



MEETING SUMMARY AND NOTES

Bay Adapt Implementation Coordination Group (ICG)

Meeting #2: *December 8, 2023*

Attendance

ICG members in attendance: Violet Wulf-Saena, Resilient Communities Initiative (co-chair); Michael McCormick, Farallon Strategies (co-chair) (virtual); Emily Corwin, FSSD (virtual); Mark Lubell, UC Davis (virtual); Len Materman, One Shoreline (virtual); Gita Dev, Sierra Club (virtual); Becky Smyth, NOAA (virtual); Julio Garcia, Rise South City (virtual); Warner Chabot, SFEI; Allison Brooks, BARC; Susan Schwartzberg, Exploratorium; Eileen White, Water Board; Tessa Beach, USACE (virtual); David Lewis, Save the Bay; Caitlin Sweeney, SFEP

Also in attendance: Zack Wasserman, BCDC; Jessica Fain, BCDC; Dana Brechwald, BCDC; Ethan Lavine, BCDC (virtual); Kathryn Riley, BCDC (virtual); Jackie Mandoske, BCDC (virtual); Victor Flores, Greenbelt Alliance; Zoe Siegel, Greenbelt Alliance; Rachel Hartofelis, MTC/ABAG (virtual); Matt Biggar, Connected to Place (meeting facilitator), Michael Germeraad, MTC/ABAG; Matt Maloney, MTC/ABAG; Josh Bradt, BARC; Steve Goldbeck, BCDC (virtual).

Meeting chat linked [here](#).

Agenda with Summary Notes

1. **Welcome from Co-Chairs Violet Saena and Michael McCormick**
 - Notes: US Geological Conference
 - Thursday Night Exploratorium after dark. Global national resilience Framework
 - They've had many one-on-one meetings to talk about the funding challenges in the State and at the federal level. How do we get all of these ideas funded? HOW do we move forward in a transformative way?
 - Many great leaders from all walks of life and agencies, want to acknowledge the BCDC team and look forward to how we push things forward. We need to keep looking ahead.

2. **Report: Regional Shoreline Adaptation Plan (RSAP) Advisory Group (Advisory Group Chair Emily Corwin)**

- **Notes:** RSAP is a region wide plan that coordinates regional sea level rise adaptation. This responds directly to some of the tasks in Bay Adapt. The resources to plan for this are distributed unevenly. Optimistic that the guidelines from RSAP will be a valuable tool and open pathways for funding and prioritizing people and nature in our adaptation planning. The advisory group has a wide range of expertise and experience across different fields and communities. There are a number of subcommittees. The most active is in the – – Who is leading, how will it be implemented. What’s next for RSAP is a reimagining statement of purpose. Hoping to have answers for the sub regional plans. State of the Estuary in Feb/ March (?)

3. Discussion: ICG’s Role, Purpose, and Priorities (Dana)

- Allow for quick introductions from ICG members
- What we heard from our one-on-ones
- What we think this group can do and how we think we can accomplish it
- Questions or suggestions?
- Optional Feedback on Joint Platform Implementation Tracking and Priorities: What are we missing?
- A quick review of major components of implementation tracking spreadsheet
- Let members know that their input from the first meeting was added to this.
- What are we missing? Take some notes from the discussion (Victor) and ask ICG members to add comments to the spreadsheet regarding what else to change or add.
- **Notes:**
 - i. Michael McCormick: wants to reframe the priorities to ask what are the things that BCDC can’t do, can support on, needs support on, can do on it’s own.
 - ii. David Lewis: A top priority of these is funding. The state is looking at a shortfall and we had made progress last year for coastal adaptation. Will likely see a clawback on those funds in the Governor’s May Revise due to the shortfall. We need to minimize or prevent those cuts.
 - iii. Zack Wasserman: Agrees with the comments and wants to recognize the limits of BCDC to advocate. We need help from everyone in the room to lead on those efforts.
 - iv. Mark Lubell: Is that prioritization in the spreadsheet? ICG prioritization draft (Dana). If we can integrate
 - v. Warner Chabot: wants to second the comments and priorities, wants to promote the top three priorities: funding, funding, funding, going back to MTC report about the 110 B required to implement. Realistically even though cities and counties are doing considerable work, many aren’t doing enough.
 - vi. Gita: Also wants to second Warner’s comments. We need to think about funding from something like a Measure AA. It passed because it was clearly for Bay restoration. However, when we talk about hard infrastructure there’s a lot less interest from people (voters?) There are donors who will only give us money for Bay Restoration. That’s something to keep in mind.

