



Meeting Objectives and Agenda

Objectives:

- Reflect and provide feedback on the Working Group process
- Discuss next steps in 2022 (e.g., refinement & policy adoption)
- Discuss post-WG opportunities to stay involved
- Final celebration!

Agenda:

Time	Section
3:00-3:05	Opening <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Land Acknowledgement
3:05-3:20	Consensus-Building Closure
3:20-3:45	Reflect on Working Group Process
	<i>At this time, City guests are welcome to join our final celebration.</i>
3:45-4:00	Next Steps on EJ Framework
4:00-4:05	Remarks by Director Rich Hillis
4:05-4:20	Opportunities to Stay Involved
4:20-4:35	Appreciations
4:35-5:00	Final Celebration

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, Zack Deutsch-Gross, Maggie Dong, Edward Hatter, Donna Hilliard, Cecilia Mejia, Thomas Namara, Tandia O'Neal, Kasey Rios Asberry, Barklee Sanders, Sharaya Souza, Felisia Thibodeaux, Irene Mahasin Thomas-Jacks, Chester Kyle Williams

City Agency staff: Tim Doherty, Taylor Emerson, Will Logsdon, Sraddha Mehta, Alex Morrison, Karen Pierce, Jon Swae

City guests: Miriam Chion (CPC), Claudia Flores (CPC), Rich Hillis (CPC, Director), Doug Johnson (CPC), Jennifer Ly (PUC), Diane Oshima (PRT)

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."

Project Updates

Giuliana reminded the community members that they should have received their remaining participation stipends already (\$500). If they haven't yet, they should reach out to Giuliana to follow up.

II. Consensus-Building Closure

Danielle provided closure to the consensus-building process. During Meeting 7 (December 2021), the full Working Group completed the first step in the consensus-building process, submitting the 1st Scores on all eight EJ Topics. The discussion during Meeting 7 concluded with a list of sticking issues to resolve before Meeting 8. All of the sticking issues were around language and word choice. We left Meeting 7 with majority consensus on the policy intention of all eight EJ Topics.

At the start of January 2022, a small group of members met to discuss the sticking issues in detail. Celina (Interim Project Manager) and Danielle (Working Group Lead) facilitated the discussion with Nina, Karen, Sharaya, and Kasey. The small group generated recommendations and shared them with the Co-Chairs, who then incorporated these recommendations throughout the EJ Framework Template. It was a valuable small group discussion to emphasize inclusive policy intentions and grounding the overall document in targeting EJ Communities. If any Working Group member wishes to see those exact recommendations, they can email the Project Team for documentation.

Leading up to Meeting 8, all Working Group members were expected to submit their 2nd Scores on all eight EJ Topics. This allows everyone the chance to re-evaluate the content after the Meeting 7 discussion and sticking issues resolution.

The Working Group reached full consensus! In the EJ Framework Template, all eight EJ Topics received scores of 3, 4, and 5 on the gradient of agreement scale. The Project Team is proud of the Working Group for co-developing thorough, rich, and meaningful content into the EJ Framework.

III. Reflect on Working Group Process

Giuliana led an open discussion to debrief, evaluate, and provide feedback on the Working Group overall. In the discussion, Giuliana encouraged candidness from all members. She first reviewed highlighted details and accomplishments of the Working Group, including:

- 17 community leaders
- 8 city staff
- 8 full Working Group Meetings
- 3 project staff
- 1 facilitator
- 8 environmental justice policy topics
- 4 subgroups
- 3 presentations from co-chairs
- 1 cohesive, bold set of policy recommendation
- 41 policy priorities
- 141 strategies

Giuliana used a Jamboard to have virtual sticky notes for input across the four reflection questions:

- Question 1: What has been your top highlight during this process?
- Question 2: Please provide feedback on the EJ WG structure: what worked and what could be improved? (Structure: large Monday meetings; 4 subgroups; Java sessions, consensus process; subgroup meetings with project team and GM, etc)
- Question 3: Please provide feedback on the EJ WG roles: what worked and what could be improved? (Role: group dynamics; 2 co-chairs per subgroup; an avg of 6 members per subgroup, etc)
- Question 4: Please provide your feedback on your overall experience as a EJ WG member.

The Jamboard pages are included on the next page.

