AGENDA

1. **Introductions; Approval of 8/24/11 Meeting Summary** 
   - 9:30 
   - Tom Mumley, IC Chair 
   - Action

2. **Public Comments** 
   - 9:40 
   - Any member of the public may address the IC on any matter regarding implementation of the Comprehensive Conservation and Management Plan (CCMP). Time is limited to three minutes. Written comments are also accepted.

3. **Director’s Report** 
   - 9:45 
   - Judy Kelly, Director
   - Attachment 2

4. **SFEP Activities** 
   - 10:00 
   - a. State of the Estuary Conference Debrief and Feedback 
     - Tom Mumley
     - Judy Kelly
   - c. IC Intentions 2012: Road map of meetings and actions 
     - Judy Kelly, Tom Mumley
   - d. Nominations, IC Chair and Vice-Chair for May 2012-May 2013 
     - Action
   - 10:45 BREAK

5. **Programs, Ideas, and Priorities from IC Members** 
   - 11:00 
   - Coastal Program Funded Projects 2010-11
     - John Klochak, US FWS
   - 11:20 
   - Developing a California Estuaries Portal, starting with S.F. Bay-Delta 
     - Jon Marshack, State Water Board
   - 11:50 
   - America’s Cup Activities 
     - Carol Bach or Brad Benson, Port of San Francisco
   - 12:15 
   - King Tides Initiative 
     - Marina Psaros, SF NERR
   - Attachment 5

6. **Agenda Items for February 29, 2012; Announcements** 
   - 12:20 
   - Action

7. **Adjourn** 
   - 12:30
Parking Options Near ABAG  
101-8th Street, Oakland, CA 94607-4756

We encourage you to take BART to our meeting, if convenient.

ABAG is located on the first floor of the Joseph P. Bort MetroCenter, 101 8th Street, Oakland, CA 94607-4756. We are directly across the street from the Lake Merritt Bart Station. When you get off the BART station, exit out of the station on 8th Street and when you surface at the street level, the 3 story building across the street is the ABAG office.

**Metered Parking** around ABAG: $2.00 an hour (2 hour limit is strictly enforced. Citations are issued at all meters, broken or not)

**Two Chinatown parking lots** – Walk 3 Blocks to ABAG  
Limited number of spaces available at mid-day  
325 & 328 7th Street  
7:00 a.m. – 7:00 p.m. (Monday – Friday)  
$7 for several hours or $12 per day

**Oakland Museum of California** (underground parking) – Walk 2 Blocks to ABAG  
*Garage is open while museum is under renovation.*  
1000 Oak Street @ 10th Street, Oakland, CA 94607  
(510) 318-8400  
Hours for Garage: 7:30 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. (Monday – Friday)  
Enter either from Oak Street or 11th Street  
$2.50 an hour or $12 all day

**Alco Parking Lot** – Walk 5 Blocks to ABAG  
13th and Alice Street, Oakland, CA 94604  
7:00 a.m. – 7:00 p.m. (Monday – Friday)  
$1.25 per hour  
$6.00 special rate – In and out privileges (must tell the attendant ahead of time to get the special rate)

**Henry J. Kaiser Auditorium Parking Lot** – Walk 2 Blocks to ABAG  
10 Tenth Street  
Oakland, CA 94607  
Hourly metered parking

**BART Parking:** Not Available. Please note that parking lot behind the MetroCenter is for BART patrons only. Please do not park here.

**Public Transit Access**  
**BART:** Lake Merritt Station is on the Fremont Line. If coming from the East Bay, change trains at 12th Street Station to a Fremont Train.  
**AC Transit:** Lines 11, 59, 59A, 62, 35X, 36X

*RATES AND INFORMATION SUBJECT TO CHANGE WITHOUT NOTICE*
1. Introductions
Tom Mumley, Chair of the Implementation Committee, called the meeting to order at 9:35 am with a round of introductions. The Meeting Summary for May 25, 2011 was approved.

2. Public Comments
There were no public comments.

3. Director’s Report
Judy Kelly noted the two big items forthcoming are the 2011 State of the Bay Report, to be released at the 2011 State of the Estuary Conference, Sept. 20-21. She stated the last remaining recommendation from the Strategic Plan on Implementation Committee Procedures needs to be approved. She announced Jennifer Krebs is working on the ABAG Fall General Assembly on October 14, highlighting low impact development implementation for stormwater treatment to be presented to ABAG elected officials with the goal of project and policy level water quality improvements.

Judy announced SFEP has had feedback from EPA on our stormwater spine proposal. She pointed out that SFEP has had support over the last four years of $12 million in funds from EPA. However, EPA has reduced the stormwater spine award from $1.3 million to $300K. Luisa noted the remaining $1 million from the San Francisco Bay Water Quality Improvement Fund would be re-competed. Judy added SFEP has $1.8 million from CalTrans and $2 million from IRWMP to complete the stormwater spine projects.

Jennifer spoke briefly about the IRWMP award. The Implementation grant award to the San Francisco Bay Area was for $30 million for a variety of projects; $10 million for recycled water; $7-8 million for water conservation; $3 million for restoration through the Coastal Conservancy. SFEP will receive $2.3 million for green infrastructure, including the San Pablo Avenue Stormwater Spine project and a streetscape in Campbell. Additional funds were awarded for 9 Disadvantaged Community (DAC) projects to be implemented by NGOs under SFEP supervision.

Janet spoke about the proposal for Phase 2 of the Trash Capture project to focus on DACs. The Clean Water State Revolving Fund (SRF) has a separate category for DACS, and SFEP is applying for an additional $3 million to fund trash capture devices for these communities.

Judy announced SFEP has produced three new video podcasts on the invasive periwinkle, Bahia Marsh restoration, and mercury which are now on our website. She also noted SFEP is on Facebook and asked everyone to friend us.
Tom announced *Estuary News* won a key award, the "Clarion" award for Best Print Newsletter 2011 from the Association for Women in Communications. *Estuary News* is in the 20th year of publication. Kudos to Lisa Owens Viani and Joe Eaton. He also mentioned that the Bay Area regional branding project for public outreach campaigns on behavior change to prevent Bay pollution is also moving forward, and we will hear more about that in future meetings.

4. SFEP Activities

a) Adopting IC Member Selection Process and Operating Procedures
The IC Member Selection Process document (Attachment 4) and the IC Operating Procedures (Attachment 5) were presented and discussed at the May meeting. Athena Honore reviewed the changes made per discussion at the last meeting to the operating procedures document. There were no changes to the member selection process. The changes included maintaining a Water Board staff member as either Chair or Vice Chair (depending on how the other position rotates). A change was also made to the member replacement process: the process to recommend changes to membership based on attendance will now be made “in consultation with the Implementation Committee members.” It was also noted that the development of an IC action plan was not included as part of the Operating Procedures, and staff was asked to work toward a planning document for the IC. Barbara Salzman then moved to approve, and Susan Adams seconded. The motion to adopt the new Selection Process and Operating Procedures was passed.

