CJWG Meeting Notes
WebEx - 12.02.21

Meeting Commence 10:00am
Disclaimer: This is a summary, not a word for word translation

Agenda:
A. Timeline
B. Review Critical DAC Decisions
C. Eligible Investments
D. DAC Criteria:
    1. Review critical questions
    2. Income-based individual criteria
    3. Map review
E. Preparing for DAC Criteria Vote:
    1. Vote elements (Break down vote? Multiple Scenarios?)
    2. What would you like to see/review before a vote?

A)Introductions:
- Alanah Keddell-Tuckey, acting EJ Director/Public Outreach Specialist, DEC, Office of Environmental Justice
- Sonal Jessel, Policy and Advocacy Coordinator, WEACT for Environmental Justice
- Eddie Bautista, Executive Director, NYC Environmental Justice Alliance
- Elizabeth Yeampierre, Executive Director, UPROSE
- Rahwa Ghirmatzion, Executive Director, PUSH Buffalo
- Lisa Covert, General Counsel, DEC
- Elizabeth Cooper, Executive Director of (ANCA) Adirondack North Country Association
- Chris Coll, Director of Energy Affordability and Equity Program, NYSERDA
- Neil Muscatiello, Director of the Bureau of Environmental and Occupational Epidemiology, Center for Environmental Health, DOH
- Joe McNearney, Director of Stakeholder Engagement, DOL
- Alex Dunn – Illume Advising, Consultant
- Amanda Dwelley – Illume Advising, Consultant
- Abigail McHugh-Grifa, Executive Director for Climate Solutions Accelerator
- Sameer Ranade, Climate Justice Advisor with Climate Action Council
- Donathan Brown, Assistant Provost and AVP for Faculty Diversity and Recruitment at the Rochester Institute of Technology
- Amy Klein, Chief Executive Officer, Capital Roots
- Jared Snyder, Deputy Commissioner of Climate, Air and Energy, DEC

A)Timeline

Discussion of Draft Timeline before DAC Vote
- Review of next CJWG meeting dates (current)Dec2, Dec9, Dec13

B) Review Critical DAC Decisions

Overview by Alex of progress made and critical decisions to make.

Eddie: Recalls the working group wanted a sense of the totality of the climate funding that we're talking about. This 35-40%. How much of that funding is for individual households vs the more geographically based definition that triggered the language in the law initially. Is this the meeting where we will dive into this more?

Alex & Chris: Yes, we have some of that content which we will get to next.

C) Eligible Investments

Discussion of slides: Chris
- ❖ Eligible investments
- ❖ Investments and Benefits slide
- ❖ Work in progress by agencies
- ❖ CJWG Feedback

Chris:
- Today identify funding going to households based on income
- For a proposal: clean energy spending as primary metric to track for 40%
- We're looking into agencies capacity for geocoding.
- What are the other benefits metrics they (other agencies) can track?
- We are working through what do the investmts look like?
  - o Are they statewide?
  - o Who is the end user?
  - o ie) Are dollars going to commercial industrial projects.

Eddie: Did we agree on a list of EJ communities? Do the agencies under climate funding understand they have a legal obligation to geocode? Yes, its been 2 years since the law passed. Do agencies understand they need to prioritize this?

Chris: At this point the agencies know.

Eddie: The more the Hochul administration can make that transparent will benefit all NY'ers. If there is a guidance we land on let's share that with the public.

Chris: We want all this to be transparent. Guidance will be made public. As budgets are allocated today things will remain constant. Big need to focus on LMI households in terms of electric.

Continuation of Slides Discussion -Chris
- ❖ CJWG Feedback
- ❖ Targeting programs to communities or individuals

Chris: Speaking for NYSERDA, we are looking at uptake in communities of color. Are we hiring technicians from DACs? What's lacking is a good baseline? Where are we with equitable inclusive indicators?

Abby: When I look at this slide and current spending does this spending help families make the transition to clean energy? What does this look like in the long term?

