

**San Francisco Bay Joint Venture  
Climate Change Policy White Paper**

*Prepared by Brenna Mahoney, Beth Huning, Arthur Feinstein*

**Purpose:** The purpose of this paper is to synthesize ongoing climate change planning processes that are occurring within the San Francisco Bay Joint Venture's (SFBJV) boundaries and to identify priority agencies and processes for the SFBJV and partners to be engaged in. In doing so, this paper specifically calls out time-sensitive opportunities for regulatory and policy discussions that would impact restoration activities throughout the region and highlights where the SFBJV can be most effective in order to influence these planning processes and policy changes. This paper can also be used as an advocacy tool to outline priorities of the SFBJV and provide a justification for these priorities.

**Summary:** It is widely understood that climate change is an imminent and long-term threat to the San Francisco Bay, outer coast and coastal estuaries, riparian habitats, and wetland-dependent species. There is an urgent call to take swift action to protect and restore San Francisco Bay area bay and coastal habitats as a buffer against rising seas and associated flooding as well as to mitigate and adapt to impacts of climate change such as increased temperatures and storm events. Indeed, a significant number of statewide, regional, and local climate change planning processes have already occurred, are underway, and are being planned. Many of these planning processes focus on protecting built infrastructure and incorporate, to varying levels, the ecosystem services that wetlands provide. Other planning processes focus on protecting and enhancing habitats and aim to restore functional wetlands and ecosystem connectivity in order to increase climate resilience. The SFBJV has an interest in engaging in these climate change planning processes and potential policy changes in order to help achieve the habitat restoration and species conservation goals of the SFBJV and partners.

**Desired outcomes in engaging with climate change planning processes**

The SFBJV will consider and advocate for the following outcomes when evaluating products of the planning processes listed below:

1. Solutions to sea level rise should be integrated with the continued implementation of the habitat goals of the SFBJV to ensure ecosystem function and landscape resiliency into the future.
2. Preservation and restoration of natural habitats, such as tidal marshes, beaches, subtidal living shorelines, and riparian, should be the first line of defense against sea level rise and flooding.
3. Improved ecological connectivity should guide the development of proposed solutions. □
4. Near-term solutions to protect habitats should avoid, wherever possible, the filling of wetlands and the Bay, unless the solutions are consistent with SFBJV habitat goals.
5. Natural infrastructure should be utilized wherever possible. Whenever possible, solutions should avoid the installation of hard infrastructure, such as sea walls, that would be barriers to tidal exchange.

6. Provision for wetland migration should be accommodated with adequate adjacent uplands for that purpose. Agricultural lands should be maintained, as they will provide future opportunities for wetland restoration and migration, as has been demonstrated in the North Bay.
7. Provisions should be made for adequate sediment to sustain both mudflats and tidal marshes into the future.
8. Planning processes should use the best available climate science.
9. While the focus of the SFBJV is habitat and species, we recognize the need to be concerned for communities. Some communities may be disproportionately impacted by climate threats like sea level rise. Resilience planning efforts should recognize the increased vulnerability of these disadvantaged communities to climate threats, and seek opportunities to minimize negative climate impacts on and maximize adaptation-related benefits to these communities.

