



**City of Oakland, ECAP ad hoc Community Advisory Committee
Meeting Minutes from Tuesday, September 24, 2019 Regular Meeting
Oakland City Hall, 1st Floor, Hearing Room 3**

Item 1. Call to Order

Meeting called to order at 6:10 PM by Co-Chair Nicole Bratton.

Item 2. 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	X	
Tyrone “Baybe Champ” Stevenson Jr.		X
Dominic Ware	X (late)	
Jacky Xu	X	

Alternates	Present	Excused
Brian Beveridge	X	
Bruce Nilles		X

Staff attendees: Shayna Hirshfield-Gold (Sustainability Analyst), Danielle Makous (Sustainability Fellow), Sooji Yang (Sustainability Fellow)

Item 3. Approval of draft meeting minutes (attached)

- Ryder: On page 8, bullet 3 it should say, “Jacky, Ryder, and Ryan discuss transportation.”
- Anne Olivia: Did the group split up last meeting?
 - Ryan Schuchard: Yes, we broke into small groups to discuss and then came back with recommendations
- Navina: I don’t understand the response to Co-Chair Nicole’s question on Page 6.
 - Co-Chair Nicole: I was asking about where the data came from, was it an actual representation of the Equity Facilitator (EF) consultant team? How was the equality defined? Is the technical consultant team incorporating equity?

- Anne Olivia Eldred: The motion is on the table to accept the minutes as accurate. If there are any clarifications, then the hope is to review before the meeting or to reach out afterward.

→ Jody moves to adopt minutes with Ryder's amendment, Brian seconds

- No objections

Item 4. Public comment

Item 5. Agenda Modification

→ Anne Olivia moves to continue committee resolution (agenda item 6) to the next meeting since Bruce isn't attending and he and Anne Olivia want to create a draft and give to committee for review in advance of the next meeting, and it's not fair for the public to receive something day of.

- No objections
- Request from Co-Chair Nicole to get out the resolution for Committee review at least 72 hours before the next meeting. Let her know if she can support.

Item 6. Committee Resolution: natural gas policy recommendations

- Agenda item tables for next meeting

Item 7. Discuss remaining items in "50%" Draft ECAP Strategy List

- Navina: Where do these recommendations come from?
 - Shayna: This is a preliminary priority list created by consultant
- Navina: How does it relate to the work that comes out of the workshops?
 - Shayna: The 2nd or 3rd page has a list of top priorities that came out of the workshops. Some of the recommendations from the workshops are prioritized in the 50% priority list. Integral did best to dovetail where recs came out of the workshops. The findings from the workshops came out days before this list of priorities, so they weren't able to fully incorporate recommendations.
- Navina: Are we going to be giving equal time to the findings that were given at workshops?
 - Shayna: We brought them to the last meeting. We can definitely discuss them.
 - Navina: I just want to make sure we're considering the community as much, if not more than, the technical consultants
- Co-Chair Nicole: We're missing that piece about community feedback
- Co-Chair Najee: One thing that we can do is to vote on specific resolutions that we recommend should be and/or have to be included in the next ECAP draft. For us, one powerful tool is to vote and make very specific recommendations about how to move forward. That will ensure that as they create the next draft, certain elements, such as the equity piece, are included. That's a tool to ensure that key priorities we already know the community wants will be included. If we look at the workshop outcomes we can focus on specific things and elevate them to ensure they're in the ECAP.
- Anne Olivia: The 50% draft was put out really shortly after findings from Equity Facilitator were published, wasn't time for consultant to incorporate EF findings into that draft. The 50% focuses more solely on GHG reductions than other concerns that the community shared.
 - *Anne Olivia passed out her printed feedback document on the 50% draft list (Attachment A)*

