, thank you. I'm sorry to have to, really have to cut you off. I'm sorry, we have so many people waiting. I think your, your experience with municipalities is very, very important for us to hear. And I agree completely, as I'm sure my colleagues do with the phenomenon that when we're talking about ecosystems, we, we can't think in terms of political or geographic boundaries. Do we have any questions from the Committee for Denise? Any questions? Okay. Thank

you very much ma'am for being here. Next up, we have Jay Patel.

DENISE SAVAGEAU: Thank you.

REP. PALM (36TH): You're welcome. Followed by M Randall Collins and Elias Petersen. So, we will hear first from Jay Patel, and I see you on the screen there, sir. Go right ahead.

JAY PATEL: Yes, good evening Chairperson and Co-Chairperson and as well whole Committee. My name is Jay Patel, and I'm owner and operator of the several gas stations, convenience store and motels. I'm working with the 70 plus people team. I respect your green environmental program, it's definitely help future, good for the, my kids, other kids and their, and other generation coming in the future.

In COVID-19 period, we lost about 30% to 40% business of the gasoline gallons. It is hard to survive right now. Gasoline gallons margin is always very thin, all the time. Any kind of extra burden in a gas, gasoline gallon is impacts lots to community in their everyday routine life. It's the wrong time to increase burden on country, state, and struggling with the high unemployment and other high costs to survive in a regular life.

Our electricity bill is already up, cost of minimum wage is going up and up every year. It's hard to survive for all the small businesses. My humble request to Committee to think same or some other sources to put this extra expense to support green Bill. Thank you.

REP. PALM (36TH): Thank you, Mr. Patel. Are there any questions from the Committee? Seeing none, we'll move along. Thank you sir, for being with us. M Randall Collins.

JAY PATEL: Thank you.

REP. PALM (36TH): Are you here?

M RANDALL COLLINS: I am. Good evening. I will keep this brief. My name is Randall Collins, I'm an Advocacy Manager with the Connecticut Conference of Municipalities and I'm here today to testify in support of House Bill 6441, AN ACT CONCERNING CLIMATE CHANGE ADAPTATION. CCM supports this Bill with revisions, just two slight revisions that we're looking for.

This is about the third or fourth year that we've been actively advocating for stormwater authorities to see it included in the Governor's package was, was, was very helpful, and very welcome for our members. Ever since we've received the, we work to negotiate the parameters of the new General MS4 General Permit, it has imposed significant unfunded costs, unfunded mandates on towns and cities. And this as a local option provides them another, another means to pay for the requirements in that Bill. It would build upon a pilot program that allowed four municipalities to enact stormwater authorities. Currently, New London is the only one that has implemented one, and Stonington is actively working on it. But we feel that if it, if it can work for New London, then Stonington has an opportunity. We should allow that opportunity for all of our municipalities.

We would like to see language, slight modification in the language. I testified the other day on the Committee Stormwater Bill, and that was the language we had worked on previously, which did include a tightening of the definition of what a municipality is. We wanted to make sure that if the stormwater authority is enacted, it's enacted by one of the 169 towns and cities, not a sewer district or a water district, but by elected officials.

We support the Buyers convenience, but we do have concerns with the lines, with the language in lines 127 to 134, which would restrict the fund, the use

of funds in municipalities that are unable to meet the 10%, 10% affordable housing threshold. I know that CCI has been actively working with desegregate Connecticut group. Hopefully, we're coming out with recommendations. But there are many municipalities that just due to environmental concerns, onsite sewage treatment cannot build out enough to meet that threshold. So that's something that would be of a concern to them.

We're not at, today we're not submitting testimony on Senate Bill 884. We actually had a webinar with Commissioner Dykes and Commissioner Eucalitto this Friday. Being a member driven organization, they wanted to take a look. I think they're probably have as many questions as, as you do, but before we take opposition, the members wanted to get a fuller understanding of that. So hopefully, we'll be submitting comments as we move down the road. But thank you very much and happy to take any questions.

REP. PALM (36TH): Thank you Randy. I have a quick question. When you talked about I guess you would rather see as decouple this from the environmental justice or the, or the, you know, the, the provision for the affordability. Is that something that you're prepared to give us more detail on? Can you just run that part by me again, please sir.

M RANDALL COLLINS: Some of our members do have concerns that it will be the, the local option buyers conveyance; that they would be, they would have restrictions that they don't need that 10% affordable housing. I'm sorry, my son wants to testify as well apparently. Thank you, buddy. Oh, thank you. And as I said, they have a little bit of a concern. They said, I know towns I've worked with in the past have said, we've looked at it, but because of our soil restrictions, we can't do onsite sewage treatment. They don't have sewer systems, it really makes it difficult for them to, to meet some of those housing goals. And in that case, it'd be very difficult. Would it be fair to them to say,

hey, you have restrictions that are placed on you for environmental reasons, you know, lack of, as you said, onsite sewage treatment. And if you can't meet it for certain reasons, that you're denied that ability to use it for land acquisition. I think we'd be happy to work with the Committee on that. Again, it's not necessarily my, my true area of expertise. Somehow I became the stormwater guy in CCM, and that's why I got thrown up today.

REP. PALM (36TH): Well, thank you. Thank you for that distinction. I would say only that, you know, there are very low density options in, in affordable housing that don't require an overhaul of sewer systems, which I know is a problem in the district that I represent, for example as well; but I, I do think we need to keep pushing for, for other models and, and micro housing perhaps. Thank you for your testimony. Do we have any questions from Committee Members? Anybody? Nope. Okay. Thank you very much, Randy. I don't see any more questions.

M RANDALL COLLINS: Thank you.

REP. PALM (36TH): Share your testimony. Next up, we have Elias Petersen, followed by Alex Cerussi and Rita King.

ELIAS PETERSEN: Good evening, Chairs Senator Cohen, Representative Gresko, Ranking Members Miner and Representative Harding and the Committee as a whole and thank you Representative Palm. My name is Elias Petersen and I am testifying in support Senate Bill 884, on behalf of Kolmar Americas and its subsidiary American Green Fuels.

American Green Fuels is a 40 million gallon per year biodiesel production facility located at Port of New Haven. We are the largest biodiesel plant in New England and on the eastern seaboard, with an estimated employment impact of 250 plus jobs and an estimated economic impact to Connecticut of about \$126.5 million annually.

Biodiesel is a readymade solution to reducing greenhouse gas emissions from the transportation sector, especially in regards to heavy duty trucking applications, which are notoriously difficult to electrify. Biodiesel is a drop in fuel, it can be utilized in many existing on road diesel engines with no modifications. On average biodiesel risks greenhouse gas emissions by 86%, particulate emissions by 47%, and hydrocarbon emissions by 67%.

We're labeled to clean air choice by the American Lung Association, reducing the risk of asthma and other respiratory diseases. We support the goals SB 884 to reduce carbon emissions from the transportation sector. And if structured appropriately, this program could incentivize the production and usage of fuels like biodiesel, by ensuring that only the petroleum portion or the nonrenewable portion of the fuels are required to be offset with emissions credits.

Connecticut can incentivize the increased usage of greenhouse gas reducing fuels like biodiesel, which provide a low cost carbon reducing fuel that can be utilized in conjunction with the electrification goals. Case in point, biodiesel is the early success story for other low carbon fuel jurisdictions like California and Canada, providing quick results on emission reductions and on road diesel engines.

We also urge policymakers to utilize the funds from the cap and invest portion of the program and to invest in biodiesel. Quickly, like I said, in the heavy duty sector in urban areas where the clean air benefits of our fuel can promote environmental justice in our state. Incentives could include incentives for higher, higher percentage of blend fuels and diesel-electric hybrid vehicles that can use both electricity and biodiesel for in traditional diesel engine applications.

So we support the goals of TCI, and hope it can be structured to support Connecticut clean fuel production. And thank you very much for your time.

REP. PALM (36TH): Thank you, Mr. Petersen for appearing before us. I see a question from our House Chair, Rep. Gresko.

REP. GRESKO (121ST): Thank you, Madam Chair. Eli, I don't know if you were on this call or Public Hearing and but earlier it was made, mentioned that potentially blending a biodiesel in with transportation fuel would create a jelling issue. And I was wondering if you can comment on that.

ELIAS PETERSEN: Yeah, I mean, historically, when you had fuels coming to the state, they weren't ASTM certified, there were problems in state maybe 10, 15 years ago. Now all the biodiesel that we make and it comes into states is ASTM certified to D6751 spec, which is the blend stock spec. You know, biodiesel has very similar properties when it meets that spec to diesel. So there, there is really not those sort of issues, especially at the lower level blends. If you were maybe getting up to a, a B100 blend, which would be 100% biodiesel compared to blending with petroleum diesel, you might have storage, you know, additional investment needed. But you know, for the most part, we're the same as diesel.

REP. GRESKO (121ST): And that being for, for temperature as well? I mean, if it gets down even a couple of nights, this past winter it was in the teens to single digits, would this react the same as diesel?

ELIAS PETERSEN: Yeah, I mean, I won't say it's exactly the same. I mean, you would want to take some precautions, like I said, with a pure biodiesel blend, but it's very similar. I mean, diesel has problems at really cold temperatures too. I mean, so the, the problem is that the fuel space are very

similar. You might be, like I said, little bit more careful with the B100 blend. But you know, a B20, B50, you're going to face the same storage infrastructure.

REP. GRESKO (121ST): Thank you Eli. And thank you, Madam Chair.

ELIAS PETERSEN: Thank you Representative Gresko.

REP. PALM (36TH): Thank you Representative. Any other questions from the Committee? Seeing none, we will move on to Alex Cerussi, followed by Rita King and then Cary Lynch. Alex, are you with us?

ALEX CERUSSI: Yes, I am. Can you hear me?

REP. PALM (36TH): Yes, we can.

ALEX CERUSSI: Great. Thank you so much.

REP. PALM (36TH): And I can see you, go right ahead.

ALEX CERUSSI: Thank you. Good evening, Co-Chair Cohen, Co-Chair Gresko, and Esteemed Members of the Environment Committee. My name is Alex Cerussi, and I'm the Policy Manager for Mercy For Animals, a nonprofit organization dedicated to constructing a more compassionate food system for all.

On behalf of our Connecticut based supporters, I commended this Committee for its consideration of Senate Bill 884, and ask that the Bill be amended to include climate friendly food procurement language, language this Committee originally considered as House Bill 5030.

In 2006, the UN warned in a landmark report that industrial livestock farming was one of the most significant contributors to the most serious of environmental problems and urged the world to take this problem seriously.

More recently, a study found that food system activities including the production, the transport disposal of food, account for nearly 30% of all global greenhouse gas emissions.

Connecticut has an opportunity here to go beyond the transportation sector emissions reductions outlined in Senate Bill 884 and reduce greenhouse gas emissions through the enactment of a climate friendly food procurement policy. Senate Bill 884 provides that the Transportation and Climate Initiative Program may fund the assessment and planning of measures to reduce emissions and mitigate the impacts of climate change. Adopting a climate friendly food policy would enable the state to assess and plan for reducing its emissions in a more efficient manner by measuring emissions that occur through the lifecycle of food procured by the state and establishing science based reduction targets accordingly.

A climate friendly food policy would also support public health and save valuable taxpayer dollars. This policy would align with Connecticut's environmentally preferable purchasing program, which as you know promotes sustainability through the procurement of products that have a reduced effect on human health, the environment, and society. While the EPP program focuses on the electric, building, and transportation sectors, adopting a climate friendly food policy would give Connecticut the opportunity to expand those considerations and further greenhouse gas reduction goals.

Climate friendly food procurement language, language this Committee originally considered as HB 5030, has support from over 22 local and national organizations. By focusing on emissions associated with food, Connecticut can realize the environmental health and economic benefits of addressing food procurement. As such, Mercy For Animals strongly

urges the Committee to amend Senate Bill 884 to include climate friendly food procurement language.

Thank you so much. It's been a long day, but I really appreciate your time.

REP. PALM (36TH): Thank you Alex. Have you read the Bill language, and do you have a specific section in mind where your language would fit in?

ALEX CERUSSI: Yeah, that's a great question. I have in fact read the Bill, in which I don't right now, but I'd be happy to follow up after the hearing today with the specific section. That being said, I know that our organization along with several others would be more than happy to, to work with any of the Committee Members on molding the language that originally came from House Bill 5030 to, to make it fit properly.

REP. PALM (36TH): Thank you for that. I think I can speak for my colleagues when I say we'd be very, you know, eager to hear that. Representative Michel.

REP. MICHEL (146TH): Thank you, Madam Chair. Thank you Alex, for testifying today, and thank you for your amazing work in this last few months. Can you elaborate when you say the Bill, HB 5030 had supported the mentioned organizations, can you go into more details a little in that part?

ALEX CERUSSI: Sure, yeah. Without, and I did submit written testimony, so some of the organizations are, are listed in that there. So without going on and listing the 22 organizations, I will just further emphasize that there is a diverse coalition supporting this language or it's at least supporting the Environment Committee taking a look or more careful look at these emissions that are associated with industrial agriculture, as a means to further reduce the state's greenhouse gas emissions.

REP. MICHEL (146TH): Yeah, and I, I, one of the things is that I think is important to note is to fight against emissions is, as a big fight and there is definitely a lot of different areas we need to make sure we include as we try to tackle on to the effects of climate change, to also attenuate those effects. But thank you so much once again, and thank you for your time today. Thank you, Madam Chair.

ALEX CERUSSI: Thank you.

REP. PALM (36TH): Thank you, Rep. Michel. Any other questions from the Committee? Seeing none, thank you, ma'am. We will move on. We will hear from Rita King, followed by Cary Lynch, and then Carine Dumit.

RITA KING: Good evening. Can you hear me?

REP. PALM (36TH): Yes, go right ahead.

RITA KING: Great. Good evening, Senators Cohen and Miner, Representatives Gresko, Harding, and Palm and the Distinguished Members of the Environment Committee. My name is Rita King, and I'm the Senior Director of Smart Grids Innovation and Planning for AVANGRID Networks, the parent company for United Illuminating Southern Connecticut Gas, and Connecticut Natural Gas.

Thank you for this opportunity to offer testimony on Raised Bill No. 884, AN ACT REDUCING TRANSPORTATION-RELATED CARBON EMISSIONS. United Illuminating in conjunction with our parent company are committed to taking proactive measures to help achieve a clean energy future for our customers and the communities that we serve. We recognize and agree that electrifying the transportation sector is a key solution for the decarbonization of the economy.

At UI, we seek to develop infrastructure and technology that enables electric vehicle market growth with priorities placed on planning our system to support charging infrastructure, integrating EV loads in a way that improves our overall system efficiency, communicating the benefits of EVs to our customers and leading by example by investigating ways to move our own fleet vehicles to clean fuels.

We support the goals of the Transportation and Climate Initiative Program to reduce CO2 emissions, improve air quality and public health, increase resilience to the impacts of climate change, provide more affordable access to clean transportation choices, promote local economic opportunities and high quality jobs.

We also support evaluation of all tools that might help achieve electrification of the transportation sector including ways to advance equity for underserved communities.

In other jurisdictions, we have launched EV charger make ready and customer programs, which offer rebates to offset construction costs associated with the electrical infrastructure required to support L2 and DC chargers to be business and municipal customers including additional goals for underserved communities.

We are actively engaged in purists grid modernization, zero emissions vehicle reopen, investigating similar make ready programs, and we're excited to collaborate with stakeholders to identify how we can best support beneficial electrification initiatives.

So thank you for the opportunity to testify. Our companies also appreciate the opportunity to be part of the conversation to advance Connecticut's energy and environmental Agenda. I'm happy to answer any questions.

REP. PALM (36TH): Thank you very much, Miss King. I see a question from Rep. Chafee.

REP. CHAFEE (33RD): Thank you, Madam Chair. Thank Miss King for speaking with us tonight. In a lot of testimony that came before you, people spoke to the fact, alluding to the fact that the distribution grid is not ready to handle electrical vehicles. I was wondering if you could speak to that a little bit, and do you think your distribution grid is currently capable of handling EVs or what is the long-term plan for that?

RITA KING: Thank you for that question Representative. We do, we are currently seeing low penetration of electric vehicles. We do have a grid modernization roadmap for United Illuminating so we understand the challenges. And we are currently looking at ways that the grid can be ready when we start to see higher penetration of electric vehicles as well as other DERs such as renewable energy and energy storage. And so we are prepping our grid, and we're looking at continued forecasts on how we can integrate those sorts of flexible loads. So our plan as part of our roadmap and the work that we're doing with the authority is for the grid to be ready when our customers need it.

REP. CHAFEE (33RD): Do you have any sort of projections, you know, how many EVs do you see coming online in the next 5 or 10 years, and are you planning around that?

RITA KING: We are forecasting based on the ZEB targets that are here in Connecticut and looking at our portion, which is about 20% of the service territory for the State of Connecticut. And so we are, we're forecasting along those lines and looking at what we need to do in order for us to meet those targets.

REP. CHAFEE (33RD): Great. Would you say you UI has current capacity or is we're going to take a lot

of investment to build up your distribution grid in order to supply, you know, the potential wave of EVs will see?

RITA KING: You know, we're, we're not seeing significant issues with capacity today, but as I mentioned, we do have limited penetration. We do anticipate that as we start to see higher levels of deployment of electric vehicles that initially we're going to see localized issues. So at the distribution transformer level, and then that will start to continue to grow, you know, across circuit. So we're developing those tools in order for us to be able to understand where that growth is going to be, what the propensity for customers to adopt electric vehicles and other types of DERs is going to be including on solar and behind the meter energy storage. We're developing those capabilities so that we're able to understand where in our system we need to reinforce and potentially upgrade.

We don't anticipate that we're going to see it all at once, so we are looking at ways that we can forecast and make sure that we have targeted improvements in place.

REP. CHAFEE (33RD): Thank you for information. Thank you for speaking with us today. And thank you Madam Chair.

RITA KING: Thank you.

REP. PALM (36TH): Thank you Representative Chafee. Any other questions for Miss King? Okay, thank you very much for being here. Appreciate it. We will next hear from Cary Lynch followed by Kai Addae and then Carine Dumit. So Cary, I see you. You are up and you have three minutes. Go right ahead.

CARY LYNCH: Hello. Hello honored Chair, Senator Cohen and Representative Gresko, and Distinguished Members of the Environment Committee. I am Cary Lynch, Climate and Energy Policy Manager at The

Nature Conservancy. Thank you for the opportunity to present testimony on behalf of The Nature Conservancy in full support of Governor's Bill 884, AN ACT REDUCING TRANSPORTATION-RELATED CARBON EMISSIONS.

First of all, The Nature Conservancy strongly supports policy aimed at reducing emissions from the transportation sector. And we support and appreciate testimony from Commissioner Dykes, Deputy Commissioner Garrett, and others throughout the day today. The Nature Conservancy is committed to elevating policies that promote equitable and just outcomes as part of our advocacy for clean transportation.

As many before me have pointed out tonight, the transportation sector accounts for a substantial portion of overall sector wide annual emissions without policy to direct action towards reducing transportation emissions, Connecticut will not meet its future emission goals.

By signing the Transportation Climate Initiative, TCI, MOU in December 2020, Connecticut signaled that we were serious in taking the necessary steps towards achieving a clean transportation future. The next logical step is pursuing regulatory authority for the state to implement TCI as outlined in this Bill. So we support this Bill and there are multiple benefits to reducing transportation related emissions.

Proceeds from TCI are substantial and with reinvestment of those proceeds and clean transportation options and infrastructure, emission reductions locally and throughout the state have potential to be significant. There is also widespread industry support of TCI.

The automobile industry has already started the transition towards zero emission vehicles. Additionally, more than 100 major investors

companies, and institutions throughout the TCI region have submitted letters to Governor Lamont in support of TCI.