4. Review: ICG’s Community Principles (Zoe)

- We have modified the Community Principles based on feedback from our first ICG meeting.
- Do you have any remaining questions about what’s in the Community Principles?
- Are we in agreement with them?

	ICG Member	Yes	No	Abstain
1	Violet Wulf-Saena, Climate Resilient Communities	X		
2	Michael McCormick Farallon Strategies	X		
3	Emily Corwin, FSSD	X		
4	Mark Lubell, UC Davis	X		
5	Len Materman, One Shoreline	X		
6	Gita Dev, Sierra Club	X		
7	Becky Smyth, NOAA	X		
8	Julio Garcia, Rise South City	X		
9	Warner Chabot, SFEI	X		
10	Allison Brooks, BARC	X		
11	Susan Schwartzberg, Exploratorium	X		
12	Eileen White, Water Board	X		
13	David Lewis, Save the Bay	X		
14	Tessa Beach USACE	X		
15	Caitlin Sweeney, SFEP	X		
	Total:	15		

5. Presentation and Feedback: Accelerating Impact on a Regional Policy, Funding and Governance Framework

- Let's allow some time for clarifying questions after each speaker but save discussion questions for after we get through all 3
- Introduction and context (Dana)
- Regional Shoreline Adaptation Plan and SB272 (Laird 2023): What's the relationship? (Jessica Fain, BCDC)
 - i. **Notes:** \$100 M statewide for adaptation. Grants should go live in a week.
 - 1. David Lewis: Is BCDC’s plan to draft guidelines, promulgate regulations by 2024. Jessica: Want to have guidelines by the end of 2024. Legislation, amendments after 2024.

2. Matt Maloney: Do local plans have to go through CEQA? Jessica: That depends on how we define the plans. Zack: To the extent possible we will make the plans at a conceptual level so they do require CEQA.
 3. Mark Lubell: How is subregion going to have teeth regarding local jurisdictions. Does it have teeth or not? Jessica, the law isn't set up like that. Within the Bay it doesn't exist. Dana: I'm leading the research into the subregional plans and have just looked at 15 plans to determine what's the best model.
 4. Michael McCormick: 272 is a highlights the benefit of this group. OPR is probably working on general plan guidelines. Safety Elements address adaptation requirements. A lot of questions to answer but also a lot of tools to help address the issues around 272. One of the only funded mandates.
 5. Gita Dev: Wants to endorse what Michael just said. Wants to make this real for the work SC does. Getting legislation and funding for 2026 leaves 8 years to adapt. We need clear metrics. We've worked on safety elements to educate lay people on City Councils.
- Moving From SLR Adaptation Funding Framework to Funding Strategy (Rachael Hartofelis, and Michael Germeraad, MTC/ABAG)
 - i. **Notes:**
 - 1.
 - Interagency MOU on Sea Level Rise Adaptation Funding (Allison Brooks, BARC)
 - i. **Notes:**
 - 1.
 - **Discussion Questions**
 - i. What recommendations do you have for these developments with regional policy, funding, and governance?
 1. David: interested to follow mou process. Interested in the funding pathway and who would be the owner. Anyone at MTC, BARC, CalTrans, is anyone talking about the funding you already have control of. Federal and State funding is difficult to use for adaptation projects. Michael G. Looked at existing pots, it looks like maybe 30 Billion over the next few years. There's also some newer smaller buckets of funding but they each have requirements. This is why it's important to see which projects are out there to see which funds they qualify for and where the gaps are. Allison: Right now you can't always use funds from one project to protect it from climate vulnerabilities. For example, some roads are protected by other infrastructure but you can't use those road funds to help with the resilient infrastructure. Allison: We are working with the USACE on a comprehensive study for implementation which provides a lot more flexibility. Goes beyond the Corps mission area. The recommendations that come out of the study aren't just for the Crop but other federal agencies and partners. It's difficult to get authorization for these studies so we have to be very specific about what the goals are.

