

POLICY BRIEF

NOVEMBER 2024



COMMUNITY BENEFIT AGREEMENT REQUIREMENTS IN NEW ENGLAND: A LEGISLATIVE OVERVIEW



POLICY BRIEF
INITIATIVE FOR ENERGY JUSTICE

AUTHOR
Annabel Shu

**THE INITIATIVE FOR
ENERGY JUSTICE**

IEJ conducts research, provides policy analysis, and facilitates dialogue to advance concrete policy pathways toward energy justice. We partner with frontline organizing groups and allies who are striving for universal access to affordable, renewable, and democratically managed energy.



www.iejusa.org

**Initiative for
Energy Justice
416 Huntington Ave
Boston, MA**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....	2
Overview.....	2
Key Findings.....	2
1. INTRODUCTION.....	3
2. CBA REQUIREMENTS IN NEW ENGLAND.....	5
2.1 Renewable Energy Development.....	5
2.2 Waste Disposal.....	6
2.3 Cannabis Establishments.....	7
2.4 General Development.....	7
3. ALTERNATIVE POLICY PATHWAYS TO COMMUNITY BENEFITS & GOVERNANCE.....	9
4. CONCLUSION.....	10
5. APPENDIX.....	11
METHODOLOGY.....	12
STATE LEGISLATURE.....	14
MUNICIPAL ORDINANCES.....	15
STATE.....	16
ENDNOTES.....	18
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	20

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

OVERVIEW

The Initiative for Energy Justice conducts research, provides policy analysis, and facilitates dialogue to advance concrete policy pathways toward energy justice. We partner with frontline organizing groups and allies striving for universal access to affordable, renewable, and democratically managed energy.

Annabel Shu is a second-year law student at Northeastern University School of Law. She completed a summer co-op with the Initiative for Energy Justice in 2024, and works to bridge grassroots community organizing with advocacy for systemic change through law.

KEY FINDINGS

This brief analyzes Community Benefits Agreement (CBA) requirements in New England legislation from 1989-2024. Forty-nine policies (forty-one state-level and eight municipal-level) involving CBAs were found in four different industries: renewable energy, waste disposal, cannabis, and general development. Most CBA legislation introduced Host Community Agreements (HCAs) in community benefits policies, with twenty-four of the bills counted either introducing or expanding HCA requirements, while only six did the same for CBAs with a community coalition or community groups. Codifying community benefits is not cohesive across the region, with states passing requirements only for certain types of developments or industries and including various combinations of CBA and HCA requirements, labor considerations, and revenue sharing agreements. Though the outlook for mandating community benefits remains unclear, community benefits and governance remains a key area of policymaking with the potential to advance tenets of energy justice through New England's transition away from fossil fuels.

I. INTRODUCTION

Community benefits policies require that the benefits from climate, energy, and environmental investments flow to communities historically overburdened by pollution and underserved by the public and private sectors. These benefits can be monetary or non-monetary but are generally transferred from a project's developer to a local government, community-based organizations, workers, and populations affected negatively by development. Community benefits policies can advance energy justice by ensuring that the benefits of the energy transition are shared equitably so that communities are not left behind in the transition to a renewable energy-based economy.¹

At the federal level, community benefits are operationalized through the Biden-Harris Administration's Justice40 Initiative, which requires that forty percent of the benefits of clean energy and climate funds flow to disadvantaged communities, and the Department of Energy's requirement for Community Benefits Plans as part of funding applications.² Another common policy tool used to direct benefits to communities is state legislation that requires Community Benefits Agreements and/or Host Community Agreements (HCAs) for development projects, including energy infrastructure projects.

Community Benefit Agreements

Community Benefits Agreements are an umbrella term for many types of negotiations. They are generally understood to involve a legally binding agreement negotiated between a coalition of community-based organizations and a developer.³ HCAs are a type of CBA negotiated between a local government and developer. Both involve project impact mitigation requirements and monetary and non-monetary benefits for the community.⁴ Another common agreement or provision of a CBA is a Project Labor Agreement (PLA), which incorporates labor considerations into development. These may include mandating a collective bargaining agreement before a project begins or requiring union input into the terms and conditions of a project.⁵ A Payment in Lieu of Taxes (PILOT) program sets up an agreement between two parties, such as a developer and a municipality or state and federal governments, to compensate the community for its loss in tax revenue due to property tax incentives or tax-exempt developments. It can be mandatory or voluntary.⁶

CBAs and HCAs have the potential to rebalance the playing field for underserved and overburdened communities at every level of government. Community members and local advocates can use these tools to increase the influence of a specific community's demands in development projects and ensure that projects are developed to maximize benefits and minimize negative impacts on the community. However, there is also potential for these tools to be co-opted in ways that continue inflicting harm against the communities they are intended to serve. In some cases, this process can be reduced to a bureaucratic exercise or turned into a one-size-fits-all benefits package that doesn't reflect the diversity of the community's needs.⁷ Therefore, it is important to fully understand the true impacts of institutionalizing CBA requirements.

This policy brief analyzes the legislative history of requiring CBAs, HCAs, and other related agreements for various development projects in New England. While this brief focuses on policies introduced and enacted at the state level, a few municipal policies are included for further context. These community benefit policies have received varying levels of acceptance and implementation across the region. It remains an open question whether the act of institutionalizing CBAs and HCAs will lead to just outcomes.