In addition to contributing to the global problem of climate change, transportation emissions contribute to asthma, heart disease, preterm births, premature death among other health impacts. Current transportation systems also create noise pollution, congestion, and stress. Assuming participation in TCI, the estimated quantifiable health benefits under a TCI like program are substantial and are potentially larger than the estimated TCI proceeds.

While we fully support policy that seeks to limit emissions from the transportation sector, we would suggest strengthen the language regarding equity in sections 1E and 1F of this Bill. TCI cannot just be a funding mechanism. We support the creation of an Equity Advisory Board to help decide how proceeds will be invested. We also support the minimum of 35% of the proceeds to be reinvested in low to moderate income communities to address environmental justice issues related to transportation. This will show a commitment to listen to and invest in communities that have been most impacted by transportation emissions and will be hardest hit by programs that will raise the cost of transportation fuels. But we think that this is just the first step and look forward to the potential evolution of such efforts. Intervention and action towards emission reduction policies will hurt Connecticut residents in a variety of ways. We lend our support to such efforts to mitigate these impacts as quickly and as equitably as possible.

And with that, I thank you for the opportunity to present testimony on Governor's Bill 884. Thank you.

REP. PALM (36TH): Thank you Cary, nice job wrapping up at lightning speed. Do we have any questions from the Committee Members, for Miss Lynch? All

right, seeing none, thank you very much for being with us. Appreciate it very much.

Next up, we have Kai Addae followed by Carine Dumit and then Brian Moran. Kai, are you with us? Yep, I see you there.

KAI ADDAE: Yes. Can you hear me?

REP. PALM (36TH): Yes, go right ahead.

KAI ADDAE: Hi. Thank you Chairs, Vice Chairs and Members of the Environment Committee for allowing me to testify in support of Senate Bill 884 today. My name is Kai Addae, I'm a resident of New Haven, a leading member of the Safe Streets Coalition of New Haven. We're a group of community members who advocate for just safe and sustainable transportation systems in New Haven so that everyone can safely and easily travel without a car anywhere they want to go.

And we support SB 884 because we know that we need transportation systems that are not only affordable but sustainable and healthy for everyone in our community, and we can't keep relying on outdated and unsafe infrastructure for travel when we know that this is destroying our climate, making people sick and leading to tragic injuries and deaths.

SB 884 can make sure our transportation system works for everyone, help prevent catastrophic climate change and support economic recovery from COVID-19. And I deeply believe that we have to take drastic action to undo climate change and prioritize the communities who are most negatively impacted by our current transportation system.

So I urge you to pass SB 884 with a couple of amendments. I urge you to modify it, so it requires guaranteed localized emission reductions in the communities that are impacted the most. And to invest significant funds to the overburdened and

underserved communities more than the minimum threshold of 35%, probably something more like 50%.

I really believe in the principles of SB 884, but think it needs stronger equity safeguards to begin to address the historic disparities. Thank you.

REP. PALM (36TH): Thank you very much Kai Addae. Did you say you live in New Haven?

KAI ADDAE: Yes.

REP. PALM (36TH): And do you feel as though your community is one of these communities that has a disproportionate effect of climate change?

KAI ADDAE: Yeah, yes.

REP. PALM (36TH): We had, we've heard some testimony from some other young climate activists. Do you, when, when did you start being aware of this problem? Do you remember how old you were or are you relatively new to this?

KAI ADDAE: I've gotten a lot more involved recently in Sunrise, New Haven, the local chapter, but have been aware of climate change and worried about it since at least elementary, middle school.

REP. PALM (36TH): So would you, would you say that other generations are less aware of the concern, less worried about the future than you are? I'm trying not to put words in your mind, I mean, I, it that seems as though a lot of young people feel it's an existential issue for them. Would you agree with that?

KAI ADDAE: Yeah, I think people of my age and especially younger are hyper aware of this issue. It is the only issue I can think about. It's going to determine where I can live, where I can work, if I can have kids, how many kids I could have, you know, where everything because if the environment

and the climate doesn't allow it, then the decisions are, are made for me.

REP. PALM (36TH): Thank you. Thank you for that. Well said. I see no questions from other Committee Members. Am I missing anybody? No, I don't think so. So thank you Kai, very much for being with us.

KAI ADDAE: Thank you.

REP. PALM (36TH): Next up, we have Carine Dumit if I'm pronouncing that correctly, Brian Moran and then following Brian we'll have Nicole Wong. So Carine, are you here with us?

CARINE DUMIT: I am, yes. Can you hear me okay.

REP. PALM (36TH): Yes, go right ahead.

CARINE DUMIT: Wonderful. Thank you very much. I was going to say good afternoon, but already good evening, and thanks for staying up late and, and for the opportunity to share with you some brief remarks, so tough act to follow after Miss Addae, but I will try my best.

My name is Carine Dumit. And I am Director of Market Development and Public Policy for EVgo for the Eastern US. And again, thank you Chair Cohen and Gresko, Vice Chair Slap and Palm, and Members of the Environment Committee for the opportunity today.

We commend the Lamont administration and the legislature for his leadership on clean transportation issues and for paving the way for initiatives that enable greater access to clean transportation throughout the state.

My testimony is in support of SB 884, AN ACT REDUCING TRANSPORTATION RELATED CARBON EMISSIONS. EVgo owns and operates the nation's largest network of public fast charging stations for electric

vehicles, with over 800 stations across the US, including approximately 12 in Connecticut.

Currently, more than 130 million people in the US live within a 10-mile type of an EVgo charger. The transportation sector is an important contributor to greenhouse gas emissions in Connecticut, and the state will need a suite of comprehensive solutions in order to meet aggressive climate and greenhouse gas emission reduction goals and circulated related targets.

EVgo supports continued economy wide efforts to reduce emissions and we applaud the state to address a, a wide range of policy considerations to tackle barriers to expanding EV and EV charging infrastructure deployment with programs such as TCI. This legislation would complement many ongoing initiatives, and we look forward to continuing to work with all of the stakeholders in enabling and in working with everyone to, for Connecticut to continue to lead in accelerating the transition to zero emission transportation.

So thanks again for the opportunity and for your time today.

REP. PALM (36TH): Our pleasure. Thank you very much. Any questions from Committee Members? I don't see any. Thank you, Carine very much for being here. And next up, we have Brian Moran followed by Nicole Wong, and then after Nicole we have Frank Ricci.

BRIAN MORAN: Can everybody hear me?

REP. PALM (36TH): Yes, we can. We can't see you, but we can hear you.

BRIAN MORAN: Oh, you can't see me.

REP. PALM (36TH): No.

BRIAN MORAN: Alright, let me try that.

REP. PALM (36TH): There we go, there you are. You have three minutes, sir. Go right ahead.

BRIAN MORAN: Thank you very much. Good evening, Co-Chair Cohen, Co-Chair Gresko, and Representative Palm, and Members of the Committee. My name is Brian Moran. I'm Director of Government Affairs for the New England Convenience Store and Energy Marketers Association. We represent convenience store and gasoline retailers, wholesale distributors, independent transportation fuel marketers in the businesses that supply them. NECSEMA represent and operate most of the fuel distributed and sold at over 8500 convenience stores in New England and employ approximately 120,000 people. In Connecticut, we represent almost 1700 convenience stores employing 25,000 people.

NECSEMA is opposed to Senate Bill 884 in its entirety. We urge the Committee to review our detailed testimony, offering a variety of perspectives based on our years' long effort following and commenting on this program, and our expertise in the retail fueling industry.

Our perspective TCI is a non-starter because it originally was proposed to be across, you know, the northeast and mid-Atlantic states and now only three are participating. This magnifies the interstate competitive issues concerning retail sales and supply and storage in this fueling marketplace. It's a non-starter because it takes away from the General Assembly, its critical role in setting government related fuel price increases for the next 30 years. We don't believe that this approach is an appropriate circuit for that balance public policymaking as customarily within the sole province of the General Assembly.

It's a non-starter because DEEP and Georgetown officials believe these costs won't be passed down

to, to consumers. In February 2020, we told the DEEP Commissioner Dykes just that in our comments in the draft TCI and MOU, that these costs and the compliance costs associated with the draft model rule, 160 pages will also be passed down to consumers at the pump.

It's a non-starter also because TCI's own modeling of the baseline reference case that between 2023 and 2032 shows that 19% to 24% of the 20, of the total 26% reduction in emissions will be achieved without implementing TCI, based on projected emission reductions from new car fuel economy standards. This is according to TCI Georgetown modeling experts, no one else's. We ask the question, is this a good value for a billion dollars? TCI officials and state regulators also overlooked the key design element concerning diesel fuel. They have not provided a cost allowance for diesel fuel like they have for gasoline. We do expect it to be higher than gasoline because of its higher carbon content.

Every product in your home spent time on a truck fueled by diesel fuel. Unlike diesel, I'll wrap up in one second. Unlike, unlike diesel, gasoline powered vehicles are a captive audience and they consume the fuel close to where it's purchased. However, given the 1000-mile range for diesel powered trucks, this isn't the case. We foresee a precipitous drop in the Connecticut, Massachusetts, and Rhode Island corridor of diesel fuel sales. This is a self-defeating public policy from the TCI allowance, revenue collection perspective, as well as harming those who sell those fuels, and it also is contrary to DEEP zone initiatives wanting to promote biodiesel. Thank you very much and appreciate your time and, and your stamina of the Committee addressing all these columns.

REP. PALM (36TH): Thank you, sir. We appreciate your being here. If I'm not mistaken, earlier one of your colleagues said that, I believe if I'm not

mistaken that Connecticut should actually increase the tax on, on gasoline. Would you, would you, would you agree with that?

BRIAN MORAN: Yeah, I think, I think what we're seeing because we're the regulated entities. And we see how burdensome this approach is, and believe that there is a far more streamlined approach to address this either through using existing taxes that already are being collected or looking at other taxes to fund these complimentary policies. If you walk down the street, out of 10,000 people, probably only two or three are going to know about TCI and about this price increase. So I think one of the key pieces of this program needs to be brought widespread public acceptance of this program.

REP. PALM (36TH): One of the previous testifiers from, from the biofuel industry was in support. Did you, did you hear that testimony, were you listening?

BRIAN MORAN: I did catch part of it. Would you summarize?

REP. PALM (36TH): No. I'm just, I'm just wondering to looking across the spectrum of your colleagues and different people in your field. I'm just curious about whether you've heard some of the testimony in support of this program?

BRIAN MORAN: Yeah. And, and I think, you know, biodiesel certainly is a, a component that is emerging to address and reduce emissions. And I think what we're, what we're predicting is that because of TCI and the logistics technologies, the trucking companies use, define, if they'll tell a driver to drive half an hour out of their way to get a better price on the fuel, because they're filling up 250 gallon saddle tanks. And it's a very competitive business in trucking and shipping. So they're likely to send and require their drivers not to fill up in Connecticut, Rhode Island, or

Massachusetts. And they can because they have 1000 mile range. They're going to go outside to non-participating states.

REP. PALM (36TH): Sir, do you believe the modeling that the TCI program would raise the, the cost about 5 cents on the gallon?

BRIAN MORAN: Do I believe, that's what they're going to do.

REP. PALM (36TH): Yes, I'm wondering what your modeling is that you are going by or what, what you estimate it to be?

BRIAN MORAN: I'm, I'm just going by what they've modeled. They've modeled and projected a five to nine cent increase per gallon to achieve a 26% reduction. And of that 26%, 19% to 24% is from fuel economy standards, has nothing to do with the allowance fee.

REP. PALM (36TH): Okay. Thank you. I see a question from Representative Piscopo.

REP. PISCOPO (76TH): Thank you, Madam Chair. Thank you Brian, for your testimony. Just a question in general, and because you mentioned that you have convenience stores also as the price of gas rises, do you see a precipitous or a correlation with slowdown in your business in the convenience store also?

BRIAN MORAN: Thank you for the question. I believe you would see, I've, I've read some studies that do show to affect consumer behavior. Prices need to rise very significantly for them to start to drop, and say, gee, I'm not going to go to the store or if I do go on a trip, I'm going to do multiple trips at once. And I'm going to do my grocery shopping, go to the drugstore and then get home. And that price increase is significant, you know, upwards of \$1.50

a gallon where people start to change their behavior.

REP. PISCOPO (76TH): Thank you. Thank you, Madam Chair.

REP. PALM (36TH): Thank you, Representative. I also see Representative Chafee has a question. Go ahead.

REP. CHAFEE (33RD): Thank you, Madam Chair. Thank you for speaking with us tonight. I just have a question. So I have been listening to testimony all day. And it seems like the argument against this, it's kind of a wide spectrum of everything from it's going to destroy my business, it's going to put every single gasoline service center in the state out of business to it's not going to work at all. And it seems like you're leaning towards it's not going to work. So I'm just curious, how is there such a wide discrepancy in the opinion of what this is going to do?

BRIAN MORAN: Thank you for the question, and also thank you Representative Piscopo for your question earlier. I think there is, there is one, I think we're at a moment in time where there is the intersection of ideology about taking action on climate change, and the practical realities of that. And I think, you know, fear, or change in general creates fear and anxiety. And I think that shows the various reactions to these proposals. So that's more on a philosophical question. I think the, the addressing emissions is a huge, huge undertaking. You've heard it range and there is truth at all that from ranging from addressing the electrical distribution system, the grid modernization that needs to occur, I would also throw in. The business model for EV charging isn't there yet, so you're not going to see the private investment by people like us, until that's remedied, until the demand charges get remedied. Those issues, I think are going to remain for a while as we transition. And, you know,

I, how I would phrase it is that we, we sell gasoline and diesel fuel, because that's what people want, and that's what they need to get around. Has their fuel choices evolve around mobility, we're going to be there with them to evolve with them as well. That answered your question?

REP. CHAFEE (33RD): Yeah, and I, I appreciate that. I mean, I guess for me, just to push back a little bit, you know, is it so much what we want or is it what we're stuck with? You know, our state, we live in a suburban state, there was a lot of sprawl. You know, I commute to work. I, I have no other alternative, but to drive to work whether it's an EV or combustion engine. You know, I think the whole point of this program is to accelerate the shift and create alternatives to driving everywhere.

BRIAN MORAN: Yeah, I guess, and that's where, where I see it is TCI as a tool, is not a greenhouse reduction tool. They're all modeling shows that the reductions, the majority of the reductions that they're going to gain from this program are being attributed to fuel economy standards of new cars. So what it can do and or what is proposing to do is address complimentary policies. However, I think that it's premature at this point to do that. I don't see, you know, EV adoption jumping and accelerating, there clearly are market signals there, and I think those are good, but those should be left to play out.

REP. CHAFEE (33RD): Alright. Thank you for your time. Thank you Madam Chair.

BRIAN MORAN: Thank you for the question.

REP. PALM (36TH): Any other questions from the Committee? Okay, seeing none. Thank you very much. Next up, we will have a Nicole Wong followed by Frank Ricci and then John Carlson. Miss Wong, you're up.

NICOLE WONG: Good evening Co-Chairs Christine Cohen and Joseph Gresko, Vice Chairs Christine Palm and Derek Slap and other Esteemed Members of the Environment Committee. My name is Nicole Wong. I'm a Campaign Manager with Green for All, a program of a national social justice nonprofit Dream Corps.

Green for All works to advance policies that address poverty and pollution, and has been actively engaged in regional conversations to push for more equitable Transportation and Climate Initiative. Through SB 884, AN ACT REDUCING TRANSPORTATION-RELATED CARBON EMISSIONS, Connecticut can adopt the Transportation and Climate Initiative Program to invest in needed transportation solutions that can support an inclusive economic recovery for those hit hardest by poverty, pollution, and the COVID-19 crisis.

As a significant source of tailpipe pollution and the top contributor of greenhouse gas emissions in the state, transportation shapes the health of Connecticut's communities, environment, and the economy. However, the system does not impact everyone evenly according to the National Equity Atlas, communities of color and Connecticut experience greater pollution exposure than white communities and are more likely to lack access to a car.

Additionally, low income families spend a greater proportion of their household income on transportation and wealthier households. We're actively working with community organizations, the Department of Energy and Environmental Protection and the Department of Transportation to develop amended language in the hopes of presenting joint recommendations. Please strengthen SB 884 in the following ways to ensure disproportionately impacted communities can actively shape the program and benefit equitably from investments.

First, Connecticut must invest significantly more than 35% of program funds towards overburdened and

underserved communities, and add a percentage that is significantly greater than their share of the total state population. Although SB 884 is designed to reduce emissions across the state as a whole, it does not explicitly address emissions in the neighborhoods with the highest air pollution, which is often concentrated in communities of color and low income communities. SB 884 must also commit to localized emission reduction measures in communities experiencing the worst air quality.

As Connecticut recovers from the COVID-19 pandemic and economic downturn, I urge you to incorporate Fair Labor Standards to ensure jobs associated with their program are prevailing wage jobs with good benefits. Investments should support workforce development programs and diverse hiring and contracting requirements to ensure access to economic opportunities for community to underrepresented the workforce or facing employment barriers.

We also urge you to strengthen the language around equity advisory bodies so that disproportionately impacted communities have significant decision making power to shape investments. SB 884 should outline this body's responsibilities clearly. To ensure this body is accessible to disproportionately impacted residents, members must be provided with adequate compensation and technical assistance to participate effectively. Connecticut can lead the region and its implementation of a more equitable Transportation and Climate Initiative program.

Please strengthen SB 884 to prioritize the needs and voices of disproportionately impacted communities and build a stronger and healthier transportation system for all. Thank you so much for your consideration.

REP. PALM (36TH): Thank you, Nicole. You are one of several people who have said that the equity piece of this could be strengthened. Is there

anything in the Bill in, in regards to the equity piece that you do find helpful or strong? You, you cited what the weaknesses are, and I'm just wondering if there were parts about it that you did like?

NICOLE WONG: Great question. Thank you for asking. I would say that a lot of equity pieces that are mentioned in the Bill are very similar to what was actually included in the regional MOU. And so the pieces that I brought for tonight are really just offering suggestions for how Connecticut can expand upon what was committed to at the regional level and really lead in terms of equity in this regard.

I think it is strong and it is important that the equity advisory body would be made up of a majority of residents of disproportionately impacted communities, so communities overburdened by transportation pollution and underserved by current transportation options. And additionally, the importance of giving this body significant opportunities to shoot the program will be key, but I think there is a lot of room in terms of expanding specificity in what the, what this body will actually be tasked to do, and also additionally how that body will be supported. So that low income community members, communities of color and other members who are disproportionately impacted by these issues will, will have an ability to direct, to direct investments from that program.

REP. PALM (36TH): Thank you. Thank you, Nicole, very much for that. Any questions from the Committee? I guess not. Thank you very much. So seeing none, we'll move on to Frank Ricci, who will be followed by John Carlson and then Chelsea Gazillo. Mr. Ricci, are you with us?

FRANK RICCI: Yes. Good evening. Frank Ricci testifying in opposition to Bill SB 884. I provide this testimony in my capacity as a concerned

citizen. Thank you for this opportunity to testify before this Distinguished Community.

Connecticut residents are hurting and approving TCI will not ease this burden. How much more will a gallon of fuel cost if TCI is approved? The Governor states five sets while his own staff stated nine sets and TCI documents state that the pass along could be as high as 17 cents. These numbers failed to make it clear that we are already paying over 50 cents per gallon at the pump in state and federal taxes. This indirect tax hurts those who are hurting the most. Not everybody has the ability or the luxury to work by Zoom. Whether it is a worker at the grocery store or restaurant, first responder, hospital, delivery person or the custodian; this Bill ends up costing them more at the pump. We also know based off our experience when the cost of fuel goes up, we all end up paying more for consumable goods, the prices at the grocery store going up.

