

# San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission

375 Beale Street, Suite 510, San Francisco, California 94105 tel 415 352 3600 fax 888 348 5190  
State of California | Gavin Newsom – Governor | info@bcdc.ca.gov

February 19, 2020

**TO:** Environmental Justice Commissioner Working Group Members  
**FROM:** Shannon Fiala, Planning Manager (415/352-3665; shannon.fiala@bcdc.ca.gov)  
Clesi Bennett, Coastal Planner (415/352-3613; clesi.bennett@bcdc.ca.gov)  
**SUBJECT: Draft Meeting Summary of February 6, 2020 Environmental Justice Commissioner Working Group Meeting**

1. **Call to Order, Roll Call, Introductions and Approval of Agenda.** The meeting was called to order by Chair Ahn at the Bay Area Metro Center, 375 Beale Street, Ohlone Room, First Floor, San Francisco, California, at 11:03 a.m.

Present were Group Members: Chair Eddie Ahn, Commissioner Sheri Pemberton, Commissioner Pat Showalter and Commissioner John Vasquez.

Not present was Group Member: Commissioner Jesse Arreguin.

BCDC Staff in attendance included Planning Manager Shannon Fiala, Coastal Planner Clesi Bennett, Environmental Justice Manager Nahal Ghoghaie, Planning Director Jessica Fain, Chief of Bay Resources Division Erik Buehmann, Enforcement Analyst Matthew Trujillo, Permit Analyst Morgan Chow, Chief of Permits Ethan Lavine, GIS Specialist Todd Hallenbeck, and Chief Deputy Director Steve Goldbeck.

Also in attendance were: Coastal Commission Alanna Casey, Brightline Defense Tanya Hanson, Brightline Defense Olivia Williams, Brightline Defense Daniela Cortes, Consultant Doug Wallace, Bay Planning Coalition Senior Policy Associate Roman Berenshyteyn and Ming Yeung, Anne Cook and Byron Rhett from the Port of San Francisco.

**MOTION:** Commissioner Vasquez moved approval of the Agenda, seconded by Commissioner Showalter. The agenda was approved by voice vote with no objections or abstentions.

2. **Approval of the October 3, 2019 Environmental Justice Commissioner Working Group Meeting Minutes.**

**MOTION:** Commissioner Vasquez moved approval of the October 3, 2019 Meeting Minutes, seconded by Commissioner Showalter. The motion was approved by voice vote with no objections or abstentions.

### **3. Update on Bay Plan Amendment Process. Ms. Bennett presented the following:**

Before we start, I wanted to give Nahal an opportunity to introduce herself since we haven't had an EJ commissioner working group meeting since she started with BCDC.

Ms. Nahal Ghoghaie spoke: I have been meeting with you all for at least a year now. As of December 9<sup>th</sup>, I started as the Environmental Justice Manager at BCDC.

I wanted to give you a brief overview of my background. I am first generation Iranian-American and I am originally from Dallas, Texas. I am conversant in Spanish and Farsi and I studied climate adaptation in watershed management with some of the Puget Sound tribes in Washington.

I moved on to work for the Washington State Department of Natural Resources on ecosystem services market mechanism research.

I moved to the Bay Area about six and a half years ago, where I worked in climate resilience with an emergency-preparedness and disaster-response organization. From there I went on to start working at the Environmental Justice Coalition for Water, which is where I was when you first met me. I was doing water and climate policy advocacy. I was managing the Disadvantaged Community Involvement Program for the Proposition 1-funded work through the Department of Water Resources.

Since then I had a short stint as an equity and environmental justice policy consultant. That was the hat I was wearing over the summer when I was working with you all on the environmental justice policy recommendations.

Ms. Bennett continued: So we are going to give a short presentation and we have some questions interspersed throughout. We are also going to have Todd, our GIS Specialist, give us a demo with a tool that we have been creating.