For any member who wants to continue their reflections, they are welcome to email the Project Team directly with comments or to set up a follow up meeting & attend a final Java with GM Session on Wednesday, January 26th at 12:30-1pm.

Q1: What has been your top highlight during this process?

My highlight is just the tremendous amount of knowledge and insight of folks in this working group. - Zack

Being able to work with familiar faces and meet other great community groups working in this space. - Alex

Meeting everyone and learning from different perspectives. - Kasey

A deeper understanding of the intersections of environmental justice. - Cecilia

Seeing all of the unique policies that each group came up with. - Will

In depth, generative discussions in our sub-groups. - Antonio

Meeting all the people from different neighborhood. - Mahasin

People shared their genuine perspectives! - Nina

I also enjoyed the contention whenever it happened because it clarified things so much in great spirit. - Kasey

Working with such a diverse group of people and getting their perspectives on various topics. - Tandia

My top highlight is being able to learn from the experiences that are shared in the subgroup meetings. The different backgrounds and institutional knowledge has been very insightful. - Maggie

Being able to bring visibility to AIAN issues and ensure Native Americans are included in the EJ section of CAP through tribal consultation, TEK, land use, and Indigenous food sovereignty. - Sharaya

Being able to learn from everyone and get a better understanding on some topics. Sharing this experience with everyone. - Augie

To be able to have valuable discussions with diverse perspectives. - Nina

I learned a lot from the conversations about organizing and connecting to others in the city. - Rev Burch

The contention made everything richer. It didn't feel like rubber stamping things; it felt like actually digging in. There were constructively critical voices, without any animosity. - Kasey

Cohesive! The subgroup discussions were on things that really matter. We didn't always agree, but we were able to come together. We were working towards a final goal, and I think we achieved that. - Chester

I enjoyed looking, reading, and working across many different service industries in SF. I heard a lot of representation of our City reflected through this work. - Felisia

Meeting all the community leaders and City staff working on environmental, social, and economic justice. I learned a lot through this process. I want to hold these lessons with me at my role in the Parks Alliance. - Thomas

Loves having been part of the process and getting to know others. - Donna H.

Being made aware of the different issues that EJ covers. - Edward

Report backs from all subgroups. - Sraddha

Q2: Please provide feedback on the EJ WG structure: what worked and what could be improved? (Structure: large Monday meetings; 4 subgroups; Java sessions, consensus process; subgroup co-chair meetings with project team and GM, etc.)

What Worked

The overall structure was great! I like that community staff was paired with City Staff. The City project team was extremely helpful - Nina

It worked. Loved the cellular model of sub-groups working together intensively and contributing to the whole. - Kasey

Co-chair structure was super helpful (as a co-chair with Danielle). - Kasey

What worked is being able to have input on all areas despite your subgroup. - Sharaya

Giving us the space to have discussion on these issues... is what worked. - Augie

We had great leaders. The Co-Chairs helped me understand what was going on in the large group. - Mahasin

Given the limitations of meeting via Zoom, the virtual meetings (large & subgroup meetings) were well organized with good facilitation. - Antonio

Co-chairs included both city agency staff and community members. This was a good structure that helped set the collaborative tone for the sub-working groups. - Will

Multiple points of intervention to tweak the process while we went, general flexibility, and consistent progress over timeline. - Alex

Like Kasey said, the consensus building process worked well because it generated discussion and debate. - Will

Skilled facilitation by Giuliana, Celina, and Danielle. I've never participated in a similar consensus process, and I learned a lot professionally. I congratulate all of the leaders. - Taylor

It worked to have two co-chairs, one city and one community. We all have other jobs and duties that make it hard to prioritize everything. The co-chairs could work 1:1 and together. - Felisia

Monthly meetings were helpful in keeping everyone on track. The subgroups gave us more time to dive deeper into specific issues that we may already work on. - Maggie

Being divided into subgroups of like thinkers worked. - Edward

What Could Be Improved

I didn't like the virtual situation and would have preferred meeting in person. - Rev. Burch

More time for cross pollination. More time to discuss would have been great instead of just working in the document. More strategic with how co-chairs spent their time. - Nina

Coming up with policies from scratch takes a lot of time and it would have helped to have more of a baseline to start from. - Sharaya

Having to find and create policies rather than having baseline policies already in the CAP to edit and build upon. It took more time to find examples and determine content. - Sharaya

