



**San Francisco Bay Joint Venture
Joint Meeting of the Science Steering Committee and the
Conservation Delivery Committee
February 12, 2015 10:00 am -2:15 pm
State Coastal Conservancy 11th Floor meeting room
1330 Broadway, Oakland CA**

Attendees: Marc Holmes, Chair Conservation Delivery Committee (The Bay Institute), Joy Albertson (US Fish and Wildlife Service, via phone), Donna Ball (Save the Bay), Chris Barton (East Bay Regional Park District), John Bourgeois (SCC-South Bay Salt Pond Restoration Project), Cat Burns (San Francisco Bay Bird Observatory, via phone), Ari DeMarco (Independent), Scott Dusterhoff (San Francisco Estuary Institute), Matt Gerhart (State Coastal Conservancy), Andy Gunther (Bay Area Ecosystem Climate Change Consortium), Tony Hale (San Francisco Estuary Institute, via phone), John Klochak (US Fish and Wildlife Service, via phone), John Krause (California Dept of Fish and Wildlife), Marilyn Latta (State Coastal Conservancy), Greg Martinelli (California Dept of Fish and Wildlife, via phone), Jen McBroom (Invasive Spartina Project, via phone), Nadav Nur (Point Blue), Chindi Peavey (Mosquito and Vector Control Districts, via phone), Stuart Siegel (Siegel Environmental), David Smith, (Gaia Consulting, via phone), Rachel Spadafore (Audubon California, via phone), Renee Spenst, Chair Science Steering Committee (Ducks Unlimited), Caitlin Sweeney (San Francisco Estuary Partnership), Sarah Swickard State Coastal Conservancy Intern), David Thompson (San Francisco Bay Bird Observatory, via phone), Laura Valoppi (South Bay Salt Pond Restoration Project and US Geological Survey, via phone), Sam Veloz (Point Blue Conservation Science, via phone), Susanne von Rosenberg (Gaia Consulting, via phone), Kerry Wilcox (Audubon, via phone), Bruce Wolfe (San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control District), Isa Woo (USGS, via phone), Julian Wood (Point Blue), Haley Zemel (Save the Bay). JV Staff: Beth Huning (Coordinator), Sandra Scoggin (Assistant Coordinator), Caroline Warner (Outreach Coordinator, via phone), Angela Haas (JV Intern)

1. Welcome and Introductions

Marc Holmes chaired the meeting.

2. Announcements or Project updates - All Participants

Renee Spenst - Since the breach event on January 6th at Cullinan Ranch, there have been lots of birds present, including Canvasbacks and other diving ducks. Combined interpretive design planning has been started. At Eden Landing, ponds E12 and 13 are in progress. A short history of Cullinan was also provided by Renee: in 1984, citizens in Vallejo stopped development on the property, and in 1990 US Fish and Wildlife purchased the land.

Marilyn Latta – The infestation acreage of invasive Spartina is down to 29 net acres; about 23 of these are in the no-treat sites, so only 6.2 of these remaining acres bay wide are on treatable sites. They have finished the treatment season, and are now e-vegetating and constructing islands at Bair Island and Muzzi Marsh.

Matt Gerhart – The State Coastal Conservancy is drafting its Prop 1 guidelines. There are three public meetings being held in March.

Chris Barton - Albany Beach Restoration and Public Access project is in the process of rebuilding what has been 1800 ft of eroding shoreline. They hope to start construction around June. Phase 1 of restoration at Breuner Marsh is complete. During the big rains it was observed that the manufactured hydrology is working nicely. Phase 2 is underway, and includes a public access component, which is set for construction this summer. That is dependent on federal funding, so it might be a long process, but things are looking good at the moment.

Bruce Wolfe - The Water Board and Army Corps of Engineers have circulated a 10 year permit for maintenance dredging. There is a push for more dredged sediment reuse. Permitting is on the Water Board meeting agenda for May.

Stuart Siegel – Siegel Environmental is working with the city of San Rafael on odor issues at Spinnaker Point. They are proposing sea level rise accommodation, and getting underway in about 3 months.

3. Coordinator's Updates - Beth Huning, SFBJV

Prop 1 - The Government Affairs Committee is analyzing which funding pots can best be utilized by JV projects. The JV will be commenting on guidelines and creating a prioritized project list.

