



Commission Workshop Nine: BCDC Laws and Policies



San Francisco Bay Conservation
and Development Commission

Workshop Agenda



- 1:30 Welcome and Introductions
- 1:40 Summary of Work to Date and Findings of Workshop 8
- 2:10 Implementation Pathway Activity
- 3:15 Discussion Report Out
- 3:30 Wrap up and Next Steps
- 3:40 Adjourn

Commission Workshop Series

- Five Year Review: Climate Change Policies
- Regional Resilience: Current Efforts, Regional Issues
- Prioritizing Regional Actions: Sticker Voting!
- Commission Consideration of Future Actions
- Commission Vote on Rising Sea Level Priorities
- Implementation of Priorities and Guiding Principles
- Projects on Parade: Examples of County-scale adaptation plans
- Bay Fill Policies: Issue Posters & Our Future Bay
- Bay Fill Action Priorities



Timeline

Action	Year 1 2017	Year 2 2018	Year 3 2019	Year 4 2020	Year 5 2021	Year 6 & beyond 2022+
--------	----------------	----------------	----------------	----------------	----------------	--------------------------

Component of Regional Adaptation Plan



Regional Adaptation Plan & Regional Asset Adaptation

Regional Working Group & Regional Assessment



Actions to Protect Regional Natural & Built Assets



Output: Regional Adaptation Plan



Innovative Financing

Financing the Future Commission Working Group

Output: Innovative Financing Recommendations



9-County ART

Alameda, Contra Costa, San Mateo, and Marin already completed. Solana, Napa, Sonoma, Santa Clara, San Francisco, and E. Contra Costa to be initiated.

Output: Consistent County Scale Assessments



Education Campaign

Develop and Launch Educational Campaign



Output: Sustained Campaign



Institutional Arrangements

BCDC Staff Research

Output: Regional Adaptation Plan

Distinct from Regional Adaptation Plan



BCDC Law, Policy, and Regulations

Work initiated with Policies for a Rising Bay and Bay Fill Commissioner Working Group. Moving forward: PRB Recommendations & Bay Fill Working Group Workshops

Output: Updated Law, Policy and Procedures




Regional Data Repository

Coordinated Regional Data: MTC, ABAG, BCDC, BAAQMD, SCC, SFEI, SFEP

Output: Data Repository



Regional Adaptation Plan/Framework



- ✓ Adapting to Rising Tides (ART) Bay Area Project
 - Regional Working Group and Adaptation Process
- ✓ ART/Bay Area Toll Authority (BATA) Regional Overtopping Maps and Analysis
- ✓ ART Community Indicators Maps and Analysis
- ✓ ART Shoreline Vulnerability Index
- ✓ ART Portfolio and Help Desk

Nine-County Adapting to Rising Tides



Action	Timeline					
	Year 1 2017	Year 2 2018	Year 3 2019	Year 4 2020	Year 5 2021	Year 6 & beyond 2022+
 9-County ART	Alameda, Contra Costa, San Mateo, and Marin already completed. Solano, Napa, Sonoma, Santa Clara, San Francisco, and E. Contra Costa to be initiated.				<i>Output:</i> Consistent County Scale Assessments	

- ✓ Alameda County ART Project
 - Oakland/Alameda ART Focus Area
 - Hayward ART Focus Area
 - Bay Bridge Focus Area
- ✓ Contra Costa County ART Project
 - City of Richmond Climate Action Plan
- ✓ Eastern Contra Costa County ART Project
- ✓ ART Portfolio and Help Desk
- ✓ Coordination with Marin and San Mateo Assessments

Innovative Financing



Action	Timeline					
	Year 1 2017	Year 2 2018	Year 3 2019	Year 4 2020	Year 5 2021	Year 6 & beyond 2022+
 Innovative Financing	Financing the Future Commission Working Group			<i>Output:</i> Innovative Financing Recommendations		

- ✓ Financing the Future Commission Working Group
 - Meetings in February, April and May
- ✓ ART Bay Area financing and funding analysis
- ✓ ART Bay Area coordination with Resilient by Design on financing and funding research and analysis

