Reflections from Department Leadership

What specific racial inequities and disparities within your department are **you** focused on addressing in 2022?

1. Increasing diversity of department equity workforce, particularly in leadership roles, through retention and hiring processes.
2. Hiring of position(s) based on available approved city budget to lead department internal and external racial equity work.
3. Advocating for additional resources and allocating funding to implement and support ongoing racial equity action plan work.
4. Restructuring department-wide performance plans and incorporation of racial equity goals into all employee plans.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please describe your engagement to date with your Racial Equity Leaders. What specific types of support are you providing your Racial Equity Leaders and other employees doing this work?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Serving as the Acting Director since mid-April, I have met with the racial equity leaders to discuss the department's Racial Equity Action Plan and report, determine funding and staffing needs, and review my budget advocacy and organizational staffing plans to support implementation and development of the department's racial equity action plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>While our ability to hire new dedicated staff is dependent on the funding provided by the city budget process, I am committed to advancing organizational changes to elevate the racial equity work as a priority for all staff both internally and with how we engage with external audiences.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Racial Equity Leaders' Reflections on Challenges and Learnings

There have been several challenges implementing the 2021 actions for the SF Environment Racial Equity Action Plan (REAP). While the Covid-19 pandemic did not make the work any easier, its existence alone was rarely cited as the sole impediment for incomplete actions. Feedback given to the Racial Equity (RE) Leaders was that there were too many REAP action items to implement. Although crucial factors such as staff time, staff availability, and departmental resources were discussed ahead of time, it seems that the equity work planned and attempted was still more than what the assigned staff could handle.

Admittedly, Racial Equity work is incredibly challenging but if the collective work is not grounded and established on a foundation of commitment and accountability then the effort sometimes feels hollow or misguided. When the director states “this is all of our work” but some staff can opt out freely because they feel ill-equipped, uninformed or just too busy to complete their commitments, then a sense of imbalance persists and RE Leaders are continuously unduly burdened with additional work to complete the assigned tasks.

Challenges to implementing the actions were varied. RE Leaders spent an enormous amount of time putting the actions and implementation steps from the REAP into a user-friendly spreadsheet so that the appropriate staff could be assigned to the relevant actions. Additional challenges are highlighted below.

Consultants

Financial resources were identified to secure consultant services. Unfortunately, due to consultants’ performance issues, RE Leaders spent copious amounts of time cleaning up consultants’ work therefore unduly burdening the RE Leaders. In addition, SFE was not able to garner a lot of interest from racial equity consultants when it issued an informal bid and an RFQ for racial equity work. This led to limited choice in terms of consultant access. Some racial equity consultants made comments that SFE and other City departments did not budget enough for racial equity work. As SFE’s budget does not come from General Fund sources, there is always a challenge to fund work that is considered outside of the direct scope of its grants and other funding sources.

Data and HR-related issues

Reliance on DHR to provide data and their overall responsibility for many of the actions, especially in the hiring, recruitment, retention, and promotion areas, can sometimes conflict
with racial equity goals. Issues include DHR’s limited capacity, lack of transparency (or lack of inclusion in) what is being worked on, and a misalignment of goals and priorities between DHR and racial equity leaders. Finally, DHR’s guidelines related to sharing data in the name of privacy considerations can further perpetuate racial inequities by concealing issues and preventing RE leaders from identifying systems that continue to benefit white people. For example, not sharing data on internal promotions due to a group size of less than 10 individuals can prevent staff from identifying any potential disparities that need to be addressed. Privacy guidelines can also contribute to the invisibility of certain races and disregard the fact that not all staff have the ability to keep their race private. In many cases, Citywide solutions under the leadership of ORE are needed to move the needle on these larger issues that relate to HR.

Accountability

It is discouraging that staff say they support racial equity initiatives but will not do the work to implement changes and it is disheartening that Racial Equity is not treated as a core value within the Department. Some staff appear to view this work as a chore rather than something they are passionate about and committed to. Furthermore, it’s very challenging to accurately track the status and progress of REAP action items when staff choose not to submit their data and are not held accountable for their actions.

Next Steps

The Department is considering focusing on fewer REAP action items and prioritizing certain actions in the future to be more intentional and effective. Many of the REAP action items, especially ones related to Hiring and Recruitment, require deeper dives, more engagement with the Racial Equity Steering Committee United (RESCU) and staff, and more detailed analysis. The creation of SMART RE goals and the prioritization of 2022 actions will require engagement with RESCU and broader SFE staff. RE Leaders will also consider the 2021 All Staff (anonymous) survey findings prepared by our consultant in the prioritization process. In order to give racial equity work the importance it deserves, considerably more staff and consultant resources are needed to perform the work. As ORE suggested in its evaluation of SFE’s Phase I REAP, there is also a need to clarify decision-making processes, especially when there is a misalignment between racial equity staff’s goals and priorities related to specific actions and those of leadership and DHR. This may be an area where the department would benefit from ORE guidance and outside consultant support.

1. Hiring and Recruitment

Findings

REPRESENTATION

Racial and ethnic diversity decreases as classification increases. From REAP Workforce Data for CY21:
- Senior Staff and Leadership (5644, 0922, 0952, 0962, 1824) – 7 White, 2 BIPOC
- 5642 – 13 White, 6 BIPOC
- 5640 – 10 White, 6 BIPOC
- 5638 – 6 White, 7 BIPOC
- 99 and 9922 – 3 White, 10 BIPOC
- Positions not listed above – 3 White, 8 BIPOC

APPLICANT POOLS

In REAP Phase 1:

- Analysis indicates that the diversity of the applicant pool decreases in senior level positions. Additionally, there is a drop-off of BIPOC candidates in the remaining applicant pool after applicants not meeting the minimum qualifications are screened out of the applicant pool.
- Except for the 5640 classification, the racial diversity of job applicants decreased as job seniority increased. Some of SFE’s job announcements list numerous desirable qualifications, which research suggests can lead to racial inequities by dissuading diverse candidates from applying to positions.

Goals and performance measures

ORIGINAL DEPARTMENT GOAL (from REAP): Remove barriers to support high levels of racial and social diversity across all classifications and promote inclusion of BIPOC communities in the environmental field.

PROPOSED NEW DEPARTMENT GOALS:

1. Within the next 5 years, identify and remove barriers to support high levels of racial diversity in 56XX and leadership positions
2. Within the next 5 years, identify and remove barriers that result in drop off in BIPOC applicants after MQ screenings

PERFORMANCE MEASURES:

1. Staff demographics across all classifications compared to baseline
2. Applicant pool data at various stages of hiring process by classification (and before and after changes are implemented)
3. Analysis of sources where applicants are finding our position announcements

Changes implemented over the 2021 calendar year

If relevant, include action numbers from the RE Action Plan.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Indicator(s)</th>
<th>Status, recommended change(s), other notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1.1</td>
<td>Barriers assessment is completed</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.2</td>
<td>Survey is administered annually</td>
<td>Completed 2019, 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.2</td>
<td>Survey results are included in the department annual review</td>
<td>Not completed; Propose changing indicator to “Survey findings presented to SFE Staff and Commission on the Environment”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.3</td>
<td>Hiring and Recruitment Policy is created, implemented, and reviewed annually to maximize results</td>
<td>Not completed; Key findings from 2019 staff survey and barriers assessment identified for forthcoming Hiring and Recruitment Policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.3</td>
<td>Candidate pool is increasingly more diverse and referred from a variety of sources</td>
<td>Awaiting data from DHR; CCSF has changed to Smart Recruiters platform, and we are unable to directly access the data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.4</td>
<td>Job descriptions display consistent and inclusive language</td>
<td>Completed; changes have been made to job description templates and there’s ongoing work to ensure content in job announcements includes inclusive language; racial equity statement now included in all job announcements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4.4</td>
<td>An increase in applicant pool with more diverse life, education, and professional experiences</td>
<td>Unable to measure this at this time; Desirable qualifications have been simplified; Propose changing indicator to measure impact of potential changes to educational requirements in MQs, which may be easier to track</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4.5</td>
<td>Increase in internal part-time and full-time staff, interns and fellows applying for job openings</td>
<td>Unable to measure at this time; New system doesn't provide an automated way to track this, especially for interns and fellows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4.6</td>
<td>Hiring, interviewing, and onboarding processes standardized</td>
<td>Not completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4.6</td>
<td>Lag times/wait times reduced for applicants</td>
<td>Not completed; length of time from posting to hire date is tracked, but has not been analyzed based on internal vs external causes for lags; PCS recruitment data reviewed by race and withdrawal rates did not show disparities by race</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5.2</td>
<td># of new partnerships with CBOs and networks (to create diverse pipelines into environmental field)</td>
<td>Three. The relationship we established with San Francisco Unified School District’s Career Technical Education program has resulted in resource allocation to teachers who</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5.2</td>
<td># of environmental scholarships and awards provided to students</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Priority actions for 2022 calendar year, including opportunities for staff input and decision-making

If relevant, include action item numbers from the RE Action Plan. Please also highlight any major revisions made to RE Action Plan since first submission.

1. Hiring and Recruitment Policy (including standardization and transparency, explicitly sharing the protocols SFE will use to improve diversity through the hiring process) *(1.1.3, 1.2.1, 1.5.1)*

2. Expand Recruitment Efforts, including engaging civil rights groups, community organizations representing under-represented communities, and networks such as Megablack and Bay Area Black Professionals, who can both publicize and promote the availability of job opportunities *(BTCC Survey Findings Report and Gould Report)* *(1.2.2, 1.2.7, 1.5.1, 1.5.2)*

3. MQ Revisions to eliminate unnecessary requirements that could limit the applicant pool *(1.2.3, 1.2.4, 1.2.5, 1.2.6)*

4. Data Collection and Tracking for Recruitment and Hiring *(1.1.1, 1.2.1, 1.3.5)*

2. Retention and Promotion

Findings²

WAGES

- In December 2021, the average hourly rate for white staff was $56.99 and for BIPOC staff was $44.34, meaning the BIPOC staff rate is 78 cents for every dollar made by white staff

---

² Eighty percent of staff (65 out of 81) completed the 2021 survey, including 32 staff of color, 29 white staff, and 4 who preferred not to state. The racial/ethnic composition of SFE on December 31, 2021 was 39 staff of color and 42 white staff (not Hispanic, Latino/a/x, or Spanish). Survey questions are included at the end of this document for reference.
In October 2019, the earning potential\(^3\) of average hourly wages was calculated to be $52.25 for white staff and $40.12 for staff of color, meaning the staff of color rate was 77 cents for every dollar made by white staff.

In the 2021 staff survey, 19% of BIPOC staff and 34% of white staff marked Agree or Strongly Agree that they feel they are being fairly compensated for the work they are performing.

