Climate Justice Working Group
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
Agenda

12:05  Business items, intros (10 min)
12:20  Investments & Benefits (60 min)
1:20   Break (10 min)
1:30   CAC Advisory Panel recommendations process (50 min)
2:20   Orientation to Draft Scenarios + instructions for review (30 min)
2:50   Next steps/scheduling (10 min)
Business Items

> Please send Rosa & Alex your groundtruthing list!
> Approval of Minutes
> Scoring background document
> Next meeting May 24
Investments & Benefits
Outline

1. Refresh on Investments and Benefits Requirements
2. Status of Workstreams
3. Investments
4. Benefits
5. Operationalizing Investment/ Benefits Tracking
6. Discussion

Investment Criteria (Projects, Programs, Investments)
Disadvantaged Communities Definition
Benefits Framework (Metrics, Allocation Rules)
Refresh on Investment and Benefits Requirements

"State agencies, authorities and entities, in consultation with the environmental justice working group and the climate action council, shall, to the extent practicable, invest or direct available and relevant programmatic resources in a manner designed to achieve a goal for disadvantaged communities to receive forty percent of overall benefits of spending on clean energy and energy efficiency programs, projects or investments in the areas of housing, workforce development, pollution reduction, low income energy assistance, energy, transportation and economic development, provided however, that disadvantaged communities shall receive no less than thirty-five percent of the overall benefits of spending on clean energy and energy efficiency programs, projects or investments and provided further that this section shall not alter funds already contracted or committed as of the effective date of this section."

Working Group Work Product, for Deliberative Purposes
Investments and benefits framework being developed in parallel with Disadvantaged Communities criteria

NYSERDA and DEC working with agencies to inventory and assess relevant investments including nature of investment, level of detail available (e.g.: address level) and agency systems for measuring, tracking, and reporting benefits
  - May 2021- assessing energy-focused portfolios (NYSERDA, NYPA, LIPA, DPS and investor-owned utilities)

Regular engagement with all agencies through a staff working group, which will serve as venue for assessing investments and calibration over time

Initial set of benefit metrics that can be tracked today have been identified, further assessment of investments and potential benefits to inform the incorporation of additional benefit metrics

NYS team assessing approach for reporting and tracking, including systems and process
Investments Considerations

> Distinction between investments that can be localized from those that are focused on infrastructure, statewide, or other systems-wide investments
  - Investments that can be localized would count towards 40% goal
  - Investments in infrastructure, or are statewide or systems-wide would not be included in accounting of 40% goal
    • However, there may be community-specific benefits that can be generated from these investments, that should be required and reported on separately (e.g.: local hiring requirements)

> Determination on how to address investments made to individuals or priority populations, residing outside of targeted communities (e.g. low-income)
Program Changes to Target Investments

> State entities will need to assess their investments and begin shifting strategies to drive benefits to communities
  - Understanding nature of investment (source of funds may dictate how investments can be targeted)
  - Incorporating requirements for benefits to communities into procurements
  - Targeting outreach and removing barriers to participation to increase uptake of programs within communities
  - Developing new initiatives to meet the needs of communities

> NYSERDA, DPS and other agency program teams began making changes in 2020
Benefits Considerations

> Benefits that are tangible or meaningful to communities need to be incorporated

> Need to balance complexity and cost of measurement, tracking, and reporting with desire to account for and to localize benefits

> Benefits metrics should be able to be used to manage to the benefits requirement, allowing for calibration of investment strategies

> Approach to benefits accounting must consider that investments and resulting benefits, as well as capacity for tracking and reporting benefits will vary by agency
Phased Approach to Benefits

