



March 10, 2023

Clerk Angela Calvillo
Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
City Hall
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102

Re: Transmittal of Planning Department Case No. 2018-017026GPA: San Francisco Environmental Justice Framework and General Plan Introduction
Board File No. [pending]

Planning Commission Recommendation: Approval

Dear Ms. Calvillo:

On March 2, 2023, the San Francisco Planning Commission (hereinafter "Commission") conducted a duly noticed public hearing at a regularly scheduled meeting to consider the proposed Ordinance which the Commission initiated on January 26, 2023. The proposed Ordinance would amend the Introduction of the San Francisco General Plan and incorporate the Environmental Justice Framework by reference.

The proposed amendment would result in no physical impact on the environment. On February 23, 2023, the Planning Department determined that the proposal is not defined as a project under CEQA Guidelines Sections 15378 and 15060(c)(2).

At the March 2 hearing, the Commission voted 6-0 (Ruiz absent) to recommend approval of the proposed Resolution.

Please find attached documents relating to the Commission's action. If you have any questions or require further information, please do not hesitate to contact me or Citywide Division Director, AnMarie Rodgers at anmarie.rodgers@sfgov.org.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be "Rich Hillis".

Rich Hillis
Director of Planning

Attachments (one copy of the following):

- Exhibit A: Planning Commission Resolution No. R-21264
- Exhibit B: Draft Ordinance (signed to form)
- Exhibit C: Planning Commission Executive Summary for Case No. 2018-017026GPA – March 2, 2023
- Exhibit D: Environmental Review
- Exhibit E: Environmental Justice Framework
- Exhibit F: General Plan Introduction
- Exhibit G: Environmental Justice Communities Map: Technical Documentation
- Exhibit H: User Guide to the Environmental Justice Communities Map
- Exhibit I: Outreach and Engagement Summary for the Environmental Justice Framework
- Exhibit J: Letters of Support from the Office of Resilience and Capital Planning and the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission

EXHIBIT A:

PLANNING COMMISSION

RESOLUTION NO. R-21264



PLANNING COMMISSION RESOLUTION NO. 21264

HEARING DATE: MARCH 2, 2023

Project Name: Environmental Justice Framework and General Plan Introduction
Case Number: 2018-017026GPA
Initiated by: Planning Commission
Staff Contact: Danielle Ngo, Senior Planner
Danielle.Ngo@sfgov.org, (628) 6527591
Amnon Ben-Pazi, Senior Planner
Amnon.Ben-Pazi@sfgov.org, (628) 652-7428
Reviewed by: Lisa Chen, Principal Planner, Citywide Division
lisa.chen@sfgov.org, (628) 652-7422

RESOLUTION ADOPTING AMENDMENTS TO THE SAN FRANCISCO GENERAL PLAN INTRODUCTION; ADOPTING THE ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE FRAMEWORK BY REFERENCE, ADOPTING FINDINGS, INCLUDING FINDINGS OF CONSISTENCY WITH THE GENERAL PLAN, THE EIGHT PRIORITY POLICIES OF PLANNING CODE SECTION 101.1, AND FINDINGS OF PUBLIC NECESSITY, CONVENIENCE, AND GENERAL WELFARE UNDER PLANNING CODE SECTION 340, AND ADOPTING ENVIRONMENTAL FINDINGS UNDER THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT.

WHEREAS, Section 4.105 of the Charter of the City and County of San Francisco mandates that the Planning Commission (hereinafter “Commission”) shall periodically recommend to the Board of Supervisors for approval or rejection proposed amendments to the General Plan in response to changing physical, social, economic, environmental or legislative conditions; and,

WHEREAS, California Senate Bill 1000 (2016) amended Government Code §65302 to require cities and counties with “disadvantaged communities,” which the statute defines to include low-income areas that are disproportionately affected by environmental pollution and other hazards that can lead to negative health effects, exposure, or environmental degradation, to amend their General Plan to include policies that address environmental justice and reduce the unique or compounded health risks in disadvantaged communities, promote civil engagement in the public decision-making process, and prioritize improvements and programs that address the needs of disadvantaged communities. This update is required upon the completion or next revision of two or more General Plan elements after 2018; and,

WHEREAS, San Francisco contains several areas that are identified in the CalEnviroScreen 4.0 map created by the California Environmental Protection Agency and the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment as “disadvantaged communities,” including portions of Bayview Hunters Point, South of Market, Treasure Island, and the Tenderloin. the Planning Department (hereinafter “Department”) conducted additional data analysis in accordance with General Plan Guidelines developed by the Governor’s Office of Planning Research. This analysis found that other areas experience elevated health risks, resulting in the creation of a local Environmental Justice Communities Map. The Environmental Justice Communities identified in the Environmental Justice Communities Map comprise about one third of the City’s land area with the highest cumulative environmental burdens, including all the disadvantaged communities as defined by state law and additional areas identified by the Planning Department. Environmental Justice Communities include portions of Bayview Hunters Point, Visitacion Valley, South of Market, Treasure Island, the Tenderloin, the Mission, Potrero Hill, Western Addition, Chinatown, Financial District, Outer Mission, and Oceanview/Merced/Ingleside.; and,

WHEREAS, the Commission in Resolution No. 20738 and the Historic Preservation Commission in Resolution No. 1127 directed the Planning Department (hereinafter “Department”) to incorporate policies that address racial and social equity into the General Plan; and,

WHEREAS, in compliance with State law, the City has amended the Safety and Resilience Element and the Housing Element of the General Plan to include environmental justice and racial equity objectives and policies; and,

WHEREAS, the Department analyzed additional demographic data in preparing the Environmental Justice Communities Map. The San Francisco Health Improvement Partnership’s 2022 Community Health Needs Assessment found significant health disparities across the city, with people of color and people residing in certain communities experiencing worse health outcomes. For instance, the study found that the City’s communities of color experience significantly higher rates of negative health outcomes including asthma and chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (hospitalization rates for Black San Franciscans are approximately 10 times higher than for White residents), cancer (rates for Black San Franciscans are 46 to 213 percent higher than City average), cardiovascular disease (American Indian San Franciscans are twice as likely to die of cardiovascular disease before the age of 65), and stroke. The impact of cardiovascular disease in San Francisco is higher among residents in the southeast half of the City, while rates of asthma and chronic obstructive pulmonary disease are higher in the Tenderloin, SOMA, and Bayview Hunters Point neighborhoods; and,

WHEREAS, the San Francisco Environmental Justice Framework (hereinafter “EJ Framework”) identifies Environmental Justice Communities in San Francisco which incorporate the State’s designation of disadvantaged communities (as defined by California Government Code §65302) and include additional local data on health and social vulnerabilities, and identifies key policy priorities and strategies to further guide development of environmental justice objectives and policies; and,

WHEREAS, the Department led the preparation of the EJ Framework in coordination with multiple city agencies through a comprehensive community-based planning effort. The Department worked closely with community members and leaders, subject-matter experts, and City agencies; and,

WHEREAS, other City agencies, such as San Francisco Department of the Environment, San Francisco Department of Public Health, and San Francisco Public Utilities Commission, have developed environmental justice programs in the City; and,

WHEREAS, the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission was the first city department, and utility in the country, to adopt an Environmental Justice Policy through SFPUC Commission Resolution No. 09-0170 on October 13, 2009; and,

WHEREAS, the EJ Framework sets out key policy priorities and strategies and represents the first citywide policy focused on advancing environmental justice across all City agencies; and,

WHEREAS, the Draft Ordinance would amend the Introduction to the General Plan (hereinafter “Introduction”) to incorporate the EJ Framework by reference and establish a commitment to integrate further policies into elements, area plans, and supporting documents to improve public health and other outcomes in Environmental Justice Communities; and,

WHEREAS, the proposed Introduction would articulate a contemporary vision guiding the City’s development and should outline the current challenges it faces; and,

WHEREAS, the current Introduction was last amended in 1996, (Resolution No. 14149) and does not reflect topics that have become central to planning in the intervening decades, such as racial and social equity and the climate crisis; and,

WHEREAS, the Draft Ordinance would holistically revise the Introduction to acknowledge San Francisco’s history more holistically, ground the General Plan in the present by referencing recent context-setting events such as the COVID-19 pandemic and the murder of George Floyd, incorporate themes from recent planning efforts such as the Housing Element, ConnectSF, the Safety and Resilience Element, establishment of Cultural Districts, and the EJ Framework. and create an invitation to revisit the text more frequently in the future; and,

WHEREAS, the proposed amendments to the Introduction would render the Introduction more timely and more reflective of current community aspirations by updating references to State requirements, recent events, community input, and City actions including establishment of the San Francisco Office of Racial Equity and the Planning and Historic Preservation Commissions’ resolutions centering the Department’s work in racial and social equity; and,

WHEREAS, in 1986 the voters approved Proposition M which added eight Priority Policies to Section 101.1 of the San Francisco Planning Code (“Priority Policies”); and,

WHEREAS, in 1987 the Introduction was added to the General Plan duplicating the Priority Policies of Planning Code Section 101.1; and,

WHEREAS, the proposed amendments would remove the Priority Policies from the Introduction but retain them in Planning Code Section 101.1, thereby maintaining the requirement of a finding of consistency with the Priority Policies for any action that requires a finding of consistency with the General Plan; and,

WHEREAS, the Commission, at a duly noticed public hearing on January 26, 2023 and in accordance with Planning Code Section 340(c), initiated the General Plan Amendments for the EJ Framework and General Plan Introduction (hereinafter “Amendments”) by Planning Commission Resolution No. R-21238; and,

WHEREAS, the Commission conducted a duly noticed public hearing at a regularly scheduled meeting to consider adoption of the Draft Ordinance for the Amendments on March 2, 2023 and in accordance with Planning Code Section 340(d); and,

WHEREAS, the Commission has heard and considered the testimony presented to it at the public hearing and has further considered written materials and oral testimony presented on behalf of Department staff and other interested parties; and,

WHEREAS, all pertinent documents may be found in the files of the Department, as the Custodian of Records, at 49 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1400, San Francisco; and,

MOVED, the Commission has reviewed the Draft Ordinance for the Amendments; and,

FINDINGS

Having reviewed the materials identified in the preamble above, and having heard all testimony and arguments, this Commission finds, concludes, and determines as follows:

1. The Amendments identify Environmental Justice Communities in San Francisco, which incorporate the State’s designation of disadvantaged communities (as defined by California Government Code §65302) and include additional local data on health and social vulnerabilities.
2. The Amendments address environmental justice by identifying priorities for General Plan objectives and policies to reduce the unique or compounded health risks in Environmental Justice Communities, promote civil engagement in the public decision-making process, and prioritize improvements and programs that address community needs as required by California Government Code §65302.
3. **General Plan Compliance.** The Draft Ordinance for the Amendments is consistent with the following Objectives and Policies of the General Plan:

HOUSING ELEMENT

OBJECTIVE 1.A

ENSURE HOUSING STABILITY AND HEALTHY HOMES

POLICY 39

Support the repair and rehabilitation of housing to ensure life safety, health, and well-being of residents, especially in Environmental Justice Communities, and to support sustainable building practices.

POLICY 40

Enforce and improve planning processes and building regulations to ensure a healthy environment for new housing developments, especially in Environmental Justice Communities.

OBJECTIVE 5.B

ADVANCE ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE, CLIMATE, AND COMMUNITY RESILIENCE.

POLICY 13

Amplify and prioritize voices of American Indian, Black, and other people of color, and other disadvantaged communities, and embrace the guidance of their leaders throughout the engagement and planning processes for housing policy, planning, programs, and developments.

OBJECTIVE 5.A

CONNECT PEOPLE TO JOBS AND THEIR NEIGHBORHOOD WITH NUMEROUS, EQUITABLE, AND HEALTHY TRANSPORTATION AND MOBILITY OPTIONS.

The EJ Framework supports these Objectives and Policies of the Housing Element by prioritizing ensuring that housing supports public health. The EJ Framework includes a map of Environmental Justice Communities, which incorporate disadvantaged communities in San Francisco as required by California Government Code §65302 and includes additional local data on health and social vulnerabilities. These policies direct future programs and resources to address health disparities in Environmental Justice Communities. The EJ Framework identifies priorities for advancing Environmental Justice in the City. The Environmental Justice Communities identified in the EJ Framework overlap significantly with the City's predominantly Black, POC, and other disadvantaged communities. The EJ Framework supports amplifying and prioritizing these communities' voices by prioritizing participation of EJ Communities in decision-making processes; building capacity for diverse voices to engage; and centering environmental justice efforts in collaboration with American Indian communities and Traditional Ecological Knowledge. The EJ Framework prioritizes ensuring robust transportation connectivity and ensuring streets and transit are accessible and safe for all.

RECREATION AND OPEN SPACE ELEMENT

POLICY 1.4

Prioritize the better utilization of McLaren Park, Ocean Beach, the Southeastern Waterfront and other underutilized significant open spaces.

POLICY 2.5

Encourage the development of region-serving open spaces in opportunity areas: Treasure Island, Yerba Buena Island, Candlestick and Hunters Point Shipyard.

POLICY 2.1

Prioritize acquisition of open space in high needs areas.