TENURE
Thirty-five percent of BIPOC women hold tenure of at least 5 years, compared with 71% of white men.

PROMOTIONAL OPPORTUNITIES
- In the 2021 staff survey, 29% of BIPOC women and 71% of white men answered Yes to the question: When there are promotional opportunities at SFE, do you feel all staff regardless of race have equal opportunity

Goals and performance measures

ORIGINAL DEPARTMENT GOAL (from REAP)\(^4\): Create internal and external pipelines to advance racial equity in the environmental field, develop systems to promote transparency and fairness in promotional processes, and work with employees to assess employee work environment or conditions that may contribute to employee turnover.

PROPOSED NEW DEPARTMENT GOALS:
1. Reduce disparity in average hourly wages between white and BIPOC staff within the next 5 years
2. Increase staff perceptions that all staff, regardless of race, have equal opportunity to promotions
3. Reduce disparities between BIPOC women and white males’ assessment of fairness in promotional opportunities
4. Reduce disparities in tenure between BIPOC women and white men

PERFORMANCE MEASURES:
1. Promotions disaggregated by race and gender, internally and externally

---

\(^3\) This analysis was an estimate of earning potential, as Racial Equity Core Team staff did not have access to actual employee salaries. Hourly wages were obtained from the Classification and Compensation Manual: https://sfdhr.org/sites/default/files/documents/Classification-and-Compensation/Compensation-Manual-FY19-20.pdf. For classifications 1094, 1222, 1310, 1424, 1543, 1632, 1822, 1823, 1844, 5638, 5640, 5642, 5644 used top step of range for Q. For 9920, 9922 used Q. For 0922, 0952, 0962 used top step of Range C. \(https://sfgov1.sharepoint.com/:x:/s/ENV-RESCUTeam-RECCoreTeam/EVVMku1WDIFGgYnnqRaFOPkBYTmw74LIRC2u5nt_qbuWrq?e=105xVH\)

\(^4\) https://sfenvironment.org/sites/default/files/fliers/files/env_racial_equity_plan_v1_123020.pdf
2. Staff assessment of equal opportunity to promotions, disaggregated by race and supervisory status
3. Staff assessment of fair compensation, disaggregated by race
4. Staff perceptions regarding work performed beyond job scope, as measured through staff survey
5. Number of exit and stay interviews completed, as percentage of staff; interview data disaggregated by race and gender compared annually
6. Wages by race and gender, including analysis of starting step by race and gender within classifications
7. Tenure, disaggregated by race and gender

Changes implemented over the 2021 calendar year
If relevant, include action numbers from the RE Action Plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Indicator(s)</th>
<th>Status, recommended change(s), other notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2.1.1 | 1. Tracking mechanism (for deployment and given functions of DSW) implemented  
2. Demographic data analyzed | Completed                                                                                               |
| 2.1.2 | 1. Budget analysis (with racial equity lens and DSW data) completed          
2. Strategies developed and published | Not completed                                                                                          |
| 2.1.3 | 1. PPE access protocol established                                          
2. DSW workers have an increased awareness of PPE access protocol | Completed. PPE info was communicated to staff in their deployment notice from the Covid Command Center and included on SFE’s intranet site for all staff. |
| 2.1.4 | 1. Compensation, paid sick leave, and flex time benefits assessed and easily accessed  
2. Increased employee awareness of additional benefits | Completed                                                                                               |
| 2.1.5 | Caretaking and safe transportation sections included in DSW deployment protocol | Completed; Exemption forms were provided to staff prior to deployment                                    |
| 2.2.1 | Pay inequities are reduced and aligned annually after salary data is reviewed | Not completed; salary survey project initiated                                                        |
| 2.2.2 | Benefits provided are annually improved                                     | Not completed                                                                                         |
### 2.3.1 Increase in knowledge about raises and promotions
Not completed; data was compiled on racial breakdown of internal promotions but was not shared with Racial Equity Leaders due to DHR guidelines on sharing data for groups of less than 10.

### 2.3.2 Increase in staff feedback about promotion and raise process
Not completed.

### 2.3.4 Reversal of diversity drop-offs in 182x classifications and/or other SFE classifications with drop-offs in diversity
Not completed.

### 2.3.5 Identify “dead end” classification and revise
Not completed.

### 2.4.2 Inclusion of questions (to identify work beyond scope of their position) in staff survey
Staff survey included question about fair compensation but did not directly ask about work beyond scope of position.

### Priority actions for 2022 calendar year, including opportunities for staff input and decision-making

*If relevant, include action item numbers from the RE Action Plan. Please also highlight any major revisions made to RE Action Plan since first submission.*

1. Pathways for staff advancement and promotion criteria (Including standardization and transparency) (**2.3.1, 2.3.2, 2.3.3, 2.3.4, 2.3.5, 2.4.2**)
2. Data Collection and Tracking (**2.2.1, 2.2.2**)
3. Employee retention, including Exit and “Stay” interview (**2.4.1, 2.5.1**)

### 3. Discipline and Separation

#### Findings

**POSITION TYPE/JOB SECURITY**
SFE has 21 employees in positions exempt from Civil Service under Category 18 (limited duration, project-based positions), not including limited term trainee positions (job classes 9920 and 9922). Among the 21 non-trainee Category 18 exempt employees there are 11 White employees, five Asian employees, three Black employees, and two Hispanic employees.
DISCIPLINARY ACTION
There was no disciplinary action taken in 2021.

SEPARATIONS
There were 13 separations in 2021 with a racial breakdown of seven BIPOC employees and six white employees. Of the 13 separations, four were voluntary separations, and nine were non-voluntary separations. Further disaggregation was not provided to racial equity leaders pursuant to DHR Age, Gender, and Race/Ethnicity Data guidelines.

Goals and performance measures

ORIGINAL DEPARTMENT GOAL (from REAP)5: Institutionalize equitable discipline and separation practices that create parity between PCS and exempt classifications and create transparency in management expectations and best practices for both managers and staff.

PROPOSED NEW DEPARTMENT GOALS:
No change

PERFORMANCE MEASURES:
1. Number of positions converted to PCS; racial demographics of PCS vs exempt staff
2. Demographic breakdown of separations

Changes implemented over the 2021 calendar year
If relevant, include action numbers from the RE Action Plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Indicator(s)</th>
<th>Status, recommended change(s), other notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 3.1.1 | 1) Create tracking mechanism  
2) Analyze data annually  
3) Increase accountability in disciplinary actions | 1) and 2) are completed and included in workforce data provided below, even though the start timeline in REAP is listed as January 2024; Disciplinary data is now tracked and disaggregated by race; No disciplinary action during reporting year |
| 3.2.1 | # of separations announced in comparison with total number of separations | Not tracked |

5 https://sfenvironment.org/sites/default/files/fliers/files/env_racial_equity_plan_v1_123020.pdf
Priority actions for 2022 calendar year, including opportunities for staff input and decision-making

If relevant, include action item numbers from the RE Action Plan. Please also highlight any major revisions made to RE Action Plan since first submission.

1. Conversion of exempt positions to PCS where staff have been in the position for more than 3 years (3.3.1)

4. Diverse and Equitable Leadership

Findings

REPRESENTATION
Racial and ethnic diversity decreases as classification increases. From REAP Workforce Data for CY21:

- Senior Staff and Leadership (5644, 0922, 0952, 0962, 1824) – 7 White, 2 BIPOC
- 5642 – 13 White, 6 BIPOC
- 5640 – 10 White, 6 BIPOC
- 5638 – 6 White, 7 BIPOC
- 9920 and 9922 – 3 White, 10 BIPOC
- Positions not listed above – 3 White, 8 BIPOC

For the respondents to the 2021 staff survey, 29% of BIPOC women indicated that they supervise staff, compared to 64% of white men. There was also a large disparity in responses to the question about interactions with authority figures in the workplace usually being a different race between BIPOC staff (84%) and white staff (14%). 5 people in the 2021 staff survey included comments about lack of staff of color in leadership positions, including a comment that top decision-makers are all white.

PROMOTIONAL OPPORTUNITIES
- In the 2021 staff survey, 66% of Supervisors and 36% of non-supervisors answered Yes to the question: When there are promotional opportunities at SFE, do you feel all staff regardless of race have equal opportunity?

CAPACITY FOR RACIAL EQUITY

---

6 Eighty percent of staff (65 out of 81) completed the 2021 survey, including 32 staff of color, 29 white staff, and 4 who preferred not to state. The racial/ethnic composition of SFE on December 31, 2021 was 39 staff of color and 42 white staff (not Hispanic, Latino/a/x, or Spanish). Survey questions are included at the end of this document for reference.
- In the 2021 staff survey, **53% of BIPOC staff** indicated that *Greater management/supervisory support* would help to *address racial inequities through work*, compared with **31% of white staff**. This is an improvement from responses to the 2019 staff survey, where **66% of staff of color** and **42% of white staff** indicated needing greater support. However, disparities by race are still present.

- In the 2021 staff survey, 7 staff mentioned feedback and decision-making practices as a barrier to racial equity, including the comment that feedback is solicited but not used to inform decisions by leadership.

- For the 2021 staff survey question *My feedback and suggestions are taken into consideration*, **47% of BIPOC staff** marked *Agree* or *Strongly Agree*, compared to **59% of white staff**. Black staff agreed at a higher rate and Asian staff agreed at a lower rate compared to aggregated BIPOC responses. Latinx staff agreed at a similar rate.

- In the 2019 staff survey, **51% of staff of color** marked *Strongly Agree* or *Agree*, compared with **73% of white staff**, to the question *I feel comfortable talking about race with supervisors and managers in my department*. Similar questions in the 2021 staff survey may indicate greater comfort with supervisors and lower comfort with program managers, although the results from 2019 and 2021 cannot be precisely compared. In 2021, there were disparities between BIPOC and white staff in feeling *safe and comfortable elevating racial equity issues in both internal and external offerings* with all types of colleagues listed:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Specific colleagues within SFE (Internal issues)</th>
<th>Specific colleagues within SFE (External issues)</th>
<th>My direct supervisor (Internal issues)</th>
<th>My direct supervisor (External issues)</th>
<th>My Program Manager (Internal issues)</th>
<th>My Program Manager (External issues)</th>
<th>Another Program Manager (External issues)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BIPOC</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disparity</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As a supplement to the survey, 10 staff participated in 1-on-1 interviews. **Interviewees overwhelmingly felt that racial equity work isn’t fully supported, championed, and structured by leadership.** Some interviewees also mentioned that the white people in senior leadership positions lack awareness and knowledge of inequities, are not attuned to their constituencies, and hold defensiveness or dismissiveness around racial equity issues. Additionally, some interviewees mentioned that senior leadership hold a limiting attitude and fixed mindset toward legacy and tradition rather than an openness to new or different ways of doing things.