2. CBA REQUIREMENTS IN NEW ENGLAND

In New England, state legislatures have been introducing CBA requirements since the 1980s. The New England region is made up of six states: Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, and Vermont. This analysis identified 41 community benefits bills introduced at the state level starting in 1989, though not all have been enacted into statute. All states besides Vermont have had at least one bill that requires CBAs, HCAs, or PLAs for development or infrastructure projects. The bills were categorized by industry: renewable energy, waste disposal, cannabis, and general development requirements. This analysis also identified eight examples of municipal ordinances incorporating community benefits, all of which were related either to general development or cannabis projects. No community benefits agreement legislation centered on renewable energy development or waste disposal was found at the municipal level.

The industries subject to legislative CBA requirements (renewable energy, waste disposal, cannabis, and general development) all share a history of environmental and racial injustice. Energy companies have continued to profit from extracting and burning fossil fuels even as climate change impacts become more devastating to frontline communities who bear the burden of energy infrastructure and extraction.⁸ Renewable energy development has the potential to reproduce this dynamic without an energy justice framework that increases access to accessible, affordable, renewable, and democratically managed energy.⁹

Historically, environmental waste facilities (such as landfills, incinerators, and recovery facilities) are disproportionately sited in low-income communities and communities of color and can cause negative impacts, such as noise pollution, odor, and negative health impacts.¹⁰ Environmental justice communities, especially in urban areas, have also been subject to the negative impacts of urban development projects, including disruptions due to construction, increased traffic and housing prices, and displacement.¹¹ Black communities and other communities of color have also historically been disproportionately policed and incarcerated for nonviolent drug offenses, leading to some efforts to ensure that cannabis facilities are owned by and benefitting Black, formerly incarcerated, and other impacted communities.¹² Policy interventions, such as community benefits requirements, must acknowledge these past harms (recognition justice) and work to reduce harm among affected communities (restorative justice).¹³

2.1 Renewable Energy Development

Renewable energy development was the topic of ten bills introduced across the region from 2010 to 2024, with three (one in Maine and two in Connecticut) enacted. In general, these bills added requirements for CBAs, HCAs, and other agreements for renewable energy projects and incentivized investment in new renewable technologies for decarbonization goals.

In 2010, Maine’s SP 582 established requirements for HCAs for wind projects, setting a minimum annual payment of \$4,000 per wind turbine to the host municipality. Along with this monetary benefits requirement, the legislation also required documentation of studies of projected revenue and energy generated in the application as well as an assessment of the benefits received by the municipality in the first year. The bill is also notable for the way it incorporates indigenous sovereignty, allowing tribes to decide whether or not to be acknowledged as a host community.¹⁴

Connecticut’s SB 999 (2021) required a developer to take “all reasonable actions to ensure” CBAs for renewable energy projects over five MW. Also, workforce development plans, which include apprenticeship programs and local hiring were required for renewable energy projects over two MW.¹⁵ HB 6851 (2023) established hydrogen as a renewable resource, thus extending the CBA and workforce development plan requirements from SB 999 to potential hydrogen projects starting in 2025.¹⁶

Though the final enacted version of Connecticut’s HB 5232 (2024) did not change the CBA requirements created in previous legislation, the introduced version would have lowered the capacity requirement for a workforce development plan from two MW to one MW.¹⁷ Other states have also introduced CBA requirements in legislation that did not become enacted policy. In 2024, Rhode Island introduced a PLA requirement in HB 7285 for geothermal infrastructure projects.¹⁸ In Maine, SP 545A (2021) tied tax incentives to a CBA or PLA in a renewable energy project.¹⁹

2.2 Waste Disposal

Waste disposal has the longest history of CBA requirements of the four topic areas in New England, with fourteen bills introduced between 1989 and 2024. Of the fourteen introduced bills, three bills have been enacted – one in Rhode Island and two in Maine.

In 1989, Rhode Island established guidelines around the use of HCAs to integrate community input into the waste disposal industry in SB 1096. The bill established a process for incorporating monetary and non-monetary community benefits into waste disposal projects, and created a base floor for monetary benefits of \$750,000 per project.²⁰ Though various amendments to this statute have been introduced over the years, the benefits requirements have not changed greatly from its 1989 conception.²¹

In Maine, both CBAs and HCAs have been established in waste disposal developments through HP 1005 (2007) and HP 646 (2011).²² HP 1005 required HCAs for privately-owned solid waste disposal facilities specifically addressing mediation and conflict resolution in negotiating HCAs.²³ HP 646 (2011) required HCAs for any waste disposal operator applying for a license to construct, alter, or operate a facility.²⁴ Other bills that were introduced but not enacted in Maine mandated specific provisions in HCAs, such as guaranteed waste disposal rights to host communities, and noise and operational hour restrictions.²⁵

New Hampshire had a single waste disposal bill introduced in 2008 that required applicants for a waste disposal facility permit to enter into an HCA; the bill was not enacted.²⁶ Connecticut's SB 505 (2007) addressed municipal taxation in waste disposal projects in a similar way to other states in the region and mandated HCAs.²⁷

2.3 Cannabis Establishments

There were twelve cannabis-related bills introduced in New England from 2021 to 2024, all in Massachusetts and Connecticut, with one bill enacted in each state. While there has been a push region-wide to ensure that the cannabis industry is equitable and supports local communities, the path chosen by lawmakers has sharply diverged between Massachusetts and Connecticut. Though both states have established state-wide cannabis regulatory boards, legislation in Massachusetts has focused on HCAs while Connecticut legislation has tended to require general social equity plans and PLAs.

