



SAN FRANCISCO ESTUARY PARTNERSHIP

CCMP Revision HABITAT Subcommittee Meeting #1

Tuesday, September 9, 2014, 1:30-3:30 pm
1515 Clay Street, 14th Floor, Room 1411, Oakland, CA

MEETING SUMMARY

Attendees: Harry Seraydarian, Arthur Feinstein, Barbara Salzman, Luisa Valiela, Jeremy Lowe, Jessica Martini-Lamb, Anne Morkill, Steve Goldbeck, Marilyn Latta, Beth Hunning, Marc Holmes, Jessica Davenport (on phone)
SFEP Staff: Judy Kelly, Caitlin Sweeney, Josh Bradt, Jesse Mills, Adrien Baudrimont

1. Welcome and Introductions

2. Background on CCMP Revision

Caitlin Sweeney provided an overview of the CCMP revision process, including overall objectives, structure, process, and schedule

3. Subcommittee Meetings Timeline and Outcomes

Caitlin went over the handout sent to the Subcommittee members regarding the timelines and objectives for the upcoming subcommittee meetings.

4. Subcommittee Ground Rules

Caitlin presented the following ground rules for the Subcommittee meetings:

- Meetings will begin and end on time
- Come prepared – read materials in advance and come ready to contribute
- One person speaks at a time
- Members represent interests of agencies and organizations and are responsible for internal briefings, etc.
- Respect completed decisions
- Operate on consensus – seek general agreement all can “live with”

5. CCMP Revised Goals

Josh Bradt presented background on the new CCMP structure and defined goals, objectives and actions (referencing the CCMP Framework document that was emailed to Subcommittee members). Josh explained the objective of the agenda item was to develop 1-3 goals for the Habitat Topic Area of the CCMP, and provided some background information on sources for possible goal language, including other NEPs, SFEP’s Strategic Plan, the 1993 CCMP Mission Statements, and the 2007 CCMP goals.

The Subcommittee had a discussion on the definition of “habitat,” what elements of the definition of habitat should be included in the goals versus other areas of the document.

The Subcommittee agreed that the goal should not include a list of habitat types but that the CCMP would define habitats somewhere in the document. SFEP staff will propose an inclusive definition of habitat types for review by the Subcommittee, drawing from other documents such as the State of the Bay report, the Subtidal, Baylands and Upland Goals reports, and others.

Josh led the Subcommittee through a short brainstorming exercise where Subcommittee members were asked to list four responses to the statement: “The Bay-Delta Estuary habitats suffer from_____.” The results of that brainstorm are captured below. Some items were mentioned multiple times.

- Development
- Non-beneficial fill
- Pollution
- Lack of freshwater flows
- Public access
- Funding
- Challenging regulatory processes
- Lack of habitat integration
- Habitat Loss
- Lack of education
- Climate change impacts
- Lack of knowledge/tools at local government level
- Lack of sediment (where we need it)
- Lack of tidal energy/constrained ecosystem energy
- Decreased resilience
- Timing of freshwater flows
- Contaminants
- Invasive species
- Conflicting use of water
- Floodplain/wastewater mgmt.
- Extreme weather events

The next brainstorm was in response to the statement: “The Bay-Delta Estuary habitats should (be)_____.” Those results are as follows (again, some items were mentioned multiple times):

- Adjusting to drivers of change
- Interconnected
- Connectivity across and along shoreline – more complete habitat/ecotone
- Large parcels
- Accommodation for sea level rise
- Connectivity between watersheds and marshes
- All available habitats are acquired and restored
- Interconnected and functioning
- Protected and appreciated
- Economically valued
- Dynamic/ever changing

- Sustain species diversity (re: climate change – how much effort do we put in to preserving species)
- Maintain habitat diversity
- Figured out what we want to do
- Protect and restore large and small parcels – complete marsh habitats
- Maintain native species diversity
- Adequate flows
- Less pollution
- Cleaner stormwater
- Green infrastructure - multiple functions
- Have a restoration authority in place
- Increasing resiliency – more space beyond present footprint, more sediment, more water
- Gradients – need to diversify topographic and salinity gradients
- Make sure the habitats are there for those species – maintain (and set up to adapt) diversity of habitats
- Anticipating climate change (broadly)
- Balance of habitats – don't lose habitats
- Structural integrity
- Delta Stewardship Council's Vision in Delta Plan (pages 119-120)
- Need to be setting up habitats that are going to be resilient to future conditions – systems that can respond

Josh then presented a straw proposal for a goal for the Habitats Topic Area as a starting point for the group to develop one or more working goals. The goal(s) will be revisited for possible refinement later in the process.

The Subcommittee agreed to the following working goal for the Habitats Topic Area:

Expand, improve, and maintain the diverse terrestrial and aquatic habitats of a self-sustaining SF Bay-Delta Estuary

6. Next Steps

SFEP staff will send out meeting summary and doodle poll for next meeting.

SFEP staff will create a webpage to for Subcommittee members to access CCMP revision documents and information.