

EJ TF Measureable Goals and Model Policy Draft Recommendations

Purpose: This document in development provides information about the measureable goals and model policy draft recommendations for the EJ TF to consider, after receiving feedback from members, agencies, communities, EJ advocates and experts from other states and local jurisdictions, and the Governor’s Office. Most recommendations include the following components:

- Updated draft recommendation language
- Strategies for implementation success
- Feedback we received throughout the summer on these recommendations
- More information to consider, especially if recommendation will be implemented:
 - How the recommendation will benefit overburdened communities
 - The gaps in state government that this recommendation addresses
 - Who can implement the recommendation
 - How the recommendation complements or supports existing state work
 - Anticipated costs
 - Any other considerations

Staff and Co-Chairs hope this document provides insight into adjustments we made on draft recommendations in accordance with feedback. This is a living document that we encourage Task Force members to contribute to.

Note to Members: We are asking that members be ready to vote on these recommendations in concept, with the acknowledgement that there will be more time for recommendation refinement. Task Force members will have multiple opportunities to provide feedback on these recommendations. Members may provide their feedback on these recommendations during the 8/7 meeting, directly in this document before or after 8/7 (note that staff may not be able to integrate your feedback in time for the 8/7 meeting), and/or in 1:1 meetings after 8/7.

Work Left To Do:

- Integrate round 2 of member feedback (which will occur after 8/7), which will include refining recommendation language.
- Include language that specifically addresses which agencies we’re speaking to. In some cases, recommendations could apply to all state agencies, while other recommendations may be directed toward specific agencies.
- Link recommendations to draft EJ Principles.
- Make a key for standard anticipated costs such as community engagement, and staffing.
- Integrate additional language regarding what agencies may need in order to implement specific recommendations.
 - This language will likely come out of agency feedback on draft recommendations, during round 2 of feedback (after 8/7).
- Organize, order, and format recommendations.
- Finalize recommendation language.

Include EJ & Equity in Agencies' Strategic Plans

Updated Recommendation: Agencies shall make achieving EJ and equity part of its strategic plan (in alignment with [Federal EO 12898](#)) in order to integrate EJ into agency protocols and processes.

Feedback:

- It will be difficult to make this a part of agency missions because they are so short; this recommendation is best suited for a strategic plan. This recommendation works well with the EJ/equity staff position recommendation because an updated strategic plan can help to change the organizational culture and staffing/hiring priorities.
- Integrating EJ and equity in strategic plans may be difficult for smaller agencies.
- EJ and equity needs to ALSO be part of the "agency protocols and processes". Having it just sit at the mission and plan is still too high level. Strategic plans need to be operationalized in the agency's protocols and processes (such as in contracting, hiring, grant making, etc.).

Strategies for Success:

- Ideally, agencies will have dedicated EJ staff to assist with implementing EJ and equity components of the agency's strategic plan.
- Agencies to use the GARE Framework that TF staff and collaborators are currently working on to help with strategic plans and programmatic theories of change.

Commented [RE(1)]: More on this to come during 8/7 meeting.

Guidance/Considerations	EJ and Equity in Agency Strategic Plans
How would this benefit impacted/overburdened communities?	<p>Partner with communities to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Embed EJ & equity into an agency's strategic plan & theories of change for programs • Evaluate measureable goals, using both quantitative & qualitative data • Report back to communities on progress toward goals in a public report <p>EJ & equity implementation plans are made available to the public:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allows low-resource agencies to be guided by other agencies & promote consistency across agencies • Allows for transparency & increased agency accountability <p>Agencies may be able to prioritize EJ and equity in their programs and processes.</p>
Which gaps in state government does this recommendation address?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Currently, most agency strategic plans do not include EJ or equity components, which means that many agencies are not prioritizing or even considering EJ or equity. This inaction is contributing to systemic and programmatic inequities, and makes it easier to diminish the importance of incorporating EJ in state government.
Who will implement?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • First, all natural resource, built environment, energy, and health agencies to have dedicated EJ staff. Expand to other state agencies over time.
How does this recommendation complement or support existing related work in state government (e.g. programs, policies, strategies)?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Look at DOH's strategic plan that includes Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion as an example. • Once stood up, the Office of Equity will work with agencies to create agency-specific DEI plans • GARE Framework will help with implementation
What is needed to implement this recommendation (e.g. Does this rec need legislation, agency rulemaking, or other internal policy)?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Internal agency work
Anticipated Cost	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agency staff to incorporate equity and EJ in plans • Agency staff to think through how to incorporate EJ and equity into agency protocols and processes.
Anything else to consider?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What support do agencies need to include EJ/equity in strategic plans? • What do agencies need in order to implement the EJ/equity components of their strategic plans?

Commented [RE(2)]: More on this to come.

Agencies to Track & Communicate Progress toward EJ and Environmental Health Goals

Updated Recommendation: In partnership with communities, create a standard method to develop, track, evaluate, and publish environmental justice and health goals focused on pollution reduction, eliminating environmental health disparities, and improving community engagement.

Feedback:

- Agencies need a standard set of goals; this will be a cost-saving measure and a way to ensure better agency alignment
- Need timely and accurate reporting
- Ensure tracking and evaluation efforts are not duplicative of other related work within state government
- From Governor's Office: There is value in having a third-party evaluator
- Incorporate internal intermediate report to partners such that midcourse correction of the process/program can be made

Strategies for success:

- Work with communities experiencing EJ issues to identify appropriate measures and baseline indicators for tracking disparate impacts and progress towards reducing disparities.
- Use **GARE Framework** guidance to help with creating agency-specific/program-specific, theories of change, measures, metrics, and indicators.
- While goals should be enterprise-wide to encourage the interagency coordination necessary to address EJ and environmental health disparities, agencies should also use statewide EJ and EH goals to inform agency-specific EJ and EH goals.
- Agencies should regularly report their progress and contribution toward enterprise-wide, and if available, agency-specific goals in a publically available report.
 - Goals can be hosted on Results WA (healthy and safe communities) and/or OFM websites.
- Health and pollution reduction metrics are outcome measures. In addition to these measures, create a process metric for community engagement that holds state agencies accountable for engaging with community and growing these activities through time until all programs are doing this work.
- Goals should track absolute numbers, and highlight changes over time.
- Quantitative metrics that are standardized across regions will be limited to what is available, what can be measured, and where it is being measured. Recommend collecting additional local data/knowledge/input, including qualitative data to complement the quantitative data.

