



MEETING SUMMARY

Implementation Committee Strategic Planning Workshop

November 6, 2019

OVERVIEW

This report provides a summary of the San Francisco Estuary Partnership's Implementation Committee (IC) Strategic Planning Workshop, which was held on November 6 2019 from 9:30 am to 4:00 pm at the Bay Area MetroCenter, 375 Beale Street in San Francisco.

PURPOSE AND DESIRED OUTCOMES

The purpose of the workshop was to focus primarily on an assessment of Estuary Blueprint progress to date and develop strategies for stalled actions.

AGENDA

The meeting was structured as follows:

- 9:30 Welcome, Introductions, and business meeting
 - 10:00 Presentation: SFEP Director provided a background on the Estuary Blueprint, and reviewed the 2016 Strategic Planning Workshop
 - 10:15 Presentation: SFEP Director provided an overview of the current status of the Estuary Blueprint actions. Action Status Briefing Sheets for all Blueprint Actions not yet complete were provided in advance of the meeting. The Action Status Briefing Sheets included: 1) staff assessment of priority level for IC review; 2) current status summary and details; and 3) staff recommendation.
-

-
- 11:00 Working Group Session I: IC members and SFEP staff broke into working groups by Blueprint Goal to review, prioritize and develop action plans for specific actions.
- 12:30 Break for Lunch
- 1:00 Working Group Session II: The working groups continued and then reported out to the group.
- 2:30 Future Priorities Brainstorm: The IC Chair facilitated a brainstorm session to set the stage for the next Blueprint update.
- 3:15 Organizational Study: SFEP Director presented the findings from an organizational assessment of SFEP undertaken by Consensus Building Institute.
- 3:45 Wrap up, Next Steps
- 4:00 Adjourn

SUMMARY OF RESULTS

A total of 23 IC members attended: John Klochak (USFWS), Barbara Salzman (Marin Audubon), Debra Kustic (Delta Conservancy), Melody Tovar (City of Sunnyvale), Beth Campbell (USACE), Becky Smyth (NOAA OCM), Josh Collins (SFEI), Sandra Scoggin (SFBJV), Matt Fabry (BASMAA), Brian Meux (NOAA Fisheries), Michael Vasey (SF NERR), Warner Chabot (SFEI), Lucas Patzek (Napa RCD), Alyson Aquino (NRCS), Jessica Law (Delta Stewardship Council), Amanda Bohl (Delta Stewardship Council), Pat Eklund (ABAG), Brad Paul (MTC), Dave Williams (BACWA), Julie Ekstrom (DWR), Chris Potter (CA Resources Agency), Luisa Valiela (USEPA), and Steve Goldbeck (BCDC). SFEP staff members were also in attendance.

The working groups evaluated a total of 23 Blueprint Actions. The results are attached (Table 1).

The group brainstorm resulted in the following list of ideas, thoughts and suggestions:

- Completion of existing actions does not equal final “fix” for the issue - need to build on actions for next CCMP to advance goals
- Context is that CCMP is required every 5 years - keep at UPDATE level, rather than revision
- Action narratives don’t align with tasks as well as they could - need to increase clarity for next CCMP
- Need more economic data for cost/benefit analysis
- Action 21 focused on water use, but water quality is also important
- Actions focused on sewage and trash could have homeless nexus
- CEC actions should be updated to included microplastics and other emerging water quality issues
- Increase nutrient management in Bay/Delta
- Increase integration of issues (especially in IRWM arena - REAL integrated water mgmt)
- Draw on nexus with public health (example includes mosquito/vector integration with recreational values)
- More philanthropic \$/attention for DACs, local govt support/capacity building, and engagement
- Increase number/quality of PPPs
- Update the CCMP revision process - consider who is/should be at the table and how do we get them at the table?
- Include stormwater - local agencies’ actions
- New topics to consider:
 - Social equity (how and how much to incorporate)
 - Economic data (cost-benefit analysis)
 - Wildfires
 - Homelessness
- Speed up decisions by tackling governance and finance with multi-agency/multi-jurisdictional decisions
- Look at statewide scale opportunities in dialogue with region
- Consider how to move process forward without rushing
- Capture ideas from SOE conference
- Provide resources to government agencies to drive equity initiatives and to disadvantaged and frontline communities
- Pursue public-private partnerships
- Funding and planning for transportation and land use must include climate adaptation, EJ communities
- Consider reconvening the Executive Committee in preparation for update