Hwy 37 – A study is being conducted by Cal Trans for alternative futures for Hwy 37. We were sent out-of-date sea level rise maps that Cal Trans was using, which showed the Napa Plant Site as not having been breached. We sent the maps in for updates and are encouraging partners to get info to the team working on Hwy 37 as soon as possible to help get these maps up to date.

Funding opportunities - The National Coastal Wetlands Grant guidelines just came out. State Coastal Conservancy, Fish & Wildlife and Department of Fish and Game have applied. Contact the program officer at the SCC to apply for this funding. The NAWCA funding deadline is July. Marilyn Latta received a NAWCA grant for living shorelines, and the NCWC Grant was received for vegetation work at Cullinan.

Flyway Festival - The festival is being held this weekend (Feb. 13-15) at Mare Island.

CA State Wildlife Commission - Holly Andre has been inducted into the Waterfowl Hall of Fame.

BCDC - Fill policies are being updated. Anne Morkill, Beth Huning, Marc Holmes, and David Lewis were contacted to be part of that committee.

NAWMP - The SF Bay Joint Venture was assessed. National and state wildlife directors and members of various waterfowl/wetland groups noted that they had never seen so many canvasbacks in one place. We demonstrated to NAWMP how the JV is addressing climate change and sea level rise. NAWMP will send recommendations based on their assessment.

South Bay Updates - Laura Valoppi creates and distributes summaries of reports related to the south bay, including Ridgeway's Rail and public access information. Anyone interested in getting on that list to receive great updates should email her.

4. JV and Partner Program Updates

SFBJV Project Web Map – *Sandra Scoggin, SFBJV*. This feature is interactive and can be used by the public. Information includes partners, acreage, and a short description about the project. This will also be linked to the project information in the database, ideally to live/current data. Hard copies of the habitat project maps will still be printed.

Database Transition Update – *Sandra Scoggin, SFBJV*. Project information is currently in the JV database, which is transferring to EcoAtlas through the JV website (with Water Board, Central Valley Joint Venture, and Delta Conservancy). Sandra will be contacting project leads for updates and project information to be implemented into database. At the April meeting, attendees can give input for the database tracking and tools. Flood control components in projects can be integrated with “Charge”, a flood management program for mapping flood control projects in the bay.

Climate Adaptation Decision Support – *Beth Huning, SFBJV*. Brady Matson is working on the final report, which should be done by next week for review. On February 27 there will be a final 2-hour webinar. The webinar will address plans for how to allocate resources under different scenarios. Conservation targets have been identified for this meeting; a few targets are region-specific. A report will be finalized and broadly distributed after the webinar.

Future SF Bay Marshes: A Climate Smart Planning Tool – *Julian Wood, Point Blue*. This tool is revised based on user input. To access, visit: pointblue.org/sfbayslr. The interactive map feature models resilience or vulnerability of marshes in SF bay based on sea level rise scenarios, and the reports feature summarizes by habitat type how sites are expected to change based on those scenarios. There will be a workshop to learn how to use this tool, as well as the Climate Smart riparian tools available, on March 25th at the Marin Wellness Center.

Midwinter Waterfowl Survey Redesign Update – *Nadav Neur, Point Blue*. There has been a core team meeting for the redesign. The redesign is aimed to make the survey more efficient and more statistically sound, to be consistent with surveys outside of the bay, and to make sure that the information gathered is useful and covering the needs of managers. Keeping large- and small-scale objectives in mind has been noted as an important part of the redesign. For example, in the old survey, spatial and habitat coverage was not stratified, not all habitats were surveyed, and there was some variability in temporal scale (i.e., single-day surveys). Point Blue is considering spreading the survey out for months to take into account bird usage of habitats throughout an entire winter. The Central Valley redesign will spread the survey over the full winter. The most recent survey was completed a few days after Cullinan had been opened in January, and several thousands of birds were counted, demonstrating the shift in habitat use of many birds. We received some funding from Migratory Birds, but this funding source is uncertain for future years.

Implementation Plan Revision – *Beth Huning, SFBJV*. The Implementation Plan needs a full revision, as was agreed at the last Management Board meeting, for implementation of the BEHGU. We are currently gathering information for process and approach, and identifying additional work to focus on in the next 5-10 years. The revision will be discussed at the April Management Board meeting. Over the next few months we'll have opportunities to solicit input.