Regional Data Repository



Action	Timeline					
	Year 1 2017	Year 2 2018	Year 3 2019	Year 4 2020	Year 5 2021	Year 6 & beyond 2022+



Regional Data Repository

Coordinated Regional Data: MTC, ABAG, BCDC, BAAQMD, SCC, SFEI, SFEP

Output:
Data
Repository



- ✓ Complete ART/BATA Sea Level Rise Mapping and Analysis project in all nine counties
- ✓ Continue to refine ART Community Indicators and mapping
- ✓ ART Bay Area regional assessment of transportation, Priority Development Areas, Priority Conservation Areas and community characteristics
- ✓ Serve data and maps on a webviewer

BCDC Laws, Policies and Regulations



Action	Timeline					
	Year 1 2017	Year 2 2018	Year 3 2019	Year 4 2020	Year 5 2021	Year 6 & beyond 2022+

 BCDC Law, Policy, and Regulations

Work initiated with Policies for a Rising Bay and Bay Fill Commissioner Working Group. Moving forward: PRB Recommendations & Bay Fill Working Group Workshops

Output:
Updated Law, Policy and Procedures

- ✓ Policies for a Rising Bay
- ✓ Bay Fill Working Group
- ✓ Commission Workshops 7, 8 and 9
- ✓ Prioritize issues for Bay Plan Amendments, legislative action, guidance, collaboration and coordination

Commission Adaptation Actions

On October 6, 2016, the Commission voted to prioritize the following actions and here is our progress to date:



- ✓ Regional Adaptation Plan (December 2016 Workshop)
- ✓ Complete County-Scale Climate Adaptation Plans
- ✓ Explore Institutional Arrangements
- ✓ Increase the Resilience of Regional Assets (December 2016 Workshop)
- ✓ Modifications to Commission's Laws, Policies, Regulations and Practices (Bay Fill Working Group Workshops held in April and May of 2017 and Policies for a Rising Bay completed in 2016)
- ✓ A Regional Education Campaign
- ✓ A Regional Data Portal
- ✓ Commission Working Group on Financing the Future (Meetings were held in February, April and May 2017)

Workshop 7, 8 & 9 - Action 5: Commission's Laws, Policies & Regulations



- ✓ Bay Fill Working Group
- ✓ Policies for a Rising Bay Project

- Share what's been learned in previous efforts
- Seek your input- do we have all of the issues? Is the characterization of the issues correct? Have we been engaging with the right partners?
- Identify priority issues- what should we work on first?
- Recommendations to the Commission for action




Workshop 7 Summary



- ✓ Eight topics were introduced and discussed.
- ✓ Participants visited three topics
- ✓ Comments, concerns and potential solutions were provided by participants
- ✓ No additional topics were identified on the “What’s Missing?” wall
- ✓ Eight groups discussed and identified qualities and features of an ideal future San Francisco Bay

Poster Session Included 8 Priority Topics

- Fill for Habitat Projects
- Green Infrastructure for Flood Protection
- Beneficial Use of Sediment
- Fill as Protection from Flooding
(Tide gates, levees and seawalls)
- Adaptive Management
- Mitigation in the Face of Rising Tides
- Social Equity and Environmental Justice
- Regional Planning



Workshop 8: Poster Session

Discussion Questions :

1. Is there anything about how the issue is framed that concerns you?
2. Considering the topic discussed, what outcome would you like the region to achieve?
3. Which issue would you identify as a priority to address in the short-term?



