

Cross Sector Mitigation Subcommittee Rubric Scoring Instruction Meeting

MINUTES

OCTOBER 14, 2021

11:05AM – 1:45PM

ZOOM VIRTUAL MEETING/CONFERENCE CALL

DISCUSSION	Cross Sector Mitigation is the first subcommittee working with Kiah Morris to apply the Scoring Rubric on high priority actions.
OVERVIEW <p>Kiah Morris provided a presentation/overview of the <i>Guiding Principles and Scoring Rubric</i>.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The guiding principles set the framework to better ensure that the recommendations are not just comprehensive but inclusive.• The exercise aims to better identify, understand, and address the social impacts, types of impacted populations, and engagement process of individual policy recommendations to ensure a Just Transition for Vermont. <p>Kiah Morris and the Cross Sector Mitigation (CSM) Subcommittee Members worked together to apply the Scoring Rubric on '<i>Weatherization at Scale</i>.'</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Four Part Proposal<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Coordinating Workforce Opportunities○ Financial Counseling○ Tariff on Bill Financing○ Workforce Development• Discussed and completed the self-assessment questions developed by the Just Transitions Subcommittee to help put the Guiding Principles into practice.<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ ADDRESSED IMPACTED AND FRONTLINE COMMUNITIES<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Discussed which frontline and impacted communities might be most impacted by this recommendation:<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Low-income/moderate-income households; rental property tenants; mobile home communities; multifamily households; group housing (ex: residential facilities, houseless service providers); older housing stock owners and flood vulnerable areas with higher energy burdens.▪ Examined the specified communities currently experience inequity around this issue.<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Low-income households: are especially burdened by their energy burdens.• Rental properties tenants: age of rental housing and rental tenants are generally lower income individuals.• Flood vulnerable areas with higher energy burdens: data may indicate that there are locations with natural gas in rural areas, (ex: Northeast Kingdom, Southern Vermont).• Building code violations or concern (ex: vermiculite) may prevent eligibility, thus the cost of remediating is not supported, consistent or resourced.• Calculations for reductions may impact the experience (ex: fixed costs) of the individual and should be considered for the need (ex: health, comfort) and not just regarding emission reductions. Co-benefits could play a role.○ ANALYZED THE BURDENS AND BENEFITS = <i>there are remaining self-assessment questions that need to be completed</i>.<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ The CSM Subcommittee agreed that the recommendation would improve the current condition. Prevent property shaming.▪ Discussed who will benefit from the proposed recommendation.<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Builders/contractors; and low-income/moderate-income impacted communities.	

- And, how the recommendation will assist with benefits being shared and/or directed to help the frontline and impacted communities.
 - Growth of green economy/new jobs created in this sector; increased health benefits from implementation; community action programs provided; private sector grows; tech center growth; workforce training centers available; small business creation; and an increased stock of new and efficient homes.
- ENSURING EQUITABLE AND JUST ENGAGEMENT = *self-assessment question section needs to be completed.*
- FUNDING AND DATA = *self-assessment question section needs to be completed.*
- IMPLEMENTATION AND OUTCOMES = *self-assessment question sections needs to be completed.*
- The CSM Subcommittee was guided to complete the remaining self-assessment questions for Weatherization at Scale. The responses from the self-assessment questions will be used to guide the group in completing the *Scoring Rubric*, which will help refine and identify area(s) of strength and challenges.

BREAKOUT SESSIONS:

- Subcommittee Members were pre-assigned and instructed to their assigned Zoom Breakout Room, while members of the public choose the Zoom Breakout Room of their preference.

BREAKOUT GROUPS 1 & 2:

- Each Breakout Group applied the Scoring Rubric on two high priority actions with the support of Kiah Morris.
- Designee led each Breakout Group.

BREAKOUT GROUP 1:

Johanna Miller, Liz Miller, Peter Walke, Christine Donovan, Jared Duval, Chad Farrell, Chris Company, Jane Lazorchak (staff), Kiah Morris (staff), and Jen Hummel (staff).

