



SUMMARY REPORT

Implementation Committee

Strategic Planning Meeting

November 2, 2016



OVERVIEW

This summary report presents findings from the San Francisco Estuary Partnership (SFEP)'s Implementation Committee (IC) Strategic Planning Meeting, which was held on November 2, 2016 from 9:30AM – 1:00PM in SFEP's office at 1515 Clay Street in Oakland, CA.

PURPOSE & DESIRED OUTCOMES

The meeting was designed as an interactive workshop and invited IC members to provide input on the structure of the Implementation Committee and their role in championing the CCMP. Specific meeting goals and desired outcomes are listed below.

Purpose

- Engage IC members as both advisors to and implementers of the CCMP and work with them to develop a plan for the next 5 years around IC structure and process.
- Gather input from IC Members on their roles and responsibilities, committee structure, membership, alignment with the CCMP, and preferred meeting and communication methods.

Desired Outcomes

- IC members will feel an increased sense of engagement with and ownership over CCMP implementation and outreach to key alliance
- SFEP will better understand how to strengthen the IC, better align membership with the goals of the CCMP, and improve regional outreach objectives.



AGENDA

The three and a half hour meeting was structured as follows:

9:30 AM	Normal business and public comment. The committee chair called the meeting to order, conducted regular business, and had public comment.
9:45 AM	Introductions, Context, & Purpose. Cristelle facilitates quick icebreaker introductions, including facilitators, staff, and IC members.
9:55 AM	Context and Purpose. Cristelle facilitates introductions around the room and defines goal of the meeting. Caitlin provides context.
10:05	Activity Set 1. Each participant was invited to add sticky dots and sticky notes to large posters around the room. The lead facilitator summarized the results to the larger room and asked clarifying questions of the group.
11:00 AM	Presentation. SFEP staff shared a short presentation highlighting the history of the CCMP, existing IC by-laws, and the new tracking tool.
11:15 (40 mins)	Activity Set 2. The room broke into 4 small groups and worked together to respond to a series of questions. SFEP staff at each table took notes on large flipcharts. Each group then shared their ideas with the room.
12:30 (20 mins)	Lunch+ Presentation from ABAG. Participants were invited to stay to enjoy lunch and ask questions of ABAG presenting staff regarding the ABAG/MTC staff consolidation.

SUMMARY OF RESULTS

Attendance

A total of **18** IC members attended (see Appendix 1), along with SFEP staff members, and facilitators from the consulting firm Michael Baker International.

Activity Set 1

Roles & Responsibilities

Each participant was invited to review a large poster listing current IC roles and responsibilities and place a sticky dot next to each one to indicate if they thought it was a strength or had room for improvement (“growth area”). Then, each participant chose the three roles and responsibilities they felt were of highest priority for the IC.



The chart below shows the results organized in order of chosen priority. The numbers represent the number of participants who placed a dot in each section. The largest numbers in each column are shown in **bold**.

IC Roles & Responsibilities	Priority	Strength	Growth Area
Set CCMP priorities and strategic direction	11	6	5
Implement actions	11	2	7
Develop strategic partnerships	10	8	5
Outreach to implementing partners	8	3	6
Champion the CCMP in public and at other regional meetings	3	1	12
Outreach to the informed public and other regional players	2	2	8
Recommend work plans and budgets	2	3	7
Communicate CCMP progress on Actions back to SFEP	1	3	8
Champion the CCMP online via social media	1	1	11
Attend IC meetings	0	5	5

The results of this activity reveal the following insights:

Most participants indicated that the most important roles of the IC include **setting CCMP priorities** and **implementing CCMP actions**. In addition, many agreed that developing strategic partnerships and conducting outreach to implementing partners are important responsibilities of the IC. Of these, many agreed that the IC currently excels at developing **strategic partnership** and **setting priorities** (these received the highest ratings in the 'Strength' column), while several others indicated there is room for improvement in the areas of **implementing actions** and **reaching out to implementing partners**.

When discussing these top priorities, participants suggested the following improvements:

- **Outreach to Implementing Partners**
 - Need to do regular follow-up with implementing partners
 - Ensure owners champion the CCMP to partners and beyond
 - Incorporate mention of the CCMP into other presentations
 - Reach beyond strategic partners to a broader stakeholder group
- **Implement Actions:**
 - Match actions to partners
 - Align IC to the actions. IC could take on actions and engage with strategic partners to ensure they are implemented.
 - Prioritize actions, but do not do this at the expense of the very important yet difficult-to-achieve actions
 - Recognize all 32 actions are priority and are distributed over five years for implementation, but that we still may not be able to implement them all
 - Reach out to entities that support CCMP goals
 - Regularly monitor the implementation of each action item

Areas for Improvement – The biggest growth areas were identified as championing the CCMP in public (both online and at regional meetings) and conducting outreach to the informed public and regional players.

