****City of Oakland**

Equitable Climate Action Plan (ECAP) Community Advisory Committee [ad hoc]

Tuesday, September 24, 2019

6:00 p.m. – 8:00 p.m.

Hearing Room Three, First Floor

One Frank H. Ogawa Plaza (City Hall), Oakland, CA 94612

Committee Members: Najee Amaranth (Co-Chair), Nicole Bratton (Co-Chair), Ryder Diaz, Anne Olivia Eldred, Margaret Gordon, Barbara Haya, Navina Khanna, Jody London, Ryan Schuchard, Susan Stephenson, Tyrone “Baybe Champ” Stevenson Jr., Dominic Ware, Jacky Xu. Alternates: Brian Beveridge, Bruce Nilles

Agenda

1. **Call to order 6:00 – 6:04**
2. **Roll call / Determination of quorum 6:04 – 6:06**
3. **Approval of draft meeting minutes (attached) 6:06 – 6:10**

*Seek motion to adopt the July 23, 2019 ECAP ad hoc Community Advisory Committee Meeting minutes*

1. **Public comment 6:10 – 6:22**

*Any person may directly address the Committee on any items within the jurisdiction of this Committee. Speakers wishing to address a specific item on the agenda may do so at the time the item is being considered.*

1. **Agenda modification 6:22 – 6:25**
2. **Committee Resolution: natural gas policy recommendations 6:25 – 6:45**

*Anne Olivia and Bruce – Discussion and vote*

1. **Discuss of remaining items in “50%” Draft ECAP Strategy List 6:45 – 7:30**

*Discussion and possible vote*

1. **Community Engagement Update 7:30 – 7:55**

*Shayna Hirshfield-Gold, Sustainability Policy Analyst*

*Verbal Presentation & Discussion*

1. **Next Meeting Topic: Discussion 7:50 – 8:00**
2. **Adjourn 8:00**

**Note: The Committee May Take Action on Any Item on the Agenda**

Public Comments: To offer public comments at this special meeting, please register with Shayna Hirshfield-Gold, Acting Sustainability Program Manager, before the start of the meeting at 5:45 p.m. Please note that the ECAP ad hoc Community Advisory Committee will not provide a detailed response to your comments but may schedule your issue for a future meeting. The Public Comment period is limited to 12 minutes. Time limits per individual speaker will be set at the discretion of the Chairperson, dependent on the number of speakers who register.

This meeting is wheelchair accessible. To request ASL interpreting, materials in alternative formats, captioning or assistive listening device, or any other disability related accommodation, please email adaprograms@oaklandnet.com or call (510) 238-5219 (V) or 711 (California Relay Service) at least three (3) business days before the meeting. Please refrain from wearing scented products to this meeting so persons who may experience chemical sensitivities can attend. Thank you.

**City of Oakland, ECAP ad hoc Community Advisory Committee**

**Meeting Minutes from Tuesday, August 27, 2019 Regular Meeting**

***Oakland City Hall, 1st Floor, Hearing Room 3***

**Item 1: Call to order**

Meeting called to order at 6:16 PM by Brian Beveridge since neither Co-Chair was present.

**Item 2. Roll call / Determination of quorum**

At roll call, quorum was established with seven Committee members present; three more Committee members joined once the meeting was underway.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Committee Members** | **Present** | **Excused** |
| Najee Amaranth | X |  |
| Nicole Bratton | X |  |
| Ryder Diaz | X |  |
| Anne Olivia Eldred |  | X |
| Margaret Gordon | X |  |
| Barbara Haya |  | X |
| Navina Khanna |  | X |
| Jody London | X |  |
| Ryan Schuchard | X |  |
| Susan Stephenson | X |  |
| Tyrone “Baybe Champ” Stevenson Jr. |  | X |
| Dominic Ware |  | X |
| Jacky Xu | X |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Alternates** | **Present** | **Excused** |
| Brian Beveridge | X |  |
| Bruce Nilles | X |  |

Staff Attendees: Shayna Hirshfield-Gold (Acting Sustainability Program Manager), Daniel Hamilton (Acting Environmental Services Division Manager), Jared O’Shaughnessy (Sustainability Fellow)