The new Chair and Vice Chair will be selected at the February 2012 meeting. At November meeting, Tom will accept nominations for the positions. Once the candidates are approved at the February meeting, they will take their positions at the May meeting. There was additional discussion on the nominating process.

b) State of the Estuary Conference
Karen had a stack of registration postcards available. The opening gala will be the evening of September 19 at the Aquarium of the Bay. Conference sessions at the Oakland Marriott are Sept. 20 and 21. Both days open with plenary talks and have breakout sessions in the afternoon. Over 140 posters have been submitted. The poster session reception is the evening of Sept. 20. A conference program was provided for review in the IC packet. Judy requested members spread the word about the conference since we have lost historic support from the state agencies this year because of budget considerations. Beth Huning offered JV support for a couple of hotel rooms if it is needed for state agency staff facing restrictions on travel costs.

c) State of the Bay Report
Judy stated final editing is this week and she is hoping to get the report to the printer by Sept. 1. The IC is familiar with the conclusions as presentations on the report were made on two occasions. She recommends going to our website for the full report and technical appendix which will all be posted by Sept. 19. She believes the report sets a new standard nationally on how NEPs should evaluate their progress.

d) San Francisco Bay Restoration Authority
Amy Hutzel made a presentation on the status of the authority, whose mission is to raise local funding for wetland restoration. She noted the legislation also covers subtidal habitat restoration and upland habitat restoration. The Board members have been selected; Advisory Committee members selected; and the Coastal Conservancy and SFEP provide support to the Authority Board with donated staff time since the RA has no funding. The Authority is considering ways of local funding and hired a polling consultant, FM3 Associates, with grant funds, to explore prospects for a sales tax or parcel tax. At the time of their polling (August 2010), a parcel tax received 65% likely support. A sales tax did not approach the 2/3 support level needed, rating
only 59% likely approval. The conclusions at that time were that providing a list of the benefits of restoration resonate much with voters and that there was more support for specific projects. By the time of a second poll in July 2011, there was less than 2/3 support for any tax measure to fund restoration, indicating a reaction to declining economic conditions. Messages that resonated were about trash and toxic cleanup. A consideration for the Authority will be the cost of a ballot measure; an estimated $2 per voter with 3.6 million registered Bay Area voters. The Authority’s next steps are to determine a time frame for a ballot measure and a possible geographic sub-area. Another issue is the cost of a mounting a ballot measure: at least $2 per voter with 3.6 million voters in the Bay Area. Next steps are to determine a time frame for a ballot measure; possible geographic area; a sunset on the tax. The current estimate from Save the Bay for the cost of needed wetland restoration in the region is $1.4 billion.


e) Bay Area Trash Capture Demonstration Project
Janet Cox gave a presentation on the status of the ARRA-funded trash capture demonstration project; 66 cities and towns are participating out of 94 (although there are no Marin County participants, since they are not yet facing permit requirements to install trash capture devices). She showed slides of the Bay Area Trash Tracker website, and explained how it is being used to help the cities navigate the purchase process, track installation of devices and capture information about maintenance. The website is a key part of information gathering for providing lessons learned for the next phases of trash capture device installations as municipalities approach upcoming deadlines for achieving zero trash discharge to receiving waters.

5. Programs, Ideas, and Priorities from IC Members
San Francisco Bay Joint Venture
Beth Huning gave an overview of what the Joint Venture is, how it came about, and what they do. They implement the US Fish & Wildlife Service Strategic Habitat Conservation strategy. The Bay Area has the highest density of listed species on the continent. 44% of watering winter fowl and shorebirds use habitat around the Bay. The JV Implementation Plan covers 3-5 years at an estimated cost of $370 million. They also track habitat projects by partners and serve as a forum for emerging issues. The JV website provides audio tours of restoration sites at the link Your Wetlands as well as conservation toolbox materials. Currently 60 active projects are proceeding and 75 have been completed in the last few years. They are working on a Monitoring and Evaluation Plan to determine how restored wetlands are functioning and the first phase is to be completed by the fall.

6. Agenda Items for November 2, 2011 IC Meeting
Suggestions included the following:
-Which aspects of the State of the Bay Report move us toward our goals and objectives
-Bay Area branding effort
-Spotlight on what NFWF is doing on the Bay, and development of the NFWF Business Plan
- EIR for America’s Cup—its issues
-Operating procedures—business of IC in next year (IC Work Plan or Intentions 2012)
-De-brief on SOE Conference

7. Announcements
• Will Travis announced the 28th hearing on the BCDC Bay Plan Sept. 1 at the Ferry Building.
• Luisa Valiela announced Sept. 24 is National Estuaries Day, and events are also planned around the King Tides events in October.
• Melody Tovar announced that January 1 San Jose implements their plastic bag prohibition ordinance.
• John Klochak announced he had a new Strategic Plan with a list of projects for funding for next year.
• Karen McDowell announced there would be a meeting of the Western Regional Panel on Aquatic Invasive Species here in Oakland on October 12-13 which will provide updates on ballast water regulations, quagga zebra mussels and others.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:30 pm.

SFEP IC Meeting Attendees

Susan Adams  ABAG, Marin County Supervisor
Amy Chastain  BACWA
Mark Green  ABAG, Mayor of Union City
Beth Huning  SF Bay Joint Venture
Amy Hutzel  Coastal Conservancy
Tom Kendall  US Army COE
John Klochak  US FWS
Larry Kolb  Friends of the San Francisco Estuary
Barbara Kondylis  Solano County
Tom Mumley  San Francisco Regional Water Board
Barbara Salzman  Marin Audubon
Harry Seraydarian  North Bay Watershed Association
Claire Thorpe  NFWF
Melody Tovar  City of San Jose
Will Travis  BCDC
Luisa Valiela  US EPA, Region 9
Alex Westhoff  Delta Protection Commission
Meredith Williams  San Francisco Estuary Institute

SFEP Staff
Judy Kelly
Elina Coulter
Janet Cox (partial)
Athena Honore
Jennifer Krebs (partial)
Karen McDowell
Jesse Mills
James Muller
Paula Trigueros
State of the Estuary Conference Debrief

*September 20–21, 2011*
State of the San Francisco Estuary Conference
10th Biennial Conference

We received great reviews from attendees of the State of the Estuary Conference in September. The conference Steering Committee will meet soon for their traditional debriefing, discussing what went well, lessons learned, and reviewing attendee evaluations. Feedback can also be sent to Karen McDowell at kmcdowell@waterboards.ca.gov.

**Staffing Changes**
Lisa Owens-Viani has moved on to new challenges, taking a new position as the Development Director of Golden Gate Audubon. The transition plan includes bringing on a new editor for ESTUARY NEWS and a review of SFEP’s communications program.

We have a few new hires as well: Susan Moffat was hired to support America’s Cup permitting and related work, and she will be housed at BCDC. We are also completing interviews for a watershed program manager position.

**State of the Bay Report**
The State of the Bay Report received significant news coverage, including stories in the San Francisco Chronicle, San Jose Mercury News (reprinted in the Contra Costa Times, and Oakland Tribune), Sacramento Bee, and East Bay Express. Radio interviews with Andy Gunther were broadcast on KGO, KCBS, KQED, KNBR, and San Jose’s KLIV. KQED’s TV program This Week in Northern California also featured discussion of the report by panelist Paul Rogers of the Mercury.

News of our report also appeared on a number of news aggregator sites and blogs, including News Fix, KQED’s Bay Area News blog. *The Chronicle and Mercury items were shared and reposted about 100 times through Facebook and Twitter.* For a list of the articles, see the Communications section, below.

