



Advisory Committee

MEETING MINUTES

October 5, 2018, 10:00 am – 12:30 pm

Elihu Harris State Building
1515 Clay Street, 2nd Floor, Room 11
Oakland, CA 94612

1. Call to Order

Luisa Valiela, Advisory Committee (AC) Chair, called the meeting to order.

AC Member Attendance: Ana Alvarez, Bruce Beyaert, Erika Castillo, Steve Chappell, Adrian Covert, Letitia Grenier, Beth Huning, David Lewis, Sally Lieber, Jessica Martini-Lamb, Mike Mielke, Anne Morkill, Gaylon Parsons, Erika Powell, Mita Prakash, Diane Ross-Leech, Ana Maria Ruiz, Gary Stern, Laura Tam, Laura Thompson, Luisa Valiela (Chair), Bruce Wolfe

Staff Attendance: Sam Schuchat, Matt Gerhart, Jessica Davenport, Kelly Malinowski, Anna Schneider

2. Determination of Quorum

AC Clerk Anna Schneider determined that there was a quorum.

3. Public Comment

There was no public comment.

4. Announcements

Erika Powell announced that the cities and county of San Mateo are creating a new entity for collaboration in the development and implementation of flood resilience projects that are multijurisdictional and multi-benefit. David Lewis announced that October 6 in Bay Day, which includes over 50 Bay-themed events. He also reminded the AC that Proposition 3, the California Water Bond of 2018, which will be on the November ballot, contains \$200 million for the San Francisco Bay Restoration Authority (Authority). Bruce Beyaert announced that the North Richmond Shoreline Festival will be held on October 6 as part of Bay Day, and that Measure FF, which will extend funding for the East Bay Regional Park District, will be on the November ballot. Luisa Valiela announced that the Governing Board appointed Adrian Covert to represent the Bay Area Council on the AC. She also announced the EPA's San Francisco Bay Water Quality Improvement Fund Request for Proposals (RFP) has been

released for approximately \$4 million for projects that will improve water quality and restore wetlands and for the first time has a concurrent decision making cycle with the Restoration Authority project funding decisions. She also announced the Bay Restoration Regulatory Integration Team (BRRIT) now has 75 percent of the funding needed and the agencies hope to start work in early 2019.

Bruce Wolfe and Beth Huning shared with the Advisory Committee their upcoming retirements. In addition, Mita Prakash announced she is leaving the Santa Clara Valley Water District and her seat on the AC.

5. Approval of Meeting Minutes of June 29, 2018

Decision: There was consensus to approve the minutes.

6. Vice Chair's Report from the September 21, 2018 Governing Board Meeting

Vice Chair Alvarez reported that the Governing Board approved the /Request for Proposals (RFP) and Grant Guidelines and application. The Board discussed the addition of acquisitions to the types of projects eligible for Measure AA funding. The Board agreed that acquisitions are lower priority than other types of projects, but no changes were needed in the language of the RFP, Grant Guidelines or application. The Board commented that the AC's performance measures report was very thoughtful, and they wanted to make sure that reporting is not too much of a burden on staff. The Board appointed the Authority's first Independent Citizens Oversight Committee, which is required by Measure AA.

7. Proposition 68 Funding for Bay Restoration

Matt Gerhart, Program Manager for the Authority, explained that Prop. 68 provides \$20 million to the State Coastal Conservancy (SCC) for funding San Francisco Bay restoration work. After subtracting statewide bond costs and staff time expenses, there will be \$16.5 million available for grants. Of this total, \$3.5 million will be allocated to projects that benefit severely disadvantaged communities. The SCC board has already allocated \$250,000 of Prop. 68 funds to the BRRIT. SCC will release grant guidelines for public comment in late October and take them to the SCC Board for adoption in December 2018.