- This isn't complete or well edited, and is not a comprehensive guide to feedback but perhaps we can use it as a guiding document to help us with conversation and to figure out what to vote on. If we take this huge document by section and say, "hey please incorporate these findings," then when we get the 75% draft we'll be able to ensure that all views are represented
- Co-Chair Nicole: through EONI I found that a lot of community members who were ignorant of what was going on in the community, they might not be thinking about greenhouse gas emissions but it is significant so we must combine the community engagement topics with the report from the consultants
- Brian: I have the same problem I've had since day 1. I feel like we're throwing stuff at the wall with no criteria to evaluate. Looking at this list there's stuff we've been doing for 10 years. For example, urban gardening, we've been doing that for 10 years. There's so much in here that looks like everything that the consultants could think of have been thrown in here. We keep talking about equity but we have no documents or filter about equity, nothing from the Department of Race and Equity. Shouldn't we be given the filter of equity to work with? I've been asking for something from that [DRE] office and not seeing it. Having trouble having a framework from which to evaluate.
 - Co-Chair Najee: We are that filter for equity. A lot of moving parts and everyone is putting their perspective on that plan.
 - Brian: But DRE has said they're going to use the Equity Indicators Project data/metrics to design public policy in the City.
 - Shayna: DRE has developed a Racial Equity Impact Analysis tool, EF team will be taking the list of strategies in the public review draft through that tool as well as tools that EJ Solutions developed. I can bring that tool to the next meeting to be shared with the committee.
 - Co-Chair Nicole: Yes, we would like to have it presented. Do the people in this room have the same challenge about lacking a framework to even start to analyze the draft? Or do you feel you have enough to give feedback?
 - Susan: I understood last meeting when asked about that and the strategies, if they were created by the consultants, in a specific way to reach the 2030 GHG targets, they said it was. I trust that the consultants figured out that these strategies in these categories need to be moved forward to reach the GHG goal.
 - Co-Chair Nicole: Who shares that view? (Co-Chair Najee and Jody agree). Equity document will be helpful to be a framework. Is this document given to consultants?
 - Shayna: Shared with Equity Facilitator
 - Navina: If this is supposed to be an equitable climate action plan then why is equity coming secondary? This should be a filter that has been part of the entire process, equity is a process not a final lens.
 - Co-Chair Nicole: Who are these consultants? Are they operating from an equitable perspective? Are they even from here? Do they check their biases at the door? They're representing a lot of the recommendations but who even are they? It feels like this committee is set up as a smoke screen. We're supposed to stand on that word? This is not how it should work. This piece of equity keeps coming up from several people as though it's a secondary thing but E for ECAP is equitable.
 - Co-Chair Najee: We are the gatekeepers
 - Jody: To me this is the process, we're all coming in here with different interests and backgrounds and different technical familiarity. This is a process that people come in with highly technical info about how to reduce GHGs, then we are the place where the equity process and the community

process come together, and that's what we're trying to figure out right now. We're working in a bureaucratic organization, things always take longer. I am sympathetic to Shayna, this is what I do in my day job and I'm presenting a CAP in Contra Costa county but we didn't spend money on an equity team, it isn't nearly as comprehensive. Maybe we add a column on the document that says "Equity", to add more leverage

- Ryan: I support Jody, an alternative to add a column, start with summary report of community input, then through those add the technical basis for each of these, then we have the discussion. Maybe some logistical issues but then it's equity first and then the technical stuff.

→ **Anne Olivia moves to include the DRE racial impact analysis in the next draft**

- Ryan: I've never seen the framework.
- Anne Olivia: Inside the comments I made/printed out, a couple of sections include my thoughts that equity is missing, and challenge base assumptions about some issues. If we say how are you going to apply something to here even though it's not complete, we can still have a basic breakdown. We can give that direction.
- Co-Chair Najee: One of the most powerful tools we have is ability to vote. When we vote those things are prioritized in these plans. It is powerful and important to make concrete votes on the things we care about and the things that we as a body want to make sure are included in next plan.

→ **Co-Chair Najee makes section motion to include the DRE racial impact analysis in the next draft**

- No objections
- Co-Chair Najee: This is only one aspect, this is not the end, we can keep voting. I took a brief look at Anne Olivia's comments and there's a lot of great content, we should dive in
- Co-Chair Nicole: We're going to do that in this meeting. The consultants have done things we have not done, they have done this work. Let's give them a little credit, we just need to understand how they address the work
- Navina: Ryan you were suggesting that we look at the 21 recs that came out of community workshops and use those at a lens to look at the other recs in the 50% draft?
 - Ryan: Just one candidate of the many ways we could do this.
 - Navina: I like that because many of the recs coming out of the community are technical.
- Navina: Is that how the consultants will use these documents together?
 - Shayna: That is one way. There are a lot of different ways the two perspectives are being incorporated. The consultant-suggested strategies are more like a universe of important carbon reduction strategies that can be considered, be added or subtracted from, and can be fleshed out. There is not a lot of detail about how the actions would be played out in the draft strategy list. A lot of the work will be merging and looking at "how can those items that were elevated as priorities in community workshops be reflected in the 'how' of carbon reduction strategies that will get us on the path".
- Colin Miller (EF Consultant): We would be happy to provide a presentation walking the committee through our response to 50% draft if that's of interest.
- Co-Chair Nicole: Last meeting everyone broke into groups and came back and reported. Co-Chair Najee had the idea to do that in the same way with Anne Olivia's feedback document. Breaking out into groups violates Brown Act.

