Environmental Justice Working Group
Meeting 7: FOLLOW UP
FULL RECOMMENDATIONS, DISCUSSION, AND CONSENSUS-BUILDING
December 13, 2021

Meeting Objectives and Agenda

Objectives:
- Host a safe and productive forum to co-create the EJ Framework with community and City leaders
- Subgroups share final presentations of full recommendations (Definition, Vision, Why It Matters, Key Policy Priorities & Strategies)
- Full working group (community and City leaders) discusses recommendations to the EJ Framework
- Full working group (community and City leaders) conducts consensus-building process

Agenda:

Time	Section
3:00-3:05	**Opening** ● Land Acknowledgement
3:05-3:40	**Final Presentations of Recommendations** ● Overview ● Subgroup 1 ● Subgroup 2 ● Subgroup 3 ● Subgroup 4 ● Wrap Up
3:40-4:55	**Discussion and Consensus-Building** ● Overview ● Initial Scoring of All EJ Topics ● Discussion of EJ Topics with 1s and 2s ● Re-Scoring of Remaining EJ Topics ● Revisit Unresolved EJ Topics

	● Name Remaining EJ Topics Without Consensus
4:55-5:00	**Wrap-Up**
	● Next Steps and Preview

Attendance

Facilitator: Giuliana Martinez (GM Consulting Group)

Planning Department Project Team: Celina Chan (Interim Project Manager), Danielle Ngo

EJ Working Group Members:

Community Leaders: Agustin Angel, Antonio Díaz, Nina Bazan-Sakamoto, Reverend Ishmael Burch Jr., Zack Deutsch-Gross, Maggie Dong, Edward Hatter, Donna Hilliard, Cecilia Mejia, Thomas Namara, Tandia ONeal, Kasey Rios Asberry, Barklee Sanders, Sharaya Souza, Felisia Thibodeaux, Irene Mahasin Thomas-Jacks, Chester Kyle Williams

City Agency staff: Taylor Emerson, Kimia Haddadan, Will Logsdon, Sraddha Mehta, Alex Morrison, Karen Pierce, Jon Swae, Keith Tanner

Summary

I. Opening

Giuliana Martinez (Facilitator) opened the meeting by inviting a Working Group member to read the land acknowledgement aloud. Kasey volunteered, and recited, "We acknowledge that we are on the unceded ancestral homeland of the Ramaytush Ohlone who are the original inhabitants of the San Francisco Peninsula."

II. Final Presentations of Recommendations

Giuliana transitioned to the Final Presentations of Recommendations, focused on the Visions and Key Policy Priorities & Strategies of the eight EJ Topics. Since everyone was expected to review the EJ Framework Template in advance, the Co-Chairs' presentations focused on just the highlighted revisions to their subgroup's content. The Co-Chairs had 6 minutes to present their revisions, and after all the subgroups presented, Giuliana facilitated a Q&A for burning questions and comments. Then, we took a two minute break.

Q&A

- **Cecilia**: I have concerns for Topics 7 (housing) and 8 (empowered neighborhoods). Did the subgroup discuss single room occupancy buildings (SROs)?
  - **Thomas**: I don't think we called them out specifically.
  - **Karen**: Early on, we did, especially when commenting on the draft EJ Communities Map. The City's maps always skip over neighborhoods with SROs. Those units were definitely considered in our overall discussion, but we didn't call them out specifically. We talk

about homes, not houses, because "homes" is inclusive of people living in cars and SROs.

- **Cecilia**: I recommend that Topic 7, Priority 3 (retrofitting) and 4 include SROs, and also include digital access. There are a lot of SROs in Chinatown, which is 80% monolingual. We also need more pathways from rental to ownership. These pathways need to be offered in multiple languages and culturally accepted communications platforms.
- **Kasey**: There's SROs in TL and SoMA, too.