**Item 3. Approval of draft meeting minutes**

* Brian (acting Chair) seeks motion to approve the July 23, 2019 ECAP Ad Hoc Community Advisory Committee Meeting minutes. Susan motions to approve; Ryan seconds.
* Ms. Margaret objects, motions to make amendments.
* Ms. Margaret: Staff needs to add a reference to the studies Shayna cited in her presentation as well as an explicit mention of black carbon.
* Ryan: For the bullet point that mentions “a new bus rule says all buses in the state will be carbon neutral by 2030,” replace “carbon neutral” with “zero emission.”
* Shayna: Staff will add page numbers to the minutes from here on out.
* Ms. Margaret: City should distinguish between the findings of modeling vs. the findings of measurements.
* Brian calls a vote on approving the minutes. All in favor; Jody and Ms. Margaret abstain.
* Brian passes the role of Chair to Nicole.
* Nicole: Again, please be sure to review meeting materials prior to meetings.

**Item 4. Public comment**

No public comment was offered.

**Item 5. Agenda modification**

* Bruce motions to add an item: Have Committee decide whether to write a letter to City Council in support of a gas ban similar to Berkeley’s; Ryan seconds and suggests making it item 6.5.
* Jody: Usually you cannot add an item to the agenda without noting the public before the meeting; you may only rearrange the agenda order or agree to skip an item.
* Bruce: It also fits with number 6.
* Jody: Don’t make this item 6.5, just bring up during item 6. Also, please make agendas easier to read by increasing font size and spacing.

