

DRAFT MEETING MINUTES

**San Francisco Bay Restoration Authority Advisory Committee Meeting
September 16, 2022, 10 am – 12 pm**

Bay Area Metro Center
375 Beale St., Board Room, 1st Floor
San Francisco, CA 94105

Agenda and meeting materials are available at:
www.sfbayrestore.org

1. Call to Order

Jessica Martini-Lamb, Chair of the Advisory Committee (AC), called the meeting to order.

2. Determination of Quorum

AC member attendance: Sara Azat, Erik Buehmann, Erika Castillo, Steve Chappell, Arthur Deicke, Rebecca Schwartz-Lesberg, Roger Leventhal, Jessica Martini-Lamb, Mike Mielke, Marquita Price, Beckie Zisser

Staff attendance: Jessica Davenport, Karen McDowell, Linda Tong, Catie Thow, Sara Haugen, Taylor Samuelson, Josh Purtle

Catie Thow, Clerk of the Advisory Committee, called the roll and determined there was not a quorum.

3. Public Comment

No public comments received.

4. Approval of Advisory Committee (AC) Meeting Minutes of May 20, 2022

(ACTION)

Item 4: Draft Meeting Minutes for May 20, 2022

Steve Chappell moved the motion and Beckie Zisser seconded. Erik Buehmann abstained. There were no objections. The minutes were approved unanimously with no corrections.

5. Chair's Report from June 24, 2022 Governing Board Meeting (INFORMATION)

Item 5: AC Member Term Expiration Dates

Chair Martini-Lamb announced the upcoming San Francisco Bay Restoration Authority (Authority) networking sessions. Project Manager Sara Haugen explained that staff are holding four networking sessions, one for each region of the Bay Area, which target potential and past grantees. The purpose of these networking sessions is to enable

participants to get to know each other, identify potential partners, and learn about the Authority.

Chair Martini-Lamb also announced that almost half of the current Advisory Committee members will be completing their terms in February 2023. The Authority recently released a Call for Applications and encouraged all current AC members to help distribute the notice.

- One AC member asked what percentage of current AC members are likely to reapply and about targeted outreach to organizations or communities to fill open positions.
 - A staff member stated that half of the seats that are expiring and, previously, approximately half of the members whose terms were expiring have reapplied. AC members who reapply are evaluated along with new applicants and AC meeting attendance is a factor in whether they are reappointed. Staff stated that they have updated their list of contacts from community-based organization and are reaching out to those contacts and tribal representatives to encourage them to apply to serve on the AC.

Chair Martini-Lamb gave a summary of the June 24, 2022, Governing Board Meeting during which the Board approved the Fiscal Year 2022-2023 budget and work plan. The Board also approved several projects including: De-Pave Project, Baylands Habitat Restoration and Community Engagement in East Palo Alto, SAFER Bay Planning Project, and the Regionally Advancing Living Shoreline Project. Chair Martini-Lamb also shared that the Board approved Erik Buehmann's appointment to the AC. Board members heard a staff update on the development of a Tribal Engagement Policy.

6. Review Draft Yearly Update on Equity Work (INFORMATION)

Linda Tong, Grant Program Coordinator

Item 6: Draft Yearly Update on Equity Work

Linda Tong provided a review of the Draft Yearly Update on Equity Work and summarized how staff had incorporated edits and comments from AC Ad Hoc Subcommittee on Equity into the draft. The Authority's progress on equity in Fiscal Year 2021-2022 includes:

1. Exploring funding policies to lower barriers to community participation such as advancing funds to grantees rather than paying in reimbursement after expenses are incurred.
2. Continuing the Community Grants Program.
3. Supporting new partnerships with community-based organizations (CBOs) by hosting networking sessions in which community-based organizations can share their experiences and lessons learned.

Linda also summarized improvements to the Community Grants Program made in Fiscal Year 2021-2022 which included:

- Based on feedback from the AC and CBOs, raised the maximum grant award from \$100,000 to \$200,000.

- Targeted outreach to specific CBOs.
- Working towards creating a cohort of Community Grant Program grantees to help build capacity.

In Fiscal Year 2022-2023 staff will work to address the remaining AC equity recommendations which include:

- Organize visits to Economically Disadvantaged Communities (EDCs) to meet communities where they are.
- Recruit new AC members that represent the diverse communities in the Bay Area.
- Develop a Tribal Engagement Policy which will be presented to the AC and Board in Spring or Summer 2023.
- Develop a long-term framework of equity guidelines with goals and performance measures in Fiscal Year 2022-2023 and implement this new framework in Fiscal Year 2023-2024.

Linda asked for AC comments or edits on the draft memo.

