

## Elly Claus-McGahan

What information should Ecology provide in its annual report?

We need to see data on impacts: <br>GHG emissions reduced (estimated) <br>List of expenditures - how were the funds spent <br>List of recipients - how were they identified, did they have to apply for funding <br>Perceived barriers to getting CCA funds <br>Distribution of funds across the state by county <br>Direct and indirect benefits to frontline communities resulting from the project; <br>Environmental health disparities reductions; <br>Unintended adverse impacts from expenditures; <br>Detailed explanation of how communities were identified, including how communities were consulted in the identification processes; <br>Geographic boundaries of the communities identified and project scope; <br>Which vulnerable populations were reached and their demographics; and <br>How frontline communities were consulted prior to receiving funding and during program implementation <br>How the goal was met or not met in spending a minimum 35% on underserved communities

What additional information should be included about spending that is formally supported by a Tribal resolution?

Which tribes, location by county. <br>Is the funding by Tribal resolution for Tribe only or in collaboration with other organizations and if so how is that tracked? <br>Impact of the funds for reducing GHG emissions and co-benefits.

What additional information should be included about spending that benefits vulnerable populations in overburdened communities?

Local information on pollution reduction because of spending - so if the funding is addressing reduction of pollution along the I5 corridor is there a measurable decrease in pollution? <br> <br>Information should be outcome based and as specific as possible including time windows of impact if it's not an immediate effect.

How should Ecology determine which projects are required to report their GHG emissions reductions?

In principal all project that expect to have an impact on GHG emissions reductions should include a report. In practice that may be hard to do. Projects that should cause a big drop in reductions should be required to report. Estimates should be acceptable, as in reduction in VMT counts can use a multiplier to indicate an estimated drop in GHG emissions. If a project falls in a jurisdiction that does a regular GHG inventory that follows detailed sources of emissions could refer to that information potentially. <br>If a project can make an

estimate of emission reductions based on other impacts that are specific (such as replacing a fleet of ICE cars with EVs) that should be acceptable.

What should Ecology consider when determining how to evaluate greenhouse gas emissions reductions from projects?

What is the source of the reduction: is it conversion to electric or other renewable energy, is it increased energy efficiency as in weatherization, is it replacing a typical carbon source material with a carbon sink material, is it preservation of a carbon sequestering natural resource (forest), etc. Evaluate the project also from a production of GHG emissions based on what goes into making the project a reality, to where the reduction takes place. What is the delta evaluate in the near term and over the long haul depending on the expected time frame of the project's effect. Example - producing an EV causes GHG emissions but it is now well understood when the break even point happens and long term reductions over the life of the car.