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

• Introductions
• DAC Criteria Timeline
• Considered Indicators
• Draft Scenarios
• Public Presentation & Comment Process
• Next Steps
Upcoming Meetings

> Potential August 4 (10am-12pm) – Prepare for voting meetings, CAC integration analysis, outstanding questions (e.g., methodology)

> Aug 12 (2-4pm) – Consensus-building on indicators; prioritize scoring revisions for Aug 26

> Aug 26 (2-4pm) – Consensus-building on scoring scenarios; preview documentation

> Potential Sept 9/10 (time TBD) – Final review before voting

> Week of Sept 13 – In-person voting from multiple locations (indicators + draft scenarios)
Indicators for Draft Scenarios
With 45 indicators, adding or changing one doesn’t shift scores much

Designation Threshold
(High-scoring tracts to designate as DACs – e.g., top third?)

Factor Importance
(Relative importance of exposures vs. climate, etc.)

Indicators
(With ~45 indicators, changing one doesn’t shift much)

Indicator Weights
(With highly-correlated indicators, weights don’t shift results much)
Questions on Considered Indicators Document?
Indicator Framework

Community Burdens and Potential Risks

- Potential Pollution Exposures
- Land use associated with historical discrimination or disinvestment
- Potential Climate Change Risks

Population Characteristics and Vulnerabilities

- Socio-demographics
- Health Impacts & Burdens
- Housing, Mobility, Communications

Generally place-based characteristics or conditions

Generally “people” characteristics
## Community Burdens and Potential Risks: Indicators in Current Scenario

### Potential Pollution Exposures
- Vehicle traffic density
- Diesel truck and bus traffic
- Particulate Matter (PM2.5)
- Benzene concentration
- Wastewater discharge

### Land use associated with historical discrimination or disinvestment
- Historical redlining score
- Remediation Sites (e.g., NPL Superfund or State Superfund/Class II sites)
- Regulated Management Plan (chemical) sites
- Major oil storage facilities (incl. airports)
- Power generation facilities
- Active landfills
- Municipal waste combustors
- Scrap metal processors
- Industrial/manufacturing/mining land use (zoning)
- Utility/waste land use (zoning)
- Housing vacancy rate

### Potential Climate Change Risks
- Extreme heat projections (>90° days in 2050)
- Flooding in coastal and tidally influenced areas (projected)
- Flooding in inland areas (projected)
- Low vegetative cover
- Agricultural land
- Driving time to hospitals or urgent/critical care
# Population Vulnerabilities: Indicators in Current Scenario

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sociodemographics</th>
<th>Health Impacts &amp; Burdens</th>
<th>Housing, Mobility, Communications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pct &lt;80% Area Median Income</td>
<td>Asthma ED visits</td>
<td>Pct Renter-Occupied Homes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pct &lt;100% of Federal Poverty Line</td>
<td>COPD ED visits</td>
<td>Housing cost burden (rental costs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pct without Bachelor’s Degree</td>
<td>Heart attack (MI) hospitalization</td>
<td>Energy Poverty / Cost Burden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment rate</td>
<td>Pct without Health Insurance</td>
<td>Manufactured homes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pct Single-parent households</td>
<td>Pct with Disabilities</td>
<td>Homes built before 1960*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pct Latino/a or Hispanic</td>
<td>Pct Adults age 65+</td>
<td>Percent without private vehicle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pct Black or African American</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pct without Internet (home or cellular)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited English Proficiency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** Future data will include Low Birthweight births and Premature Deaths

*Proxy for lead-based paint risk. We may assess alternatives.
CalEnviroScreen 4.0 Indicators

- 21 indicators
- Not designed to cover climate change
- Does not include race/ethnicity for legal reasons

Data update – Still working on a few things

> Small data updates and QA/QC (low birthweight coming soon!)
> Adding back in the 138 tracts with very low population & scoring on Burdens alone
> Adding 19 tracts where >5% of land is Tribal/Indigenous Reservation or owned by Indigenous Governments
> Analytics around what’s driving scores and what indicators aren’t contributing much
> Testing factor weights (e.g., relative importance of environment vs. climate or sociodemographics vs. housing)
Annual Update Process

Document what CJWG and staff team want to improve (future data collection or advanced analysis)

Additional data needs may emerge from public comment – Save time/budget to address

CJWG can recommend annual process to review and improve indicators (what do you recommend?)
What will help you prepare to vote?
Recap of last meeting

Discussion
• Income (e.g., DACs with higher income)

Changes we made
• Display whether designation came from Statewide, NYC or ROS score
• Show same income metrics as in score (<80% AMI; <100% FPL)

We did not make changes to scenario *yet* pending today’s discussion
Tract Diagnostics

Indicates whether DAC designation from Statewide or Regional calculation

Same income metrics used in DAC scoring
We learn from every comment

Example: “This looks higher-income because it gentrified quickly, but it’s close to a train station and highway interchange and has a large neighborhood of lower-income and non-English-speaking households.”

Example: “I agree this shouldn’t be a DAC because all of the buildings are renovated, there is a park and lots of transportation options.”