**Goals and performance measures**
ORIGINAL DEPARTMENT GOAL (from REAP): Create an inclusive, diverse, and equitable management team, in which leadership is culturally competent, and power and decision-making are shared across the range of employment levels.

PROPOSED NEW DEPARTMENT GOALS:

1. Within the next 5 years, identify and remove barriers to support high levels of racial diversity in 56XX and leadership positions (Goal duplicated in Section 1)
2. Within the next 5 years, reduce disparities between supervisors and non-supervisory staff assessment of fairness in promotional opportunities, and increase staff perceptions that all staff, regardless of race, have equal opportunity to promotions
3. Improve BIPOC staff’s safety and comfort in elevating racial equity issues to supervisors and program managers in the next 2-5 years
4. In the next 2-5 years, reduce disparities by race for staff who need greater supervisory and management support to work on racial equity, and increase all staff’s assessment of supervisory and management support
5. Reduce number of staff who felt their concerns were not taken seriously and adequate action not taken regarding microaggressions, bias, and/or racism

PERFORMANCE MEASURES

1. BIPOC representation in leadership, senior staff, and supervisory positions
2. Staff assessment of equal opportunity to promotions, disaggregated by race and supervisory status
3. Staff comfort with elevating racial equity issues to managers and supervisors, disaggregated by race
4. Staff assessment of management and supervisory support and capacity for racial equity, disaggregated by race

Changes implemented over the 2021 calendar year
If relevant, include action numbers from the RE Action Plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Indicator(s)</th>
<th>Status, recommended change(s), other notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1.1</td>
<td>% increase in diverse leadership</td>
<td>No change in Senior Staff and Leadership demographics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1.3</td>
<td>Senior leadership demographic included in the department annual report</td>
<td>Only Commissioner demographics were included in the Commission’s annual report. The Department did not have a separate annual report. Senior Staff demographics were included in 2020 Phase I REAP.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.1.5

1) Completed report and suggested changes to secure long-term resources
2) # of staff who have racial equity items that are closely linked to their goals/tasks/assignments and not just related to trainings and learning

1) Workload analysis completed, and resource gaps identified; consultant resources secured
2) Data not collected; Propose changing indicator to # of staff that have REAP implementation in their PPARs

4.2.1

1) Improved perception of management’s understanding of on-the-ground issues
2) Increased awareness of on-the-ground issues

Not completed; field work was largely put on hold due to the pandemic.

Priority actions for 2022 calendar year, including opportunities for staff input and decision-making

If relevant, include action item numbers from the RE Action Plan. Please also highlight any major revisions made to RE Action Plan since first submission.

1. Identify strategies to improve diversity in managerial and leadership positions (4.1.1)
2. Racial Equity Training and Coaching (including training on facilitating racial equity conversations) (4.1.2)
3. Institutionalize use of racial equity tools and track changes made (4.2.3)
4. Increase leadership engagement on racial equity and ensure racial equity work is well structured and well resourced (4.1.5)

5. Mobility and Professional Development

Findings

Some findings from the 2021 staff survey\(^8\) can support work in this section in the future:

- 8 respondents mentioned promotion opportunities as a barrier to racial equity, including comments that the 99 class is the most diverse and yet rarely receive the time and opportunities to build the necessary skills to professionally develop

\(^8\) Eighty percent of staff (65 out of 81) completed the 2021 survey, including 32 staff of color, 29 white staff, and 4 who preferred not to state. The racial/ethnic composition of SFE on December 31, 2021 was 39 staff of color and 42 white staff (not Hispanic, Latino/a/x, or Spanish). Survey questions are included at the end of this document for reference.

Department name: SF Environment
Racial Equity Progress Report for 2021
- 5 respondents mentioned fair compensation as a barrier to racial equity, including comments that the 99 class is underpaid and often do the most interfacing with communities of color.
- Several staff interviewed identified that staff in trainee and lower classification positions, which have the most BIPOC representation, have been used as the face of the Department, and to portray the Department as more diverse and equitable than it actually is.

**Goals and performance measures**

**ORIGINAL DEPARTMENT GOAL (from REAP)**: Centering experiences of BIPOC staff, invest resources and establish transparent and equitable practices to ensure individualized staff growth in line with staff's career path and personal development goals.

**PROPOSED NEW DEPARTMENT GOALS**: No change

**PERFORMANCE MEASURES**

1. Staff access to and participation in professional development opportunities such as conferences, training, travel, etc.
2. Inclusion of professional development in all staff PPARs and evaluation of whether individual staff's professional development objectives have been met during “stay” interviews and mid-year check-ins.
3. Evaluation of junior staff and interns’ participation in informational interviews and other cross-program activities through “stay” interviews and mid-year check-ins.

**Changes implemented over the 2021 calendar year**

*If relevant, include action numbers from the RE Action Plan.*

---

### Priority actions for 2022 calendar year, including opportunities for staff input and decision-making

*If relevant, include action item numbers from the RE Action Plan. Please also highlight any major revisions made to RE Action Plan since first submission.*

1. Work with fellow RE Leaders from other City agencies and Racial Equity Consultants to develop guidelines for inhouse mentorship programs *(5.2.2)*
2. Standardize inclusion of professional development objectives in work plans and PPARs *(5.1.3)*

### 6. Organizational Culture of Belonging and Inclusion

#### Findings

**INTERNAL PRACTICES**

---

80% of staff (65 out of 81) completed the 2021 survey, including 32 staff of color, 29 white staff, and 4 who preferred not to state. The racial/ethnic composition of SFE on December 31, 2021 was 39 staff of color and 42 white staff (not Hispanic, Latino/a/x, or Spanish). Survey questions are included at the end of this document for reference.
1. In the 2019 survey, **39% of white respondents** marked *Strongly Agree* or *Agree* that the department’s internal policies “consider and address institutional racism,” compared with **25% of POC respondents**. In the 2021 staff survey, **28% of white respondents** marked *Strongly Agree* or *Agree* that SFE’s internal equity work is creating observable change, compared with **22% of BIPOC staff, 36% of Latinx staff** and **23% of Asian staff** indicated agreement, and **Black staff indicated agreement at the lowest rate.** **38% of white staff** and **41% of BIPOC staff** marked *Somewhat Agree*, a rating which was not included in the 2019 survey. It is unclear whether staff experiences moved from *Neutral* to *Somewhat Agree* from 2019 to 2021, or if the differences are due to including more tiers to rank responses.

**WORK ENVIRONMENT**

2. In the 2021 staff survey, **59% of women of color experienced microaggressions** at least once per year, whereas **36% of white men** did. For **BIPOC staff who experienced a microaggression**, only **22%** took action, compared to **62% of white staff**. Of the total staff who took action after either experiencing or witnessing a microaggression, only **35%** felt that their action effectively resolved the issue.

3. In the 2021 staff survey, 7 staff mentioned feedback and decision-making practices as a barrier to racial equity. 68% of staff identified white fragility as present in the work environment once per year or more, and **72% of staff identified tokenism as present in the work environment once per year or more**.

4. In the 2021 staff survey, **25% of BIPOC staff** answered *True* to the statement: *Others prefer that I assimilate to the White Culture and downplay my racial background;* **44% of BIPOC staff** answered *True* to the statement: *Others assume that people of my racial background would succeed in life if they simply worked harder, 55% of Latinx staff marked True,* and **Black staff marked True** at the highest rate.

5. Nearly half (45%) of all survey respondents indicated *being treated with less courtesy than other people, being treated with less respect than other people,* and that *people act as if they’re better than you.* The top three identities that respondents attributed to their experience were gender identity (48%), age (46%), and race/ethnicity (24%).

6. When asked for examples of barriers to transformative change in the current organizational cultures or internal practices, the following themes surfaced:
   a. **Lack of diversity in staff and opportunities for advancement** (16 respondents)
   b. **Lack of funding and resources for this work** (15)
   c. **Lack of transparency, communication, and safety** (11)
   d. **Defensiveness/shaming and lack of change to feedback** (8)
   e. **Management, senior leadership, and certain individuals and programs at SFE don’t see the value of equity** (8)
   f. **Lack of lived experience in SFE leadership** (8)
EFFECTIVENESS OF RACIAL EQUITY

7. For the 2021 staff survey question: I feel that addressing racial inequities is a priority for SFE, **39% of BIPOC staff** marked Agree or Strongly Agree, compared to **52% of white staff**. For the question: SFE puts racial equity at the forefront of its decision-making processes, **19% of BIPOC staff** marked Agree or Strongly Agree, compared to **41% of white staff**.

8. For the 2021 staff survey question about the efficacy of racial equity activities at SFE:
   a. **32% of BIPOC staff** indicated that SFE’s racial equity trainings were effective, compared to **71% of white staff**
   b. **52% of BIPOC staff** indicated that SFE’s racial equity tools were effective, compared to **74% of white staff**
   c. **37% of BIPOC staff** indicated that SFE’s conversations at team meetings were effective, compared to **48% of white staff**

Interviewees mentioned wide variations in staff fluency and comfort with racial equity, as well as inconsistencies with racial equity tool applications and discussions. Twelve survey respondents and several interviewees identified the importance that racial equity training be built into work time. Seven survey respondents and several interviewees identified problems with most of the Department’s equity work falling on a few staff of color.