- One AC member asked if there is a cap to the indirect cost rate for the Community Grant Program.
 - One staff member stated that the current limit is 20% which was recently increased from 15%. This limit is for the Community Grant Program and the regular grant rounds.
 - Another staff member stated that this is a guideline for grantees, and there are limited circumstances where grantees can go above 20%.
- One AC member asked about the form of outreach to CBOs.
 - One staff member stated that outreach starts with emails and then can evolve to meetings when necessary.
- One AC member asked if AC members can receive an email stating they are encouraged to attend the networking sessions.
- One AC member stated that their project is being reconsidered for the Authority's Grant Round 6 after being ranked highly during Grant Round 5, but not funded. This AC member is in the process of applying for other funding for this project and has found that other funding entities require a 50% match. The AC member emphasized that funding outside of the Authority can be harder to access due to match requirements and believes this should be taken into consideration in the future.
 - One staff member stated that it is highly likely that the Authority will issue annual requests for proposals in the future.
- One AC member stated that it is difficult for them to see economically disadvantaged communities (EDCs), Black, Indigenous, and people of color (BIPOC), and tribal identity as separate groups, when they do not necessarily have to be mutually exclusive. This AC member feels they are a member of EDCs, BIPOC and non-federally recognized tribes, yet there is no term for this.
 - One AC member asked if the language in the Draft Yearly Update on Equity Work addresses this concern.
 - AC member stated that having discussions and the language in the draft memo are beginning to address this concern and open a door to further understanding.

7. Annual Performance Assessment of Bay Restoration Regulatory Integration Team (BRRIT) (INFORMATION)

Schuyler Olsson, San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission, Chair of BRRIT

Jana Affonso, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, BRRIT Policy and Management Committee

Item 7: Bay Restoration Regulatory Integration Team (BRRIT 2022) Annual Report

Schuyler Olsson provided a summary of the BRRIT Annual Report which covers activities from May 2021-April 2022. This report was presented to the Governing Board in June 2022. Since the inception of the BRRIT, it has permitted six projects, three projects currently in the application status, and 15 projects in the pre-application process. Over the next year the BRRIT anticipates permitting the three projects currently in the application status phase. Lessons learned during this reporting stage include:

- Projects, particularly those in the pre-application phase require a large amount of interagency coordination.
- Early coordination with agencies and the pre-application process continues to be key to the success of the project
- For projects that have gone through the whole pre-application process, agencies are seeing more complete permit applications when they are submitted thus making the permitting application process much smoother.
- The BRRIT will continue to be nimble and adjust to varying project needs and timelines.

Jana Affonso summarized the BRRIT Policy and Management Committee (PMC) which supports the BRRIT and the restoration community by working to identify and resolve policy issues within their authority. The PMC has a Permit and Policy Improvement List of ranked issues that have arisen through the permitting process. The Permit and Policy Improvement List is constantly revised by the PMC as they resolve issues annually. For example, the PMC created an Aquatic Resource Type Conversion Framework which was edited heavily by the BRRIT. The BRRIT and the PMC are working on finding solutions to permitting challenges for nature-based solutions within each agency's authority. The PMC has also identified regional monitoring, site specific monitoring, and synthesizing the lessons learned as a result of monitoring, as current challenges. They are working with BRRIT members to find solutions.

- One AC member asked for a definition of type conversion.
 - Jana and Schuyler clarified that type conversion refers to when a habitat goes from one type of habitat to another as a result of restoration. For example, when a mudflat is converted to shellfish bed. The purpose of the Aquatic Resource Type Conversion Framework is to understand how to identify the benefits of going from one type of habitat to another.
- One AC member asked for further explanation of the issues with type conversion as it relates to the BRRIT.
 - Schuyler stated that it is important to the BRRIT to know when a habitat goes from one type to another, they would like to know how to value the new habitat, and if mitigation is needed to replace the old habitat. The

BRRIT would like to ensure they are working with projects that provide net benefits for ecosystem services for each habitat.

- One AC member would like to know about the process for soliciting lessons learned from BRRIT projects.
 - Jana responded that the PMC/BRRIT would be very interested in creating a more formal mechanism for reporting lessons learned during BRRIT projects. There could be opportunities to do so on the BRRIT Annual Report or on the BRRIT website. The Lower Walnut Creek Restoration Project could be a possible example from which to glean lessons learned.
- Chair Martini-Lamb asked how BRRIT lessons learned are disseminated among colleagues at agencies even if it for non-BRRIT projects.
 - Schuyler responded that BCDC shares lessons learned in staff meetings with staff who work on and off BRRIT projects.
 - Jana responded that the USFWS works on projects throughout the Bay and Delta and uses lessons learned on those projects but could see an opportunity to develop this in other regions in the future.
- An AC member stated that the 900 Inness project went through the BRRIT process and is now almost completed. Seeing before and after pictures, like those presented in Item 8 are very powerful and useful.
- An AC member asked if the process with BRRIT is easier than the process before the BRRIT.
 - Schuyler responded that it is much easier with the BRRIT because most projects require multiple permits from different agencies and with the BRRIT, agency staff can easily consult with other agencies to work together on permit requirements. The BRRIT also has many positive responses from their post-project satisfaction surveys that point to their effectiveness.

