

The following remarks and testimony were offered by New York State and New York City officials and members of the public in response to the US Environmental Protection Agency's proposed repeal of the Clean Power Plan. The remarks and testimony were collected at a public hearing on January 9, 2018 at The New School in New York City.

Remarks by Daniel Zarrilli, Senior Director of Climate Policy and Programs and Chief Resilience Officer at the New York City Mayor's Office

Good afternoon, everybody. Welcome to the People's Hearing.

That's it. I want to hear some noise. I was hoping to say, "Welcome to Scott Pruitt's retirement party." But maybe we'll get to that next. I guess.

My name is Dan Zarrilli. I'm a senior director for Climate Policy and Programs here in the Mayor's office. I'm thrilled to be here today. It is so critically important that New Yorkers voices are heard on the Clean Power Plan, and that's what today is about. We need to make sure the EPA hears from us.

We've got a lot of people to thank for pulling this together today. First and foremost, we've got the sponsors of this event. We've done incredible work with the State Attorney General's Office, Eric Schneiderman and his team. Let's give them a round of applause.

We have great support from our local council member Costa Constantinides. Let's thank him.

Our hosts at the New School, and you'll hear from them in a second, Michelle DePass and Joel Towers. Thank you so much for having us here in your house.

It's remarkable that I probably can't even get through this whole list, and so I'm not going to try, all the advocates, all the organizers, all the supporters who helped us get people out here today, who helped co-sponsor this event. Thank you to all of you.

Certainly the Mayor's office team, Michael Shake and his team in the Climate Policy and Programs team in the Mayor's office. A special thank you to all of you here today who are here to make sure your voices are heard. Thank you, and give yourself a round of applause.

I have one more thank you, of course. To our friends at the state DEC and Joel Binder. We're going to thank him. He's going to speak in a few minutes as well. Thanks to the state DEC.

We're here to talk about the Clean Power Plan. What the Clean Power Plan is really about fundamentally is climate action. It's about clean air. It's about climate justice. All of those things are incredibly important here in New York City. We know that, and we need to make sure that message gets to the EPA.

When they took steps to rescind the Clean Power Plan, and at first only decided to take comments from one public hearing in West Virginia, we knew that was wrong. We stood up with many cities across the country demanding more hearings. They did relent. There's one in San Francisco, there's one in Wyoming and there's one in Kansas City; but still ignored New York City. That's why we're here today. It's wrong that they're not hearing from New York City. We need to make sure that the EPA hears from New Yorkers, that's what we're here to do today.

We know that climate change is probably the fight of our lives, but increasingly becoming the fight of the lives of our children, our grandchildren. We saw the effects here during Hurricane Sandy. The most recent hurricane season continues to put an exclamation point on it. The wildfires in California. All of that is going to be hard enough to deal with, going forward. It's even worse when we have a void of climate leadership in D.C. right now, at the EPA and in the White House. But, the good news is, that we don't wait for others to make our voices heard. We don't wait for others here in New York to make sure that we take action on climate, when a challenge arises. So, there's no time for that. We step up and we lead, and that's what you're seeing here today and that's what we're all doing here together as a city.

Sandy, itself, was a turning point for a lot of us in thinking about climate change and especially the administration here in the city, we took steps to immediately accelerate our own climate action, committing to an 80% reduction in greenhouse gases by 2050, aligning ourselves with the Paris Agreement, releasing a new 1.5 degree plan, to make sure that we're on target for the stretch target of the Paris Agreement and accelerating our own action with building retrofit mandates that we're hoping to pass soon, as well as other action on electric vehicle and more to come. There's a lot more of that and working with other cities. But, our collective voices need to be heard at this point. It's clear that the EPA has forgotten its mandate, to protect human health and the environment. And again, the Clean Power Plan setting the first ever limits on carbon pollution from power plants, which is the largest source of pollution in the country that's driving dangerous climate change, has to be addressed. These changes, had they gone into effect, would have prevented 3,600 premature deaths, 90,000 childhood asthma attacks and would continue to help us meet our commitments to the Paris Agreement. And that's why canceling the Clean Power Plan is completely unacceptable and that's why we're fighting back.

With the leadership of the AG's office, we're already engaged in litigation to protect the Clean Power Plan, and now today, we're taking our voice into the comment section, into the EPA directly, to make sure that they understand that climate change is already impacting New York City in the here and now. It's not something that's going to happen to somebody else, far away. It's happening to all of us and it's happening here and now, and will have catastrophic consequences. The EPA's legally obligated to regulate greenhouse gas emissions from its power plants. That much is clear. And New York and New York City have been reducing our own emissions, taking matters into our own hands, but we need the Clean Power Plan to address the emissions that are coming from the power sector, even further. Without this Clean Power Plan, the city's air quality and the health of our residents will suffer. So, we want to hear from you. We want to make sure these messages get to Washington. We're going to help deliver these messages to Washington that we get here today, because in the absence of that public hearing with the EPA, we're going to make sure those voices are heard.

So, I'm going to turn it over now to our friends at the AG's office. Michael Myers is going to say a few words up here at the podium. We'll have a few other introductory remarks. We'll go through the ground rules and then we're going to get into it. So, thank you, everybody for being here today and it's a real pleasure to be here to work with all of you to make sure New York's voices are heard. Thank you very much. Michael.

Remarks by Michael Myers, Senior Counsel, New York Attorney General's Office

Thank you very much, Dan. Good afternoon. I'm Michael Myers, Senior Counsel in the New York Attorney General's office. I'm pleased to be here today on behalf of Attorney General Eric Schneiderman's Environmental Protection Bureau at this public hearing on EPA's proposed repeal of the Clean Power Plan. The Attorney General's office has fought for national limits on carbon pollution for power plants for 15 years. Most recently, we led a coalition of 18 states and seven cities, including New York, defending the Clean Power Plan in court.

We're here today at The New School, because EPA, under administrator Pruitt, refused our request and that of many other states, to hold a public hearing where our residents, who are at the front lines of climate change's increasingly devastating impacts, could be heard. And although EPA has apparently declined our invitation to hear your testimony in person, a transcript of today's testimony, as well as written statements, will be sent to EPA.

Attorney General Schneiderman strongly opposed EPA's proposed repeal of the Clean Power Plan. The Clean Power Plan is well grounded in the law and the science. In my brief remarks today, I'll discuss one of the fundamental flaws of the proposed repeal and also highlight the plan's importance to our efforts as a country and a state, to address climate change harms.

EPA told the D.C. Circuit Court last year, that no serious effort to address the monumental problem of climate change can succeed without meaningfully limiting power plants' CO2 emissions. Yet, that is exactly the course EPA now proposed to take in repealing the Clean Power Plan without first replacing it with an equal, or better, rule. The law is clear. EPA has an obligation under the Clean Air Act to limit carbon pollution from existing power plants. Replacing something with nothing would violate the statute. That's why Attorney General Schneiderman has promised to sue if EPA follows through with its proposed repeal.

Regarding the Clean Power Plan's importance, it's the first nationwide limit on climate change pollution from existing fossil fueled power plants. And although the rule's requirements are modest, they add up to meaningful reductions, because all states with fossil fueled power plants, must take steps to cut carbon pollution. We can, and must, do more to address climate change, including expediting a transition to zero carbon sources of energy, but the Clean Power Plan can serve as a cornerstone for those efforts. If implemented, the plan would reduce climate change pollution from existing power plants by roughly one third, from 2005 levels. That's like taking 70% of our gasoline powered cars off the road, from a climate change pollution standpoint.

The Clean Power Plan's emission reductions are essential to help stem the increasing harms that all of us, especially our most vulnerable communities, face from climate

change. For example, we've seen throughout New York more extreme rain fall events, in which, unprecedented amounts of rain have washed away roads and homes, causing the loss of life and large-scale property damage. And storm damage is also worsened by sea level rise. This past October, we marked the fifth anniversary of Hurricane Sandy, where sea level rise worsened the destruction the storm caused in our communities, including two million people left without power and 43 deaths. Sea level rise increased Sandy related flooding by 25 square miles, resulting in damage to the homes of an additional 80,000 people in the city. And Sandy's cost in New York will likely reach 40 billion dollars, including over 32 billion to repair and restore damaged housing, parks and infrastructure and to cover economic losses and other expenses.

And as the climate warms, it will make it even harder for New York to address the pervasive problem of smog, which triggers asthma attacks and even premature deaths. The science tells us that unless we significantly reduce greenhouse gas emissions now, we can expect even worse harms in the future. Limiting carbon pollution from power plants, also results in reductions in other harmful pollutants, such as sulfur dioxide, nitrogen oxides and mercury. That means fewer premature deaths, asthma attacks and lost work days. Indeed, we've seen these benefits as a result of New York's participation in the successful, regional greenhouse gas initiative.

In closing, Attorney General Schneiderman will continue to fight to limit harmful climate change. This includes holding the EPA to its legal obligation, to require limits on carbon pollution from power plants that endangers New Yorkers. The Attorney General calls on EPA to abandon its misguided and dangerous efforts to repeal the Clean Power Plan. Thank you.

Dan: Next up, Councilman Constantinides, who we should applaud for getting critical legislation passed and signed by the mayor yesterday to phase out and accelerate the phase out of the dirtiest fuels in the city's power plants. We want to thank him for that, as well.

Remarks by Costa Constantinides, Member, New York City Council (District 22)

Costa C.: Good afternoon. My name's Costa Constantinides, Council Member representing district 22, and I've been a chair of the Environmental Protection Committee of the Council for the last two and a half years and a member of the committee, beginning my eleventh year, either as a staff member or a member of the committee. As we all know in this room, there is simply no debate over the existence of man-made climate change. The science has shown this. The data has shown this, and increasingly, our own lived experience has shown this. Just this past week alone, we've been inundated with frigid bursts of arctic air, which have likely grown stronger, due to the effect global warming has had on the jet stream. Leave the eastern U.S., however, and you will see nearly everywhere else on Earth is currently experiencing temperatures far above normal for this time of year. There are few parts of this planet that have yet to endure an unnatural amount of warmth, chill, storms, wildfires or other disastrous weather events over the past decade. And this comes with a high cost. In 2015, Citi Bank estimated that the cost of inaction could rise as high as 44 trillion dollars by 2060. Despite all that, we're gathered here today because the national EPA has decided that none of these sobering facts-The National EPA has decided that none of these sobering facts, matter. And that, former

President Obama's Clean Power Plan, which have required a 32% emissions reduction from power plants by the year 2030, must be overturned.

And, the press release announcing this shift. The EPA Administration, Scott Pruitt, toted the agencies reinstating transparency and to how we protect our environment.

This from the man who is Attorney General of Oklahoma, revealed only through an open records request, that his office literally copied and pasted letters drafted by the Oil and Gas companies onto government stationary for submission to Obama's EPA.

The press release also claimed that the repeal of the Clean Power Plan, would save up to 33 billion dollars and avoided compliance cost.

Aside from that fact, other power producers have already made market driven investments in more efficient equipment. The federal office of Management and Budget, has estimated the government has already had to spend 350 billion dollars four to six billion dollars a year, and in the following 20 years, the cost will rise to between 13 and 23 billion dollars a year. And that's just the monetary losses.

As Dan's already talked about, as adopted the original Clean Power Plan would have prevented 3,600 premature deaths. 1,700 heart attacks, 90,000 asthma attacks, and 300,000 missing worked and school days a year. That is saying nothing of the countless lives that will be lost around the world due to extreme heat and sea level rise over the course of the next century.

Even if the Administration takes this cost position that the lives of those outside the borders of the United States are simply not our responsibility, which we strongly disagree with. The reality of climate change, which is bound to create a refugee crisis. To be sure we still have a chance to advert this catastrophe and to resist the worst abuses of this administration. There is much we must and can do on the local and state levels.

Here in New York City, we have taken the initiative as Angeline talked about just yesterday. Mayor de Blasio, signed into law legislation that would speed up the phase out of number 4, number 6 oils in local power plants. On the state level, the regional greenhouse gas initiative, will be strengthened. Seeking an additional 30 million emissions reductions in participating states. Equivalent to avoiding one year's worth of emissions from over 25 million cars.

Ultimately, we cannot succeed unless we are all in this together. We need a national and global commitment to combat climate change. I ask the EPA to reconsider this rash, capricious decision that is little justification of them preserving profits and the worse excesses of the fossil fuel industry.

And if it doesn't reconsider, I'll be proud to stand shoulder-to-shoulder with our partners, our Attorney General Eric Schneiderman and our Mayor Bill de Blasio, as we bring this Administration into court to have them explain their poor actions on behalf of the American people. Thank you.

Remarks by John Binder, Counsel, Department of Environmental Conservation

John Binder:

Thank you. My name is John Binder and I'm an attorney with the state department of Environmental Conservation. I want to thank the city and also the Attorney General's office for hosting this event. And, I also want to thank Mike Meyers and others from the Attorney General's office who vigorously defend the state's interest in litigation. Particularly, on climate change issues. And most importantly, I want to thank you all from being here and making your voices heard.

New York State strongly opposes EPA's attempt to roll back Federal climate change initiatives like the Clean Power Plan. The changing climate, which we all know is caused by greenhouse gas emissions, imperils Americans and residents of the state in a number of ways. From the damage caused by rising sea levels that are threatening to submerge a large portion of the eastern United States. To, the intense storms like we saw last year. To the drought and extreme heat events. To the spread of diseases and of course, to the substantial alteration of the natural environment and habitats.

Given all of these and other profound impacts of climate change. Weakening any program that address climate change is misguided and irresponsible. Instead of going backwards, EPA should be maintaining and strengthening programs like the Clean Power Plan. In order to continue progress towards the emission reductions that science informs us are needed in order to reduce the substantial risks the public health and the environment, that are resulting from a changing climate.

In spite of the federal government going backwards Which is the highest admitting fuel and we're doing all of this through a combination of emission limits and programs that support renewable energy. Both large, centralized sources of renewable energy like wind and solar farms. But also, distributed energy resources.

Through all of these efforts, we have already reduced emissions from the power sector in New York by almost 50% since 2005. Which is already beyond the Clean Power Plan's target for 2030. And, despite what many people claim, we've had this environmental progress with economic benefits. We've created jobs. We've reduced energy bills and we've provided tremendous public health benefits, valued in the billions of dollars.

One key program in this regard, is the Regional Greenhouse Gas Initiative, known as REGI, which is mentioned by some of the other folks already. This is a nine state regional program that caps and reduces greenhouse gas emissions from the power sector. By requiring power plants to buy emission allowances, the program has resulted in over a billion dollars that's being reinvested for clean energy purposes throughout the state. These investments help to further emission reductions while also creating jobs and boosting the economy. Again showing that it's not an either, or. We can have environmental progress and economic progress at the same time.

Under Governor Cuomo's direction, we've reduced the emissions cap once already in 2014 and we announced back in August that we will be proposing a second round of emissions reductions. And with those reductions in place, we will have a mandatory, legally binding emissions cap by 2030 that is 65% below 2005 levels.

Given that kind of progress environmentally coupled with economic benefits that we've seen, it's simply inconceivable that the nation cannot achieve the Clean Power Plan's,

relatively modest 32% reduction target. That's just half of what we've already achieved and will achieve in the region by 2030.

We know it's possible in New York and in the ready states because, we've already done it and we're going to continue doing it. We're getting these emission reductions by building renewable energy, using energy more efficiently, and phasing out the dirtiest power plants.

One example is the Clean Energy Standard, which is a New York State program that requires a nation leading 50% renewable energy by 2030. So, half of our electricity in the state will be from renewable energy resources by 2030. We also have set a nation leading target of 2,400 megawatts of offshore wind by 2030.

Just last week, as part of the state of state, Governor Cuomo announced additional nation leading climate change and energy initiatives. Including, the nation's most ambitious goal to support energy storage, which allows carbon free resources like solar and wind to be stored for use at peak times. Reducing reliance on inefficient and dirty peaking power plants.

Governor Cuomo also announced the zero cost solar for all program, which will provide the cost saving benefits of shared community solar for 10,000 low-income New Yorkers.

All of these initiatives and others, enable us to phase out the highest admitting power resources. There are only two power plants left in the state of New York that still burn coal and as Governor Cuomo has directed, the department DC will be establishing regulations setting limits of carbon dioxide emissions on existing power plants so that, these remaining coal burning power plants will be re-powering or closed by 2020.

Governor Cuomo has also directed the department to establish limits on ozone forming pollutants from high admitting peaking power plants. And also, to include these power plants under the REGI cap.

Through all of these efforts, we're leading the nation and even the world, in reducing emissions from the power sector. Governor Cuomo recently joined with the Governor's of California and Washington State, back in June, to establish the United States climate alliance. Which now has 15 states that are committed to meeting or exceeding the emissions targets under the Paris agreement.

But again, as important as all of this leadership is at the city and the state level. We are ...

John:

At the city and the state level. We are only responsible for a small portion of United States emissions and that's why we need national action as well. The Clean Power Plan was just one example of a common sense initiative which would have enabled all states, across the country, to follow the lead of New York and reap the environment and economic benefits that we can realize when we implement these types of programs.

Clean energy initiatives reduce emissions, create jobs and provide public health benefits. That's why the Clean Power Plan should be made even stronger and not repealed. We will continue to fight for these kinds of programs at the state and federal level; we'll continue

to implement them at the state level and with that, I don't want to take up any more time.

We want to hear from you, so thank you, and we look forward to hearing your input.

Dan Zarilli:

Thanks, John. I'd love to echo that. Enough of us, let's hear from you. Let's get this started. A couple ground rules. We have our first panel coming up with ... I'm just going to announce the names.

The first panel, Michelle DePass and Joe Towers. Feel free to join, and maybe I'll do some ground rules while you're heading up to the stage.

Everyone has three minutes to speak. We've got a big crowd. We do want to keep this moving and we do want to get everyone's comments. So, let's keep our comments on the EPA and directed on the Clean Power Plan, all of this is going to be packaged up and delivered to the EPA.

We're not taking questions tonight, but what we're going to be doing is taking the testimony and be helping deliver that to the EPA. All of this is being recorded, transcribed, the transcribed testimony will be submitted to the EPA by their comment deadline.

But just as an extra caution, we're encouraging everyone to go onto the official EPA site and deliver their comments there as well through their system. If you haven't registered and you're not on the list, there's a sign up at the registration desk in the back. We're looking forward to accommodating everyone that we can in the time we have here today.

And with that, enough of us. Let's turn it over. Michelle?

Testimony offered by Michelle DePass, Dean of the Milano School of International Affairs, Management and Urban Policy, Tischman Professor of Environmental Policy and Management and Director of the Tischman Environment and Design Center here at the New School

Thank you very. Thank you very much. Sorry, technology. Thank you very much and welcome to The New School. My name is Michelle DePass, I'm the dean of the Milano School of International Affairs, Management, and Urban Policy. Tischman Professor of Environmental Policy and Management and director of the Tischman Environment and Design Center here at the New School.

I strongly disagree with the Environmental Protection Agency's decision to repeal the Clean Power Plan. I oppose this decision as a former local and state employee, as an environment and climate justice leader, and most importantly, as a former assistant administrator of the Obama US EPA and as a parent and as an educator.

The choice to repeal this plan reflects strategic negligence on the part of Scott Pruitt's EPA. Eliminating what would be one of the most significant actions taken to address the impacts of carbon pollution in the United States. Without the Clean Power Plan, there will be no rules in effect to limit carbon dioxide emissions from power plants nationwide.

The EPA's 2009 Endangerment finding, based on rigorous scientific data and analysis, rules that carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gases are a danger to human health and the environment. In 2014, the Supreme Court upheld the ruling that it is the EPA's responsibility to curb greenhouse gas pollution and to use the Clean Air Act to issue performance standards, limiting carbon pollution from stationary sources.

Repealing the Clean Power Plan contradicts the legally affirmed duty and the purpose of the EPA, and will have disastrous human health impacts and impacts on climate. You've heard it from the mayor's office and you've heard it from our councilmen, but this data bears repeating the EPA's regulatory impact analysis indicates that if the Clean Power Plan is enforced, by 2030 it will prevent 300,000 missed days of work and school, 1,700 non-fatal heart attacks, 90,000 asthma attacks in children, and 3,600 premature deaths.

Without the Clean Power Plan, huge numbers of American women, men, and children will be impacted. Lives will be lost and why would an agency tasked with protecting us turn their backs on these evidentiary numbers?

Climate change is a clear and present danger to this nation. Sea levels are rising ... own national climate assessment report states human activity, especially emissions of greenhouse gases, are the dominant cause of the observed warming since the mid-20th century.

This move to repeal the Clean Power Plan shows a blatant disregard for reality. In addition, as the effects of climate change worsen, the federal government has no plans to increase disaster resilience and preparedness, or to improve and expedite disaster recovery. This double whammy will impact New Yorkers' health and well-being in very deep ways.

In 2012, super storm Sandy caused more than \$19 billion in damage and lost economic activity and New York City and put New Yorkers at immediate risk of hypothermia, increased flu transmission, and exposure to contaminated water.

Meanwhile, hospitals lost power. Some New Yorkers were unable to access routine healthcare, and essential medications chronic illnesses, and still more suffered from mental health effects.

Five years later, we have not fully recovered from the storm and we are not impervious to the future storms that we will face.

As with the case with Sandy, the effects of climate change impacts will be most strongly felt on low-income and communities of color, that are already overburdened with social and environmental injustice.

Power plants historically have been located in low-income communities of color, contributing to climate change and poisoning those communities with toxic and harmful co-pollutants, like sulfur dioxide and particulate matter.

My own institution seeks to be a part of the solution. The New School's Climate Action Plan is guided by a goal to be carbon neutral by 2040. And we have a number of energy-saving, efficiency-boosting projects underway.

However, given the location of the university, we have limited options to generate our own electricity on site, thus we cannot realistically meet our long-term carbon goals without New York City achieving a cleaner, more renewable grid.

Abandoning the Clean Power Plan moves us in absolutely the wrong direction. A regressive agenda on climate change also demotes the United States on the world stage. The federal government is currently ignoring the inevitable global shift to renewable energy, without investing in renewable energy domestically, we are missing out on opportunities to lead the global energy transition.

As an environment and climate professional and a community member who has worked for decades to bring much needed protection to the American people in my own hometown of New York City, I adamantly oppose the decision to repeal the Clean Power Plan.

Instead of taking a do-nothing approach to addressing climate change, this EPA should strive to fulfill its mission to protect human health and the environment by enforcing the Clean Power Plan, and going a step further to develop strategies to ensure justice and equity in its implementation.

It was not so long ago when the US EPA was moving ground-breaking actions on ozone, mobile source emissions, as well as stationary sources in concert with the states and local government. I was there. I know they can do it again. Thank you.

Testimony by Joel Towers, Executive Dean, Parsons School of Design, The New School

Joel Towers: I would like to thank attorney general. Well, first I'd like to thank Dean DePass. I'd like to thank attorney general Schneiderman, Mayor de Blasio, Council member Constantin Tinnitus and the New School, of which I am a proud member, for the opportunity to speak today and in order to be respectful of our time constraints, I will address my comments directly to Mr. Scott Pruitt, administrator of the United States Environmental Protection Agency, as if he had accepted our invitation.

Administrator Pruitt, my name is Joel Towers and I am the executive dean of Parsons School of Design, a college within the New School. For nearly three decades, I have worked as a professional architect, designed sustainable buildings for clients around the world and as a professor, designing curriculum for students to prepare them to be leaders in the creation of resilient products, systems, and services.

At Parsons, we are at the forefront of adapting to and mitigating the effects of climate change through design. It is exciting and rewarding work. We are building the future and it's full of possibility.

At Parsons, we believe in an expansive view of design. We understand that human imagination and endeavor are constantly remaking the world. That as a species we prod and bend and transform the raw materials and energy flows of the planet into the objects, bases, and places of everyday life. Human beings-

Joel Towers: Spaces and places of every day life. Human beings are artists and designers capable of the most compassionate, far-sighted, and joyful actions, and we are capable of doing great

harm. Design is not a neutral act. Design enables human action. It is purposeful, and magnifies capacity. It is a generative and a regenerative endeavor, with immediate impact and long term implication. Mr. Pruitt, solving the challenges of our time will require more than ever, the creative and innovative potential of artists and designers working in collaboration with a diverse array of community stakeholders as well as business leaders, policy makers, scientists, and engineers.

The most impressing challenge facing us today is climate change. So let me be perfectly clear from the outset. I believe that the EPA's proposed repeal of the clean power plan would be a significant policy mistake, and presents a clear and present danger to the economic and environmental health of the nation and its citizens. Abandoning the clean power plan will delay the de-carbonization of the US energy sector at a time when the scientific evidence is overwhelmingly clear that carbon based fuel sources must be retired and replaced by renewable energy as quickly and responsibly as possible.

Simply put, we are in a race to adapt to and mitigate the impacts of climate change. At stake is the habitability of planet Earth and its capacity to support human life as well as many non-human flora and fauna. In that race, the clean power plan is one strong policy tool, that if properly employed, will position the United States to play a leadership role in the economy and ecology of the future. The clean power plan supports three important and interconnected policy goals. It reduces greenhouse gases, especially carbon dioxide. It improves human health and welfare, and it drives energy sector innovation towards cleaner carbon based fuels, and ultimately towards carbon free renewable sources.