## **Introduction**

### ***Climate Vulnerability and the San Francisco Bay Area***

Climate change has the potential to affect many aspects of the San Francisco Bay and coastal habitats. This paper focuses on the effects of climate variability, sea level rise, and storms (storm surge) on habitats and species. Of particular concern to the SFBJV are the impacts to habitats and species from sea level rise and increased storm events, as a rising Bay and ocean can drown tidal marshes and mudflats. Extreme storms can erode streambeds, thus removing fish habitat and impacting riparian habitat. Water temperature changes can affect productivity of forage species for water birds and other wildlife. Bay Intertidal habitats such as mudflats, tidal marshes, eelgrass beds, etc., exist as a boundary between deeper waters and upland habitats. Submerged during high and some moderate tides and exposed to the air during low tides, intertidal habitats are some of the richest in biodiversity and productivity of all Bay habitats, both terrestrial and aquatic. Because their elevation ranges are so limited, a rise in sea level can easily result in their drowning, i.e., permanent complete submersion. Tidal marsh “transition zones” are relatively narrow bands of uplands immediately adjacent to the tidal marsh. These quasi-uplands may still support wetland vegetation but are usually not inundated even at high tides. They provide important habitat for many marsh creatures as well as land for wetland migration. Additionally, seasonal wetlands or vernal pools will experience altered hydrologic regimes with increased droughts and extreme storms. Additionally, many wetlands, both saline and freshwater, are significant sites of carbon sequestration and drowned marshes will no longer sequester additional carbon. The science of climate change is advancing quickly, there is a need for additional scientific research and modeling of sea level rise, storm surge, and other climate variabilities. to inform adaptive management.

Recent research has indicated that with accelerated habitat restoration and adequate sediment in the Bay, existing tidal marshes, in particular, may be able to keep pace as sea levels rise. Since it takes time for wetlands to establish themselves, restoration efforts need to be initiated as soon as possible and preferably within the next 15 years. The Baylands Goals Science Update indicates that for the Bay habitats to function as healthy ecosystems and support wildlife and human communities, we need to restore estuary-watershed connections that nourish the Bay with sediment and freshwater and design complexity and connectivity into the landscape at various

spatial scales. Full marsh ecosystems, including transitional habitats and wetland migration space provide the greatest benefits to a rising Bay and, where possible, should be included in planning processes that address a rising Bay and its changing shorelines.

***Climate change planning processes in the San Francisco Bay Area***

Numerous planning processes throughout the San Francisco Bay area are working to account and plan for the many likely impacts of climate change. These planning processes occur at various governance levels, at specific sites, localities, as well as regionally, and through private and nonprofit organizations and cross agency and organization collaborations. Types of planning processes include city and county Climate Action Plans and Sea Level Rise Vulnerability Assessments, proposed restoration and implementation projects, collaborative working group discussions, planning documents that address the effects of climate change, and regulatory discussions that are ongoing with many participants such as multiple SFBJV partners, land managers, regional agencies and organizations and NGOs. Local and regional governments are also discussing and planning for the effects of sea level rise and increased flooding. While several attempts to merge or centralize all these efforts and develop a unified approach to planning for and addressing the impacts of sea level rise and increased flooding have been initiated, the Bay Area's approach to sea level rise remains fragmented. However, and as discussed below, several region-wide planning approaches have recently been initiated.

***How the San Francisco Bay Joint Venture (SFBJV) engages with issues of climate change***

The SFBJV is a self-directed, voluntary, non-regulatory partnership of NGOs, agencies (State, federal, regulatory and resource) and the business community. The mission of the SFBJV is to protect, restore, and enhance all kinds of wetland habitats for the benefit of birds, fish and other wildlife. Since its founding in 1996, and adoption of the original Implementation Plan, *Restoring the Estuary* in 2001, climate change has emerged as one of the most important drivers impacting the ability of the SFBJV to accomplish its goals. Specific goals, among others, of the SFBJV for these processes include: preservation and restoration of tidal marshes as a first line of defense against sea level rise and flooding; provision for wetland migration by providing adequate adjacent uplands for that purpose; sustaining mudflats; and provision of adequate sediment to sustain both mudflats and tidal marshes. SFBJV efforts recognize the critical need to preserve the Bay Area's ability to sustain its human population while ensuring that disadvantaged communities do not suffer disproportionately.

The work that the SFBJV conducts for the benefit of habitats is founded on the concept of Strategic Habitat Conservation (SHC). The SHC cycle includes biological or ecological planning, habitat design and delivery, monitoring and evaluation. Included in this comprehensive portfolio of activities are 'outreach' and 'policy' work that will enable us to accomplish our goals set forth in the 2001 Implementation Plan - to protect, restore, and enhance 200,000 acres of various wetland habitats and associated uplands. However, 'policy' was not specifically addressed in the 2001 Implementation Plan, but subsequent SFBJV plans (Climate Adaptation Plans, CADS, San Pablo Bay NWR, NFWF Business Plan, etc.), recognize that influencing policy decisions at the federal, State, regional, and local levels directly impacts the ability of SFBJV partners to deliver habitat projects and address important issues that threaten or impact the ability of the SFBJV to accomplish its goals.