**State of the Bay Report Goes to Santa Monica**
Karen McDowell will give a presentation about SFEP’s State of the Bay report at the Santa Monica Association of National Estuary Programs Directors and Administrators Meeting during the week of October 16-20.
San Francisco Bay Restoration Grant Program Bill Reintroduced
The bill to create a San Francisco Bay Restoration Grant Program was reintroduced in the House of Representatives as H.R. 3034 by Representatives Speier, Eshoo, Garamendi, Honda, Lee, McNerney, Miller, Pelosi, Stark, Thompson, Woolsey, and Lofgren. A companion bill is expected to be introduced in the Senate. The current version designates an Annual Priority List for projects to be funded, to be compiled by the program Administrator in consultation with the San Francisco Estuary Partnership, the State of California, affected local governments in the San Francisco Bay estuary watershed, and any other relevant stakeholder involved with the protection and restoration of the San Francisco Bay estuary that the Administrator determines to be appropriate. Projects would need to advance the goals and objectives of the CCMP. Grants under the program would require a 25% non-Federal match. The bill sets a yearly funding level of $20 million for 2012 through 2016.

Grants/Contracts Received
- $230,000 from USGS for State of the Estuary/Delta Science Conference support
- $598,800 from USEPA for Section 320 NEP funding for FFY 2012
- $307,646 from EUSEP for Phase I of the San Pablo Avenue Green Stormwater Spine project.

Funding Opportunities
As a service to the IC, we are including a list of upcoming grant funding opportunities with this report. We maintain a database of upcoming opportunities, which we’ve queried two ways: one is based on upcoming opportunities with known deadlines, and the other forecasts January-April dates for grants that are annual or cyclical, based on last year’s information. We plan to include an updated list of these opportunities with each IC meeting packet going forward, and discussion will be a standing item at each meeting.

34th America’s Cup in San Francisco: Web Resources
Basic information about the 34th America’s Cup can be found at:
- SF Office of Economic and Workforce Development's AC34 Event Page  
- AC34 Official Website  
  www.americascup.com
- SF Planning Department's Website with the AC34 Draft EIR  

Water Quality
Trash Capture Demonstration Project Update
As the Bay Area-wide Trash Capture Demonstration Project looks forward to the November 1, 2012 construction deadline, we have progress to report. At least 15 municipalities are installing or preparing to install “large” trash capture devices, and least 30 have let SFEP know that they plan to install only small catch basin inserts to capture trash and debris. The project’s first large trash capture device, a hydrodynamic separator, was recently installed in Dublin alongside the Dublin/Pleasanton BART station.

We have more than $700,000 in orders on hand, with almost 700 devices already installed.
SFEP recently arranged and hosted a large device installation forum where representatives of cities aiming to install large device had an opportunity to hear from colleagues who have already ordered and constructed them. Most of the municipalities that are planning to install large devices will do so in the spring and summer of 2012.

Jesse Mills presented at a seminar on trash capture device maintenance and data collection, hosted by the Alameda County Clean Water Program. Jesse is available to speak with other countywide stormwater programs about our website’s advantages as a record keeping and reporting tool.

**Clean Boating: New Honey Pot Day and America’s Cup Outreach**

SFEP staff worked with six different marinas in the East Bay to coordinate a Bay Area Honey Pot Day, held October 23. To conduct outreach, SFEP partnered with DBW and the Dock Walkers, a volunteer group created to educate boaters, dockside, about the effects of marine pollution.

SFEP staff has also been working on America’s Cup issues, together with DBW, the Port of San Francisco, the AC34 Event Authority, and the city of San Francisco to ensure that all potential boating pollution issues and invasive species were addressed in the draft EIR and the subsequent Implementation Plans.

**First Study Documents Levels of PCBs in Bay Area Building Caulk and Sealants**

SFEI has released a draft of its report on PCBs in caulk and sealants in Bay Area buildings for SFEP’s PCBs in Caulk Project. The report includes the first data on PCB levels in caulk in Bay Area buildings, as well as an estimate of PCB loadings to San Francisco Bay from PCB-containing caulk that is exposed during building demolition or remodeling activities.

PCBs were detected in 88% of the sealant samples collected from Bay Area buildings, with 40% exceeding USEPA’s allowable limit (50 ppm). PCB concentrations ranged from 1 to 220,000 ppm (22%). These data suggest that PCBs are prevalent in currently standing Bay Area buildings constructed or maintained during the period of PCB usage, and are consistent with previous studies that have identified the highest concentrations of PCBs in concrete and masonry buildings built between 1950 and 1980.

The PCBs in Caulk project has also drafted a model management process that incorporates PCB control into demolition permits issued by municipal building departments. The process would require testing caulks for PCBs if buildings meet the age and type criteria, following a PCB Runoff Prevention Plan, and using BMPs to protect water quality during demolition/remodeling activities. If PCB levels in caulk exceeded regulatory limits, building owners would be referred to Federal and state agencies to coordinate cleanups.

PCBs were commonly mixed into building caulk and joint sealants from the 1950s to the 1970s, when EPA banned this practice. Under the TMDL for PCBs in San Francisco Bay, pilot studies are working to identify where PCBs are being released to urban runoff, and how to reduce those loads to the Bay.
Communications

ESTUARY NEWS October Issue
A new issue was released in October, featuring articles about a carbon credit concept for “farming” tules, the tunnel being dug through the South Bay to replace the existing SFPUC drinking water delivery pipelines as part of their system overhaul, and highlights from the September State of the Estuary Conference and State of the Bay report. You can also check it out on our website.

SFEP In the News

Media coverage of the State of the Bay report:

Report on S.F. Bay details progress, problems

Carolyn Jones, Chronicle Staff Writer
September 19, 2011
San Francisco Bay is cleaner than it has been in generations, but increased pumping of freshwater to Central Valley farms threatens to turn parts of the bay into salty, fishless backwaters, according to a comprehensive report to be released today.

"The State of San Francisco Bay," which draws on two years of research, offers a primarily positive snapshot of the bay, from pelicans to plankton. The waterways that sustain and define the region feature more wetlands and less toxins and raw sewage, and are mostly safe to swim in, according to the report.

"As we move more levers, the bay does respond," said Andrew Gunther, lead author of the report, which was published by the San Francisco Estuary Partnership and heavily funded by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. "We can never go back to how the bay was in the early 1800s, but it's pretty clear we're making it a lot better than it was."

Things were not so rosy in the 1940s and 1950s. Developers wanted to fill in much of the bay for houses, and the water smelled so bad from discharges of wastewater and untreated sewage that it was dubbed "Lake Limburger." In Alviso, silver coins would turn brown just from toxic gases, according to the report.

Wetlands successes
Among the biggest improvements since then, the report said, is the transformation of 16,000 acres of salt flats into tidal wetlands, mostly in the South Bay. Wetlands provide homes for nesting and migrating birds, nurseries for fish, and a degree of flood control for the shoreline.

Last week, work crews breached a levee along the Hayward shoreline, allowing bay waters to flow through a 630-acre expanse of salt for the first time in 150 years. Another highlight of the report is the reduction of metals that were once prevalent in the bay. The amount of copper and nickel, for example, dropped by nearly 50 percent from 1995 to 2010 thanks to tightened restrictions on water treatment and industrial discharge.

Residents who live near the bay have also made a difference in its health, the report concluded. Urban water use dropped 20 percent over the past 25 years, even though the Bay Area's population has grown by 20 percent. Meanwhile, record numbers of volunteers help pick up trash and remove nonnative plants. But the report also contains warnings about the bay's future.

Populations of many fish and crustaceans - such as striped bass, bay shrimp, split-tail minnows and long-fin smelt - have plummeted with increased pumping of freshwater from the Sacramento-San Joaquin River Delta to the Central Valley, said report co-author Tina Swanson of the National Resources Defense Council.