- **Nina**: For Topics 7 and 8 (neighborhoods) Priority 1, is it possible to include non-profit workers? I appreciate wanting City workers to live in the city, so I want that to include non-profit workers, too. We could include especially "community-based non-profit workers."
  - **Thomas**: That did come up in subgroup conversation, and a good idea to add.
- **Augie**: For Topic 1 (climate), climate disasters should consider the homeless and unhoused.
  - **Alex**: Yes, that's definitely a part of the vulnerable populations definition. We can add a note for this definition during implementation.
- **Augie**: For Topic 2 (environment), how are we going to hold OEWD accountable for curricula that are tailored to each neighborhood? Each neighborhood has their different needs.
  - **Alex**: We can make a note for curricula to be culturally competent during implementation.
- **Augie**: For Topics 1 and 2, when referencing American Indian leadership, should we specify American Indian leadership or open to leadership of all Indigenous groups?
  - **Nina**: In Traditional Ecological Knowledge (TEK), it is limited to just American Indian consultation. To specify, we included reference to BIPOC communities and other Cultural Districts.
    - **Sharaya**: Agree, it should specifically be around American Indian consultation. If you don't specify "American Indian," then "Indigenous" could be any of us. TEK is a state and federal level policy specifically aimed around the American Indian community.
  - **Sharaya**: "Indigenous" does not mean "American Indian" when it comes to policy making. People use them interchangeably, but a requirement to use Indigenous practices or knowledge could apply to anywhere globally.
  - **Sharaya**: US EPA - Traditional Ecological Knowledge (TEK) is the accumulated knowledge American Indians and Native Alaskans have about their environment. It's important for scientific research, but is threatened by environmental change. EPA is working with Tribal and Native Alaskan communities to incorporate TEK into environmental science, policy, and decision-making.
  - **Nina**: We do have a number of priorities that vary between TEK and Indigenous leadership.
- **Edward**: Was there any discussion on the location of SROs?
  - **Karen**: Not other than to point out where they are already located, and that one of the early COVID responses was that they're going to use SROs. However, there are no SROs in the southeast.
  - **Edward**: There's a lot of conversation around planning SROs in family areas. SROs invite a transient style of living that families strongly oppose, especially in Potrero Hill. This is a hot topic on the 17th Street Corridor.
  - **Kasey**: A number of SROs are homes for people who are living with families. Subgroup 4's focus on homes with dignity has been important; hard to be prescriptive of every element about housing. We want to say to the City: We want all neighborhoods to be family neighborhoods. We want all housing to have dignity, whether they're single

rooms or apartments. That was the spirit I heard from that subgroup. It's important to recognize that many of our neighborhoods are not seen by the City as deserving of resources, especially those with SROs. It's important to provide everyone–whether they live in a family or not–housing with dignity.

- **Kasey**: A fundamental principle for me is that decisions should be made by the people who bear the burdens. That's turning things upside down from how it's normally practiced. We have an opportunity to articulate that, so I hope we can find those moments across all of our work.
- **Karen**: I would like to be added to the discussion around the use of BIPOC and Indigenous. I object to using "BIPOC" and would like to speak about how disrespectful it is to many populations.
    - **Sraddha**: I feel like the Office of Racial Equity should be part of the discussion regarding the term BIPOC because many departments have been following their guidance to use that term.
        - **Celina**: Agreed, perhaps we can ask Sarah Tseng from Office of Racial Equity to join that conversation.
        - **Taylor**: ORE and CON are working on a project to standardize racial categories.

Next Steps:
1. Cecilia - provide specific language around SROs and Chinatown to Thomas and Karen
2. Nina, Alex, Karen, Augie, and Sharaya - discuss the use of "American Indian" vs. "Indigenous" throughout Topic 1 (climate) and Topic 2 (environment)
3. Nina, Alex, Karen - discuss the use of "BIPOC" throughout Topic 1 (climate) and Topic 2 (environment)

III. Discussion and Consensus-Building

Overview

After the break, Giuliana transitioned to the consensus-building process and Celina shared a reminder of what it means to express consensus. She shared that:

Full consensus of these recommendations is solely an expression of support from the individual EJ WG members and does not constitute an endorsement by the organizations with which members are affiliated. It does not mean that you are in complete agreement with all of the content in the Framework. The proposed policy priorities and strategies reflect the diversity of needs required to build a more holistic movement for environmental justice. The content developed thus far and presented today may not reflect everything that was discussed during our meetings. You're expressing consensus as to whether the content developed thus far reflects our shared goals for environmental justice.