The SFBJV directly engages in site-specific and regional climate change planning processes and policy discussions described above to help achieve its habitat and species conservation goals. With a large number of ongoing planning processes, there is a need to prioritize these efforts in order to focus SFBJV engagement with these processes. This is to ensure that these efforts will succeed in policy discussions that result in plans and regulations that will not only address the human cultural and infrastructure needs in the face of sea level rise but will also ensure the continued health and productivity of the Bay, coast and upland aquatic habitats. Synthesizing those processes, their outcomes and products, and potential agency/organizational policy changes will inform how the SFBJV will engage in climate change policy and provide background for policy strategies to be incorporated in the SFBJV Implementation Plan.

### **Organization and Intended Use:**

This white paper is comprised of two sections: *White Paper* and *Catalogue of Climate Change Planning Processes*.

#### White Paper

This report details issues of concern of climate change and sea level rise for the SFBJV, as described above, and, in the discussion below, highlights and describes in more detail key and urgent engagement priorities.

#### Catalogue of Climate Change Planning Processes

This online table details completed, ongoing, and planned planning processes and reports. Planning processes are organized spatially, by lead agency, and by key issues. Other information such as primary contacts and SFBJV partner engagement priorities will also be kept up to date by requesting SFBJV partner review.

The table can be found [here](#).

#### Intended Use

This paper was produced to help guide the SFBJV and partners in prioritizing where to invest their efforts to have the most impact in the climate change planning process for the benefit of wildlife and habitat. It will also serve the interested public as a guide to these processes and help inform them about the SFBJV goals for these processes.

### **Use of This Paper and SFBJV Partner Engagement:**

- This paper will be used as a resource for SFBJV partners to determine in which planning meetings to engage.
- It will be used as a resource to identify and encourage common support for the objectives itemized in the paper.
- The paper will be distributed to all SFBJV partners as a way to encourage participation in one or more of these planning processes. An engagement or implementation strategy will be developed by the SFBJV Government Affairs Committee.
- The paper or the summary can/should be distributed to all of the planning agencies urging them to take into consideration the SFBJV recommendations.

- A 2-page summary of this paper could be developed for office holders.
- The messages/outcomes in this paper can be used for public communications such as media, editorial boards, etc.

**A Living Document:** This white paper on climate change planning processes is considered a living document. It analyzes the current and prevailing planning processes, and as additional processes are brought to the attention of the SFBJV, they will be evaluated to determine the level of SFBJV participation. This white paper and supporting table will be updated yearly at the discretion of the Government Affairs Committee as a part of the yearly work plan development.

### **Key Engagement Priorities**

This section is intended to provide more detail about key engagement priorities in climate change planning processes. These are planning processes that are time sensitive and ones that are most likely to result in implementable actions and policy changes both at local and regional scales. Intro to this section. It is intended that the content described below will be kept up to date and planning processes will be added, edited, or removed as appropriate. The following organization is not meant to reflect prioritization within this list.

#### **(1) BCDC**

##### **1a. Bay Plan / McAteer-Petris Act Amendments**

##### **1b. Adapting to Rising Tides (ART) Bay Area and Regional Working Group**

#### **(2) NFWF Coastal Resilience Assessment**

#### **(3) San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB)**

#### **(4) Plan Bay Area**

#### **(5) Regional Advanced Mitigation Planning (RAMP)**

#### **(6) Highway (SR) 37 Stewardship Study and Planning for Realignment and Widening**

#### **(7) Resilient by Design**

### **Full Descriptions:**

#### **(1) BCDC**

##### **1a. Bay Plan / McAteer-Petris Act Amendments**

**Summary:** BCDC is currently undergoing a review of its San Francisco Bay Plan with possible amendments to the McAteer-Petris Act specifically to examine policies regarding Bay Fill and Social Justice and Equity.