"The further upstream you go, the less healthy the bay gets," she said. "We're essentially subjecting the bay to chronic drought conditions, even in wet years."
Dozens of species in San Pablo and Suisun bays rely on a mix of salt water and freshwater, particularly a flush of snowmelt in the spring that signals them to breed or migrate.

Vorster noted that Central Valley farmers aren't the only ones to blame, as Bay Area residents and industries also rely on diversions of freshwater. Still, farmers need to cut back water use - just as Bay Area residents have - for the sake of the bay, he said. Some Central Valley agriculture districts "are just swimming in water, even in dry years," he said.

Fights over agricultural water use have roiled state politics for decades. Told of the report on the health of the bay, a spokeswoman for the Westlands Water District in Fresno, the largest agriculture district in the United States, said cutting such water supplies would lead to other problems.

The less water for farms, the fewer jobs and less revenue for the state's economy, said the spokeswoman, Gayle Holman. Farms in the Westlands district contributed $1 billion to the economy last year, she said. Westlands farmers are already using less water, she said. Last year the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation allowed them 80 percent of what they had been entitled to according to their water rights, she said.

"Every drop of water our farmers use goes directly into producing food and fiber for our nation," she said. "For us, reports like this are very frustrating because we already are cutting back."

Protecting the brand

But the health of the bay has many other economic impacts, according to the report. Fisheries, tourism, property values and overall quality of life are linked to the vitality of the waterways, said Gunther, who directs the Center for Ecosystem Management and Restoration.

Without freshwater, the bay would cease to be an estuary, he said. It would just be an inlet of the Pacific.

"We are, after all, the 'Bay' Area," he said. "It's part of our identity. It's our global brand."

E-mail Carolyn Jones at carolynjones@sfchronicle.com

This article appeared on page A - 1 of the San Francisco Chronicle.

New report: San Francisco Bay getting healthier, not in the clear yet

By Paul Rogers

Like a patient out of intensive care yet still suffering aches, pains and the need for a lot of rehabilitation, San Francisco Bay is on the mend but far from enjoying a clean bill of health.

That's the conclusion of a new report released Monday by a team of scientists studying Northern California's signature natural feature and a broad range of its issues -- from wetlands to wildlife, toxic pollution to trail access.

"The bay's health is definitely getting better. We're making progress," said Andrew Gunther, an environmental scientist and chief author of the "The State of San Francisco Bay 2011." "But we still have a way to go. Starting with the Gold Rush, we had a century of degrading the bay. And we've only been restoring it since the early 1970s."

The report comes out every two years in advance of the biennial State of the Estuary Conference, a scientific and public policy meeting that starts Tuesday at the downtown Oakland Marriott.
Among its key findings this year: The bay is far less polluted now than in the 1950s and 1960s. After Congress passed the Clean Water Act in 1972, billions of dollars were spent, and continue to be spent, upgrading the sewage treatment plants that filter the wastewater of 7 million Bay Area residents and release it into the bay. Modern technology removes up to 99 percent of the pollutants in that wastewater. Meanwhile, toxic substances like DDT and PCBs have been banned, no significant filling of the bay has happened in decades, and in the past two years state regulators have imposed strict new rules requiring Bay Area cities to dramatically reduce the amount of trash that flows down storm drains and creeks into bay waters.

Wetland restoration also is a major bright spot. In the past decade, roughly 10,000 acres of wetlands have been restored, much of it at the former Cargill salt ponds in the South Bay. The bay has roughly 50,000 acres of tidal marsh, up from about 40,000 in 1999, and researchers are working toward a long-term goal of 100,000 acres. Most encouraging, biologists already are seeing increases in birds, and a wide variety of fish, from anchovies to leopard sharks, are turning up in the newly restored wetlands. But there are still major problems.

Among the top problems, according to the report, is the continued diversion of fresh water that would have naturally flowed into the bay. Large dams and pumps that move billions of gallons of water from the Sacramento-San Joaquin River Delta to farms and cities have cut freshwater flows into the bay by 50 percent. That has allowed salty water from the ocean to push farther eastward under the Golden Gate, in significant concentrations up as far as Contra Costa County. That change, which accelerated in the past decade, has been linked to crashing fish populations, said biologist Christina Swanson, one of the report's authors.

"For the past several decades, the bay has been in a state of chronic drought," Swanson said. "Protecting the bay's ecosystem and recovering its fisheries will require changes in water management in the bay's tributary rivers and the Delta to increase freshwater flows, particularly during the spring."

Compared to the 1980s, the abundance of pelagic, or open water, fishes in the past five years was 88 percent lower in Suisun Bay, 68 percent lower in San Pablo Bay, and 55 percent lower in South Bay, the report noted. That information comes from monthly fish surveys done in 35 locations around the bay by state Fish and Game biologists who have used nets to catch and measure fish regularly since 1980.

Other challenges include invasive species, like the overbite clam, which crowd out native species. Tougher regulations requiring ships to empty their ballast water outside the Golden Gate have made a difference, but the bay still has more than 200 nonnative species that in many cases have pushed out or diminished natives.

And there are legacy pollutants left over from the Gold Rush like mercury, which still washes down from closed mines in Santa Clara County and the Sierra Nevada. The bay is slowly flushing more mercury out to the ocean than is put in, but it will take generations before all fish in the bay are safe to eat, particularly for women of childbearing age.

The report, which will be posted at www.sfestuary.org, was prepared by the San Francisco Estuary Partnership, a program of the Association of Bay Area Governments that is funded by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and the state of California.

One major challenge, as state and federal agencies move ahead with restoring 15,100 acres of former Cargill salt ponds, is funding. With budgets tight, future progress may be slow going on that work, and on efforts to expand the Bay Trail, 310 miles of which is completed toward a 500-mile goal.

"San Francisco Bay is at the hub of our economy and our quality of life," said Gunther. "How are we going to keep improving the bay? To get the benefits, we are going to have to make investments."

Contact Paul Rogers at 408-920-5045.
Scientists say San Francisco Bay is healthier

By The Associated Press
5:50 a.m., Sept. 19, 2011

OAKLAND, Calif. — An environmental report says San Francisco Bay is healthier since degradation began during the Gold Rush.

Environmental scientist Andrew Gunther tells the San Jose Mercury News (http://bit.ly/pqQyJx) the San Francisco Bay restoration didn’t begin until the 1970s, more than a century after Gold Rush degradation began.

He says the bay’s health is definitely getting better, with wetlands restoration a bright spot.

But more rehabilitation is needed.

Among the top problems is diversion of fresh water flows. Dams and pumps that move water from the Sacramento-San Joaquin River Delta to farms and cities are cutting flows into the bay 50 percent.

"The State of San Francisco Bay 2011" report was released Monday in advance of the biennial State of the Estuary Conference starting this week at the downtown Oakland Marriott Hotel.

---


The Associated Press

Brown’s Canal Threatens Delta

By Robert Gammon

According to a report released this week by the San Francisco Estuary Partnership, which is funded largely by the US Environmental Protection Agency, the continued diversion of freshwater from the delta, and thus, the bay, is making both more salty and less hospitable to wildlife. The report noted that the bay is cleaner now than it has been over the past few decades, but it also warned that freshwater flows into the bay have been slashed by 50 percent, making it more brackish. The number of open-water fishes found in Suisun Bay is now 88 percent lower in than in the 1980s, 68 percent lower in San Pablo Bay, and 55 percent lower in South Bay, the San Jose Mercury News reported.