NEXT STEPS

SFEP staff agreed to provide a summary and an analysis of the results to the next IC meeting in March 2020.

Table 1. IC Strategic Planning Workshop Summary Results_110619

Blueprint Action #	Staff Recommended Priority	Recommended Action(s) from Workshop	How/Notes
1	High		
		Starting point of action is within Task 1-2 (difficult to assemble necessary group to lead Task 1-1). If Task 1-2 can move forward, then Task 1-3 can logically follow, creating models to complete the policy framework. This action is achievable if conditions can be met to allay assumed concerns of jurisdictional managers within pilot watersheds. Need to develop a "safe harbor" approach to attract voluntary participation.	First step is to develop Draft Watershed Selection Criteria. Tom Mumley may have draft criteria available as a starting point. Assemble Working Group (senior level reps from NOAA fisheries, USFWS, BCDC, Water Board, CDFW, SFEI) to review criteria discuss safe harbor issue, cross-cutting watershed policies. If a "go", select pilot watersheds (suggestions: Coyote creek, Napa, Pescadero, Alameda). Once selected, two main focus areas for assessment would be: 1) sediment supply and 2) stream temperatures. SFEP suggested to assemble Working Group and hold meetings
2	Medium		
		Add NMFS as a collaborating partner for action	
		Amend milestone of Task 2-1 to "hold initial meeting of the SF Bay Steering Committee." Also discussed amending language of task to show focus of WRMP on ambient condition and tracking project success	Options: 1. Revise/add milestones to Blueprint 2. Capture additional areas of progress in tracker and in newsletters, etc. 3. Keep as note for next update - expand milestones/success then
		Amend milestone of Task 2-4 to "establish the benchmark site network (also known as the sentinel marsh monitoring network" and add some descriptive text that defines the benchmark network	

Table 1. IC Strategic Planning Workshop Summary Results_110619

		Milestone for Task 2-5 is too ambitious. Amend to "convene stakeholders to ID objectives and priorities to establish a stream gauge network"	
3	Medium		
		Expand milestones to show progress beyond acreage (such as funding, regulatory improvements, plans)	Options: 1. Revise/add milestones to Blueprint 2. Capture additional areas of progress in tracker and in newsletters, etc. 3. Keep as note for next update - expand milestones/success then
4	Low		
		For current progress reporting, link to new science and highlight as success	
		For next Blueprint update, look at current science on what makes good transition zones	
5	Low		
		Look into Pacific Herring Fisheries Mgmt Plan and how it could help with this action Confirm or look into other areas of progress	
6	Low	NO REVIEW/ACTION	
7	Medium		
		-Find new champion for 7-2/7-3 which are instream habitat specific	Possible new champions: Leslie Ferguson/RWQCB, Delta Conservancy, Jeff Miller/Alameda County
		-Track upcoming release of Bay Area Open Space Council's Conservation Lands Network Report. May help advance 7-2/7-3 and will likely guide what the SFBJV's Riparian Subcommittee might look like.	
		-Compile list of ID'd priority watersheds	

