Oregon Energy Strategy Environmental Justice and Equity Working Group Meeting [5]

December 18, 2024, 11:00-12:00pm.

Post-Meeting Notes

Meeting Summary

ODOE and the CETI-OES Team presented on the feedback pertaining to the complementary analyses received during the most recent Advisory Group meeting and through the public comment portal. Based on that feedback, ODOE and the CETI-OES Team presented the proposed approach for these analyses, including the representative customer groups selected for the Energy Wallet analysis, the regions selected for the Air Quality modeling, and the layers to be analyzed in the geospatial mapping. Several WG members expressed appreciation for ODOE and CETI-OES' consideration of stakeholder input in adjusting the complementary analyses approach.

In-Meeting Notes

Participants

ODOE	CETI-OES Team	WG Members (9)
Joshua Price	Angela Long, Rockcress	Sarah Wochele, CUB
Edith Bayer	Eileen Quigley, CETI	Alma Pinto, NW Energy Coalition
Jessica Reichers	Mariah Caballero, CETI	Alessandra de la Torre, NW Energy Coalition
Lauren Rosenstein	Ruby Moore-Bloom, CETI	Christina Zamora, KLCAS
Alan Zelenka	Jeremy Hargreaves, Evolved Energy Research	Greer Klepacki, CEP
Mary Kopriva		John Maddalena, SEI
Stacey Heuberger		John Seng, Spark Northwest
Anne Thrall-Nash		Tim Lynch, Multnomah County Office of Sustainability
Joni Sliger		Lisa Arkin, Beyond Toxics

Introduction

- Lauren introduced the call, explained WebEx functionality, and reviewed Group Agreements.
- Lauren went over agenda; presentation, discussion, and upcoming policy discussions.

Complementary Analyses Overview:

- Ruby gave overview of Phase 1 engagement process and overall project timeline.
- Angela went over Energy Wallet and introduced stakeholder feedback on the Wallet, including three topics of overall feedback:
  - Energy transition; feedback emphasizing how the analyses will be used to address and minimize hardship;

- Policy guidance; feedback emphasizing how the analyses can help identify policy opportunities; and
- Continuing engagement; feedback emphasizing the importance of having diverse, balanced voices in the Strategy development process.
- Angela presented on the Energy Wallet and factors informing the selection of customer groups. These include:
  - Representation: the customer groups should reflect many, diverse Oregonian groups. Commenters also asked that the analysis take utility-types into account.
  - Energy burden: the Energy Wallet should identify groups that would be most vulnerable or impacted by the energy transition to explore how Oregon can provide for energy cost affordability as well as opportunities for improved housing and efficiencies.
- Incorporating Wallet feedback:
  - Angela stated that the CETI-OES Team is unable to analyze distinct COU- and IOU-customer groups because of the degree of granularity available to the model. However, CETI-OES did update consumer gas and electricity costs based on Oregon-specific data, considered regional-specific costs for oil and propane, as well as VMT, energy-use intensity, income data.
  - CETI-OES also added Rural and harsh climate; Willamette single families; and Urban low-income multifamily renter customer groups for consideration based on commenter feedback.
  - Angela presented customer group mapping based on NEEA RBSA data, a region-wide characterization of building characteristics and stocks in the Northwest used as the basis for the Energy Wallet analysis. Anegla also noted that, because of a small sample-size for manufactured homes, the data for that customer group was expanded to include all of the Northwest. All other remaining customer groups are Oregon-specific.
- ANOVA analysis
  - Mariah: ANOVA analysis ran based on public comment to get a quantitative assessment as to whether RBSA data between customer groups reflects actual, statistically-significant differences between these groups
- Customer groups proposal
  - CETI-OES considered customer group priority rankings based on MENTI and public comment feedback against the ANOVA analysis to arrive at proposed customer groups.
  - Proposed customer groups are:
    - Average homeowner; Rural home; High-priority area homes; Manufactured homes; and Low-Income Renter (Multifamily)
  - High-priority area homes were added to address factors such as risk of energy burden and impacts for low-income families, people of color households, and low-weatherization households.
  - Rural households were not analyzed as distinct from rural, harsh-climate households based on ANOVA findings.
  - The low-income renter multifamily customer group was selected on the basis of urban representation and stakeholder feedback.

