



Meeting Objectives and Agenda

Objectives:

- Continue building a safe and collaborative space
- Java with GM recap and updates
- Subgroup overview and defining EJ
- Community Engagement Plan

Agenda:

Time	Section
3:00-3:10	Opening <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Zoom Etiquette ● Land Acknowledgement ● Recap of Meeting 2
3:10-3:15	Icebreaker <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Brief Introductions ● Question: What color describes your feelings today?
3:15-3:20	Recap and Takeaways of Java Sessions <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● CBO Trends and Takeaways ● County/City Takeaways ● Q&A
3:20-3:45	Subgroup Overview <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Revisit Subgroup Purpose ● Subgroups Structure ● Proposed Schedule ● Work Plan ● Q&A and Discussion
3:45-4:20	Subgroup Introduction & EJ Definition <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Instructions for Breakout Rooms ● Breakout Group Activity: Subgroup Introductions & EJ Definitions ● Report Back

4:20-4:45	Community Engagement Plan <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Plan Overview ● Q&A
4:45-5:00	Wrap-Up <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Homework ● Preview Meeting 4 ● Group Announcements

Attendance

Facilitator: Giuliana Martinez (GM Consulting Group)

Planning Department Project Team: Miriam Chion (Community Equity Division Director), Luis Caro, Lisa Chen (Project Manager), Celina Chan, Danielle Ngo (Working Group Lead), Leslie Valencia, Jacob Wallace Jr.

EJ Working Group Members:

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

City Agency Staff: Alex Morrison, Karen Pierce, Keith Tanner

Summary

I. Opening

Giuliana Martinez (Facilitator) started the meeting by reading the land acknowledgment, honoring the unceded ancestral homeland of the Ramaytush Ohlone, who are the original inhabitants of the San Francisco Peninsula. She provided a recap of the last meeting, referring to the Meeting 2 Summary Notes, and explained that those notes contain the mapping activity feedback as a resource for subgroups moving forward. Celina Chan (Project Team) shared an update on the stipend information, that the stipends to Working Group community members will be disbursed in two transactions. Lastly, the Community Equity Division Director, Miriam Chion, spoke about racial and social equity, environmental justice, and the importance of building consensus on policy recommendations to develop the Environmental Justice Framework.

II. Icebreaker Activities

Everyone shared a quick introduction in the meeting chat and answered, “What color are you feeling today?” Giuliana solicited a couple of people to share their answers aloud.

III. Recap and Takeaways of Java Sessions

Giuliana gave an update on the Java Sessions. The Java Sessions are a separate, optional space to ask questions, check-in, get to know each other, and discuss more about the EJ WG. Giuliana identified two

days out of the month to conduct a regular Java Session (every second Wednesday, 12:30 - 1 pm and every second Thursday 9:30 - 10 am of the month). Members who are unable to make these times are welcome to reach out to Giuliana directly for check-in opportunities. Giuliana then explained that the next Java Session would be about discussing the governance and voting process of the Working Group.

IV. Subgroup Overview

Danielle Ngo (Project Lead) and Giuliana continued the meeting by revisiting the subgroup’s framework, purpose, structure, and proposed schedule. The subgroups will be made up of the community leaders and City staff. The subgroups’ goals are to discuss members’ shared goals and co-develop policy recommendations, with the ultimate goal of achieving consensus. The subgroups will be meeting throughout the rest of Fall 2021 and at the end of their work, their recommendations will be incorporated into the EJ Framework. The subgroups have two co-chairs each, one community leader and one City member, tasked with convening and facilitating the subgroup meetings. The rest of the subgroup is a balanced mix of Working Group members to best fit members’ interests and experience to the EJ Topics, they will offer their experience and judgement to create policies. Danielle shared resources to support the subgroup work (e.g., Google Drive, Google Groups). The Project Team is also available for any questions, data and research requests, and policy coordination.

The scope of work for the subgroups is to define Environmental Justice and topic-specific priorities, create a vision for their topics, explain why EJ matters, propose key policy priorities (actions that the city can take to achieve EJ), and think about how to implement this work. All of these components will be built into the EJ Framework. Giuliana then spoke about the overall schedule and explained that the Working Group would meet outside the main meeting space. The subgroup rosters were then shared with the Working Group, which is also documented in the Subgroup Work Plan and Scope document.

