Implementation Coordination Group (ICG) Meeting #4

June 27, 2024, 10:00 am - 12:00 pm

Redwood Room, 5th Floor, Bay Area Metro Center, San Francisco (Zoom option)

Desired Outcomes

- Start to better coordinate and align ourselves with funding opportunities
- Determine next steps to make progress toward our 2024 goal of establishing a framework for funding plans and projects (Task 6.2)

Materials

- <u>Joint Platform Progress Report</u> (June 2024)
- <u>2024 Work Plan</u>
- ICG Overview
- ICG's Community Principles
- Meeting #3 Notes

Attendance

ICG members in attendance: Violet Wulf-Saena, Resilient Communities Initiative (cochair); Michael McCormick, Farallon Strategies (co-chair); Allison Brooks, BARC(virtual); Amy Hutzel, SCC; Cam Oaks, Caltrans; Emma Greenbaum, Exploratorium; Julie Snyder, MTC-ABAG; Warner Chabot, SFEI; Selena Feliciano, (virtual); Heidi Nutters, SFEP; Len Matterman; Julio Garcia, Resilient South City (virtual), Elieen White (virtual); Louisa Vallela, EPA (new addition), Cameron Carr, Bay Planning Coalition; Gita Dev, Sierra Club; Christopher Caputo, Caltrans

Also in attendance: Jessica Fain, BCDC; Dana Brechwald, BCDC; Phoenix Armenta, BCDC; Corey Copland, BCDC, Zoe Siegel, Greenbelt Alliance; Matt Biggar, Connected to Place (meeting facilitator); Zack Wasserman, BCDC (virtual); Ella McDougall, OPC (virtual)

Key Takeaways:

- There was a desire to be able to dive deeper into discussion topics and not pack the agendas as much
- There was an interest in reviewing the joint platform progress report
- There was a collective interest in continuing conversations to align funding through the new subcommittees or groups

Welcome from Co-Chairs (Violet Saena and Michael McCormick)

Report: Joint Platform Progress (Dana Brechwald, BCDC)

Notes: keep joint platform progress report positive. Amy Hutzel was concerned about how the BRIT was portrayed. There was a call to potentially go into more detail about the BRIT in a future meeting.

Report: RSAP Guidelines Update (Jackie Perrin-Martinez, BCDC)

Quick Report: Project Priority List Update (Cory Copeland, BCDC)

Gita: Who controls the access to the Bay, Recommend reframe land use chapter to see how

regulatory regime and land use regime work together

Len: Regulatory regime needs to match the jurisdictional requirements.

Julio: We don't want to lose meaningful community involvement. What is the definition we provide for meaningful community involvement, need to not lose meaningful community involvement, need to define what "meaningful community involvement" means

Gita - It's not just land use, it's water use. What you are doing in the water should be part of the plan. - how does water use play into it - fish and wildlife + water quality control board jurisdiction

- cities and counties overlook it
- worries about BCDC getting stuck looking over the bills of all related plans

People are worried about the burden of meeting all of the requirements

Allison Brooks - agree with Gita, we need to be walking about the intersection between regulatory and planning, commented on the overpacking of agendas and limiting discussions

Allison Brooks worries that people will tweak proposal plans to meet funding plans. Suggests BCDC states goals for funding so organizations have consistency and reliable way to understand their resources

Presentation and Discussion: Align Funding Programs to Get Plans and Projects Done (Michael McCormick, moderator)

Panelists

Amy Hutzel, CA Coastal Conservancy

- Budget cuts of 392 mil
- Many different venues coordinating
- Budget was not great this year,\$37 mil was cut from coastal resilience and SLR. Has been told there will be a healthy amount of funding in the climate bond.
- SF bay restoration authority. Trying to prioritize funding for economically disadvantaged vulnerable authorities
- SF Bay Program Funding for SLR adaptation
 - \circ 5 mil \rightarrow 50 mil
 - 14 mil BIL-SFBWQIF funding coming shoreline resilience in underserved communities 2024-26 - open in October
 - Funds community-based organizations
 - o SF Bay program priorities w/ SLR
 - Wetland, Subtidal and shoreline habitat restoration/resilience + BRRIT

Luisa Valiela, US EPA (https://www.epa.gov/sfbay-delta/sfbwqif)

- SF bay program, vetted priority list (50 mil/year based on 11 program communities (brit
 is a program priority) huge federal funding opportunity coming soon, 4 of 11 priority list
 typed below, BRRIT is an additional priority not listed below can take over projects
 that lost their money for
- Subtidal habitat, eelgrass and oyster reef restoration
- Beneficial reuse of Dredged Material Support
- Large scale shoreline resilience, multi-benefit project

- Large scale tidal wetlands restoration

Ella McDougal, CA Ocean Protection Council (SB 1 Grant Program)

- o SP1 funds OPC and BCDC coordinating
- Give SLR funding to local jurisdictions grant program aligns w/ BCDC standards (SLR adaptations plans)
 - low minimum standard whoever wants \$\$ needs to have a vulnerability assessment
- Lots of different plans (track 1) + track 2
- o TA program expedited access to funds for underserved local govs
- Funds supposed to expire in 2 years → rolling quarterly, can make it flexible and modify it often
 - Deals with communication limits
- Luisa with fed gov? org reached out and adopted successful programs that ran out of funding
- Just approved contra costa and south sf
- o FB1 and FB2 guidelines

Cameron Oaks, Caltrans - maintains transportation assets

- "State highway network"
- Bridges, tunnels, and drainage are the core of the SHOP program
 - Bridges being one of the biggest deals in the Bay Area
- Looking to do feasibility studies

Panel Questions

- How can we align grant funding programs to make it easy for grantors and grantees to know what to do?
 - Ella: we try to strike a balance and do due diligence while not holding people back for years
 - Luisa: we want to take "sloppy seconds" but this is an informal process. If you're working on other funding, reference that in your funding documents
 - Michael: OPC is building an offboarding into other funding programs into their technical assistance program
 - Amy Hutzel: we have an ongoing grant program. Most of the conservancy's grant program is not grant rounds

_

- How can BCDC's Regional Shoreline Adaptation Plan and SB 272 be a catalyst for aligning various funding programs?
- Michael: some of these projects may be maladaptive, how to mesh these two will be an interesting conversation
 - Ella: were designing our program to meet the needs of 272. We just approved two projects (SF and CCC), working with BCDC to ensure they meet their needs. This is the purpose of this program.
 - Allison: there are the RSAP guidelines but there needs to be more resources to ensure cities can complete plans
- Response and Discussion
 - Violet: Cities need funding and support to lead community engagement

- around sb272. Theres already alignment and relationships, what's missing is where the communication is going
- Julio: SSF got funding for 272 and they just found out from the press release.
 Cities don't tell community organizations when they apply for grants in related issues
- Omar: Relationship with Philanthropy and local government and CBOS, great example in Marin, they are working with MCF on a 10 mil EPA grant.
- Adrian: great to see this level of coordination available given the amount of funding that's available relative to need.

Discussion: Next Steps (Violet Saena and Dana Brechwald)

Gita: important for language to be accessible

Allison: we need more time. We could have framed this differently about what people want to do and organizing the committees more organically

Selena: these committees will be more important. Would love for these committee

meetings to dive deeper

Michael: lets work to understand which funders can fund RSAP, would ask funders to review

RSAP to see how they could be tweaked. Maybe thin down the number os

Planning/Regulatory interface (land use/water)

Report: Annual Forum (Zoe Siegel, Greenbelt Alliance)