This discussion will be broken into two main parts. First we are going to talk about implementing the new polices that we passed. And then Nahal is going to touch on some of our longer-term goals that are related to environmental justice.

An update on what has happened since the vote on October 17<sup>th</sup> of last year; in mid-November, we submitted our materials on the amendment to the California Office of Administrative Law and received their approval on December 27<sup>th</sup>. Shortly after that, we submitted a Coastal Management Program change submission to NOAA's Office of Coastal Management and we are anticipating approval in just few days, February 8<sup>th</sup>. And lastly we have updated our website to reflect the new findings and policies and the Fill for Habitat Amendment.

I wanted to remind you of the guiding principles that you adopted in the Bay Plan Amendment back in October. And these principles are intended to inform and shape the Commission's actions.

This afternoon we are going to dig a little deeper into each of these principles and how we are working towards each of them.

#### 4. Discussion on Implementation

Ms. Ghoghaie presented the following:

There are several implementation materials that we have been working on since we last met. We have been working on creating forms of guidance for our regulatory staff to carry out these policies including a “How-to Guide”. We’ve been developing a “Policy Frequently Asked Questions” document that will be on our website and is aimed at applicants to help them understand what the policies say and when the policies are applicable. It will also contain several resources related to meaningful community involvement, which is a big aspect throughout many of the policies.

And we have also been working on putting our community vulnerability mapping data into a user-friendly public tool. We showed you these maps approximately two years ago and we’ve moved from a static pdf to a user-friendly, online mechanism and in a minute, Todd is going to give you a demo on that.

Before that, I wanted to ask if there are any other materials that you think we should create or that you see missing here. And this discussion is open to anyone, so it doesn’t just have to be Commissioners. (No attendees voiced comments)

Okay then; with that I want to invite Todd to give us a demo of the mapping tool.

Mr. Todd Hallenbeck addressed the attendees: We are really excited to share these web tools that we have been working on. Clesi and Nahal provided a lot of input on the formation of these tools and we pulled heavily from the Background Report and materials that were developed as part of the amendment process.

Following the launch of the Bay Shoreline Flood Explorer last year, this represents our next step in publishing GIS data and tools for better engagement with our stakeholders.

The tools I am about to share leverage work that was done within the ART Program to do community-based vulnerability mapping. These are maps that are based on different socio-economic and contamination characteristics that reduce a community’s ability to plan for, recover from, and respond to a disaster.

The goal of these tools is to provide information about this mapping – what it is and how it can be used by a variety of audiences, whether that is community members that are just learning about this mapping effort, BCDC staff who may be reviewing applications, or project applicants that are designing outreach and engagement around development proposals.

So we wanted to have multiple points of entry for these various audiences around what level of information they need or technical skills they have.

So the first of these entry points is what we are calling the “Learning Section”. This is a set of images and text that help explain different concepts about environmental justice, BCDC, the Bay Plan Amendment, and social and contamination vulnerabilities.

It is pretty high level, but it tries to lay some history and context for the types of discriminatory policies that have been in place around the Bay Area, how BCDC's mission and policies relate to that history, as well as how the recognition of that has prompted these Bay Plan Amendments to be conducted.

This is an opportunity to link folks to those resources where appropriate. We are not going into the details of the amendment process. This is just walking people through that history.

Then we start to dive into the vulnerability mapping itself. We provide information about the fact that these maps were developed to help our program better understand how community vulnerability relates to flooding but that this information is useful in the context of the Bay Plan Amendment as well.

And then we break down the data a bit and highlight what the characteristics are that are contributing to this mapping of vulnerability.

One of those is social vulnerability and the use of census-derived characteristics, here listed to indicate if a block group is within a threshold of pre-determined vulnerability. This mapping and the indicators and the thresholds of those were chosen over the last many years within a project by ABAG called for stronger housing and safer communities.

And so this has had a lot of vetting in terms of what those characteristics are that can contribute to this vulnerability.