In Massachusetts, S 3096 (2022) required a HCA for new or renewed permits for marijuana establishments. The HCA requirements did not include minimum payment amounts but did require a one-time community impact fee of at most three percent of gross sales from the marijuana establishment over eight years.²⁸ An earlier version of this legislation had set up the community impact fee as renewable every five years.²⁹

In 2021, Connecticut considered two bills, SB 888 and HB 6377, both of which explicitly banned HCAs between cannabis establishments and municipalities and instead required applicants to negotiate a PLA as a component of a social equity plan. However, SB 888³⁰ allowed the municipality to collect a one-time fee of up to \$50,000 for "necessary and reasonable...[public safety] costs" in relation to the opening of a cannabis establishment. The other bill, HB 6377,³¹ introduced a PLA mandate for new construction and renovation of cannabis establishments. In 2024, HB 5150³² succeeded in requiring a PLA mandate for the construction of a cannabis establishment, in addition to further regulating the cannabis industry, but did not include a ban on HCAs.

Municipalities are helping to shape the policy conversation around CBAs and the cannabis industry. In the late 2010s, three Massachusetts municipalities (Brockton, Cambridge, and Medford) introduced and codified cannabis-related ordinances. These ordinances generally attach an HCA requirement to permitting cannabis businesses.³³ Brockton also codified a Payment in Lieu of Taxes requirement for any projects sited on tax-exempt property.³⁴

2.4 General Development

Most state legislation requiring HCA or PLA provisions for general development projects were introduced in response to specific development. For example, Rhode Island enacted an HCA requirement for the Providence I-195 IWay Project in 2002, which was replaced in 2011 with a requirement for a non-enforceable discussion with the host community.³⁵ In 2001, Rhode Island considered legislation that would have required an HCA for a specific ferry company's development in Narragansett.³⁶

On the municipal level, two cities in Rhode Island, Newport and Providence, have passed ordinances regarding community benefits. In 2021, Newport attached a CBA requirement to applications for zoning amendment permits, specifically focusing on redevelopment projects as part of the city’s Innovation Hub project.³⁷ In 2023, Providence created a community benefits fund under the control of local government with revenue from PILOT payments generated by the ProvPort development project.³⁸ Monetary benefits generated from the revenue sharing agreement would go toward community priorities such as “racial and environmental justice, economic and environmental impact, labor, job training, port/neighborhood relations, parks, and recreation infrastructure.”³⁹ Somerville, Massachusetts is also currently setting in place a community benefits infrastructure, both by setting definitions and rules for community coalitions⁴⁰ and advisory committees for PILOT agreements.⁴¹

Type of CBA Requirements

STATE	General Development	Waste Disposal	Renewable Energy	Cannabis	Other: Energy Committees
Connecticut		✓	✓	✓	
Maine		✓	✓		
Massachusetts	✓			✓	
New Hampshire		✓*			
Rhode Island	✓	✓	✓*		
Vermont					✓*

* Introduced but not enacted

3. ALTERNATIVE POLICY PATHWAYS TO COMMUNITY BENEFITS & GOVERNANCE

Many policies that do not mandate or address CBAs still focus on advancing community input, priorities, and decision-making power for energy and other infrastructure planning. At the local level, Vermont is considering institutionalizing municipal-level research, planning, and program execution efforts. At the state level, Massachusetts is attempting to restructure its approach to permitting and siting reform to advance community engagement and environmental justice. While neither approach has been enacted into state legislation, the movement toward community benefits and governance through these pathways remains possible.

Vermont has a widespread network of town energy committees, which HB 414 in 2019 introduced into the state legislature. The bill established state legislative guidelines for municipalities setting up committees, which can research alternative energy sources and execute energy development and weatherization programs.⁴² Though the legislation was not enacted, energy coordinators in Vermont can be appointed to oversee municipal energy activities,⁴³ and non-municipal energy committees do exist to develop, propose, and help implement energy and climate projects and initiatives.⁴⁴ In the 2023-2024 session, the Massachusetts legislature had multiple siting reform bills introduced in both the House and the Senate. In one bill, S 2113, developers were required to first communicate with communities near their projects and begin facilitating dialogue by writing a proposal and analysis of the project including risks and benefits in public health, environment, energy, and the economy for those communities.⁴⁵ In a similar bill in the House, H. 3215, developers were required to consult with host communities before siting developments.⁴⁶

4. CONCLUSION

In New England, legislation that requires CBAs tends to focus on HCAs as the standard for community benefits policies, especially for the cannabis industry and waste disposal permitting process. Out of all bills counted, 24 were classified as either introducing or building out HCA requirements, while only six did the same for CBAs. A key area for further study is municipal ordinances, especially ordinances requiring CBAs or creating model CBA language. Topic areas in municipal ordinances mirrored topics brought in the same state legislature, perhaps implying a relation between local advocacy and state efforts.

While legislation can require negotiations between developers and communities through a CBA or HCA, legislation cannot ensure that the negotiations will go well, or that they are always appropriate for any development context. New England's approach to community benefits requirements in development appears more piecemeal than cohesive, with requirements only for certain types of developments or industries, or combining PILOT agreements, CBA and HCA requirements, labor considerations, and revenue sharing agreements. However, legislation in one state seems to influence legislation in other jurisdictions. There have been waves of legislation tied to specific industries, such as the increase of waste disposal legislation across New England states in the late 2000s, or the sudden surge of cannabis-related legislation in the early 2020s. In the past few years, there has been a greater push for CBAs in renewable energy development, in part due to federal and state policies advancing community benefits requirements. Connecticut, Maine, and Massachusetts have explored CBA requirements for renewable energy projects through legislation, acting as both regional and national leaders.⁴² However, more research is necessary to understand how HCAs and CBAs are utilized for renewable energy developments.