POLICY 1.10

Ensure that open space is safe and secure for the City's entire population.

POLICY 2.3

Provide recreational programs that are responsive to community needs and changing Demographics.

POLICY 1.8

Support urban agriculture and local food security through development of policies and programs that encourage food production throughout San Francisco.

POLICY 5.1

Engage communities in the design, programming and improvement of their local open spaces, and in the development of recreational programs.

POLICY 5.4

Reduce governmental barriers to community-initiated recreation and open space efforts.

The EJ Framework supports these Policies of the Recreation and Open Space Element by prioritizing the equitable distribution of public facilities including parks and open space. McLaren Park, the Southeastern Waterfront, Treasure Island, Yerba Buena Island, Candlestick Point and Hunters Point Shipyard are all located in Environmental Justice Communities identified in the EJ Framework, as are many of the “high needs areas” identified in the Recreation and Open Space Element. Other relevant priorities include ensuring that public facilities including parks and open spaces are accessible and safe for all, and offer diverse, flexible, and inclusive programming; increasing climate resilience and innovation in the food system and increasing nature-based food opportunities; increasing community participation in decision-making processes; and developing community partnerships.

SAFETY AND RESILIENCE ELEMENT

POLICY 1.1.2

During climate mitigation activities, prioritize investment and resources in Environmental Justice Communities, especially through existing community-based efforts.

POLICY 1.1.5

During response activities, the City should partner with non-governmental entities to respond to hazard impacts in Environmental Justice Communities.

POLICY 1.1.6

During recovery and reconstruction activities, rebuild in ways that remedy safety and resilience injustices in Environmental Justice Communities.

POLICY 1.2.1.

In all stages of safety and resilience, prioritize the needs of people most impacted by the adverse impacts of hazards.

POLICY 1.2.3

Prioritize documentation of historic, archaeological, and intangible cultural resources in the most vulnerable areas to the climate crisis, starting in Environmental Justice Communities.

POLICY 1.2.4

Prioritize funding for infrastructure maintenance and improvements in Environmental Justice Communities.

POLICY 2.2.2.

Examine the risk of flooding and evaluate adaptation actions that will protect people and the built and natural environments to help inform land use, capital investment, and other policies.

POLICY 2.2.3.

Seek sufficient funding to address climate hazards through all phases of mitigation, preparedness, response, recovery, and reconstruction.

POLICY 3.1.7

Starting with properties associated with Environmental Justice Communities, expand life safety and functional recovery considerations to increase the likelihood that historically valuable architecture and structures will survive all hazards, and encourage the adaptive reuse of historic structures.

POLICY 3.1.11

For existing housing and building stock, provide training, guidance, and assistance to build resilience against extreme heat, poor and hazardous air quality, and flooding, especially in Environmental Justice Communities and other vulnerable people.

POLICY 3.2.2.

Research and maintain information about all hazards, including adverse impacts on vulnerable communities.

POLICY 3.2.3.

Coordinate interagency Citywide efforts to assess the City's vulnerabilities to multiple hazards, such as poor air quality, flooding, and extreme heat.

POLICY 3.2.8

During retrofits and new construction, prioritize building practices that emit lower greenhouse gasses and build resilience to multiple hazards at once, especially in Environmental Justice Communities.

POLICY 3.3.1

Reduce the risk of all hazards to community facilities and lifeline infrastructure, starting with Environmental Justice Communities.

POLICY 3.3.3

Conduct capital planning to advance resilient infrastructure prioritizing life safety and functional recovery, as well as the needs of Environmental Justice Communities and other vulnerable people.

OBJECTIVE 3.4

SPECIFIC HAZARDS. IDENTIFY AND PURSUE PROGRAMS AND PROJECTS THAT MITIGATE AND SAFEGUARD AGAINST MULTIPLE HAZARDS ACROSS MULTIPLE ASSETS, ESPECIALLY FOR ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE COMMUNITIES AND OTHER VULNERABLE PEOPLE.

POLICY 3.4.4

Develop a plan for supporting Environmental Justice Communities and other vulnerable people during Sheltering-in-Place activities, to protect from poor and hazardous air quality, pandemic, and other hazards.

POLICY 4.4.3

Form effective and clear partnerships with non-government bodies, such as community organizations, institutions, private companies, and development partners to reach all people, especially Environmental Justice Communities and other vulnerable people.

POLICY 5.2.1

Work collaboratively with nonprofit and community partners to assist Environmental Justice Communities and other vulnerable people during and immediately after a disaster to ensure resumption of social services.

POLICY 6.1.1.

Support actions to mitigate the spread of homelessness pre-disaster and increase the likelihood that the City's stock of lowest-cost housing will survive post-disaster.

POLICY 6.1.3

Repair damaged neighborhoods in a manner that facilitates resident return and minimizes long-term displacement, prioritizing Environmental Justice Communities and other communities disproportionately impacted by housing disparities.

OBJECTIVE 6.3

EQUITABLE INVESTMENT. PURSUE PLANS AND STRATEGIES THAT WOULD EQUITABLY REBUILD SAN FRANCISCO FOR EVERYONE, STARTING WITH ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE COMMUNITIES

The EJ Framework supports these Objectives and Policies of the Safety and Resilience Element by identifying the Environmental Justice Communities they refer to, and by identifying priorities to enhance safety and resilience in these communities. Relevant priorities identified in the EJ Framework include: 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; Distribute public facilities equitably; Work to undo past harms; Prioritize participation of EJ Communities in decision-making processes; Develop community partnerships to expand city's reach.

4. **Planning Code Section 101 Findings.** The Draft Ordinance is consistent with the eight Priority Policies set forth in Section 101.1(b) of the Planning Code in that:

1. That existing neighborhood serving retail uses be preserved and enhanced and future opportunities for resident employment in or ownership of such businesses enhanced.

The Amendments would help preserve and enhance neighborhood serving retail uses and future opportunities for employment. The EJ Framework prioritizes healthy and resilient environments, healthy food access, and equitable and green jobs, ensuring a robust customer, ownership and employee base for neighborhood serving retail uses in Environmental Justice Communities.

2. That existing housing and neighborhood character be conserved and protected in order to preserve the cultural and economic diversity of our neighborhoods.

The Amendments would help conserve and protect existing housing and neighborhood character. The EJ Framework prioritizes safe, healthy and affordable homes, protecting vulnerable tenants, and empowering neighborhoods in Environmental Justice Communities.

3. That the City's supply of affordable housing be preserved and enhanced.

The Amendments would help preserve and enhance affordable housing. The EJ Framework prioritizes addressing housing affordability and availability in Environmental Justice Communities.

4. That commuter traffic not impede MUNI transit service or overburden our streets or neighborhood parking.

The Amendments would not impede MUNI transit services, overburden streets, or neighborhood parking. The EJ Framework prioritizes ensuring adequate, accessible, and safe transit in Environmental Justice Communities.

5. That a diverse economic base be maintained by protecting our industrial and service sectors from displacement due to commercial office development, and that future opportunities for resident employment and ownership in these sectors be enhanced.

The Amendments would not permit office development where it is not currently permitted. The EJ Framework prioritizes fostering a robust network of work & entrepreneurship, promoting pathways for workers' empowerment and self-determination, and facilitating the just transition of the city's economy and workforce, thus expanding employment and business ownership opportunities in Environmental Justice Communities.

6. That the City achieves the greatest possible preparedness to protect against injury and loss of

life in an earthquake.

The Amendments would enhance preparedness to protect against injury and loss of life in an earthquake. The EJ Framework prioritizes increasing climate resilience in Environmental Justice Communities.

7. That landmarks and historic buildings be preserved.

The Amendments would have no impact on landmarks or historic buildings.

8. That our parks and open space and their access to sunlight and vistas be protected from development.

The Amendments would help protect parks and open spaces. The EJ Framework prioritizes adequate public facilities including parks in Environmental Justice Communities.

Analysis of applicable General Plan Objectives and Policies has determined that the proposed action is, on balance, consistent with the General Plan as it is proposed to be amended.

5. **Planning Code Section 340 Findings.** The Commission finds from the facts presented that the public necessity, convenience, and general welfare require the proposed amendments to the General Plan as set forth in Section 340(d).
6. **Environmental Findings.** The Commission finds the Environmental Review has been completed prior to the Commission taking action on this Draft Ordinance. The Department has determined that the EJ Framework and the proposed amendments to the Introduction are not defined as a project under CEQA Guidelines Sections 15378 and 15060(c)(2) because they would not result in a direct or indirect physical change in the environment. The EJ Framework and the proposed amendments to the Introduction articulate broad visions and priorities to guide city policy objectives. They do not identify specific future city policies and do 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; and,

NOW, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Commission hereby adopts the Draft Ordinance for the Amendments as described in this Draft Resolution; and,

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Commission incorporated changes described by staff at the public hearing on March 2, 2023, including the following: 1) minor revision to the Environmental Justice Communities Map legend text from “top 30% of burdened area” to “top one-third of burdened area” and 2) additional supplemental material, the User Guide to the Environmental Justice Communities Map, offering guidance for different use cases by City agencies; and,

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Commission hereby submits the Draft Ordinance for the Amendments to the Board of Supervisors for its approval pursuant to Planning Code Section 340(d); and,

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Commission directs the Department to update the General Plan’s Land Use Index to reflect the Amendments once the Draft Ordinance has been adopted and these amendments are final if necessary; and,

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Commission directs the Department to include hyperlinks to General Plan elements, area plans, Land Use Index, the EJ Framework, Commission resolutions, local and State laws and other items discussed in the Introduction and EJ Framework when posting the Introduction and EJ Framework on the Department website once the Draft Ordinance has been adopted and these amendments are final, and to maintain these hyperlinks in good working order; and,

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Commission directs the Department to update the Environmental Justice Communities Map of the EJ Framework from time to time as new data become available.

I hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution was adopted by the Commission at its meeting on March 2, 2023.



Jonas P. Ionin
Commission Secretary

AYES: Braun, Diamond, Imperial, Koppel, Moore, Tanner

NOES: None

ABSENT: Ruiz

ADOPTED: March 2, 2023

EXHIBIT B:
DRAFT ORDINANCE
(SIGNED TO FORM)

[General Plan - Environmental Justice Framework and General Plan Introduction]

Ordinance amending the San Francisco General Plan by adopting the San Francisco Environmental Justice Framework and amending the Introduction to the General Plan; affirming the Planning Department’s determination under the California Environmental Quality Act; and making findings of public necessity, convenience, and general welfare under Planning Code, Section 340, and findings of consistency with the General Plan and the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1.

NOTE: **Unchanged Code text and uncodified text** are in plain Arial font.
Additions to Codes are in *single-underline italics Times New Roman font*.
Deletions to Codes are in ~~*strikethrough italics Times New Roman font*~~.
Board amendment additions are in double-underlined Arial font.
Board amendment deletions are in ~~Arial font~~.
Asterisks (* * * *) indicate the omission of unchanged Code subsections or parts of tables.

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. Findings.

(a) Section 4.105 of the Charter provides that the Planning Commission shall periodically recommend to the Board of Supervisors, for approval or rejection, proposed amendments to the San Francisco General Plan (“General Plan”).

(b) On _____, 2023, the Board of Supervisors received from the Planning Department the proposed Environmental Justice Framework and General Plan Introduction Update that incorporates such framework into the General Plan and amends the Introduction to the General Plan. These amendments are on file with the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors in File No. _____ and is incorporated herein by reference.

1 (c) Section 4.105 of the Charter further provides that if the Board of Supervisors fails to
2 act within 90 days of receipt of the proposed Environmental Justice Framework and General
3 Plan Introduction Update amendment, then the proposed amendment shall be deemed
4 approved.

5 (d) Planning Code Section 340 provides that an amendment to the General Plan may
6 be initiated by a resolution of intention by the Planning Commission, which refers to, and
7 incorporates by reference, the proposed General Plan amendment. Section 340 further
8 provides that the Planning Commission shall adopt the proposed General Plan amendment
9 after a public hearing if it finds from the facts presented that the public necessity,
10 convenience, and general welfare require the proposed amendment or any part thereof. If
11 adopted by the Commission in whole or in part, the proposed amendment shall be presented
12 to the Board of Supervisors, which may approve or reject the amendment by a majority vote.

13 (e) California Senate Bill 1000 (2016) amended Government Code §65302 to require
14 cities and counties with “disadvantaged communities,” which the statute defines to include
15 low-income areas that are disproportionately affected by environmental pollution and other
16 hazards that can lead to negative health effects, exposure, or environmental degradation, to
17 amend their General Plan to include policies that address environmental justice and reduce
18 the unique or compounded health risks in disadvantaged communities, promote civil
19 engagement in the public decision-making process, and prioritize improvements and
20 programs that address the needs of disadvantaged communities. This update is required
21 upon the completion or next revision of two or more General Plan elements after 2018.

