SAN FRANCISCO BAY
RESTORATION AUTHORITY

MEETING MINUTES

San Francisco Bay Restoration Authority Advisory Committee Meeting
November 19, 2021, 10 am – 12 pm

Agenda and meeting materials are available at:
www.sfbayrestore.org

1. **Call to Order**
   Jessica Martini-Lamb, Chair of the Advisory Committee (AC), called the meeting to order.

2. **Determination of Quorum**

   AC member attendance: Ana Alvarez, Sara Azat, Erika Castillo, Steve Chappell, Adrian Covert, Arthur Deicke, Nahal Ghoghaie, Letitia Grenier, Christopher Gurney, Lee Huo, Shin-Roei Lee, Roger Leventhal, David Lewis, Chris Lim, Greg Martinelli, Jessica Martini-Lamb, Lisa Horowitz-McCann, Ana Maria Ruiz, Luisa Valiela, Diane Williams, Beckie Zisser

   Staff attendance: Jessica Davenport, Karen McDowell, Erica Johnson, Laura Hollander, Taylor Samuelson, Linda Tong

   Laura Hollander, Clerk of the Advisory Committee, called the roll and determined there was a quorum.

3. **Public Comment**

   There were no public comments.

4. **Approval of Advisory Committee (AC) Meeting Minutes of September 10, 2021 (ACTION)**
   Item 4: Draft Meeting Minutes for September 10, 2021

   Decision: There were no comments, and the meeting minutes for September 10, 2021 were approved.

5. **2022 AC Meeting Schedule (INFORMATION)**
   Jessica Davenport, Deputy Program Manager
   Item 5: Proposed 2022 AC Meeting Schedule

Jessica Davenport, Deputy Program Manager, shared that the proposed schedule for 2022 Advisory Committee Meetings was shared with the AC prior to this meeting to ensure there are no conflicts with holidays or major events.
Jessica Davenport explained that, in accordance with the amended Brown Act, for the Governing Board, AC, and Oversight Committee to continue meeting virtually after this meeting, the Governing Board will need to make a finding every 30 days that there is still a state of emergency and public health guidance encouraging social distancing. Since the next AC meeting is scheduled for March 2022, the board would need to make this finding at its February meeting. The hybrid option is not workable. Governor Newsom extended the State of Emergency through the end of March 2022. Staff will provide an update prior to the March meeting if the situation changes, and the board no longer needs to make this finding.

6. **Chair's Report from October 15, 2021 Governing Board Meeting**
   (INFORMATION)

   Chair Martini-Lamb gave a summary of the October 15, 2021 Governing Board Meeting. The Board approved Greg Martinelli's return to the Advisory Committee to represent CDFW. The Board also approved grants for the Evolving Shorelines Project at Bothin Marsh and the Candlestick Point Stewardship Project. The board also heard an early update on implementation of AC equity recommendations, as well as a presentation from Sonoma Land Trust on the Sonoma Creek Baylands Strategy. The Governing Board's 2022 Meeting Schedule was approved, and there were discussions on Project Management Challenges and Solutions, as well as the requested change to the Oversight Committee and Advisory Committee stipend from an "opt in" to an "opt out" approach, which will be presented at the December meeting as an action item.

7. **Yearly Update on Implementation of AC Equity Recommendations**
   (INFORMATION)
   Lisa Horowitz McCann, Vice Chair, Lead for Ad Hoc Subcommittee on Equity
   Linda Tong, Grant Program Coordinator
   Item 7: Memo on Implementation of Equity Recommendations
   Exhibit A: Recommendations from the Advisory Committee to the Governing Board on Implementing Measure AA in a Manner that Benefits Economically Disadvantaged Communities, as Amended by the Governing Board

