

Attachment 1. Summary of Key Staff Recommendations on Amending the Grant Program Guidelines

1. Eligible Project Locations

In Appendix B: Definitions and Clarifications of Eligibility Criteria, Section 1C, staff recommends adding the following statement:

“To be eligible, projects must be located within the nine Bay Area counties along the shorelines of San Francisco Bay, San Pablo Bay, Carquinez Strait, Suisun Bay, and most of the Northern Contra Costa County Shoreline to the edge of, but not including, the Delta Primary Zone, that are in areas consistent with guidance provided in the *Baylands Ecosystem Habitat Goals Science Update* (2015) and *Subtidal Habitat Goals Report* (2010), including:

- In subtidal areas (lying below mean low tide), within a reasonable distance of the shoreline;
- In baylands, i.e., areas that lie between the maximum and minimum elevations of the tides over multiyear cycles, including those areas that would be covered by the tides in the absence of levees or other unnatural structures, including the portion of creeks or rivers located below the head of tide; or
- On uplands adjacent to potential or actual tidal wetlands that can provide transitional habitat and/or marsh migration space, as well as areas that are needed to enhance the project’s resilience to projected sea level rise.”

2. Environmental Justice

In Appendix C: Definitions and Clarifications of Prioritization Criteria, Section 2D, Benefits to Economically Disadvantaged Communities, staff recommends adding the following statement:

“The Authority intends this criterion to mean the project will provide tangible benefits to these communities, which may be judged on the basis of elements such as the direct involvement and support of local community groups, a demonstrated track record working within communities, use of proven strategies to increase relevance of messaging and outreach, ability to alleviate multiple stressors within communities, including, but not limited to, addressing the need for additional recreational amenities, resilience to climate change, reductions in pollution burdens, greater civic engagement, and enhanced leadership development opportunities.”

3. Prioritization of Planning vs. Implementation Projects

In Appendix C: Definitions and Clarifications of Prioritization Criteria, Section 1A, San Francisco Bay Area Conservancy’s Selection Criteria, to provide greater clarity regarding how the Authority’s prioritization criteria will be applied to planning versus implementation projects, staff recommends adding the following statement:

“The Authority interprets ‘can be implemented in a timely way’ to mean that projects are demonstrably at a stage where they will be able to proceed upon the receipt of funding, considering factors such as site control, landowner agreement, support of the public, design

constraints, permitting considerations, and security of match funding. For initial planning or design phases, these factors may be judged relative to the eventual implementation phase. Similarly, the project’s ability to provide “opportunities for benefits that could be lost” may be interpreted in the context of a project’s full implementation.”

4. Appropriate Use of the Project List

In Part II, Section D, Potential Project List and Map, staff recommends revising the explanation of the Authority’s project list to state:

“~~Included as Appendix F is~~ The Authority has produced and placed on its website a potential project list and map, showing the types of projects that could potentially be supported with grant funds from Measure AA to be expended in accordance with these grant guidelines. This list of projects that are potentially eligible for Authority funding will be referenced in the development of solicitations, and the presence of projects on the list will be an additional criterion utilized during the evaluation of applications. Projects are not required to be on the list in order to secure funding, but those that are on the list, having been scoped for potential eligibility prior to their proponents’ applications, will be prioritized for funding, while also taking into account all of the other selection criteria used to help inform the Authority and its staff of the number, timing and funding needs of the projects that may apply for funding. The Authority’s project list will help guide the development of requests for proposals, as well as their timing. However, neither the presence nor the absence of a project on the Authority’s list will have any bearing on its prioritization for funding.”

5. Success Criteria, Monitoring and Evaluation

In Part IV, Section E. Project Monitoring and Reporting, staff recommends revising the text as follows:

“All grant applications must include a monitoring and reporting component that explains how the effectiveness of the project will be measured and reported. The monitoring and reporting component of projects will vary depending on the nature of the project and may include regional monitoring approaches as appropriate. The grant application evaluation will assess the robustness of the proposed monitoring program. In addition, Authority staff will work with grantees to develop appropriate monitoring and reporting templates and procedures.”

“All projects must complete a final report, including a lessons-learned summary report fully and clearly describing lessons learned under all phases of the project including design, construction and monitoring. Lessons learned must focus on project trouble areas and issues to be addressed as a guide to future projects to avoid these issues to the extent possible.”

In Appendix C: Definitions and Clarifications of Prioritization Criteria, Section 2F, Monitoring, staff recommends adding: “The Authority will interpret this criterion to mean it will prioritize projects that commit to the regular assessment and reporting of project outcomes and include meaningful ways of sharing their results with the broader community.”