TCI-P (Transportation and Climate Initiative – Program)

- Join the TCI-P; adopt rules to participate in the TCI program starting in 2023. Enact a complementary policy that goes further to ensure equity outcomes (consider a firewalled fund, establish an expanded equity board, direct a minimum/significant investment in low-income, rural, overburdened, and underserved communities, ex: 70%), and have funds go to transportation related or efficient transportation enabling investments.
- Discussed and completed the self-assessment questions.
 - ADDRESSED IMPACTED AND FRONTLINE COMMUNITIES
 - Discussed which frontline and impacted communities might be most impacted by this recommendation:
 - Low-income and rural communities of Vermont would benefit.
 - Communities with increased levels of air pollution and in higher traffic areas would benefit from reduced emissions.
 - Examined the specified communities currently experience inequity around this issue.
 - Multiple factors (i.e.: socioeconomic stressors, minority, geographic locations, indigenous populations) currently increase vulnerability and attribute to health and the environment. TCI-P would help elevate the persisting environmental health disparities.
 - ANALYZED THE BURDENS AND BENEFITS
 - The Breakout Group agreed that the recommendation would improve the current condition – more sensitive to EJ community.

- Discussed who will benefit from the proposed recommendation, and how the recommendation will assist with benefits being shared and/or directed to help the frontline and impacted communities.
 - TCI-P is designed to have the fossil fuel providers pay, which in-turn would be passed down to the consumer; however, it is projected that most of the cost(s) being passed down to the consumer would have a greater impact on out-of-staters and Vermonters with a gross income of \$110k or more. Folks with a gross income of \$50k and below would receive money back. The monies to invest in TCI-P would come from out-of-state folks and higher income families.
 - In addition, the auction process for fossil fuel providers and participating in the carbon market for transportation fuels, generating revenue and off-setting incurred costs.
 - Addressed which communities will be burdened the most by the recommendation and how the burden can be shifted away from impacted communities?
 - The alternative to TCI would be a flat tax/income tax option and/or progressive carbon pricing; however, with implementing TCI-P the funding formula would generate funds, providing opportunities to distribute funds, including to impacted communities.
 - Discussed the long-term and potential intergenerational impacts of this recommendation for identified communities.
 - Lesson(s) from reducing GHP, raising revenues, then can go to thermal, etc.
- ENSURING EQUITABLE AND JUST ENGAGEMENT = *self-assessment question section needs to be completed.*
- FUNDING AND DATA = *self-assessment question section needs to be completed.*
- IMPLEMENTATION AND OUTCOMES = *self-assessment question section needs to be completed.*
- The Breakout Group was guided to complete the remaining self-assessment questions for the Transportation and Climate Initiative Program. The responses from the self-assessment questions will be used to guide the sub-group in completing the *Scoring Rubric*, which will help refine and identify area(s) of strength and challenges.

100% Renewable Energy Standard (RES)

- Expansion of renewable energy standard.
- Discussed and completed the self-assessment questions.
- ADDRESSED IMPACTED AND FRONTLINE COMMUNITIES
 - Reviewed the Efficiency Vermont Energy Burdens Study for clarity. Anything done in this sector, impacts everyone across-the-board.
 - Design details of the RES program really matter and are needed to do this exercise in a productive way. A RES design can take months and take the time to be thoughtful in its intended proposal.
 - Important to think about communities outside of Vermont and our current electricity procurement impacts on impacted/frontline communities outside of Vermont, (ex: Hydro Quebec). Program design should not be considered within the CAP as that is outside scope. Important to recognize that fossil fuels are going to continue to get more expensive and renewables are going to get cheaper.
- ANALYZED THE BURDENS AND BENEFITS = *there are remaining self-assessment questions that need to be completed.*
 - Discussed who will benefit from the proposed recommendation, and how the recommendation will assist with benefits being shared and/or directed to help the frontline and impacted communities.

