Collaborators Work Group for the Clean Energy Transformation Act Cumulative Impacts Analysis

Notes from Meeting #2, September 25, 2019
Please contact Jennifer Sabel (Jennifer.Sabel@doh.wa.gov) if you have edits to these notes.

Convener: Washington State Department of Health

Meeting Attendees:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Association of Washington Businesses: Peter Godlewski</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cowlitz Public Utility District: Steve Taylor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front &amp; Centered: Deric Gruen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NW Energy Coalition: Joni Bosh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of the Governor: Lauren McCloy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Power: Jacob Goodspeed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health Seattle King County: Richard Gelb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puget Sound Clean Air Agency: Joel Creswell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puget Sound Energy: Kara Durbin, Phillip Popoff, Sandy Sieg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle City Light: Mendy Drake, Wendy Johnson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tacoma Power: Lisa Rennie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Energy Project: Shawn Collins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities and Transportation Commission: Kendra White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UW Climate Impacts Group: Amy Snover, Jason Vogel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UW School of Public Health (DEOHS/CHanGE): Jeremy Hess, Esther Min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA Dept. of Commerce: Emily Salzberg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA Dept. of Ecology: Ben Blank, Jill Schulte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA Dept. of Health: Marnie Boardman, Tina Echeverria, Lauren Freelander, Heather McCauley, Jennifer Sabel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA State Board of Health, Health Disparities Council: Esmael Lopez, Elise Rasmussen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington Public Utility District Association: Nicolas Garcia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSU Energy Program: Vince Schueler</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Meeting Objectives:

1. Refine our common understanding of purpose and intended users / customers of CETA CIA
2. Gather input on scope of community engagement and priority goals
3. Discuss next steps for the Community Engagement Team and the Data & Tool Development Team

Jennifer Sabel opened the meeting, and asked Lauren McCloy (Office of the Governor) to provide remarks re: background and intent of Section 24 of the Act, which follow:
NEW SECTION. Sec. 24.
By December 31, 2020, the department of health must develop a cumulative impact analysis to designate the communities highly impacted by fossil fuel pollution and climate change in Washington. The cumulative impact analysis may integrate with and build upon other concurrent cross-agency efforts in developing a cumulative impact analysis and population tracking resources used by the department of health and analysis performed by the University of Washington department of environmental and occupational health sciences.

Intent & background:
There is a recognition of historic inequities in the impacts of environmental pollution. There is a public interest in ensuring that the benefits of the clean energy transition are shared equitably, and especially targeted toward frontline communities, or communities experiencing the first and worst impacts of climate change.

This may include:
- Communities that have been disproportionately impacted by environmental pollution
- Tribal communities
- Vulnerable populations, or those experiencing adverse socioeconomic and health factors.

The intent is that, as utilities implement this bill over the next 25 years, their investment and program design decisions are informed by these data. As more data becomes available, we hope that the tool can be updated to reflect new science, driving continuous improvement in our fulfillment of the public policy objective.

This work builds on:
- Work by the Coalition for Jobs and Clean Energy in the drafting of I-1631
- Consultation with tribes
- Work done by the Washington Tracking Network in developing environmental and public health data tools to inform decision-making

The expected uses of the tool:
- To identify highly impacted communities
- To inform utility integrated resource plans, which must include:
  - an assessment of energy & non-energy benefits to vulnerable populations and highly impacted communities, and
  - public health and environmental impacts, costs, and risks to those groups
- The expectation is that the assessment will inform both resource selection and program design, such as:
  - Electrification of transportation options in areas highly impacted by diesel pollution
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- Delivery of targeted energy efficiency programs to low-income households
- Partnerships with tribes on development of community renewable energy projects
- Shifting or reinforcement of critical infrastructure at risk of impacts by climate change
- Others?

Audience for the CIA:
- Utilities
- Customers / the public
- Regulators
- Competitive energy service providers

Comments and questions:
One participant wanted to know how Washington Tracking Network (WTN) “topics” on the WTN Information By Location tool have been used in other contexts. DOH staff Tina Echeverria and Ecology staff Ben Blank described the WTN topic developed to assist with the VW Settlement, called “Diesel Pollution and Disproportionate Impact”. Decision-makers needed a way to look at diesel pollution to inform decisions regarding use of settlement funds, such as projects to electrify busses.

Tina also discussed uses of the “Environmental Health Disparities” topic (stemming from work conducted by UW DEOHS doctoral candidate Esther Min with Front & Centered staff and partners, described below), the “Social Vulnerability to Hazards” topic, and the “Planning for Health” topic. Emily Salzberg from Commerce noted that one of their programs has used the "Lead Exposure Risk" topic to visualize data related to both lead risk and poverty.

A participant asked how much of the data on WTN is retrospective versus future focused. Tina said the topics on WTN do not currently contain future projection data. There is a tool to look at data points over time (time series), but no modeled data. Another suggested that the risk weighting / scoring underlying IBL topics is a type of model – Tina agreed that WTN uses an algorithm to weight variables in each topic, and clarified that WTN does not currently incorporate any predictive modeling (for example, data outputs from models that run a variety of scenarios to predict future average temperatures).

Another participant asked if WTN has ever evaluated usability of the site or received feedback on its use / application. DOH staff said user testing was conducted several years ago. As well, the staff gather feedback on topics from collaborators as they are being developed, as well as getting feedback on draft versions of the tool from broader groups of stakeholders.