<p>Q&A and Discussion <i>Note: Questions that came up in the Zoom Chat or that weren’t addressed are included in the Bike Parking Lot section at the end of this document.</i></p>
<p>Question 1: Is it possible to switch groups? Response: The groups were made based on your stated interest and we did our best to respect everyone’s top options. If you are not comfortable with your assignment, feel free to reach out to the Working Group Lead (Danielle Ngo).</p>
<p>Question 2: Is there an option to attend other subgroups’ meetings? Response: Yes, we encourage you all to be as involved as possible, and you are all welcome to collaborate with each other on topics you feel are related.</p>
<p>Question 3: <i>Comment</i> - I want to make sure we don’t overburden people by making them go to other groups, we should respect the team process and schedule meeting times for groups to collaborate.</p>
<p>Question 4: <i>Comment</i> - I am against voting; I would like to work towards consensus as much as possible. How should we approach this method of decision-making as a group? (+1)</p>
<p>Question 5: Will the subgroup meeting be on Zoom, or is there an option to meet in person? Response: We want to encourage Zoom due to safety concerns. Feel free to discuss with your co-chairs and groups. From there, you would take what the group decides on to the Project Team.</p>

V. EJ Definitions & Subgroup Introductions

Celina discussed the process of developing the draft definition of environmental justice, which reads:

“The equitable distribution of environmental benefits and the elimination of environmental burdens to promote healthy communities where all San Franciscans can thrive. Government can foster environmental justice through processes that amend past injustices while enabling proactive, community-led solutions for the future.”

The draft definition came from work of a previous EJ intern (Isa Gaillard) who conducted a literature review and held interviews with experts on environmental justice from public agencies and community-based organizations. The EJ definition is a working draft because it is important for community members to have a say in the process in order for it to accurately reflect community needs in the city. Celina shared feedback received on the definition from the Homework Survey sent prior to the meeting, and went over the next steps for refining the EJ definition, asking the group for their thoughts and offering for the group to create a list of EJ principles/vision statements that can go into further detail than the overview definition. Everyone went into breakout groups based off of their subgroups to introduce themselves and discuss the EJ definition.

After the breakout rooms, every subgroup co-chair shared what their group discussed about the EJ definition.

- Subgroup 1 (Climate Resilience & Justice, Clean & Healthy Environments) shared that they liked the definition as a foundation to build on. They thought that the definition could define equity better and that it could add more about sustainable and connected neighborhoods. They were in support of a separate vision document that could go into further detail about past injustices and topic-specific principles. Subgroup 1 all agreed that the definition should be broad.
- Subgroup 2 (Healthy Food Access, Equitable & Green Jobs) said that they would like to tackle the sources of the EJ burdens in their version of the definition. They were also proud to share that they came to their first team decision about scheduling a time to meet outside of the main Working Group meetings.
- Subgroup 3 (Physical Activity, Healthy Public Facilities) said the second sentence of the definition could be strengthened. They also said that their group had a discussion of what the first part of the first sentence implies and how it affects the role of government. Their recommendation was to focus on the ability to thrive vs “creating a community where everyone can thrive.”
- Subgroup 4 (Safe, Healthy, and Affordable Housing, Empowered Neighborhoods (and data)) said that there were areas where the definition could improve. They created questions as recommendations, “How are San Franciscans?, Are they the long term residents, new residents, or undocumented residents?, How inclusive is the EJ definition?, and Who does it target?” They also said that the definition should emphasize mental health, community support groups, and quality of life, citing the disappearance and displacement of communities and the impact that has on residents. The last group also thought that the definition should erase the phrase “elimination of EJ burdens” and change it to “equitable distribution of burdens,” since eliminating EJ burdens may be unrealistic.

VI. Breakout Group Notes

See below.

VII. Community Engagement Plan

The Project Team then shared the broader community engagement plan and timeline for the EJ Framework. The community engagement strategies aim to solicit additional information from the community to find solutions to EJ issues. The Project Team revisited the timeline of previous and planned community engagement activities. In Fall 2020 and Spring 2021, the team did youth engagement with Balboa High School, Malcolm X Academy, and San Francisco State. The team also hosted informational workshops on the EJ Framework as part of the Planning Department's General Plan Virtual Events in March 2021.

Future community engagement will include focus groups and a survey, which will target people living and working in the EJ Communities. Both will have in-language options (e.g., Spanish, Chinese) and incentives for participants to compensate them for their time. Celina asked the Working Group to share the survey with their networks once it is complete.