Commented [RE(3)]: More on this to come.

Commented [RE(4)]: Environmental health

Guidance/Considerations	Track and Communicate Progress
How would this benefit impacted/overburdened communities?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Developing measureable goals in partnership with communities will ensure that government is tracking the metrics communities care about. Communities can use this publically available data to track progress and inform their advocacy work. • Having a unified and coordinated method for tracking progress toward EJ in state government will foster more opportunities for interagency collaboration to make progress toward a standard set of EJ and environmental health goals.
Which gaps in state government does this recommendation address?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Currently, there is no systematic method to track State government's progress toward environmental justice. While the Environmental Health Disparities Map helps to understand and visualize the current context, we do not yet have a tool to track progress toward EJ over time with absolute numbers. Statewide metrics and measures focusing on reducing pollution, ending environmental health disparities, and improving community engagement can assist with creating agency-specific EJ goals, and will allow for greater government transparency and collaboration. • Currently, there are no standard set of EJ goals across agencies, which is possibly contributing to duplicative or contradictory efforts by state agencies. Having a streamlined set of goals that are timely and accurately reported is likely to save government resources and funds. • Currently, there are no regular publically available reports focused on EJ across state agencies, making it difficult for communities and government agencies alike to learn more about government efforts around EJ. Publishing public reports tracking progress toward EJ and EH goals is one way state government can demonstrate its commitment to transparency and community trust.
Who will implement?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Goal development: Agencies will need to invest in targeted outreach in communities experiencing EJ concerns, including Tribes and Indigenous communities, to identify and define baseline metrics and measures. Agencies can use the Community Engagement Subcommittee's guidance and best practices to inform this outreach, and should also contract with trusted community organizations to assist with outreach. In addition to community engagement, state agencies should coordinate with academic institutions and NGOs to support goal development, tracking, and evaluation. These cross-sector partnerships will be particularly helpful in creating a thoughtful and thorough data plan (e.g. who will contribute to which data sets, identifying data sources, etc.), data analysis and dissemination plans, and evaluation of progress toward achieving goals. • Tracking and evaluating goals: If stood up, the permanent EJ workgroup can work to create, track, and evaluate these goals with support from Results Washington, the Office of Financial Management, or other entities that specialize in and maintain public data dashboards. Alternatively, a third-party reviewer or agencies could review reports and track and evaluate progress toward EJ goals. • Publishing Reports: Each agency will be responsible for producing its own report that documents agency efforts to meet EJ and EH goals. If stood up, the permanent EJ workgroup can be responsible for reviewing these progress reports.

How does this recommendation complement or support existing related work in state government (e.g. programs, policies, strategies)?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> EJ outcome measures could belong in Results WA's "Healthy and Safe Communities" set of outcome measures Refer to Puget Sound Partnership's Vital Signs for possible EJ measures Office of Equity Task Force's Results WA recommendation: "Work with Results WA and agencies to create agency-specific performance measures and a public dashboard to publish outcomes. Office of Financial Management's data dashboard could be used to track agencies' EJ activity. [Example: Workforce Performance Measures Dashboard] WSDOT has accountability measures in its Grey Notebook
What is needed to implement this recommendation (e.g. Does this rec need legislation, agency rulemaking, or other internal policy)?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Internal agency work
Anticipated Cost – current budget or additional funds (staffing, office space & equipment, trainings, community engagement needs/expenditures, interagency coordination, travel)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Community engagement expenditures: Would need to work with communities and tribes to identify appropriate and meaningful metrics and measures for EJ and environmental health. This might include travel and public meetings expenditures such as reimbursement, food, childcare, etc. Interagency staff coordination with Results WA/OFM to monitor and update data periodically. Staff time to track, evaluate, and publish progress toward EJ goals in a publically available report. Evaluator options: stand up permanent EJ workgroup, hire a third-party evaluator, agency EJ/equity staff, the Governor's office
Anything else to consider?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What are the benefits and drawbacks to hiring a third-party evaluator? How frequent should agencies have to report progress?

Commented [RE(5)]: Will eventually include a standard set of expenditures related to community engagement and staffing. Agency members, please provide any guidance here.

Senior Leadership Position Dedicated to EJ & Equity

Updated Recommendation: Agencies will have at least one staff position dedicated to integrating EJ principles specifically, and equity more broadly, into agency actions.

Feedback:

- This position should specialize in EJ, as dedicated EJ positions are rare in state government, and be able to translate EJ to the broader equity conversation as necessary.
- While there is a preference for EJ staff to be a on an agency's executive team, give agencies flexibility in determining how to best integrate EJ staff into their own organizational structure in manner that ensures access to the agency's executive leadership team.
- Incorporate equity and EJ into all job descriptions.
- In the best case scenario, EJ staff would be a new hire/position in order to reduce the risk of conflating EJ with equity. We cannot assume that equity/DEI experts are also EJ experts.
- Agencies should prioritize trainings and other EJ-focused professional development opportunities across all agency staff.
- Executive leadership to support EJ staff.

Strategies for Success:

- Qualified EJ staff will have demonstrated experience working with communities facing EJ concerns and a deep understanding of the EJ discipline, including how to connect EJ to equity.
- Agencies ensure EJ staff are closely connected to agency to agency executive leadership.
- EJ staff co-construct an informal¹ community of practice within their agency and among other agency staff to:
 - Support agency accountability to communities
 - Facilitate equity and EJ learning opportunities at agencies
 - Apply equity and EJ lens to agency work
- EJ staff responsibilities:
 - Lead EJ staff to serve on the permanent EJ workgroup, if stood up.
 - Participate in informal interagency EJ community of practice
 - Track and communicate agency progress toward EJ, perhaps in partnership with an external entity
 - Oversee EJ-specific community engagement, including reviewing, updating, and implementing the agency's community engagement plan (see [Community Engagement Subcommittee's first recommendation](#))
 - Work with agency to adopt statewide EJ definition and EJ principles
 - Ensure EJ and equity is included in the agency's strategic plan, and that the agency is actively working toward EJ and equity
- Agency leadership will be best suited support EJ staff by participating in ongoing EJ and DEI trainings and professional development opportunities. Furthermore, agency staff that regularly interface with the public (e.g. community engagement coordinators) should closely collaborate with dedicated EJ staff, and also participate in EJ and DEI trainings. Existing training resources are included in the corresponding table below.
- Over time, the agency will support and resource lead EJ staff with other staffing support. Support staff would ideally come from different departments within the agency with the goal of infusing EJ and equity across the agency.