Goals and performance measures

ORIGINAL DEPARTMENT GOAL (from REAP)¹²: All staff feel they belong at SFE and perceive it to be an inclusive, respectful, and fair workplace. Staff understand institutional racism and are equipped to address racial disparities in their work

PROPOSED NEW DEPARTMENT GOALS:

1. Within the next 2-5 years, reduce acts of microaggression in the work environment, with a focus on reducing the disproportionate burden on women of color

2. Within the next 2-5 years, increase staff’s positive assessment of the efficacy of racial equity activities, and reduce disparities between BIPOC and white staff’s assessment

PERFORMANCE MEASURES

1. Staff assessment of internal equity work creating observable change, disaggregated by race

¹¹ Selected either 4 or 5 on a 1-5 scale
2. Percent of staff who experience and/or witness microaggressions, disaggregated by race
3. Staff assessment of effective resolution of microaggressions, disaggregated by race
4. Staff assessment of the efficacy of SFE’s racial equity activities, disaggregated by race

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Indicator(s)</th>
<th>Status, recommended change(s), other notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.1.1</td>
<td>Department mission, policies, and procedures are updated and available</td>
<td>Department’s strategic plan includes a racial equity goal for the very first time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://plan.sfenvironment.org">http://plan.sfenvironment.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1.2</td>
<td>Regular, scheduled meetings with RE Team to implement RE Action Plan</td>
<td>Completed; Identified RESCU liaisons from each program area; RESCU engaged in Department's RE Action Plan development and implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1.3</td>
<td>RE Action Plan is published on department website</td>
<td>Completed RE Core Team identified need for consultant help and proposed idea to leadership. RFQ process was conducted, and consultants were selected. One consultant supported the department’s staff survey process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1.4</td>
<td>Ongoing reporting to staff, board, and commissioners on RE Action Plan updates</td>
<td>Completed for 2021. Presented updates at All Staff and Commission on the Environment meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1.5</td>
<td>% Staff feel work environment is inclusive, respectful, and fair, disaggregated by race</td>
<td>Awaiting results from the 2021 All Staff survey. SFE will propose new indicators based on questions asked in survey.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 6.1.6 | 1) # of training, conference, or discussion regarding diversity, equity, and inclusion completed by staff per quarter  
2) % Staff feel work environment is inclusive, respectful, and fair, disaggregated by race  
3) % Staff feel equipped to address racial equity at work | 1) 94% of staff received racial equity training  
2) Awaiting results from 2021 All Staff survey  
3) Awaiting results from 2021 All Staff survey  
Department convened an antiracism learning circle for interested staff  
Annual staff survey included questions about training needs and opportunities |
|---|---|
| 6.1.7 | 1) Annual survey with disaggregated data and feedback  
2) % Staff feel work environment is inclusive, respectful, and fair, disaggregated by race | 1) Completed  
2) Awaiting results from 2021 All Staff survey |
| 6.2.1 | Increase in staff feedback, participation, and response to communications | Not completed  
All staff are engaged through various forums; The Department's mailing lists are kept up to date, new staff are on-boarded and setup with new processes |
| 6.3.4 | # Increase in translated materials | 15 translated materials not including interpretation services (Note: currently not tracked as a percentage of total materials produced; propose changing indicator to % of written materials translated and possibly % of public meetings with interpretation services offered)  
Created a resource document that serves as a guide to ordering interpretation services for both ESL and disability services. |
| 6.4.2 | 1) Process to track budget adjusted  
2) % budget spent supporting marginalized populations (increase from amount in 2020 Vulnerable Populations Engagement Assessment) | - Note timeline for implementation steps needs to be adjusted to new Phase 2 timeline; budget equity analysis was not completed. |
| 6.5.1 | 1) # of meetings with a specific focus on application of RE principles  
2) # of projects, programs and initiatives started in 2021 that use the RE Scan Tool | 3 internal policies and practices were assessed and improved with the RE Scan Tool; 48 external programs, policies, strategies were assessed using RE tools. |
6.5.2 1) # and diversity of staff working on legislation and diversity of stakeholders engaged in new policy development
2) # and diversity of stakeholders engaged in new policy development

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Data was not collected | 4 SFE Programs utilized RE Leaders’ Office Hours
RE Leaders have monthly office hours to work with SFE staff on RE Scans and other issues. We work with staff from all Department programs to operationalize racial equity into program work. This is meant to build the capacity of staff to recognize opportunities to advance racial equity. |

6.5.3 1) # of programs that utilize open office hours
2) # of program/policies that incorporate racial equity analysis recommendations

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.6.1 # of instances the community agreement is used

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Priority actions for 2022 calendar year, including opportunities for staff input and decision-making**

*If relevant, include action item numbers from the RE Action Plan. Please also highlight any major revisions made to RE Action Plan since first submission.*

1. Engage with Racial Equity Consultant to customize trainings and coaching to better meet the needs of BIPOC staff *(6.1.6)*

2. Plan for a broad range of trainings and coaching during work hours, including educating staff about the historic systemic/structural racist practices that created the current conditions, so that the equity work is integrated into environmentalism efforts *(6.1.6)*

3. Implement structural changes to expand capacity to implement Racial Equity Action Plan, improve accountability of all staff, and reduce burden on staff of color *(6.1.2, 6.1.4)*

4. Work with racial equity consultant to institutionalize use of racial equity tools, support SFE Programs in tool application and racial equity discussions, and improve accountability *(6.4.2)*

5. Educate all staff on the protocols to report a grievance, complaint, or any form of workplace bias, discrimination, or harassment *(6.6.2)*

6. Teach staff how to interrupt or report a microaggression when witnessed, whether they are centrally involved or not *(6.6.2)*

7. Strengthen the follow up on any incidents reported on, to track the specific incident, intervention, and result *(6.6.2)*
**7. Boards and Commissions**

**Findings**

In 2019, **36% of All Staff** surveyed marked *Strongly Agree or Agree* for the statement *SF Environment’s external-facing policies and procedures (those that impact the general public and other stakeholders) consider and address institutional racism*. Responses were similar between white and staff of color.

There was some improvement in staff’s evaluation of the Department’s external equity work for the 2021 statement *I believe SFE is changing its practices to better address institutional racism in its external facing policies and procedures*, but the improvement was not equal for BIPOC and white staff.

- **44% of BIPOC staff** marked *Strongly Agree or Agree*, compared to **62% of white staff**
- **Black and Asian staff indicated agreement at a higher rate** than the aggregated BIPOC staff responses, and **Latinx staff indicated agreement at a lower rate**

Staff evaluation was lower for the 2021 statement *I feel that SFE’s current external-facing equity work is effective in creating observable positive changes towards creating racial equity in the communities it serves.*

- **25% of BIPOC staff** marked *Strongly Agree or Agree*, compared to **41% of white staff**
- **Asian staff indicated agreement at a lower rate** than the BIPOC rate, and **Black and Latinx staff indicated agreement at similar rates to aggregated BIPOC staff response**
- **34% of BIPOC staff** and **38% of white staff** marked *Somewhat Agree*. The *Somewhat Agree* category was not included in the 2019 survey, and it is unclear whether staff experiences moved from *Neutral* to *Somewhat Agree* from 2019 to 2021.

For the 2021 staff survey statement *SFE seeks input on decision making from communities of color*, **25% of BIPOC women** marked *Strongly Agree or Agree*, compared to **57% of white men**. For the statement *SFE puts racial equity at the forefront of its decision-making processes*, **13% of BIPOC women** marked *Strongly Agree or Agree*, compared to **50% of white men**. Twelve survey respondents wrote that *SFE should do more* to engage and support the diverse community it serves, and 5 respondents wrote that *SFE should do less* policy creation that disenfranchises. Five respondents wrote that an inadequate connection or understanding of communities being served is an example of *racial equity work being*

---

13 Eighty percent of staff (65 out of 81) completed the 2021 survey, including 32 staff of color, 29 white staff, and 4 who preferred not to state. The racial/ethnic composition of SFE on December 31, 2021 was 39 staff of color and 42 white staff (not Hispanic, Latino/a/x, or Spanish). Survey questions are included at the end of this document for reference.
ineffective at SFE. Seven survey respondents and several interviewees identified problems with approaches that are not evidence-based, and difficulty in understanding how various activities and efforts impact racial equity.

**Goals and performance measures**

**ORIGINAL DEPARTMENT GOAL (from REAP)**: All members perceive their Commission to be inclusive, respectful, and fair. Members are empowered to consider and address racial equity in decisions. New and existing policies and practices support historically marginalized communities and collaborate with communities and institutions to eliminate racial inequity.

**PROPOSED NEW DEPARTMENT GOALS:**
No change

**PERFORMANCE MEASURES**

1. BIPOC representation in Commission on the Environment and Urban Forestry Council
2. Staff assessment of racial equity in external programs, disaggregated by race
3. Commissioner assessment of racial equity in Department’s programs, disaggregated by race (future, and in alignment with Phase 2 REAP)
4. Public assessment of racial equity in Department’s programs, disaggregated by race (future, and in alignment with Phase 2 REAP)
5. Completion of racial equity scans and report back on changes implemented

---

**Changes implemented over the 2021 calendar year**

*If relevant, include action numbers from the RE Action Plan.*

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Indicator(s)</th>
<th>Status, recommended change(s), other notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 7.1.2 | 1) Annually collect board/ commission demographic data  
2) Include data in annual report  
3) Use data to guide recruitment efforts  
4) Greater racial and gender equity in board and/or Commission members | 1) and 2) completed, with the exception of demographic data on the Urban Forestry Council, which was not collected  
3) Not completed  
4) When demographics were collected by DOSW in 2019, 6 of the 7 seats on the Commission were filled, and 50% of Commissioners were People of Color. In 2021, all 7 seats were filled, with 43% People of Color. |
| 7.1.3 | Resolution around racial equity adopted                                       | Completed                                                                                                    |
| 7.1.4 | # of policies and issues related to racial equity that are heard, reviewed and/or implemented | 3 internal policies and practices were assessed and improved with the RE Scan Tool; 48 external programs, policies, strategies were assessed using RE tools.  
The progress of the implementation of racial equity work is now a part of the Director’s annual performance appraisal, by the Commissioners  
The achievements are covered in other areas as they involve setting up systems (i.e. tracking, hiring of contractors, conducting surveys) that will become the foundation of the discussion and follow-up with the Commission. Department staff also engaged the Commission on its Racial and Social Equity Assessment Tool for the Climate Action Plan. |
| 7.1.5 | 1) Participatory budgeting processes  
2) Community advisory working groups  
3) Issue-specific task forces | Implementation steps timeline needs to be adjusted to new timeline for Phase 2, and/or be re-written? |

### Priority actions for 2022 calendar year, including opportunities for staff input and decision-making

*Note: this section will be prioritized during the development of the Department’s Phase II Racial Equity Action Plan.*

1. Annual collection of demographic data from Commission on the Environment and Urban Forestry Council members *(7.1.2)*
2. Racial Equity agenda items at Commission on the Environment meetings *(7.1.4, 7.1.5)*
Department Resourcing for Phase 1 RE Action Plan

Please describe your department’s resourcing for Phase 1 RE Action Plan implementation in 2021. Include employee names, titles, and organizational chart. Note the designated Racial Equity Leader(s) with an asterisk. Please clearly distinguish between:

- (1) - Staff who were assigned full-time (all responsibilities were directly related to Phase 1 RE Action Plan and other departmental racial equity work)
- (2) - Staff who were assigned part-time (had responsibilities not directly related to racial equity, which were reduced for them to take on racial equity work)
- (3) - Staff who were voluntary (had responsibilities not directly related to racial equity, which were not reduced for them to take on racial equity work)
- (4) - Consultants/vendors (including firm name and contract number, if applicable)

The Department did its best to distribute the large workload associated with its Phase I Action Plan implementation efforts. The primary work was to be spread amongst staff from different programs, the department’s DHR representative, the Director, the Racial Equity Leaders (RELs) and the racial equity consultants. The assigned staff were asked to manage and implement specific action items that were often closely related to their work-responsibilities and sometimes their personal interests.

