

CCMP Revision – Habitats Subcommittee Meeting #3

February 5, 2015

Attendees: Luisa Valiela (phone), Jessica Martini-Lamb, Korie Schaeffer, Beth Hunning, Arthur Feinstein, Barbara Salzman, Jessica Davenport (phone), Harry Seraydarian, Marc Holmes, John Bourgouis, Jeremy Lowe, Josh Collins, Anne Morkill, Marilyn Latta

Not in Attendance: Letitia Grenier, Steve Goldbeck

NOTES ON PROPOSED ACTIONS (with next steps/assignments noted in red)

Overall Notes for Habitats Section:

- link to species should be more clear – habitats need to support species
- Need to determine process/criteria for what to specifically bring forward from other reports (and when to duplicate, reference, modify...)
- Request for more specificity on plan structure before next meeting

Action 1 - Construct pilot projects that will test and refine (Green Infrastructure) management measures for infrastructure left in the Hazard Zone.

- Need to better define “pilot project”
- Possibly revise outcome – includes guidelines and 3 pilot projects, need to clarify and focus
- Action difficult to fully understand out of context with series of actions proposed by Jeremy

Action 11 - Create a “green infrastructure” vision for the Baylands

- Create a Bay-wide vision would happen in less than 5 years
- It is not clear that it would address habitat. Integrate habitat with a broader vision.
- We need to work with the developers. What are we trying to protect that’s not being protected?
- CA DFW would be a good owner
- Habitat needs to be brought forward in the objective. There already is a Regional GI plan (all LID and Green Infrastructure) this can be attached to. People will not see Baylands in this. Build **habitat value** into the green infrastructure and LID
- Can look at this proposed action as “Climate Change Resiliency”
- “Green infrastructure” is so related to water quality and small scale retrofits – need another term?
- Nature Based Adaptation is another term
- Positive response regarding organizational framework Jeremy used for suggested actions
- Preservation is not in here. With Sea Level rise, it is not so much a question of restoration but keeping what we have. It is not reflected here (except for constraints part). A lot of wording improvements good be made.

- Overall structure proposal – 1) design and planning on a large scale (vision), then 2) implementation actions, then 3) monitoring and assessment actions.
- De-emphasize green infrastructure, highlight habitat. Need a separate action on preservation?
- Make sure we address how actions relate back to the target.
- Asked for priority actions that could happen in 5 years. Some of these might drop out. Some of JL's are sequential.
- Possible to take a species approach or habitat approach.
- Refer back to Baylands goals update
- **SFEP staff to work with Jeremy and others to revise based on feedback**
- **Possible separate action on Preservation**

Action 2 - Restore Tidal Marsh and Associated Subtidal Habitat in the Delta and Suisun Marsh

Action 3 - Achieve Integrated Flood Management and Habitat Enhancement in the Yolo Bypass

Action 20 - Reduce or Reverse Subsidence and Sequester Carbon while Creating Habitat

- All three come from Delta Plan - they are being measured and track and good to have a connection with something concrete
- Action 2 Habitat
- Action 3 Flood plain habitat in Yolo Bypass – Trying to make it parallel to the bay integrating habitat and flood protection
- Action #20 Subsidence
- Value to bringing these from Delta Plan to CCMP - to bin them together with the Bay multi-benefit project (shows linkages between Flood Protection and Habitat Enhancement as a larger region (interdependent system) sharing overarching principles and funding sources. Having the bay and delta goals in the document educates public that this is a shared system.
- Great that these actions have numeric targets and are already adopted in DP
- We need something similar to #2 for the bay. Can we push it so that it goes further than DP?
- There needs to be some integration with #2-3 under an overarching principle
- Conceptual consensus that there is an umbrella concept. If we want to identify places it becomes a long list. If we call out specific places, do we want to have sub-actions or references to other plans? Make sure the umbrella actions is what we agree upon.
- If we can raise the profile or the recommendations from BEHGU, it would be good. We can build on recommendations of other plans if they are appropriate.
- We didn't really do the delta last time. We are now, maybe we put it in the introduction, but it is a big change. i.e., tidal marsh restoration (very different in bay and delta).

Action 4 Integrated Flood Control and Habitat Restoration

- Wanted to include watershed due to damage to habitats caused by Flood control. Green infrastructure will eventually fit under this as well
- What degree to we want to embrace the watershed concept? If so, we need to modify our definition of habitat (i.e. riparian, lakes). How far into the watershed world do we go?
- AF – It is time now to advocate for riparian.
- Watersheds, tidal, open estuarine – The 3 types. This might be our structure
- **Josh will draft a separate "watershed" action**

Action 5 Delta Restoration

- Covered with Jessica's Delta actions

Action 6 Promote Subtidal and Intertidal Sand Flat Creation and Replenishment Projects

- Took key items out of subtidal goals for 6-8
- We are losing sand flats to harvesting. Should be tied to beneficial re-use
- Sand flats are beaches
- Maybe add mudflat