- Anne Olivia: When we did community engagement plan for EBCE, we had to do everything together cause otherwise it's a violation of the Brown Act
- Jody: Some interpret that if public can't hear deliberation of the small groups then its violation, something else is that between meetings we can break into smaller groups less than quorum and then bring recommendations back next month
- Navina: Colin said he can present findings to us, not sure if there will be time but can we get it emailed to us?
 - Request to staff that committee receive EF feedback on draft strategy list
- Anne Olivia: Colin also suggested that we receive the top votes in each category not just the top 21 overall. As a process point what if we start with "what do you all feel about the introduction, about the goals, etc.?"
- Co-Chair Nicole: Lets go through each section and provide feedback.
- Co-Chair Najee: If things come up you want to vote on, bring them up.

Looking at Feedback document (Attachment A) provided by Anne-Olivia.

- Anne Olivia: The ECAP is long and my feedback is NOT a summary; it's just my feedback. Simply doing one goal at any cost, we know who pays for that, so we must say that we have co-equal goals that must all be achieved. Doesn't mean that we sacrifice GHG goals, but that we prioritize people who live here. We should develop forecast of these factors along with GHG paths, and the carbon abatement and other GHGs/co-pollutants associated with carbon. This is the general direction I gave for this section, that's it. Others may have other opinions.
- Navina: Do you have a suggestion for how to be incorporated? I read this and think it's great.
- Co-Chair Najee: I would like to move that this feedback, particularly Just Transition language, gets added into the introduction. Are we able to take this language as is and put it into the ECAP?
 - Shayna: It will definitely be considered. We might not be able to take it verbatim.

→ Co-Chair Najee makes motion to include Just Transition language into final ECAP introduction.

- No objections
- Anne Olivia: I included general recommendations in "Goals" strategy, including language that prioritizes equity, including two resolutions that this came out of, clearly states decarbonization as co-equal to others goals, include reference to state level work
 - Navina: Want to add in the goals not just being about stopping carbon emissions but contributing to thriving ecosystem, such as via urban forestry, protection of land, water, etc.
 - Jody: Would that get at issues of resiliency? Seems we can have statement about building a resilient city, would include green infrastructure, vibrant ecosystems, clean water, etc.
 - Co-Chair Nicole: any additional thoughts or comments
 - Anne Olivia: All we're doing at this point is sending feedback, we're still making recommendations on the ECAP document
 - Co-Chair Najee: We are pushing to include different things
- Navina makes motion to include goals language including resiliency/vibrant ecosystem language.**
 - No objections
- Anne Olivia: BAU section review in her feedback document.

- Huge disparity with distance based fares. BAU is we're not going to achieve GHG or other goals if we don't act. VMT is important but actual reduction is almost non-existent from development of higher income housing near transit; those people are more likely to own EVs. Dramatic difference in affordable housing near transit lowering VMT. If we want to reduce VMT then we need to promote the strategies that actually reduce it. We're not looking at secondary emissions.
- Jody: I really appreciate this work. I'm a little bit concerned that there's a presumption that staff doesn't want to do what we're saying. I am presuming that as this conversation evolves, that is exactly what staff will do. There is going to be a process, it's messy, it's not cut and dry, not adverse to the ideas here but I'm not sure that at the end of the day there will be conflicts between what we've voted on and what makes it into the plan.
- Co-Chair Nicole: There may be something on here that you feel should not be in the ECAP
- Anne Olivia: I have faith in staff to take what we say and look at it, and tell us what they can and cannot incorporate and why. I wrote these down so that the consultant can specifically look at something written down.
- Navina: My understanding is that us saying this carries weight.
- Co-Chair Nicole: We want to see the City implement our recommendations into the next draft, but there will be multiple drafts. So I'm assuming not everything recommended will go into the final but it will make it into the draft.
- Co-Chair Najee: Or it at least will go into consideration. Making recommendations will solidify what our opinions are.
- Ryan: A little disoriented. We're going through your personal thoughts, Anne Olivia?
- Anne Olivia: Not my intention, I just wrote down my feedback.
- Ryan: Do others feel they should write down their recommendations? We're spending a lot of time on one person's thoughts.
- Anne Olivia: My goal was to have everybody do the same thing, but that didn't happen. It looks like our chairs said we should use my feedback as a guide for this discussion. There is still opportunity for any members of this committee or from the public to submit public comment on this document.
- Co-Chair Nicole: We talked about creating a shared google drive, others talked about sharing with Shayna individual emails, I personally felt it would be better for us to all see each other's' feedback. We should have a shared document to share feedback.
- Susan: Possible shortcut, since we did cover some issues last time and gave feedback on transportation, buildings, and land use, then maybe we can focus on waste, or an area we didn't cover last time.
- Anne Olivia: I have a really big issue with buildings and electrification. Decarbonization is not the same as electrification. Tried to write this out clearly but it's technical. There are a lot of things that create emissions from buildings, and we don't want to electrify energy waste, electricity is expensive and we need to make sure we're not shifting the cost onto people who could be displaced through these measures. (Look at page 7-9 of 50% draft and pg. 4 of feedback document). I am adamantly opposed to the framing that is presented. It presents what I believe is a false duality/choice. Electrification is one important tool of energy efficiency, but what is laid out here says that GHGs at all costs, period, and then equity second. Very careful in how I framed this in my feedback document so that the scientific arguments and the justice argument on why I'm opposing the section is clear and not just passionate. Feel strongly that this framework will have impacts on communities that

are already carrying a disproportionate burden on communities already carrying the burden. Don't have to be mal-intentioned to have negative impacts.