The primary staff are called REAP Leads and they are assisted by Helpers, that typically were members of the Department’s Racial Equity Steering Committee United (RESCU) team. Each action item was assigned a Consult, whom the team could reach out to when addressing challenges or tougher questions the Helpers couldn’t answer. If the Consultants could not address their issues, then the RELs had designated office hours for staff when needed.

The teams consisted of REAP Leads, Helpers and Consults and due to the nature of the action items, teams were responsible for as little as 2 and as many as 33 action items. And although the groups are described as teams it was widely understood that each individual REAP Lead was primarily responsible for managing the implementation of each action item which included periodic progress update reports. Because the Department only completed its formal REAP Tracker in November 2021, the REAP Leads provided their first formal status updates for all of 2021 in mid-January 2022. Before the tracker was completed, most REAP Leads gave informal updates during periodic check ins with the Department’s RE Action Plan Tracker coordinator.

Soko Made*, City Government Zero Waste Sr. Coordinator (2)
Sraddha Mehta*, Sr. Environmental Justice Coordinator (2)
Elizabeth Felter, Climate & Hazard Resilience Analyst (2)
Anne Wong, Environmental Associate (2)
Raymond Manion, Environmental Justice Coordinator (2)
Cyndy Comerford, Climate Program Manager (2)
Lavanya Deepak, Executive Assistant to Director (3)
What changes, if any, do you plan for 2022?
The Department has requested additional funding to support its racial equity efforts in its FY 2022/2023 budget. Currently, the Department does not receive General Fund support. If the budget request is granted, the Department would add a Racial Equity Senior Coordinator position, additional funding for racial equity consultant services, and grant funding for community-based organizations. If the budget request is not approved, SFE will still have a limited amount of funding for a racial equity consultant to support training and coaching activities to improve organizational culture and build capacity. Additionally, SFE may restructure implementation of the REAP, so that Racial Equity Steering Committee members play a greater role in managing implementation efforts for each section of the REAP. For example, each REAP section may have two steering committee members who are responsible for coordinating and tracking implementation for that section.
Departmental Racial Equity Progress Report  
Annual Report for 2021

Part B  
Submit final to ORE by April 1, 2022  
Attend ORE working sessions in January-February 2022 to develop Part B.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attachment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Budget Equity Tool: Department Inventory</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Completed department inventory spreadsheet</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excel sheet sent to ORE and word version is attachment 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attachments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attachment 1: Workforce and board/commission demographic data</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include relevant data on status of racial equity within department, such as race/ethnicity by job classification, average pay, discipline and separation, promotions, and changes over the last calendar year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attachment 2: Racial Equity Action Plan</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Link to or attach current version of department Racial Equity Action Plan:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attachment 3: SF Environment 2021 Staff Survey</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administered by SF Environment’s Racial Equity Consultant, Be the Change Consulting. Survey analysis report and recommendations are forthcoming.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attachment 4: Racial Equity Action Plan Implementation Dashboard and Data Repository</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Images of REAP implementation tracking dashboard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attachment 5: REAP Implementation Progress Report Form</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFE staff leads assigned to implement actions were requested to submit a quarterly progress report form for the action.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attachment 6: Budget Equity Tool: Department Inventory

Completed department inventory spreadsheet
Attachment 1: Workforce and Board/Commission Demographic Data

REAP Workforce Data for Calendar Year 2021 (CY21)\(^\text{16}\)

As of December 31, 2021, SFE’s workforce size was 81 employees, comprised of the following racial demographics – 42 White employees, 19 Asian employees, 11 Hispanic employees, six Black employees, and three Filipino employees.

As of December 31, 2021, the workforce at SFE is comprised of 39 employees in Permanent Civil Service (PCS) positions and 42 employees in exempt positions (including exempt classifications such as Proposition F retiree positions, and position-specific exempt classifications such as Director, Commission Secretary, etc.).

- The 39 PCS employees are comprised of 22 White employees, nine Asian employees, four Hispanic employees, three Black employees and one Filipino employee.
- The 42 exempt employees are comprised of 20 White employees, 10 Asian employees, seven Hispanic employees, three Black employees, and two Filipino employees.

SFE has 21 employees in positions exempt from Civil Service under Category 18 (limited duration, project-based positions), not including limited term trainee positions (job classes 9920 and 9922).

- Among the 21 non-trainee Category 18 exempt employees there are 11 White employees, five Asian employees, three Black employees, and two Hispanic employees.

The majority of SFE employees work in one of six job classes. Classes 9920 and 9922 are limited-term trainee positions. Due to the specific knowledge, skills and experience required for SFE positions, SFE utilizes a specific environmental job series for many of its positions - job classes 5638 Environmental Assistant, 5640 Environmental Specialist, 5642 Senior Environmental Specialist, and 5644 Principal Environmental Specialist. These six classes comprise 67 of the 81 SFE positions.

The demographics for specific classes and groups of classes is as follows.

- Senior Staff and Leadership (5644, 0922, 0952, 0962, 1824) – 7 White, 2 BIPOC
- 5642 – 13 White, 6 BIPOC
- 5640 – 10 White, 6 BIPOC
- 5638 – 6 White, 7 BIPOC
- 9920 and 9922 – 3 White, 10 BIPOC
- Positions not listed above – 3 White, 8 BIPOC

\(^\text{16}\) Workforce Data was provided by SF Environment’s DHR Consultant. Certain data may be omitted due to DHR guidelines for disclosure of employee information.
Hiring, Promotions, Transfers, and Separations during CY21

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BIPOC</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hires</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotions w/ in SFE</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotions external to SFE (within CCSF)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separations from City employment</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>28</strong></td>
<td><strong>18</strong></td>
<td><strong>46</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discipline
SFE took no disciplinary action in CY21

Pay Data for December 31, 2021

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Average of Hourly Rate&lt;sup&gt;17&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>56.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIPOC</td>
<td>44.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>50.90</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Average of Hourly Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>56.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>54.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>46.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>38.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>36.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>50.90</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Commission on the Environment Demographics

As part of our Racial Equity Action Plan, the Commissioners fulfilled an obligation to complete a demographic data census. A 2008 City Charter Amendment, passed by the voters, authorized the Department on the Status of Women to analyze and report the diversity of appointments for City boards and commissions every two years. The Commission on the Environment has 7 seats total, of which 7 are filled. Through voluntary participation in the survey, the Commissioners reported the following information: 4 female and 3 male of which 2 are LGBTQIA+ identifying members, 2 Asian, 4 white, 1 Latinx.

<sup>17</sup> Hourly rate calculation includes range changes, but does not include acting assignment pay, bonuses, bilingual pay, or other types of pay.
Urban Forestry Council Demographics

Councilmember demographic data was not collected in 2021.
Attachment 2: SF Environment Racial Equity Action Plan

SFE 2021 Racial Equity Survey Staff Questions

Demographic data is collected to provide a summary of the diversity of employees who participated in the survey and will allow us to conduct a more in-depth analysis of the survey questions, including a comparison of results for those who represent different demographic categories and/or supervisory status. Remember your responses will not be linked to your identity.

* 1. **What is your race and ethnicity?** *(Select all that apply)*

Examples of race and ethnicity categories:
- American Indian or Alaska Native
- Asian
- Black or African American
- Hispanic, Latino/a/X, or Spanish
- Middle Eastern or Northern African
- Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
- White
- Prefer not to state

* 2. **Do you identify as having a disability?**

- Yes
- No
- Prefer not to state

* 3. **What is your gender?** *(Select all that apply)*

- Genderqueer/Gender Non-Binary
- Man
- Trans Man
- Trans Woman
- Woman
- Prefer not to state
- Gender not listed. I identify as:

* 4. **Which program area do you belong to?**

(Note: this information will be aggregated and summarized by SFE’s consultant, BTCC, without identifying individuals.)

- Administration
- Climate and Systems
• Outreach and Communications
• Energy
• Policy and Public Affairs
• Toxics Reduction and Healthy Ecosystems
• Zero Waste
• Prefer not to state

* 5. Do you supervise staff?
  • Yes
  • No

* 6. I have been with the SF Environment for:
  - Under 1 year
  - 1-2 years
  - 2-5 years
  - 5-10 years
  - More than 10 Years

* 7. When there are promotional opportunities at SFE, do you feel all staff regardless of race have equal opportunity?
  • Yes
  • No
  • I don’t know

* 8. Did you complete DHR’s Implicit Bias Training (either in-person or online)?
  • Yes
  • No
  • I don’t know

* 9. Have you completed SFE’s Racial Equity Training (the training was conducted by Soko Made and Sraddha Mehta to introduce the concept of why we lead with race, examples of how institutional racism might manifest in government policies and programs, and how we can apply a racial equity tool to our work)?
  • Yes
  • No
  • I don’t know
* 10. Please rate each of the statements below on a scale from Strongly Disagree to Strongly Agree.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I think it is valuable for SFE to discuss the impacts of race and strive for equity in our internal and external practices.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe SFE is changing its practices to better address institutional racism in its external facing policies and procedures.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel that SFE’s current internal-facing equity work is effective in creating observable positive changes towards racial equity in the workplace.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel that SFE’s current external-facing equity work is effective in creating observable positive changes towards creating racial equity in the communities it serves.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am actively involved in addressing racial disparities through my work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel that I am being fairly compensated for the work that I am performing and this is reflected in my current salary.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My feedback and suggestions are taken into consideration.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 11. I feel safe and comfortable elevating issues pertaining to racial inequities as they apply to the internal culture, policies and practices within SFE, with: *(Select all that apply)*

- Specific colleagues within SFE
- SFE’s DHR consultant
- SFE Leadership
- My direct supervisor
- My Program Manager
- Another Program Manager
- None of the above
- Other (please specify)
* 12. I feel safe and comfortable elevating issues pertaining to racial inequities as they apply to our external offerings with: *(Select all that apply)*

- Specific colleagues within SFE
- Specific colleagues in other City Departments
- SFE Leadership
- My direct supervisor
- My Program Manager
- Another Program Manager
- None of the above
- Other (please specify)

Please refer to the following definitions to answer questions 13-15:

- **Elitism**: The advocacy or existence of an elite as a dominating element in a system or society.
- **Favoritism**: The practice of giving unfair preferential treatment to one person or group at the expense of another.
- **Patriarchy**: A system in which men hold the power and women are largely excluded from it.
- **Power imbalances**: A power imbalance is expressed when one group is able to dominate decision-making or otherwise asserts power in ways that disadvantages others.
- **Tokenism**: The practice of making only a perfunctory or symbolic effort to do a particular thing, especially by recruiting a small number of people from underrepresented groups in order to give the appearance of sexual or racial equality within a workforce.
- **White fragility**: A state in which even a minimum amount of racial stress becomes intolerable [for white people], triggering a range of defensive moves. These defensive moves can prevent education about and action to dismantle racism.
- **Microaggressions**: A statement, action, or incident regarded as an instance of indirect, subtle, or unintentional discrimination against members of a marginalized group such as race or gender. (Some examples of microaggressions include: “Wow, your English is so good”, “Can I touch your hair”, “You must be related to someone high up to have gotten this position!”, “Sure we care about diversity but we have to ensure the most qualified person gets the job.”)