Action 7 Protect existing (no net loss) and increase native eelgrass populations using a phased approach

- Straight forward and measureable. Although a living resource, eelgrass is key habitat

Action 8 Protect existing (no net loss) and increase native oyster populations using a phased approach

- Straight forward and measureable
- Oyster reefs as habitat rather than oyster population (living resource)

Comments on Actions 6-8:

- Sub-reference from subtidal goals
- Where do we draw the line from leaving in in subtidal goals v listing specifically in the CCMP?
- Sand mining is related to sand around the bay. Regional Permits were just issued for sand mining for 10 years. This will be a challenge – sediment management
- Action for sand flats is to protect what we have.
- Steve Goldbeck is also on this committee and is thinking about sediment management actions
- How many others can we bring in
 - Add Rocky intertidal? – **New action to be drafted by ML**
 - Goals for artificial structures (i.e. removing old pilings)? - **New action to be drafted by ML (with consideration of comments regarding habitat value)**
- Is there a systematic approach to reach back to other plans. Have the authors of the plans been approached to bring forward actions? How and when is it going to happen?
- Suggest approaching authors with what we want to use, not as a generic question.
- We have the owners around the table.

Action 9 Develop a regional monitoring program

- Get the agencies with the biggest bucks to have other monitoring sites rather than just having project specific monitoring
- What are we monitoring?
- This action is specifically focused on the little streams and watersheds that drains to the bay
- ALL monitoring needs a consistent and regional approach.
- JA is working on this in Living Resources.
- Monitoring currently happens at project level. There is not comprehensive monitoring anywhere in CA. There are 2 state initiatives that correct this.
- JV been working on consistency with monitoring
- **AM, JA, BH, HS, JC will work on monitoring actions.**

Action 10 Develop and implement a comprehensive regional program by (date?) that supports habitat enhancement and sea Level rise adaptation throughout the bay incorporating the ecotone (or horizontal levee) concept for both large and small scale projects

- Frame it with habitat first.
- Confused by regional program and what is the action.
- Incorporate ecotones, horizontal levees, etc. and have agencies endorse it in some way. Goal is to get key agencies that may be obstacles to collaborate.
- Needs some rewriting
- Goes in with JL's other actions. It deals with shoreline while protecting habitats
- Concerned about specific inclusion of horizontal levees in action (still in experimental phase) – rephrase?
- Concern that developing a regional program will add another layer of complexity to get a project implemented. Needs to happen concurrently with implementation so it facilitates projects getting built rather than adding to burden
- One is implementation and the other is enabling (thru official rationalization that creates agencies support) . We need both.
- Put local governments in here and it will take more than 5 years.
- Is it planning or implementation? Don't want planning to preclude implementation.
- Similar recommendation in BEHGU.
- When do the owners buy into this? Is this feasible??

Action 12 Strategize the removal of key constraints out of the Baylands hazard zone.

- "Baylands" was defined in Bayland goals
- Might be a similar recommendation in the BEHGU report
- We should point out the opportunities to others – maybe owners are also "us" – those who could help identify opportunities based on selected criteria

Action 13 Develop "green infrastructure" management measures for infrastructure left in the hazard zone

- Different ideas around that can benefit the habitat. Particularly the regulatory implications.
- Then went to action #1 (pilot projects) in the order of JL's list.
- 3 examples, Aramburu, Living shorelines, Oro Loma
- 3 future examples (listed a few)
- Would like to see an infrastructure project be one of the projects. If it is a seawall, can we create it where it has more positive impacts to habitat. Need to work this very carefully.

Action 14 Develop and sustain collective leadership

- The JV should be listed here.
- Local community stakeholder groups are important.
- Possibly the Restoration Authority should be included here.

Action 15 Undertake subregional vulnerability assessments and develop adaptation (shoreline resilience) strategies

- Include Plan Bay Area
- Other Subcommittees also want to see an action on this topic
- Need to work with agencies and organizations who are working on this – JPC, etc.

Action 16 Write subregional water and sediment management plans

- Role of IC?
- Relationship to Flood Control 2.0/Sedimatch
- **Beth is going to revise this action**

Action 17 Think creatively of new ways of financing

- Needs to be more specific on actions i.e. SFBRA
- Google? EPA Geographic programs?
- **SFEP staff to work with MH on revising**

Action 18 Update all plans, regs and laws to maintain the protection of the environment and wildlife while accommodating adaptation strategies

- Stay away from endangered species act and anything federal
- Could find schedule for when plans are supposed to be updated and be more focused and strategic with this action
- Where are the real opportunities and what is the role of the CCMP here?
- Wetland and Riparian Area Protection Policy?
- Possibly call out BCDC and Regional Board and DFW. Don't forget delta

Action 19 Implement and monitor the shoreline resilience strategies

- SFBRA – is likely to be on the ballot at same time as release of new CCMP – opportunity
- Adaptive management
- What is specific outcome and who is responsible?

NEW Suggested Action Topics:

Watershed approach to restoration planning

Resiliency for local tributary watersheds

Public Access