

**San Francisco Estuary Partnership
Implementation Committee Meeting**

August 26, 2015

Elihu M. Harris State Building
Oakland, California

DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY

Welcome and Introductions: Tom Mumley, Vice Chair of the Implementation Committee, called the meeting to order at 9:40 AM with a round of introductions.

Public Comment: None

Directors Report: Judy reported that Paula Trigueros, SFEP's Contracts Manager, will formally retire after the State of the Estuary Conference. Paula will stay at SFEP as a part time retired annuitant however so SFEP will continue to have the benefit of her help. Judy reminded the group she is also retiring at the end of December. Applications are currently being accepted for the Director position. The application period will close September 4th.

Judy reported on the upcoming EPA evaluation of SFEP. An evaluation of SFEP is required every five years under the National Estuary Program. EPA representatives and program evaluators from other NEPs will be coming to the State of the Estuary Conference as part of this year's evaluation. SFEP will also host a half day workshop for the evaluation team.

Judy noted Alex Westhoff will return in November to the IC in his new capacity with Marin County.

Karen reported that the State of Estuary Conference (SOE) program is set and abstracts will be on the website within the next week. There are 160 posters and over 80 speakers. Registrations are coming in. SFEP has done well with fundraising for conference, but can still use additional donations from partners.

Judy reported that the 2015 State of the Estuary Report (SotER) will be released at the SOE conference, as well as Regional Monitoring Program's Pulse of the Bay. The SotER will be an excellent report with many new indicators and sidebars. She also noted that many important documents are being released over next 6 months, including BEHGU in October so stay tuned.

Jennifer reported that SFEP submitted the Bay Area IRWMP Round 4 proposal to DWR for \$41 million for a variety of projects throughout region. The proposal includes two larger projects – the AQPI project to modernize precipitation forecasting systems (managed by SFEP), and one on regional sea level rise research

and adaptation responses (Coastal Conservancy is the lead agency on four innovative wetland restoration projects).

Action Items:

Harry Seraydarian moved to approve the May minutes, Carol Mahoney seconded, and all approved.

Reports on SFEP Activities

Comprehensive Conservation and Management Plan

Caitlin Sweeney provided an overview of the current status of the CCMP revision. She reviewed the process so far including: the formation of the IC/CCMP steering Committee in Jan 2014, which made critical decisions along the way, represented the IC, and helped populate subcommittees. Subcommittees were formed and met, and Caitlin briefed the IC on the status over the past year. At the last IC meeting in May, the IC reviewed action topics under new organizational structure. On July 30, there was an “all subcommittees” meeting and participants went through the entire draft document.

The next issue of Estuary News Magazine will have an insert on the CCMP including a matrix of draft goals, objectives and actions, and information from a recently developed factsheet (distributed to the group at the meeting). SFEP will release a public draft of the CCMP at the SOE on September 17th. There will also be a “CCMP Pop-Up Workshop” at the SOE-conference. The public comment period will be from Sept 17-Nov 13. The IC meets Tuesday, November 17, and will review comments and suggested revisions.

Comments

Tom Mumley pointed out that although the actions have owners, there is disparity in level of detail and/or lead agencies. Will this be tightened up?

- Caitlin responded that, yes, the owners will be tightened up.

Tom Mumley asked about the cost of the actions, how the total amount necessary will be very large. Seems like overwhelming list compared to capacity.

- Caitlin responded that we must cost out actions under EPA requirements. Judy added that at end we will map out actions over five years to be integrated into SFEP workplan, match funding sources, and conduct gap analyses.

The IC then considered the question of where there were any red flags in the draft document, anything they could not live with. Also, were any priority actions missing?

Kate Poole had no red flags and expressed that it is okay to be ambitious and that she is not concerned about the large funding needs.

Matt Fabry had no red flags.

Jessica Davenport has been working closely with staff and will supply additional feedback offline.

