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Background
The San Francisco Planning Department is seeking to amend the San Francisco General Plan by adopting a new Environmental Justice Framework (“EJ Framework”) and updating the General Plan Introduction (“Introduction”). The new EJ Framework would fulfill the City’s obligations under Senate Bill 1000 (“SB 1000”) and is proposed to be incorporated by reference into the updated Introduction.

The Environmental Justice Framework represents the first citywide policy focused on advancing environmental justice across all City agencies and policymaking. The Planning Department began work on the EJ Framework in March 2020, in collaboration with other City agencies working on environmental justice, including San Francisco Department of Public Health, San Francisco Department of the Environment, and the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission.

The Department also proposes to update the language of the Introduction to reflect current values and themes from public engagement. The existing Introduction was last amended in 1996, via Planning Commission Resolution No. 14149. The General Plan serves as a comprehensive roadmap for how the City will change and develop into the future. It provides a comprehensive set of goals, objectives, and policies to guide the public and private sectors and influence how we live, work, and move about, as well as the quality and character of the City. The proposed General Plan Amendments include:
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- **Environmental Justice Framework:** The EJ Framework outlines key environmental justice priorities that City policymakers should work to address. The EJ Framework includes an Environmental Justice Communities Map (“EJ Communities Map”), identifying areas of the city that face disproportionate burden of environmental health challenges, informed by state and local data. The EJ Framework is a state-mandated component of the General Plan, in accordance with SB 1000 and Government Code §65302(h). The EJ Framework will outline a set of visions and priorities to be incorporated into the General Plan, in strong alignment with citywide racial and social equity goals.

- **Updates to the General Plan Introduction:** The Introduction includes a summary of the intent and purpose of the General Plan. The Department proposes to update the Introduction with themes distilled from extensive community engagement conducted in several recent long-range planning efforts, including recent work on the EJ Framework, Housing Element, Safety & Resilience Element, ConnectSF, Cultural Districts, and the Planning Commission’s and Historic Preservation Commission’s resolutions centering the Department’s work in racial and social equity.

Associated environmental justice policies will continue to be incorporated into the various General Plan Elements. The first set of policies can be found in the Safety & Resilience Element (adopted 2022) and Housing Element (adopted 2023). Collectively, the EJ Framework, EJ Communities Map, and associated policies in the General Plan Elements will provide guidance to City agencies and other stakeholders on how to advance environmental justice in their work.

This informational hearing serves as a public presentation to the Human Rights Commission. This body of work has relied on the long-term partnership and coordination with Office of Racial Equity staff, including Shakirah Simley, Sami Iwata, and Sarah Tseng. In particular, interagency coordination has supported the development of the EJ Communities Map and the policy recommendations developed by the Environmental Justice Working Group.

**Issues and Considerations**

**Major Policy Updates**

The Environmental Justice Framework presents the following content:

- **Introduction.** This section shares a brief overview of the history and present-day context of environmental justice and racial and social equity in the City.

- **What Is Environmental Justice?** This section shares the City’s definition of environmental justice and presents the Environmental Justice Communities Map, which describes areas in the City that have higher pollution and are predominantly low-income.

- **Environmental Justice Priorities.** This section shares the outline of a set of visions and priorities across a range of policy topics critical to advancing environmental justice in the City. For each topic, the vision statement describes bold, aspirational outcomes that serve as a guidepost for implementation and enforcement. The priorities describe major activities the City can undertake to address environmental justice. The topics and priority statements are shown below, with the full policy language shown in the
EJ Framework.

**Healthy and Resilient Environments**
- Limit and protect against pollution exposure
- Prepare for seismic hazards, other natural disasters, and the climate crisis
- Expand nature-based solutions, green infrastructure, & urban greening
- Invest in resilient public utility systems and affirm access to water, power, and sanitation as a human right
- Ensure public access to data & information
- Empower community planning for climate resilience and justice

**Physical Activity and Healthy Public Facilities**
- Distribute public facilities equitably
- Ensure public facilities are accessible and safe for all
- Offer diverse, flexible, and inclusive programming in public facilities
- Support environmental education programs
- Ensure robust transportation connectivity
- Ensure streets and transit are accessible and safe for all

**Healthy Food Access**
- Affirm healthy food as a human right
- Empower workers and community members
- Leverage the food system as a means of strengthening communities
- Foster climate resilience and innovation in the food system
- Increase nature-based food opportunities

**Safe, Healthy, and Affordable Homes**
- Work to undo past harms
- Build accountability & oversight in the housing systems
- Address housing affordability & availability
- Protect vulnerable tenants
- Expand housing choices citywide
- Ensure that housing supports public health

**Equitable and Green Jobs**
- Provide living wages for all
- Foster a robust network of work & entrepreneurship
- Promote pathways for workers’ empowerment and self-determination
- Facilitate the just transition of the city’s economy and workforce

**Empowered Neighborhoods**
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- Prioritize participation of EJ Communities in decision-making processes
- Build capacity for diverse voices to engage
- Center environmental justice efforts in collaboration with American Indian communities and Traditional Ecological Knowledge
- Foster a culture of transparency and communication
- Develop community partnerships to expand city’s reach
- Address community safety

Environmental Justice Communities Map

The proposed EJ Framework includes the EJ Communities Map to identify the areas of the City that face the top 30% of cumulative environmental and socioeconomic vulnerability. It is built off of CalEnviroScreen 4.0, and is refined with additional local data. The EJ Communities Map depicts a gradient of pollution exposure and social vulnerability in San Francisco. The areas in red are deemed Environmental Justice Communities, representing the top 30% of cumulative environmental hazards in the City. EJ Communities are often (though not exclusively) low-income communities and communities of color. These areas fall primarily along the southern and eastern areas of San Francisco and include neighborhoods such as Bayview Hunters Point, SoMA, Treasure Island, Mission Tenderloin, Visitacion Valley, Chinatown, and Potrero Hill, among others. The full documentation of the EJ Communities Map details the methodology and analysis (Exhibit B).

Community Outreach and Engagement for the Environmental Justice Framework

The proposed EJ Framework builds upon over two years of outreach and engagement with the community and City partners. Outreach activities included an Environmental Justice Working Group (comprised of community leaders and City agencies), focus groups, youth engagement, briefings, a survey, and a series of General Plan Virtual Events. The full outreach and engagement summary details the goals, approach, and outcomes from the outreach and engagement activities (Exhibit C).

Implementation

As a policy document, the EJ Framework guides city decision making and actions, such as funding programs and regulating development. The EJ Framework contains broad visions and policies to reduce exposure to environmental pollution, build healthy communities, and advance racial and social equity. However, it does not directly impact funding allocations, staffing, and/or land use policies and must be supplemented with additional actions and policies to be fully realized.

Implementation of the EJ Framework is carried out through numerous City plans and programs. In addition to City-led actions, the EJ Framework relies upon the private sector, community-based organizations, and a range of additional stakeholders to support full and robust implementation of these policies. The EJ Framework highlights examples of such work in its sidebars.

In addition to the EJ Framework, there are environmental justice policies being incorporated into other General Plan Elements. The implementation of such policies will be determined by the respective Element. For the Safety & Resilience Element (adopted 2022) and the Housing Element (adopted 2023), the environmental justice
policies primarily add focus to providing resources and conducting community outreach and engagement with Environmental Justice Communities.

Beyond the General Plan, there are many City agencies who have implemented environmental justice programs and continue to incorporate environmental justice into their work. To highlight a few:

- **SF Department of the Environment.** The Department of the Environment has decades-long commitment to environmental justice and has worked alongside low-income communities of color to eliminate or mitigate environmental burdens, increase the accessibility of environmental programs and benefits, engage community members, and improve the health outcomes of these communities. As part of this commitment, communities most impacted by environmental stressors and climate change are prioritized in the provision of resources and services and the long-term work of community leaders is recognized and supported. For example, since 2001, the Department of the Environment has awarded more than $12 million in funds to nonprofit groups to promote a healthier, sustainable environment in the southeast area of the City, through the Environmental Justice Grant Program.

- **SF Department of Public Health.** The Department of Public Health’s environmental justice work, part of their Environmental Health Program, has tackled environmental justice in the City through health promotion, indoor air quality programs, lead prevention, COVID-19 support, and other public health approaches for decades.

- **SF Public Utilities Commission.** In October 2009, the Public Utilities Commission became the first city department, and first utility in the country, to adopt an Environmental Justice Policy. The policy affirms and commits the SFPUC to the goals of environmental justice to prevent, mitigate, and lessen disproportionate environmental impacts of its activities on communities in all SFPUC service areas and to insure that public benefits are shared across all communities. In their Fall 2022 Grant Cycle, the Green Infrastructure Grant Program included the Environmental Justice Communities Map as part of the applicant review, to fund the design and construction of green stormwater infrastructure on large public and private properties, with the goal of reducing stormwater runoff while delivering public benefits that enhance the quality of all for SFPUC rate payers.

- **SF Recreation and Park Department.** In November 2022, the Recreation and Park Commission adopted the Environmental Justice Communities Map methodology to redefine their Equity Zones. The Equity Zones are used to quantify resource decisions and intentionally align staff to prioritize parks and service to residents in Equity Zones, in alignment with the Strategy Plan’s Equity Metrics.

- **SF Human Rights Commission.** In July 2019, the City adopted legislation creating the Office of Racial Equity to ensure that all City agencies move towards centering their work in racial equity, including addressing health disparities and environmental racism. In December 2022, the Human Rights Commission received the Draft Reparations Plan developed by the African American Reparations Advisory Committee, including recommendations on addressing historical wrongs related to housing,
education, and economics.

**Next Steps**

The project team is continuing to offer informational hearings to interested commissions and briefings to the Board of Supervisors. By the time of the adoption hearing, the project team aims to finalize the Environmental Justice Framework, complete environmental review, and publish an online Environmental Justice Data Portal as supplement to the EJ Communities Map.

**Forthcoming Schedule:**

- **February 9th, 2023**  
  Informational Hearing @ Human Rights Commission
- **On or after March 2nd, 2023**  
  Adoption Hearing @ Planning Commission
- **April – May, 2023**  
  Hearings @ Board of Supervisors

**Attachments:**

- **Exhibit A:**  Initiation Draft of the Environmental Justice Framework (Proposed for Adoption)
- **Exhibit B:**  Environmental Justice Communities Map: Technical Documentation
- **Exhibit C:**  Outreach and Engagement Summary for the Environmental Justice Framework
EXHIBIT A:

INITIATION DRAFT OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE FRAMEWORK (PROPOSED FOR ADOPTION)
Land Acknowledgement

The San Francisco Planning Department acknowledges that we are on the unceded ancestral homeland of the Ramaytush Ohlone, who are the original inhabitants of the San Francisco Peninsula. As the indigenous stewards of this land and in accordance with their traditions, the Ramaytush Ohlone have never ceded, lost, nor forgotten their responsibilities as the caretakers of this place, as well as for all peoples who reside in their traditional territory. As guests, we recognize that we benefit from living and working on their traditional homeland. We wish to pay our respects by acknowledging the Ancestors, Elders, and Relatives of the Ramaytush Ohlone community and by affirming their sovereign rights as First Peoples.

Disclaimer

This Environmental Justice Framework articulates broad visions and priorities to guide city policy objectives. The Environmental Justice Framework does not identify specific future city policies and does not approve, fund, or authorize implementation of any specific projects. New and amended City policies and any implementation project will be reviewed and approved over time and follow protocols and best practices for adoption, which may require additional public review, review by City decision-makers, and/or environmental review under the California Environmental Quality Act. As a result of those reviews, there may be alternatives and mitigation measures developed that may be implemented as well.

The Environmental Justice Framework also names example strategies and actions being performed in the community related to environmental justice. They include City-led initiatives, community-led initiatives, and partnerships between the City and community. Some of these examples are broad vision documents that guide City policies, and some are more concrete. Some have been adopted, and some are still under review at the time of this document’s writing. If and when any of the examples still under review is proposed for adoption, it will go through robust community planning and environmental review, as needed.
I. Introduction

"If we want a safe environment for our children and grandchildren, we must clean up our act, no matter how hard a task it might be.”

— Hazel M. Johnson, the “Mother of the Environmental Justice Movement”

“…Environmental justice is like an umbrella, and the spokes within the umbrella are made up of things like housing and economic justice, health, and education. If the spokes are broken, then the umbrella is inoperable.”

— Cheryl Johnson, daughter of Hazel M. Johnson

Every person deserves the opportunity to live in a healthy environment that supports their physical and mental well-being. In San Francisco, as in many other communities, we see that people of color, low-income residents, and other vulnerable\(^1\) groups are disproportionately exposed to hazards, such as unsafe housing conditions, illegal dumping, polluting industries, high-risk traffic conditions, crime, and violence. These communities often have limited access to supportive infrastructure and public services, such as healthy food, quality public education, stable and well-paying jobs, accessible parks, and other essential needs.

\(^1\) In this context, “vulnerable” refers to groups that have reduced access to resources, including, but not limited to, youth, seniors, people with limited English proficiency, people with disabilities, and people returning from incarceration. It can also refer to groups that are more impacted by certain conditions, such as environmental injustices, housing displacement, health threats (e.g., asthma, COVID-19, etc.), and the impacts of the climate crisis.
These injustices stem from a long history of *environmental racism*, a term that recognizes that American Indian, Black, Latinx, and other communities of color have historically borne—and in many cases, continue to bear—the brunt of environmental hazards due to systemically racist policies and actions. These racial disparities are compounded by the intersections with class, gender identity, sexual orientation, disability, immigration status, and other identities that result in inequitable treatment or opportunities.

