San Francisco Bay Restoration Authority Advisory Committee
Ad Hoc Committee on Economically Disadvantaged Communities

MEETING NOTES
Prepared by Katherine Dudney, Management Analyst. East Bay Regional Park District
August 30, 2019
10AM-1PM
Meeting Location:
State Coastal Conservancy - Del Norte Conference Room
1515 Clay Street, 10th Floor, Oakland CA

Attendees

Advisory Committee (AC) Members
- Dr. Ana M. Alvarez, Deputy General Manager / East Bay Regional Park District
Advisory Committee Vice Chair / Ad Hoc Committee on Economically Disadvantaged Communities
- Zahra Kelly, Director of Public Advocacy / Nature in the City
- Mike Mielke, Senior Vice President / Silico Valley Leadership Group
- Anne Morkill, SF Bay National Wildlife Refuge Complex Manager, U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service
- Ana Maria Ruiz, General Manager / Midpeninsula Regional Open Space District
- Diane Williams, Health Educator / Planting Justice
- Marina Psaros, Principal / Corovai
- Shin-Roei Lee, Board Director / Chinese American Environmental Professional Association

San Francisco Bay Restoration Authority (Authority) Staff
- Jessica Davenport, Deputy Program Manager
- Heidi Nutters, Project Manager
- Nahal Ghoghaie Ipakchi, Project Consultant
- Linda Tong, Project Manager

East Bay Regional Park District Staff (Supporting or Observing)
- Katherine Dudney, Management Analyst
- Alice Kinner, Training Manager
- Lisa Goorjian, Chief of Design and Construction

1. Welcome & Introductions

Facilitator: Economically Disadvantaged Communities Ad Hoc Committee Chair Dr. Ana M. Alvarez, East Bay Regional Park District

Each attendee introduced themselves and their role. Facilitator briefly described the history of the Economically Disadvantaged Communities Ad Hoc Committee (Committee) and the purpose of the meeting. This is the second meeting of the Committee, and the objective is to learn from the recommendations of other reports (APEN, Greenlining Institute), agencies (e.g., Portland Metro), and the SFBRA Community Based Assessment recommendations to develop recommendations for increasing equity in the granting process for consideration of the Advisory Committee on October 11th and the Governing Board on December 6, 2019.

2. Presentation on Recent Equity Reports by Greenlining Institute and APEN
Presenter: Linda Tong, SFBRA Project Manager

The presenter provided an overview of new reports aimed at state and local policymakers that address improving equity and environmental justice in climate resilience programs. Research from the Asian Pacific Environmental Network (APEN) shows a path forward for identifying the people and regions most impacted by climate change, while a guidebook from The Greenlining Institute provides a practical resource for implementing an equitable approach to building climate resilience.

APEN: *Mapping Resilience: A blueprint for thriving in the face of climate disasters.* The report reviewed 40 frameworks (maps) related to community vulnerability, identifying several outstanding frameworks. Recommendations include:
- Assessing climate vulnerability based on regional characteristics and specific threats rather than statewide comparisons
- Not developing new climate vulnerability indicator sets (many good frameworks already in place)
- Need to develop a centralized and well-disseminated set of climate vulnerability indicators and visualization platform
- Public officials should ground-truth and complement vulnerability maps with community expertise

Greenlining: Making Equity Real in Climate Adaptation and Community Resilience Policies and Programs: A Guidebook. It is precisely designed for policy and decision makers involved in grant programs. The guidebook includes specific examples of existing policies and programs. Four steps are provided for '*making equity real' (impactful)*:
1. Embed equity in the mission, vision, and values
2. Build equity into the process
3. Ensure equity outcomes
4. Measure and analyze for equity

The presenter provided some specific examples of implementing these steps, and a fifth of sharing best practices and lessons learned.

The Committee discussed one of the examples related to measuring for equity and commented on the need to ensure that any required measurements/analyses issued by the grant program are realistic, measurable, developed in coordination with communities, and do not needlessly increase barriers.

3. Presentation on Portland Metro Parks: Park Planning & Nature w/ Communities of Color
Presenter: Lisa Goorjian, EBRPD Chief of Design & Construction

The Presenter provided an overview of advancing racial equity initiatives of Oregon Metro – a three-county parks and open space special district in the Portland area. Highlights included specific tactics that were implemented that made equity programs relevant and successful, such as:
- Having local communities engaged early in the process – staring when funding measures were proposed to be put on the ballot;
- Developing a community focused grant program, Partners in Nature;

Item 7B: Appendix 2

- Working through the Connect with Nature Program with communities of color to plan and design parks;
- Working with community-based organizations to identify local leaders for outreach;
- Developing a toolkit to be used by other park agencies for engaging communities of color;
- Conducting work in concert with emerging city and state government racial equity policies;
- Ensuring consistency at regional, leadership, policy, and staff levels;
- Providing authentic engagement from beginning to end;
- Providing economic compensation, including a stipend, to community-based organizations, community members and leaders for their participation and contribution;
- Removing agency structural and procurement barriers;
- Working at the local level, where parks would be located, and designing for the local community;
- Representing the local community in printed and advertising materials;
- Considering specific cultural needs (cultural relevance) e.g., the importance of family cooking meals as part of connecting to nature;
- Turning opportunities to provide interpretive programming or special events over to local organizations to teach and manage rather than managing at the agency. Naturalists taught local community leaders to give and lead tours.

The Committee discussed the importance of having buy-in at multiple levels – from leadership to staff. They also discussed funding opportunities and whether there are restrictions in the Measure AA guidelines. Funds must be tied to a project, but there may be some flexibility on how that is defined.

