MEETING NOTES

Welcome and Objectives: BCDC Commissioner John Gioia welcomed working group members and talked about how the ART approach used in Contra Costa County will be followed by other in the region. Wendy described where we are in our project: stepping away from Plan step and moving towards the Implement and Monitor step.

Updates and News Items:

- Wendy reported on BCDC’s ART Bay Area Sea Level Rise Analysis and Mapping Project and new Caltrans Sustainability grant with MTC and BARC that is funding a project on Regional Resilience and Adaptation.
- Joby London (Sustainability Coordinator for CCC) asked if the new, more complete regional maps cover eastern Contra Costa County. Wendy explained eastern Contra Costa and Solano Counties are not included because they require new modeling efforts, and that these counties have limited current or future flood maps. We are looking for funding for this work because it is critical to the region.
- Adam Lenz (City of Richmond) reported that Richmond was able to integrate ART products into their Climate Action and Adaptation Plan. They didn’t have funding for the adaptation component until partnering with ART. The plan will go to the City Council for approval this fall.
- Holly Smyth in Hercules reported that Hercules will draw on ART products as they work on the Safety Element Update to their General Plan, which will serve as their Local Hazard Mitigation Plan.
- Holly Smyth offered a tour of the Bayside Bridge and Chelsea wetland (re-creating tidal wetland marsh) following the final working group meeting in Hercules.
- Sandra Hamlat at East Bay Regional Park District reported that the ART Vulnerability and Risk Assessments is being incorporated into park planning and that they have integrated the ART sea level rise and shoreline maps into the District’s GIS.
- Paul Detjens of CCC Flood Control said that he and Wendy gave a presentation on ART to the FMA in Sacramento with Lower Walnut Creek restoration project as an example.
- Update on Prop 1 funds. ART put in a proposal for disadvantages communities funds for outreach. Our proposed project is for ART staff to provide direct technical support to communities in CCC and around the region. Michael Kent says $6.5 million is available. Out of 40 proposals, 10 or 11 were in CCC. It may not be too late to put in a project for
outreach—get in touch with coordination committee. There might be another round of proposals later.

- Tim Fitzpatrick reported that he worked with Wendy to revise and improve alternative analysis for a waste containment closure plan to better address ground water contamination risk that will increase with sea level rise.
- Joby London reported that she is investigated potential for a countywide citizen advisory board on sustainability.
- Adam Lenz reported that Richmond is hosting a Trust for Public Lands Hack-a-thon on October 19th to help create a tool to explore opportunities for green infrastructure. They’ll be drawing on ART data.
- Kelly Malinowski reported that the Conservancy will host an urban greening grant competition with the focus of funding only on the Bay Area, not the whole state.

**Presentation on Population and Demographic Analysis and Outcomes.** Elizabeth reviewed the projects ten indicators of community vulnerability and resilience and the mapping and analysis methodology used. She presented maps that summarize findings. See accompanying powerpoint for her slides. Here are group comments on her presentation:

- Group needed clarification on the fact that for all community indicators (except income) thresholds are calculated for the entire Bay Area.
- Question about what “concentration” means on the maps. (Answer: this references the a threshold or triggering amount in a % of the block group that flags that block group as having a concentration of a individuals or households with specific characteristics)
- Question about whether we’ve mapped people at risk only within the flood zone or across the county. Elizabeth explained we mapped the entire study area using American Communities Survey (ACS) data to show populations at risk in different geographies.
- To address the challenges of working with this ACS data, Michael Kent suggested talking to Bay Area Regional Health and Equity Initiative. Their epidemiologists struggle with similar questions and might have advice.
- Question about block group v. census track data. Block=smallest (defined by geography), block group=mid size (for demographic analysis and defined by population), census track=biggest (defined by population).
- Question on whether or not all indicators were equally weighted when you map them together? (Answer: Yes, equally weighted).
- Question about if we will also compare to MTC Communities of Concern as well as CalEnviroScreen as we move forward with our regional analysis. Answer: Yes.
- Question about whether or not the maps show us whether any given indicator is way above the trigger level or just right above the trigger level. Answer: The printed maps do not show this but we do have this information in the GIS and we can provide.

**Brief Review of Key Planning Issues and Evaluation Criteria Exercise.** Working group members broke off into pairs and worked together to evaluate one of the actions under the “Access to Services” Key Planning Issue. Pairs evaluated the actions in terms of the evaluation criteria
provided (see accompanying handout for a list of the criteria). Here is a summary of feedback reported to the whole group on this exercise:

- Evaluation criteria would be easier to apply if lead agency was listed with the action.
- “Maybe” should be a response. E.g. Q: Would the action support nature-based solutions? A: Maybe, it depends on how it was implemented.
- The action language was vague and did not clearly tie back into the Key Planning Issue language.
- In many planning efforts actions would have measurable outcomes, but these KPI actions seem higher level and not directly measurable.
- You need specific knowledge about the asset or issue to respond to the evaluation criteria focused on feasibility.

**Open House and Open House Report Back.** Working group members read through Key Planning Issue Adaptation Responses and provided written feedback directly on the posters. The six Key Planning Issues are: water-dependent industries; employment sites; creek-side communities; access to services; ad-hoc flood protection; and parks and open spaces. Each person used stickers to vote for three actions he/she would like to prioritize for implementation. The group provided the following feedback:

- The short, mid, and long-term categories for actions were logical.
- There were many actions that broadly arrive at Emergency Planning and Land Use Planning Type actions. These concepts could be used to group actions.
- These actions could lead to a lot of different new/revised governance structures. We shouldn’t think of implementing each of these actions alone, rather combine issues logically into similar JPAs, education programs, and government structures that can implement multiple actions.
- As an organizing framework are there certain actions that have the same policy home?
- Prioritize cross-cutting/county-wide infrastructure such as rail, waste water, and transportation. These things hit everything else—if you don’t have water, sewage, transportation, you have nothing.
- The issues being addressed by Northern Waterfront Economic Development Initiative is not represented here. She is concerned that they need to be pulled in.
- The SF Bay Restoration Authority might be the place for certain actions that require new governance structures to live.
- The county suggested presenting ART project to the Mayor’s Council. Wendy reminded the group to invite us to speak and local or countywide meetings.
- Commissioner Gioia asked that we brief the BCDC Commission on this work.

**Closing.** We’ll be focused on evaluating select actions and developing implementation pathways at the last meeting – November 16th at 9 am in Hercules.