San Francisco’s history of state-sanctioned racism originated with the genocide, exploitation, and dispossession of the American Indian people on whose land our state and nation were founded. This history of racism extended through systems and policies that served to segregate, displace, and harm communities of color. The examples of state-sanctioned racism are too numerous to list in full, but include laws in the late 19th century limiting where people of Chinese descent could live and work; redlining practices and racial covenants starting in the 1930’s that excluded people of color from renting and buying homes in well-resourced neighborhoods; the forced removal and internment of people of Japanese descent during World War II; urban renewal projects and eminent domain during the 1950’s and 1960’s that were used to justify the wholesale displacement of Black residents and other communities of color; and the intentional siting of polluting freeways and industrial facilities in communities of color and low-income communities. Even though the City has taken steps to undo the damage caused by these past actions, we continue to see pervasive health and other disparities along lines of race, place, and class. For instance, life expectancy in San Francisco greatly varies by race (72 years for Black residents vs. 82 years for white residents) and by neighborhood (77 years in the Bayview vs. 88 years in the Inner Sunset).²³

The environmental justice movement grew largely out of the Civil Rights Movement (1954-1968), as communities afflicted by poor health outcomes fought for stronger environmental protections. These efforts gained prominence nationally, culminating in the First National People of Color Environmental Leadership Summit in 1991, followed by a federal government directive requiring agencies to address environmental justice in 1994.⁴⁵ The San Francisco Bay Area has a long legacy of community activism advancing economic, social, and environmental justice. San Franciscans have successfully fought for the closure of the last fossil fuel-fired power plant in the Bayview, the remediation and reconstruction of unsafe public housing facilities, funding for additional community facilities and infrastructure in EJ Communities, and stronger laws to mitigate pollution from new construction. Still, many environmental health challenges remain unresolved.

---

This Environmental Justice Framework (“EJ Framework”) acknowledges that local government has a critical role to play in working with communities to redress environmental injustices and move towards an equitable future. It leverages the City’s prior work to address environmental justice and identifies additional priorities for the City, based on collaboration with and feedback from community members. It is meant to guide decisionmakers and identify additional policy areas that will be incorporated throughout the San Francisco General Plan, in accordance with California Senate Bill 1000 (2016). The EJ Framework is also intended to align with the City’s work to advance racial and social equity, as directed by the Office of Racial Equity and resolutions by the Planning Commission and Historic Preservation Commission directing the Planning Department to center its work on racial and social equity.

The Planning for Healthy Communities Act (SB 1000)

California Senate Bill 1000 (SB 1000; “The Planning for Healthy Communities Act”) was authored by Senator Connie Leyva and co-sponsored by the California Environmental Justice Alliance (CEJA) and the Center for Community Action and Environmental Justice (CCAEJ) in 2016. It requires cities and counties to either adopt an Environmental Justice Element or integrate policies, objectives, and goals to address environmental justice throughout other elements of their General Plan. These policies must reduce the “unique or compounded health risks” in the communities most impacted by environmental justice, spanning topics that include (but are not limited to) air quality, public facilities, food access, safe and sanitary homes, and physical activity.

---

6 There have been numerous efforts throughout City agencies to address environmental justice. To name a few, the Department of Public Health, Department of the Environment, and the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission have been leaders in developing policies and programs that reduce environmental pollution and advance healthy communities.

7 City and County of San Francisco. Racial Equity Ordinance (Ordinance No. 188-19). August 9, 2019.

II. What Is Environmental Justice?

In state and federal law, environmental justice is defined as the “fair treatment of people of all races, cultures, and incomes with respect to the development, adoption, implementation, and enforcement of environmental laws, regulations, and policies.” For purposes of this EJ Framework, the City defines environmental justice as follows:

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.

The EJ Framework has been guided by data analysis on environmental, economic, and health disparities, resulting in the development of an Environmental Justice Communities Map (“EJ Communities Map”; Figure 1). The EJ Communities Map depicts a gradient of pollution exposure and social vulnerability in San Francisco. It builds upon CalEnviroScreen, a map produced by the California Environmental Protection Agency (CalEPA) and California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA) and is refined with additional local data sources. The areas in red are deemed Environmental Justice Communities, representing the top 30% of cumulative environmental hazards in the City. EJ Communities are often (though not exclusively) low-income communities and communities of color. These areas fall primarily along the southern and eastern areas of San Francisco and include:

---

9 California Code, Government Code § 65040.12, subd. (e).
10 This definition acknowledges the responsibility of government to partner with community to foster environmental justice, and it was informed by a literature review and feedback from community leaders. It also builds upon the decades-long efforts of environmental justice advocates (including the Environmental Justice Principles and the Jemez Principles of Democratic Organizing, which both grew out of the First People of Color Environmental Leadership Summit in 1991).
11 California Environmental Protection Agency and Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment. California Communities Environmental Health Screening Tool (CalEnviroScreen). Last accessed November 2022: https://oehha.ca.gov/calenviroscreen/about-calenviroscreen
12 The San Francisco Environmental Justice Communities Map includes four main layers of data: CalEnviroScreen from CalEPA and OEHHA; state income limits from California Department of Housing and Community Development; Air Pollution Exposure Zone from San Francisco Department of Public Health; and Areas of Vulnerability analysis from SFDPH. The methodology follows the 2020 State General Plan Guidelines published by the California Office of Planning and Research, “Chapter 4: Required Elements.”
neighborhoods such as Bayview Hunters Point, SoMa, Treasure Island, Mission, Tenderloin, Visitacion Valley, Chinatown, and Potrero Hill, among others.\textsuperscript{13}

State guidance on SB 1000 calls for cities to convene a process for communities to become meaningfully involved in the decision-making processes governing land use planning in their neighborhoods. In this spirit, the EJ Framework has been developed in collaboration with community leaders, residents, and workers in the EJ Communities. The EJ Framework and EJ Communities Map received input and support through a range of engagement activities seeking to amplify the voices of community members—including a virtual open house, focus groups, youth engagement, and an Environmental Justice Working Group comprised of leaders from community-based organizations and City agencies. In particular, the Environmental Justice Working Group developed policy recommendations through a consensus-building process, which guided the development of the EJ Framework.\textsuperscript{14}

What is the San Francisco Environmental Justice Framework?

This EJ Framework is part of \textit{Introduction to the San Francisco General Plan} and provides guidance to City agencies on how they can address environmental justice in their work. It describes policy priorities to advance health in the \textbf{Environmental Justice Communities}—communities of color and lower-income communities that face higher pollution and other health risks—co-created with community members and organizations working in these areas. These priorities will be further developed into goals, objectives, and policies incorporated throughout the General Plan Elements. The first set of environmental justice policies are incorporated in the Safety and Resilience Element (adopted in 2022) and the Housing Element (adopted in 2023). Subsequent updates are planned for the Transportation Element (anticipated adoption in 2025) and other General Plan Amendments.

The San Francisco General Plan is a citywide document that enshrines the City’s vision for the future and guides our evolution and growth over time. Placing the EJ Framework within the Introduction serves to establish environmental justice and racial equity as foundational City goals that policymakers

\textsuperscript{13} For more information on the San Francisco Environmental Justice Communities Map, see: \url{https://sfplanning.org/project/environmental-justice-framework-and-general-plan-policies#ej-communities}

and City agencies should proactively address. Subsequent efforts should ensure that the EJ Communities are prioritized for specific policies and resources that can help redress historic injustices and meaningfully improve economic, health, and other outcomes.

**Figure 1. Environmental Justice Communities Map**

Source: SF Planning, 2023
III. Environmental Justice Priorities

The EJ Framework outlines a set of visions and priorities across a range of policy topics critical to advancing environmental justice in the City. For each topic, the vision statement describes bold, aspirational outcomes that serve as a guidepost for implementation and enforcement. The priorities describe major activities the City can undertake to address environmental justice. Although many of these policy ideas could apply citywide, the EJ Framework is centered on priorities that people living and working in EJ Communities identified as critical to improving health in their neighborhoods. The EJ Framework guides all aspects of the General Plan, including the Elements, Area Plans, and Land Use Index.

The visions and priorities are organized in these six policy topics, adapted from SB 1000:

- Healthy and Resilient Environments
- Physical Activity and Healthy Public Facilities
- Healthy Food Access
- Safe, Healthy, and Affordable Homes
- Equitable and Green Jobs
- Empowered Neighborhoods
Healthy & Resilient Environments

WHY IT MATTERS
San Francisco has a long history of policy and land use decisions that have disproportionately exposed communities to environmental pollutants that impact quality of life and often result in adverse health outcomes, such as increased rates of asthma, heart disease, and other chronic illnesses. For example, residents in Bayview Hunter’s Point grapple with the impacts of industrial contamination at the Hunter’s Point Shipyard, air pollution from the U.S. Highway 101 and Interstate 280 freeways, and other environmental violations. The impacts of the climate crisis, which include poor and hazardous air quality, extreme weather events, and sea level rise, are predicted to exacerbate these health disparities.

VISION
We envision a City where everyone lives and works in a healthy and resilient environment. This means limiting exposure to pollution harmful to human health from both acute (e.g., toxic materials from an individual business) and widespread sources (e.g., air pollution from freeways). The City would be resilient to the climate crisis and other hazards, such as earthquakes, extreme heat, inland flooding, sea level rise, and poor air quality. Mitigation and adaptation strategies would prioritize communities that have historically faced disproportionate exposure to environmental burdens, and our most vulnerable communities at risk of health consequences and safety hazards, such as youth, seniors, and people with disabilities.

PRIORITIES

| Limit and protect against pollution exposure | Protect communities from all sources of pollution, including air, soil, water, and noise pollution. Limit exposure from temporary sources of pollution (for example, construction activities), ongoing sources (for example, freeways and polluting businesses), as well as future risks (for example, accidental release of hazardous materials). |
| Prepare for seismic hazards, other natural disasters, and the climate crisis | Implement hazard and climate mitigation and adaptation measures to prepare the City for the climate crisis and protect those who are most vulnerable. Build robust partnerships between the City, communities, and other groups to ensure adequate capacity for emergency preparedness in the event of a disaster (for example, disaster supplies, lifeline supplies, and neighborhood activation). |
Expand nature-based solutions, green infrastructure, & urban greening

Restore natural habitats and the ecological function of the City by developing neighborhood-specific targets and stewardship programs for watersheds, tree canopy cover, green infrastructure, urban greening, and other biodiversity targets. Align these mitigation and adaptation measures to protect areas of high climate vulnerability.

Invest in resilient public utility systems and affirm access to water, power, and sanitation as a human right

Ensure that all residents and workers have access to safe, clean, affordable, accessible, and low-carbon sources of clean drinking water, electricity, wastewater services, broadband internet, and other utilities. Invest resources and promote actions that support the human right to water, power, and sanitation, particularly low-income households and people experiencing homelessness.

Ensure public access to data & information

Provide public access to reliable and up-to-date information on neighborhood environmental conditions, climate vulnerabilities, and public health concerns. Include references to government sources and community-led studies and programs.

Empower community planning for climate resilience and justice

Build community-based planning processes for San Franciscans to engage in local decision-making on healthy and resilient environments, including neighborhood investments, emergency resources, and other community needs.

Example Strategies

The following strategies are examples of successful work being done in the community related to environmental justice. They include City-led initiatives, community-led initiatives, and partnerships between the City and community.

- CleanPowerSF (SFPUC)
- Hazards and Climate Resilience Plan (ORCP)
- Heat and Air Quality Resilience Project (ORCP)
- Islais Creek Southeast Mobility and Adaptation Strategy (SF Planning, SFMTA, and Port of San Francisco)
- San Francisco Climate Action Plan (Mayor’s Office, SF Environment)
- San Francisco Urban Forest Plan (Public Works, Urban Forest Council, and Friends of the Urban Forest)
- Urban Risk Lab (Neighborhood Empowerment Network)
- Waterfront Resilience Program (Port of San Francisco)
Physical Activity & Healthy Public Facilities

WHY IT MATTERS
The health benefits of daily physical activity are well-documented. Throughout the public engagement process, EJ Communities expressed the need for improved access to parks, recreation centers, and other community facilities; programming that better suits the needs of their families and communities; and other opportunities to engage in daily physical activity. Similarly, residents and workers described barriers to traveling on city streets by foot, bike, and transit, with a high number of fatalities and severe injuries concentrated on streets in EJ communities. This further limits people’s ability to get around safely and discourages many from incorporating physical activity into their daily routine.

VISION
We envision a City where everyone can access healthy public facilities and engage in regular physical activity. This means that public facilities—such as community centers, libraries, parks and recreation facilities, schools, and hospitals—are situated, designed, staffed, and programmed to ensure equitable access and safety for all. These public facilities and the transportation network that connects them to the community should facilitate active and low-carbon transportation modes, such as walking, cycling, and public transit. Regular physical activity is critical for physical and mental well-being, helping reduce stress, anxiety, and depression and helping prevent certain chronic health conditions.

PRIORITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distribute public facilities equitably</th>
<th>Evaluate the need for community facilities in EJ Communities and add new or expand existing facilities as needed.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ensure public facilities are accessible and safe for all</td>
<td>Ensure that all public facilities are safe, clean, and inviting and offer safe and convenient access for people of all ages, abilities, and identities, including individuals and families experiencing homelessness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offer diverse, flexible, and inclusive programming in public facilities</td>
<td>Expand program offerings at public facilities to meet dynamic and evolving community needs. Partner with the community to ensure that programming is culturally appropriate and inclusive. Offer a range of opportunities for people of all ages, abilities, and cultures to participate in public programs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Support environmental education programs
Expand programs providing opportunities to engage with the natural world, such as community gardens, nature walks, environmental education, and other environmental programming offered in parks and public open spaces.

Ensure robust transportation connectivity
Protect, maintain, and invest in transportation infrastructure and services that offer accessible, interconnected, and affordable mobility options, including streets, sidewalks, active transportation, and transit. Improve transportation network connectivity where gaps exist due to freeways, rail lines, and other transportation infrastructure (such as at underpasses and overpasses).

Ensure streets and transit are accessible and safe for all
Ensure that streets and transit are accessible, safe, convenient, and supportive of active transportation modes such as walking and cycling. Prioritize investments in communities that have experienced disconnection and disinvestment from past transportation planning. Prioritize street improvements aligned with the City’s Vision Zero Strategy, which aims to eliminate traffic fatalities.