---

Bay Was a Stinky Mess

September 20, 2011, 8:32 am • Posted by Amy Standen

SF Bay from space. (Photo: NASA)

Over the weekend, I went camping on Angel Island, which was gorgeous and hot. But we almost never got there. Traffic on the Embarcadero was so packed with bicyclists, farmers’ market customers, bicycle cabs, tourists and joggers, that we almost missed the ferry.

Today, I realized that people flocking to the bay for fun is actually a modern problem. Because 40 years ago the goal was to avoid the San Francisco Bay as much as possible.

That’s because it stank, says Andrew Gunther, executive director for the Center for Ecosystem Management and Restoration, in Oakland. He's the lead author on the State of the San Francisco Bay, (PDF), released on Monday. Gunther and I talked just before the
opening of the 2011 State of the Estuary Conference.

Do you remember what the Bay was like before the Clean Water Act was passed, in 1972?

I moved here in 1980, so I don’t. But my wife’s family is from the Bay Area, and she told me that when she was a girl, they used to drive from Mountain View to visit her grandmother in Berkeley. When they approached the Bay, they’d roll up their windows. In her family the Bay was called Lake Limburger, because of the aroma.

Ah, the sweet smell of raw sewage...

I ran across a reference that in the 1950s, in the Alviso area...if you were to walk by the shore with silver coins in your pocket, they’d turn brown in a matter of minutes...

I agree. In our modern era, where everything happens so fast, people don’t tend to realize that we’ve only been restoring the San Francisco Bay and controlling pollution for 30 to 40 years, whereas -- if you start at the Gold Rush -- we’ve spent a hundred years degrading it. When you look at that time scale, you can see we’re making amazing progress.

But some problems, according to the report, are getting worse. For example, the amount of fresh water in the Bay.

It’s a dynamic. The central bay, by the Golden Gate Bridge, is always a fairly oceanic, salty environment. Then as you move upstream, you move into what we call brackish water environments, and then you get into fresh water. In the spring, that fresh water extends farther into the Bay. Then, in the fall, like right now, the fresh water recedes because there’s less flow from the rivers.

So an estuary has this dynamic pulsing of salt across the year. But as we divert fresh water (for drinking and irrigation, for example) we have a situation where we have less of that dynamic pulsing, and also less total fresh water coming into the estuary. That affects all of the ecological processes and the resident organisms that have evolved for that dynamic system.

Jack Ward Thomas says “Ecosystems aren’t more complicated than we think, they’re more complicated than we can think.” We’ve seen significant decline in the fish populations, particularly in the Suisun and San Pablo Bays. And we’re pretty sure that’s due, at least in part, to the loss of this dynamic of fresh/salty water. And then there are the animals that would eat those fishes, too, so you get this cascade of effects through the food chain.

The 2011 State of the San Francisco Estuary Conference runs through Wednesday, in Oakland.
## Last Year’s Grant Opportunities

### Proposition 84 IRWM Grants 2011 Round 1
- California Department of Water Resources
- **URL**: [http://www.water.ca.gov/irwm/integregio_implementation.cfm](http://www.water.ca.gov/irwm/integregio_implementation.cfm)
- **PDF**: [http://bairwmp.org/docs/Proposition%2084%20Brochure%20v4_9-3-2010.pdf](http://bairwmp.org/docs/Proposition%2084%20Brochure%20v4_9-3-2010.pdf)
- **ID**: 35
- **Updated**: 7/29/2011
- **Ceiling**: $30,000,000.00
- **Due Date**: 1/7/2011

### Bring Back the Natives Grant Program 2011
- National Fish and Wildlife Foundation
- **ID**: 73
- **Updated**: 7/27/2011
- **Ceiling**: $150,000.00
- **Due Date**: 1/14/2011

### San Francisco Bay Area Water Quality Improvement Funds 2011
- Environmental Protection Agency Region 9
- **ID**: 11
- **Updated**: 8/22/2011
- **Ceiling**: $0.00
- **Due Date**: 1/28/2011

### Agricultural Water Enhancement Program (AWEP)
- Natural Resources Conservation Service
- **ID**: 8
- **Updated**: 9/26/2011
- **Ceiling**: $0.00
- **Due Date**: 1/28/2011

### Sacramento District Conservation Fund
- National Fish and Wildlife Foundation
- **ID**: 101
- **Updated**: 9/28/2011
- **Ceiling**: $0.00
- **Due Date**: 1/31/2011

### Five-Star Restoration Program 2011
- National Fish and Wildlife Foundation
- **URL**: [http://www.epa.gov/owow/wetlands/restore/5star/](http://www.epa.gov/owow/wetlands/restore/5star/)
- **ID**: 78
- **Updated**: 7/27/2011
- **Ceiling**: $40,000.00
- **Due Date**: 2/14/2011
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Ceiling</th>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Updated</th>
<th>Due Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resource Conservation Funds 2009</td>
<td>$100,000.00</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7/29/2011</td>
<td>2/20/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source Reduction Assistance Grant Program</td>
<td>$130,000.00</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>7/27/2011</td>
<td>2/24/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estuary Habitat Restoration Program</td>
<td>$1,000,000.00</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>7/29/2011</td>
<td>3/10/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Waters Capacity-Building Grants</td>
<td>$70,000.00</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>7/29/2011</td>
<td>3/14/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Enhancement Implementation Grant</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7/29/2011</td>
<td>3/15/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trail and Open Space Grant</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>7/29/2011</td>
<td>3/15/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant Program</td>
<td>Ceiling</td>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Updated</td>
<td>Due Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watershed Stewardship Grant</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>8/22/2011</td>
<td>3/15/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisheries Restoration Grant Program</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>7/29/2011</td>
<td>3/15/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Estuarine Research Reserve System</td>
<td>$900,000.00</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>7/29/2011</td>
<td>3/24/2011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Upcoming Grant Opportunities

Sorted by due date with the earliest dates first. Grants with a continuous cycle are grouped at the end.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grant Program</th>
<th>Ceiling</th>
<th>Due Date</th>
<th>URL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coastal Impact Assistance Program (CIAP) for Non-Construction</td>
<td>$4,000,000.00</td>
<td>12/31/2011</td>
<td><a href="http://www.grants.gov/search/search.do;jsessionid=yffcTktJScDcPhnKhPrLpGc2ZC0nr9Myilj6Mn8xtGn2Sz8h">http://www.grants.gov/search/search.do;jsessionid=yffcTktJScDcPhnKhPrLpGc2ZC0nr9Myilj6Mn8xtGn2Sz8h</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal Impact Assistance Program (CIAP) for Construction</td>
<td>$4,000,000.00</td>
<td>12/31/2011</td>
<td><a href="http://www.federalgrants.com/Coastal-Impact-Assistance-Program-CIAP-for-Construction-California-Recipient">http://www.federalgrants.com/Coastal-Impact-Assistance-Program-CIAP-for-Construction-California-Recipient</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal Program at San Francisco Bay</td>
<td>$50,000.00</td>
<td>12/31/2011</td>
<td><a href="http://www.fws.gov/sacramento/cp/cp_coastal-prog.htm">http://www.fws.gov/sacramento/cp/cp_coastal-prog.htm</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Rivers</td>
<td>$100,000.00</td>
<td>12/1/2011</td>
<td><a href="http://www.americanrivers.org/our-work/restoring-rivers/dams/background/noaa-grants-program.html">http://www.americanrivers.org/our-work/restoring-rivers/dams/background/noaa-grants-program.html</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Engineering program</td>
<td>$110,000.00</td>
<td>2/17/2012</td>
<td><a href="http://www.nsf.gov/funding/pgm_summ.jsp?pims_id=501029">http://www.nsf.gov/funding/pgm_summ.jsp?pims_id=501029</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Sustainability</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>2/17/2012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Title</td>
<td>Ceiling</td>
<td>Due Date</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneficial Uses of Dredged Material (CAP Section 204)</td>
<td>$18,000,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquatic Ecosystem Restoration (CAP Section 206)</td>
<td>$5,000,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clean Water State Revolving Fund Program (CWSRF)</td>
<td>$300,000,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clean Beaches Initiative (Prop 84)</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ocean Protection Council Grants</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Army Corps of Engineers - Sections 1135 &amp; 206</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development Assistance Programs</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Beneficial Uses of Dredged Material (CAP Section 204)**