- Considered the Clean Energy Industry Report and correlation to job creation details for this sector. Job creation can be very great in this sector. Need to emphasize equitable job training when seeking and recruiting individuals.
 - Addressed which communities will be burdened the most by the recommendation and how the burden can be shifted away from impacted communities?
 - Need to take into consideration how we engage with organized labor.
- ENSURING EQUITABLE AND JUST ENGAGEMENT = *self-assessment question section needs to be completed.*
- FUNDING AND DATA = *self-assessment question section needs to be completed.*
- IMPLEMENTATION AND OUTCOMES = *self-assessment question section needs to be completed.*
- After discussing the above referenced self-assessment questions, the Breakout Group also left open for more discussion/consideration, the following:
 - Need to consider how to move ahead with an equitable design process concerning a 100% RES plan and what the breakout group/sub-committee wants to leave in the CAP, so that future policy makers can continue to move forward in an equitable way.
 - In addition, people who have previously designed RES policy did not have good community feedback. Need to continue to think about how we speak with communities concerning the design, in keeping transparent. Need to encourage public discussion and highlight that this has not yet happened in entirety for the 100% RES concept. Also, it's important to have the communities support and understanding that some of these things are beyond of the control of the subcommittee members.
- The Breakout Group was guided to complete the remaining self-assessment questions for the 100% Renewable Energy Standard. The responses from the self-assessment questions will be used to guide the sub-group in completing the *Scoring Rubric*, which will help refine and identify area(s) of strength and challenges.

BREAKOUT GROUP 2:

Gina Campoli, Ed McNamara, Richard Cowart, David Farnsworth, Peter Bourne, Bram Kleppner, Kelly Klein, Ryan Path, Marian Wolz (staff), and Kiah Morris (staff).

Clean Heat Standard

- Discussed and completed the self-assessment questions.
- ADDRESSED IMPACTED AND FRONTLINE COMMUNITIES
 - Discussed which frontline and impacted communities might be most impacted by this recommendation:
 - Fossil Fuel dealers and networks of them.
 - Workforce currently delivering heating fuels may not be threatened by a clean heat standard.
 - Transition time for businesses (especially smaller businesses) may be the larger issue/question.
 - This sector accounts for over 1/3 of emissions – communities will benefit from a reduction of emissions.
 - Any Vermonters who would pay more at least in the early years based upon this policy and be unable to afford it.
 - If transition is needed for the type of heat source a home is using, there will be a significant shift needed in workforce.
 - Examined the specified communities currently experience inequity around this issue.

- Similar to Weatherization at Scale – great inequity in distribution of energy burdens across households.
 - Goal of CHS would be to distribute in such a way where cost burden is minimized across households.
 - Labor force impacts / keeping dollars in state / impact to wood products sector.
- ANALYZE THE BURDENS AND BENEFITS = *self-assessment question section needs to be completed.*
 - ENSURING EQUITABLE AND JUST ENGAGEMENT = *there are remaining self-assessment questions that need to be completed.*
 - How have frontline and impacted communities been part of creating and implementing this recommendation? And how will they in the future?
 - Customers have not been part of the clean heat standard working group.
 - Have not had listening sessions with customers.
 - Customers could be limiting – there could be people who don't directly pay heating bills, (ex: those that live in group housing).
 - Impacted communities should not just include paying customers, need to insure looking at impact to BIPOC communities.
 - Ensure conservation aspect of heating standard is front and center – close coordination is needed between delivery of energy efficiency services and clean heat solutions.
 - FUNDING & DATA
 - How will this recommendation be funded? What percent of funding will be specifically to support frontline, low-income and impacted communities? Will there enough funding to make it affordable and accessible for identified communities?
 - In general, the obligation to perform is on wholesale fossil fuel providers – proposal includes provision that a (undefine) fraction of benefits must be delivered to qualified low- and moderate-income housing units.
 - Proposal does not currently have specific assistance to fuel dealers and employees on job development and transition assistance. Could be provided in conjunction with a broader workforce development process – cross cutting issues with VCC.
 - Are rental properties occupied at a higher rate by BIPOC communities? Is BIPOC percentage higher in Chittenden County – should considerations on that be included in program proposal and design?
 - Rental units/ manufactured homes/multifamily homes should be part of carve out in program.
 - Opportunity to promote potential new business model and ownership business models for BIPOC communities – if greater usage of wood chip fuel (for example), new business could be created for that – think about ownership of new businesses and create opportunities for that growth for BIPOC communities.
 - How will we know about the impacts of this recommendation on identified communities? Which data or indicators will be needed? What process was used to determine the indicators are resonate and relevant to most impacted community needs? How will it be collected and shared?
 - What are expected costs of biofuels, heat pumps, and advanced wood heat.
 - Important to understand what Vermonters would choose given a range of choices?
 - Are these questions to include all upfront costs and co-benefits?
 - Where are we on development of workforce dev program that would include the kind of jobs that this policy would create?