Let's take these one at a time. Reducing CO₂. CO₂ is a pollutant that results from the burning of fossil fuels, and when released into the atmosphere, traps solar radiation, leading to what is commonly known as the greenhouse effect. It is a significant contributing factor to global climate change. The science on this is not in question. The EPA has furthermore determined that CO₂ in the atmospheric levels consistent with anthropogenic forcing endanger public health and welfare.

The clean power plan is a flexible and innovative response to this harm, because it supports the regulation and the reduction of greenhouse gasses.

Improving health and welfare. There are many health and welfare benefits to reducing the impact of climate change due to the excessive accumulation of greenhouse gasses in the atmosphere that are the result of human activity, largely from the industrial revolution until today, and there is severe risk of catastrophic damage if we do not act now to mitigate more extreme future climate change. The clean power plan, as part of a comprehensive strategy to deeply decarbonize the American economy, will help to avoid increased drought, wildfires, heatwaves, sea level rise, and increased storm volatility, see Puerto Rico, and it will address many different environmental justice considerations, including climate induced migration, food and agricultural insecurity, and the reduction of airborne pollution, such as ozone in particular matter, that results from fossil fuel combustion.

Quoting from the clean power plan, low income communities and communities of color are already overburdened by pollution, and disproportionately affected by climate change. The clean power plan alone will not address all these concerns, but it is an important step in the right direction. What is additionally needed is a comprehensive commitment to

deeply decarbonize the global economy, and we remind you that the Paris Accords represent an important step in that direction.

Promoting energy independence and economic growth. You might recognize that phrase. President Trump's executive order of the same name led to the EPA's consideration of repealing the clean power plan. Ironically, the president's executive order would be best realized by implementation of the clean power plan. The Clean Power Plan will lead to the increased efficiency and technological advancement of current "electrical utility generating units." It will also drive further innovation and adoption of non-carbon based energy generation. This in turn will lead to true energy independence and economic growth, particularly by developing wind and solar sources. As studied by the US department of energy indicates that the contiguous United States has the potential for over 10,000 gigawatts of onshore wind power, an amount nine times larger than the total US electric consumption.

Including Alaska, Hawaii, and the US territorial waters, potential offshore wind, it becomes abundantly clear that the future economic interests of the United States are aligned with the exploitation of this renewable energy source. Far more so, it should be said than off shore drilling for oil.

Solar has even greater potential. Every 90 minutes, the energy embedded in sunlight striking the Earth's surface is greater than the total worldwide energy consumption, from all sources combined as measured in the year 2001. Harvesting even a fraction of this would represent extraordinary energy independence and economic opportunity. In conclusion, let me reiterate my unwavering belief that the EPA, in order to uphold its stated mission of protecting human health in the environment, must act to enforce, not repeal the Clean Power Plan, adopt it as a final rule by the agency on December 22, 2015. It is worth noting that the Clean Power Plan was a result not only of extensive scientific and policy expertise, it was also deeply inclusive and the product of one of the most extensive and long running outreach processes the EPA has ever conducted, garnering over 4,000,000 comments.

The regulatory certainty in the innovation embedded in the Clean Power Plan will represent a clear political and market signal to the United States [inaudible] independence. I unequivocally support implementation now of the clean power plan.

Dan Z.: Thank you very much.

The second panel we have up ... I've got Bruce Ho, Kevin Steinberger, and Conor Bambrick. If you will please come up to the stage. Thank you.

And after that, just as a heads up, Adrienne Esposito, Megan Ahearn and Eric Weltmen.

Testimony by Bruce Ho, Senior Energy Advocate, Natural Resources Defense Council

Bruce: Good afternoon. My name is Bruce Ho and I'm a senior energy advocate at the natural resources defense council or NRDC, and I want to thank the Attorney General's office, the Mayor's office, and others for organizing this hearing. I'm joined by my colleagues Kevin Steinberger, Kahlil Shaheed, and BJ Lamaya, who also testify by many NRDC members. And on behalf of our 3,000,000 members and supporters, including more than 180,000 in

New York, we are here to register our strong opposition to the EPA's proposed repeal of the Clean Power Plan.

Since 1970, NRDC's lawyers, scientists, and other environmental specialists, have worked to protect the world's natural resources, public health, and the environment. Our top institutional priority is curbing global warming emissions, and building a clean energy future, and we have been deeply engaged on the Clean Power Plan, as well as climate and clean energy efforts at the city, state and regional levels, including in New York City and New York state.

Experience in New York confirms that we can cut carbon pollution, grow our economy, and create jobs, while protecting public health, and saving money on our energy bills. Since 2009, New York has participated in the regional greenhouse gas initiative, or RGGI, the nation's first market to cut carbon pollution. Together with 8 other states, New York has cut carbon pollution from power plants by more than 40%. In the process, these states have cut illness causing soot and smog, saving 5.7 billion dollars in health cost, and preventing hundreds of premature deaths, thousands of asthma attacks, and tens of thousands of lost work days.

They've also achieved other benefits. The regions economy has outpaced the rest of the country, even as the RGGI states have cut carbon pollution almost two times faster. Electricity prices are down, even as they've risen in states outside of RGGI. And RGGI has saved customers 773 million dollars on the energy bills, thanks to investments and energy efficiency and other programs, and will save New Yorkers 4.3 billion dollars in the year ahead. RGGI has also boosted economic growth by at least 2.9 billion dollars, and created more than 30,000 years of full time employment.

The RGGI states have so successfully cut carbon pollution, that they've already achieved their clean power plan targets, more than a decade early. But New York and it's partners aren't stopping there. They've committed to cut pollution at least 30% more by 2030, and expect to spur 3.95 billion dollars in economic growth, put 2.11 billion dollars in families' pocket books, and create 34 thousand employment years by doing so. Now other states, including New Jersey and Virginia are looking to join the program. And New York State has also been leading through other critical initiatives, including the US climate alliance, the state's fifty renewable energy by 2030 standard, and commitments to develop 2400 megawatts of offshore wind, and shut down the Indian point nuclear facility without increasing emissions.

Point nuclear facility without increasing emissions. Recently, Governor Cuomo committed to establishing an energy efficiency target for the state by Earth Day, and following through with a concrete and ambitious target and a comprehensive framework to achieve it will be critical to harness the benefits of this resource.

New York City has also been leading as as the first city to issue a plan to meet the goals of the Paris Climate Agreement. Through its 1,000 megawatt solar goal, its groundbreaking 2009 efficiency framework and other initiatives cut greenhouse gas emissions 80% by 2015. New York is considering landmark legislation to establish building energy performance requirements.

New York state and cities leadership is critical, but actions by only some states and cities won't solve climate change. Carbon pollution from other states and regions continues to harm all. We need leadership from our federal government to ensure every state does its part to prevent the worst impacts of climate change. I urge the EPA to withdraw its dangerous Clean Power Plan repeal proposal and fulfill its duty to protect Americans from climate pollution.

Thank you.

Testimony by Kevin Steinberger, Policy Analyst, Natural Resources Defense Council

Kevin S.: Good afternoon. My name is Kevin Steinberger, and I am a policy analyst with the Natural Resources Defense Council in our New York office. I study the health, study, and economic impacts of clean energy policies. I'd like to thank the Attorney General's Office, the Mayor's Office, the Council Member's Office, and the New School, as well as others, for the opportunity to provided testimony today on the EPA's proposed repeal of the Clean Power Plan. I'm here today with my colleagues Bruce Ho, [Kaleel Shahid and VJ [Lamay] to express our strong opposition to the Clean Power Plan, on behalf of NRDC's three million members and online activists, which include over 180,000 New Yorkers.

My testimony will focus on clean energy and climate progress across the country and how the benefits of the Clean Power Plan far outweigh it's modest cost. The clean energy economy is strong and growing. Renewables are increasingly becoming the lowest cost option in many regions of the country, and reached a combined 7% of the generation mix in 2016. In 2016, US carbon emissions from power plants fell to their lowest levels since 1988, and official data will likely show that emissions were even lower in 2017. Carbon pollution from power plants was 4% lower in the first nine months of 2017 than over the same time period in 2016. Carbon emissions from the power sector have been falling rapidly over the past decade due to strong renewables growth, flat electricity demand, and increased investments in energy efficiency, strengthened public health protections, and low natural gas prices.

The Clean Power Plan reinforces and builds on these market trends by embracing the kind of flexible strategies that the industry already employs. The Clean Power Plan would gradually phase in the emissions limits between 2022 and 2030, and was projected to result in emissions cuts of roughly 32% below 2005 levels by 2030, which also translates to 19% below 2012 levels, which is the baseline year that EPA used to set the targets. Since 2012, power sector carbon emissions have already fallen more than 10%, in other words, the power sector has already achieved more than 55% of the cuts required by 2030 in just four years.

The reality is that study after study has shown that the rule has actually gotten cheaper because of these changes taking place in the electricity market, despite EPA administrator Scott Pruitt's claims and misleading accounting that try to make it look like the Clean Power Plan is now more expensive. The Clean Power Plan, coupled with strong investment in energy efficiency would help accelerate clean energy growth and bolster our economy. A recent report from the business group Environmental Entrepreneurs found that repealing the Clean Power Plan would deny Americans the opportunity to create 560,000 jobs and to add 52 billion dollars to our economy. At the same time, the Trump administration and Scott Pruitt have also continued their war on science in an

effort to dismiss the overwhelming benefit to the rule. When it issued the Clean Power Plan, EPA concluded that the plan would produce tremendous climate and public health benefits that far outweigh its cost. In 2030, the net benefits, after accounting for costs, were expected to reach 26 to 45 billion dollars.

The goals of the Clean Power Plan are readily achievable at even lower cost than the EPA initially projected when it finalized the rule. Despite its best efforts, the EPA can not escape the conclusion that the Clean Power Plan has significant climate and public health benefits that far outweigh its modest cost, and the rule should not be repealed.

Thank you again for the opportunity to testify in this important matter.

Testimony by Conor Bambrick, Environmental Advocates of New York

Conor Bambrick: Thank you. My name is Conor Bambrick with Environmental Advocates of New York. I also want to thank the Office of the Attorney General, the Office of New York City Mayor, the New School in DC for offering up this forum for us here today.

Climate change is the most pressing issue of our time. The impacts are real and we are experiencing them now. We're seeing intensified storms, prolonged periods of extreme heat, increased severity of smog and particle pollution. Climate change is making people sick. It's harming the economy, and it's destroying our infrastructure. The Clean Power Plan, while modest in terms of its carbon reduction goals, is an important public health regulation that will save lives. It should not be repealed.

We know from experience that the Clean Power Plan can reduce pollution while also boosting the economy. Through the Regional Greenhouse Gas Initiative, we have successfully put in place a carbon cap and invest program here in New York and in the Northeast, the Mid-Atlantic states. Since 2009, New York has experienced a 46% reduction in carbon pollution from the power sector. Over one billion dollars has come into the state to be spent on energy efficiency and clean energy initiatives, generating an estimated savings of over 15 million tons of CO2 equivalent, and 4.3 billion dollars in customer savings. Region wide analysis of the health impacts indicate between 13,000 and 16,000 avoided respiratory illnesses. Up to 390 avoided heart attacks, and between 300 and 830 premature deaths avoided.

The RGGI Model is working, and it's getting better. The states have agreed to an additional 30% reduction through the year 2030, well beyond the Clean Power Plan targets. We're attracting new states to the program, and states with the RGGI collaborative are now starting to talk about expanding to transportation through the Transportation and Climate Initiative. As a New Yorker, I understand the urgency and the need to act aggressively on climate. As a father of a small child living with asthma, I understand the terror of watching your child struggle to breathe and the consequences of inaction if we don't act on climate aggressively.

Thank you very much.

Testimony by Adrienne Esposito, Executive Director, Citizens Campaign for the Environment

Adrienne E.:

Good afternoon. My name is Adrienne Esposito. I'm the Executive Director of Citizens Campaign for the Environment. Thank you for allowing to add our voices to the people's hearing for the Clean Power Plan.

I'll also pretend that Administrator Pruitt is in the room. Administrator Pruitt, we are here to tell you that we believe that weakening or getting rid of the Clean Power Plan is irresponsible, it's dangerous, and it's also negligent. That, even if the EPA, which is supposed to be the Environmental Protection Agency, and unfortunately has turned into the Eliminating Protections Agency, even if they're not going to feel strongly about protecting children, 90,000 asthma attacks, 3,600 premature deaths, the 300,000 missed days of work, and preventing 1,700 heart attacks, even if that's not compelling to them, let's talk about the real impacts of climate change. Because New York, as we know, is on the front lines and let's look at upstate New York because there's enough very good people who can talk about the impacts to New York City. New York's a big state with big problems and big challenges.

In New York, on a dot ... Sorry. In like, Ontario this year, we had some of the largest flooding in the history of that region, and that is because of unprecedented precipitation and also snow melt in the spring. That flooding caused roads to break down, caused infrastructure, shoreline flooding as well, and shoreline erosion. It caused homes to be damaged, and the economic impact was tens of millions of dollars to have emergency response and also restoration efforts to occur. In-... and also restoration efforts to a car in just that one area. So it's not just coastal communities throughout America. It is in many communities throughout America where these economic but also societal impacts are being felt and are being, costing us a lot of money.

You know, I live on Long Island, so I would be remiss if I didn't talk about the impacts of climate change to Long Island. Superstorm Sandy isn't a memory of yesterday. It's a wake-up call for today. We lost everything in some communities. We lost schools, hospitals, homes, cars, boats, jobs, businesses, literally everything. I volunteered on a crew to help homeowners who didn't have insurance or couldn't help themselves, and every weekend we went into people's homes and we literally tore down the walls if they had mold. We got up the tile floors because underneath was filled with black mold, and we took out of their home everything they owned. Everything from clothing to children's toys to the walls to photo albums, and we dumped it at the curb for the garbage men to pick up because they couldn't keep it.

Impacts like that, you can't see, and you can't experience, and you can't know from the plush real estate of the penthouse in Trump Towers. But you know it when you experience it, and it is our moral and ethical obligation to mitigate that, and it's not just those main, big storms. It's ocean acidification. All three estuaries on Long Island have higher acidity levels today than they did five years ago according to Stony Brook University research. That means the shellfish industry and the fin fish industry will be adversely impacted and are being adversely impacted.

Also, we have saltwater intrusion into our aqua system, which means wells that are now supplying drinking water to three million people will no longer be viable very soon. So these are challenges that will need to be undertaken, and we can not hide our head in the sand and be climate deniers. So to all of you, the governor, the DEC, New York state attorney general, the mayor and our agencies, really, I want to say to you that we need

you now more than ever, and I know you're on the front lines for us, but I want to add the fuel to your fire because you know the famous saying that "all that is required for evil to triumph is for good men to do nothing."

So we need you to amplify your voice and all the good men and women who are here today to use our voice. We can't wait three years. The clock is ticking. My clock is ticking, I know, but the clock is ticking and the damages are happening now. We can not repeal the Clean Power Plan. We can not backtrack. We can not go back to the 1970s where pollution was abundant and rampant and accepted. So thank you for your efforts, and we appreciate your fight and your support, and we're there with you.

Testimony by is Megan Ahearn, Program Director, New York Public Interest Research Group

Megan Ahearn: Good afternoon. My name is Megan Ahearn. I'm the program director for the New York Public Interest Research Group, and we appreciate the opportunity to testify today, and thank you for holding this people's public hearing.

While the Clean Power Plan does not go far enough, it's outright repeal without a stronger replacement would be a setback for our country and our planet, and I'd like to make four points. First, that there are shortcomings which much be addressed in the CPP. There are benefits to the CPP, which provide a floor for vital public health protections and investments in clean, renewable energy. The proposed repeal is part of an ongoing assault on climate science by the Trump Administration despite being over 80 times more potent as a greenhouse gas over two decades. It fails to adequately define methane emissions and leakages from fracked gas operations in infrastructure, and moreover, long-term capital investment in natural gas infrastructure would ensure that it will displace efficiency in renewable energy approaches that are necessary to decarbonize the planet.

These conversations to address these problems and other environmental justice issues have been ongoing and occurring, and input from frontline communities and climate scientists must be prioritized over polluting, dangerous fossil fuel interests and the climate deniers that are currently in our national offices.

Number two, still, as the regulatory impact analyses from the EPA repeal proposal itself acknowledges, the CPP would reduce pollutants that contribute to soot and smog that make people sick, from the things that other people have mentioned, reducing by tens of thousands asthma attacks in children to deaths that are caused by soot and smog. On top of that, from soot and smog reductions alone, for every one dollar invested through the Clean Power Plan, American families will see a

That far more Americans are already employed in the renewable energy sector than in coal and other fossil fuels. More than twice as many Americans now work in the wind industry as in coal mining.

Last but not least, New York State must lead. We can go beyond, and we must go beyond the modest CPP applications and truly lead the U.S. in efficiency in renewable energy by rejecting expansion of natural gas in New York State and publicly committing to significantly exceed the carbon reductions in the CPP by ... Last page, two bullets.

The state's goal for greenhouse gas emissions must be accelerated to reflect the target goal of keeping global warming below 1.5 degrees, and we need state and local governments including in New York City to set ambitious near-term goals to transition to 100% clean, renewable energy as rapidly as possible, and transition to zero emissions vehicles and increase funding for mass transit.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify today, and for defending the Clean Power Plan in Washington.

Testimony by is Eric Weltman, Senior Organizer, Food and Water Watch

Eric Waltman: Good afternoon. My name is Eric Weltman, and I am a Brooklyn based senior organizer with Food and Water Watch. On behalf of Food and Water Watch's one million supporters nationwide, I wanted to thank Attorney General Schneiderman, Mayor de Blasio, Chairman Constantinides for their tremendous leadership in the fight against climate catastrophe. Clearly, the Trump administration has recklessly abdicated its responsibility to protect the health and well-being of our nation and planet. We appreciate you stepping into the breach by holding this hearing, and beyond that, the attorney general's leadership in speaking in defense of the Environmental Protection Agency and opposing cuts to the EPA budget.

It's up to New York and other states and cities across the nation to lead the charge against climate change, to move off fossil fuels, to stop building oil and gas pipelines, power plants and other fracking infrastructure, and to transition to 100% renewable energy.

And it's up to us and leaders like Attorney General Schneiderman, Mayor de Blasio and Chairman Constantinides to resist, to resist Trump's efforts to dismantle the rules and regulations that protect the air we breathe, the water we drink, the food we eat, and the climate we depend upon.

Food and Water Watch strongly opposes the EPA's proposed rule to withdraw the Clean Power Plan, deeply flawed as we believe the plan is. Make no mistake. What drives EPA's proposed withdrawal is not the pretense of limited statutory authority offered in the proposed rule and its related proposal to devise a new plan. What we are witnessing is another manifestation of the Trump administration's dangerous denial of the climate crisis we are already suffering from. As the dedicated staff of the EPA know, the climate crisis is not a conspiracy. We are now suffering from the damaging impacts of increased global warming. Tragically, the Clean Power Plan doesn't even come close to accomplishing what is needed to keep oil and greenhouse gas emissions from plunging our climate into further chaos. Rather than withdrawing the plan, the EPA should strengthen it, to rapidly eliminate all fossil fuel greenhouse gas emissions including methane from fracking operations, and should be doing so without the use of market based pollution credit trading schemes that now exist in the plan.

Just as the court recently found EPA's 90-day stop-gap methane rule delay to be an unreasonable and capricious abuse of agency discretion, this rule withdrawal would likely be found illegal when challenged. The Clean Power Plan was finalized after a comprehensive public comment period during which industry had every opportunity to argue against it. Now that it has been finalized, industry is free to challenge the rule in a court of law as it is been doing.

However, we are confident that the courts will recognize the climate denied illusions and financial self-interests driving the Trump administration's dangerous anti-science agenda and strike down this dangerous effort. We are grateful for the EPA staff who are courageously doing their jobs under-

For the EPA staff who are courageously doing their jobs under dispiriting cloud of an administration hellbent, hellbent on undermining their agency's mission. We are grateful for your leadership in respecting science, speaking up for truth, and standing up to the fossil fuel industry. The final analysis, New York and the nation must move off fossil fuels, and it's up to leaders like yourselves and the amazing allies - the folks we have here in the audience today - to do it.

Testimony by Khalil Shahyd, Senior Policy Advocate, Natural Resources Defense

Khalil Shahyd: Thank-you. Good afternoon, thank-you to the AG's office, the mayor's office, the New School, and of course you all - the people of New York - for hosting us and also for your leadership. My name is Khalil Shahyd, I'm a Senior Policy Advocate with the Natural Resources Defense Council. I'm here speaking today representing the Energy Efficiency for All project, or EEFA.

EEFA is a national partnership led by Elevate Energy, the National Housing Trust, and the Natural Resources Defense Council, working to bring awareness to energy efficiency in affordable multifamily housing. We work with building owners, with managers, with tenants, with businesses, advocates, and utilities in order to achieve energy savings in multifamily properties. Two years ago, EEFA collaborated with many partners in the affordable housing community to work with the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency to ensure that the Clean Power Plan meets the needs presented by the nations low income families living in affordable housing in every state and congressional district.

We supported the EPA in the development of the Clean Energy Incentive Program in order to ensure that the benefits of the CPP are shared broadly across society, and that potential adverse impacts on low income rate payers are avoided. Low income families experience an average energy burden that is twice as high as the median U.S. household energy burden and three times higher than that of non low income households. Three times higher. For these reasons, we strongly oppose the attempts to weaken, replace, or repeal the Clean Power Plan.

Implementing the Clean Power Plan through the early adoption and incorporation of the Clean Energy Incentive Program would have delivered numerous benefits to the nation's poorest families, those struggling with rising energy costs that are increasing faster even than the cost of housing in many states. Many low income and vulnerable households have few residential options but to rely on poorer quality housing that results from residential segregation, long term neighborhood disinvestment, and deferred maintenance to our housing stock. These homes tend to be energy inefficient, impacting the financial stability of many families due to high utility bills and increasing recurring illnesses from poor indoor air quality.

Struggling families sometimes spend more than 20% of their income on electricity and heat, far more than the national average of 7.2%. For these people, a cold winter can bring hard choices heat or medicine, utilities or groceries, or even hidden dangers. For

example, space heaters, stove tops and ovens are involved in 79% of fatal home heating fires when building heating systems are inadequate. Existing weatherization and low income bill assistance programs are inadequate to meet the needs and services. The Clean Power Plan would provide an incentive and expand programs and market opportunities to generate the resources necessary to deliver the goods. Failure to implement the CPP could mean that these households can expect electricity bills that are on average \$17 higher per month in 2030 than they would be if we just ...

Weatherization assistance programs alone reduce America's climate pollution by two million metric tons. The total residential energy efficiency can account for as much as 550 million metric tons of CO2 equivalent emissions, or equal to the combined electric power emissions of California, Texas, New York, Florida, Illinois, and Virginia. There are also jobs and economic development benefits. In the state of New York alone, retrofitting low income multifamily housing over a 10-year period would create approximately 23,000 jobs across the state's economy. In the New York metro area, that number would be about 11,300. For every dollar invested in energy efficiency for low income families, two dollars are put back into the economy through energy savings and increased income from job creation. In fact, energy efficiency already accounts for more than 2.2 million jobs across the nation.

Because of these and other benefits, we strongly urge the EPA not to weaken, repeal or replace the Clean Power Plan. Thank-you.

Testimony by VJ LeMay, Environmental Epidemiologist, Natural Resources Defense

VJ LeMay: Good afternoon and thank-you for offering this people's forum. My name is VJ LeMay, and I work for the Natural Resources Defense Council as an Environmental Epidemiologist who studies the health effects of climate change. I'm here today with my colleagues and on behalf of our three million members and online activists who oppose the proposed repeal of the Clean Power Plan. I'm also a former U.S. Environmental Protection Agency scientist.

There is no more far-reaching or urgent public health challenge than climate change. It's a global threat with impacts that reach into our local communities today, not in some distant future. To reduce this threat, we must oppose the repeal of the Clean Power Plan. The health risks stemming from climate change are numerous and serious. First, flooding risks threaten many of our state's residents here in New York. The evidence is clear that climate change is fueling sea level rise, and since 1900 the sea level near New York city has risen about a foot, nearly twice as rapid as the global average. With unmitigated climate change, sea level rise in New York Harbor could reach as high as six feet by the end of the century.

A second major climate change driven health concern is exposure to extreme heat, which is linked to early death on both short term and seasonal time scales. In this country, extreme heat events cause more deaths each year than all other extreme weather events combined. High temperatures interfere with the body's respiratory and circulatory systems and disrupt our thermal equilibrium. Average annual temperatures in New York State increased about six degrees Fahrenheit from 1900 to 2013. But climate change boosts that rate of warming by increasing energy choices and greenhouse gas emission

reductions today. Parts of New York City experience high daytime temperatures and less nighttime cooling due to the urban heat ...

To ozone pollution, and also reducing particle pollution, while in the longterm reducing the emission of carbon dioxide which exists in our atmosphere for about a century. This is a win-win for public health and the economy.

