

San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission

375 Beale Street, Suite 510, San Francisco, California 94105 tel 415 352 3600 fax 888 348 5190

State of California | Gavin Newsom – Governor | info@bcdc.ca.gov | www.bcdc.ca.gov

February 5, 2020

TO: Regional Shoreline Adaptation Strategy Leadership Advisory Group

FROM: Jessica Fain, Planning Director (415/352-3642; jessica.fain@bcdc.ca.gov)

SUBJECT: Meeting Summary for the January 28, 2020 Regional Shoreline Adaptation Strategy Leadership Advisory Group Meeting

Meeting Outcomes

The Leadership Advisory Group:

1. Affirmed the 6-month Regional Strategy approach to developing a Joint Platform, with suggestions noted below;
2. Provided feedback on Guiding Principles; and
3. Discussed the process, timeline, and next steps to develop the Joint Platform, with suggestions noted below.

Action Steps

- Incorporate feedback on Guiding Principles and circulate with LAG, which will be finalized at the next meeting
- Develop a proposal for working groups and guiding questions to shape actions, and bring to LAG for discussion at next meeting
- Develop a local government and public engagement strategy, including a website, and share with LAG. Consider how to engage federal agencies
- Explore if and how to consider multiple climate hazards through this process, i.e., stormwater flooding in addition to sea level rise and/or additional climate change impacts, such as drought and wildfire
- Set up dates for upcoming LAG meetings
- Share longer versions of PowerPoints for related initiatives, such as Plan Bay Area and ART Bay Area with LAG

Discussion Notes

Introductions and Attendance. The meeting was held at SPUR San Francisco, 654 Mission St, San Francisco, California.



Leadership Advisory Group members or alternates in attendance included: Katherine Dudney (EBRPD), Erika Powell (CHARG/San Mateo), Zack Wasserman (BCDC Chair), Anne Halsted (BCDC Vice Chair), Warner Chabot (SFEI), Zoe Seigel (Greenbelt Alliance), David Lewis (Save the Bay), Emily Loper (BPC), Paul Campos (Building Industry Association), Mark Lubell (UC Davis), Sam Schuchat (SCC), David Behar (SFPUC/BayCAN), Lisa McCann (SFWQCB), Will Travis, Bruce Riordan (BayCAN), Caitlin Sweeney (SFEP), Ellen Cross (CHARG), Melissa Jones (BARHII), Therese McMillan (MTC/ABAG), Brad Paul (MTC/ABAG), Adrian Covert (BAC), and Laura Tam (SPUR). On the phone: Dave Pine (San Mateo County) and Mike Mielke (Silicon Valley Leadership Group).

Other staff in attendance included Larry Goldzband, Steve Goldbeck, Jessica Fain, Dana Brechwald, Nahal Ghoghaie, Shannon Fiala, Samantha Cohen (BCDC); Julie Beagle (SFEI); Michael Germeraad, Dave Vautin (MTC); and Lucian Go (BARC). The meeting was facilitated by Gina Bartlett (Consensus Building Institute).

Welcome and Introductions

Zack Wasserman, BCDC Chair, and Allison Brooks, BARC Executive Director, introduced the meeting.

Zack: Today we'll present a 6-month process to gain consensus on what we should do, the goals, and the strategies. The release of the LAO report has given this issue a sense of urgency and promote action by the legislation. Need to gain consensus within the Bay Area to speak to legislature. There are two main challenges for regional rising sea level: (1) Come up with a cohesive, comprehensive, specific plan for what we need to do to get moving; and (2) How we organize on a governance level

Allison: We're all committed to this issue but play different roles. How are we going to organize ourselves and our resources? This is a housing, transportation, and local-level issue. While we work through the process, we may not be able to wait until the end.

Review Agenda and Working Agreements

Gina Bartlett, Facilitator, reviewed the agenda and working agreements for the meeting.

Regional Strategy Approach

Presentation by Jessica Fain, Dana Brechwald and Michael Germeraad

Jessica Fain:

- This proposal is a result of collaboration with a "Thinkers" group – a subset of staff and RSAS members – over the past several months. Thank you.
- A reminder: SLR is not a distant problem. While much of the responsibility of adaptation falls to the local jurisdictions, local only responses will lead to suboptimal local and regional outcomes.