> Phased approach to benefits metrics tracking and reporting
> Begin by tracking and reporting benefits that are currently measured or can be incorporated in the near term
  • Solve for inconsistency in agency measurement/reporting capacity and program outcomes
  • Report additional outcomes or investments that are not accounted for in the initial set of metrics
> Incorporate additional benefits metrics, based on input from stakeholders and ability to measure and report
# Potential Benefits Metrics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>POSSIBLE METRICS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spending</td>
<td>Direct agency spending on projects and other investments ($)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jobs and Training</td>
<td>Directly contracted training and jobs (FTEs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supply chain jobs (associated with Agency spending but not directly contracted/controlled)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant Bill Savings</td>
<td>Participant energy bill savings ($)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Energy bill assistance (credits for low-to-moderate-income customers) ($)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transportation fuel cost savings ($)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy Savings</td>
<td>Energy savings (MWh and MMBtu)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transportation fuel savings (MMBtu)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>Avoided emissions from reduced on-site fossil fuel combustion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Avoided emissions from gasoline and diesel transportation fuels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health (longer-term)</td>
<td>Health impacts from avoided on-site building fossil fuel combustion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Health impacts from avoided transportation fuel combustion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Health impacts in air basin of power generation facilities from avoided fuel combustion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Approach to Operationalizing

Phase 1 (through 2021)

1. Starting in 2021 begin to track and report identified benefits metrics:
   a) Establish a public-facing dashboard to track progress
   b) Begin tracking agencies and portfolios that have the most relevance; incorporate agencies and portfolios over time
   c) Focus on programs/investments that are place-based, phase in systems or societal-wide investments as possible
   d) Including a supplemental report card to provide additional metrics or qualitative outcomes related to equity or climate justice
2. Develop a process to review progress and identify opportunities to calibrate investments and identify additional benefits with the CJWG
3. Require agency procurements to incorporate provisions to deliver benefits to DAC in procurements
4. Develop model for aggregating benefits, where practicable

Phase 2 (2022 and beyond)

1. Incorporate additional agencies, portfolios, investments as practicable
2. Implement process for review of performance and investment calibration with CJWG
3. Establish and implement process for working with state agencies for reviewing and calibrating their investments to deliver benefits to DAC towards the 40% goal
4. Establish process for incorporating feedback from and priorities of communities into initiative planning
NYSERADE Profile: Investments & Strategy Shifts

Baselining Investments

Market Development Portfolio Investments within Interim DAC*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Funding Deployed to Projects within DAC</th>
<th>% of Funds Deployed to Projects within DAC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential (1-4 Family) EE</td>
<td>$59.30</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multifamily EE</td>
<td>$34.30</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>$57.80</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>$176.10</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>$4.40</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMI</td>
<td>$92.2</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multisector</td>
<td>$5.80</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Mapped Investments</td>
<td>$337.70</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*includes investments/projects that have been geo-coded to date

Strategy Shifts

- Internal energy equity capacity building, focused on opportunities for delivering benefits to disadvantaged communities; improved stakeholder engagement; and advancing justice, equity, diversity, and inclusion competencies
- Development of new initiatives focused on disadvantaged communities, across NYSERDA portfolios:
  - Clean Green Schools
  - Affordable housing in DAC
  - Capacity building grants and engagement support
  - Regional Clean Energy Hubs
- Refinement of existing strategies/initiatives to ensure benefits to disadvantaged communities
NYSERDA Profile: CEF Petition, December 2020

### Market Development Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus Area</th>
<th>Est. Budget ($ millions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LMI</td>
<td>$540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family</td>
<td>$77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multifamily</td>
<td>$66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial, Industrial, Agriculture</td>
<td>$302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Construction</td>
<td>$117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communities</td>
<td>$63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>$24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clean Heating and Cooling</td>
<td>$68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workforce Development</td>
<td>$91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Codes and Stds, Other Multisector Initiatives</td>
<td>$110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributed Energy Resources</td>
<td>$37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repurposed CEF evaluation funds</td>
<td>$6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserve of 3% (unallocated)</td>
<td>$45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$1,547</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Identified Investments to Benefit Disadvantaged

#### Market Development (MD)
- **Clean Green Schools** – funding for eligible P-12 schools to reduce school energy use and assist in the conversion to carbon-free fuels.
- **Empower and Assisted Home Performance** – providing no-cost and substantially discounted energy efficiency solutions to income-eligible New Yorkers, helping save energy and money.
- **Beneficial Electrification** for LMI and Affordable Housing– advance replicable solutions for heat pump adoption in the LMI and affordable housing sectors, while ensuring customer protections.
- **Technical Assistance & Predevelopment** – supporting housing agencies, contractors, developers, and builders for the inclusion of clean energy or high performance building and retrofits.
- **Community-Based Workforce Development** – community-based training partnerships between clean energy businesses, training organizations, industry associations, and underemployed residents in historically disadvantaged communities.
- **On-the-job training for priority populations** – increased support for clean energy businesses to hire persons from priority populations.
- **Career Pathways Funding and Training** – solicitation to train and place new entrants to the HVAC and building electrification industry.