Poster Session:

- 45 minutes
- Eight topics to choose from, visit 3
- Handouts available for all topics
- Staff will summarize
- Share your thoughts about what you learned, response to questions

Workshop 8: Table Top Discussion Activity



- Pick a topic and proceed to that table
- Discuss the pros and cons of each proposed action
- Discuss the timeframe proposed for each action
- Add information or actions as needed
- Individually rank each action

Timeframes:

- Short Term 1 - 2 years
- Medium Term 2 - 3 years
- Long Term 4 - 5

Topics

- Fill for Habitat Restoration
- Beneficial Use of Sediment
- Mitigation in the Face of Rising Tides
- Social Equity and Environmental Justice

Priority Issues to address within the next 3 years :



- Fill for Habitat Projects
- Beneficial Use of Sediment
- Mitigation in the Face of Rising Tides
- Social Equity and Environmental Justice



Priority Issues to address in 4 to 7 years:

- Natural Infrastructure for Flood Protection
- Fill as Protection from Flooding (Tide gates, levees and seawalls)
- Adaptive Management



Issue: Fill for Habitat Projects

BCDC's current policies limit Bay fill in habitat restoration and enhancement projects to a "minor amount," which poses an additional policy burden, beyond the "minimum amount of fill necessary for the project" required by the McAteer-Petris Act. *Text in italics was suggested at Workshop 7.*

Action			Implementation				
Timing	Description	Related Actions	Type of BCDC Action (Bay Plan Amendment, Guidance Document, Etc)	Other Responsible Agencies	Interested Parties/Stakeholders	Is this action a priority for further evaluation and potential implementation? Scale 1-5 (1=low priority, 5=high priority)	
Short Term	Consider revising or removing the "minor amount of fill" test included in resource policies for habitat, enhancement, restoration, and adaptation. ? - When does and what timeframe does it count as habitat?		Bay Plan amendment		EBRP, STATE PARKS	4,4,5,5,5,5	
	Develop policies that specifically address long-term habitat resilience, life of the project, and evolution of habitats, in light of climate change.	Adaptive Management	research, guidance, Bay Plan amendment	RWQCB, EPA, USACE, CDFW, USFWS, NMFS, Bay Restoration Authority		4,4,4,5,5,5	
	Consider amending the Bay Plan to include stronger policies supporting the use of green infrastructure, where appropriate, over traditional or "gray" infrastructure. Including combinations of green and gray.	Green Infrastructure, Adaptive Management	guidance, Bay Plan amendment		RWQCB, EPA, USACE, CDFW, USFWS, NMFS, Bay Restoration Authority	WASTEWATER FLOOD CONTROL AGENCIES	3,3,3,3,4,5
	Develop regulations that are specific to enhancement and restoration projects, and authorize the Executive Director to administratively approve small projects without significant adverse impacts. ? - What is the definition of "small"? Guidance document for enhancement and restoration for projects that are not small - Split - Small projects featured		regulations update	GUIDANCE w/SPECIFICS TO HABITAT RESTORATION			3,4,4,5,5,5
	Consider modifying or removing portions of Bay Plan Dredging Policy Eleven, associated with the Middle Harbor Enhancement Project, so that Bay habitat restoration projects using dredged sediment are considered on their own merit.	Beneficial Reuse	Bay Plan amendment			SAVE THE BAY	4,4,5,5,5,5,5
	Authorize <i>pilot projects</i> , at appropriate scales, to determine the viability of new methods and identify the best techniques for placing fill for habitat restoration. (This comment was provided at workshop 7) *pilot projects - Does this have to be "innovative"? Would that make habitat projects not qualified? Determine where it's appropriate to treat as a pilot and when does it need testing. DESIGN CRITERIA	Beneficial Reuse	Bay Plan amendment, guidance		RWQCB, USACE, EPA, USFWS, NMFS, CDFW, Bay Restoration Authority, etc.		5,5,5,5,5,5,5
Mid Term	Reduce mitigation requirements or exempt habitat restoration projects from mitigation.	Mitigation	clarify issue, guidance, Bay Plan amendment FORMALIZE THE PROCESS	Water Board, USACE, EPA, CDFW, USFWS, NMFS, Bay Restoration Authority		(5 = If done right / 1 = If not) 3,5,5,5,5	
Long Term	Consider updating or modifying the definition of "fill" to be less restrictive for beneficial reuse of dredged sediment for habitat restoration. (This comment was provided at workshop 7) Design criteria for fill for habitat vs. fill for development		legislation (McAteer Petris Act)	Legislature, EPA, USACE, RWQCB, CDFW, USFWS, NMFS		1,1,3,5	
	Create greater flexibility with regards to fill for restoration and the adaptive management of restoration sites. Monitoring should add value and be mindful of staff and other resources	Adaptive Management; Beneficial Reuse	legislation (McAteer Petris Act)	Legislature		1,2,3,5	
Acronyms:	CDFW - California Department of Fish and Wildlife; DTSC - Department of Toxic Substances Control; EPA - Environmental Protection Agency; MTC - Metropolitan Transportation Commission; NMFS - National Marine Fisheries; RWQCB - Regional Water Quality Control Board; USACE - U.S. Army Corps of Engineers; USFWS - U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service						