**Full Description:** The review of possible changes to the McAteer-Petris Act comes after a year of public workshops that BCDC held through its Adapting to Rising Tide (ART) program to review climate change policies and to “develop an action plan to address current and future flooding and to build regional resilience.” There is a consensus from BCDC that restoration work needs to be sped up to adapt to the consequences of sea level rise. The review and amendment process was approved by the Board of Commissioners on July 20th, 2017. Additionally, BCDC will look to examine other policies in the future but have not stated which policies these are.

This work comes out of recommendations from the BCDC Policies for a Rising Bay Project (2016).

BCDC may use case studies to evaluate policy changes. An example of a project that BCDC has undertaken to examine flood risk reduction benefits provided by tidal marsh is the **Corte Madera Conceptual Sea Level Rise Adaptation Strategy**. Published in 2013, this project looks at how to reduce the vulnerability of tidal wetlands to sea level rise. This report has a section on Constraints (page 17) including policy challenges. From the report: *There may be regulatory challenges associated with converting existing wetland habitat to brackish wetlands and uplands, and mitigation may be required for impacts to existing habitat. Any discharge of treated wastewater to the transition zone slopes would need to be permitted by the appropriate agencies. The use of dredged material to create the transition zone slopes and the local reuse of treated wastewater would repurpose resources that are currently not reused to the fullest extent possible. In the future, however, new ways to reuse these resources may be found, leading to competition for finite supplies.*

#### **Timeline:**

- Amendment process: after its review is complete, BCDC plans to hold an initial public hearing in May 2018 and for the Board of Commissioners to vote on amendments in August 2018 after language is finalized.
- Meetings
  - Bay Fill Policy Work Group (<http://www.bcdc.ca.gov/bayfill/bayFillmtg.php>):
    - 2017: September 21, October 19, November 16, December 21.
    - 2018 TBA
  - Other meetings TBA on ART website.

#### **JV and Partner Engagement**

- Attend public meetings, provide written and oral comments.
- Keep tabs on future policies that will be reviewed/maintain relationship with BCDC staff
- On July 20th, 2017, the SFBJV Management Board agreed to form a committee which will work to engage in the amendment process. Members: Arthur Feinstein (chair, Govt. Affairs), Marc Holmes, Caitlin Sweeney, Barbara Salzman, Jeff McCreary, Matt Gerhart, Diane Ross-Leech, Greg Martinelli, and Julian Meisler (Sonoma Land Trust). Others to be included at the discretion of Arthur, Marc, and Caitlin.
  - This group can meet before the end of 2017 to organize and set specific goals for outreach to BCDC and partners.
  - Review bay fill policies in the McAteer-Petris Act (Chapter 1) and discuss recommendations/public comment made to BCDC
  - Review BCDC Policies for a Rising Bay project (see below) to understand current policy, language, and BCDC recommendations that are likely to drive the above conversation and analysis.

### **1b. Adapting to Rising Tides (ART) Bay Area and Regional Working Group**

**Summary:** ART Bay Area is conducting a region-wide transportation vulnerability assessment with funding by CalTrans and support from MTC and consultants. BCDC established a regional working group of stakeholders to advise on this assessment.

**Full Description:** ART Bay area will be conducting vulnerability assessments of key assets within the following sectors: transportation, vulnerable communities, Priority Development Areas (PDAs), and Priority Conservation Areas (PCAs). The vulnerability assessment itself is being conducted by BCDC planning staff. The regional working group will meet roughly every other month to provide input. The Kick off meeting was on September 21st, 2017 and plans to meet again in February 2018.

BCDC contact staff: [carey.batha@bcdcc.ca.gov](mailto:carey.batha@bcdcc.ca.gov), [adam.fullerton@bcdcc.ca.gov](mailto:adam.fullerton@bcdcc.ca.gov), [Elizabeth.felter@bcdcc.ca.gov](mailto:Elizabeth.felter@bcdcc.ca.gov), and [eliza.berry@bcdcc.ca.gov](mailto:eliza.berry@bcdcc.ca.gov).