22 (f) San Francisco contains several areas that are identified in the CalEnviroScreen 4.0
23 map created by the California Environmental Protection Agency and the Office of
24 Environmental Health Hazard Assessment as disadvantaged communities, including portions
25 of Bayview Hunters Point, South of Market, Treasure Island, and the Tenderloin. The Planning

1 Department conducted additional data analysis in accordance with General Plan Guidelines
2 developed by the Governor's Office of Planning Research. This analysis found that other
3 areas experience elevated health risks, resulting in the creation of a local Environmental
4 Justice Communities Map. The Environmental Justice Communities identified in the
5 Environmental Justice Communities Map comprise about one third of the City's land area with
6 the highest cumulative environmental burdens, including all the disadvantaged communities
7 as defined by state law and additional areas identified by the Planning Department.
8 Environmental Justice Communities include portions of Bayview Hunters Point, Visitacion
9 Valley, South of Market, Treasure Island, the Tenderloin, the Mission, Potrero Hill, Western
10 Addition, Chinatown, Financial District, Outer Mission, and Oceanview/Merced/Ingleside.

11 (g) The Planning Department analyzed additional demographic data in preparing the
12 Environmental Justice Communities Map. The San Francisco Health Improvement
13 Partnership's 2022 Community Health Needs Assessment found significant health disparities
14 across the city, with people of color and people residing in certain communities experiencing
15 worse health outcomes. For instance, the study found that the City's communities of color
16 experience significantly higher rates of negative health outcomes including asthma and
17 chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (hospitalization rates for Black San Franciscans are
18 approximately 10 times higher than for White residents), cancer (rates for Black San
19 Franciscans are 46 to 213 percent higher than City average), cardiovascular disease
20 (American Indian San Franciscans are twice as likely to die of cardiovascular disease before
21 the age of 65), and stroke. The impact of cardiovascular disease in San Francisco is higher
22 among residents in the southeast half of the City, while rates of asthma and chronic
23 obstructive pulmonary disease are higher in the Tenderloin, SOMA, and Bayview Hunters
24 Point neighborhoods.

1 (h) The proposed Environmental Justice Framework identifies Environmental Justice
2 Communities in San Francisco which incorporate the State's designation of disadvantaged
3 communities (as defined by California Government Code §65302) and include additional local
4 data on health and social vulnerabilities, and identifies key policy priorities and strategies to
5 further guide development of environmental justice objectives and policies.

6 (i) On _____, 2023, at a duly noticed public hearing, the Planning Commission
7 adopted the proposed Environmental Justice Framework and General Plan Introduction
8 Update by Resolution _____, finding in accordance with Planning Code Section 340
9 that the public necessity, convenience, and general welfare required the proposed
10 amendments. Said Resolution is on file with the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors in File No.
11 _____ and incorporated herein by reference.

12 (j) The Board of Supervisors finds that the proposed Environmental Justice Framework
13 and General Plan Introduction Update are, on balance, consistent with the General Plan, as
14 amended, and the priority policies of Planning Code Section 101.1 for the reasons set forth in
15 Planning Commission Resolution No. _____, and the Board hereby adopts those
16 findings as its own.

17 (k) The Planning Department has determined that the actions contemplated in this
18 ordinance comply with the California Environmental Quality Act (California Public Resources
19 Code Sections 21000 et seq.). Said determination is on file with the Clerk of the Board of
20 Supervisors in File No. ____ and is incorporated herein by reference. The Board affirms this
21 determination.

22 (l) The letter from the Planning Department transmitting the proposed Environmental
23 Justice Framework and General Plan Introduction Update to the Board of Supervisors and the
24 Planning Commission's Resolution approving the proposed Environmental Justice Framework
25 and General Plan Introduction Update is on file with the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors in

1 File No. _____. These and any and all other documents referenced in this
2 ordinance have been made available to the Board of Supervisors and may be found in both
3 the files of the Planning Department, as the custodian of records, at 49 South Van Ness
4 Avenue, San Francisco, and in File No. _____ with the Clerk of the Board of
5 Supervisors at 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, San Francisco, and are incorporated herein by
6 reference.

7
8 Section 2. Amendments to the General Plan.

9 The Board of Supervisors hereby amends the General Plan by:

10 (a) Adopting the San Francisco Environmental Justice Framework as shown in Exhibit
11 A to this ordinance, as a document incorporated by reference in the General Plan. As stated
12 in subsection (b) of Section 1 of this ordinance, the San Francisco Environmental Justice
13 Framework is on file with the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors in File No. _____.

14 (b) Deleting the existing Introduction to the General Plan, and adding a new
15 Introduction to the General Plan, as follows:

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

24 **Introduction**
25

1 San Francisco is a place of singular beauty, combining an exquisite natural setting with a
2 unique human-made urban landscape. Human settlement of San Francisco originated with the
3 Ramaytush Ohlone people, who maintained three semi-sedentary villages on the peninsula. The
4 Spanish colonists built on or near those lands when they established the Presidio and the Mission,
5 resulting in the eventual displacement, subjugation, and cultural erasure of these communities. Since
6 then, the City has grown with a density that is unusual on the West Coast. Where other cities flatten
7 their hills or wind streets around them, here the rush to develop created a defiant street grid that
8 accentuates the inclines and introduces dramatic vistas across the bay and deep into the cosmopolitan
9 center. San Francisco's lively and varied pattern of neighborhoods, commercial centers, and parks has
10 nurtured a remarkable diversity of communities. It has been not only a hub for the Bay Area but a
11 global center of economic energy, technological innovation, and influential political, social, and
12 cultural movements.

13 Amid this beloved setting lies the inherent, often hidden fragility, including vulnerability to
14 natural disasters and to the mounting consequences of anthropogenic climate change. The city has also
15 been shaped by a history of injustices including segregation, urban renewal, and the inequitable
16 distribution of environmental benefits and burdens. The City's human scale is justly celebrated for its
17 charm and livability – but the City continues to struggle with housing affordability.

18 **Purpose**

19 The San Francisco General Plan is the embodiment of the City's vision for the future, serving to
20 guide evolution and growth over time. It provides a comprehensive set of goals, objectives, and policies
21 that influence how people live, work, and move about, as well as the quality and spirit of the City.
22 Periodic updates via a public adoption process ensure that this document remains freshly relevant. The
23 General Plan governs actions by all arms of San Francisco's government. It is implemented by the
24 city's direction of public resources and guidance of private development.

1 State law and San Francisco's Charter require a comprehensive, long-term general plan for the
2 physical development of the city. The San Francisco General Plan ensures that there is adequate
3 infrastructure to support residential, commercial, recreational, and institutional land uses and
4 facilities, and that neighborhoods are walkable and connected by a robust transportation system
5 geared toward public transit, walking, and biking. Economic growth should position San Francisco for
6 a resilient future sustainably linked to and coordinated with regional development.

7 The General Plan attempts to navigate complex imperatives between preserving cherished
8 qualities and assets, tackling needed changes, and preparing for both known and unpredictable
9 challenges and crises. In 2020, as the COVID-19 pandemic and the killing of George Floyd highlighted
10 inequalities, the Planning Commission passed Resolution Number 20738 to center the Planning
11 Department's work program and resource allocation on racial and social equity. This mandate has
12 been incorporated into the General Plan. In doing so, the City and County of San Francisco
13 acknowledges and apologizes for the history of inequitable planning policies and actions that have
14 resulted in racial disparities. San Francisco must take reparative actions and build accountability in
15 collaboration with American Indian communities, Black communities, communities of color, and other
16 historically marginalized and disenfranchised communities.

17 **Process and Vision**

18 The General Plan's goals, objectives, and policies have been developed with extensive
19 community engagement. These robust conversations and public hearings are designed to distill a
20 shared vision for the City's future.

21 In this shared vision, San Francisco strives to be...
22 ...a just city, committed to racial and social equity, starting with recognizing and seeking to
23 rectify past injustices.

24 ...an inclusive city, where all can find a home and community as well a nurturing environment
25 for creativity and self-expression.

1 ...a safe, livable, and environmentally sustainable city, where all are able to live healthy lives
2 and access thriving natural systems, restorative parks, and a high-quality built environment. The
3 climate crisis requires urgent local, regional, and global action.

4 ...an economically vital city, where all are able to prosper. Economic vitality is possible only
5 where stable, meaningful livelihoods are protected, entrepreneurial dynamism is fostered within an
6 ecosystem that can withstand geopolitical turbulence and financial volatility, and everyone can access
7 ladders to opportunity

8 ...a city that recognizes that achieving justice, inclusivity, safety, livability, environmental
9 sustainability and economic vitality requires accountable government, regional cooperation,
10 transparent processes, and incorporation of diverse communities into all aspects of decision making.

11 **Structure**

12 The General Plan consists of a series of Elements and Area Plans.

13 Each Element addresses a topic and generally applies citywide, while Area Plans relate these
14 topics comprehensively to specific parts of the city in a greater level of detail. Several of the Elements
15 correspond to topics that state law requires the General Plan to address, including Air Quality,
16 Community Facilities, Environmental Protection, Housing, Recreation and Open Space, Safety and
17 Resilience, and Transportation. San Francisco has also chosen to address additional topics through
18 Elements including Arts, Commerce and Industry, and Urban Design. Policies related to land use are
19 located throughout the General Plan and are cross-referenced in a Land Use Index.

20 Environmental Justice policies required by the State have been integrated throughout the
21 General Plan. The Environmental Justice Framework, hereby incorporated into the General Plan by
22 reference, sets out key policy priorities and strategies which will be integrated into elements, area
23 plans, and supporting documents to improve public health and other outcomes in Environmental
24 Justice Communities, which are primarily communities of color and lower-income communities that
25 face higher pollution levels and other health risks.

Area Plans of the San Francisco General Plan include:

- Balboa Park Station
- Bayview Hunters Point
- Candlestick Point Subarea
- Central SoMa (South of Market)
- Central Waterfront
- Chinatown
- Civic Center
- Downtown
- East SoMa (South of Market)
- Executive Park Subarea
- Glen Park
- Hunters Point Shipyard
- Market and Octavia
- Mission
- Northeastern Waterfront
- Rincon Hill
- Showplace Square/Potrero
- Transit Center District Subarea
- Treasure Island/Yerba Buena Island
- Van Ness Avenue
- Western Shoreline
- Western SoMa (South of Market)

Introduction

1 *San Francisco is a special place. Foremost is its dramatic physical beauty, created by bay and*
2 *ocean surrounding a cluster of hills that are often illuminated by brilliant sun or shrouded in silvery*
3 *fog. The views from these hilltops were given to us inadvertently. The early settlers, in their scramble to*
4 *forge a new life, imposed a simple grid system on the land. So instead of streets winding themselves*
5 *around the hills we have streets that can scale the hilltops to reveal extraordinary vistas. These vistas*
6 *give us a city that appeals from any perspective and sparks our imagination.*

7 *Secondly, San Francisco is compact. Its density creates a rich variety of experiences and*
8 *encounters on every street. The city is cosmopolitan and affable, easily traversed by foot or by bus, and*
9 *offers an intriguing balance of urban architecture.*

10 *Thirdly, San Francisco is the center, the soul of the region and cooperative efforts to maintain*
11 *the area's quality of life are imperative. The City has long been a magnet for business, culture,*
12 *retailing, tourism and education. Its rich 150 year history reflects the cultures of the world and gives*
13 *energetic diversity to its neighborhoods. The residents strive to maintain this tradition, welcoming*
14 *people from around the world to participate in the promise of a healthy city.*

15 *There are many issues we must face as we look to the future of our economy, work force,*
16 *housing stock, transportation systems, open spaces, and vacant lands. San Francisco is a dynamic*
17 *entity within which there are constant pressures for change and renewal. It remains the finance capital*
18 *for the West and is an emerging gateway to the Pacific Rim. However as we enter the 21st century, new*
19 *technologies, medical research and design are providing additional economic opportunity.*

20 *The City's General Plan serves to guide these changes to ensure that the qualities that make San*
21 *Francisco unique are preserved and enhanced. The General Plan is based on a creative consensus*
22 *concerning social, economic, and environmental issues. Adopted by the Planning Commission and*
23 *approved by the Board of Supervisors, the General Plan serves as a basis for decisions that affect all*
24 *aspects of our everyday lives from where we live and work to how we move about. It is both a strategic*
25 *and long term document, broad in scope and specific in nature. It is implemented by decisions that*

1 ~~direct the allocation of public resources and that shape private development. In short, the General Plan~~
2 ~~is the embodiment of the community's vision for the future of San Francisco.~~

3 ~~State law requires that the General Plan address seven issues: land use, circulation, housing,~~
4 ~~conservation, open space, noise and safety.~~

5 ~~The Charter approved by the voters in November 1995 requires that the Planning Commission~~
6 ~~recommend amendments to the General Plan to the Board of Supervisors for approval. This approval~~
7 ~~changes the Plan's status from an advisory to a mandatory document and underscores the importance~~
8 ~~of Referrals establishing consistency with the General Plan prior to actions by the Board of~~
9 ~~Supervisors on a variety of actions.~~

10 ~~The San Francisco General Plan is designed as a guide to the attainment of the following~~
11 ~~general goals:~~