It is my hope that the elected leaders will advocate for our residents that keep our state running. Many of them can't come and testify because they're working today. We are all concerned about the environment. However, science dictates that our environment is improving with pollution going significantly down since 1990. Our elected officials need to make Connecticut affordable and rising the price of gas during a pandemic is not the answer.

There is also one other thing that is very concerning to me. This was touted as a regional reform, but only Massachusetts, Rhode Island and a city, the District of Columbia opted in; 10 states quietly, well, I would say nine states quietly opted out. New Hampshire's Governor issued a stern rebuke by saying under this scheme, he actually called it a scheme, New Hampshire drivers would be forced to pay a significant new gas tax with little environmental benefit to the state. I ask that our elected

officials speak up for those who don't have a special interest groups representing them today that are just trying to go to work and don't want to pay more for gas; we need to make Connecticut more affordable.

There is one other issue. We're still going to need to fund transportation fund. So if this money is not going there, the state is under crushing pension debt, we have to fund pilot and we have to fund the transportation fund. So I know there is going to be some new revenue streams that you're going to be debating soon, so I'm hoping that those are earmarked and we make Connecticut more affordable, and we don't just keep putting it on the backs of the middle class and those who are poorest in our state. Thank you very much for your time. And I really appreciate your dedication and your patience to the state because to be on this all day long is exhausting enough. I appreciate what you do. Thank you.

REP. PALM (36TH): Thank you, Mr. Ricci. And thank you for sticking with us. One thing that you said caught my ear when you said that pollution is improving and that the climate change is reversing. Can you run that by us again?

FRANK RICCI: Well, I didn't say climate changing is reversing. I believe that the climate is always changing regardless of pollution. But according to the Environmental Protection Agency, national concentrations of air pollution has dropped significantly since 1990, and that's 1990 to 2019. So I think you're going to see even a more drastic because less people are driving right now. But from 1990 to 2019, during the same period, the US economy continued to grow. Americans drove more miles and the population and energy use increased. So I think it goes to a speaker that was before me who was talking about the fuel economy standards are making a big difference. So what I'm talking about for pollution is if on this EPA study, CO2 emissions was

down, I think, I got to put on my glasses I apologize; CO emissions, carbon monoxide was down 69%, box emissions was down 47%, NOX emissions was down 65%. So we are making improvements to the, the environment. I mean, I'm a fisherman, I'm concerned about the environment. I want the environment to be there for my granddaughter to take those hikes to go fishing. But the environment is improving from fuel economy standards. And we're just going to put another indirect tax that's going to be passed along to those people who are working the hardest for us right now during a pandemic.

REP. PALM (36TH): Thank you for that answer. I, I just wanted to point out that in Connecticut, our, our air quality standards are, are not where they should be, but, but thank you very much for your testimony. I see a question from Representative Michel.

REP. MICHEL (146TH): Just, just very quickly, just to a comment as well on this. I was just going to say, well you folk, were you talking about the emissions from transportation?

FRANK RICCI: Yes, sir. I'm talking about emissions from transportation. And I will be glad to provide the Committee with a copy of the study from the EPA.

REP. MICHEL (146TH): I know, the reason why I was asking is because I think also we need to get overall emissions. But then thank you very much Madam Chair and thank you Mr. Ricci for your testimony.

REP. PALM (36TH): Thank you Rep. Michel. Any other questions from the Committee? Okay, seeing none, then I think we are going to move on to John Carlson, followed by Chelsea Gazillo, and then Ken Coomes. John Carlson, are you with us, sir?

JOHN CARLSON: I am. Thank you, Representative.

REP. PALM (36TH): Thank you.

JOHN CARLSON: And thank you, Chair Cohen, Chair Gresko, and Distinguished Members of the Environment Committee. I appreciate this opportunity to highlight my organization and the businesses we work with our support for the Transportation Climate Initiative. I'll try to bridge my remarks given the late hour and the fact that many of the points that I would make have been well covered by colleagues and partner organizations.

My name is John Carlson. I work in the state policy team at Ceres. We're an organization that works with large companies and investors, mostly Fortune 500 and larger, who are committed to driving sustainability throughout the economy. Our policy coalition, the BICEP network businesses for innovated climate and energy policy is a group of 70 major corporations including household names like Unilever, IKEA, JLL, DSM, who are committed to sustainable climate and clean transportation policies like TCI.

I also am pleased to share the support that we organized over the last year from well over 100 businesses and institutions who signed on to our business letter in support of TCI, including other companies such as DHL, Wayfair, Timberland, Siemens, who all urge Governor Lamont to sign the TCI Memorandum of Understanding last fall.

These businesses are now supporting the implementation of the proposal and encourages the Senate to advance SB 884, to enable Connecticut's full participation in TCIP. We support TCI because our companies have generally they've made commitments to reducing their environmental footprint, reducing the emissions that result from their businesses. These aren't incorporations that are generally in the transportation supply chain. They don't stand to benefit from policies like this. But they want to reduce that environmental

footprint. So they're procuring renewable energy, reducing waste, purchasing EVs and taking a variety of actions to green their operations. But transportation is a particularly difficult problem because their companies rely on a transportation system for moving people and goods that is outside of their direct control. They rely on shipping companies, logistics providers, last mile delivery services that all burn fossil fuels. So if our corporations want to reduce their environmental footprint, they need a systemic reform, it's not something they can direct within their own operations.

We need this modern, clean, reliable transportation system, and TCI alone will not achieve that. But it is the overarching policy that will tie the rest of the targeted policy efforts together and create the economic incentives that push carbon emissions out of the system. You know, by charging polluters for the dirtiest transportation fuels, while creating markets for cleaner options or setting a cap on allowable emissions that decreases over time, you're going to ensure that reductions will be achieved.

I also want to highlight our support for many of the equity provisions that my partners have highlighted, and some of the suggestions that they have made for how these equity boards should be implemented. Our companies would like to set those policies as well and fully support the members of the community to have a voice in how this investment serves.

REP. PALM (36TH): Thank you. Thank you for wrapping up, appreciate it very much. Sorry to cut you off. Any questions from the Committee? Okay, seeing none, we're going to move on. Thank you very much for your testimony.

JOHN CARLSON: Thank you very much Representative.

REP. PALM (36TH): Yes, I believe next up is Chelsea Gazillo, followed by Ken Coomes and Kim Libera.

CHELSEA GAZILLO: Thank you. And good evening Co-Chair Senator Cohen, Representative Gresko, Vice Chair Senator Slap, Representative Palm, Ranking Member Senator miner, Representative Harding, and Distinguished Members of the Environment Committee. Before I start, congratulations go to Representative Gresko for your recent appointment as Environment Committee Co-Chair and to you Representative Palm for your recent appointment as Vice Chair to the Environment Committee.

For those of you that do not know me, my name is Chelsea Gazillo, I am American Farmland Trust New England Policy Manager. In Connecticut, I direct the Working Lands Alliance, a broad based statewide coalition dedicated to saving Connecticut's farmland from development and ensuring a prosperous agricultural future for all of Connecticut's residents.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify in support of HB 6441. Working Lands Alliance was proud to participate in the Governor's Council on climate change, working in natural lands Ag and soils Working Group. Many of the provisions in HB 6441 are outlined as tools the state can implement to promote climate smart agriculture and increase farmland preservation efforts.

In 2020, American Farmland Trust released a special report titled Farms Under Threat in New England perspective, where we outlined that between 2001 and 2016, almost 23,000 acres of Connecticut's farmland were converted to urban development or low density residential land use. Section 2 of HB 5441 will give municipalities the option to invest in local farmland preservation efforts including community farms preservation program projects. Farms that are protected through the community farms preservation program require a local match. HB 5441 Section 3 would be a tool to fund this local match.

The Community Farms Preservation Program is a program that state uses to protect small farms. These small, smaller properties are oftentimes the only farmland, young and beginning farmers can afford who are looking for land to start a farm business.

Sorry, it's been a long evening. Finally, Section 19 through 23 will authorize the Green Bank to establish an environmental infrastructure fund that can be used on climate change adaptation and resiliency projects. This will benefit farmers who want to implement climate smart agricultural practices, but lack the funds to do so. This can include aiding farmers with cost share associated with implementing healthy soil practices, see investment costs and equipment and cover crop seeds, water quality and infrastructure improvements, and on farm energy investments.

The environmental infrastructure fund could support a short term goal of getting the state to a cover crop usage of 50%, which would be an additional 17,000 acres of land that are in cover crops. This would result in the reduction of 157 metric tons of CO2 emissions over the next 20 years, which has the same mitigation impact as removing 1700 passenger cars off the road every year for 20 years. In short.

REP. PALM (36TH): I hate to interrupt you. It sounds like you're wrapping up.

CHELSEA GAZILLO: I'm wrapping up. In short, our working lands hold the key to help the states adopt and become resilient in the face of climate change. Thank you for the opportunity to testify. And I welcome any questions.

REP. PALM (36TH): Thank you for your very close reading of the Bill. Do I see any comments or questions from our Committee Members? No, I don't

believe so. Okay, thank you very much, Chelsea.  
Appreciate your being here.

CHELSEA GAZILLO: Thank you so much.

REP. PALM (36TH): Next up, we have Ken Coomes,  
followed by Kim Libera and then Leah Hass. Mr.  
Coomes, are you with us?

KEN COOMES: Yes, I am. Can you hear me?

REP. PALM (36TH): Yes, sir. Go right ahead.

KEN COOMES: Okay. Hi, to the Members of the  
Environment Committee, I would like to voice my  
opposition to the proposed Senate Bill 884, and  
thank you for affording me this opportunity.

My firm's supply is over 30 independent fuel  
facilities in the State of Connecticut. The  
majority of these are a single station mom and pop  
operators. Many of my customers are struggling to  
complete environmental and fuel dispensing system  
upgrades. In addition to SB 884, several recent  
legislative proposals threatened their very  
existence. Today, I am their voice.

Migration to EVs and alternative fuel vehicles is a  
worthy objective. Over time, this will happen.  
However, the additional onerous taxes imposed by TCI  
and they are taxes will endanger the economic  
recovery. Also, it is unclear how much of these  
funds will actually go to the goal of conversion  
after the respective bureaucracies are created.

I firmly believe that EVs become much more viable  
when the electric grid is upgraded, a nuclear power  
generation is expanded and rare earth mining is  
increased to accommodate demand. I wonder what the  
community advocates who oppose pipelines will say  
when the required new rare earth mines are peeled  
open.

Since November, the futures price of our Bob gasoline has doubled. We have ceded the role of being the swing producer to Saudi Arabia, prices are increasing rapidly. In a few short months, we have lost our position as the world's leading energy power. Losing our energy independence will not be far behind.

We are familiar with the phrase robbing Peter to pay Paul by subsidizing electric vehicles not only is this occurring, but you are also depriving Peter from his livelihood. I urge you to let the free markets prevail, do no harm. Thank you.

REP. PALM (36TH): Thank you sir, for your testimony. Are there any questions from the Committee to Mr. Coomes? No, okay. Seeing none, I believe next we have Kim Libera.

KIM LIBERA: Good evening. My name is Kim Libera and I am an earth scientist and mathematician with 110 plus credits in my field. I am concerned about this issue because I do not want us to become Texas and California if this body continues to make law based on emotion. I do not want a 100% electrified grid. What I do want is a market driven by consumers and welcome all players to the grid, okay. It is very geographic, specific there.

Now to the issue of climate, okay, this is my field. The sun is the primary driver of our climate and there is no need for alarmism. The unique configuration of our globe's continental plates and oceans is the next biggest factor in these move over time. The climate is not driven by a specific gas that comprises a mere 0.035% of the air and only absorbs photons in three specific wavelengths. I believe what you are concerned about are the sulfur and nitrogen oxides that accumulate particularly in cities and out of the tailpipe, okay? This is known as the urban heat island problem. You cannot eliminate it, you can alleviate it.

And what I don't see mentioned here today and what I would like to see is investment in the maglev trains and gyroscopic vehicles, because you will lose the entire source of diesel. And that will be a great improvement and you will create hundreds of thousands of jobs. This area is where we trail China and India. Overall, the United States of America, calendar year 2019, led all countries in reduction of emissions across the world. That is a little known fact. You make it sound like we're not doing anything, we have because we have rights on the book, but you can do this in the transport sector and it will make a difference, and it will be able to transport people around as they have been saying all day today. And the product is very good because it gets people to their destination faster with this technology.

And, again, another alleviation device for urban heat islands is, I do recommend that windmills be situated proximal to cities because the problem with cities is you're not moving air. If windmills can slightly move air across the ground, you will get some relief in dissipation of these gases. Thank you.

REP. PALM (36TH): Thank you very much. Perfectly timed. I see a question from Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH): Thank you.

KIM LIBERA: Yes.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH): Thank you for coming in and testifying. You, you packed a lot into three minutes. I want to ask you a couple of questions about it. First off, could you, you rattled real quick what your qualifications are? Could you explain what your qualification in this area?

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH): Okay. I have, I have a master's degree in Earth Science that encompasses

four subjects, Astronomy, Meteorology, Geology, and Oceanology. I hold a master's in math and a Bachelor's in math. I've been following this subject for about 20 years. I, I am an earth person.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH): Earth person, okay. Where do you do, do you work in the field?

KIM LIBERA: Well, I am, I am a retired person by disability. There, I, I worked in different sectors of the public government. I also was a teacher and I went back and finished my Master's in Earth Science, finished in 2009. That was my 10th. So more of what I do are small projects. But I, I am a blogger in this subject, and I continue to take horses. I watch podcasts there. So it's not like I don't know what I'm talking about. I do know the prominent people in the field and just because my name is not Al Gore does, does not mean I lack credibility.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH): Okay. Did you submit any written testimony?

KIM LIBERA: Yes, I did. It is a lengthy testimony. I certainly would appreciate it if you at least read it over the summer, you will learn a lot from it. Feel free to send me an email if you want to do a coffee chat, that's fine, but I can't provide you with some education that is not out there because of bias.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH): Okay. Now, you, you had mentioned some new technology.

KIM LIBERA: Yes.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH): You went through it very quickly, and I didn't understand what you were?

KIM LIBERA: Okay. These are called maglev trains and gyroscopic vehicles, okay. A maglev train is a

highest speed train that does not use diesel. It runs on the principles of magnetism and semiconductors and they can move as high as 600 miles an hour. And they are very clean and very safe, okay. The gyroscopic vehicle move somewhat slower because it's mostly an urban thing, but I suppose it could be used in office parks and works on those same principles of magnetic levitation. And what the vehicles are able to do is transport primarily commuters, okay. And it has retractable stilts that can allow it to follow a magnetic line engrained into the highway or asphalt, okay. And it will adhere to this line and it can lower itself for any bridge, it can go through tunnels, it can drop people off on a rotary depot, okay. This stuff is all on YouTube. And I have been trying to urge my Congresswoman to go for it. I just can't get any answer. But this will alleviate a lot of the emissions sector problem that everybody seems to be complaining about today.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH): Do you, do you know if that technology has been rolled out anywhere in the world?

KIM LIBERA: It is, it is rolled out in China, in India. It is already active in Germany and the gyroscopes are being developed in Australia. I did hear from Tom Condon, a writer for the Connecticut Mirror very recently. He indicates now somebody has maybe got a link, maybe it's Elon Musk, I don't know there because like I said, I've been trying to lobby for this, because you can move a decent amount of people. And if commuters use it, the word will get out and you will begin to draw vacation people off the road by using it.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH): Now that technology uses electricity, right?

KIM LIBERA: This, no, you misunderstood what I said. This relies on the principles of magnetism. It does use electricity at startup and the gadgets.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH): I, I got you on that, but in order to do the, the magnetic levitation, you need to have superconducting?

KIM LIBERA: Semiconductors.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH): I mean, I mean.

KIM LIBERA: So yes, semiconductors.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH): You need to have electromagnets, right? And electromagnets run on electricity.

KIM LIBERA: Well, the, the electric, the electrical part are some of the coils. The magnets are simply those alloys that are best used in magnets, namely iron and nickel and cobalt.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH): Okay. Alright, well, I'll, I'll take a look at your written testimony. I, I, certainly reading it this summer is not going to be helpful for the purposes of this legislative session.

KIM LIBERA: Well, I know. Look, I know it's, it's, it's, it's long and we're not going to build Rome overnight, okay. You could talk to Len Suzio about it, I'm sure you know who he is. Okay, but I, I, I just want to say it's very hard as a citizen activists who really knows their stuff to make headway because everybody has an unconscious bias. Oh, what do you know, your name is not Al Gore, you don't have some fancy title.

REP. PALM (36TH): Ms. Libera, I'm going to have to cut you off and ask Representative Dubitsky, I believe he was prepared to either wrap up or ask you another question. Sir, do you want to pursue your line of questioning?

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH): No, that was, that was my last question. Thank you, Madam Chair. Thank you for coming in and testifying. And we'll see if we can take a look at your written testimony. Thank you.

REP. PALM (36TH): Thank you, Representative. Any other questions from the Committee? All right, seeing none, thank you Miss Liberia for being in here. We're going to move on the next few speakers are Bruce Ho, Mark Borowski, and Ruth Canovi. So beginning with Bruce Ho, are you here, sir?

BRUCE HO: I am, yes.

MARY ANN TURNER: Not me yet.

REP. PALM (36TH): Okay, Bruce Ho is up. Thank you. We can see you and hear you. You have three minutes.

BRUCE HO: Thank you. Good evening Co-Chairs Cohen and Gresko, Vice Chairs Palm and Slap, Ranking Members Miner and Harding and Members of the Committee. Thank you for the opportunity to testify this evening in support of SB 884.

My name is Bruce Ho, and I'm a Senior Advocate in the Climate and Clean Energy Program at the Natural Resources Defense Council or NRDC. We're an international nonprofit environmental organization with more than 23,000 members and online activists in Connecticut.

On behalf of our Connecticut members and activists, I urge the Environment Committee to support SB 884 to authorize Connecticut's participation in the regional Transportation and Climate Initiative program to tackle the climate crisis. As has already been discussed today, the transportation sector is responsible for 40% of Connecticut's carbon pollution, which is almost twice the emissions of power generation.

Without meaningful action to cut this pollution, Connecticut cannot do its part to avert the worst impacts of climate change. SB 884 would be a key step forward in tackling this transportation pollution. By authorizing the Transportation and Climate Initiative program, the Bill would ensure that tailpipe emissions from cars, trucks and buses comes down over the next decade, and because the program is regional, Connecticut will leverage its action with its neighbors including Massachusetts and Rhode Island, leading to even greater pollution reductions and benefits.

The program will help fund solutions that Connecticut needs for cleaner, healthier transportation. By holding oil companies accountable for their pollution, the program will generate over \$1 billion for Connecticut to invest in expanded mass transit, zero emitting electric buses and trucks, safe walkable bikeable neighborhoods and other innovative programs. These investments will create jobs, they'll grow the economy and they'll put more money in the pockets of Connecticut residents by saving fuel and providing more transportation choices.

The Transportation and Climate Initiative program is an opportunity to build a better, healthier, fair, and safer transportation sector in Connecticut. Under SB 884, at least 35% of investments would benefit Connecticut's most underserved and overburdened communities and residents of these communities would help shape investment through an Equity Advisory Board that advises state agencies on implementation.

NRDC supports these commitments, but we also urge the Committee to go even further. In Massachusetts for example, legislators are considering a Bill to direct 70% of that programs, program investments underserved and overburdened communities.

So I want to thank you again for the opportunity to testify. And again, NRDC urges you to support SB 884 with even stronger commitment to equity in the Bill. Thank you.

REP. PALM (36TH): Thank you very much Mr. Ho, for your testimony and for staying with us this long. Any questions or comments from Committee Members? I don't see any, thank you sir, for being with us.