**Timeline:** Regional Working Group Meetings began in late Fall 2018 and will be held throughout the project timeframe, end of 2019.

#### **JV and Partner Engagement**

- A key focus of the JV may be to discuss location, size and habitat potential of existing PCAs and consider possible suggestions for additional PCASs
- Ensure that SFBJV are informed about timing of meetings.
- Attend meetings to track how habitat and wildlife are prioritized in the SLR assessment/actions especially in JV priority regions.
  - Register for the working group here.
- Track discussions on policy concerns, needs, and potential changes (see above as well).

#### **(2) NFWF Coastal Resilience Assessment**

This project, funded by NOAA in partnership with Army Corps, led by Point Blue, NEMAC, and NatureServe, is conducting a watershed assessment of San Francisco Bay as a part of other national targeted watersheds (others are on the east coast). The objectives of the assessment are to identify areas of the landscape where implementation of conservation actions will have maximum benefit for human community resilience and fish and wildlife habitat. This assessment accounts for coastal and inland storm events and SLR.

The Coastal resilience assessment will be a combination of a threat index and asset index (which includes social vulnerability and critical infrastructure). This will highlight areas of high concentration of community assets that are threatened by coastal flooding.

Future workshops will have stakeholder opportunity to:

- Identify relevant plans/studies that help inform analysis
- Identify key fish and wildlife species and habitat
- Identify spatial data
- Provide input to vulnerability models
- Provide resilience projects in the watershed

- Provide review of draft results

What they need, specifically:

- Fish and wildlife datasets - particularly in regards to identification of storm threats and community assets.
- Projects in the area that are not fully implemented or funded. Which projects will achieve most community resilience and benefit fish, wildlife, and habitats?

**JV and partner involvement:** Contact Maya Hayden ([mhayden@pointblue.org](mailto:mhayden@pointblue.org)) to be on listserv and to be invited to workshops.

### **(3) San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board (Water Board)**

**Summary:** The Water Board is reviewing its policies and regulations to determine how it can more effectively address climate change impacts and wetland and stream restoration while overseeing the protection and restoration of all of the San Francisco Bay Region's beneficial uses of water.

**Full Description:** The Water Board has begun reviewing and analyzing its policies and regulations to determine how it can more effectively address climate change impacts and wetland and stream restoration while overseeing protection and restoration of San Francisco Bay's beneficial uses of water. This is a high priority planning project identified by the Water Board in its 2015 Triennial Review of the Basin Plan. Water Board staff are examining a series of issues that have been raised by stakeholders, including wetland fill policies for ecosystem restoration and flood protection that consider sea level rise, use of treated wastewater and stormwater as a source of freshwater to nourish tidal marshes, and expanded use of sediment to benefit baylands and build shoreline resilience. Board staff plan to inform the public and the Water Board about projects historically permitted by the Board, the flexibility in permitting restoration and shoreline resilience projects provided by existing policies and regulations, how adaptive the Board has been able to be in the current policy framework, and whether policy changes should be pursued. Board staff are considering holding a public workshop with the Water Board in 2018 to discuss the current permitting approach, potential regulatory improvements, provide case studies, and discuss whether changes to the Basin Plan are needed.

Currently, the Board has a U.S. EPA grant to look at some of these policies in relation to the State's wetland program. This is being conducted in collaboration with the SF Estuary Partnership.

Board staff are also collaborating with SFEI on a project to support shoreline resiliency planning and develop tools for assessing alternatives.

Issues that the Water Board is interested in reviewing:

- Multi-benefit projects that require fill in baylands to support climate change adaptation projects, including tidal marsh enhancement/protection, flood protection that provides ecosystem benefits, endangered species protection, and beneficial use of treated wastewater and dredged sediment.