As New England moves away from polluting and inequitable energy infrastructure through a green transition, community benefits and governance is a key area of policymaking that can advance energy justice. State legislation has the potential to diffuse to other states within New England or other regions; however, different host communities or community coalitions have their own specific needs and priorities, which makes it necessary for states and localities to adapt different policies to their context. State and local CBA requirements can be useful venues for incorporating community voices into equitable development projects. Analyzing legislative community benefits requirements can support future campaigns to create more equitable developments in line with both federal initiatives and future decarbonization and clean energy targets.

APPENDIX

METHODOLOGY

CBA legislation was classified as a piece of legislation that mandated a CBA at any step of the development process. HCA legislation was classified as a piece of legislation that mandated an HCA process or established an HCA directly in the legislation. PLA legislation was classified as a piece of legislation that mandated a PLA process or other workforce agreement directly in the legislation. Some of the bills were repeatedly brought back year after year, but they were not consolidated in order to track how often the issue was reintroduced. However, bills that were jointly brought in both a given state House or Senate were consolidated.

Forty-nine different pieces of legislation were identified in the region through a preliminary search of legislative databases (see below). Some of these bills found were neither HCA or CBA legislation by the above definition. Also included in this larger count were bills that generally incorporated ideas of social equity, included other agreements (common provisions often included in a CBA or HCA, such as a PLAs), or had non-mandatory community benefits plans. While these were included in the overall count, they were not included in our count of CBA or HCA legislation in the policy brief. The justice implications and specific nature of each agreement or requirement were not evaluated. Other agreements that were noted as potential steps in increasing community agency and voice include PLAs, which could include collective bargaining agreements before the start of any development, proof of consultation/good-faith effort to include community members, which is often unenforceable, and Payment In-Lieu of Taxes (PILOT) agreements, which have specific uses in the case of non-profit or otherwise tax-exempt organizations. All may be a part of a successful CBA or HCA process, but they often are just that - one part of a larger negotiation process.

Finding the legislation started with trawling legal databases such as Lexis-Nexis and Westlaw using keywords “community benefits agreement,” “community development,” and “host community agreement.” Other terms used were “project labor agreement” or “payment in-lieu of taxes.” The search was narrowed by jurisdiction at the state and local level. If a bill mentioned a host community but did not discuss compensation, consultation, or an agreement, it was not included in the analysis. After compiling this larger list of legislation, each bill found was checked with each of the state-specific legislature websites.

METHODOLOGY

For some jurisdictions, such as Rhode Island, bills could only be found on the state legislature website from 1997 onwards, so earlier bills were not able to be independently verified outside of the general database search. State legislatures in New England generally have two year sessions; the search was conducted during the 2023-24 session for certain states, though the status of relevant bills was verified at the end of the legislative session. For municipal legislation, MuniCode and eCode360 databases were used. Many municipalities do not have their legislation in the database, so there are likely ordinances and statutes that were not discoverable through this method. This research is current as of July 2024.

STATE LEGISLATION

Renewable Energy

[S.B. 999, 2021 Leg., Jan. Sess. \(Conn. 2021\)](#) (enacted)
[H.B. 6851, 2023 Leg., Jan. Sess. \(Conn. 2021\)](#) (enacted)
[H.B. 5232, 2024 Leg., Feb. Sess. \(Conn. 2024\)](#) (enacted)
[S.P. 582, 124th Leg., 2nd Reg. Sess. \(Me. 2010\)](#) (enacted)
[S.P. 545, 130th Leg., 1st Spec. Sess. \(Me. 2021\)](#)
[S. 2113, 193rd Leg., 1st Reg. Sess. \(Mass. 2023\)](#)
[H. 3215, 193rd Leg., 1st Reg. Sess. \(Mass. 2023\)](#)
[H. 4501, 193rd Leg., 2nd Reg. Sess. \(Mass. 2024\)](#)
[H. 7285, 2024 Leg., Jan. Sess. \(R.I. 2024\)](#)
[H. 414, 2019-2020 Leg., 1st Reg. Sess. \(Vt. 2019\)](#)

Waste Disposal

[S.B. 505, 2007 Leg., Jan. Sess. \(Conn. 2007\)](#)
[H.P. 705, 121st Leg., 1st Reg. Sess. \(Me. 2003\)](#)
[H.P. 1005, 123rd Leg., 1st Reg. Sess. \(Me. 2007\)](#) (enacted)
[H.P. 646, 125th Leg., 1st Reg. Sess. \(Me. 2011\)](#) (enacted)
[S.P. 683, 125th Leg., 2nd Reg. Sess. \(Me. 2012\)](#)
[H.B. 1429, 2008 Leg., 2nd Reg. Sess. \(N.H. 2008\)](#)
[H. 5608, 2007 Leg., Jan. Sess. \(R.I. 2007\)](#); see also S. 402
[H. 7407, 2008 Leg., Jan. Sess. \(R.I. 2008\)](#)
[S. 238, 2009 Leg., Jan. Sess. \(R.I. 2009\)](#)