Issue: Beneficial Reuse

In San Francisco Bay, wetland restoration projects have beneficially reused dredged sediment since the 1970's when the Faber Tract marsh was created. Dredged sediment has been used for decades in levee maintenance for flood protection, agriculture, and managed wetlands. Dredged sediment has also been used, along with upland soils for construction projects. Its use in wetland restoration projects is somewhat limited due to additional equipment requirements, water management, and cost involved to place it on site. Recently, restoration projects have started to use upland soil as base fill due to the availability of large quantities of these soils. Currently, beneficial use of sediment is primarily limited to upland areas and those behind dikes, with few exceptions such as Middle Harbor Enhancement Project at the Port of Oakland. Some groups are advocating using dredged and other sediments to create marshes, beaches, and other shoreline features in areas that are currently mudflats or subtidal Bay in an effort to adapt to rising Bay waters. *Text in italics was suggested at Workshop 7.* **LEGISLATION - To give broader authority to what is "necessary" but not allowable now. Critical to Flexibility**

Action			Implementation			
Timing	Description	Related Actions	Type of BCDC Action findings, policies, regulations, guidance, etc.)	Other Responsible Agencies	Interested Parties/Stakeholders	Is this action a priority for further evaluation and potential implementation? Scale 1-5 (1=low priority, 5=high priority)
Short Term	Pilot projects, at appropriate scales, could be encouraged to assist in understanding sediment pathways and impacts on existing habitat. <i>Explore sediment augmentation of marshes through in-Bay placement. (This comment was provided at workshop 7)</i>	Fill for habitat restoration	Bay Plan amendment, regulations, guidance	USACE, Water Board, EPA, NOAA, USFWS, CDFW	SCC, SBSP, MARIN AUDUBON, BPC, LOCAL GOVERNMENTS	5
	Consider amending Bay Plan Dredging Policy Eleven to remove the requiring the use of only a minor amount of dredged sediment in habitat restoration projects until Middle Harbor Enhancement Project is proven to be successful.	Fill for habitat restoration	Bay Plan amendment	USACE, Water Board, EPA, NOAA, USFWS, CDFW	ENVIROS, SAVE THE BAY, MARIN AUDUBON, SUSAN SWARTZ, POTENTIAL OPPOSED	3,4,5,5
	(1) An impacts/benefits analysis could be conducted to examine the trade offs of in Bay beneficial reuse and habitat conversion. (2) Complete an economic analysis of ocean disposal vs. beneficial reuse and score the "real" costs. (This comment was provided at workshop 7)	Mitigation, Green Infrastructure, Fill as Protection, Marshes and Mudflats, State Bill on Economic Analysis Lots of research on habitat conversion - still in camps (2) BPC	analysis by staff or outside entity	USACE, Water Board, EPA, NOAA, USFWS, CDFW	NATE KAUFFMAN PROJECTS, SBSP, BIRD RESEARCHERS, JOHN T., JOSH ACKERMAN, NILS WARNOCK	2,4,4,5,5,5,5
	Can we use mildly contaminated material in deeply subsided sites?			USACE, Water Board, EPA, NOAA, USFWS, CDFW		
Mid Term	Focus reuse of sediment where natural supplies are limited. (This comment was provided at workshop 7)	Regional sediment management planning	Bay Plan amendment, guidance	USACE, Water Board, EPA, NOAA, USFWS, CDFW		4,4,4
Long Term	*Develop sediment stockpile areas around the region to provide sediment on an as needed basis.	Outside entity would need to develop site	permit for stockpile area if within Commission's jurisdiction	RWQCB, USACE, potentially EPA		
	<i>Consider amending Bay Plan Dredging Policy Eleven by eliminating the connection between Middle Harbor Enhancement Project and other habitat restoration projects that use dredged sediment.</i>	Fill for habitat restoration	Bay Plan amendment			
	*Consider adopting policies to further reduce ocean disposal of clean sediment. Consider changing the disposal test to project sponsor must show that beneficial reuse is not feasible. (This comment was provided at workshop 7)		Bay Plan amendment, guidance, LTMS amendment	RWQCB, USACE, EPA		5,5,5,5
	* TOGETHER MAKES A STRATEGY					