On a related note, Executive Officer Sam Schuchat said that the [South San Francisco Bay Shoreline Project](#), one of the projects funded by the Authority in April, recently received \$177 million in federal disaster supplemental funding.¹ The project will provide flood protection, restore 2,900 acres of former salt evaporation ponds, and improve public access in the Alviso area.

¹According to the [Santa Clara Valley Water News](#), "The federal government's portion of the \$177 million project is about \$71 million; the state share is about \$61 million; and the [Santa Clara Valley] water district's share is almost \$45 million. The water district and state will need to reimburse the Army Corps for our share of the project cost, but the up-front funding means there will be less time spent applying and waiting for funding, which should minimize construction delays."

8. Draft Communications Plan: Request for Input

Anne Morkill summarized the [report of the Ad Hoc Subcommittee on Communications](#) to the AC. She reviewed the four goals for the Authority's communications work and noted that the Communications Plan relies on the AC to help implement it.

Taylor Samuelson, Public Information Officer (PIO) for the Authority, provided some context for the [Draft Communications Plan](#) by noting recent success in the Authority's communications work, including coverage of the projects funded in the initial grant round by KQED radio, the San Francisco Chronicle, and the Mercury News. She then reviewed key elements of the Draft Communications Plan, including key messages, target audiences, communication channels, and risks, and asked for feedback from AC members on what resources they need from staff to help implement the plan.

AC feedback included the following:

- AC member groups and agencies have large networks that can be used to spread messages.
- Providing a 15-minute presentation at regular meetings of AC member groups can be very effective.
- The Authority's PIO could connect with PIOs at AC groups and agencies to spread Authority messages.
- The Authority could provide tools and information for AC member groups to distribute, e.g., through newsletters.
- The Authority could engage audiences through the social media of AC groups. It would be effective to maintain a photo archive and use photos showing how a project area has changed over time.

Taylor will use the feedback provided at the meeting to finalize the Communications Plan and she will present it to the Governing Board.

9. Formation of an Ad Hoc Subcommittee on Community Engagement

Chair Valiela said that this item is intended to follow up on the suggestions provided by the Environmental Justice Panel as the June AC meeting. Jessica Davenport, Project Manager, presented the [staff's proposal](#) to use the memo as a starting point for developing a scope for a two- to three-year consulting contract for establishing a community engagement program that results in long-term benefits for economically disadvantaged communities (EDCs). Staff proposed working with an ad hoc subcommittee of the AC to develop a project proposal that can be brought to the Governing Board for consideration for funding in early 2019.

There was a diversity of opinion about whether the Authority should develop a long-term community engagement program that includes building capacity or focus on short-term community-led projects in a limited number of communities. There was a suggestion to build bridges between larger restoration entities and community-based organizations so that

organizations with stronger fiscal management skills could hire smaller community-based organizations as subcontractors on particular projects.

Decision: The AC decided to form an ad hoc subcommittee to define next steps in providing benefits to EDCs. The following AC members volunteered to serve: Ana Alvarez (lead), David Lewis, Sally Lieber, Mike Mielke, Gaylon Parsons, Marina Psaros, and Diane Ross-Leech. (Marina Psaros was not present at the meeting but indicated prior to the meeting via email that she was interested in serving on the subcommittee.)

10. Restoration Authority Grant Reviewer Selection Process

Jessica Davenport announced that AC members who do not have a conflict of interest are invited to serve as grant application reviewers. Staff will be assessing the need for reviewers after reviewing what kind and how many applications are received. The tentative time commitment is 6-10 hours in the months of December, January and February. AC members interested in serving as reviewers should email Kelly Malinowski (Kelly.Malinowski@scc.ca.gov). A reviewers' meeting will be held at the State Coastal Conservancy in mid-December.

11. Recruitment of AC New Members: Request for Help with Outreach

Jessica Davenport noted that the call for applications for new members and re-appointment of existing members with terms expiring on February 10 went out on September 18. AC members with expiring terms are encouraged to re-apply, if they are interested, and all members are encouraged to help with outreach.