Archived (not available online)

S. 1096, 1989 Leg., Jan. Sess. (R.I. 1989) (enacted)
H. 5204, 1995 Leg., Jan. Sess. (R.I. 1995)
S. 240, 1995 Leg., Jan. Sess. (R.I. 1995)
S. 702, 1995 Leg., Jan. Sess. (R.I. 1995); see also H.B. 2912
H. 8325, 1996 Leg., Jan. Sess. (R.I. 1996)

Cannabis

[S.B. 888, 2021 Leg., Jan. Sess. \(Conn. 2021\)](#)
[H.B. 6377, 2021 Leg., Jan. Sess. \(Conn. 2021\)](#)
[H.B. 5150, 2024 Leg., Feb. Sess. \(Conn. 2024\)](#) (enacted)
[S. 72, 192nd Leg., 1st Reg. Sess. \(Mass. 2021\)](#)
[H. 178, 192nd Leg., 1st Reg. Sess. \(Mass. 2021\)](#)⁺
[H. 174, 192nd Leg., 1st Reg. Sess. \(Mass. 2021\)](#)⁺
[S. 2660, 192nd Leg., 2nd Reg. Sess. \(Mass. 2022\)](#)⁺
[S. 2801, 192nd Leg., 2nd Reg. Sess. \(Mass. 2022\)](#)⁺
[S. 2823, 192nd Leg., 2nd Reg. Sess. \(Mass. 2022\)](#)⁺
[H. 4791, 192nd Leg., 2nd Reg. Sess. \(Mass. 2022\)](#)
[S. 3096, 192nd Leg., 2nd Reg. Sess. \(Mass. 2022\)](#) (enacted)¹; see also H. 108
[H. 124, 193rd Leg., 1st Reg. Sess. \(Mass. 2023\)](#)

General Development & Miscellaneous

[S.P. 462, 127th Leg., 1st Reg. Sess. \(Me. 2015\)](#)
[S. 2027, 193rd Leg., 1st Reg. Sess. \(Mass. 2023\)](#)
[S. 948, 2001 Leg., Jan. Sess. \(R.I. 2001\)](#)
[S. 2740, 2002 Leg., Jan. Sess. \(R.I. 2002\)](#) (enacted)
[S. 114, 2011 Leg., Jan. Sess. \(R.I. 2011\)](#); see also H.B. 5994

¹ All bills marked with + were reintroduced in different forms and enacted part through Massachusetts H. 108/S. 3096 (2022). As such, these bills have similar policies and language.

MUNICIPAL ORDINANCES

Cannabis

Brockton, Mass., Code ch. 11, art. III, § 27-24.4 (2018).

Brockton, Mass., Code ch. 11, art. XV, § 11-423 (2019)

Cambridge, Mass., Zoning Ord. § 11.804 (2018)

Medford, Mass., Code ch. 14, art. IX, § 14-523 (2020).

General Development & Miscellaneous

Somerville, Mass., Code § 2-V-2-309.15 (2021).

Somerville, Mass., Code § 2-IX-7-220 (2018).

Newport, R.I., Code § 17.66 (2021).

Providence, R.I., Code of Ord. ch. 2023-1 (2023).

STATE

Enacted

[CT SB 999, 2021 Leg., Jan. Sess. \(Conn. 2021\).](#)

CT SB 999

- S.B. 999, 2021 Leg., Jan. Sess. (Conn. 2021); Public Act of July 1, 2021, No. 21-43, 2021 Conn. Acts. (establishing community benefits agreement and workforce development requirements for covered renewable energy developments).

CT H.B. 6851

- H.B. 6851, 2023 Leg., Jan. Sess. (Conn. 2021).
- Public Act of June 27, 2023, No. 23-156, 2023 Conn. Acts. (establishing hydrogen as a renewable energy source and covered project under S.B. 999).

CT HB 5232

- H.B. 5232, 2024 Leg., Feb. Sess. (Conn. 2024).
- Public Act of May 21, 2024, No. 24-31, 2024 Conn. Acts. (expanding community benefits agreement requirements to lower MWh solar projects).

CT HB 5150

- H.B. 5150, 2024 Leg., Feb. Sess. (Conn. 2024).
- Public Act of May 11, 2024, No. 24-76, 2024 Conn. Acts. (adding project labor agreement to marijuana establishments).

ME SP 582

- S.P. 582, 124th Leg., 2nd Reg. Sess. (Me. 2010).
- Act effective July 12, 2010, ch. 642, 2010 Me. Laws 2111 (providing predictable benefits to host communities for wind developments).

ME HP 1005

- H.P. 1005, 123rd Leg., 1st Reg. Sess. (Me. 2007).
- Act of June 25, 2007, ch.406, 2007 Me. Laws (establishing host community agreement standards and requirements between communities and waste disposal facilities).

ME HP 646

- H.P. 646, 125th Leg., 1st Reg. Sess. (Me. 2011).
- Act of Mar. 30, 2012, ch. 566, 2012 Me. Laws 1540 (expanding host community agreement standards for waste disposal facilities).

MA SB 3096

- S. 3096, 192nd Leg., 2nd Reg. Sess. (Mass. 2022).
- Act of Aug. 11, 2022, ch. 180, 2022 Mass. Acts (regarding equity in the cannabis industry).

RI SB 2740

- S. 2740, 2002 Leg., Jan. Sess. (R.I. 2002).
- Act of June 12, 2002, ch. 22, 2002 R.I. Pub. Laws (requiring a host community agreement negotiation process with the City of Providence).