Global momentum is building on the side of actions to mitigate climate change and New York State must continue to lead in matters of regional, national, and global importance. The nation and indeed the world watch what happens in New York State. Strongly supporting the original terms and goals of the Clean Power Plan will benefit the health and economic vitality of our residents today and for future generations. Thank-you for the opportunity to testify on this urgent issue.

Testimony by Pat McClellan, State Policy Director, New York League of Conservation Voters

Pat McClellan: Hi, my name is Pat McClellan. I'm the State Policy Director for the New York League of Conservation Voters. I'd like to thank the event organizers for having us here today and talking about this important issue.

Although it's modest, the Clean Power Plan is still the most important regulatory policy that the EPA has ever issued to address greenhouse gas emissions from power plants. It's the mechanism by which the United States will meet our obligations under the Paris Climate Agreement, it's a down payment on decarbonization of our economy, and it has enormous positive implications for public health. That's why the plan is supported by overwhelming majorities of Americans, why the New York League of Conservation Voters has supported it since it was first proposed, and why our members joined with more than eight million other Americans to submit comments in support of the plan when it was first proposed.

New York is a national leader in clean energy from its participation and leadership role in the Regional Greenhouse Gas Initiative, to the Clean Energy Standard, to its commitment to phase out coal fired power plants by 2020. But we're not an island, although we're on one today. The fact that pollution's negative externalities don't recognize state borders is one of the reasons why the EPA was created in the first place. Even if New York had zero emissions, national emissions would still drive climate change that harms New York's environment and economy, and causes respiratory illnesses, heart disease, and other serious health issues for New Yorkers.

According to the Federal Government's own estimates, by 2030 the Clean Power Plan could prevent 90,000 asthma attacks and 300,000 missed work and school days. A recent analysis by the current administration found that the plan could prevent as many as 4,500 premature deaths every single year by 2030. Furthermore, a recent study by the Universal Ecological Fund estimated the economic impacts of extreme weather caused by climate change and negative health impacts caused by fossil fuel pollution at \$240 billion every year for the past decade.

Repealing the plan would mean more sick children, more expensive hospital visits and chronic illnesses, and thousands of premature deaths that could have been prevented. The Clean Power ... Of premature deaths that could have been prevented. The Clean

Power Plan is an effective first step towards reducing greenhouse gas emissions and other pollutants generated by power plants. Repealing it will worsen global climate change and harm public health, especially for the most vulnerable communities.

On behalf of the New York League of Conservation Voters, and our members, I respectfully urge the EPA to leave the Clean Power Plan in place and fully enforce its provisions.

So, Christina, Shea, and Catherine? Oh, I'm sorry. I'll get a little closer. The panel coming up after this: panel six. Rachel Spector, Wes Gillingham, and Anna Baptista. Thank you, over to you.

Testimony by Christina Wienecke, Director of Public Policy, American Lung Association (NY)

Christina W.: Good afternoon. I thank you all for your work here today for giving the opportunity to New Yorkers to have their voices heard on this important topic. While the Lung Association has had the opportunity to testify at the limited number of the EPA's public hearings, we are thankful to put forth this testimony, re-iterating our concerns and providing some local information for the attention of the EPA.

I am Christina Wienecke, and I serve as the Director of Public Policy in New York for the American Lung Association. I'm representing not only the 6.5 million New Yorkers who live with failing air quality and the 900,000 New Yorkers who suffer from chronic lung disease, but also the millions more who desire to breathe clean air and to protect their good health.

The American Lung Association has championed the EPA's efforts to set strong carbon pollution standards for both new and existing power plants. And some states already, having accomplished more in some categories than the EPA had set as a target, we have even found that the plan's goals were actually too modest in face of the scope of the problem. And rather, that more aggressive targets and more aggressive complying states should be state.

Nevertheless, we are on record as supporting the Clean Power Plan as a tremendous step forward in the United States' fight against carbon pollution. It should not be a surprise that we are here today to oppose its repeal.

Revoking the Clean Power Plan gives power plants a license to pollute. Repeal allows them to continue to avoid paying for the cost of their pollution to the tune of some 90,000 pediatric asthma attacks, 4,500 premature deaths, hundreds of thousands of lost work and school days and tens of billions of dollars each year by 2030.

We stand by what we said in testimony to the EPA two years ago carbon pollution that is driving climate change poses a current and growing threat to public safety. The changing climate threatens the health of Americans alive now and in future generations.

Climate change is already affecting the health of people in our region. Many communities of color and low-income face higher risks from climate change and from pollution from power plants. And ozone, a serious respiratory irritant, that can lead to asthma attacks,

hospital from and premature death, is likely to be worse in much of the Northeast as a result of climate change.

Indeed, the case has done nothing but grow stronger year by year with even more science backing up the effects of air pollution on our health. The proposal at hand indicates that the EPA is considering whether it should issue a rule addressing greenhouse gas emission from power plants.

Not only has the EPA already found the science to be abundantly clear that carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gases pose a danger to public health but the United States Supreme Court has in three separate decisions, confirmed that the EPA has the authority and the duty to protect public health from these pollutants.

In short, it is illegal for the EPA to answer the question of whether it should address this hazard in the negative. The EPA must do so. Not only do reports show that health benefits and decreased mortality from the Clean Power Plan are especially likely to accrue in much of New York, but we also strongly emphasize that the populations potentially at risk from exposure to air pollution are not a few persons in fragile health.

Rather, they are groups containing millions of New Yorkers who are at risk of unhealthful levels of ozone, putting them at risk of premature death and serious health effects.

In closing, per person, we produce more carbon emissions at one of the world's highest rates. However, our nation has the capacity to confront and fix this problem. I'll use an analogy from our colleague at the American Lung Association.

Imagine if all the world's people were in a lifeboat with multiple leaks, but the reason we choose not to fix our leak is that the benefits of doing so aren't accruing only to us. In many ways, that is reflective of the flawed logic behind the administration's justification for repeal. We simply cannot put America first without putting the planet first. We need a strong Clean Power Plan implemented so that we can surely prioritize the health and well-being of all Americans. Thank you.

Testimony by Catherine Scopic, Sierra Club

Catherine S.: Thank you, New School. Michael Myers, of the Attorney General, Eric Schneiderman's office. Representative from Governor Cuomo's office, Dan Zarrilli of the mayor's office, and now Nicholas with Costa Constantinides as a member of the New York state city council. Thank you for this opportunity.

My name is Catherine Scopic, I am a member of Sierra Club Atlantic chapter and speaking today as a citizen and parent, who hopes that my daughter and all future generations will have life as we know it.

Yes. I support the Clean Power Plan. And I greatly urge the EPA to resume your responsibility of protecting human health and the environment. In addition to the good work that we have found, and listened to in our representatives here today, speaking of the good work that New York state has already done, I'd like to share with you three brief stories and before I do, I'd just like to say that I support the Clean Power Plan and if I could change anything, I would just ask that in the grid, in the mix they're not a nuclear or

gas power in the mix, that we have more renewable energy. I'm wearing my wind-power dress. Wind turbine dress. And that we do it even sooner.

Like the Reggie is 10 years ahead I believe, we said. And the governor's office said that we would like to move to zero energy emissions. Right? I'd just like to share, very briefly, three little stories.

Samsø Island in Denmark has used energy in a new and sustainable way that gives them free heat. It gives them free power and puts money in their pocket. USA, here in the USA, Greenberg Kansas, was almost destroyed by a tornado and they decided to rebuild green and they did so, using solar, wind, geothermal and so forth.

Third little story. Elon Musk, before December 1st this year, delivered 100 megawatt power system to South Australia and this gets its power from the 270 megawatt wind farm and when fully charged, it can supply energy for 800 homes for 24 hours, or 30,000 homes for 1 hour in a blackout.

These are three stories having to do with renewable energy victories. I bet you there are a lot of stories here in the audience. Raise your hand if you also could tell of a renewable energy victory. Okay. So this is what we have to do. We have to keep talking about these renewable energy victories until we are 100% renewable energy.

Talk to your friends, your family members, everybody so that they know that it is a reality. And in addition to all the legislation and work we're doing to get it enacted, that we know that it's possible.

The last thing I would like to do is close with a quote. "It's not the strongest of the species that will survive, nor the most intelligent, but the most responsive to change." EPA, I ask you to respond to climate change. Because what we're talking about here is our very survival and the survival of all life. Thank you.

Testimony by Shea O'Reilly, Organizing Representative, Sierra Club

Shea O.: Good afternoon, my name is Shea O'Reilly and I am an organizing representative for the Sierra Club and a resident of Brooklyn, New York. I'd like to thank our attorney general for his leadership in defending the Clean Power Plan and for organizing this hearing to provide New Yorkers the opportunity to testify on the EPA's proposal to repeal this important program.

At the Sierra Club, we represent over 3 million members and supporters, including about 180,000 here in New York and 19,000 in New York City alone. We are strong supporters of the Clean Power Plan.

The Clean Power Plan, our nation's first federal limits on carbon pollution for existing power plants, is the result of the most robust public participation process that the EPA has ever undertaken. The EPA reached out to states, utilities, organized communities of color, tribes, labor unions, and the public at large, and the agency received million of written comments supporting the proposal.

Public support continues to this day with one poll after another showing Americans' broad support for this policy. The Clean Power Plan is necessary to curb dangerous carbon pollution that is exacerbating extreme weather events around the country. We know the effects of Superstorm Sandy here in New York; they have already been elucidated by people who spoke before me.

But here in New York, sea levels are rising 50% faster off of our coastline than the global average, due to our geology and geography. While our state is working to reduce conventional air pollution that contributes to the formation of smog and soot, the Clean Power Plan will also help decrease emissions of these harmful air pollutants emitted by fossil fuel-fired power plants from outside of our state.

These benefits are particularly critical to New York, which lies downwind of numerous coal-heavy states that are contributing to our inability to attain and maintain national standards for smog. Everything to our inability to attain and maintain national standards for smog. The EPA is legally required to regulate carbon pollution from power plants and the Clean Power Plan establishes reasonable [inaudible] our state's experience successfully reducing carbon emissions from power plans under the Regional Greenhouse Gas Initiative by 40% since 2008 when this program became effective constitutes key part of the EPA's administrative record justifying the reasonableness of the Clean Power Plan.

We know that the clean energy economy will continue growing regardless of this Administration's strategy of favoring polluting industries, but without the Clean Power Plan this country will lack a nationwide strategy to guide this transition, which is critical for those states whose policies continue to promote the burning of fossil fuels.

I want to say also that the EPA has inappropriately cooked the books to justify its proposed repeal in order to mislead the public on the benefits and costs that the plan would entail. Beside the shady, underhanded behavior from EPA Administrator Scott Pruitt, this also could set a very dangerous precedent for other rules and regulations passed at the federal level allowing for states to circumvent and avoid becoming in compliance with them. Okay. I know my time's up, so I'll wrap it up.

The EPA's legal obligations and the urgency of the climate crisis demand that the Agency issue a replacement rule of similar or even higher stringency than the Clean Power Plan. I want to be clear, the Clean Power Plan is not sufficient for rising to the challenge of climate change. We also need regulations on potent greenhouse gases like methane to prevent the expansion of fracked gas infrastructure in power plants. We need more stringent policies that hastily move us off of all fossil fuels and we need a plethora of initiatives to support clean energy development, but while not sufficient, the Clean Power Plan is necessary. The EPA must not reverse the hard won progress we have made to reduce carbon pollution and we will fight to protect the health of our communities from these threats to our clean air and our climate. Thank you.

Testimony by Rachel Spector, Director of Environmental Justice, New York Lawyers for the Public Interest

Rachel Spector: Good afternoon. Thank you to Attorney General Eric Schneiderman, to the Mayor's Office, to DEC, to Council Member Constantinides for being here, and for having this hearing today. My name is Rachel Spector and I'm the Director of the Environmental Justice Program at New York Lawyers for the Public Interest. Our office uses law in organizing to

advocate for the elimination of disparate environmental burdens faced by low income communities and communities of color in the New York City area.

Climate change and power plant emissions are among the greatest emissions are among the greatest threats to environmental justice communities. It is a shame that the EPA really limited the public's ability to speak on the record about this proposed repeal of the Clean Power Plan, as it will have a huge impact on people around the country, particularly in low income communities and communities of color where people are already suffering the greatest harm from climate change and co-pollutants from power plant emissions. Repealing the Clean Power Plan, which while it's insufficient, was the most comprehensive step thus far to reduce U.S. greenhouse gas emissions, is a shocking display of disregard for science, for the lives of people living in frontline communities, and for the world we will leave to our children and grandchildren.

The State of New York, as many others have said today, has independently taken many steps to reduce greenhouse gas emissions from power plants, so why do we here in New York care about repeal of the Clean Power Plan? First, greenhouse gas emissions anywhere contribute to climate change across the globe and here in New York City, we are particularly vulnerable to the effects of climate change. New York City has more residents living in potential flood zones than any other city in the country, and waterfront communities of color, such as Sunset Park and Hunts Point are disproportionately affected by rising sea levels. We know this, of course, from super Storm Sandy. Fifty-five percent of those impacted by the storm surge during that storm were low income renters, earning on average \$18,000 per year. Power outages from that storm lasted for weeks, leaving many residents unable to even leave their problems or maintain critical medical equipment and supplies. As climate change accelerates, storms and flooding will occur more frequently.

In addition, many low income communities and communities of color in New York City are urban heat islands, where lack of shade or vegetation combined with heat-magnifying paved surfaces exacerbate already rising temperatures from climate change. Urban heat islands and the unaffordability for many of air conditioning creates serious health risks for lower income New York City residents, particularly for elderly people or those with respiratory conditions. Second, co-pollutants from the most polluting fossil-fuel burning power plants in other states both disproportionately affect people of color there and also New Yorkers as they are blown eastward into our state. Seventy-eight percent of African Americans live within 30 miles of a coal fired power plant. Oh, my time is up already? It goes so fast.

In addition, Latino communities and indigenous and low income communities are more likely to live near coal fired power plants. I will add that as lawyers, we must note that there is no valid legal basis for repeal of the Clean Power Plan as the EPA is required to regulate greenhouse gases. Repeal of the Clean Power Plan is contrary to law, to science, to the wishes of the majority of Americans to our moral obligation to future generations and to those in environmental justice and frontline communities in New York and around the country. NYLPI strongly urges the EPA to reconsider the proposed repeal and commit to continuing efforts to reduce greenhouse gas and co-pollutant emissions from power plants and other sources. Thank you.

Testimony by Wes Gillingham, Associate Director, Catskill Mountainkeeper

Wes Gillingham:

Hi, I'm Wes Gillingham, the Associate Director of Catskill Mountainkeeper. I just want point out that we now have the information that shows that this is not ... We just came through the third hottest year on record, but it was the most costliest year on record, Harvey, Maria and Irma causing the most damage there. But, I really want to address what this hearing is about, is this hearing is about the details of the Clean Power Plan.

At Catskill Mountainkeeper, I've spent a large portion of my life digging through documents like the CPP to see if they really protect the Catskills in New York State and our communities. Let it be known that there are serious issues with the CPP. It does not protect communities from co-pollutants and depending how a state institutes its implementation plan, it actually can incentivize natural gas production.

Look back to why I made the drive down here from the Catskills for this hearing. I drove down here today because before I co-founded Catskill Mountainkeeper, I farmed for a living. I experienced two hundred-year floods and a five-hundred year flood in a five-year period. Climate change is real. It's here. It's affected me personally and many of you in this room. It drowned three of my tractors and washed away 60% of my topsoil, putting my vegetable production out of business. I am here not to tell you how the CPP will fix anything. It certainly doesn't walk the dog or put the cat out, but I'm here to show my support for the work of Eric Schneiderman, our Attorney General. Thank you for weighing in when the Delaware River Basin Commission was about to frack the Delaware River Basin in pursuing a NEPA lawsuit.

Thank you for weighing in and stopping the Constitution Pipeline for prematurely cutting forest for a pipeline that wasn't approved yet. Thank you for continuing to defend the state's home rule ability to protect its own water courses from the impacts of infrastructure and gas infiltration into our state. Thank you for supporting solutions to climate change, such as supporting the Climate and Community Protection Act, which will steer New York into a serious road of making a just transition away from fossil fuels.

Lastly, I want to encourage the Attorney General to sue the pants off the supposed "Stable Genius" , and sue the industry flunky Pruitt and stop them in their tracks from ruining our communities and our state. Thank you.

Testimony by Anna Baptista, Professor, The New School

Anna Baptista:

I want to thank the co-hosts for giving us this opportunity to weigh in. My name is Ana Baptista and I am a professor here at the new school in the environmental policy and sustainability management program. I'm also a member of the New Jersey Environmental Justice Alliance. I'm from Newark, New Jersey, so this is not just an opportunity for New Yorkers, for many people in the region to weigh in and have an opportunity to respond to the EPA's repeal.

It is vital to allow the voices of the people to be heard on this critical matter. The manner and intent of the EUS EPAs repeal of the clean power plan is unacceptable. This rule was the product of years of public input and review. It was a fundamental effort to begin the process of mitigating climate change. The EPA has a moral, ethical and legal obligation to mitigate climate change. If you examine the agency's mission statement, which is still online, it clearly states that the mission of the EPA is to protect human health and the

environment. It goes on to explain on that same website that this includes looking at national efforts to reduce environmental risk based on scientific information.

So this repeal is reckless, undemocratic and directly contradicts the best available science about climate change. The reality is that this proposal put forth by the EPA is not just another bureaucratic policy maneuver, the repeal of this significant climate mitigation rule will have dire consequences for us locally and globally. The threats of climate change no longer just threats, they are already being felt in devastating ways at home and abroad. They are being born by the most vulnerable and least responsible among us in society.

Communities of color, low income communities, indigenous communities, poor and marginalized people across the world are on the front lines of this ever expanding climate disaster. The clean power plan rule was not a perfect rule, but it was not insignificant. It was because this rule was so potentially impactful that environmental justice activists and scholars called on the EPA to go further and deepen the potential lifesaving impacts of reducing carbon emissions and co-pollutants.

Last year, the new school released three white papers with leading environmental justice scholars and we hosted several webinars detailing the environmental justice implications of this rule. And the ways it could go further to strengthen and improve outcomes for the communities most impacted by climate change and pollution. This repeal goes in the opposite direction, moving our country further from a just and realistic transition away from fossil fuels. The manner in which this repeal is being conducted also reflects the value that this administration places on the will of the people and the responsibility to public, open and accountable processes.

I teach environmental justice and sustainability to graduate students, and this is a great case study and a reminder that issues as important as climate justice cannot be delayed or stymied. They require engagement with the issue in multiple fronts, many scales, utilizing all of our resources. I not only oppose the appeal of this rule, I repudiate the manner in which the repeal is being conducted, and the underlying intent to disenfranchise the public, and derail the hopes for coordinated federal action on climate change it is their duty and their purpose.

Testimony by Genovive Gunther, Faculty, The New School

Genovive G.: Hi, my name is Genovive Gunther and I am a part time faculty member in the literary studies department at the new school and affiliate faculty with the Tishman Environment and Design Center. But today I'm not going to testify in my role as an academic or a writer, but in my role as a mother. I'm going to address myself to Scott [Pruitt] directly. Mr. Pruitt, I speak to you today on behalf of my eight year old son and on behalf of all of New York States children. These children deserve a habitual planet. America must not repeal but enforce the Clean Power Plan.

America must go all the way to powering our economy on 100% renewables. In order to have a 66%, just slightly better than 50/50 chance to halt global warming at two degrees Celsius, cumulative global emissions must remain below 800 gigatons of CO2. That carbon budget gives us less than 20 years until all greenhouse gas emissions must cease. If we

continue to emit greenhouse gases at our current rate, we will warm our climate between 3 and 4.5 degrees Celsius over my son's lifetime.

Mr. Pruitt, you like to repeat the misleading talking point that we cannot measure our effect on the climate with precision. But here's what you never say, we do not need anymore precision than we already know to enjoy to know that warming our world, even just three degrees Celsius will kill people. The glaciers that supply drinking water for millions are already melting. Where are these people going to get fresh water?

The oceans next to which billions of peoples live are already rising. Where are these people going to go? A recent study demonstrated that American farmers will no longer be able to grow corn in the Midwest once temperatures rise four degrees Celsius. What are we going to eat? What about the eastern hurricanes and floods, the western droughts and wildfires? The northern cold snaps, the southern heat waves that will bring untold devastation to families that my son's generation may well want to raise and protect.

Mr. Pruitt it does not have to be this way. We have a choice. We have a choice between destruction and death on the one hand or the transition to clean power on the other. So let us choose life. Do not repeal the Clean Power Plan. Instead create millions of jobs in a new global industry, lower the cost of public health and safety, and invest in our future so that my son and his beautiful friends, and really all beautiful children everywhere can live safely on the only planet that sustains their life. Thank you.

Testimony by Stephano Coulius, Transportation Planner, National Parks Conversation Association

Stephano C.: The National Parks Conservation Association is the national advocate for all national parks across the country. Since 1919 the National Parks Conservation Association has worked to protect and preserve our nations natural, historic and cultural resources for future generations. In the northeast the National Parks Conservation Association is the advocate for 49 sites including the 10 national parks that are located within New York City.

My name is Stephano [Coulius] and I work as a transportation planner with the National Parks Conversation Association in our northeast office based here in New York City. I'm here today with my colleague Tatiana [Orlove], senior program manager. We're here today to express our concerns about the proposed repeal of the Clean Power Plan. We do not support this move by the EPA to do away with the very law that would help clean up some of nations worst polluters that are driving climate change. Coal fired power plants. National parks and millions of people around the country have already experienced the damaging impacts of climate change, creating dangerous situations for communities, public health, nature and wildlife.

Climate change creates enormous challenges for national parks, amplifying extreme unpredictable weather, like stronger storms, longer droughts, hotter temperatures, and uncontrollable wildfires. Rising water levels threaten history of parks, such as the Harriet Tubman Underground Railroad National Monument. 25,000 acres honoring the bravery of someone who risked her life to bring enslaved Americans to freedom. The Statue of Liberty on Ellis Island which welcomed over 14 million immigrants to this country and are a foundation to our history.

Sea level rises also rapidly eroding coast lines and threatening the health and well-being of coastal national parks, like Jamaica Bay National Wildlife Refuge. In October of 2012 over 50 national park sites were significantly affected by the unusually powerful hurricane Sandy that hit the region. Parks like [inaudible] Fire Island National Seashore and the Gateway National Recreation Area were particularly hard hit by extreme flooding. The administrations move to repeal to appeal the Clean Power Plan counters existing law and is being carried out in ways that prevent adequate public input.

We applaud New York State Attorney General Eric Schneiderman for holding this hearing and giving us the opportunity to make our voices heard. We also want to recognize the leadership of the mayor's office and councilman [inaudible] and thank the Department of Environmental Conservation as well.

Testimony by Christopher Collins, Executive Director, Solar One

Christopher: Good afternoon. I'd like to thank the attorney general's office, the mayor's office, the governor's office and chairman Constantinides office as well, and the new school. My name is Christopher Collins. I'm the executive director of Solar One, an environmental education non-profit based in New York City. Solar One's mission is to rely education and resources that creates sustainable and resilient urban environments.

We educate teachers and students in more than 600 New York City public schools, train workers for careers in energy efficiency and building operations and maintenance and facilitate clean energy projects in New York City's underserved markets. I'm here today to voice my organization's strong opposition to the EPA's proposed repeal of carbon pollution emission guidelines for existing stationary sources, electric utility generating units.

Electric power plants are the single largest source of emitted carbon dioxide, nitrous oxide and other pollutants that are known to be harmful to humans and the environment on which we depend. By regulating this dangerous pollution, the clean power plan will accelerate our transition to clean energy sources, such as solar energy and wind, a transition that promises to create economic opportunity and high quality local installation jobs that can't be outsourced.

The EPA's own research found that the climate and health benefits of adopting the clean power plan would be anywhere from 26 to 45 billion dollars greater than the cost of compliance, a significant economic benefit that our society can't afford to pass up. Most importantly, the EPA found that implementing the clean power plan would prevent 3600 premature deaths, 1700 tax, and 90,000 asthma attacks each year.

As a society, we simply can't afford to wait. Lives are on the line and we strongly encourage you to act in the interest of the American public by standing by the clean power plan. Thank you.

Testimony by John Ingram, 350 NYC

John Ingram: My name is John Ingram. I'm with the climate activist group 350 NYC. Attorney General Schneiderman's hearing today on Governor Cuomo and Mayor de Blasio's move to divest pension funds from fossil fuels are positive signs that New York is willing to face the

future and become a leader in a rapidly changing world. To diminish the disruption of global warming, the U.S. needs to transform its energy economy in the next decade.

If we undertake this transition now, we may simultaneously address parallel changes that are dividing our society. New York, New York, our global city and provincial state our a microcosm of a broader division that is advancing in other regions. I paraphrase from a recent co-op [inaudible] in the Times, by Emily Badger, titles, "What happens when the richest U.S. cities turn into the world?"