The social vulnerability is provided in these ranks of "Highest", "High," and "Moderate" social vulnerability. This provides a little bit of background on that. There is a lot more detail that we are linking out to more technical guidance, but users can explore this map a little bit and start to get a sense of what that means for the shoreline.

Then we talk about contamination vulnerability which is the other component of this. And this is information pulled from CalEnviroScreen and is a similar ranking of contamination vulnerability based on these various indicators.

And similarly you can do a light engagement and interaction with these maps as well.

At that point we are providing a little bit more information about the data sources and links to the more technical mapping methodology and also highlighting that this data is evolving as new communities survey information comes out and the underlying social characteristics may change and those rankings may change over time.

So that is an ongoing process and the 2018 data, which was released in the last month or so, will be integrated over the coming weeks.

We also wanted to highlight what the overlap is between this vulnerability and sea level rise and flooding, since this is a core component of what the ART Bay Area Project was looking at.

So here, we are introducing some concepts around sea level rise, and providing access to the Bay Shoreline Flood Explorer that people can interact with inside this tool if they wanted to explore flood risks along the shoreline.

And then we present some of the findings from ART Bay Area around what does this type of flooding mean for socially vulnerable residents in the Bay Area to give a sense of impact and overlap.

The big green patch you see here is the way that we are providing in the Flood Explorer, the designation of the Eastern Contra Costa Adapting to Rising Tides Project that was conducted, as well as the set of flooding information for that part of the shoreline.

Commissioner Vasquez asked: Is that more Delta?

Mr. Hallenbeck replied: It is the eastern extent of our jurisdiction into parts of the Delta, yes. So that is why it is reflected there.

Commissioner Vasquez added: I think it is important because Solano and Contra Costa both have one leg in the Bay and one leg in the Delta, so those conflicts are going to occur right about where the tip of that green starts to indicate.

Mr. Hallenbeck continued: And we have a separate tool to provide the flood information for that part of the shoreline.

Ms. Fain noted: At the Commission meeting today, we are going to get a briefing on the East Contra Costa Project.

Commissioner Vasquez added: Well so much is going on in the Delta itself. And with sea level rise, how much salt can come into the Delta is changing. And when you add in the Tunnel and everything else – things are changing.

Commissioner Showalter asked: Isn't the overlap in that green area with the East Contra Costa ACP area?

Mr. Hallenbeck answered: I believe so, but I'm not 100 percent sure of that.

This is essentially the project area for where the Eastern Contra Costa Adapting to Rising Tides Project occurs. There are some estimates around the impacts that may occur in the future and then some communities have been called out as far as the ART Bay Area Project is concerned.

This is an opportunity to try to drill down a little bit further and call out that these are real communities and provide a little bit more information about how those communities may be impacted early on.

At that point, we are highlighting the next level of interaction with this data which is a separate web mapping application. We talk briefly about how we think this information is to be used.

Largely, this is geared at having folks know whether or not a project may be in or outside of some of these vulnerable block groups in which case it may trigger different types of outreach and permitting process.

We want folks to go to this tool so that they can start exploring that. This is the meatier engagement around interaction with this data and where we envision a lot of our staff and project applicants probably spending the most amount of time.

I am going to run through a simple demo because we are still seeing how the data is used and seeing how the process works. Right now, this example involves a project applicant proposing a commercial development project in East Palo Alto. One of the first steps is navigating to that section. (Mr. Hallenbeck manipulated the web page on the screen for attendees to see)

The applicant would type in the address of the project and there would be this indication that the project is occurring within this vulnerable block group.

Using the legend, you can see that this is the highest, social vulnerability that we mapped or characterized. You can then get specific information about the characteristics of that block group by clicking on the shape on the map.

We can scroll here and get information on the social and contamination vulnerabilities, which indicators are contributing to that ranking and more information about estimated population, the individual percentages of population within that block group that are related to these indicators.