- Jody and Co-Chair Najee agree not to throw out energy efficiency in quest for decarbonization

→ **Co-Chair Najee makes motion to include the 3 bullet points from page 3 of Anne Olivia's feedback document into ECAP recommendations.**

- Navina: No objections, but opportunity here to address gentrification, opportunity to name what needs to happen with new construction and what needs to happen with housing
- Ryder: One of my biggest concerns in the 50% draft was about the lack of housing. If you look at downtown plan, none of it includes affordable housing, how can we use the ECAP to push the downtown plan to include affordable housing?
- Co-Chair Najee: We need to develop language as part of the recommendation for how to include housing.
- Brian: How did we get a building energy strategy that doesn't include efficiency? This is fundamental to energy management today. How did we pay a bunch of consultants and they didn't come up with efficiency as a first step? We're not even weatherizing anyone's houses.
 - Shayna: The shift from energy efficiency into electrification in emphasis is one that recognizes the major thrust of what needs to happen in order to get to carbon goals. With the assumption that we're going to have a carbon free grid by 2030, EBCE's emissions were 90% carbon free in 2019 so we're probably going to get there sooner than 2030. With a carbon free grid and the massive climate forcing effect of methane, the main focus needs to be removing methane from homes. Energy efficiency is a strategy, but that's why I was focusing earlier in saying that this list does not include the "how". I acknowledge this is difficult to read in part because it's not complete, it's a high-level strategy list. Assure you that energy efficiency is one way to get at the "how" of the decarbonization strategy.
- Brian: What we have are strategies that start at the top and never work its way down to the actual people living in homes in Oakland. It's a big part of the problem that this approach is upside down. How do we make people's lives better by using energy, specifically clean energy?
- Co-Chair Nicole: Its worded as if, "If we reach this goal of electrification then everybody will be better off." It's not a true statement, and its built just from a GHG goal. Maybe that goal needs to change and is unreasonable. This statement comes out of that goal but not necessarily to do what Brian is saying of starting at the home level.
- Anne Olivia: I want you to know that my opinions are controversial, not universally shared when I say that electrification is a strategy of energy efficiency. Not all carbon-free energy is good (nuclear, large hydro) (impact to native communities and ecosystems), while gas burning is detrimental to public health. Burning gas 80% efficient in homes vs 40% efficient in power plants, so by electrifying we could just shift where the burning happens. There are existing mandates that existing structures (of which we have about 170,000 in Oakland) will be all electric but they don't have funding mechanism to implement. Neither existing mandates nor this draft list of strategies say that renters will be protected if landlords raise the rent. I have the most faith in EBCE, but this narrative is unintentionally misleading. I know who bears the cost of reducing carbon at all costs. If you want to electrify load, must put money into that new load. These things are not across the board agreeable.

When looking at the whole pie, transportation is 60%, shifting away from buildings.

→ **Co-Chair Najee makes second motion to include the 3 bullet points from page 3 of Anne Olivia's feedback document into ECAP recommendations.**