The more global, quote, the more globally connected a city, the more prosperous it is. As these cities gain global ties, they may also be shutting local ones, where their interland communities that have lost their roles in the modern economy, or lost their jobs to other countries. The economic basis shifted in a way that favors big cities. Because it is focused in knowledge and idea exchange and on a glomeration.

Because [inaudible] if incentivized, this work can connect and educate New Yorkers from City, State, and region with the economy of our transformative future. Trump's backward looking administration is desperately trying to revive the fossil fuel industry and its dead end jobs. It won't work. Trashing the clean power plant is foolish and demoralizing. Reviving offshore drilling is bad business and destructive.

Gas investment is destructive and unnecessary as a bridge to renewables. The price of renewable energy is already lower than fossil fuels in many places and continues to plummet. Storage technologies are rapidly advancing to address the pressure of renewable energy sources on the grid. The market is bigger and stronger than Trump's impulsive reactions.

The administration's weakening of our country's technological and economic position in this inevitable, but highly competitive transition hurts us all. For New York to sustain the guidelines of Obama's clean power plan is not enough. The clean power plan was an easy reach for New York State, especially in its alliance with the regional greenhouse gas initiative. We need to set a higher standard to restore a realistic path to climate's ability and demonstrate for the rest of the county how the new economy can revitalize our region.

The proposal for amending state bills, A 5105, and S 5908, to meet 100 percent renewable energy by 2030 may seem impossible now, but if we commit ourselves to this reality based challenge, it is likely that the exponential growth that comes with disruptive and new technologies will kick in to get us there.

As Nicholas Kristoff reminded us in the Sunday Times, "The state of the world on many important measures is better than ever, but as a species, we need some highly visible winds in the next few years to reduce climate change to a tolerable level, or lose the future for our offspring." The clean power plan should remain. New York should transcend it, whether it remains or not. Thank you.

Testimony by Patrick Houston, New York Communities for Change

Patrick: Good afternoon. My name is Patrick Houston. I'm here on behalf of New York communities for change. Today I'm here on behalf of one of our members Rachel Rivera.

She's been a member there longer than I've been one of the employees there. She wasn't able to make it today because of a family emergency, but I'm going to share her testimony.

Testimony by Rachel Rivera, New York Communities for Change

Rachel R. Thank you for this opportunity. Thank you, Attorney General Schneiderman and the mayor's office for holding this hearing. My name is Rachel Rivera. I'm a board member with New York Communities for change. I'm also a Sandy survivor. While we have many experts testifying today that we appreciate, we also want to put some focus on the results of climate change on people like me. Ordinary New Yorkers.

Before I get into that, I want to say to Attorney General Schneiderman, your willingness to stand up to Trump to enforce our laws, to help people, is deeply appreciated. Your fight to hold Exxon accountable is pathbreaking. Your support for a corporate polluter fee, which would make polluters pay for the common pollution they currently dump into our air for free, also sets the pace for a progressive governance to fight the climate crisis.

I'm a mom with a family. During Sandy, I heard a crackling noise from my ceiling. I got very worried and grabbed my smallest child from her bed. Immediately after that, the roof came down on her bed. We ran out into the night with just about nothing. From there, we went into the shelter system, which you know can be a very real struggle. We lost everything, including our pets.

I'm a pretty strong adult, so I can handle that situation. My daughter is just a child. She still has nightmares about Sandy and gets scared when it rains and thunders. I'm also Puerto Rican. So, don't I just have the best of luck when it comes to hurricanes? In all seriousness, it's hard to talk about. My family in Puerto Rico includes my mother and other close relatives. Their houses were all flooded. A close family friend died in the storm. Over 100 days later, as hedge funds and Wall Street raped and pillaged the island, Puerto Rico was still without power.

The Federal Government, lead by Trump, is handling the situation even worse than Katrina. I'm not the only NYCC member hit by Sandy, or hurricanes, of course. These disasters are especially hard, because we do not have the money and the power. It's a lot harder to get back on your feet when you're living paycheck to paycheck and face discrimination.

Climate change an inequality are deeply intertwined as problems, both locally and globally. As bad as they are, these recent hurricanes are only a bitter poor taste of what's to come if we don't rapidly slash climate pollution. We only have a few days left to cut pollution fast enough to add any real hope in holding heating below two degrees Celsius. We need to act fast now at the federal, state, and local level. I'm very glad to see your fight, General Schneiderman, against the repeal of the clean power plan.

While the plan does not lead to deep enough pollution cuts alone, it's still vital to put in place, because it would force pollution reductions from many States, often red states, that are not acting anywhere fast enough. That's not to say that New York is doing enough. Far from it. Let me say this clearly to Attorney General Schneiderman, you are

leading the rest of the State, lead by Governor Cuomo, needs to step up. We appreciate your work, however.

On the city level, energy use in buildings I'll be happy to share more of it after this. Again, my name is Patrick Houston, with New York Communities for Change. I can also have you get in touch with Rachel Rivera.

So, finally, she concludes, sadly, the mayor and council member Constantinides proposals for the buildings plans fall far short of what is realistically needed to meet our climate goals. They do not cut pollution fast enough or deep enough. We need much stronger requirements for buildings. That's the climate works for all plan, which we support. It would create good jobs to solve the climate crisis, while protecting affordable housing.

I can tell you first hand what the future of far more extreme weather looks like. We cannot allow this city to be flooded away. Thank you for fighting for the repeal of the power plan. Together, we can solve this.

Testimony by representative from NYU Institute for Policy Integrity

IPI Rep:

Good afternoon. Can you hear me. Sorry. Good afternoon. I thank you to the offices of Attorney General Schneiderman, Mayor de Blasio, thank you to the News School for hosting. I'm speaking today on behalf of the Institute for Policy Integrity at NYU School of Law. We are a nonpartisan think tank dedicated to improving the quality of government decision making through advocacy and scholarship in administrative law, economics, and public policy. We've conducted extensive analysis of the Clean Power Plan, and you can find a lot of materials on our website, its policyintegrity.org. So I'm going to really briefly run through some of our main points relevant to the repeal.

First and most importantly the Clean Power Plan delivers enormous net benefits to the public. The agencies original analysis of the rules showed that it would regenerate between 32 and 54 billion dollars in annual health and environmental benefits, compared to between 5.1 and 8.4 billion in annual compliance cost industry. Recent analyses, which are actually compiled in a new policy integrity report show that the compliance costs would now, in fact, be far lower due to electricity sector trends. Repealing the rule would only benefit a small group of companies, leaving Americans to pay the price for dirtier air and dangerous impacts from a changing climate.

Second, as we argued when the rule was first under attack, the approach taken by EPA and originally promulgating the rule was legal and steeped in bipartisan precedent. The original rule was consistent with decades of Clean Air act practices under both parties despite Administrator Pruitt's claims of illegality.

Third, the public should be concerned about current administration's efforts to repeal the Clean Power Plan have not been conducted in good faith. EPA relies on the disingenuous and faulty analyses in order to make the repeal appear cost benefit justified. The analysis accompanying the proposal claims that the repeal will save the electric power producers up to 33 billion annually by 2030. In 2015, just two years ago, EPA estimated that the emissions rules could be achieved at less than 1/5 of that price. Additionally, the means by which the administration is seeking to dismantle this critical climate policy follows a pattern of questionable deregulatory tactics. Several similar attempts by the

administration of roll back rules that benefit the public have gone to courts, only for the Administration's actions to be overturned.

Fourth and finally, EPA is currently seeking comments on a replacement rule, but it's favored approach for new regulation would doubtlessly prioritize reducing costs industry over improving public welfare. We stress that an inside the fence approach to regulating power plants would likely result in increased greenhouse gas emissions and other air pollutants, increasing damages to both climate and the public health. Such a policy will certainly not represent the best systems of emission reduction called for in the statute, and would do an injustice to both the intent of the original rule and to the American people. Thank you.

Testimony by Judith Weis, Professor of Marine Biology at Rutgers University, Alliance of Nurses for Healthy Environment

Judith Weis: Thank you and thank you for having this hearing. My name is Judith Weis. I'm a professor of Merida of marine biology at Rutgers University. I'm I think the first one to talk on behalf the 70% of the planet, that is the ocean that is severely impacted by climate change. I have a number of points to make.

Firstly, the ocean absorbs most of the heat that's released, which is good for us, but the ocean is warming faster than the air, and the warmer waters cause, in some cases, disastrous results. You've probably read about the bleaching of the Great Barrier Reef, coral reefs all over the world are in great danger of surviving because the bleaching involves a sort of departure of little algae that live inside corals that photosynthesize and create most of the food for the coral. When it gets too hot, they're expelled, and when, they may recover but if bleaching events, high temperature events happen too often and too close together, the corals die. And that's what's happened in a huge portion of the Great Barrier Reef.

Another effect of the rising temperatures is that animals are moving north. We used to have lobsters in Long Island Sound. Lobsters are pretty much gone from Long Island Sound. They're found further north in northern Maine and Canada. As the temperature warms up they're moving north and that's just one example.

Thirdly, sea level rise. We've had a lot of people talking about effects of sea level rise on human communities. I want to talk about the effect on a natural community that lives at the edge of the water, namely salt marshes. Salt marshes act as a protective buffer for us against waves, and wind surge, and things like that when there are storms. But the marshes are themselves greatly in danger by sea level rise. They have to either rise up to keep up, or move inland. And in an urban area there's certainly nowhere to go inland, you've got roads and houses right there. So salt marshes are in great danger of being basically exterminated by sea level rise.

Another point, on a different issue besides warming, is the issue of carbon dioxide dissolving in the ocean, which again, reduces the amount of warming that we get, but when a lot of the carbon dioxide dissolves in the ocean, about 1/3 of all the carbon dioxide we emit dissolves in the ocean, and that causes the ocean to become more acidic. And the more acidic water is really extremely harmful to animals that make shells, and there are a lot of important marine animals that make shells, many of which are

important commercially for us. Mollusks like clams and oysters, and they're already problems of these animals not being able to make their shells properly. So for all these reasons I'm very worried about the state of the ocean in reference to climate change, and I support the Clean Power Plan as a step in the right direction. Thank you.

Testimony by Adrian Wald, Alliance of Nurses for Healthy Environment

Adrian Wald: Good afternoon. Thank you to the organizers of this hearing and thank you for this opportunity to offer my remarks to the Environmental Protection Agency, expressing my great concern about the dangerous and ill advised proposal to repeal the critical protections of the Clean Power Plan. My name is Doctor Adrian Wald. I'm college nursing professor and public health advocate, as well as a member of the Alliance of Nurses for healthy environment, and a member of the American Public Health Association. The proposed repeal of the Clean Power Plan will put the health of our citizens and our environment in serious danger. While I'm also deeply concerned about the impact of the proposed repeal on our economy, the harmful effects on human health, and especially on health equity are of grave concern to me.

As a nurse scientist and educator I teach future nurses, some are here with me today, how to protect human health and prevent disease. As nurses, we treat patients who suffer from the well known health effects of carbon pollution and climate change, the challenge the change of the Clean Power Plan is designed to address. These health effects from smog and air pollution particularly harm the health of those who are most vulnerable, our elderly patients, young children, and those with cardiac or lung diseases, such as asthma and patients with chronic conditions. The EPA's own protections, as have already been stated here, when fully implemented will greatly protect public health by preventing, on an annual basis, thousands of premature deaths, heart attacks, asthma attacks.

In New York our lower income and other vulnerable communities including black, Latino, Asian, and others will be disproportionately affected by reckless EPA actions like the increasing existing health disparities such as the much higher rates of asthma in lower income and communities of color. The Clean Power Plan is a critically important step in reducing carbon pollution from power plants, taking real action on climate change nationally. It sets strong but realistic standards for power plants, aims to strengthen cleaner, and lower polluting energy technology option with customized goals for each state. The Clean Power Plan demonstrates-has goals for each state. The Clean Power Plan demonstrates the United States' commitment and leadership in addressing global climate change. The plan, by targeting fossil fuel use, takes serious action to address climate change that, as we have witnessed in New York City, has led to record storms like Hurricane Sandy. Nurses were on the front line in hospitals during and after Sandy and witnessed the devastation caused to our patients and communities and the strain put on the healthcare system.

Repealing the Keep Clean Power Plan will be harmful and dangerous. The proposed repeal puts our economy at risk while clean energy creates jobs, prioritizes human health and the health of the environment. I urge the EPA not to repeal or to weaken the Clean Power Plan. Those of us who clearly remember breathing the thick, black soot in the late 1960s and early '70s in New York City prior to the Clean Air Act know that this is not the direction we want to go in. Rather, we must take action to reduce carbon emissions while

prioritizing the health of New Yorkers and all Americans over the interests of the fossil fuel industry and move forward with the Clean Power Plan. Thank you.

Testimony by Catherine McVay Hughes

Catherine M. V.: Good afternoon. Thank you for the opportunity to testify. My name is Catherine McVay Hughes. I served 20 years on Manhattan Community Board 1. More than half of that time is Chair or Vice-Chair. After super storm Sandy, I was appointed to Co-Chair of the New York Rising Community Reconstruction Program for Southern Manhattan. I'm a founding member CB1's Manhattan Task Force and a member of the New York Harbor Regional Storm-Surge Barrier Working Group.

Today I speak as a 30 year downtown resident, proud of what we've built and rebuilt in lower Manhattan, deeply concerned that this investment made by our city, our state, and our entire country is in grave danger from the threats of climate change, extreme weather events, and rising sea levels, and even more so if the Clean Power Plan were to be repealed. A couple quick facts ...

One, 2017 was the costliest year ever for the weather and climate disasters in the United States totaling \$306 billion dollars, of which \$265 were for the three hurricanes.

Two, the National Flood Insurance Program offered by the Federal Emergency Management known as FEMA and its reauthorization are uncertain. Congress passed a third term, short term extension until January 19. We do not know if or how much the Federal Government will assist in rebuilding our community after the next super storm. Sandy, which cost \$19 billion dollars in repairs and some downtown infrastructure is still under repairs such as the Brooklyn-Battery Tunnel.

Three, Moody's, a major credit rating agency recently added climate to credit risks and warned cities to address their climate exposure or face rating downgrades. This will impact New York City because scientific data increasingly points to climate change as a major threat to New York City.

Four, climate change will worsen inequality in our society if underserved communities become uninhabitable. Migration, some planned and some in panic, will stress already overburdened and social welfare systems and infrastructure. The best way to mitigate these effects is to limit the greenhouse gases that are currently causing infrastructure.

Therefore, it is more important than ever for our country and our city to focus on the Paris Climate Agreement of 1.5. I look forward to working with you further on decreasing the use of dirty heating oil in our school buildings and greening our infrastructure.

Two, the city must construct a layer of defensive local sea walls and regional storm surge barriers to address future storm surge barriers. And three, as a large investor and as a hub of the global financial system, the city needs to support the work of the Financial Stability Board's task force on climate related financial disclosures.

I'd like to take one minute just to show you a couple of illustrations. Here's a picture of where the storm surge barrier could be. This graph here is the official sea level rising of possibly 6 feet by 2,100. But most importantly are the two maps in the back. If we do not

meet our goal of 1.5 degrees, you can see a lot of our city will be underwater, and at four it's even worse. I just wanted to point that. Thank you very much.

Testimony by Harriet Shugarman, Executive Director, Climate Mama

Harriet S.: Thank you, gentlemen, and I echo everyone's thanks. I'll be delivering an abridged version of my written statement. My name is Harriet Shugarman, and I am the executive director of Climate Mama, an organization that reaches families in all 50 states and over 100 countries. I am also the Chair of the Climate Reality Project New York City Metro Chapter and an adjunct professor of climate change policy. In addition, and perhaps most importantly, I am the mother of two teenagers who I have raised here in EPA Region 2.

EPA Region 2 represents citizens of New Jersey, New York, Puerto Rico, the US Virgin Islands, and eight tribal nations. Not one hearing held in our region. Shameful and disheartening. Our motto at Climate Mama Tell the truth, actions speak louder than words, and don't be afraid. Sentiments as parents, we all teach our children. We also teach our children early on that if you make a mess you need to clean it up. Our mother earth has shown us in innumerable ways that the mess that we are creating on our planet because of greenhouse gas emissions is not only making her sick, but also creating situations where life for many species including our own is now threatened.

The Trump administration estimated the proposed repeal of the Clean Power Plan would provide up to \$33 billion, although now we hear much less in terms of compliance costs in 2030. Air pollution in the US causes as many as 50,000 deaths per year already and costs as much as \$40 billion a year now in healthcare and lost productivity. I think we can do that math.

According to a report released yesterday by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, the US has sustained 219 weather and climate disasters since 1980, which overall costs reached or exceeded \$1 billion each, with costs exceeding totally over \$ 1.5 trillion. And in 2017 there were 16 events with losses in excess of \$1 billion, resulting in 362 deaths. And as we just heard with costs of over \$306 billion.

Health impacts from climate change have directly hurt my family. My son has developed seasonal asthma. My husband and son have severe poison ivy allergies. My daughter has breathing problems. I have friends with West Nile virus and many with lyme disease. The World Health Organization has told us that air pollution is a carcinogen and perhaps the greatest threat to human health. My husband is an oncologist. He already is too busy.

The Clean Power Plan needs to be updated and strengthened, not dismantled. In hindsight, we now know that including gas, a fossil fuel as an option within the Clean Power Plan was and remains a serious mistake. Science is clearly showing us that gas is a plank leading to a steep cliff and a bridge to nowhere. Fix the Clean Power Plan. Don't dismantle it or repeal it. Carry out the EPA's stated mission to protect human health in the environment. Enact strong carbon pollution standards, global warming, pollution and its impacts are creating immense social economic and moral costs that we are now passing on to our children. Their future and ours depends on what we all do today. Thank you.

Testimony by Christine Clarke, Environmental Director, Action Together New Jersey

Christine C.:

Hello, my name is Christine Clarke. I am the environmental director with Action Together New Jersey. We are 18,000 progressives across the state at atnj.org. Thank you for the opportunity to testify today. As a mother of four, as my son's homeschool teacher, as a director, and as a team lead with Action Together New Jersey ... As one of two members of my household with asthma, as someone concerned with the conditions of the country and the planet my children will inherit, I am here to ask that the EPA keep, support, and improve the Clean Power Plan.

As per the EPA, this first ever United States plan to reduce fossil fuel emissions and to protect clean air, was created after unprecedented outreach to states, tribes, utilities, stakeholders in the public, including more than 4.3 million comments received on the final rule. It is by the nature of its creation a demonstration of democracy at work finding best practices to uphold. The Clean Power Plan is a critical puzzle piece in solving the big picture problem of how to tackle human accelerated climate change. It cuts pollutants that harm public health while encouraging the development of cleaner energy like solar and offshore wind. It supports growth of our economy as the global renewables race demands better technology, forward thinking scientific exploration and the collaborative decision making that helps America thrive.

Wind and solar are the fastest growing employers for a multitude of reasons, and not least among them is the strong public desire to move toward a clean energy future. These renewable options offer a compelling means for states to meet Clean Power Plan goals, which would reduce greenhouse gas emissions 32% below 2005 levels by 20-

The gas emissions 32% below 2005 levels by 2030. My team and my family are behind this movement as well. My son has expressed an interest in pursuing marine biology, and is upset reading about ocean dead zones and the President's offshore drilling ideas, while bills like the Save Our Seas Act of 2017 are stalled in House subcommittees.

And the EPA under Scott Pruitt is considering repealing environmental safeguards like the Clean Power Plan. Our EPA is supposed to protect public health, clean air, lands and waters, and as is the case in present time, transition us forward into reliance on renewable energy with bold leadership and action plotted on behalf of the common good. Considering that scientific consensus establishes the Earth is warming due to human activities, and greenhouse gases are a threat to public health, the Clean Power Plan's actionable goals to reduce those threats must be upheld and improved.

The United States is supposed to be a global innovator and an exemplar in doing the right thing. To forfeit our international leadership on climate action and repeal protective regulations that safeguard the public are not only dangerous to the people and the planet, but show a full abandon of the foundational principles upon which our sense of national identity was established. There is no honor in choosing short-term pollution profit over public health, especially when failure to enthusiastically compete in the booming renewables market globally. Or set and keep good policy practices would jeopardize our longterm economic position as a nation. We must keep the Clean Power Plan and improve it. Thank you for the opportunity to submit testimony.

Testimony by Rabbi Marisa Elana Jame, Congregation Beit Simchat Torah

Rabbi James:

Honored state and city representatives, beloved New Yorkers, I'm Rabbi Marisa Elana James. I am one of three rabbis who serve at Congregation Beit Simchat Torah here in Manhattan. CBST is one of the first and largest synagogues serving LGBTQ people and straight individuals and families. I am here representing our whole congregation, and especially the more than 200 children in our congregation who will suffer most from the effects of climate change if administrator Pruitt and the Trump administration go through with plans to end the EPA's Clean Power Plan.

The Supreme Court has ruled three times that the EPA is legally obligated to protect-

We not only support this plan, but want a more ambitious one. One that cuts more carbon more quickly from the power sector. One that replaces fossil fuels with clean energy. Our community's building, our synagogue, is already powered by 100% renewable energy, and that's the goal we want to achieve for our state, our city, and our nation.

Across the nation, 52 municipalities, six counties, and the state of Hawaii have committed to transitioning to 100% clean power, and New York City, and New York state can absolutely get on board.

At CBST, we've seen what happens when we disregard the impact of fossil fuels on our climate. In Hurricane Sandy, we lost prayer books, ritual objects, part of our archives, and individual members of our community lost much more. We were out of our home in the West Village for more than three months, and we know that we were luckier than many whose lives were devastated by the storm. In this city alone, standee impacted by the impacts of climate change killed 43 of our fellow beloved New Yorkers.

By contrast, there are only benefits to switching to clean energy. Our synagogue's new space has efficient lighting, using 20% less electricity per square foot supplied by clean sources like wind and solar power. Our energy bills are lower, allowing us to spend more money on programs and projects that benefit our community and our city.

Importantly, our commitment to clean energy also helps us meet our religious obligations as Jews. One of the Torah's first commandments is to provide careful stewardship of the world around us, that God created. Our tradition calls upon us to choose life, and to protect life, whether from simple dangers, or from more complex ones, like the pollution pouring from power plant smokestacks.

Our obligations are not only to our own community members, to New Yorkers, to Americans, but to the people and living things in every corner of this Earth, and to the Earth itself. In the description of the creation of the world, in the Book of Genesis, at the end of each day of creation, God looks at the creations of that day and says, "Look how good this is." It is painful to look at the devastating effects of climate change knowing how much work there is to do before we can honestly look and say, "how good this is". But our impact on the Earth and its inhabitants must eventually be for good. This is the holy work we must do.

Our congregation whole-heartedly supports both the state's and city's efforts to protect the Clean Power Plan. But even more, we urge you, and New York's other elected officials to do more. Especially in the face of Pruitt's and the Trump administration's efforts to destroy federal environmental protections and climate goals. Now is the time for New

York's leaders to dream dreams as big as the constituents' dreams. We will be standing here behind you. New Yorkers are known for making things happen, and I have faith that we will. Thank you.

Testimony by Joel Kupferman, New York Environmental Law

Joel Kupferman: Good afternoon. I'm Joel Kupferman from the New York Environmental Law and Justice Program and the Environmental Justice Initiative. We have written, but I'm gonna skip most of that because I feel like I'm back in elementary school, where everyone gave the same country report over and over again. So we basically affirm all those facts, and we just wanna bring one or two others. And also, maybe break from the pack, and try to urge the city, the state, to do more than they have been doing.

It's easy, we're all sitting here yelling at EPA and criticizing them, but it's easy to pick a scapegoat. Through our work, I have to say that we sued the feds, the state, and the city at different times. And it's time that all of us work on this team, and not just place blame on others.

We believe that the CPP is the first and only nationwide power plant carbon emissions reduction program that really works. There's a lot of report about mortality there, but I think the most urgent that just came out from the New England Journal of Medicine, Air Pollution Mortality in the Medicare Population, which analyzed over eight million people, elderly. That there's significant evidence of adverse effects related to exposure to PM 2.5 and ozone at concentrations below current national standards. Every time we're at a court case, the people, the polluters or whatever, and even the city, the state, approve something saying it's below those national levels. But all these studies have shown that it even affects people there, so that's the word to the state and the city. The most pronounced were among self-identified racial minorities and people with low income. Among black persons, the effect estimate from PM 2.5 was three times as high as that for overall population. So we have to start averaging all those figures and effects that are out there.

One minute to go, okay.

But would could the New York City mayor and the city council, New York state, do? Here's my recommendations. Do not let unfettered buildings take place in flood zones. Do not weaken FEMA's flood zone mapping. Yesterday's Times, they talked about FEMA wanted to map Canarsie and all the shorelines, and New York City is fighting to make it less, to basically close their eyes that their flooding's existing. Don't do that anymore. Do not weaken environmental reviews. Do not let city council rubber stamp projects that are out there. There's a lot of objections by all these community groups here, it comes to city council, and they basically rubber stamp it. Do not do that anymore. Do enforce the Bad Actor Policy. No more contracts or leases for landlords and developers that are violating all these laws, that are polluting, that are causing greenhouse gases, and yet the city gives them a little bit of fines, and then just gives them contracts and whatever. Do advise the New York state DC Health Department and other agencies to increase accountability. The Attorney General's office has two roles. One is to be proactive, but the other is defending the EC and the Department of Health, in many, many cases, they're not doing the right thing. We also wanna mention that we represent the Tetanus Associate of Alfred E. Smith Houses.

