

CJWG Meeting Notes

WebEx - 5.24.2021

Meeting Commence 1:00pm

Agenda:

- A. Introductions & Business Items
- B. Timeline & Review Periods
- C. Investment & Benefits Refresh
 - o Q&A
- D. CAC Advisory Panel Recommendations Process
- E. DAC Scoring Criteria Update & Maps
- F. Next Steps/Scheduling

Introductions:

- Elizabeth Yeampierre, Executive Director, UPROSE
- Sonal Jessel, Policy and Advocacy Coordinator, WEACTION for Environmental Justice
- Eddie Bautista, Executive Director, NYC Environmental Justice Alliance
- Rahwa Ghirmatzion, Executive Director, PUSH Buffalo
- Jerrod Bley, Clean Energy Program Director, Adirondack North Country Association
- Mary Beth McEwen, Executive Director, Cornell Cooperative Extension Oneida County
- Abigail McHugh-Grifa, Executive Director, Climate Solutions Accelerator
- Dr. Donathan Brown, Adirondack Diversity Solutions
- Rosa Méndez, Director, Office of Environmental Justice, DEC
- Chris Coll, Director of Energy Affordability and Equity Program, NYSEERDA
- Neil Muscatiello, Director of the Bureau of Environmental and Occupational Epidemiology, Center for Environmental Health, DOH
- Joseph McNearney, Director of Stakeholder Engagement, DOL
- Sameer Ranade, Climate Justice Advisor (Presenter)
- Amanda Dwelley, Illume Advising (Presenter)
- Alex Dunn, Illume Advising (Presenter)

Business Items

Chris: Work backwards from public meetings

Timeline & Review Periods

Jerrod: I prefer not to have next meeting the same week of the CAC meeting

Abigail: For me yes. I'm also okay with June 10 if needed.

Elizabeth: I think July is a good idea

Investments & Benefits Refresh -Chris

On the investments side:

- looking at how focus on those that can reach communities and not broader system wide.
- then to identify how to account for those that reach individuals or households who meet parameter of program (for example LMI) but may not be in an area that's been identified.

Question from last meeting: about application to broader set of investments. State interpretation is clean energy portfolio. We are discussing this at the request of the working group.

Question from last meeting: about tracking benefits by race or ethnicity? That is an area we are exploring. In some cases where there are applications we can incorporate self-identifying questions but some programs may be much harder to determine a demographic end user.

Eddie: Part of what we talked about previously is ability to have a baseline sense of where current spending is now to measure progress. Is that being worked on and when will we get a sense of assessment of current baseline?

Chris: Plan is later this year to report out going back to 2020. For some agencies that has been done and we are working with a number of agencies to compile and understand their programs. From there we will work with them on geocoding and analysis which is needed to get a baseline report.

Abigail: So 2020 is a baseline year. We are now halfway through 2021, and you mentioned NYSERDA is at 21%?

Chris: Some of the NYSERDA investments were geocoded. We can compare those to the interim definition. Once we land on a final criterion for DACs the final number for NYSERDA may look different.

Abigail: Is there intention to retroactively make up the difference?

Chris: The intention is to develop strategies to drive investments to the disadvantaged communities informed by the analysis of progress. We need to know how far away we are. Then we can approach the best way to meet our goals. The commitment is to orient programs so they are meeting the goals.

Elizabeth: So, look at 40% as basement not ceiling. Where were the allocations and commitments before? Concern of taking place of programs that are already designed to go to disadvantaged communities. How do we add or build to those and not replace them? Accounting should be additive, not counting the programs already targeting disadvantaged communities.

Jerrod: Should be additive and transparent.

Chris: We are trying to assess the programs, looking back and also looking forward. Revisit the initial question of how we think about investments that are directed at individuals? E.g.) Energy assistance listed in CLCPA. The basis is income eligibility. Should we be counting that as a whole towards 40%? Instead do we count as income eligible retrofit programs like EmPower or WAP?

Abigail: Kind of gets to what Elizabeth said about additive?

Elizabeth: It's not exactly the same.

Rahwa: Can some initial modeling with NYSERDA's portfolio (which seems to be up & running) be done to help us imagine & inform the rest of agency funding?

