

San Francisco Estuary Partnership
Implementation Committee Meeting

Tuesday, November 17, 2015

Elihu M. Harris State Building

Oakland, California

DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY

1. Welcome and Introductions

Amy Hutzel introduced Caitlin Sweeney as our new executive director, effective December 26th.

2. Public Comments/Meeting Summary Approval

There was no public comment. Harry Seraydarian moved to approve the meeting summary, Matt Fabry seconded, and all were in favor.

3. Director's Report – Judy Kelly

- I will be departing and Caitlin will be stepping in as Director.
- We had our five-year program evaluation by EPA this year. Luisa Valiela has been heavily involved in this process and EPA was pleased with our performance. Our draft review letter was very positive.
- The state has made its decision on round 4 of IRWMP and SFEP was selected to manage the grant for the region. We are now administering Rounds 2, 3, and 4 for our regional partners. I want to thank our staff for their work, especially Jennifer Krebs.
- Please check out our State of the Estuary Report web page which includes great material and a video (<http://www.sfestuary.org/about-the-estuary/soter/>).

4. Reports on SFEP Activities

State of the Estuary Conference Highlights – Karen McDowell

- 800+ people registered, and there were 860 posters. We will post some of the presentations online and are reviewing evaluations. We are planning a post-conference meeting with the planning committee and Caitlin.
- Warner Chabot noted that we got very good press on the Pulse report and there was a very positive evolution of the report in that we are getting some of the authors to weigh in on the work that we hope to have done by 2050.
- November 2016 Bay Delta Science Conference planning is currently underway and we are working at getting a contract signed with the venue.

CCMP Status and Next Steps – Caitlin Sweeney

Last time we spoke, we were about to release the Estuary News insert in August which gave an overview of the goals, objectives and actions.

The draft CCMP was released September 17 and we solicited online comments via our website. At the SOE conference, we had a CCMP Pop-Up Workshop to provide a forum for attendees to discuss the new CCMP and community building. The booth was staffed at all times, and we gave out SFEP pins to participants as well as a link to our website where the comments on the CCMP were being solicited. 61 organizations provided 300 responses.

Outreach methods include: SFEP homepage; follow up emails from the Pop-Up workshop; SFEP mailing list of 4500; additional mailing lists, newsletters, Bay Area Watershed Network, BASMAA, etc.; social media – Facebook, Twitter, etc.. Comments from online solicitation included 18 commenters from private and public entities.

Discussion:

- Tom noted limited local government comment is noted (only City of Oakland). Many of the actions do require local involvement. There are parties that need to play a role that don't seem engaged at this point, we will need to try and wrap them into this as we move forward. Judy and Caitlin clarified that the next stage of targeted outreach is to contact the lead agencies for buy in on the activities and goals.
- Harry asked who made the comment about enhanced focus on environmental justice, and Caitlin clarified that it were anonymous.
- Jane noted that the SFPUC reviewed the CCMP and had no comments

Next steps: We will review comments, compile them, post them, and integrate them into our product. We will assign the actions owners/leads and participating partners. We will set an implementation schedule/funding analysis, develop a framework for measuring performance and success, and flesh out document – framing text, sidebars, relation to existing plans, etc. We will convene the steering committee February 2016 (expected), and bring the finalized document to the IC for approval in March, 2016 (expected). The document would then need to be approved by the Executive Council, and we'd expect a final revised CCMP released in May/June, 2016.

Further discussion:

- This could support Restoration Authority ballot measure work if that is happening in the summer time.
- Is timing realistic? The release date seems optimistic with the amount of work we have left on the table. Lead agencies, costing, schedules, activities refinement, etc. It is overwhelming. We're talking millions of dollars in resources that this document is addressing. Response: We have funding to do a large part of this work so that it isn't all up to staff to complete.
- Will there be a communications rollout plan? Consultants will help move that forward.

- Could there be a shorter name for this document? The current name would be a barrier to the success of a successful media strategy. Response: The CCMP is known language by its key circle and a reference to the CWA language. However, it doesn't mean we can't take a look at this. Suggestions solicited; please email Judy.