Acronyms: DTSC - Department of Toxic Substances Control; EPA - Environmental Protection Agency; MTC - Metropolitan Transportation Commission; RWQCB - Regional Water Quality Control Board; USACE - U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
LTMS - Long Term Management Strategy for the Placement of Dredged Sediment in the Bay Region

***Added/Changed to the Worksheet**

***Deleted and replace...**

Issue: Social Equity and Environmental Justice

Shoreline flooding from climate change and rising sea level will affect communities differently depending on their location and resources. Disadvantaged communities located in low-lying areas are often disproportionately affected and less able to recover from flooding. Minority and low-income communities have more difficulty finding temporary or permanent replacement housing in the Bay Area due to its housing shortages and high costs. Such communities are also often at greater risk of exposure to hazards or toxic substances mobilized by flooding given their proximity to brownfields and industrial areas. *Text in italics was suggested at Workshop 7.*

Action			Implementation			
Timing	Description	Related Actions	Type of BCDC Action (findings, policies, regulations, guidance, etc.)	Other Responsible Agencies	Interested Parties/Stakeholders	Is this action a priority for further evaluation and potential implementation? Scale 1-5 (1=low priority, 5=high priority)
Short Term	<i>Consider</i> Adopt Bay Plan findings and policies on social equity and environmental justice, specifically for public access, mitigation, shoreline protection, and climate change policies.	Mitigation, Fill for Habitat Restoration	Bay Plan amendment, guidance	EPA, RWQCB, DTSC, USACE and local jurisdictions		5,5,5,5,5,5,5
	Review to determine if changes are necessary to Adequately address environmental justice in the McAteer-Petris Act	N/A	research	N/A		5,5,5,5,5,3
	Create a Citizen Advisory Group that has meaningful participation in Commission processes (This comment was provided at workshop 7)	ART Bay Area	collaboration, guidance	local jurisdictions		5,5,5,5,5,1
	Communication and community engagement		plan implementation			5,5,5,5,5
Mid Term	Prevent loss of public access and open spaces and improve shoreline protection in disadvantaged communities.	Fill for Habitat Restoration, Mitigation, ART Bay Area	guidance, staff training	EPA, RWQCB, DTSC, USACE and local jurisdictions		5,5,5,5,5,5
	<i>Equity</i> Quality checklist for permits - (This comment was provided at workshop 7, staff is unclear about its meaning).	N/A	guidance, regulations	N/A		5,5,5,5,5,5
	Expand 100 FT. Shoreline Band Jurisdiction inland and authority beyond Public Access		legislation			5,5,5,5,5
Long Term	Ensure the regional adaptation plan under development addresses the concerns of disadvantaged communities.	ART Bay Area	ART Bay Area	local jurisdictions, MTC		5,5,5,5,5,5
	<i>Protect Employment Centers</i> (This suggestion was provided at workshop 7, however, staff notes that housing and neighborhoods are key areas to protect)	ART Bay Area	research	local jurisdictions		5,5,5,5,5,1