¹ Non-mandatory, and not necessarily a public meeting

Guidance/Considerations	Senior Leadership Position Dedicated to EJ & Equity
How would this benefit impacted/overburdened communities?	<p>Agency staff co-construct a community of practice within their own agencies & among other agency staff to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support agency accountability to communities • Facilitate equity & EJ training at agency, and over time, other trained agency staff can support agency EJ/equity work. • Apply equity & EJ lens to agency work • Communities have a point person to contact at each agency • Agencies are better aligned and coordinated to proactively address EJ, environmental, and equity issues. • Track and communicate agency progress toward EJ and eliminating environmental health disparities.
Which gaps in state government does this recommendation address?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Currently there are few EJ-focused staff at state agencies which is contributing to a competency gap in how state government addresses and prioritizes EJ. EJ is a highly specialized discipline, and should be treated as such within state agencies. • Currently communities with EJ concerns are often not able to find a direct contact at agencies when an EJ issue arises, and are often unclear about varying agency responsibilities and authority to address specific EJ needs. Having an EJ point of contact can ensure communities are directed to the appropriate agencies, and can facilitate interagency coordination to better meet community needs. • Currently agency executive leadership and staff who regularly interface with the public are not required to have EJ and equity training to help inform their work. When agency staff are not trained on EJ or DEI, it contributes to inequities and makes it easier to diminish the importance of incorporating EJ in state government. Agency decision makers who understand EJ and equity are better equipped to champion EJ and equity within their agencies to build the sustained capacity needed to prioritize EJ and equity across agency strategies, policies, and programs.
Who will implement?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • First, all natural resource, built environment, energy, and health agencies to have dedicated EJ staff. Expand to other state agencies over time. • Each agency should coordinate with the Office of Equity, as it will be responsible for assisting agencies with DEI training curricula.
How does this recommendation complement or support existing related work in state government (e.g. programs, policies, strategies)?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review GARE's Racial Equity Core Team Toolkit for further explanation and examples of how to create and sustain government positions and teams working toward equity. • EPA's EJ trainings – EPA will provide training resources and time to support the development of state-specific EJ training. • WSDOT's EJ Training • WSDOT has hired an EJ and community engagement coordinator • Office of Equity (if stood up) will assist agencies with DEI training curricula • The Community Engagement Subcommittee is working on leadership competencies for equity and community engagement.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Seek guidance from the DEI Council's work: Model Policies and Considerations for a Diverse, Equitable, Inclusive and Respectful Work Environment, Enterprise-Wide DEI Competencies, and other DEI Committee documents
What is needed to implement this recommendation (e.g. Does this rec need legislation, agency rulemaking, or other internal policy)?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Internal agency work
Anticipated Cost	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agency EJ/equity trainings and curriculum – possibly for all leadership and public facing/community engagement jobs Optional: hiring of new staff Optional: EJ/equity incorporated into all job positions Lead EJ staff time to participate in EJ workgroup, if stood up
Anything else to consider?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How else can agencies support the lead EJ staff person? What agency systems/processes will allow EJ staff to influence agency priorities? What is needed to make an argument for this being an essential position? How can EJ staff ensure accountability to communities?

Convene a Permanent EJ Workgroup

Updated Recommendation: Convene a permanent EJ interagency workgroup that includes members representing overburdened communities.

Feedback:

- Be intentional about how to integrate this workgroup into existing equity efforts in state government (e.g. Office of Equity, Commissions, and Business Resource Groups).
- Give this workgroup enough authority to hold agencies accountable as an oversight body (e.g. workgroup can review community engagement plans, strategic plans, and track progress toward EJ and ending environmental health disparities).
- Be thoughtful and intentional about how this workgroup would conduct community engagement, and be accountable to communities.
- Leverage the Community Engagement Subcommittee's recommendations around tribal engagement. Additionally, include the voices of Tribes, Indigenous communities, and Urban Indians across the state.
- A permanent EJ workgroup is necessary, and also, it cannot replace other government actions. State government needs both.
- Ensure adequate resources are dedicated to the workgroup.
- Make room to ensure that residents from communities with EJ concerns are able to participate, instead of "being represented" by non-profit staff that is not from their community.
- The group should create smaller sub-groups focused on specific agency projects (e.g. MTCA could have an EJ advisory board that could help direct work on clean-ups).

Strategies for Success:

- Communities and agencies share workgroup leadership responsibilities. Agencies defer to community leadership as appropriate.
- Share power and resources between government and communities.
- Give enough authority to this workgroup as an oversight body to hold agencies accountable to communities with EJ concerns (e.g. workgroup can review community engagement plans, strategic plans, and track and publish progress toward EJ and ending environmental health disparities)..

Community Participation on Boards: More generally, the Office of Equity should support strong community participation on government boards and commissions. To remove barriers to participation, the Office should review and recommend changes to:

1. statute that governs the compensation of board and commission members; and
2. application processes for board and commission membership.

Workgroups, such as councils, commissions, and boards are often governed by statute that prohibits member reimbursement unless the agency/organization obtains an exemption. Even with an exemption, members of advisory boards can only be reimbursed for certain expenses and are not compensated for their time.² These barriers place the burden on community members to volunteer their time and other resources, which can be prohibitive. Providing input and feedback should not come at a cost to communities. The Office of Equity should lead the way in formalizing a process that compensates members for their time and provides upfront financial support for mileage, lodging, and meals.

² Washington State Legislature. Chapter 43.03.220 RCW: Compensation of members of part-time boards and commissions—Class one groups. Retrieved from: <https://app.leg.wa.gov/RCW/default.aspx?cite=43.03.220>. Office of Financial Management, State Administrative & Accounting Manual (SAAM): Chapter 10.70: Boards, Commissions, or Committees. Retrieved from: <http://www.ofm.wa.gov/sites/default/files/public/legacy/policy/10.70.htm>.