- Policy considerations under review:
  - Wetland fill and restoration:
    - Review of the Basin Plan's fill and mitigation policies and interpretation of the California Wetlands Conservation Policy – i.e., the "no net loss" policy. The current standard is avoid, minimize, and then mitigate for wetlands impacts
    - Placement of fill, including fill that creates habitat
    - Open water vs. tidal marshes – how to address conversion of one water body type to another when they are currently viewed the same under the State's wetlands policy
    - Impacts to jurisdictional waters and waters of State (temporary vs. permanent impacts) during project implementation and as a result of a project over time
    - Wetland protection - how can we encourage optimization of horizontal levee/transition zones/ecotone levees when current policies may consider them fill that requires mitigation
    - Hardening of shorelines vs. nature-based solutions
    - Evaluation of the landward edge of projects – how to minimize fill and maximize wetland restoration
  - Treated municipal wastewater and municipal stormwater; shallow water discharge as source of freshwater for wetlands (addressing nutrients and contaminants of emerging concern)
  - Sediment management
    - Beneficial reuse of dredged sediment - options for placement
    - Watershed management: flood control and connections to the Bay, including restoration of connectivity, ecological values (supporting fisheries, etc.), and geomorphic processes of local tributaries
    - Tidal marsh evolution - marsh plain accretion

**Timeline:**

Spring 2018: Staff Report to Board

Fall 2018: Board Workshop on its Policy Review Findings

**JV and Partner Engagement:** The JV and its partners are encouraged to comment on grant findings and proposed policy revisions as they are released to the public and subsequently presented to the Water Board.

**(4) Plan Bay Area**

**Summary** OBAG2 funding RFP to be released soon, opportunity for PCA review and nominations.

**Full Description:** Currently, the 2040 Action Plan of Plan Bay Area recommends to “expand the region’s network of natural infrastructure, coordinate regional programs to preserve and expand natural features that reduce flood risk, strengthen biodiversity, enhance air quality, and improve access to urban and rural public space.” Additionally, to “leverage existing initiatives - including Priority Conservation Areas (PCAs), Resilient by Design Challenge, SFEP, and Bay Restoration Authority, and partner with special districts and cities.” as well as to “establish the Regional Advance Mitigation Program (RAMP), advance mitigation for infrastructure projects to strengthen regional biological conservation priorities, and work to secure off-site compensatory mitigation lands for multiple infrastructure projects in-advance of environmental reviews to improve both project delivery and conservation outcomes.”

165 PCAs were established, designated in two batches in 2008 and 2015 ([list](#) / [map](#)). Plan Bay Area lists the [benefits of PCAs](#).

In 2013, ABAG released the first One Bay Area Grant (OBAG1) round for grants. Currently, ABAG is working on the schedule for OBAG 2 grant round, and a RFP will be sent out in late spring 2018. The next designation period for PCAs will be aligned with the next Plan Bay Area update in 2021. For OBAG 2, eligible projects will be located within or immediately adjacent to PCAs that have already been designated.

**Timeline:** OBAG2 RFP TBA mid-2018, will announce the next opportunity to nominate PCAs.

#### **JV and Partner Engagement**

- During OBAG1 funding round, JV partners nominated and pursued designation of certain sites to be included as PCAs. Some were and others were not. OBAG2 is an opportunity for the JV to review and reaffirm priority areas and advocate for UTZs to be included.
- Along with nominating new PCAs, the JV and partners can review where the current PDAs and PCAs are located, what policies and planning processes are occurring in these areas, and how local partners can be involved in the management of the current PCAs.
- Spread the word about PCAs and OBAG2 funding. Important notes about OBAG 2 funding:
  - The match requirement has been dropped from 3:1 to 2:1
  - There are now new PCA types that are eligible, particularly Urban Greening
  - The MTC funding is now flexible for use on all PCA types so won’t have a transportation bias.
  - Will likely incorporate Bay Area Greenprint into the grant program evaluation, emphasizing multi-benefits.

#### **(5) RAMP Regional Area Mitigation Program**

A pilot investigation sponsored by MTC with funding from the Coastal Conservancy and the Bechtel Foundation with TNC as the lead partner organizing. It could lead to a new regional program housed and MTC with SCC involvement/support. The program needs dedicated funding sources that are flexible for use to advance mitigation, which don’t currently exist. RM3 could help provide a start as could SB1 or Caltran funding> There is a TAC of regulators and

transportation agencies developing a framework for the program but nothing is currently running in terms of advance mitigation, except for the RCIS process in the south and east bay.

