

CJWG Meeting Notes Webex – 2.11.25

Meeting Commence 2:03pm

*Disclaimer: *Please note this is not a word for word translation.*

Agenda:

1. Opening remarks
2. Roll call
3. Approve minutes from previous minutes
4. DAC review
5. Continued deliberation on new indicators
6. Next Steps

CJWG Members & Panelists:

- Alanah Keddell-Tuckey, EJ Director, Office of Environmental Justice, DEC
- Amy Klein, Executive Director, Capital Roots
- Michael DiRamio, Assistant Director, Energy and Climate Equity, NYSERDA-Albany
- Elizabeth Furth, Empire Fellow, DOL, NYC
- Abigail (Abby) McHugh-Grifa, Executive Director, Climate Solutions Accelerator of the Genesee-Finger Lakes Region, Region Buffalo
- Amber Johnson, Organizing and Training Director, New York Energy Democracy Alliance, Binghamton
- Neil Muscatiello, Director of the Bureau of Environmental and Occupational Epidemiology, Center for Environmental Health, DOH , Albany
- Jill Henck, Clean Energy Program Director, Adirondack North Country Association, Saratoga
- Julie Suarez, Associate Dean for Land Grant Affairs and Director of Translational Research Programs, Cornell University, representing Albany

In-Person Event Locations (NY) :

- NY Green Bank, Alistair W.C. Clark Boardroom, 1333 Broadway, Suite 300, New York, NY 10018
- New York State Energy Research and Development Authority (NYSERDA) Headquarters, Boardroom, 17 Columbia Circle, Albany, NY 12203
- Brooklyn Heights Public Library, 286 Cadman Plz W, Brooklyn, NY 11201
- Saratoga Springs Public Library, Susman Room, 49 Henry Street, Saratoga Springs, NY 12866
- Broome County Public Library Exhibit Room, 185 Court Street, Binghamton, NY 13901
- DEC Region 8 Office, 6274 East Avon-Lima Rd., Avon, NY 14414

Roll Call

- Quorum reached.

Approval of Minutes from previous meetings:

Vote on meeting minutes for Nov 12, 2024, and January 21, 2025.

Jill: I'd like to thank Abby in my absence last month. Abby, I appreciate your comment of not wanting to make decisions without myself or Sonal present.

Abby: I am happy you are here.

Vote: Yes vote from Alanah, Jill, Michael, Neil, Amy, Abby, Sonal, Elizabeth F, and Julie. Amber did not vote. The minutes are approved.

DAC criteria review:

Alex: Our goal today is to review maps with new indicators and perhaps have an interim vote. Vote will be followed by discussion.

Overview of maps:

Alex: Diabetes would go into health sensitivity as one part going into that factor.

8 scenarios and results:

- Scenario 1: original indicators with refreshed data
- Scenario 2: refreshed data plus diabetes information
- Scenario 3: refreshed data plus diabetes plus airport proximity
- Scenario 4: refreshed data plus diabetes plus rail proximity
- Scenario 5: refreshed data plus airport proximity
- Scenario 6: refreshed data plus airport proximity plus rail proximity
- Scenario 7: refreshed data plus rail proximity
- Scenario 8: refreshed data plus diabetes plus airport proximity plus rail proximity

Alex: Using the maps lets focus on scenarios 2,5, and 7 to see if we want to add diabetes, airport or rail proximity. If we say yes we can then tinker with how to add them.

Abby: So every scenario has fewer total DACs than if we stick with the refreshed data. Am I interpreting that correctly?

Alex: Yes.

Abby: I am reluctant to lose DACS in place of indicators.

Amber: I do not know much about Elmira or Oswego. So I cannot say I am comfortable with loosing those.

Amy: Why are we manipulating the data?

Alex: If you think about all the things we've been doing, it is all interconnected. It is still 35% with small manipulations that change it. Any questions on the thresholds? Amy does it feel ok to you?

