



## **WRI CCS Community Engagement Guidelines, April 23-24, 2009**

### **Workshop Summary**

#### **Highlights:**

##### **Assessing Current Practices:**

- It is important to recognize the philosophical and larger societal issues around climate change and coal and how that framing impacts CCS community engagement.
- There are existing analogues for community engagement in other industries as well as CCS-specific experiences which offer a basis for the guidelines.
- A careful analysis of the various constituents in a community and their sentiments is critical at the outset of developing a public outreach/engagement strategy because the specific community context shapes their views about the technology.
- It is important that the community engagement process is transparent and open, and there is a need to clearly define what is meant by a transparent process in the guidelines.

##### **Audience:**

- The key audience identified for the CCS community engagement guidelines are decision-makers: local communities affected by CCS projects (community leaders, landowners and other citizens), regulators identifying requirements for community engagement, and project developers implementing community engagement around a planned project.

##### **Scope:**

- In thinking about scope of the CCS community engagement guidelines, it is important to think carefully about how to balance the interest of different audience segments and geographic scope of the document.



## **Detailed Summary:**

WRI initiated the process of developing community engagement guidelines for CCS with a stakeholder meeting in Washington DC on April 23-24, 2009. The meeting was well attended by experts from NGOs, local community groups, industry (electric utility and oil and gas), academia, social scientists, policymakers, and regulators who brought diverse perspectives to the discussions. The meeting agenda covered a wide range of issues including a review of participants' experiences with community engagement, both specific to CCS and pertaining to other energy and infrastructure development in the United States and abroad. A detailed agenda is attached for your reference; key highlights from the meeting are summarized below.

### **1. Identifying and Assessing Existing Practices for Community Engagement:**

The first set of discussions focused on identifying and assessing existing practices for community engagement. There are existing laws governing aspects of community engagement that provide insight for CCS. Additionally, international project developers and U.S. Department of Energy's regional partnerships are conducting community outreach and engagement as they move forward with large scale CO<sub>2</sub> injections. The participants shared their experiences with engaging communities and discussed what effective community engagement entails. Many stakeholders shared examples of what worked and what did not in terms of effective community engagement.

#### **1.1 Examples of effective community engagement:**

- Providing information and resolving people's questions effectively
  - Questions do not always indicate opposition
  - Discuss people's concerns
- Engaging communities from the beginning of the project instead of bringing them in when decisions are already made
- Holding home visits or small group meetings instead of, or in addition to, public hearings
- Identifying and engaging a local project representative who understands the community
  - Use local knowledge to develop communications plan
- Involving local universities
- Using multiple media
- Extending discussions beyond coal to climate change issues (in some cases)
- Laying a foundation before a public meeting



- Tying the project to local community benefits
- Engaging in a dialogue with interveners
- Fostering two-way engagement/sharing information and make joint decisions
- Using trusted risk communication techniques
- Providing decision-relevant information
- Testing the message ahead of time
- Ensuring that the project team is well coordinated
- Leveraging the newness of CCS technology; “first-of-a-kind—cool factor”

### **1.2 What doesn’t work for effective community engagement and hence requires careful consideration:**

- Failing to involve community
- When opposition becomes about feelings and emotions, not facts
- Providing too much information or project advocacy
- Failing to target information to host community needs. For example, some communities are not receptive to climate change as a reason for doing CCS, but they might accept it on the basis of community benefits

### **1.3 Detailed considerations for effectively engaging communities:**

#### **Understand local community context:**

It is important to note that what works in one situation may not work in another, so a careful analysis of the various constituents in a community and their sentiments is critical at the outset of developing a public outreach/engagement strategy. The specific community context shapes their views about technology. The target community to engage expands if injected or displaced fluids cross state borders. The relationship with the host site will impact community views, and community views on CCS may vary in different regions based on past experience with industry; this is also true among countries. Moreover, communities may or may not embrace CCS because of its larger role as a climate change mitigation strategy, and they may support it for other myriad reasons such as economic benefits of the technology. Stakeholders acknowledged that different members of a community will take a different type and level of engagement as the concerns may be different. For example, some community groups may be more concerned about the impact of CO<sub>2</sub> leaks on the underground sources of drinking water, while the landowners may be more worried about compensation.