Joel Kupferman: Alright. Alfred E. Smith Houses, a \$63 million rebuild due to Hurricane Sandy. The trees are being ruined and threatened, and this is under federal, state, and city supervision. And in 1996, over 700 people died in Chicago from the heatwave, and yet the cities and the state is approving a lot of building, and the threatening of taking away that open spaces and nature housing. So we just recommend that we listen to everyone that was here, whatever, but before we just throw stones at EPA, that the state and the city should do a lot more. Thank you.

Testimony by Terry Glassman

Terry Glassman: I'm Terry Glassman. I'm representing myself. I'm a mom. I'm a nurse. And I'm a citizen. I also did attend recently Al Gore's Climate Reality training. I wouldn't call myself a leader quite yet, but I'm getting there. I have to spend some time and learn everything.

I read article after article, day after day, about the atrocities perpetuated on the Environmental Protection Agency by this administration and Scott Pruitt. I watch in disbelief the people put forth to fill positions, people with no scientific background, bubbling through Senate hearings, incoherently trying to answer simple questions regarding climate change and science.

I have a real concern about the direction the EPA is being taken. I voice my opinions. The frequent refrain is to not get worked up about it. "There's nothing you can do about it." I cannot sit back. I cannot relax about it. There's something that I and everyone else can do about it. Gone are the times when you didn't have to get politically involved and fight because I believe we are at a precipice. We need to speak up and be heard. Isn't that what it's about to be Americans? If that's not, then what is?

We elect politicians to speak for us. Are they listening to us? I'm glad that you are listening to us. Do we really want to throw in the towel and let the chips fall where they may. I don't want to argue with one side or the other. I don't want to be right to prove someone else wrong. I want to be logical, pragmatic, and conscientious about the path we take from here. I'm not a politician, but I am passionate about the earth we live on.

All this political turmoil, this does need to be worked out. We need to come together as a country, as a city, as a community, and we need to end when we do. We need to have a viable planet to live on. We all need to take care of our home. So I take this road. I'll continue to fight for our environment so when we get it all figured out, when we come together and head in a good direction, and we do what's best for the many, not the few, we will still have a healthy planet to move forward on.

It's not about money or winning. It's about survival. We have one earth and one environment. And all the fossil fuel money in the world will be of no use to anyone, if we pollute the earth to the point of no return. And we are approaching this precipice.

Climate change is not a political issue. The climate, the atmosphere, the health of our planet affects each and every person. The World Health Organization announced that air pollution is now the single biggest environmental health risk with approximately seven million deaths linked to indoor and outdoor air pollution. This is more than double previous estimates.

Our atmosphere is not endless. When we pump CO2 and other noxious gases into the atmosphere, it stays there. The earth is a closed system. What happens here, stays here. It's time to respect our limited resources, and take the step to protect them for all generations to come.

The CPP was designed to hasten state utilities' adoption of renewable energy, improve air quality and public health across the nation, and ensure that the United States meets its commitment to the Paris Climate Accord. I oppose the repeal of the CPP presented by the administrator of the EPA, Scott Pruitt. The Environmental Protection Agency's ... I'm sorry. The Environment Agency's mission is to protect human and environmental health. The CPP is in accordance with this mission. Regardless of our political ideology, we all share the same earth and the same atmosphere. Let's protect our greatest asset.

So I send this out there, my little voice striving to be heard. Those of you who have the political voice, protect us. I submit this with a petition I wrote, that had about 600 signatures, to the EPA.

Thank you for your time.

Testimony by Heather Leibowitz, Director, Environment New York

Heather L: Hi. My name is Heather Leibowitz. I'm the Director of Environment New York. And I just wanted to say thank you to the Attorney General's office, Mayor de Blasio, the DEC, and everyone else involved. And I'm happy to have the opportunity to provide testimony today. I'm here to speak out in opposition to any attempt to repeal and weaken the Clean Power Plan.

As if it wasn't already clear, 2017 provided much more evidence that we are changing our planet in dangerous ways. The average temperature across the U.S. was 2.6 degrees warmer than normal, making it one of the three warmest years in U.S. history. Fires raged across the western states, with more than a million acres burning in Montana, while in California, wildfires burned into the usually calm month of December.

These signs are a planetwide fire alarm, warning us that we are burning way too much coal, oil, and gas. We know that major reductions in global warm occlusion are urgently necessary, and that we must stop putting carbon into our air, and repower our society with clean, renewable energy.

However, the Trump administration is pouring more fuel on the fire of climate change instead of trying to put them out. The administration is working to dismantle the Clean Power Plan, the first and only federal limit on global warm occlusion from power plants that protects public health, promotes climate change solutions, and encourages investment in clean energy.

If fully implemented, the Clean Power Plan would reduce U.S. power plant emissions 32 percent by 2030, with huge corresponding health and environmental benefits. By 2030, it would prevent as many as 4,500 premature deaths each year, along with 90,000 asthma attacks, and 300,000 missed work and school days. Repealing the Clean Power Plan would mean more sick kids, more expensive hospital visits, and thousands of premature deaths

that would have been prevented, and could lead to more intense and destructive severe weather events.

The Clean Power Plan would also accelerate the transition to clean energy that is already underway. Here in New York, our state has really been the leader to cut power plant pollution, as part of an innovative and successful Regional Greenhouse Gas Initiative, along with eight other states in the mid-Atlantic and Northeast. But this program, by itself, is not enough to stop catastrophic climate change. We've seen states, cities, and businesses across the country moving forward with clean energy solutions that reduce air and carbon pollution, and grow the clean energy economy.

In contrast, EPA administrator Scott Pruitt, and others in the Trump administration, are attempting to take us backwards by repealing the Clean Power Plan, with limited public engagement and transparency. This is truly ridiculous. The Clean Power Plan didn't come out of thin air. EPA conducted extensive public outreach and solicited stakeholder feedback from every corner of the country. It is based on the strong legal foundation, consistent with the law, earlier court precedent, and other EPA standards that protect America from dangerous pollution. American's have sent more than eight million comments to EPA in support of standards limiting carbon pollution from new and existing power plants, that more than ever have been received by the agency.

And in conclusion, dismantling the Clean Power Plan poses grave risks to citizens and communities across New York and the United States. Climate deniers and fossil fuel lobbyists have freedom of speech in this country. However, they do not have the right to yell fire in a movie theater, and they do not have the right to endanger our children's lives. Ignoring air pollution won't make our country great for kids with asthma or older Americans who are struggling to breathe. Ignoring climate change won't make American families safe from storms powered by oceans that was rising and growing warmer, or wildfires fueled by hotter temperatures.

When it comes to global warming, President Trump needs to accept the science, recognize the reality, and put the health and well-being of Americans first.

Thank you.

Testimony by Stephen Altobelli, American Thoracic Society

Stephen A: Good afternoon. My name is Stephen Altobelli. I'm on the staff of the American Thoracic Society. I would first like to thank you all for convening this hearing this afternoon. The ATS is a medical professional society of more than 16,000 physicians, scientists, and allied health professionals dedicated to the prevention, detection, treatment, cure, and research of respiratory disease, critical illness, and sleep disordered breathing. Think of our members as the lung doctors. Our members are deeply concerned about the reality of climate change, and the real and negative impact global climate change will have on our patients, our community, and the world at large.

First off, let's start with what should be obvious. Climate change is real and it's driven primarily by human activity. The science documenting the reality of climate change is clear, consistent, comprehensive, and compelling. The many reports of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change and the U.S. National Climate Assessment

collate and summarize the wealth of scientific literature that documents the reality of climate change.

In short, human activity, particularly our energy use, is literally changing the global environment for everyone. These changes, if left unaddressed, will have adverse global consequences for generations to come. Climate change harms human health in multiple ways.

First, heat waves are predicted to worsen. Extreme heat increases mortality, especially in the elderly and those with chronic disease, and increases hospitalization for respiratory and other causes.

Second, climate change worsens air pollution. High temperatures result in higher levels of ozone pollution, which worsens asthma, and it increases higher levels of ozone pollution, which worsens asthma and increases risk of respiratory hospitalization and mortality.

Third: Climate change lengthens the pollen season and raises pollen production, which may help explain an increasing prevalence of allergy in the U.S.

Fourth: Mold exposure is increasing due to more frequent hurricanes, heavy rainfall, and flooding. This can trigger asthma attacks and worsen other chronic lung conditions.

Fifth: Wildfires release a range of pollutants, including particulate matter and acrolein, which is a respiratory irritant, and carcinogens such as formaldehyde and benzene. Breathing wildfire smoke increases the risk of respiratory and cardiovascular emergency room visits and hospitalizations.

As you can see, associated health effects are happening now, and our members are seeing it. In a 2015 survey, 77% of U.S. ATS members noted worsening of chronic lung disease as a consequence of climate change. These are our health effects our docs are seeing every day, and they're getting worse.

In response, the U.S. has been advocating for years for vigorous policy action on climate change. We have conducted a number of hearings in Congress. We've testified before the Congress and the EPA. We've filed amicus briefs in federal court. We're disappointed in the Trump administration's decision to repeal the Clean Power Plan, and we strongly urge the administration to reconsider its decision. And thank you for your time here. I have a longer statement that we've submitted. Thank you.

Testimony by Nancy Vann, Executive Director, Safe Energy Rights Group

Nancy Vann: Hi, my name is Nancy Vann. First I'd like to thank Attorney General Schneiderman for convening this panel, so that we all can be heard. I'm a retired Wall Street lawyer, and the president of Safe Energy Rights Group.

When that organization was formed, its main focus was fighting against the installation of 42-inch, high-pressure fracked gas pipeline a little over 100 feet from the critical structures at the Indian Point nuclear power plant. That plant is less than 40 miles up the Hudson River from where we're sitting right now.

We considered a lot of names for our group Stop the Pipeline, Don't Frack with Our Nukes. But what really wanted was safe energy. So we went with that. No health risks. No explosions. No killing our planet.

I think if we ask everyone in this room ... Well, maybe not quite everyone, if Scott Pruitt's still here, what you really want from our energy future, safe energy would be the answer most would give. The number one answer.

So what we're here to discuss is not our goal, but which energy path is least risky, and what's the best way to get it implemented. The Trump path to climate change denial is by far the worst. A 9.5 on a 10 point scale of most horrible. I'd give it a full 10, except that every time we think things can't get any worse, they do.

We other human beings can consider a number of choices for where to put our hopes and our money, and those seem to be one and the same thing these days. There are truly clean energy wind, solar, existing hydro, wave, geothermal, and the often overlooked efficiency. Some of those may seem expensive now, but will yield economies later that will more than make up for the cost.

Then there's nuclear. As a matter of full disclosure, I live about five miles from the Indian Point plant, so I'm considered a front-line resident. Not a lot of consolation for the very serious cancer I developed seven years after moving there.

But a pipeline rupture there would likely have a blast radius of about 4,000 feet, completely engulfing the plant. And the immediate radioactive emissions would be predicted to cover a 50 mile radius. Remember how far I said we were from Indian Point? 40 miles. Feel any safer now?

Of course, there's an array of fossil fuels. The difference between coal, oil, and gas can be debated, but even skeptics concede that methane, or natural gas, remains the most in the atmosphere at least 12 years, and during that time, it's more than 80 times worse than CO2 as a greenhouse gas. The fact is, methane is worse than either coal or oil in the relevant future of 12 years.

In 12 years, we'll arrive at 2030, the target date for the implementation of the Clean Power Plan. A plan which seeks to curtail CO2 emissions, but does nothing to address the far more dangerous methane emissions until Building Block Three. In the meantime, billions of dollars are being spent on infrastructure to enable us to produce even more methane in 2019, 2020, 2021, and so on.

2029 methane will hang around until 2041. Those molecules will be mocking us for decades if efforts are not made to stop them now. We need to not repeal the Clean Power Plan. We need to replace it with a Safe Power Plan that actually includes all of the threats to our environment. And we shouldn't even have to debate whether it will be repealed. We should be fighting tooth and nail to make it better. Thank you very much.

Testimony by Kevin Cawley, Executive Director, Thomas Berry Forum for Ecological Dialogue at Iona College

Kevin Cawley: Thank you. I'm having trouble guessing the headcount in the room now, but I want to say thank you to everybody who stayed with us for the day, and the afternoon, and also the

panel. My name is Kevin Cawley, I'm an executive director of the Thomas Berry Forum for Ecological Dialogue at Iona College. I'm also speaking on behalf of the New York Metro Catholic Climate Movement.

I wonder how many in the room were at the march in April? Way back. For care of the earth and climate. There was a sad moment, for me at least. We were walking back from the march. It's over. Everybody's hot and exhausted. And we're passing the EPA building. And you could see what had happened.

People who had been marching with their signs and their banners were leaving them on the steps of the EPA. It looked like one of those very sad shrines you see sometimes at the scene of a tragic accident, when they leave flowers and candles. And it reminded me today, as we're talking about the EPA, there are still people there at the EPA laboring away as best they can, and if we could keep them in mind. There are lots of good folks still trying to do the right thing.

As a Catholic, I lift up Pope Francis's statement in his 2015 encyclical, [Laudato Si']. There's an urgent need to develop policies so that in the next few years, the emission of carbon dioxide and other highly-polluting gasses can be drastically reduced. For example, substituting for fossil fuels and developing sources of renewable energy.

Care for our poor and vulnerable neighbors, and care for creation are integral themes of Catholic social teaching. Climate change poses an undeniable threat to our security, our public health, and economy. Now is the time to support critical climate change safeguards, build a clean energy economy that works for everyone, and protect human life and dignity and all of God's creation.

I support continuation of the CPP. Should the EPA decide to repeal and replace it, then the replacement rule must meet or exceed the CPP's human health protections and carbon reduction goals. Furthermore, the CPP should not be repealed until the replacement rule is operational.

EPA's mission is to protect human health and the environment. CPP repeal without an equal or superior alternative in place would leave a vacuum that harms human health and the environment. As EPA has signaled its intention to repeal the CPP, I urge EPA not to do so. Thank you for your time.

Testimony by Christopher Vichiola, New York Renews

C. Vichiola: My name is Christopher Vichiola, I served as an advisor for the Obama administration. I'm with New York Renews. I am against Mr. Pruitt and other members of the Trump administration to repeal the Clean Power Plan that's in place.

It's a known fact, it's obvious, that toxins destroy your lungs and other parts of your organs. That's just common sense. Obviously, Mr. Trump and Mr. Tillerson are very involved with oil. We've seen oil spills happen, destroying wildlife, and even destroying human beings' lives.

I'm also a member of Black Lives Matters, and I've seen people of color being affected by abuse of powers, as far as with energy. It divides people.

I am very supportive of the Clean Energy Power Plan. I served also with the too, law firm, with the Karen Silkwood case, years ago, against the Kerr-McGee nuclear power plant.

Obviously, I'm gonna be very short and direct with this. Common sense. Toxins destroy human beings. Toxins destroy wildlife. The upper one percent, Mr. Trump and his administration will also be effected as the environment deteriorates. It affects everybody. So, in essence, I do support the Clean Power Plan.

I wanted to thank Attorney Schneider's office, and Mayor de Blasio's office for bringing this together here. Thank you very much.

Testimony by Pramilla Malick, Chair, Protect Orange County

Pramilla Malick: So I'm gonna ask people who are leaving to please stay for the next couple of minutes. Myself and the next speaker represent frontline communities, and I think we deserve to be heard. Because it's time for some truth telling. And please turn your clocks off, thank you.

My name is Pramilla Malick. I'm the Chair of Protect Orange County, an all-volunteer grassroots community organization. I would like to thank Attorney General Schneiderman and Councilman Constantinides for the opportunity to present testimony on this critical matter.

Protect Orange County represents several frontline communities in New York under siege by ever-expanding frac gas infrastructure, due entirely to the extreme extraction economy of fracking embodied in the Clean Power Plan. This hearing has been framed by a false and dangerously politicized narrative, which ignores facts and science. That narrative is that the Clean Power Plan is a bold, progressive initiative to combat climate change, and incentivize investment in renewable energy that is now thwarted by Donald Trump and climate-denying ideologies, who only seek to protect the archaic fossil fuel industry. This is entirely false. The Clean Power Plan will facilitate greater dependence on frac gas. By only regulating CO2 and not methane, it gives new frac gas power plants supremacy over existing coal plants, actually displacing investments in renewable energy.

Grassroots environmental groups disagree with our colleagues in the engeo world on this plan. While they have large institutional donors to answer to, we answer only to impacted citizens and the air, water, and climate stability that we depend on. We oppose the Clean Power Plan based entirely on the science on the impacts that we bear witness to on a daily basis. We are not climate-deniers, nor Trump supporters, but are bold climate activists. We are frac-tivists.

The Clean Power Plan will rapidly precipitate an irreversible climate change, as well as public health catastrophe that will adversely impact New York citizens, both directly and indirectly, due to our close proximity to the frac fields in Pennsylvania, our role as a critical transportation for frac gas, as well as our large annual consumption of energy. New York City is the second largest consumer of power in the world. Wrap your head around that. And if the Clean Power Plan is adopted, it will become entirely dependent on frac gas.

Methane has 86 to 100 times the global warming impact as CO2. And although coal burns cleaner than natural gas, gas leaks methane from wellhead to consumption as a measured rate of 15%. Climate science tells us frac gas is substantially worse than coal, and of course nuclear has no comparative carbon footprint. These estimates are conservative. Living near these facilities, we know they leak methane constantly, because we can smell it.

We consulted with several prominent climate scientists. Howarth, Ingraffea, Hansen and Jacobsen. And none thought the Clean Power Plan was a good idea. Orange County, known for the famed Black Dirt Region of New York, yields an abundance of organic crops due to its rare soil. Just an hour outside of New York City, is it one of the largest suppliers to city farmers' markets. It is also home to many first-responders who risk their lives every day to serve and protect you, New York City. Yet our communities have been designated a sacrifice zone, as a large 650 megawatt frac gas power plant, the CPV Valley Power Plant, is constructed in the middle of a critical environmental area, to serve New York City, approved as a result of bribery. And we're still waiting for your office to investigate it.

And if New York City becomes dependent on this plant, it's game over for the climate. Scientist Anthony Ingraffea says it will increase the state's greenhouse gas emissions from the power sector by in excess of ten percent. Just like that, overnight, if the switch is turned on. And also, he calculated that it would cost us \$900 million a year in healthcare and infrastructure costs.

In Dutchess County, Cricket Valley is being developed, also to serve New York City. Together they will increase greenhouse gas emissions by over 25%. Attorney General Schneiderman, if you really want to prevent catastrophic climate change, you must prosecute these projects. Today, as I speak, children in our community are being poisoned. Pets and farm animals are dying. Families are being displaced from their homes. Farms and forests are being fragmented. And our planet is being cooked faster than science can document. This plan would exponentially expand those impacts, and we will be catapulted out of the proverbial frying pan into the fire.

And yes, there are many environmental justice communities in its path, like the one next to the CPV Valley Power Plant, who were so excluded from the process that they thought a hotel was under construction. And more alarming is that what's happening in the frac fields of Pennsylvania foretells our future, as infant mortality and childhood cancer rates skyrocket, while regulators ignore the high radioactivity of frac gas. As I drove down the FDR the other day, with Indian Point already half closed, I saw gas power plants, Astoria, East River, Ravenswood, pouring toxic, radioactive emissions into the sky. I thought of all the children living near those plants, like under Astoria Gen, in Councilman Constantinides' district, and the silent assault on their bodies.

If you support the Clean Power Plan, that's what you are sentencing all of our children to. It is a dangerous deception. You can't trade poisons and trade victims, and call it an environmental victory. Our children deserve better. And those of you who understand that this Plan facilitates frac gas, it is naïve to think that it can be fixed or improved under this administration. Thank you.

Testimony by Johanna Fallert, Dutchess County Progressive Action Alliance

Johanna Fallert:

Thank you, Pramilla. I'm Johanna Fallert from Poughkeepsie, New York. I'm a member of the Dutchess County Progressive Action Alliance, and I live in a frontline community. I believe the battle to protect the Clean Power Plan is the wrong battle. It's akin to US Attorney General Sessions waging a war against marijuana when we have the largest opioid addiction problem ever. The CPP was created when we thought that natural gas was clean energy and a good substitute for coal plants that emit the greenhouse gas carbon dioxide. Now we know better. We know that the main component of natural gas is methane, the most powerful of greenhouse gases that contribute to global warming. Methane is 86 times more powerful over a 20 year period than carbon dioxide emitted from coal plants, or any other place. The Clean Power Plan is the wrong plan for our times, because it incentivizes the natural gas industry. Natural gas energy accelerates global warming, endangers the planet, and harms our health.

Mr. Schneiderman, you and Governor Cuomo need to put more money, more time, and more effort into ending the fossil fuel industry in New York. Now, not later. We desperately need you to lead us to clean energy.

We desperately need you to lead us to clean energy renewables and energy efficiency in New York State. Under Governor Cuomo, New York is rapidly expanding its gas infrastructure. Methane leaks into the atmosphere when it's fracked out of the earth, when it's transported through the pipelines, and when it's burned at the power plant. The optics are great when the attorney general and governor are suing the Environmental Protection Agency because air pollution from other states is damaging air quality in New York.

The reality, however, is that New York is allowing two more power plants fueled by natural gas to be added to the infrastructure. Hundreds of people spoke out against the Competitive Power Ventures plant in Middletown at a hearing like this, but the governor's representatives expressed his approval. My own congressman in the 18th congressional district, Sean Maloney, is distancing himself from CPV. In Dutchess County, New York's DEC approved the Cricket Valley Gas Line plant. It will be among the largest plants fueled by gas in the Northeast. Congressman Faso, who worked to current greenhouse gap complying with the Paris Agreement.

In conclusion, New York's planet cooking, polluting gas infrastructure is perfectly aligned with the Clean Power Plan and we must redirect the state's focus. Everyone who breathes loses when there is air pollution. In New York in 2016 and 2017, there were nearly 12 and a half million people living within a half mile of gas and oil infrastructure, and almost three million of them were students from day care through college age. 750,000 kids, who are especially vulnerable to pollution, suffered asthma from pollution due to oil and gas ozone smog. A half a million school days were lost due to sickness from oil and gas ozone smog pollution.

Overall, 238 New York counties have elevated cancer risk concerns. This data is well documented by reliable sources that I am happy to provide. The governor and Mr. Schneiderman want to protect us from out-of-state pollution. But who will protect the people of New York from the State of New York? I traveled two and a half hours to New York City to urge Mr. Schneiderman and Cuomo to fight harder to protect all of us here, as

well as the future of our children, by taking action to end fossil fuel dependency now. Thank you.

Testimony by Julie Kleiber, Alliance of Nurses for Healthy Environments

Julie Kleiber: Hello. Thank you for having us here today. My name is Julie Kleiber and I'm a registered oncology nurse. I am here today representing myself, the Alliance of Nurses for Healthy Environments, and most importantly my patients. Repealing or weakening the critical protection of carbon emissions fails to protect all Americans from the harmful health implications of their pollution and climate change. The US Global Change Research Program highlights in their 2016 report the impacts of climate change on human health in the United States, a scientific assessment that the negative health effects we will develop as a result of our lack of protecting carbon emissions includes and is not limited to asthma, lung disease, poor mental health, premature death, cardiac disease, gastrointestinal disease, and vector born diseases such as Lyme disease.

For my oncology patients, many of whom have already weakened immune systems, these health implications are even more dire. It is challenging to tell a patient they can't go out in public, especially in New York City with the close proximity to others for fear of catching a cold or another illness. I can't imagine a world where I have to tell a patient they cannot go outside because the poor air quality will kill them. We are witnessing and will continue to see increases in average temperatures, more extreme weather events and sea level rise, all highlighted today.

After the recently destructive hurricanes and wildfires that occurred across our nation, the real economic and human toll of extreme weather events is evident. Extreme weather damages in 2016 alone is estimated at \$53 billion. During hurricane Sandy, the generators that powered hospitals were flooded to the point the electric grid was shut down and nurses and staff had to carry patients down many flights of stairs, manually supplying them with oxygen and life saving measures.

America is a pioneer in the field of medical research. All the advances of modern science will be negated if we decide to outline our skyscrapers with smog. The leading world's climate scientists are in agreement. We will see more severe and destructive events like this if we do not take measures to transition to clean energy and cut carbon pollution. I support the fundamental solutions that are comprised within the 2015 finalized Clean Power Plan and implore our elected officials and the EPA to set the bar high, lead, and move forwards, not backwards in our efforts to limit carbon emissions that contribute to these devastating global climate impacts. Thank you.

Testimony by Ruth Hardinger, Damascus Citizens for Sustainability

Ruth Hardinger: This talk is a short version of what I have submitted. Ruth Hardinger, that's me, speaking for Damascus Citizens for sustainability, or DCS. New York State Clean Power Plan must include natural gas as a pollutant, and not supposed to be a clean fuel. Beside that the gas is primarily fracked gas causing profound damages where it is mined and processed. It's a leak from some of those sources and from compressor pipelines, et cetera. It's a major sort of climate change, not an energy source to be encouraged in a Clean Power Plan.