Jennifer Sabel discussed progress to date:
(see slides “8-20 Review.pdf”)
Jennifer provided a recap of Meeting #1 and learnings in the interim. That meeting revealed a wide array of perspectives, priorities and questions about what data will be included in the tool and potential applications. (Points from the Aug 20th meeting on slide 3). Perspectives shared at the first meeting and in the intervening weeks have underscored that a) the analysis/tool should be designed for use in multiple contexts, including people in the electricity sector and by community members; b) the tool will not likely fulfill everyone’s hopes or serve all needs perfectly; and c) planning for communication about the tool should be built into the process.

To that end, DOH communication staff Heather McCauley joined the meeting. Her participation and that of other communication experts around the table (e.g., UW CIG Dr. Heidi Roop) will be vital to success.

**Community concerns made visible – 2 presentations:**
(see slides “Unfair Share Report to DOH Mapping.pdf”)

**Deric Gruen (Front & Centered)** reviewed the process and findings from community listening sessions conducted in 2017 that informed the report “An Unfair Share: Exploring the Disproportionate Risks from Climate Change Facing Washington State Communities”. Deric elucidated a framework for understanding how factors like lower income, language barriers, race and ethnicity, or pre-existing health issues can combine with factors that influence exposure (such as where a person lives and works) to disproportionately increase risk of impacts experienced when harms from events like floods, drought, heat waves or wildfires occur.

With an aim to hear the concerns of people who experience disproportionate risks, and using a community-based approach (for example, partnering with locally-based organizations serving members of that community to convene the listening sessions), the project asked community members in different parts of Washington to talk about their concerns regarding pollution, climate change and water. Concerns voiced included economic and employment impacts especially for people working outdoors; concerns about water, food, sea level rise and traditional practices; concerns about pollution; concerns about health, especially respiratory issues and global disease; fear for the future; concerns about social cohesion; and concerns about housing, among several other issues.

Deric also touched on some of the recommendations following from the report, including the observation that: “Efforts to build community resilience to climate change in Washington state are more likely to be effective if they are inclusive and reinforce existing social structures that promote cohesion.”

More info and report: [https://frontandcentered.org/unfair-share/](https://frontandcentered.org/unfair-share/)
Debolina Banerjee (Puget Sound Sage) reviewed highlights from their report, “Our People, Our Power, Our Planet – Community Led Research in South Seattle”. Debolina described the community-based participatory action research methods used in their work, which was led by a community-based steering committee, and mobilized a team of volunteers from their communities of focus to conduct round tables, interview individuals and organizational leaders, and generate a prioritized set of issues to address with local agencies and policy-makers. The effort revealed that a top concern for community members is housing affordability and displacement. Climate change related issues include concerns about impacts of climate hazards on food prices, and potential risk of disease and health impacts from climate change.


Thank you to both Deric and Debolina for their presentations. DOH would like to bring forward the voices of communities from around Washington related to this work. Let us know if you have suggested reports, presenters, or other information that could enhance this CETA CIA Collaborators Work Group shared understanding of issues, concerns and ideas.

CETA CIA Community Engagement Scope, Planning and Opportunities (see CETA-CIA_CommEngageScope_DRAFT.pdf)

DOH staff Marnie Boardman shared a draft one-pager describing purpose, scope and assumptions concerning the process for engaging various interests and communities to inform the Cumulative Impacts Analysis. The one pager suggests that community engagement should be solicited once a draft tool is available, rather than going to communities with a blank slate and asking for ideas about data to include in the tool. Still, broader conversations with communities being carried out by other projects could provide additional valuable context, and the CIA development could benefit from additional community engagement.

The Environmental Justice Task Force is an example of a separate effort involving concerns of and conversations with communities disproportionately impacted by pollution. Elise Rasmussen and Esmael Lopez from the State Board of Health described the Board’s role in convening the EJ Task Force and related work, which will entail a series of community meetings around the state. Esmael has worked in communities around Washington for several years, and shared perspectives on the importance, approaches and benefits of building community relationships and improving two-way information exchange between communities and agencies/institutions.

Commerce’s CETA workshops and public meetings may offer another opportunity to glean insights from people around Washington. Emily Salzberg talked about some of the public input processes that Commerce has underway, as related to other pieces of the Act and required Commerce rulemaking.
Meanwhile, participants seemed to agree that it was appropriate for DOH CETA CIA community engagement planning efforts to focus primarily on gathering input following development of a draft version of the CIA tool.

Thank you to staff from State Board of Health and Commerce for sharing information about these respective projects and opportunities for dialogue and learning.

**Indicators Discussion and Development**  
(see slides “Indicators_09252019.pdf”)

DOH staff Lauren Freelander reviewed her work to date in comparing potential indicators referenced in the Act and data currently available on Washington Tracking Network at the census tract level (used in other topics or as standalone indicators). She then reviewed a list of potential climate related indicators or data that were mentioned at the August 20th meeting, noting those topics for which there is some data on WTN, as well as demographic factors mentioned at the last meeting. Some data related to commercial electricity use is also available on WTN.

Next steps include naming the topic, collecting and formatting data for indicators, developing draft visualizations, and conducting a sensitivity analysis.

**Meeting wrap up**

Jennifer closed the meeting with a few next steps, noting that DOH will convene another large Collaborators’ Work Group meeting (like this one) sometime in the first quarter of 2020. Meanwhile, the Data & Tool Development Team will get underway first, and a Community Engagement Planning Team will follow.

Please let DOH staff know if you want to be on these teams. More information will be communicated via the DOH CETA CIA website and our Gov Delivery email distribution list for this work (subscribe from the website:  [https://www.doh.wa.gov/CETA/CIA](https://www.doh.wa.gov/CETA/CIA)).