BRUCE HO: Thank you.

REP. PALM (36TH): Next, we have Mark Borowski, followed by Ruth Canovi and Mary Ann Turner. Mr. Borowski, are you with us?

MARK BOROWSKI: Thank you Representative. Thank you Representative. Good evening, Senator Cohen, Representative Gresko, and Distinguished Members of the Environment Committee. My name is Mark Borowski, and I'm the Government Affairs Manager for BP for the US East Coast.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide testimony in support of Senate Bill 884, which will open the way for Connecticut to participate in the Transportation and Climate Initiative capital invest program designed to reduce CO2 emissions from the transportation sector.

The potential benefits of TCIP to Connecticut are well documented and have been covered by many of the witnesses here today. What I'd like to do is focus on why a company like BP, a major producer, distributor and marketer of gasoline and diesel transportation fuel, believes this program is not only good for people and good for the planet, but also good for business and good for Connecticut and why others should see it that way also.

Last year, we announced our ambition to become a net zero company by 2050 or sooner and help the world get there too. That includes advocating for well-

designed market based policy like this. This program offers an efficient and cost effective way to tackle one of the most pressing issues of our time.

BP has established some significant milestones along the path to our transformation. These include scaling down our gas and oil production by more than 40% by 2030, a tenfold increase in low carbon investments from around 500 million a year to around 5 billion per year by 2030, and developing 50 gigawatts of renewable energy generating capacity by 2030, a 20 fold increase from today.

While companies like ours can and must play a leading role in bringing about a lower carbon future, government leadership is essential. We support well designed carbon pricing programs such as the Regional Greenhouse Gas Initiative for example, but use the power of competitive markets to change behavior, reduce emissions, and encourage innovation. Such programs would also provide the certain companies like ours need to invest and bring new technologies to people faster and at the scale required for real progress. Nowhere this be more apparent than in the case of a company like ours, which will be directly impacted by the transformative effect TCI program could have on the fuel and transportation system in the region.

As a cap on investment on emissions lowers and the cost of those emissions rise, we've received market signals incentivizing things such as the emergence of hydrogen fuel cells, biodiesel and other low carbon biofuels, the electrification of trucking fleets, and in general incentivizing EVs and increasing demand for EV charging infrastructure. We see tremendous potential business opportunities in these areas. We want to be a part of that transformation and think others should do. That is why BP is a founding member of the coalition for a better business environment, a diverse group of businesses representing important sectors of our

economy to include energy, transportation, and manufacturing.

Programs like TCI provide the predictability businesses like ours need. It's scaled approach over time allows us to build lower carbon innovations into our plans so we can all be a part of the clean energy economy.

We believe strongly that investment in improving Connecticut's and the region's transportation infrastructure can yield multiple benefits for the economy, our employees, and our customers in addition to reducing greenhouse gas emissions to clean the transportation system and facilitate more efficient goods and services.

Okay, I'll wrap it, I'll wrap it up here quickly.

REP. PALM (36TH): Thank you.

MARK BOROWSKI: Will cover the economic benefits because I think those have been pretty well stated, but we also support efforts by the TCI states to address equity in the region. And we think that the resources this program can provide will go a long way to those efforts for the states. Thank you again for the opportunity to testify. I look forward to working with you and answering any questions you might have.

REP. PALM (36TH): Thank you sir, very much. One of the things that you said really struck my ear, which is that this program would add predictability. Many of the folks testifying against it have said just the opposite that it, that it is too unpredictable and that they aren't sure what the net result at the pumps would be. I, I'm certainly not asking you to speak for them, but I'm just wondering if you heard that testimony and if you'd like to respond?

MARK BOROWSKI: I did hear it, and I won't speak to anyone else's, you know, individual business

situation. But we see when the, when there is a price built into the system, it provides us the long term certainty we need to make long term investments. You know, when you're transforming a system like this, you're talking many years and billions of dollars, and decisions like that don't get made overnight. You need to be able to look out in the future and see what your costs are going to be and what the incentives are, and particularly market based systems like this provide that certainty and investment incentive.

REP. PALM (36TH): Thank you. Thank you for that very much. I see a question from our Chair, Representative Gresko, followed by Ranking Member Harding. Go ahead, Mr. Chair.

REP. GRESKO (121ST): Thank you, Madam Chair. In your testimony Mark, you said that BP would be affected financially if TCI went into effect the, here in Connecticut, Rhode Island, and Massachusetts, am I correct?

MARK BOROWSKI: Yes, and, and hopefully the broader region.

REP. GRESKO (121ST): So my follow up question, my 64th, well, \$1 billion question is.

REP. PALM (36TH): Don't get yourself.

REP. GRESKO (121ST): Well, and I'm not going to mean to put you on the spot here. But would BP pass that cost on to their consumers and their customer?

MARK BOROWSKI: I, I think it is to be honest inevitable that some, some cost, if cost of the doing business goes up, there is the likelihood that some costs get passed on to consumers. But unlike a gas tax for example, which is a set amount, that is going to be, you know, defined by legislation, the markets going to decide what the cost and you know, we are very confident in the cost control mechanisms

have been placed out of this, into this program, there will always remain the incentive to remain competitive vis a vis other, other companies. And as technology improves, and fuels for example, become less carbon intensive, that will lower the requirement for, for credits. Yeah, so it's a very complex market system that can be introduced by, by a program like this, which is why we think it's, it's a much better alternative than attacks or, or regulation that you know, would pick a winner or a loser at a technology versus letting the market decide.

REP. GRESKO (121ST): Well, your support of the, of the program is, is, is noted. But you know, the opponents, what I'm trying to say is if, if, if advocates and environmental groups and the, and the government didn't take these steps to, to try to incentivize a change from fossil fuels, we wouldn't even be here at this point having this conversation. So I'm thinking that, I would just like to see as we go forward, a more of a commitment that maybe you're not going to pass that cost down to the consumer. I know that you have to do business and there is a bottom line, but you said it's a competitive business and I can't think of, of a better selling point than saying, hey, you know, we're not passing the cost down to our customer.

MARK BOROWSKI: I couldn't agree more, and I'll be honest, I'm not familiar with the margins in every particular market and, and you know, how things get, you know, you know, what people have to do you know, maintain a profit. But I, I think that's clearly an incentive to you, to lower your own costs so that you can provide a product better and cheaper than your competitor.

REP. GRESKO (121ST): Thank you, Mark. And thank you, Madam Chair.

REP. PALM (36TH): Thank you. To the Ranking Member, Rep. Harding.

REP. HARDING (107TH): Thank you very much, Madam Chair, I appreciate it. And thank you sir, for, for coming today and waiting so long and testifying, appreciate your testimony. I just really been following up very much on, on pretty much on what Representative Gresko or Chair Gresko had mentioned. I'm, I'm just wondering, wouldn't, isn't there a better way to potentially fund these initiatives than if, if you're going to testify in support of this and putting in the extra money to, to invest in these, in these programs, which are critical, agreed. Wouldn't it be a better way to fund this and to pass it down to the, the consumers here in the state who, who have to pay these increased fees by your company?

MARK BOROWSKI: Again, I, I think it's very hard to say that, you know, that the cost would definitely, would definitively be passed along to, to consumers. And in terms of funding, it transitioned to, I'm assuming you're talking about funding of advanced fuels, technological innovation, etc. Is that what you're talking about, funding?

REP. HARDING (107TH): Well, no. What I'm actually referring to is the different programs that would be funded based upon the, the additional revenue the State of Connecticut would accrue from, from, from this, from this program.

MARK BOROWSKI: We generally try to avoid telling the states how to invest their money and, and what, you know, what to say how they should, how they should fund certain programs, how they should, you know, how they, what they should do with those investments. What we, what I'm trying to focus on here is the incentive that this would provide us as a business to innovate, cut costs and produce lower carbon products for our customers.

REP. HARDING (107TH): I appreciate, no, I appreciate that. I appreciate that. Yeah, and I

think that again, and I don't want to speak for Representative Gresko, but I think he said that pretty, he said it verbatim and, and I'll just repeat it. I just think what we're concerned with here is, is how the bottom line and how this is going to, you know, the fees that are going to be potentially passed down to the consumers of the state. I mean, these are all worthwhile initiatives. I think that any, any reasonable person would agree with that. I think that, as I'm sure your company is as well. I think that, you know, that's really the concern here. So that's what we're trying to, I guess navigate through is trying to fund these worthwhile programs, trying to make sure that there is equity in, in, how we do this and everything else. But at the same time, you know, not passing down these potential burdensome costs to the, to the residents of the state.

MARK BOROWSKI: And you know, the last point I'll make, unless you have other questions is, I think, what we like about market based systems like this that foster competition, is that usually when you turn, when you, when you unleash the competitive nature in, in corporations to invest and innovate, historically I think you find that cost to the consumer drop, rather than rise over time.

REP. HARDING (107TH): And, and I appreciate that. And thank you so much for, for staying all night and for your, your testimony and for your hard work on this. Thank you. Thank you, Madam Chair for your time.

REP. PALM (36TH): Thank you, Rep. Harding.  
Esteemed Ranking Member, Senator Miner.

SENATOR MINER (30TH): Thank you, Madam Chair. So I'm not sure whether you heard some of the earlier testimony from the fuel community, I'll call it; where, in some of their opinions, we've come a long way. No one is saying we've gotten to the promised land, but that because of changes in emission

standards, changes in fuel economy, many of the factors that we're trying to continue to influence have in fact been significantly influenced already. Would you agree with that?

MARK BOROWSKI: I, I think it's indisputable that there has been progress, yes.

SENATOR MINER (30TH): And, and thank you. And so when I think about the next step and I think about the step that we're, that we're about to take let's say with the passage of this Bill; it, it surprises me that the fuel industry would be advocating for a system of bidding and trying to recover costs in the hopes of developing better fuels when that it would seem to me if I was making a pitch to a board of directors, I would say we could do that right now. We don't need this REC system to provide revenue. If BP wanted to go into the bond market or wanted to float stock, they could bank roll all of the things that I think the Commissioner was talking about, perhaps with the exception of the moving target of 35% of the revenue raised, which will somehow end up in the municipalities to deal with the disenfranchised people that, that bear the majority of the burden of pollution from one form or another. Am I wrong that you couldn't do this on your own without kind of getting into bed with the State of Connecticut?

MARK BOROWSKI: So, I'll give an example in some history from BP that far predates me, but I think is illustrative of why we would prefer a system in place that puts the costs on emissions and continues to you know, lower the cap and making emission, the cost of emissions higher, and why we would like to certainty that that sort of system provides. You know, many, many years ago, in the late 90s, the Kyoto Accords were you know, were adopted and people thought there was going to be a real push to put a price on carbon or to do it, you know, make it all out effort to reduce emissions, and BP many people may remember beyond petroleum from literally you

know around the year 2000. And BP made the decision to invest a lot of money in solar wind and other renewable energies. And then the price of natural gas and oil plummeted and removed all the incentives for continuing to invest all that kind of money and BP lost all that money that they invested. I know, they lost all of it, again way before my time, but the example still holds true.

So you know, what you want is the incentive to continue to be there and to drive competition to drive innovation so that those things can be brought, those technology can be brought to market and ever increasingly rapid rate and lower cost. Hopefully, that answers your question.

SENATOR MINER (30TH): Well, it does. Actually when you when you just mentioned the earlier investments. So I can see how if you had five different major players in the fuel industry, speculation, whether it's speculation to drill for more oil and gas, or speculation to branch off into other energy sources has some level of risk. And by creating a playing field here where everyone is assessed equally, the risk is the same for all.

MARK BOROWSKI: As like market based programs like this that don't pick winners or losers, but let the market decide.

SENATOR MINER (30TH): Amongst, amongst petroleum producers?

MARK BOROWSKI: Well, you know, we can, we are, we are committed to transforming away from being an international oil company to an integrated energy company. So we consider ourselves an energy company.

SENATOR MINER (30TH): And I, and I appreciate that. I don't know if you, just my last question. I guess I don't know if you've been listening to the conversation around the 35% set aside for the

communities that I spoke of earlier. And, and have you?

MARK BOROWSKI: I, I've been listening to quite a bit of the testimony and I'm familiar with the argument, yes.

SENATOR MINER (30TH): And so the argument seems to be already being made that 35 is not enough, and that perhaps that number should be higher. Is that kind of a discussion, where are you at all in terms of how big this piece of the pie will be when it comes to evening that playing field amongst the petroleum or energy producers?

MARK BOROWSKI: The, that is a, that is a discussion that we really feel is up to the states. Again, we support the efforts of the states, they're considering this program to address equity and we think it's important that they do that, but we believe that's, you know, a decision for the states to make.

SENATOR MINER (30TH): Okay, thank you. I appreciate you hanging with us.

MARK BOROWSKI: Appreciate the opportunity.

REP. PALM (36TH): Thank you, Senator Miner. Any other questions from the Committee? Seeing none, we will have Ruth Canovi, on deck is Mary Ann Turner and then followed by Andrew Haripaul. Ruth, are you with us?

RUTH CANOVI: Yes.

REP. PALM (36TH): I see you there. You have three minutes, ma'am.

RUTH CANOVI: Great. Thank you. Good evening, Distinguished Members and Chairpersons of the Environment Committee. Thank you so much for the opportunity to speak tonight. My name is Ruth

Canovi, I'm the Director of Advocacy for the American Lung Association in Connecticut. We work to save lives by improving lung health and preventing lung disease through research, education, and advocacy. And we appreciate the opportunity to comment on Senate Bill 884, and we strongly urge the Committee to pass the Bill.

As the Lung Association, we're very concerned about the quality of the air that we all breathe. For over 20 years, we've been releasing our State of the Air report, which looks at two dangerous air pollutants, ozone pollution in particular, matter pollution. We want to track this to see how we're doing in cleaning up our air and also educate the public about the health risks of exposure to poor air quality.

Exposure to ozone pollution causes a number of health ailments including respiratory harm and cardiovascular harm. And rising temperatures from climate change are making it harder to reduce ozone. Connecticut's ozone levels are too high, in fact, we have some of the worse ozone levels in the eastern half of the country.

Particle pollution is a known carcinogen and has many other dangerous health impacts including premature death, non-fatal heart attacks, aggravated asthma, decreased lung function, and increased respiratory symptoms. The transportation sector in Connecticut contributes to a significant share of these pollutants as well as greenhouse gas emissions that drive our climate crisis. We simply cannot ensure clean air and a livable climate for all Americans without addressing transportation pollution.

TCIP is an important tool to reduce transportation pollution, improve air quality, reduce carbon pollution, and invest in more efficient and reliable transportation system.

In September of 2020, we released a report entitled The Road to Clean Air, which demonstrates a significant potential health outcomes and cost savings if we electrify the transportation sector. We recommend that this State maintain a comprehensive approach to reducing harmful transportation pollution that includes reducing vehicle miles traveled through prioritizing active transit, transportation, making transit investments and supporting widespread transition to zero emission technologies.

We recognize that major sources of air pollution are often located near where underserved and overburdened communities live and work, which means exposure to pollutants emitted can be immediate and harmful. The Lung Association also recognizes that people in these communities also face a greater burden of lung disease, making them even more vulnerable to these pollutants.

Clearly, it is critical that the benefits of programs and investments intended to reduce the burdens of transportation pollution should benefit our most impacted communities. So we had urged the passage of Senate Bill 884, TCI is, is a bold and necessary step to address air quality and climate change with a regional approach. And I thank you so much for the opportunity to speak tonight.

REP. GRESKO (121ST): Well, thank you Ruth, and thank you for your patience and your endurance.

RUTH CANOVI: Thank you to all of you for that too.

REP. GRESKO (121ST): We got a little bit ways to go, but I don't see any hands raised from my colleagues. So thank you for your testimony.

RUTH CANOVI: Thank you. Have a good evening.

REP. GRESKO (121ST): You as well. Next on our list is Mary Ann Turner, and then followed by Andrew Haripaul, and then Amy McLean. Mary Ann?

MARY ANN TURNER: Good evening, Chairman and Ranking Members and Esteemed Committee Members. So I'm writing to you in opposition of Bill SB 884, AN ACT REDUCING TRANSPORTATION-RELATED CARBON EMISSIONS.

It would be great if the Bill would benefit Connecticut and its citizenry, but it won't in my opinion. This is an inadvertent toll tax. It will force gas prices to go higher and will not be - and our residents will not be able to afford to drive in our state. When Governor Lamont was on the record in January of 2020 saying he was backing away from the Regional Climate Initiative because of gas price hikes, it's curious to wonder what changed.

This weekend I received an email from Representative Arnone trying to soft pedal this Bill which will devastate the return to normalcy after a year of COVID-19 shutdown. How do I know this? Well, just go buy gas, it's already hitting \$3 a gallon already. With the possibility of 17 cent rise at best and are already overtaxed gasoline now, the only group who will benefit will be, will be OPM. The gross receipts tax will skyrocket.

Does anyone actually believe the current administration will leave the money in the special transportation fund when they've been known to use the words like divert, rather than keep your hands off? Our government, Governor has aligned himself with the Georgetown Climate Center who is spearheading under the disguise of modern, modernizing infrastructure. But it's really taking, talking about underserved communities. This group's Transportation and Climate Initiative is on the record saying they want governors to sign on to a progressive climate plan with a bloated and expensive administrative costs and with a timeline of 2050.

Gasoline prices will rise to the point where Connecticut citizens will not be able to afford it. The state will not recover from the COVID government shutdown, and it will put people out of work and when people do venture out, it'll be out of necessity not out of pleasure, making more businesses closed and Connecticut stepping that much closer to being one of the worst states to live in.

When the gas hit \$5 a gallon if I need to remind you in 2011, the year of Obama, the state coffers enjoyed the gross receipts tax income. The public suffered and jobs are lost. Governor Lamont made a statement he wants Connecticut drivers to drive less and to do that he will make them pay, and he will make them pay a lot. That idea that cleaner travel options are available is not true, at least not in the near future.

This is another Bill that will turn America backward fuel useful decline, but for all the wrong reasons and the group with the liberal think tank operatives from the Georgetown Climate Center will be the only one smiling as they put one more nail in the Connecticut coffin or should I say northeast coffin.

This Bill should not pass on one point alone. Government should not be putting outside organizations before the very people they are elected to serve. The Climate Center itself, the Climate Center realizes it's that the free market will drive emission change. The free market will drive emission change, and that it is how it should be, not government intervention. I oppose the Bill and will, and as it will not make Connecticut a better state, it'll take us one more step closer to being the worse. How about we just say no?

REP. GRESKO (121ST): Mary Ann, thank you for your testimony. You have a question from Representative O'Dea.

REP. O'DEA (125TH): Thank you, Mr. Chair. I just want to thank you Miss Turner for your testimony. Both the transportation and now environment you've, you've had a long day and, and for the record, Mr. Chair, I've pulled over, put my blinkers on while I, while I'm testing, why I'm asking these questions. But I just want to say thank you ma'am, and thank you Mr. Chairman for the time.

MARY ANN TURNER: Thank you.

REP. GRESKO (121ST): Thank you, Representative O'Dea. Drive safe. Seeing no other hands raised, Mary Ann, thank you for your patience and your endurance and for sharing your opinions with us.

MARY ANN TURNER: Alright, good night everyone.

REP. GRESKO (121ST): Good night. Next on the list is Andrew Haripaul, followed by Amy McLean, then Thomas Lefebvre.

ANDREW HARIPAUL: Good evening. My name is Andrew Haripaul, and I'd like to first thank you all for your time to allow me to speak tonight.