- 12 ~~● Protection, preservation, and enhancement of the economic, social, cultural, and~~
13 ~~esthetic values that establish the desirable quality and unique character of the city.~~
- 14 ~~● Improvement of the city as a place for living, by aiding in making it more healthful, safe,~~
15 ~~pleasant, and satisfying, with housing representing good standards for all residents and~~
16 ~~by providing adequate open spaces and appropriate community facilities.~~
- 17 ~~● Improvement of the city as a place for commerce and industry by making it more~~
18 ~~efficient, orderly, and satisfactory for the production, exchange and distribution of~~
19 ~~goods and services, with adequate space for each type of economic activity and~~
20 ~~improved facilities for the loading and movement of goods.~~
- 21 ~~● Coordination of the varied pattern of land use with public and semi-public service~~
22 ~~facilities required for efficient functioning of the city, and for the convenience and well-~~
23 ~~being of its residents, workers, and visitors.~~

1 • ~~Coordination of the varied pattern of land use with circulation routes and facilities~~
2 ~~required for the efficient movement of people and goods within the city, and to and from~~
3 ~~the city.~~

4 • ~~Coordination of the growth and development of the city with the growth and~~
5 ~~development of adjoining cities and counties and of the San Francisco Bay Region.~~

6 ~~The Plan is intended to be an integrated, internally consistent and compatible statement of~~
7 ~~objectives and policies and its objectives, and policies are to be construed in a manner which achieves~~
8 ~~that intent. Sec. 101.1(b) of the Planning Code, which was added by Proposition M, November 4, 1986,~~
9 ~~provides as follows:~~

10 ~~The following Priority Policies are hereby established. They shall be included in the preamble~~
11 ~~to the General Plan and shall be the basis upon which inconsistencies in the General Plan are~~
12 ~~resolved:~~

- 13 ~~1. That existing neighborhood-serving retail uses be preserved and enhanced and future~~
14 ~~opportunities for resident employment in and ownership of such businesses enhanced;~~
- 15 ~~2. That existing housing and neighborhood character be conserved and protected in order~~
16 ~~to preserve the cultural and economic diversity of our neighborhoods;~~
- 17 ~~3. That the City's supply of affordable housing be preserved and enhanced;~~
- 18 ~~4. That commuter traffic not impede Muni transit services or overburden our streets or~~
19 ~~neighborhood parking;~~
- 20 ~~5. That a diverse economic base be maintained by protecting our industrial and service~~
21 ~~sectors from displacement due to commercial office development, and that future~~
22 ~~opportunities for resident employment and ownership in these sectors be enhanced;~~
- 23 ~~6. That the City achieve the greatest possible preparedness to protect against injury and~~
24 ~~the loss of life in an earthquake.~~
- 25 ~~7. That landmarks and historic buildings be preserved; and~~

1 8.—~~That our parks and open space and their access to sunlight and vistas be protected from~~
2 ~~development.~~

3 ~~The manner in which the general goals are to be attained is set forth through a statement of~~
4 ~~objectives and policies in a series of elements, each one dealing with a particular topic, which applies~~
5 ~~citywide. The General Plan currently contains the following elements: Residence, Commerce and~~
6 ~~Industry, Recreation and Open Space, Community Facilities, Transportation, Community Safety,~~
7 ~~Environmental Protection, Urban Design and Arts. In addition, a Land Use Index cross-references the~~
8 ~~policies related to land use located throughout the General Plan. Additional elements may be added~~
9 ~~from time to time.~~

10 ~~The Plan also contains several area plans which cover their respective geographic areas of the city.~~
11 ~~Here the more general policies in the General Plan elements are made more precise as they relate to~~
12 ~~specific parts of the city.~~

13 ~~In addition to the elements, area plans and the land use index comprising the complete General~~
14 ~~Plan, there are several documents which support the plan. These include background papers, technical~~
15 ~~reports, proposals for citizen review, environmental impact reports or negative declarations, program~~
16 ~~documents, and design guidelines. Program documents provide schedules and programs for the short~~
17 ~~range implementation of the General Plan.~~

18 ///

19 ///

20 ///

21 ///

22 ///

23 ///

24

25

1 Section 3. Effective Date. This ordinance shall become effective 30 days after
2 enactment. Enactment occurs when the Mayor signs the ordinance, the Mayor returns the
3 ordinance unsigned or does not sign the ordinance within ten days of receiving it, or the Board
4 of Supervisors overrides the Mayor's veto of the ordinance.

5
6
7 APPROVED AS TO FORM:
8 DAVID CHIU, City Attorney

9 By: /s/ Robb Kapla
10 ROBB KAPLA
11 Deputy City Attorney

12 n:\legana\as2023\2300013\01658773.docx

EXHIBIT C:
PLANNING COMMISSION
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY FOR
CASE NO. 2018-017026GPA – MARCH 2,
2023



EXECUTIVE SUMMARY GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT

HEARING DATE: March 2, 2023

Project Name: San Francisco Environmental Justice Framework and General Plan Introduction
Case Number: 2018-017026GPA
Initiated by: Planning Department Staff
Staff Contact: Danielle Ngo, Senior Planner
danielle.ngo@sfgov.org, (628) 652-7591
Amnon Ben-Pazi, Senior Planner
amnon.ben-pazi@sfgov.org, (628) 652-7428
Reviewed by: Lisa Chen, Principal Planner, Citywide Division
lisa.chen@sfgov.org, (628) 652-7422
Environmental Review: Not Defined as a Project under CEQA Guidelines Sections 15378 and 15060(c)(2)

Recommendation:	Approval
------------------------	----------

Background

The Planning Department (hereinafter “the Department”) is undergoing a multi-year effort to modernize the City’s General Plan, since the last major element update in 2014 (Recreation and Open Space Element). The Department recently completed updates to the Safety & Resilience Element (adopted 2022) and the Housing Element (adopted 2023). The proposal for the Environmental Justice Framework (“EJ Framework”) and the General Plan Introduction (“Introduction”) seeks to amend the General Plan by adopting a new EJ Framework and updating the 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 Introduction. The Transportation Element is scheduled for a comprehensive update to be completed in 2025.

General Plan policy guides public and private action, serving as a comprehensive roadmap for how the City will change and develop into the future. The EJ Framework represents the first citywide policy focused on advancing environmental justice across all City agencies. It includes a set of vision and priority statements that were developed with robust feedback from the community. The Introduction represents current values and themes from public engagement, and serves as the “front door” setting the intention of the General Plan,

The proposed General Plan Amendments include:

- **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. Rather than a standalone Environmental Justice Element, the EJ Framework will be adopted in the General Plan Introduction to ensure that environmental justice is integrated throughout the General Plan.
- **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.

The EJ Framework is provided in full as Exhibit A. This document reflects over two and a half years of work to identify community needs and values pertaining to environmental health conditions, healthy communities, and racial and social equity. It represents a close collaboration between numerous City agencies, particularly with the San Francisco Department of Public Health, the San Francisco Department of the Environment, and the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission.

This adoption hearing serves as the Planning Commission’s formal opportunity to consider the proposed General Plan Amendment since the initiation on January 26, 2023. If approved, the proposal is forwarded to the Board of Supervisors for consideration of adoption.

Project Updates Since January 26, 2023 Planning Commission Initiation Hearing

At the January 26, 2023 initiation hearing, there was a strong display of interagency support for the EJ Framework and continued collaboration on implementing environmental justice policies. After staff presentation, the Commissioners heard public testimony from City staff at the Municipal Transportation Agency, Recreation and Parks Department, the Port of San Francisco, Department of Environment, and Department of Public Health. These five agencies participated in the process to develop the EJ Framework, especially by participating on the Environmental Justice Working Group to draft policy recommendations. Their testimony emphasized a shared desire to leverage the EJ Framework to direct the work of their respective agencies around

environmental justice and to consider the EJ Framework as a working document that evolves over time to meet the needs of the community.

The Commissioners also heard from three community members during public comment, one of whom submitted supplementary written comment. The three speakers were involved in the project's outreach and engagement process and expressed support for the EJ Framework. Their comments emphasized the need for implementation of the EJ Framework by City agencies; to continue environmental justice work in collaboration with the American Indian community; and to highlight the City's work with the African American Reparations Advisory Committee to repair harm in Black communities.

Since the January 26, 2023 initiation hearing, the project team held public hearings with the Environment Commission and Human Rights Commission. The project team also accomplished various minor updates, including: updates for the EJ Framework Draft for Adoption (Exhibit A); updates for the General Plan Introduction Draft for Adoption (Exhibit B); completed analysis of Environmental Review (Exhibit C); updates for the Draft Ordinance (Exhibit D); updates for the Draft Resolution (Exhibit E); updates for the EJ Communities Map Technical Documentation (Exhibit F); and updates for the EJ Framework Outreach and Engagement Summary (Exhibit G).

Public Hearings

The project team visited the Environment Commission and Human Rights Commission to discuss the EJ Framework and the intersectional issues. As part of the staff reports, the Commissioners received copies of the January 26, 2023 Initiation Draft of the EJ Framework. At both hearings, there were no comments received from members of the public.

Environment Commission Informational Hearing (February 7, 2023)

The presentation closely mirrored what the project team shared at the January 26, 2023 initiation hearing at Planning Commission. It also highlighted the essential coordination with Department of Environment staff, particularly as City agency staff members on the Environmental Justice Working Group ("EJ Working Group"). The EJ Working Group was a cornerstone activity as part of the outreach and engagement process (Exhibit G), and it was critical for City agency staff to co-develop draft policy recommendations with community members most impacted by environmental injustices. Department of Environment staff supported the project team in the scoping and recruitment of the EJ Working Group and participated fully in the eight-month activity.

The Environment Commission expressed support of the EJ Framework and appreciation for the depth and thoroughness of the work. The Commissioners were particularly interested in the EJ Communities Map and its value in depicting a fine-grained understanding of environmental burden in the City, as compared to the state's CalEnviroScreen.

- Commissioner Stephenson asked a series of clarifying questions about the scope and schedule of updates for the General Plan. In parallel to the Climate Action Plan directing the actions of the Department of Environment, she was curious about the relationship of the General Plan to SF Planning. The project team clarified that the City's General Plan is a state-mandated land use document that encompasses a range of policy topics such as commerce, housing, air quality, transportation and safety. The project team explained that each policy topic area—or Element—is updated on its own cadence; the Housing Element is mandated

to be updated every 8 years, whereas other Elements have no mandates for regular updates. The EJ Framework does not currently have a mandate to be updated.

- Commissioner Ahn expressed support for the EJ Communities Map and its inclusion of communities that are not identified by CalEnviroScreen as a DAC, such as Chinatown. He encouraged the project team to communicate the methodology and analysis of the EJ Communities Map to the relevant state agencies, CalEPA and OEHHA, to advocate for changes to CalEnviroScreen that would result in a more accurate and inclusive definition of Disadvantaged Communities in San Francisco.

Human Rights Commission Informational Hearing (February 9, 2023)

This presentation also closely mirrored what the project team shared at the January 26, 2023 initiation hearing at Planning Commission and highlighted the essential coordination with HRC staff on the EJ Working Group. HRC staff supported the project team in the scoping of the EJ Working Group and participated on the policy subgroup for Safe, Healthy, Affordable Homes and Empowered Neighborhoods.

The Human Rights Commission expressed support of the EJ Framework and appreciation for the depth and thoroughness of the work. The Commissioners were particularly interested in the EJ Communities Map and its value in depicting a fine-grained understanding of environmental burden in the City, as compared to the state's CalEnviroScreen.

- Commissioner Clopton asked about the relationship between the EJ Framework and contamination issues in Bayview Hunter's Point. She asked about the City's plans to hold the Navy and developer accountable to contamination in the neighborhood and its adverse impacts to the health and wellbeing of the community. The project team described high-level priority statements in the EJ Framework around clean and healthy environments (e.g., mitigating and eliminating environmental pollution), as well as priorities around empowered neighborhoods (e.g., community members and the City working together to repair past harms and empower community-led solutions for environmental justice). The project team also shared that while the issues are related, the EJ Framework is a separate effort from the contamination issues and clean up work in Bayview Hunter's Point.
- Commissioner Reverend Shaw asked for the project team's plans for broadly sharing the EJ Communities Map and its accompanying data around health disparities and racial and social equity. The project team described that there is technical documentation to the EJ Communities Map that describes its scope, methodology, and analysis, as well as plans to publish an accompanying Environmental Justice Data Portal ("Data Portal"). The Data Portal will share additional data on health disparities and racial and social equity that is not included in the EJ Communities Map, but is still relevant to environmental justice.
- Commissioner Aquino asked a clarifying question of which neighborhoods are considered an EJ Community. She expressed support of the EJ Communities Map and its inclusive determination of areas in the City that are facing disproportionate environmental burden. The project team clarified that the following areas are determined as EJ Communities, the top one-third of areas in the City with environmental burden. The EJ Communities include Bayview Hunter's Point, Chinatown, Excelsior, Japantown, Mission, Oceanview-Merced Heights-Ingleside, Outer Mission, Potrero Hill, SoMa, Tenderloin, Treasure Island, Visitacion Valley,

and Western Addition.

Changes from Initiation Draft to Adoption Draft of the Environmental Justice Framework

There have been minor updates made to the Adoption Draft of the Environmental Justice Framework (Exhibit A). The revisions incorporate feedback gathered at the January 26, 2023 Planning Commission initiation hearing.