Commented [RE(6): Excerpt from the [Office of Equity Task Force Report](#).

Could apply to the Reparations TF draft recommendation as well.

Task Force Members – what are your thoughts on this?

The Office of the Governor is responsible for appointing members to [over 230 boards and commissions](#). Individuals interested in serving on one of these boards or commissions must submit an [application](#), which includes the following fields:

- Board/commission meetings are held during the day. Are you able to come participate in day meetings?
(No/Yes)
- Employment/Experience with fields for job title and employer information
- While these questions are not required, they can deter some individuals from applying and therefore serve as potential barriers. The Office of Equity should review these practices, among others, to recommend changes to the structures that promote opportunities for some populations and communities while restricting opportunities for others.”

Guidance/Considerations	Permanent EJ Workgroup
How would this benefit impacted/overburdened communities?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Workgroup to serve as a consistent conduit between government and communities by elevating community EJ concerns to local and state government by identifying which agencies are best suited/have the authority to address specific EJ concerns. • Workgroup can work closely with the Office of Equity and Commissions to deliver quality customer service to overburdened communities. • Workgroup to continue building on the Community Engagement Subcommittee's body of work, and recommend strategies for centering community voice across State government. • Workgroup can identify opportunities to support community capacity building related to EJ (e.g. cleanups and community EJ advocacy work). • Workgroup to prioritize communities with cumulative environmental & health burdens, and sensitive populations in its community engagement and service delivery approach. • Workgroup to have authority as an oversight body to hold agencies accountable to communities (e.g. workgroup can review community engagement plans, strategic plans, and track and publish progress toward EJ and ending environmental health disparities). • Workgroup to communicate and collaborate with local government to address EJ issues across the state. • Workgroup Goal: Deliver barrier-free access to government EJ services
Which gaps in state government does this recommendation address?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Currently, there is no mechanism in State government to address EJ-specific community concerns. EJ issues are often left unheard and inadequately addressed such as, but not limited to: environmental clean-ups across Washington, farmworker's rights (especially in light of COVID-19), wildfire hazards, workplace hazards and exposures, addressing concerns related to existing or possible new sources of pollution in communities. An EJ workgroup can serve as a conduit between state government and communities to adequately support EJ efforts. • Currently, there is no other interagency body working to proactively advance EJ. A permanent EJ workgroup would lead to increased interagency coordination and alignment with respect to EJ-focused investments, ultimately saving government resources and money. • A permanent workgroup would lend itself to a community of practice for all agency EJ staff, and has the potential to bring in innovative ideas and solutions from commissions, communities, academic institutions, and NGOs. • A permanent workgroup can advise state staff on integrating the EJ Task Force's EJ Principles into state agency actions.
Who will implement?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ideally, dedicated lead EJ staff at agencies to serve on this permanent workgroup (see recommendation) • Representatives from overburdened communities • Tribal and Indigenous leaders (ideally, multiple Tribes should be represented, including representation from Urban Indians and other Indigenous groups).

How does this recommendation complement or support existing related work in state government (e.g. programs, policies, strategies)?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This workgroup could work closely with the Office of Equity, Commissions, and the Governor’s Interagency Council on Health Disparities. • City of Seattle’s Office of Sustainability and Environment’s EJ Committee can serve as a local governance structure example, and could be a future local partner of the State workgroup.
What is needed to implement this recommendation (e.g. Does this rec need legislation, agency rulemaking, or other internal policy)?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislation to give authority for this workgroup to convene. • Legislation or policy changes to make the workgroup more accessible for community members to participate (see: Office of Equity TF guidance). • Legislation to improve community engagement practices (see recommendation re: RCWs)
Anticipated Cost	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adequately resource and staff this workgroup in order to break down barriers for participation among members and communities. This can include: compensation, schedule considerations, travel expenses, language and technology access, and childcare. • Paying for community’s time to participate in work group and during community engagement work (see: Office of Equity TF guidance above). • Staff for the permanent group (e.g. community engagement coordinator, manager, administrative and communications support). • Agency staff time to participate, ideally lead EJ staff at agencies. • Funds for meetings • Office space for workgroup staff
Anything else to consider?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How do we ensure that this group stays true to EJ? While it is important to recognize the overlapping priorities and goals of climate justice and environmentalism work, there are a myriad of EJ-specific issues this workgroup should prioritize. • Who will host this workgroup? Alternatives to Creating a New Body: (1) Add to scope of Office of Equity if/when advisory board is created; adequate funding needed (2) Extended responsibility for Governor’s Interagency Council on Health Disparities; adequate funding needed. (3) A specific state agency or the Governor’s Office. • How do we ensure that this is not another silioed government workgroup? How can the workgroup best work with Commissions, Resource Business Groups, and the Office of Equity? What other groups should we consider? • What kind of authority should this work group have? • How can we ensure fewer barriers to community participation in this workgroup? Refer to the Office of Equity Task Force’s note about barriers to participating on boards.

Amending RCWs to Support Community Engagement

Original Recommendation: Provide adequate financial support for community engagement by amending RCWs touching procurement of goods and services ([RCW 39.26](#)).

Feedback:

- Agencies establish these policies on a case by case basis, we don't have specific standards around how public meetings should be accessible, etc.
- Are we able to provide a recommendation to federal government in instances where community engagement is federally funded, meaning there are federal restrictions imposing barriers to community engagement?
 - Instead of "provide adequate support" say improve financial support.
- In addition to considerations regarding childcare, compensation for time spent, food availability, etc, in the time of COVID-19 we should also include provisions for access in spite of limited broadband
- Rephrase from "financial support" to "financial investment in community engagement" because there is a return on investment into doing meaningful engagement and the financial costs shouldn't be as a "handout" to communities.
- Other big barriers: no interpretation or translated materials available for the communities; no easily accessible community meeting spaces (agencies host meetings at their office buildings instead because it's free and convenient for staff)

Suggested Updated Recommendation Reflecting Feedback:

- Increase financial investment for community engagement by amending RCWs touching procurement of goods and services ([RCW 39.26](#)).
 - Examples of Common Barriers preventing community from engaging with government:
 - No childcare
 - No compensation for community time, travel, expertise, & wisdom
 - No food at community meetings, especially important for evening meetings
 - Access to broadband for video remote meetings

Strategies for Success:

- There should be cross-agency coordination as much as possible that creates a common "best practice" of how and when to offer the types of services described.