Acronyms: DTSC - Department of Toxic Substances Control; EPA - Environmental Protection Agency; MTC - Metropolitan Transportation Commission; RWQCB - Regional Water Quality Control Board; USACE - U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

***Added/Changed to the Worksheet**

***Deleted and replace...**

Issue: Mitigation


As project proponents take measures to adapt to sea level rise through additional fill, an increased need for mitigation is likely. Mitigation has generally been provided on a project-by-project basis, resulting in smaller potentially less effective and productive restoration projects. The Commission may consider promoting more regional mitigation opportunities. This approach may provide an opportunity to create more extensive habitat restoration projects that are resilient to sea level rise. *Text in italics are suggestions from Workshop 7.*

Action			Implementation			
Timing	Description	Related Actions	Type of BCDC Action (findings, policies, regulations, guidance, etc.)	Other Responsible Agencies	Interested Parties/Stakeholders	Is this action a priority for further evaluation and potential implementation? Scale 1-5 (1=low priority, 5=high priority)
Short Term	(NOT INCENTIVE) Develop permit monitoring requirements that improves the understanding of how projects are responding to sea level rise as well as adaptation thresholds.	Adaptive Management	guidance, Bay Plan amendment	RWQCB, USACE, EPA, CDFW		1,1,1,2,2,2,2,2
	(NI) Develop strategies to ensure the mid to long-term viability of projects.	Adaptive Management	research, guidance			1,3,3,3,3,3,3,3,4
	(1) <i>Work with specific applicants, (i.e., Caltrans) to create an advanced mitigation program. (This comment provided at workshop 7)</i>	Regional Planning	guidance, Bay Plan amendment	RWQCB, USACE, EPA, CDFW, Bay Restoration Authority (MTC, CCC, EBRPD)		1,5,5,5,5,5,5,5,5
	Encourage regional planning to reduce adjacent flooding via pre-application coordination	Regional Planning, Social Equity	collaboration, guidance	RWQCB, USFWS, USACE, CDFW, EPA, local government		1,1,1,1,1,2,2,3,3
	Consider establishing incentives for local governments and projects that identify designated inland migration areas.	Social Equity	guidance, Bay Plan amendment	RWQCB, USFWS, USACE, CDFW, EPA, local government	EBRPD	1,1,5,5,5,5,5,5,5
Include project ecosystem service benefits such as economic (e.g., flood protection, erosion control) and social (e.g., aesthetic benefits, recreational opportunities) effects when determining mitigation requirements.	Fill for Flood Protection, Fill for Habitat Restoration, Green Infrastructure, Social Equity	guidance, Bay Plan amendment		EBRPD	3,5,5,5,5,5,5,5,5	
Mid Term	Consider amending the Bay Plan to favor ALLOW regional mitigation over onsite mitigation.	Adaptive Management, Social Equity	Bay Plan amendment	RWQCB		3,5,5,5,5,5,5,5,5,5
	Reduce mitigation requirements, or exempt habitat restoration projects from mitigation. DEPENDING UPON EXTENT OF IMPACTS	Mitigation	clarify issue, guidance, Bay Plan amendment	RWQCB, USACE, EPA, CDFW, Bay Restoration Authority		3,3,3,3,3,3,3,3,5,5
	Consider amending the Bay Plan to provide mitigation benefits for projects completing INCLUDING an adaptation planning process.	Regional Planning	guidance, Bay Plan amendment	RWQCB, NMFS, USFWS, USACE, CDFW, EPA		5,5,5,3,3,3,3,3,3
Long Term	(CHANGE TO SHORT-TERM GOAL) Develop regional mitigation sites for use by projects that cannot provide onsite, functional equivalent, or adjacent mitigation.	Adaptive Management		work by others	EBRPD	5,5,5,5,5,5,5,5,5

Acronyms: CDFW - California Department of Fish & Wildlife; EPA - Environmental Protection Agency; NMFS - National Marine Fisheries Service; RWQCB - Regional Water Quality Control Board; USACE - U.S. Army Corps of Engineers; USFWS - U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service

*Added/Changed to the Worksheet

*Deleted and replace...