* 13. On average, how often do you identify these as present in the work environment?
* 14. If you have experienced microaggressions in the work environment, did you take any action?
   - Yes
   - No
   - I prefer not to answer
   - Not applicable
   - Other (please specify)

* 15. If you have witnessed microaggressions in the work environment, did you take any action?
   - Yes
   - No
   - I prefer not to answer
   - Not applicable
   - Other (please specify)

* 16. If you took action, what action did you take? *(Select all that apply)*
   - Informed or Reported to SFE DHR Consultant
   - Reported externally outside SFE
   - Informed or Reported to a Supervisor
   - Sought comfort/allyship with a trusted colleague
   - Addressed the issue with the person directly
• I took no action
• Not applicable
• Other (please specify)

* 17. If you took action, did you feel this effectively resolved the issue?
• Yes
• No
• Not applicable
• Other (please specify)

* 18. Please mark true or false to the following statements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>True</th>
<th>False</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>When I interact with authority figures in the workplace they are usually of a different race.</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My opinion is commonly overlooked in group discussions because of my race.</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others assume that my work would be inferior to people of other racial groups.</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others prefer that I assimilate to the White Culture and downplay my racial background.</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My contributions are sometimes dismissed or devalued because of my racial background.</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others assume I will behave aggressively because of my race.</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others assume that people of my racial background would succeed in life if they simply worked harder.</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 19. In your day-to-day work experiences, how often do any of the following things happen to you?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Once per year</th>
<th>A couple times per year</th>
<th>Once per month</th>
<th>More than once per month</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>You are treated with less courtesy than other people are.</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You are treated with less respect than other people are.</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People act as if they think you are not smart.</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People act as if they are afraid of you.</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People act as if they think you are dishonest.</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People act as if they're better than you are.</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You are called names or insulted.</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
* 20. If you responded with anything other than Never for the question above, would you attribute your experience to any of the following aspects of identity? (Select all that apply)

- race/ethnicity
- disability
- sex/sexual orientation
- gender identity
- marital status
- nation of origin
- age
- religion
- social class
- height, weight
- political orientation
- Not applicable

* 21. Please rate each of the statements below on a scale from Strongly Disagree to Strongly Agree.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral or Not Applicable</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>When I have spoken with leadership about issues regarding microaggressions, bias, and or racism my concerns were taken seriously.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I have spoken with leadership about issues regarding microaggressions, bias, and or racism in the workplace action was taken.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 22. Please rate each of the statements below on a scale from Strongly Disagree to Strongly Agree.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral or Not Applicable</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have been provided the institutional knowledge, resources and skills I need to obtain a higher position.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am encouraged by leadership to apply my skills to obtain a higher</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
* 23. Please rate each of the statements below on a scale from Strongly Disagree to Strongly Agree.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral or Not Applicable</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am satisfied with my current level of involvement in addressing racial inequities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel that addressing racial inequities is a priority for SFE.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFE provides support for resolving workplace issues involving institutional racism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFE hires contractors that are sensitive to issues of racial and social equity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFE seeks input on decision making from communities of color.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFE puts racial equity at the forefront of its decision-making processes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 24. The following racial equity tools would help me address racial inequities through my work: (Select all that apply)

- More information / training
- More time and resources
- Greater management / supervisory support
- Work is included in the Performance Plan and Appraisal Review (PPAR)
- Workplace Coaching
- Other (please specify)

* 25. How would you rate the effectiveness of the following activities SFE is taking?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>1 = Not Effective At All</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5 = Extremely Effective</th>
<th>I have not experienced this activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trainings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial equity tools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conversations at team meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
* 26. Are there other examples at SFE where you see racial equity work being effective? Please describe.

* 27. Are there other examples at SFE where you see racial equity work being ineffective? Please describe.

In your own words, what do you think a focus on racial equity and inclusion should mean for SFE’s mission and activities? Please describe in questions 28-30.

* 28. What should we do more of?

* 29. What should we do less of?

* 30. How are you operationalizing racial equity in your program area?

* 31. What are some examples of barriers to transformative change in the current organizational cultures or internal practices?

32. Would you be interested in participating in deeper focus group interviews? If yes, please provide your name.
# REAP Summary Dashboard

## Racial Equity Action Plan Section

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Racial Equity Action Plan Section</th>
<th># of Actions</th>
<th># of IPs</th>
<th>Not Started</th>
<th>In Progress</th>
<th>Ongoing</th>
<th>Completed % Complete</th>
<th>IP Hours Current Quarter</th>
<th>IP Hours Current Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - Hiring &amp; Recruitment</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - Retention &amp; Promotion</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>47.6%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - Recruitment &amp; Retention</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>53.3%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - Diverse &amp; Equitable Leadership</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>42.3%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - Mobility &amp; Professional Development</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - Organizational Culture of Inclusion &amp; Inclusion</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 - Boards &amp; Commissions</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total                            | 40          | 104     | 20          | 32         | 14      | 38                   | 36.5%                  | 0                    | 1035                |
### Racial Equity Action Plan

#### SFENV REAP Data Repository

**Department name:** SF Environment  
**Racial Equity Progress Report for 2021**

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REAP Area</th>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Actions</th>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>Financial</th>
<th>Consultant</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Timeline Start Date</th>
<th>Timeline End Year</th>
<th>Implementation Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resilience</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.</td>
<td>Develop a bilingual and cultural competence training program that aligns with the City’s Racial Equity Framework and policies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.</td>
<td>Develop a bilingual and cultural competence training program that aligns with the City’s Racial Equity Framework and policies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.</td>
<td>Develop a bilingual and cultural competence training program that aligns with the City’s Racial Equity Framework and policies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.</td>
<td>Develop a bilingual and cultural competence training program that aligns with the City’s Racial Equity Framework and policies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.</td>
<td>Develop a bilingual and cultural competence training program that aligns with the City’s Racial Equity Framework and policies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.</td>
<td>Develop a bilingual and cultural competence training program that aligns with the City’s Racial Equity Framework and policies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**SFENV REAP Narrative Survey**  
**SFENV REAP Dashboard**

---

**45**
Attachment 5: REAP Implementation Progress Report Form

The purpose of this questionnaire is to provide a periodic update on the implementation plans associated with the SF Environment Racial Equity Action Plan (REAP). To begin, please have your Action ID# & Implementation Plan ID# from the REAP Tracker ready. This survey will take approximately 5 to 10 minutes and all questions are required.

**Questions 1 - 5: REAP Action, Implementation Plan IDs**
Implementation Plan identification information associated with this report will be needed.

1. Select the REAP Area you are updating
2. Select Action Reference ID# (This can be found in column D on the REAP Tracker)
3. Select Implementation Plan reference ID# (REAP area’s 1-5) (For Section 6 and 7, select N/A from drop-down menu)
4. Select Implementation Plan reference ID# (REAP area’s 6 and 7) (if you are updating Sections 1-5, select N/A from drop-down menu)
5. Select the Quarter and Year when the work was performed

**Questions 6 – 10: Implementation Plan Status Updates**
You’ll be asked to update the status, dates and percentage complete, if applicable.

6. Please update or re-state the current status of your Implementation Plan ID #.
7. Are you updating the Start Date of your Implementation Plan ID #? If so, please input your response in question #8.
8. To update the start date of the Implementation Plan, please enter the revised start date below.
9. Please update or restate the current % of Completion of your Implementation Plan ID#.
10. What was the Actual Completion Date of the Implementation Plan ID # based on your response in question 9?

**Questions 11 – 16: Progress, Activities, Implementation Plan Barriers**
You’ll be asked to describe Implementation Plan activities for the reporting period, a narrative description of engagement activities and notable successes and to describe any challenges encountered during this period.

11. What were the notable achievements of your implementation action/ steps? (This quarter)
12. Please rate the question below. (Making progress on the implementation action/ steps was:)
13. Approximately how many total staff hours were spent on this IP this quarter?
14. How have your actions/ steps addressed the overall Strategy of this Racial Equity Action Plan section? (Each action items’ strategy can be found in the REAP)
15. Were there barriers to accomplishing planned activities?
16. If so, please describe the barriers and how these barriers might be addressed

**Questions 17 – 19: Resources, Achievements, Target Audience & Engagement**
You’ll be asked for a narrative description of engagement activities, resource needs, any costs associated with the activities any changes to the Implementation Plan as well as any notable successes will be needed.

17. Did your action result in a systems/ organizational, policy or resources change within the Department?
18. Describe how your action resulted in a systems/ organizational, policy or resources change within the Department.
19. Who were the SFE staff/ communities/ groups that were engaged in the activities described, for this REAP area and Strategy?
### A. Department priority issue areas for improving racial equity or closing racial equity gaps, especially within its existing services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue Area</th>
<th>Brief Description</th>
<th>Notes or Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collaborations with affordable housing residents</td>
<td>There is a need to improve capacity and expertise to partner with affordable housing residents.</td>
<td>Awareness and accessibility gap for residents on programmatic offerings and compliance with mandates. Examples include access bulky item pickup, household hazardous waste pick up, and Mandatory Recycling and Composting Ordinance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culturally appropriate outreach and services</td>
<td>There is a need to augment culturally relevant in-language outreach and training that includes translation and interpretation</td>
<td>Lack of equitable funding throughout the department and lack of staff and/or contractors that can offer culturally relevant and in-language outreach and training. Examples include multilingual support and technological barriers to complying with Green Halo requirements and limited in-language energy contractors to serve Chinese-language residents.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Capacity building and co-creation with communities | Leadership needs to be developed and needs to guide partnerships beyond the initial issues that bring them together so we can shift to value things that are important for communities. This should focus on policies and programs that lift up low-income and BIPOC communities rather than burden them. | Need to develop partnerships and financial support for community based organizations to do environmental equity projects. Also need adequate staffing and time to engage with a diverse group of stakeholders prior to policy adoption and there is desire to ensure environmental programs have sufficient funding to mitigate impacts on economically vulnerable communities. 

