



**City of Oakland, ECAP ad hoc Community Advisory Committee
Meeting Minutes from Tuesday, January 28, 2020 Regular Meeting
1 Frank H. Ogawa Plaza, Hearing Room 3**

Item 1. Call to Order

Meeting called to order at 6:19 PM by Co-Chair Nicole Bratton.

Roll call / Determination of Quorum

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		
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 (ECAP Project Manager), Danielle Makous (Sustainability Fellow), Sooji Yang (Sustainability Fellow)

Item 2. Approval of draft meeting minutes (attached)

→ Motion to adopt minutes made by Jody; Anne Olivia seconds

- All in favor, except Ryder who abstained due to absence from the 01-28 meeting.

Item 3. Public comment

- Ryan shared new funding opportunities for clean mobility projects in Oakland through cleanmobilityoptions.org

Item 4. Agenda Modification

- Anne Olivia suggested switching Items 5 (Timeline Update and Implications) & 6 (Alignment of Community Priorities with Current ECAP Draft) on the agenda as Colin Miller (Equity Facilitator) had to leave at 7pm.

Item 6. Alignment of Community Priorities with Current ECAP Draft

City staff presented on how the community priorities from the workshops and surveys, in addition to the community comments and feedback from the town halls, online draft (Konveio), local organizations, and the Committee, appear in the current ECAP draft action language.

Colin Miller from the Equity Facilitator team gave an update on the Racial Equity Impact Analysis, which will be complete by February 19th. After initial review of the Transportation and Land Use Action items in the current draft ECAP, the Equity Facilitator team is pleased overall with the changes made with one exception: TLU-1, 5th bullet point, states "...prioritize development of housing of all income levels near transit." EF team suggested changing it to "for people who are low income, very low income, and extremely low income."

Members of the public (David Ralston and a representative from Public Bank East Bay) and the Committee discussed the "Explore" language of the public bank action item.

- David Ralston: As the Committee looks over the items, I think it's important to look at and track the verbiage. For example, this first item on public banks.
 - Ryan: The City probably had reasons for that. Shayna, could you comment?
 - Shayna: The Cities of Oakland, Richmond, and Berkeley supported a feasibility study for a public bank. In discussions with Public Bank advocates, staff learned that the feasibility study was flawed. There's widespread agreement that any public bank has to happen on a regional scale, similar to a CCA [Community Choice Aggregation, like East Bay Community Energy]. Given this is a plan for one city, it's hard to say directly we're going to support this when it inherently must be regional. The director of the Finance Department, which would be the lead on this, says there needs to be more research, that a public bank would need to be regional, and it's not the only option out there. Washington DC has a green bank that's showing some promise for funding climate action. Remember the goal: it isn't to create a public bank. The goal is to divest from fossil fuels and have some sort of locally revolving set of funds available for the sustainability work that we need to do. And a public bank is one great way of doing that, but the City needs flexibility to explore other options. The Finance Director wanted this language, and Equity Facilitator was happy with it.
 - Representative from Public Bank East Bay (PBEB): We met with the Oakland Finance Director, and I'm confused by what I just heard. You spent all this time and money in the last year on focus groups, and these focus groups said their number one priority is a public bank. Yes, this is regional. Richmond, Berkeley, and Alameda County have all put their money into the initially-flawed study. Oakland has an opportunity to be transparent and reflect the people who live here. We are modeling after successful public banks in North Dakota, Germany, etc.
 - Nicole: Could you speak to how it should be presented in the ECAP?
 - PBEB: I suggest changing the language to say "Support Creation of an East Bay Regional Public Bank" as demonstrated by the people of Oakland.
 - Jody: I'm comfortable with the current language. There's a lot of information that needs exploring.
 - Ryder: There is a set of values that go along with the public bank. I don't know what a green bank is and I'm not comfortable with supporting something that the community didn't vote on.

- Anne Olivia: Ryder, maybe you can prepare a written statement talking to our community advocates around item one and the values that go along with a public bank.
- Susan Shacker from Public Bank East Bay also presented on the advantages of a public bank, including holding fees that would cost Oakland less than what is being paid now to Wall Street banks. She also made the request to replace “junior” with “community” before “college” under action item W6.