Nominations for Chair/Vice Chair positions – Amy Hutzel

We need to select these positions in March to take effect in May. Tom and I are willing to stay in our positions. If you want to nominate anyone else, please email suggestions to Caitlin. The Regional Board has a spot as chair or vice chair, and Tom is happy to play either role. There is no obligation to change from the current setup. Staff will send email to IC members for possible nominations and vote in March meeting.

Update on ABAG/MTC Merger Issue – James Muller

- ABAG is SFEP's administrative entity. ABAG and the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) jointly produce Plan Bay Area, but there is some contention regarding their ability to work together. MTC funds ABAG for the land use component (\$4 million).
- MTC proposed in summer 2015 to move ABAG responsibilities to MTC and remove funding from ABAG. That lost funding would eliminate ABAG's ability to provide some core staff and functions that SFEP depends on. The Union got involved, and Santa Clara County Supervisor Dave Cortese and SF Supervisor David Campos negotiated a resolution passed by both the ABAG and MTC boards in late October to move towards a full merger instead defunding.
- A consultant, expected to be retained this month, will develop a merger plan by June. If that fails, MTC will return to the plan to substantially defund ABAG. As SFEP is a satellite of ABAG, we are at risk if ABAG can't administer grants or dissolves.
- A merger between the agencies has been attempted twice before.
- Practical implications of merger would be changes to staffing and governing. Some cities are very concerned about losing a stake in the regional planning process. There is also the issue of ABAG retiree benefits.
- Is the friction about substance or logistical? There are two issues: 1) meeting our housing needs with incommuting, and 2) displacement. Despite suggestions that we suffered major schedule delays, we performed quite well compared to others in the state.
- MTC's budget is \$40 million but with toll funds, goes to \$1 billion. ABAG has 40 staff, MTC has 200. Caitlin: This is also an opportunity for us to review what works and what doesn't for us. Matt: Related to CCMP: local municipalities don't know about SFEP.
- How are other NEPs structured? At what point does the Partnership look for a new home or at least think about pros and cons?
- Amy: Staff will come back in March with description of how we work now, other options from other NEPs, and an update on the merger situation.

5. IC Member Activities

SF Bay Restoration Authority – Amy Hutzel

The RA was established by state law in 2008 and is housed at ABAG. It has very limited funding and has a board appointed by ABAG's executive board, which is composed of local elected officials. San Mateo Supervisor Dave Pine is likely to become the new chair.

The RA is charged with developing and dispersing the funds for the SF baylands in habitat enhancement/restoration, flood protection, and public access. The RA's November 18th meeting materials include a list of potential projects, with a map, that the RA could support (<http://abag.ca.gov/cgi-bin/attachments.pl?agenda=a111815a.htm&group=a>).

Ballot measure language has been reviewed by counsel and a final draft is ready to present to the RA at its January 13, 2016 board meeting. We will conduct a poll before that meeting to assess Bay Area voter support. Another poll recently showed that the Bay Area was the most supportive in the state for this type of measure.

Summary of ballot measure:

- \$12 per parcel tax for 20 years, would fund clean, safe water; birds and wildlife; integrated flood protection; and shoreline public access.
- Project evaluation factors will include greatest positive result, benefit to economically disadvantaged communities, geographic distribution, and others.
- 50% of funds raised would be appropriated based on population and obligated. The rest would go to projects in any district. 5% of funds would go to admin and to ballot measure costs. \$20 million per year would be generated with this measure.

Comments

- Water Quality is one of the key components, but it's not clear what type of WQ projects would be funded. It seems that this is really focusing on restoration work. Response: the goal of this component is to remove pollution, trash, and harmful toxins in the bay. The RA would need to assess how far up watersheds these projects could be funded: what is the nexus between the proposed project site and the shoreline.
- Are we anticipating state and federal match? How is that going to play into the messaging? Response: These funds will certainly increase federal and state funds coming into the area, but it's not clear that that would have a role in messaging.
- Large trash capture devices could be a solution to water quality issues with this funding, but they do not appear here. Could these be funded? Response: The list is certainly not exhaustive and I have solicited input from local governments. I don't think that these devices are necessarily excluded from being funded.