**Item 6. Review & discussion of *“50%” Draft ECAP Strategy List***

* Shayna: The draft (Attachment 1) has 8 sections and was developed over the last 9 months by our consultant, Integral Group. It includes lessons from other leading cities’ plans, extensive technical research, and advice from climate and industry experts, and focuses on actions within the City’s sphere of control. The priority list on pages 5 and 6 comes from the 8 community workshops that engaged almost 400 people. The draft mentions where recommended actions dovetail with community values and suggested solutions. This is an internal draft, to identify whether the proposed actions are feasible and reflect initial priorities. Feedback will lead to the public 70% draft, to be completed in early October. That will be posted online prior to two communitywide Town Halls. The actions in here are concepts; the wording and specific details will change. What we need to know from the Committee is your perspective on community needs. Are there actions here that are nonstarters? What’s missing? What other sections does the ECAP need, like youth engagement and green economy? Note that there are non-policy items that could affect how Oakland thinks about climate action, and/or are important for a climate-justice-oriented economy, that may not make it to the list of top 40 actions.
* Nicole: We could divvy up the document between the Committee members to give you feedback on our collective perspective for the sake of time.
* Ms. Margaret: Back to the draft introduction, it seems too contradictory. It is my understanding that all documents coming from the City are supposed to have a certain equity lens. Did the consultants include equity in their work for this draft?
  + Nicole: Is your question about the wording?
  + Ms. Margaret: Yes, but there is also supposed to be an equity lens. Did the consultants use that lens? If they did not, the draft needs to be brought to the Equity Department for review.
  + Shayna: This initial draft has not gone through the equity review yet. We are in the preliminary phase of identifying potential actions, which we can then assess through the lens of equity.
  + Brian: Can we log that this document has not yet been reviewed through an equity lens?
    - Shayna: Yes.
    - Ms. Margaret: Please include this note in the introduction
* Jody: I have a couple of questions for Shayna: There are a lot of measures here, which will be difficult to manage. Are you comfortable having this many measures? Do you feel you can track all of them, and are the stakeholders like the Port ready to step up and take these actions and track their metrics?
  + Shayna: Our current ECAP has 175 actions, and this draft has 42. We’re sharing these with internal staff to see whether they’re feasible. We may reduce the number of measures during the review process. We’re asking staff if they can develop metrics for these actions to measure progress through the decade.
  + Daniel: You are among the first to read this document, in conjunction with departments in the City. We want to get a sense from you how the community may receive these actions before we remit our comments to the consultants.
  + Shayna: We need feedback on this by the end of the first week of September. Recognizing that there is a lot of information in here, and not a lot of time, I can take feedback from each of you over email or through the Chairs. High-level feedback will be the most helpful.
* Brian: I have no criteria of evaluation here to say yea or nay on this to reduce the number of actions. Everything listed here looks great. Are there criteria for equity, feasibility, etc.? I don’t feel ready to give feedback until I have criteria.
* Bruce: Do these measures meet our climate goals for 2030 and 2050? Second, are we able to tease out the health benefits of these actions so we are not just looking at carbon reduction benefits?
  + Daniel: The ECAP consultants have a model that will attempt to calculate this, but we’re not far enough along to get detailed results yet.
* Nicole: Are we supposed to believe this data all came from the community? How did those who voted even choose the actions they did? Not all of these actions are from the community.
  + Daniel: Don’t think of this as a formal full draft. The Equity Facilitators and ECAP consultants are working concurrently. We wanted you to see this draft priority list to ensure the actions presented by the consultants pass the smell test.
  + Nicole: Are the equity consultant and the ECAP consultants working together?
  + Shayna: They’re separate teams but we work together closely. Another piece that will be included down the line is the racial equity impact analysis, which the Equity Facilitator will conduct.
* Susan: Was this done in alignment with the targets we have on the table? By doing all of these things, we have a chance of achieving our goals. Do the consultants say which of these have a greater potential than the others? Do some of these have a bigger bang for their buck?
  + Shayna: That is the purpose of the carbon impact column.
  + Daniel: There are a few like mode-shifting to low carbon transportation that are most impactful from the GHG emissions perspective.
* Colin: The equity facilitator team is doing an initial equity review of the 50% ECAP draft that they will return to the ECAP consultant team by next week.
* Najee: After we get the 70% draft, what is the next step?
  + Shayna: Town halls and an interactive, online draft that anyone can make comments on. Afterwards, all of the feedback will go back to both consultant teams and they will work to incorporate it. There is an in depth racial equity impact analysis starting now that will be repeated in November through January.
* Nicole: Let us move forward with our perspectives on these actions.
  + Shayna: The reason we have the consultants is to do the deep technical analysis. What to me is most valuable from this Committee is hearing what sort of framing to use when looking at these actions, and what high-level things are missing.
  + Nicole: I am interested in what lens the consultants are using and whether the consultants themselves are equitable. Please ask consultants to check their own biases while working.
* Najee: Off the top of our heads, is there anything that should definitely be included in this plan? For me, these green jobs that are being created should have some portion set aside for marginalized people; we must ensure that building upgrades keep housing affordable for Oakland residents.
  + Ryan: That’s an important part. There are some subject areas that have the potential to be regressive and harm equity, but if done the right way can have a progressive, equitable effect. There should be categories to discuss the pros and cons of equity in each action. For instance, parking.
  + Nicole: Thank you Ryan. In providing feedback, is it suitable to do it in the form of a Google Doc? I want it to be available for us to all provide our feedback.
    - Jody: I think you’re going to have a problem with that. I would be happy to receive 12 emails about what to include and discuss it at the next meeting.
    - Shayna: I am fine receiving individual feedback.
    - Brian: I don’t understand the purpose of a Committee that then functions as individuals. As a Committee, we should be discussing the issues and determining the position of the Committee. If we are sending separate notes, then we don’t need a Committee. The individual comments sent to staff will be done during the 30-day public comment period. The only thing we can do is establish criteria for evaluation.
    - Susan: As Nicole and Brian said, this is a lot of stuff to cover and we don’t have much more time tonight. If you would like to divide this up for the rest of the time, then we can address some actions.
    - Nicole: Let’s split up, and then after this meeting you can provide more feedback to staff.
* Ms. Margaret: I would like to have a three-minute discussion about Port leadership. Some of the things in this draft have nothing to do with the Seaport Plan. Under the Port leadership, P4 has nothing to do with the Seaport Plan. If it has to do with ships, it should say it. Also, the seaport plan has nothing to do with the airport.
  + Brian: The Port runs the seaport and the airport. What’s your recommendation?
  + Ms. Margaret: We have never had a discussion about what happens at the airport, so why is it here? They need to clarify their language. Where are the footnotes? Where are the references?
  + Shayna: This section has to do with Port leadership, which covers both the seaport and airport and real estate. Many assumptions go into the ECAP analysis, and the consultants call them out under the key assumptions section.
  + Ms. Margaret: You will confuse the general public if you just say Port, they will think it is just the seaport.
  + Brian: For electrification by 2023 goal, does the Port refer to the tenants or the buildings?
  + Daniel: This action item is referring to electricity provided by the Port. Tenants who receive electricity form EBCE will not be affected.
  + Bruce: Do tenants have gas access?
  + Daniel: The Port is a gas utility, but most tenants receive their gas from PG&E
* Najee: Let’s break into smaller groups, take these smaller pieces, and review together. I think three groups of three would be effective. Let’s spend the next 15 minutes developing suggestions to bring to the Committee. Buildings, transportation, and land use are the big three. Should they go together?
  + Bruce: We could split them up.
  + Jody: Three groups could each address one of the big three.
* Jody, Susan, and Bruce discuss buildings.
* Jacky, Ryder, and Ryder discuss transportation.
* Najee, Brian, and Ms. Margaret discuss land use.