Implementation Discussion

Implementation Pathways are a tool that help partners develop a shared understanding and agreement on **how** specific actions should be implemented

Pathways visually depict:

- Who will lead and who will partner
- The information, resources or support needed to initiate the action
- The steps to take to achieve the action and desired outcomes



Implementation Discussion

For each of the identified actions:

- What funding opportunities are there?
- Will advocacy be necessary?
- What information will be needed?
- What is the regulatory landscape?
- Are there institutional arrangements to support it?
- Would this action:
 - Build social resilience and equity?
 - Protect or enhance the environment?
 - Solve an information or governance challenge?
 - Build local or regional economic resilience
- What is the priority - is it only a local priority or is it also a regional priority?



Implementation Exercise



Break into five groups, starting at one action work as a group to fill in the Implementation Pathway, at the end of the round, rotate to a second action table and add to the information provided by the previous group.

Choose Two Actions

- 1st round: 30 minutes
- 2nd round: 25 minutes

ACTION # 1 Develop and disseminate guidance to business and industry on the best practices for reducing the potential impacts of flooding and sea level rise on their facilities and the services and systems they rely on.

Key outcomes of this action: _____

① Actors & Information

Who will lead the action?

Who needs to be an engaged partner?

Who are the interested and affected constituencies?

Who are the strong advocates or local action champions?

Information needed to initiate action:

Sources of that information:

② Timeline for Implementation

What can we do now? →

What can we do next?

What can we do long term?

③ Feasibility

Biggest roadblock to implementation:

Potential unlocking actions or solutions:

Possible funding sources:

Permits (if needed):

What support is needed from the region, state, and federal government?

④ Double Check: Does the action advance resilience goals?

Serves to advance resilience goals because the action:

- Improves or protects multi-modal access to housing, jobs or services
- Protects public health and safety
- Protects especially vulnerable community members
- Maintains recreational and educational opportunities
- Promotes or retains jobs
- Maintains commuter movement
- Maintains goods movement
- Reduces service or network disruptions
- Creates or maintains appropriate habitat and biodiversity
- Maintains or improves water quality
- Promotes grey to green and nature-based solutions?
- Supports or creates collaborative, transparent decision-making
- Encourages broad public and/or private sector partnerships

Final Check: Will this action achieve your desired outcome?

- Yes
- No

What steps would the Commission take to adopt a Social Equity & Environmental Justice Bay Plan amendment and/or include Environmental Justice in a McAteer-Petris Act amendment or other Commission legislation?

Year 1 & 2

What are the primary outcomes of this action: _____

① Actors & Information

Who needs to be a partner in this action?

Who are the interested and affected constituencies?

Who are the strong advocates or champions?

What Information is needed to initiate action?

Sources of needed information:

② Timeline for Implementation

What is the first step?

What can we do next?

What are the other steps before completing the action?

Are there other steps that need to be taken for this can action be successful?

③ Feasibility

Biggest roadblocks to implementation:

Potential solutions to overcome these roadblocks:

What support is needed from the region, state, and federal government?

Will this action accomplish the primary outcomes outlined above?

④ Double Check: *Does the action advance the regional goals?*

Serves to advance resilience goals because the action:

- Improves or protects multi-modal access to housing, jobs or services
- Protects public health and safety
- Protects especially vulnerable community members
- Maintains recreational and educational opportunities
- Promotes or retains jobs
- Maintains commuter movement
- Maintains goods movement
- Reduces service or network disruptions
- Creates or maintains appropriate habitat and biodiversity
- Maintains or improves water quality
- Promotes grey to green and nature-based solutions?
- Supports or creates collaborative, transparent decision-making
- Encourages broad public and/or private sector partnerships

Report Back Discussion



- Insights from the discussion?
- Any new issues or solutions added?
- Thoughts on priorities of actions and timing?



Next Steps



July 20th Commission Meeting:

- Staff Recommendation to Commission on Actions
- Commission discussion
- Commission vote to adopt Recommended Actions