Strengths & Areas of Growth

The second set of posters posed four related questions and asked IC members to write their responses to each question on sticky notes (as many as they wished). The themes of their responses are summarized under each question shown below:

- *What does the IC **do well**?*
 - Collaboration
 - State of the Estuary Conference
 - Food and drink at meetings
- *What does the IC **not do very well**?*
 - **Funding** – SFEP does a good job of getting grants, but IC members need to help find funding for action implementation.
 - **Implementing and prioritizing actions** - Need a tracking tool. Prioritization is a concern because more difficult actions that take more time to implement could fall to the bottom of the list, but that doesn't mean they are less important. Instead, need to regularly evaluate the process and structure for identifying the status of each action and remove roadblocks for the actions that seem to be stuck. IC members need to incorporate action implementation into home agency work plans. Allow IC members to self-select and become a "champion" for individual actions and identify gaps. Need to expand IC membership to ensure there are champions for all actions.
 - **Outreach** – Need to do more outreach to local government and public officials, including the restoration authority. Need to go to them (AKA city staff and elected officials) to make it easy for them to engage. Need to communicate with agencies that are supporting implementation and find out how they can use our support.
- *What **should** the IC do, but doesn't?*
 - **Funding** – SFEP needs to receive more funding and help IC members support action implementation.
 - **Outreach** – Need to identify who we're reaching out to (e.g., public to gain support, and/or partners who implement actions?) and what kind of outreach we're doing to each group. Need a targeted outreach plan for the IC that addresses who, how, and what the messaging is. IC members should go attend and present at partnership agency meetings to build wider knowledge of the CCMP. Need to identify how best to reach out to engineers and planners at city departments.
 - **Raise Awareness** – Any home agency newsletter or policy paper can reference compliance with the CCMP to help raise awareness regionally. Need a Restoration Authority approach that integrates with the goals of the CCMP.

*What does the IC do, but **shouldn't**?*

-
- **Implementation** - Should not be in the weeds implementing projects. Should rely on partners.
 - **Take positions** – Should not take positions on issues and actions outside of the CCMP.
 - **Structure** – Should be structured with clearly defined roles and responsibilities.

Activity Set 2

After staff gave a short presentation (see slides in Appendix) about the history of the IC, the existing by-laws, and the new CCMP tracking tool, IC members divided into 4 small groups and worked together to discuss and respond to a series of forward-looking questions. The results are summarized by category below.



Where do we want to be?

Participants were asked to discuss and respond to the following questions:

1. Who (as a committee or organization) exemplifies where we want to be?
2. We will know we are successful when...?
 - a. Our committee consists of...
 - b. Our committee is...
 - c. Our extended network of partners are..
 - d. Our estuary is...
 - e. Our communities are...

Who exemplifies where we want to be?

When asked for “role model” organizations that exemplify where the IC would like to be, participants across groups listed organizations that get things done, have active and engaged members, bring people (and diverse groups) together, and are collaborative.

We will know we are successful when...

Common themes in response to the question of what success looks like included:

- **Engaged Members & Partners.** Have committed and actively engaged members who regularly attend and take a lead on implementing actions; broad engagement across entity types (business community, cities/counties, environmental justice groups); more demographic diversity; more representatives from the Delta.

- **Subcommittees.** Establish working groups/subcommittees to tackle specific issues.
- **Lead Implementation.** The IC owns Action 32 and IC partners take more of a lead in implementing actions.
- **Achieve Resilience.** Work toward Estuary resilience to sea level rise.



The chart below shows the specific responses by each small group.

	Who exemplifies where we want to be?	We will know we are successful when...
Group 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Needs to be small workgroups or committees • BACWA, BASMAA, NBWA all have active, engaged subcommittees and defined role for chair(s) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Success is when members show up, are committed, and take responsibility to report back to someone.
Group 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SF Bay Joint Venture – good at finding funding, implementing • Bay Area Open Space Council – smaller but great outreach; “bring people together” • Sierra Club – brings people together 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Want to see more implementation • Need more entities engaged • Demographic diversity • Representation by environmental justice orgs and focus on environmental justice • Regular attendance • Partners are referencing the CCMP and

		implementing <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SLR resilience for Estuary • Actively engaged partners in protection and restoration of Estuary
Group 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CCMP specified where the IC wants to be (Action #32). • We want to be implementing, engaged with staff, committee members, partners etc.. • Our organizations are doing the work. Need continual feedback loop! • Work with staff, partners, action owners to move individual Actions • Be a resource for partners 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We are (re)structured in the way we like • With new CCMP, opportunity to reprise workgroups and/or subcommittees with SFEP staff too • IC should be owner of Action 32 (IC is SFEP) • IC partners should take more lead in actions
Group 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RMP: Consensus, collaboration, diverse, representation from particular categories, has a clear government strategy • BAFPA: has clear focus/mission 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need more business community representation • More dischargers – city/county, transportation corridors • More upstream and delta representatives

What do we need to get there?