Example Strategies
The following strategies are examples of successful work being done in the community related to environmental justice. They include City-led initiatives, community-led initiatives, and partnerships between the City and community.

- Equity Zones (SF Recreation and Parks)
- Green Infrastructure Grant program (SFPUC)
- Green Schoolyards Program (San Francisco Unified School District)
- Muni Service Equity Strategy (SFMTA)
- Safe Routes to School (SFMTA)
- San Francisco Green Connections (multiple City agencies)
- Southeast Community Center (SFPUC)
- Vision Zero SF (SFMTA)
Healthy Food Access

WHY IT MATTERS

One in four San Francisco residents is at high risk of food insecurity due to low income, and there are significant disparities in accessing healthy food that is affordable and culturally appropriate. Being food insecure is associated with lowered life expectancy and a range of chronic health conditions, it and can be especially harmful to the health of children and seniors, people who are pregnant, people experiencing homelessness, and people with preexisting health conditions.

VISION

We envision a City where everyone has easy and secure access to healthy, affordable food that suits their needs and dietary preferences, and supports their cultural identity. Food is healthy when it promotes a healthy environment and the well-being of everyone involved in its production, processing, distribution, consumption, and disposal.

PRIORITIES

Affirm healthy food as a human right

Expand programs that ensure access to healthy and culturally appropriate food, particularly for fixed income, low-income, and food-insecure individuals, such as Market Match programs, free school meals, healthy corner stores, food recovery, and urban agriculture programs.

Empower workers and community members

Consult with workers and community members to create local food assistance programs, workforce development programs, and other programs that facilitate access to healthy food and create living-wage jobs.

Leverage the food system as a means of strengthening communities

Consider the potential benefits of a local food system for workforce development, economic resilience, sustainable land use, and improved public health outcomes in City plans and programs.

Foster climate resilience and innovation in the food system

Facilitate local and regional food production (such as community gardens, rooftop and vertical gardens, and cottage industries), incorporate climate resilience throughout the local supply chain (such as net-zero emissions food distribution and infrastructure investments), and support youth training and workforce development in healthy food-related skills and industries.
Increase nature-based food opportunities

Affirm Traditional Ecological Knowledge\(^\text{15}\) and nature-based food practices. Support nature-based and culturally appropriate access to public land and open space for foraging, gathering, cultivating, fishing, and hunting\(^\text{16}\) of food as well as conducting other nature-based cultural practices.

Example Strategies

The following strategies are examples of successful work being done in the community related to environmental justice. They include City-led initiatives, community-led initiatives, and partnerships between the City and community.

- **Urban Agriculture Program** (SF Recreation and Parks)
- **Free and Reduced School Meals Program** (San Francisco Unified School District)
- **Food Recovery Program** (The SF Market)

---

15 According to the National Park Service, Traditional Ecological Knowledge (TEK) is “…the on-going accumulation of knowledge, practice and belief about relationships between living beings in a specific ecosystem that is acquired by indigenous people over hundreds or thousands of years through direct contact with the environment, handed down through generations, and used for life-sustaining ways.” (Source: National Park Service (2020). “Overview of TEK.” Accessed January 5, 2023 at: https://www.nps.gov/subjects/tek/description.htm)

16 There are currently no designated areas within the boundaries of the City and County of San Francisco for hunting. However, this policy priority reflects feedback from the American Indian community to have opportunities for practicing their food cultures. This policy priority supports regional opportunities for hunting.
Safe, Healthy, & Affordable Homes

WHY IT MATTERS
Access to safe, healthy, and affordable homes is a basic human right, and it is integral to one’s health and economic security. The soaring cost of housing in San Francisco has further magnified racial and social disparities and has led to the decline in population of people of color (specifically American Indian, Black, and Japanese residents) and to the increase in the number of unhoused and housing-insecure individuals. Additionally, many vulnerable low-income and people of color residents find themselves living in increasingly unhealthy and precarious living conditions (e.g., poor indoor air quality, overcrowding, lack of heating or clean water). The trauma of housing displacement and housing insecurity impacts health, education, and employment outcomes that can affect people throughout their lives, as well as that of future generations.

VISION
Every person in San Francisco has the right to a safe, healthy, and affordable home, regardless of race or ethnicity, national origin, immigration status, disability, sexual orientation, or language spoken. Residents should be free to live in peace without worry of unsafe living conditions, harassment, or threat of eviction by landlords. Healthy homes should be built using non-toxic building materials and have easy access to public facilities, parks, public transportation, and healthy food options.

PRIORITIES
- **Work to undo past harms**
  Work to repair past injustices and stop or reverse the population decline of American Indian, Black, Japanese, other people of color, and other communities that have experienced displacement.

- **Build accountability & oversight in the housing systems**
  Increase accountability and public participation in the development and implementation of housing programs, particularly for groups representing American Indian, Black, other people of color, and other disadvantaged communities.

- **Address housing affordability & availability**
  Increase funding for affordable housing development, stabilization, and site acquisition at the scale needed to ensure full affordability for all those whose incomes prevent them from accessing stable housing. Explore models such as community land trusts, affordable ADUs, affordable homeownership, and
other ways for low- and moderate-income residents to build equity through housing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Protect vulnerable tenants</th>
<th>Prioritize support for vulnerable renters, including expanded access to affordable rental and ownership units, culturally competent housing outreach and education programs, and protections against involuntary displacement.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expand housing choices citywide</td>
<td>Expand affordable housing in San Francisco’s higher income neighborhoods, such as the western and northern areas of the City, enabling more residents to benefit from greater access to public and active transportation, educational opportunities, community facilities, retail, and other services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure that housing supports public health</td>
<td>Ensure that existing and new developments include features that contribute to physical and mental health, such as open spaces, communal areas, and recreation amenities. Work to, stabilize, preserve, and upgrade existing housing stock to address unhealthy living conditions. Eliminate the use of toxic materials and ensure that housing built on environmentally contaminated land undergoes strict procedures for remediation, community engagement, and reporting.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Example Strategies**

The following strategies are examples of successful work being done in the community related to environmental justice. They include City-led initiatives, community-led initiatives, and partnerships between the City and community.

- Child Lead Poisoning Prevention Program (SFDPH)
- Advocacy for increased local, regional, state, and federal funding for affordable housing
- Acquisition and rehabilitation programs to stabilize tenants in existing affordable housing (such as MOHCD’s Small Sites program)
- Increased funding and enforcement to protect vulnerable tenants from the threat of displacement
- Programs targeting residents displaced by urban renewal and their descendants (such as Certificates of Preference)
Equitable & Green Jobs

WHY IT MATTERS

As it becomes increasingly expensive to live in San Francisco, there is a growing need to ensure that the City offers a diversity of jobs that provide living wages and opportunities for workforce training, and career growth. San Francisco has the second highest income inequality in the Bay Area, with significant disparities in income and workforce participation. There is significant opportunity to remedy the underrepresentation of Environmental Justice Communities in well-paying vocations and careers. To address income disparities and unemployment rates, the City can support and advance policies that ensure living wages, offer quality benefits (e.g., sick leave, health care, retirement), promote dignified labor, expand career advancement opportunities, and generate social and economic benefits to the community.

VISION

We envision a City with an abundant network of jobs and workforce opportunities that contribute to the development of healthy communities. All jobs in San Francisco would provide living wages and benefits, value workers’ physical and mental health, and offer workforce training and professional development opportunities. This network of jobs and workforce opportunities would include, but is not limited to, established and emerging industries contributing to public health and environmental sustainability such as healthcare, renewable energy, environmental remediation, and other related fields.

PRIORITIES

Provide living wages for all

Ensure that low-income people and people of color communities have access to jobs that pay a living wage and provide workforce training and professional advancement opportunities.

Foster a robust network of work & entrepreneurship

Dedicate City resources to building jobs and workforce opportunities, providing training and mentorship, and advancing emerging trades and industries that contribute to healthy communities. Offer tools, resources, and networks that provide workforce training, apprenticeships, mentorship,

---

career development, management opportunities, and facilitate business ownership.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Promote pathways for workers’ empowerment and self-determination</strong></th>
<th>Create employment pathways along the jobs pipeline that enable youth, seniors, returning citizens, and other underrepresented groups to participate in equitable and green jobs of their choosing. Protect and strengthen organized labor and other types of business ownership, such as worker-owned cooperatives.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| **Facilitate the just transition of the city’s economy and workforce** | Incorporate environmental justice as a pillar of the City’s economic future, particularly through local and small business development. A fair and just transition would ensure the City’s job opportunities and economy prioritize and uphold sustainability principles, as well as secure workers’ rights and contribute to their health. |

---

18 The term “returning citizens” is an alternative to more stigmatized terms for individuals returning home after being in incarceration (e.g., ex-con, ex-felon). For more, see: [https://unitedreturningcitizens.org/what-is-a-returning-citizen/](https://unitedreturningcitizens.org/what-is-a-returning-citizen/)

19 “Just Transition is a vision-led, unifying and place-based set of principles, processes, and practices that build economic and political power to shift from an extractive economy to a regenerative economy. This means approaching production and consumption cycles holistically and waste-free. The transition itself must be just and equitable; redressing past harms and creating new relationships of power for the future through reparations.” – Climate Justice Alliance. For more, see: [https://climatejusticealliance.org/just-transition](https://climatejusticealliance.org/just-transition)
### Example Strategies

The following strategies are examples of successful work being done in the community related to environmental justice. They include City-led initiatives, community-led initiatives, and partnerships between the City and community.

- **CityBuild** (OEWD)
- **CityDrive Program** (OEWD)
- **Gardener Apprentice Program** (SF Recreation and Parks)
- **Green Construction Training** (Success Centers)
- **Greenager Program** (SF Recreation and Parks)
- **HealthCare Academy** (OEWD)
- **Kitchen Incubator Program** (La Cocina)
- **Local Business Enterprise Ordinance** (CMD)
- **Youth Stewardship Program** (SF Recreation and Parks)
- **Apprenticeship programs in cement masonry, horticulture, and environmental services** (Public Works)
- **Construction pre-apprenticeship training program in Tuolumne County** (SFPUC)
- **Work-based learning opportunities for SFUSD students** (SFPUC)
Empowered Neighborhoods

WHY IT MATTERS

Despite San Francisco’s longstanding legacy as an incubator of community-led activism and its rich tapestry of civic organizations, the City continues to receive feedback that people feel unheard, particularly when it comes to decisions that impact historically under-resourced communities. The City’s complex public decision-making processes can make it difficult and time-consuming for many people to participate in processes that stand to directly impact them. Even when people can participate, there is often deep-seated skepticism about whether their feedback will be incorporated.

VISION

We envision San Francisco residents, business owners, and community organizations working across neighborhood boundaries and collaborating with elected officials and City departments to inform and impact decision-making processes. Empowered neighborhoods prioritize community cohesion, hold their City officials accountable, and are provided with resources to enable change within their communities. Empowered neighborhoods move beyond transactional relationships with City government by working together to actively define and facilitate equitable and just outcomes.

PRIORITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prioritize participation of EJ Communities in decision-making processes</th>
<th>Seek and devote resources to engaging meaningful, ongoing participation and community involvement in decisions that are most likely to impact EJ Communities.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Build capacity for diverse voices to engage</td>
<td>Establish orientation materials, trainings, and capacity-building opportunities for community members to fully participate in decision-making processes. Ensure these opportunities prioritize communities that have been historically excluded from and disenfranchised by policymaking processes, particularly American Indian, Black, Latinx, other communities of color, and other vulnerable groups. Increase participation accessibility for those who may experience barriers to participation (such as youth, seniors, people with disabilities, LGBTQ+, transgender, transitional-aged youth, etc.) Establish fair and accountable processes to compensate community members for their time and effort.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Center environmental justice efforts in collaboration with American Indian communities and Traditional Ecological Knowledge

As First Peoples, American Indians have an inherent relationship with the land as traditional stewards, and a unique understanding of natural environments that predates modern science. Future initiatives should include intensive collaboration with American Indian tribes throughout the scoping, development, adoption, and implementation processes.

Foster a culture of transparency and communication

Develop a culture of transparency through proactive and accessible public notice, communication, and engagement from the City regarding projects that would impact EJ Communities.

Develop community partnerships to expand city’s reach

Support opportunities for peer knowledge-sharing and collaborative partnerships between communities and the City. Partner with the San Francisco Cultural Districts and other community institutions to expand outreach and communication between the City and EJ Communities.

Address community safety

Work collaboratively with communities to address public safety, as it is a public health challenge and major impediment to community cohesion and participation.

Example Strategies

The following strategies are examples of successful work being done in the community related to environmental justice. They include City-led initiatives, community-led initiatives, and partnerships between the City and community.

- Environmental Justice Grant Program (SF Environment)
- Racial & Social Equity Action Plans (all City departments)
- San Francisco Cultural Districts Program
- Community Advisory Committees and other advisory groups

20 According to the National Park Service, Traditional Ecological Knowledge (TEK) is “…the on-going accumulation of knowledge, practice and belief about relationships between living beings in a specific ecosystem that is acquired by indigenous people over hundreds or thousands of years through direct contact with the environment, handed down through generations, and used for life-sustaining ways.” (Source: https://www.nps.gov/subjects/tek/description.htm)
EXHIBIT B:
ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE
COMMUNITIES MAP: TECHNICAL DOCUMENTATION
SAN FRANCISCO ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE COMMUNITIES MAP: TECHNICAL DOCUMENTATION

Background

California Senate Bill 1000 (“SB 1000”) requires jurisdictions that have Disadvantaged Communities (DACs) to incorporate environmental justice into their general plans upon the next revision to two or more elements. SB 1000 cites CalEnviroScreen, a statewide mapping tool from California Protection Agency (CalEPA) and Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA), to identify DACs. Using 20 pollution, health, and socioeconomic indicators, CalEnviroScreen identifies the top 25% of census tracts in the state as DACs. DACs are used to administer grant funding from the State’s Cap-and-Trade Program, prioritize toxic site cleanup, and promote sustainable economic development. In San Francisco, portions of Bayview Hunters Point, SoMa, Treasure Island, and Tenderloin are identified as DACs. A common critique of CalEnviroScreen among San Francisco environmental justice advocates and City agencies is that several other neighborhoods with health and environmental challenges do not meet the criteria to be considered disadvantaged.

