



Implementation Coordination Group (ICG) Meeting #6

February 5, 2025, Noon - 3:00 pm

<p>Desired Outcomes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Understand where we are with the Joint Platform, including how we're tracking metrics ➤ Assess the direction of the Bay Adapt funding framework [Task 6.2] in light of recent progress ➤ Discuss next steps for ICG members role in implementing RSAP 	<p>Resources</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> February ICG Report <input type="checkbox"/> Presentation PPT <input type="checkbox"/> ICG Overview <input type="checkbox"/> ICG's Community Principles <input type="checkbox"/> Meeting #5 Notes <input type="checkbox"/> Interagency SLR MOU
--	--

Noon	Lunch available for order
12:30	Welcome, Introductions, Context Setting, where do we go from here? (Michael McCormick and Violet Saena, co-chairs) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Welcome from our new Steering Committee Members • What has changed since we began?
12:55pm	Joint Platform Status Update
1:10pm	Updates: Status of funding conversations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public Funding (Amy Hutzal, SCC, and Allison Brooks, BARC) • Private Funding (Rigel Robinson, BAC, and Eric Olson) • Investment Strategy (Cory Copeland, BCDC) • Army Corps of Engineers New Comprehensive Study (Tessa Beach, USACE and Amy Hutzal, SCC)
1:40pm	Breakout Discussion: What and how should the ICG help advance in 2025? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What's next for supporting the funding conversation now that they have made some progress? How can the ICG advance pieces that are still missing or support these "spinoff" conversations? • Funding was identified as a priority topic by the ICG last year, but other topics were also of interest. What's next for the ICG to incubate? Where are there opportunities to open new conversations or support nascent efforts? Where are things "stuck" that this group might want to help along?
2:20pm	Presentation and Discussion: Kick off RSAP Implementation (Dana Brechwald)
2:50	Wrap Up and Next Steps and Meeting Feedback <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Save the Date: Rising Together Summit Sept 15 • Resource sharing • BCDC SLR Working Group
3:00	Adjourn

2024 Quarterly Meetings

February 5, Noon-3pm	May 2, 10am-12:30pm	Sept 5, 10am-12:30pm	Nov 7, 10am-Noon
----------------------	---------------------	----------------------	------------------

Attendance:

Online: Eileen White, Eric Olson, Erik Alm, Lary Goldzband, Rylan Gervase, Selena Feliciano

In person: Warner Chabot, Caitlin Sweeney, Rigel Robinson, Allison Brooks, Amy Hutzal, Julio Garcia, Michael McCormack (Chair), Laura Tam, Gita Dev, Mark Lubell, Tessa Beach, Becky Smythe, Cecilia Gutierrez, Jessica, Allison Chan, Dana, Victorina, Zoe, Corey, Katie Fallon, Amanda

Notes:

Welcome:

- Warner: litigation on funding, hearing on friday will give us answers on whether or not there will be a junction (?) this will go on for some time
- Julio: we have a lot of undocumented immigrants in our areas of work, so we need to create strategies to engage these communities that are even afraid of sending their kids to school
- Rigel: made me nauseous to see the row of billionaires at the inauguration and where this country is going, but also it was a row of people who are extremely influential and have a vested interest in the Bay Area. that might be uncomfortable, but it is something that we are thinking about
- Gita: very happy the RSAP actually passed, as we expected it to have a hard time passing. Now implementation is coming to play, and we are finding that councils and public works departments that are dealing with flooding are clueless about this. We are thinking of an educational outreach campaign to city councils to give them an idea, and we hope to make progress in this
- Becky: Last week was a coastal geotools conference, the only geospace tools conference in the country, and there are really exciting things happening in the private sector and across the country, in terms of conservation, and there is hope, we are still working and moving forward.
- Michael: EJ tools are coming back online, we can connect separately on that