- No objections
- Navina: Lets finish the buildings part. Let's talk about process for giving feedback.
- Jody: The ideal way would've been for Anne Olivia's feedback to be published with the agenda and for all of us to have reviewed ahead of time.
- Co-Chair Najee: We agreed last meeting that we would send out suggestions to Shayna, so we should do that and then she can send them out or include them in the agenda for the next meeting.
- Navina: Lets shoot to get that to each other through Shayna in the next few weeks
- Jody: I don't know that we can do a massive group share, so it will get published as attachments to agenda
- Navina: Another thing to be helpful as point of process is to review what needs to happen before next meeting, fill people in who were absent.
- Co-Chair Najee: Agree that each of us will send at least 3-5 recommendations in the next 2 weeks, Shayna to send group a reminder if she hasn't heard from someone.
- Co-Chair Nicole: Recommendations are voluntary, but it seems like everyone wants to add to Anne Olivia and that's our role. Shayna will add all the emails to the agenda.
- Anne Olivia: Volunteer to work with chairs and Shayna on how the process of adding to agenda will work. Everyone should still email it in.
- Brian: I completely disagree. The purpose of these public meetings is for us to deliberate. 60% of meetings are discussing process and the Brown Act. Some of us only talk about a single issue, and we have 48 things to talk about. The purpose of a public commission, a review/advice body, is to have a public discussion, not to have email communication with staff. We're not a body if we all make separate comments.
- Co-Chair Najee: We're going to send our recommendations to Shayna individually, just as a framework for discussion of the next meeting.
- Brian: Why aren't we just having that discussion?
- Co-Chair Najee: To streamline the process, to have something to look at, so that when we come here we've already read it and to be able to look back at the document.
- Brian: 3-5 recommendations about what?
- Jody: If something is missing.
- Co-Chair Nicole: The recommendation moving forward is for the members of this Committee to go through this draft strategies list and to go through Anne Olivia's feedback document, then provide feedback on what needs to be changed/missing/eradicated. If you would like to do this, please provide at least 3-5 feedback points. Email your feedback document to Shayna directly, and then she will add the feedback to the agenda that will become available to the Committee earlier than 1 week before the next meeting.
- Co-Chair Nicole: Suggest we carry Agenda Item 8 over to next meeting and continue discussion of 50% draft as it relates to the feedback document
- Shayna: When we met last month, we said that this month would be the final discussion of the preliminary strategy list because of where we are in the process. The public draft of the ECAP will be submitted to staff for review before the next meeting. Staff will then be reviewing it, and we will make sure that the city can stand behind everything in there. There will be some time for staff to finesse the draft, given that this is an extra month of this feedback. For me to be able to do anything with it, it will need to be concise and high level (unless it's a specific urgent point or correction). I suggest that the committee focus less on the wording of the actions, and more on the high-level strategies that are suggested. Keep in mind that there is not

going to be a lot that staff can do with detailed feedback at that point. The Town Halls are scheduled for Nov 2nd and 13th, so our goal is to have public draft live at least a week before that.

- Navina: That's the version that will include equity facilitator review? We spent a lot of time on that and how that was missing from this 50% draft. Maybe consultants should come to next meeting.
 - Shayna: The consultants will hear your feedback through me.
 - Brian: We're not going to be able to see how any of this feedback is reflected in the document before it goes public.
 - Shayna: The public draft will still be a draft, and still many months for this committee to weigh in. I suspect that your review of the public draft will be easier because there will be clear language about how each action will be carried out.
 - Co-Chair Nicole: Don't get caught up in outcome, focus on just giving the recommendations because that's the most important part right now.
 - Brian: We are not empowered, this is a smokescreen. Maybe some stuff will be incorporated, maybe not.
- Public comment from NLC member:
 - There was a question from a workshop about the previous ECAP and how implementation has gone, some has been implemented but other actions were contradictory. How will this ECAP be implemented? Is there intention to include this in update to Oakland's General Plan?
 - Co-Chair Najee: Shayna was saying that when the next draft becomes public, there will be more implementation language and the public will be able to include feedback.
 - Shayna: The intention of staff is to include this in the Land Use & Transportation Element of the General Plan, or at least that is the hope. That won't happen before 2023 at the earliest. Council has appropriated funding to hire staff for a general plan update, but it's a massive undertaking for the Planning and Building Department to update the City's General Plan. That is the time when the ECAP can be included as an optional element to the General Plan or the LUTE.
 - Anne Olivia: You can look at Contra Costa's General Plan and how their CAP was incorporated.

Item 8. Community Engagement Update

- Carried over to next meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 8:11 PM.

Attachment A – Anne Olivia's Feedback Document

Feedback on the 50% ECAP

I would like to thank staff for bringing us a wonderful beginning to a ECAP. I also want to recognize that they have been responsive to concerns and questions raised in reviewing this document, and share many of the concerns around equity that I am about to share.

I also want to acknowledge that our Equity Facilitation partners turned in their findings report just before the release of this 50% draft, and that there was little time to

incorporate those findings into this draft. I look forward to seeing their inclusion in the 75% draft, along with the recommendations of this committee. I appreciate the request for feedback on lessons learned, past challenges, and policy mechanisms that can support (or hinder) the implementation of these strategies, and am doing my best to incorporate that feedback here.

I would like to stress that this report, while a great start, has not yet incorporated any of the City of Oakland's goals beyond carbon reduction. Focusing exclusively on GHG reductions has disproportionate benefits for wealthy people and unduly punishes those with less economic resources. In the City of Oakland, those lines often have racial biases that we are actively attempting to address in this plan. I see this as a platform to add the other goals of the community, its representatives on this committee, and our City Council, who appointed us, to create a plan distinct from previous plans- one that recognizes that Climate change is happening and that the degree to which we plan for the resilience of our community will determine our ability to respond to whatever challenges we face in the future. A plan that centers community resiliency, and does not embrace further internal displacement. A plan that loves and values the people who currently live here, and would like to keep them.