Guidance/Considerations	Amending RCWs to Support Community Engagement
How would this benefit impacted/overburdened communities?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reducing barriers to community engagement will allow a broader cross-section of people to participate allowing their expertise and lived experience to shape policy and other governmental processes that would better reflect the needs and desires of their local communities.
What gap in state government does this recommendation address?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Currently, state government sees low participation from certain communities in a variety of government processes including strategic planning, policy development, implementation and enforcement. Amending RCWs touching procurement of goods and services will address common barriers to participation.
Who will implement?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Once a legislative change is made, each agency will be responsible for implementation.
How does this recommendation complement or support existing related work in state government (e.g. programs, policies, strategies)?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agencies are either required to, or desire to, conduct more effective and meaningful community engagement. This proposal would allow for increased participation from a broader cross-section of WA state residents.
What is needed to implement this recommendation (e.g. Does this rec need legislation, agency rulemaking, or other internal policy)?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Legislation is needed to remove barriers in current law that prevents these types of services to be offered to the public.
Anticipated Cost	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Each of these services will have an attendant cost that will fluctuate based on the anticipated scope of feedback and needs of the community being engaged.
Anything else to consider?	

Agencies Contracting with Local Community Organizations

Original Recommendation: Agencies contract with trusted community organizations that have policy expertise in developing legislative and regulatory policies with community input.

Feedback:

- How is an agency deciding who to hire to conduct community engagement? How do we gauge if that individual really has relationships with trusted organizations?
- Check the assumption that there is actual trust/support from the community or partner organizations to the represented organization. Be wary of gatekeepers.
- How can this process recognize the variety of knowledge and expertise types? Need more than just government and academic expertise – need community expertise and expertise from lived experiences.
- What's the feedback mechanism to make sure agencies are accountable to contracting with expertise and trusted organizations?
- There should be a focus here on the master contracts list. This should be thought of as a "Priority Hire", type process. A starting point would be to provide this option as a service as agencies can procure under the master contract so then you have a pre-approved list for organizations are on this list.
- Have impacted communities apply for community grants to help monitor pollution / EJ data in their neighborhood(s)
- Tap into programs that are already working with IYAI+ to develop workforce training programs, specific to city services & infrastructure. Some programs are trying to get a high-school to post-grad technical certification to provide youths in underserved communities a 'leg up' on internships at utilities/municipalities, leading to employment. Funding should be directed to helping support these programs.
- In addition to partnering with community organizations, agencies should similarly consult with worker organizations for the workers that will do the work.
- Add "and a proven track record" after "policy expertise"

Suggested Recommendation Reflecting Feedback:

- Agencies contract with local community organizations with proven track records that have policy expertise and/or know how to solicit expertise from communities. Areas of work could include development of strategic plans, policy development, community engagement or any other process that would benefit from the expertise held by local organizations and the communities they work with.

Strategies for Success:

- For the trusted organizations that your agency partners with, use that relationship to learn more about the best practices for engaging with that specific community.
- Create an option for your agency to directly contract with community members (when deemed most appropriate) without always having to go through a community organization. But make sure that contracting process is easy and accessible to the community members.
- Use the info from the [community engagement guidance document](#) to help agencies identify trusted community organizations and scale up or down their approaches to working with communities based on the task at hand.

Guidance/Considerations	Agencies Contracting with Local Community Organizations
How would this benefit impacted/overburdened communities?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Government actions and processes, having benefited from direct input by representatives from impacted communities, would be designed and targeted to more positively address community concerns.
What gap in state government does this recommendation address?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agencies have tended to contract with professional, highly paid consultants who, in turn, reach out to community organizations who are asked to provide their time and expertise without compensation. This proposal is intended to offer a more direct path for agencies to hear directly from the relevant stakeholders.
Who will implement?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This work could be done by the relevant division handling either community outreach or services procurement in each agency. This recommendation would benefit from multi-agency coordination so as to create a "Master List" of organizations. The Office of Minority and Business Enterprises should be consulted in the implementation of this recommendation.
How does this recommendation complement or support existing related work in state government (e.g. programs, policies, strategies)?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Office of Minority and Business Enterprises is tasked with increasing the number of diverse contractors working with state agencies. This is a similar effort but more targeted towards non-profit and other types of civic organizations.
What is needed to implement this recommendation (e.g. Does this rec need legislation, agency rulemaking, or other internal policy)?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Applications, procedures and other processes related to contracting with state agencies should be reevaluated and considered for revision in order to increase ability of small, understaffed organizations can qualify and be considered for these types of contracts.
Anticipated Cost	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Additional staff time will be needed in order to redevelop contracting policies to ease allowance of smaller organization to participate while still safeguarding agency responsible use of state funds for this work. After the development of these changes, there should be no additional costs outside of the assumed costs of staff time related contracting for any type of goods or service.
Anything else to consider?	<ul style="list-style-type: none">

Dedicated Revenue for Overburdened Communities

Recommendation: For environmental legislative proposals tied to current or new revenue sources, dedicate a percentage of the budget to serving overburdened communities. The greatest considerations should be for communities that are ranked 9 or 10 on the Environmental Health Disparity Map.

Feedback:

- Identify promising ideas for where this money could go
- MTCA funds could be reprioritized to communities with the greatest burden of environmental toxics.
- Community organizations are using the map for policy making and directing investments and see the map as a helpful tool to more clearly make the connection between systemic racism and EJ
- A potential use of funds could include community grants to monitor pollution: we need capacity building and training for citizen scientists, and need to make sure that money actually gets to community
- Can be used for priority hires for contracting. Utilities may be using the map for hiring along these lines.
- Dedicated revenue should be connected to existing funding lanes (e.g. DOT directing funds to overburdened communities) versus sending funds directly to communities.
- In carrying out the work tied to the funding contemplated, in addition to the criteria mentioned in the goal already, it should be required that the work be carried with high labor standards regardless of whether a public or private entity is the beneficiary of the new spending. These should include wage standards and contracting with minority-owned enterprises.
- Hopefully, “overburdened” will have been defined previously.
- How can these types of directed investments be protected from being re-appropriated to other purposes in times of budget deficits?
- Include in that revenue source, adequate staff capacity to support and provide technical assistance to communities that may be new to receiving agency grant funding before. This includes assisting them in applying for the grants and then managing the grants. This will help build the communities’ capacity overtime instead of relying on the same organizations that continue to apply and receive funding on behalf the community.
- Funds could go towards Infrastructure Curriculum and Work-readiness youth programs to get these community members into infrastructure/utility related internships/careers and eventually leadership.
- Goals and assessment metrics need to be in place so people know clearly what the dedicated funds are going to. We need measurable action on the ground that is meaningful to those communities. We need to include communities from all around the state too, not just urban areas in Puget Sound.
- The map can hide problems based on bad info from census tracts. For example, Whatcom census tracts can hide small neighborhood concerns. EHD is a good starting point but does not have enough detail for some purposes.