Chris: The law requires us to track. We want energy bill assistance to become the Band-Aid not the primary source for people to change their thinking. Goal is to reduce alliance on bill assistance.

Alanah: We can discuss meeting quarterly in the future. -Chris, Lets table that.

Rahwa: I'm leaning toward inclusion of people based on income. Do any state agencies provide training for MWBEs? Funding needs to be dedicated to this. Milwaukee has a good program involving water and green infrastructure. They've invested a lot of money in MWBE training.

Chris: NY state does have a requirement for agencies to meet training for MWBEs.

Rahwa: How do we generate more revenue?

Sonal: Ownership. If we're employing a big company that's not owned by people in DACS they are still making a major profit from being contracted to do specific work. Even though 40% of the people they've employed are from DACs. Prime example is the worker cooperative.

Chris: Our work ahead is digging into the best way to measure this. We do have additional resources coming onboard to assist with reporting.

Eddie: Spoke on the Revitalize partnership whose goal is to work on replicable models that communities can use in terms of actually owning clean energy infrastructure. Is NYSERDA considering revisiting a grant program similar to Revitalize?

Chris: Our NY Sun program will focus on ownership models. What are the supports needed to actually replicate.

D) DAC Criteria

Questions for DAC definition (slide) - Alex
Question to working group: What information would change the way you vote?

Eddie: These are his 2 problems. What is fair for NY city downstate and what's fair for upstate? Secondly the household vs community question. Infrastructure is not usually discussed at household level.

Alex: Those are the big questions. No added information will help make these decisions Eddie brought up. How do we create an equitable system for all of NY state?

❖ Next Steps from Nov17 Meeting (slide)- Alex

To working group: Is there anything else we're missing?

Abbigail: Question for Chris. Which of these is easiest to implement?

Chris: What everything is structured around right now is 60% of the state median income. There are solar initiatives available for families up to 80%of the state median income. We want to stick to the 60-80%. Programs are designed around 60-80%.

❖ Continued Slide presentation and Discussion

Eddie: Does a demographic breakdown of these numbers exist anywhere in general? Racial demographic breakdown?

Chris: It is tricky to have precision. We can estimate by race and ethnicity. Can search LMI tool on NYSERDA's webpage.

Amanda: NY city has the greatest extra number of people in DACS Housing mobility and migration. 60% reside in NY city.

Abigail: What percent of NY city households are under DACs?

Amanda: Not on current slide but we can look at another slide. In urban areas DAC definition is capturing 74% in high poverty households living outside a DAC.

Eddie: What decisions are needed today to progress to final vote?

E) Preparing for DAC Criteria Vote

Revisit of slide 6: Review of critical decisions-Illume
- Add Income based individual criteria- Group says yes. Votes from: Abigail, Sonal, Donathan and Eddie*(tentatively)
- Consider geographic minimum after year 1
- If added: How to define low-income households?
  - o <60% SMI used by programs more;
  - o <80% AMI more inclusive, but harder to implement,
  - o start with 60% SMI and re-assess after 1 year

- Additional considerations:
  - o ongoing agency information/analysis
  - o evaluate in 1 year to 'add more guardrails' around individual definition

- share of investments meeting 40% goal from geographic DACS or LMI HHS outside of DACS

- Critical Questions:
  - Individual criteria (income-based definition)
  - Low-income definition/threshold
  - DAC designation threshold (35%-40%?)

Distinction between low-income communities and low-income households:
- Low-income community is based on geographic data.
- Low-income household is based on income.

Conclusion: At the agency level we are aligning around looking at investments as the primary benefit metric we count. We want to make sure we account for other impacts/cobenefits. We are looking at our next CJWG to discuss where we are as a state on this topic.

Next Steps

- Illume will send out updated slides and summarized information to everyone
- Questions reach out to Illume , Alanah, or Chris
- Amanda will work on tweaks.
- Working group please submit your input by tomorrow (Dec.3,2021) to stay on track for Dec.9,2021's meeting
- Next meeting Dec 9,2021 will focus on maps and addressing questions.

-Meeting End 12:58pm