

San Francisco Bay Restoration Authority Advisory Committee Meeting

June 5, 2020, 10:00 am – 12:30 pm

Zoom Teleconference

Agenda and meeting materials are available at:

www.sfbayrestore.org

1. Call to Order

Luisa Valiela, Advisory Committee (AC) Chair, called the meeting to order at 10:03. Luisa presented an overview on participating in the meeting with the Zoom platform.

2. Determination of Quorum

AC Member Attendance: Myla Ablog, Teresa Alvarado, Ana Alvarez, Sara Azat, Bruce Beyaert, Erika Castillo, Steve Chappell, Arthur Deicke, Gregg Erickson, Letitia Grenier, Christopher Gurney, Beth Huning, Zahra Kelly, Shin-Roei Lee, Roger Leventhal, David Lewis, Chris Lim, Jessica Martini-Lamb, Lisa Horowitz McCann, Erika Powell, Marina Psaros, Ana Maria Ruiz, Laura Thompson, Luisa Valiela, Diane Williams, Beckie Zisser.

Staff Attendance: Jessica Davenport, Maggie Jenkins, Linda Tong, Karen McDowell, Heidi Nutters, Sam Schuchat. Maggie Jenkins, AC Clerk, determined there was a quorum.

3. Public Comment

Jessica Davenport announced new additions to the San Francisco Bay Restoration Authority (Authority) staff, including Sea Grant Fellow Maggie Jenkins and Project Manager Erica Johnson.

4. Approval of Advisory Committee (AC) Meeting Minutes of December 13, 2019 (Action)

5. Decision: There was consensus to approve the meeting minutes for December 13, 2019. Chair and Vice Chair's Report (Information)

Vice Chair Alvarez reported that the Governing Board meeting on February 14, 2020 included approval of the Annual Report, a presentation on the EcoAtlas Dashboard for Authority performance measures, updates on equity work and the proposed Community Grants Program, and a presentation on the Measure AA Special Parcel Tax Annual Levy Report.

Chair Valiela reported that the Governing Board meeting on May 8, 2020 included approval of the Fiscal Year 2020-2021 Budget and Staff Work Plan, and funding authorizations for two projects: the North Richmond Living Levee Project and the San Pablo Baylands Collaborative Protection and Restoration Project. The meeting also included presentations on the 2020 grant program materials, a performance evaluation for

the Bay Restoration Regulatory Integration Team (BRRIT), and a staff overview of Grant Round 3, including a list of nine projects recommended for funding .

Chair Valiela announced that there is no AC tour planned for 2020 due to COVID-19 and recommended the Open Road segment with Doug McConnell for a virtual opportunity to view sites. She honored Bruce Wolfe, former Executive Officer of the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board and AC member, who passed away in February 2020 and announced that the meeting would be adjourned in his honor.

Chair Valiela introduced two new AC members—Lisa McCann and Teresa Alvarado—and announced that AC member Shelly Masur has resigned.

Lisa McCann of the Water Board and Teresa Alvarado of SPUR introduced themselves.

Chair Valiela acknowledged the privilege of having access to and meeting in a safe space.

6. Staff Work to Date to Address Equity Recommendations from the Advisory Committee (Information)

Jessica Davenport, Deputy Program Manager for SFBRA, presented on how the Authority staff has incorporated equity recommendations from the Advisory Committee into the 2020 grant program materials and Staff Work Plan. Staff drafted a Pre-Application to allow new applicants an opportunity to consult with staff, amended the scoring criteria to include 20 points for community involvement and innovative partnerships, and updated the grant application checklist. In addition, staff simplified language and revised the grant application to better address community involvement. Staff plan to provide technical assistance and outreach to project proponents, complete a basic application template and provide examples of competitive proposals before releasing the Request For Proposals (RFP), and add projects proposed by community-based organizations to EcoAtlas.