And all these things are information that can be used in the outreach and engagement process. We have information about language spoken in this area. We have ethnicity information and so on. Those are all things that can be leveraged when an applicant may be deciding how to go about the outreach that they may be required to do as part of an application.

There may be larger projects that involve overlap of multiple, block groups. There are ways to get information on multiple block groups as well. For that we are using what is called a "Select Tool". More than one block group can be selected as you see me doing right now. You can then export this information out to a spreadsheet.

That would allow for easy sharing of this information with project applicants or with staff, and also use in a different format outside of this tool.

That is one way that people can come to this site and get information and then get it out of the tool and use it to craft aspects of their application.

These are some of the basic tools. There are additional things related to being able to change base maps and printing this information.

We want to provide some of these step-by-step information instructions to new users so that they can interact with the tool appropriately.

We also provide information and links out to other resources; in particular, the community mapping methodology.

That relates to the final way that we are trying to share this information, which is to more technical users that may have access to GIS software who want to download the data directly. That will be another opportunity for people to get this information and bring it into their own machines and do further analysis.

So those are the three ways this learning component, this interactive map, and the data download in which we are trying to get this information out will work for potential users.

As I mentioned, the data and the methodologies are living projects in that, as new American Communities Survey data comes out, that this data will be updated with those new five-year estimates.

As we use this data in different and new ways, there may be aspects of things like the indicators or other components of the data that may evolve with changing needs. This is how we see this data being used and hopefully it can be a supportive tool for folks in the process of implementing these policies.

Commissioner Vasquez asked: Will it get down to the census blocks?

Mr. Hallenbeck answered: These are block groups which are smaller than census blocks.

Commissioner Vasquez stated: I'm not so sure of that because they have gotten pretty small.

Mr. Hallenbeck reiterated: These are block groups.

Commissioner Vasquez continued: So with the new census it will change again?

Mr. Hallenbeck replied: With the new census, it will change again.

Commissioner continued his questioning: And how often will it be refreshed?

Mr. Hallenbeck responded: I believe the American Communities Survey data is released on about a two-year basis. And so that is the update frequency that we are anticipating.

Chair Ahn asked: Who does the data input or is it automatic?

Mr. Hallenbeck explained: The Census deals with all the ACS data processing. They provide a lot of metrics and data tables that are used in many different ways around the country and the world.

BCDC staff then takes that information and converts it according to these indicators and metrics that we have identified as pertinent to our definition of vulnerability and generate this mapping product from it.

Right now that is being converted from a very manual process to one that relies on a lot of script. One of our staff members is doing this.

Chair Ahn asked: Can you give us an idea of how many people-hours it takes?

Mr. Hallenbeck replied: I think in the previous workflow that was not an insignificant amount of time. There was a lot of manual processing that could have been up to a couple of weeks of someone's time. We are hoping that with this new approach, this is maybe a couple of days of someone's time.

Ms. Anne Cook of the Port of San Francisco asked: What is the intersection of the mapping with access to the shore? Is that a vulnerability because access to the shore is a health indicator perhaps? Or does that come when somebody proposes a project?

I am just wondering how that is factored in on the vulnerability side or is it used on the private side?

Mr. Hallenbeck answered: I will just say that from the mapping there is no constraint given to the identification of these vulnerable block groups in relation to its proximity to the shoreline because the ART Program was applying this methodology across the Bay and the nine Bay Area counties and you can see vulnerability according to these indicators well inland as well. Part of that is that the indicators were developed not only to reflect risks or vulnerability to flooding, but also to seismic hazards. That is why the mapping component doesn't have any balance on that shoreline proximity in the context of how it is used for the project review.

Ms. Bennett added: Unfortunately, we don't have comprehensive data on the quality of public access for every single community. That would be an awesome data set if we had it. (Laughter) It is data that we don't have regionally or in any kind of comprehensive manner, but it is reviewed on a project-by-project basis.

