Meeting Procedures

Before beginning, a few reminders to ensure a smooth discussion:

• Working Group Members should be on mute if not speaking.
  • If using phone for audio, please tap the phone mute button.
  • If using computer for audio, please click the mute button on the computer screen (1st visual).

• Video is encouraged for Working Group members, particularly when speaking.

• In the event of a question or comment, please use the hand raise function (2nd visual). Click the participant panel button (3rd visual) for the hand raise function. Rosa or Alanah will call on members individually, at which time please unmute.
Welcome and Roll Call
April 21 Agenda

> Welcome and Roll Call
> Business Items
  > Meet Sameer
  > CAC Scoping Plan
  > Timeline
> Review Approach to Date
> Critical Decisions – *with maps*
> Next Steps
Business Items

> Please send Rosa & Alex your groundtruthing list!
> Approval of Minutes
> Climate Action Council scoping plans
> Timeline
Meet Sameer & Climate Action Council Recs
Meet Sameer Ranade: Climate Justice Poet and Environmental and Social Justice Advocate!

Feel free to contact Sameer anytime about climate justice and mapping-related concerns, thoughts, or questions!

Work Email: Sameer.Ranade@nyserda.ny.gov

Work Cell: 347-867-5508

Excited to build on the WA health disparities mapping experience in NY!
Advisory Panel Recommendations

Each Advisory Panel is making recommendations to CAC (8 panels)

CLCPA requests CJWG consultation on draft scoping plan; the recs are the draft scoping plan

CJWG will have the opportunity to offer feedback on the recommendations at the June 8 CAC meeting

The recommendations are extensive – If you tried to review them all it could take between 16-24 total hours per person, but we are working to highlight key parts for you and will be in touch soon on how best to share the information with you in a digestible manner well before June 8
Timeline and What’s Ahead
What’s Ahead

Work Ahead
1. Groundtruthing list
2. Review draft scenario maps
3. Review revised scenarios
4. One-on-one meetings
5. Review public meeting materials
6. Review draft documentation

Decisions Ahead
1. Proportion of state to be DACs (e.g., 25%, or 30%, or more)
2. Distribution of DACs (regional equity)
3. Consensus on indicators (set that decide criteria)
4. Consensus on approach (how to combine the indicators)
5. Consensus on scenarios to post

Also need time for:
Investments & Benefits
CAC scoping recommendations
This timeline is very ambitious and assumes we'll get data in time for milestones. It also assumes bare minimum time for discussion of some topics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Apr 19</th>
<th>Apr 26</th>
<th>May 3</th>
<th>May 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CJWG Apr 21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CJWG needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Timeline + time/contributions needed</td>
<td>• Groundtruthing sessions (shorter &amp; optional)</td>
<td>• Consider/provide feedback on critical questions/decisions</td>
<td>• First look at draft scenarios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Tee up critical decisions with examples</td>
<td>• Review CAC Advisory Panel recommendations</td>
<td>• Review CAC Advisory Panel recommendations</td>
<td>• Discuss Investments &amp; Benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Discuss first batch of CAC Advisory Panel recs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>May 17</th>
<th>May 24</th>
<th>May 31</th>
<th>June 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CJWG needed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CAC June 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Review draft scenarios in maps</td>
<td>• Feedback on draft scenario maps</td>
<td>• Continue reviewing scenarios in maps</td>
<td>• Attend/contribute to CAC meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• One-on-ones with Alex &amp; Rosa</td>
<td>• Prioritize revisions</td>
<td>• Finalize written response to CAC Advisory Panel recs</td>
<td>• Receive revised DAC scenarios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Review CAC Advisory Panel recommendations</td>
<td>• Prep for CAC panel recs feedback meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>June 14</th>
<th>June 21</th>
<th>June 28</th>
<th>July 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CJWG needed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CJWG needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Review revised scenarios</td>
<td>• Feedback on revised scenarios</td>
<td>• Review revised scenarios</td>
<td>• Vote to approve draft scenarios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• One-on-ones with Alex &amp; Rosa</td>
<td>• Discuss public materials and/or documentation</td>
<td>• Review revised scenarios</td>
<td>• Agreement on public-facing materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Review proposal/outline for public meeting process (?)</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Review educational PPT for public meetings</td>
<td>• Feedback for documentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Review documentation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Next Steps

What we’re working on

Indicator reduction/selection (input from state & federal experts)

GIS analysis for missing indicators (Agency collaboration; GIS team)

Tableau interface

Evaluate scenarios (overlap; groundtruthing)

What we need from you

Groundtruthing community list

Carve out time to review maps
Where we are

We’re still here.

Identify Need
Observe/Research
Prioritize
Begin downloads
Explore data
TEST

DEVELOP
New Ideas
Troubleshooting
Create combinations
Test
Iterate
Optimize

APPLY
LEARN
ADJUST
RE-APPLY
Agree on criteria

Adjust
Grow

Identify data and data wrangle
Create designations and iterate
Agree on criteria

Where we are
Working on two fronts

Data and Indicators

1. Working on critical data pieces – environmental and climate risk indicators
2. Prioritizing critical indicators with experts (DEC, DOH, climate)

Scoring and Designation

1. Considering scoring options: Grouping, weighting, regional scoring
2. Comparing scenarios
Indicators we’re still waiting for

1. **Climate**: Flood risk, storm surge, sea level rise (optional: extreme temperatures, vegetative cover)

2. **Health**: Premature death, low birthweight

3. **Environmental hazards**: Proximity to state permitted/regulated facilities *(various)*

4. **Other**: Distance/access to healthcare facilities

These will change the scenarios
Upcoming Scoring Questions (with examples)
Reference Slides: Questions that will come up as you start looking at mapping

trying to get ahead of documentation

https://i.gifer.com/EcFk.gif
Combining data is a stepped process

We can’t just add all the indicators we select together.