8. Communications and Performance Measures Update (INFORMATION)

Taylor Samuelson, Public Information Officer

Catie Thow, Sea Grant Fellow

Item 8A: DRAFT One-Pager on Key Performance Measures and Updates, Fiscal Year (FY) 2021-2022 and Cumulative

Item 8B: DRAFT San Francisco Bay Restoration Authority Performance Measures, FY 2021-2022

Item 8C: Map of Funded Projects, Cumulative through FY 2021-2022

Taylor Samuelson presented a one-page summary of key performance measures, updates, and a project map for FY 2021-2022. Taylor mentioned that for the first time, some of the Authority projects are now closing out. Taylor asked for volunteers from the AC serve on the Annual Report Ad Hoc Subcommittee. Subcommittee members would review a draft of the annual report and send edits directly to Taylor.

Catie Thow presented the performance measures table for FY 2021-2022 and highlighted a few key accomplishments during this fiscal year.

- One AC member asked about the \$300 Million of additional funds leveraged over the past five years and the lessons learned from leveraging those funds.
 - One staff member shared information about the South Bay Shoreline Project having a cost-share between the US Army Corps of Engineers and Valley Water. Staff also mentioned that the 900 Inness Project had a large portion of leveraged funds. Staff stated that some projects have more leveraged funds than others and the Authority’s funding can be used by grantees to start to leverage funds from other sources.
- One AC member asked for an update on the campaign goal of restoring 500 acres of shellfish beds and habitat.
 - A staff member stated that the Regionally Advancing Living Shoreline Project will include creating 10 plans for living shorelines some of which will include shellfish bed habitat. This project will also create a regional collaborative to share information for key shoreline landowners to streamline permitting for shellfish bed projects. The staff member also added that other projects the Authority has funded have leveraged funds that will be used to add to this campaign goal.
- One AC member asked if staff has calculated shoreline mileage by region, and whether this could be used as a factor when determining how to allocate funding.
 - Staff mentioned that this number is difficult to calculate because of varying shoreline geography.
 - Another AC member mentioned that the Baylands Ecosystem Habitat Goals Report, the Subtidal Goals Report, or the San Francisco Estuary Institute may have this information.
- One AC member favors an additional color on the project map to show completed projects.
- One AC member asked for bullets in the “Authority Milestones” section of the one pager.
- One AC member asked to make Authority planning money awarded more prominent.
 - Staff stated that planning dollars, number of plans, number of projects at the planning stage are tracked. Acreage of planning projects are not counted to avoid false reporting of projects that do not come to fruition. Once a project progresses from planning to construction, staff includes the acreage in the performance measures table.
- Chair Martini-Lamb mentioned that the Authority’s performance measures will be evolving to align with the indicators developed by the Wetlands Regional Monitoring Program (WRMP). In the coming months the AC will receive updates on this.
 - A staff member added that this process is just starting and stated that the WRMP will be looking for input early and often on this.
 - One AC member stated they will be part of the Peoples and Wetlands Work Group of the WRMP.
- Chair Martini-Lamb asked for volunteers for the ad hoc subcommittee to review the Annual Report.

- Staff stated members of the ad hoc subcommittee would have two opportunities to review and comment, once on the outline and once on the draft report. The subcommittee could have an in-person or virtual meeting if necessary.
- Two AC members volunteered to serve on the subcommittee.
- One AC member asked if there are targets for performance measures.
 - Staff stated that there are targets for some of the performance measures which overlap with the Measure AA Campaign Goals. There are also targets for geographic distribution of funding by region, but the other performance measures do not have targets.
 - AC member asked to put the targets into the table and an asterisk for those who do not have targets.
 - Staff stated that they put an asterisk in the previous reports.
 - One staff member mentioned there are nuances with Campaign Goals and adding information into the chart that could prove to be difficult.

9. Announcements (INFORMATION)

No announcements from AC members.

10. Public Comment

No public comments received.

11. Adjourn

Chair Martini-Lamb adjourned at 11:46AM.

Note: Agenda items may be taken out of sequence at the discretion of the Advisory Committee. Any person who has a disability and requires reasonable accommodation to participate in this public meeting should contact Taylor Samuelson no later than five days prior to meeting. Questions about the meeting or agenda can be directed to Taylor Samuelson at Taylor.Samuelson@scc.ca.gov.