

**James Fitzgerald Marine Reserve Pilot CCA Project Pilot
Steering Committee Meeting
August 29, 2007 Summary**

Participants:

In person: Kellyx Nelson, Carolann Towe -Resource Conservation District (RCD); Lisa Sniderman-Coastal Commission (CCC); Sam Herzberg-San Mateo County (SMC) Parks; Kathryn Slater-Carter-Montara Water and Sanitary District/Midcoast Community Council; Kat Ridolfi-San Francisco Estuary Institute (SFEI); Carmen Fewless-Regional Water Quality Control Board

Phone-In: Rainer Hoenicke (SFEI); Kathleen Van Velsor-Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG); Ann Stillman (San Mateo County Public Works); Jack Gregg, Al Wanger (Coastal Commission)

Agenda items, key discussion points, agreements:

1. Announcements and Updates

Carolann has taken a job at SMC RCD! Kellyx has talked to Surfrider to consider who would be a good replacement member on the SC (see Agenda Item 6 below). Kellyx provided a quick update on the \$845,000 Pillar Point Harbor Prop 50 grant that SMC RCD received from the State Water Resources Control Board to identify sources of fecal contamination at Pillar Point (which will also include some groundwater areas through Pillar Point Marsh and parts of Denniston Creek). Kellyx described it would mostly focus on hydrology and microbial source tracking work, and that Lisa (CCC) and Carmen (Regional Board) will be participating on the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) for the project, which includes a variety of participants. The first meeting of the TAC will likely be in October. Regular updates on this project will be a standing agenda item that Kellyx will provide at SC meetings. Contact Kellyx for more info (kellyx@sanmateorcd.org).

Action Item:

- **Kellyx will send the Project Description to the SC members and tech team that includes the timeline, scope of work including data collection schedule, TAC member list, etc.**

2. Frame what we've done since June 2007, where we are today, propose where to go

Lisa (CCC) provided a quick summary of the email she sent to the SC on July 18, 2007 that updated the SC on the status and next steps on the pilot project. The key points: Lisa provided the comments from the SC on SFEI's tech memo to SFEI/ABAG July 2 with the caveat that the SC understood they did not have the resources to put into excessive revisions. Lisa asked that they consider the SC's suggested revisions at the very least related to accuracy and clarity. Further, the staffs from CCC and Regional Board have been meeting with SFEI/ABAG regularly since June and will continue to meet to help guide progress on all three pilot projects to coordinate, discuss upcoming tasks, review draft deliverables, etc. Lisa reiterated that the SC had only reviewed the tech memo and needs to review the draft report and supporting documentation to get a better sense of how far we have come on a watershed assessment for FMR. Many of the SC members may have looked at the tech memo as a stand-alone document without considering the larger context.

Kellyx noted that the desires of the SC were to: (1) assess the watershed in terms of nonpoint source pollution, (2) develop an implementation plan, and (3) implement projects to reduce nonpoint source pollution, and that those goals overlapped significantly but were not the same as the deliverables that that SFEI has under their grant with the Water Board. She described that while our SC will review and provide input on SFEI's Draft Report and supporting docs where appropriate (see Agenda Item 3), this Draft Report is a summary of the technical work SFEI/ABAG conducted in accordance with their 319(h) grant. This information will greatly help to inform a watershed assessment for FMR, for example, SFEI/ABAG conducted an impervious surface assessment, management measure inventory, etc., but this draft (and the final report) is not intended to be the public face of the FMR CCA or meet the three desires of the SC- assess, plan, implement. Kellyx also indicated that there was not funding in SFEI's contract to complete a watershed assessment on top of the other technical work required by their grant, and that our SC had identified the completed WA as a gap. Kellyx noted that Lisa (CCC) had taken on the drafting of the preliminary watershed assessment (PWA) document, having placeholders where information was needed, and compiling all of the relevant technical information into one document. This is essentially a merging of the knowledge and work the SC has done, e.g., identifying land uses, and the technical information that is needed for the assessment, with the work that SFEI/ABAG has done.

Lisa suggested that the SC focus on getting comments on SFEI's Draft Report and supporting documentation first, since there are deadlines associated with them, and then have that feed into the PWA document. Once a draft PWA is complete, the SC and SFEI/ABAG can also provide their review and comment, and the SC can identify how to vet this document to a larger audience.

