

CARBON CAPTURE COALITION

2025 FEDERAL POLICY BLUEPRINT

Communities Working Group
Meeting Notes
June 26, 2024

Meeting Summary

The Coalition's 2025 Blueprint Communities Work Group met on June 26 for its inaugural meeting. The meeting focused on various aspects of carbon management policy, community engagement, and economic development.

Key discussion topics included:

- Outline of the process for the Community Work Group,
- Latest jobs analysis from [Rhodium Group](#) and [GPI co-benefits analysis](#) that will inform the Blueprint language,
- Stakeholder engagement best practices,
- Communicating the benefits of carbon capture technologies,
- Effective policy mechanism to ensure community benefits, and
- Transparent communication with host communities.

Additionally, emphasis was placed on maintaining bipartisan support for carbon management by avoiding specific references to initiatives like Justice40 or executive actions that could be impacted by changes in the administration in 2025.

Key Takeaways

Upcoming Events:

- An in-person Work Group meeting in Washington, DC, on October 7th to review and discuss the draft blueprint outline.

Intro call	6/10
Communities (WG 1)	06/26
Ensuring Investment Certainty (WG 5)	07/10
Resources for Next Generation Tech Deployment (WG 4)	07/24

Demand-Side Policies (WG 2)	08/07
Transport & Storage Infra. (WG 3)	08/12

Community Work Group:

- Focus on jobs and economic development, frontline community concerns, and implementing a supportive policy framework for carbon management.
- Aim to integrate community concerns into broader policy discussions and weave in throughout the Blueprint, where appropriate.

Stakeholder Engagement:

- Develop best practices for stakeholder engagement and increase transparency.
- Ensure benefits flow to affected communities, including job creation and pollution reduction.
- Improve interagency coordination to address community interests.

New Information for 2023 Blueprint:

- Co-benefits report by GPI and updated jobs analysis from the Rhodium Group.
- Avoid specific references to Justice40 or executive actions to maintain bipartisan support. Instead, use language that broadly encompasses those programs.

Framing Questions:

- Consider the role of third-party entities in verifying project benefits.
- Explore policy mechanisms to ensure benefits reach affected communities.
- Develop specific policy recommendations for other work groups.

Co-benefits of Carbon Capture:

- Presentation on amine-based carbon capture systems and their health and economic benefits.
- Discussion on the efficiency and cost-effectiveness of retrofitting facilities with carbon capture technology.

Discussion and Q&A:

- Need for more projects and research to understand and communicate the benefits of carbon capture.
- Importance of community trust and effective communication regarding safety and benefits.
- Please reach out to Coalition staff with any additional suggestions or ideas. If there are topics you would like considered for inclusion in the next iteration of the Blueprint, we need to hear from you.

Meeting Notes

Welcome

- Housekeeping
 - October 7th Work Group in person in DC
 - Opportunity for discussion and feedback on draft of Blueprint. We will send out a calendar hold soon.
- Overview of Framing Considerations for Communities WG
 - Jobs and Economic Development
 - Frontline Community Concerns
 - More overarching; working on the implementation of the supportive policy framework for carbon management
 - Not anticipating specific proposals on communities, but want to weave our consensus language regarding community concerns throughout the Blueprint, as appropriate

Presentation

- Overview of Existing Coalition Consensus Positions
 - **Work with stakeholders:** develop stakeholder best practices and increase transparency. No one-sized approach to community engagement.
 - **Ensure benefits flow to affected communities:** jobs and economic development, co-benefits (incidental removal of other pollutants in air due to carbon capture)
 - **Improve interagency coordination:** Improve transparency, ensure agencies talk to each other on issues which affect community interests
- **New Information Relative to 2023 Blueprint**
 - Two new pieces of work since the publishing of the last Blueprint which will inform the 2025 Blueprint:
 - GPI co-benefits report
 - Rhodium Group updated analysis for jobs across carbon management technologies in midcontinent and midatlantic regions.
 - Useful in that it not only collects all jobs across sectors in different states, but also has a breakdown of different types of jobs and incorporates any boost in job potential from enhancements to 45Q enacted under IRA
 - Will not reference Justice40 or specific language on executive action so that potential changes in the administration will not impact this section too strongly. Need to be sensitive to remaining bipartisan and not speaking on anything anyone would find objectionable.
- **Framing Questions for Group Discussion**
 - Is there a role for outside entities to verify project benefits for host communities given that some communities have expressed low trust in DOE and project developers?
 - Has been a question that has arisen both with implementation of Hydrogen and DAC Hubs, so it is a timely issue that could help build rapport with community and tribal leaders.