The following comments were made by the AC:

- An AC member expressed support for the improvements and excitement to hear that feedback that the AC provided was incorporated.
- An AC member expressed support for simplification of the grant program materials and reduction of questions that tend to lead to duplicate responses in the application, noting that this would be helpful for both applicants and reviewers.
- AC members varied in their opinions on whether 20 points for community involvement or innovative partnerships was appropriate or excessive. Those who thought 20 points was excessive expressed concern that this would result in low scores for projects in the North Bay, in rural areas, and areas with few economically disadvantaged communities (EDCs). One member suggested that applicants be eligible to earn points in this category as long as they tried to engage the community, whether or not they were successful. Those who thought that 20 point was appropriate noted that it is important to reach out to the surrounding community and to engage people, especially youth, in order to encourage stewardship. It was noted that “meaningful” community engagement is context dependent, and different strategies can be utilized for urban and rural areas. It was

also noted that proponents of projects in more rural areas or that are not directly adjacent or within EDCs have the option to bring community members/students to the restoration site to add a community involvement component.

The following were questions from the AC and answers from Authority staff:

- Should there be a definition of “meaningful” community engagement?
 - The State Coastal Conservancy (SCC) has a document on tips for community engagement that outlines examples– this currently forms the definition of meaningful community engagement.
<https://scc.ca.gov/files/2019/04/Tips-for-Meaningful-Community-Engagement.pdf>
 - There is also language in the RFP that helps to define meaningful community engagement. For example, it can be demonstrated by including support letters from community representatives.
- What is the definition of innovative partnerships? Is this information provided in RFP?
 - The San Pablo Bay Collaborative Protection and Restoration Project is an example of a project with innovative partnerships in the North Bay, where the application included support letter from many partners, including water agencies and restoration groups. The project also integrates education into restoration by bringing students from Vallejo to the project site. Authority staff agreed to add a definition of “innovative partnerships” to the RFP.

7. Recommendations on Next Steps for Economically Disadvantaged Communities (EDCs) (Action)

Dr. Ana Alvarez, EDC Ad Hoc Subcommittee Lead, presented the short and long-term equity recommendations developed by the Ad Hoc Subcommittee and commented on the importance of prioritizing projects that benefit EDCs.

She reported that the subcommittee focused on developing a process and discussed creating a guiding pathway, fostering meaningful engagement, and removing barriers. In order to solicit involvement, they had an environmental justice panel and conducted a community-based assessment. They utilized a feasibility exercise and an online survey to incorporate feedback from all members.

She provided a status update on the implementation of the equity recommendations. Of the ten near term recommendations (six -twelve months), eight have already been implemented by Authority staff and were incorporated into the Annual Work Plan FY 20/21 and the grant program materials. Half (five of ten) of the short term recommendations (one-two years) have been implemented. The two long term recommendations (three to five years) have not yet been implemented.

Dr. Alvarez announced that she was seeking endorsement from the AC on the short and long term recommendations from the Ad Hoc Subcommittee.

The following were discussion points on the proposed AC recommendation:

- One AC member recommended using better mapping, identifying focus areas where partnerships could be formed between community-based organizations and implementation organizations with wetland restoration skills.
- Another AC member was supportive of the focus on identifying projects directly within EDCs, but noted there is also an option to provide EDC residents with access to projects outside of where they live.
- AC members acknowledged and thanked Dr. Alvarez for her work and leadership.

Chair Valiela conducted a poll to gauge support for the equity recommendations developed by the ad hoc subcommittee. There was no opposition to the equity recommendations.

Decision: Reached consensus on endorsing the short and long term recommendations from the Ad Hoc Subcommittee. The AC Vice Chair will present the recommendations at the July 17, 2020 Governing Board meeting. She will ask the board to accept the recommendations and direct staff to report annually on progress toward implementing them.

8. Update on the Annual Report (Information)

Taylor Samuelson, Public Information Officer for Authority, presented the [Annual Report of the SFBRA Fiscal Year 2018-2019](#). The following additions recommended by the AC were included: introductory material explaining the importance of the Measure AA and thanking the voters for their support, more visuals, and a special section on the BRRIT. The report also incorporated feedback from the Oversight Committee and the Silicon Valley Leadership Group, which suggested including the number of projects in each county, increasing the accessibility of the language, and developing a one-pager. In the future, the Authority will look into multi-media opportunities.

Karen McDowell, Deputy Program Manager for the Authority, presented an overview of the finances.