RI SB 114

- S. 114, 2011 Leg., Jan. Sess. (R.I. 2011).
- Act of July 9, 2011, ch. 267, 2011 R.I. Pub. Laws (repealing host community agreement requirement for the I-195 Development Project and replacing it with dialogue guidelines).

RI SB 1096

- S. 1096, 1989 Leg., Jan. Sess. (R.I. 1989).
- Act of July 10, 1989, ch. 508, 1989 R.I. Adv. (establishing host community agreement requirements for waste disposal facilities in Rhode Island).

STATE

UNENACTED

S.B. 888, 2021 Leg., Jan. Sess. (Conn. 2021).
S.B. 505, 2007 Leg., Jan. Sess. (Conn. 2007).
H.B. 6377, 2021 Leg., Jan. Sess. (Conn. 2021).
S.P. 545, 130th Leg., 1st Spec. Sess. (Me. 2021).
H.P. 705, 121st Leg., 1st Reg. Sess. (Me. 2003).
S.P. 462, 127th Leg., 1st Reg. Sess. (Me. 2015).
S.P. 683, 125th Leg., 2nd Reg. Sess. (Me. 2012).
H. 178, 192nd Leg., 1st Reg. Sess. (Mass. 2021).
H. 174, 192nd Leg., 1st Reg. Sess. (Mass. 2021).
H. 124, 193rd Leg., 1st Reg. Sess. (Mass. 2023).
S. 72, 192nd Leg., 1st Reg. Sess. (Mass. 2021).
H. 3215, 193rd Leg., 1st Reg. Sess. (Mass. 2023).
H. 4791, 192nd Leg., 2nd Reg. Sess. (Mass. 2022).
H. 4501, 193rd Leg., 2nd Reg. Sess. (Mass. 2024).
S. 2660, 192nd Leg., 2nd Reg. Sess. (Mass. 2022).
S. 2113, 193rd Leg., 1st Reg. Sess. (Mass. 2023).
S. 2027, 193rd Leg., 1st Reg. Sess. (Mass. 2023).
S. 2801, 192nd Leg., 2nd Reg. Sess. (Mass. 2022).
S. 2823, 192nd Leg., 2nd Reg. Sess. (Mass. 2022).
H.B. 1429, 2008 Leg., (N.H. 2008).
H. 7285, 2024 Leg., Jan. Sess. (R.I. 2024).
S. 948, 2001 Leg., Jan. Sess. (R.I. 2001).
S. 240, 1995 Leg., Jan. Sess. (R.I. 1995).
H. 5204, 1995 Leg., Jan. Sess. (R.I. 1995).
H. 8325, 1996 Leg., Jan. Sess. (R.I. 1996).
S. 702, 1995 Leg., Jan. Sess. (R.I. 1995).
H. 5608, 2007 Leg., Jan. Sess. (R.I. 2007).
S. 238, 2009 Leg., Jan. Sess. (R.I. 2009).
H. 7407, 2008 Leg., Jan. Sess. (R.I. 2008).
H. 414, 2019-2020 Leg., 1st Reg. Sess. (Vt. 2019).

MUNICIPAL

Brockton, Mass., Code ch. 11, art. III, § 27-24.4 (2018).
Brockton, Mass., Code ch. 11, art. XV, § 11-423 (2019)
Cambridge, Mass., Zoning Ord. § 11.804 (2018)
Medford, Mass., Code ch. 14, art. IX, § 14-523 (2020).
Somerville, Mass., Code § 2-V-2-309.15 (2021).
Somerville, Mass., Code § 2-IX-7-220 (2018).
Newport, R.I., Code § 17.66 (2021).
Providence, R.I., Code of Ord. ch. 2023-1 (2023).