Celina also mentioned the interview activities that Luis Caro and Jacob Wallace (Project Team) are conducting to display on a public website that is meant to inform and engage the public about EJ issues in San Francisco.

Q&A and Discussion <i>Note: Questions that came up in the Zoom Chat or that weren't addressed are included in the Bike Parking Lot section at the end of this document.</i>
Question 1: When will the surveys be available? Our community (Potrero Hill) usually experiences many requests for surveys, if you aim to get it out around October then that would be prime time because we are having a community festival. Response: The survey will be available in Fall 2021. The team is aiming for October.
Question 2: Will focus groups be virtual? Response: Yes, the focus groups will be virtual and over Zoom.
Question 3: How will we as a group and team deliver correct information that does not leave out the perspectives from groups that are often marginalized from these types of discussions? (+1 comment on the survey outreach concern) Response: This is a great question, as the team hopes to recruit a diverse and representative set of focus group participants to share about resident experiences in EJ Communities. The team will partner with CBOs to co-host and recruit for the focus groups.
Question 4: <i>Comment</i> - The conflict with surveys for low-income/minority communities is that they will only be 40% effective. The surveys will only give an insight into the bigger problems. If there is an honest effort to advertising then this will be more effective, after all is said and done, there needs to be a long-term follow-through for the Planning Department to communicate what they found and what they plan to do about it. I've had this method work in LA, they blasted out the information they found and how they plan to address what they found. At the end the public got to see where it went.

VIII. Closing and Next Steps

The meeting ended with Danielle going over the homework and previewing the next meeting (Meeting 4). The homework is for the Working Group to review their subgroup's work plan and scope of work, and

to participate in the subgroup meetings. Meeting 4 will focus on presentations from the subgroups on their initial ideas for their “Definition”, “Vision”, and “Why It (EJ) Matters” sections.

IX. Group Announcements

1. Alex Morrison (ORCP) shared about the SF Heat Watch Campaign during Meeting 3. The Campaign has a 1 pager with information and a link for volunteers to follow up. Alex appreciates any assistance in sharing it out to garner more volunteers! For any questions, reach out to Alex.Morrison@sfgov.org.
2. Chester Williams is leading a major project to help unhoused residents find housing in the Bayview. It is a program to help residents get money for rent. For more information on rental relief, reach out to bayviewteachery@gmail.com.
3. Sharaya Souza is planning AICD’s first outdoor event in a while (with masks) to celebrate their one-year. It is on September 25th and all communities are welcome to join building a connection with Mother Earth: <https://americanindianculturaldistrict.org/events>
4. Felicia is leading a Wellness Hub in Lakeview where anyone can get tested and vaccinated on Fridays and Saturdays. There will be rapid testing Monday-Saturday starting August 23rd.

Bike Parking Lot

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

1. Will focus groups be conducted virtually?

Yes, the focus groups will be conducted virtually, due to the continued public health emergency and to prioritize the health and safety of community residents.

2. In regard to the Environmental Justice (EJ) Framework, we are working on, it seems that we are generating a living document? Are we making a product that will be regularly revisited and renewed?

The Environmental Justice Framework will be incorporated and live in the City’s General Plan. The General Plan--its Introduction, Elements, and Area Plans--is continually updated on a rolling basis. This allows for the EJ Framework to be revisited and renewed, although there is no set timeline for that yet. Unlike other components to the General Plan, this is the first time the City will possess an EJ Framework.

Breakout Group Notes

The breakout groups split into the four subgroups for the first time. They spent 25 minutes to 1) get to know one another and 2) review the environmental justice definition and discuss some of the feedback provided in the homework survey. The subgroup co-chairs facilitated for the first time with the following discussion questions:

Definition of Environmental Justice

- 1) What do you think about the proposal to 1) finalize the draft EJ Definition taking into consideration proposed modifications; and, 2) also develop a secondary EJ Principles or Vision document that goes into greater detail?

- 2) Do you have any other feedback that you didn't share in the survey, or now that you've had a chance to skim other members' comments?

Environmental Justice Framework Outline (if time allows)

- 3) What were your gut reactions to the EJ Framework Outline? Do you feel anything is missing?
- 4) Do you have any questions or comments?