The Committee asked City staff what the Committee can do with the document to be helpful in moving the ECAP to the next stage. City staff responded that as the action items have been significantly revised to address concerns and requests from the Committee and from the community (through the Town Halls and online feedback), and have been sent to the City Attorney for legal review and to the Equity Facilitator for the Racial Equity Impact Analysis. Thus, the narrative language is where the Committee can be most helpful in terms of providing feedback on the context, rationale, challenges, and opportunities of the actions to influence their implementation.

Item 65. Timeline Update and Implications

Shayna provided the updated timeline: The ECAP will be presented to Council on Tuesday, June 2nd. This adds 6 more weeks to the process, giving more time to review the Racial Equity Impact Analysis and financial analysis with the final action items.

- Najee: At this point, are we able to make suggestions to the action items?
 - Shayna: We can't make any major changes to the action items. They've already been sent to the City Attorneys for review. There are caveats to that – we're considering dropping the road-pricing item because there were equity concerns over that. We're also considering dropping the airport accreditation item, and another TLU item based on our conversation with AC Transit. If we make any major changes, then we'll have to resubmit to the legal review and racial impact analysis.
 - Anne Olivia: We need to be able to make substantive feedback and have that feedback be taken seriously. And if that means extending the timeline by two months which is unfortunate, it would be far less unfortunate than implementing a plan for 10 years that doesn't reflect the needs of the community. And I can't find the past drafts online unless I go through the specific agendas – they should be accessible to the public for a proper public engagement process.
- Nicole: What guarantee do we have that our feedback is taken seriously?
 - Shayna: We can't make major changes and still stick with the timeline. I think one action item is something we can change. I need to talk with other staff because this isn't something I can make the call on here. There's narrative that will influence how the action items will be carried out and implemented over the next 10 years. Action items aren't the end-all, be-all for implementation direction.
- Jody: This is way too much. I'm wondering how everything will be prioritized, how the Council will process everything. It's just not possible for everything to be the number one priority. I have concern that this is too big and bulky to implement.
 - Najee: When you look at the 75% draft, there's a local carbon impact and cost to each item, and I think they're going to look at these two things to develop which to prioritize first. Shayna, do you have any information on how they're going to prioritize each of these items? Is there going to be information in the ECAP itself on how things are going to be prioritized?

- Shayna: Yes, but we haven't gotten to that yet. Right now, we're trying to finish up what the actions are.
- Nicole: And we as the Committee can add direction on which items to prioritize?
- Shayna: Yes.

Item 7. Community Oversight in ECAP Implementation

The Committee discussed a community oversight body for ECAP implementation:

- Shayna: With an extended timeline, there's no rush to talk about the community oversight.
 - Nicole: We can do this down the line.

David Ralston from OCAC spoke in support of a community commission throughout the whole ECAP implementation. He presented two recommendations: One, the ECAP be placed as a formal element in the General Plan. Two, all community priorities must be included in the plan with equity maps that depict how actions will impact communities.

- Nicole: How much of this is feasible?
- Shayna: It's up to the Planning & Building Department. The General Plan update will probably happen in the next 3-5 years, and the ECAP will most likely be incorporated.

→ Anne Olivia makes motion to establish a community oversight committee for ongoing implementation; Najee seconds.

- All in favor

The Committee made a suggestion to include language that the ECAP be adopted into the General Plan.

Item 8. Committee Discussion: Next Meeting content

The Committee discussed prioritization of metrics to evaluate the ECAP action items based on GHG reductions, equity impact, costs, and communities. City staff reiterated that the ECAP is responsive to Council-adopted GHG reduction targets and the Climate Emergency and Just Transition Resolution. Anne Olivia shared two useful tools to prioritize and evaluate programs: EBCE's three pillars (social, environmental, and economic equity and justice) and MTC's displacement prediction tool. Anne Olivia also volunteered to look at existing language around prioritization and send it to City staff to be published in the next agenda.

→ Co-Chair Nicole makes motion to extend the meeting by 10 minutes.

- All in favor

The Committee divided the sections amongst themselves to review and provide feedback of only urgent concern to City staff by February 17th. City staff will compile the feedback and publish it with the agenda for the next meeting. The Committee Co-Chairs will send an email to the absent Committee members about this process.

- Ryan and Nicole: Transportation and Land Use
- Ryder: Material Consumption and Waste, Public Bank
- Barbara: Carbon Removal
- Anne Olivia: City Leadership, Buildings – specifically electrification, Public Bank

- Jacky: Buildings
- Najee: Adaptation
- Brian: Port

Item 9: Adjourn

Meeting adjourned at 8:14 PM