Mr. Erik Buehmann added: I would say that the regulatory staff could use these tools to look at adjacent communities that could inform what kind of access you have or what kind of projects would provide what types of access. It could also inform us as to what kinds of amenities would be appropriate in any given project.

Ms. Cook continued: So you are going to be looking at what is there now for the vulnerable communities versus what could be provided through this project?

Mr. Buehmann explained: Whenever you provide maximum feasible public access, you want to design it to be an asset to the Bay but also for the vulnerable communities. It is not specific, so it doesn't have what the problems with the access are.

Ms. Ghoghaie was recognized: I just wanted to add that just taking it one step further when thinking about the actual communities that will be engaged by the applicants; we have talked about having another layer that shows existing efforts similar to EcoAtlas or maybe even taking data from EcoAtlas, so the applicant can leverage existing outreach efforts, so not to over burden community groups that are invited to these engagement activities.

We even have an idea of having a map layer that shows community-based organizations and where they are located and phone numbers if they opt in to be a part of that map. That way, the applicant can reach out to them and see if they are interested in partnering on a project or just to conduct meaningful community engagement, but also to design educational kiosks and signage for public access.

Mr. Hallenbeck added: And I think there is some information that we can be pulling that has been developed through the ART Program that has identified community-based organizations.

Ms. Ming Yeung from the Port of San Francisco commented: I think you mentioned that the tool would be available to the general public. Is there a timeline for when it would be unveiled?

Mr. Hallenbeck replied: the goal is for it to be publicly available. That would be in conjunction within the next couple of weeks as the final implementation guidance is going to be released.

Ms. Bennett continued: So Nahal is going to talk about some of the training opportunities that we are going to be having at the end of the month. The hope is that this is ready for those.

Chair Ahn commented: I like the granularity of community vulnerability versus contamination vulnerability, but we should discuss how our policies will address communities or are they just considered the same for intent and purposes? And I also notice that there is a distinction between highest, high, and moderate. For the purposes of applying our policies, are we making distinctions in these thresholds?

Ms. Bennett replied: So we are not making a distinction between moderate, high, and highest. We just talk about vulnerable communities, so it would be any of those thresholds. When the mapping designation comes into play is whether or not meaningful community involvement needs to occur.

It could be any threshold of vulnerability except for “low” or “no vulnerability”. That isn’t considered.

Mr. Hallenbeck added: The mapping process does identify a category of low community vulnerability where there is data and they do not meet these thresholds. Those aren’t being displayed on the map currently.

Chair Ahn asked: Any other questions? (No questions were voiced) I really want to make sure that all of this work is appreciated on multiple levels. Hopefully, we have already mapped out also the policy-making bodies that would take an interest in this.

Other agencies have gone beyond this whole internal discussion about expanding beyond CalEnviroScreen and looking at different tools.

Ms. Bennett continued: With new policies, means new sections in staff reports. (Laughter) In our permit and federal consistency application staff reports, you will now see findings around these policies. You might see findings related to the existing communities, where projects are located or some of the existing environmental justice concerns there, descriptions and outcomes and analyses of the community involvement work that was done for the project, as well as information on disproportionate project impacts.

Is there any education or training that we could provide to the Commission to ensure that you are best able to interpret some of this information that will now be included in our staff reports?

Commissioner Showalter commented: I just think that when we have some examples, it will be important to go through how this applies. And we will have to play it by ear but the best thing would be to just use a few case studies as they come up.

I think it would be particularly helpful if they are in different sections of the region, because there are different communities and community cultures in each of those communities and I am sure that they will need to have the outreach specially tailored to them.

My suggestion would be to have case studies.

Ms. Bennett asked: And do you mean case studies and examples of projects that meaningfully involved and successfully involved the community – so a success story?

Commissioner Showalter added: I think whatever comes up, so you can educate us. I think it would be better if it wasn't too abstract and if it was related to a specific project.

Commissioner Vasquez commented: For me, it is – how has all this work resulted in a project itself? It is almost like a before and an after, so you can point to it and say – okay, I get it now.

