



**San Francisco Bay Regional CHARG: Coastal Hazards Adaptation Resiliency Group
 January 20, 2016 Policy Working Group Action Items + Meeting Minutes
 Location: Eliju M. Harris State Building, Oakland CA**

Participants

<u>Name</u>	<u>Organization</u>
Alex Porteshawver	City of Benicia
Allison Brooks	Bay Area Regional Collaborative
Amy Hutzell	San Francisco Bay Area Conservancy Staff
Ani Thompkins	Convey
Carl Morrison	BAFPAA
Dyan Whyte	California Regional Water Quality Control Board
Eduardo Martinez	City of Richmond
Ellen Johnck	Ellen Johnck Consulting
Kenneth Schreiber	Land Use Planning Services, Inc.
Len Materman	San Francisquito Creek Joint Powers Authority
Lisa Messano	Michael Baker International
Martha Whetstone	San Francisco International Airport
Nicole Metzger	Atkins
Robert Blizzard	Caltrans
Rosalyn Yu	San Francisco International Airport
Vijay Kesavan	Bay Area Regional Collaborative
Warner Chobot	San Francisco Estuary Institute

Action Items:

- Future Meetings
 1. Proposal to change cadence from monthly conference calls and quarterly in-person meetings to bi-monthly in-person meetings
 2. Alternate meeting locations between sides of the Bay
 3. Include dial-in option (eliminates State Building as a meeting location option)
 4. Co-Chairs create action-oriented agendas going forward
 5. Should the Policy Working Group create subcommittees?
- City of Richmond meeting opportunity on March 4th will be rescheduled

General Discussion:

- A. San Francisco Bay Restoration Authority: Regional parcel tax measure on June 2016 ballot in all nine Bay Area counties
 1. How is CHARG involved with the parcel tax measure? What individual actions and collaborative efforts can CHARG support?
 - i) CHARG can assist effort by adding voices and getting involved with the campaign
 - ii) CHARG should look at the Selection Criteria established by the Bay Restoration Authority
- B. John Gioia representative for Richmond
 1. 7-member board with no money and no staff
 2. Ballot access costs secured from local government agencies
 3. Separate campaign with separate people involved raising funds for local campaigns
 4. Project list not included in ballot measure – calls for proposals if passed
 5. Authority has policies that will govern selection criteria but nothing about regulatory process, only funding source
 6. Necessary funding needs are closer to \$1.5B than estimated by parcel tax measure
- C. Project analysis/Workshop
 1. Workshop on project Implementation – where do we run into challenges in the process, are there regulatory fixes or regulatory hurdles that make process difficult? What are the gaps and problems that we can overcome through improvements to systems, processes, laws or regulations?
 2. Identify what the Policy Working Group wants to achieve
 3. Inventory / map of restoration projects in the Bay Area
 - i. Sediment necessary to build up habitats; Baylands Report indicates 2-3 times increased need over next year as in past 3-4 years
 - ii. Alameda County using sediment dredged from shipping lines to shore up habitats – also addresses funding issue as shipping pays for the dredging
 - iii. Seal Beach project in Long Beach
 - iv. East Bay Parks concerned with migratory paths, leeching of ground water, and Bay water protection
- D. Coordination and Regional-level Planning

Need for a regional role, particularly around land use, and in transition zones between projects. Need to understand where things are in conflict. Need to understand vulnerabilities across region, where projects are underway, the relationship between projects, the gaps in knowledge, etc. How much is this going to cost? What are the sources of funding? How do we prioritize one project over another? What is the conservation strategy?

 1. How do the different Working Groups coordinate efforts?

2. Large-scale solutions that take regional challenges into consideration
 - i. Rebuilding seawall in San Francisco
 - ii. Impact on low-income neighborhoods
 - iii. Coordinate efforts among organizations with common goals; several groups trying to address issues via special legislative hearings divides the whole.
 - iv. Participate in public BAFPAA calls so that everyone is in the loop on current projects and not messing each other up
 - v. Prevent agencies having to reinvent the wheel
 - vi. Address gap in Plan Bay Area process: Mapping and policies of transition zones with implications for land use (current building, construction sites) have not taken these into their scenarios, creating a different set of problems

E. Permitting and Regulation

1. Identify regulatory restrictions and improve regulatory environment
2. Objection to the assumption that barriers are regulatory instead of process-based
3. Stress on timing: Historical processes aren't going to be effective; delays in the implementation of projects with natural solutions will create greater pressure to use hardscapes as a solution
4. Capital, operations, and maintenance three compliments for implementing permits
5. Wildlife permits require up-front funding
6. Letter-writing campaigns
7. Programmatic approach: Streamline regulatory approach to create a "fast-pass", e.g. if a project meets a certain number of criteria it gets approved, then is monitored and adapted as the project proceeds. Is there a better way to approach approvals while adhering to regulatory laws regarding species, clean water, the Bay, etc.? Are these State laws set up to adapt to the needs of climate change, and, if not, they should be changed.
8. Process example: Santa Cruz participates in initial evaluation and ongoing process of potential projects; permitting is fast because questions have already been addressed.
 - i. Shape the process so projects can come through – strip layers
 - ii. State (vs. Federal) level organized in a way to aid success
 - iii. Exception of regular water board concerned with district or State, not region; 30 State Legislators with 6-8 years left in terms is positive
 - iv. Organizations in conflict – Federal and USACE versus regulatory
 - v. Time and concurrent efforts issues

Conclusion

More money, more urgency, clarification of regional approach; drill down to evaluate and prioritize projects



COASTAL HAZARDS ADAPTATION RESILIENCY GROUP *for the San Francisco Bay Region*

POLICY WORKING GROUP MEETING AGENDA

January 19, 2016 10:00 – 11:30 AM

Elihu M. Harris State Building, 1515 Clay Street Room 2, Oakland, CA

TIME	TOPIC	PRESENTER
10:00 am	Introductions <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Name • Organization • Interest in Working Group 	Working Group Co Chairs: Allison Brooks Len Materman Hank Ackerman John Bourgeois
10:20 am	Review CHARG / Policy Working Group priorities and 2018 outcomes and discuss next steps on moving the agenda forward: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inventory of Policies that affect resiliency • Governance Strategies <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ CRI on governance funding • Educate Policy Makers • Conduct Regulatory Workshop 	Working Group Co Chairs
11:20 am	Next Steps	All
11:30 am	Adjourn <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Next meeting: Tuesday, February 16 10:00 – 11:30am conference call 	All