

## CCMP REVISION

### Instructions for Subcommittee Meeting #3

Thank you all for your great work over the past few months. We are making significant progress towards a new CCMP. SFEP staff will continue to work with the draft content generated thus far, both in the Subcommittee meetings and through correspondence between meetings.

For the next Subcommittee meeting, we will put aside the discussion on goals and objectives to focus instead on **actions**. Turning our attention for the next 1-2 meetings to the short-term (5 year) task-based action level will generate critical material as the foundational output we can circle back to for revising/refining the objectives and goals. Some of us are goal-based top-down thinkers and some of us are output-based bottom up thinkers. This approach of beginning with goals and objectives, turning our attention to actions, then circling back to goals and objectives will provide a framework that supports both the top-down and bottom-up approaches and will generate a suite of content that SFEP can then organize and bring back to the Subcommittees as a comprehensive proposal.

To prepare for the next Subcommittee meeting, we are asking you to send us your ideas for actions in advance (specific instructions below).

The following may help you in generating your ideas for actions:

- Remember that the definition of an action is a task or set of tasks/strategy to meet an objective (it is fine if your Subcommittee has not yet agreed on objectives). Actions are achievable within 5 years and have a measurable outcome.
- The State of the Bay report provides a structure for assessing the health of the Bay through measurable indicators. The indicators in the State of the Bay report were selected because they are meaningful and relevant, consistent with the scientific understanding of the ecosystem, and can be measured with existing, reliable data. Please refer to Table 1 in the introduction of the report ([http://sfep.sfei.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/12/3Intro\\_SOB2011.pdf](http://sfep.sfei.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/12/3Intro_SOB2011.pdf)) for a list of indicators. Each indicator also includes a benchmark against which to compare the measured values of the indicator.

**To the extent possible and desirable, the CCMP should include actions in response to the status and trends of the indicators in the State of the Bay Report. When crafting your actions, please refer to the indicators and benchmarks. However, please do not feel limited by the indicators or the benchmarks. Your suggested actions may go beyond the indicators in the report or may be oriented towards a more aggressive target than the benchmark in the report.**

The 2015 version of the report will expand those Bay indicators to the Delta where possible and will also add new indicators. Though the new indicators are still being finalized, the likely list includes:

- Habitat: Subtidal indicators – regional extent of native eelgrass and oyster beds
- Habitat: Gulf of the Farallones – dissolved oxygen indicator
- Habitat: Baylands – New Bay watershed indicator, Delta riparian forest indicator
- Living Resources: Ridgway's Rails
- Living Resources: Harbor seal abundance
- Ecological Processes: Food Web – Brandt's Cormorant reproductive success
- Ecological Processes Climate change indicator – available baylands migration space

SFEP staff will continue to inform the Subcommittee members' of the status of updated and new indicators and benchmarks for the 2015 State of the Estuary Report.

- You may wish to refer to Table A in the meeting packet for Meeting #2. Table A includes the sources for the draft objectives SFEP staff generated, and includes many actions from various sources (including the 2007 CCMP, the Subcommittee brainstorm and the State of the Estuary Report). The meeting packet for Meeting #2 is on the Subcommittee Resources webpage (<http://www.sfestuary.org/ccmprevisionsubcommitteeresources/>). Scroll down to the name of your Subcommittee, click on the "Meeting 2" tab, and click on "Meeting Packet")

## SPECIFIC INSTRUCTIONS

By **Friday, January 23rd**, please email Caitlin a list of your **top 3-5 suggested actions** (if you absolutely can't limit yourself to 5 actions, then feel free to add more). Your suggested actions should be in the following format:

1. 1-3 sentences describing the action
2. The measurable output of the action within 5 years (i.e., how will we track success of the action? What is the desired outcome?)
3. Suggested owner of the action (who will be responsible for *implementing* the action?)
4. Why is this action a priority? (What makes it a significant issue? What critical need will it help meet? How does it respond to the health of the Estuary as measured by the indicators in the State of the Bay Report?)

SFEP staff will collect and organize all suggestions (which may also include important actions from SFEP's perspective for consideration) and will send out a compiled list of actions prior to the next Subcommittee meeting.

## **ACTION EXAMPLES**

Below we have provided 3 examples, one from each Topic Area, to give you an idea of the structure and level of detail we are looking for.

### **WATER**

**Recycling** (element discussed in “Water” Subcommittee but included under “Stewardship” in State of Bay Report)- fits under staff draft objective-Improve management of water demand

- 1) Wastewater and water agencies will collaborate and increase Bay Area recycling to 63 thousand acre feet (or 160 thousand acre feet) by 2021 and develop a long term strategy to reach 270 TAF by 2035.
- 2) Desired outcome is an increase in recycled water by 2021 at least equal to increase from 2001-2010 (target could be higher based on analysis of progress since 2010) and a firm commitment (output) to reaching potential of 270 TAF already identified by 2035.
- 3) Owners should be Bay Area Clean Water Agencies (BACWA) and Bay Area Water Agencies Coalition ( BAWAC)
- 4) This element of managing water demand is included in State of the Bay Report (page 60), highlighted in California’s Water Action Plan and included as a new funding category in Prop 1.

### **HABITAT**

**Integrated Flood Control and Habitat Restoration** (not in State of Bay report as indicator but related to watershed health indicator- riparian area width)

- 1) Flood management agencies, stormwater entities, and watershed groups will collaborate on integrated (multi-objective) projects to both improve flood management and restore natural habitat. Bay 2020, the regional entities will develop an overall strategy and track progress.
- 2) Desired outcome is increased number of integrated projects effectively implemented (output) along with a regional strategy and tracking (output). Long term outcomes should show improved watershed health and improved flood management.
- 3) Owners should be Bay Area Flood Protection Agencies Association (BAFPAA), BASSMA, and BAWN.
- 4) This element was discussed at both Water and Habitat subcommittees and identified as a priority in the 2013 IRWMP-(Objective 4-3 - Identify and promote integrated flood management projects to protect vulnerable areas {Measure-Number of integrated flood management projects including elements such as sediment management, fisheries enhancement, natural channel function improvement, riparian habitat enhancement, ground water recharge, etc.}) Concept also included in Prop 1 under IRWMP- \$ 200 m statewide for stormwater multi-benefit projects.

## LIVING RESOURCES

**Improve nesting success for tidal marsh birds.** The tidal marsh abundance index has a benchmark of 0.93 birds per hectare, summing across three tidal marsh bird species (black rail, tidal marsh song sparrow, and saltmarsh common yellowthroat). This density is a target value. There are 2 types of actions that can help improve population numbers/density – improve habitat quality and improve nesting success.

- 1) By 2017, define the region's top 10 priority nesting sites and institute predator controls such as feral cat trapping and neutering programs, rat eradication and control and other control measures determined to be needed
- 2) Desired outcome is an increase in tidal marsh birds in the Bay Delta region
- 3) Owners are State and US Fish and Wildlife agencies
- 4) The number one threat for tidal marsh birds, leading to low reproductive success is predation on nests. Reducing predator populations or reducing access of predators to tidal marsh nests are two actions that can be taken. Such predators include native predators that are human-associated such as American crow and common raven, as well as non-native predators, which includes domestic cats (house cats as well as feral cats), but also rats. Successful implementation of this action will increase the number of tidal marsh birds tracked by the State of the Estuary Report indicators in tidal marsh bird populations.