Army Corps of Engineers


**ID** 72 | Updated: 7/27/2011 | Ceiling $18,000,000.00 | Due Date:  

**Aquatic Ecosystem Restoration (CAP Section 206)**

Army Corps of Engineers


**ID** 70 | Updated: 9/26/2011 | Ceiling $5,000,000.00 | Due Date:  

**Clean Water State Revolving Fund Program (CWSRF)**

State Water Resources Control Board


**PDF** [http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/grants_loans/srf/docs/forms/app_w_instructns.pdf](http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/grants_loans/srf/docs/forms/app_w_instructns.pdf)

**ID** 38 | Updated: 7/29/2011 | Ceiling $300,000,000.00 | Due Date:  

**Clean Beaches Initiative (Prop 84)**

State Water Resources Control Board


**PDF**

**ID** 34 | Updated: 7/29/2011 | Ceiling $0.00 | Due Date:  

**Ocean Protection Council Grants**

Ocean Protection Council

**URL** [http://www.opc.ca.gov/category/funding-opportunities/](http://www.opc.ca.gov/category/funding-opportunities/)

**PDF**

**ID** 33 | Updated: 7/29/2011 | Ceiling $0.00 | Due Date:  

**Army Corps of Engineers - Sections 1135 & 206**

Army Corps of Engineers


**PDF**

**ID** 21 | Updated: 9/22/2010 | Ceiling $0.00 | Due Date:  

**Economic Development Assistance Programs**

Economic Development Administration


**PDF** [http://www.eda.gov/PDF/FY%202011%20EDAP%20FFO-FINAL.pdf](http://www.eda.gov/PDF/FY%202011%20EDAP%20FFO-FINAL.pdf)

**ID** 44 | Updated: 7/29/2011 | Ceiling $0.00 | Due Date: 3/10/2011
Implementation Committee
Meeting Dates
2012

Wednesday, February 29, 2012, 9:30am-12:30pm
Wednesday, May 23, 2012, 9:30am-12:30pm
Wednesday, August 22, 2012, 9:30am-12:30pm
Wednesday, November 28, 2012, 9:30am-12:30pm

Location: 1515 Clay Street, 2nd Floor - Room 15, Oakland, CA
Several members of the implementation committee expressed the desire to have a clearer “road map” of what the IC will be doing over the next calendar year: what we will work on together, and what we hope to accomplish as a body. We drafted this document for discussion, as a way to give you an opportunity for input early on into 2012 meetings. The outline below is a starting point for further discussion at the November meeting. With your input, we plan to fill these in with expected agency actions, grant opportunities, potential collaborations, and more.

**IC 2012 Road Map**

**February 29, 2012**
- State of the Bay Report Next Steps: How do we improve scores? What do we focus on?
- Presentation on State of the Birds Report
- Draft SFEP Work Plan 2012-2013
- Chair and Vice Chair election
- Claire Thorp presentation on NFWF
- Oil Spill response and restoration: Cosco Busan DARP presentation by trustee agencies on what has changed and preparation for response to the next spill
- Regional, state, and federal funding: state funding for water resources, outlook for federal appropriations and authorizations for DOI, Corps, EPA
- Standing item: Upcoming known funding opportunities
- …

**May 23, 2012**
- Final SFEP Work Plan 2012-2013
- Chair and Vice-Chair new term begins
- Potential in-depth discussions of America’s Cup
- Delta decisions: briefing and discussion on how the IC wants to be involved
- Regional outreach brand update and Action
- Regional, state, and federal funding: SFBRA outlook for 2014/2016
- Standing item: Upcoming known funding opportunities
- …

**August 22, 2012**
- Standing item: Upcoming known funding opportunities
- …

**November 28, 2012**
- Standing item: Upcoming known funding opportunities
- …
Proposal to Develop a California Estuaries Portal
Initially Focused on the San Francisco Bay-Delta Estuary

The Problem

The San Francisco Bay-Delta is the state’s largest and most important estuary. Many state, federal and local agencies, regulated dischargers, and water bond grant recipients spend millions of dollars each year monitoring, assessing and reporting on the condition of the San Francisco Bay-Delta estuary ecosystem. While some coordination efforts currently exist—including the Interagency Ecological Program (IEP, since 1970), the San Francisco Bay Regional Monitoring Program (Bay RMP, since 1993) and an emerging Delta RMP—there is currently no overall structure to coordinate all of these activities nor a universally agreed upon way to integrate the data and information gained from these activities into a coherent ecosystem health assessment. At present, the specific mandates of each agency/organization result in inconsistent monitoring objectives and methods to collect, assess, and manage the data, making it difficult to integrate data from different studies and sources. What is more, there is no single user-friendly place to access the data.

The Monitoring Council’s Solution

To directly address such problems, California Senate Bill 1070 mandated that the California Environmental Protection Agency and the California Natural Resources Agency enter into a Memorandum of Understanding to establish the California Water Quality Monitoring Council. The Monitoring Council has developed recommendations, accepted by the two Agency Secretaries, that include a bold new vision. The best way to coordinate, integrate and enhance California’s water quality and related ecosystem monitoring, assessment and reporting efforts is first to provide a platform for intuitive, streamlined access to water quality and ecosystem health information that directly addresses users’ questions. Theme-specific workgroups, under the overarching guidance of the Monitoring Council, evaluate existing monitoring, assessment and reporting efforts and work to enhance those efforts so as to improve the delivery of water quality and ecosystem health information to the user, in the form of theme-based internet portals. To date, a number of theme-specific workgroups and portals have been created. Their efforts clearly demonstrate that the Monitoring Council’s vision is, in deed, correct.

Needs Identified

The need for a workgroup and a portal focused on delivering answers to users’ questions about the San Francisco Bay-Delta Estuary has already been identified.

- The Water Boards’ Strategic Workplan for the San Francisco Bay/Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Estuary identified the need for a comprehensive water quality monitoring program for the Delta, with the short-term goal of compiling existing data sets and regularly assessing and reporting, and a long-term goal of comprehensively coordinating water quality monitoring in the Delta to ensure most efficient use of resources and regular assessment and reporting. The Delta RMP is forming to address this need. At the Delta RMP kick-off meeting, stakeholders identified several needs for data compilation, analysis and reporting:
  - Agreed upon assessment questions that drive the assessment and reporting process and ultimately design of the RMP
  - A scientifically credible process, in which stakeholders can participate, to ensure that data are appropriately assessed, interpreted, and reported
  - Ensure that data are accessible
  - Ensure that when data from multiple sources are integrated, it is appropriate to do so
  - An appropriate level of QA/QC that will ensure that data are of a quality needed to answer the assessment questions
• A recent contaminant synthesis report, *Evaluation of Chemical, Toxicological, and Histopathologic Data to determine their role in the Pelagic Organism Decline* (Johnson et al, 2010) commissioned by the Central Valley Regional Water Board and recently published by UC Davis, stated, "[u]ntil such time as a single monitoring program is put into place that frames sample collection for multiple ecological and taxonomic parameters in a biologically meaningful way, future discussions of contaminant-related issues will end in disappointment." The report recommended that "[t]he long term monitoring program should have ongoing data interpretation and analysis as a co-equal goal along with sampling and analysis" and that "[d]ata from all water quality data generators in the Delta should be submitted to the State’s Regional Data Center in SWAMP-comparable format."