In compliance with SB 1000 and guidance from the Governor’s Office of Planning and Research (OPR), the San Francisco Planning Department (“Department”) chose to conduct additional analysis to better understand environmental justice in San Francisco. Municipalities are encouraged to define additional areas facing environmental and health challenges in their jurisdiction that should be considered as part of General Plan policies to address environmental justice.²

The Department has developed the Environmental Justice Communities Map (“EJ Communities Map”) to identify areas in the City that face disproportionate burden of environmental health challenges, informed by state and local data. The EJ Communities Map is included in the Environmental Justice Framework (“EJ Framework”), a set of visions and priorities to ensure all residents and workers live in and enjoy healthy, clean

---

¹ Disadvantaged Communities” means an area defined by the California Environmental Protection Agency. These areas are pursuant Health and Safety Code §39711 OR areas that are low-income and disproportionately affected by environmental pollution and other hazards that can lead to negative health effects, exposure, or environmental degradation (Government Code §65302(h)(4)(A)). The statute further defines “low-income area” to mean “an area with household incomes at or below 80 percent of the statewide median income OR with household incomes at or below the threshold designated as low income by the Department of Housing and Community Development’s list of state income limits adopted pursuant to §50093” (Government Code §65302(h)(4)(C)).

² Although communities are encouraged to conduct analysis and define additional areas facing environmental and health challenges, this analysis would only apply to local policymaking. CalEnviroScreen will continue to be the official map for state policies and programs.
environments. The EJ Framework is meant to highlight policy priorities that can explicitly improve health in EJ Communities.

Methodology

OPR published guidelines to encourage municipalities to incorporate local data on pollution burden and health risk factors in their analysis of DACs in their own jurisdictions (Figure 1).

Figure 1. OPR’s Recommended Screening Process for Identifying Additional Disadvantaged Communities

Goals of San Francisco’s EJ Communities Map:

The Department had several goals in developing the EJ Communities Map:

- Use local data to show additional areas that are lower-income and face high pollution and other health challenges
- Create a map that better aligns with maps by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission, San Francisco Department of Public Health, San Francisco Recreation & Parks, and other local agencies
- Designate areas where policies and resources could be directed to promote community health
- Develop an analysis that could be easily replicated in the future
- Reflect community feedback on areas of high need

The Department considered over 100 data sets and indicator maps for inclusion in the EJ Communities Map. This included maps that provide an index or composite of other data, such as the Communities of Concern Map (San Francisco County Transportation Authority) and the Community Vulnerability Map (Bay Conservation and

---

3 The EJ Framework outlines key environmental justice priorities that City policymakers should work to address. It is a state-mandated component of the General Plan, and it includes a set of visions and priorities in strong alignment with citywide racial and social equity goals. For more information: https://sfplanning.org/project/environmental-justice-framework-and-general-plan-policies#engagement

Development Commission), as well as individual datasets on related topics (e.g., housing, transportation, and climate).

After thorough review of data applicability, the Department used the following data sets for the EJ Communities Map:

**Table 1. EJ Communities Map Datasets & Weights**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dataset and Weight</th>
<th>Indicator(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| CalEnviroScreen 4.0 – 60% Source: CalEPA, OEHHA | Pollution exposure:  
- Ozone  
- PM2.5  
- Diesel particulate matter  
- Pesticide use  
- Toxic release from facilities  
- Cleanup sites  
- Hazardous waste generators and facilities  
- Solid waste sites and facilities  
- Drinking water contaminants  
- Traffic density  

Population characteristics:  
- Educational attainment  
- Linguistic isolation  
- Poverty  
- Unemployment  
- Housing burdened low-income household  
- Asthma  
- Cardiovascular disease  
- Low birthweight infants |
| State Housing Income Limits: median household income – 10% Source: CA HCD | Median HH income below $69,600 (San Francisco threshold for very low-income, two-person household) |
### Areas of Vulnerability (AOV) – 10%
Source: SF DPH

- Poverty
- Persons of color
- Youth
- Seniors
- Unemployment
- High school or less
- Limited English proficiency persons
- Linguistically isolated households
- Disability

### Air Pollution Exposure Zone (APEZ) – 20%
SFDPH, SF Planning

Data included: PM2.5 concentrations greater than 10μg/m3 (including ambient levels)

---

**Raster Analysis & Symbology**

The EJ Communities Map was developed by conducting a raster analysis in ArcGIS that combined multiple layers of data into a final raster map. A raster analysis is a type of spatial and quantitative analysis that places two or more thematic maps on top of one another to form a new map.

In a raster analysis, geographic areas are broken up into individual cells or pixels, and each cell is assigned a numerical value. For the EJ Communities Map, these values are computed as a weighted average of the underlying datasets, as indicated in Table 1. For instance, CalEnviroScreen 4.0 is the most heavily weighted dataset at 60%. (Or put another way, 60% of the final map is a result of this dataset.)

To display the final map, the Department grouped the raster analysis results into categories and assigned a color ramp that was modeled on CalEnviroScreen 4.0 (with green indicating the lowest cumulative environmental burden, and red indicating the highest environmental burden). The final symbology of the map reflects 30 classes, grouped into seven categories, arranged from least to highest cumulative environmental burden (Figure 2).
The colors used for symbolizing the values are meant to be very similar with the colors used in CalEnviroScreen 4.0 to identify the tracts with the lowest scores (green and yellow colors) and highest scores (orange and red colors) of environmental burden. The values between 21 and 30 represent the top 30% of burdened areas and are deemed Environmental Justice Communities. In other words, these are the areas with the highest cumulative environmental burdens. These areas are symbolized with the red color.

The value 999 represents the major parks and industrial areas in San Francisco. This is Golden Gate Park, Lincoln Park, McLaren Park, and the industrial area around Islais Creek. These areas are symbolized with the grey color.

Please note that there is missing data for the census tract around Islais Creek. The statewide data set, CalEnviroScreen 4.0, excludes this tract, due to the small population size, even though the area is known to contain multiple sources of pollution (which is also reflected in CalEnviroScreen’s underlying datasets). Therefore, the Department decided to symbolize this area with a red and grey hatching pattern to reflect the high environmental burdens in this area.

- Dark Green (least environmental burden): 0, 1, 2, 3
- Medium Green: 4, 5, 6, 7
- Green: 8, 9, 10
- Light Green: 11, 12, 13
- Yellow: 14, 15, 16
- Orange: 17, 18, 19, 20
- Red (top 30% of environmental burden): 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30

**Feedback**

The draft EJ Communities Map was released in December 2020. The map received public feedback for refinement throughout the community engagement process. Overall, the public feedback was positive on the draft map, and it also received positive reception from other City agencies. In particular, the Environmental Justice Working Group appreciated the opportunity to think collectively about neighborhoods that are facing various health and economic challenges.5

---

5 The Environmental Justice Working Group is a group of community and City government leaders who collaborated to co-create policy recommendations for the EJ Framework, identify community needs and assets, and provide feedback on specific needs for its implementation. The Working Group met on a monthly basis from June to January 2022. The Working Group developed a list of policy recommendations for the City to consider as part of the EJ Framework. For more information: [https://sfplanning.org/project/environmental-justice-framework-and-general-plan-policies#engagement](https://sfplanning.org/project/environmental-justice-framework-and-general-plan-policies#engagement)
The Environmental Justice Communities Map (Figure 3) identifies the top 30% of areas experiencing environmental burden in San Francisco. These Environmental Justice Communities include the Mission, Potrero Hill, Excelsior, Outer Mission, Oceanview-Merced Heights-Ingleside, Chinatown, SoMa, Japantown, Western Addition, Bayview Hunter’s Point, Visitacion Valley, Treasure Island, and the Tenderloin. Environmental Justice Communities are often low-income communities and communities of color. As environmental justice is defined by remedying past harms and enabling community-led solutions, it is important to focus policies and resources to these communities, which are often overlooked in local decision-making processes.

For the purposes of the EJ Framework, the City defines environmental justice as follows: 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.
The Department has also prepared versions of the map that are more visualized and for presentation purposes (Appendix A).

**Next Steps and Future Applications**

As the map methodology was designed with easy replicability in mind, the map can be updated whenever any of the four data sets is updated. In practice, the most logical opportunity to update the map would be whenever CalEnviroScreen is updated, which has generally occurred every 2-5 years.

Additionally, the Department created an interactive ArcGIS StoryMap (Data Portal) that allows users to explore other data relevant to environmental justice, such as housing, transportation, climate, public services, etc. The Data Portal also includes excerpts from interviews with residents and workers in EJ Communities.

The primary function of the EJ Communities Map is to guide the San Francisco General Plan. EJ Communities are referenced within General Plan policies, including the Safety & Resilience Element (adopted 2022) and the Housing Element (anticipated adoption 2023). However, the map may be used by a range of City agencies and partners to support programs and policies that can advance environmental justice and equity. For instance:

- The Department is using the map for other processes, including the Budget Equity Assessment Tool, Racial & Social Equity Plan, and the Environmental Justice Analysis of the Housing Element 2022 Update.

- The Department is coordinating with other City agencies who are interested in using the map for similar mapping efforts and programs, including the Equity Zones (Recreation and Parks), Green Infrastructure Grant Program (Public Utilities Commission), Waterfront Resilience Program (SF Port) and others.
EXHIBIT C:

OUTREACH AND ENGAGEMENT
SUMMARY FOR THE ENVIRONMENTAL
JUSTICE FRAMEWORK
SAN FRANCISCO ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE FRAMEWORK: OUTREACH & ENGAGEMENT SUMMARY

Project Background

The Environmental Justice Framework outlines a set of visions and priorities for advancing environmental justice in the City. The Environmental Justice Framework contributes to citywide work to ensure all residents and workers live in and enjoy healthy, clean environments. It will be incorporated by reference in the General Plan Introduction to ensure that environmental justice is integrated throughout the General Plan, in strong alignment with citywide racial and social equity goals. Additionally, there will be associated environmental justice policies adopted into subsequent General Plan Element updates. The Environmental Justice Framework represents the first citywide policy focused on advance environmental justice across all City agencies. 1

The Environmental Justice Framework fulfills the City’s obligations under Senate Bill 1000 (“SB 1000”), 2 and is the result of a multi-year, cooperative, public and interagency planning process that began in Fall 2020. Although the General Plan is a citywide document, outreach and engagement was centered on the neighborhoods identified in the Environmental Justice Communities Map (Figure 1), which are often low-income communities and communities of color. The activities were designed to hear from residents, workers, and community-based organizations about their needs and identify solutions for environmental justice in their neighborhoods.

Additionally, the Environmental Justice aligns with concurrent efforts to modernize the City’s General Plan: the Safety & Resilience Element (adopted 2023), the Housing Element (anticipated adoption 2023), the Transportation Element (anticipated adoption 2025), and the General Plan Introduction (anticipated adoption 2023). With these updates underway, it was an important consideration to present outreach and engagement opportunities cohesively to the public. The project team was conscientious of the challenge drawing attention to

1 The Environmental Justice Framework in the San Francisco General Plan represents the first citywide policy focused on advancing environmental justice across all City agencies. In 2009, the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission was the first City department, and utility in the country, to adopt an Environmental Justice Policy. (SFPUC Commission Resolution No. 09-0170, 13 October 2009). For more, see: Environmental Justice Policy (sfpec.org)

2 California Senate Bill 1000 (“SB 1000”): The Planning for Healthy Communities Act (Leyva, 2016) requires jurisdictions that have Disadvantaged Communities (DACs) to incorporate environmental justice into their general plans upon the next revision to two or more elements. The environmental justice policies are required to reduce the “unique or compounded health risks” in DACs by: reducing pollution exposure, including the improvement of air quality; promoting civic engagement in the public decision-making process; and prioritizing improvements and programs that address the needs of DACs. In San Francisco, the updates to the Safety & Resilience Element (adopted 2022) and the Housing Element (anticipated adoption 2023) trigger the need for compliance with SB 1000. The EJ Framework proposes a set of visions and policies in the Introduction to guide further integration of goals, objectives, and policies throughout relevant General Plan Elements.
long-range, comprehensive planning efforts during the COVID-19 pandemic when individuals and families were enduring heightened strain on their basic needs, especially for low-income communities and communities of color.

Figure 1. Environmental Justice Communities Map

Outreach & Engagement Goals

SB 1000 encouraged this process to promote the community’s participation in local planning and decision-making, prioritizing their needs in improvements and programs to reduce “unique or compounded health risks.” To that end, the outreach and engagement activities aimed to reach the residents, workers, and community leaders tied to Environmental Justice Communities. The activities were designed to hear direct anecdotes about living and working conditions in the City, environmental justice concerns, and proposed solutions for the City to perform.

Throughout this outreach and engagement process, the work aimed to elevate environmental justice to a citywide dialogue, across neighborhood boundaries, and build upon the City’s prior environmental justice work led by other agencies (e.g., SFDPH, SF Environment, and SF PUC). The project team aimed for all the input gathered to shape the City’s future environmental justice work. In addition to supporting the development of the
Environmental Justice Framework and subsequent General Plan Amendments, the project team aims to steward specific, detailed feedback related to programs and projects in the community with partner City agencies.

The COVID-19 pandemic made outreach and engagement activities particularly challenging, and so nearly all activities were conducted virtually. Given the challenges of conducting virtual outreach, the outreach and engagement strategy focused on partnering with community-based organizations that have existing connections with people living and working in Environmental Justice Communities. Lastly, the activities were mindful of participation fatigue and provided compensation to partners and participants for their input and emotional labor, when possible.