- The good news: we have a strong foundation for action and are not starting from scratch.
- Our charge to this group: Over the next 6 months, develop and adopt a strategy that lays out the actions necessary to adapt the Bay area to rising sea level to protect people and the natural and built environment
- This Joint Platform will be a clear vision for how the Bay Area can *Adapting Better* and *Adapt Faster*: Reduce risk collectively. Elevate local adaptation. Prioritize and act regionally. Fast-track implementation. Remove barriers. Unlock/align funding and financing.
- This Strategy is comprised of three key elements:
 - 1) Develop guiding principles for rising sea level
 - 2) Develop a joint platform
 - 3) Make a commitment to act together
- How do we get there? Guiding principles can influence “action areas” and specific “actions” which can then be endorsed and implemented region wide
- Joint Platform: 10-15 priority actions
- Timeline: We’ve spent the fall scoping and organizing, with you, the Thinkers group and hopefully finalizing that phase here today. We’re transitioning into Guiding Principles. We will spend the Spring developing the Joint Platform actions. We envision this happening through an iterative series of smaller working groups where we can refine and present back to this group the Action concepts. We also envision 1 or 2 public forums where we can vet and solicit feedback from a broader array of public stakeholders. This will all come together in a final Joint Platform, which we will look to this group to endorse.
- It is also important to remember that there are still many other activities occurring simultaneously. It is our intention to align and leverage. Next we will hear about two of them: ART Bay Area and Plan Bay Area 2050.

Dana Brechwald:

- I’m here to present a quick overview of ART Bay Area and how it will support the RSAS.
- ART Bay Area looked at 4 systems interrelated regional systems: transportation, natural lands/PCAs, future growth/PDAs, and vulnerable communities. We started by understanding how these systems were exposed across the region as a whole, then zoomed into scales that were more manageable and understandable to local jurisdictions to better understand how these systems overlap and share vulnerabilities due to co-location. This resulted in analysis of 15 regional datasets and 32 zoomed-in focus areas.
- We measured 32 different indicators across all four systems to understand the consequences of flooding. For example, for highways, we measured how many average annual daily trips would be impacted if a segment of the highway was flooded. I’ll highlight findings from a few areas of analysis.

- Starting with Future Growth Areas - this graph shows the number of planned new residential units in PDAs that may be impacted by sea level rise. At 12", the picture looks pretty good – only 260 planned units may be impacted. However, this jumps quite a bit by 36" to nearly 60,000 units, and by 108" TWL, over 140,000 new housing units could potentially be impacted by flooding. Early on, the downtown San Rafael PDA is impacted first. However, North San Jose is not impacted until 24" TWL, with nearly 24,000 new units potentially impacted by 108" TWL. Other high-impact PDAs include the Bayview/Hunters Point Shipyard/Candlestick Point PDA in San Francisco and the Coliseum BART Station Area PDA in Oakland.
- Looking at the region's freeways: At 12", over 680,000 daily vehicle trips could be impacted. Given the degree of traffic volume we are already seeing, and the lack of redundant capacity in other systems, this degree of impact would be extremely disruptive not only to residents, but employers and the economy. By 108", this number jumps to 12.3 million daily vehicle trips. Early on, this disruption occurs primarily in Marin and Sonoma counties in areas that are not surprising as they already flood today – US 101 and US 580 in Marin and SR-37 in Sonoma. But by 48", Impacts are felt throughout the region, with some of the biggest impacts on US-101 in San Mateo, US-880 and 80 in Alameda, and US-101 in Santa Clara.
- Lastly, let's look at contamination. We looked at areas that had contamination that were co-located with socially vulnerable residents. A lot of our contaminated sites may not be remediated to a standard that would prevent contaminant mobilization if the sites get wet. Add social vulnerability and exposure to flooding on top of that, and this points to areas where we need to pay extra attention. While only 1,700 units of socially vulnerable residents may be impacted by contamination and sea level rise at 12", this grows to over 50,000 by 108". It is critical that the region supports the ability for these communities to adapt and not suffer disproportionate impacts. Many of these sites align with former military or industrial spaces. Early on, the greatest impacts occur in Marin County, in the Canal District in San Rafael, as well as Alameda Island, Martinez, Vallejo, and East Palo Alto.
- Regional hot spots: Now, let's look at co-located vulnerabilities that have been identified as high significance to the region. We got to these "hot spot" clusters by layering the top 5 highest consequence indicators for each system over each other and then flagging areas that contained: At least 1 top 5 transportation asset, at least 1 PDA OR PCA with a high consequence indicator, AND presence of a vulnerable community.
- "Hot spots" change as total water levels rise, but there are a few clusters that remain relatively consistent across time, meaning that these might point to areas that the region wants to coordinate around.
- In summary: ART Bay Area presents a picture of how the regional sea level rise story will unfold over time across 4 systems *in the absence of action*; provides data for regional and local prioritization and decision-making; organizes the major planning issues around sea level rise and provides 80+ adaptation responses to help inform Joint Platform.
- The full report plus a summary report will be released at the end of February. We are working with media partners and will host a release party. We are also going to travel to