ENDNOTES

1. For more discussion of how community benefits policies can advance energy justice, see IEJ's white paper, "Community Benefits Policy and Energy Justice" (Initiative for Energy Justice, June 2024), <https://iejusa.org/community-benefits-policy-and-energy-justice/>.
2. U.S. Department of Energy, "About Community Benefits Plans"; The White House, "Justice40: A Whole-Of-Government Initiative."
3. Gross, "Community Benefits Agreements"; Salkin and Lavine, "Understanding Community Benefits Agreements."
4. Sotolongo, "Community Benefits Policy and Energy Justice."
5. Glass and Walter, "How Project Labor Agreements and Community Workforce Agreements Are Good for the Biden Administration's Investment Agenda"; Emerald Cities Collaborative, "Anatomy of an Effective Community Workforce Agreement."
6. Kenyon and Langley, "Payments in Lieu of Taxes By Nonprofits: Case Studies."
7. Sotolongo, "Community Benefits Policy and Energy Justice."
8. Mulvey and Shulman, "The Climate Deception Dossiers"; Vohra et al., "Global Mortality from Outdoor Fine Particle Pollution Generated by Fossil Fuel Combustion."
9. Temper et al., "Movements Shaping Climate Futures"; Levenda, Behrsin, and Disano, "Renewable Energy for Whom?"
10. Lane et al., "Historical Redlining Is Associated with Present-Day Air Pollution Disparities in U.S. Cities"; Chavis Jr. and Lee, "Toxic Wastes And Race In The United States"; Bullard, Dumping in Dixie: Race, Class, and Environmental Quality.
11. Lucas-Darby, "Community Benefits Agreements"; Farley, "Disrupting the Knowledge and Power Imbalance in Community Benefits Agreement Negotiations"; Salkin and Lavine, "Negotiating for Social Justice and the Promise of Community Benefits Agreements."
12. Patterson et al., "Building the Prison to Legal Drug Dealing Pipeline."
13. Baker, DeVar, and Prakash, "The Energy Justice Workbook."
14. S.P. 582, 124th Leg., 2nd Reg. Sess. (Me. 2010) (enacted in Me. Gen. Code § 35-A-3451).
15. S.B. 999, 2021 Leg., Jan. Sess. (Conn. 2021)(enacted in Conn. Gen. Stat. § 31-53d).
16. H.B. 6851, 2023 Leg., Jan. Sess. (Conn. 2021) (enacted in Conn. Gen. Stat. § 31-53d).
17. H.B. 5232, 2024 Leg., Feb. Sess. (Conn. 2024).
18. H. 7285, 2024 Leg., Jan. Sess. (R.I. 2024).
19. S.P. 545, 130th Leg., 1st Spec. Sess. (Me. 2021).
20. S. 1096, 1989 Leg., Jan. Sess. (R.I. 1989) (enacted in R.I. Gen. Laws § 23-19-13.4).
21. Ibid.
22. H.P. 1005, 123rd Leg., 1st Reg. Sess. (Me. 2007) (enacted in Me. Gen. Code § 1310-N-9); H.P. 646, 125th Leg., 1st Reg. Sess. (Me. 2011) (enacted in Me. Gen. Code § 1310-N-9).
23. H.P. 1005, 123rd Leg., 1st Reg. Sess. (Me. 2007)(enacted in Me. Gen. Code § 1310-N-9).
24. H.P. 646, 125th Leg., 1st Reg. Sess. (Me. 2011) (enacted in Me. Gen. Code § 1310-N-9).
25. H.P. 705, 121st Leg., 1st Reg. Sess. (Me. 2003).
26. H.B. 1429, 2008 Leg. (N.H. 2008).
27. S.B. 505, 2007 Leg., Jan. Sess. (Conn. 2007).
28. S. 3096, 192nd Leg., 2nd Reg. Sess. (Mass. 2022) (enacted in Mass. Gen. Laws § 94G-3).
29. S. 72, 192nd Leg., 1st Reg. Sess. (Mass. 2021).
30. S.B. 888, 2021 Leg., Jan. Sess. (Conn. 2021).
31. H.B. 6377, 2021 Leg., Jan. Sess. (Conn. 2021).
32. H.B. 5150, 2024 Leg., Feb. Sess. (Conn. 2024) (enacted in Conn. Gen. Stat. § 21a-421e).
33. Brockton, Mass., Code ch. 11, art. XV, § 11-423 (2019); Cambridge, Mass., Zoning Ord. § 11.804 (2018); Medford, Mass., Code ch. 14, art. IX, § 14-523 (2020).
34. Brockton, Mass., Code ch. 11, art. III, § 27-24.4 (2018).
35. S. 2740, 2002 Leg., Jan. Sess. (R.I. 2002) (enacted in R.I. Gen Laws § 37-22); S. 114, 2011 Leg., Jan. Sess. (R.I. 2011) (rev'd in R.I. Gen. Laws § 37-22).
36. S. 948, 2001 Leg., Jan. Sess. (R.I. 2001).
37. Newport, R.I., Code § 17.65 (2021); Newport, R.I., Code § 17.66 (2021).
38. Providence, R.I., Code of Ord. ch. 2023-1 (2023).
39. Ibid.
40. Somerville, Mass., Code § 2-IX-7-220 (2018).
41. Somerville, Mass., Code § 2-V-2-309.15 (2021).
42. H. 414, 2019-2020 Leg., 1st Reg. Sess. (Vt. 2019).

ENDNOTES

43. 24 V.S.A. § 1131 (2012).

44. Vermont Natural Resources Council, “Town Energy Committees.”

45. S. 2113, 193rd Leg., 1st Reg. Sess. (Mass. 2023).

46. H. 3215, 193rd Leg., 1st Reg. Sess. (Mass. 2023).

47. S.B. 999, 2021 Leg., Jan. Sess. (Conn. 2021); S.P. 582, 124th Leg., 2nd Reg. Sess. (Me. 2010); S.P. 545, 130th Leg., 1st Spec. Sess. (Me. 2021); H. 4501, 193rd Leg., 2nd Reg. Sess. (Mass. 2024).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Baker, Shalanda, Subin DeVar, and Shiva Prakash. "The Energy Justice Workbook." Boston, MA: Initiative for Energy Justice, December 2019. <https://iejusa.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/12/The-Energy-Justice-Workbook-2019-web.pdf>.

Bullard, Robert D. *Dumping in Dixie: Race, Class, and Environmental Quality*. Westview Press, 1990.
Chavis Jr., Benjamin F., and Charles Lee. "Toxic Wastes And Race In The United States." New York, NY: United Church of Christ, 1987.
http://d3n8a8pro7vnm.cloudfront.net/unitedchurchofchrist/legacy_url/13567/toxwrace87.pdf.

Emerald Cities Collaborative. "Anatomy of an Effective Community Workforce Agreement." Emerald Cities Collaborative, 2022. <https://emeraldcities.org/j40playbook/>.

Farley, Bill. "Disrupting the Knowledge and Power Imbalance in Community Benefits Agreement Negotiations: Lessons from the Aggie Square Development in Sacramento, California." *Journal of Urban Affairs*, January 30, 2023, 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07352166.2022.2155527>.