I'm a retailer in the state operating several gas stations, convenience stores, and I'm against the Senate Bill 884, the TCI proposed Bill. Two of my stores are near borderlines of Rhode Island and Massachusetts. We're currently priced over 30 cents per gallon than the average retail gas price than Massachusetts, why, because of our current gas taxes.

Our consumers are well aware of the price differential and if they decide to make a fuel purchase, it's a minimal purchase to get by. The more they have to spend at the pump equates to less they will spend in the store. While this is labeled as an environmental program equating to 17 cents per gallon increase, it will be seen as another gas tax.

As you know, our margins as a whole are shrinking. Sales are down 30 to 40% both in convenience store and on the fuel due to COVID. It is not, it is clearly, it is clearly not the right time to bring this matter to the table and have revenues collected off of fuel sales go towards the TCI program.

As it stands today, two of my stores are near failure, dealing with the loss of sales both at the pumps and in this store. We cannot afford to keep taking more hits especially during these downward trending times. It equates to, it will equate to a loss of staff, increase in retail and potentially closer, not to mention me figuring out how to replace my income and provide for my family as well.

The state also wants to push for a menthol and flavored tobacco ban, which makes up 40% to 60% of inside store sales by category. How much more can we tolerate as small business owners in this unfriendly business state?

Lastly, I can't understand why we would support a Bill that would help fund our demise and industry and push to go to electric vehicles. In our future plans, we are exploring having EV charging stations available in our locations as the infrastructure is in place to make convenient stops. However right now, research shows it's a large investment and a long return of investment. Local, we would need local government and federal government help to make these moves.

It almost seems as though we should push for tolls again and help lower the pain at the pumps with the excessive taxes already being passed through to consumers. Just in Connecticut alone right now on regular fuel is approximately 45 cents per gallon before even we get to retail the fuel.

As the sands of consumer thinks, we make huge margins on fuel and most of the pricing structures

based on all after taxes, make up the majority of street price plus rate.

Just like to thank you for your time, and there is just one quick little thing if I do have time to add.

REP. GRESKO (121ST): Go ahead.

ANDREW HARIPAUL: Yep. I'm pretty sure I just heard that British Petroleum representatives say they don't own any gas stations in Connecticut and they never deal with the consumer. They have no problem passing on their cost to the consumer. Unlike me, I have to stand across the counter, look my customers in the eye and explain why the price of the pump went up higher. It just makes for one more challenge for us out here as a small business owner. And, again, I am against this Bill. Thank you.

REP. GRESKO (121ST): Well, thank you for the testimony. And so, so how are you doing it now then? The gas, the price of gas has just gone up 30 cents over the last three, three weeks. So what do you say to your customers now that come in and complain that the gas prices are too high and, and it ends up in the pockets of the individuals who we are trying to target?

ANDREW HARIPAUL: I mean, we have to do the same thing we do on a daily basis. We follow the news, and we explain to them to the best of our ability, why the prices have gone up. And we sympathize with them because we're consumers as well that have to also, you know, front the same cost that they do.

REP. GRESKO (121ST): As am I, but I would be able to stomach it better if it was an investment into infrastructure that might actually find its way to your business via the Green Bank for example, during testimony rather than say, the price went up and, and there's nothing I could do about it.

ANDREW HARIPAUL: I mean, we're in the business to sell fuel. If you guys have a better program to justify this with something solid, saying that this money will be reinvested into our businesses to help provide the electronic charging stations and the language was a little bit more clear, maybe we would be you know, I'm not, I'm not against it in the sense that we shouldn't be going green. But I am against it in the sense that it's literally going to take away one more thing that I have to offer as a business or where we can help make these margins to survive with the incurring expenses going up.

REP. GRESKO (121ST): Understood, I will put you in touch with the Green Bank and we'll see what we can do.

ANDREW HARIPAUL: Thank you.

REP. GRESKO (121ST): Thank you. Thanks for the testimony. Anyone else? I don't see anyone hands raised. So Andrew, thank you for your time and your testimony.

ANDREW HARIPAUL: Thank you. Good night.

REP. GRESKO (121ST): Next up is Amy McLean, followed by Thomas Lefebvre and then Chris Phelps.

AMY MCLEAN: Thank you. Good evening everybody, and Honorable Chair Persons Cohen and Gresko, and Vice Chair people Palm and Slap, and all of your, all the Committee Members. My name is Amy McLean. I am here tonight in testimony in support of 884, reducing transportation related carbon emissions.

I work with, with the Acadia Center and we appreciate the opportunity to provide this testimony. We are a nonprofit research and advocacy organization, committed to advancing the clean energy future. Acadia Center advocates for the equitable clean energy future for Connecticut, tackling regulatory and legislative energy policy

transportation, energy efficiency, beneficial electrification, utility in innovation, and renewable energy.

Connecticut today has an opportunity to deliver the clean air and improved transportation options that the state's residents and businesses deserve. Chronic underinvestment, both in marginalized communities and alternatives to personal vehicles has resulted in congested roads, inadequate public transport, and neighborhoods lacking access to economic opportunities. At the same time, the imported fossil fuel used to power vehicles remains Connecticut biggest contributor to climate change as a major source of the air pollution that disproportionately harms black and brown residents.

At this time, it's time to end the toxic combination by passing legislation to advance a modern, equitable and sustainable transportation future. You know, no single policy is going to fix these challenges overnight, we understand that. But the Governors or this Act 884, is a suite, with a suite of other Bills, Connecticut will deliver meaningful progress toward transportation and climate justice.

While this hearing focuses on the equitable implementation of TCI program through 884, the following Bills are also critical to the equitable transformation and decarbonization of the transportation, of transportation in Connecticut. And some of you have heard these Bills already in different, in different communities. One is 68, it is a bunch of them that all have to do with different types of transportation policies. It's in my written testimony, I won't go through each one, but there are eight of them that I say in that.

I know we've talked a lot about TCI and what it is, but you know, it's a collaboration between states, stretching from New England to North Carolina with a goal of delivering regional solutions to transportation and climate challenges. Through the

effort the states have made and developed the TCI program, TCIP, a cap and invest program designed to reduce pollution from gasoline and diesel fuels while generating a new source of funding for clean and equitable transportation investments.

So I hope that you all will please see it as a good investment to support this Bill in its entirety, and move us on the path of clean energy and transportation. Thank you.

REP. GRESKO (121ST): Amy, thank you for your testimony, and for, during the marathon here. I'm looking to see if we have any questions, I see none. So again, thank you for your time and for your advocacy.

AMY MCLEAN: I just want to say thank you all for your efforts. It's not an easy job and I appreciate you're doing it.

REP. GRESKO (121ST): Thank you. Next is Thomas Lefebvre, followed by Chris Phelps.

THOMAS LEFEBVRE: Good evening, everybody. Mr. Chairman, Esteemed Members of the Environment Committee. My name is Thomas Lefebvre, and I am the Coordinator of the Transport Hartford Academy at the Center for Latino Progress here in Hartford, and I'm here to show my strong support for Connecticut SB 884, AN ACT REDUCING TRANSPORTATION-RELATED CARBON EMISSIONS and to amend it in order to strengthen its equity dimension.

The Transport Hartford Academy is a nonprofit dedicated to advocating in favor of more sustainable and equitable modes of transportation in the Greater Hartford region. We are particularly excited about the Transportation and Climate Initiative, and we have been working with a strong and wide group of supporters for the past year-and-a-half. If approved by the Connecticut Legislature, SB 884 will allow the state to implement transformative policies

that will take care of the devastating effects of air pollution, while addressing transport inequities and climate justice.

And I want to stress that, and I really believe that in many ways, our transportation system reflects who we are as a society, and at the moment, it is a pretty cruel society and a pretty selfish one. In a state where four major cities have disproportionately high rate of house [inaudible] the inadequacy of our public transportation system is a measure of how the proximity to go to work, to school, to doctor or to the grocery store.

This iniquity has negative consequences on the economy on public health and on education. Our transportation system is also particularly harmful to the most vulnerable members of our communities. Air pollution, primarily coming from transportation in Connecticut is at its most unhealthy level in community that are, that are the least responsible for it, including low income and Black and Brown communities.

Our public transportation network needs to be organized and extended. TCIP will bring 89 million of revenue in its first year in Connecticut. And I think the share of those revenues to program focused on over building and under subcommittee, TCI is going to help bridge the gap of social innovation for transportation inequities in our state. In addition, the program we set up an equity advisory body who is already to monitor the implementation of TCI.

And it's more than justice is common sense. The more society is able to move in a safe, reliable, and sustainable way, it'll be a more productive one. And we boost the post pandemic economic recovery of our states. For instance, TCI is permitted to create 61 million in health benefits and 17 million in safety benefits within the next 10 years.

And we also in a moment where we need to be serious about climate change, I mean, the US President Biden brought the USD set back into the price argument and pledged to make the US a 100 clean energy economy, 100% a clean energy economy by 2050. The -- I'm going to wrap up now. And I'm just going to conclude by saying that my written testimony highlights some of the equity elements that I'd like to be strengthened. And I thank you for your attention.

REP. GRESKO (121ST): Thomas, thank you for your testimony. And let's all guess who has a question? Oh, Representative Michel.

REP. MICHEL (146TH): Thank you, Mr. Chair. Well, Thomas Lefebvre, I, I just wanted to thank you again for testifying tonight. And I really like the fact that you raised a really important point that we don't hear enough about, which is the parallel between the inequities in transportation, and education. And I thought that was a great point you made in your testimony, and I really appreciate you testifying and bon soir.

THOMAS LEFEBVRE: Thank you very much for your time.

REP. MICHEL (146TH): Merci, Mr. Chair.

REP. GRESKO (121ST): Thomas, thank you for sticking it out, and for your testimony, and much appreciated.

THOMAS LEFEBVRE: Thank you.

REP. GRESKO (121ST): Next, we're going to go to Chris Phelps, followed by Steven Pastir, and then Paul Vosper.

CHRIS PHELPS: Thank you, Representative Gresko, and all the Members of the Committee. I just have to say one benefit of the, of this Zoom format for Public Hearings is I think it makes it easier for

both you and us to actually participate in these things for their duration. I don't think I've ever seen this many Members of Committee sticking it out this long and are able to stick it out this long in a Public Hearing before it's, it's.

REP. GRESKO (121ST): Be in my pajamas. So you know, let's go.

CHRIS PHELPS: Well, yeah. I'm glad you can only see me from the, the chest up, let me just say. Now, but, I'm Chris Phelps with Environment Connecticut. I think I've just used up, wasted a minute of my time here. We've submitted testimony in support of Senate Bill 884, and I'm not going to read that testimony because honestly, you've heard the, much of the same argument that we make in that testimony from many people today. But one thing I do want to point out is, you've heard much the same argument in support of this Bill from a cast of characters who I would hazard a guess, you're never going to hear testify in support of the same Bill before any Committee in the legislature ever again.

Environmental advocates such as myself, BP, I'm pretty sure this is the first and possibly the only time we'll ever find ourselves on the same side of an issue in the legislature, but also the CEO of Fuss & O'Neill and consumer advocates and, and people from across the state because this is a really serious issue that we're confronting in this Bill, that you're confronting in this Bill; and that's how to decarbonize and drive our transportation system in Connecticut towards zero carbon, which is what we know the science tells us we need to do if we're going to combat global warming and climate change.

I'd like to speak to a few of the, the discussion points that have come up today, because I think there has been a lot of really good and obviously passionate discussion on both sides of this issue in a little bit of time I have left. And I want to

speaking first off to one thing. I think it was Representative Chafee and one of the members of the gasoline station owners community was, were talking about, and I think he asked a question about and pointing to the fact that even amongst that community, here today you've heard a lot of divergent, sometimes at least partially contradictory testimony and talking points about this Bill.

And, and I have a take on that, that I, I don't want to get into the truths or untruths to the point because I think that actually misses the larger point here. This Bill addresses an issue as I've alluded to already I think that deals with disruption in, in our transportation system and the economy in which we live as it relates to transportation; that is happening now and is accelerating. And I think that, that creates very real fear of the changes that that is bringing, particularly for people in that industry. I get it, I think we all get that.

As, but I want to point to something that I think was Commissioner Dykes said at the very beginning of the day; however many hours ago that was now, that one of the reasons for a program such as the Transportation Climate Initiative, is that it provides guardrails around that transition from our current paradigm, if you will, for, for transportation systems particularly on road fuels, towards where we're trying to head, towards decarbonizing our transportation system. It's really nice to happen according to science in the next 20 years or so. I think that's the bell, so I'll wrap up by just pointing out another quick or trying to answer a question I don't think I heard the answer earlier, but if I, if it was, I apologize for taking more of your time. It was Senator Miner who asked a very on point question about affordability of electric vehicles and what's the, what's the MSRP of electric vehicles today. I think the lowest priced new electric vehicle on the market

today is, is the mini made by BMW that comes in right about or just below \$30,000.

In addition to that, I've Googled the info, and right now on the market in within 20 miles of my house in Portland, Connecticut, there are dealers with 20 cars, electric vehicles that are used electric vehicles for sale for less than \$10,000, and then dozens more between that and \$30,000. The point being that I'm trying to make is, because this speaks to a theme that came up earlier today, the market for electric vehicles is growing, and it's increasingly accessible to everybody. Average folks like us as well as people who can afford the Mercedes electric vehicle, if you will. And policies like TCI provide the guardrails to help drive us even further in that direction, and really benefit everybody in an equitable fashion as has been discussed earlier today. I'll stop there, because I know I'm way over three minutes and I apologize for taking more of your time. Thank you.

REP. GRESKO (121ST): Chris, thank you, and thanks for sticking it out, and for your advocacy and for your testimony. I don't see any hands raised, so again, thanks for being persistent and sticking with us, sir.

CHRIS PHELPS: Thank you, Representative.

REP. GRESKO (121ST): Next, we have Steven Pastir and Nasim Abid, and then Paul Vosper. Steven, are you muted?

STEVEN PASTIR: Hello, can you hear me?

REP. GRESKO (121ST): Yes, there you go.

STEVEN PASTIR: Okay. Thank you Chair and Co-Chair and everyone who hung in there today for the duration of this hearing. And it's been interesting listening to a lot of different perspectives on this, but for myself, I'm a second generation

service station owner and operator. And we've been in this business for almost 50 years at this point.

And what I think is the biggest thing and again, I'm, I'm speaking at this point in opposition to the Bill because my understanding of it is, is there is really not a lot of opportunity in it for people that are in my business at this point. And I think that's the major concern. Where is the opportunity for us as service station and convenience store operators going forward or is this the end of our business as we know it? You know, for my children going forward, that we not have a business that we can pass on, or that's going to be able to sustain and support our families and communities going forward. That, to me is my main concern. And again, as I've, we've heard other testimony this evening from other operators, you know, we're all about going green, and you know, the importance of that in the environment for future generations. But you can't forget about the people that are on the street, operating these businesses and supporting families and communities by them.

So, again, my concern is what is the opportunities in this for us as service station owners that have been the kind of the cornerstone of the communities, especially during this pandemic where we provide a lot of products and services that a lot of people couldn't get in communities from grocery stores and that in the early parts of the lockdown. So we're an important part of the community. We support a lot of people, we have a lot of employees that rely on these businesses, and we need some types of assurances or opportunities that can come that we can be included in, in some of these initiatives going forward. Thank you.

REP. GRESKO (121ST): Steven, thanks for your persistence and hanging with us. And I would just say to you what I said to a previous individual who testified with the same concern that I think the individuals from the Green Bank earlier in the day

when I, when the question was posed to them about this exact instance, if, if you were, if we go forward with TCI, it's a big F. There would be availability for businesses who are interested to try to adapt and segue into what is, what is coming down the pike because, you know, it's, you've heard the list of companies that have made it very public that they were not going to be making any more internal combustion engines. Now that's down the road a ways, but this is where you, you know, you need to start to plan for that down the road, you know, now. So I think that component is, is included in this Bill as far as the Green Bank goes, but I don't see any other hands raised in the room. So Steven, thanks again for your, for your testimony, and thanks for having your business here in Connecticut and, and go and get some sleep.

STEVEN PASTIR: Thank you.

REP. GRESKO (121ST): All right. Next is Nasim Abid followed by Paul Vosper, and then Maria Cecilia.

NASIM ABID: Good afternoon. My name is Nasim Abid. Am I online?

REP. GRESKO (121ST): Yes, we can hear you and see you. Go ahead.

NASIM ABID: Okay, thank you. I have been in gasoline business for the last 35 years. I own a gas station in downtown New Haven, in my real, real low income neighborhood. Our average customers cannot afford the electric vehicles, the cars they are driving is 15 years old, and if we're trying to put little more tax on that, they are already too poor to afford a new car.

And I heard even Wayne Weikel, the Alliance for Automotive Association, he said the Nissan LEAF and you know, the Chevy Bolt are in \$10,000 range. We agree with that, but those are used car, how long those battery's going to last? And once those

batteries are bad, where those land, I mean those batteries going to go in the landfill or where, number one? And number two, we're trying to push for electric, where does Connecticut electric come from? 95% of our electric is generated by fossil fuel, which is the natural gas. I mean, it's not that, that much pollution, pollution, but still it's fossil fuel, part of like a gasoline and natural gas.

So we are getting away from one fossil fuel to another fossil fuel, unless otherwise we work out on first that and where our electric is produced, either by solar wind or by water, I, I don't think so there is any sense, and our Governor, you know, mean that they are trying to help out the richer community because the incentive is on a new vehicle, not on a used vehicle. So \$5,000, yeah, Greenwich and Stanford people could afford those \$35,000, \$50,000 \$100,000 cars, and they could enjoy that discount. But once it comes to the poor people, now they got to run with the maintenance and all that, number one.

And number two, we don't even have a Tesla repair shops or anything in our state, so how we're going to fix those cars. So either we have to take it across the border to New York and let them fix it. So this is, this is what I'm trying to, you know, mean, achieve. I mean, we are servicing the poor neighborhood. And you know, I mean, my business is, my clients, they buy that by the dollar amount, not by the gallons. So I'm buying \$10 a gallon. Okay, I think my time is up.

REP. GRESKO (121ST): Yes, you heard the bell. Nasim, thank you for your perspective, being there on, on the front line, and I do not see any questions for you at this point. So thank you again for your persistence and for your testimony.

NASIM ABID: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

REP. GRESKO (121ST): Next, we're going to go to Paul Vosper, then Maria Cecilia.

PAUL VOSPER: Yes. Hi, good evening Chairs, Ranking Members, Members of the Committee. My name is Paul Vosper. I'm the President, CEO of Oasis Charger Corporation. We're an EV charging manufacturing company. We're headquartered in Norwalk. We have an R&D Center in East Hartford and a manufacturing facility in Oxford, Connecticut. We've installed our chargers in more than 23 states as well as Canada, Mexico, and we're working to expand our footprint internationally.

No surprise, I'm testifying in strong support of SB 884. I have submitted written testimony, so I'm going to try not to repeat what I've said there, but maybe pick up on a few things, things that have come out through the course of the day. I mean, I think there are two realities whether we like it or not, EVs are coming and they will replace the combustion engine, and we cannot afford it to keep burning fossil fuels. We've talked about equity, and I think that is a very important component of what we're doing. But we also have to think about the equity for future generations, and if we continue to burn fossil fuels, we are destroying the environment for our children and our grandchildren.

I also agree with the prior testimony on the benefits of the TCI, especially regarding environmental justice. So often, our disadvantaged neighborhoods lag in any new technology that's brought about. We need to make sure that it doesn't happen with EVs. These are the communities that not, not only benefit from the reduced pollution, but the lower cost of powering an EV and the much lower cost of ownership.

