



**San Francisco Bay Area Water Trail
Implementation Meeting #2
November 30, 2011**

Meeting Summary

Attendees:

Project Management Team (PMT): Ann Buell, Steve Watanabe, Ellen Miramontes,
Laura Thompson

Advisory Committee (AC): Richard Skaff, Jonathon Goldman, Penny Wells, Lynn
Cullivan, Cecily Harris, Brian Wiese, Barbara Salzman,
Jill Demers, Bill Curry, Ted Warburton, Ted Choi,
Anne Rockwell

Stakeholder Group: John Hitchens, Brad McCrea, Jack Judkins, Anthony
Paredes, Jr., Fran Sticha, Galli Basson, Antoinette
Romeo (via phone),

Meeting Facilitator: Ariel Ambruster (from Center for Collaborative Policy)

Not in Attendance (AC): John Krause, Cheryl Essex, Jennifer Heroux, Thomas
Boone

Finalization of Water Trail Implementation Process Charter (Led by Ann Buell)

The group reviewed revisions made to the document (November 2011 version with underlining and strikeouts), based on the discussion at the September 15 WT meeting. The revisions 1) clarified alternates' participation in the Advisory Committee, 2) expanded on the expected outcome of stewardship to include minimization of impacts on bay resources, and 3) clarified the conflict of interest language for PMT and AC members.

Barbara: Wants to be sure AC Alternates (or "shared" seats) have a chance to comment during the meeting. Response: All AC Alternates will have a chance to comment as part of the Stakeholder Group when participating in meetings.

1330 Broadway, 13th Floor
Oakland, California 94612-2530
510•286•1015 Fax: 510•286•0470

Reminder: The Charter is a living document that can be changed as necessary and through agreement by the PMT, Water Trail Staff, and the AC.

The revisions to the Water Trail Project Implementation Charter were accepted by the AC and PMT. The Finalized Charter will be posted on the Conservancy website Water Trail page (www.scc.ca.gov). Before long, it will be posted on the Water Trail website (www.sfbaywatertrail.org) as well.

Finalization of Education, Outreach and Stewardship Program (Led by Laura Thompson)

The group reviewed revisions made to the document (November 2011 version with underlining and strikeouts), based on the discussion at the September 15 WT meeting and comments submitted by AC members after that meeting.

Penny: Replace the photograph on the Water Trail website with an image showing people wearing the proper gear. Response: The suggested change has been made.

Themes and Messages

Barbara: Under Theme 3, bullet point three, “shorebird flocks” should be added as an additional, separate bullet with a message about disturbance. Also, adjust wording on what disturbance looks like. Flying away is too late. Boaters should look for other more minor signs of disturbance, such as paddling.

Brian: The 250-meter buffer applied to rafting birds should not apply to “shorebird flocks.”

Bill: Consider eliminating the metric references.

Response: An additional bullet point will be added about shorebirds. It will not include a reference to a 250-meter buffer.

Richard: Suggests creating a video to educate the public about bird sensitivity.

Response: A more robust discussion is needed on the issue of measurements and buffer distances. A sub-committee was created to discuss buffer distances for wildlife, navigational safety and military zones. It will include Brian, Jill, Barbara, Cecily, Penny, and perhaps others. Water Trail Staff will follow up.

Tools

Antoinette: Section B, Signage, reference to Water Trail and Bay Trail signs: Some potential Water Trail sites, such as the Alviso Marina County Park, already have signs and would need to discuss with Water Trail staff before adding more signs (other than the Water Trail logo).

Richard: In Section C, Brochures and Section D, Website, add a definition of “accessibility.” Also, ensure that all outreach media, such as websites with videos and photos, are ADA-

accessible for people with visual and hearing impairments, as appropriate. Lighthouse for the Blind is a resource for large print and Braille, and Richard is willing to help.

Penny: Suggests capitalizing “accessibility” to make it clearly related to ADA. Response: Text will be revised as needed to make this clear.

Question: Will signs address powered vessels? Response: To be handled on a case by case basis.

Question: Will brochures be updated, and what will the level of detail be? Answer: Brochures will be updated periodically. They are unlikely to contain details that will go out of date quickly. The website will have more detail. The first brochure will provide general information with website addresses, an overall map and other contact information. The WT program will produce the brochures.

Barbara: In Section K, Annual Assessment: Need to clarify the reporting mechanism mentioned in text. Response: Ann agreed to clarify the language.

Antoinette: There are challenges with law enforcement because some jurisdictions do not have the capacity to respond to emergencies.

Ann: Water Trail could bring together different entities to discuss coordination of emergency response programs. This issue will be handled on a site-specific basis for now.

Penny: Add to education program that VHF radios are a reliable form of boater communication. Response: Will add to Theme 1 in relation to the bullet point about unreliability of cell phones on the Bay.

Barbara: It would be helpful for the Water Trail program to provide funding for coordination in the context of wildlife issues (however, there is no law covering this).

Richard: It would be helpful for the Committee and staff to develop a list of organizations that provides emergency services.

Partnerships

Barbara: Change “Audubon Society” to “Audubon Societies” under Section D, Environmental Education and Interpretive Program. Response: Will do.