Chris: Yes, NYSERDA's assessment can be used as a template for other agencies

Community Air Monitoring

Jared: First conversation on this topic. CLCPA requires DEC to undertake community air monitoring by October 2022 in at least four highest priority locations within disadvantaged communities based on potentially high exposure. Following monitoring there will be strategies to reduce or mitigate.

Dirk: Background on statewide monitoring. About sixty sites for various pollutants. Most are based on EPA design criteria for pollutant. About half in Long Island and NYC regions.

Jared: Statewide programs show regional air pollution levels. Some programs in the past targeted specific communities as examples for community level monitoring. They are focused on community specific concerns or exposures from one source. Other examples are CAMP-EJ done by NYC EJA and others in NYC. An entity called Aclima has done targeted monitoring in places like California's Bay Area and Brooklyn, NY. They do block by block using vehicle mounted systems. That kind of study can be broader.

Dirk: Albany's South End project paired a stationary monitor with backpack monitoring. Over a year of monitoring including taking photos of vehicles to understand the traffic related exposure. Also took background measurements at another location. What we learned is that more particulates are coming from local traffic than the port or railyard. Walk around study taught us that the one area by Ezra Prentice homes had high activity in traffic compared to other areas mostly related to truck traffic. We also did benzene sampling at various locations and found that residential areas and sites near highways were not particularly high but were high at petroleum storage facilities.

Jared: There are multiple considerations. We want to hear from the CJWG and develop an approach for community air monitoring. Next steps want to make some

preliminary decisions. These may include using a contractor or other partnerships and continuing engagement with the CJWG.

Eddie: When we did CAMP EJ it was important to us to partner with groups on the ground. We want that to be a key component of how DEC engages.

Elizabeth: A lot of us have experience with air monitoring. It is important to be transparent with communities.

CAC Advisory Panel recommendations process

Sameer: I am working to support you on this engagement with CAC. I am here as a resource for the CJWG.

Results of survey review:

- most votes for gathering into three groups that include a rep from each geography to present on two or three panels.
- also most were open to idea of a PowerPoint and to presenting principles of justice to CAC that are consensus based.
- proposal for presentation.

Jerrod: Would each of the three categories provide recommendations on all the panels?

Sameer: Each group would give feedback on two or three panels.

Eddie: This approach feels premature. We don't know everyone's opinion and need time to engage as a group. We're being asked to quickly come up with consensus without a conversation. Be mindful of calendars – lots of other responsibilities related to session ending and NYC elections.

Sameer: Happy to help organize time for CJWG to discuss.

Rosa: This is not the only opportunity to provide feedback to the CAC. It is important to get the feedback started to ensure it gets into the draft scoping plan.

Elizabeth: It is an opening and framing opportunity.

Jared: Tried to have a variety of perspectives on the advisory panels including EJ, industry, other environmental groups, consumer organizations, labor, etc. No one perspective is a majority. Views that were not consensus are reflected in the report outs from each panel. Also, a flag on open meetings law that the CJWG as a group triggers that responsibility.

Eddie: Does that apply to the non-agency working group members? Can we get a legal interpretation?

Jared: Will touch base on that question.

Elizabeth: If this is centered on racial justice and equity that carries a lot of weight.

Abigail: I'd like for us to start by identifying overarching principles that we all agree on. Then, apply those to the panel recommendations possibly in smaller groups. It's unlikely we can accomplish all of that by June 8. I do think we could nail down the principles.

Sonal: This is happening really fast. I'd appreciate meeting with the group on just this topic.

Abigail: We're missing the bigger framing to use as a lens.

Sameer: Some principles we already heard about are listed. I want to continue to flesh these out.

Eddie: I want to go through all the recommendations and discuss them with our members.

Elizabeth: We have tons of principles- please head to Climate Justice Alliance website. Jemez Principles for Democratic Organizing

Rosa: The surveys were a tool to help us organize but we can help organize discussions if that is preferred route.

Jerrod: We need more time to dissect the panel recommendations. Everyone needs to come to the table and be present for consensus building.

Sonal: This is not our last chance. We can put something written together.

Jared: CAC needs to put a scoping plan together by the end of the year. That is the framing for the timeline. CJWG can come in repeatedly during that process.

Next steps/scheduling

- Principles and framing focus for June 8,2021
- Organize discussion on panel recommendations
- Information regarding meetings and materials can be found on www.climate.ny.gov