I wanted also to focus on the investment impact of the TCI. We do have, this state does have the opportunity to lead the nation in EV infrastructure. If you look at the various EV charging providers,

most of those companies build their charges overseas. We are the only state as far as I'm aware of, where the EV charging manufacturer is built in the state, and we have two companies, ourselves, and our friends at EVSE, who testified earlier. And we also have a very high adoption rate, particularly in places like Fairfield County, yet were 21st in the nation in terms of the amount of level three fast chargers and 23rd in the nation in terms of the number of available level two charges.

We have large black spots along major arterials, like 95, 91, 84 in the merit. And so, and I also agree with prior testimony that the TCI has to be seen as part of a broader set of initiatives including the, the, the Green Bank and we've benefited from the Green Bank. PURA is also undertaking a Make Ready program that will substantially assist. I'll finish off by saying the opportunity we've talked, we've heard a lot about economics today. But the opportunity is a \$500 billion market in the US. We are hiring advanced manufacturing jobs, electrical engineers, software engineers. We're working with the community colleges and the University of Connecticut in terms of both training and development. Also happy to address some of the questions that have come up on things like cost and gas station transition and the impact on the grid if that's of interest.

REP. GRESKO (121ST): Well, thank you Paul. And I don't see any hands raised in the, in the room. But, well, we have one, Representative Hennessy.

REP. HENNESSY (127TH): Thank you, Mr. Chair. Yeah, I'd be interested to hear what you have to say about the cost that you had just mentioned transition?

PAUL VOSPER: Well, look, I think the, I think we're paying the cost anyway right. I mean, one of the things that we, we, we, lease gasoline and then there are a number of different studies out there, but the, the impacts, the negative impact, the cost

of gasoline is about \$50 to \$100 per ton of carbon. So whether we like it or not, that cost is being incurred by the state through you know, things like health costs and so on. So, all this is doing is, is, is identifying those costs and placing them on the groups that are effectively selling the, the product at a lower rate than they should be.

EVs also represent a significant reduction in cost. I think it was Ben Florsheim this morning or earlier today talked about the fleet market. The largest fleet in the country is New York City's fleet and they have estimated that the EV fleet cost them 60% lower to buy and, and run for seven years than the equivalent diesel and gasoline vehicles. So there are significant savings, and that savings is also on the consumer. When you buy an EV, battery prices are coming down, now there are federal and state incentive programs to reduce the upfront cost as an active secondary market, secondhand market rather for cars, but the cost of ownership is significantly lower. When it costs me between \$7 or \$8 to, to fuel my car to drive 300 miles on a public charger, that's not the, the cost of charging at home is obviously lower than that. So and there is virtually no maintenance on an EV.

So the cost of EVs is somewhat of a, I've heard quite a lot of misinformation today on, on that cost. I've also heard a lot about the gas stations. I will say that we have a very active business in the state, in our neighboring states and around the country, installing chargers at gas stations and convenience stores. We work with Pride. We work with noble gas, which is an independent gas station here in the, in state. We're working with a number of, of convenience stores across Canada and the southeast. And so, it's not a zero sum game here. I mean, there, there is a role for the convenience store and the gas station in this new economy. And I think the TCI, as it's been mentioned many times, can help defray some of the costs of that additional hardware. But this isn't a zero sum game. It's not

a diesel gasoline for these guys. There are significant opportunities. I'll, I'll stop there.

REP. HENNESSY (127TH): Okay. Thank you very much for your testimony. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

REP. GRESKO (121ST): Thank you, Representative. Next, we have Representative Chafee.

REP. CHAFEE (33RD): Thank you, Mr. Chair. It's Chafee, by the way. Thank you for speaking with us tonight. I definitely appreciate that you're making your chargers in Connecticut. I was curious, I don't know if this was proprietary or not. How much does it cost to install a charger?

PAUL VOSPER: It's not proprietary. It is, it can vary dramatically depending on whether you're talking about a fast charger or a level two charger. And what, if you're doing it in a new development, it's very cheap, because most of the cost is already being included in the, in the cost of, of building a building. So it's really what you think about retrofitting an existing building, and it's somewhere between \$2000 and \$5000 for a level two charger. The level threes are much more expensive, they run on 480 volts, it can be \$20,000 \$30,000 just for the install cost, not for the equipment. Having said that, our neighboring states have what's called Make Ready programs, where the utility companies will pay for the installation of equipment, that's true in New York, that's true Massachusetts, New Jersey, Rhode Island. PURA has a proposal to, to, to work with Ever Source and UI to bring a Make Ready program to the state. And I think that is probably the single biggest reason that we're falling behind our neighboring states and EV charging, a charger adoption. But that program combined with the TCI could, could really add significantly to the infrastructure in the state.

REP. CHAFEE (33RD): What type of demand did the chargers placed on in the distribution grid? I know

you said that level three is 480 volts. How many amps does that draw, and do you think they're correct? Distribution grid is capable of handling the amount of chargers to proceed in the future.

PAUL VOSPER: Well, the, the estimate is that the EV vehicles eventually, because obviously this is, this is going to happen over time. So it's not like tomorrow, we will start driving EVs and we're going to deal with that load. But over time, as we start getting into larger penetration, we got to think about adding about 25% more demand onto the grid.

I would say that we have a problem with the grid today that has nothing to do with EVs, but has a lot to do with underinvestment, old equipment, multiple, you know, multiples, you know we saw in Texas what happened there, had nothing to do with anything other than a mismanaged system. But the EVs actually can help ameliorate some of those problems.

We are moving to a situation where not only do you put a charge into the car, but the car can provide a charge to a building or to a grid, is what we call vehicle to building or vehicle to grid. So you have to start thinking about that EVs is a sponge. They can sponge up excess capacity during the day when, when renewables are more active, and can be recharged either late at night when the grid is quiet or during the day after the, the morning peak and the evening peak. Smart charging, and, and our charges can do this as can many chargers, can respond to signals from the utility company or from the building that the grid is under stress and to turn off or to turn down. So it's not a zero sum game by any stretch of the imagination, and there are some, there is existing technology that allows chargers to, to, to not overburden the grid, and within the next two or three years to actually help supplement what's happening in the grid.

I don't mean to say by any means that the grid doesn't need attention, it does. But that has, but

it needs attention based on the demand we have today. And if we're going to, you know, as we continue to, to move into the future, if we continue to under invest in the grid, this problem is going to get worse, not better.

REP. CHAFEE (33RD): Thank you for your testimony. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

REP. GRESKO (121ST): You're welcome. Thank you. Next we have Representative Mary Mushinsky.

REP. MUSHINSKY (85TH): Same, same question about the charging. These can be off peak charged at night when demand is lower on the grid, correct?

PAUL VOSPER: Correct. California already has a, sorry, I didn't mean to interrupt you. I, I interrupted you I think.

REP. MUSHINSKY (85TH): Well, no, that was, the first thing was, I assume, I assume that people would charge them especially if there is meters to, to change demand or to reward off peak demand, which is we're talking about that in the Energy Committee right now actually. So, so if that was true and you could save money by charging at night, I assume people would charge their electric vehicle at night when the rates were lower and the demand is lower.

PAUL VOSPER: We already have examples of that. So in, in California, there, there is nighttime charging. So if you charge after 11 o'clock, I think, it's 11, either 10 or 11, I can't remember the exact time; but the rate drops to half of what it would be during the day. So if most EVs have a, have the ability to turn on when you, when you set it to my car for example, maybe I can set it to start charging at 11 o'clock, so I don't have to come down and, and plug it in, in my pajamas. But we've also seen it, you know My Home Country is the UK of, I say I'm British by birth and American by choice. But in, in my country, we have time of use

charging in residential, and every, every dryer in the country is sold with a clock on it. And everybody in the country dries their clothes after midnight because the rates are so much lower. So we know that incentivizing customers to, to charge off peak if you like when the grid is quiet, works, and it works very well.

REP. MUSHINSKY (85TH): Okay, and then final question is, do you see a role for the convenience stores once we switch over to more electric vehicles in the state, in the State of Connecticut, residential?

PAUL VOSPER: Yes. So my, my background is in real estate before I, I took over this company. The, the convenience stores provide a necessary service in the community. Gasoline is nothing more than the product that gets you to stop, but all of the profit is made when you walk into the convenience store. So the profit on gasoline to the convenience store operator is tiny if, if at all. What they really hope you do is you walk and you buy a pack of cigarettes or a Diet Coke or sandwich, that's where the real money is made. EV charging does nothing more than the same way. You know, I heard a testimony earlier today that it takes 24 hours to charge your vehicle, that's nonsense. And the new technology, the new battery technology, its coming out in the next 24 months will allow vehicles to charge in under five minutes.

So you know, the convenience store, it doesn't matter whether they're selling gasoline or electrons, people will stop, they'll need to top up their vehicles. And while they're doing that, they're going to walk in and you know, they shouldn't be able to buy the cigarettes and the diet cokes and all the other things that, that have the high profit margins.

REP. MUSHINSKY (85TH): Okay, thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

PAUL VOSPER: You're welcome. Thank you, Representative.

REP. GRESKO (121ST): Yes, thank you Mary. And before we let you go, what you said is stuck in my head. Your, your two companies here in the State of Connecticut are manufacturing these electric vehicle charging stations. If, if TCI was to go through, do you see an avenue to potentially turn Connecticut into like a manufacturing hub for, for EVs as a possibility?

PAUL VOSPER: Yeah, so I think the, you know, it, it certainly has the possibility of being the leader in EV charging. You know, our, our company is growing at a very fast clip, because of the, the need for charging. But you know, we are, and we are hiring, as I suspect our friends at EVSE are doing as well. We're hiring you know, people with electrical engineering expertise, advanced manufacturing expertise. We, we are in the state because the state has a deep base of those types of people. And the community, and we, we work with a number of community colleges with advanced manufacturing programs to feed our need for those types of employees.

So, you know, we, we are quoted every day by other states in the south. We have no intention of leaving, because going in the panhandle of Florida, for example, I will not be able to hire the same quality of people. While we do that by bringing those, that kind of expertise into the state, it also brings, it also attracts other groups, you know, particularly the battery manufacturers, they're very similar part of the ecosystem to us. And so, and the batteries are the most important part of the car there, it's about a third of the cost of the vehicle.

If we can develop, if we can encourage more battery manufacturers in the state, that's like finding oil

in Saudi Arabia in 1937. This is, the lithium ion battery and whatever technology replaces that is going to drive significant economic benefits. And we're talking, you know, the numbers are huge in terms of the, the capital that will be invested in the state or could be invested in the state and the, and the revenues that a company like ours can generate in the state. So yes, it's a, it's a holistic attraction and there is no reason why the state cannot be the leader in the country. You know, Texas has already got Tesla, Nevada has already got Tesla, California has a couple of makers, car makers; but everything else is up for grabs, batteries, and EV charging. There was absolutely no reason why the state can't be a leader in that.

REP. GRESKO (121ST): Well, thanks again for the education and for your persistence and, and for your testimony.

PAUL VOSPER: I very much enjoyed it. Thank you, sir.

REP. GRESKO (121ST): Next up, we have Maria Cecilia Pinto de Moura, and then I don't see Gobinda Shrestha waiting. So if we have to skip over, it, it'll be Michael Rapetski next.

MARIA CECILIA PINTO DE MOURA: Good evening Co-Chairs, Vice Chairs, Ranking Members and Members of the Environment Committee. My name is Maria Cecilia Pinto de Moura. I'm Senior Vehicles Engineer at the Union of Concerned Scientists. UCS is a national nonprofit organization and we use rigorous independent science to solve some of the, our planet's most pressing problems.

Senate Bill 884 is an opportunity to start to reduce Connecticut's carbon dioxide emissions from cars, trucks, and buses. Actions to reduce carbon dioxide also have direct co-benefits for local air quality and human health. Exposure to PM2.5 from fossil

fuels was responsible for one out of five global deaths in 2018. Even a small increase in long-term exposure to PM2.5 has been shown to increase mortality from COVID-19.

For Connecticut, Harvard research was estimated deaths and hospitalizations avoided from improvements in air quality and active mobility. In 2032, the health savings in the state range from average annual 270 to 360 million, possibly reaching almost 700 million. I want to stress that these health savings are avoided expenditures in addition to TCIP proceeds. These benefits will directly impact Connecticut residents as people breathe clear air and have smaller health care bills.

Exposure to PM2.5 from on road vehicles is highly inequitable due to a long history of misguided policies such as redlining. At UCS, we quantified this inequity. In Connecticut, the average exposure for Latino residents is 27% higher than it is for white residents. For African-American residents, the exposure is 30% higher.

TCIP is one way to start to address this inequity. The 35% minimum of proceeds to be dedicated to investments that benefit communities is not sufficient and should be higher than the community share of the total Connecticut population. There are strong examples from California, where 57% of investments are currently benefiting communities and in Massachusetts, where a Bill would be set, would set this share to 70%.

A survey found that two-thirds of respondents in Connecticut support the state's participation in the program. It also demonstrated broad support for directing program proceeds to a variety of projects that benefit overburden and underserved communities such as expanding public transit, walkability, communications, electrification, and road maintenance.

I urge Connecticut to pass Senate Bill 884, and to strengthen it by prioritizing the voices and needs of disproportionately burdened and underserved communities. Thank you very much for your leadership.

REP. GRESKO (121ST): Well, thank you Maria Cecilia, for, for sticking it out, and for providing us with your testimony. I don't see any questions pending from Members. So again, thank you for your testimony.

MARIA CECILIA PINTO DE MOURA: You're welcome. Thank you very much.

REP. GRESKO (121ST): I don't see Gobinda. So we're going to next go to Michael Rapetski followed by James O'Donnell.

GAIA MCDERMOTT: I have Christopher Kelly on after Michael.

REP. GRESKO (121ST): Is, is Michael; I don't see him up there.

GAIA MCDERMOTT: I have missed 140, I don't hear him, however.

REP. GRESKO (121ST): Okay. Michael?

MICHAEL RAPETSKI: Hello.

REP. GRESKO (121ST): Here we go.

MICHAEL RAPETSKI: Hi, I'm trying to, hold on sorry. Here we go. Good evening. My name is Michael Rapetski. I'm a lifelong Cheshire resident in strong opposition to SB 884 joining TCI, and the gas price, or the gas price hike that will result.

If you haven't noticed the taxpayer paying residents of this state are leaving in droves, more and more with each new tax, and yes, this will be viewed as a

tax. This comes a matter of weeks after implementing payroll deductions for state FMLA. The audacity to attempt all this during a pandemic when so many residents and businesses are struggling is surreal.

TCI is supposed to push people away from gasoline and toward electric vehicles to say otherwise is a complete farce. There are several problems that face our state with electric cars, one problem being Ever Source. We are absolutely being robbed by Ever Source with astronomical rates. This past summer exemplifies that with issues that our state has yet to fix.

So essentially, you're raising the cost of fuel in the hopes that people switch to more expensive source of power. This will not work and will give Ever Source and other power companies even more of monopoly on essentially two industries now, power and transportation.

Second, many in your state because of our current economic situation cannot afford expensive electric cars. So now, you're pushing hardworking people further into despair. Not to mention one of the leading car manufacturers Tesla cannot legally be sold in Connecticut. People are going out to New York to buy them as they're doing now, and who will get the sales tax, New York, not Connecticut. Again, this is not helping the problem, but worsening it.

Minneapolis just reversed the decision on switching their entire public transit bus line after finding 30% to 40% battery loss in colder climates and overheating chargers. If we are truly concerned about the environment, where is our battery recycling plan? This gas hike will not benefit one Connecticut rotor bridge which a current gas text allegedly does. So now you're pushing people away from gasoline, which we taxed for benefit of our transportation system, to a source of energy that

does not benefit our transportation system. Where are we going to get money for our roads and bridges when gasoline tax revenue declines, some other new tax, no, we will not have it.

The additional costs that companies operate in Connecticut will incur will either force them to leave the state or pass along the cost to the consumer. There are no electric over the road trucks being sold, those trucks will continue to be diesel and the extra costs incurred by this gas tax will just be passed along to the consumer in the products that we buy.

We're putting the cart before the horse in writing the legislation to direct the market in a direction where the technology does not exist or has been proven to work. The middle class cannot scream any louder, we need help. Please consider these points and put Connecticut and its residents first, pull out a TCI and help Connecticut working class. I know that Connecticut can be stronger together. Thank you for your time.

REP. GRESKO (121ST): Well Michael, thank you for the testimony, and thank you for sticking it out this late into the evening. I don't see any questions pending from Members. So again, thank you for taking the time and letting us know how you feel and for the testimony.

MICHAEL RAPETSKI: Thank you.

REP. GRESKO (121ST): Next on our list is Christopher Kelly, I fibbed a little bit, and then James O'Donnell.

CHRISTOPHER KELLY: Alright, hello. Good evening Chairs Cohen and Gresko, Vice Chairs Slap and Palm, Ranking Members Miner and Harding, and all Distinguished Members of the Environment Committee. My name is Chris Kelly, and I'm the Peter B. Cooper Legal Fellow at Save the Sound. I'm here to express

our support for House Bill 6551, AN ACT CONCERNING ENVIRONMENTAL AIR QUALITY. Thank you for your time and your attention, now 11 hours into this hearing.

As my colleague Charles Rothenberger told you, I will be addressing the environmental justice aspects of HB 6551 and amendments which we are requesting. The most important thing I can do is to direct you to the written testimony as submitted, which explains the necessary amendments in detail.

Now Section 1 of the Bill creates an environmental equity working group to identify disadvantaged communities in the context of reducing existing pollutant and greenhouse gas sources. This is necessary as part of the comprehensive energy transition and it will address existing sources of pollution in the communities least able to afford the transition we need. However, I would like to emphasize for you the importance of addressing future pollution and giving our state agencies the tools they need to prevent environmental injustice.

Section 2 of this Bill is a forward looking provision which modifies the Section of the General Statutes known as Connecticut's Environmental Justice Law. Essentially, the language in question empowers the DEEP and the citing council to reject permit applications for certain types of facilities which are unnecessarily polluting or which otherwise add upon the already unbearable conditions in our most polluted communities. This language is absolutely necessary to change our state permitting standards as polluting facilities are still being approved, despite clear harm and against the opposition of residents and much of our own state government.

The conditions in our most polluted communities are indeed unbearable, as many of my fellow advocates who have attested during this hearing, referring to extreme air pollution in cities like Hartford and Waterbury, where respiratory conditions like asthma

are pervasive. But please be aware the environmental justice communities exist across the state including in rural and suburban communities where residents are affected by facilities in their own neighborhoods.

The language in Section 2 is adapted from a Bill passed in New Jersey last year, which is referred to as the holy grail of environmental justice laws. This is now the gold standard for how to mandate environmental justice considerations in the permitting of polluting facilities. We expect many more states will be adopting laws like this in the near future. I know no reason why New Jersey should be able to pass transformative environmental justice legislation and Connecticut should not.

Without passage of the language in Section 2, Connecticut will fall behind on this issue and continues long, unfortunate history of piling the burden of pollution upon the communities most unable to speak up for themselves.

We requested amendments and testimony which we believe will improve the application of environmental justice law and would be appropriate to include in this Bill. These include expanding the definition of affecting facilities, affecting facilities, to encompass other significant facilities not already explicitly included, but which similarly burden pollutes surrounding the inputs. These include waste transfer stations, recycling facilities and resource recovery centers, as well as data centers which may pollute the air through the use of diesel generators. I ask you to take full advantage of this opportunity to pass the Bill with company amendments and bring real environmental justice to Connecticut. Thank you for this opportunity to speak.

REP. GRESKO (121ST): Comes right on the three minute mark. Thank you for the testimony,

Christopher. We have a couple of questions for you. First, Representative Michel.