Glass, Aurelia, and Karla Walter. "How Project Labor Agreements and Community Workforce Agreements Are Good for the Biden Administration's Investment Agenda." Center for American Progress, July 21, 2023. <https://www.americanprogress.org/article/how-project-labor-agreements-and-community-workforce-agreements-are-good-for-the-biden-administrations-investment-agenda/>.

Gross, Julian. "Community Benefits Agreements: Definitions, Values, and Legal Enforceability." *Journal of Affordable Housing & Community Development Law* 17, no. 1/2 (Fall /Winter 2008 2007): 35–58.
Gross, Julian, Greg LeRoy, and Madeline Janis-Aparicio. "Community Benefits Agreements: Making Development Projects Accountable." *Good Jobs First and the California Public Subsidies Project*, 2005. <https://goodjobsfirst.org/community-benefits-agreements-making-development-projects-accountable/>.

Kenyon, Daphne A., and Adam H. Langley. "Payments in Lieu of Taxes By Nonprofits: Case Studies." *Lincoln Institute of Land Policy*, September 2012. <https://www.lincolninst.edu/publications/working-papers/payments-lieu-taxes-nonprofits/>.

Lane, Haley M., Rachel Morello-Frosch, Julian D. Marshall, and Joshua S. Apte. "Historical Redlining Is Associated with Present-Day Air Pollution Disparities in U.S. Cities."

Environmental Science & Technology Letters 9, no. 4 (April 12, 2022): 345–50.
<https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.estlett.1c01012>.

Levenda, A.M., I. Behrsin, and F. Disano. "Renewable Energy for Whom? A Global Systematic Review of the Environmental Justice Implications of Renewable Energy Technologies." *Energy Research & Social Science* 71 (January 2021): 101837. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.erss.2020.101837>.

Lucas-Darby, Emma T. "Community Benefits Agreements: A Case Study in Addressing Environmental and Economic Injustices." *The Journal of African American History* 97, no. 1–2 (January 2012): 92–109. <https://doi.org/10.5323/jafriamerhist.97.1-2.0092>.

Marantz, Nicholas J. "What Do Community Benefits Agreements Deliver? Evidence From Los Angeles." *Journal of the American Planning Association* 81, no. 4 (October 2, 2015): 251–67. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01944363.2015.1092093>.

Mulvey, Kathy, and Seth Shulman. "The Climate Deception Dossiers: Internal Fossil Fuel Industry Memos Reveal Decades of Corporate Disinformation." *Union of Concerned Scientists*, July 2015. <https://www.ucsusa.org/resources/climate-deception-dossiers>.

Patterson, Kelly L., Robert Mark Silverman, Ambreen Rehman-Veal, Li Yin, and Suiyuan Wang. "Building the Prison to Legal Drug Dealing Pipeline: A Comparative Analysis of Social Equity Policies in Recreational Cannabis Licensing." *Societies* 14, no. 6 (June 13, 2024): 88. <https://doi.org/10.3390/soc1406088>.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Pellow, David N. "Toward a Critical Environmental Justice Studies: Black Lives Matter as an Environmental Justice Challenge." *Du Bois Review: Social Science Research on Race* 13, no. 2 (2016): 221–36.

<https://doi.org/10.1017/S1742058X1600014X>.

Salkin, Patricia E., and Amy Lavine. "Negotiating for Social Justice and the Promise of Community Benefits Agreements: Case Studies of Current and Developing Agreements." *Journal of Affordable Housing & Community Development Law* 17, no. 1/2 (Fall /Winter 2008 2007): 113–44.

"Understanding Community Benefits Agreements: Equitable Development, Social Justice and Other Considerations for Developers, Municipalities and Community Organizations." *UCLA Journal of Environmental Law and Policy* 26, no. 2 (2008): 291–332.

Sotolongo, Marisa. "Community Benefits Policy and Energy Justice." White Paper. Initiative for Energy Justice, June 2024. <https://iejusa.org/community-benefits-policy-and-energy-justice/>.

Temper, Leah, Sofia Avila, Daniela Del Bene, Jennifer Gobby, Nicolas Kosoy, Philippe Le Billon, Joan Martinez-Alier, et al. "Movements Shaping Climate Futures: A Systematic Mapping of Protests against Fossil Fuel and Low-Carbon Energy Projects." *Environmental Research Letters* 15, no. 12 (December 1, 2020): 123004.

<https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/abc197>.

The White House. "Justice40: A Whole-Of-Government Initiative." *Environmental Justice*, 2022.

<https://www.whitehouse.gov/environmentaljustice/justice40>.

U.S. Department of Energy. "About Community Benefits Plans." *Clean Energy Infrastructure*, 2023.

<https://www.energy.gov/infrastructure/about-community-benefits-plans>.

Vermont Natural Resources Council. "Town Energy Committees." *Community Planning Toolbox* (blog), n.d.

<https://vnrc.org/community-planning-toolbox/tools/town-energy-committees/>.

Vohra, Karn, Alina Vodonos, Joel Schwartz, Eloise A. Marais, Melissa P. Sulprizio, and Loretta J. Mickley.

"Global Mortality from Outdoor Fine Particle Pollution Generated by Fossil Fuel Combustion: Results from GEOS-Chem." *Environmental Research* 195 (April 2021): 110754.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envres.2021.110754>.