Subgroup 1 (Climate Resilience & Justice, Clean & Healthy Environments)

Question 1

- Well worded, reflects inclusivity. We can build on this and use it as a foundation.
- Be more specific about what type of equity the group is striving for.
- Looking at sustainable and connected neighborhoods.
- Adding definitions to climate resilience and justice, clean and healthy environments.
- Adding mitigations necessary (especially the southeast sector of town).
- Bold - "government SHOULD foster..." more forward thinking and visionary.
- Room for policies: specifically to littering and dumping a fine to pay through community courts to do some work in the community.
- Be more specific about past injustices (no mention of racism or discrimination).
- "It's worth specifically calling it out..."
- General as it can be - like a mission statement.
- Instead of specific it should be more overarching, captivating all that falls under EJ.

Question 2

- Group agrees to develop a secondary EJ definition.

Subgroup 2 (Healthy Food Access, Equitable & Green Jobs)

Question 1

- Make it simple enough for a caveman to read or so that public understands what the organization is about. He wants the community to understand. Structure and vocabulary are his major areas of concern.
- Race and racism is not mentioned in the definition. Environmental challenges and social vulnerabilities.
- "Enabling" is not a strong enough statement. He agrees with Chester with not being too wordy. Processes, policies, and Action are more than just processes. He wants def to reflect work that will be done.
- Community and empowerment should be at the top. She wants the definition to mention being resident led. She feels like we should call out the issue directly like planning or legacy redlining as the cause of the need for this community led work and policy.
- She likes how it is community led but there is no section about education or empowerment.

Question 2

- We continue to define a working definition of EJ. She mentioned richness: education, housing, and land use.

Subgroup 3 (Physical Activity, Healthy Public Facilities)

Question 1

- (second sentence +3) (+1 to the access part, vital word)

- “Burden to promote healthy communities where all SF can thrive” - change to “provide people access to thrive for those who want to thrive, to thrive”, changing environment is just one step towards making it thrive, it can foster good health but it does not mean people will want to thrive
- Used to work in housing, giving housing away and some people would turn them down. Government can do all they can but the government is only the first step to push people to thrive. A perfect government would want people to thrive but that's not the case. Promoting the idea that SF residents can have ACCESS to thrive, unhoused example...
- Likes the current definition, is wondering if any revisions have been made yet based off of feedback?
- Maybe we can add more specific, complementary points to address Felicias comment
- I also feel like we could change the tone to strengthen the commitment/responsibility of government. Indicate the responsibility of the government in this by adding stronger language
- It could be stronger (government wording comment). In the real world, EJ is a two way street, community and government both need to get their stuff together, there are other factors at play
- Language for government was also mentioned in the homework, does the group feel the same way about the issue with the language?
 - (+1 from entire group)
- I agree with the stronger language for the second sentence. I also think their point towards access is important too. Adding the word access could make this stronger.
- Do you think that the access term could go in the principles document or should it go in the definition?
 - It could, but that would depend on what others said in the homework. I do believe the government should be strong but it makes it seem like if all things are perfect in government then all would thrive and that is not realistic, some people do not want to thrive. Burden and responsibility does not completely fall on the government, people also need to take responsibility.

Subgroup 4 (Safe, Healthy, and Affordable Housing, Empowered Neighborhoods (and data)

Question 1

- The phrase “Elimination of environmental burdens” has some trade offs. It implies having to get rid of some of the infrastructure that already exists (i.e: trains, roads) and is therefore, unrealistic. Instead the definition should be, “The equitable distribution of environmental benefits AND burdens.” Most of the burdens are in the Southeast part of the city, and since everything towards the West is residential. The Eastern corridor and Southeast side of the city gets a disproportionate amount of burdens.
- Who are San Franciscans? Is it recent immigrants, does it include the unhoused too? This needs to be defined more.
- Drafting the government part makes sense (*Government can foster environmental justice...*), however, it is equally important to highlight the work that non government groups, or individuals, are doing.

- Promoting healthy communities is a very important part. I do not know if San Franciscans get all the benefits across the City, or if there are enough services to keep communities healthy. I can see the change in the African American community, with housing and health, it feels as if we're disappearing. When you see a whole community vanish to the point that you don't see yourself in it anymore, I think that has to do with housing and not being able to afford to live here.
- Mental health is important. Where is that in the definition? We have to take into consideration the quality of air and water and how that affects your mental well being.
- Quality of life is an important metric.
- I would like to see a sub definition of healthy communities. What do we mean when we say we “to promote healthy communities.” Defining quality of life, mental health, and all of that is also important.