#### **Opposition to projects:**



Stakeholders highlighted that CCS is emerging in a world where there will be opposition and discussed the different facets of this opposition. Opposition to CCS could stem from general opposition to coal and coal-fired power plants. In some cases the communities may question the technology because of risks of CO<sub>2</sub> leakage. Community opposition to CCS is often organized and coordinated. It is therefore important to understand the perspectives of different community constituents and engage the opposition parties to address their concerns genuinely.

**Public meeting format:**

The format of public meetings also influences the outcome. Stakeholders noted that the traditional format for public meetings may not be successful in all cases, and that sometimes face-to-face meetings and open house meetings with demonstrations (including descriptive models of geologic storage) work more effectively. At a minimum, public meetings should offer an opportunity for the public to receive answers to their questions.

**Two-way engagement:**

The importance of two-way community engagement (direct community engagement or reaching out to the leaders of a community first and then defining ‘targeted community’) was emphasized. Emphasis should be given to identifying constraints that may impact the effectiveness of the outreach process.

**Media influence:**

Stakeholders highlighted the role of media in influencing public opinion. The timing and manner in which the media frames an issue is critical in shaping public opinion about the technology.

**Social science research on CCS:**

The group discussed the need for more government funding for research on CCS public awareness; conducting surveys, focus groups, and public awareness workshops, as well as the need to outline how this will promote successful CCS demonstrations.

**2. Audience:**

The second issue discussed in detail was the audience for community engagement guidelines for CCS.

Stakeholders identified three groups that need to be engaged while moving forward with demonstrating and potentially deploying CCS:

- Host community



World Resources Institute

10 G St., NE, Washington, D.C. 20002

Tel: 202-729-7600

Fax: 202-729-7610

<http://www.wri.org/wri>



- Acknowledge the different players in an affected community — businesses, legislators, NGOs — and create separate strategies for communicating with each
- Point to already-developed and tested guideline methodologies that have been developed for other technologies
- Engage at top level while doing community engagement within an organization
- Fill the gap in lack of information for regulators/policymakers/project developers on how to engage communities
- Include discussion of how community engagement relates to existing regulations (going beyond minimum requirements; business case for community engagement)
- Play role of communicator/source of information (government and industry are not always trusted)
- Consider limiting the scope of this document to storage (not capture and transportation)

### **3.1 Transparency in engaging communities:**

During the discussions different themes emerged for defining ‘transparency’ in community engagement efforts:

- Lessons for transparency can be taken from nuclear industry experience in Scandinavian countries
- Some stakeholders offered caution about being transparent
  - Providing information too early in a project when the developer does not have answers can create mistrust
  - Transparency may not always be effective in risk communication
- Need to understand carefully how and when transparency is important, and clearly define what is meant by a transparent process

### **3.2 Global vs. U.S. Guidelines:**

Another important consideration discussed was whether the guidelines should have an exclusively United States (or developed country) vs. a global scope. Stakeholders had different views on this question. Some felt that it is good to keep a narrow scope and develop in-depth U.S.-focused guidelines, while some felt that there are issues relevant to the international context and that it is possible to have a distinction on the U.S. vs. international guidelines in one document.

### **4. Next Steps:**



WRI will distribute meeting notes and a draft document outline to the stakeholder group for review.

A conference call will be held during the week of April 27<sup>th</sup> with invitees who were not able to participate in the discussions in Washington, DC.

There are a few issues WRI has identified that merit further discussion prior to drafting the guidelines document, which will be reviewed and discussed at a September meeting.

To facilitate gathering this information, the following topics were identified for smaller workgroup discussions. Workgroup members will meet by phone (at least once) to discuss experiences and issues related to the following topics:

- Access to information (what information does a community need and how can that information be best provided)
- How to communicate risk information
- Addressing the broader societal concern about coal and the climate change context for CCS
- Identifying the process for community engagement

During the wrap-up session, stakeholders identified the following areas and made suggestions that require further discussion/consideration as we move forward with the process to develop a robust set of guidelines:

- Issues associated with actual storage — lessons from FutureGen
- Remediation planning
- Legal issues with subsurface storage
- Changing attitudes toward community engagement
- Interplay between existing regulations and community engagement
- Consider narrowing the focus for developed countries, which later can be a springboard for guidelines for the international community
- Report can have side bars to cover what's happening globally
- Need to have more voices at the table, including more representatives from the western U.S., international community, and local community
- Do not reinvent the wheel as there is a lot of existing information on risk communication and community engagement
- Consider Toxics Release Inventory, ISO14063 Guidance on Environment Communication as a model