Ms. Bennett stated: So really understanding how the engagement changed the design or impacted the design of the project.

Commissioner Vasquez added: So we can say that all this work didn't make a difference. (Laughter) For you all, that is important. I want to thank staff for the wonderful work they did. I didn't realize how much it would take, nor what the scope of work would be involved but, I want to say thanks again.

I think people are going to want more out of this tool.

So our first priority is to ensure that those involved in the permitting process are not only aware of these policy updates but also that they understand what the new policies entail.

So we are focusing on an initial webinar which will be presented in partnership with our member EJ Review Team organization; Nuestra Casa from East Palo Alto will be sharing some insights on their work doing meaningful community engagement.

The webinars will be tailored for permit applicants and will provide the most immediate opportunity to learn about these policies. So we will have two, live, lunch-time webinars on February 25th and 27th and we will record the webinars and will be posted on our website.

So, from there we hope to present these policies in person at standing meetings and would love to follow up with you all after this meeting if you have any suggestions of agendas that you think we should try to be included on.

We have listed the various audiences for the anticipated engagement activities here. And the events will include internal staff training as well as community and BCDC staff partnership in capacity building events which will be important opportunities for bi-directional learning and will support the ultimate goal of building trust.

And then we will have some Commission briefings and events for the Design Review Board as well.

While the activities that were previously outlined relate directly to how we are implementing the work via permitting the range of activities that we must do to fulfill the guiding principles we set out for ourselves is much broader and will be an ongoing part of our work.

And the good news is that we now have me a full-time person working on this helping lighten the load for all the staff that has already done a wonderful job of developing this work.

The next steps are already underway. We have established a relationship with the tribal engagement staff at the State Coastal Conservancy to ensure that tribal engagement policy efforts are coordinated and streamlined to the best of our ability.

And we have also been working internally with BCDC staff on incorporating the EJ policy considerations into the Seaport Plan Update and the regional-shoreline, adaptation, planning efforts.

And I will be giving a more thorough briefing on the specifics of this work and these goals at a future Commission meeting.

Ms. Bennett continued: And so with that, we have a few questions for the Working Group. We want to make sure that the Commission is engaged and involved in creating and establishing our Environmental Justice Program and undertaking some of the efforts that Nahal just described.

So first, we would welcome any ideas about what is the best way to engage the Commission and bring them along in this program creation.

Commissioner Pemberton commented: I think that maybe including something about it in the Executive Director's Report, mentioning what is new or informative could be part of that. And then exploring some other kind of creative tools in an interactive way with the Commissioners, like Survey Monkey or something like that would be helpful.

Asking questions like – what don't you know or what would you like to know could be helpful.

Commissioner Vasquez opined: I just think it is going to take a while for all of this to sink in. What is going to be the role for this Working Group after this? I think they kind of tie in to each other.

The bigger Commission is probably relying on the work that we have done as to guide them and lead them along in approving everything. I don't know how much engagement means to the individual Commissioners unless it is specific to their situation.

Chair Ahn added: It is really important, creating breakouts for lack of a better word, segmentation of geographies. And then of course the bigger picture so they can compare and contrast, but I have confidence that the mapping tool is very good and granular, but it would also be good to check with folks who represent a lot of these communities as well.

Commissioner Pemberton added: And another thought is maybe to tie it back to from time-to-time more broadly to what the state is doing. There is a lot of focus on environmental justice. The Governor's Office and other state agencies may be part of that education, that the Commissioners know about what other relevant agencies are doing or what the governor is prioritizing on environmental justice.

Ms. Bennett observed: It sounds like something that could be included in Executive Director Reports or maybe a series of regular briefings or something like that.

Chair Ahn continued: So jumping to question number two, I would be happy to work with staff to identify those bodies mentioned by Commissioner Pemberton at the state level. There are a ton of entities working on this. The more we can make this visible will cause us to develop our tools in our policies.