#### Innovation & Research (I&R)
- **Advanced HVAC Challenge** – targeting common LMI building types/seeds.
- **Air Innovation for Affordable Decarbonization** – Investments designed to reduce the cost of clean energy through optimization of the power grid, clean buildings technologies, and clean gas and liquid fuels.
- **Pollution Remediation** – Program to support improved air filtration solutions to accelerate pollution remediation in disadvantaged communities.

#### NY-Sun
- **Solar for All** – utility bill assistance program funding solar to benefit homeowners/renters unable to access solar.
- **Affordable MF Housing Incentive** – PV installations serving affordable housing properties.
- **Technical Assistance & Predevelopment** – Grants to address key barriers to PV and storage projects providing benefits to LMI, Environmental Justice and disadvantaged communities.
- **Community Solar, Solar paired with Storage** – incentive adders for community PV, projects that pair PV and energy storage and provide resiliency and/or financial benefits to LMI customers and affordable housing.
- **Peaker Reduction and Replacement** – Project deployments that support the potential for solar and energy storage to repower or replace electric generating peaker units.

NYGB
- **NVGB Financing for Affordable Housing** – financing products to catalyze clean energy within the existing capital stack for affordable housing.
- **NVGB Financing of Energy Efficiency in Disadvantaged Communities** – financing products to promote energy efficiency across building typologies to stabilize energy costs and improve air quality in disadvantaged communities.
Discussion
CAC Advisory Panel Recommendations Process
Items we'll Cover:

> Timeline and Roles

> Super High-Level Review of Recs

> Suggested Lens to Viewing Recs

> Options for Presenting Feedback and Next Steps
CAC Scoping Plan Timeline

- Advisory panels submit draft recs to CAC
- **June 8** (tentative date): CJWG verbally shares perspectives on recs at CAC meeting
- **Spring/Summer 2021**: CJWG shares perspective on recs in writing to CAC
- **Remainder of 2021**: CAC completes draft plan
- **Start of 2022**: CAC releases draft for public comment, holding at least six regional public meetings

- By **10/2022**: DEC, upon working with CJWG, prepares community air monitoring program
- **Start of 2023**: Based on collection of input and analysis, CAC approves and adopts the Final Scoping Plan and releases it to the Governor and Legislature for consideration
- Elements of the approved plan that require new laws to be implemented must be enacted by the Legislature and those that do not require new statutory authority will be implemented via administrative and regulatory actions (in some capacity these actions can and are being taken now) Questions?
CJWG Role

Each advisory panel shall coordinate with the environmental justice advisory group and climate justice working group.

Review Eight Advisory Panel Recs from:

- Agriculture & Forestry
- Energy Intensive and Trade Exposed Industries
- Just Transition WG
- Waste

(First set of recs)

- Energy Efficiency & Housing
- Land Use and Local Government
- Power Generation
- Transportation

(Second set of recs)
The justice provisions in CLCPA are critical to implement the law equitably and effectively.

Air monitoring and community informed emission reduction programs to eliminate hotspots

Priority Investments

Our work on DAC criteria and defining and tracking benefits can help ensure investments and benefits accrue in the communities as justice merits

Ongoing Public Oversight via the EJ Advisory Working Group and the CJWG
Suggested Lens Reviewing and Responding to Recs

> Do the recommendations progressively transform our institutions to achieve equal protection under the law? For instance, do they redress the effects of historical and ongoing discriminatory or unfair treatment based on race, gender, income, disability, geography or other such factors?

> Do you agree with the stringency of the emission reduction targets by sector and in aggregate? What does your answer depend on?

> Does the transition plan aim to lift every boat? i.e. would the changes place new burdens on already overburdened communities or eliminate the existing burdens?

> Do they give every community the same degree of protection from environmental harm?

> Do they align with your organization’s mission and vision of climate justice?

> Do they reflect the status quo or something transformative like the Green New Deal?

> Do they equitably incorporate resilience?