Damascus citizens had Gas Safety Inc actually measure gas distribution pipelines leakage in Manhattan City and found out that at least 6% of the volume of gas moving through the system and is likely much higher. There are studies on the DCS website with measurements from 2012 to 2017. Methane is 90 plus percent of natural gas, and methane is 105 times stronger than carbon dioxide in holding heat in the atmosphere during its eight and 12 years short term half life.

In Manhattan, we are standing in a cloud of methane from leaky infrastructure. The gas causes health impacts, including asthma, climate change including sea level rise. As the climate warms, the water around us is swelling and rising and we must pay attention. Damascus Citizens for Sustainability argues that natural gas is not a bridge fuel to less hazardous energy sources, but a grave danger to necessary resources and a cause of global climate change. The process that supplies the gas have profound health and environmental impacts. Gas inevitably leaks on the way from the wells to pipelines to end users. It also migrates through the underground pathways to reach aquifers and the surface.

The previous mayor, Michael Bloomberg, promoted fracked gas, and in his current book writes that when safety and responsibility extract it, it has been a good send for the environment and public health. Because of exemptions to measure protection laws held on the fossil fuel industry, safe and responsible extraction can't and won't happen. The leaks in the system mining, moving, and delivering the gas has been measured and leaks are far exceeded and the level that make the gas even worse than coal. Including gas in Clean Power Plan in any form is going the very wrong way. Thank you very much for the work that you're doing. I really appreciate it.

Testimony by Margaret Perkins, 350 NYC

Margaret P.: My name is Margaret Perkins and I'm a member of the climate group 350 NYC. My testimony is just to make one point about the repeal of the Clean Power Plan. This point is that this repeal is driven by the 26 states that sued the EPA in 2015. The head lawyer in that suit, of course was Pruitt, and this alone should've disqualified him from being nominated to the head of the EPA. The investment of this group of states in the repeal is shown in this chart. You probably can't see it here, but this chart represents the percent of electric power that comes from coal for the states that sued the Clean Power Plan and those that are going to abide by the Clean Power Plan.

The percent of power ... This is power on the grid that comes from coal in these 26 states is still 60%. This is compared to only 23% in the states that are not going to sue against the CPP. And these states also have much more ambitious renewable portfolio standards and a much greater transition to renewable energy. Not surprisingly, these 26 states are a huge drag on our national emissions targets. Although some states have reduced their emissions, and this was detailed for the states. This is nowhere near enough what we are seeing in these 26 states. Very few of them, not all of them, there are a few that have decided to invest in renewables. But the majority have not reduced their emission rates, maybe 1% in the last four or five years.

So there's no way that we're going to reach the ... Okay. There's no way we're going to reach the 26% reduction in emissions agreed upon in the Paris Climate Accords unless these 26 states come under the regulation of a robust Clean Power Plan. And the repeal will further cripple that transition. The CPP has been stuck in the courts for 18 months and the DC district court due to the suit that was filed by the 26 states and funded by Koch brothers and many other powerful energy corporations, Murray and so on. We know them all. And the question that we all have to answer here is What are we going to do about this repeal? It looks like the repeal, by all chances, will probably go through. And what are we going to do for the next three years in terms of these 26 states? Are we going to allow them to pursue their relentless move towards just further and further polluting the atmosphere and causing global warming? Thank you.

Remarks by Michael Myers, Senior Counsel, Environmental Protection Bureau, Attorney General Eric Schneiderman

Michael Myers: All right. Good evening, everyone. I've been told to get the proceeding started so we can go ahead and get the testimony rolling as soon as possible. I want to thank everyone for coming out tonight. I'm Michael Myers. I'm a Senior Counsel in the Environmental Protection Bureau of Attorney General Eric Schneiderman. I'm pleased to be here today on behalf of the Environmental Protection Bureau on this hearing on the proposed repeal of the Clean Power Plan. The Attorney General's office has fought for national limits on carbon pollution from power plants for 15 years. Most recently, we've led a coalition of 18 states and seven cities including New York defending the Clean Power Plan in court.

We're here today or tonight at The New School because EPA under Administrator Pruitt has refused our request and that of many other states to hold a public hearing where our residents who are on the front lines of climate change's increasingly devastating impacts could be heard. Although EPA has apparently declined our invitation to hear your testimony directly, a transcript of today's testimony as well as any written statements will be sent to EPA for its consideration during the rule making. The Clean Power Plan is well-grounded in the science and the law. In my brief remarks today, I wanted to quickly discuss one of the fundamental flaws in EPA's proposed repeal and also make some brief remarks about the importance of the Clean Power Plan.

EPA told the DC Circuit Court last year that no serious effort to address the monumental problem of climate change can succeed without meaningfully limiting power plant CO2 emissions. Yet that is exactly the course EPA now proposes to take in repealing the Clean Power Plan without first replacing it with an equal or better rule. The law is clear. EPA has an obligation under the Clean Air Act to limit carbon pollution from power plants. Replacing something with nothing would violate the statute. That's why Attorney General Schneiderman has promised to sue EPA if they follow through with this repeal. The Clean Power Plan is the first nationwide limit on climate change pollution from existing power plants.

Although the rules requirements are modest, they add up to meaningful reductions. Because all states with fossil-fueled power plants must take steps to cut carbon pollution. We can and must do more to address climate change including expediting a transition to renewable zero carbon sources of energy. The Clean Power Plan can serve as a cornerstone for those efforts. The Clean Power Plan's emission reductions are essential to help stem the increasing harms that all of us, especially our most vulnerable communities face from climate change. For example, we've seen throughout New York more extreme rainfall events in which unprecedented amounts of rain has washed away roads and homes causing loss of life and large scale property damage.

Storm damage is also worsened by sea level rise. This past October in New York, we marked the fifth anniversary of Hurricane Sandy where sea level rise worsened the destruction, the storm caused in our communities including two million people left without power and 43 deaths. The sea level rise increased Sandy's related flooding by 25 square miles resulting in damage to the homes of an additional 80,000 people in the city. It's estimated that the cost of Sandy will likely reach \$40 billion. As our climate warms, it will make it harder for New York to address the pervasive problem of smog, which triggers asthma attacks and even premature deaths.

The science tells us that unless we significantly reduce greenhouse gas emissions now, we could expect even worse harms in the future. Limiting carbon pollution from power plants also results in the reduction of other harmful pollutants such as sulfur dioxide, nitrogen oxides and mercury. That means fewer premature deaths, asthma attacks and lost work days. Indeed, we've seen those benefits as a result of New York's participation in the Regional Greenhouse Gas Initiative. In closing, Attorney General Schneiderman will continue to fight to limit harmful climate change. This includes holding EPA to its legal obligation to require limits on carbon pollution from power plants that endangers New Yorkers.

The Attorney General calls on EPA to abandon its misguided and dangerous efforts to repeal the Clean Power Plan. Thank you. I'm going to ask Assistant Commissioner from DEC, Jared Snyder now to make some remarks.

Remarks by Jared Snyder, Deputy Commissioner, New York Department of Environmental Conservation

Jared Snyder: Good evening, everyone. I'm Jared Snyder. I'm the Deputy Commissioner at the New York Department of Environmental Conservation. We are the agency that would implement the Clean Power Plan in New York State. I'd like to start by thanking New York City and the Attorney General's office for hosting this meeting. I want to thank you all for taking time out of your evenings to come here and provide input in this important process. New York strongly opposes EPA's attempt to roll back federal climate initiatives like the Clean Power Plan. The changing climate imperils all Americans in many ways from the damage caused by rising sea levels and intense storms to drought, extreme heat, the spread of disease factors and alteration of our natural habitat.

Given these profound impacts weakening any national emission reduction programs is misguided and irresponsible. Instead, it is essential that EPA maintain and strengthen existing emission reduction programs in order to continue progress towards the emission reductions that science tells us are needed to reduce the substantial risks to public health and safety, the result from the changing climate. That is what we are doing in New York under Governor Cuomo's leadership. We are building a low carbon electricity system powered by renewable energy and eliminating the use of coal, the highest-emitting fuel. We have already reduced power sector emissions almost 50% since 2005, which is beyond the Clean Power Plan's target for 2030 for the nation.

We have done this while creating jobs, reducing energy bills and providing tremendous public health benefits valued in the billions of dollars. Now, one key program is the Regional Greenhouse Gas Initiative known as RGGI, which is a nine-state regional program that caps and reduces emissions from the power sector. By requiring power plants to buy emission allowances is raised over a billion dollars for investment in clean energy in New York. At Governor Cuomo's direction, we reduced the emission cap in 2014 and have proposed a second round of further cap reductions. Ensuring that by 2030, emissions will be 65% below 2005 levels.

Given that kind of progress, it is inconceivable that the nation cannot achieve the Clean Power Plan's target of 32% reduction, half of what we are achieving in New York. New York's Clean Energy Standard requires a nation leading 50% renewable energy by 2030. We've set a nation leading target of 2400 megawatts of offshore wind power by 2030. Last week, Governor Cuomo announced additional nation-leading initiatives including the

nation's most ambitious goal to support energy storage, which allows carbon-free wind and solar power to be stored for use at peak times, reducing reliance on fossil fuel-fired power plants. Governor Cuomo announced the zero cost solar for all program, which will provide cost saving solar power to 10,000 low income New Yorkers.

All of these initiatives enable us to phase out high-emitting power plants. Only two plants in the state still burn coal. As Governor Cuomo directed DEC, we'll issue regulations this year that will ensure the end of coal burning by 2020. Governor Cuomo directed DEC to establish new limits on high-emitting peaking power plants and include those in RGGI for the first time. As important as New York's climate leadership is, the leadership also shown by the city of New York and the Attorney General's office and the leadership of other states, we are responsible for only a small fraction of US emissions.

That's why we need national action as well. The Clean Power Plan is a common sense initiative that enables residents of all states to follow the lead of New York state and reap the benefits of clean energy initiatives that reduce emissions, create jobs and provide substantial public health benefits. In our view, it should be strengthened, not repealed. Thank you and we look forward to your input.

Remarks by Jainey Bavishi, Director, Mayor's Office of Recovery and Resiliency

Jainey Bavishi: My name is Jainey Bavishi. I'm the Director of the Mayor's Office of Recovery and Resiliency. I just wanted to reiterate my colleagues' thanks for coming out tonight, taking time out of your evening to provide your perspective on this important issue. I am just going to go over the ground rules for tonight. Each person will have three minutes to speak, no more. We have instituted this time limit in order to be able to get through all the comments. There is a timekeeper in the front row who will give you a one minute warning and then let you know when time is up. This hearing is on EPA's proposed repeal of the Clean Power Plan. As such, all testimonies should be directed to the EPA.

At this hearing, we will not be taking any questions. We're only receiving comments on the EPA's proposed repeal of the Clean Power Plan. The hearing will be recorded and transcribed. All transcribed testimony will be submitted to the EPA by January 16th. As a reminder, please also be sure to submit your written comments through the formal EPA channels by the deadline. If you have not registered beforehand and would like to testify, please sign up at the registration desk, which is in the lobby just behind those doors. We will try our best to accommodate everyone. With that, I would like to call up the first panel. Deborah Goldberg from Earthjustice, Andrew Moon from SunFarmer and Kartik Amarnath from New York City Environmental Justice Alliance.

Testimony by Deborah Goldberg, Managing Attorney, Northeast Regional Office, Earthjustice

Deborah G.: Good evening. Is this on? Okay. Good evening. My name is Deborah Goldberg. I'm the Managing Attorney of Earthjustice's Northeast Regional Office located here in Manhattan. I am also a long-time resident of New York. Earthjustice opposes the Environmental Protection Agency's misguided proposal to repeal the Clean Power Plan, our nation's first federal limits on carbon pollution from power plants. New Yorkers know all too well that we need to tackle climate change. Five years ago, Super Storm Sandy inflicted immense damage on eight countries and many US states including this city and region. Sandy was

an unprecedented storm by several measures. Human cause global warming worsened the impact.

The result was \$71.4 billion in damage with 233 fatalities including 158 in the United States. As bad as it was, Sandy is far from the only climate-driven disaster that has forced its way onto the front pages in recent years. Hurricanes, wildfires and flooding all attest that climate disruption is a problem that will not solve itself. The lesson from these calamities is clear. If we are to avoid the worst future impact of climate change, we need to take strong and decisive action now to cut the carbon emissions that are driving our global temperature upward and making extreme weather events the new norm. Doing so necessarily means tackling carbon from power plants. No other stationary sources emit more carbon. Nearly a third of US total comes from power plants.

The Clean Power Plan is a moderate, readily achievable blueprint for making meaningful cuts in those emissions and it must not be repealed. Repeal of the Clean Power Plan would violate not fulfill EPA Administrator Scott Pruitt's claimed intent to go back to basics and return to EPA's core mission. The Clean Air Act, one of our foundational public health and environmental laws requires that EPA develop protections against harm from pollution including harm to weather and climate. After considering the overwhelming evidence, EPA reasonably and responsibly concluded that carbon pollution threatens such harm. For its part, the Supreme Court has three times underscored EPA's obligation to protect against harmful carbon pollution.

Indeed, citing the very Clean Air Act provision on which the Clean Power Plan rests, the court ruled that the act speaks directly to power plant carbon emissions. If the plan is repealed, EPA will abdicate its legal duty under the Clean Air Act and court precedent. Given the destruction and severity of extreme weather events and other climate-related impacts, we simply cannot afford more delay in addressing carbon pollution. Instead of repealing the Clean Power Plan, EPA should defend it vigorously.

Testimony by Andy Moon, CEO, SunFarmer

Andy Moon: Hello. Good evening. My name is Andy Moon. I'll talk really fast because I wasn't planning to speak in just three minutes. I am an entrepreneur and CEO of SunFarmer, which is a solar energy company. I've worked in the American private and nonprofit sectors for the last 12 years. I'm here today to plead with the EPA and the current administration to preserve the 2015 Clean Power Plan. Here's why. First of all, renewable energy, not coal create jobs for the future. Fossil fuels are not the energy source of the future and Americans know that. Two thirds of American support expanding renewable energy over fossil fuels. Coal will not be the employer of the future either.

In 2017, the US coal industry employed about 160,000 people while the US solar industry employed over 373,000 people. The wind industry employed over 100,000 people. Repealing the Clean Power Plan will jeopardize American clean energy jobs, the main engine of job growth for the energy sector. Second, China will crush the United States in capitalizing on the renewable energy business opportunity and will gain political leverage over the US as a world leader on environment. Renewable energy will power the world's future. Chinese businesses have successfully capitalized on the business opportunity. They've done it with significant support from the Chinese government.

China already manufactures two thirds of the world's solar panels and has installed a total of 77 gigawatts of solar, which is nearly double the amount of solar that the United States has. While the US considers doubling down on coal, China's President has pledged to invest US \$360 billion on renewable energy in the next five years. That will create over 13 million new jobs. My work in Asia and Africa through the nonprofit SunFarmer, I increasingly see China exerting its influence. When I visited Ghana earlier this year, all of the local companies were looking to China rather than the US for solar equipment and for financing. A Chinese firm with government financing will build one of the largest solar plants in Nigeria, which is worth nearly US \$500 million. Since World War II, countries around the world have looked to America for leadership.

People want to work with American companies and use American innovations. It simply does not make sense for us to give up our world leadership role and environment to China. It doesn't make financial sense to let China dominate the business opportunity for renewable energy. Third, the Clean Power Plan will have a significant positive financial impact. By the EPA's own analysis, before it was taken off the website, the Clean Power Plan will lead to climate and health benefits worth an estimated 55 to \$93 billion per year in 2030. This includes avoiding 4,600 premature deaths and 145,000 asthma attacks on children each year. This far outweighs the cost of the plan, which is approximately \$8 billion in 2030.

Even if you don't agree with the scientific consensus that we need to take immediate and drastic action to avoid climate related natural disasters, there's a compelling health and economic benefit. Finally to close, change is hard. We need leadership from the government and the EPA. In the short term, there's always winners and losers. In times of these, we need leadership from our government to make sure that people like coal miners have a way to transition to new jobs. As a business person, I strongly believe there'll be many more jobs in clean energy than there will be in coal. Making the transition will be a win-win for all Americans.

As American citizen, entrepreneur and behalf of 1,000 business colleagues, environmental entrepreneurs and nonprofit organization, I strongly request that we preserve the Clean Power Plan as a way of the future. Thank you.

Jainey Bavishi: Before we hear from our third panelist, can everyone hear me? Before we hear from our third panelist, I'd like to just call up the second panel so we can transition smoothly. Elizabeth Stein from the Environmental Defense Fund, Dan Sherrell from New York Renews and Brett Thomason from ALIGN.

Testimony by Kartik Amarnath, New York City Environmental Justice Alliance

Kartik Amarnath: Thank you. My name is Kartik Amarnath. I'm here to testify on behalf of the New York City Environmental Justice Alliance or NYC-EJA for short. NYC-EJA is a nonprofit city-wide alliance linking grassroots organizations from low income neighborhoods and communities of color and their struggle for environmental justice. As champions of environmental justice advocacy, we would like to thank the Attorney General of New York City and The New School for convening this people's hearing on the Clean Power Plan in light of the Trump administration's unwillingness to hold hearings accessible to New Yorkers and stakeholders across the Northeast of the United States. The Environmental and Climate Justice Movement has had deep concerns with the original Clean Power Plan.

These concerns range from an over reliance of schemes similar to cap and trades or recognizing certain types of waste incineration as complying with the emissions reductions goals. The Clean Power Plan's many shortcomings voiced by frontline communities since it was originally proposed are significant. However, we never advocated for a total repeal of the only federal policy that upholds our commitments to the Paris Agreement by requiring greenhouse gas reductions from power plants, one of our country's largest sources of emissions. According to a recent study whose simulations were reviewed by the US Department of Energy's own national laboratories, a repeal of the Clean Power Plan would cause the national economy upwards of \$600 billion and lead to an estimated 120,000 premature deaths.

Since low income communities and communities of color disproportionately live in close proximity to power plants and other polluting infrastructure, these deaths will unjustly be concentrated in the communities that our movement is committed to serving. It is about time that political leadership across the nation accounts for the decades of historic environmental burdens that have disproportionately harmed low income communities and communities of color. Rather than a repeal of the Clean Power Plan, regulations must incorporate aggressive climate goals and insure just transition to a regenerative economy.

While New York state would presumably reach CPT compliance doing part to a changing energy landscape, our participation of the Regional Greenhouse Gas Initiative do in part also to our participation in the Regional Greenhouse Gas Initiative. We must push regressive climate action that reflects the urgency of our collective crisis. To this regard, we would like to convey our gratitude to the Attorney General for supporting the state-wide New York Renews Coalition since its inception and for formally supporting our coalition's innovative polluter fee, which provides a mechanism for our state to achieve a just transition and be a national leader in the fight for climate justice.

While this President's administration would rather give handouts to dirty and dying industries like coal, the New York Renews polluter fee would generate about \$7 billion annually to invest in transitioning to renewable energy, growing New York's economy and uplifting community state-wide. For a quarter century, the New York City Environmental Justice Alliance has fought to support communities and their struggle for environmental justice. No matter the odds, we will continue this fight by advocating for aggressive and equitable climate action at all levels of government. We have taken this precedent to court before and we will continue to challenge the violence of this administration's polluting agenda on all fronts. Thank you.

Testimony by Elizabeth Stein, Environmental Defense Fund

Elizabeth Stein: My name is Elizabeth Stein. I'm a fourth generation New Yorker and an Attorney at Environmental Defense Fund, a nonprofit and non-partisan environmental organization headquartered in New York City with more than 166,000 members and activists in New York. I've lived in Harlem since 2005. Two members of my household suffer from asthma, a condition that can be exacerbated by ozone and particulate matter or pollution. My colleague, EDF Attorney Ben Levitan of Kentucky provided comments in the October 28th, 2017 EPA Public Hearing in Charleston, West Virginia. Like him, I respectfully speak in support of the Clean Power Plan.

In addition to yielding profound public health and environmental benefits for families and communities in all parts of the country and improving the quality of life for millions of Americans, the Clean Power Plan will serve as an economic driver powering the economy into a cleaner energy future that all other major industrialized nations recognize as essential to achieve. We are deeply concerned that EPA's proposing its harmful repeal of this protection without providing Americans across the country an adequate opportunity to present their views. I want to take this opportunity to thank New York Attorney General Eric Schneiderman and New York City Mayor Bill de Blasio for providing this much needed opportunity for public comment concerning the proposed repeal of the Clean Power Plan.

When EPA issued the Clean Power Plan in 2015, they estimated that the plan would create \$52 billion in annual benefits. Subsequent analysis from NYU's Institute for Policy Integrity and also by MJ Bradley conclude the compliance with the Clean Power Plan has become traumatically cheaper as a result of the plummeting cost of clean energy. In late 2017, The Trump administration released the latest climate science special report. Its conclusion is stark. Climate change is accelerating and the risks to America are growing more severe. Here in New York, we are seeing the kinds of events that become more intense and frequent with climate change with increasing frequency. Most notably in the case of Hurricanes Irene and Sandy. Climate change also increases the frequency of extreme winter events including major snowstorms.

Of the six heaviest snowfalls ever recorded in New York City, half have occurred during the lifetime of my oldest child who turns 15 today. Climate change may even contribute to extreme cold weather events of the type we've recently experienced because a warming Arctic may leak in the jet stream allowing polar air to penetrate further south than normal. EPA's proposed repeal of the Clean Power Plan would also harm people's health and communities down wind of highly polluting power plants costing thousands of American lives and increasing the risk of asthma attacks, heart attacks and other harmful health impacts for some of the most vulnerable Americans. New York City is a case on point. We are the only Northeastern city that the American Lung Association has ranked among the most polluted for ozone.

Air pollution from upwind power plants burning coal is a significant contributor to this dubious distinction. A recent study found that 2700 annual premature deaths in the city could be tied to PM and ozone pollution. Thank you for giving me the opportunity to speak today in support of preserving the Clean Power Plan. Again, we urge EPA to retain the Clean Power Plan and to hold more hearings so that more Americans can share their views. Thank you.

Testimony by Brett Thomason, Alliance for A Greater New York

Brett Thomason: Hi, everyone. I'm Brett Thomason. I'm a Climate Organizer with ALIGN, the Alliance for A Greater New York. We're a coalition of environmental justice and labor unions that have come together to address the climate crisis and the ways we can address it here in the City of New York. The EPA's decision to reverse the provisions of the previous administration's Clean Power Plan without any replacement is another example of the Trump administration's willingness to sacrifice the safety, health and well-being of Americans for the short term narrow interest of industry. Repealing without the benefit

of even hearing public testimony further exemplifies this callous disregard that the President and his surrounding administration have for the people they claim to represent.

We want to thank this body for creating a forum where the public's voice can at least be heard. Well not the only solution that the global climate crisis, the Clean Power Plan represents the only offer the federal government has made to address one of the largest sources of pollution in the United States, the emissions that come from fossil fuel burning generation plants. By forcing efficiency upgrades, alternative fuel use or the additional use of renewable energy and the retail electricity sector, projections estimate that if implemented, these regulations would have reduced pollution from power plants by almost 32% below 2005 levels.

The climate benefits from those reductions can't be understated but more important to bear in mind are the thousands of lives lost to asthma attacks, heart attacks and other sickness related to unsafe particulates in the air due to fossil fuel burning in our energy sector. These important regulations would have saved lives, would have saved time lost and billions of dollars in public health expense. In light of the President and Secretary Pruitt's irresponsible repeal of this program, we here in the city and the state of New York need to feel even more urgency around our own policies to address the climate crisis.

Actions such as deploying renewable energy to progressively satisfy a greater share of New York's energy use each year putting limits and fines on the amount that industries can pollute and investing in transportation, energy and efficiency for structural projects across the state are needed now more than ever. This should serve as a reminder and a wake up call to our elected officials. Talk must lead to action. Policies need to be implemented and expanded. New York needs to lead the fight on climate change, showing that it's feasible, affordable and necessary. The time to act is now. The repeal of the Clean Power Plan is a signal that we will get no help from the federal government for the foreseeable future.

The Trump administration is devoted to the protection of profits for a narrow segment of coal producers and their major investors. This comes at the expense of the rest of us. Particularly, the most vulnerable whether it's low income, communities of color living near polluting generation facilities, the sick and aging, most susceptible to health issues or the workers and families in coal country who are going to continue to see no benefits yielded from this repeal. In closing, ALIGN thanks this body for providing this forum to echo what countless New Yorkers believe. Climate change is a persistent worsening threat and we demand bold action in every level of government to address it.

We look forward to working towards solutions that will create clean air and a healthy environment, create thousands of good paying clean energy jobs and bring prosperity for future generations. Thank you for your time.

Jainey Bavishi: Before we hear from our last speaker on this panel, I'd like to announce our next panel. Marcia Annenberg from NYC 350. Jessica Roff from Riverkeeper and Lisa Dicaprio from The Sierra Club. Please be ready to come up as soon as this panel is over.