We need to group indicators that “speak to” a specific concept together.

^ How CalEnviroScreen groups things together (our groups will likely differ)
Combining Data

Group data*

Combine Groups

Calculate Overall Score

Designate DACs based on their relative score

← specific groups TBD pending indicator selection

← This could be statewide, regional or both
Critical Question for CJWG: Share of DACs

In general, what share of communities (census tracts) should be designated as DACs?
Critical Question for CJWG: Share of DACs

In general, what share of communities (census tracts) should be designated as DACs?

Since scoring is relative (slide 34), there is no clear or objective line or formula where everyone above the line is a DAC and below the line is not.

We can show maps with different thresholds for you to compare.
Critical Question for CJWG: Regional Parity

What does regional parity look like for you? What if NYC has more DACs than other areas? Is that okay or should we aim to adjust things?
Critical Question for CJWG: Regional Parity

What does regional parity look like for you? What if NYC has more DACs than other areas? Is that okay or should we aim to adjust things?

If we only calculate scores statewide (e.g., compare every community to the whole state), NYC will likely have far more tracts with high scores.

Blue areas emerge as potential DACs if we look at NYC scores separately from Rest-of-State.
Critical Question for CJWG: Regional Parity

**Statewide Score**
Look at how each community ranks (on all of the data) within the **entire** state

**Regional Scores**
Look at how each community ranks (on all of the data) in NYC separately from the rest of the state (to allow more Upstate and rural areas to be DACs)

Proposal: Designate communities that fall into top X% statewide OR regionally
Example of Regional Results

Besides looking at maps, how proportional is the distribution of DACs?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Percent of All Census Tracts</th>
<th>Percent of DACs (32% of state)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New York City</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Island</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-Hudson</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western NY</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finger Lakes</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Region</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central NY</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Tier</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mohawk Valley</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Country</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average of Median Income $73,913 $51,828
Average % BIPOC 45% 69%
Pct that are HUD QCTs 22% 67%

Most rural regions

In this scenario, Western NY makes up 7.9% of DACs, while it's 7.4% of all census tracts.
Critical Question for CJWG: “Super” Criteria

Should any criteria (like low income) be a final or “super” criteria or filter?
What if non-low-income communities score as DACs based on burdens and vulnerabilities?

What if East Hampton village ended up as a DAC because it has high climate change risks?
What if non-low-income communities score as DACs based on burdens and vulnerabilities?

It’s possible that some communities that score high on the combined index may not be low income or high BIPOC...

...Should any criteria (like low income) be a final or “super” criteria or filter?
Evaluating Scenarios and Groundtruthing
Evaluating Scenarios

How can we tell if one scenario is a better fit?

Groundtruthing (alignment) against…
…Your selected tracts
…Other definitions (e.g., BOAs, historical redlining?)

Regional distribution: What seems equitable?

Key criteria: Low income, BIPOC....?
Your list of DACs & Not DACs

Still needed for groundtruthing!

Go to https://public.tableau.com/views/NYCensustracts/NYMap?:language=en&:display_count=y&:origin=viz_share_link

Hover over the map to get the census tract name – it’s a long number

Write down the following:

• Tracts you think should be DACs
• Tracts you think should NOT be DACs
• Reason why it’s a DAC or not
• Send email to Rosa and Alex with your thoughts
# Similarities to CalEnviroScreen

We have learned (and are using/adapting) a lot from CalEnviroScreen and California’s DAC definition.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Similarities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relative Scoring</td>
<td>Relative scoring approach – Use percentiles of underlying data; calculate overall score on multiple variables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Criteria</td>
<td>Evaluate multiple pollution sources, burdens and stressors; consider population characteristics and public health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combining Burdens with Vulnerabilities</td>
<td>Develop overall score for each of two components, and multiply scores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designation of DACs</td>
<td>Uses relative scoring results to identify communities with relatively higher scores on multiple indicators; designates top X% as DACs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iterative improvements</td>
<td>California has had (and we assume) several improvements and iterations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Differences with CalEnviroScreen**

We are using/adapting a lot from CalEnviroScreen and California’s DAC definition, but there are some key differences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CalEnviroScreen</th>
<th>New York Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Developed as <strong>screening tool</strong> to help identify (but not designate) communities</td>
<td>We need to <strong>identify and designate</strong> communities as “disadvantaged” for the purpose of directing investments and benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focused on pollution exposure &amp; population characteristics more sensitive to pollution</td>
<td>Expands beyond environmental indicators to consider (a) historical discrimination and disinvestment, and (b) climate risks and vulnerabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not include race/ethnicity</td>
<td>Includes race/ethnicity and considers structural racism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All scores and designation are relative to statewide levels</td>
<td>Considering separate scores for NYC vs. rest of state (to allow more rural communities to designated)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>