Content Updates:

- To acknowledge the City's efforts to repair harm in the Black community, there are new references to the African American Reparations Advisory Committee (San Francisco Human Rights Commission). These references are in the Introduction (pg. 4) and Empowered Neighborhoods (pg. 27).

Visual Updates:

- The EJ Communities Map has been updated (pg. 8). This version uses a different color scheme to enhance the EJ Communities (in red), the areas facing the top one-third of cumulative environmental burdens. The underlying analysis and determination of EJ Communities has remained unchanged.
- Each policy topic has a header photo, including a photo source, caption, and hidden alt text (pgs. 10, 13, 16, 19, 22, 25). The header photos celebrate an example of each policy topic and makes the EJ Framework more visually appealing.

Changes from Initiation Draft to Adoption Draft of the General Plan Introduction

The following minor updates were made to the proposed General Plan Introduction since the Initiation Draft was published for the January 26, 2023 initiation hearing:

- To enhance readability, the subheading "*The Purpose of the General Plan*" was shortened to "*Purpose*".
- To correct grammar, a definite article was added to the sentence "*It is implemented by **the** city's direction of public resources and guidance of private development.*"
- Added references to two Area Plans which were inadvertently omitted from the Draft Ordinance at Initiation, namely the Central SoMa (South of Market) Area Plan and the Treasure Island/Yerba Buena Island Area Plan.

Changes to Draft Ordinance

There have been minor updates made to the Draft Ordinance (Exhibit D). The updates include additional context for the EJ Framework and EJ Communities Map, deletion of the "Directions to the Planning Department" section, and formatting and technical changes to correct typos and to conform to the Clerk of the Board's formatting style. The updates do not substantively change the content of what was presented at the January 26, 2023 Planning Commission initiation hearing.

Additional context for the EJ Framework and EJ Communities Map has been added to Section 1 of the Draft Ordinance to include:

- Subsection (e) provides additional details on California Senate Bill 1000 (2016) and Government Code §65302 which define Disadvantaged Communities and require the General Plan to include policies that address environmental justice.
- Subsections (f) and (g) outline the relationship between state-defined Disadvantaged Communities, the locally-designated Environmental Justice Communities Map, and disparate health outcomes documented in San Francisco Health Improvement Partnership’s 2022 Community Health Needs Assessment.
- Subsection (h) affirms that the EJ Framework and EJ Communities Map address the requirements of California Senate Bill 1000 and Government Code §65302 pertaining to Disadvantaged Communities and accompanying environmental justice policies and objectives.

Other non-substantive edits include:

- Directions to the Planning Department (Section 3 of the Initiation Draft Ordinance) have been deleted as unnecessary.
- The proposed General Plan Introduction, included in the Draft Ordinance, was amended as described above.

Changes to Environmental Justice Communities Map Technical Documentation

There have been minor updates made to the San Francisco Environmental Justice Communities Map: Technical Documentation (Exhibit F). In addition to light copyediting:

Content Updates:

- Rather than describing EJ Communities as the “top 30% of areas” experiencing environmental burden in San Francisco, all text references were updated to the “top one-third of areas.”
- The Appendix was updated to share the full color and outline versions of the EJ Communities Map for other people’s flexible use. The version of the map that excluded Lakeshore from the EJ Communities was removed from the Appendix.

Visual Updates:

- The EJ Communities Map has been updated (pg. 6). This version uses a different color scheme to enhance the EJ Communities, the top one-third of areas (in red). The underlying analysis and determination of EJ Communities has remained unchanged.

Changes to the Community Outreach and Engagement for the Environmental Justice Framework

There have been minor updates made to the San Francisco Environmental Justice Framework: Outreach & Engagement Summary (Exhibit G). In addition to light copyediting:

Content Updates:

- A section was added to summarize Briefings, Web Updates, GovDelivery and E-Blasts, and Direct Feedback via Email. (pg. 23). This section summarizes the project team's open offer for the community to provide direct feedback; request a project briefing; learn about project updates; and engage in key outreach and engagement opportunities.

Visual Updates:

- The EJ Communities Map has been updated (pg. 2). This version uses a different color scheme to enhance the EJ Communities, the top one-third of areas (in red). The underlying analysis and determination of EJ Communities has remained unchanged.

Required Commission Action

The Commission is being asked to **adopt** the proposed amendments to the General Plan for the Environmental Justice Framework & General Plan Introduction. The project team recommends that the Commission adopt the Draft Resolution (Exhibit E) approving amendments to the General Plan Amendment and request that the Board of Supervisors adopt the amendments.

Recommendation

The Department recommends that the Commission **approve** the proposed Draft Ordinance and adopt the attached Draft Resolution to that effect.

Basis for Recommendation

The proposed EJ Framework (Exhibit A) and update to the General Plan Introduction (Exhibit B) embed environmental justice and racial and social equity into the General Plan by incorporating the EJ Framework by reference into the Introduction and updating the language of the Introduction to reflect current values and themes from public engagement. Here are the six environmental justice topics of the proposed EJ Framework and their highlighted features:

Healthy and Resilient Environments

This topic addresses the mitigation and elimination of environmental pollution to address adverse health outcomes and health disparities. It also addresses the impacts of the climate crisis, as disasters are occurring more frequently, intensely, and simultaneously. The priorities work to build healthy environments and climate resilience for 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.

Example Priority

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.

Physical Activity and Healthy Public Facilities

This topic addresses aspects of the built environment that support daily physical activity. These aspects largely pertain to the transportation network (prioritizing active and low-carbon transportation modes) and public facilities such as community centers, libraries, parks and recreation facilities, schools, and hospitals. The priorities seek to enhance the accessibility, quality, maintenance, and safety of physical and public facilities so that the community can improve their physical and mental well-being.

Example Priority

Offer diverse, flexible, and inclusive programming in public facilities

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.

Healthy Food Access

This topic addresses the human right to healthy food. It addresses food insecurity, which is associated with a range of chronic health conditions and lowered life expectancy, especially for children and seniors, people who are pregnant, people experiencing homelessness, and people with preexisting health conditions. The priorities work to improve access to healthy, affordable food that suits the needs, dietary considerations, and cultural identity of the community.

Example Priority

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.

Safe, Healthy, and Affordable Homes

This topic addresses the human right to safe, healthy, and affordable homes. The soaring cost of housing in San Francisco has further magnified racial and social disparities, and it has led to the decline in population of people of color (particularly American Indian and Black residents) and to the increase in the number of housing-insecure and unhoused individuals. The priorities were developed in parallel with the recently adopted Housing

Element, and work to create healthy housing for every person in San Francisco, regardless of race or ethnicity, national origin, immigration status, disability, sexual orientation, or language spoken.

Example Priority

Ensure that housing supports public health

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.

Equitable and Green Jobs

This topic addresses the network of job and workforce opportunities that contribute to the development of healthy communities. Beyond a traditional “green job,” this topic seeks to address income disparities and unemployment rates, ensure living wages and quality benefits, and promote dignified labor and career opportunities. The priorities work to provide residents with economic security, helping stabilize communities and generating social and economic benefits to the community.

Example Priority

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.

Empowered Neighborhoods

This topic addresses the voices of historically under-resourced communities in local decision-making processes. With empowered neighborhoods, residents, business owners, and community organizations can work across neighborhood boundaries and in collaboration with the City to cocreate and impact decisions that affect their community. The priorities work to build community cohesion, hold City government accountable, and provide the community with resources to enable change.

Example Priority

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.

Environmental Review

The proposed Ordinance and General Plan Amendment are not defined as a project under CEQA Guidelines Sections 15378 and 15060(c)(2) because the policies do not result in a direct or indirect physical change in the environment (Exhibit C).

Public Comment

The Department conducted over two years of outreach and engagement from Fall 2020 to Fall 2022. The approach, process, and findings are summarized in Exhibit G.

The project team will receive additional comment at the Planning Commission adoption hearing scheduled for March 2, 2023, and any subsequent adoption hearings that may be held relating to this project.

Attachments:

Exhibit A:	Adoption Draft of the Environmental Justice Framework
Exhibit B:	Adoption Draft of the General Plan Introduction
Exhibit C:	Environmental Review
Exhibit D:	Draft Ordinance
Exhibit E:	Draft Resolution
Exhibit F:	Environmental Justice Communities Map: Technical Documentation (Updated for Adoption)
Exhibit G:	Outreach and Engagement Summary for the Environmental Justice Framework (Updated for Adoption)
Exhibit H:	Letter of Support from the Office of Resilience and Capital Planning
Exhibit I:	Letter of Support from the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission

EXHIBIT D:

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW



ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

Project Name: San Francisco Environmental Justice Framework and General Plan Introduction
Case Number: 2018-017926GPA
Staff Contact: Jessica Range, Principal Environmental Planner
jessica.range@sfgov.org, (628) 652-7564

Determination: Not Defined as a Project under CEQA Guidelines Sections 15378 and 15060(c)(2)

Summary

The Department has determined that the Environmental Justice Framework (“EJ Framework”) and the proposed amendments to the General Plan Introduction (“Introduction”) are not defined as a project under CEQA Guidelines Sections 15378 and 15060(c)(2) because they would not result in a direct or indirect physical change in the environment.

The EJ Framework and the proposed amendments to the Introduction articulate broad visions and priorities to guide city policy objectives. They do not identify specific future city policies and do 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.

EXHIBIT E:
ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE
FRAMEWORK

San Francisco Environmental Justice Framework

MARCH 2023



San Francisco
Planning

San Francisco
Department of Public Health

SAN FRANCISCO
ENVIRONMENT
DEPARTMENT


San Francisco
Water Power Sewer

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 vulnerable¹ 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 (for example, the formation of an African American Reparations Advisory Committee to develop recommendations for repairing harms in the Black community resulting from City policies), 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).^{2,3,4}

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.^{5,6} 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

2 City and County of San Francisco. Establishing African American Reparations Advisory Committee Ordinance (Ordinance No. 259-20). December 8, 2020.

3 San Francisco Health Improvement Partnership (SFHIP). San Francisco Community Health Needs Assessment 2019. 2019. Last accessed November 2022: <http://www.sfhip.org/chna/sf-chna/>

4 San Francisco Healthy Homes Project. Community Health Status Assessment. 2012. Last accessed November 2022: https://www.sfdph.org/dph/files/EHSdocs/PHES/Healthy_Homes_Assessment_BVHP_2012.pdf

5 First National People of Color Environmental Leadership Summit. Principles of Environmental Justice. 1991. Last accessed November 2022: <https://www.ejnet.org/ej/principles.html>

6 United States Environmental Protection Agency. Summary of Executive Order 12898 – Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations. 1994. Last accessed November 2022: <https://www.epa.gov/laws-regulations/summary-executive-order-12898-federal-actions-address-environmental-justice>

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 justice⁷ 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.^{8,9}

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 (CCA EJ) 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.

7 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.

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

9 San Francisco Planning Commission. Centering Planning on Racial and Social Equity (Resolution No. 20738). July 11, 2022.

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.”¹⁰ For purposes of this EJ Framework, the City defines environmental justice as follows:¹¹

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.



Photo Credit: FatCamera / iStock

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.^{12,13} The areas in red are deemed Environmental Justice Communities, representing the top one-third of cumulative environmental hazards in the City. EJ Communities are often (though not exclusively) low-income communities and communities

¹⁰ California Code, Government Code § 65040.12, subd. (e).

¹¹ 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).

¹² 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>

¹³ 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.”

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.¹⁴

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.¹⁵

What is the San Francisco Environmental Justice Framework?

This EJ Framework is part of [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 **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 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.



14 For more information on the San Francisco Environmental Justice Communities Map, see: <https://sfplanning.org/project/environmental-justice-framework-and-general-plan-policies#ej-communities>

15 Policy Recommendations for the Environmental Justice Framework. Environmental Justice Working Group. January 24, 2022. Last accessed January 2023: <https://sfplanning.org/project/environmental-justice-framework-and-general-plan-policies#info>

Figure 1. Environmental Justice Communities Map



Source: SF Planning, 2023

NOTE: This map was created to meet the requirements of CA Senate Bill 1000. The legislation requires that municipalities identify where "Disadvantaged Communities" are located, defined as areas facing elevated pollution burden coupled with a high incidence of low-income residents. This map is based on the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA) CalEnviroScreen 4.0 Map, modified to incorporate additional local data on pollution burden and socioeconomic disadvantage.

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



The 2017 People's Climate March heightened activism at the local level for environmental justice, and it was one of the most diverse showings of any environmental event in U.S. history.

Photo Credit: Becker1999 / Flickr

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)



Photo Credit: SFMTA Photo

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



Distribute public facilities equitably

Evaluate the need for community facilities in EJ Communities and add new or expand existing facilities as needed.



Ensure public facilities are accessible and safe for all

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.



Offer diverse, flexible, and inclusive programming in public facilities

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.



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)

The Bayview Farmers Market supports healthy food access in the community by providing an accessible and affordable option to buy fresh produce.



Photo Credit: Dale Cruse / Flickr

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 Knowledge¹⁶ and nature-based food practices. Support nature-based and culturally appropriate access to public land and open space for foraging, gathering, cultivating,

¹⁶ 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>)

fishing, and hunting¹⁷ 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)

¹⁷ 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.