Testimony by Dan Sherrell, New York Renews Coalition

Dan Sherrell:

Great. Thanks so much. My name is Dan Sherrell and I'm the Campaign Coordinator for the New York Renews Coalition. I want to begin with a wholehearted thanks to the Attorney General's office, to Eric Schneiderman and all his staff for organizing this people's hearing and for hearing our voices even though the federal government chooses to deliberately ignore them. From leading the investigation to Axon, to endorsing a carbon tax for New York state, the Attorney General has shown time and time again that he understands the urgency of the climate crisis and is ready to take the kinds of bold stances that pave new ground in addressing the problem. As a young person looking at a lifetime of increasing temperatures and worsening storms, I'm sincerely grateful for the leadership.

Frankly wish that there are many more elected officials who are willing to take similarly bold stances. I'll keep my comments high level. Clean Power Plan is a critical part of our country's climate and energy policy. By limiting emissions from existing power plants, the Clean Power Plan is a big win for both the environment and public health. If implemented, it would cut 730 million metric tons of carbon pollution from the atmosphere and radically reduce exposure to harmful air pollution, preventing thousands of premature deaths every year. It's also worth noting and being candid about the fact that the Clean Power Plan is not and was never meant to be a silver bullet. If we're taking the scientific consensus seriously, we must de-carbonize our national economy at a faster rate than the CPP alone can accomplish.

In other words, the Clean Power Plan is crucial and it must also be treated as the absolute minimum that states should be doing on climate change. This is what's so insidious about the federal government's systematic dismantling of common sense climate policy is that by ruling back even the bare minimum, they make the status quo seem heroic. We can't let Washington lower the bar. They need to know that as New Yorkers, not only are we going to fulfill our obligations under the Clean Power Plan but we understand we need to go well beyond them to protect our citizens and create thousands of new jobs in renewable energy.

As I mentioned, I'm the coordinator of a broad coalition of labor, environmental and community organizations called New York Renews wherein Buffalo and the Bronx, when Brentwood, all across the state were putting forward a bold vision to get New York to 100% renewables with equity and justice for frontline communities and workers paid for by putting a fee on the corporate oil and gas companies that are polluting our atmosphere. We're extremely grateful for the Attorney General in standing with us on that. While here in New York, we understand we should be holding fossil fuels financially accountable for their damages and using the revenue to usher in a green new deal, the federal government is fighting to unleash those same companies on the public, free of all safeguards and plethora of subsidies.

This would be an attack on the American people and their livelihoods. It's just extremely poor economic decision making. On behalf of the New York Renews Coalition and the 135-member organizations representing hundreds of thousands of New Yorkers, we urge the federal government to switch course, keep the common sense Clean Power Plan in place and build on it from there. Thanks again to the Attorney General for hosting this hearing and we look forward to continuing to fight the Trump rollbacks but not only that, pursue a proactive vision for a truly equitable and sustainable economy. Thank you for your time.

Testimony by Marcia Annenberg, NYC 350

Marcia A.: Hello. I work with 350 New York City as an artist and educator. 30 years ago, Dr. James Hansen, America's leading climate scientist warned Congress that our ecosystems were imperiled from greenhouse gas emissions. 12 years ago, Al Gore warned the American public in this film and being a truth that we get a 10-year window to take action to avoid catastrophic climate change. Was this an exaggeration? Was this the truth? The answer would be yes, the truth. If we look at the temperature records for the past four years, yes. If we look at the regular flooding of Miami during high tide, yes. If we look at the worst forest fires in California's history, yes. If we look at Hurricane Harvey pouring 60 inches of rain on the Houston area, yes.

If we remember that we are standing on the epicenter of Hurricane Sandy in 2012, the water from the Hudson poured into our subways and stopped the furnaces from functioning at NYU's Langone Medical Center. In the public imagination, global warming is affecting a few polar bears looking for food in the Arctic where they applied new shipping lanes connecting Arctic continents. What hasn't the public been told? They haven't been told that the melting glacial ice is changing the pattern of ocean circulation, which changes our climate. They haven't been told that melting prima frost in the Arctic contains both carbon dioxide and methane that will overwhelm the atmosphere with warming gases if the world continues to warm.

They haven't been told that our warming oceans are killing the phytoplankton that supply 70% of the world's oxygen. As we contemplate the Clean Power Plan, the question is not should we repeal it? The question is, does it go far enough to control dangerous emissions or destroying our ecosystems? We didn't ask to be the generation that would determine the fate of our future but without a doubt, it is our generation that has been given this mission. When our grandchildren look back on this time, will they wonder. How did we fail them so profoundly? They'll look back in gratitude that we did everything in our power to protect them? At this point in time, the forces of denial and darkness are in charge of our federal government.

We must work together to bring the light of science into our decisions to protect our children, our grandchildren and the children to come. Thank you so much.

Testimony by Lisa DiCaprio, Atlantic Chapter, Sierra Club

Lisa DiCaprio: My name is Lisa DiCaprio. I am speaking on behalf of The Sierra Club Atlantic Chapter. First, we would like to express our appreciation to Attorney General Eric Schneiderman for leading a coalition of 23 states, counties and cities to defend the Clean Power Plan and for organizing this people's hearing with Council Member Costa Constantinides. The Sierra Club supports the Clean Power Plan as a way to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and facilitate the transition to a new green economy based on renewable forms of energy, on shore and offshore wind, solar power and geothermal. In opposing this plan, the Trump administration denies the science of climate change and erroneously claims that the US economy will benefit from eliminating environmental regulations and increasing our reliance on fossil fuels.

This is not true for these four reasons. One, as has been stated in 2007, the Supreme Court found that carbon dioxide emissions are a pollutant under the Clean Air Act. That

the EPA is required to outline and implement a plan to reduce these emissions. The Clean Power Plan finalized by the EPA in August 2015 allows the states to determine how to achieve emission reduction targets. The main point I think everyone is making is that this is not an option but a requirement for the EPA. Secondly, everyday we see new evidence of how climate change caused by human activity is threatening the habitability of our planet. Not only for humans but also for multiplicity of animal and plant species in what is now being called the sixth great extinction. Three, climate change is now affecting all sectors of the US economy.

As documented in the most recent 2017 National Climate Assessment Report, the increasing causes of climate change are detailed in several recent studies such as the October 2017 recently issued US General Accounting Office. Similarly, Moody's investors service has announced that its credit ratings will now be influenced by how states and municipal governments address and implement measures to ameliorate climate change vulnerabilities, which represent extensive financial risks for investors. The result of not addressing these climate change risks will be a downgrading of their bottom ratings, which means that any kind of loans will be increasingly expensive. This means that even climate denying governors and/or mayors will face the consequences of not addressing climate change.

As it's becoming increasingly clear, the competitive economies of the 21st century will be those that transition in the most rapid and innovative ways, to 40 the new energy paradigm of energy conservation efficiency and renewable forms of energy. Finally, in defending the Clean Power Plan, we're also defending the EPA. As it is obvious that the Trump administration's opposition to this plan is part of the strategy to transform the EPA from an agency to protect the environment to an agency to protect the polluters who are destroying our environment. Thank you.

Jainey Bavishi: I'd like to invite the fourth panel to be ready to come up as soon as we hear from our last speaker. Robert Kafin from the Adirondack Council, Margaret Berry from the Section of Environmental and Energy Law of the New York State Bar Association and Daniele Gerard from Three Parks Independent Democrats.

Testimony by Jessica Roff, Director of Advocacy and Engagement, Riverkeeper

Jessica Roff: Hi. I'm Jessica Roff, the Director of Advocacy and Engagement at Riverkeeper and also fourth generation Brooklynite. Riverkeeper with 60,000 members, volunteers and advocacy partners is a member supporter and watchdog organization whose mission includes safeguarding the environmental recreation on commercial integrity of the waters of the Hudson River including the East River and the waterways of New York City. For 50 years, Riverkeeper has been working with communities, advocates, citizen scientists, businesses and industries along New York City's waterways on a myriad of issues affecting the river, its watershed and communities involved giving us a unique perspective on issues of climate change, energy development and resiliency. We thank you for this opportunity to testify.

Riverkeeper fights everyday for a clean, safe and secure energy future without which our precious drinking water supplies in the iconic Hudson River will never truly be protected. We post all new fossil fuel infrastructure projects that are unnecessary and threaten the climate, the Hudson and the communities where they are located and beyond. Dirty

energy among other things contributes to sea level rise and storm surges both of which directly threaten the Hudson River. We support and promote the enormous opportunities associated with energy efficiency and renewable power and are working to close dangerous and unnecessary energy like the Indian Point Nuclear Power Plant.

This administration's attack on climate protections from rolling back environmental and anti-pollution laws to withdrawing from the Paris Agreement to proposing to repeal the Clean Power Plan is dangerous, short cited and something we're committed to fighting against. While there are some productive goals in this plan, we must also recognize that the CPP is flawed. CPP through its failure to mandate renewables and energy efficiency in Cold Stead is by default still based on an energy system powered through natural gas and neither of these forms of energy are clean, safe or environmentally feasible. Nor are they sustainable or resilient.

To be safe, sustainable and resilient and to protect the Hudson River, which provides drinking water to 100,000 people, millions more in times of drought, to combat the fossil fuel industry's relentless encouragement and the administration's actions, we need to invest in comprehensive, energy efficiency programs throughout the state. Sorry. To make new fossil fuel infrastructure development obsolete. New York independent system operator finds that even after closing the 2000 megawatt Indian Point Nuclear Plant, there'll be only 100 megawatts needed in 2021. Most of which can be met through some generation transmission and energy efficiency. 43 That generation must be provided by environmentally sound renewable energy built with real and transparent community involvement.

There's no other way to cut our emissions and to reach our energy goals. The demand for natural gas continues to decline so steeply that there are threats of "gas apocalypse." Given that every month, there's been a decline over the past since 2016. This will lead to fire cells of plants and the repeated changes of plant ownership means we need strong controls moving forward while we work to make them obsolete. CPP is important because it does limit emissions from coal fired plants and it is important to fighting climate change and protecting communities, water and air. As these policies move us away from coal, CPP makes room for its replacement. The key is it must be paired with legislation and regulations that make those replacements safe, clean, community powered, renewable energy and energy efficiency.

Legislations and regulations are complicated and almost always flawed. CPP does not give us all the answers. It's just a tool. We need to work to make it the most efficient tool that it can be. It puts the power in the hands of the states, which is now exponentially more important. We're counting on the Attorney General as well as the New York state government to do the best work it can to accomplish these goals with or without the Clean Power Plan. We need energy efficiency yesterday. Rhode Island and Massachusetts are already beating us. We need renewable energy in storage developed in conjunction with communities, particularly low income and communities of color and not just promises. This must be New York's priority to protect our water, our communities and the Hudson River. Hopefully, it will be done with the CPP.

Jainey Bavishi: Thank you so much. Thank you.

Robert Kafin: Now, your instructions said five minutes, three minutes.

Jaimey Bavishi: No, three minutes.

Robert Kafin: I changed the rules.

Jaimey Bavishi: Leave a copy of it in here.

Testimony by Robert Kafin, Chairman of the Board, Adirondack Council

Robert Kafin: Thank you to Attorney General Eric Schneiderman and the other government agencies for providing this forum to enable the public to come in on the US EPA's illegal and unreasonable proposal to repeal the regulations known as the Clean Power Plan. My name is Robert Kafin. I am Chairman of the Board of Directors of the Adirondack Council. The council is a privately-funded, not for profit organization dedicated to ensuring the ecological integrity and wild character of New York's environmental Adirondack Park. The Adirondack Park is a six million acre preserve of public and private lands comprising the largest park in the contiguous United States. The park safeguards the largest intact temperate deciduous forest on earth. It contains more than 90% of all of the ancient never logged forest and 90% of the motor-free wilderness in the Northeast.

It is a national treasure. The park's future is endangered by a rapidly warming global climate. Climate change is already showing some of its harmful effects in the park in the form of severe storms, flooding and extreme swings in temperature. Long term climate change threatens the character and vitality of the park. The federal Clean Power Plan was an outstanding opportunity to reduce greenhouse gases across the United States in a fair, effective and affordable manner. Implementation of the plan would also have brought substantial side benefits in terms of reductions and other air pollutants including those that cause acid rain and smog that also harm the Adirondack Park. Congress has been unable to address the challenges of climate change through new comprehensive legislation.

Thus, the US EPA needed to use testing authority under the Clean Air Act to issue regulations to protect public health and the environment from the uncontrolled emissions of greenhouse gases from a variety of sources of air pollution. The Clean Power Plan was part of that effort. The repeal of the Clean Power Plan will leave the United States with no formal program to address the contribution to climate change from large fossil-fueled power plants despite the clear, scientific evidence that climate change is harming to people, communities and natural resources. This harm is especially evident in New York with the effects will be felt from the Sea Coast to the Mile High summit of Mount Marcy on the Adirondack Park.

If it repeals the Clean Power Plan, EPA will be failing to observe its legal obligation to regulate greenhouse gases from electric utility generating units. The United States Supreme Court has already upheld an EPA ruling declaring that greenhouse gas emissions endanger public health. This placed a burden on EPA to enact standards and guidelines for existing sources of air pollution such as mass of fossil-fired power plants that contribute huge quantities of carbon dioxide to the atmosphere. New York has been a leader over the years enforcing the federal government to do things that it didn't want to do under the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990 and its predecessor Clean Air Act.

If EPA repeals the Clean Power Plan, we're repeating the same mistakes made by prior administrations that failed to adhere to the requirements of the Clean Air Act passed by Congress and signed into law by prior presidents. We are sure that Attorney General Eric Schneiderman on behalf of our state will have to sue power plants whose emissions are harming the people, infrastructure and natural resources if EPA does not uphold the Clean Power Plan. Let me close by saying that the Clean Power Plan should not be repealed. To do so would be violating the Clean Air Act. To do so would be a repudiation of sound science. To do so would reflect the failure to use proper economic, analytic tools and underestimate the true cause of carbon dioxide emissions.

To do so would be a blow to the health of millions of Americans. To do so would permit the continued vandalism of the natural resources of the Adirondack Park by unregulated polluters and the unraveling of its winter recreation based economy. I urge the EPA to withdraw its proposal to repeal the Clean Power Plan, to defend it in court and to fully implement it. Thank you.

Testimony by Daniele Gerard, First Vice-President, Three Parks Independent Democrats

Daniele Gerard: My name is Daniele Gerard. I'm first Vice-President of Three Parks Independent Democrats in the Upper West Side political club covering the area roughly from 96th St. to 106th St., from Central Park West to Riverside Drive. I'd like to thank Attorney General Schneiderman, our former state senator for holding these hearings today and for all he is doing to stand up to the current administration's debasement of democracy. Climate change is an emergency. The EPA should act like it. Preserving the Clean Power Plan is a good place to start. At the time, the Clean Power Plan was introduced, Three Parks did not think it went far enough. It was too reliant on the oil and gas industry and too favorable to nuclear power.

As early members of the successful movement to ban fracking in New York state in 2014, Three Parks has adamantly opposed to continued reliance on fossil fuels. As opponents of the continued operation of the Indian Point Nuclear Power Plant in Westchester County, we worked for years to close the reactors. Both of these campaigns involved degenerating thousands of petition signatures and hundreds of calls to our elected officials. In the face of the ignorant and shameless determining United States policy today, the corporate todies, those who utterly ignore science, reason, humanity and the economic and social justice across the board in favor of their corporate masters, the Clean Power Plan represents a commitment to combating climate change, putting people's health get ahead of corporate profits and creating jobs and clean energy.

We should build on it to ramp up wind and solar power production under the provisions for substituting renewable sources for fossil fuel powered generation. Why can't New York build wind turbines for distribution around the United States? Why can't we be the state that does the same for solar panels? Why shouldn't we be the state that sets the standard for conservation measures, which can save 20% of the energy we use? We can do this under the Clean Power Plan. We still can if Attorney General Schneiderman and those he's working with continue to fight back to do the job that the federal government was designed to do. Republicans are rolling back environmental regulations as fast as they can.

We have to stop their momentum in every possible way. We can all be part of standing up to the thoughtless and selfish who are causing severe harm to our country everyday they remain in power. Preserving the Clean Power Plan is a good place to start.

Jainey Bavishi: I'd like to invite our fifth panel to come up as soon as we hear from our last speaker. Jerry Rivers, North American Climate, Conservation and Environment. Malia Brown, Organizing for Action and Elisabeth Soto, Young Evangelicals for Climate Action.

Testimony by Margaret Berry, New York State Bar Association Environmental and Energy Law Section

Margaret Berry: Thank you to the office of the Attorney General, the office of the Mayor and other co-sponsors for this opportunity to provide comments on EPA's proposed repeal of the Clean Power Plan. My name is Margaret Berry and I am providing these comments today on behalf of the New York State Bar Association Environmental and Energy Law Section. The section has also submitted written comments to EPA. This testimony and the written comments reflect the opinions of the section and do not represent those of the New York State Bar Association unless and until they have been adopted by its House of Delegates or Executive Committee. The section has urged EPA not to finalize the proposed repeal unless and until devices and equally effective alternative plan for reducing greenhouse gas emissions from existing power plants.

Existing power plants are the largest domestic stationary source of carbon dioxide emissions. If the proposed repeal is finalized, it would leave greenhouse gas emissions from these facilities unregulated for an indefinite period of time. Repeal of the Clean Power Plan without an adequate substitute plan is unacceptable and unlawful. EPA's proposed repeal would simply push the decision of how or even whether to regulate greenhouse gas emissions from existing power plants down the road. Just a furl of action contravenes EPA's statutory obligations under the Clean Air Act. Moreover, as the climate science special report published in November by the US Global Change Research Program makes clear, the United States cannot afford to lase in the mitigation of greenhouse gas emissions.

The report provided an alarming compendium of the physical impacts that our historical emissions are already having and of the environmental havoc that is projected in the absence of prompt and effective measures to reduce emissions. Physical impacts however are only part of the story. They will necessary lead to social and economic impacts as well. These threats are well-documented and the US Global Change Research Program's third national climate assessment in 2014. Most relevant to our comments today however is EPA's 2009 endangerment finding, which was crystal clear in documenting the substantial risk greenhouse gas emissions pose to public health and welfare. Having issued the endangerment finding, EPA has an affirmative, non-discretionary obligation to regulate greenhouse gas emissions from power plants.

The Clean Air Act imposes a mandate that EPA may not neglect so long as the endangerment finding remains in effect. EPA recently issued an advanced notice to propose rule making, seeking information about a potential future rule making to regulate greenhouse gas emissions from existing power plants. However, as the client science special report emphasized, substantial emissions reductions in the near term are essential to any realistic plan for keeping the increasing global average temperature below two degrees Celsius. The Clean Power Plan should not be repealed unless EPA is

prepared to move forward with proposal for an equally effective substitute plan. Thank you.

Testimony by Jerry Rivers, North American Climate Conservation and Environment

Jerry Rivers: This administration with the goal of decreasing carbon pollution in the US protecting health and investing a new sources of clean energy. Environmental protection agency administration, Scott Pruitt stated that the CPP needs to be repealed because the Obama administration overstepped its power when the plan was mediated. Pruitt is determined to keep America dependent on harmful fossil fuels. The Clean Power Plan leads to a healthier citizens and contains effort to combat climate change. According to research by the Trump Administration, the CPP would prevent 45,000 premature deaths each year. By 2030, it would also reduce asthma attacks and other respiratory disease. Repealing the CPP would lead to sickness and early deaths and have a disastrous effect on the environment.

It would also hurt thousands of jobs from the quickly going clean energy sector. Climate change also pose a threat to our planet, a threat to our security, our public health, our world economy, our culture and our society. Now is the time to support critical climate change safeguards but build a clean energy economy that works for everyone to protect our human health and indignity of all of God's creation. The Clean Power Plan seeks to reduce pollution from the United States largest sources of power by 32%. By 2030, EPA's own estimate the CPP could prevent a projection of 500 to 36,000 premature deaths, 90,000 asthma attacks in children up to 17,000 heart attacks and 17,000 hospital emissions.

I share the disappointment in the EPA's intention to repeal the CPP as it's risk damage to our air, our water, our soil and most important, our people, particularly the poor and invariable. The last phrase is, let's keep our planet healthy so our children could have a healthy planet, a clean air, a clean water to drink and rich soils to provide food sources. Thank you.

Testimony by Daniele Gerard, First Vice-President, Three Parks Independent Democrats

Malia Brown: I would like to begin by thanking the offices of Attorney General Eric Schneiderman and the New York City Mayor Bill de Blasio for organizing this hearing and The New School for hosting. My name is Malia Brown. As the New York State Climate Lead for Organizing for Action and a Charter Member of the Climate Reality Project, I've spent a significant amount of time discussing the need to reduce carbon dioxide emissions with the residents of New York state. I testify today not as a scientist or policy expert but as a community organizer, an environmental advocate, eager to continue the conversation on how best to keep our air and water clean. Let me be clear. I strongly oppose the Environment Protection Agency's move to repeal the Clean Power Plan.

Nearly five years ago, when former President Barack Obama directed the EPA to create nationwide limits on carbon pollution from power plants, I began gathering signatures in support of the plan. In the years following, I committed speaking engagements, panel discussions and moderated Q&A's throughout the neighborhoods of New York City. Community outreach has made it clear to me that New Yorkers support regulations that reduce carbon pollution and protect our environment. Young people, especially are

enthusiastic about laying the framework for more sustainable future. New Yorkers accept the overwhelming scientific evidence that says carbon dioxide emissions contribute to a change in climate.

We have seen the effects of these changes firsthand. I was one of many people who volunteered to clean up debris after Hurricane Sandy. I was not qualified but I was available. There is an urgency to dealing with these disasters. We're vulnerable to more extreme weather that will surely come. New Yorkers recognize the connection between a change in climate and the health and safety of our families. We expect our government officials and federal agencies to make decisions with our best interest in mind. The EPA has a responsibility to reduce carbon pollution, which is why the move to repeal the Clean Power Plan without a replacement is misguided and dangerous. There is no evidence to show that this decision will have no negative impact on our environment.

Furthermore, there have not been sufficient hearings to ensure that the voices of diverse people are heard. EPA Administrator Scott Pruitt and the Trump administration say that a repeal of the Clean Power Plan will be cost effective and good for our economy. There is little incentive to investing coal. No profit is worth degrading the air that we breathe. The fate of future generations should not be casualty to an already dying industry. I worry about what kind of world we will leave for our children. I wonder if we will condemn them to an unlivable planet. I hope that we will rely on human ingenuity and transition from dirty fossil fuels to renewable energy like solar and wind. The Clean Power Plan accelerates that transition. I ask that the EPA reconsider its repeal. Thank you.

Testimony by Elisabeth Soto, Young Evangelicals for Climate Action

Elisabeth Soto: Hello, everyone. My name is Elisabeth Soto. I'm here on behalf of the Young Evangelicals for Climate Action, a national group that organizes young evangelicals in the US coming together and taking action to overcome the climate crisis as part of their Christian discipleship and witness. As well as on behalf of C4, Christians Concerned about Climate Change, a local meetup and movement that started here in NYC at Redeemer Presbyterian Church. I stand before you and against the EPA's actions today because of the moral imperative that is protecting the Clean Power Plan, our nation's most comprehensive and ambitious plan for addressing carbon emissions. More importantly, I stand before you because of the call I've been given. A call to live as Christ lived if I'm to say that I know Him.

This means caring not just for my neighbor but also the least of these, whom Jesus identifies as the poor, the oppressed and those in need. The very demographic and population most at risk for being impacted by climate change, not only in New York City and the US but all over the world. Today, we are witnessing the effects of climate change and the consequences of fossil fuel usage all around us. Our oceans are becoming more acidic and our weather more unpredictable. More frequent and severe wildfires and hurricanes, hunger and the contamination of water, job loss and billions of dollars in climate change economic loss is just a taste of the effects of climate change and a worsening reality that awaits us if we do not change course.

Yet at a time when the UN has declared to the world that we have only three years to prevent the most dangerous effects of climate change, the EPA has been working to systematically dismantle every fighting chance we have for a better future. Not just for

my generation but for generations to come. The Clean Power Plan is one of the few barriers that stop power plants from dumping unlimited amounts of carbon pollution into the atmosphere. Yet this plan along with 60 other environmental regulations are being done away with, without a second thought by the EPA and the leaders behind it. As a 20-year old woman with dreams of having a family of my own, I cannot express the degree to which it pains me that I may not be able to secure the basic necessities of the children I hope to have.

What will I tell them when they ask me why these problems weren't prevented? What will I say to them when they ask why their safety and well-being was carelessly forgotten? The answer is, I have no answer. There is no good reason for scrapping the Clean Power Plan. Not when clean energy jobs outnumber fossil fuel jobs by more than 2.5 to one. There is no good reason when solar and wind industries are creating jobs at a rate 12 to 17 times faster than that of the rest of the US economy or when companies like Eastern Kentucky are building solar farms in place of coal mines and creating jobs for displaced coal miners. There is no good reason when for the first time, solar and wind energy is cheaper than fossil fuel energy. Enough is enough. There was once a man hated by the government, hated by his own people and hated by the world.