Table 1. IC Strategic Planning Workshop Summary Results_110619

		-Increase SFBJV capacity to track 7-4, riparian acreage restored.	Could be a good intern project. Also challenging to translate riparian restoration to acreage.
		-Check Eco-Atlas for Delta restoration acreages (tracked for Conservancy-funded projects)	
8	High		
		Do not pursue advancing Task 8-1	
		Refocus on seasonal wetlands (as opposed to only vernal pools), and how grazing fits in. Integrate grazing BMPs	For next blueprint update?
		Revise Task 8-3 milestone to be workshops	Four workshops devoted to BMPs, work with RCDs to identify habitat and climate resilience values
9	Medium		
		-Consider if other invasives need to be added	Now or for future Blueprint Update?
		-Develop a full understanding of where we are, and create a workgroup to discuss Task 9-2 and 9-3.	SFEP and DPIIC workgroup? Cal-IPC weed management areas
		-For task 9-4, identify if other species that should be included in target (ex, lepidium).	
10	Medium		
		-Check progress on Task 10-2 - may not be accurately reported (check w/ USFWS)	
		-Look for additional partners to advance tasks	
11	Low	NO REVIEW/ACTION	
12	Low	NO REVIEW/ACTION	
13	Medium		
		Task 13-4 - Analyze SFEI's sediment reports when complete (summer 2020) and then	

Table 1. IC Strategic Planning Workshop Summary Results_110619

		decide if we need to either adapt an existing tool (such as project tracker, eco-atlas, sedimatch) or consider adding another tool. Sandy beach restoration projects in Aramburu and Encinal - determine any needed additional pilot efforts	
14	Low	NO REVIEW/ACTION	
15	Low	NO REVIEW/ACTION	
16	High		
		Consider expanding ownership to MTC (w/ NOAA and DSC as collaborators)	
		Consider redefining the milestone from completing 30 community plans to: have ABAG (and collaborate with Delta counties) assess making Action 16 a major priority issue, determine how many Co/City hazard mitigation plans exist and how many incorporate natural resources as asset category, and explore options to provide technical assistance	At what level does Cal OES incorporate natural resource protection in mitigation plans? What is needed between 2021 and 2026 to provide support to Bay and Delta jurisdictions to upgrade their plans?
		Consider raising as major panel topic at June ABAG Gen Assembly. Consider integrating Action into Plan Bay Area (or Implementation Plan). Consider that Plan Bay Area incorporate a policy that local Hazard Mitigation Plans integrate natural resources. Encourage Plan Bay Area to explore resources to provide technical support and funding to city/counties	
		Consider use of MTC/ABAG websites to show: Status, integration of natural resource protection as an asset, sources of funding, best management practices	
17	Low	NO REVIEW/ACTION	

Table 1. IC Strategic Planning Workshop Summary Results_110619

18	Medium		
		Task 18-2 could be accomplished by sharing the 2019 State of the Estuary Report with the State Water Resources Control Board	
		Task 18-3 could be considered complete if: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We consider recent coverage of the topic by PPIC, CA Water Blog, Delta Stewardship Council, Marin IJ article on State of the Estuary Report • We look to or include EBMUD's newer messaging on flows on their website and partnership with The Nature Conservancy (also a possible example for how to message on this complex topic) • Delta Stewardship Council also updating their Ecosystem Amendment, which will be considering climate change and flows; the Delta Plan Interagency Implementation Committee (DPIIC) is discussing the VSAs, the Biological Objectives (need to take into consideration climate change), and WQCP and there are not many public venues for these discussions. 	Need to clarify the task as importance of educating which audience: elected officials? General public?
19	Low		
		Add DWR as collaborating partner	Ask Julia Ekstrom/John Andrew for verification of DWR's work with drought planning
		For future updates, should SGMA be considered? Perhaps GSAs?	
		IRWM is active in Bay Area and should be included - perhaps as a partner?	
		Legislation is being recommended for requiring more drought planning from small water suppliers	

