

**Comments of the Union of Concerned Scientists in Support of 2050 Climate Roadmapping
Massachusetts Joint Committee on Environment, Natural Resources and Agriculture
Hearing, 5/14/2019**

Thank you, Chairwoman Gobi, Chairman Pignatelli, and committee members. My name is John Rogers and I am a senior analyst in the Climate and Energy program at the Union of Concerned Scientists, a non-profit that puts rigorous, independent science to work to solve our planet's most pressing problems. Joining with people across the country—including thousands in Massachusetts—we combine technical analysis and effective advocacy to create innovative, practical solutions for a healthy, safe, and sustainable future.

There are a range of important bills under consideration by this committee today, including ones that address climate change—impacts and adaptation—from a range of angles. I will focus my brief remarks in support of the opportunities presented in H.832, *An Act to create a 2050 roadmap to a clean and thriving commonwealth*, and S.524, *An Act relative to 2030, 2040, and 2050 emissions limits*.

As this committee knows well, the science on climate change is quite clear: It's real, it's us, and it's serious. What should be equally clear is what we can do about it: We have readily available to us a broad range of technologies and approaches to allow us to make and use electricity, to get from point A to point B, and to meet a host of other important needs, in ways that are much cleaner—and often, and increasingly, cheaper—than how we've done it in the past.

What we need are appropriately ambitious, science-based targets, and clear guardrails for meeting them, at lowest cost and in the most equitable way. And that's where H.832 and S.524 come into play.

Some of the key provisions in H.832 and S.524 include:

- Updating the Global Warming Solutions Act to account for the latest climate science, both international (IPCC 2018) and domestic (NCA 2018), which points clearly to the need to achieve reductions to *at least* net-zero emissions by mid century
- Requiring identification and assessment of different pathways to meet that target, across our economy—the “backcasting” that Rep. Meschino mentioned in her testimony.

- Creating intermediate targets, for reductions by 2030 and 2040, to keep us away from dead-end pathways and investments—such as new natural gas infrastructure—that might look good to some in the short term but that will hamper our long-term progress, potentially at great cost
- Requiring strong attention to the equity dimensions of our actions on marginalized populations and low- and moderate-income households, knowing that they are some of the ones most likely to be hurt by any *in*action

I will put in a plug, too, for the provision in H.832 that clarifies that municipal light plants—like the one that serves my community—are covered by the GWSA. Just as the GWSA did not expect investor-owned utilities to come to their own conclusions about what made sense for their customers and the state with regard to global warming, it seems important to make clear what role we need MLPs to play, given that they account for 14 percent of state electricity use.

So we very much appreciate your attention to H.832 and S.524, and to the important issue of climate change. With the clear signals that these bills would help provide, we can continue to turn from the challenge of climate change to the promise of a clean energy economy. Thank you.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "JH Rogers", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

John H. Rogers
jrogers@ucsusa.org
617.301.8055