

First, I want to commend the architects of the plan for being rather bold and comprehensive. Parts of the plan that I think are particularly valuable are:

- Electrification of transportation and building, with an emphasis on using State purchasing power to aggressively move in areas under direct State control
- A prioritization of low-income areas and areas disproportionately affected by fossil fuel externalities
- A focus on the inevitable labor displacements that will occur by moving away from fossil fuels, and the desire to make that an opportunity for affected workers
- A variety of methods increasing investment in research and development of new clean technologies
- Proposals for reducing miles traveled and making New Jersey a more transit-friendly state

Things that I would like to see improved in the plan:

- I would like the plan to be much more aggressive in its position on fossil fuel use in the energy sector over the next 5 years, including a moratorium on the expansion of pipelines and other petrochemical processing infrastructure. It will be politically and financially harder to dismantle the fossil fuel apparatus in 2039 if we're building more of it in 2019, and denying permits seems to be straightforwardly consistent with a future cost analysis and existing regulatory authority.
- Most of the existing targets have a discrete deadline fairly far off in the future (2030, 2050). I would prefer to have those deadlines reinforced with annual targets (e.g. 3% per year) and some planned trigger mechanism for what happens if annual targets are not met.
- There may be legal constraints to what the administration can do on its own regarding building codes, but the section on advocating for changes rather than implementing changes to building codes struck me as overly tentative.
- Though many environmentalists are opposed to the inclusion of non-renewable carbon-neutral technologies in the plan, I agree with the implicit argument that we need to try everything that we can. That said, the renewable targets are less ambitious than I would like.
- There should be a more concrete social welfare approach to labor that will get displaced by the fossil fuel transition, somewhere in between job training and a job guarantee.
- There was a lack of discussion of carbon capture. This can be a thorny issue, as some people think of advocacy of carbon capture as admitting defeat or selling out to industry. That said, my understanding is that it will be exceedingly difficult to achieve a carbon-neutral economy (as opposed to a carbon-neutral energy sector) by 2050 without having effective carbon capture in place, and I would like to see much stronger investment in R&D in that space over the near term.

As a general comment, I'd be delighted to see the plan become even more aggressive. As a rate payer and tax payer, I'm completely comfortable bearing the costs necessary.

-Jonathan Rein, Cherry Hill resident