Responsibilities

Participants were asked to respond to the following prompts:

- *Are these the right roles and responsibilities or are there any you would remove or are any missing?*
- *Define each role/responsibility in terms of what you think it should entail.*
- *How (by what means and in what time frame) should each role/responsibility be carried out and by whom?*

Common themes in response to these questions included:

- **Focus on Key Responsibilities.** Implement the CCMP, track CCMP progress, help remove roadblocks, approve work plan and budget, outreach to and work with partners.
- **Organize IC around Goals.** To facilitate accomplishment of responsibilities, IC needs more clearly define roles/commitments, needs to be held accountable, should establish working groups and should onboard/train new members.
- **Outreach and Partnerships.** IC members should better engage partners, spread the word about the CCMP, and help them play a larger role in implementing actions.



The chart below shows the specific responses by each small group.

Group 1	Group 2	Group 3	Group 4
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implementing actions and developing partnerships are related. Partners should be more involved. Clearer roles & responsibilities for each member in each type of stakeholder group (e.g., stormwater, water supply, flood control, etc....) Orientation for new members 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> IC is a committee, not a board Adopt policies and processes Implement CCMP Work with partners (MOUs might create constraints) Guidance to new IC members on what IC does Clarify role of EC vs IC Sit on working groups Approve work plan and budget Accountability for implementation of CCMP Track CCMP 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Take ownership and implement CCMP actions Specific roles/responsibility for CCMP Willingness to implement CCMP actions Existing by-laws does not represent responsibilities. "Must haves" are good. Desired qualifications are okay. ID tasks/actions that aren't moving and work to identify 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> IC members should be primary communicators to agencies and affiliates All IC members should champion CCMP regardless of ability to implement Structured commitments Working with relevant agencies to get their support and commitment Each agency's board/decision makers – need to know CCMP and support priorities

	progress	and solve issues	
--	----------	------------------	--

Meetings

Participants were asked to respond to the following question: *How often should the committee meet, who should be required to attend, and what should the format of the meetings include?*

Common themes in response to the question included:

- **Meet Quarterly.** Most groups agreed on quarterly meetings, with a few suggesting that subcommittees could meet more frequently as needed.
- **All Key Members Attend:** Two groups indicated that all committee members should attend. Two groups suggested that members with less involvement could participate less often. One group requested a more formal process for alternates.
- **Focus on Action.** A few groups requested that the meetings be more focused on reviewing the progress of the CCMP and identifying where/how the IC could help move actions forward. There was an expressed interest that meetings be more focused on actionable next steps, instead of being purely informational.

The chart below shows the specific responses by each small group.

Group 1	Group 2	Group 3	Group 4
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meet quarterly with working groups as needed. • Need more formal alternate attendees 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quarterly • All IC members should attend + have alternates • Regular progress update on CCMP & challenging tasks 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IC meeting frequency should be equivalent with IC level of engagement in implanting actions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quarterly • All committee members attend – or – only those reporting on actions? • More action!

Members

Participants were asked to discuss and respond to the following questions: *Who should be an IC member? What should the charter state about required/optional membership? Should membership be based on individuals or organizations? How should new members be chosen?*

Common themes in response to these questions included:

- **Define Membership.** Clearly define purpose of IC membership.
- **Members Represent Organizations.** Most groups agreed that membership should be based on organization. If someone represents multiple agencies/perspectives, they should make it clear to the group. All implementing agencies should be on the IC.
- **Intentional Selection.** Identify membership categories to fill and avoid duplication. Choose groups that will implement actions, are committed to SFEP/CCMP, and will do outreach to other harder to reach groups.

- **Who's Missing.** Need to involve more committed community/advocacy groups, local agencies, and groups that can do effective outreach to those on the fringes.

The chart below shows the specific responses by each small group.

Group 1	Group 2	Group 3	Group 4
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Define membership categories (i.e., healthy estuary, regional groups, ...) without duplication. • Tighten up definition and purpose of membership. • Should every county be represented? • Who is a member representing when they have multiple roles? IC members can speak with multiple hats. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agencies decide representation from their agency • Membership subcommittee (or IC as a whole) to discuss bringing new members on a quarterly basis • Implementing agencies (CCMP) should all be on IC • Elected officials, planners, business, AG are missing from IC • Missing: Community/advocacy groups and advocacy groups and local agencies. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IC selects member agencies/orgs and entities select representative • Nominating and review process for IC members • As non-fiduciary advisory/guidance roll, no quorum requirement • CCMP 'blue print' attracts and justifies funding and membership • Consider individual drive and commitment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prefers organizations versus specific members (i.e. named person) • Include "at large" members • Select groups that will help implement actions, show a commitment to SFEP & CCMP, and can reach fringe groups.