   Vice Chair Horowitz McCann shared that she is leading an ad hoc subcommittee on equity to follow up on the past AC work that led to the development of the AC recommendations that were subsequently adopted by the Governing Board.
   Linda Tong gave a presentation on progress to date implementing the recommendations. The Authority updated their competitive grant round materials for Round 4, including the points allocated for a project's level community involvement and benefits. The guidelines were also updated to make the criteria clearer, and allowed applicants to meet with Authority staff for a consultation prior to submitting their application. The Authority has also created a Community Grants Program, now in its second year, which funds community-based organizations in economically disadvantaged communities. The budget for this program includes stipends for community advocates to educate other residents about environmental issues and restoration designs. Staff also hosted several regional networking sessions to reach more community-based organizations, connect them with restoration organizations, and to learn more about funding. The Authority has also

updated some funding policies to lower barriers to community participation, including an advance funds option, change stipends for the Oversight Committee and AC, and funding community participation. In the future, staff are considering more ways to involve community participants in the grant process, including adding more community members to the Advisory Committee. The Governing Board showed support at the last meeting for next steps for staff, including building tribal relationships and adopting equity guidelines for the agency.

- One AC member commented that the Authority might be interested in work by Planting Justice, Robin Freeman of the Ronald V. Dellums Institute at Merritt College, and the Sogorea Te Land Trust on a creek restoration site near 105th Avenue in East Oakland. Staff responded that Authority staff is working with Planting Justice and Sogorea Te Land Trust on another community project.

Vice Chair Horowitz McCann presented an update on the work of the ad hoc subcommittee on equity to date and future direction of the group. The subcommittee is considering making a recommendation to the Governing Board in March for the following year's budget to increase the total amount for community grants, increasing the cap for funding, or both. The subcommittee is also considering offering more training and resources for primary grantees to encourage meaningful connection with community-based organizations. The subcommittee is also discussing overall equity guidelines for the Authority.

- One AC ad hoc subcommittee member commented that the group will focus on supporting staff in their efforts that have already been implemented.

8. Geographic Distribution of Funds (INFORMATION)

Jessica Davenport, Deputy Program Manager

Item 8: Memo on Geographic Distribution of Funds

Attachment 1: Grant Round 4 Summary

Attachment 2: Estimate of Future Funding Needs by Region for Current and Potential Authority Projects

Jessica Davenport gave a presentation on the geographic distribution of funds, brought about by questions from the Governing Board about the project selection process. All regions are on track to meet the targets as outlined in Measure AA. Jessica then gave a summary of the Round 4 selection process, including that geographic distribution is one of the prioritization criteria. Staff was aware of the individual funding needs of each region based on population and funding awarded to date. There were eight projects recommended for funding in Round 4.

The board also requested information on future funding needs for projects that had been funded for the planning phase by the Authority. Jessica presented a summary of this table, which indicates that based on the needs identified, it will be possible for each region to meet their 20-year targets for restoration project funding. She emphasized that this table does not represent whether projects will be funded by the Authority.

- One AC member commented that these are 20-year goals for geographic distribution of funds, and are very useful for communicating to taxpayers.

However, the most important thing is to restore the most tidal marsh in the Bay as fast as possible.

- Another AC member commented that there are geographic differences in opportunity for tidal marsh restoration, as it mostly lies in the South Bay and North Bay, including Suisun Marsh. There is less opportunity acreage-wise in East Bay and West Bay.
- Another AC member commented that there is a need to focus on where the greatest opportunities lie and that a lot of work has been done to understand where these opportunities lie, but they appreciate public commitment to taxpayers and concern over distribution of funds.
- Another AC member asked if these funds could be used to respond to an emergency, e.g., a tsunami, given that so many climate catastrophes are happening,
    - Staff commented that the Authority is authorized to work within the scope of Measure AA and the SFBRA Act. If there was an emergency action that could fit within the scope, it could be considered, but there are lots of other funds for emergencies available that would be appropriate.
- Another AC member commented that there is a regulatory requirement to have money spent equitably across the region. However, residents in the East Bay and West Bay will still benefit from having funds spent in other regions because issues across the Bay will still impact taxpayers in other regions.
    - Another AC member asked if the language in Measure AA regarding geographic distribution of funds acknowledges this point. Another AC member responded that not all the funding in Measure AA is subject to the geographic distribution requirements, rather it is just a portion (50%).
    - Another AC member commented that there is a tension between getting value for the dollar and distributing benefits to communities fairly. We need to start communicating about this to the board. An AC member commented that we should work on messaging regarding the communal good provided by projects in all regions for the Governing Board and for communication to their constituents.
        - Staff commented that they encourage AC members to share information about the economic factors and cost-effectiveness associated with various types of restoration projects to support messaging. Chair Martini-Lamb suggested that the ad hoc subcommittee on the Annual Report could take this up.
- An AC member commented that the opportunity to educate people about restoration and its benefits is greater in the more developed areas, and those urban projects enable people to learn about the benefits of restoration baywide.