Tom Mumley had no red flags, just minor concerns in the details; and asked if there is a fund-raising action. Caitlin responded that there is an action focused on funding. Tom would also like to see how monitoring can be better integrated (unsilo-ed), how the RMP for the Bay and Delta could be supported. Finally, the Champion of Estuary/stewardship section could use more thought and lacks some doable connections to the SotER.

Amy Hutzel noted that for Action 36, “avoiding” impacts to wildlife is a high/impossible bar and that the action should include words like “minimize,” or “compatible with wildlife” Also would like to see specific mention of the Bay Trail and completing the spine of the trail. Amy also noted that for Action 3, there is a task that includes creation of transition zone, but “create” should be in action description.

Carol Mahoney noted that she participated in the subcommittees and steering committee and thought staff did a good job incorporating comments. Looking at the matrix, Goals 3 and 4 seem isolated from the others. Perhaps we could indicate which are primary and secondary goals/objectives met.

Harry Seraydarian said he was happy from watershed and from the water supply perspectives. He pointed out the mention of flood management within the task level but that the term was not used in any action titles and should be (13 & 15 may be best opportunities).

Luisa Valiela had no red flags, and supports incorporation of “flood management” into action language. She noted that Action 37 is not ready to go as a draft.

Michael Vasey noted that staff had done a great job so far and that he would like to have SFBNERR as owner of some specific items. He also suggested adding something about the work is going on to develop tools to inform decision-makers (example: Coastal Intelligence—data gathering & analyses). He also suggested using more active language in objectives, specifically under Goal 4 (i.e. looking for “action” instead of “support” for CCMP objectives from local elected officials).

Bill Brostoff noted that USACE has not participated much due to resource constraints but could be owner of some more items. He suggested using the term “flood risk management” instead of just “flood management.”

Tom Mumley added we look to manage floods not control them and that we also need to acknowledge where flooding can be beneficial.

Luisa Valiela expressed appreciation for the consultant's work on the fact sheet.

Michael Vasey brought up how at the recent Climate Change symposium issues (wildfires, sea level rise, flooding) are being looked at on a broad scale which may be useful for our water-related work. He also suggested we could look at vulnerable communities with respect to climate change (environmental justice).

Jessica Davenport asked how the IC members felt about inclusion of Delta issues in the CCMP. Does it make sense? Does it seem to fit?

- Luisa Valiela responded that, yes, it makes sense, but identifying leads and other issues may seem disjointed and that would reflect the reality on the ground.

Tom Mumley pointed out there is very little engagement on the CCMP at local governmental level.

- Matt Fabry agreed and thinks many don't know CCMP exists. Policy level work will need elected officials to understand and act.
- Judy noted that the CCMP is not mandatory for locals, it is a collaborative vision and that our tools are the bully pulpit and directing funding to local initiatives.
- Kate Poole noted that Action 37 is important for Bay Area officials as well as Delta.
- Amy Hutzal expressed that we want elected officials to be champions.
- Group concluded that more outreach to entities like ABAG Executive Committee and local forums is needed in this next phase.

Break and Celebration of Paula's Years of Service to SFEP: Judy noted that Paula is retiring after 14 years at SFEP. She will remain available as a part-time retired annuitant for one year. Judy Kelly thanked Paula for her contributions to SFEP with a speech and the IC celebrated Paula with applause and cake.

Reports on SFEP Activities. Cont.

GreenPlan Bay Area

Jennifer Krebs provided an overview of the project and the team members: SFEP, SFEI, San Mateo, and San Jose for the State Board grant. The new EPA grant funds, covering phase 2, includes the partners above plus BASMAA, Oakland, Richmond, Contra Costa County, and the ABAG East Bay Corridor.