The key group targeted during outreach and engagement were Environmental Justice Communities. The Environmental Justice Communities Map identifies the top 30% of areas experiencing environmental burden in San Francisco. These Environmental Justice Communities include the Mission, Potrero Hill, Excelsior, Outer Mission, Oceanview-Merced Heights-Ingleside, Chinatown, SoMa, Japantown, Western Addition, Bayview Hunter’s Point, Visitacion Valley, Treasure Island, and the Tenderloin. Environmental Justice Communities are often low-income communities and communities of color. As environmental justice is defined by remedying past harms and enabling community-led solutions, it was important to focus outreach and engagement to communities that are often overlooked in local decision-making processes that directly impact their livelihoods.

### Outreach & Engagement Summary

The outreach and engagement process began in Fall 2020 and ended in Fall 2022, lasting over two years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall 2020-Spring 2021</th>
<th>Youth Engagement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Youth Engagement</strong></td>
<td><em>In partnership with: Malcolm X Academy, Balboa High School, and San Francisco State University</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2021</td>
<td>General Plan Virtual Events and General Plan Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer 2021</td>
<td>Key Stakeholder Interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer 2021-Winter 2022</td>
<td>Environmental Justice Working Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2022</td>
<td>Environmental Justice Focus Groups</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

3 For the purposes of the EJ Framework, the City defines environmental justice as follows: 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.
Youth Engagement

Malcolm X Academy Elementary School

In Fall 2020, the Planning Department partnered with the Y-PLAN (Youth Plan, Learn, Act, Now) program at UC Berkeley’s Center for Cities and Schools and students/faculty at the California College of the Arts (CCA) to co-host a series of educational workshops with Ms. Rebecca Seid’s class of second graders at Malcolm X Academy, a SFUSD elementary school in the Bayview Hunters Point neighborhood. The courses were focused on hearing students’ feedback and recommendations on how we can advance environmental justice in the Bayview community, including the Islais Creek area (which is the subject of ongoing planning efforts at the Planning Department and other City agencies).

The project team and Y-PLAN staff designed the series of four workshops to be conducted remotely given the COVID-19 pandemic, but each student was provided with a kit of materials and printed instructions to allow students to engage in tactile and hands-on activities appropriate to this age group. For each class session, staff from Y-PLAN and/or the Planning Department provided a brief overview presentation describing environmental justice topics and providing instruction on that week’s assignment. Undergraduate architecture students from CCA provided additional support by helping facilitate small group activities, developing supporting graphics to illustrate students’ ideas, and providing opportunities for students to learn about the design industry.

The topics and activities included:
- “Tower of Power” activity: students design and build a sculpture and incorporate adjectives to describe themselves
- What is environmental justice?
- Neighborhood mapping of strengths, challenges, and opportunities in the Bayview
- Brainstorming recommendations for environmental justice
- Final presentation to the school staff and Planning Department
- Final reflection

Given the students’ ages, the potentially sensitive nature of environmental justice topics, and the academic and social upheaval that many youth experienced during pandemic, these sessions employed an asset-based approach that focused on generating positive solutions and building a sense of teamwork between the students and adults. This approach extended to the final presentations, which incorporated elements of comic book storytelling, including having each student introduce themselves as a “superhero” and identify their own strengths.

Generally, the project team heard positive feedback about the experience from the students, school staff, and partners. All the partners acknowledged the challenges of adapting the curriculum to a virtual format, particularly with youth in this age group, and there were several instances where we had to readjust our
approach and recalibrate our expectations of what is possible. Nonetheless, the experience provided a valuable opportunity for youth and adults to collaborate on community-building projects, and for the project team to hear students’ direct experiences with environmental justice.

![Figure 2. Example of a Final Presentation Board by Malcolm X Academy Students](image)

**Balboa High School**

In Spring 2021, the Planning Department partnered with an educator at SFUSD’s Balboa High School (Conrad Benedicto) to develop and implement environmental justice curriculum with one class of juniors (studying U.S. History) and three classes of seniors (studying American Government). For each grade level and class, the Planning Department collaborated to develop four 50-minute educational workshops, designed to augment their academic coursework with real life examples of how the Planning Department develops and implements policies to address environmental justice and equity. For each class session, the project team attended to deliver a short lecture on environmental justice topics and to help facilitate activities in small groups. In between these sessions, Mr. Benedicto developed additional assignments designed to increase students’ understanding of environmental justice and to meet the learning objectives of his classes. Due to the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic, all sessions were conducted virtually as part of students’ regularly scheduled course schedules.

Each series of classes was designed to build towards a final deliverable, which varied depending on grade level. The deliverables and course content were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Final Deliverables</th>
<th>Class Topics</th>
<th>Example Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Juniors    | Environmental Justice Neighborhood Asset Map | • What is Environmental Justice?  
• What are maps and how do we use them to inform policymaking?  
• Digital mapping demo  
• How to conduct interviews | • Hand-drawn neighborhood maps  
• Key stakeholder interviews  
• Developing EJ asset maps on Google Maps |
| (1 classroom, approximately 30 students) |                           |                                                                              |                                                        |
| Seniors    | Design an ordinance to address an environmental justice issue | • What is Environmental Justice?  
• Steps to researching &   | • Create and administer a                                                        |
(3 classrooms, approximately 95 students) | developing policies | survey on EJ topics
---|---|---
- How do policies get adopted in San Francisco?
- How to conduct interviews & surveys
- Key stakeholder interviews
- Researching data to support legislation
- Drafting legislation

In both grade levels, the topics and activities provided an opportunity for students to share honest anecdotes and information about how environmental justice impacts their lives. Many described challenges in accessing public facilities, convenient transportation, safe streets, adequate housing, and healthy food. To keep conversations positive and constructive, we encouraged students to think holistically about the strengths and opportunities for change they see in their neighborhoods, rather than just focus on the challenges.

*Figure 3. EJ Asset Map by Balboa High School Juniors*
In addition to the four course sessions, the project team and Mr. Benedicto co-hosted a final presentation for the students to present their work in front of their peers and adults, including teachers and City staff across several agencies. The presentations provided a powerful opportunity for students to practice public speaking and to express their perspectives and policy recommendations to planners and policymakers.

The project team and Mr. Benedicto also hosted a final reflection session with each class, designed to solicit students’ general feedback on the class sessions, what environmental justice topics are most relevant to them, and highlight any other topics they felt were missing. Students filled out a survey and provided additional feedback through a facilitated discussion using an online Jamboard to collect comments. Feedback on the sessions was generally positive, with many students saying that they appreciated the opportunity to work on real-life policy topics that impact them and their loved ones. Students also reported feeling much more knowledgeable about environmental justice after completing the class series. (90% reported that they feel “very familiar” with environmental justice issues, compared to just 11% before the courses.)

San Francisco State University: Urban Studies Capstone Project
In Spring 2021, the project team worked with a team of four undergraduate students in the urban studies program at San Francisco State University to design and implement an environmental justice data portal using StoryMap, an online mapping platform from ArcGIS. The project was designed to fulfill the students’ undergraduate capstone project requirement, while providing them with a professional development opportunity to design a deliverable for use by agencies and organizations in the planning field.

Over the course of the semester, the students worked with the project team to design and build an interactive Environmental Justice Data Portal on StoryMap that allows users to explore a range of data on environmental justice topics, including information on health indicators, pollution, housing, transportation, and public facilities. The data portal is a valuable tool for public education and policy development, as it allows stakeholders to explore the specific challenges and needs that each EJ community faces. At the conclusion of the Spring 2021 semester, one of the students continued to work on the project with the Planning Department as a summer intern. During this time, the student enriched the data portal further by adding stories and quotes from the Key Stakeholder Interviews with residents and workers in EJ communities (described below). The final EJ Data Portal will be launched and made available to the public in early 2023.

**General Plan Virtual Events and General Plan Survey**

The General Plan Virtual Events were a two-week series of virtual events to coordinate public outreach and engagement across the General Plan. In addition to the General Plan update efforts (Housing Element, Transportation Element, Safety & Resilience Element, and Environmental Justice Framework), the events also included the Racial & Social Equity Action Plan and Recovery Strategies. In sum, there were 17 effort-specific workshops and capacity-building sessions offered in March 2021. The General Plan Virtual Events explored the role of the General Plan and the updates underway, providing an opportunity to share ideas for action that the City could take to achieve an equitable, livable, and sustainable future.

The main goals of the General Plan Virtual Events were to:

- Make participation accessible for community members by offering several virtual event opportunities.
- Gather input by offering more opportunities to influence the Department’s policy and program decisions.
- Engage and build knowledge among San Franciscans, particularly American Indian, Black, and other People of Color on:
  - the role of the General Plan on the social and economic outcomes of our residents;
  - the work of the Planning Department in the context of the General Plan;
  - the importance of environmental justice in advancing racial and social equity; and
  - the Department’s approach to engagement, particularly during the Stay Safe at Home Order.

There were two workshops offered for the Environmental Justice Framework. The workshops were duplicates of each other, offered at different times to increase accessibility, on March 17th and March 25th, 2021. The workshops
garnered 160 registrants and 76 attendees. They were held on Zoom and recorded on YouTube for future reference.

Each workshop included a project overview, panel discussion with City staff from peer agencies with environmental justice programs, and breakout rooms to discuss the Draft Environmental Justice Communities Map. Panelists included Karen Pierce (SFDPH), Edgar Barraza (SFPUC), Sraddha Mehta (SF Environment), and Cyndy Comerford (SF Environment), who were invited to discuss, “What is and should the City be doing to promote environmental justice?” During the breakout rooms, small groups discussed the strengths, opportunities, and challenges of attendees’ neighborhoods and solicited general feedback on the draft Environmental Justice Communities Map.

The General Plan Virtual Events also launched the General Plan Survey, which remained open through August 2021. The survey was offered in English, Spanish, Chinese, and Filipino, all online. Participants had the chance to win one of five $50.00 Visa gift cards through a raffle. The project team asked the following questions:

1. How should the City prioritize the following Environmental Justice topics in order to address health and well-being in the neighborhoods most impacted by pollution and inequities (such as Bayview, Tenderloin, SoMa, Chinatown, Mission, Visitacion Valley, Excelsior, and Potrero Hill)? Rank the topics in order of importance to you, from 1 to 8. [required]

2. Which neighborhood conditions pose the biggest barrier to health, equity and wellbeing, either for you personally or for the community you serve? Select your top 5 choices. [required]

3. Please share any other ideas you have for how the City can address Environmental Justice and Racial & Social Equity in the neighborhoods and populations most impacted by health and structural inequities. (write-in response)

**Key Stakeholder Interviews**

The purpose of the key stakeholder interviews was to gather qualitative information on the experiences with environmental injustices among residents, community leaders, and people who work in the EJ Communities. The project team interviewed residents, workers, and community organizations who live and work in the EJ Communities. First, a group of stakeholder contacts were drafted and a group of open ended questions were formulated. The questions created for these interviews were to identify strengths, challenges, and opportunities for the city to address EJ issues.

In total, 24 stakeholders were interviewed from the EJ Communities. These interviews ranged from 30 minutes to an hour in length and about 7-17 questions were asked at each interview. The interviewees were provided compensation, and some of the themes from these interviews are being incorporated into a forthcoming StoryMap (Data Portal). Below is the full list of interviewees, their organizations, and their titles:

### Summer 2021 Interviewees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name(s)</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Title(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Felicia Smith</td>
<td>Central City SRO Collaborative</td>
<td>Tenderloin</td>
<td>Volunteer Tenant Lead/ Resident</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Memo to Planning Commission

**Hearing Date:** January 26, 2023

**San Francisco Environmental Justice Framework**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Name(s)</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Title(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Edward Hatter</td>
<td>Potrero Hill Neighborhood House</td>
<td>Potrero Hill</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Irene Mahasin Thomas-Jacks</td>
<td>San Francisco African American Faith Based Coalition</td>
<td>Hunters Point</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Cecilia Mejia</td>
<td>Brightline Defense</td>
<td>SoMa</td>
<td>Program coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Chester Williams</td>
<td>Fillmore Media Systems &amp; Services</td>
<td>Fillmore</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Kasey Rios Asberry</td>
<td>Demonstrations Gardens – Tenderloin Peoples Congress</td>
<td>Tenderloin</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Maggie Dong</td>
<td>Chinatown Community Development Center</td>
<td>Chinatown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Thomas Namara</td>
<td>SF Parks Alliance</td>
<td>SoMa</td>
<td>Southeast Area Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Christian Martin</td>
<td>SoMa West Community Benefit District (SWCD)</td>
<td>SoMa</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Wallace Pak Yiu</td>
<td>Community Youth Center</td>
<td>Bayview</td>
<td>Program Coordinator/Resident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Sharaya Souza</td>
<td>American Indian Cultural District</td>
<td>SoMa</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Margarita Mena</td>
<td>Central City SRO Collaborative</td>
<td>Tenderloin</td>
<td>Volunteer Tenant Lead/Resident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Isabel Gonzales</td>
<td>Central City SRO Collaborative</td>
<td>Tenderloin</td>
<td>Volunteer Tenant Lead/Resident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Rosa Alvarado</td>
<td>Central City SRO Collaborative</td>
<td>Tenderloin</td>
<td>Volunteer Tenant Lead/Resident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Felisia Thibodeaux</td>
<td>IT Bookman</td>
<td>Lakeview</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Eddie Ahn</td>
<td>Brightline Defense</td>
<td>SOMA</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Robert Fraser</td>
<td>Code Tenderloin</td>
<td>Tenderloin</td>
<td>Technology specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Nina Bazan-Sakamoto</td>
<td>Japantown Task Force</td>
<td>Japan town</td>
<td>Community Organizer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Spring 2021 Interviewees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Name(s)</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Title(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Nicole Hsu</td>
<td>SFUSD</td>
<td>Bayview</td>
<td>Teacher/Resident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Maria Hernandez</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Bayview</td>
<td>Resident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Gabriel Leyva</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>SoMa</td>
<td>Resident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Stephanie E. Aguirre</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Bayview</td>
<td>Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Barklee Sanders</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Treasure Island</td>
<td>Environmental Review Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Claire Amable</td>
<td>San Francisco Bicycle Coalition</td>
<td>SOMA</td>
<td>Community Organizer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Below is a summary of findings from the interviews based on topics that were found in the interviews: Housing, Transportation, Parks/Open Space, Public Safety, Food Access, Health/Wellbeing, Community Resilience, Youth/Education, Pollution/Climate, and Economic Mobility/Wellbeing (Appendix B).