In San Francisco, having safe, healthy, and affordable housing includes promoting neighborhoods that are well-connected, healthy, and rich with community culture.

Photo Credit: raqpixel / iStock

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.



Protect vulnerable tenants

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.



Expand housing choices citywide

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.



Ensure that housing supports public health

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.

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)

The Candlestick Point Native Plant Nursery is a program by Literacy for Environmental Justice for educational programming, green workforce development, and native habitat restoration.



Photo Credit: SF Conservation Corps and Literacy for Environmental Justice

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.¹⁸ 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




¹⁸ San Francisco Health Improvement Partnership (SFHIP). Community Health Data. Economic Environment. 2022. Last accessed January 2023: <http://www.sfhip.org/chna/community-health-data/economic-environment/>

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.
	Promote pathways for workers’ empowerment and self-determination	Create employment pathways along the jobs pipeline that enable youth, seniors, returning citizens, ¹⁹ 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.

19 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/>



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 transition²⁰ 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.

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)

20 "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>



With empowered neighborhoods, community members can work cohesively with the City to undo the harms of past actions and enable proactive, community-led solutions for the future.

Photo Credit: Drazen_ / iStock

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 both undo the harms of past actions and also actively define and facilitate equitable and just outcomes.

PRIORITIES



Prioritize participation of EJ Communities in decision-making processes

Seek and devote resources to engaging meaningful, ongoing participation and community involvement in decisions that are most likely to impact EJ Communities.



Build capacity for diverse voices to engage

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.



Center environmental justice efforts in collaboration with American Indian communities and Traditional Ecological Knowledge²¹

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.

21 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>)



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 the 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 African American Reparations Advisory Committee** (SF Human Rights Commission)
- **San Francisco Cultural Districts Program**
- **Community Advisory Committees and other advisory groups**

EXHIBIT F:

GENERAL PLAN INTRODUCTION



INTRODUCTION TO THE SAN FRANCISCO GENERAL PLAN

Land Acknowledgement

The City and County of San Francisco 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.

Introduction

San Francisco is a place of singular beauty, combining an exquisite natural setting with a unique human-made urban landscape. Human settlement of San Francisco originated with the Ramaytush Ohlone people, who maintained three semi-sedentary villages on the peninsula. The Spanish colonists built on or near those lands when they established the Presidio and the Mission, resulting in the eventual displacement, subjugation, and cultural erasure of these communities. Since then, the City has grown with a density that is unusual on the West Coast. Where other cities flatten their hills or wind streets around them, here the rush to develop created a defiant street grid that accentuates the inclines and introduces dramatic vistas across the bay and deep into the cosmopolitan center. San Francisco's lively and varied pattern of neighborhoods, commercial centers, and parks has nurtured a remarkable diversity of communities. It has been not only a hub for the Bay Area but a global center of economic energy, technological innovation, and influential political, social, and cultural movements.

Amid this beloved setting lies the inherent, often hidden fragility, including vulnerability to natural disasters and to the mounting consequences of anthropogenic climate change. The city has also been shaped by a history of injustices including segregation, urban renewal, and the inequitable distribution of environmental benefits and burdens. The City's human scale is justly celebrated for its charm and livability – but the City continues to struggle with housing affordability.

Purpose

The San Francisco General Plan is the embodiment of the City's vision for the future, serving to guide evolution and growth over time. It provides a comprehensive set of goals, objectives and policies that influence how people live, work, and move about, as well as the quality and spirit of the City. Periodic updates via a public

adoption process ensure that this document remains freshly relevant. The General Plan governs actions by all arms of San Francisco's government. It is implemented by the city's direction of public resources and guidance of private development.

State law and San Francisco's Charter require a comprehensive, long-term general plan for the physical development of the city. The San Francisco General Plan ensures that there is adequate infrastructure to support residential, commercial, recreational and institutional land uses and facilities, and that neighborhoods are walkable and connected by a robust transportation system geared toward public transit, walking, and biking. Economic growth should position San Francisco for a resilient future sustainably linked to and coordinated with regional development.

The General Plan attempts to navigate complex imperatives between preserving cherished qualities and assets, tackling needed changes, and preparing for both known and unpredictable challenges and crises. In 2020, as the COVID-19 pandemic and the killing of George Floyd highlighted inequalities, the Planning Commission passed [Resolution Number 20738](#) to center the Planning Department's work program and resource allocation on racial and social equity. This mandate has been incorporated into the General Plan. In doing so, the City and County of San Francisco acknowledges and apologizes for the history of inequitable planning policies and actions that have resulted in racial disparities. San Francisco must take reparative actions and build accountability in collaboration with American Indian communities, Black communities, communities of color, and other historically marginalized and disenfranchised communities.

Process and Vision

The General Plan's goals, objectives and policies have been developed with extensive community engagement. These robust conversations and public hearings are designed to distill a shared vision for the City's future.

In this shared vision, San Francisco strives to be...

...a just city, committed to racial and social equity, starting with recognizing and seeking to rectify past injustices.

...an inclusive city, where all can find a home and community as well a nurturing environment for creativity and self-expression.

...a safe, livable and environmentally sustainable city, where all are able to live healthy lives and access thriving natural systems, restorative parks, and a high-quality built environment. The climate crisis requires urgent local, regional, and global action.

...an economically vital city, where all are able to prosper. Economic vitality is possible only where stable, meaningful livelihoods are protected, entrepreneurial dynamism is fostered within an ecosystem that can withstand geopolitical turbulence and financial volatility, and everyone can access ladders to opportunity.

...a city that recognizes that achieving justice, inclusivity, safety, livability, environmental sustainability and economic vitality requires accountable government, regional cooperation, transparent processes, and incorporation of diverse communities into all aspects of decision making.

Structure

The General Plan consists of a series of Elements and Area Plans.

Each Element addresses a topic and generally applies citywide, while Area Plans relate these topics comprehensively to specific parts of the city in a greater level of detail. Several of the Elements correspond to topics that state law requires the General Plan to address, including [Air Quality](#), [Community Facilities](#), [Environmental Protection](#), [Housing](#), [Recreation and Open Space](#), [Safety and Resilience](#), and [Transportation](#). San Francisco has also chosen to address additional topics through Elements including [Arts](#), [Commerce and Industry](#), and [Urban Design](#). Policies related to land use are located throughout the General Plan and are cross-referenced in a [Land Use Index](#).

Environmental Justice policies required by the State have been integrated throughout the General Plan. The Environmental Justice Framework, hereby incorporated into the General Plan by reference, sets out key policy priorities and strategies which will be integrated into elements, area plans, and supporting documents to improve public health and other outcomes in Environmental Justice Communities, which are primarily communities of color and lower-income communities that face higher pollution levels and other health risks.

Area Plans of the San Francisco General Plan include:

<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Balboa Park Station• Bayview Hunters Point• Candlestick Point Subarea• Central SoMa (South of Market)• Central Waterfront• Chinatown• Civic Center• Downtown• East SoMa (South of Market)• Executive Park Subarea• Glen Park	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Hunters Point Shipyard• Market and Octavia• Mission• Northeastern Waterfront• Rincon Hill• Showplace Square/Potrero• Transit Center District Subarea• Treasure Island/Yerba Buena Island• Van Ness Avenue• Western Shoreline• Western SoMa (South of Market)
--	--

EXHIBIT G:

**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)¹ 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 policies and programs. CalEnviroScreen will continue to be the official map for state policies and programs.

environments.³ 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).⁴




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; and,
- 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; and,
- Designate areas where policies and resources could be directed to promote community health; and,
- Develop an analysis that could be easily replicated in the future; and,
- 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>



⁴ General Plan Guidelines. Chapter 4: Required Elements. July 2020. Governor's Office of Planning and Research. Last accessed January 2023: https://opr.ca.gov/docs/20200706-GPG_Chapter_4_EJ.pdf

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

Dataset and Weight (see “Raster Analysis & Symbology” for more)	Indicator(s)
<p>CalEnviroScreen 4.0 – 60% Source: CalEPA, OEHHA</p> 	<p>Pollution exposure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 <p>Population characteristics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Educational attainment • Linguistic isolation • Poverty • Unemployment • Housing burdened low-income household • Asthma • Cardiovascular disease • Low birthweight infants
<p>State Housing Income Limits: median household income – 10% Source: CA HCD</p> 	<p>Median HH income below \$69,600 (San Francisco threshold for very low-income, two-person household)</p>

<p>Areas of Vulnerability (AOV) – 10% Source: SF DPH</p> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Poverty • Persons of color • Youth • Seniors • Unemployment • High school or less • Limited English proficiency persons • Linguistically isolated households • Disability
<p>Air Pollution Exposure Zone (APEZ) – 20% SF DPH, SF Planning</p> 	<p>Data included: PM2.5 concentrations greater than 10µg/m3 (including ambient levels)</p>

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).



Figure 2. EJ Communities Map Legend

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 areas that approximately scored in the top one-third (32.3%) 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 one-third 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>

Final Environmental Justice Communities Map




Figure 3. Environmental Justice Communities Map

Source: SF Planning, 2023

NOTE: This map was created to meet the requirements of CA Senate Bill 1000. The legislation requires that municipalities identify where "Disadvantaged Communities" are located, defined as areas facing elevated pollution burden coupled with a high incidence of low-income residents. This map is based on the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHA) CalEnviroScreen 4.0 Map, modified to incorporate additional local data on pollution burden and socioeconomic disadvantage.

The Environmental Justice Communities Map (Figure 3) identifies the top one-third of areas experiencing environmental burden in San Francisco. These Environmental Justice Communities include the Bayview Hunters Point, Chinatown, Excelsior, Japantown, Mission, Ocean View-Merced Heights-Ingleside, Outer Mission, Potrero Hill, SoMa, Tenderloin, Treasure Island, Visitacion Valley, and Western Addition. 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,⁶ it is important to focus policies and resources to these communities, which are often overlooked in local decision-making processes.

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 (adopted 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 Department), Green Infrastructure Grant Program (San Francisco Public Utilities Commission), Waterfront Resilience Program (Port of San Francisco) and others.

⁶ 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.


APPENDIX A: ADDITIONAL FULL COLOR AND OUTLINE VERSIONS OF ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE COMMUNITIES MAP

Environmental Justice Communities

Environmental Justice Burden






NOTE: This map was created to meet the requirements of CA Senate Bill 1000. The legislation requires that municipalities identify where "Disadvantaged Communities" are located, defined as areas facing elevated pollution burden coupled with a high incidence of low-income residents. This map is based on OEHHA's CalEnviroScreen 4.0 Map, modified to incorporate additional local data on pollution burden and socioeconomic disadvantage.



Environmental Justice Communities

Environmental Justice Burden

-  Top one-third of burdened area
-  Data Not Available
-  Area with high pollution burden (not included in OEHHA CalEnviroScreen 4.0 due to missing data/low population)

NOTE: This map was created to meet the requirements of CA Senate Bill 1000. The legislation requires that municipalities identify where "Disadvantaged Communities" are located, defined as areas facing elevated pollution burden coupled with a high incidence of low-income residents. This map is based on OEHHA's CalEnviroScreen 4.0 Map, modified to incorporate additional local data on pollution burden and socioeconomic disadvantage.




EXHIBIT H:

USER GUIDE TO THE ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE COMMUNITIES MAP



USER GUIDE TO THE SAN FRANCISCO ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE COMMUNITIES MAP

Overview of The EJ Framework and the EJ Communities Map

The Environmental Justice Communities Map (“EJ Communities Map” or “Map”) identifies areas in the City that face disproportionate burden of environmental health challenges, informed by state and local data. The EJ Communities Map is part of the [Environmental Justice Framework](#) (“EJ Framework”). The EJ Framework establishes a set of visions and priorities to ensure all residents and workers live in and enjoy healthy, clean environments. The EJ Framework is meant to highlight policy priorities that can explicitly improve health in Environmental Justice Communities (“EJ Communities”).

The goals of mapping the geography of San Francisco’s EJ Communities include:

- Use local data to refine areas that are lower-income and face high pollution and other health challenges;
- Create better alignment with maps by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission and San Francisco’s Departments of Public Health and Recreation & Parks;
- Designate areas where policies and resources could be directed to promote community health;
- Develop an analysis that could be easily replicated in the future; and,
- Reflect community feedback on areas of high need.

The Map identifies the top one-third of areas experiencing environmental burden in the City. These EJ Communities include the Bayview Hunters Point, Chinatown, Excelsior, Japantown, Mission, Ocean View-Merced Heights-Ingleside, Outer Mission, Potrero Hill, SoMa, Tenderloin, Treasure Island, Visitacion Valley, and Western Addition. EJ Communities are often low-income communities and communities of color. As environmental justice is defined by remedying past harms and enabling community-led solutions,¹ it is important to focus policies and resources to these communities, which are often overlooked in local decision-making processes.

Direct Resources: The primary application of the EJ Communities Map is to designate areas where General Plan policies and City resources could be directed to promote community health. In the EJ Framework, all of the vision and priority statements apply to EJ Communities. The EJ Framework intends to guide all City departments to advance environmental justice in the top one-third of environmentally burdened areas in the City.

¹The 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.