• The IEP Coordinators and Lead Scientist recently raised several needs to the IEP Directors regarding the future of the program. The team identified three overarching science activities in need of immediate improvement:
  o Data management and accessibility
  o Analysis, synthesis, assessment, and communication
  o Modeling

Options for program adaptation were divided into four categories:
  o Broadening the geographic scope of the program to include water bodies upstream and downstream of the Delta
  o Broadening the scope to include shallow water and riparian habitats
  o Incorporating additional mandates, plans and initiatives, including coordination with the Water Board’s Bay-Delta Strategic Workplan and the Monitoring Council
  o Additional science activities, including ecological status and trends monitoring, monitoring tool development, reporting and communication, and improving science interaction and cooperation

**A California Estuaries Portal and Workgroup**

Greater efficiency and effectiveness can be achieved through integration of existing programs and coordination efforts. The Monitoring Council has already identified the need for a California Estuaries portal, and an underlying workgroup, devoted to the health of California estuarine ecosystems. The California Estuary Monitoring Workgroup would initially focus its efforts on our largest and most important estuary, the San Francisco Bay-Delta. Such a workgroup, sponsored by the Monitoring Council, would be tasked with identifying key questions to assess the ecological health of the San Francisco Estuary, the data and methods available and needed to address the questions, and the methods to access, display, and work with the data and information through a new California Estuaries Portal, linked from the *My Water Quality* website (www.CaWaterQuality.net). The workgroup would also identify redundancies, data gaps and inefficiencies in the current monitoring activities and develop solutions for improvements. Finally, this workgroup would interact with other Monitoring Council workgroups to gain access to additional data, information and tools, so as to permit even more comprehensive assessments of water quality and ecosystem health in California. The many benefits to all players of the new California Estuary Monitoring Workgroup include:

• Identifying monitoring and related activities already underway that address the needs of each member
• Integrating data on biology, contaminants, and flow and making it available for multiple purposes
• Identifying issues related to QA/QC and data comparability
• Identifying and refining assessment questions to address the needs of agency decision makers, legislators, agency staff, scientists, and the public
• Ensuring a transparent process through workgroup structure and function
• Partnering with other Monitoring Council workgroups, such as the California Wetlands Monitoring Workgroup and the Healthy Streams Partnership, to gain access to additional data types

**Workgroup Membership**

*Organizations currently coordinated through the Interagency Ecological Program:*

- California Department of Water Resources (Division of Environmental Services)
- California Department of Fish and Game (Bay-Delta Region)
- California State Water Resources Control Board (Water Rights)
- U.S. Geological Survey (California Water Science Center)
- U.S. Bureau of Reclamation (Central Valley Operations Office and Delta Division)
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Stockton Fish & Wildlife Service Office)
- U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
- U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

*Other Programs and Organizations:*

- San Francisco Bay Regional Monitoring Program
  - San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board
  - San Francisco Estuary Institute
- Delta Regional Monitoring Program
  - Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board
- Delta Stewardship Council - Delta Science Program
- California Department of Water Resources
  - Municipal Water Quality Investigations
  - Central District Surface Water Monitoring
- California Department of Fish and Game
  - Biogeographic Information and Observation System
- Delta Protection Commission
- Delta Conservancy
- San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission
- State and Federal Water Contractors Agency – SFWC Science Program

September 30, 2010
1. Introductions
   Tom Mumley, Chair of the Implementation Committee, called the meeting to order at 9:35 am with a round of introductions. There were no questions on the Agenda. The Meeting Summary for August 25, 2010 was approved.

2. Public Comments
   There were no public comments.

3. Director’s Report
   Judy Kelly, Director, noted some highlights from the Director’s Report.
   a) SFEP continues to pursue an array of funding sources for CCMP implementation projects.
   b) The Subtidal Habitat Goals team is close to issuing the Final Subtidal Habitat Goals Report; it is due in January 2011 and will have its own website.
   c) Karen McDowell is attending the ANS (Aquatic Nuisance Species) Task Force annual meeting in the Washington DC area and has just been voted the Chair of the Western Regional Panel of ANS. SFEP has been heavily engaged in work on aquatic invasive species for many years.
   d) The Bay-Delta Science Conference which SFEP coordinates on behalf of the Bay-Delta Science Program was held in Sacramento in September and attendance was very good despite economic factors. Abstracts will be posted on the conference website.
   e) SFEP has begun planning for the 2011 State of the Estuary Conference. There will be additional discussion later on the conference. We have a contract with the Oakland Marriott for space and are considering reducing the conference to 2 rather than 3 days. In partnership with The Bay Institute a kickoff at the Aquarium of the Bay will be held the night before the conference starts.
   f) Judy and some staff will be out of the office next week at the ANEP (Association of National Estuary Programs) fall meeting in Florida.
   g) The initial polling for the San Francisco Bay Restoration Authority was completed. Some highlights included support for a ballot measure to fund restoration. It was pointed out that polling is quite abstract versus concrete voting on new taxes, and the economy is still questionable.
   h) A handout with proposed meeting dates for the IC for next year was discussed. The February date is problematic for Tom Mumley bringing up the question of should there be a rotating Vice Chair for the IC. Judy stated under the Strategic Plan there is an action to look at the operating procedures for the IC. Susan Adams noted that the California Association of Counties has its statewide meeting in November in San Francisco and asked that we avoid those dates.

4. SFEP Activities
   a) Status of Strategic Plan Implementation—Judy reported there has been progress on a number of objectives of the plan. Under Goal 2 Objective, there was a meeting of the Executive Council on May 13 at which they endorsed the Strategic Plan. The Steering Committee is under development.
Susan Adams asked about the status of the Speier bill and of the San Pablo Bay funding. Judy stated there was a difference at the moment between the House/Senate bills. The Senate bill initially had no funding spelled out, but Senator Feinstein recently amended to include $35 million/year for 10 years for the SF Estuary as part of the Great Waters bill. Supervisor Adams noted she would be attending the National Association of Counties (NACo) conference in Washington the first week of March and asked who she should speak to about the bill.

Peter LaCivita will inquire about the San Pablo Bay funding.

Judy mentioned, in advance of Andy Gunther’s agenda item on the new State of the Bay report, that examples of State of the Bay/State of the Estuary reports from other estuary programs were displayed on the back table. She requested feedback from IC members regarding content and visual display.

b) SFEP Green Stormwater Spine Project
We are fleshing out the details for this proposed grant project to construct stormwater treatment facilities in seven cities along San Pablo Avenue. Each city would design their own project with the goal of treating one acre of impervious surface. CalTrans is giving $1.8 million for construction of the projects. Tom noted retrofitting can be part of their mitigation for stormwater treatment on projects that could not have onsite treatment due to right-of-way or other issues. There is currently a deficit due to the new Bay Bridge and the Macarthur Maze reconstruction. 404 permits require avoidance/mitigation for approval. The Board can leverage multiple projects’ mitigation requirements: every construction project is required to do stormwater mitigation and when it cannot be done onsite, then it can be done on artery streets that are state roads such as San Pablo Ave.