**Environmental Justice Working Group**

In alignment with the Jemez Principles for Democratic Organizing, the project team and city partners created an Environmental Justice Working Group to co-develop policy recommendations for the Environmental Justice Framework. The Environmental Justice Working Group intentionally brought together community leaders representing Environmental Justice Communities and city staff whose work programs are focused on or relate to environmental justice. With the facilitation of Giuliana Martinez of GM Consulting Group, the Environmental Justice Working Group created a space where diverse perspectives and solutions can be addressed. The ultimate goal was to identify shared priorities and actions that are aspirational, yet achievable, and that would have the greatest impact in advancing environmental justice, racial and social equity, and health across San Francisco.

Over eight months (June 2021 – January 2022), the Environmental Justice Working Group was charged with co-developing policy recommendations for the Environmental Justice Framework, identifying community needs and assets, and providing feedback on specific needs for implementation. The Environmental Justice Working Group reached full consensus on their policy recommendations on January 24, 2022. The policy recommendations were published as supplemental materials on the project website, and provide a valuable reference document for City agencies working on addressing environmental justice and equity.

**Recruitment**

The project team conducted recruitment of the EJ Working Group for two months (April – May, 2021). The recruitment efforts aimed to have a robust pool of interested community leaders and City staff to represent the Environmental Justice Communities and topics. The application materials were distributed by email to community-based organizations and City agency partners working in EJ Communities, and there was one informational session to share the goals and commitments of the Environmental Justice Working Group. The project team developed criteria to score each applicant’s interest form (see below), which was used to inform the final selection of EJ Working Group members. Each community leader who fully participated in the Environmental Justice Working Group received a $1,000 participation stipend.

**Criteria:**

- Work with American Indian, Black, or other communities of color and/or low-income communities in SF
- Diversity of race/ethnicity & socioeconomic status
- Diversity of age and formal education
- Diversity of sex, gender identity, sexual orientation
- Neighborhood representation, specifically areas most burdened by environmental justice
- Connection to a wide network of community members and organizations

---

4 [add reference to the Jemez Principles](https://sfplanning.org/project/environmental-justice-framework-and-general-plan-policies#info)

• Demonstrated interest and/or experience working on environmental justice issues
• Commitment to attending Working Group meetings, sharing information, and engaging with coalitions and partner organizations

For City staff, the project team briefed partner agencies to capture widespread buy-in and interest to engage in this effort. The project team contacted several agencies through the City’s Racial Equity Leaders group (and their respective agencies), due to the direct ties between environmental justice and racial equity. SFDPH, SF Environment, and SFPUC all have ongoing environmental justice programs, and were key partners to establish the initial process and identify other City staff.

There were additional agencies supportive of the work and who lacked staff capacity to fully engage in the Environmental Justice Working Group. These agencies continued to stay involved through periodic updates from the project team and invitations to attend specific Environmental Justice Working Group meetings as draft policy content was being discussed.

For City staff, the project team briefed partner agencies to capture widespread buy-in and interest to engage in this effort. The project team contacted several agencies through the City’s Racial Equity Leaders group (and their respective agencies), due to the direct ties between environmental justice and racial equity. SFDPH, SF Environment, and SFPUC all have ongoing environmental justice programs, and were key partners to establish the initial process and identify other City staff.

There were additional agencies supportive of the work and who lacked staff capacity to fully engage in the Environmental Justice Working Group. These agencies continued to stay involved through periodic updates from the project team and invitations to attend specific Environmental Justice Working Group meetings as draft policy content was being discussed.

Figure 5. Structure of the Environmental Justice Working Group

The structure of the Environmental Justice Working Group is shown in Figure 5. The Project Team consisted of SF Planning staff and GM Consulting Group. The SF Planning staff provided expertise on the General Plan, as SF Planning is ultimately responsible for the final policy development and adoption process. GM Consulting Group was selected through a competitive process to identify a third-party facilitator familiar with community and City collaboratives, environmental justice topics, and policy development work. GM Consulting Group was essential to helping identify shared goals and guiding the group towards outcomes and deliverables. The final composition of the Working Group included 17 community leaders representing the Environmental Justice Communities and 10 City staff representing the agencies with programs relevant to environmental justice.

Monthly Working Group Meetings
The Environmental Justice Working Group members met for eight months (June 2021 – January 2022). The figure below shows the overview of the topics at the monthly Working Group meetings (Figure 6). The early meetings focused on an orientation to the scope of work and process of the Working Group. This allowed time to clarify roles and expectations, build working relationships, and get to know each other better in the fully virtual work environment. Then, starting with Meeting 3, the Working Group initiated subgroups to organize the policy discussion into more manageable small groups. The subgroups served as the main space for policy co-development and deliberation. Meetings 3 through 6 included a mix of working sessions in subgroups, with time for each group to present draft policy recommendations with the full Working Group for feedback. Finally, the later meetings focused on finalizing the policy recommendations through a consensus-building process. There is documentation of each meeting on our project webpage.⁶

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1 | Orientation & Launch | • Introductions  
• EJ Framework  
• EJ WG Orientation |
| 2 | Definition of EJ: EJ Communities Map & Data | • Draft EJ Communities Map  
• Breakout: neighborhood mapping |
| 3 | Definition of EJ Subgroups | • Subgroup Process  
• Breakout: subgroup working session |
| 4 | Working Session: Definition, Vision, & Why It Matters | • Round Robin: Definition, Vision, & Why It Matters  
• Breakout: subgroup working session  
• Governance and Consensus Building |
| 5 | Working Session: Key Policy Priorities & Strategies | • Round Robin: Key Policy Priorities & Strategies  
• Breakout: subgroup working session |
| 6 | Presentation on Draft Recommendations | • Subgroup Team Presentations on Draft Recommendations |
| 7 | Consensus Building | • Full Recommendations  
• Consensus Building Process |
| 8 | Final Celebration | • Closure, Retrospective  
• Wrap Up & Next Steps |

**Figure 6. Monthly Overview of Environmental Justice Working Group**

Subgroup Meetings (outside of Monthly Working Groups Meetings)

During Meeting 3, the EJ Working Group started to meet within subgroups to address the environmental justice topics. The project team organized four subgroups based on the members' interest and experience (Figure 7). Each subgroup had two co-chairs, one community leader and one City staff, to contribute their leadership, facilitate policy discussions and steward the development of draft policy recommendations. The bulk of content development occurred in the subgroup spaces (small group discussion, offline work), rather than the full Working Group spaces. The project team provided monthly check in meetings with the co-chairs to support their facilitation and leadership, assess the content development, and address any issues with member engagement. These check ins also served as a space to identify cross-cutting themes or challenges across the subgroups and identify where there was confusion about the direction of the work.

**Figure 7.** Environmental Justice Working Group Subgroups and Topics

**Voting & Consensus-Building Process**

The goal of the EJ Working Group process was to develop a unified set of policy recommendations through a consensus-building process. This involved several months of iteratively developing policy ideas in the subgroups, for ultimate consideration and voting by all members in the final meetings.
At each monthly Full Working Group Meeting during months 4 to 7, the subgroup co-chairs presented draft content from their subgroup and fielded questions from the full membership to identify points of support and tension in the draft recommendations. After full group meetings, the members were also expected to provide their feedback into a shared working document for co-chairs and subgroups to address.

Before launching the final voting and consensus-building process in Meeting 7, the co-chairs created a “final draft” of their recommendations for all the membership to assess. The project team clarified that the level of finalization is for the core policy intentions, and that copyediting and fine tuning of details can be done after the Working Group. The overall expectation was to have a complete set of recommendations, knowing that these are recommendations to refine after.

During Meeting 7, the EJ Working Group conducted the consensus-building process on the draft policy recommendations created by all the subgroups. Each WG member expressed their level of consensus of all eight topics. The project team encouraged the members to focus on the key policy priorities and strategies of each topic and assess the topic as a whole, to avoid getting bogged down by details. The members used a live, editable spreadsheet as a tool for inputting and displaying the levels of consensus for the draft policy recommendations. It was important for the consensus-building process to be transparent to identify each member’s level of agreement with the core policy intentions, so that the project team could work to resolve any issues immediately and directly. Members used the following scoring rubric:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consensus Gradients of Agreement</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 Whole-heartedly support decision</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Support decision; basically like it</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Decision is okay; some concerns &amp; reservations but can live with it</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Grave concerns; not comfortable with the decision; many reservations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Disagree; veto; totally opposed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We conducted an initial round of scoring (1st Scores) to gauge if any EJ Topic had already reached full consensus. If there were topics with any member expressing “1” or “2,” Giuliana facilitated discussion to assess the issue of concern, alternatives, and boundaries. At the end of Meeting 7, there were a total of seven sticking issues that prevented full consensus; overall, representing specific language choices. Most draft policy recommendations reached consensus at this point, and due to time constraints, the project team facilitated a follow-up conversation to try and resolve the sticking issues.

To resolve the sticking issues, the project team facilitated an offline conversation with the EJ Working Group members who expressed concern over these issues. Together, the project team and several EJ Working Group members reached recommendations to resolve these issues. The co-chairs then incorporated these recommendations throughout the draft policy recommendations.

Before Meeting 8, all EJ Members were expected to express their level of consensus again (2nd Scores). This allowed for changes of opinion and the opportunity to improve any Topics receiving “1” and “2” scores. At Meeting 8, the EJ Working Group celebrated that they reached full consensus – all eight EJ Topics received scores of “3,” “4,” and “5” from all members of the EJ Working Group.
Summary of WG Member Feedback & Process Reflection

During the final meeting, Giuliana facilitated a robust space for reflection and debrief of the Working Group experience. Giuliana ensured that all members contributed to the discussion, which focused on what worked, what could be improved, and overall feedback of the Working Group. The scope and intentions of the Working Group were ambitious, and so it was critical for the project team to hear all types of feedback to improve future outreach and engagement.

Overall, there was a positive assessment of the Working Group process. The majority of comments appreciated the diversity and representation of who was involved, the organization and structure of the eight months, and the scope of work. Members desired more time to avoid feeling rushed and overwhelmed, opportunities to cross-pollinate on intersecting topics, and a more balanced workload, particularly since subgroup co-chairs were expected to commit extra time to facilitating the groups and developing the work between meetings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>What Worked</th>
<th>What Could Be Improved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>• Mixed Working Group Structure. People valued the mixed composition.</td>
<td>• More time needed for subgroup presentations; timeline spent on working sessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Mixed Co-Chair Structure. Good structure for collaborative tone of the subgroup meetings; also helped with capacity; leadership.</td>
<td>• Opportunities to cross pollinate between subgroups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Subgroups: small groups to work intensively and contribute to the whole, more time for deep dives.</td>
<td>• More meeting time for dialogue, rather than the offline track changes/comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Good facilitation from Giuliana and project Team</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The process had multiple points to be flexible and adaptable.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role</td>
<td>• The size and diversity of the group was great</td>
<td>• Too much responsibility of the co-chairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Small subgroups and co-chairs</td>
<td>• Lots of synthesis and editing on the co-chairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Subgroup dynamics,</td>
<td>• Timing the meetings/scheduling to make sure everyone could make it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Clear goals and expectations; welcome packet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Reminder that city staff are not responsible for representing our individual agencies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The recruitment of the Working Group members sought to bring a variety of perspectives and experiences with environmental justice and planning processes, and the feedback affirmed the positive impacts of these goals. Overall, members enjoyed working and learning from each other, the richness in the policy discussions and deliberations, and the process based on co-creation and consensus-building. Here are some testimonials from members:

*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.*

*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.*
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 Project Team. That goes a long way. It feels like our time and voice were valued.

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

The Environmental Justice Working Group was a highly successful outreach effort. It succeeded in bringing together community leaders and City staff together to co-develop policy recommendations for the City’s environmental justice efforts. This work was done fully virtually in eight months, and it is a major success to have generated bold policy ideas that will improve the long-range vision of the City.

In the spirit of the Jemez Principles for Democratic Organizing, this was a successful effort to let the people who are most affected by environmental justice speak from themselves – the lived experiences and expertise of EJ Community residents and leaders. The collaboration with City staff ensured that there was widespread buy in throughout city agencies to help ensure the robustness and resonance of policies across all the EJ Topics. The collaborative working environment helped bring community needs and policy writing closer together, making sure that the final recommendations can be successful through adoption and meaningful for EJ Communities.

**Environmental Justice Focus Groups**

The project team hosted a series of focus groups that provided residents and workers an opportunity to share their experiences with environmental injustices. The focus groups were organized by geography and/or language-based communities that were hosted in partnership with community-based organizations, in order to reach residents who are often overlooked in community outreach and engagement. While the Environmental Justice Working Group was an eight-month effort that developed a robust set of policy recommendations, these focus groups served to reach additional community members affected by environmental injustices to ground truth and refine the policy recommendations.

The partnering community-based organizations were identified through a public selection process. They received a stipend to convene and cohost ($1,500) or convene, cohost, and facilitate ($2,500) the focus group. The community-based organizations were responsible for recruiting the focus group participants, who each received a $50 gift card. The focus group participants were expected to review the set of policy recommendations, condensed into an advance participation guide that anchored the focus group discussion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Community Partner</th>
<th>Neighborhoods/Communities Targeted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>October 11, 2022</td>
<td>Promotoras Activas San Francisco</td>
<td>Spanish-language community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 18, 2022</td>
<td>Carnaval San Francisco (CANA)</td>
<td>Mission, SoMA, Tenderloin, Outer Mission, OMI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 3, 2022</td>
<td>Booker T. Washington Community Service Center</td>
<td>Western Addition</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7 Jemez Principles for Democratic Organizing, Southwest Network for Environmental and Economic Justice (SNEEJ), Jemez, New Mexico, December 1996. [https://www.ejnet.org/eq/jemez.pdf](https://www.ejnet.org/eq/jemez.pdf)
From the focus groups, the project team heard the following themes:

**Clean, Healthy Environments & Climate Resilience**

*Strengths & Assets in the Community*
- There is a lot of existing strength and cohesion in communities (e.g., community-level rapid response to the pandemic, neighbors taking care of each other, open space and community events volunteers, citizen science efforts). However, this is done against the backdrop of neglect and inaction by the City.