Amy: Yes, I guess so. I may have been jumping ahead.

Alex: Let's start ground truthing.

Abby: As of right now I like this change. Sad to lose one but hey we gain two.

Amber: I do not know much about Elmira or Oswego. I cannot say if I am comfortable losing them.

Alex: Vulnerability is very high.

Julie: I worry about losing Oswego. Do we have a map with all three characteristics, diabetes, proximity to rail and proximity to airport?

Alex: Yes we do. It's basically the same.

Sonal: I do not speak for all of NYC. Let the record show that. Can we see around JFK? It doesn't look like a clear enough benefit to change what we have.

Jill: I find this fascinating. To my knowledge, there is no airport in Altona. There is one in Ogdensburg. I am grappling with adding indicators right now. I don't think now is the best time.

Alex: Proximity to air is a model based on noise. So the airports here could just mean there is something noisy around them. It might not be directly in Covington. Does it feel like a tossup? From a statistical standpoint my position is the fewer the indicators the better.

Julie: Can you go back to airport criteria?

Abby: Losing Orleans and Genesee county. I don't love this.

Sonal: What does this mean for NYC regarding folks who don't have enough subway access?

Alex: Perhaps this is not the right way to get rail data. The idea is to get pollution. Using noise as a proxy might not be balancing that quite right. Maybe we need to figure out something else.

Amy: When I raised rail as an issue I was speaking of commercial rail running through a variety of DACs. I'm sure that's the case in many other urban areas across NY state. I was thinking of the dangers commercial rail poses.

Adriana: If I may. This also comes from letters we received from advocates of DACs in southeast Queens. They are worried about proximity to rail for the same reason. Specifically waste being transported from Long Island to southeast Queens.

Alex: I recommend we ditch this as an indicator. In the future let's find a better measure for identifying commercial rail. Let's discuss if members want to make any changes now? If not do we vote today?

Abby: I would love to go for the vote today.

Amy: I agree with Abby. Let's update the data and hold off on adding any other indicators. It does not make sense to add any.

Neil: I agree with Abby and Amy. I am up for a more formal process to make this judgement. I agree with moving forward with just the update to the census tracts.

Michael: I am mindful of us diluting the other indicators that are in there already. It does not seem like there's a strong case to mess with the indicators. I support us just voting to update to the 2020 census.

Elizabeth F: I would like to not vote today because we are three members down. If we do vote today I would likely abstain.

Julie: I am wholeheartedly in favor of voting on using the 2020 census.

Amber: I think it's important to update to the 2020 census data. As for the changes I don't feel they were significant. I do vote that we get the 2020 data in there.

Sonal: I am prepared to vote today.

Jill: I am prepared to vote not to add any indicators and to use the 2020 census data. I appreciate Alex and Illume for their hard work.

Alanah: I agree that we should vote to update to the 2020 census data and hold off on adding any indicators until we can revisit this. Some of the indicators we want to add may be too broad.

Alex: Thank you everyone. We went through the methodological components a few meetings ago. Should we go through them again today? It's the thresholds we tinkered with. Are we good?

Abby: What would be the purpose if changing them is not on the table?

Alex: I want to be as transparent as possible about what we have done. I will show those quick for the benefit of our new members.

- Overview: double weighting of factors. Explanation of the voting process and voting rules.

Vote on using updated 2020 census data:

Voting members: Elizabeth F, Amy, Neil, Michael, Jill, Alanah, Julie, Sonal, Amber, and Abby. **Vote taken:** unanimous yes.

Alex: Big shout out to her Illume team for their technical work.

Alanah: To Illume, DOL, DOH, and to the CJWG members a big thank you! Our March meeting will be removed from the calendar. If anyone has any questions, comments, or concerns, please email Alanah directly.

Next Steps

- Cancel March CJWG meeting
- Next meeting will be in the summer of 2025.
 - **Meeting Adjourned: 4:00pm**