I look forward to seeing our other values as a city in the 75% draft.

Introduction (pg 1):

Include a Just Transition, social, economic, and environmental justice into our Climate Action Plan for it to be Equitable, recognizing that carbon is only one of the issues we face. Paths to creating a just and equitable city acknowledge that climate change is happening - and action taken in Oakland alone will not stop it. The resilience of our community must be centered in our plans. This will help bring key stakeholders into participation and active contribution in enacting the plan.

1. To avoid exacerbating systemic racism through strategies that disproportionately impact low income Oakland residents and residents of color, we must take this opportunity to explicitly state a Just Transition, racial, social, economic, and environmental justice are goals that must be co-equal with GHG reduction.
2. Include development of forecasts of these factors along with GHG impacts in our plan and next steps.
3. Include carbon abatement (reducing emissions), other GHGs besides CO₂, and reducing co-pollutants associated with CO₂ in Next Steps

Goals (pg 2):

1. Overall, make language stronger and more specific.
2. Change “Carbon” to “greenhouse gas emissions”.
3. Include particulates, nox, other ghgs, and co-pollutants that may or may not be ghgs
4. Include language that prioritizes equitable and positive outcomes for people currently living in our city, That accepted strategies will not displace current residents, that accepted strategies will not worsen the burden communities already disproportionately impacted by climate change face.
5. Include language from, or reference to, the Green New deal & the Just Transition resolutions.
6. Include language that clearly states decarbonization as co-equal to our other goals that must all be achieved, not one at the expense of the other. GHG emissions reduction, and the unique culture, history, and diversity of Oakland.
7. Include some reference to city policies in relationship to state climate goals and climate plan

BAU (pg 3):

Questions and concerns:

- In the title, add that the City of Oakland won't meet any of its equity goals either.
- Clarification on the Key Assumption:
 - Electricity is zero carbon by 2030. Why do we assume electricity will be zero carbon by 2030? Not all zero carbon electricity is good, and the use of nuclear was just floated as it is carbon free. We are also talking about adding new load, as I brought up before, not using our existing load, which can have a very different carbon footprint.
- Add local renewable development. It is more important to build local clean energy, including energy efficiency, than it is to get to 100% carbon free supply. Electrification without new local clean energy doesn't get us there.
- Growth in Oakland is concentrated in multifamily developments near transit
 - VMT are not reduced equally across all multifamily developments near public transit. Higher income and market rate housing development near public transit does not reduce VMT by any significant amount, where as VMT is dramatically different when low income, below market rate, and affordable housing developments are placed near public transportation systems. Higher income and market rate housing developments are also the most likely to have EVs, thereby further reducing the impact on emissions.
- EV adoption is low (consistent with EMFAC projections of 0.2% of VMT by 2050)
 - Alameda county has lower adoption rates than other areas, and ideally this will be addressed in some of the upcoming EBCE programs, but it will still primarily benefit wealthier individuals. From an equity lens, this must be taken into consideration with public transportation development, accessibility, and cost controls.
- This lacks in discussion on the current BAU of public transportation. There are huge inequities in distance based fares, disproportionate costs passed to seniors, disabled, youth, and low income folks, with individuals are spending \$50-100\$ a week on BART to commute to work. It does not address limited hours of operation, poor connection schedules, and the extreme high cost of attempting to use public transportation.
- In general:
 - there is a lack of focus on areas of highest disparity, that should be called out and named. We are making some rough base assumptions and not considering "secondary" emissions caused by Oakland's development, housing, and transportation policies. Displacement is bad for communities, and awful for the environment.

- In the graph, Emissions are shown to rise only after 2040, does this include the introduction of EBCE?
- As Transportation accounts for the vast majority of future local ghg emissions for Oakland, we should make this a top priority

Recommendations:

1. Graph should disaggregate natural gas and electricity.
2. Either
 - a. Include language that specifically states the above issues

Or include language that:

- b. Includes equity as a goal of the city, prioritizes local renewable development, specifies low income, below market rate, and affordable housing development near public transportation, addresses free and reduced fare public transportation and additional public transportation development

Community Engagement (pg 4)

This section lacks specificity, I assume on account of time, and have confidence this will be addressed in cooperation with our Equity Facilitation team and the dedicated members of our City staff. Additionally, there should be specific goals. For example, Community owned solar should be something we coordinate with EBCE, should set specific capacity goals, like 100 megawatts by a specific year. By what margins were particular actions favored, and to what degree do they achieve which of our co-equal goals, so we may end up with a balanced approach across all our goals.

Strategies (pg 7):

Buildings: decarbonization is not the same as electrification; for example, refrigerators, heat pumps, and a/c units emit high gwp refrigerants which account for a significant share of building emissions. Additionally, adding electricity demand risks simply shuffling carbon emissions on the grid, not creating anything new or actually reducing emissions.