Suggested Recommendation Reflecting Feedback:

- For new revenue sources with an environmental nexus, agencies should direct a certain percentage of investments, grants or programs related to that revenue source into serving communities disproportionately burdened by pollution that are ranked 9 or 10 on the Environmental Health Disparity Map or identified through a similar analysis if the EHD map is lacking a key metric or does not accurately reflect a given area in WA.
 - In addition, work funded by new revenue should have high labor standard requirements regardless of whether a public or private entity is the beneficiary of the new spending. These should include wage standards and contracting with minority-owned enterprises.

Guidance/Considerations	Dedicated Revenue for Overburdened Communities
How would this benefit impacted/overburdened communities?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The result of this dedicated revenue is that agencies will be directed to invest resources and programs under their control in the areas that are most disadvantaged. In addition, funds can go toward grants, hiring, and contracting opportunities.
What gap in state government does this recommendation address?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Communities with high levels of pollution and other disparities have been traditionally underinvested in for decades contributing to many of the disparities faced by neighborhoods across the state. Dedicating revenue to overburdened communities is one important strategy for reducing environmental health disparities in WA state.
Who will implement?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Individual agencies tasked with oversight and implementation of a given revenue source.
How does this recommendation complement or support existing related work in state government (e.g. programs, policies, strategies)?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Department of Ecology oversees the implementation of the Model Toxic Control Act and has used both the EHD map and other criteria in order to identify areas for environmental cleanup, remediation, and pollution prevention programs statewide: https://ecology.wa.gov/Spills-Cleanup/Contamination-cleanup/Rules-directing-our-cleanup-work/Model-Toxics-Control-Act. The New York Climate Leadership and Community Protection Act sets a target for disadvantaged communities to receive 40 percent of the overall benefits from the state's climate programs, and at a minimum, disadvantaged communities must receive no less than 35 percent of those benefits. California's SB 535 mandates that 25% of the proceeds from the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund go to projects that provide a benefit to "disadvantaged communities" as identified by the CalEnviroScreen. The CalEnviroScreen was a model used in developing the WA EHD Map
What is needed to implement this recommendation (e.g. Does this rec need legislation, agency rulemaking, or other internal policy)?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Legislation is needed to create a new revenue source and the directed amount to be dedicated to impacted communities. In addition, rulemaking by the relevant agency would be required to implement this direction from the legislature.
Anticipated Cost	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Staff will be needed to implement to overall law. Additional resources may be needed for community engagement in implementation. This could include ensuring there is adequate staff capacity to support and provide technical assistance to communities that may be new to receiving agency grant funding before. This includes assisting them in applying for the grants and then managing the grants. This will help build the communities' capacity over time instead of relying on the same organizations that continue to apply and receive funding on behalf the community.
Anything else to consider?	<ul style="list-style-type: none">

Mandated Use of Cumulative Impact Analyses (CIAs)

Original Recommendation: Mandate use of cumulative impacts analyses to support prioritization of overburdened communities across these agency activities:

- Community Engagement
- Grants & Loans
- Capital Investment
- Contracting
- Fees & Costs of Service
- Program Planning, Monitoring, & Evaluation
- Policy Development Rulemaking

Feedback:

- CIA is a confusing phrase. Possible to use a more straight forward description of what is meant?
- Need to ensure use of this type of analysis does not conflict with state and federal requirements.
- Is there a way to pair this with mapping recommendations? For example, using the map to do project prioritization in one of the agency activity categories (e.g. permitting).
- “Prioritization” – what does that really mean? Find a balance between being too prescriptive and too vague.
- This is a great recommendation for technical experts to include EJ and equity into their work.
- How would we ensure state staff has the training to develop these types of analyses?
- This could be a good push for more funding to update the map and more data.
- Tribal consultation in addition to mandated use for: program planning/monitoring/evaluation, policy development, and rulemaking agency activities.
- In addition to considering fees & costs of services, consider revenue sources more broadly as part of this evaluation. Consider using the Social Vulnerability Index as an additional way to measure these impacts: <https://svi.cdc.gov/>
- Statement on “Mandated use of cumulative impacts analyses to support prioritization of overburdened communities across these agency activities:” means defining “overburdened communities” will be important.
- Could cumulative impact also include health outcome indicators?
- The word “indicators” is used here but not mentioned previously—how does indicator relate to “metrics”, “goals”, “principles”, “objective”?
- In addition to the conventional environmental health factors (air pollution and other environmental hazards etc.), it would be important to broaden “environmental health factors” to also capture community/neighborhood/structural conditions that support or does not support their health and wellbeing (e.g., walkability, green/open space, access to healthy and affordable foods, access to cooling spaces during a heat event etc.).
- Also there is a lot of local data that are not incorporated into state-level tools, so state agencies should have funding and tools to reach out to local jurisdictions for important micro-level information that either could be incorporated into the state tools or be considered in addition to what the state has access to.
- This work should also include looking forward to identify gaps in knowledge that should be obtained (both from community and data gathering/research) and incorporated into the consideration of cumulative impacts.

Suggested Recommendation Reflecting Feedback:

- Mandated use of environmental health analyses, including but not limited to the [Environmental Health Disparity Map](#), that combine the impact of multiple environmental health indicators such as environmental exposures, environmental effects, impact on sensitive populations and other socioeconomic factors.
 - Use of these types of analyses should only be done when not in conflict with other state and federal requirements.
 - Reference Mapping Subcommittee recommendations when considering the appropriate uses of the EHD map and its limitations. Those recommendations are also useful when another type of analysis is being developed.

