



**San Francisco Bay Regional CHARG: Coastal Hazards Adaptation Resiliency Group
 March 15, 2016 Policy Working Group Action Items + Meeting Minutes
 Location: MetroCenter, 101 8th Street, Conference Room 171, Oakland**

Participants

<u>Name</u>	<u>Organization</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Organization</u>
Alex Porteshawer	Michael Baker International	Kathy Schaeffer	UC Berkeley
Allison Brooks	BARC	Ken Schreiber	San Mateo County
Amy Hutzal	SCC	Luisa Valiela	EPA
Ani Thompkins	Convey	Maria Lorenzo-Lee	CA Department of Water Resources
Brenda Goeden	BCDC	Martha Whetstone	SFO
Caitlin Sweeney	SF Estuary Partnership	Monaiza Humayun	California State Assembly
Carl Morrison	BAFPAA	Nixon Lam	SFO
Daniella Hirschfeld	UC Berkeley	Robert Spencer	Urban Economics
Deborah Hirst	San Mateo County	Stuart Siegel	
Dyan Whyte	CA Reg'l Water Quality Control	Sybil Hatch	Convey
Jack Liebster	Marin County	Vijay Kesavan	BARC
Joshua Polston	Port of Oakland	Warner Chabot	SF Estuary Institute
Kara Gross	Silicon Valley Joint Venture		

Policy Committee Goals

The Co-chairs of Policy Working Group have identified 3 major activities that they would like to focus on in the next year.

- 1) Hosting one or more Implementation Workshops.
- 2) Facilitating information sharing of ongoing projects around the Bay.
- 3) Providing a venue or clearinghouse where agencies can solicit comments on regional plans that are in development.

General Discussion:

A. Introductions

B. Implementation Workshop

1. Co-Chair Len Materman presented the business case for a workshop would bring regulators and permittees together to discuss shoreline construction projects. There is general agreement that the

current process is time consuming and inefficient. Len stated that he would like to see a permitting process that is more transparent, efficient, and consistent. Len suggested that perhaps CHARG could help host a bi-annual implementation workshop where a select set of projects could be brought before the committee, while the targeted outcomes of these workshops would be to improve the transparency, efficiency and consistency of the permitting process. This could perhaps help build CHARG into a learning organization.

2. Len opened the topic up for conversation from the attendees.
3. Proposal for implementation workshop
4. Discussion
 - i. It was noted that there are several groups working to improve processes, including BCDC with Flood Control 2.0 and USACE JARPA (Joint Aquatic Resource Permit Application, a unified permit multi-agency process). These efforts are targeted toward bringing projects in front of multiple regulatory agencies, laying out requirements on a project-by-project basis. Flood Control 2.0 is talking to people who are regulated and who regulate.
 - ii. It was noted that there are joint fed/state entities convening on small projects. It was suggested that perhaps CHARG could build on these efforts.
 - iii. BAFPAA supporting a project legislative hearing, which is delayed awaiting reappointment to the assembly, but the reason for the hearing is to discuss permitting challenges. Hoping legislative committee will suggest that they try to resolve the issues. Possible that the federal agencies could be willing to participate (example of USACE Silver Jackets event sponsored by BAFPAA). How do you get the decision makers to come to the table? This legislative hearing might be a good opportunity.
 - iv. Two current BCDC permitting case studies, one on Napa River and one on San Fransquito Creek.
 - v. Example of success: USACE guidelines for vegetation on levees in the Central Valley was the result of a nearly year-long series of monthly meetings, showing a high level of commitment from senior leadership to be involved in the discussion (possibly the result of threatened litigation).
 - Example of success: Santa Cruz County resource conservation process - regulatory agencies are brought into meeting on a monthly basis, taking projects from identification through initial concepts through the details, with regular interaction
 - Example of success: Dredge material office is most structured; focused on sediment quality and what can be done with the material. It has an MOU, has staff dedicated to it, and has specific funding. They have other priorities but every two weeks they attend the meeting.
 - vi. There was some discussion around the current challenges. These include:
 - Gaps between senior management and permit issuers in permitting process.
 - Conflicting instructions or a difference of perception in what should be included in a permit.