Learn More: The Planning Department (“SF Planning”) created an interactive ArcGIS StoryMap (Data Portal) that allows users to explore other data relevant to environmental justice, such as housing, transportation, climate, and public services. The Data Portal also includes excerpts from interviews with residents and workers in EJ Communities. The SF Planning [project webpage](#)² hosts a wealth of information on environmental justice work and next steps.

How to Use the EJ Communities Map

1. It’s a gradient! The Map presents environmental burden with a spectrum of seven categories, with the lowest environmental burden in green and the highest environmental burden in red. Given its numerous factors and complex nature, the SF Planning intentionally presented environmental burden as a spectrum, rather than a binary of being “in” or “out” of an environmentally burdened area.

2. Begin with the map as a base. Without prescribing its use, the Map can be a base for decision making to direct resources and action in areas with the highest cumulative environmental burden. There is discretion and flexibility in adding additional considerations relative to the issue at hand. Be thoughtful and transparent about unique considerations that call for adaptation of the Map.

A department may choose to use the Map for broad applications, such as when the issues at hand affect the *services* to EJ Communities. There are issues such as access to open space, transportation service, and public safety that may be addressed in locations outside of the EJ Communities, while still improving the services to EJ Communities. In this case, consider using a buffer (e.g., 50’, 100’, 200’) around the EJ Communities to designate eligible service areas.

A department may choose to use the Map for specific applications, such as when the issues at hand affect the *locations* and *residents* of EJ Communities. For issues such as affordable housing, dispersing grant funding, and green infrastructure, it’s important to directly target the built environment and residents, workers, and community leaders. In this case, consider using the high-resolution Map to identify specific locations or adding an overlay with other spatial layers (e.g., parcels, streets).

3. Conduct outreach and engagement. Creating change for environmental justice begins with community empowerment. Outreach and engagement is recommended to ensure the needs and priorities of EJ Communities are benefitting from department action.

Next Steps

The Map methodology was designed to be easily replicable. This Commission-approved methodology means that SF Planning can update the Map whenever any of the underlying data sets are updated (e.g., CalEnviroScreen, Air Pollution Exposure Zone, Areas of Vulnerability analysis, and state income limits).

² For more information: <https://sfplanning.org/project/environmental-justice-framework-and-general-plan-policies#engagement>

EXHIBIT I:

**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 (adopted 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 long-range, comprehensive

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 \(sfpub.org\)](http://Environmental Justice Policy (sfpub.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 (adopted 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.

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

Source: SF Planning, 2023

NOTE: This map was created to meet the requirements of CA Senate Bill 1000. The legislation requires that municipalities identify where "Disadvantaged Communities" are located, defined as areas facing elevated pollution burden coupled with a high incidence of low-income residents. This map is based on the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA) CalEnviroScreen 4.0 Map, modified to incorporate additional local data on pollution burden and socioeconomic disadvantage.

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 SFPUC). 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 one-third 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,³ 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.

Fall 2020-Spring 2021	Youth Engagement <i>In partnership with: Malcolm X Academy, Balboa High School, and San Francisco State University</i>
Spring 2021	General Plan Virtual Events and General Plan Survey
Summer 2021	Key Stakeholder Interviews
Summer 2021-Winter 2022	Environmental Justice Working Group <i>In partnership with: American Indian Cultural District, Bayview Hunters Point Community Advocates, Brightline Defense, Chinatown Community Development Center, Code Tenderloin,</i>

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.

	<i>Demonstration Gardens – Tenderloin Peoples Congress, Fillmore Media Systems & Services Co., Japantown Cultural District, PODER, Potrero Hill Neighborhood House, Residents Supporting Community on Treasure Island, San Francisco African American Faith Base Coalition, San Francisco Parks Alliance, San Francisco Transit Riders, Sistah Music Snax Entertainment, Southwest Community Corporation, and St. Andrew Missionary Baptist Church</i>
Fall 2022	Environmental Justice Focus Groups <i>In partnership with: Promotoras Activas San Francisco, Carnaval San Francisco, Booker T. Washington Community Service Center, Potrero Hill Neighborhood House, City of Dreams, and Wu Yee Children's Services</i>
Ongoing	Briefings, Web Updates, GovDelivery and E-Blasts, and Direct Feedback via E-Mail

Youth Engagement

Malcolm X Academy Elementary School: Second Graders and Third Graders

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

Balboa High School: Juniors and Seniors

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:

Grade	Final Deliverables	Class Topics	Example Activities
Juniors	Environmental Justice Neighborhood Asset Map	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What is Environmental Justice? What are maps and how do we 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hand-drawn neighborhood

(1 classroom, approximately 30 students)		use them to inform policymaking? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Digital mapping demo How to conduct interviews 	maps <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Key stakeholder interviews Developing EJ asset maps on Google Maps
Seniors (3 classrooms, approximately 95 students)	Design an ordinance to address an environmental justice issue	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What is Environmental Justice? Steps to researching & developing policies How do policies get adopted in San Francisco? How to conduct interviews & surveys 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Create and administer a survey on EJ topics 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.

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.




Figure 3. EJ Asset Map by Balboa High School Juniors

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.)




Figure 4. Survey Results from Balboa High School

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 \$50,000 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

	Name(s)	Organization	Community	Title(s)
1	Felicia Smith	Central City SRO Collaborative	Tenderloin	Volunteer Tenant Lead/ Resident
2	Edward Hatter	Potrero Hill Neighborhood House	Potrero Hill	
3	Irene Mahasin Thomas-Jacks	San Francisco African American Faith Based Coalition	Hunters Point	
4	Cecilia Mejia	Brightline Defense	SoMa	Program coordinator
5	Chester Williams	Fillmore Media Systems & Services	Fillmore	

6	Kasey Rios Asberry	Demonstrations Gardens – Tenderloin Peoples Congress	Tenderloin	Executive Director
7	Maggie Dong	Chinatown Community Development Center	Chinatown	
8	Thomas Namara	SF Parks Alliance	SoMa	Southeast Area Manager
9	Christian Martin	SoMa West Community Benefit District (SWCD)	SoMa	Executive Director
10	Wallace Pak Yiu	Community Youth Center	Bayview	Program Coordinator/ Resident
11	Sharaya Souza	American Indian Cultural District	SoMa	Executive Director
12	Margarita Mena	Central City SRO Collaborative	Tenderloin	Volunteer Tenant Lead / Resident
13	Isabel Gonzales	Central City SRO Collaborative	Tenderloin	Volunteer Tenant Lead / Resident
14	Rosa Alvarado	Central City SRO Collaborative	Tenderloin	Volunteer Tenant Lead / Resident
15	Felisia Thibodeaux	IT Bookman	Lakeview	Executive Director
16	Eddie Ahn	Brightline Defense	SOMA	Executive Director
17	Robert Fraser	Code Tenderloin	Tenderloin	Technology specialist
18	Nina Bazan-Sakamoto	Japantown Task Force	Japan town	Community Organizer

Spring 2021 Interviewees

	Name(s)	Organization	Community	Title(s)
19	Nicole Hsu	SFUSD	Bayview	Teacher/Resident
20	Maria Hernandez	N/A	Bayview	Resident
21	Gabriel Leyva	N/A	SoMa	Resident
22	Stephanie E. Aguirre	N/A	Bayview	Student
23	Barklee Sanders		Treasure Island	Environmental Review Manager
24	Claire Amable	San Francisco Bicycle Coalition	SOMA	Community Organizer

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,⁴ 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.⁵

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
- 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

⁴ [add reference to the Jemez Principles]

⁵ <https://sfplanning.org/project/environmental-justice-framework-and-general-plan-policies#info>

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

Meeting	Topic	Activities
1	Orientation & Launch	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introductions • EJ Framework • EJ WG Orientation
2	Definition of EJ EJ Communities Map & Data	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft EJ Communities Map • Breakout: neighborhood mapping
3	Definition of EJ Subgroups	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Subgroup Process • Breakout: subgroup working session
4	Working Session: Definition, Vision, & Why It Matters	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Round Robin: Definition, Vision, & Why It Matters • Breakout: subgroup working session • Governance and Consensus Building
5	Working Session: Key Policy Priorities & Strategies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Round Robin: Key Policy Priorities & Strategies • Breakout: subgroup working session
6	Presentation on Draft Recommendations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Subgroup Team Presentations on Draft Recommendations
7	Consensus Building	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Full Recommendations • Consensus Building Process
8	Final Celebration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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.

⁶ <https://sfplanning.org/project/environmental-justice-framework-and-general-plan-policies#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:

Consensus Gradients of Agreement	
5	Whole-heartedly support decision
4	Support decision; basically like it
3	Decision is okay; some concerns & reservations but can live with it
2	Grave concerns; not comfortable with the decision; many reservations
1	Disagree; veto; totally opposed

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.

	What Worked	What Could Be Improved
Structure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mixed Working Group Structure. People valued the mixed composition. • Mixed Co-Chair Structure. Good structure for collaborative tone of the subgroup meetings; also helped with capacity; leadership. • Subgroups: small groups to work intensively and contribute to the whole, more time for deep dives. • Good facilitation from Giuliana and project Team • The process had multiple points to be flexible and adaptable. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More time needed for subgroup presentations; timeline spent on working sessions • Opportunities to cross pollinate between subgroups • More meeting time for dialogue, rather than the offline track changes/comments
Role	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The size and diversity of the group was great • Small subgroups and co-chairs • Subgroup dynamics, • Clear goals and expectations; welcome packet • Reminder that city staff are not responsible for representing our individual agencies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Too much responsibility of the co-chairs • Lots of synthesis and editing on the co-chairs • Timing the meetings/scheduling to make sure everyone could make it

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.⁷ 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.

Date	Community Partner	Neighborhoods/Communities Targeted
October 11, 2022	Promotoras Activas San Francisco	Spanish-language community
October 18, 2022	Carnaval San Francisco (CANA)	Mission, SoMA, Tenderloin, Outer Mission, OMI
November 3, 2022	Booker T. Washington Community Service Center	Western Addition
November 15, 2022	Potrero Hill Neighborhood House	Potrero Hill, Bayview Hunters Point, Visitacion Valley
December 1, 2022	City of Dreams	Bayview Hunters Point
December 6, 2022	Wu Yee Children's Services	Chinese-language community

Each focus group lasted for 90 minutes. All of the focus groups, except for with Wu Yee Children's Services, was hosted in-person at the community partner's facility. After a brief project overview, with emphasis on the draft policy recommendations, the focus group discussion walked through the advance participation guide. We asked

⁷ Jemez Principles for Democratic Organizing. Southwest Network for Environmental and Economic Justice (SNEEJ), Jemez, New Mexico, December 1996. <https://www.ejnet.org/ej/jemez.pdf>

the participants, “Are your community’s needs addressed by these draft strategies? What is missing or needs to be changed?”

The focus groups reached 63 individuals. The majority of focus group participants were female (81%). There was a fair balance of racial and ethnic diversity among Hispanic, Latino, or Latinx (31.7%), Black, African-American, or African descendant (25.4%), East Asians (23.8%), White, European, or Caucasian (15.9%), and American Indian, Alaskan Native, or other indigenous group (9.5%) individuals. The focus group participants captured seniors (28.6%), a demographic that was not captured in other outreach and engagement events, as well as people living with a disability or visual impairment (25.4%). The majority of participants are low-income (55.6% below \$75,000 annually). Among the EJ Communities targeted for these focus groups, there was strong representation from Bayview Hunters Point (20.6%), the Mission (23.8%), Western Addition (22.2%), Potrero Hill (17.5%), and Chinatown (14.3%). The participants included people who have experiences with displacement (11.1%) and food insecurity (7.9%). For the participants’ housing types, many are part of families with children (46%), live alone (20.6%), or are related adults living together (11.1%). For more detailed information, see Appendix C.

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 rippling from flooding, taxpayer dollars used to remedy the public realm).

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.

Briefings, Web Updates, GovDelivery and E-Blasts, and Direct Feedback via E-Mail

Throughout the course of the project, the project team provided an open offer for community members and community-based organizations to share direct feedback with the team (e.g., 1:1 meeting, phone call, email) and to request a briefing on the project (e.g., presentation and discussion). This open offer was published on the project web page: <https://sfplanning.org/project/environmental-justice-framework-and-general-plan-policies>

- The project team joined the San Francisco State University’s Urban Planning senior seminar in January 2021. This briefing shared an overview of SB 1000 and the development of the Data Portal, and it resulted in a SFSU student joining the SF Planning Department’s Summer Internship Program the subsequent summer.
- The project team presented at Youth Commission in March 2021, as a combined presentation with the Department’s Child and Youth Engagement Strategy. After presenting broadly on the Department’s General Plan Updates and the EJ Framework, the project team solicited feedback from the Commissioners about incorporating youth voices into planning and policy processes & for their interest in engaging in upcoming outreach activities.
- The project team briefed Bayview Alliance in October 2021, a group of CBO representatives and allies that work on climate resilience and environmental justice on behalf of Bayview-Hunters Point. This briefing provided feedback about the draft EJ Framework and encouraged more integration of environmental remediation of the Hunters Point Naval Shipyard, the findings and recommendations of the 2021-2022 Civil Grand Jury Report, and the City’s ongoing work on reparations to the Black community.