Table 1. IC Strategic Planning Workshop Summary Results_110619

20	High		
		Task 20-1 - maybe UC Davis study by Prof Sandoval might be an acceptable standin	Review study and share other recent research that might be considered to fulfill this task Lucas Patzek and Darcie Luce suggested to work on task
		Task 20-2 - Consider convening RCD as a forum, tech transfer. Consider revising milestone to be the forum. Consider Napa RCD or RCDs in general as owners of task (decide later)	Explore whether there is an existing RCD forum where this would fit. Something similar to Working Lands Forum at SOE? CARCD annual meeting?
21	High		
		Add DWR as an owner or collaborating partner?	
		Task 21-1-DWR does have a program and model that will be fed to water users/providers to inform other programs	Ask Julia Ekstrom for more info/clarification
		Task 21-1 and/or Task 21-2 - DWR is supposed to be doing this using remote sensing analysis - informing municipalities (or water agencies?) what target should be	
		Task 21-3 - Expand definition of progress to include other programs besides ReScape	Ask Matt Fabry about whether various water-efficient landscape training programs need to be standardized - whether BAWSCA should have a structured approach to training
		Task 21-4 - Intent seems to be pilot through municipalities.	BAWSCA may be a resource. Municipal actions need to be better recognized and tracked Melody Tovar and Darcie Luce suggested to work on task
		AB 1668 targets small water suppliers and rural communities for implementing something similar to water shortage plans in UWMPs, and also includes ag water suppliers in	

Table 1. IC Strategic Planning Workshop Summary Results_110619

		requirements for updating water management plans	
		Next CCMP update should include the water quality connection on this task and invasive species management	
22	Medium		
		Downgrade priority for action to LOW	
		Both tasks can be considered more or less complete. Public acceptance of recycled water is already accomplished (task 22-1). Bay Area One Water Network is holding regional meetings (task 22-2) to break down silos and have discussions about promoting reuse	
		Task 22-1 - split milestone of outreach into two submilestones: identify success with irrigation and identify challenges of the future. People now want access to recycled water - Task may be obsolete	
		Task 22-2 - BACWA is undertaking regional nutrient study. This task should be identifying all hurdles besides funding and permitting, including collaboration with water agencies and their concerns over loss of customer base, stranded assets, water transfers, government arrangements, refinery use/sector	
		Next Blueprint Update - IPR and DPR is next challenge, public education will be needed. State is now working on standards for IPR/DPR	
23	Low		
		Add Delta Stewardship Council as collaborating partner.	

Table 1. IC Strategic Planning Workshop Summary Results_110619

		COG plans need more recognition of water	
24	Low		
		Everything is going in right direction, with the MRP and green infrastructure master plans. Only obvious need is more \$	
		Next CCMP update - we will have other tasks to champion	
25	Low		
		Bay RMP is lead partner, progress being made	
		BACWA has a white paper to focus on monitoring in effluent	
		Next CCMP Update: needs some rewriting	
26	Low		
		Add State Lands Commission as owner or collaborating partner for abandoned vessels	
		Boating and waterways funds pumpout program - good but needs more \$\$	
		Next CCMP Update: add task on flushable wipes, address overlap with homeless population	
27	COMPLETE		
28	Medium		
		Add Delta Stewardship Council as collaborating partner. This is an issue in Bay and Delta - can bring Delta in more now that more progress is being made	
		Problem with milestones: when are Tasks 28-1 and 28-2 considered done?	
		Need to secure additional funding	

Table 1. IC Strategic Planning Workshop Summary Results_110619

		Improve tracking of funding going to address issue	
29	COMPLETE		
30	Medium		
		On track in Bay, Delta catching up	
		Related to homeless population issue	
		Task 30-1 - language could be changed to track bans, not just EPR	
		Keep track of pending legislation	
		How to incorporate citizen science (example, Napa RCD does citizen science data management)	
		Next CCMP Update: incorporate trash indicator in the State of the Estuary Report	
31	Low		
		DSC has a list of additional funding for the planning and implementation of recreation projects	
		Connect progress of work in Bay and Delta	
32	Low	NO REVIEW/ACTION	