Guidance/Considerations	Mandated Use of CIAs
How would this benefit impacted/overburdened communities?	<p>Benefits:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • These types of analyses allow for impacted communities “to be seen” by state agencies and removes the “burden of proof” that communities are often required to provide when advocating for relief from negative conditions in their homes or places of work. • Use of environmental health analyses would allow government agencies to have a better understanding of a range of impacts being felt in a certain community from and allow for the development of a range of policies and procedures that are more effectively created to address those concerns.
What gap in state government does this recommendation address?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • While many of these types of analyses are currently utilized by a variety of state agencies and other local governments, their use is voluntarily, limited to specific purposes, and/or not widely shared or understood. By requiring the use of this type of analysis, state government has can more easily make the connection between the environment and health to guide actions.
Who will implement?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To ensure consistency of application, there should be ongoing collaboration of agencies using these types of analyses. The proposed permanent EJ workgroup would be key table and a valuable resource in this effort. • Individual agencies would adopt and use specific analyses that meet their specific needs.
How does this recommendation complement or support existing related work in state government (e.g. programs, policies, strategies)?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SB 5116 – The Clean Energy Transformation Act requires utilities to use a cumulative impacts analysis of the communities highly impacted by fossil fuel pollution and climate change in Washington for incorporating into clean energy action plans and clean energy transformation plans. Rulemaking by Commerce and the UTC is in process on how to implement this requirement. • The CalEnviroScreen is being used by CalEPA to aid in administering environmental justice grants, promote compliance with environmental laws, prioritize site-cleanup activities and identify opportunities for sustainable development. • A number of state agencies have utilized the EHD map in different aspects of their work, including by not limited to the Departments of Ecology, Commerce and Transportation.
What is needed to implement this recommendation (e.g. Does this rec need legislation, agency rulemaking, or other internal policy)?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requiring these types of analyses can be created through legislation, executive order, or at the direction of an agency director.
Anticipated Cost	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are costs to updating, maintaining and other wise improving current resources like the EHD Map. • There may be additional staff time needed to develop new analyses. It is unclear if this should be considered an additional new cost since these types of analyses are currently being done within existing resources. At the same time, there are likely a number of staff that would need to be trained in this type of analysis and its development (see Mapping Subcommittee recommendation regarding developing a practitioner training for how to use the EHD map).
Anything else to consider?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •

Incorporating Environmental Justice into State Environmental Laws

Original Recommendation: Environmental Justice Goal Added to the Growth Management Act

Feedback:

- We need to be broader by applying a focus on EJ and health goals in a variety of laws that impact the natural and built environment
- The EJ Task Force should look at other land use laws, the Clean Air Act, Clean Water Act and SEPA to make sure EJ is cross-walked with these laws in a very intentional way.
- EJ goals should also be included in county/municipal codes that implement the GMA
- There should be a deeper emphasis on Climate change issues. Transportation and road building are very detrimental to ecological systems and highways have often (always) been built in ways that destroy lower income communities. Climate change will hit lower income communities faster and harder though everyone will be badly impacted. It seems that an EJ statement in the growth management act is appropriate to call this out.
- EJ goals in GMA should be sure to include specific mandates on addressing climate justice, affordable housing and displacement due to gentrification and/or climate change.
- The EJ goal in GMA should be mandatory.
- EJ related requirements once enacted should only apply to new projects and should not be applied to projects that have already broken ground or have substantially completed. Regulatory agencies have to be coordinated in the permitting process; if a project cannot move forward, agencies should notify at the beginning of the process.
- This really needs to be mandatory if we care anything about housing costs and the unaffordability of most urban areas, the growing poverty of especially urban neighborhoods. There should be requirements that any new development in cities include 20% affordable living apartments accessible to people below the poverty line. Also, urban densification preferred to residential suburban sprawl because city services are much cheaper to provide in this situation, in addition to leaving more space undeveloped. This may already be in the GMA

Suggested Recommendation Reflecting Feedback:

Environmental Justice considerations and procedures should be incorporated into a range of state environmental laws. The following are illustrative examples of how this could be accomplished in WA State:

- [Modernizing the Evergreen Communities Act](#) (SB 6529/HB2413)
 - This update of the Evergreen Communities Act to help communities develop urban forestry plans aligning with other high priority goals, such as salmon and orca recovery, environmental health disparities, human health, and local air and water quality improvements. Bill includes a focus on environmental justice, and ensure at least 50 percent of all program activities benefit highly impacted communities.
- Growth Management Act
 - [CA Senate Bill 1000](#) provides an example of incorporating environmental justice into WA's Growth Management Act. For example, EJ could be incorporated as a new mandatory goal. This goal could require the identification of disadvantaged communities, prioritizing improvements and programs that address the needs of disadvantaged communities including addressing reduction of GHG that put communities at risk due to climate change, require affordable housing and addresses concerns related to gentrification and displacement.
- State Environmental Protection Act

- [Pennsylvania Enhanced Public Participation Policy](#) – This policy was created to ensure that EJ communities have the opportunity to participate and be involved in a meaningful manner throughout the permitting process when companies propose permitted facilities in their neighborhood or when existing facilities expand their operations. Only those [activities that may lead to significant public concerns](#) due to potential impacts on human health and the environment trigger this process. Such activities include new major source of hazardous air pollutants, commercial incinerators, coal preparation facility or expansion of large concentrated animal feeding operations.
- New Jersey [Senate Bill S232](#)
 - This bill, if enacted, would require consideration of the potential for disproportionate cumulative health impacts on the local community when certain types of new facilities, or expanded facilities, are proposed in an overburdened neighborhood. It would also give members of the community greater notice and opportunities to be heard.