> Do they empower communities to lead the transition?

Things to share with CAC members:

- Do the recommendations take NY in the direction intended by the CLCPA?
- What corrections would you make, broadly and/or specifically?
- What are the positive aspects of the recs that you would highlight?
- The basis of your perspective and why it’s crucial for them to consider

What else would you add here?
Recommendations – Note that panels were directed to factor climate justice into their work products

- **Ag & Forestry**: Avoid development of forest and ag lands, promote small farms and local healthy food economies, expand urban forestry - **Would GHGs by 253% below 1990 levels by 2050**

- **EITE**: Cut GHGs in a way that prevents emissions from being exported out of state and create an instate supply of green companies - **Would GHGs by 91% below 1990 levels by 2050**

- **EE & Housing**: Slash energy use in appliances and the structure of buildings, phase in bans on fossil fuels in housing, and protect people in need of affordable housing - **Would GHGs by 30% below 1990 levels by 2030; 2050 target in reach but new solutions likely needed**

- **Just Transition Panel**: Direct support for existing, displaced, and future workers, implement labor standards where possible, incorporate climate justice curriculum in K-12/Higher Ed, create Climate Justice Job Corps, target employment and business growth in DACs and for WMBEs

- **Land Use**: Boost smart growth, i.e. ETOD and mixed income/use of buildings; facilitate clean energy siting, embed adaptation/resilience in state agency work and provide tools and resources to localities to mitigate risks

- **Transportation**: Set caps on GHGs via TCI and CFS, adopt new ZEV standards, pursue dense affordable housing near transit hubs, explore congestion pricing and VMT fees in place of gas taxes – **Would GHGs by 77% below 1990 levels by 2050**

- **Power Gen**: Pursue Energy Justice via community owned energy, fund community engagement and empowerment to shape policy, enforce clean air regs in DACs more strictly - **Would GHGs by 95% below 1990 levels by 2050**

- **Waste**: Product stewardship standards, repair cafes, setup recycling and composting systems, regulate wastewater and septic tank systems - **Would GHGs by 68% below 1990 levels by 2050**
Options for giving feedback (or some combo of all)
CAC members need to hear from each of YOU!

1. Each CJWG member presents before the CAC, with the time for each divided in equal proportion by the number who wish to speak
2. CJWG collaborates on one letter and submits to CAC, and presents before the CAC, with the format and number of speakers collectively determined
3. CJWG members present before the CAC in self-selected groups, with the amount of time for each divided in equal proportion by the number who wish to speak
4. CJWG members are divided into groups of three such that each includes representation of urban, suburban, and rural areas. Different panel topics could be assigned to each group

In all cases, CJWG may also submit written comments, as one collective, in self-selected subgroups, and/or as individuals. These comments will be collated and submitted to the CAC as one document

*As needed: Sameer can assist you with research and in the creation of materials and will share a poll with each of you to understand your preference, and be available for 1:1 meetings at a time that works well for you

Discussion!
Where we are

Identify Need
Observe/Research
Prioritize
Begin downloads
Explore data
TEST
Create combinations
Test
Iterate
Optimize
New Ideas
Troubleshooting
DEVELOP

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

We’re here.

APPLY
LEARN
ADJUST
RE-APPLY
Track
Adjust
Grow

Adjust
Agree on criteria

Where we are

Identify Need
Observe/Research
Prioritize
Begin downloads
Explore data
TEST
Create combinations
Test
Iterate
Optimize
New Ideas
Troubleshooting
DEVELOP

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

We’re here.
This document has important details of the approach.

Today we’re going to show you maps!
Draft Indicator Framework

Community Burdens and Potential Risks*
- Potential Pollution Exposures*
- Land use associated with historical discrimination or disinvestment*
- Potential Climate Change Risks*

Population Vulnerabilities*
- Socio-demographics*
- Health Impacts & Burdens*
- Housing & Mobility*

*The names of these groups may shift depending on selected indicators.
Yay! Maps

DAC Scenario Map

DAC Designation: DAC
Burden Score: 45
Vulnerability Score: 75
Tract: 36055009602
Region: Finger Lakes
County: Monroe
Place: Rochester city