Joint platform update

- Larry: assures BCDC is not stopping, even though there is a lot of uncertainty. We've lived through uncertain times before, we'll live through this.
- Michael: federal data is no longer available or inaccessible sometimes, is the data shown stored locally?
 - Katie: All this federal data is downloaded from GIS and on a spreadsheet locally
 - Also backed up on the github
 - Big source is satmap, where people individually put their adaptation projects, but this is not from the federal government
- Michael: This is visually appealing, great user interface, great for staff reports.. But what is the intended audience for this?
 - Katie: useful for all, it has a lot of use cases, it is written so anyone could understand it

Updates on funding - investing (cory)

- Are you doing anything on the mapping to illustrate where disadvantaged communities are?
 - Social vulnerability will be looked at using the same data set and contamination vulnerability data set as used in the RSAP. We will keep equity in mind on both how we use the data and how we communicate it.
- Warner: 3 or 4 organizations already have spreadsheets with funding opportunities. How are you making the best of that so its not duplicative? What are the actual outputs of this tool? Seems like it will highlight projects that are already approved, and also identify funding opportunities. Is that correct?
 - We are trying to link funding sources to projects in implementation phases that are ready to seek funding. Also differentiating in terms of funding language, so we can be prepared and have all the information to go talk to funders or decision makers. We currently have a lot of data sources that have that info, but don't link the source to a specific project
- Caitlin: proposed projects vs permitted projects. How do we come up with a list of prioritized projects that have not been technically approved yet as a public agency?
 - This is a major question the steering committee should consider. Maybe we don't make an exact

priority list, but a guide on how to prioritize projects based on specific criteria. We are trying to make something that meets a lot of different needs, rather than the one and only, absolute priority list.

- Jessica: developing funding strategy is agency strategy, commission is aware of it and it's something they'll work out.
- Julio: suggestion to link CBOs to agencies, sometimes agencies have a hard time connecting with CBOs. Incorporating the EJ mapping tool should be incorporated into this too.

Updates on funding - public (amy and allison)

- Mark: Did you talk about local level funding at all?
 - We are focused on state and federal funding, but also looking on regional funding.
- Laura Feinstein: what indirect rates will be allowed under prop 4? It says grantees will be allowed to use their usual rates, but some others say agencies will limit indirect rate to 10%. This is an issue for nonprofits, as we lose money. Has there been any progress or final decision on this?
 - There has not been a decision. There is an effort to coordinate across the different agencies that are coordinating prop 4 funds.

Updates on funding - private (rigel and eric)

- Value capture through transit oriented development is a concept that already exists, so maybe being in touch with BART and other transit agencies
 - Absolutely, we want to make sure that the policy tools are responsive to the transit agencies

Updates on funding - army corps (tessa and amy)

- Mark: What are the deliverables of the study?
 - General investigation authorization is usually focused on a project, or subset of projects, that the corps recommends to congress. Which is different from a general plan like the one in everglades. We are optimistic to achieve a regional plan and multiple projects
- One shoreline: there are many projects in planning phase that have received FEMA funding, sometimes it's difficult or even a deal-killer for the corps. Does the corps have an approach to this issue?
 - In general what we understand is that the other agency, FEMA in this example, would have the director sign on in the use of their funds to augment the corps project. We have a long time, so we should start conversations with any agencies that have overlapping projects to resolve augmentation issues.
 - Follow up questions: in terms of non federal share, if it's done bay area wide, and it starts to spin off into smaller areas, it might get complicated. Is there a strategy for this?
 - Cory will figure it out! Jk. The Coastal Conservancy has prop 4 funding, including cost shares with the federal government, but that is still not enough money to fund every project we want to work on. So we need to involve, from the beginning, local government and any agencies that could enter a cost-share agreement with the federal government.
 - There is a lot of leeway for various non federal entities to engage.
- Gita: since this new study, and since the corps now can look at the bay in a different way.. What about the farm bill? There is so much in fisheries, and so much of the bay is a nursery habitat for food. I know this is a weird question, but for example ducks unlimited goes to the farm bill directly and gets millions of dollars in funding rather than going into little pots
 - Corps is not funded through the farm bill, but with a regional strategy we are not limited to things the corps could fund, like looking at social, environmental benefits in addition to the traditional economic benefits.