He walked on this earth condemning those in power for their hypocrisy, greed and sin, humbling them through his weakness, sacrifice and love. He looked into the eyes of the vulnerable and suffering and told them, "You matter." As Dr. Martin Luther King once said, "Our lives begin to end the day we become silent about the things that matter." To all of you in this room, whether Christian, Muslim, Jewish or not affiliated with any faith, we have something to stand and fight for, a hope of a better future. I thank you for being here and for making your voice heard against this appalling and unmerited revocation of the Clean Power Plan. To the EPA, to Scott Pruitt and everyone behind his actions, we stand in solidarity today, united that the Clean Power Plan matters. Climate change matters.

Our future matters and our children's future matters. On behalf of YECA, C4 and the thousands of Christians that do care about climate action in this country, I thank you.

Jainey Bavishi: I'd like to invite our next panel to come up. Natalie Cronin, Charles Davenport from Stop Cricket Valley Energy and Suzy Winkler.

Testimony by Natalie Cronin

Natalie Cronin: Hi. Thank you. My name is Natalie Cronin. I am a Child Care Provider here in New York City. My reasons for being here began in eight years old. I grew up in Western Pennsylvania. At that time, I began to question why our creek was polluted and why it was allowed to be polluted. The waterfalls and the cliffs and even the turtles were bright orange. I came to learn that everyone in our world was tied to coal. We were expected to accept this as part of our bread and butter. Today 30 years later, I'm a mommy raising my children in a city that boasts about its water. We've learned so much in that time about the effects of smog, soot, mercury on our health and well-being.

We've learned about the climate disruption of carbon and methane and the ugly disastrous processes involved from fracking farmland and chopping out mountains and drilling spills in the oceans. Our leadership has systematically ignored these facts and

continues to cuddle polluters. This industry has been guilty of human rights abuse since the times since 16 tons and what do you get? An ESO script. Today, industry bullies and sues and intimidates and silences victims that are hurt by their processes. It infuriates me as a voter and a consumer that we have been restrained as innovators and creators, as Americans. To bring our nation into the future, we cannot shop our way out of this issue as parents.

We need to instead raise our voices in support of this very imperfect plan. We refuse to be encumbered by the past and robbed of our future alongside our children. I'm very, very grateful for this opportunity to speak today for my family and my fellow human beings and New Yorkers. Thank you.

Testimony by Charles Davenport, Stop Cricket Valley Energy

Charles D. : Charles Davenport, Wappingers Falls, New York. There are two natural gas-powered, electric-generating plants under construction here in New York state today. One is the 650-megawatt Competitive Power Ventures Plant near Middletown, New York. The other is the 1100-megawatt plant in Dover Plains, New York, Cricket Valley Energy. There are those who say that the global warming effects of the carbon dioxide and methane emissions connected with these two plants alone will put New York City under water. I don't want to discuss hypocrisy and global warming today. I want to talk about hypocrisy and the lives of children. Government Cuomo and Attorney General Schneiderman are suing the EPA to protect New Yorkers from air pollution coming from other states.

Schneiderman says, millions upon millions of New Yorkers are still breathing unhealthy air due to smog pollution. A huge amount, which is blowing into New York from upwind states. Cuomo says, exposure to smog is also linked to premature deaths. Some groups including children, the elderly and those within existing lung diseases such as asthma are at especially heightened risk from smog pollution. Meanwhile, up in Dover Plains, New York, the 1100-megawatt Cricket Valley Energy plant is under construction. The DEC said, before approving the project, this project will be a major source of NOX and VLC, both precursors to ozone. These chemicals contribute to the formation of smog. Smog being the stated reason for Cuomo's and Schneiderman's lawsuit.

Meanwhile, incredibly Dover Plains high school, middle school, complexes within three quarters of a mile of this plant. The Wingdale Elementary School is two miles away. That's 1100 vulnerable children within two miles of this plant. To Cuomo and Schneiderman want us to believe that hundreds of tons of poisons can be released into the air and not harm nearby children? Pollution coming from Michigan and Illinois? Geez, that's a dire and horrific health hazard. Give us a break. What about protecting the children of Dover Plains from Cricket Valley pollution? Why are we doing this? It's not because we need more electric power. The previously mentioned New York independent system operator report that says that we need an additional 600 megawatts of power by 2027.

The smartest need they say can be met by combinations of solutions including generation, transmission, energy efficiency and demand response measures. Our free market says, "Hey. If our shortage are threatened shortage of a commodity exists, the price of that commodity will go up." That's not happening in the electricity market. The price of electricity is so low that nuclear generating plants in Upstate New York need a \$7.6 billion tax payer subsidy to stay in operation. These generating plants, the old ones

and the new ones are being constructed and kept running not because of any need for electricity but for the sake of politics, that's tax-basing jobs and to provide independent investment opportunities. I can't say who the investors are but many are foreigners.

I suspect that much money comes from the Cayman Islands and Swiss bank accounts. Mr. Attorney General, Mr. Governor, we don't want more methane-powered plants that contribute to global warming and that poison our children. Be true environmental leaders. Stop the construction and operation of the Competitive Power Venture Plant and the Cricket Valley Energy Generating Plant. Thank you.

Testimony by Suzy Winkler

Suzy Winkler: That's a good act to follow. Suzy Winkler. I'm from Burlington Flats, New York. That's four hours from here. I am representing my grassroots group, People Not Pipelines. In 2014, food and water watch slammed the proposed the proposed Clean Power Plan saying it was incentivizing fracking. That the plan with its reliance on cap and trade schemes and state market solutions along with woefully unambitious climate goals, carbon goals far from did what it needed to do to change fracking and natural gas in the state of New York. Food and water watch had that right. Though soon after the plan was degraded even further. Now, more than three years later, eight attorneys general are fighting for what is a dangerous and losing plan.

Many big environmental organizations are clamoring to preserve CPP but are silent on the sort of frack gas infrastructure that the plan actually calls for, which includes the Cricket Valley and the CPV frack gas power plants and all the pipelines that support them. Our environmental movement has neither the time nor the money on our side. The deep pockets of the political right and industry have tipped the scales against our efforts. The climate crisis is real and the wolf is at the door, guys. If constitution pipeline taught me anything, it's that one should pick one's battles wisely. I ask tonight, why choose a losing battle that distracts from a far more critical fight?

Not only is the Clean Power Plan too weak as Mark Jacobson says but as Cornell's Dr. Robert Howarth has stressed, it promotes frack gas as a replacement for coal and oil. When methane leakage is added to CO2 from combustion, frack gas heats the planet faster. How is it possible that a terrible plan based on erroneous leakage numbers and designed to allow gas corporations to continue business as usual is being elevated by this lawsuit? Had the Republican administration crafted this CPP plan? It would have been trounced by the Democrats is unacceptable. Posturing against Trump for this plan is a waste of our precious time and limited financial resources. It sidetracks us and keeps us from the work that's most needed.

Our movement is being co-opted to promote a methane-induced climate catastrophe. The answer is not to implement the CPP on a state level. Rather, let each state seek a way forward that works around the obstacle that's the federal government. On a state level, we're not doing what's needed either. All eight AGs who are currently suing the EPA should work with laser-focus to get their own houses in order. What can each state accomplish without Washington's approval? That's the question. Governor Cuomo should start with bold and brave action that is absolutely within his authority by rescinding the air permits for the CPV and the CVE gas-fired power plants. For goodness sakes, don't

build a 16-megawatt gas-fired power plant downtown in Albany, the capital of New York and the state that banned fracking?

This plan will continue to disproportionately expose people in Albany's environmental justice community of Sheridan Hollow to far more than their share of the pollution. Given the very real crisis in both government and climate, I call on Governor Cuomo and AG Schneiderman to accept this challenge and choose aggressive, positive action above political theater. We need an energy plan that incentivizes the immediate implementation of a renewable energy infrastructure, not the fracking of our nation.

Testimony by Gary Keir, Carbon Xprint

Gary Keir: Hello. My name is Gary Keir. I'm from a small company called Carbon Xprint. When one door closes, another one opens. There is more than one way to accomplish what we want to accomplish. This may be an opportunity. We can have a work around for the Clean Power Plan. Please consider the following points. The cost of solar and wind energy is on parity with fossil fuels and continues to decline. The cost of energy storage continues to decline. Energy efficiency standards such as passive house already pay for themselves. The more we invest the experience curve demonstrate that these technologies will get even cheaper. The IEA estimates that we need \$44 trillion of green investment in renewable energy, storage efficiency and infrastructure to avoid the catastrophic effects of climate change.

The return on that investment is estimated to be \$115 trillion. The demand for green investment currently outstrips the supply according to current bonds initiative. In the end, with or without regulation, it all comes down to money. The US and New York in particular is a financial center of the world. We can use investment as a tool to solve this problem. Institutions, companies and individual investors want to do something about climate change but they simply lack the opportunity. They want to do the right thing but they also want to measure how they are doing. There is a need to demonstrate quantifiable responsibility to shareholders, customers and constituents. Think of our own opportunity. There are lack of opportunity.

We have to do something constructive about climate change. When people have skin in the game, they pay more attention to the goal. What gets measured gets managed. What gets measured gets done. A generally accepted price of carbon is \$40 a ton. Governments can give institutions, companies and individual investors an opportunity to act on climate change by ensuring or creating more green bonds. By pricing a green bond unit at \$40 a ton, each \$40 unit can be used by institutions, companies and individual investors to measurably balance one ton of the carbon flip into their stock portfolio for their energy usage. This method is called Carbon Xprint. As a reference, \$100,000 investment in the Vanguard S&P 500 index fund has a 15-ton carbon footprint. This free market and method is measurable and profitable.

It can be a viable addition or an alternative to regulation, carbon trading or carbon tax. Priced at a market approach can attract a greater number of supporters to climate action and disarm some of its critics. Thank you very much.

Testimony by Christie Colaprico

Christie C.: Hello. My name is Christie Colaprico. I've never delivered a testimony before and I hate public speaking but this proposed repeal let me know that I needed to speak up. I'm not government official or a scientist. I'm just your average concerned citizen who loves this country and planet and who doesn't understand how the Environmental Protection Agency could make a decision that's the exact opposite of protecting the environment. I'm here to testify and to urge the EPA to reconsider their proposed repeal of the Clean Power Plan. Our government is supposed to be a government for the people but the proposed repeal puts our health, our lives and our futures at risk in favor of fossil fuel interest.

As a resident of New York City, I'm no stranger to air pollution. I don't understand why anyone wouldn't want to make cleaner air a reality. The recent regulatory impact analysis done by the EPA on October of this year even supports the notion that the Clean Power Plan could prevent 4500 premature deaths per year by 2030. This projection by the current administration is even higher than the 3600 projected by the Obama administration. Other projected health benefits of the plan include but are not limited 3 to less asthma attacks on children, less heart attacks per year and less hospital visits per year. Your own research proves that the Clean Power Plan is good for the people of the United States.

Now, let's talk climate change. Though there's still a tremendous amount of work that needs to be done, we've made an enormous strides in recent years to cut down on CO2 emissions from power plants. In 2016 for the first time in the last 40 years, there were no longer the leading source of CO2 emissions. We can afford to regress. The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration announced just yesterday that 2017 was the costliest year ever for US weather disasters at 306 trillion, 100 billion more than the previous record. We endured 16 separate climate disasters in the US in 2017 and 362 people lost their lives as a result. For the third consecutive year, every state across the continental US was warmer than average. Five of which experienced their warmest on record.

Having another year like 2017 would be disastrous for our economy. Not to mention the havoc and heartbreak these catastrophes cause the citizens of this country. If we don't see our changes now, we could be sure that natural disasters will not only keep coming but get worse. While countries like Iceland and Sweden to name a few are making critical strides in the renewable energy game, we're stuck with an administration with the 20th century mindset. Our president is supposed to be the leader of the free world but how can we be free when we are so chained to an integrated power system that relies on burning fossil fuel. How can we consider ourselves world leaders when we are pulling back in our commitment towards clean energy? Science has repeatedly proven to us that sea levels are rising.

It drops and rise in temperature were leading to more extreme storms and wildfires. Climate change is real. It's not a debate. The only debate is if you, Mr. Pruitt are going to put your people who are all environmental stakeholders and do not deserve to live on a planet burdened by pollution ahead of your corporate interest. Thank you to Attorney General Schneiderman and everyone else here just an ordinary citizen like me to make a comment.

Testimony by Mike Aaronson

Mike Aaronson: My name is Mike Aaronson. First, I'd like to thank Attorney General Schneiderman, Mayor de Blasio and the sponsoring environmental organizations. I'm here today to testify against the repeal of the Clean Power Plan. The fact is, carbon emission is a dire hazard to our health and to our climate. The Clean Power Plan addresses this issue by setting carbon emission limits. Each state has individualized goals. States have the autonomy to achieve these goals in any way that works best for them. In doing so, states for innovation generate new jobs all while protecting our health, climate and future. This is the type of tomorrow we should invest in, not a tomorrow that is environmentally, technologically and socially regressive.

Administrator Pruitt and President Trump continue to perpetuate the false argument that the Clean Power Plan and environmental protections like it are killing jobs and the economy. According to the Department of Energy employment and energy report, 2.2 million Americans work in full or in part in energy efficiency products and/or services. 133,000 jobs in this sector were added in 2016 alone. Other numbers are over 100,000 employees in wind, which is a 32% increase from 2015. Over 350,000 people work in whole or in part in solar. These numbers speak for themselves. Renewable energy efficiency are growing the economy and generating jobs. Administrator, you have access to the same numbers as I do. Your repeal is not going to help the economy.

It's not going to create jobs. Then I ask, what do you hope to accomplish by repealing the Clean Power Plan? Any short term arguments for this repeal are vastly outweighed by the immediate and long term consequences to our health, environment and future. As climate change and pollution is not limited to being purely an environmental issue. It's a public health issue. It's a human rights issue. It's a social justice issue, an economic issue. It's an issue that poses an immediate and long term threat to each and everyone of us. With that said, make no mistake. A blue wave is coming. It grows stronger by the day. Should you so choose to repeal the Clean Power Plan, you will only fuel our resolve. As we are not going to stand idle. We will not be silent and we will not falter.

Instead, we will be united. We will be loud. We will resist and in the end, we will prevail. With that said, I want everyone in this room to send a message to Trump and Pruitt. Who here is going to sign up with one of these amazing environmental organizations and get involved? Come on. I want to hear some cheers. Who here is going to get involved? Come on, guys. I want to hear some cheers. Awesome. Awesome. Thank you again to the Mayor's office. Thank you, Attorney General Schneiderman. I yield the remainder of my time.

Testimony by Paul Reale, Director, CUNY Building Performance Laboratory, Building Operations Research

Paul Reale: Testing. Yeah. I'm on. I'm Paul Reale. I'm the Director of Building Operations Research with CUNY's Building Performance Laboratory. Most arguments to repeal the Clean Power Plan center on either the loss of jobs or the sheer folly in it because man made climate change does not exist. Neither of these arguments is remotely valid. Regarding

climate change denial, I will not waste your precious time even dignifying that argument with a response. Instead, I turn your attention to the purported jobs that would disappear as a consequence of the Clean Power Plan going into effect. In fact, the opposite is true to dramatic effect.

This quote from a report based on the US Department of Energy data. "Clean electricity jobs are no doubt the engine that drives America's electric energy economy. Outstripping the number of paychecks provided by the fossil fuel industry by at least five to one." That would drive that job creation. Enacting and enforcing the Clean Power Plan would require reductions in power plant emissions from burning fossil fuels. There are two fundamental ways to realize those reductions. The first way is by shifting our electricity sources away from fossil fuels to carbon-free sources of energy, such as wind and solar. Designing, installing, operating, maintaining renewable energy systems takes tremendous human capital, jobs. Yet the energy cost is competitive with fossil fuel-based energy.

The second way to reduce emissions is by slowing the growth of energy consumption through energy conservation and efficiency. This may seem like an aside but let me be clear of the many approaches to de-carbonize the electric grid. Energy efficiency far outshines all others in terms of cost, environmental impact, policy alignment, grid capacity and grid reliability. With nearly 50% of all the energy in the United States being consumed in industrial, commercial and residential buildings, energy efficiency in buildings is a rich area for job growth. One significant example market is New York City. Its buildings fall into three areas, pre-war, post war and modern. We are now on the precipice of the eco era of building construction.

Some new buildings consume 80 to 90% less energy than conventional buildings. Somewhat counterintuitively are significantly more comfortable than their older counterparts. The jobs associated with these building tanks will be assumed by those already in designer construction. Though these workers are acquiring new knowledge and new skills. However, six million commercial buildings and 126 million households already exist in the United States. The vast majority of these buildings can undergo retrofits that can on average reduce their energy consumption by well more than half. Until that happens, the simple path to energy efficiency in buildings is in running buildings more efficiently. Techniques developed by the Pacific Northwest National Laboratory is being used and enhanced by my team at the CUNY Building Performance Laboratory.

When applied, building-wide reduce total building energy consumption 14% on average. These are no cost in low cost majors effectively yielding a boundless return on investment. Okay. It's difficult to argue that turning things off when you don't need them or turning them down when you don't need them at full power has a lot of pizzazz. Given the implied research and training my team conducts, I am convinced that these techniques will become widely adopted. Not only in many New York City buildings but on a global scale. This is the low fruit with high ROI that greatly reduces energy consumption with little effort.

This approach will be used for the next 20 or 30 years in parallel with the burgeoning workforce that will retrofit our buildings to be inherently more efficient and again, the creation of these jobs will be accelerated by the Clean Power Plan. In short, deciding to forego the Clean Power Plan is denying a large net increase in American jobs. These jobs are local jobs that's because building retrofits and operations occur on site, not overseas.

The same is true for accelerating the deployment of renewable energy plant. Let's not talk about repealing the Clean Power Plan. Let's get on the right side of history. Let's enact the Clean Power Plan. Let's get to work. Thank you.

Testimony by Emily Marte, WE ACT for Environmental Justice

Emily Marte: Good evening. My name is Emily Marte. I'm from Harlem, Washington Heights. I'm a member of WE ACT for Environmental Justice. I'm also a student at George Washington University. I would like to make a few points. The Clean Power Plan was supposed to be a critical piece of national policy. It's the only national policy that would essentially tackle the issue of greenhouse gas emissions from power plants responsible for climate crisis. In the past year, climate catastrophes have affected us globally in different forms. It has affected my family in the Caribbean, my family in Florida and many other people. Weather has evidently increased in intensity and this is science based. If there is a policy like the Clean Power Plan that could lessen these climate change issues, we want to move forward with it and adjust the climate change issue.

In a country as large as ours, having one public hearing in Charlottesville, West Virginia on a matter of such importance to the United States now and our future doesn't make sense to me. It's a shame that this administration is trying to curtail the rights of citizens to have our voices heard of these important policies. Lastly, why are we devaluing the work that has been done by researchers and professionals and a spectrum of fields like climate, environment, geology, health, economics, etc. The point of their work is to help the government make informed decisions on matters like climate change. Climate change is an issue that affects us in different levels. If experts say we need to take action through programs like the Clean Power Plan, that would help us use resources more sustainably, then we should adopt the plan.

The plan made sense. It would address issues beyond climate like environmental injustice and the people want that. I want to thank the Attorney General for making this hearing possible along with co-sponsors like WE ACT for Environmental Justice.

Testimony by Cecil Corbin-Mark, WE ACT for Environmental Justice

Cecil Corbin-M.: I, too want to open by thanking the Attorney General's office for their leadership on creating this people's hearing. I certainly, as a leader in an organization that is one of the co-sponsors, WE ACT for Environmental Justice, I'm really grateful that this day has actually happened. I know that there are many EJ organizations both across the country and right here in New York City that are also really grateful and have co-sponsored this event as well. I want to acknowledge their hard work. That's not part of my time. In the United States, there are higher percentages of communities of color and low income communities living near power plants. In fact, there are many rural power plants that are located in small communities with high percentages of low income populations.

In urban areas, nearby communities tend to be both low income communities and communities of color. The EPA's Clean Power Plan released in August of 2015 require that states reduce their carbon emissions from fossil fuel-fired power plants. It would have if it were allowed to come into full force and effect, been the first time that the EPA is requiring state regulators to actually adopt new CO2 emission levels and to demonstrate how they would meaningfully engage all stakeholders. For us, that's very significant.

Workers of low income communities, communities of color and indigenous populations and people living near power plants are usually the last if at all to be engaged in the making of policy. We saw this and we fought for the idea that this would be a really meaningful engagement for those types of communities.

As the Clean Power Plan with its many flaws like its cap and trade approach to dealing with carbon emissions, reductions where it's rolled out. There would also be required to describe their engagement with their stakeholders and evaluate the effects of their plans on vulnerable communities and take steps necessary to ensure that all communities benefit from the implementation. Now, while I don't want to be completely full throated in terms of my support for the Clean Power Plan, I do support it. I want to be clear but it is a flawed approach to dealing with carbon emissions. That said, it is the only approach that we have nationally.

For the EPA Administrator Pruitt and the current administration, our 45th President to think that it's important for us to be repealing this in the wake of some of the climate disasters that have been happening just over this last year. It's ridiculous. That said, I want to offer four key points of how a Clean Power Plan could move forward and address some of the inequities and environmental injustices that might be reaped from actually going forth in its current structure and design. One, as I said before, creating opportunities for higher impact engagement. Making sure that EJ communities and key stakeholders in low income communities near and living around clean power plants should review the business of all states as they develop their state implementation plan.

They should really look to take very seriously the full engagement process that many EJ advocates across this country and particularly WE ACT and lifestyle fight of Washington DC really helped to push the EPA to actually craft. I think the results of high impact engagement should result in a definite improvement in environmental conditions for those communities and some reductions in emissions and improvement in health overall. Two, conducting an environmental justice analysis is one of the key things that was put into the plan. We want to encourage states to move forward with developing those key areas for criteria for analysis, for environmental justice and to move forth as the Clean Power Plan encourages states to conduct their own analyses in taking into consideration communities and their needs in developing their plants.

This is a really important part of the state implementation process and should be taken extremely seriously. The guidance puts forth our guidance to how states could do this puts forth a real way in which an EJ analysis should be conducted and tools and resources are available to states if they need help for that. Three, consider other options to reduce emissions of CO2 without necessarily employing a cap and trade program. Now obviously, that rolls off the tongue quite easily but it is not a simple undertaking. Other allowances such as the clean energy incentive program should be really focused on. While the use of cap and trade program is not something that EJ communities supported, it's definitely promoted by the Clean Power Plan as a primary option for compliance.

This is a concern for many of those who live near polluting facilities. We support achieving emissions reductions without the use of cap and trade. While data is still being gathered to quantify the potential localized increases in pollution in places like California and some of the Northeastern states where current cap and trade systems exists, it is our hope that states strongly considered opting other strategies for compliance and to build into their

structure to something to prevent the deterioration of their quality at the local community level if a trading mechanism is employed.

Three, building in continuous monitoring and evaluation processes in the final state plan that are always transparent to those particularly in impacted communities but all public to track the quality and health outcomes in low income communities and communities of color in particular. Four, we really do need to commit additional resources, disparity economic development and job growth and opportunities in impacted communities. The opportunities for trading and job growth in the clean energy sector has been well-documented by many people as well as the deployment for energy efficiency and renewable energy.

I think it's really important for overly impacted communities to see that these resources are put forth to help make sure that the roll out of the Clean Power Plan in their communities actually does take into consideration opportunities for job growth. I know that I'm overtime and I just want to end again by offering thanks to the Attorney General's office and the New York City Mayor's office on sustainability and long-term planning, anyone else on the staff and to DEC. Thank you.

Remarks by Michael Shaikh, Deputy Director of Climate Policy and Programs, New York City Mayor's Office

Michael Shaikh: Thank you. With that, I want to formally conclude this hearing with a few remarks. First, I think this hearing and I think I can speak for my colleagues at the state as well that this was a tremendous signal to the federal government that climate change is real and that we need aggressive action on it. It's also an incredible validation of the environmental and climate justice movement that's gripping this country at the moment but that the federal government continues to deny. The hearing in some ways doesn't stop here. We are taking your testimony. It will be transcribed and will be submitted to the EPA. If you do have written copies, I encourage you to leave them at the registration desk. I also encourage you to submit them online through the formal EPA channel as well.

It doesn't hurt to make sure that they hear it twice. While this hearing was directed primarily at a federal action and the federal government and the Trump administration, I think it also important for local government officials and state officials, I think it validated their work but also signaled that we have to move quicker. I think we have to double down on a lot of what we're doing and also continue innovating that we have been but also in many other ways. Finally, I also want to express huge amounts of gratitude to The New School. This is an institution that has been unafraid to open its doors for years to allow the public to speak truth to power. I particularly want to thank Anthony Curry, Molly Craft Johnson, Amy Malsin and Scott.

Scott, sorry if I got your last name, I don't have your last name here but the AV technician has been just a huge help here. Thank you all again. Particularly those who traveled far and wide to be here, it was a real pleasure having you. Again, your voices don't stop here. They will continue on to DC and into the EPA. Thank you very much.