REP. MICHEL (146TH): Thank you, Mr. Chair. Thank you Mr. Kelly, for again hanging with us the whole day. And thank you for your testimony and also your written testimony. I wanted to ask if you could elaborate the, on the 2020 greenhouse gas reduction target, and versus the 2015. I think you, you're pointing out in your testimony that we appear to be on track to meet the 2020 targets, but it might be, we might be a little bit behind for what problems, can you elaborate a bit on this?

CHRISTOPHER KELLY: Thank you for your question Representative Michel. I don't believe that I've extensively addressed climate change emissions reduction goals in my testimony, that was mostly deferred to my colleagues, Charles Rothenberger earlier. If, if I'm misunderstanding your question, I would welcome clarification?

REP. MICHEL (146TH): No, no, it's okay. It's part of the testimony, it's fine. And then, I have a couple of questions, so just for the sake of time, I'll move on. Do you think the DEEP is ready to implement this Bill?

CHRISTOPHER KELLY: That is an excellent question Representative Michel, and it allows me to clarify one of the amendments which I've asked for in testimony. So Section 2, as I said, enables DEEP in the citing council to apply different standards and permitting facilities, essentially take into account whether a, a facility is the least polluting that it could be, and whether it inflicts burdensome pollution and harm upon communities, disproportional to other communities.

So logically, this requires developing a method to actually compare the burden of pollution in different communities, and this is not just between different towns and cities, but even neighborhoods

within different cities and towns. And also considering what would be the impact of an individual type of facility.

There are concerns from conversations that we've had that by immediately implementing Section 2 of this Bill, it would require DEEP to apply a standard that they're not prepared to apply that they don't have the data available to do that yet. And the concern is that, in doing so, it would actually be harmful and hurt environmental justice efforts because it would be misapplied law.

So the amendment that I've asked for is that the implementation of Section 2 be delayed to a specific date in the future. I think it's very important to actually pass the language in Section 2, this has been agreed all around by different advocates, by people we've spoken to in state government, as being excellent language and being the goal. It's based off of the language of New Jersey law that I referred to. But I think it's important to actually enshrine that in law as saying this is the path that we are on. The legislature sets the path, and then it gives DEEP time to actually implement the effective tools to administer and enforce that standard that we're going to go for.

Other states are working on this, New Jersey had years to develop the methodology and collect the data. Washington State's Department of Public Health has put together a, an impact mapping system, they use statistical modeling to compare the different harms that exist in different communities around the state and also about how to either remedy or how those might be worsened by different kinds of facilities. We believe that DEEP can do the same thing. I would love for you to be able to put that into law and say that they have a certain amount of time. I think that's also very important to set those goals on behalf of DEEP, especially considering the difficult times that we were in. DEEP is facing a retirement cliff in 2022, that Save

the Sound has referred to in multiple public hearings and we're very sympathetic to this. And we look forward to them being able to hire on new staff with appropriate resources to work towards this goal.

REP. MICHEL (146TH): And then, thank you for that. That's fantastic. And, also can you give us more details on the public participation piece, please?

CHRISTOPHER KELLY: Yes, certainly. So the heart of the environmental justice law is to give residents in the areas where either a proposed new facility is proposed to be located or where there is already one that's receiving a modified permit. The heart of that is to give the residents who have their notice that there is going to be a new facility or a change in the facility, and an opportunity to speak on it.

The law doesn't across the board prohibit facilities because we were, it must be recognized that there are times when there is an actual need for certain kinds of facilities that might also have detrimental effects. But the important thing here is that there are a lot of communities in the state where these kinds of facilities and, but I say these kinds could be trashed energy facilities, could be landfills. They're located there because it is where they receive the least opposition. That might be because residents there are, they might work two or three jobs, they might not be available to go and make their voices heard. This isn't the 90s anymore, we don't receive newspapers at their door everyday with important public notices about what's happening down the street. And also the land values might be the cheapest there, and so that might be the most desirable place to locate a facility.

And when you put a landfill in a neighborhood, suddenly those home values go down and it becomes a place where you're not going to get your money back, and becomes more attractive to place other facilities there. So we seek to embolden the public

notice standards. This has already been done in previous amendments or rather this has previously been put into the law. And we want to increase that even more. Part of one of the things that needs to be addressed is that there are language barriers that exist in a lot of neighborhoods, which makes it very difficult for them to receive proper notice and to communicate and participate properly.

There are also a lot of people who are not on the internet. And so it would be appropriate that if they live nearby that they receive mailed notice.

REP. MICHEL (146TH): Okay, that's great. And that actually is a great way to, to go to my next question, and I'll keep, try to keep this one short. Do you want to expand the definition of environmental justice mean, and so can you touch upon that as well, because I think that's a very important piece as well?

CHRISTOPHER KELLY: Of course. So the, aside from I mentioned in my testimony, one of the definitions we wanted to change is affecting facility to expand that. We also want to expand the definition of environmental justice community. Currently, the environmental justice law only applies to permitting and what's, what are considered to be environmental justice communities that's already defined in the law.

Environmental justice community is only defined in terms of economic characteristics, which is very important. It is based off of census designated tracks, I believe, under certain income level. And it's also includes any municipalities that are distressed municipalities under Connecticut State Law. This works very well to an extent. It covers a lot of the poorest communities in the state that needs support. It covers communities, which are both urban and rural in character. However, it ignores other kinds of barriers that are well known,

if you know anything about environmental justice,  
and in lot of ways injustice in general.

There is no recognition in there about barriers that  
might, may not be economic in nature, but maybe  
racial or linguistic, as I just referred to before  
about language. We did not propose specific  
language for those things, we felt that it was most  
appropriate for the legislature to determine what  
exactly should be the threshold to the barriers that  
should be defined in there. But we think that's  
very important that in order to achieve  
environmental justice, we need to recognize race and  
linguistic barriers.

REP. MICHEL (146TH): Right. And, I mean, it is  
limiting when we're talking about a whole, for  
example a whole city as not being a community in  
distress when there are parts of the city where they  
are communities, communities in distress. And  
that's kind of I think something that should be also  
looked into, I think there might be some language  
that might have been worked on recently. But I  
appreciate everything. And I have more questions,  
but thank you, thank you very much for hanging with  
us. And thank you, Mr. Chair.

REP. GRESKO (121ST): Thank you. Next we have  
Representative Hennessy.

REP. HENNESSY (127TH): Thank you, Chairman. So  
thank you very much for your testimony. Something  
that I picked up when you were reading your  
testimony, expanding facilities and you had  
mentioned transfer station. And I really thought  
that was, we were in there. Could you talk more  
about the facilities that are in there and those  
that need to be included, that are?

CHRISTOPHER KELLY: Certainly. At this time  
facilities that are included under, there is  
actually quite a few categories, it's pretty good so  
far. Life affecting facilities are electric

generating facilities for the capacity of more than 10 megawatts, sludge or solid waste incinerators or combustors, sewage treatment plants with a capacity of more than 50 million gallons per day, intermediate processing center volume reduction facility or multi town recycling facility with a certain combined with the volume, new expanded landfills, medical waste incinerators, and major sources of air pollution as defined by the Clean Air Act.

So there are lot of things, the big things are, are very much considered and they're the things that actually probably don't come up all that often anymore. I don't know how likely we are to see any more trashed energy incinerators, considering that we have two of the ten largest in the country in the state and, and they can't get anywhere near capacity. Landfills are also little out of style these days, although maybe once those incinerators shut down, we'll see what happens with that.

So having those things is very important, though those are things which many of them have very obvious health risks and hazards, very obviously contribute pollution, or have the risk of contributing pollution.

One of the issues that has come up before with permitting under this law is that there are times when either DEEP or the Citing Council, when they're reviewing these facilities aren't certain about whether they have the right tools, whether they are specifically authorized to apply this level of scrutiny to certain kinds of facility, which may often makes it very important to include the names of their facilities in there that you have, you can't just assume that there might be a catch all or that it's close enough.

I also think that not only is it inefficient to leave some facilities out that might cause pollution whereas we count others, but it's also hardly fair

to the operators of these facilities, which are significant. Part of, part of what we consider here is that these facilities, they're not a pop-up store that's going to be there for a few months. They're going to be there for years and years and therefore they justify a rigorous permitting process.

It's not fair for the operators of some facilities have to go through rigorous permitting process when other facilities are just happened to not be caught under the law, but pose the same pollution risk estimates other facilities. So for instance, many the recommendations we have for expanding the definition of effective facility are based around waste. These waste facilities they talk about landfills, but are transfer stations included. Transfer stations still involved in accumulation of wastes. I've personal experience working on a project one done in New Haven where it led to accumulation of vermin in the neighborhood odors. There was stormwater runoff into the Quinnipiac River. There can be pollution that could come from those facilities, now that if they're perfectly managed, then perhaps not. But what matters here is the risk.

Also data centers is something that has popped up relatively new on the radar. The legislature just proceeded with the data center building criticize come to the state. They use an enormous amount of energy, as my colleague Charles Rothenberger was talking about earlier today, and they also have tendency. It's apparently common for them to use diesel backup generators. Large diesel backup generators for enormous facilities like data centers can contribute an enormous amount of air pollution, you don't want to be living near that. So that should be included under this law so that people who live in the community have a saying whether they think that the possibly economic value of citing data center there is worth the air pollution risk.

REP. HENNESSY (127TH): Thank you. So in your written testimony, you write about a reasonable pollution. Could you explain what reasonable pollution means?

CHRISTOPHER KELLY: Yes, Representative Hennessy. I may have taken a little bit of a shortcut there to, to not go too far in my, in my testimony to not be ridiculous. By unnecessary pollution what we're referring to is a facility where it's clear that there are options for how the, the facility is planned or for the permit application, where it could be less polluting than it is proposed to be. And so DEEP has the, would have the option or Citing Council of rejecting a permit for a facility where it could reasonably be less polluting, possibly by changing the infrastructure there by changing some sort of aspect of the permit application. They would have the option of rejecting it with them making available that it could come back with a modified permit application.

REP. HENNESSY (127TH): Thank you, Christopher. Thank you, Representative Gresko.

REP. GRESKO (121ST): Thank you Jack. Next, we have Representative Dillon.

REP. DILLON (92ND): Hi, thank you. And thank you for your testimony. I'm intrigued and you're really talking through the using the coalition of the courts and administrative law and they say read through your testimony, speed reading I might say, so I wouldn't pretend to, to do justice to it. Do you anticipate at any point of a community engagement model that includes problem solving or consensus building around some of these issues?

CHRISTOPHER KELLY: Thank you for your question Representative Dillon. Would, would you mind just, just clarifying a little bit more because I want to make sure that I don't waste your time and, and

answer directly. About what you meant by problem solving and, and?

REP. DILLON (92ND): Well, having lived through a landfill, you know, which is in New Haven actually, and I spent a lot of my time in public life trying to figure out what to do about it. What if you don't do that? You know, what if you don't want to landfill there. What are the other solutions as a community that, that we can embrace? How do we solve the problem that generated this facility to begin with?

CHRISTOPHER KELLY: So you're referring to, to say an already existing landfill, not, not a proposed?

REP. DILLON (92ND): I'm being -- I'm thinking of the solid waste problem, and how we, how we resolve the solid waste problem. I, I offline would like to get back up on the compost issue by the way, but, but that's a separate issue. But I don't think of that as contaminant and that's interesting. But, yeah, it's really just about empowering a community to make sure that they have control over citing that's happening by default, because they didn't have power in the begin with, to begin with is that accurate. And so you don't necessarily envision pulling people together to say, if we don't have, if we don't have this, what are we going do with all that stuff?

CHRISTOPHER KELLY: I think I understand now Representative Dillon, and, and you and everyone else on Commission, absolutely feel free to reach out to me anytime to talk about any of these issues. I would love to work together on that.

So I feel like I should, that is the pretty fair assessment. I, I feel like I should draw a line between two different aspects of what I've been talking about, though. So one is the ability of the state agencies to deal with permits either, it might be new permit, it might be a modified permit for an

already existing facility. That is one thing that I've been talking to. Another part which came up with Representative Michel asking about one of my amendments on public notice, as I'm saying that this is all about public notice. The, aside, so, part of the existing law, that the existing environmental justice law that makes this very community oriented is authorizes the creation of committee environmental benefit agreements. These are a way for communities to offset the, the pollution in the harm of these different facilities.

At times, these are not considered to be entirely effective particularly by environmental groups, because it in a way, it allows a facility to provide some sort of benefit, which might help to offset the, the cost of their pollution, but it doesn't justify the, the existence of the pollution in the first place. It's very easy for a facility to contribute money towards a neighborhood community clinic when the sickness that they're causing could have just been prevented in the first place if they had proper pollution controls or were cited elsewhere.

One of the amendments that we're asking for in the public participation sort of category is that there'll be actual community involvement in the negotiation of the Community Environmental Benefit Agreement, CEBA. This doesn't solve all the issues, it doesn't automatically create coalitions, although in my experience, there have been a lot of communities that do a very good job with that themselves. But under the current law, there is only required to be opportunity for the public to provide comments before the negotiations CEBA actually begin. And then the CEBA has been negotiated with the participation of the chief elected official or town manager and has to be approved by the legislature. So it's democratic, because it has to be approved by the legislature of the community, of the municipality, excuse me. But that doesn't mean that the public actually has to

say, in the course of negotiation they're required to have saved before negotiation begins. So one of the amendments and this comes from numerous conversations with various advocates and community groups including a number of people who testified to, in this Public Hearing in the Bill, and I'm grateful for that; is that the Bill be amended to require participation not only by the chief elected official or town manager, but by actual members of the community who live nearby themselves.

REP. DILLON (92ND): Thank you, that there has been some really fantastic testimony today and you look exhausted, Mr. Chairman. Thank you very much for your endurance.

REP. GRESKO (121ST): Thank you Representative, and thank you Chris for enlightening us.

CHRISTOPHER KELLY: Thank you very much.

REP. GRESKO (121ST): Next on our list is James O'Donnell, followed by, well I don't see Yousaf Kashmiri or Shemal Depani. So following James O'Donnell will be Kevin Curry.

JAMES O'DONNELL: Hi, good evening. Thank you Chairs and Committee Members for listening to me this evening and for your endurance. I'm James O'Donnell. I'm a Professor of Marine Sciences at UConn and served as the Executive Director of the Connecticut Institute for Resilience and Climate Adaptation since 2014, when it was founded. And I've also been a Co-Chair of the GC3 Science Subcommittee. I submitted some written testimony earlier today, and I just want to make a few points that highlight a few things that I really wrote about.

So climate, first is a climate change, is not a shoreline problem. A lot of people began to think it is, but we need to expect that cooling expenses, insurance costs, heat related hospital visits,

business restrictions, will all increase in the next few decades. And the cost of maintaining resilient power systems, water systems, transportation, and communication systems will rise as well, and it's fairly inevitable. Worse, the evidence, the extreme weather is our latitude is going to get more likely is getting stronger based on recent results I'm impressed with. And when these issues affect us all and our, and our grandchildren and we need to pay attention to and they've got costs. So an urgent reduction in the rate of emissions of greenhouse gases will make a difference at the end of the century, but will still have significant impacts for the foreseeable future for next few decades, at least, even if we do have rapid reductions in greenhouse gas emissions reductions.

So there is obstacles to adapting though, and climate change problems often manifest in a small part of a political jurisdiction, to a bridge or a particular role or a neighborhood. And sometimes the, these problems areas spanned borders of several towns, and that makes consultation and consensus building about solutions, project scheduling, political decision making and revenue generation, all difficult. HB 6441 recognizes most of these obstacles and it creates new tools for towns to address them effectively. And it is a Connecticut solution. In a state where geography and development patterns are pretty fractured and diverse and the conditions of local governments is strong, this Bill is not prescriptive. Tons of considerable flexibility on the authority and how to use it, any of new funding options to resolve problems. And so CIRCA and my team are help -- are looking forward to trying to help develop implementation strategies, which will guide towns and we can help share them.

Finally, we're going to be dealing with these problems for decades, and with my lifetime I'm sure. It is obviously appropriate need to make investments. Now that in the future and so HB 6441

builds in the success of the Connecticut Green Bank to expand options for financing resilience and adaptation projects. And together with the revenue generation mechanisms, make a great, grip pair. This combination of local control with accurate risk mapping and revenue generation in a broad array of resilience and adaptation priorities can be advanced.

Thanks for your efforts and attention and happy to answer any Committee questions.

REP. GRESKO (121ST): Thank you very much James. And we're going to go to our Senate Co-Chair, Senator Cohen.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and hi Jim, good to see you.

JAMES O'DONNELL: Thank you.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): And thank you for your testimony. I had asked the Commissioner and her team about 12 hours ago, not that long but, feels that way. And I just, you know, a surface specifically called out in the Bill as, as you know, you know indicating that towns may call upon your team for assistance. I wonder how you might envision that, that assistance. Do you, do our towns using you currently for consulting, could you speak to that a little bit?

JAMES O'DONNELL: Yeah. There, there is a big demand for both informal and formal programs from, from CIRCA. The moment our funding is restricted to towns in Fairfield County and New Haven County because its federal funds and I have to pay attention to reports and things like that. So there is a, there is a gap at the moment. The fund, the funding is pretty, pretty strong for those towns, but the rest of the state is, I think a little getting less attention than it needs. So I understand the Commissioner has some ideas for how

to move this forward, and I'm hoping that together with the University and the Leadership and your Committee, etcetera, a way to fund these things will work, be worked out.

I, I listened to much of the testimony today and I understand there is lots of concerns about funding and costs, etc. And so I don't, I don't think I'm able to provide an idea for how it should be done. I can give bottom line numbers and goals, etcetera, and options. And I prepared some notes on that.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Thank you for that. And, I, I mean, are you providing any sort of consulting services to municipalities right now beyond the federal funding that you have, is CIRCA able to provide sort of private consulting, if you will, the municipality pays CIRCA directly for services?

JAMES O'DONNELL: Yeah. We, we, we have a very limited capacity to do that, because the faculty of the University are sort of state employees really. And so we have some latitude on, on what we can spend time on. So for example, I visited Mason's Island recently where there is a road flooding problem, and we helped with new application to the FEMA program this year. So, but, you know, the scope of it, the need is much greater than that. So often good application, a competitive application for a federal grant in the millions of dollars range or more, requires engineering design drawings, requires benefit cost analysis, requires lots of formal kinds of stat, that, that can cost several hundred thousand dollars, you know. So, so towns need help both in imagining what, what can be done, organizing consensus about whether it's a right thing or not, and then you need help paying for the, the paperwork, the engineering, the benefit cost analysis etcetera, that's part of an application.

Once they've got all that, they can submit an application and then you need 25% of the project costs in much. So that's why I think this Bill is

so, so valuable. Like, with together with the Green Banks and investment options, towns can begin to plan ahead and sometimes projects don't get funded the first time, and so if you're saving money, the interest will grow and then you can borrow money at cheaper rates, etc. Together, this package solves a lot, and I hope CIRCA can participate to, to help guide development of these, such programs.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): So as, as you're aware in, in 2019, the legislature passed some enabling legislation around climate change and coastal resiliency reserve funds where municipalities could essentially create these funds with a vote of their legislative body. My understanding is that there are several towns ready to do this, but they, there are a couple of roadblocks and some involving investment options and the like. But I'm hearing you know, that other towns are putting dollars away to the tune of \$200,000, \$300,000, and \$400,000. It sounds to me that the planning portion of this is quite costly, and then we're talking about, you know, millions of dollars in shoring up infrastructure and the like, creating living shorelines. You know, there is the physical components of this, burns and all sorts of things like that to really shore up our coastline.