With the few additional changes listed above and the development of subcommittees, the revised Education, Outreach and Stewardship Program was supported by the Advisory Committee. The final version will be posted on the Conservancy’s Water Trail page at www.scc.ca.gov, and on the Water Trail website before long (www.sfbaywatertrail.org).

Trailhead Designation: Tidewater Boating Center, East Bay Regional Park District (EBRPD) (Led by Ann Buell)

Ann provided a PowerPoint overview of the Tidewater Boating Center with photos and maps. She reviewed park features, environmental issues, sign content, BCDC permit conditions, and the Water Trail program conditions of designation. Steve described the origin and amount of the Cal Boating grant to EBRPD (\$300,000) for the new floating dock that will be added to existing piles at Tidewater and will help to reduce user conflict between those using long rowing shells and other site users such as kayakers.

Richard: In the checklist, sites should not be referred to as “ADA-Compliant” because there are California mandates that require the federal level of compliance and often more. The “program” needs to be accessible.

Bill: Clarification is needed for terminology such as ramp, gangway, and run.

Response: Accessibility language needs to be refined in the education program and other Water Trail documents. Bill and Richard agreed to provide information to staff for this clarification as a sort of accessibility editorial sub-committee.

Question: What is the need for the second gangway? Answer: To be used by the long rowing shells.

Question: Can the second boathouse (not the one leased to Oakland Strokes) be used for public boat storage? Answer: Not in the short term.

Question: Is there a locked gate? Answer: Yes.

Penny: The Middle Harbor port and commercial vessels in the area should have been included in the environmental review as a potential safety issue for Tidewater.

Question: Is a permit needed from EBRPD for a group of a certain size? Answer: Permits are not required, but a group of more than 50 people can get an event permit in order to have a reservation. Large groups are encouraged to do so.

Comment: Concern expressed about the lack of information about signs. EBRPD clarified that it will install an interpretive sign that addresses wildlife values, location of habitats and why they should be protected, but will not include buffer language. Ann acknowledged that the sign program for the WT is still under development but that the program-level approach to signs will be brought back to the AC, as will the logo and draft brochure. The WT sign plan for Tidewater will be worked out after EBRPD has created their own interpretive sign for the site, and then will be brought back to the AC.

There was discussion of using “in bay” signage to alert boaters of sensitive habitats, but it was noted that these types of signs could be obstacles to navigation.

Barbara: Requested more information about the BCDC permit for Tidewater, specifically about Special Condition II-B-4: Quarterly Wildlife Training and Annual Reporting. Is it a template for future sites? Who is doing the assessment? What is considered an adverse impact on wildlife? Suggests a standard template for the permit assessment.

Barbara: Asked for a commitment from the Water Trail Program regarding monitoring.
Response: Monitoring will continue to be discussed as part of the program as a whole. Clarification of BCDC permit requirements for Tidewater or other sites will need to come from BCDC staff. The PMT and WT Staff will work with BCDC on this question of permit requirements and monitoring.

Comment: Add permit information to the Site Description so it is public information.
Response: The name of the permit and relevant excerpts are already part of the Site Description, although in a separate document.

Cecily: Questioned whether it is the purview of this committee to review permit requirements.

Ellen: Thinks it is valuable to get AC feedback on permit conditions.

Cecily: The permit process could be a barrier to potential sites.

Comment: Additional public information should include an on-the-ground contact at the site (to report necessary bathroom maintenance, for example).

Comment: The Site Description, along with specifying public/private, should name the entity. Response: The name of the owner is included in the opening paragraph of the Site Description. The public/private data entry field is meant to highlight only whether the site is in public ownership or private ownership.

Penny: It has been over six years since the legislation passed. We need to show progress.

Penny: Suggests removing the brochure as a condition of designation.

Richard: The brochure will be general in nature and will refer to the website and the program as a whole.

Ted: It would be ideal if the brochure could be updated annually.

Jonathan: There are other broad issues, beyond wildlife, that impact the entire program. These will evolve over time. Not designating has negative impacts for future sites. We need consensus for the overall objectives.

Ann asked for Conditional Designation of Tidewater Boating Center, with these conditions:

- 1) Development of Water Trail sign, brochure, logo and website. All of these will be brought back to Advisory Committee for guidance.
- 2) Installation of Water Trail sign with logo and Water Trail website address, with content to be determined.

Advisory Committee Guidance:

The Advisory Committee supported the conditional designation of Tidewater Boating Center as a Water Trail site.

Project Management Team Decision:

The Project Management Team decided to conditionally designate Tidewater Boating Center.

Next Steps for Water Trail Staff (with input from AC on many items):

- Post finalized Charter online.
- Post finalized Education, Outreach, and Stewardship Program online.
- Convene wildlife buffer distances sub-committee.
- Begin development of Water Trail logo and brochure.
- Continue development of Water Trail website.
- Continue the development of the Water Trail Sign Program.
- Set a standing day and time for Water Trail Implementation meetings in 2012.
- Consult with “ADA language” subcommittee as needed.
- Develop and share guidelines for potential Water Trail site owners/managers interested in designation.
- Work with BCDC on permit questions.
- Develop a helpful list of existing regulations relevant to Water Trail sites to post online.

Meeting adjourned.