I would have appreciated more time to cross-pollinate in discussion. - Kasey

Taking on this task during a pandemic was a little difficult. - Edward

The report backs and discussion felt rushed in the main meeting. Maybe focusing on one section per meeting (though the process would have taken longer). - Sraddha

It was limiting to meet people in other subgroups. - Antonio

The consensus process felt overwhelming since there was a lot to go over and think about. We could have two subgroups meet together to go over the priorities. - Maggie

Giving more time for subgroups to present - Cecilia

Would be nice to have more time for dialogue between groups during the development process (maybe multi-group sessions) rather than just offline. - Alex

Forward view of where we can go from here. - Kasey

Timing. We started in the middle of the fiscal year. We had budgets, audits, and other things to juggle that challenged getting the best of us. - Felisia

The time frame and more discussion between groups and suggestions on strategies. - Augie

More dance breaks. - Kasey

Q3: Please provide feedback on the EJ WG roles: what worked and what could be improved (Role: group dynamics; 2 co-chairs per subgroup; an avg of 6 members per subgroup, etc.)

A little too much onus on co-chairs. I'm not sure if that expectation should stay and be the case. Size of the group and diversity within the group was great. - Zack

Liked small subgroups. Liked that co-chairs took extra time. Nina and Alex went above and beyond. Thank you to co-chairs for being open to feedback. - Sharaya

I loved that it was a great mix of City and community folks in our subgroups! - Nina

A lot of synthesis and editing work did fall upon the co-chairs- so I think a lot more time was spent by the co-chairs compared to non-cochairs. - Nina

The small working sub-group was very intimate and dynamic. - Kasey

I thought the roles and subgroups worked very well! - Augie

The project material was really excellent and reading it helped me keep focus. - Rev. Burch

The leadership on both sides was good. From both the community and the city. It was definitely a big job for the co-chairs. It was great to see everyone's various expertise. - Tandia

We had great leaders and subgroup help me understand what we did in the larger group. Thank you Thomas and Karen all the other members. - Mahasin

I felt that my group worked really well together. I think the only improvement would be the timing of the meetings as we were not always able to get everyone to attend, but it is difficult as everyone has work. - Maggie

The combination of city agency staff and community members in subgroups worked well. - Will

Clear goals was a big help and two-by-two leadership supportive! - Kasey

I would like to be able to share the discussion more with people who don't always participate in planning and policy or are under-represented. - Kasey

It helped set the tone and worked as a reminder that we are not all responsible for representing our individual agencies - Will

Kudos and recognition to Alex and Nina as co-chairs. Liked small group with city and community together. could use more time since it felt rushed. - Sraddha

Good to have 2 co-chairs. It was always good to have someone step in when one co-chair had to step away. Project team assisted to co-facilitate. - Alex

As a WG member, I'm not responsible for representing all the views of my agency. Welcome Packet helped to have clear expectations and definitions of WG members from the beginning. - Will

Totally agree that co-chairs did a great job of incorporating a lot of feedback - thanks Nina and Alex! On the recommendations for change - it does seem like a lot of work fell on the co-chairs' shoulders - Will

I'd like to incorporate more voices: youth, seniors, folks who work at other jobs, people who speak languages other than English. - Kasey

The community role felt confusing at first, but it felt clearer later on about how to share my thoughts for my community. - Rev. Burch

Q4: Provide feedback on your overall experience as a WG member

Yes, the SF Planning team is super organized! - Sraddha

Seriously you all should teach a class on how to facilitate a community engagement process! - Will

I really enjoyed being part of this group. Feel grateful to learn from everyone here. Look forward to what's next. - Maggie

The planning and design felt excellent. I didn't feel pressured or a lack of communication. - Chester

My overall experience was pretty amazing. Thank you for giving us the space, leadership and voice to be able to share our experiences, thoughts and community feedback. - Augie

You definitely made sure that all voices were heard, even if you had to call them. It really felt like the voices were valued by the team. that goes a long way. It feels like our time and voice were valued. - Felisia

I haven't had consensus-building experience before, was eye opening to see what feedback looked like. I'm excited to see where this goes. - Cecilia

Was great to be able to co-create with community members in real-time :) - Alex

This was an incredible process. Worked with a lot of groups. This one is really successful. the leadership group is the most organized. this is the most I've ever come to seeing an EJ approach in SF. - Karen