12. Meeting Process Check-In: What's Working, What's Not

Chair Valiela led an exercise in which AC member were asked to write on sticky notes what they thought was working and what needed improvement in several categories: AC meeting, ad hoc subcommittees, site tours, the environmental justice panel, and other topics. This was following by a "lightning round" in which each member had one minute to give feedback. Major themes included an interest in knowing how the work of the AC is being used by the Governing Board and staff, and how the AC could be more useful. Members expressed interest in hearing from the Governing Board about what kinds of advice they want from the AC. AC member Anne Morkill's summary of the results is provided as Attachment 1.

13. Proposed Schedule for AC Meetings in 2019

Jessica Davenport provided a proposed list of meeting notes and noted that she would add an additional date on the second Friday of December to meet the requirement of quarterly meetings.

14. Public Comment

There was no public comment.

“What’s Working and What’s Not”: Advisory Committee Check-In Discussion Notes

San Francisco Bay Restoration Authority Advisory Committee Meeting
October 5, 2018

Summarized by Anne Morkill, AC Member

Input from Round-Robin, Organized by Theme

Advisory Committee (AC) Meetings

- **Meeting Topics**
 - Concerned about governance issues – AC should be able to review annual administrative costs and proposed expenditures to make sure staff and resources are focused
 - Include schedule of grant cycles each meeting so we know where in the cycle we are at; status update at beginning of each AC meeting to reorient ourselves
 - As projects are funded, want to hear progress on implementation
 - Become more familiar with restoration projects
 - Need stronger integration with restoration community – tours are good but need more presentations by practitioners on projects and tools available now so don’t reinvent the wheel
 - Broader understanding of multiple benefits of wetland restoration and adaptation capacity – holistic perspective
 - Invite presentations about restoration beyond the Bay to learn new things
- **Process**
 - Would be nice to have a Governing Board (GB) member in attendance for connection
 - Feel connected to GB through Luisa’s report-outs
 - AC is deliberative and informative; divergent viewpoints are good
 - Priceless discussions and networking with diverse group
- **Time Management**
 - Need more time for Q&As and discussion especially with specific topics and expert panels
 - Provide time for round-robin at end of each meeting for ongoing feedback
- **Minutes and Meeting Materials**
 - Minutes do not include enough detail on comments or input
 - Summarize input into themes, outliers, decisions, minority reports
 - Notes and packets are good; brief summary is sufficient
 - Don’t want meeting notes to be too detailed –misquoting or misattribution to wrong person can create problems
- **Membership**
 - Like diversity of membership
 - Need more racial and ethnic diversity represented on the AC
 - Have better EJ community representation on the AC; provide feedback to GB so they will consider feedback when they consider pool of applicants
- **Videoconferences vs. In-Person Meetings**

- Good videoconference capability would help (not just teleconference) to have more participants, but should not be a substitute for in-person
- Videoconference in groups at regional hubs
- Videoconference can be distracting; too easy to multi-task
- Need to commit to attending in person; more productive
- Everyone needs to commit to attending meetings in person; only quarterly
- **Miscellaneous**
 - Offer decaf coffee and herbal tea!

Ad Hoc Subcommittees

- Ad hoc subcommittees are a lot of work but provides more specific focus on important topics; effective and productive
- Can ad hoc subcommittees invite non-AC members to broaden expertise and insight?