**(6) Highway (SR) 37 Stewardship Study and Planning for Realignment and Widening**

**Summary:** Planning for redesigning SR 37 is happening quickly. However, this process will take a while from design to implementation. The purpose is to alleviate traffic and flooding on the 19-mile stretch of highway across the North Bay.

**Full Description:** Two studies have previously been conducted by UC Davis for CalTrans to determine options for re-design and widening. While an elevated causeway was preferred by participants, no Preferred Alternative was identified as per CEQA definitions. The CalTrans planning horizon is potentially up to 40 years. In the interim, a group of potential investors considered a toll road option, and Solano County has been pushing surrounding counties to move forward on redesign to expedite remediation of traffic and flooding, as portions of SR 37 are below sea level and already subject to inundation during storm events. Rather than having individuals and counties address the issues themselves, MTC has also engaged in a planning process and has formed an Environmental Working Group to bring environmental concerns into the design sooner than later.

**Timeline:** There are meetings first Thursday of every other month (odd-numbered months).

**JV and Partner Engagement:** The SFBJV Management Board agreed that the JV vision of restoration and conservation should be incorporated into the plans and adopted the following statement: *the Joint Venture will support a Highway 37 design that is compatible with and advances the ecological restoration and conservation goals for San Pablo Bay.*

SFBJV North Bay partners, coordinated by the Coastal Conservancy and Sonoma Land Trust, have put together a Baylands work group to develop collective recommendations, positions, and strategies. They are tracking meetings and issues as they and keeping participants informed. Working groups (vision, policy, communications) meet to develop recommendations for the full group to consider and help maintain consistency in messaging as they participate in meetings held by the lead agencies.

Partners of the SFBJV have been invited to be part of the MTC Environmental Working Group. SFBJV partners are providing the historical analysis. The SFBJV has funded baseline maps that illustrate current and planned restoration to analyze impacts of potential design options. The SFBJV is coordinating with partners to ensure that an integrated design does not negatively impact past restoration and accommodates future habitat restoration and migration of tidal wetlands.

This is a lengthy and ongoing process. For efficiency, it's suggested that SFBJV partners participating in the Baylands Work Group continue to stay engaged through the various work groups. Regular updates should be provided to both the SFBJV Conservation Delivery Committee and Management Board so that SFBJV input can be considered throughout the process.

## **(7) Resilient by Design**

**Full Description:** The top 10 design teams have been chosen for the Resilient By Design Bay Area Challenge and the next phase, the Collaborative Research Phase is beginning.

[Note, in April 2018, a team ended their program, leaving 9 design teams in the challenge]

Collaborative Research Phase: September to early December 2017. Tours for the teams are being held in the East Bay (already complete), North Bay (October 2-6), South Bay (October 16-20), and San Francisco (November 1-3). Each team will publicly present 3-5 design ideas on November 15. Public input on these designs will be accepted November 15-22. Team and “design opportunity” will be matched by December 8. Site descriptions and team assignments were released on January 11, 2018.

Collaborative Design Phase: Teams will develop site-specific conceptual design solutions in coordination with community groups and state and local government partners. Design Teams work with local jurisdictions, community leaders and organizations to develop detailed implementation plans. Design Teams will primarily drive the work schedule; however, there will be dates where all the teams come together for midterm critiques, public events, and further learning on topics requested by the teams. These may include issues that are necessary to ensure the success of the ultimate project, such as local regulatory frameworks, public financing, state or federal government programs, etc.

**Timeline:** Resilient by Design has an online calendar of events - includes workshops and seminars as well as opportunities to engage with the design teams. The challenge itself will end in May 2018 but the recommendations from the designs will be incorporated into discussions around the Bay.

**JV and partner involvement:** The JV can focus on representing the restoration and conservation of habitats and species in design plans.