Estuary News – Ariel Rubissow Okamoto

Many of the funds provided for the Estuary News have come from members of this group. Most of you have a two year commitment, and this is an opportunity to review whether we want to continue producing the Estuary News. We have funding through December.

Discussion:

- Tom – In our RMP steering committee meeting, we discussed our RMP inserts over the next year and are expecting the Estuary News publication to continue. I appreciate the larger questions, but the RMP is certainly willing to be a player in this.
- When would you call in your editorial board to assess this question? Response: The editorial board has no decision making power.
- Warner - SFEI is very interested in continuing this publication. There are many things that are coming down the pipeline that will need attention called to them. I think we underinvest in communications currently. Can you say under the current financing scheme, how much funding do you have?
 - We are funded through December of this year. We are doing more online publications with longer stories. The budget we had over the last two years didn't really allow me to grow. Our publication is \$60-70k a year. Another \$30k would allow us to expand.
- Tom – When and how will these decisions be made?
 - Ariel - We have \$20k from the Delta Science Program and possibly another \$10k from the RMP. Caitlin will be involved in determining this.
 - Judy – It looks like we need to have a series of conversations around this issue including Maven, Bay Nature, and amongst ourselves to determine what permutation of Estuary News we want to have as we move forward. It is healthy to ask if printing four times per year is the best way to host this info in 2016.
 - Jessica – We always link stories and online content to other resources and project descriptions. As we roll out the CCMP, I think we could use this as a platform to reflect on how projects integrate with the CCMP.

Baylands Goals Science Update - Matt Gerhart

Tidal marshes have been a big focus. We have attempted to understand what is in progress, in relation to the 2009 benchmark and historical benchmarks. We compared tidal marshes in 1998, 2009, and “future.” One of the report’s focuses has been marsh resilience to sea level rise. We present scenarios of marsh resilience during sea level rise in regard to different levels of sediment supply.

The Bayland Goals update is a synthesis and updates all the drivers.

- Some themes include:
 - Restore complete systems (high, plane, low, subtidal)
 - Sediment supply is critical
 - Install of marshes as quickly as possible to take advantage of sediment supply
 - We need to plan for marshes to migrate inland
- Next steps:
 - We got a great media splash – 15 articles, 2 or 3 TV spots – we want to keep it up.
 - San Jose Mercury News just endorsed the Restoration Authority as a tangential benefit of this update. The Sears Point breach was a great showcase.

- At some point, we will need to work with ABAG to get counties and cities to support this document and its processes.
 - Comments
 - Tom – Are proposed CCMP actions in sync with the Goals?
 - Caitlin – Yes, they are. There are about 5 actions that are directly related. The documents were produced simultaneously, so there was a lot of discussion around this. We will ensure that our language syncs up closely with this update.

6. Concluding Business

- Harry S – NBWA will have its conference in April and Judy will moderate.
- Amy H – IC members, please email any additional agenda item suggestions for the Road Map.

Attending

IC Members:

- Michael Vasey, SF Bay NERR
- Harry Seraydarian, North Bay Watershed Association
- Amy Hutzler, State Coastal Conservancy
- Tom Mumley, SF Bay Regional Water Board
- John Klochak, U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service
- Matt Fabry, San Mateo Countywide Water Pollution Prevention Program
- Kate Poole, NRDC
- Bill Brostoff, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
- Warner Chabot, San Francisco Estuary Institute
- Jessica Davenport, Delta Stewardship Council
- John Andrew, DWR
- Jane Lavelle, SFPUC

Presenters:

- Ariel Rubissow Okamoto, Estuary News
- Matt Gerhart, State Coastal Conservancy

SFEP staff:

- Judy Kelly
- Caitlin Sweeney
- James Muller
- Josh Bradt
- Karen McDowell