DRAFT PE Comments (April 11, 2019)

1. Has the NEP fully address challenges identified in the 2014 letter?

Financial management: SMBNEP has addressed the comments from the 2014 program evaluation recommending that it "continue to explore new funding mechanisms and opportunities."

- They have embarked on new efforts to diversify funding including local businesses holding fundraising events and the TBF annual fundraiser.
- In November 2017, the Bay Foundation bolstered its partnership with Loyola Marymount University by forming the Coastal Research Institute. This relationship can leverage research power, additional grant opportunities, and hopefully additional funding through the University in the future.

Deliberative Process / Ex. 5

Outreach and Public Involvement: EPA recommended "SMBNEP to continue to clarify its roles and responsibilities on key environmental projects and urge all partners to publicly clarify their respective roles as well."

- One way the NEP has tried to do this is by having the SMBRC Executive Director step down and only wear one hat as the Bay Foundation Executive Director.
- While not specifically noted here, NEP staff have done presentations over the past year as part of the CCMP revision process to further explain the roles and responsibilities of each of the Management Conference committees.

EPA also recommended "that the SMBNEP continue to use the Watershed Advisory Council meetings as a vehicle for public participation in CCMP and work plan implementation oversight"

- SMBNEP responded that the WAC meets at least annually to provide input on work plan priorities. There is opportunity for public input at all commission meetings and input is incorporated into the work plan and CCMP when appropriate. Staff have begun to document public inputs in response table that are also made publicly available.
- There have also been comments through a recent survey on SMBNEP governance and structure recommending that the WAC structure be evaluated.
- *Perceived challenge:* While important comments from the public are provided through the WAC, meetings are often contentious and members of the public exhibit rude behavior, making the environment unfriendly and making it a difficult environment to have an effective meeting. I recommend that 1) SMBRC adopt a behavior code for all meetings and 2) a neutral facilitator be hired to help make the WAC meetings less contentious and more productive.

EPA also encouraged "the SMBNEP to continue communicating on a regular basis with all its stakeholders as well as to encourage public involvement in the implementation of the CCMP"

Perceived Strengths

- SMBNEP staff engage stakeholders in various restoration projects and all public events are posted online as well as shared through e.g. lyris.
- Recommendation: look for opportunities for SMBRC governing board members to share information with their constituents

2. Has the NEP provided appropriate/enough supporting information/documents that corroborate their performance measures responses?
    a. Yes, SMBNEP has provided more than sufficient documentation supporting their performance measure responses.
    b. Does their workplan summary narrative adequately describe those elements identified on page 6 of the PE Guidance? *"Use the logic model to describe Key NEP work plan goals and activities, stages of progress toward achieving the NEP's environmental milestones and targets, and role of key stakeholders supporting the activities. The following elements describe generally what is in an NEP work plan to achieve CCMP goals" (p6 of the PE guidance)*

    1) Habitat: "Habitat restorations included subtidal rocky reefs (kelp forests), wetlands, dunes, beaches, riparian corridors, fish barrier removals, and non-native invasive weed maintenance. During this period, ***SMBNEP acquired 1,722 acres into the public domain for the purposes of restoration or protection and restored an additional 149 acres."***

    2) Water Quality: several water quality improvements accomplished from implementing green stormwater infrastructure that treats trash, metals, and bacteria etc. these projects were primarily funded by the state bonds.

    3) Living Resources: Several projects are listed that improved habitat for native endemic species, especially those which are rare, threatened, or endangered. Species include abalone, California red legged frog, Western snowy plover, and Southern California steelhead trout.

    4) Healthy Communities
    5) Trainings
    6) Direct Assistance