1. include reduction of energy consumption and/or energy efficiency
2. Include “without displacing Oakland residents” or something similar
3. Include not cost shifting on to low income communities

Transportation:

1. This should be identified as the area where deepest carbon reductions are possible for meeting policy targets
2. Include fleet and other types of vehicle electrification
3. Include language on public transportation, not just transportation
4. Address adoption of motorcycles and other similar vehicles
5. Have major concerns around this inclusion of autonomous vehicles, need more information

Waste:

1. Include language on reduction of waste through reduction of consumption
2. More specific in general

Land Use

1. Include language that acknowledges a history of inequitable land use and development, and language that addresses that specifically calls for equitable outcomes in land use

Adaptation:

1. Include equity, resiliency, and preparedness

Municipal Leadership

1. Include development of community leadership
2. Include local resiliency (lead by example with city - controlled assets to increase local resiliency)

Strategies (graph, page 8)

Should the Port be included under transportation?

Strategies with specifics (pg 9):

Energy Use in Buildings:

This presents a false duality. 1) efficiency is a specific segment of the state climate plan for reducing ghg emissions, and the most at risk, 2) efficiency is at the top of the loading order for state policy priority, and much more certain to reduce emissions with lower environmental burden than fuel conversion, and 3) it is crucial to prioritize efficiency to avoid "electrifying wasted energy", and also to include low cost local solar and other forms of local renewable development to offset electrification demand; electrifying

energy waste has little to no benefit for climate, and will increase customer cost since electricity is much more expensive than natural gas.

Electrification without Energy Efficiency does not get us where we need to be. Electrification is one tool in energy efficiency models, but not the only one and not always the best one for every location. The approach section to this strategy lays out a false narrative. The equity section is particularly disturbing. I applaud the prioritization of health benefits, as the climate benefits of this are relatively small.

1. “the City should consider the impact on costs, evictions, and other equity considerations for vulnerable communities”
 - a. the City must do more than just "consider" these things; all electrification should be required to reduce customer costs, and the climate plan and programs should be designed to insure this happens.

In order to get complete comments on this, I will need more time.

1. **B1:** Require all new construction to be gas-free by 2023
 - a. Community Benefits: improved : please indicate for whom.
 - b. Impacts on frontline communities are unlikely unless paired with funding and mandates for below market rate housing development
2. **B2:** Require all existing buildings to be all- electric by 2040
 - a. **Major flag:** Requiring existing building to go all electric without a funding mechanism places massive financial burdens on poor people. Include a funding mechanism that does not cost shift on to residents.
 - b. Prohibit landlords raising rents if work is done on rental properties, require inclusion of anti-displacement language at this stage
 - c. Largest energy consumers are industrial, with some qualifying for direct access, which is way dirtier and likely to exacerbate the emissions issues
 - d. Prohibits the use of existing pipes for other combustibles
 - e. Include requirements that there is cost savings and real ghg reduction, and not just carbon shuffling falsely claimed as carbon reduction.
 - f. ev charging is transportation; should not be confused with building sector, to avoid false attribution of sector, or double counting.
3. **B3:** Retrofit one City building to be all-electric
 - a. Look at RMI case study of model home in Oakland

Transportation (pg 10):

1. This section focuses only on vehicle electrification, specifically SOVs, and lacks a vision for public transportation. Add other transportation focuses
2. Add reduction of the necessity to travel ever increasing distances.

Transportation (pg 11):

- **Approach:**
 - Approach lacks specificity, add public transit specifically.
 - this confuses existing plug loads (normal demand prior to adding new electrified heat and cars) with incremental demand for electricity. need to look carefully at marginal grid emissions, and risk of carbon shuffling. this is where local efficiency and local solar to meet electrification demand is crucial to avoid illusory carbon reduction.
- **Key assumptions:**
 - Job and Population Growth will be concentrated in a few specific areas. Specific Plans for those areas will require VMT reductions below what currently exists*
 - this does not specify who benefits from these jobs, or incorporate anti-displacement housing measures.
- **Equity:**
 - “Reliable, safe, and widespread transportation access is critical to an equitable Oakland. Transportation planning should respond to Oakland’s mobility needs”
 - Add public to the first sentence
 - Avoid language that sounds like we are prepping for a larger gig economy for our population.
 - LOVE free transit for all. Does that include those who are displaced from here by rising housing costs, but still have to commute?
 - Type of transit use is just as important to reduce ghg in this sector as "carbon-free" transportation, .

Suggestions and Questions

- Include language on motorcycles and motorcycle parking
 - More affordable to buy, better enviro wise, higher income from parking fees, congestion benefits.
- Put equity first
- Increase use of intelligent transportation systems... what is that? Are we advocating for autonomous vehicles?