2. Len: The on the ground issue in his county is there are major projects along the shoreline that are receiving entitlements from cities and BCDC. The conditions will change. We want to work with cities on their adaptation plans. Question is the timeline and permitting doesn't align well with the need to do zoning at the local level. Hoping that the timeline and approvals will match with the local level.
3. Eileen: Q for Allison - Who are going to be parties to the MOU? Who are the signatories? BCDC, Air District, MTC, ABAG, BARC, CalTrans, Conservancy, and SFEP.
4. Michael M.: SB 379 dynamic, really see SB 272 as focused implementation on the local mandate. Over half of the jurisdictions have made an effort to comply. Half still haven't met it. 272 is more of an implementation of the Bay Adapt platform. We need to formalize and bring specificity to the general plans. Dana: Thinking about alternative paths to compliance and reference. It can vary based on the size and complexity of the subregion. Allison: The challenge with General Plans is that cities don't update them that often. Dana: Safety Elements are tied to the Housing Element updates which happen every 8 years. Violet: CRC is currently working with a lot of cities on Safety Elements. Also working on EJ elements. Tessa: also wants to echo what Len said, implementing agencies, with 272 needing to connect and harmonize with the plans.
5. Matt M: Guidelines are great but what is the connection to technical assistance and resources for local jurisdictions? MTC has put out about \$25 million for cities and half of them are still out of compliance. What does funding and TA look like now and what do we need? Dana: Our goal is to put out guidelines and account for what's already going on. Have set aside some money for TA but it's not enough. Comment: Thinking about guidelines, it feels like BCDC is being very proactive with its engagement. Sometimes we get guidelines without a conversation. Would encourage everyone to use the vision and principles we already have to go out for funding.
6. Warner: the point of urgency is important but funding is important. The \$110 B MTC report is like a 5 fire alarm. Looking at high sea level rise impacts due to global conditions. None of the hundreds of Bay Area elected officials are taking the report serious. That's why there's no momentum on a regional bond of 100-200 billion successor to Measure AA. Having the pool of money will also provide the vehicle for regional cooperation because no local government will give up their power to a regional government. Recommends that every organization dedicate some time and funding to promote the report to all the elected officials across the 9 county Bay Area.
7. David: Credit to Len and agree with Violet. One Shoreline si doing a

lot of great work. There's also a NOP in the Burlingame Millbrae area. In the fine print, there's a preference for a certain solution that will most likely not be able to get permitted. We need to change a lot of laws that used to work for what they were intended but don't anymore.

8. Allison: As we are imagining this MOU it can capture everything we're doing but the outcome is getting projects delivered and reducing our risk. We need to think about how we're getting all of what we're talking about delivered in an equitable way.
9. Gita: Appreciate all that Len and Warner said. Wants to bring up and issue with implementation. What they found with Climate Action Plans is that they were put on a shelf and collected dust but what actually works is a metrics checklist. Build in the metrics that can be built in every year. Same with Peninsula Clean Energy, they came up with metrics that can be looked at every year. We don't need 500 page documents filled with fluff but shorter 20 page documents that the council members can read and track. When we talk about assets, let's always say and remember that the Bay is the biggest asset.
 - ii. How do we apply the same collaborative model and political will that made Bay Adapt a success to the implementation of SB272?
 - iii. What should a regional funding strategy do? What factors do we need to understand better?
 - iv. What are the most pressing issues that a regional agency MOU on sLR should aim to resolve?

6. Wrap Up and Next Steps

- Local Electeds Task Force
- 2024 Quarterly Meetings
 - i. Feb/March (virtual)
 - ii. May/June (in-person, in conjunction with the Annual Forum)
 - iii. Aug/Sept (virtual)
 - iv. Nov/Dec (virtual)
 - v. Solicit ideas/projects and/or priorities discussed earlier
- Content for the next meeting
- Annual forum, link to May/June ICG
- Evaluation/Feedback
- Closing comments from Zack Wasserman

7. Adjourn + Gather for Lunch - Mendocino Farms, 300 Mission St.