- Air Quality modeling
  - Ruby introduced feedback on AQ modeling, including general support for modeling; interest in examining COU vs IOU customer territories; and consideration for more-granular AQ mapping.
  - No specific feedback was received on selected regions; the 10 regions originally proposed will be used for CETI modeling.
  - Tim Lynch asked in chat: could you clarify if any of the AQ data will look at impacts of indoor AQ? And to clarify, I am thinking about +/- impacts from fuel sources/technology choices in homes, gas vs. electric heating/cooking for example.
    - Ruby: Good question, Tim. The EPA COBRA model used for air quality impacts only addresses outdoor air quality. You can read more about the EPA COBRA modeling in their FAQ: https://www.epa.gov/cobra/cobra-questions-and-answers Others have brought up concerns about indoor air quality but unfortunately we cannot quantify those impacts with this analysis. To your second point, the energy pathways modeling results will show a change in household technologies (e.g., electric heating), so we may be able to draw some conclusions about general impacts to indoor air quality, but we will not quantify those impacts in the air quality modeling.
    - Tim: Thanks for that clarification. That was my recollection of past conversations. Helpful to note we may be able to do further analysis bases on household technology modeling
  - Please refer to the published slide materials to review the final regions selected for the Air Quality modeling.
- Geospatial mapping
  - Mariah: the CETI-OES Team's original goal remains to show 10-15 bivariate or univariate maps, showing census-track level energy/justice factors. Additionally, geospatial mapping will be based on publicly available data and code so as to be transparent and replicable for future efforts.
  - The purpose of the geospatial mapping is to assist in identifying communities with pressing needs in the energy transition and to inform policy discussions.
  - Feedback received:
    - The team received general support and feedback that equity issues such as race, ethnicity, language, income, poverty and education should be reflected in the mapping, as well as percent of individuals receiving Medicare and Medicaid benefits as well as the percentage of individuals receiving social security disability income.
    - The team also heard a recommendation to postpone selection of some variables until after modeling results published; team will move forward with 10-15, but try to remain flexible as opportunities or interests arise.
    - There was also interest in producing an interactive map. Doing so is not in scope of this project, but is of interest for future efforts and could be accomplished

based on the replicable approach used to generate the geospatial mapping at this juncture.

- o Please refer to the published slide materials to review the final mapping indicators selected for the geospatial mapping.

Clarifying Questions

- Lauren opened the floor for questions
  - o Sarah expressed appreciation for explanation, especially how groups were differentiated and prioritized in the analysis
  - o Christina Zamora: I like the thoughtful approach and willingness to incorporate feedback in a way that is useful and representative across the energy wallet, air quality modeling and geospatial mapping.
  - o Lisa Arkin; asked if CETI's geospatial mapping has been compared against federal EPA mapping to see how reliance on local data produces different results?
    - ▪ Mariah: much of the mapping relies on similar data; the only big difference is that federal tools summarize data at federal level (are you at 60th percentile for poverty, nationally, for example). Oregon specific indicators will provide better percentile rankings for Oregon purposes.
    - ▪ Mariah thinks the current geospatial mapping will be a great starting point to further analyze specific questions in the future, based on the geospatial mapping being based on publicly available data.
  - o Lisa; when will maps be available?
    - ▪ Mariah: January-February.
    - ▪ ODOE + CETI/OES will send an email when this material is available.
    - ▪ Lauren says HB 4077 calls for Oregon's Environmental Justice Council to develop an Oregon-specific mapping tool, though this tool is likely not ready for a few years. Says DEQ and Oregon Health Authority are working on this project primarily. Lauren is happy to provide members with information on that mapping effort.
- Angela wanted to clarify a response to prior comments on how the Energy Wallet analysis relates to the modeling efforts?
  - o Energy modeling only examines change of cost over time, but CETI-OES will try to break up the modeling inputs to reflect customer groups in Eastern and Western Oregon.

Wrap up and Phase 2

- Lauren presented on upcoming tentative Policy Working Group schedules and organization
- Lauren invited EJ and Equity WG members to express interest in attending other Policy Working Group meetings to ensure that an EJ and Equity perspective is reflected across Energy Strategy work.
- Lauren expressed appreciation for folks' participation and adjourned the meeting

Next Steps

- ODOE to share complementary analyses results via email with WG members as they become available.

Virtual Meeting Chat

Jessica Reichers

11:05

Hi Everyone! I am monitoring the chat for any questions or comments. Feel free to reach out if you need anything!

Ruby Moore-Bloom

11:16

NEEA RBSA: https://neea.org/data/residential-building-stock-assessment

Alessandra

11:19

Angela, can you repeat the 3 added customer groups?

Hugh Arceneaux ODOE

11:21

o Rural and harsh climate (added) o Willamette single families (added) o Urban low-income multifamily renter (added)

Alessandra

11:21

Thank you!

Tim Lynch

11:26

Ruby, could you clarify if any of the AQ data will look at impacts of indoor AQ?

Jessica Reichers

11:27

Hi, Tim. Ruby will respond in the chat shortly.

Tim Lynch

11:28

And to clarify, I am thinking about +/- impacts from fuel sources/technology choices in homes, gas vs. electric heating/cooking for example.

Ruby Moore-Bloom

11:31

Good question, Tim. The EPA COBRA model used for air quality impacts only addresses outdoor air quality. You can read more about the EPA COBRA modeling in their FAQ: https://www.epa.gov/cobra/cobra-questions-and-answers Others have brought up concerns about indoor air quality but unfortunately we cannot quantify those impacts with this analysis.

To your second point, the energy pathways modeling results will show a change in household technologies (e.g., electric heating), so we may be able to draw some conclusions about general impacts to indoor air quality, but we will not quantify those impacts in the air quality modeling.

Tim Lynch

11:33

Thanks for that clarification. That was my recollection of past conversations. Helpful to note we may be able to do further analysis bases on household technology modeling.

Christina Zamora

11:34

I like the thoughtful approach and willingness to incorporate feedback in a way that is useful and representative across the energy wallet, air quality modeling and geospatial mapping.

Jessica Reichers

11:35

Thanks, Christina!

Tim Lynch

11:46

Thanks for your work on this, excited to see it moving forward!

Jessica Reichers

11:46

Happy holidays, all!