- The level of detail in a project discussion varies greatly between a senior leader and a staff member due to the amount of time each has to spend on a given project.
 - Issues are often uncovered in the implementation stage of a project when it is difficult to go back or amend the permit.
 - Because these projects take a long time, it is challenging to keep the same staff engaged through the life of the project.
 - The priority for Fish and Wildlife is the Delta; agencies are woefully understaffed for what they're trying accomplish and have to set priorities for the resources available. In terms of interagency opportunities, Marin County has a monthly meeting, but participation is voluntary; at the last meeting there were only two agencies present, USACE and the Water Board. If there were to be a more project-oriented meeting, resources would be needed to get agencies to attend the meeting, planning for years in advance.
- vii. Assembly member Bill Quirk is willing to help if possible in getting state agencies to the table to discuss objectives; Monaiza Humayun can arrange a meeting between CHARG and Bill Quirk to discuss collaboration.
 - viii. Possible implementation workshop agenda and topics for discussion: More policies and better coordination are needed to ensure that resilient shoreline projects can move forward.
 - ix. General spirit that could be encouraged through the process is that we have to try things, and some things might not work; we have to take risks in getting our arms around the impacts of climate change we (and particularly the public) need to embrace risk by piloting things, trying things again and again.
 - x. Agencies have policies that they're required to uphold and some may recognize that their policies are not perfect, but at the federal level there are significant challenges and obstacles that the agencies can legally stand behind and make work.
 - xi. Projects to include and highlight: Recommended that the group be selective about projects chosen to highlight policy issues. Argument that test projects should be generally applicable to multiple projects around the Bay.
 - xii. Port of Oakland working on a project that's 7-8 months from construction, in critical post-design phase and looking at permits to take project from concept to building stage. Might serve as a test case of how this kind of regional cooperation might work. Airport perimeter dike in south field of airport was built in 50s on marshland FEMA compliance issues, element of seismic resiliency – no criteria for seismically stable dike – component addressing future sea level rise, raising level of dike. 4-1/2 mile long dike, mid \$50M range for project. Inland wetlands – temporary platforms during construction; 2 acres total of wetland mitigation impact.
 - xiii. It would be helpful to have a non-vested stakeholder to play role of facilitator to bring people together.

C. Other items of discussion

5. Suggested that it would be useful for entities and regulatory agencies to have a spreadsheet (or pipeline or matrix) laying out all shoreline projects that we know of that are in planning or building phase including, timeframes for permitting, costs, etc. so that we would be able to identify what projects would be discussed at the biannual meetings, representing different kinds of projects around the Bay Area.
6. While issues with the permitting process are valid, there was some opinion that there are bigger issues to tackle in creating a resilient shoreline for the Bay Area from a bay-wide policy perspective. For example, the impact of armoring, the role of railroad and transportation systems, and positive examples of horizontal levee designs in progress. Several participants expressed the desire to use the CHARG Policy Working Group to examine these larger overarching policy decisions.

D. Information sharing and website

1. Currently one page hosted on ACFCD website; CHARG purchased www.sfbayareacharg.org; Carl Morrison offered BAFCAA pages for CHARG to use, which would be free of charge
2. Discussion of user needs and possible content for an upgraded CHARG website:
 - i. A curated, relevant, one-stop shop where it's easy to find up-to-date information on projects being planned or implemented in the Bay Area and state of California without reconstructed efforts – including case studies and cost of adaptations.
 - ii. A source of shared information in addition to available conferences, workshops, and meetings
3. Website would be a large undertaking in both set-up and maintenance; with so much fast-changing information on sea level rise it's a challenge to track down all the information and keep it up-to-date; there are different approaches to facilitating data collection, including identifying a framework with large categories and using the website as a connection point between projects and agencies
4. Other resources: StormSmart Coasts website (<http://stormsmartcoasts.org/>) has a nice interface, but California information not included yet. CA Adaptation Network listserv hosted by Center for Ocean Solutions Science at Stanford