Lisa also noted she is organizing a Green Streets Forum in February for planners and designers to demonstrate engineering innovations in design. It will be held at the El Cerrito City Hall on February 16, 2011, and there is space for up to 300 attendees. SFEP also received a small grant from the Alameda Countywide Clean Water Program to construct a rain garden on Cordonices Creek.

Lisa also gave an update on the current EPA RFP; it includes a remaining amount of $2 million from the 2010 appropriation for the San Francisco Bay Water Quality Improvement Fund. It will be open for 90 days. The RFP is available on the Region 9 website. Deadline is January 28. Projects can range from $500,000 to $1.5 million. The 2011 appropriation remains unknown. There is a possibility those funds will be dedicated to certain project types. Some applicants for the 2010 funds may include Ducks Unlimited for Culllinan Ranch restoration, Marin County, and the City of San Jose.

c) State of the Bay Report
Andy Gunther, CEMAR, is leading the San Francisco Indicators Consortium (SFEP, SFEI, TBI, and PRBO) on developing the report for the 2011 State of the Estuary Conference and gave a presentation on the status.

Citizens of the Bay Area need a comprehensive assessment of how the Bay is doing. There is a need to inform, and a need for a science-based assessment to answer the subjective questions: Is it healthy? Are things getting better or worse? Those questions spur further questions: What “things”? What’s “better”? What are the benchmark/reference conditions? Report development is keeping these needs in mind:

- The report needs to be scientifically defensible, with high quality data systematically organized.
- The report needs to be publicly meaningful.
- The report needs to be cost effective.
The report needs a transparent methodology.
The report needs to be well documented for future reference, so that its data can be reviewed over time and re-examined.

Two Important Caveats:
• Understanding the state of the system does not explain the source of the problems
• Both natural variability and human impacts are confounding factors

Process:
• Indicator review/selection
• Reference condition/benchmark
• Indicator/index calculation
• Comparison to benchmark/develop method of scoring
• Peer review

The group is currently completing a DWR-funded project to review indicators, gather data, and categorize indicators by the watershed assessment framework. Some examples of categories and proposed indicators:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Landscape</td>
<td>Extent of wetland/riparian cover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydrology</td>
<td>Spring freshwater flow; trends in flood peaks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biota</td>
<td>Fish community index, bird community index, and invertebrates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stewardship</td>
<td>Recycled water use, steelhead smolt production</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pollution</td>
<td>Water quality index, sediment quality index</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Products for the State of the Bay effort would include a technical appendix; a practitioner’s report; and a one page “report card”; there will also be a large data archive. The project team intends to hyperlink the published web content with additional drill-down data.

Questions and comments included:
Mark Green, Mayor of Union City and ABAG President noted there is only one indicator his constituency is interested in: Fishing/harvesting. I.e., can you eat anything from the Bay? It was noted the Bay is listed as impaired for eating certain types of fish.

Rick Morat noted the Delta has gone through a regime change. Regarding the public’s desire to know whether things are things getting better or worse; he felt different report cards should be pitched to different segments of the public.

Susan Adams wanted to know about the diversity of biological species and what is the ratio of invasives vs native species? Also, how is sea level rise being addressed?

Amy Hutzel repeated that the ability to eat food from the Bay is a key indicator. She also would like an indicator on accessibility to the Bay—such as the amount of Bay Trail constructed. She also felt sea level rise to be an important indicator as well as the volume of sediment available for existing and restored wetlands. She noted reduced sediment input and the reuse of dredged material. The sediment issues, quantity, extent of mudflats are important. A new sediment management plan is now under development.

Luisa asked about the new inter-agency group on sediment management; Tom Mumley stated the effort is just beginning. The amounts of dredged material over time can be found on the LTMS website.

Melody Tovar felt the objective of the report was not clear. Is it to help agencies make management decisions and get people to support those decisions? She felt the purpose needed to be better described and the audience engaged early.
There was discussion of the report as a bridge between regulatory and science effort; the geographic variability of the Bay; indicators of how people use the Bay; building environmental capital; the value of natural resources; stewardship—number of swimmer days; number of fishing licenses.

Leo Winternitz suggested tributary watersheds as a possible indicator; the percent of stream with in-stream flow standards. 3% have protective flow standards. How will the report be used? Consider the state of the system or the causes and sources of issues. Andy responded the intent is to focus on the state of the system rather than a focus on stressors.

Susan Adams felt it should be beneficial as a tool to request more funding. Marc Holmes noted the release at the Aquarium of the Bay kickoff planned for the 2011 State of the Estuary Conference will start a campaign for publicity. Beth thought there should be an endangered species indicator.

Rick Morat noted that the objective is clear; public information generates public opinion which shapes public policy.

IC members were encouraged to email Andy or Judy with additional ideas.

d) 2011 State of the Estuary Conference
The 2011 State of the Estuary Conference will be held on Tuesday, September 20 and Wednesday, September 21 in Oakland. (Mark Green noted the League of California Cities meets Wed-Thurs-Fri in San Francisco.) A number of IC members are serving on the SOE Coordinating Committee: Amy Hutzel, Leo Winternitz, Luisa Valiela, Beth Huning. Athena (filling in for Karen) asked that members who had speaker suggestions or keynote speaker suggestions or session topics should send them to Karen.

Keynote speaker suggestions:
- Dianne Feinstein
- Phil Isenberg
- Tom Philip (Sacramento Bee reporter)
- the Director of the MWD
- Jerry Brown
- Jared Diamond
- Jared Huffman

Theme suggestions:
- the Bay Restoration Authority proposed initiative for a benefit assessment district
- usage of the Bay (fishing, swimming, accessibility, Bay Trail is 500 miles short, health, recreation)
- beneficial uses for fish, wildlife, people
- regional perspective on sustainable community
- a focus on diversity (outreach for a diverse audience)
- sea level rise/wetland connection
- long range planning/infrastructure
- over-appropriation of water supply
- tribute to Stephen Schneider
- To start with: State of the Estuary; Enhancing Our Estuary for Future Generations.
5. Programs of IC Members-Amy Chastain, Executive Director, BACWA
BACWA is a joint-powers authority of the five largest wastewater agencies in the Bay Area: San Francisco PUC, City of San Jose, Central Contra Costa Sanitary District, East Bay Municipal Utility District, and East Bay Dischargers Authority. There are over 60 members consisting of POTWs, collection systems, etc. They have seven standing committees on topics such as pollution prevention, biosolids, recycled water. Amy would like BACWA to be thought of as a resource. The past focus was the era of toxics (mercury, PCBs, copper). The organization now focuses on energy, bio-gas, climate change, nutrients (impacts of ammonia), and green chemistry/product stewardship. There is also a big move toward revised wastewater master plans. Amy stated there was opportunity for collaboration on indicators, recycled water, etc.

6. Agenda Items for February, 2011, IC Meeting
Judy will have an initial draft of the FFY 2012 Work Plan, and there will be updates on the SOE Report and Conference. Please send Judy ideas for future meetings. It was suggested to address the status of water in the State, and Beth Huning will give an update on joint venture restoration priorities.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:25 pm.
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