

# San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission

455 Golden Gate Avenue, Suite 10600, San Francisco, California 94102 tel 415 352 3600 fax 415 352 3606

August 14, 2015

**TO:** Bay Fill Policies Working Group Members

**FROM:** Lawrence J. Goldzband, Executive Director (415/352-3653; larry.goldzband@bcdc.ca.gov)  
Joe LaClair, Chief Planning Officer (415/352-3656; joe.laclair@bcdc.ca.gov)  
Brenda Goeden, Sediment Program Manager (415/352-3623; brenda.goeden@bcdc.ca.gov)

**SUBJECT: July 16, 2015 Commission Fill Policies Working Group Meeting Summary**

**ATTENDEES:** Commissioners: Barry Nelson, Chair, Jim McGrath, and Jane Hicks. Public attendees included John Coleman (Bay Planning Coalition) and Jill Singleton (Cargill).

1. **Roll Call, Introductions and Approval of Agenda.** Chair, Barry Nelson, called the meeting to order at approximately 11:00 am.
2. **Comments on the June 18, 2015 Meeting Summary.** The summary was approved.
3. **Committee Discussion of Future Meetings Workplans.** The Working Group (WG) was provided a staff work plan proposal, describing potential topics and issues to be addressed at future meetings. The draft work plan will be revised and redistributed. WG discussion highlights included:
  - a. We need to make sure that the proposed issues on the work plan are paired with related issues in an efficient and useful way.
  - b. *The Fill to Enhance Habitat & Conservation of Tidal and Subtidal Areas* is a profound topic. In the case of in-bay disposal, the presence of the green sturgeon is a first-order barrier. Without engaging them NOAA Fisheries, this type of fill is going nowhere.
  - c. Tidal channels are an important way for the Bay to dissipate the tide. Using both levees and barriers significantly reduces the tidal prism. The WG could agendize the *Tidal Barriers* and the *Surface Area and Volume* topics together to further the discussion.
  - d. Classic adaptive management vs. phased adaptive management
    - i. Classic adaptive management – learn what does and doesn't work and adjust strategy over time.
    - ii. Phased approach/permanently-temporary approach – given that we know that sea level rise (SLR) is happening, the lifespan and use of shoreline assets dictates the way we adjust our strategy.

- iii. Temporary inundation of assets vs. permanent inundation needs to be considered.
    - e. What large scale or complex adaptive management projects have worked?
      - i. Hamilton Wetlands, Oro Loma, South Bay Salt Ponds are all ongoing experiments that have changed management actions based on results.
    - f. Legal or political obstacles should be added to the work plan as a discussion topic.
      - i. Mitigation banking – what type of mechanisms are currently available? A regional approach to mitigation banking is needed.
      - ii. Some of the outcomes from the Policies for a Rising Bay and Bay Fill Policies Working Group have political and legal ramifications.
      - iii. Federal regulations need to be addressed as well.
    - g. The work plan seems to have plenty of input from experts, but what about other states, cities and local areas?
      - i. GAO will be visiting with BCDC in the near future.
      - ii. Advice from experts/agencies that worked on New York’s shoreline plan?
        - (1) Arcadis could provide some input.
      - iii. Will Travis could connect the WG with some international experts.
    - h. Equity topic could move up in the schedule. A good opportunity to have a discussion between both the Rising Sea Level WG and this WG with the Environmental Justice groups to learn about BCDC’s jurisdiction our goals.
    - i. Dredging is a subset of sediment management. Other than fill for habitat, are their other questions regarding dredged material that this WG should be discussing?
      - i. In-Bay disposal as beneficial reuse – where is it appropriate to dispose and how much?
4. **Selection of New Working Group Name.** The item was postponed.
5. **Adjournment.** The meeting was adjourned at approximately 12:30 p.m.