Then, Giuliana shared slides to overview the consensus-building process.
- First, we will go through all the EJ Topics to identify an initial score (1st Score). The Project Team will share a link to the consensus-building tool in the chat for everyone to input their scores independently, for all eight EJ Topics at once. If there are any Topics with full consensus (all scores are 3-5), then we will not spend further time discussing them.
- Second, for the remaining EJ Topics, we will ask the members scoring 1s and 2s to share their thoughts and suggested amendments. The Co-Chairs will have priority to respond, before

opening up to the subgroup members and larger Working Group. During this discussion, all members are encouraged to communicate their alternatives and boundaries as best as possible.

- Third, we will re-score the remaining EJ Topics by having everyone input their scores independently, taking into consideration the discussion (2nd Score). At this point, we aim for full consensus for all EJ Topics. If there are sticking points, we will reassess the remaining 1s and 2s to clarify the positions of all sides. Potentially, we may leave the meeting with a few EJ Topics that lack full consensus.
- In the event of remaining 1s and 2s, the Project Team will coordinate offline conversations with the respective Co-Chairs and the 1- and 2-leaning members. Once we reach resolution, we will update the full Working Group over email. Then, during the final WG meeting, we'll revisit our group's consensus at the start of the meeting.

As a reminder, the consensus scale is: (5) strong support (4) support and okay with it (3) ambivalent/neutral (2) disagree (1) blocking.

After Giuliana reviewed the process, Danielle shared the consensus-building tool and walked through it to orient all the members.

Clarifying Comments

- **Karen**: I hear you, Giuliana, but I'm still concerned about this being called full consensus. If I'm going to vote on the full topic, there's certain things that are themes across a number of them (e.g. use of "residents," "green," and "BIPOC"). If I apply what we're doing right now, then I would have to be a "1" on any of those topics that use these terms I'd like the group to discuss. But, I don't want to do that. The full topic is a 4 or 5 for me, but there are priorities that include something I don't agree with.
    - **Giuliana**: I can't tell you how to vote because I don't want to minimize your voice, but we have time for 1s and 2s to share their thoughts. It's a dialogue and we'll hold space for that. If we have to add more time, then that's what we'll do.
- **Sraddha**: I wanted to share something Celina shared with me that was helpful. As City staff, we're not acting on behalf of our agencies. What we're putting here is our personal opinion - with our expertise and experience.
    - **Celina**: That's true for everybody. This is your expression of consensus as an individual, it's not tied to your organization or city department, etc.

Initial Scoring of All EJ Topics

Danielle shared the link to the consensus-building tool in the chat and the Project Team worked to ensure all members had access. The Working Group spent a few minutes allowing all members to input their initial scores for all eight EJ Topics.

TALLY OF INITIAL SCORES	(5) strong support	(4) support and okay with it	(3) ambivalent/ neutral	(2) disagree	(1) blocking
1) Climate Resilience & Justice	10 votes	11 votes	2 votes	2 votes	0 votes

2) Clean & Healthy Environments	12 votes	8 votes	2 votes	3 votes	0 votes
3) Healthy Food Access	10 votes	8 votes	2 votes	5 votes	0 votes
4) Equitable & Green Jobs	9 votes	8 votes	7 votes	1 votes	0 votes
5) Physical Activity	8 votes	10 votes	5 votes	2 votes	0 votes
6) Healthy Public Facilities	8 votes	11 votes	5 votes	1 votes	0 votes
7) Safe, Healthy & Affordable Homes	6 votes	16 votes	2 votes	1 votes	0 votes
8) Empowered Neighborhoods	3 votes	14 votes	7 votes	1 votes	0 votes