*Challenges & Concerns in the Community*
- There’s a lack of resources and tools that prevent clean neighborhood environments, limiting the ability for communities to take care of themselves (e.g., lack of trash cans, lack of public restrooms).
- There’s slow and non-response by the City to respond to maintenance requests (e.g., overflowing trash cans, dirty public restrooms, tree maintenance, graffiti removal).
- There’s illegal activity that challenges the cleanliness of their neighborhoods (e.g., graffiti, illegal dumping).
- There’s concern over pollution exposure from construction activities and the Shipyard.
- There’s concern over climate hazards (e.g., sea level rise, flooding, extreme heat).
- There’s concern that new development is being construction without consideration of climate resilience, and consequences will be felt throughout the entire neighborhood (e.g., sidewalks...
Proposed Solutions & Opportunities

- There should be more resources, staffing, and new jobs for neighborhood clean up. For example: installation and maintenance of trash cans, public restrooms, and trees; public education about proper waste management for trash, recycling, and compost.
- There should be more clarification and public awareness of the responsibility for households and business over sidewalk cleanliness.
- There should be guidance so that people can make cheap, easy, sustainable choices.
- There should be more campaigns, incentives, and bans for consumers to use less plastic and more compostable materials.
- There should be more emergency preparedness for all households (e.g., emergency supplies, information, response).
- There should be more community education and rapid communication for what to do in the event of a hazard.
- There should be more environmental monitoring of pollution exposure.

Healthy Public Facilities & Physical Activity

Strengths & Assets in the Community

- There are safe and high-quality parks in the City, but not in all neighborhoods.
- There are strong open and green spaces in the City (e.g., adult exercise equipment on Sunset and Sloat, Carolina Green Space). However, not every community has nearby, quality green spaces.
- The community relies on available public transportation options for the early mornings (e.g., drop off kids before work) and late evenings (e.g., returning home after night shifts).

Challenges & Concerns in the Community

- The City's public transportation system's level of service is inadequate for everyone to use it as an option/alternative to driving.
- The sidewalks and streets are in poor condition (e.g., cracked, dirty, uneven, steep), making it discouraging to walk or bike.
- The City still needs parking spaces for people like seniors and low-income households who travel between multiple jobs.
- The community feels unsafe and uncomfortable taking active transportation options to use open and green spaces.
- The open and green spaces in the community have graffiti, trash, dog waste, and dirty public restrooms.
- The community feels discouraged from using open and green spaces because of the presence of homeless people and poor park conditions.
- There isn’t enough programming for young kids, school-aged kids, families, adults, and seniors.

Proposed Solutions & Opportunities
• The streets and roadways should be lit up and beautified.
• There should be security and other ways to make parks safer for kids.
• There should be effort to improve the culture of physical activity in all communities.
• There should be more communication and outreach, that is culturally and linguistically appropriate, about all the existing public facilities and programs available to the community (e.g., park ambassadors)
• There should be more childcare during programming and other public activities.
• There should be more programs and interactive activities for kids, families, adults, seniors, the disabled, and the ESL community.

Healthy Food Access & Equitable and Green Jobs

Strengths & Assets in the Community
• There are a few places where the community can get produce and grow their own food that is fresh, healthy, and culturally appropriate (e.g., Lucky in Bayview, San Bruno Supermarket in Bayview, Alemany and Civic Center Farmers Markets, Hummingbird Farm, Mission Food Hub, Booker T. Washington Community Service Center). However, there are only a few known locations, that provide hope, a model, and a starting point so that everyone has access to healthy food.

Challenges & Concerns in the Community
• There are unhealthy food options near schools and in my neighborhood (e.g., food deserts, food swamps).
• The grocery stores (e.g., Foods Co, Lucky) lack quality produce that is affordable, diverse, and healthy.
• There’s concern about toxins in my produce.
• The food assistance programs (e.g., food banks, food pantry) lack quality produce, diverse options, and culturally-appropriate foods.
• There are challenges signing up for and accessing CalFresh benefits (e.g., disability, income limits, hot food program is not present in Chinatown, lack of culturally-appropriate food, not all retailers accept CalFresh).
• There is a lot of business turnover and retailers concerned about setting up shop and hiring local employees in the community, due to neighborhood theft.
• It’s difficult getting a local job in the City (e.g., networking, living wage, local job in your neighborhood).

Proposed Solutions & Opportunities
• There should be healthy food for all ages, cultures, abilities, and the homeless.
• There should be local markets that provide healthy food options at an affordable rate for those living in the community.
• There should be community gardens and orchards available to all communities, so people can grow
and learn to grow their own food.

- There should be sustainable City resources for food pantry, food recovery, and food waste efforts.
- There should be universal acceptance of CalFresh.
- There should be community education about food storage, food safety, and pest control.
- There should be less coffee shops.
- There should be a jobs network to retain local graduates (people born and raised in San Francisco) to work in their community.
- There should be mass communication and social media about job opportunities, food and gardening programs.
- There should be jobs to clean up neighborhoods and open spaces in the City, light blight along the shoreline.
- There should be resources and support for local business owned by Black, Indigenous, and other people of color.
- There should be support for employees to use their sick time and access health care (e.g., workers rights).

**Safe, Healthy & Affordable Homes**

*Strengths & Assets in the Community*
- It's helpful to have social workers who are aware of family situations.
- There is helpful peer counseling from people who've experienced homelessness and displacement themselves, to support people currently in those conditions.

*Challenges & Concerns in the Community*
- There is no true affordable housing in the City for a person with a minimum wage job.
- The buildings have pollution. There is lead in buildings, and the abatement process is too costly and challenging, making the homes especially unhealthy for kids. There is mold in buildings. There is poor indoor air quality, especially with indoor smoking.
- There are poor and substandard housing conditions, slow or non-response to building maintenance (e.g., elevators, toilets, bathrooms, door locks, window screens, rats).
- There is tenant harassment (e.g., false notices of violations, accusations, poor maintenance of paperwork like rental payments).
- There is concern about the ratio of open space per person, as the City becomes more dense.
- There is concern about the high percentage of veterans among our homeless population.
- There is concern and tension with neighbors who are dependent on substances (e.g., drugs), smoking (e.g., tobacco and marijuana), and pedophiles.
- It's challenging to use Section 8 housing vouchers.
- There are dead people in our streets.

*Proposed Solutions & Opportunities*
- There should be an oversight community so that developers follow through on their commitments (e.g., meet inclusionary housing commitments).
- The vacant buildings should be renovated, repurposed, and made available for housing, like empty
office buildings.

- The City should enact a vacancy tax to incentivize the full use of housing units.
- There should be requirements for properly cleaning housing units between tenants.
- There should be lead remediation programs and funding.
- Section 8 housing vouchers should stay with the resident when they move.
- There should be more security and safety measures at housing sites.
- There should be programs to support aging-in-place.
- There should be redress for the American Indian community, like free housing.
- There should be more care for the homeless and veterans, like free housing and healthcare.
- There should be more supportive services at housing sites (e.g., health care, mental health care, wrap around services).
- There should be information about available services for the homeless (e.g., showers, toilets, shelters, food).
- The EJ Communities Map does not take into consideration the concentration of homeless people in neighborhoods.
- We need affordable homes that have connection to open and green spaces.

Empowered Neighborhoods

**Strengths & Assets in the Community**

- In West Portal, people feel safe walking around and businesses thrive.
- In the Mission, the community took matters into their own hands and responded to the pandemic.
- Potrero Hill and Dogpatch have a lot of volunteers for their open and green spaces.
- 311 and 211 are good resources to learn information.
- There’s people who take care of each other, neighbors helping neighbors.
- The local schools and colleges have local students learning about psychology and social work.
- This environmental justice presentation is helpful.

**Challenges & Concerns in the Community**

- There is a lot of negativity towards City Hall: skepticism, sense of corruption, lack of accountability, budgetary misuse, feelings of no follow through, feelings of giving lip service to communities and taking power from them.
- There is slow and non-response by City agencies (e.g., Police Department, Fire Department, Public Works). There's feeling that certain communities, like the Bayview and the Mission, are neglected and not taken seriously.
- They are concerned the City is not a good place for youth and future generations to live in (e.g., unsafe, poor public services, lack of job opportunities).
- The community is desensitized to violence, pollution, open air drug markets, death in the streets, human trafficking, etc.
- The community experiences racism. There is anti-Asian violence, anti-Chinese hate speech, Black people dying from toxins, and Black people feeling like their community is “the bottom of the list.”
- There's a sense of division between neighborhoods, like Potrero Hill vs. Dogpatch, the Mission, and the Bayview.
- People see 24th and Mission as “a Third World country.” There are people selling stolen items,
businesses without hygiene standards, and break outs of violence.

- People feel being priced out (e.g., multiple jobs, unaffordable homes, gentrification, high cost of living).

**Proposed Solutions & Opportunities**

- City Hall needs to be accountable to the community and respect community voices: show up in neighborhoods and do the work.
- We want to have pride in our neighborhood, especially pride from the youth.
- There should be more safety measures: anti-violence, anti-theft, and light up streets. There should be neighborhood fairs, activities, etc.
- There should be Little Free Libraries.
- There should be community fridges with free food.
- There should be structure and respect for all businesses: street vending, designated market halls and flea markets, brick and mortar restaurants.
- There should be more community members involved in local decision making.
- There should be opportunities for neighborhood discussions that are linguistically and culturally-appropriate (e.g., outreach and engagement, designated discussion forums, opportunities to get to know neighbors, town hall meetings).
- There should be more engagement with ESL communities.
- There should be community representatives and ambassadors that connect with residents, share information, and serve as trusted messengers.
- There should be environmental justice in school curricula.
- The EJ Framework should use the term “disparities” instead of “burden,” because it feels like it’s the people who are burdening the neighborhoods.
- There should be resources for mental health and substance dependency issues.
- There should be restitution, public health resources, and resource giving to Black people.
Appendix A: Environmental Justice Questions in General Plan Survey

1. How should the City prioritize the following Environmental Justice topics in order to address health and well-being in the neighborhoods most impacted by pollution and inequities (such as Bayview, Tenderloin, SoMa, Chinatown, Mission, Visitacion Valley, Excelsior, and Potrero Hill)? Rank the topics in order of importance to you, from 1 to 8. [required]
   
   a. POLLUTION REDUCTION – Reducing air, noise, toxic, and other pollution from vehicles, industrial businesses, and other activities
   
   b. HEALTHY FOOD ACCESS - Limited access to healthy food stores (e.g. grocery stores, farmers markets, corner stores) and supplemental nutrition like food banks
   
   c. PHYSICAL ACTIVITY - Problems with or lack of infrastructure to support access to services, recreation and physical activity, including sidewalks, bicycle lanes, parks, and recreation centers
   
   d. OTHER PUBLIC FACILITIES – Problems with or lack of other city infrastructure to support health and wellbeing, including, but not limited to, libraries, schools, neighborhood centers, educational facilities, medical facilities, homelessness services, and police and fire services
   
   e. SAFE & AFFORDABLE HOUSING - Concerns about housing affordability & access, housing options, and safe/healthy housing (such as housing free from lead paint, mold, inadequate heating/cooling systems, and other hazards)
   
   f. GREEN JOBS - Concerns about income, access to equitable & green jobs (such as jobs in renewable energy, environmental remediation, urban greening, and related fields)
   
   g. CLIMATE JUSTICE – Concerns about mitigating and adapting to the impacts of climate change, including, but not limited to, sea level rise and flooding, extreme heat, wildfires, and drought
   
   h. NEIGHBORHOOD EMPOWERMENT - Concerns about how the City engages with residents and makes decisions that affect community health and environmental issues; Availability of resources to support community-based organizations that support residents and businesses

2. Which neighborhood conditions pose the biggest barrier to health, equity and wellbeing, either for you personally or for the community you serve? Select your top 5 choices. [required]
   
   a. Pollution (e.g. air, noise, water, and/or toxic pollution) from vehicles, industrial businesses, wildfires, or other activities
   
   b. Dumping trash and other items in public places (streets/sidewalks, parks, vacant lots, etc.)
   
   c. Limited access to grocery stores, neighborhood markets and farmers markets, and other affordable healthy food options
   
   d. Limited access to food pantries and other nutrition assistance (such as SNAP/EBT, free school breakfast & lunch, etc.)
   
   e. Sidewalks, crosswalks, and safety for people who walk and use mobility devices such as wheelchairs
   
   f. Bicycle lanes and safety for people who use bicycles to get around
   
   g. Buses and trains that get me to where I want to go
   
   h. Access to parks and recreational activities (such as sports and other programs at recreation centers)
   
   i. Access to affordable health care services like doctors, dentists, hospitals, and mental health services
   
   j. Availability and response time of fire department and paramedic services
   
   k. Access to other public facilities (such as libraries, schools, post offices, etc.)
   
   l. Feeling safe when I am outside my house (e.g. when I’m out in my neighborhood at night, visiting parks, waiting at transit stops, etc.)
   
   m. Access to permanent affordable housing serving a range of incomes and household types (such as families, seniors, unhoused residents, and other populations)
   
   n. Unsafe or unhealthy conditions in homes (such as mold, poor ventilation, and parts of the home needing repairs)
   
   o. Access to resources that keep me cool during extreme heat days [such as trees/shade, air conditioning, cooling centers (e.g. in libraries or other community spaces), and water]

3. Please share any other ideas you have for how the City can address Environmental Justice and Racial & Social Equity in the neighborhoods and populations most impacted by health and structural inequities. (write-in response)
Appendix B: Key Stakeholder Interviews Summary of Themes

Key Themes

Housing
The theme for housing appeared in every interview. Residents and community leaders spoke about how challenging it is to afford housing in San Francisco. Many residents shared how they struggle to find housing. The Single Resident Occupancy (SRO) resident mentioned how it is impossible to improve their housing situation due to the high cost of housing. Some community leaders also expressed that the housing quality was drastically different for affordable and low-income housing, citing the quality as poor. Community leaders shared how lower income housing tends to have problems like water damage, windows that cannot fully open, sewer leaks and more. They also shared how many residents cannot afford to upgrade their housing quality due to constraints from income.