Site Tours

- Site tours at least once a year are a must
- Site tours should focus on projects that have been funded
- Lot of opportunity to engage with broader community and groups on site tours e.g., local elected officials, community leaders

Webinars

- Webinars or virtual meetings in between each AC quarterly meeting would help keep engagement

Environmental Justice Panel

- Environmental Justice (EJ) group needs to continue discussion and engagement, not just single panel
- How can we better integrate and leverage implementation with economically disadvantaged communities and EJ community organizations and smaller nonprofits?
- EJ issues related to economic factors and displacement (supply and demand of housing) and beyond our control, so need to avoid mission creep

AC Effectiveness Questions

- Want to know more about how our input is considered
- How is our input being considered by the GB?
- What does the GB want from us?
- Feedback loop – are we getting a return on investment for our time here?
- Are we really influencing GB decisions and staff recommendations?
- How do staff and GB consider our input?
- Are we value-added or just requirement of law?
- Create opportunity to bridge with Independent Citizens Oversight Committee

Input Provided on Sticky Notes, Organized by Theme

AC Meetings

- **Meeting Topics**
 - Dedicate a % of time for educational opportunities by showcasing or highlighting work on sea level rise, water quality, etc.
- **Process**
 - Agendize action items for discussion at beginning of meetings and provide announcements from AC after action items or end of meeting
 - Meetings have been run very efficiently with good use of staff reports
 - Enjoy participation of SCC Exec officer and GB members
 - Could be useful to start the meetings with a quick reminder of what's going on with the Authority in each quarter; it's hard to remember the "thread" sometimes, especially if missed meeting
 - Is there a job description for AC members or a charter and clear purpose for AC and their work? This should be a reminder regularly
- **Time Management**
 - Meetings often don't allow enough time for all views to be heard on a topic; "rushing"
 - Not enough time to build consensus and hear concerns; rush to vote within time limits which leaves some members frustrated; questions value of our input
 - Meeting agenda tend to be packed with a lot of members wanting to speak; at times, some AC members have not had a chance to communicate due to lack of time. Perhaps about 10 minutes or some space could be added for AC comments as a regular part of the agenda so all members can have 1 minute opportunity to make their comments during this agenda item; alternatively, meetings could end at 12:45 pm to accommodate this need is the group is open to that
 - Meetings working well – duration, frequency, structure, rotation between SF and Oakland
 - Meeting frequency seems appropriate and 2.5 hours is good
 - AC most valuable in Bay RA start-up mode; quarterly meetings probably not needed in 2019
- **Minutes and Meeting Materials**
 - Minutes should report on AC members comments; they tend to only report what staff presented
 - Packets are informative
 - Agenda packets and meeting notes prepared by staff are excellent
- **Location**
 - I like having meetings near public transit; bouncing between SF and Oakland helps alleviate the longer commute between one and the other
 - Hold all meetings in Oakland State Building; not SF metro center because it's not close to BART
 - Suggest move all meetings to SF – seems more centralized and easier to get to with traffic etc.
 - The SF location is so much easier to access (seconded)

- Prefer future meetings be held in Oakland
- Meeting locations alternating between Oakland and SF is good
- More explicit clarity on meeting location
- Please some way to do a videoconference
- Build nexus with GB meetings in the morning and AC meetings in the afternoon at same place
- Rotating meetings to different parts of the Bay Area and maybe 1 night meeting may make the AC seem more inclusive
- Virtual meeting in between in-person meeting may help bridge our efforts better; cut down on travel ; improve continuity; help with volunteer support
- **Membership**
 - Broad diversity of groups/organizations represented
- **AC Effectiveness Questions**
 - How is AC input used; is the AC just another wetlands or EJ group, or is it really influencing GB decisions (hopefully)? Like to see meetings continue and increase the work to inform GB decisions
 - Tell me as AC member what messages you'd like me to carry
 - More information on how AC input/products are used – how does what we do cycle through SFBRA activities?
 - We are advisors but feels like staff making decisions behind the scenes; would help to know how our input has influenced decisions/recommendations (or why it was not considered)

Ad Hoc Subcommittees

- Effective for addressing questions & formulating recommendations for full AC to consider; best to work on discreet, small items to arrive at concrete, useful recommendations given limited committee member time
- Good process for addressing issues
- Challenging without designated staff help; poorly organized by ad hoc lead in my experience
- Appreciate the number of on-going ad hocs being limited; seems more supportive of limited staff resources
- Requires designated staff to support and ensure success
- Like that committees are focused and short-term effort
- We need ad hoc subcommittee to align our outreach with Engineers Week (March); create canned activity or powerpoint or kit for teachers or agencies to share with communities to educate on importance of restoring the Bay