Bayland Ecosystem Habitat Goals Report Update for Climate Change Recommendations and Implementation – *Matt Gerhart, BEHGU Update Lead*. The BEHGU is an update of the 1999 report. The original report, focusing on restoring the historic condition, will be preserved. This update is specific to climate change, and focused on functions that establish the complexity needed to restore a shifting and dynamic estuary. It is in production and roll-out phase, and currently we have 600 pages of materials. The BEHGU near-term vision includes a diverse, connected mosaic of baylands and adjacent uplands, and

complete tidal wetland ecosystems. The long-term vision involves the potential need to migrate habitats and deal with loss and off-setting of habitats and species due to climate change and sea level rise.

The three parts of the report are: 1) Executive summary, at the policy level, 2) Science synthesis and recommendations (this will constitute the bound copy), and 3) Science chapters available online, with appendices and case studies. A lot of emphasis will be on the web piece, including linking to the other regional, live resources and tools.

Comments from the meeting attendees:

- Connectivity of life cycles of plant and animal spp – plants and animals moving through the landscape
- It is important to conduct outreach to cities, counties, the Army Corps of Engineers, flood control districts, land use planners, and resource agencies.
- There are tradeoffs when managing for critical species: managing for short term sometimes conflicts with long term.
- Loop messages into polling on restoration authority
- It is important to give a concrete timeline associated with the new recommendations in order to support the request for \$75 million dollars of CA Department of Fish and Wildlife money for the bay, especially since it is a relatively small area. Some of the messages from this planning document could be incorporated into an argument for more funding for bay projects.
- Beneficial re use – Corps of Engineers is going through their CEQA NEPA for their dredge program in bay. Leverage them as the biggest dredger in the bay. Since sediment issues also come from the watershed side, communication between the watershed regulators and the bay regulators seems important. We should connect sediment to habitat – we haven't really studied the what happens when we reduce sediment from the watersheds. Tying this in to flood control is also important – BEHGU could be the plan that outlines how we should.
- Where does CADS fit in to this? Possibly as an example of how some decision processes will be used to implement the plan.

More feedback should be directed to Matt Gerhart.

Flood Control 2.0 – *Caitlin Sweeney, Robin Grossinger, and Scott Dusterhoff*. Flood control channels at the bay interface are a uniquely challenging opportunity, and very important given the associated economic costs, the significance to the bay ecosystem, and the effects of climate change. The goal of Flood Control 2.0 is to develop a set of tools and a process for increasing flood protection and resilience to sea level rise, as well as to the increased risks associated with storm events, sediment issues, and aging infrastructure. In the works is a regional channel/bayland typology tool for informing appropriate management concepts. This tool looks at fluvial-tidal interface types around the bay, and at historic and current sediment delivery and storage. At this point, using the gathered information on typology, Flood Control 2.0 is focusing on channels where deposition is high. There is an interactive map on storymaps.sfei.org where you can see the changes in fluvial-tidal interface over time. This tool is planned to be completed by the spring of 2016.

5. Questions and Discussion between the SFBJV Science Steering Committee and the Conservation Delivery Community regarding highest priority science needs

Note: Mid-winter waterfowl changes and updates should be included as urgent needs of the conservation community and as part of the short-term goals of the SSC.

As it stands, the three documents listed as guiding documents in the SSC charter were used to create a list of identified needs. [The 31-page document with needs from eight planning documents was not lost/is

available. In the case of a need with multiple references, the need on the 11-page document was written to be all-encompassing and each of the needs referenced were more specific and can be viewed on the 31-page document as-written.]

Comments:

- Instead of “increased coordination” (which is understood), call instead for “optimized coordination”.
- If asking a questionnaire, since these are very in-depth questions, can they be pared down? Perhaps just for prioritization of identified needs.
- Regarding #6: Standardization and information sharing could be “more ambitious”; the example given is that data gathered by multiple people on Ridgway’s Rail surveys might be very different in method and information, and therefore difficult to integrate.
- Categories could be useful: on the ground and project goals versus long-term project tracking.
- Management context link needed from science needs; outcomes of attaining these needs versus not needed to prioritize

6. The joint meeting of the Science Steering and Conservation Delivery Committees of February 12, 2015, was adjourned.