% BIPOC: 84%
Median Income: $21,591
Redline Score: 4

% of Tracts in Region that are DACs
- Region
  - New York City: 42%
  - Long Island: 10%
  - Mid-Hudson: 30%
  - Western NY: 33%
  - Finger Lakes: 29%
  - Capital Region: 24%
  - Central NY: 31%
  - Southern Tier: 25%
  - Mohawk Valley: 35%
  - North Country: 20%
  - Grand Total: 33%

DACs Vs All Others
- Region
  - Avg. Redline Score
    - DAC: 2.8
    - Non DAC: 1.2
    - Grand Total: 3.0
  - % BIPOC
    - DAC: 34.3%
    - Non DAC: 65.0%
    - Grand Total: 44.6%
  - Avg. Burden 1 - Pollution
    - DAC: 89
    - Non DAC: 54
    - Grand Total: 44
  - Avg. Burden 2 - Disinvestment
    - DAC: 36
    - Non DAC: 48
    - Grand Total: 40
  - Avg. Burden 3 - Climate
    - DAC: 48
    - Non DAC: 45
    - Grand Total: 47
  - Avg. Vul. 1 - Health
    - DAC: 42
    - Non DAC: 67
    - Grand Total: 50
  - Avg. Vul. 2 - Sociodemographics
    - DAC: 40
    - Non DAC: 59
    - Grand Total: 46
  - Avg. Vul. 3 - Housing
    - DAC: 45
    - Non DAC: 62
    - Grand Total: 50

DAC Designation by Region
- Region
  - % of All Tracts
    - DACs
    - Non DACs
  - % of all DAC tracts
    - New York City: 44% 57%
    - Long Island: 12% 4%
    - Mid-Hudson: 10% 10%
    - Western NY: 7% 8%
    - Finger Lakes: 6% 6%
    - Capital Region: 6% 4%
    - Central NY: 4% 4%
    - Southern Tier: 3% 3%
    - Mohawk Valley: 3% 3%
    - North Country: 2% 1%
    - Grand Total: 100% 100%
Early maps to get your reaction to big things

We are waiting for better data for many indicators, but have proxy data for key concepts.

We are testing several ways of scoring, and haven’t weighted anything yet.
Tables beside the map

Percent of tracts **within** a region that are a DAC

24% of tracts in the Capital Region are designated DACs

Comparison of attributes of tracts that are designated DACs in this scenario

DAC census tracts have a higher vulnerability health score than non-DAC census tracts

Percent of DACs in a region vs the total % of tracts in that region

Western NY has 7% of the state’s tracts but 8% of the DAC tracts

### Percent of Tracts in Region that are DACs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>% of Tracts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New York City</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Island</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-Hudson</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western NY</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finger Lakes</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Region</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central NY</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Tier</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mohawk Valley</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Country</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### DACs Vs All Others

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Non DAC</th>
<th>DAC</th>
<th>Grand T.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Avg. Redline Score</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% BIPOC</td>
<td>34.3%</td>
<td>65.9%</td>
<td>44.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. Burden 1 - Pollution</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. Burden 2 - Disinvestment</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. Burden 3 - Climate</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. Vul. 1 - Health</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. Vul. 2 - Sociodemographics</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. Vul. 3 - Housing</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### DAC Designation by Region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>% of All Tracts</th>
<th>% of all DAC Tracts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New York City</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Island</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-Hudson</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western NY</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finger Lakes</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Region</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central NY</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Tier</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mohawk Valley</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Country</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What you see when you hover over a tract

Information that can help you compare different census tracts

**DAC Designation:** Whether the census tract is a DAC in this scenario

**Burden Score:** Average burden score (average across the 3 burden factors)

**Vulnerability Score:** Average vulnerability score (average across 3 vulnerability factors)

**Tract:** Census tract number

**Region:** Larger region

**County:** County

**Place:** Closest identifying town or city

**% BIPOC:** Percent of residents who are BIPOC

**Median Income:** Median income of census tract

**Redline Score:** Historic redlining score (1-4) with higher scores showing higher likelihood of the area being redlined
The map
As we go through our example in Tableau –

What other information would you find helpful when comparing scenarios?
Next Steps
DAC Next Steps

- One-on-ones
- Tutorials or small group review
- Release DRAFT tableau for WGs to explore