

Digest of Green Reports and Studies

| | |
|--------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Title | <i>Economic Growth and Greenhouse Gas Mitigation in California</i> |
| Author | David Roland-Holst |
| Organization | UC Berkeley |
| Author Contact | None Given |
| Publication Type | Report- Results from Case Study |
| Publication Date | August 2006 |
| # of Pages | 40pp |
| URL | http://utahcleanenergy.org/files/u1/as_Mitigation_in_California_UC_Berkeley_2008.pdf |
| Summary | This is a follow-up report to a study released by the same author, David Roland-Holst, in January of 2006. The earlier study “concluded that achieving half the 2020 targets would promote economic growth in California.” This report, released in August 2006, presents the findings of further research about California reaching the 2020 goals, and “confirms the earlier conclusion about economic benefits.” The Berkeley Energy and Resources (BEAR) model was used in this research to help to “evaluate the complex linkages between climate policy and economic activity.” |
| Key Findings | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “California’s GHG targets are attainable, but too ambitious to be met by voluntary initiative.” • “Regulatory and market-based strategies are complementary; each excels at achieving different forms of mitigation.” • Reduced greenhouse gas emissions achieve positive economic results “from two primary sources: savings from improvements in energy efficiency and reduced energy bills that offset the cost of achieving emission reductions and, in related policy scenarios, the benefits of investing in technologies for innovation.” |
| Recommendations | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Policy actions to meet the targets should be relatively inclusive, with mandatory participation by all sectors representing a significant share of emissions.” • “An Emissions Cap, supported by regulatory and market-based implementation programs, can return California’s GHG emissions to 1990 levels by 2020 and stimulate the state economy.” • “Climate policies that create direct incentives for industries to invest in new technologies can provide additional stimulus for new employment and growth.” |
| Definition of “Green” | None Given |
| Methodology | Use of models (Berkeley Energy and Resources (BEAR)), Literature Research |
| Data Sources Cited | California Climate Action Team |
| Report Geography | California |
| Green Occupations Cited | None |
| Green Industries Cited | None |
| Keywords | BEAR model; Economic growth; AB 32; Greenhouse Gas; Climate policies; California. |
| Legislation Cited | AB 32 |
| Bibliography (Y/N) | Y |
| Reviewer Name/Org | D. Costello / Labor Market Information Division, California |

NOTE: This Digest is provided for information purposes only. Employment Development Department does not necessarily endorse any of these reports or publications.