3. Discuss SFEI's Draft/Final Report and relevant deliverables status and review process

Thanks to all of the Tech Team for all of their hard work pulling a lot of information into one report and multiple complex deliverables. Kat (SFEI) provided an overview and a letter re: instructions/guiding questions for SC during review of Draft Report and supporting documentation (deliverables) as well as hard copies of the Draft Report. Kat indicated this report is a summary of all tech work conducted since May 2006 and described the contents of the Draft Report. Kat stated that the package (Draft Report and all deliverables) was too large to email and it would be put on SFEI's website. Kat will email out to the SC directions to access the draft documents. Further, Kat indicated that the Draft Report and supporting documentation do not all apply to FMR, but many sections do so she included everything so that the SC members can review and comment on any document if they so choose. Kat noted that she needs comments back no later than **September 28**, and that she would like the SC to appoint one person to provide comments. The SC appointed Kellyx, and she agreed to be the point person. The SC decided it would hold a special meeting to discuss and compile SC comments on **September 20**. That meeting will be held in San Francisco at CCC's office from 10 am-1pm. One deliverable that is particularly important for FMR is the impairment assessment referred to in the Draft Report under 4.1 Evaluation of the status of water quality conditions. Carmen (Regional Board) and Lisa provided the SC with a copy of some proposed revisions/comments on that section to begin the dialogue. Additionally, SFEI is seeking comments from the state agencies that have been meeting with the tech team (CCC, State Water Board, Regional Board, BCDC) due by September 13. Lisa and Carmen will share these comments with SC members as appropriate and SC members will receive Final Report.

Action Items:

- **Kat: Will send out letter re: instructions/guiding questions for SC Review of Draft Report and supporting documentation**
- **All: Review Draft Report (consider SFEI's guiding questions); and relevant deliverables-focus on FMR Impairment Assessment-Lisa and Carmen's proposed revisions provided to SC; be prepared to share comments at September 20 meeting**
- **Lisa: will email SC address, directions to CCC in San Francisco**

4. Revisit Timeline, any needed refinements and uses

Kellyx reviewed the timeline she had presented at a prior SC meeting. In addition to the major milestones in our pilot project, the timeline also includes other projects happening in parallel. Kellyx also described the revisions that Kat proposed to the timeline including removing ABAG deliverables since SFEI and ABAG are a team and the deliverables are already reflected, and moving back some dates for proposing SC goals and targets for the Action Planning stage since we are still in the WA stage. Additionally the SC discussed adding other items to the timeline, such as San Vicente Creek parking lot project, San Vicente Creek Restoration Prop 40 work, etc. It became clear that there may be a lot of items to track and the SC may want to consider either, two timelines, one for our work and one to track other relevant work, or some easily readable legend. Ann from SMC proposed that it would be helpful for each project to have some minimum information, e.g., title of the project, funding source, short description, contact. The SC would need to discuss this further to flesh this out. This timeline could also be an important document and be used to explain to others all of the efforts taking place on the Midcoast and how we are coordinating. Perhaps it could also be used as a poster at the next public workshop and have the participants add to it as appropriate. Rainer proposed that this timeline should be mailed out before each SC meeting to SC members to update. Rainer also indicated he'd email his revisions to Kellyx the timeline with his suggested modifications so as not to take up time during the meeting.

Action Items:

- **Rainer/Kellyx: Will email the revisions to timeline to SC**
- **All: Review timeline to ensure that relevant information on projects that you are involved with is included, suggest other revisions as appropriate (e.g., changing timing for vetting PWA), and send to Kellyx**

5. Revisit data development list and TAC roles; id early actions

Carried over until November 1 SC meeting.

6. Discuss expanding SC membership

The SC had a great discussion about the people we think are needed to participate or otherwise keep engaged in this CCA pilot project, especially as we move into another phase of the project. Kathleen was asked to address membership approaches, and reported that it may be useful to consider categories of membership – e.g. business interests, government agencies, non-governmental organizations. It was noted that SCs can become unmanageably large and inevitably some members will weed themselves out due to lack of time/resources. Still, early incorporation of other interests is essential to making any action plan work. There are a number of planning and investigation processes moving forward (LCP, GGNRA, DFG, POST, State Parks) that would be good to incorporate and reference. Rainer and Kat will circulate a table that concisely

summarizes which “champions,” “gatekeepers,” and “implementers” need to fulfill various roles either as part of the SC or as communicators and liaisons to other planning and decision-making processes. This will benefit the proposed MOU as well. Sam (SMC Parks and Recreation) pointed out that the people on the SC aren’t necessarily the ones who can implement actions or make key decisions. The SC proposed three additions, a representative from County Environmental Health (e.g., Dean Peterson), a representative from the Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary (MBNMS) (e.g., Bridget Hoover), and a representative from the business community (Princeton Citizens Advisory Committee, possibly Jullian McCurrach. Further, Carolann will consider a replacement for Surfrider. Carolann and Kellyx indicated that they have been in contact with Surfrider, Environmental Health and MBNMS about the CCA pilot project. The SC agreed that the timing to ask these new proposed SC members to start participating would likely be November or later, after SFEI has provided a Final Report and perhaps when a draft PWA is complete and next steps identified. The SC also identified a need to engage the County’s planning and possibly building departments as well as managers and the Board of Supervisors. For example, Ann indicated it might be good to ask what we want each of these people who want to participate to do and that we need a large diagram of our public outreach strategy and a map of process elements (which the timeline can help meet). (The SC would need to have further discussions to determine feasibility and whether any resources exist to do this). Kathleen noted that C/CAG is responsible for administering and implementing the County’s storm water permit. For this reason, there was recently SFEI communications with the C/CAG director. Further, we should be asking what the outcomes of the project may be, e.g., if one outcome is changing practices, who might that affect? The SC will continue to explore these questions at the next regular meeting. Roles and responsibilities of key participants may also be outlined in the draft MOU, which may be an appropriate vehicle to engage them (see next agenda item). The SC also expressed a need for some introductory materials which might be pulled into a CCA pilot marketing package and combined with the draft MOU. Lisa will provide the draft introduction from the PWA document and the SC members can use it to draft a more concise document. At the November 1 meeting, the SC will use the table that Kat and Rainer will send out to start discussing who we need to talk to, at what points do we need those people engaged in the process, and whether to incorporate these points into our timeline.