every Bay Area county to share localized findings, and will be publishing a handful of companion reports in the spring and summer.

Michael Germeraad:

- How does Plan Bay Area address sea level rise?
 - MTC/ABAG have recognized SLR needs to be integrated into Plan Bay Area 2050 and a strategy will be included in the plan
 - In Feb they will be prioritizing actions to move forward
- What sea level rise analyses are being done for Plan Bay Area?
 - The *Futures Finals Report* was released last week looking at future impacts to the region. Explored 1, 2 and 3' of SLR in four future scenarios
 - Staff also developed a draft *Needs and Revenue Assessment* for sea level rise, calculating how much revenue the region might expect from existing sources to adapt rising seas over the next 30 years, and how much may be needed to address most 3' flooding concerns. Estimate for existing sources: \$2 Billion. Estimate for need: \$20 billion.
- How will Plan Bay Area shape adaptation outcomes in the Bay?
 - Plan Bay Area highlights the need to develop new revenue sources to fund adaptation in areas with high impacts with 3' of rise.
 - The Implementation Plan is the 4 year action plan. This group can help shape the implementation plan for Plan Bay Area

Discussion on Regional Strategy

- Warner Chabot: We have great resources in ART Bay Area and Plan Bay Area so let's not reinvent the wheel. It would be great to put the PowerPoints online to review these projects on our own time to get up to speed. We need to recognize what we're building off of.
 - ZW: I agree, but I think amongst the many reports out there, there are a few more that are part of the initial foundation of work, including the Adaptation Atlas, what CHARG is doing, and the Water Board's plan to adapt to climate change.
- Anne Halstead: How do we get buy in from MTC/ABAG?
- Brad Paul: From here on out let's not use the word CASA again since it was a controversial process. Let's say "recent regional housing efforts" instead. The "housing legislation working group" was successful, which was going out and talking to elected officials. You can go to venues where you can talk to elected officials all at once rather than 101 individual cities. You can go to ABAG meetings and get on the calendar, but think about when that makes sense. We're going to be doing this for RHNA. You can attend countywide meetings at each county or a league of cities meeting. Present what it is we're talking about, but also ask them for their ideas (we got great ideas from legislative working group).

- Paul Campos: You've taken a positive step towards that goal by highlighting Plan Bay Area, which is important for MTC/ABAG and stakeholder groups participating since 2013. How can this both inform and be consistent with Plan Bay Area? It's a message that would be well received by MTC/ABAG.
- Allison: My concern is that we will have 10-15 projects not nested in how it's actualized down the line. How are resources flowing? How are we prioritizing what happens at the local level? The action items need to make sense together and demonstrate how they achieve an outcome. I'm worried different working groups will come up with different things. We need a regional approach. Plan Bay Area is a framework for analysis, where information lives, performance metrics, and how money flows to local government to do planning.
- Will Travis: I want to compliment the staff on the presentations. What I found was there's subtle things in there, like using ART Bay Area and Plan Bay Area. We're building on a very solid foundation of excellent analytical work. I suggest to not pick it apart, just move forward.
- David Behar: How do we entrain the local government to get the elected officials and staff? There are vast resources for SLR at the local government staff level, which is separated from elected officials. There are dozens of folks working on this. We want them to comment and support what we do—it's necessary.
- Jessica: BAYCAN always comes up; you're bringing together the constituency. How can we work with them more closely or have BAYCAN active in the working groups as we develop this?
 - David Behar: 38 members in BAYCAN and 100 something jurisdictions, so while BAYCAN is great there's still more outreach to be done.
- Caitlin Sweeney: I like the strategic, action-oriented direction and the pivot. We need to knit our strategies together. Our time is right now; let's build on the LAO report. If we can have a package that includes an outreach strategy and where the money flows, that would be more successful. How do we make sure to engage everyone? We need defined roles and responsibilities to be more successful.
- David Lewis: My biggest concern is this group diving in without much more definition of what the commitments at the end would look like. Which players in the room can make commitments? What impact will this 6-month process have in the end? Second, I think that addressing these risks and needs around SLR in the absence of doing other flood impacts outside of SLR is a mistake. Those folks you're trying to engage are more concerned about general flooding. Folks might get more involved in a serious way if that's brought up.
- Melissa Jones: I appreciate building from what we have and integration through Plan Bay Area. How much thinking have you done from an equity lens? ART thought about that and I assume so in Plan Bay Area too. Are there pieces we need to talk more about based on what you've seen?