Annual Goals

Participants were asked to discuss and respond to the following question: *What should the committee goals be and how should they be set and measured?*

Common themes in response to these questions included:

- **Goalsetting & Work plans.** Set SMART goals for the IC, with a focus on what is achievable. Create annual work plans for each action and measure quarterly.
- **Evaluation & Measurement.** Track all CCMP actions by task milestones, measure quarterly, and reevaluate goals annually. Track accomplishments toward Action 32. Identify where each IC member/action needs help.
- **Outreach.** Evaluate outreach conducted to date, including which groups have been reached. Clearly define purpose of outreach and move forward accordingly. Identify regional groups and connect each with an IC member and staff representative

- **Working Groups.** Set up working groups around specific focus areas.

The chart below shows the specific responses by each small group. Group 2 did not respond to this question.

Group 1	Group 3	Group 4
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Link all SFEP staff to a regional group to share status updates – work with IC member rep. • Need to identify regional groups • Evaluate how much outreach has been conducted (how many groups have been informed?) → What is the purpose of informing groups? (1) identifying opportunities, (2) looking for buy-in. • Track Action 32 implementation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implementation of CCMP actions measured by Task milestones • Reports/presentations on CCMP actions • Have reports from partners • Annually re-evaluate 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Create SMART goals (especially “A” = achievable) • Workplans, annual plan for each action; measure quarterly • Set expectations and reporting points (i.e., report on Actions X in Spring, X in Fall, etc..) • Set expectations for SFEP annual workplan to EPA (more involvement, less rubber stamp) • ID where IC committee members need to help • Respond to conditions (drought/flows) – set up focus area/workgroups • How do we get the content info to populate the tracker tool?

Next steps for staff

Participants were asked to discuss and respond to the following question: *“Based on your conversation, are there any next steps for SFEP staff to help accomplish what you have laid out in your charter?”*

A common theme throughout the responses to these questions was the importance of finding a balance between the role of IC members and the role of staff in supporting them. Several groups suggested that IC members should take the lead with staff support.

Group 1:

- Develop talking points for IC members to take to various partners and other groups

Group 2:

- IC members take lead on Action with staff engagement

Group 3:

- Support vs. lead: members, implementers (owners, collaborating partners), staff

Group 4:

- Make it so – make it work!
- Set up nominations committee to tackle IC members
- Analyze/review IC operating procedures and make recommendations
- Provide gaps analysis to IC on membership
- Report out tracker at meetings
- Call out issues and bring them to the attention of the IC to address

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, there are a number of concrete steps that can be taken toward accomplishing the responsibilities that the IC agreed are the most important, which include: (1) implementing the CCMP, (2) developing strategic partnerships, and (3) reaching out to implementing partners.

Overall IC members would like to play a larger role in ensuring that actions are implemented and that the right partners are involved and they feel that restructuring the committee would help. Some recurring recommendations for committee restructuring included: (1) select IC members who are committed, (2) fill gaps in IC membership, and (3) work in goal-oriented subcommittees, (4) establish a structured method for reporting back on progress toward actions, (5) consistently track progress toward actions, and (6) identify roadblocks and sticking points where IC members can assist.

Finally, several suggestions emerged for ways to strengthen outreach and involve more partners, including: (1) identify underrepresented groups and potential new strategic partners, (2) establish a targeted outreach plan and talking points for IC members to use when speaking about the CCMP and encourage IC members to regularly cite the CCMP, (2) conduct targeted outreach to underrepresented strategic partners by going to them.

APPENDIX 1: List of Attendees

Luisa Valeila, EPA

Amy Hutzell, SCC

Tom Mumley, SFRWCB

Mike Vasey, SF NERR

Barbara Salzman, Marin Audubon

Arthur Feinstein, Citizens Committee to Complete the Refuge

Amy Richey, SFEI

John Coleman, BPC

John Andrew, DWR

Beth Huning, SFBJV

Tom Kendall, USACE

Jane Lavelle, SFPUC

Carol Mahoney, Zone 7

Jessica Martini-Lamb, SCWA

Gary Stern, NMFS

Dyan Whyte, SFRWQCB

Matt Fabry, San Mateo Countywide PPP

Steve Goldbeck, BCDC

Molly Martin, EPA

SFEP Staff