Commissioner Showalter commented: And as part of our education outreach, if you have presentations prepared that we can give to local organizations it would be helpful.

The other thing I wanted to mention was in the ART presentation that was given at the Commission meeting last time, they said that they were going to be regional meetings or board and county meetings. I think it was at least one per county.

Somehow, I think dove tailing with that effort to make sure that the EJ component gets out, is useful. It is the whole idea of using standing meetings to further this along. Once you get people together to share with them what BCDC is doing, then this is helpful.

Ms. Bennett continued: What role do you all see this Commissioner Working Group playing? And also logistically, do you want to meet every month? Do you want to meet quarterly? Are there certain items that you want to pick up?

Commissioner Pemberton chimed in: I think maybe over the course of the year putting out ways that the Working Group could get involved or participate more and have more ongoing, regular communications as the work is happening might spark some ideas.

Commissioner Ahn opined: I feel a lot of progress has been made since our last meeting in October, so that is good. I would like to throw some potential frequencies out here – like maybe once every two months? For me, quarterly feels a little too long. I think monthly might be too much.

Commissioner Vasquez stated: Yes, maybe every two months might be acceptable. If it is needed for us to provide some kind of direction and briefing us on developments is good.

You talked about community engagement. So how are we reaching out to city staffs or county staffs?

I would be happy to put something together. In 2015, I did the Adapting to Sea Level Rise in Solano County. I wanted all the technical folks to start thinking about this – your planners, your engineers, everyone that is involved in future development of the community to look and begin to think and make this part of their thinking process. This is probably another way of doing that so that they can look at this tool and say, how do I use it?

Ms. Bennett continued: So we have a pretty substantial interested parties list from the Amendment itself. And one of the processes that we did in developing that list was going online and research every shoreline local government and getting the contact information of their planners who are working on things that are related to this.

We've also been speaking our regulatory staff members about past permittees and folks that they see coming in for permits often and they will all be on the list invited to these webinars.

And then hopefully we will find standing meetings around the region and maybe co-hosted with local governments.

Ms. Ghoghaie commented: One example of a group that we are trying to develop that outreach effort with is BayCan. It is the Bay Climate Adaptation Network. And that is only for local jurisdictions. So it is all city and county folks in this group. But it does not represent all of them.

Commissioner Vasquez stated: I would like to host one in Solano County. The one thing that a board member can do is convene people. To advance that kind of discussion, every two months we have all the cities and boards of supervisors get together and the elected officials would be there, and you can talk to them.

Ms. Bennett continued: We would love to reach out to all of our Commissioners who are in local government about having a meeting in their jurisdiction.

Ms. Cook asked: And what about the same kind of outreach for the business community and the development community? I think they would want to leverage their resources to accomplish most of this.

I think a lot of those folks are going to have to do this well in order to not have it cost them time and money.

Ms. Bennett responded: We are planning to invite them all to the webinars that we are having. And we have a lot of their contact information. We are planning on presenting to the business community where possible.

The last question that we had for you is – do you have any advice for us or any thoughts about some of the longer-term items that Nahal mentioned that we are starting to work towards? If you want to see us prioritize certain things, we would love to hear that.

Commissioner Pemberton commented: One thing that comes to mind is language access. I am imagining that would just be wrapped up in the community outreach and engagement. That is something that came to my mind that is important. These all look really good to me.

Ms. Fiala asked: Has State Lands been able to make strides in that regard?

Commissioner Pemberton answered: We are working on that. It is challenging.

Ms. Fiala added: It's an expensive endeavor.

Commissioner Showalter chimed in: Another topic that came up a lot in our discussions was the difficulty that vulnerable communities have in having a regular representation and the importance of providing grant funds or some sort of financial assistance to help people take part.

So has there been any movement on that?

Ms. Ghoghaie replied: Not that I know of.

Ms. Fain added: I think it is something we can start to explore. We don't have a dedicated funding stream for that right now, but Nahal has been here a month and a half and is putting together her workload.