- Jessica: Yes! There are process and substance questions. ART Bay Area has revealed several of those touchpoints. Contamination keeps bubbling up. On a process level, it's an ongoing area where we are committed to work but need to figure out how we make that happen in a meaningful way. We have a new staff member, Nahal, who is focused on EJ at BCDC.
- Larry Goldzband: (In response to David L.) BCDC is committed! Sam and I were just in Sacramento last week, and the first time in my 7 years at BCDC, an administration actually talked about adaptation and committed to doing something—not just about climate bonds, but about legislation. This effort not only looks locally but looks at Sacramento with regard to how the administration will deal with the tough issues that we see and that they are beginning to see.
- Therese McMillan: A few of us were a part of the Bay Area Delegation Caucus meeting; what I walked away with is that tactically we need to position ourselves to make the most out of the emerging bond packages and legislative attention to the subject and how it will manifest itself in the next couple of months. It struck me, of all the things we needed to do, that there are 3 things that are important for action items: 1) planning, 2) permitting, 3) investment.
 - For planning, that's an area we've done a lot of groundbreaking work. More importantly, from reading about the bonds, it's about the larger climate change effects, not just about SLR. What the state is looking at is a larger portfolio of flooding, drought, wildfire, etc. At a regional level we want you to plan for that portfolio. Assemblymen were clear that legislature will not dictate what we do but will have the faith in the region to plan and set your work if you can show that you can responsibly do it. First, we need to bring the planning to the forefront (not just in SLR, but other areas too). That's a way to bring the collection of all local jurisdictions to the table, not just the ones that ring the Bay. What's in it for them?
 - For permitting, the action there is the collaborative effect. How can we make permitting better?
 - The investments are the hardest thing. Where we put the money will be the hardest decision. That's where the regional role is most important. That's where you can dictate priorities, results, and tradeoffs. If we cat fight over the money, the first thing we show is that the state won't give us more money. The region needs to decide how we manage and facilitate those priorities and tradeoffs. To my mind, that's the most strategic thing given the current environment in Sacramento.
- Ellen Cross: Back to David's comment, CHARG is doing a study on fluvial flooding, which brings the constituents further inland than just the shoreline. Underscoring what Therese said, this is a more holistic approach that the legislation is looking for. We need multi-benefit driven solutions. Green solutions are getting funded. We need to recognize the mid- and long-term sustainability of outcomes and we need a mix of solutions.

- Erika Powell: On David's comment regarding the local implementation. I'm an engineer and a planner. There's both policy and project implementation. I want us to think about that. Projects are long term and can take decades. Policy can just take a couple years. If we look at this schedule and we want the project implementers (such as BAFPA, etc.) to participate in this, we need to operate on local government schedule. We're on a fiscal year schedule. If we want to show up at these meetings or get staff to show up to these meetings, we needed to know that a year ago because of finances. For future planning, please keep that in mind. Otherwise, you're missing the bottom-up, which follows a different funding model.
 - Gina: Yes, we need different kinds of engagement given those constraints.
- Bruce Riordan: I have two points.
 - 1- In your presentation one of the possible suboptimal outcomes of local implementation is that there's no way to measure progress. If we don't figure out a way to make this less vague in the way we talk about SLR and flooding and what we're going to do for adaptation it's going to be hard to tell the story to get the support of cities and counties and hard to get money. I'd love to see a process for us to measure progress.
 - 2- I'm so pleased to hear Therese's call for a more holistic approach. This has been a tension in the Bay Area from the beginning. SLR vs climate adaptation. There are pros and cons. We've been mostly focused on SLR, but I'd love to see that discussed more here and figured out here.