Discussion of EJ Topics with 1s and 2s

Topic 1 (climate): Augie, Karen
- **Augie**: The terminology feels exclusive around all groups and race. Let's make change for the whole. I'd be interested to include other Indigenous groups (Central America). There's also Black, mixed, …
- **Karen**: For me, I have 3's for language. When you say "BIPOC," that means Black, Indigenous, and all other groups are lumped together in "other communities of color." There are specific issues and needs that are not universal. Using that term is disrespectful because it calls out Black (the community I'm most concerned about) and lumps together all other groups. That lets people off the hook, and we shouldn't do that. When we're talking about environmental justice, we're leaving out poor White communities. When we say BIPOC, we're excluding those people and instead, we should be specific on Environmental Justice Communities.
  - **Kasey**: For me, we can return to our principles for the design of environmental justice. We can put aside a colonial mentality that wants to divide us into sections, and these divisions have contributed to environmental degradation. We can put the people bearing the burdens in charge of solving the problems. I hope to follow Karen's direction around inclusivity.
  - **Kimia**: In relation to using a broader term, like marginalized, it might make things unclear when we're addressing inequities tied to race. There are disparities that are clearly based on race, and you can see that through income levels or other indicators. I vote for using race-based terminology when we are trying to address racial disparities. When we're talking about broader disparities, then we can use other terms.
- **Karen**: In the definition, "residents" is also limiting. We need to be sure to include everyone who is visiting San Francisco. We want safe places for everyone in this City.

Topic 2 (environment): Augie, Karen, and Kasey

- **Augie**: Same comment as above. I want to make sure unhoused people have a seat at the table. They live near freeways, are affected by flooding in their RVs and tents, etc…
- **Karen**: Same comment as above, re: BIPOC.
- **Karen**: For Priority 2, the term "empowerment" is used. Empowerment implies that you're going to get resources, but I also want it to include meaningful participation or real community involvement.
- **Karen**: I want to use something other than "green." The term is limiting and I prefer something like "resilient."
- **Kasey**: Wherever we can say "demonstrate," "deliver," words that are active in ensuring City programs shall include, in demonstrable ways, we should do that. We can add more teeth in our policies.
- **Kasey**: In Strategy 2.1, there's reference to data collection. Whenever we say "create a gap analysis, need analysis, etc…" we should specify that "residents" and the community are designing and owning this data.

Topic 3 (food): Augie, Karen, Kasey, Nina, Sharaya
- **Nina**: I generally agree with everything, but I wanted to flag a definition for "healthy food." It doesn't specify it being organic, pesticides, … so I want more specificity.
- **Nina**: I'm also interested in the subsidies mentioned applying to organic farmers as well.
  - **Kasey**: Does that mean subsidies =don't already exist for organic farmers,or are there existing programs you recommend?
  - **Nina**: I'm interested in highlighting that foods directed to food insecure populations do *not* support industrial agriculture.
- **Nina**: Separately, I'm wondering if there could be stronger language around community empowerment. I'd like to add community gardens, for communities that want that.
  - **Kasey**: We can elevate that.
  - **Cecilia**: For Priority 5, there is content around farmer's markets and market match programs that can help your interest in regenerative farming.
- **Augie**: To build off accessibility concerns, we can also expand specificity around unhoused folks.
  - **Kasey**: We are calling out accessibility in general terms, about farmers markets and food access being closer to where people live.
- **Augie**: For the EBT discussion, is there a way to ensure unhoused folks have access to farmers markets? We could also offer transportation to and from farmers markets.
- **Chester**: I want to offer some insider information. The City is looking at creating community markets, looking at Potrero, Richmond, Bayview as a pilot. We had those same conversations about healthy food access and the people living there. There's often double efforts and miscommunication.
- **Sharaya:** The data excludes American Indians. I'd love more inclusion of American Indian issues for healthy food access - access to traditional and cultural foods, safety to access. I am happy to provide examples.