- Need to determine how to finance transitions for individual households.
 - Load control / electrical needs - complex
 - Data question – what % of renters are BIPOC? How will they be impacted?
 - Think through the startup costs vs operating costs.
- IMPLEMENTATION AND OUTCOMES = *self-assessment question section needs to be completed.*
- The Breakout Group was guided to complete the remaining self-assessment questions for the Clean Heat Standard. The responses from the self-assessment questions will be used to guide the sub-group in completing the *Scoring Rubric*, which will help refine and identify area(s) of strength and challenges.

Electric Vehicles

- Discussed and completed the self-assessment questions.
 - ADDRESSED IMPACTED AND FRONTLINE COMMUNITIES
 - Discussed which frontline and impacted communities might be most impacted by this recommendation:
 - Gas stations – business model and businesses around gas stations would be impacted by this switch.
 - Automobile repair shops; mechanics
 - CA standard forces manufactures to deliver cars to VT – additional action that is looped into CA standard topic.
 - Dealers are impacted – point of compliance is when car comes into VT; dealers need support of manufacturer or other resources to carry regulation forward.
 - Local banks could be impacted when it comes to financing. Local banks could be hesitant to finance those vehicles. Need to provide financing options for low- and moderate-income households.
 - Program looking at up to \$4,000 rebate at time of purchase only for new cars and for established dealers, not an up-front financing option.
 - Transportation is integral to most people – assume everyone who drives to support needs would be impacted.
 - Research that shows transportation burdens – more rural communities have higher transportation burden / lower income families have higher burden with energy costs. Larger portion of income spent on fossil fuels.
 - Positive benefit – people who live near a highly trafficked road – less pollution
 - Currently focusing on existing programs – is that the right approach?
 - Highest threshold is \$50,000 income or less; middle is 125k or less
 - VTRANS doing a dive on whether these existing programs are effective on getting EVs into low-income households.
 - Questions in VTANS study – how is the program being taken up by communities and groups of people, why are people not participating?
 - At this point with incentive programs, have been working well thus far but need more information to expand. For example, if income cap is raised, will that help expand to communities that need it most?
 - Emphasis in proposal to bolster used car market for EVs.
 - Examined the specified communities currently experience inequity around this issue.
 - Public charging:

- State now looking at locations that will be best for public charging stations.
 - Level III charging needed along roadways – VTRANS focusing funding program on these types of charging options.
 - For impacted communities – need to ensure they have the at-home charging options.
 - Public charging stations for renters/households that do not have access to private charging should be in a public space (public parking lot/ on street charging).
 - Ensuring electric utilities are strong partners and potential deliverers of public charging study and solutions is key – fast charging in addition to level II chargers near homes and businesses is a public good – needs to be thought of that way to enable the transition being discussed.
 - Municipalities will play a large role in public charging as well because they own many of those public lots/spaces that would be best for charging for residents of neighborhoods. What is the scale needed for charging stations near homes?
- ANALYZE THE BURDENS AND BENEFITS = *there are remaining self-assessment questions that need to be completed.*
 - Which communities will be burdened the most by this recommendation and how can that burden be shifted away from impacted communities?
 - Information gaps – is information on programs getting out to frontline and impacted communities?
- ENSURING EQUITABLE AND JUST ENGAGEMENT = *self-assessment question section needs to be completed.*
- FUNDING AND DATA
 - How will this recommendation be funded? What percent of funding will be specifically to support frontline, low-income and impacted communities? Will there enough funding to make it affordable and accessible for identified communities?
 - There is money in the transportation fund for this.
 - Potential for federal funding
 - Long term funding opportunity through TCI-P
 - Utility funds
 - Funding for the upgrades needed in many places for charging points or household power supply.
 - There is a role for utilities for funding charging stations.
 - The way the program is written now is for low- and moderate-income communities – is that enough?
 - There are people who cannot afford to own or operate a vehicle – their needs need to be addressed.
 - Other transportation options need to be provided for those populations.
 - How will we know about the impacts of this recommendation on identified communities? Which data or indicators will be needed? What process was used to determine the indicators are resonate and relevant to most impacted community needs? How will it be collected and shared?
 - Charging stations:
 - How do we engage with the business community and employers on charging? Having charging at work will be important, especially for people with partial EVs, will need to be able to charge at work.
 - Workers who do not have access near their homes will need increased access to charging near their workplaces. Ensuring workplace charging programs are more routine/accepted by all facets of the business community and workplaces.

- Compliment by requirements to have X number of spaces in parking lot be EV charging.
 - Larger benefit – VT is a solar deployment state – daytime charging can soak up some of that excess solar energy. Having programs at workplaces where there is increased usage (load control usage).
 - Building codes for new commercial spaces – require certain amount of charging for EVs in parking.
 - Homeownership is a concern – limits abilities to control charging.
- IMPLEMENTATION AND OUTCOMES = *there are remaining self-assessment questions that need to be completed.*
 - Does the recommendation support the natural environment? Does it promote fairness to all living things?
 - If the state keeps building more roads (not unique to electrifying vehicles) – there will be a negative impact on the natural environment. If population grows, there will be more cars on the road which will require continual expansion of roadways to address congestion.
 - Needs to be complimented with a land use policy to support compact settlements.
 - The Breakout Group was guided to complete the remaining self-assessment questions for the Electric Vehicles. The responses from the self-assessment questions will be used to guide the sub-group in completing the *Scoring Rubric*, which will help refine and identify area(s) of strength and challenges.

CONCLUSIONS	<p>The CSM Subcommittee has identified and completed an extreme amount of prep-work regarding their high priority actions for inclusion in the CAP (Climate Action Plan). It is understood that more work is needed, (ex: completing the remaining self-assessment questions and applying answers to the Scoring Rubric, etc.).</p> <p>CSM Subcommittee Members were encouraged to ask and seek guidance from other committees, colleagues, etc., for any gaps still needing to be addressed, specifically with completing the equity lens process for high priority actions.</p> <p>CSM Subcommittee Members expressed concern regarding the CAP deadlines enforced by the State of Vermont and the unrealistic timeline allotted to complete all the required tasks, in preparation for the drafting deadline. In general, 'just needing more time' has been a shared sentiment. A lot of productive work has been completed thus far and should not go unrecognized. The knowledge, expertise, and passion that each of the subcommittees contribute is remarkable; therefore, CSM members where/are encouraged to call out specific areas needing more time to develop out, when drafting their portion of the CAP.</p> <p>CSM will continue to complete the Scoring Rubric for any remaining high priorities, one-on-one and during the next two upcoming subcommittee meetings.</p>
--------------------	---

ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
Continue to prep and work on tasks for drafting deadline.	All	11/01/2021

RECAP/OTHER ANNOUNCEMENTS

FOLLOW-UP	Implement New Meeting Time on Thursdays (11a-2p) for the CSM Subcommittee to complete the required time-sensitive tasks.
SPECIAL NOTES	Next Meeting is scheduled for Thursday, 10/21/2021 at 11am (via Zoom)