An example is lack of programmatic budgets to collaborate with internal and external budgets to build robust EV charging programs. Programs that could benefit from additional equity partnerships include reusable delivery systems, small groceries for non-plastic bags and CRV redemption programs. |
Incentives and programs for communities and businesses to be in compliance with regulations and to support low-income and BIPOC communities to be early adopter to mitigate environmental harms | Many ordinances and mandates do not have resources or funding to support implementation and therefore can potentially have equity impacts. Additionally, low-income families do not have sufficient income to be early adopters of environmental programs and cannot reap the health and social benefits. | Lack of technical assistance for implementation of complex regulations and lack of funding to support communities. Examples include funding for C&D technical assistance for debris transporters, affordable housing with the RSO ordinance and EV and residential housing electrification incentives.

Racial equity action plan implementation | Racial equity action plan implementation | Staff time and resources are needed to improve usability of racial equity tools and include monitoring and evaluations. We need to see better ways to attract and increase diverse applications.

### B. Item name and description

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of activity, function, program, service, or initiative</th>
<th>Brief description of purpose</th>
<th>Activity/service type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENV-ADMIN Administration (Executive leadership, HR, Policy, Finance, and administration)</td>
<td>Brief description of purpose</td>
<td>1 - Public-facing activity or service 2 - For other City departments 3 - Within department only</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| ENV-WASTE | Zero Waste Program | 1 - Public-facing activity or service  
2 - For other City departments  
3 - Within department only |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Zero Waste Program develops and implements policies, programs and initiatives for all sectors to advance zero waste and achieve 2030 targets of material discard generation and disposal reduction that includes construction and demolition debris. Zero waste means products are designed and used according to the principle of highest and best use, which includes a hierarchy of prevent waste, reduce and reuse, then recycle and compost, so no material goes to landfill or high-temperature destruction. The program works with residents, businesses, institutions, city agencies as well as service providers in participating in and achieving compliance with zero waste policies and programs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| ENV-TOXICS | Toxics Reduction & Healthy Ecosystems Program | 1 - Public-facing activity or service  
2 - For other City departments  
3 - Within department only |
| --- | --- | --- |
| The Toxics Reduction & Healthy Ecosystems Program is a portfolio of programs to reduce the use of toxic chemicals in products (largely, consumer products) and provide safe disposal opportunities for hazardous products at the end of their useful life, to improve the health of people and the planet, starting in San Francisco. The portfolio of programs includes:  
1. Green Business Program  
2. Healthy Nail Salon Program  
3. Integrated Pest Management Program  
4. Buy Green Program  
5. Healthy Homes Residential Outreach Program  
6. Household hazardous waste retail take-back programs  
7. Safe Drug Disposal Program  
8. Urban Forestry Council |
| 1-Public facing (for businesses)  
1-Public facing (for businesses)  
2 - For other City departments  
2 - For other City departments  
1/Public facing (for residents)  
1-Public facing (for businesses)  
1 - Public-facing activity or service  
1 - Public-facing activity or service and 2 - For other City departments |
| ENV-CLIMATE | The Climate Program is actually not one program - but a compilation of programs that are aimed at protecting and mitigating the impacts from climate change through various projects, programs and policies to ensure we have a regenerative, equitable, healthy and resilient future. It includes:
  - Environmental Justice - a team that works to address environmental burdens and increase access to environmental programs such as bringing environmental initiatives, such as IPM and Zero Waste to affordable and public housing sites
  - Green Building - a team that leads City policy initiatives and advances cutting-edge practices in design, construction, and operation to ensure all new and existing buildings in San Francisco are environmentally responsible and progressing toward zero emissions
  - Climate Action - a team that develops and delivers world-leading climate policies, plans, and strategies for San Francisco that ensure racial equity, social and economic justice at the core of this work. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Climate Program</td>
<td>1 - Public-facing activity or service 2 - For other City departments 3 - Within department only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate Action</td>
<td>1 - Public-facing activity or service 2 - For other City departments 3 - Within department only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Building</td>
<td>1 - Public-facing activity or service 2 - For other City departments 3 - Within department only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Justice</td>
<td>1 - Public-facing activity or service 2 - For other City departments 3 - Within department only</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Climate Program is actually not one program - but a compilation of programs that are aimed at protecting and mitigating the impacts from climate change through various projects, programs and policies to ensure we have a regenerative, equitable, healthy and resilient future. It includes:

- **Environmental Justice** - a team that works to address environmental burdens and increase access to environmental programs such as bringing environmental initiatives, such as IPM and Zero Waste to affordable and public housing sites.
- **Green Building** - a team that leads City policy initiatives and advances cutting-edge practices in design, construction, and operation to ensure all new and existing buildings in San Francisco are environmentally responsible and progressing toward zero emissions.
- **Climate Action** - a team that develops and delivers world-leading climate policies, plans, and strategies for San Francisco that ensure racial equity, social and economic justice at the core of this work.
### ENV-ENERGY
Energy and Clean Transportation Programs
- Bay Area Regional Energy Network Residential and Commercial Energy Efficiency Rebate Programs
- EnergyAccessSF Energy Efficiency Outreach Program
- US Department of Transportation’s Clean Cities Coalition Alternative Fuels Program
- California Energy Commission Charging Infrastructure for Medium- and Heavy-duty trucks grant.
- Fix Lead SF Lead-based Paint Remediation Program

- The Bay Area Regional Energy Network’s suite of energy efficiency programs provide rebates for the installation of energy efficient equipment and appliances in single- and multi-family residences and small- and medium-sized businesses.
- EnergyAccess SF is an energy efficiency outreach program that is dedicated to improve racial equity in energy program participation. Energy Access SF gives access to energy efficiency rebates programs and utility rate discounts to residents and small businesses in Disadvantaged Communities.
- The Clean Cities Coalition program provides technical assistance to local fleets owners and operators to reduce reliance on fossil-fuels by using electric vehicles.
- The California Energy Commission grant’s purpose is to develop a plan to build and deploy equitable charging infrastructure for medium- and heavy-duty trucks, particularly small fleets belonging to local small businesses and the municipal fleet.
- Fix Lead SF is a multi-agency collaboration that seeks to remediate lead-based paint surfaces in the city, prioritizing ZIP codes with high concentration of lead-paint notices of violation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 - Public-facing activity or service</th>
<th>1 - Public-facing activity or service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - Public-facing activity or service</td>
<td>1 - Public-facing activity or service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - Public-facing activity or service</td>
<td>1 - Public-facing activity or service</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ENV-OUTREACH
Outreach Program
Communications & Marketing
Transportation Demand Management (TDM)
Environment Now
Environmental Education
Data

1. Communications & marketing staff promote public awareness of and participation in Department programs and services
2. The TDM team is responsible for managing the City & County of San Francisco

1. Public-facing activity or service
2. Public-facing activity or service

For other City departments
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.</th>
<th>Francisco’s Commuter Benefits suite of programs (which includes WageWorks/Health Equity Pre-tax Commuter Benefits and the Emergency Ride Home Program); providing administration and customer service for the Commuter Benefits Ordinance and the Tenant Bicycle Parking in Existing Commercial Buildings Ordinance; and partnering with MTA, the TA and Planning as part of the Citywide interagency TDM working group, which often involves managing or co-managing TDM projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Environment Now conducts outreach (presentations, technical assistance, etc.) to San Francisco residents and businesses to promote awareness of, participation in, and compliance with environmental programs, services and policies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>The Environmental Education Team educates K-12 students in San Francisco about zero waste, toxics reduction, water conservation and related topics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Public-facing activity or service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Public-facing activity or service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Within department only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>The Data Coordinator creates reliable and scalable data management systems that enable data analysis, reporting, and program evaluation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## C. Overall resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Estimated FTEs and/or budget amount</th>
<th>Funding type</th>
<th>Estimated number of contracted service providers or consultants for this activity/service, if any</th>
<th>Names of 5 largest contracted service providers or consultants for this activity/service, if any</th>
<th>By total contract amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENV-ADMIN</td>
<td>16/$5.9M</td>
<td>SR, GR, &amp; WO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV-CLIMATE*</td>
<td>11/$2.5M</td>
<td>SR, GR, &amp; WO</td>
<td>-Five Activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>activities/service areas</td>
<td>(1) Racial Equity survey and trainings</td>
<td>(2) Municipal Green Building Decarbonization</td>
<td>(3) Long Term Funding and outreach</td>
<td>(4) Climate Equity Hub</td>
<td>(5) GHG Inventory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Seven (7) Consultants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Be the Change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-DNV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Center for Law, Energy and the Environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-CivicMakers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Dalberg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Arup/Cascadia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENV-ENERGY</th>
<th>9/$7.1M</th>
<th>GR &amp; WO</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Activities:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Metropolitan Transportation Commission (Bay Area Regional Energy Network programs)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. PG&amp;E (EnergyAccessSF)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Department of Public Health (Fix Lead SF)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. US Department of Transportation (Clean Cities Coalition)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultants:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Recurve Data Analytics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. TRC Engineers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Arup</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENV-OUTREACH</th>
<th>29/$6.1</th>
<th>SR, GR, &amp; WO</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Activities:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ten (10) contracted service providers (consultants) for at-large program support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two (2) grant-based service providers (CUESA, Leadership for Environmental Justice) - Environmental Education Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three (3) work orders (SFPUC, SFUSD Environmental</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most Likely To</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Engine is Red</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>True North</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WageWorks/Health Equity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CivicActions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
D. Racial equity alignment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Department priority equity issue areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENV-ADMIN</td>
<td>List any priority equity issue areas from (A) that are relevant to this activity. If none, leave blank.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV-ZERO WASTE</td>
<td>Affordable housing increased staff resources and assistance improved source separation and RSO compliance and improve Bulky Item Collection; Rethink reusable grants and assistance businesses with extra $ for BIPOC; Increased support for economically disadvantaged and BIPOC businesses; Increased staff and resources to reduce illegal dumping and impacts on disadvantaged communities and addressing racial equity impact of increasing C&amp;D recovery processing; Racial Equity Action Plan implementation increased staff and resources;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| ENV-TOXICS       | • Collaborations with affordable housing residents  
|                  |   ○ Need support (funding and policy) to advance requirements for pest prevention in building projects and to assist residents in public and non-profit housing to reduce exposures to toxic chemicals  
|                  |   ○ Need funding to advance less-toxic building products in non-profit and public housing  
|                  | • Culturally appropriate outreach and services  
|                  |   ○ Many toxics and pollution issues disproportionately impact BIPOC communities and require specialized outreach to engage, educate and |

*Program received GF adback FY21-22 for $730,000*
activate with incentives and rebates, as well as make it easy to eliminate toxic exposures

- **Incentives and programs for communities and businesses**
  - Lack of funding for improvements can be a hurdle for businesses to become either certified Green Businesses or Healthy Nail Salons.

