

James Root
84 Lake Ave. #4
Danbury, CT
06810

Governor's Council on Climate Change
DEEP

May 24, 2016

Dear GC3,

Thanks for the stakeholder presentation on May 5. I was unfortunately unable to make the hearing or the satellite broadcasts in person, but have caught up somewhat through the video.

Having said that, I would have liked to have seen the state and ratepayer sponsored methane buildout addressed more fully, in both the stakeholder event and the preceding 'ADM' meeting. This omission puzzles in light of the size and centrality of the buildout-in terms of home and business conversions, interstate pipelines and associated facilities, and monster power plants-in CT's energy and climate outlook.

Even the 'ADM' presentation, or what I see of it, did not come to grips with risks entailed by the state in its methane scheme. The only real detail I saw examined perspicuously was the correlation, in graphs, between methane prices and overall energy prices. There was no real effort to connect this correlation, with whatever its significance is, to the overall mission of the GC3 in reconciling Connecticut energy policy to the climate reality going forward. I would like to DEEP, especially since it appears to be MCing these events, discuss the difficulties, business-wise, the CES methane plan and legislation is having-with the end of the oil/gas price spread, the abject failure of local methane distributors (despite outlandish regulatory interference) to meet CES oil/gas conversion totals, and the cancellation of interstate pipelines (i.e.

Kinder Morgan's NED) on which DEEP and PURA have already authorized ratepayer funded capacity purchases worth billions. I think at least a brief discussion on the dicey and ill-conceived economics of the methane buildout is called for in light of DEEP's own rhetoric, in the form of Ms. Dykes ADM presentation, which takes the trouble, in this ostensibly environmental forum, to tout the economic advantages of methane.

I understand it is difficult because of the direction the administration is currently taking with methane in its CES and implementing legislation, but I would like the GC3 and DEEP to take a less disingenuous and more perspicacious (and responsible) look at the gargantuan investment and commitment the state is currently putting into cheap methane from increasingly politically liable fracking fields to the west where activism and the inevitable increasing federal regulations will drive up methane prices even withstanding the commencement of export of fracked methane by fuel shippers.

Outside of the economic slant, the GC3 should be true to its mission, and start taking fugitive methane emissions into account in its methane GHG calculations-or at least stop speaking so confidently about methane's low GHG numbers. Also there must be a real discussion about the trade off between continuing investment in methane and the ineluctable switch to renewables-regardless of the political difficulty of the latter. The relationship is not necessarily zero-sum but opportunity costs associated are not really being addressed at all. The aforementioned economics of methane is part of this more environmental discussion. The GC3 can, at least, point out more clearly to the administration, the liabilities, especially in regards to state legislated climate and emission goals that Hartford's present methane policy entails. I would like to see future ADM and stakeholder meetings and their agendas set the stage for accomplishing this in later GC3 reports.

Best Regards,
James Root

Danbury