- C: One example given was a project developer who funded a University study on environmental baseline prior to drilling test wells, which allowed a trusted third party to provide real data to the community.
 - C: Community Benefits Plans (CBPs) are already challenging and fraught for projects that have not yet met final investment decision (FID). Concern regarding project developers making promises we can't deliver on.
 - What are some policy mechanisms that federal agencies can incorporate into funding or permitting applications to ensure benefits flow to affected communities?
 - C: Is there space to develop a cooperative agreement framework, where project developers can cost-share on providing funds to community-based engagement or research?
 - Beyond general language and framework are there things we should be thinking through with regard to specific policy recommendations for other Work Groups?
 - C: We need to think about policy best practices to enable stakeholders/communities to feel like they have something to say. We have to figure out a way to ensure communities have a sufficient voice. There is a big risk that CCS gets written off as "false solutions," etc.

Presentation on GPI Co-benefits report

- GPI collaborated with Carbon Solutions on a study that examined amine-based carbon capture systems in various industries across the country to determine the possible air-quality co-benefits of installing carbon capture retrofits.
 - Amine system has flue gas coming in, interacting with solvent, stripping CO₂. The treated gas is vented and solvent with CO₂ heated up, CO₂-rich solvent has CO₂ removed, which is then transported to sites for storage or utilization. Pre-treatment of flue gases is necessary to protect the amine-based system from degradation.
- Beyond health benefits to pollutant reduction, pre-treatment of flue gases also improves the efficiency of the capture system. All three main pollutants (NO_x, SO_x, PM) looked at by the analysis harm not only health but also the lifetime and efficiency of amine-based systems.
- Looked at various health benefits, including asthma attacks, mortality, etc. Looked at both health benefits and economic value with the help of the [COBRA](#) model developed by the EPA. Looks at both industry and region in terms of opportunity. Numbers only specific to 54 representative facilities included in the study, not all facilities across the country.
 - In all cases, saw an improvement in health benefits for facilities in each region; the level of benefits varied based on facility types and region
- Across all regions and industries, there is a potential for removing these co-pollutants as part of the carbon capture system to have a positive impact not only on carbon emissions but also on health benefits to those in surrounding communities. The benefit (versus cost of treatment and capture) is dependent on the sector and cost of capture, as well as co-pollutants in the emissions stream.

Discussion and Q&A

- Q: From a research perspective, what are the next steps to understand potential benefits and then communicate these analyses that show benefits as tangible information for communities?
 - A: More projects will help to better understand the potential co-benefits of project deployment. DOE is funding more studies in this area; DOE has shown interest but we really need more projects to see the ability both from a co-pollutant reduction standpoint and also to see how to make the system really work well in terms of both CO₂ capture and co-pollutant reduction. Communicating these benefits to communities will be down to specific facilities. I think it's important for individual facilities to tout any potential air quality benefits.
 - For DOE, there is a great opportunity here to show additional benefits of carbon capture and figure out ways to incentivize co-pollutant removal in ways that aren't currently law (i.e. 45Q incentivizes the capture and storage of CO₂).
- Q: What about the potential leakage of CO₂ from pipelines?
 - From a safety perspective, most minor leakage rates pose no sort of health risk, so more of a consideration during maintenance and blowdowns, which are a little larger. On CO₂ pipeline leakage, there will be minor amounts of leakage at times; the question is what threshold communities will be okay with. It is important to figure out how to communicate that those are still safe, and rates of leakage aren't climate impacting. Hopefully anticipated updated regulations from PHMSA will ensure standards are even safer than they already are.