- How to tackle the issue of misunderstanding surrounding the issue of climate change and CCS





**Effective Community Engagement in  
Carbon Capture and Storage (CCS) Projects**

April 23-24, 2009

<b>Thursday April 23, 2009</b>	
1:00-1:15 pm	Opening Remarks and Introductions (All) <i>Debbie Boger, WRI</i>
1:15-1:45	WRI CCS Project Overview and Need for Developing Community Engagement Guidelines <i>Sarah Forbes, WRI</i>
1:45-2:15	Overview presentations about existing requirements in key coal-consuming countries <i>United States (Sarah Wade, AJW)</i> <i>European Union (Heleen DeConinck, ECN)</i> <i>China (Xiaomei Tan, WRI)</i> <i>Developing economies (Kirk Herbertson, WRI)</i>
2:15-2:45	Group Discussion: Defining the baseline for community engagement around CCS <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• What engagement has occurred surrounding CCS projects from participants' experience to date?</li><li>• What are the minimum requirements?</li><li>• How similar are the requirements among states and countries? Between research efforts and industrial projects?</li><li>• Who is responsible for community engagement under these national and state frameworks?</li></ul>
2:45-3:15	Group Discussion: Assessing current practices <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• What are the true challenges to engaging the public?</li><li>• Do existing requirements for public participation work from your perspective?</li><li>• Will research experience translate to commercial projects?</li><li>• How can guidelines be helpful in safe and effective CCS deployment?</li><li>• How do you make guidelines valuable from a community perspective? Industry perspective? Government perspective?</li><li>• How can existing requirements be strengthened and improved?</li></ul>
3:15-3:30	Break



3:30-4:30	<p>Group Discussion: Scope and Audience</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• What should be included in community engagement guidelines?</li><li>• How does general technology awareness affect the engagement surrounding any one project?</li><li>• Is a global scope possible given the challenges and differences in law among countries?</li><li>• Who are the actors/decisionmakers involved in community engagement around CCS projects? How can we draft guidelines to target these decisionmakers?</li><li>• How do we ensure our guidelines will be relevant to each actor category?</li><li>• What are the roles of government, NGOs, industry?</li><li>• Do we want to include recommendations for public monies for broad CCS awareness in this effort?</li><li>• How do guidelines for community engagement need to change as the technology moves from demonstration to early adopters and deployment?</li></ul>
4:30-5:00	Wrap-up Discussion and Review of Plan for Friday's Discussion
5:00-6:30	Reception at WRI



<b>Friday April 24, 2009</b>	
8:30-9:00	Coffee
9:00-9:15	Introductions and Summary of First Day Discussions <i>Debbie Boger and Sarah Forbes, WRI</i>
9:15-9:30	Engaging Communities in the Infrastructure and Development Projects: A perspective for CCS <i>Kirk Herbertson, WRI</i>
9:30-9:45	Stakeholder Involvement for CCS: Lessons learned from ongoing projects and ISO 14,063 as a possible model for framing the Issue <i>Gretchen Hund, Battelle</i>
9:45-10:15	Group Discussion: Applicability of broad energy infrastructure guidelines to CCS community engagement <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What about CCS is unique and requires different community outreach compared with traditional energy projects?</li> <li>• What about experiences in the developing world is relevant to CCS demonstrations? What isn't?</li> <li>• How can we best ensure that this process is robust from a governance perspective?</li> </ul>
10:15-10:30	Break
10:30-11:30	Group Discussion: Access to information <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What does a community need to know about a proposed project?</li> <li>• Is industry able to provide that information to the public?</li> <li>• What is the role of government in providing this information?</li> <li>• What guidelines can we draft to outline information that can be provided in the context of informing, consulting, and negotiating with communities?</li> </ul>
11:30-12:00	Wrap-up. Individual comments from around the table. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What specifically would you like to see the community engagement guidelines cover that we may not have yet discussed?</li> <li>• Is there interest in establishing working groups on key topics?</li> <li>• How do you see these guidelines being used in your efforts?</li> <li>• Concrete planning for final 2 sessions</li> </ul>
12:00-1:00	Lunch and Next Steps Planning at WRI