Can we get a commitment from you for the next 6 months?

Yes: Majority

Maybes: 2

- Erika: staffing time is a challenge
- Katherine: We need to talk about it as an agency (EBRPD)

No: 0

- Dave Pine: I try to envision the end product when I do something like this. Guiding principles are straightforward. Action areas is what? A series of policy briefs of different action areas? I haven't heard us talk much about that. Prioritizing projects or a plan? I see policies but not projects. What is the product?
- Jessica: The actions are going to be what we make of them. If the action is to come up with a framework on how we make regional decisions for funding, that's what we would articulate. It's not just any policy brief; let's come up with THE priority policy items we want to commit to.
- Dave: It's important to define what the action areas are. What's the question we are trying to answer? Do we want to spend a lot of time talking about permitting problems? Is that a good use of our time? As opposed to a mechanism for ranking projects? It will be time well

spent to define what those 6-8 questions that we need to answer are if each question is an action item.

- Allison: I agree with that.
- Jessica: I think that this is step #1 for the working groups
- Erika: One of the things we presented to the LAO caucus was: we need to identify risk. Once you know what your risk is you can collectively prioritize those areas based on need. Also, dividing into short vs long term implementation. What are the hot spots and how soon can we implement them? There were 3 federal agencies listed. The federal agencies need to be part of this conversation. We're going to be asking them to change how we permit or fund those projects.
- Allison: I can't agree with Dave more. I worry about us breaking off in our groups. How is this all adding up and moving us towards a clear way in which we're all collectively approaching this issue? I like the risk reduction strategy. Local and subregional is where the work needs to happen.
- Gina: Seems like the Thinkers group should cultivate what these 6-8 questions would be. It could be a next step
- Warner: This builds on what I said previously with the good foundation of ART and Plan Bay Area. We need a strawman proposal. I had the same reaction as Dave Pine. The action proposals are the core of what we're trying to produce and it's still fuzzy. At the next meeting let's see the strawman proposal of the action areas. We'll have a better focus then.
- Gina: Today we want you to spend time today on guiding principles and at the next meeting we will go to action areas.
- Melissa: I appreciate Bruce and Therese's comments on thinking of climate impacts together. It enables us to have public engagement forums to speak to a broader set of people and impacts. That's the way communities are framing things. Mostly around fire, flood and drought. We can have robust public forums on this.

Develop Guiding Principles for the Regional Shoreline Adaptation Strategy

- Dana: Guiding principles are shared values to agree upon. It could be a way to quickly evaluate how projects can be evaluated or areas where we are missing actions. If a guiding principle doesn't have any actions, we can realize we have a gap. Any time the region comes together to make a decision, we can look to these, for example for policy proposals, region-wide plans, or grants they can be used as evaluation criteria. These are our strawman proposals and we want feedback on this.
- Gina: For the activity, we are going to allow for personal reflection and then discuss in small groups. What do you like? What's missing? What might you change?

Sticky Notes on Guiding Principles

Support Early Movers and Fast Action: *Don't limit early innovators and facilitate fast adaptation actions even as new regionally coordination is developed. Early adaptation projects are charting a new course for region, especially for wetland restoration.*

- Like this as a key focus on how to move forward
- Early movers: "...so long as they do not put others at risk..."
- As long as it doesn't displace burdens and impact overall regional resilience
- Add: take advantage of enough opportunities for leadership at state level
- Change: into broad call to develop specific ACTIONS—short, mid and long (projects/programs)
- Balance against more expensive greater need projects
- Missing: At the same time, recognize where we are NOT in a rush but have time to plan, serve the climate and implement local long-term strategies
- "Support" → an alternative to SF BRA to deal with multi-benefit projects?
- "Fast action" → may not be needed. Consider timeline, phasing and sequence. Some places can WAIT. But also not causing negative impacts elsewhere.
- The phrase "support early movers" was unclear because what does "support" mean? Is this really needed as a principle, or are we just trying to acknowledge there are lots of projects (flood control, restoration) that are going on now that aren't going to benefit from a future new governance idea? How important is that really? Should we actually support things that aren't multi-benefit/resilient just because they have already gotten started?