- An AC member commented that more representation of underserved communities on the Advisory Committee is needed.
    - Staff responded that they agree and that there is a plan to focus on involving more community members in the Advisory Committee in the future.

9. AC Charter Review (INFORMATION)
Chair Martini-Lamb
Item 9: AC Charter

Chair Martini-Lamb explained that the charter is reviewed every three years and asked if there were any questions or comments regarding the charter.

- One AC member raised whether video conferencing could continue to be an option in the future, especially if people could not attend otherwise.
    - Staff commented that if the Governing Board stops making the remote-setting finding, we would have to go back to the regular Brown Act requirement, and if AC members are going to be remote, they need to be in location that is on a public notice (e.g., members' home addresses would be public).
- Another AC member asked whether the public could continue to meet via video conference?
    - Staff responded that they are reviewing whether this is possible. Some other agencies are currently doing this. The Yerba Buena Room is currently reserved for future dates and there is capacity there for hybrid and remote meetings to take place there.
        - Chair Martini-Lamb asked if this scenario would be allowable under the Brown Act or if the charter would need to be updated. Staff will investigate this.
- An AC member asked whether it would qualify as a "public setting" if the public and the AC members are able to call in. Staff responded that this is not currently within the Brown Act requirements, so this would not be the case if the emergency order is lifted.
- An AC member asked if we could meet in two locations in the future for in-person meetings to make travel easier for AC members.
- One AC member commented that they would not be able to attend in-person meetings before her agency's requirements change.
- A few AC members commented that their workplaces could be a good option for meeting places.

Chair Martini-Lamb raised the issue of whether the charter should be amended to require members of the AC to leave the video conference or the room during discussion of a recommendation of a project that could benefit their agency or organization.

- There were no comments.

Chair Martini-Lamb raised the question of whether the charter should be amended to require the AC to track and report on the level of consensus, i.e., how many people are in different positions on the consensus scale.

- An AC member commented that the point of changing this would be to report this to the board. Chair Martini-Lamb reviewed current requirement, which says that recommendation will be considered a consensus if members vote 3 to 5 on the gradient of support. The minutes will reflect whether consensus was reached, so language would need to be added to the charter to require reporting/recording of gradient of support.
    - Staff commented that consensus-based decisions are not a vote, rather the spectrum is designed to assess where people are in a decision and facilitate discussion.
- An AC member commented that it might still be useful for the Governing Board to see the level of support from the AC instead of a binary yes or no. Another AC member supported this notion.
- Another AC member asked if the Governing Board has ever asked for this detail. Staff responded that there is no restriction on including a summary of the full discussion to the Board, and the level of detail reported to the board is up to the AC Chair.
- Staff suggested to put this on the agenda as an action item for March.
    - Chair Martini-Lamb, Vice Chair Horowitz McCann, and Roger Leventhal will work on this item.

10. Announcements (INFORMATION)

- One AC member noted that the federal bipartisan infrastructure bill included increased funds for the San Francisco Bay Water Quality Improvement Fund (essentially $5 million in extra funding for each of the next five years). The EPA will likely release two requests for applications of $5 million each next year.
- Another AC member announced that the Oakland Shoreline Leadership Academy final presentations will occur on December 11th.
- Another AC member announced that the Wetlands Regional Monitoring Program virtual open house will occur on December 8.

11. Public Comment

No public comments.

12. Adjourn

Note: Agenda items may be taken out of sequence at the discretion of the Advisory Committee. Any person who has a disability and requires reasonable accommodation to participate in this public meeting should contact Taylor Samuelson no later than five days

prior to meeting. Questions about the meeting or agenda can be directed to Taylor Samuelson at Taylor.Samuelson@scc.ca.gov.