I guess what I'm getting at is if you know, that it could be costly to pay for the planning and then where do, where do all these dollars come from? Is it your position that it would be beneficial? You know, again, we, we have to explore funding options, but to create a line item for CIRCA appropriate line item for the state to perhaps provide grant programs for funding, some of your services to municipalities and maybe matching, but I, don't know, I'm just, I'm just sort of throwing things out there because it is so vitally important. We, we've heard this all day long that towns really begin resiliency planning and that, that, you know, rating equations is in folks at the federal level are really looking at this; how are, you know, the coastal states beginning to

prepare and adapt and prepare for sea level rise? And so I'm just trying to, to consider, you know how costly this is for folks and how costly it is for the state as well. But what can we do to mitigate some of those costs, how can we create some matching grant programs? I think this Bill gets us personally there, but not all the way there. And so I'm just wondering what your thoughts are in terms of funding and how we might --

JAMES O'DONNELL: Yeah, so thanks. I, yeah, I do. I have thought about this. And you know, there is what, there has been a lot of planning actually over the last five years. And so most towns have resilience plans, now especially along the shoreline, and many inland towns have them too. What's the stumbling point is getting from planning to implementation. So very few projects have, have actually had these, have moved to implementation. And the one, the ones that have, have generally gotten federal grants and they've had some sort of way to fund the planning that's necessary to write the proposals that's got, that will, has an engineering drawing and, and a credible cost estimate, right. These are things that are fundamental. And a town generally has to dig that money up itself and then apply for a grant, which you may not win. And if it, if it wins a grant, it can charge the cost of the planning to the grant. But it still has to make the 25% or 30% or something matching. So there is big obstacles to turn for facing times. Planning and getting the drawings and PCA is the first one. And so I think that some state funds to accelerate that would be helpful.

This Bill, 6441, allows them to start putting money away for their share of the cost. And there have been a few projects in Connecticut over the last three or four years where the state has not provided the match. But there are so many projects and needed across the state that I know that's not going to be continued. Towns are going to have to raise money to do it themselves, right. And they're also

going to have to win federal grants. And so I think that, that's the strategy, you need to provide some money to help planning, we need towns to be encouraged to understand they've got to share some of the costs. This Bill provides mechanisms to raise revenue to pay for bonds and that's a big, a big advantage. And these, these will, these steps I think will bring down the barriers to move from planning to implementation.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Okay, thank you. I, and I just, just for clarification, you know, when this Bill said, may consult with CIRCA, is CIRCA prepared for that, I guess is the bottom line?

JAMES O'DONNELL: For the, for the next year-and-a-half or so, we have resources to, to, to, you know, to help a little, but after that I think there needs to be a stable decade old kind of perspective. We need to institutionalize this operation, rather than make it a year-to-year grant-to-grant kind of program.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Okay, thank you so much Jim. And thank you, Mr. Chair.

JAMES O'DONNELL: Thank you.

REP. GRESKO (121ST): Thank you. Next for the question is Representative Parker.

REP. PARKER (101ST): Thank you, Mr. Chair. Thank you Jim, for being here. It's nice to see you. My question is sort of following up on what Senator Cohen was asking about, and just maybe seeing if you could sketch out briefly when you think about what that annual, maybe one, give us one or two years sense of, of the funds needed to maintain CIRCA at the level where you can provide this planning. Can you help us all get a sense of what those dollars are, and, and given your basic operations, what you need to maintain to be able to unlock all this

additional funding. Just suggesting some numbers for us?

JAMES O'DONNELL: Yeah. Yeah, sure. So that is a difficult position to be in, but I'll do it anyway. We, so we've operated the CIRCA since for about seven years. And the first three or four years, we operated about a million dollars a year. And during that time, we provided about third of the resources to towns for projects. So there was a Hartford project to, for, to hire a sustainability coordinator and develop some plans for stormwater management. We funded a project in Old Saybrook for a living shoreline demonstration, things like that.

Projects at times are prioritized, but they had sort of a broader applicability. Lessons could learned, could be used by other towns. And so that third of the money was spent on those kinds of things. That money was expanded three years, three years ago now. And since then, we've been working on this federal grant that we won as part of the Bridgeport NDRC program, is a \$60 million project to build a berm. UConn got about \$8 million for planning in New Haven and Fairfield County. And without those funds, we've been conducting extensive outreach with towns and people in the two counties, and we're trying to develop plans for a project that would be significant, reduce flood risk, and also create economic development opportunities.

So the, the idea is not just to focus on fixing a problem, but rather looking for a way to fix a problem that creates opportunities as well. In that project we're spending about \$2 million a year, right? So, so, but we don't have any funds to give to towns to implement their priorities. You know, this is a planning initiative, and it's got love. And the goal is for that is to actually develop several, maybe six applications for FEMA and perhaps NOAA projects that would actually do and it actually implement things. We want to, we want to make changes, not just do plans. And so, so to answer

your question specifically, we need to continue that level of or expand the level of things that we're doing in New Haven, which involves funding for our staffing at UConn, and money for contractors and consultants to do, to create these plans. We have about \$2 million a year, and that would allow us to do what we're doing there in the other counties of the state. And I think we should view that as having a return, perhaps tens of, ten times, right. Their goal would be to write proposals that bring dollars to the state for, to fix things and towns and the return on investment should be an order of magnitude of ten, right? That will be what viewed as a success.

And over the last seven years, since Saturday Commissioner, the previous Commissioner setup CIRCA, we've spent about \$3 million of state money, and we've raised about \$13 million of federal money. So, so that's the record. And I think that we need to institutionalize this so that towns can bank on it, they can count on it. And it's not, you know, relying on the availability of grants, which is, which is uncertain. And, but we need to, we need to win now, but we need investment to win.

REP. PARKER (101ST): Thanks, Jim. I appreciate that.

JAMES O'DONNELL: Thank you.

REP. PARKER (101ST): As a, as a nonprofit director, I, I understand the idea of having longer term general funding that keeps you moving and not just waiting on grant, grant year-to-year. So we appreciate the work you do and, and thank you for laying that out.

REP. GRESKO (121ST): Thank you, Representative Parker. And thank you James.

JAMES O'DONNELL: Thank you.

REP. GRESKO (121ST): Next on the list is Kevin Curry followed by Jessie Stratton.

KEVIN CURRY: Can you hear me? This is Kevin. Can you hear me?

REP. GRESKO (121ST): Yes, go right ahead.

KEVIN CURRY: Okay. This is Kevin Curry. I'm a lifelong Connecticut resident, a product of your vocational educational schools, graduate at Wilcox Tech. And unlike a lot of people, I was in the automotive field for years before I became a fuel distributor. So I understand the EV cars and I understand the, the internal combustion engine and simply what's happening here is we are shifting over. I went through the supermarket parking lot today just looking at the age of cars and probably the average age of a car was probably 10 to 15 years old. And I looked around and I know GM is looking at moving everything out by 2035 or 2032, everybody has got a different year. But it is going to be many years to come that the gas stations will be around and I just don't want to be part of something that's going to be a problem that you want us to just pay for. You want to pay to put us out of business. You know, the tax that you're putting on the gas is actually, it is a tax no matter how you look at it, it's similar to the gross receipts tax.

We know the EV market is here, it's going to grow. Unfortunately, we don't know what the consequences are. You look at the, all the windmills that came up, the turbans that are out there. Now they can't be disposed of. You look at the K cups that were set up to make coffee easier. Now, you're producing magnitudes of plastic that is into our waste streams. There is a lot of things that we think we're heading in the right direction, but we don't always know.

I feel that this is a tax that will greatly hurt all of my small dealers that, you know, we sell gas to

around Connecticut. And I also believe that the tax on the gas is going to hurt everybody in the state. You know, the, the products that go to the grocery stores are delivered by trucks that use fuel. There is going to be a higher cost to them. Anything that's ordered online is going to be delivered, higher cost to the deliveries, people for their heat for their house. Any product that you come in, that's using the vehicle, you're looking to fund all these programs by, they're great programs. But unfortunately, I don't think that a gas tax is the way to do this.

I am adamantly opposed to this, and I believe that it will hurt the middle class taxpayers more than anybody. And we need to help the taxpayers and we have to stop giving things away to everybody. And you know, the EV market is only there today because it is funded by state and federal programs to, to get them running. Most people wouldn't be buying these cars if they had to pay for them themselves without all the subsidies. For those reasons, I'm opposed to this, and welcome to any questions you may have.

REP. GRESKO (121ST): That was timing Kevin, right at the buzzer. Thank you for your perseverance and for your testimony. I don't see any questions from the room at this point. So again, appreciate the education.

KEVIN CURRY: Thank you.

REP. GRESKO (121ST): Thank you. Next we have Jessie Stratton, followed by Chris Herb. Former Chair Stratton, are you there?

JESSIE STRATTON: Sorry, sorry. I thought you would unmute it. Anyway, good evening Representative Gresko and Senator Cohen, and Senator Miner and Representative Harding and other Members of the Committee who have persevered for almost 12 hours now. It is a pleasure to be here to strongly

support House Bill 6441, and you have my written testimony, so I won't reiterate that. But I'd kind of like to pick up off the comments that Jim O'Donnell was just making, because I think that's what is so exciting about the opportunities that this Bill presents.

I am a member of the Town of Groton's Resilience and Sustainability Task Force, and we've spent the last two years along with town departments identifying the resiliency needs and others of the town and that's no secret, it's pretty simple what needs to be done. The problem is for Groton, and as Jim was outlining for most other municipalities in the state, that the resources available are woefully inadequate to address those needs.

So well, all four of these options within 6441 present towns with the option, no requirement to adopt one of them, to help create funds and put them in the fund that last year's legislation allowed municipalities to create. It's very exciting, but I think two parts of it; the part of the Bill that actually excites me the most is the Green Banks involvement through the infrastructure environmental infrastructure fund. It is one thing to start to say, okay, can we scrape together the matching funds to apply for a federal grant or something, but to actually finance the work in some kind of reasonable way, and this Bill offers the Green Bank the opportunity to build on the same kind of successes it's had in renewable energy and other areas.

The other thing I would really like to point out, I think people referred to the Brick funding that FEMA has available right now, which is one of the sources of funding for these projects. That's about \$500 million a year right now.

In an interview last week, Treasury Secretary, Janet Yellen said they anticipate that becoming \$1.3 billion dollars. So it's quite a few orders of magnitude different and I think one of the things

that the state and the municipalities within it need to do is to be prepared to try to access those funds, to do the planning as Jim was saying, and be able to write the proposals to apply for what will be very significant funding in that going forward.

The other thing that I would just note, there were a lot of comments earlier in the day on the optional conveyance fee, and again, I think it was stressed different times. That is a ceiling of what the charges could be, no municipality would need to levy it at that rate, but for shoreline communities like Groton and others that are wrestling with a lot of the issues related to sea levels that's a really important thing.

REP. GRESKO (121ST): Well, thank you Jessie for your testimony. It's good to hear your voice. And I don't see any hands raised in the room. So on behalf of the Committee, thank you for all your, your past work, and I would be remiss if I didn't say a special hello to you from our LCO Brad Towson. And again, thanks for your persistence and hanging with us.

JESSIE STRATTON: Thank you for your perseverance tonight.

REP. GRESKO (121ST): And we are wrapping it all up with Chris, Chris Herb. Oh, yeah Chris Herb.

CHRIS HERB: Good evening. My name is Chris Herb. I'm the President of the Connecticut Energy Marketers Association. I'm here tonight in opposition to Senate Bill 884. Our members own, operate, and distribute fuel to over 1000 gas stations in Connecticut. If the purpose of this Bill is to, to lower emissions, then it's already a failure.

According to TCI, the gas and diesel tax would need to be increased by 17 cents per gallon to reduce emissions 25%. Earlier today, DEEP testified that

TCI will achieve a 26% percent reduction at a five cent per gallon tax. DEEP has already departed from the documentation the TCI has issued. So how can we trust the environmental benefits will be if we create this tax.

TCI also acknowledges that emissions will be reduced if it's not even adopted, by as much as 17.5%. So, we don't even need it, and, and it's going to fall by 17.5%, which means that Connecticut only gets a 7.5% emissions reduction. Is it really worth it? You have to ask yourself that question.

That's all from TCI, that's not from the industry, that's not from a university, that's TCI documents. It was suggested that TCI would not be passed on, but the typical supply contract that my members offer only a penny or so above the cost of the fuel. There is room to eat it, and it will have to be passed on, no matter what the cost is.

I have heard several questions about how the proceeds of the tax will go to build in EV infrastructure. We ask the Committee to part for a second from what's in the proposal, and just consider actually charging the people who will profit from it. Charge the electric utilities, charge the electric charging manufacturers, charge the EV manufacturing companies; don't charge your constituents to build this infrastructure, charge the people who will profit from it. And by the way, let's throw BP and that since they've seem pretty eager to be able to pass these costs on to our, to our customers and your constituents, let's have them pay for it too. I think Representative Gresko made a great point earlier that they have plenty of money and plenty of ways to raise the money to do this.

The families I represent are in their third and fourth generation where they have installed, they have invested hundreds of millions of dollars in their properties. Let's let the industry pay for their infrastructure, just like my members have

Connecticut family owned businesses, seems fair to me.

Finally, I would remind you that TCI is a part of a bigger effort to electrify the entire economy in Connecticut. You're pursuing policies that further rely on monopolies like EverSource and AVANGRID who deliver the highest electric rates in America. And by the way, they've just asked for another increase. And I'm sure there'll be many more to come in your careers just like there has been in the past.

The other point I'd make is that we're changing, we're really trading one point of emissions for another. We're trading tailpipe emissions for electric generation emissions. The vast majority of electricity in Connecticut is generated with natural gas, which is according to EPA 87 times more potent at trapping greenhouse gases than carbon. So if methane from natural gas is doing that damage, then what are we really achieving by adopting this? The Bill doesn't move the environmental needle at all. DEEP testified earlier today that sea level rise was a huge concern, this Bill doesn't fix that, it doesn't change it, especially when most states aren't even participating.

So I'll just leave you with, we'd like you to oppose this Bill because all it does is increase costs for working class people who have to drive to work, school, and church. Thank you.

REP. GRESKO (121ST): Thank you Chris, and you have a question from Senator Cohen.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Hi Chris, thank you for your testimony. You mentioned at the beginning of your testimony, the 17 cents, is that from the Tufts University study that was mentioned earlier today?

CHRIS HERB: Yeah, directly. Yep, I'll email it to you, it's directly from the, the TCI PowerPoint that

was given to all the stakeholders that I participated in the process with.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Okay. So, and you're saying that in order for TCI see the level of reduction that stated that it's going to meet to be 17 cents increase?

CHRIS HERB: Yeah, that's why, that's why we were very curious about the Commissioner saying that it would, you could get a 26% emissions reduction with a five cent increase where TCI was saying that you need to get a 25% emissions reduction, you would need a 17 cent increase. Again, no matter what, what number you pick, it seems to me that, that there is vast disagreement amongst regulators, whether it's George, Georgetown Climate Center, who is the one who created this program or is DEEP in their own analysis of it, but you know what, I, I will tell you that if we, if you create TCI and we implement the five cents per gallon, and it ends up that DEEP is wrong and Georgetown Climate Center is right, then you'll have to increase it. And that's what we're warning you about, especially when there is other sources of funding that can come from it, like the electric industry itself.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Well, I, I guess, the two questions there are, is the increase in the gas at the pump, the increase in the price of the pump; how does that correlate to the decrease in emissions? Because typically, it's the number of allowances that you sell, that creates the decline in the emissions. So I'm just not, I'm not getting the correlation between the price at the pump and, and that, that decline.

CHRIS HERB: Yeah, so obviously the obligated parties, the wholesalers upstream who will be required to purchase these credits, will, what we heard today is that there is going to be a mechanism in place that won't allow it to exceed 5 or 10 cents a gallon. So I don't know how many credits that

equates to, but the bottom line is, is it's monetized in a way that will be passed through the supply chain to the consumer ultimately, and if TCI is telling us in their documents, like I said, I'll provide, I'll provide you the specific presentations that they gave on this. They're saying 17 cents will, is how you achieve a 25% reduction. I don't know how DEEP capping it at five cents achieves a 26% reduction. The math doesn't work for us.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Okay, thanks for that. I, you know, I also am curious about when that when that report came out. Was it after this new program that, with new language in the Bill with a cross containment resume and all of that was created or was it prior to that?

CHRIS HERB: It was the last. I'm sorry, yeah. It was the last stakeholders process that I was involved in. So I'm not sure if, I mean, I guess it wouldn't, I'll answer it this way. I guess it wouldn't even matter if it was before that there wasn't the cost containment because cost containment only controls the cost, it doesn't equate to the lower emissions. If they're saying it takes 17 cents, all you're doing is not achieving the emissions goals that you want by lowering it to a five cent per gallon tax.

I guess that's probably the bigger point. If the committee's desire is to see a 25% or 26% reduction in emissions, then you need what Georgetown Climate is saying is, is you need that higher one. So regardless of the, the cost containment mechanism, the bottom line is, is that you will eventually have to raise it up to accomplish your goals.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Yeah. I'm still, I'm still not totally clear on that. And I, and I do believe that before the MOU was signed in December, there was a lot of, they were doing a lot of modeling and it took on different iterations. So I just will be curious, we'll have to, we'll have to sort of touch

back with the Commissioner and better understand where those numbers came from and why, why they're not jiving.

CHRIS HERB: But I'm definitely, I'm sorry.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Go ahead.

CHRIS HERB: I'm definitely not a smart enough guy to be able to create this modeling or just simply responding to what the industry was told by Georgetown Climate.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Okay. Thank you for that. And so it sounds like you believe that it should be greater emissions reduction, but that 26% seems like not enough for. So, I'm just wondering is there anything that you would suggest in terms of emissions reductions within the transportation sector or how do we achieve greater reduction?

CHRIS HERB: I think you misunderstood what I was saying. What I'm saying is, is that it's much more expensive than what was portrayed in DEEPs testimony earlier, that it's going to be much more costly than five cents a gallon to get to that 25% or 26% reduction that we keep hearing about. So I, I wasn't suggesting that we do that. I'm saying that if you're choosing electricity as the key vehicle, you have two problems. The first one is, is the majority of electricity is generated with natural gas. Our natural gas system, which I've testified before this Committee dozens of times is leaking like crazy, it's 87 times more potent in trapping greenhouse gases and carbon dioxide.

So the first problem is, we're just trading a tailpipe emission for a natural gas electric generation plant emission. So we don't, we don't get a lot of movement forward on that sense. And then the second piece of it is, is that I would say that if electricity ease that vehicle in which you guys have chosen to reduce emissions, then make the

utilities pay for it, make Tesla pay for it. Why are you making constituents, because again, I think you guys understood after and I've listened to all respond to this today, that if my members are only charging a penny, a penny-and-a-half or two cents over the rack price of gasoline to the, to the gas station, there is no way to absorb anything.

You know, it has, it would have to be a half a penny for us to be even considering the competitive environment that would allow us to eat it. So since it's being passed through, don't make motorists pay more, make the electric vehicle industry, the electricity industry pay for that. That seems like a win-win. You get the funding you need, you can accomplish those goals and we don't end up putting burdens on motorists.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Okay.

CHRIS HERB: It's just a different way to think, it's like just flipping it around, just look at it from a different angle.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Appreciate it. Thank you.

CHRIS HERB: Thank you.

REP. GRESKO (121ST): Chris, we appreciate you sticking it out with us. And I believe that wraps up our, I'm going to stretch this because my timer says 9:59.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Yeah, we have to be able to say we had a 12-hour hearing. I'm sure a Ranking Member must have a comment or two.

REP. GRESKO (121ST): Yes. Thank you everybody for sticking it out and for enduring. We appreciate it. Lot of good information passed back and forth. And we will, we will see you all hopefully on, on Friday. Thanks everybody. Good night.

362  
DA/jb/mi

ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE

March 8, 2021  
10:00 A.M.

REP. DILLON (92ND): Good night.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Good night everyone.