Pick the Right Strategy for the Right Place: *Ensure that adaptation actions deployed at a regional scale are adaptable enough to fit local needs and conditions. The Bay is collection of distinct places with unique physical and social conditions.*

- How would strategies be deployed at regional scale?
- Maybe do not "deploy actions at a regional scale." The actions need to add up
- Combine: go green with pick the right strategy. Go green is subset of find the right strategy
- ...as long as it doesn't impact other jurisdictions adversely and improves regional resilience
- OLU as a potential organizing principle?
- Balance with the need for specificity to make meaningful advancement
- Add: develop list of priority projects that should get money, permits, be nominated in various plans
- Right strategy, right place, right time

- Missing: do no harm to other locales
- Missing: develop workable frame—works for planning long-term resilience in a resource constrained environment that reflect deep uncertainty as to future sea levels

Put Socially Vulnerable Communities First: *Collectively prioritize adaptation projects that support or protect socially vulnerable communities. Climate change will disproportionately impact marginalized communities with fewer resources.*

- How will we define and prioritize these? State definitions written for similar programs are flawed
- Change: not “first.” Rich areas are important too, eg. SF Waterfront. → Do no harm. Make nobody worse off.
- (-): acknowledge socially vulnerable communities but DON’T put them first
- By framing issues in terms of present concerns so its easier to enter conversation
- Balance against greatest negative impact- which will affect these communities too
- Change to “Prioritize locations where socially vulnerable communities live, work, pray and play.”
 - Again, it’s not as concise as we’d like, but my group thought we should be more specific and get rid of the term “put.”
 - The group also thought we should include at least where vulnerable communities work to make sure we’re including farmers and other vulnerable laborers.
- Focus prioritization on time as well. Which communities will be impacted first?
 - These could be great, potentially replicable, models for how to work with other at-risk communities in the future.
 - Include a clear timeline of when communities will be hit, and make sure timeline reflects prioritization of socially vulnerable communities

Empower Communities to Lead: *Actively enable communities to not just survive in the face of sea level rise, but to “bounce forward” by removing barriers to local problem solving so that community members and groups can empower themselves. Community members know their neighborhoods best and can play a critical role in making the most locally beneficial adaptation decisions.*

- Change: need to provide money and resources to empower community leadership
- Like: this is vital and “prioritize” means driving funding/resources to communities with less money

- But may not have knowledge/resources to analyze problems and may take too many resources to train. Maybe emphasize input rather than leading.
- So much of what we need to protect are assets that are REGIONAL or sub-regional, not COMMUNITY-LEVEL
- Broadly define community. E.g.: residents, businesses, public/open space users, legislator representatives, those who benefit from ecosystem and human services?
- “...will help socially vulnerable communities rise to the top of the priority list”
- Like: emphasis on local community empowerment and vulnerability. Collaboration emphasis. Customized solutions focused on local contexts.
- Establish a structure that empowers communities to lead while protecting regional assets
- Are we focusing on vulnerable communities in this principle? If so, may want to change it to “Empower local communities to lead, particularly those that are socially vulnerable.”
 - While the above suggestion might get at the intended message of this principle more effectively than the existing phrasing, it’s also probably too wordy, so we could work on this at the next Thinkers meeting.
 - Added “local” because of the fact that some communities aren’t geographically static (Brad’s car club example).
- Is this getting at capacity building in order to enhance local community leadership?
- Combine with put socially vulnerable communities first

Go Green Where Possible: *Whenever feasible, use natural infrastructure solutions that reduce flood risks and create multiple benefits before hybrid or grey solutions. Adapting to rising sea level will require a mix of green and gray infrastructure.*

- This is a subset of picking the right strategy for the right place
- Focus on **multiple** benefits. Quantify where possible
- Like: go green is essential to make green infrastructure a priority for funding as well.
- Link up mitigation funding to green projects (Bay Area clean water agencies)
- At end of list give two examples (e.g. horizontal levees)
- Change: go green where possible “and where it makes more sense in the next 50 years to do so”
- Multi-benefit approach rather than supporting one over another to foster and ensure sustaining solution
- Acknowledgement that some aspects of green infrastructure may be most usable in short term, and then options may change, as land use decisions change.

- Go green where appropriate
- Combine with pick right strategy
- “Go Green Where Possible: Whenever feasible, INTEGRATE and PRIORITIZE natural infrastructure solutions that reduce flood risks and create multiple benefits INTO hybrid or grey solutions. Adapting to rising sea level will require a mix of green and gray infrastructure.”