- **Capacity building and co-creation with communities**
  - Environment Now staff turnover (99-series staff) doesn’t lend itself to deepening relationships with community, particularly in Green Business program; longer-standing, more senior staff (i.e. transitioning 9922s to 5638s) would support this objective
  - Additional funding to offer grants to CBOs to help deliver Healthy Homes messages and offer rebates and other incentives to Green Businesses
  - Additional funding to offer Toxics Reduction Grants to CBOs

### ENV-CLIMATE

- **Collaborations with affordable housing residents**
  - The prevalence of pests and the use of pesticides are significant issues in affordable housing and SROs. There is a need for more resources to manage pests in the safest and most effective manner at these sites where there are high asthma rates with vulnerable populations.
  - Many affordable housing sites experience challenges with implementing zero waste programs. Additional resources are needed to support these sites with outreach, education, and technical assistance to ensure they are compliant with ordinances and avoid contamination charges.

- **Culturally appropriate outreach and services**
  - Targeting outreach and services to those most vulnerable to the impacts of climate change will require additional staff and funding for CBOs that serve the most vulnerable residents, including low-income communities of color. There is currently a lack of resources for outreach for non-zero waste related activities. Language accessibility must also be budgeted for in all engagement activities.

- **Capacity building and co-creation with communities**
  - Implementation of the Climate Action Plan will require significant resources for partnerships with community based organizations that will support implementation
  - Future planning efforts will require resources for community representatives to participate in planning processes and decision-making

- **Incentives and programs for communities and businesses**
  - Lack of funding for improvements (such as decarbonization) can be a barrier for small businesses and low-income residents. Adequate incentives are needed to ensure everyone benefits from climate action efforts.

- **Racial equity action plan implementation**
  - Racial Equity Action Plan implementation will require adequate staffing and funding for professional services to ensure the work doesn’t unintentionally burden staff of color with additional work. Currently, the work is largely unfunded due to the nature of SFE’s funding sources.

### ENV-ENERGY

- **Incentives and programs for communities and businesses**
  1. Lack of funding and technical assistance to help residential and small business sectors remove all their natural gas using appliances at once.
  2. Lack of funding to conduct contractor outreach to inform and incent residential electrification - e.g. electrification isn’t a mystical burden on projects but rather opportunities to generate new business while improving health and safety.
  3. Lack of funding to develop a workforce that supports small building electrification - not just installation, but also in supply-chain, awareness, technical assistance,
program implementers, and etc.

- **Capacity building and co-creation with communities**
  1. Lack of funding to build robust electric vehicle charging programs to serve multi-unit residents that must depend on a public charging network.
  2. Lack of funding to build a robust electric vehicle-sharing network.
  3. Incredible intra-city bureaucracies that prevent the ability for the department to quickly apply for state and federal grants (to fund energy and clean transportation programs).
  4. Lack of funding to raise awareness about: the benefits of electric vehicles, electric vehicles rebate and tax-credit programs, and resources that connect electric vehicle buyers with rebate and tax-credit programs.
  5. Lack of funding for staff to conduct long-range planning to do #1 and #2.
  6. Lack of funding for staff or 3rd party to do #4.
  7. Lack of funding to assist local small- and medium-sized businesses with planning to convert their fossil-fuel trucks and vans to electric equivalents and assess their charging options.

- **Racial equity action plan implementation.**
  1. Grants completely fund the Energy and Clean Transportation programs. Therefore, Energy and Clean Transportation staff must contractually work on grant scopes of work all the time. If the grant's scope isn't specifically to improve racial equity then staff has no capability to work on racial equity action plan implementation.
  2. Related to #1, staff must train up and continually engage with the racial equity committee re: implementation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENV-OUTREACH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collaborations with affordable housing residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Mechanisms for participating in some programs don't necessarily align with needs and capacity of residents, e.g. the process for scheduling a bulky item pick-up. If programs don't work for intended audiences, it bears on Outreach's success in educating and successfully promoting participation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Culturally appropriate outreach and services |
| - Internal language capacity is a barrier to multilingual, culturally relevant communications (notably in Chinese) across owned channels, e.g. social media |
| - Budget can be a factor in communicating to audiences across via culturally relevant channels (e.g. Chinese-speaking community and WeChat), notably in campaigns |
| - More diverse contractors would support ensuring cultural resonance of communications |

| Capacity building and co-creation with communities |
| - Environment Now staff turnover (99-series staff) doesn't lend itself to deepening relationships with community; longer-standing, more senior staff (i.e. adding 5638s to team ranks) would support this objective |

| Incentives and programs for communities and businesses |
| - Effectiveness of community-based social marketing efforts would be strengthened by the ability to provide relevant products and resources to community (e.g. samples of cleaning products, in the case of the Safer Cleaning Campaign); budget is a barrier |

**Racial equity action plan implementation**
**E.a Racial equity-related activity information**

*Complete only for line items that are aligned with a department priority equity issue area (D)*

*If data is not collected within department, enter "not available"*

*If data needs is collected but needs further analysis, enter "to be updated"*

*If any of this information exists in a separate report or document, please also include the link in the cell*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Locations</th>
<th>Open to general public or application/referral required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENV-ADMIN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV-ZERO WASTE</td>
<td>Bayview Hunters Point, Treasure Island</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV-TOXICS</td>
<td>Bayview Hunters Point, Treasure Island, Filmore, Excelsior</td>
<td>1 and 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV-CLIMATE</td>
<td>Bayview Hunters Point, Chinatown, Affordable housing sites (throughout San Francisco, including Mission, Tenderloin, Western Addition, Bayview Hunters Point, Potrero, Chinatown and beyond)</td>
<td>1 and in some cases 2 (affordable housing referrals)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV-ENERGY</td>
<td>Bayview Hunters Point, Excelsior, South of Market, Outer Mission, Mission, Tenderloin, Oceanview/Merced/Ingleside</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV-OUTREACH</td>
<td>Excelsior, Bayview</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program</td>
<td>Estimated number of people served</td>
<td>Estimated racial/ethnic demographics of people served</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Suggest 10 words or less</strong></td>
<td><strong>Suggest 30 words or less</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENV-ADMIN</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENV-ZERO WASTE</strong></td>
<td>Potentially thousands of residents and businesses</td>
<td>Affordable housing residents, BIPOC community members and BIPOC-operated businesses, low income communities of color, residents living in EJ neighborhoods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENV-TOXICS</strong></td>
<td>Potentially thousands of residents and businesses</td>
<td>Affordable housing residents, BIPOC community members and BIPOC-operated businesses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENV-CLIMATE</strong></td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>The Environmental Justice (EJ) Program serves low-income communities of color, residents living in EJ neighborhoods highlighted in SF Plannings EJ Communities map, and affordable housing residents throughout San Francisco.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**E.b. Racial equity-related activity information**

*Complete only for line items that are aligned with a department priority equity issue area (D)*

*If data is not collected within department, enter "not available"*

*If data needs is collected but needs further analysis, enter "to be updated"*

*If any of this information exists in a separate report or document, please also include the link in the cell*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Additional demographics of people served</th>
<th>Community input and decision-making</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENV-ENERGY</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>Energy programs serve residents in multi-unit dwellings and single- and multi-unit dwellings and small businesses in San Francisco’s Disadvantaged Communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV-OUTREACH</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>Multiple/varies; outreach and communications activities conducted by the Outreach (Communications &amp; Community Engagement) program serve residents and businesses citywide, with frequent targeting of specific populations (e.g. residents of multi-unit dwellings; food businesses; residents and small businesses in Disadvantaged Communities) depending on the project or program for which support is being provided</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**E.c Racial equity-related activity information**

Complete only for line items that are aligned with a department priority equity issue area (D)
If data is not collected within department, enter "not available"
If data needs is collected but needs further analysis, enter "to be updated"
If any of this information exists in a separate report or document, please also include the link in the cell
| ENV-ADMIN |  |  |
| ENV-ZERO WASTE | • Low-income communities  
• Children and youth  
• Immigrant communities  
• People whose primary language is not English  
• People with disabilities  
• Seniors | • Workshops or meetings |
| ENV-TOXICS | • Low-income communities  
• Children and youth  
• Immigrant communities  
• People whose primary language is not English  
• People with disabilities  
• Seniors | • Grant program proposal review  
• Stakeholder meetings co-facilitated with CBOs  
• Workshops, meetings  
• Survey feedback |
| ENV-CLIMATE | • Target low-income communities of color, EJ groups, American Indian community, affordable housing residents and property managers  
• LGBTQ+, Seniors, Youth, Environmental Justice; Chinese-only Speaking population; Spanish-only speaking population; Families, especially those with children; Those who live and work outside; Labor groups | • Workshops or meetings  
• Advisory committee or commission  
• Surveys  
• Stakeholder interviews and focus groups  
• Online platforms  
• EJ Task Force meetings  
• Stakeholder meetings co-facilitated with CBOs |
| ENV-ENERGY | • Low-income communities  
• People whose primary language is not English  
• Children and youth  
• Immigrant communities | • Workshops or meetings  
• Advisory committee or commission |
| ENV-OUTREACH | • Low-income communities  
• Children and youth  
• Immigrant communities | • Workshops or meetings |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Estimated FTEs and/or budget specifically for racial equity improvements</th>
<th>Names of contracted providers or consultants for racial equity improvements, if any</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENV-ADMIN</td>
<td>The Department has requested additional funding to support its racial equity efforts in its FY 2022/2023 budget. Currently, the Department does not receive General Fund support. If the budget request is granted, the Department would add a Racial Equity Senior Coordinator position, additional funding for racial equity consultant services, and grant funding for community-based organizations. If the budget request is not approved, SFE will still have a limited amount of funding for a racial equity consultant to support training and coaching activities to improve organizational culture and build capacity. Additionally, SFE may restructure implementation of the REAP, so that Racial Equity Steering Committee members play a greater role in managing implementation efforts for each section of the REAP. For example, each REAP section may have two steering committee members who are responsible for coordinating and tracking implementation for that section.</td>
<td>Include as attachment if too many to list in cell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV-ZERO WASTE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV-TOXICS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV-CLIMATE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV-ENERGY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV-OUTREACH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**E.d Racial equity-related activity information**

*Complete only for line items that are aligned with a department priority equity issue area (D)*

*If data is not collected within department, enter "not available"*

*If data needs is collected but needs further analysis, enter "to be updated"*

*If any of this information exists in a separate report or document, please also include the link in the cell*