The project team also provided project updates and shared opportunities to engage in the project through web updates, GovDelivery, and e-blasts. These updates shared project milestones, such as the draft EJ Communities Map, and opportunities to participate in the EJ Working Group and EJ Focus Groups.

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

Housing appeared as a theme in every interview. Many residents shared how they struggle to find housing. Residents and community leaders spoke about how challenging it is to afford housing in San Francisco. Some community leaders also expressed that 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 income constraints. The Single Resident Occupancy (SRO) resident mentioned how it is impossible to improve their housing situation due to the high cost of housing.

These shared sentiments about 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 housing inventory. Many of them find themselves living in buildings that need to be retrofitted to meet the standards of today's new developments. The waiting list backlog for affordable housing, displacement, and increase in homelessness have 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 spoke the most about transportation challenges. Their challenges were related to a lack of transportation modes; many of them must rely on driving to get around. Interviewees who were closer to downtown spoke about the impacts that COVID-19 had on the transit system. Many said that COVID-19 negatively impacted their ability to use transit, since COVID-19 made the SFMTA discontinue service on certain transit lines.

Opinions on transportation quality 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 the City, residents seemed to struggle with public transportation. For example, the Lakeview community interviewees in the southwest referred to their community as an "island" once the M Line was cut because of COVID-19 travel restrictions. In addition, Bayview and Visitation Valley communities in the southeast expressed desire to have more reliable transit access.

Parks

Parks came up for each interview, and many of the responses were the same, despite referring to different geographies. Many interviewees cited their parks as "dangerous," "bad," and "unsafe." Interviewees said that they liked the parks in their community; however, they face challenges utilizing them because of the presence of many people experiencing homelessness living in the parks. Interviewees who live in EJ Communities

downtown said that they did not have enough parks, and the few parks available 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 Districts 6 and 10. The Lakeview community has beautiful parks, according to an interviewee; however, “if you’re not in shape, you can’t get to them.” This reality makes it almost impossible for seniors in the community to enjoy them. There is also need for more parks and green spaces for communities like Chinatown, Tenderloin, and SoMa. Lastly, McClaren Park in San Francisco’s southeast section is a park that needs more attention by the Recreation & Parks Department, and possibly additional public safety measures, because it was shared that, “people burn stuff and throw trash.” The interviewees would like more investment into City parks.

Public Safety

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

One of the community leaders was scared to visit parks because of the recent increase in hate crimes towards Asian Americans. He received racial slurs and does not feel confident going into parks. Gun violence was noted as being one of the challenges that residents in the Bayview have to deal with as a reality. It was shared that the Tenderloin community often deals with criminal behavior on a daily basis. On the other hand, community members of Lakeview, Chinatown, 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 the lack of 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 citywide issue according to interviewees. The most challenges surrounded 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. The Bayview was a community that lacks many options for grocery store, and they also have to travel outside of their community to seek out options. Having access to culturally-relevant food was another issue plaguing our EJ Communities. The 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. One positive was in the Western Addition. They seem to have healthy food options, a range of different price points, and grocery stores in walking distance.

Physical and Mental Health

Health impacts varied between physical and mental health impacts. Community organizations and residents spoke about the health effects that residents live through, from asthma to mental health challenges. Each community organization spoke about how they notice families and children with higher asthma rates. There were personal stories shared about family members who spent their lives in an EJ Community eventually died from cancer. Residents also shared how their environment has impacted their mental health. 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 physical or mental health impact. Some of these were caused by the environment. In the case of the 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 developmental delay. Similarly, Chinatown and Tenderloin residents also struggle with developmental delay in its SRO populations. In the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, developmental delay is coupled with “impulse control,” a condition that causes people to participate in self-harm. In the Lakeview, residents can’t participate in “preventative health measures” because of 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

When asked about community strengths, interviewees spoke about how united their communities are, and that 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. 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 come in many forms during the interviews. Public facilities in the Lakeview have served as resource centers for residents to be heard and supported. The formation of tenant councils and resident committees in Chinatown has allowed SRO residents to become better advocates for their needs. Youth-led leadership groups have allowed SoMa residents to address air quality issues. Collaboration in the Bayview focused on India Basin Shoreline Park, allowing residents to participate in equitable projects by sharing their thoughts and ideas about the new park redevelopment. Community-based organizations in the Tenderloin lead successful workforce efforts by allowing residents to share ideas about workforce solutions to meet their 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 of their educational programs. Residents said that they needed more educational 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. The Bayview is working with youth on the improvements to India Basin Shoreline Park; however, there’s still a need to have a successful

afterschool resource center. There is still high unemployment in Bayview among its youth. The Tenderloin is doing their best to help residents get certifications and provide other educational resources to be 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. In all the interviews, dirty streets and air pollution were mentioned.

Air quality was an overwhelming concern for communities in the Tenderloin, SoMa, and Chinatown. One expert mentioned that the Bayview did not have the same level of good air quality as the Richmond. 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 throughout the interviews. These themes did not appear directly; they came up while interviewees spoke about the inequities to access resources, privileges, and power. Many of the challenges stemmed from the community's socioeconomic status. EJ Communities tend to have low-income residents who cannot afford to improve their housing quality, they cannot afford to drive to the big parks, they cannot afford to shop at certain grocery stores, and 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 professions. One community who works in the tech industry reflected 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, "The families who live here are house rich and money poor." When you couple the housing issues with the lack of access to adequate transportation within 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 (e.g., Muni, grocery stores, schools) and community-based 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 advocated 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 the 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 these interviews into the needs of EJ Communities when speaking with EJ Working Group members. There are three opportunities that should be explored. 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 CBOs to figure out a way to help seniors and youth navigate the digital landscape. Lastly is access to funding, potentially building or restructuring the contracting process to make it 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	
Female	81.0%
Male	15.9%
Transgender (femme presenting)	0.0%
Transgender (masculine presenting)	0.0%
Genderqueer/Gender non-conforming	0.0%
Other not listed	0.0%
Prefer not to answer	3.2%

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

Age Range	
18-39	33.3%
40-59	38.1%
60 or older	28.6%
Prefer not to answer	0.0%

Are you a person living with a disability or visual impairment?	
Yes	25.4%
No	66.7%
Prefer not to answer	6.3%

What is your household's yearly income range (approximate)?	
Less than \$50,000	42.9%
\$50,001 to \$75,000	12.7%
\$75,001 to \$100,000	9.5%
\$100,001 to \$125,000	7.9%
\$125,001 to \$150,000	4.8%

\$150,001 to \$200,000	3.2%
More than \$200,000	0.0%
Prefer not to answer	11.1%

Which neighborhood(s) do you identify with? (check all that apply)	
Bayview Hunters Point	20.6%
Chinatown	14.3%
Excelsior	7.9%
Japantown	4.8%
Mission	23.8%
Ocean View-Merced Heights-Ingleside	3.2%
Outer Mission	3.2%
Potrero Hill	17.5%
SoMa	4.8%
Tenderloin	4.8%
Treasure Island	3.2%
Visitacion Valley	4.8%
Western Addition	22.2%

Do you identify with any of the following? (check all that apply)	
I am a neighborhood resident	76.2%
I work in this neighborhood	34.9%
I am an environmental justice advocate	9.5%
I am a business owner	3.2%
I am a parent	31.7%
I am unhoused	0.0%
I have experienced displacement	11.1%
I do not have access to healthy and affordable food	7.9%

What is your housing type?	
Live alone	20.6%
Family with children	46.0%
Couple (married or unmarried) no children	7.9%
Related adults living together	11.1%
Roommates living together	3.2%
Different families living together	1.6%
Unhoused or staying in a shelter	1.6%
Other	3.2%

EXHIBIT J:
LETTERS OF SUPPORT FROM
THE OFFICE OF RESILIENCE AND
CAPITAL PLANNING
AND
THE SAN FRANCISCO PUBLIC UTILITIES
COMMISSION



LONDON N. BREED
Mayor

CARMEN CHU
City Administrator

BRIAN STRONG
Chief Resilience Officer

Planning Commission
Room 400 of City Hall
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
March 2

RE: 2023 Environmental Justice Framework and General Plan Introduction Updates

The Office of Resilience and Capital Planning (ORCP) is pleased to offer support for the 2023 Environmental Justice (EJ) Framework and updates to the San Francisco General Plan. The EJ framework provides a set of policies that are comprehensive in scope and developed in direct partnership with community representatives. The framework identifies the communities most burdened by environmental racism and proposes concrete policies to ameliorate these harms. It will serve as a guidepost for all City agencies as we collectively move forward in advancing environmental justice.

ORCP partnered with SF Planning on the development of draft policy recommendations in a successful process which put community voices front and center and culminated in recommendations across a wide range of topic areas. These policies have relevance to the City's overall efforts to create a climate resilient City with robust City services for all of San Francisco's residents. ORCP looks forward to continuing to collaborate with the community and other City agencies to align our efforts in order to realize the vision that's been set in this framework. Implementation of this framework will have a dramatic and positive impact not only for the identified EJ Communities but also to the broader City as a whole.

ORCP is grateful to be able to support the adoption of this framework as it furthers ORCP's commitment to the provision of healthy public facilities and a healthy, resilient environment which we strive to embody in our department's day to day operations. We believe this work is essential and timely as the City moves to modernize the overall General Plan policies.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Brian Strong".

Brian Strong
Chief Resilience Officer and Director of the Office of Resilience and Capital Planning



February 24, 2023

San Francisco Planning Commission
Room 400 of City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102

RE: San Francisco Environmental Justice Framework and General Plan Introduction,
2018-017026CWP

Dear Commissioners:

The San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) is pleased to support the San Francisco Environmental Justice (EJ) Framework. The EJ Framework is incorporated into the updated San Francisco General Plan and articulates broad visions and high-level priorities for advancing environmental justice citywide. The EJ Framework fulfills the City's obligations under Senate Bill 1000 and is in alignment with citywide goals to advance racial and social equity. As the first utility in the nation to adopt an Environmental Justice Policy in 2009, the SFPUC supports the effort represented by the Planning Department's General Plan EJ Framework to advance environmental justice across City agencies.

The EJ framework provides a set of environmental justice priorities organized into six topics: Healthy and Resilient Environments; Physical Activity and Healthy Public Facilities; Healthy Food Access; Safe, Healthy and Affordable Homes; Equitable and Green Jobs; and Empowered Neighborhoods. These broad priorities will guide future updates to the General Plan Elements, strengthening the Plan's support of environmental justice and racial equity. The EJ Framework also includes an Environmental Justice Communities Map ("EJ Communities Map"), identifying areas of the city that experience the top 30 percent of cumulative environmental burdens. The Environmental Justice Communities Map is produced with state data sources and refined with additional local data. The SFPUC uses the Planning Department's EJ Communities Map to help guide more inclusive implementation of the Green Infrastructure Grant Program.

The SFPUC participated in the Planning Department's two-year Environmental Justice Working Group process to identify priorities for the EJ Framework and provide feedback on the Environmental Justice Communities Map. The EJ Framework reflects priorities set forth by both City and community partners through a comprehensive process.

London N. Breed
Mayor

Newsha Ajami
President

Sophie Maxwell
Vice President

Tim Paulson
Commissioner

Tony Rivera
Commissioner

Kate Stacy
Commissioner

Dennis J. Herrera
General Manager




The SFPUC is committed to the goals of environmental justice to promote healthy communities in all SFPUC service areas by eliminating disproportionate environmental burdens and distributing public and environmental benefits equitably. The EJ Framework is in alignment with the environmental and racial justice principles established by the SFPUC Environmental Justice Policy (2009) and SFPUC Racial Justice Resolution (2020). The SFPUC supports the EJ Framework's priority to invest in resilient public utility systems and affirm access to water, power, and sanitation as a human right (Healthy and Resilient Environments). This aligns with SFPUC's commitment to providing reliable and affordable water, power, and sewer services to all San Franciscans. The EJ Framework's priority to prepare for seismic hazards, other natural disasters, and the climate crisis while aiming to protect those who are most vulnerable is in alignment with SFPUC's climate policy to address disproportionate climate impacts on low-income and communities of color. The SFPUC broadly supports the other EJ Framework's priorities, including to expand nature-based solutions, green infrastructure, and urban greening programs (Healthy and Resilient Environments); to promote pathways for workers' empowerment and self-determination (Equitable and Green Jobs); and to foster a culture of transparency and communication regarding City projects that impact EJ communities (Empowered Neighborhoods).

The SFPUC is also committed to eliminating race-related barriers and modeling leadership that creates an equitable work environment for all employees. The SFPUC has developed and is in the process of implementing its Racial Equity Action Plan to center racial and social equity in existing programs. The SFPUC is in support of the SF EJ Framework's priorities to undo past harms against disadvantaged communities, provide living wages for all, and promote pathways for workers' empowerment and self-determination. The SFPUC has begun acting on some of these priorities through connecting SFUSD high school students to career awareness events and internship opportunities highlighting career paths within the utilities industry.

The SFPUC supports the 2023 Environmental Justice Framework to advance the City's racial and social equity goals. We request the Planning Commission approve the adoption of the 2023 General Plan Environmental Justice Framework.

Sincerely,



Dennis J. Herrera
General Manager