I wanted to get to Java sessions more, but had time conflicts. Overall, you guys deserve an A for how you designed and put on this program. - Chester

Overall this was a great experience. Not only the interactions and learning opportunities related to EJ, but also learning about how to run a complex community engagement plan. - Will

Participating in the EJ WG has clarified my thinking and sense of purpose beyond my expectations. A beautiful challenge. - Kasey

I appreciate that city staff stepped up and provided their insights. They also provided suggestions and embraced all of the ideas. We need to pat ourselves on the back, it's not easy work. - Karen

The overall structure was clear from the beginning and very well organized and well-facilitated. - Will

For future work, based on experience at PODER, is to engage community stakeholders in co-creating the process itself. Not just in decision-making, but co-creating the process. - Antonio

The committee did a good job teaming people I was proud to work with intergeneration group. As a senior I was proud to learn and let my concerns be heard. - Mahasin

Really great to learn from everyone. You did a great job pairing everyone's expertise in the subgroups and across subgroups. Good to see work across subgroups to be connected. - Cecilia

Thomas did an amazing amount of work. - Karen

I felt grateful and it was exciting to be part of such a transformational working group! - Nina

I loved the communication, everyone was so professional, and it felt like this group had been around for 12-15 years! - Rev. Burch

Agreed! Such great leadership and just a phenomenal group of folks. - Zack

It was an honor to be part of this working group and looking forward to what comes next. -Tandia

IV. Next Steps of EJ Framework

After reflecting on the Working Group, Celina detailed next steps for the EJ Framework. At this time, City guests were welcome to join the meeting room, and they were invited to introduce themselves in the Zoom Chat.

Celina began with a reminder of the Working Group's main deliverable. She reviewed language excerpted from the Welcome Packet.

The deliverable produced by the Environmental Justice Working Group (EJ Working Group) will be a draft EJ Framework document, that will be further developed by the City for consideration and adoption in the General Plan by policymakers (including the Planning Commission, Mayor, and Board of Supervisors). The Framework will include San Francisco's definition of environmental justice, a final EJ Communities map, and the vision and priorities for achieving environmental justice and racial equity in San Francisco for the eight EJ topics.

As part of the EJ Framework, Celina shared back a revised definition of Environmental Justice. This definition incorporates feedback from the Working Group:

Environmental Justice is the equitable distribution of environmental benefits and elimination of environmental burdens to promote healthy communities where everyone in San Francisco can thrive.

Government should foster environmental justice through processes that address, mitigate, and amend past injustices while enabling proactive, community-led solutions for the future.

Now that the Working Group has reached full consensus on the policy recommendations, the Project Team will work to uplift the content into positions where it is most likely to succeed. The Project Team will package the Working Group policy recommendations into the full EJ Framework, including new content to be developed, such as background policy context on SB 1000, purpose of the EJ Framework, and historical context of environmental justice in San Francisco. The Project Team will include the high-level content on definitions and key policy priorities in the EJ Framework.

There will also be content recommended by the Working Group that is a better fit to be placed in a specific Element of the General Plan. The policy priorities and strategies may be more relevant to the Element's scope, such as transportation or safety & resilience, and have a higher chance of being understood and implemented.

There will also be content, such as implementation actions, recommended by the Working Group that is a better fit to be relayed to other City agencies. This content may be too detailed and specific to include in the General Plan, a high level policy document, and more appropriate for a particular agency to incorporate into their purview.

The Project Team will conduct additional outreach (focus groups, survey) to continue refining the recommendations generated by the Working Group and identify additional community needs. The focus groups and survey will target EJ Communities and occur this spring. If there's disagreement that arises, or significant modifications that would change the original policy intentions, the Project Team will return to the Working Group for consultation. This can look like a direct check in with one or a few of the members, or a broad offer to anyone that has capacity and interest.

The Project Team aims to initiate for adoption in the fall. The Working Group will receive email updates in preparation for and during the adoption process from Danielle.

Moving forward, the Project Team is looking forward to remaining in contact with Working Group members. Based on the next steps, there are a few opportunities to stay involved. First, members are encouraged to support upcoming outreach, including disseminating the survey. Second, they can be involved in consultation on refinement of the EJ Framework. Third, members can join briefings with Supervisors to provide remarks and attend Planning Commission hearings to provide public comment. Lastly, with health and safety conditions willing, the Project Team is interested in hosting an in-person celebration!

