



## **SAN FRANCISCO ESTUARY PARTNERSHIP**

### **CCMP Revision LIVING RESOURCES Subcommittee Meeting #1**

Friday, September 12, 2014, 10:00 am-12:00 pm  
1515 Clay Street, 14th Floor, Room 1411, Oakland, CA

## **MEETING SUMMARY**

Attendees: David Woodbury, Grant Ballard, Gordon Becker, Arthur Feinstein, Beth Huning, Marc Holmes (on phone)

SFEP Staff: Judy Kelly, Caitlin Sweeney, Josh Bradt, Karen McDowell

### **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 is to develop 1-3 goals for the Living Resources 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.

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 living resources suffer from\_\_\_\_\_.” The results of the brainstorm are captured below. Several of the items were mentioned multiple times:

- Non-Native Species
- Altered Water Flow
- Contaminants
- Loss of Wetlands/Habitat (urbanization)
- Cats
- Lack of Sediment
- Too many stakeholders
- Changing Habitats
- Declining Habitat quality
- Displacement
- Nuisance Native Species (ex., Gulls)
- Sea Level Rise
- Extreme Weather
- Over impairment of water resources (ratio of what you take to supply)
- Encroachment on key habitats
- Habitat conversion to farmland
- Lack of Management and Enforcement
- Migratory Impediments (culverts and dams) Fish, but also true for larger mammals
- Lack of public awareness on all above issues
- Lack of public caring
- Lack of Funding
- USACE/EPA/FEMA - no nature based solutions to flood control
- Habitat fragmentation/ lack of connectivity

The next brainstorm was in response to the following statement: “The Bay-Delta Estuary living resources should (be)\_\_\_\_\_.” The results of that brainstorm are captured below. Again, some items were mentioned multiple times.

- Living resources should be in viable & (resilient adaptable and stable) population sizes
- Considered in development decisions
- Provided basic habitat needs
- Funded through ongoing revenue means
- Native species flourish
- Endangered/listed species are recovered
- Seasonal closers or protected areas for sensitive species or high densities of species
- Supporting cats indoors program
- LR should be inspirational, source of happiness, and sense of well being
- No loss of biodiversity
- Ecosystem services are functional and recognized
- Eatable fish, rid of toxins
- A delta that functions of a delta
- Natural Flow Regime
- Don’t give up on species

Josh then presented a straw proposal for a goal for the Living Resources 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 Living Resources Topic Area, with the acknowledgement that there may be further discussion and revisions specifically regarding use of the term “natural communities”:*

**Sustain and improve the natural communities of the Bay-Delta Estuary, including its tributary watersheds and surrounding wetlands**

#### **6. Next Steps**

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

SFEP staff will set up a web page for Subcommittee members to access documents and information relevant to the CCMP revision process.