Guidance/Considerations	Integrate EJ into state environmental laws
How would this benefit impacted/overburdened communities?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comments from public participants at EJ Task Force meetings and in Community Conversations hosted by Front & Centered repeatedly raised concerns that they did not receive adequate notice or have sufficient time in order to raise concerns about projects in their area that impacted their quality of life. In addition, they have been told by both state and local governments that the specific concerns they addressed, like how many different forms of pollution or toxic exposures, were worsening their health. By inserting provisions that account for broader public participation while taking into account a broader array of concerns, it is hoped that these concerns could be addressed.
What gap in state government does this recommendation address?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Multiple government agencies have expressed that they are unable to address concerns raised by different communities due to the limitations of their jurisdiction and issues within their purview to address. Incorporating EJ into a variety of state laws would fill this gap by allowing agencies to address a cross-cutting array of issues.
Who will implement?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Individual agencies would be tasked with rulemaking and implementation after relevant legislation has been enacted.
How does this recommendation complement or support existing related work in state government (e.g. programs, policies, strategies)?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This recommendation builds on current areas of responsibility for agencies but expands their authority to be more inclusive in the range of concerns they would be allowed to address and direct them to have a broader stakeholder engagement strategies and processes.
What is needed to implement this recommendation (e.g. Does this rec need legislation, agency rulemaking, or other internal policy)?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Legislation is needed to add any of these components to current state laws.
Anticipated Cost	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Staff time and additional employees would be needed to implement and run expanded public processes and respond to a broader array of issues. Resources should be allocated for broader based community engagement both for official processes but also to be responsive to a broader array of issues that would fall into their purview.
Anything else to consider?	<ul style="list-style-type: none">

Create a Statewide Reparations Task force

Updated Recommendation: Study and develop repair proposals for WA State. Task Force should focus on reparations for the Black community based on the legacy of slavery and Jim Crow laws. However, the Task Force should also take into consideration the impact systemic racism has had on Native, Indigenous, Latinx, Asian communities and others. Direct connections to EJ and reparations include land theft, colonization, segregation, redlining, internment, employment discrimination, and financial services discrimination.

Feedback:

- This feels outside the scope of the EJ Task force. It would help to have more about the direct connection between the elements outlined in the slide (e.g. redlining, land theft, etc.) and how they directly related to EJ.
- Precedent for this work happening in Ashville, NC proposals include giving cash assistance to Black communities and prioritizing investments in public health, climate plans, and education.
- In the context of race and reparations, the abolition movement is seeking to reallocate existing funding streams that negatively impact front line communities.
- What lessons we can learn from federal efforts to scope reparations, and ways we can connect the concept of reparations to other funding pathways under consideration by the task force.
- Investments should be directed to education, ethnic owned businesses, traffic calming, biodiversity (like canopy cover), safe sidewalks, delayed building repairs, support for local non-profits, fair & affordable housing/multi-purpose housing, transit options, holding actors accountable to improving air quality, office space for job training and making sure all of these investments are made to withstand the projected impacts of climate change such as extreme heat, flooding, threats to food systems, water quality (storm water infrastructure) -- letting communities decide what to do with funding.
- Community led participatory budgeting should be a recommendation.
- Lean on the community engagement best practices and recommendations for how to do this work meaningfully (e.g. pay people for their time -- especially for work on reparations).
- CE recommendations exist to balance the scale -- people's rights have been designed out of government on purpose. These inequitable outcomes exist purposefully -- this is an opportunity to correct wrongs.
- It is a mistake to conflate Black and Indigenous situations, especially given the Boldt 1 and 2 decisions about Indigenous fishing rights in Washington State, and the fact that there is a governor's task force making fisheries policy with the Dept. of Fisheries and the treaty tribes through the Northwest Indian Fish Commission. Please see Vine Deloria's "Custer Died for your Sins", chapter on the red and the black, and a couple of articles by Michael Marker, UBC professor.

Additional Information Connecting Environmental Justice to Reparations

- Delegates to the First National People of Color Environmental Leadership Summit heal in Washington, DC in 1919, drafted and adopted 17 principles of Environmental Justice. Since then, The Principles have served as a defining document for the growing grassroots movement for environmental justice.
 - Principle 9 -- "Environmental Justice protects the right of victims of environmental injustice to receive full compensation and reparations for damages as well as quality health care."
- "Community-Based reparations could serve as a source of funding for neighborhood associations, community-based entities, community groups, or individuals living within a specified community or zip code that have suffered historic environmental injustices. These reparations might be provided by the perpetrator of the injustice or by an entity, corporation, or government that allowed the injustice to continue unregulated and unchecked."
 - Kaiman, Catherine Millas *Environmental Justice and Community-Based Reparations*, 1327 *Seattle University Law Review* Volume 39, p. 1358.

- “Environmental justice reparations may take many forms: the uncompromised cleanup of air, water, and land poisoned by industrial users. Reparations might entail making a commitment to monitor certain toxins and exposure pathways. They might entail making a commitment to convert polluting industries to industries that use clean production technologies. Environmental reparations to some communities might encompass an entire bioregion . . . Environmental reparations represent a bridge to sustainability and equity. Even if environmental reparations are limited to monitoring and measuring environmental impacts and their accumulations, at least we can begin the process of establishing an environmental baseline in our urban areas.”
 - Collin, Robin Morris and Robert. *Book: The Quest for Environmental Justice, article Environmental Reparations.*

Guidance/Considerations	Integrate EJ into state environmental laws
How would this benefit impacted/overburdened communities?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reparations in any form whether increased government investments in targeted programs, prioritization of environmental clean ups, or cash payments would benefit impacted communities by beginning to address hundreds of years of systemic racism and policies that were designed to disadvantage many communities of color through most of WA State and US history. However, this recommendation is about creating a Task Force that would only study and make recommendations on this issue.
What gap in state government does this recommendation address?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> State government has played a role in negatively impacting a cross section of communities of color throughout WA. A Task Force would detail specific instances of WA government negatively impacting communities and provide recommendations on how to address these long-term impacts.
Who will implement?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> An identified agency (Office of Equity, Council on Health Disparities or multiple agencies working collaboratively (Commissions on Hispanic, API and African-America Affairs) could all be tasked with staffing and running this process.
How does this recommendation complement or support existing related work in state government (e.g. programs, policies, strategies)?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Office of Equity is one form of reparations as it is attempting to reduce disparities faced by people of color in WA State. The EHD Map is a way of cataloging and creating a baseline of understanding of the issues facing BIPOC communities in WA.
What is needed to implement this recommendation (e.g. Does this rec need legislation, agency rulemaking, or other internal policy)?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requiring these types of analyses can be created through legislation, executive order or at the direction of an agency director.
Anticipated Cost	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The cost of the Task Force could include staff time, community engagement, hosting info on a website, and travel and/or compensation for Task Force members are all potential costs.
Anything else to consider?	<ul style="list-style-type: none">