Q&A

- **Kasey** - Why aren't there focus groups planned for Arabic and Tagalog speaking communities?
 - **Celina** - We have resource constraints that prevent us from hosting focus groups for a wide range of non-English languages. We are prioritizing Spanish and Chinese speaking communities. However, we're open to discussing more and would appreciate any connections you may have to Arabic and Tagalog speakers and interpreters.
- **Karen** - If we have a community based organization in mind, as a potential focus group partner, can we coordinate with you? I think a lot of folks on this Working Group may have potential partners in mind, and it would be valuable to provide the opportunity for these perspectives to enrich the final product.
 - **Celina** - We can set up a meeting with you and the potential partner to discuss.
- **Kasey** - How have the partner organizations been identified? I would like to help identify gaps and offer partner organizations to fill those gaps. Throughout this Working Group process, there have been moments where participants express the idea to receive ongoing validation of the work. It would be great to do the same with the selection of partner organizations.
 - **Celina** - The Project Team will maintain versions of the EJ Framework's development and the documented changes. We plan to share this progress with the Working Group so that you can see the changes.
 - **Giuliana** - There will be a level of transparency so you can see the transformation of the work. This is included in the next steps and all Working Group members are invited to follow along for feedback. We really want to respect all the work you've put in.
- **Diane** - Similarly, it would be great for the Planning Department to convene City agency discussions to help city departments to become familiar with the EJ Framework. This will assist in the application and integration with equity initiatives in individual departments.

V. Remarks by Director Rich Hillis

Rich Hillis (Director of SF Planning) provided remarks to the full Working Group. Director Hillis joined the first Working Group meeting and returned to celebrate the accomplishments and unprecedented process of the EJ Working Group. This is the first citywide advisory group that includes both community leaders and City staff collaboration on a range of environmental justice issues, with a focus on neighborhoods that are most impacted by health challenges. He thanked community leaders for their leadership, given all the work they do to serve vulnerable communities during the pandemic. He thanked City staff for their partnership to guide the work and act collaboratively as a City government. He thanked the City guests in the audience that provided widespread support for the EJ Framework.

Director Hillis celebrated the achievements of the Working Group - creating a set of shared priorities that we can all work towards. He emphasized the leadership of the Co-Chairs to facilitate subgroup policy discussions and provide a safe space for everyone to contribute. Director Hillis wrapped up by referencing the project's next steps and encouraged everyone's support through the adoption process.

VI. Opportunities to Stay Involved

After remarks from Director Hillis, Danielle described other community engagement and outreach opportunities to stay involved. The Working Group members have all demonstrated deep commitment to their communities and these opportunities provide additional projects that could benefit from their expertise and knowledge. These opportunities relate to EJ Communities and the EJ Topics.

The Project Team solicited six opportunities from other SF Planning projects: summer internship, Racial & Social Equity Action Plan's Planning Code Audit & Racial and Social Impact Analysis Guidelines, Transportation Element Update, SoMA Community Advisory Committee, Environmental Planning Notification Materials, and the Climate Action Plan.

Other City staff were invited to share opportunities from their departments. Will Logsdon (PUC) and Diane Oshima (PRT) both shared opportunities. Then, Giuliana opened up the conversation to all others in the room for group announcements.

VII. Appreciations

Giuliana transitioned to appreciations. As a surprise, the Project Team and Working Group members created digital certificates of appreciation for all of the Co-Chairs. Each pair of Co-Chairs received a certificate and appreciative comments from their subgroup members. Giuliana invited the members to read their comments aloud. The Co-Chairs reacted to the surprise and then all Working Group members continued to share appreciations to one another aloud and in the Zoom Chat.

VIII. Final Celebration

As a final activity together, Giuliana led the Working Group in writing a group letter to San Francisco. Imagined in 25, 50, or even 100 years from now, what impacts can we see in our communities for environmental justice? All members were invited to contribute one sentence that starts with "I hope" or "I wish" to generate a letter from the full Working Group.

After the group letter was written, Danielle organized everyone into a virtual group photo. Go Niners!

Bike Parking Lot

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

There were no Bike Parking Lot items during Meeting 8.