Action Items:

- **Kat/Rainer: Will send out draft of table of champions... for SC continued use**
- **All: Discuss additions to SC at September 20 SC meeting since we may want participation at November 1 SC mtg**
- **Lisa: Will send out draft introduction from PWA for SC use describing the CCA program, structure, goals, watershed assessment, etc.**

7. MOU process-follow up

Kellyx emailed the SC a draft MOU May 21. Kellyx noted that the draft MOU can help get needed attention from higher level management to the project. The draft MOU also includes the agreed upon Operating Principles and general provisions. She noted that she only received one comment. (Lisa notes that this item has been carried over during multiple SC meetings due to the focus on the technical memo). Currently, the draft MOU includes these agencies: MWSD, Regional Board, San Mateo County, RCD, Surfrider, Coastal Commission, County Parks and Recreation, County Environmental Health, Department of Public Works, Midcoast Community Council. Kellyx will resend the draft for SC comments. She would like comments in track changes no later than **September 6**.

Action Items:

- **Kellyx: Will email to SC draft MOU and attachments**
- **All: review draft MOU and provide comments to Kellyx by SEPTEMBER 6. Kellyx will recirculate via email after revising the draft MOU**

8. Permit coordination and relationship to CCA pilot

Sam (SMC Parks and Recreation) had emailed the SC information re: permit coordination several months ago. Sam described that his item was informational. He indicated that there is a group that stemmed from the FishNet4C program that is working on permit streamlining and watershed maintenance standards for projects that install best management practices involving creeks and wetlands. Essentially, trying to make it easier for people to “do the right thing.” This information will be available to export to other areas of the county that are not part of the FishNet4C study area. For more information, see the County’s Public Works-Watershed Protection website:

http://www.eparks.net/smc/department/home/0,,5562541_5562589_16435276,00.html.

Sam also mentioned that the watershed ordinance the County has been developing is getting closer to completion. It is essentially taking a lot of the protections afforded in the coastal zone such as streamside setbacks and extending them to other unincorporated areas of the County. It will likely be available for the public in a few months. Further, Kellyx described that she had been involved with permit coordination for resource conservation measures, but that that is on hold due to lack of funding. Kathleen also mentioned JARPA, a joint simplified permit application for development activities in or near Bay Area aquatic environments (see:

<http://sfep.abag.ca.gov/projects/JARPA/JARPA.html>).

Kat had described that storm drain mapping currently was being conducted for FMR as part of their Prop 50 contract, and Ann noted that some of that was also being conducted by the County public works and appeared to be duplicative. Kat, Ann and Kathryn, who serves on the Drainage Subcommittee, had a discussion after the meeting to coordinate.

Sam/Ann will provide presentation on CCA pilot project to the SMC Watershed Protection and Restoration Coordinating Council. Kellyx may also participate/present. Most likely, they will wait until Final Report and completion of draft PWA.

9. Drought and relation to CCA project

Carried over until November 1 SC meeting-Rich was not in attendance.

10. Next Steps/emerging actions/other action items

Special Steering Committee meeting will be on **September 20, CCC office in San Francisco, 45 Fremont Street, 20th floor**. Next regular SC meeting: Thursday, November 1, 10am-12 pm, Montara Sanitary District. (There may be additional special meetings before then.)

Other:

Shortly after the SC meeting adjourned, Sam noted that it would be helpful to see the maps that were generated for the public workshop and get a status on whether the suggested revisions have been incorporated, or if not, do the report/supporting docs say that somewhere?

The SC briefly discussed the public meeting formats including the possibility of a Blue Circle focused on the theme of the FMR CCA for a general gathering and celebration of CCA and a more agency-focused meeting for specific feedback on the draft PWA.

Action Item:

- **Kat will coordinate with Kathleen to determine status of map comments during Winter workshop and any necessary revisions (or note maps where comments were suggested but revisions not made) and report back to SC**