The following were discussion points on the Annual Report:

- One AC member noted that the interest in a detailed annual report is higher in the first few years. As the program matures, it may be better to invest more energy into cumulative reports covering three to five years rather than producing annual reports. Another member noted that, over time, the annual report could turn into a brief dashboard.
- Another AC member commented that the cover and graphics throughout the report are great.
- There was interest in getting the report out sooner, as it took one full year.
- There was interest in why the South Bay has already surpassed the 20-year minimum funding allocation target and other regions are much lower, and a suggestion to discuss this further at a future meeting.
- There was a question about how this annual report will be integrated into the State of the Estuary Report and Wetland Regional Monitoring Program (WRMP).

- There was a suggestion to use polygons instead of dots on map to allow the scale of projects to be visible.
- There was a suggestion to make the electronic version of the annual report more interactive.

9. EcoAtlas Dashboard for Performance Measures (Information)

Cristina Grosso, Program Manager for the San Francisco Estuary Institute, presented an overview of EcoAtlas, which is an online data management and mapping tool that provides a standardized way to track projects. Cristina noted that a layer outlining EDCs could be made available in EcoAtlas to help identify priority project areas.

Maggie Jenkins, Sea Grant Fellow for the State Coastal Conservancy, presented a subset of performance measures that were selected for the EcoAtlas dashboards. The Authority dashboard displays summary statistics and data visualizations for several performance measures, including acres by habitat type, community engagement metrics, funding authorized, progress towards 20-year funding targets for each region, funding by county, and progress towards Measure AA campaign goals.

The following were discussion points:

- It was noted that the BRRIT is not included in the pie chart displaying the funding authorized by county.
- Some differences were observed in the wording of the progress towards the Measure AA campaign goals in EcoAtlas compared to the wording in the annual report.
- It was suggested that the tooltip for the graphic showing the progress towards Measure AA campaign goals could display the projects contributing to progress toward the selected campaign objective.

10. Wetlands Regional Monitoring Program Update (Information)

Heidi Nutters, Environmental Planner with the San Francisco Estuary Partnership and Project Manager for Wetland Regional Monitoring Program (WRMP), presented an overview on the WRMP development process. The WRMP plan was released in April 2020. The WRMP will help to answer regional management questions, facilitate a process for project-specific monitoring, support science and research through a shared data platform, and improve science-based monitoring requirements. The WRMP includes a steering committee, science advisory team, and core team. The plan has four main components, consisting of the science framework, administration and governance implementation road map, and data management. The Technical Advisory Committee for the WRMP has been established. Next steps include developing the funding strategy and charter, developing data management and a delivery system, and training and outreach. The WRMP team has been coordinating with the Authority to develop performance measures and coordinating with the BRRIT. A workshop with the BRRIT is planned to identify the nexus between WRMP and BRRIT.

There were no comments from the AC Committee members

11. Brainstorming Session on AC Priorities for Fiscal Year 2020-2021 (Information)

Chair Luisa Valiela asked for input from the AC members on the next meeting. The following poll question was posed, “Since it is likely that our next meeting on September 11, 2020 will also be held online, do you think that: it should be shorter than 2.5 hours, should avoid action items, should consider a platform other than zoom, should include guest presenters on particular topics.” A majority of AC members thought the meeting should be shorter than 2.5 hours and that there should be guest presenters on particular topics.

Another poll question was posed, “What would you like to hear about in the next couple of meetings: more about projects’ status and funding, science updates, make your own presentations to the AC from your organizations perspective, economic impacts in relation to SFBRA progress.” The AC member’s suggestions included the following: more about projects’ status and funding (63%), economic impacts in relation to SFBRA progress (58%), science updates (42%), make your own presentations to the AC from your organizations perspective (13%).

The following were suggestions and comments from AC members:

- Would like to hear from the BRRIT Chair on how projects are moving forward and how their collaboration is working. Members are interested in hearing challenges and lessons learned from the BRRIT.
- Would like to better understand how work of community-based organizations from EDCs fits with the goals of the Authority.
- Would like to see 1-2 minute pre-recorded videos of each project site to share with AC members because they can’t tour the project sites in person.

12. Announcements (Information)

There were no other announcements.

13. Public Comment

There was no public comment.

14. Adjourn in Honor of Bruce Wolfe

Chair Valiela adjourned the meeting in honor of Bruce Wolfe at 12:38pm.