Practice Inclusive, Collaborative Governance and Decision Making: Promote transparent, coordinated decision-making across community, local, regional, state, and federal government that acknowledge and align the unique roles, responsibilities, and authorities at each scale. Adaptation outcomes will better protect the entire region when all scales contribute and collaborate in reducing risk.

- Collaborative permitting process in addition to planning
- Almost the same as “practice inclusive collab. Gov and decision making”. The whole point of a regional shoreline adaptation is to solve problems together
- Combine: practice inclusive and empower communities. One principle on decision making.
- Note needed. Should be a given.
- Website with notes and materials- model transparent decision making

Solve Multiple Problems Together: Ensure that adaptation actions advance multiple regional and local goals around housing, economy, society, and environment. Sea level rise is just one of several crises facing the Bay Area.

- Dislike: too vague. Where does the money actually go? What are the hot spots? Who does what? Who gets permits quickly? No federal agency connection. No acknowledgement of political leadership opportunities.
- Add: clarify the meaning of endorsements. What does it mean to make a “compact” or other governance mechanism?
- Suggest combining: consider interconnectedness and trade offs is foundation for cross-jurisdictional and multi-beneficial projects/actions
- Evaluate SLR risks and consequence within context of other regional priorities, such as housing, economy, transportation and others
- Not entirely. How can these SLR oriented guidelines apply to all climate hazards?
- Harmonize adaptation actions with applicable regional and local plans. E.g. Plan Bay Area and the local general plan
- Change: needs to solve multiple problems AND multiple hazards

- Particularly where projects are already moving forward other goals
- Combine: interconnect/tradeoffs and solve multiple problems together into → guiding principle on recognize multiple climate dimensions and develop mechanism to choose/rank among them
 - *There was decent support for the idea to merge these two principles. Solve Multiple Problems Together was the one people liked more, but it would need to weave in the idea of tradeoffs.*
- The larger set of climate impacts are an important element to this work. This is part of the solve multiple problems together piece.
- Maybe it could be a more positive strategy if multiple benefits were discussed.
- Decision makers need agency to solve multiple problems together.
- Together = joint accountability

Consider Interconnectedness and Tradeoffs: Support actions that minimize negative impacts, including flood risk, housing pressures, or disruption to infrastructure, to other parts of the Bay. Adaptation must occur within an ecosystem of regionally interconnected networks.

- Combine this and #6
- Very important to consider impact of these land use decisions on other regional crises (housing, transportation, etc.)
- This title is too abstract and “wonky.” How about a more personal title like: “Don’t hurt your neighbor” or “be a good neighbor”
- Take a risk tolerance approach
- Nothing about trade-offs in description of this important guiding principle
- “consider” is too vague and weak. Maybe use “promote” or “increase”
- As a community we need to know how solving problem x impacts problem y, positively or negatively.
 - Acknowledge tradeoffs << don’t hide it. Negative impacts should stop projects, but they need to be transparently stated.
 - Projects need to “amplify” benefits. Not just one issue or one benefit.

New Guiding Principles

- Don’t forget the ocean coast
- Plans will change and projects will fail—embrace uncertainty and plan for it

- Do not act now in ways that foreclose future options
- Add upstream flood risks, not just shoreline SLR to scope and prioritize
- Don't let the perfect be the enemy of the good
- Prioritize actions/projects (and funding for them) that require urgent initiation
- Network outside the Bay Area. Learn from others
- Consider timescale—look for long-term solutions phased into short-term to long-term actions
- Evaluate risk/time issues. Some needs may take a long time to plan and permit, but if we don't start spending time now, consequences may be devastating
- Evaluate greatest risk with greatest impact (i.e. water treatment plants)
- Measurable results—encourage measurable goals and objectives to be able to track progress toward those goals

Next Steps

Jessica: We will take this feedback and take another pass at the guiding principles. At the next meeting, we will finalize this. The next item is action areas. There were great thoughts about how we take it down to specific action area categories. We can reconvene that Thinker's group to take another pass at that. Lastly, how do we divvy up the working groups? Please let us know if you have staff resources to commit to that.

Warner: Throw out suggested dates so that people can think about whether they can make it or not.

Zack: Thank you all for coming.