Jing Wu from SFEI presented the GreenPlan IT tool. GreenPlan IT is a watershed-scale planning tool for municipalities to identify suitable locations and determine cost effective implementation scenarios for various GI/LID types. This tool can be used for GI Master Planning and reasonable assurance analyses in meeting target goals. The modeling tool establishes baseline conditions, the locator tool identifies

feasible sites, and then the optimization tool uses a learning algorithm to determine the most cost-effective combinations of GI/LID types among those sites. In addition to assisting in the development of GI Master Plans, the tool can be also used to evaluate phased implementation and track progress (reduction of contaminants over time, etc.). Under Phase 2, SFEI will convene a TAC to identify and prioritize recommended GreenPlan-IT enhancements, which will likely include added Water Quality functionality, flexibility, and a LID tracker tool.

SFEI took about two years to build the Green Plan-IT tool. They had a budget of \$315k to develop the tool and \$135K to trial it with partnering municipalities. The Toolkit and user guides are available for download at <http://greenplanit.sfei.org/>.

Josh Bradt provided an overview of the next steps under the EPA grant (\$1.7M over 3 ½ years). The work plan components include:

- Planning—Municipal Green Infrastructure Master Plans; GreenPlan IT 2.0; and a Regional Roundtable to develop a road map for expanding Greenhouse Gas Reduction and transportation funding policies to include GI;
- Implementation—creation of standard GI designs for typical intersections, and construction projects in San Mateo, Sunnyvale, and San Jose;
- GI Tracking—development of GIS database and map of projects in the ground.

Comments

Amy Hutzel asked if she could we use this tool to evaluate proposals for Prop 1?

- Josh replied that local governments are now doing “random acts of greening” and additional GI planning analysis to support a proposed project could be helpful in making funding selections

Mike Vasey stated it is important to think about linking floodplains and marsh plains. How can we take this kind of approach and think about how to apply to tidal wetlands?

- Josh responded that would essentially be a watershed management plan that links resources, stormwater mgmt., etc. The “green infrastructure” in this plan is really about retrofitting hardscape in public right of ways.

Harry Seraydarian asked about where wastewater and stormwater management intersect? How can we integrate? What is the relationship between GI and inflow and infiltration?

- IC members briefly discussed this without resolution. It was noted that promoting stormwater infiltration may exacerbate Infiltration/Inflow into vulnerable sanitary sewer lines.

Carol Mahoney added that since wastewater has a way to raise money and stormwater doesn't, emphasizing maintenance cost savings, reduction of need for additional infrastructure will be important. She also brought up the issue of water

rights pertaining to storm flow into creeks – Tom responded that his issue is on the SWRCB’s radar and should be tracked but may not be a big issue in the 9 county region.

Concluding Business

Review the Roadmap:

The IC agreed to add a briefing on BEHGU to the November IC meeting. Additional ideas for future agenda items included: a speaker on the cap and trade program and use of funds for adaptation in addition to mitigation; blue carbon/wetlands storage capacity; and the Delta Plan performance measures report.

Announcements:

Erin Chappell announced that at the climate symposium in Sacramento, DWR spoke about their recently published report with 10 climate assessment models that perform the best for California. The CEC is now using those 10 models for the upcoming 4th California Climate Assessment and providing them for CalAdapt.

The meeting was adjourned, and the next meeting is Tuesday, November 17th.

Meeting Attendees:

IC Members

Erin Chappell, DWR
Jessica Davenport, Delta Stewardship Council
Matt Fabry, San Mateo Countywide Water Pollution Prevention Program
John Klochak, USFWS
Jane Lavelle, SFPUC
Carol Mahoney, Zone 7 Water Agency
Jessica Martini-Lamb, Sonoma County Water Agency
Tom Mumley, SF Bay RWQCB
Kate Poole, NRDC
Harry Seraydarian, NBWA
Luisa Valiela, EPA
Mike Vasey, SFBNERR
Amy Hutzell, SCC
Bill Brostoff, USACE

Presenters

Jing Wu, SFEI

SFEP Staff

Judy Kelly
Athena Honore
James Muller
Caitlin Sweeney

Paula Trigueros
Jennifer Krebs
Adrien Baudrimont
Karen McDowell