Note: Draft maps exclude 138 census tracts (2.8%) with very low population because Vulnerabilities data is missing/unreliable; they will be scored separately on the basis of Burdens alone.
Zooming Out

This is a draft map that will change if/when scenario changes.
Regional Distribution of DRAFT Scenario

In this scenario, 35% of all tracts are DACs, ranging from 9% in LI to 47% in NYC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>% DAC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New York City</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Island</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-Hudson</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western NY</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finger Lakes</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Region</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central NY</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Tier</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mohawk Valley</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Country</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Potential lever: Factor Importance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Burdens and Potential Risks</th>
<th>Population Vulnerabilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Potential Pollution Exposures</td>
<td>Socio-demographics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land use assoc. with historical</td>
<td>Health Impacts &amp; Burdens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>discrimination or disinvestment</td>
<td>Housing, Mobility,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Communications</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Potential Climate Change Risks
- Population Vulnerabilities

Note: Since Burdens and Vulnerabilities are multiplied, they have equal weight, regardless of how you weight things within them.
Post-scoring criteria?

It’s possible that some communities that score high on the combined index may be higher-income (or lower BIPOC)…

…Should we apply an additional criteria or filter after scoring? E.g., exclude high-income?
What haven’t we looked at together

- Climate-change-vulnerable areas?
- Long Island?
- Rural areas?
Go to Tableau

Note: Draft maps exclude 138 census tracts (2.8%) with very low population because Vulnerabilities data is missing/unreliable; they can be scored separately on the basis of Burdens alone.
What will help you prepare to vote?
Public Meetings and Comment Process
Public Process

Educational Session(s)

Pre-recorded training? Optional “live” session?

Public Hearings

“Following the adoption of the draft criteria and disadvantaged communities list, CJWG will hold a minimum of six public hearings.”

Comment Period

“There will be a 120 day comment period following the release of the drafts”
Public Hearings

These hearings will be held in locations across the state and available via WebEX.

- 3 Upstate
- 3 Downstate
Next Steps
Next Steps
Details on Approach If Interested
Inclusion Considerations

Inclusion decisions consider:

- Data coverage & granularity
- Data quality (e.g., measurement or sampling error)
- Modeled vs. directly-collected or measured data
- Correlations
- Technical guidance (e.g., DEC, DOH, DOS)

So far, we obtained & evaluated data for 90+ indicators (a) on their own, and (b) in combination
Review: Combining Data

Group Indicators into Factors

Combine Factors into Components

Calculate Statewide & Regional Scores

Designate DACs based on their relative score

![Diagram showing the process of combining data into factors, components, and scores.](image)
Multiply to represent that Vulnerabilities serve as Effect Modifiers to Burdens

Some decisions move things more than others

Designation Threshold
(High-scoring tracts to designate as DACs – e.g., top third?)

Factor Importance
(Relative importance of exposures vs. climate, etc.)

Indicators
(With ~40 indicators, changing one doesn’t shift much)

Indicator Weights
(With highly-correlated indicators, weights don’t shift results much)

https://www.clrp.cornell.edu/q-a/272-excavator_certification.html

https://compactequip.com/excavators

Photo by Andres Siimon on Unsplash

Photo by Anaya Katlego on Unsplash
Critical Question for CJWG: Share of DACs

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

We’ve discussed the idea of “leave no DAC behind”, but we need to operationalize this as the final % will be an arbitrary number.
DRAFT Designation Approach

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

**Regional Scores**
How each community ranks (on all of the data) in NYC and Rest-of-State separately

- **NYC Scores**
  - top 25%

- **Rest-of-State**
  - top 25%

Designate communities that score in either top 25% *statewide* OR *regionally*

About 1/3 designated

Future: Include tribal/indigenous land & low-population areas with high burdens
Some decisions move things more than others

**Designation Threshold**
(High-scoring tracts to designate as DACs – e.g., top third?)

**Factor Importance**
(Relative importance of exposures vs. climate, etc.)

**Indicators**
(With ~40 indicators, changing one doesn’t shift much)

**Indicator Weights**
(With highly-correlated indicators, weights don’t shift results much)
Starting point for Factor Importance

Community Burdens and Potential Risks
- Potential Pollution Exposures: 2x
- Land use assoc. with historical discrimination or disinvestment: 1x
- Potential Climate Change Risks: 1x

Population Vulnerabilities
- Socio-demographics: 2x
- Health Impacts & Burdens: 2x
- Housing, Mobility, Communications: 1x

Note: Since Burdens and Vulnerabilities are multiplied, they have equal weight, regardless of how you weight things within them.
Indicator Limitations

Documentation (for public comment) will discuss:

- Indicators/data we **considered** but did not pursue, and why
- Data limitations, including Census (e.g., not specific enough to race/ethnicity), public health data (e.g., limited data @ sub-county level), and more
- Recommendations for future/additional community-level data (e.g., migration)
- Potential for periodic indicator review/updates
Legislation allows for continuous improvement

We are cataloging recommendations for data to gather, if possible, and consider in the future.