For more information, the group can contact Dan Moeller, Conservation Program Director, dan.moeller@oregonmetro.gov, 503-797-1819 (Phone).

4. Community-Based Assessment (CBA) Findings & Recommendations
Presenter: Nahal Ghoghaie Ipakchi, Project Consultant

The Presenter reviewed the methods and findings described in the Community-Based Assessment Document. The study provided an equity-focused assessment of the Measure AA grant program with goals to 1) identify gaps in serving and engaging frontline communities, 2) recommend approaches, strategies, and actions for addressing gaps, 3) identifying opportunities to integrate racial and environmental justice and 4) provide strategies and recommendations that provide long-term benefits for economically disadvantaged communities and achieve the most equitable outcomes.

The methods included a desktop review of materials, such as the Greenlining Report, for a baseline understanding; brainstorming with the Advisory Committee, conducting individual interviews with social justice leaders, and holding focus group discussions. Seventeen recommendations were categorized into five themes:
1. Perceived Relevance (Communicating Measure AA)
2. Barriers to Engagement
3. Capacity Building and Investments
4. Grand Funding Program Operations
5. SFBRA Representation

Item 7B: Appendix 2

The recommendations ranged from simplifying language and phrasing to cultivating partnerships to seeking more diverse representation. It was noted that many of the focus group members did not recall/recognize Measure AA or its language, but they did believe see the relevance once the measure was explained. The Presenter indicated that there was an initial mistrust, which was mitigated through the help of community partners. The Presenter encouraged the Committee to consider how to implement all of the recommendations, even if they needed to be phased over time.

The Committee discussed obtaining additional information on resources that provide accessible, inclusive and concise language. The Committee also discussed how the granting program could be set up for community-based groups to be encouraged to apply; the competition from multi-million dollar projects proposed by large agencies was discussed as a perceived barrier. Partnerships were discussed as one option, with the need for trust building and early engagement as an important component. The importance of having a stable Authority contact was identified as one way to help build and maintain trust. Additionally, government officials should be meeting with their constituents. Another topic of discussion centered around the need to reduce administrative burdens to make applying, monitoring, and reporting requirements accessible to community groups.

After the Committee decides how to move forward with the recommendations to the Advisory Board, the next step would be for Authority staff to develop an Implementation Plan that translates the recommendations into action steps, such as modification to materials, to be taken over time.

5. Focus Mapping CBA Recommendations
Alice Kinner, EBRPD Training Manager

Committee members participated in an exercise to place recommendations on axes of low to high impact and less to more feasible (only appointed SBRA Advisory Committee members participated in the exercise).The results of the exercise are shown in the photo below. The two lists below attempt to roughly show how the Committee members ranked the recommendations. Please keep in mind that these lists approximate the results of the exercise, but do not reflect the view of any specific Committee member. The recommendations have been abbreviated for ease of reference. Six recommendations that were highest on both impact and feasibility axes are colored blue. There was general consensus that most of the recommendations would have fairly high impact.

Most Feasible	Most Impact
14. Amend scoring criteria	9. Develop a separate application track
5. Clarify eligibility and application requirements	13. Execute an education campaign
12. Include funding for education and trainings	14. Amend scoring criteria
11. Offer technical assistance to support first-time applicants	17. Strive for inclusive staffing through the executive levels
	7. Reduce administrative burdens
16. Hold Committee meetings throughout the subregions	1. Simplify language
3. Establish a communications strategy; 8. Establish a hub to facilitate connections	15. Seek more diverse representation
	4. Require partnerships to carryout education and outreach

Item 7B: Appendix 2

1. Simplify language	5. Clarify eligibility and application requirements
9. Develop a separate application track	8. Establish a hub to facilitate connections
2. Hire staff with above average cultural competency	11. Offer technical assistance to support first-time applicants
4. Require partnerships to carryout education and outreach	3. Establish a communications strategy
13. Execute an education campaign	10. Cultivate Agency staff skills to build trust. 12. Include funding for education and trainings
15. Seek more diverse representation	6. Promote cross-disciplinary projects
6. Promote cross-disciplinary projects	2. Hire staff with above average cultural competency
10. Cultivate Agency staff skills to build trust.	16. Hold Committee meetings throughout the subregions
17. Strive for inclusive staffing through the executive levels	
7. Reduce administrative burdens	
Least Feasible	**Least Impact**

General feedback on the exercise was that it was difficult to make assignments due to a) limited familiarity with the recommendations, which had only been provided earlier in the week, b) length of recommendation text and ability to quickly internalize them, and c) the lack of implementation detail, which would affect both the feasibility and impact. The recommendation 'Develop a second separate application track for small community groups' was pulled out for discussion as Committee members had different visions for how it could be implemented. Further discussion could look into implementation and also timelines. The full recommendations list will be further explored and refined at the next meeting, scheduled for September 19, 2019.

6. Next Steps & Review of EDC Committee Scope of Work

The Committee will reconvene one more time on September 19 to focus on identifying potential gaps (what's missing?); solicit priorities from each individual Committee member from CBA Report, Greenlining Guidebook and/or lessons learned from Portland Metro Parks; and reach consensus on what is important for the Committee to advance. Additionally, we will be doing some work over email in order to include this item as part of the next SFBRA Advisory Committee (AC) meeting scheduled for October 11 (our deadline is Sept 30th at latest). The AC's feedback will be incorporated to finalize a set of recommendations for the consideration of the SFBRA Board at their meeting in the month of December.

7. Adjourn