The sentiment behind housing was a constant among the interviewees. The lack of available housing coupled with affordability was a major concern. Low income residents and seniors were reported to be the most affected by rental increases and lack of inventory. Many of them find themselves living in buildings that need to be retrofitted to meet the standards of today's new developments. The backlog of affordable housing waiting list, displacement, and increase in homelessness has many residents and community leaders searching for answers from policymakers and local government to eventually address these issues.

Transportation
Interviewees who were in the southern quadrant of the city were the ones who spoke the most about challenges relating to transportation. Their challenges were related to a lack of modes of transportation, many must rely on driving to get around. Interviews who were closer to downtown spoke about the challenges related to transportation because of the impact that COVID had on the transit. Many said that COVID negatively impacted their ability to use transit since COVID made the SFMTA discontinue service on certain transit lines.

Opinions on transportation were mixed depending on the community. The Western Addition, SOMA, Tenderloin and Richmond Districts were communities that possessed quality transportation for residents who could afford it. In the Southeast and Southwest sections of town seemed to struggle with public transportation. For example, the Southwest Lakeview community interviewees referred to their community as an “Island” once the M Line was cut because of Covid 19 travel restrictions. In addition, Southeast’s Bayview and Visitation Valley communities expressed desires to have more access to transit because of the community members lack reliable transportation.

Parks
Parks came up for each interview, and many of the responses were the same despite being about different geographic locations. Many cited their parks as “dangerous,” “bad,” and “unsafe.” Interviewees said that they liked the parks in their community; the challenge with utilizing them was because many unhoused residents live in them. Interviewees who live in EJ communities downtown said that they did not have enough parks, and the few tend to be overcrowded. They commented on how children and families have to wait in lines because too many people are using them.
Responses concerning parks and green spaces touched on a variety of topics ranging from safety to accessibility. Safety was a concern in parks in districts 6 and 10. The Lakeview community has beautiful parks according an interviewee however “if you’re not in shape you can’t get to them.” This reality is making it almost impossible for seniors in their community to enjoy them. There is also a need for more green spaces and parks for communities like Chinatown, Tenderloin, and SOMA. Lastly, McClaren Park in San Francisco’s Southeast section of town is a park that needs more attention by Park & Rec and possibly law enforcement because it was shared that “people burn stuff and throw trash.” It seems that my interviewees would like more investment into city parks.

**Public Safety**

Public Safety was the biggest concern that came up in every interview. Interviewees shared that they fear going outside because they have witnessed shootings, robberies, and drug-gang-related activities in their community. One interviewee from Tenderloin shared how they were held at gunpoint at a local park. Interviewees in each community shared concerns over public safety, and this challenge was spoken the most about in each interview. Comments about pedestrian street safety were also brought up a few times. Interviewees shared how they felt unsafe walking on the sidewalks, they compared their streets to freeways, saying that drivers go too fast and they often feel at risk of a collision with automobiles.

Public safety was a concern for the people I interviewed. One of the community leaders I spoke with was scared to visit parks because of the recent increase in hate crimes towards Asians. He received “racial slurs” and does not feel confident going into parks. Gun violence was noted as being one of the challenges that Bayview has to deal with as a reality. It was shared that the Tenderloin community often deals with “criminal behavior,” on a daily basis. On a bright side community members of Lakeview, Chinatown, The Western Addition and SOMA did not mention public safety as an issue.

**Food**

The main challenge relating to food was the cost of groceries, proximity to grocery stores, and groceries not having culturally appropriate foods. Interviewees spoke about how they do not have easy access to groceries they can afford or groceries that sell foods from their culture; the interviewees in the southern quadrant of the city said that they must travel long distances to get groceries. Interviewees closer to downtown noted that they have to travel outside their neighborhoods to get affordable groceries. Every community also commented that there were more liquor stores and smoke shops than grocery stores and markets with healthy foods.

Food justice was a city wide issue according to interviewees. There seem to be a challenge and most of it stemmed around affordability and access. In Visitation Valley and Lakeview they have access to healthy food options however they must travel a mile or more to get to the healthier food options. It seemed that the Tenderloin and SOMA struggled with similar issues in regards to having access to grocery stores within walking distance to their residents. Bayview was a community that lacks many options for grocery store and they too have to travel outside of their community to seek out options. Having access to “culturally relevant food” was another issue plaguing our EJ communities. Majority of EJ communities are very diverse however they face a challenge of finding culturally relevant foods. It seems the smaller grocery markets in their communities only cater to one specific ethnic group of people. One positive was the Western Addition they seem to have healthy food options, a range of different price points, and a grocery stores in walking distance.
Health/ Mental Health
Health impacts varied between physical and physiological health impacts. Community organizations and residents spoke about the health effects that residents live through, from asthma to mental health. Each community organization spoke about how they notice families and children with high asthma rates. Personal stories about family members who spent their lives in EJ Communities, who eventually died from cancer, were shared. Residents also shared how their environment has impacted their mental health, and one Tenderloin resident shared how they were held at gunpoint with their children at a park and how that event has impacted their lives.

Every EJ community had some form of health or mental health impact. Some of these were caused by the environment in the case of Bayview where “toxic waste, nuclear waste, poor air quality, and contaminated soil” have left residents suffering with high levels of “asthma and cancer.” Children living in SROs are experiencing higher rates of development delay. Similarly to Chinatown the Tenderloin also struggles with development delay in its SRO populations. Couple this obstacle with reports of “mental health” for example one mental health condition brought up was “impulse control,” a condition mentioned in the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders. The results of this condition causes people to participate in self-harm. In the southwest side of town Lakeview residents can’t participate in “preventative health measures” because a lack of hospitals and health clinics. It was reported that many residents only go the hospital when something is wrong. Collectively leaders and residents are trying to find solutions to eradicate these health disparities.

Community Resilience / Empowered Neighborhoods
In each interview, mostly challenges came up; when asked about strengths and what interviewees liked about their communities, themes for community resilience and neighborhood empowerment appeared. Interviewees spoke about how united their communities are, and they rely on community organizations, public facilities, and each other for help and resources. There was much support for community organizations that host events and attempt to unite the community better. Interviewees spoke about how they have been able to find solutions to their problems by getting support from community organizations and through their neighbors.

Community Resilience has come in many forms. Public facilities in Lakeview have served as resource centers for community to be heard and supported. The forming of tenant councils and resident committees in Chinatown has allowed SRO residents to become “advocates” for their needs. Youth led leadership groups have allowed SOMA residents to address air quality issues. Collaboration in Bayview focused on India Basin Shoreline Park is allowing residents to participate in equity by sharing their thoughts and ideas about the new park redevelopment. CBO’s in the tenderloin leading successful workforce efforts by allowing residents ideas to help them meet the needs.

Youth/Education
Themes relating to youth and education also appeared in a few interviews. Education was more common; many community organizations spoke about the technology barrier being a challenge in their work. Residents said that they needed more education facilities to help keep the youth off the streets. The youth theme came from interviewees speaking about how children are segregated at school and how many kids spend time on the streets in environments that are not suitable for their development.

There are youth in the SOMA that are helping lead impactful efforts to improve air quality. Bayview is working with youth on the improvements to India Basin Shoreline Park however there’s still a need to have a successful
after school resource center geared towards educational needs. There still high unemployment in Bayview among youth. The Tenderloin is doing their best to help residents get certifications and provide other educational resources to competitive in the job market. Nothing was mentioned from other communities on youth efforts.

Pollution / Climate
Pollution was another theme that appeared multiple times in each interview. More of the comments on pollution came from the EJ Communities closer to downtown. Interviewees spoke about their challenges living near unhoused populations, and many said that they struggle to enjoy parks and walk home because they must avoid tents. Dirty streets and air pollution were the two topics that appeared during all the interviews. Air quality was a overwhelmingly a concern for communities in the Tenderloin, SOMA, and Chinatown. One expert in did mentioned that Bayview did not have the same level of “good air quality” as the Richmond District. The remainder of my interviewees either didn’t know much about the air quality in their community or would only point out certain areas of concern. For example, the “flat lands” had poorer air quality in comparison to the “top of the hill.” Overall interviewees outside of the northeastern portion of town seemed satisfied with the air quality.

Economic Mobility/Wellbeing
Socioeconomic mobility and wellbeing were other themes that appeared thought the interviews. These themes did not appear directly; they came up while interviewees spoke about the inequities in access to resources, privileges, and power. Many of the challenges from the other themes that appeared stemmed from the community’s socioeconomic status. EJ communities tend to have low-income residents who cannot afford to improve their housing quality, and they can not afford to drive to the big parks, they can not afford to shop at certain grocery stores, the list goes on. Interviewees spoke about being on limited incomes; many of the residents who live in EJ Communities are senior citizens, veterans, or low-income families.

Referencing economic disparities was often mentioned through each interview. The cost of living in San Francisco affects people of all ages and profession. One community who works in tech reflects on the challenges, “I know many programmers who can’t afford to live here.” The lack of affordable housing has negatively affected seniors, “if I could find the right piece of property at a good price I’d be in San Francisco in a heartbeat.” The economic issue even affects current homeowners according to an interviewee from the OMI community: “he families who live here are house rich and money poor.” Couple the housing issues with the lack of access to adequate transportation within our EJ communities it appears that middle, fixed, and low income San Franciscans are struggling to navigate a very complex problem.

Strengths, Challenges, and Opportunities

Strengths
When discussing strengths, interviewees shared how their community has the ability to unite and solve problems. Community members rely on each other, facilities (like MUNI, grocery stores, schools) and community organizations to support each other. Commitment was one of the strengths that stood out the most. There are organizations, community leaders, and workers that have consistently help advocate for issues that matter to their respective communities. They collectively share a willingness to collaborate with the city to address their needs.
Challenges
Challenges that appeared in the interviews were related to housing, transportation, parks, public safety, food, health, education, pollution, facilities, and socioeconomic factors. Every neighborhood had its unique set of challenges to different degrees, but in general, all of these themes appeared for every interview. The overall challenges can be summarized into prioritization. Everyone agrees there is a need for housing however figuring what community deserves affordable housing first will be difficult along with figuring out the cost to accomplish this task. Covid 19 seems to be another challenge that can affect the efforts that are being made by the city to address any of the topic areas of my interviews such as: education, public safety, access, pollution, crime, transportation, and food justice. Safety and stopping the spread of the virus is key however a lot of these issues expressed by community will need more of a hands on approach.

Opportunities
A few interview questions asked what the city could do to address the challenges discussed. Interviewees said that the city needs to acknowledge the demographics in a community and incorporate them in the planning and policy process. Residents said that they feel hopeless in the bureaucratic process since it is so long and most of them never see any results. Community organizations said that the city needs to maintain and communicate better with organizations, they feel they are only contacted when something is needed.

There are countless opportunities that have come from my research into the needs of EJ communities when speaking with EJ working group members. There three opportunities that should be explored based on the results. First is creating a neighborhood services task force led by community and supported by the city government can help in addressing short terms goals of the community. Second is education, possibly working with SFUSD and CBO's to figure out a way to help seniors and youth navigate the digital landscape that is now San Francisco. Lastly, is access to funding potentially building or restructuring the contracting process to make seamless for organizations to have access to funding so they are able to address the needs of community in a prompt fashion.
## Appendix C: Environmental Justice Focus Groups Participant Intake Summary

### Gender Identity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender Identity</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>81.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transgender (femme presenting)</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transgender (masculine presenting)</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genderqueer/Gender non-conforming</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other not listed</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to answer</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Ethnicity and Race (check all that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity and Race</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East Asian (e.g., Chinese, Japanese, Korean, Taiwanese)</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Asian (e.g. Indian, Pakistani, Nepali, Bangladeshi)</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East Asian (e.g. Filipino, Vietnamese, Cambodian, Thai, Burmese, Indonesian, Laotian)</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Eastern or Northern African</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black, African-American, or African descendant</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic, Latino, or Latinx</td>
<td>31.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian, Alaskan Native, or other indigenous group</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, European, or Caucasian</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other not listed</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Age Range

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Range</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-39</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-59</td>
<td>38.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 or older</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to answer</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Are you a person living with a disability or visual impairment?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to answer</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### What is your household’s yearly income range (approximate)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Range</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than $50,000</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,001 to $75,000</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$75,001 to $100,000</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,001 to $125,000</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$125,001 to $150,000</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Range</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$150,001 to $200,000</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than $200,000</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to answer</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Which neighborhood(s) do you identify with? (check all that apply)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighborhood</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bayview Hunters Point</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinatown</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excelsior</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japantown</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ocean View-Merced Heights-Ingleside</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outer Mission</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potrero Hill</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SoMa</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenderloin</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasure Island</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitacion Valley</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Addition</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Do you identify with any of the following? (check all that apply)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identification</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am a neighborhood resident</td>
<td>76.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I work in this neighborhood</td>
<td>34.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am an environmental justice advocate</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am a business owner</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am a parent</td>
<td>31.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am unhoused</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have experienced displacement</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not have access to healthy and affordable food</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**What is your housing type?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Type</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Live alone</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family with children</td>
<td>46.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couple (married or unmarried) no children</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Related adults living together</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roommates living together</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different families living together</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unhoused or staying in a shelter</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>