Commissioner Vasquez asked: She doesn't have it done? (Laughter)

Ms. Fain continued: Well, she is putting together her work program. One of the things we are discussing is when do you need that input and how do we structure something like that so we can get that type of engagement, but in a way that is most useful.

Commissioner Showalter noted: I just don't want it to fall through the cracks, because it is a very important issue. We do have a lot of generous philanthropists in the Bay Area. You just have to connect to them in the right way, which isn't always easy.

Mr. Doug Wallace commented: A related question is providing technical assistance to underrepresented groups in terms of grant applications assistance. I don't know if you have thought about that. That's a big hurdle.

Ms. Ghoghaie stated: Yes, thank you.

Mr. Wallace continued: With upcoming potential climate bonds and Measure AA and other funding sources – I think the thought in the Legislature is 35 percent of funds to the Bay Area currently would go to these kinds of grants which is a positive sign because they have to be able to get the door open.

Ms. Ghoghaie concurred: I agree. I have been working with a couple of our community-based partners on helping them secure funding.

Ms. Bennett noted: At this point, BCDC doesn't give grants or make grants. I know Nahal has worked with the Restoration Authority who administers the Measure AA funding on this exact topic.

Ms. Ghoghaie added: They are improving their scoring criteria and their guidelines to make it more inclusive and accessible for groups that haven't ever applied for such type of funding.

Commissioner Vasquez stated: You know with SB 1000, how many counties and cities are really addressing it in their general plan? Are there triggers that necessitate having to address it? I don't see anybody talking about that or volunteering by saying – let's open our general plan up and put this chapter in it.

So I don't know that they recognize that they have to do this.

Ms. Bennett continued: There has been a little bit of movement that I've heard about. We did a survey of the different counties and cities around the Bay Area to see if they were doing this. And a lot of folks are just not at a general plan update point. In some cases, they haven't done it in 20 years and they don't know when they will do it next.

There were a few local governments who indicated that there is a general plan update coming in the next three to five years and this is something they want to think about.

We had a meeting a few months ago with some folks from the city and county of San Francisco. I think they are updating their transportation element and they want to build environmental justice into that element specifically.

And then I know there has been some pressure on the city of Oakland when they do their general plan update to include this. I don't know where that has landed.

Ms. Ghoghaie added: They are in the ECAP, so Equity and Climate Adaptation Plan effort, and they are hoping that the process will inform the general plan update and it will continue a relationship between community-based leaders and the City around environmental justice.

Commissioner Vasquez noted: It would help if they amended or added to it that said at some point you have to put this into your general plan and not just say so many chapters and then you have to.

In our county, with our general plan, we didn't update it for 28 years.

Ms. Ghoghaie stated: I believe APEN is working on that. APEN stands for Asian Pacific Environmental Network. I believe they are working in Sacramento to enhance the general plan.

Commissioner Vasquez stated: I've suggested it to our planning department that they begin to look at it and say – you know, it is better to have it in place already than to be told to put it in.

Chair Ahn chimed in: We've talked about this in the past, but we can file this as a bucket under "Enhanced Community Outreach Engagement". We need to build up our social media which will be an important part of this work. It is to raise general awareness. It goes beyond just underrepresented groups, but it is related.

Mr. Goldbeck stated: But we are working on a social media approach. We are trying to get there with the resources we have.

Ms. Ghoghaie added: Coming soon on Twitter and Facebook. (Laughter)

Chair Ahn asked: Any other questions or thoughts? (No comments were voiced)

Ms. Bennett asked: Does anyone have any questions before we wrap up? (No comments were voiced)

**5. Public Comment. Chair Ahn continued:**

Any general public comment? (No comments were voiced although members of the audience gave comments during the meeting) Seeing none we will adjourn.

**6. Adjournment**

There being no further business, Chair Ahn adjourned the meeting at 12:02 p.m.