- “Last Mile” concept does NOT address the last 35 miles, or people commuting outside of white collar business hours. Last mile solutions should also include parents with children, elderly, disabled, and people with stuff, like groceries.
- also consider adding alternatives to transportation such as mixed use development, and distributed work.
- Call this out as the area with the deepest potential for carbon reduction

Specifics (pg 12):

1. **Ensure new mobility platforms and technologies support City’s carbon and equity goals**

- a. How do you measure/ensure that?
- b. Lacks in specificity: define demonstrate, measure, and preference
- c. Consider issues with rideshare companies, include language that addresses the higher cost of EVs - would this result in higher rental fees to drivers who can’t afford their own car? Increased costs tend to result in longer hours, people sleeping in cars, etc. Incentivize rideshare needs to address exploiting workers
- d. recommend deep scepticism about "autonomous" vehicles; this is not necessarily a carbon reduction measure, and not proved to be safe or reliable. what's wrong with employing drivers, which could provide job benefits, with worker protections?

2. **Rethink Parking**

- a. **Major flag:** This policy is highly problematic. It will have disproportionate impacts across race and class lines. It will exclude undocumented community members and those of us who actually share our cars, instead of paying for ride shares. Making parking harder punishes those who have been displaced from our neighborhoods and have to commute from areas where public transportation is inaccessible, expensive, and often takes many hours to complete. This is a cost shift that disproportionately impacts low income people who can’t afford live in walkable neighborhoods.

3. **Hold regular open streets events**

- a. Don’t we already do this? Again, identify the beneficiary.

4. **Supplement Existing Transit with Shuttle Service**

- a. need to consider gaps and last connection to destination from transit networks

5. **Free Transit**

- a. A road map to free transit should happen well before 2030, cost is a major determining factor in transit options

6. **ZEV Action Plan**

- a. should consider low cost and/or free and wide availability of ev charging, and standards.

7. Neighborhood car sharing:

- a. This is not increased public transit. At all. This is increased car sharing. It is only going to be accessible by people who have credit cards, which is hugely problematic anyways.

Port Leadership (pg 13):

1. The equity statement should be specific and include actionable items.
2. Include renewable energy production
3. Influence tenant sustainability: add date
4. port is really part of transportation; as a major additional section, rather than subsection of transport.

Waste (pg 16):

1. Add language that states consumption reduction as a goal (energy as well as stuff)
2. Look at local renewable development, see the City of Hayward for an example. All of their municipal buildings are powered by energy capture from their waste water treatment plant, there are models for the dumps too.
3. Make sure this doesn't incentivize consumption in order to produce waste, but don't let existing waste energy escape
4. Include support and active funding for starting small local businesses for existing residents of Oakland, targeting communities carrying disproportionate impacts of climate change and suffering from internal displacement. Create small businesses doing these things in the areas that are impacted, but make sure the people who own the businesses are FROM those communities.
5. Equity bulky block party: include letting renters schedule bulk pick ups.
6. Add language for waste pick up, recycling, and compost at encampment sites
7. Address dumping practices on encampments.
8. Establish infrastructure for edible food recovery:
 - a. programs like Faith Cafe in Portland are awesome,
 - b. address the issue with not being able to drop off bread from bakeries at food kitchens, only things wrapped in plastic bags.
9. **Key Questions for reviewers:** source separation of organics and other materials, clean materials, and training people to treat properly, are important for making waste into useful resources.

Leadership (pg 25)

1. Key Assumptions:

- a. The City is slowly replacing its fossil-fueled vehicles with carbon-free vehicles, without a strict timeline
 - i. electric vehicles are an important and even crucial way to reduce carbon emissions, but are not by themselves "carbon-free".
 - b. The City has the legal ability to update its Utility Franchise Agreements, although it has not been updated in almost a century.
 - i. this could be useful; need to think more carefully about options beyond just monitoring and fixing leaks in the gas system
- 2. Evaluate all City expenditures and operations through a climate assessment**
- a. not just assessment, but also climate plan, programs, and actions should be integrated into budget and etc.
- 3. Buy Local**
- a. supporting local businesses may or may not imply lower carbon or more local product/resource, unless we are specifically adding those qualifiers for which local businesses we support.

Excluded Actions (pg 27):

- 1. Energy Benchmarking**
- a. ab 802 is about utility data collection for energy efficiency; oakland is served by ebce cca for most customers, with some large customers served by da providers. the cca should be a natural entity to manage this, since they already have most customer data. CCA provides minimum 85% carbon-free electricity, which takes care of the large majority of decarbonizing buildings.
- 2. Blue Carbon**
- a. maybe consider coordination with other bay area jurisdictions that have more suitable locations for these things?