Topic 4 (jobs): Kasey
- **Kasey**: For my subgroup topics (3, 4), the 2s are just a note to go through the details learned from others.

Topic 5 (activity): Augie, Sharaya
- **Sharaya**: Similar to Topic 3, I'm interested in access to cultural spaces. Our exercise might look different to other communities; cultural competency for parks staff.

- - **Nina**: I like that! Traditional cultural programming in outdoor public spaces. I would include yoga,chi gong, and medicinal dance.
    - **Felisia**: I agree with that intention, but I don't want to specify the specific communities. The people who use the spaces will make it important to them.
  - **Augie**: Same comment as above, about inclusion of unhoused peoples. I'm interested in implementation avoiding displacement of unhoused peoples. I want information about re-location to navigation centers, having somewhere to sleep, solutions based, etc.

Topic 6 (facilities): Augie
- **Augie**: Same comment as above, about inclusion of unhoused peoples.

Topic 7 (housing): Cecilia
- **Cecilia**: Same comment as above, about SROs.

Topic 8 (neighborhoods): Nina
- **Nina**: I have the same comment about community-based non-profit workers.
- **Nina**: I wasn't clearly understanding Priority 1.3, what if that person can't afford to live in SF?
  - **Karen**: The City needs to step up and have housing that our City employees can afford to live in.

Next Steps:
1. Subgroup 1 (Nina, Alex)
   a. Augie - terminology around Indigenous groups, unhoused
   b. Karen - terminology that refers to race, BIPOC, residents, green, and empowerment
2. Subgroup 2 (Kasey, Danielle)
   a. Nina - definition of healthy food
   b. Nina - inclusion of regenerative agriculture and food production
   c. Nina - elevation of community empowerment
   d. Augie - inclusion of unhoused peoples
   e. Sharaya - inclusion of American Indian access to traditional gathering
3. Subgroup 3 (Zack, Celina)
   a. Augie - inclusion of unhoused peoples
4. Subgroup 4 (Thomas, Karen)
   a. Cecilia - inclusion of SROs
   b. Nina - inclusion of community-based non-profit workers

At this point in the meeting, the Working Group did not execute the following planned agenda items:
- *Re-Scoring of Remaining EJ Topics*
- *Revisit Unresolved EJ Topics*
- *Name Renaming EJ Topics Without Consensus*

IV.   **Wrap-Up**

Celina offered a series of next steps to conclude this meeting and follow up with the consensus-building process. Danielle will share the meeting notes (this document) to the group to record the consensus-building discussions. Everyone, especially the 1s and 2s, are highly encouraged to review the notes for accuracy. These notes serve as a way to document the positions and responses of our sticking issues throughout the EJ Framework.

The Project Team and Giuliana will facilitate offline conversations around the language, framing, and clarifications brought up today.

The Working Group members will perform the second scoring (the re-scoring step) on their own. The consensus-building tool will be updated and re-shared with the group. In an ideal scenario, all of the EJ Topics will reach full consensus at this point.

If there are remaining 1s and 2s (extreme sticking points), the Project Team and Giuliana will facilitate offline conversations with the relevant individuals before Meeting 8.

The attendees expressed thumbs up reactions, nodded their heads, and replied in the chat that they agree with the next steps. The meeting ended at 5:10pm.

Bike Parking Lot
Comments and questions that were raised in the Zoom Chat and during the discussion that were not addressed during the meeting.

Chester: How will the final City-lead evaluate our decisions?
Response: *After conducting additional outreach to gain more perspectives from people living and working in EJ Communities, the Project Team will refine and incorporate the recommendations from the Working Group into the EJ Framework. The EJ Framework will go through the adoption process in Fall 2022 to receive approval from the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors, before receiving review and signature from MayorBreed. The Working Group members will be updated and encouraged to share their support of this work during briefings and hearings. It is important to demonstrate to the Commissioners and Supervisors how this work is supported by members of Environmental Justice Communities. After adoption, the EJ Framework will serve as the City's vision for how to advance environmental justice, and city agencies should utilize the framework as a guiding document.*