Reconvening to share ideas:

* Transportation:
  + T1 – Make an addendum to include incentives or investments from ride sharing companies in underserved communities.
  + Ridesharing – S.B. 1014 might supersede what the City can do on ride sharing with EVs. The City should use requirements, not incentives.
  + Parking – Change to “Redesign Parking.” Staff should look at the parking report more closely. We also want the City to consider those who live in their cars and how parking redesign will affect them.
  + Transportation and housing are tightly related. Affordable housing requires less driving for people.
  + T5 – Reword to say “supplement existing transit with innovative micro-transit services;” we also suggest the city experiment with running EVs.
  + We propose an addition: The City is rolling out a new bike plan. Swiftly rolling this out and leaping at opportunities will perhaps have the biggest reduction impacts.
* Buildings:
  + B1 – 2023 should be lowered to 2020; Berkeley is already doing it now.
  + B3 – Make sure we catch things like the new Kaiser building, which will be bigger than the Salesforce tower and would be a wonderful gas-free beacon.
  + Equity needs to be clearly stated as a priority.
  + Need to find out if 2040 is sufficient to reach our goals
  + Comfort, insulation, health all need more detail in this section.
  + Retrofitting City buildings seemed a little modest, but there is the use of tax money question – where would it be best spent?
  + Important to focus on the MUSH sector (municipal buildings, universities, schools, hospitals) to catalyze demand and ensure bulk projects, especially to give tradespeople the confidence that the demand will be there.
  + Big idea: Focus on libraries or other community-serving buildings in frontline communities, focus on apprenticeship program with trades to do the retrofit work, partner with Peralta or OUSD
  + Talk about embedded carbon in building materials; while Oakland does not drive global material markets, we should be supporting and joining solutions to make steel and other building materials be as low-carbon as possible.
  + Ryan: We can also imagine a whole ecosystem of bike parking and EV charging around these library projects.
  + Daniel: Note there is an embodied carbon action in Land Use section
* Land Use:
  + L1 – This is a state law issue.
  + L2 – This has a lot of parts; we should find some other constituency to use than just bicyclists. They don’t drive already, so why would they care about parking?
  + L3 – This should be the strategy for L1.
  + We need to implement S.B. 1000. We need an environmental justice component in our general plan and we shouldn’t have to wait.
  + Need to explain embodied carbon, opportunity zone, overlay terminologies.
  + Need to define daily needs; we suggest neighborhood-serving retail.
  + Equity focus for local small businesses. In West Oakland, they tore down vacant storefronts in the ‘70s, so now all we have are vacant lots. When these big developers come in, we should trade density for lease subsidies in ground floor commercial spaces.
  + Ms. Margaret: Some of the approaches here are not my experience. We need to deal with the old buildings that cause health issues. The City needs to look at the permits they give to transportation related businesses that increase exposure to combustion byproducts. There should be a glossary included when this goes to the greater community. Senior homes and schools need air filtration for future fire seasons.
* Najee: Nicole and I are adamant that these solutions and future suggestions be provided in a document. Does anyone have questions?
  + Jody: Thank you staff.
  + Bruce: The City Planning department is going to be putting forth a series of changes to prevent gas in new buildings. Do we as a Committee want to put together a statement on our support of a gas ban? I would be happy to work with Anne-Olivia to write something up.
    - Daniel: To clarify, staff is bringing forward code changes as we do every three years in October.
    - Jody: It is within our purview to send a letter to whoever adopts the code (Council).
    - Shayna: There will be a public meeting September 12 from 3 to 5 PM regarding building electrification and proposed requirements.
    - Brian: Bruce, are you suggesting we add an item to next meeting’s agenda to review this letter?
    - Bruce: Yes.

**Item 8. Community engagement update**

* Shayna: In the interest of time, I covered the high points of the community engagement process so far. If you want to go deeper, I recommend you read the Findings Report from the community workshops, as prepared by the Equity Facilitator (Attachment 2). I also sent out a link to the community ECAP survey, which is the second phase of community engagement and is available in English, Spanish, and Chinese.
* Najee: Can we all agree to send this link to at least two other people?
  + All: Yes.

Meeting adjourned at 8:07 PM.