Site Tours

- Continue site tours, but try to make them joint tours with GB
- Site tours are great; need more; varied and throughout the year; work with JV and others
- Do site tours 1x a year
- Make visits more visible on social media

- The site visit was a bonding opportunity where AC members got to know each other; engage with project managers; learn about wetlands; learn about the challenges with projects; learn about the needs
- Poll confirmed attendees on where they will be traveling from so the start/finish location could be planned around the most convenient location
- Loved the site tour; we should do it at least once a year
- Friday site tours work best; less traffic, end of the week easier to carve out time; consider a south bay set of tours of work completed/planned
- Site tour was awesome; perhaps there should be two per year as it improves AC member – rapport building
- North Bay (Marin, Sonoma, Solano) tours would be great
- Would like overview of projects underway as powerpoint if not too burdensome during the AC meeting
- More please; 4 per year?!

Webinars

- Could be done by guest speakers; they do not necessarily have to be local; perhaps guest speaker for outside Bay Area or California to enhance our education
- Consider bringing in discussion of what holistic approach (not just wetlands) to flood protection means and impacts to SFBRA
- Learn more about fellow AC members' organizations; webinar that provides "lightning round" 3-5 minutes each about organization's mission, goals, audience, priorities, etc.
- Webinar for potential grantees to learn best practices for applying
- Consider previewing the webinars at a future AC meeting
- Provide links to webinars for later viewing and ability to share with our own staff and networks
- I did not know we did these (or maybe we haven't for a long time)?
- Continue webinars but save staff time by relying on existing materials from e.g. JV, SFEI, SFEP
- Updates on funded projects – progress and implementation
- 101 webinars good; ready for 201 series now – more detail and understanding of projects would improve ability to review proposals
- Educational opportunities are important (includes site tour, EJ panel, webinars); there are many AC members who are not directly engaged or as knowledgeable as practitioners are about wetlands
- Posting of webinars for AC members to access on their own time

Environmental Justice Panel

- EJ panel was excellent; more of this with CBOs and other diverse audiences
- EJ panel should be standing item (annually) with different panelists to encapsulate more voices
- EJ panel stimulated a lot of discussion and it was inspiring; but there was not enough time for all AC members to voice their comments and ask questions
- Limit program; focus on EDCs near restoration sites; CBOs should partner with larger entities capable of carrying out restoration projects; small groups generally wouldn't be capable of doing project

- Build upon existing capacity such as where RBD engaged with EJ community
- So important to listen to affected, under-represented voices
- Clearly identify which EJ communities are “grant eligible” and the organizations working with those communities so AC members can be informed and better coordinate with these organizations on potential projects
- Start with focused effort e.g. select 2-3 EDCs that already have capacity and help them engage with (link to) restoration projects; their success will grow/expand throughout their network

Other Comments

- How do we get more members that are diverse on AC?
- Public access – I would like to see more attention on public access and connecting people to wetland restoration projects as part of our key messages; for example: presentations to AC, GB as key part of communication strategy; after all, it is the way people will actually understand this entity’s work
- Committee overall has been positive experience; learning from others
- More focus on communication; outreach; and EDCs
- Could project grantees be required to take drone photos/videos over time to show how sites evolve?
- Would be helpful to know if GB members find any benefit from AC input
- Want to hear from GB - what do they want from the AC?
- Should have more time for Q&A and discussions during AC meetings
- AC should have the opportunity to review and provide feedback on the SFBRA annual budget
- The way people’s names get submitted and AC members selected seems a bit exclusive
- Staff time is valuable – don’t create extra make-work just for AC