

San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission

455 Golden Gate Avenue, Suite 10600, San Francisco, California 94102 tel 415 352 3600 fax 415 352 3606

June 9, 2017

TO: All Commissioners and Alternates

FROM: Lawrence J. Goldzband, Executive Director (415/352-3653; larry.goldzband@bcdc.ca.gov)

Sharon Louie, Director, Administrative & Technology Services (415/352-3638; sharon.louie@bcdc.ca.gov)

SUBJECT: Draft Minutes of June 1, 2017 Commission Meeting

1. **Call to Order.** The meeting was called to order as a committee of the Commission by Acting Chair Halsted at the Bay Area Metro Center, 375 Beale Street, Board Room, First Floor, San Francisco, California at 1:12 p.m. Agenda items would be taken out of order until such time as a quorum was established.

3. **Public Comment.** No public comment was given.

5. **Report of the Chair.** Acting Chair Halsted reported on the following:

a. **Next BCDC Meeting.** At our June 15th meeting, in the Yerba Buena room across the way, we will hold the 9th Rising Sea Level workshop.

b. **Ex-Parte Communications.** In case you have inadvertently forgotten to provide our staff with a report on any written or oral ex-parte communications, please provide those to the Commission as soon as possible. That completes my report and Executive Director Goldzband will give his report.

6. **Report of the Executive Director.** Executive Director Goldzband reported: I would like Commission Zwissler to report on the Funding the Future meeting this morning.

Commissioner Zwissler addressed the committee: We had a very engaged and well-attended meeting this morning. In the first half of the meeting we had a briefing on Geologic Hazard Abatement Districts. This is part of our ongoing effort to understand possible financing vehicles for addressing our adaptation needs in the coming years. We learned about this particular vehicle and how it is being deployed across the state. We had particular examples of Broad Beach and Malibu discussed. In this southern California area the homeowners have assessed themselves \$50,000.00 a year to repair and protect their personal beachfront property.

info@bcdc.ca.gov | www.bcdc.ca.gov
State of California | Edmund G. Brown, Jr. — Governor



BCDC MINUTES
June 1, 2017

Then we had a really great discussion on green bonds and understanding how those work. We discussed the opportunities and pitfalls of these tools. I think it's a fruitful conversation and we are learning a lot. We are going to be having some more Working Group meetings and then at some point we will be coming back to the Commission and the public with some further conversation.

Executive Director Goldzband continued:

Looking at the New York Times website this morning made me more frustrated right now than any other day of my tenure as your Executive Director. Driving here this morning after an interesting and fulfilling meeting at Google headquarters with representatives of the Silicon Valley Leadership Group talking about BCDC, Adapting to Rising Tides, uncertainty, and all things rising sea level. I listened to the news reports of the Trump Administration's possible plans for the U.S. to exit from the Paris Climate Accords. Those plans have now been announced. Because I spent a lot of time working on Capitol Hill and in Sacramento, I always used to feel connected to the policy making process works, even if I disagreed with the outcome. But, today, I feel very disconnected from the federal government. It's not just that the Trump Administration appears to view the world so differently than I do – it's that they seem to have no ability to recognize the validity of another's viewpoint and then to disagree with it. I'd feel better if we were speaking past each other, but now it seems like we are living in different realities and that all sides of an issue seem to be resisting efforts to come to agreement.

Therefore, perhaps there is no better time to resurrect a statement from a non-statesman. The late Woody Hayes was a great football coach but a lousy communicator. Indeed, Hayes was fired after he assaulted an opposing player during the last few minutes of a bowl game. While he was a coach, Hayes was fond of saying that to overcome an enemy, one should "paralyze resistance with persistence." In that vein, I hope that passage of the Commission's updated Strategic Plan places BCDC in the forefront of persistent policy making that will make the Bay Area more resilient to rising sea level, just as Mar-a-Lago must become.

I apologize for being absent from our last meeting. On the evening beforehand I was asked by the Senate Budget Subcommittee staff to testify in Sacramento on behalf of a motion to provide BCDC with \$500,000 per year for ten years to pay for the tenant improvements necessary to build out the fifth floor of this great new building so that we can move into that space this fall. That motion was approved by the Subcommittee and the expenditure is now one of the issues that the Senate and Assembly budget conferees must consider. Steve and I have spoken with all parties and I am fairly confident that the funds will remain in the budget as it exits the Legislature and heads toward the Governor, in great part because former BCDC Commissioner Bob Wieckowski chairs the Senate Budget Subcommittee and ex officio BCDC Commissioner Assembly Member Phil Ting chairs the Assembly Budget Committee. We shall keep you updated on the process.

In this season of interns, our new staff Cardinal is Claire Miles. Claire recently earned her bachelor's degree in Earth Systems at Stanford and is working toward a Master's degree in Environmental Analysis and Management. This summer Claire will assist our enforcement staff with our backlog of enforcement cases.

BCDC MINUTES
June 1, 2017

We do have our two new legal interns today. Eric Hagle and Sara Lucy from Berkeley Law are sitting in the audience. They will be helping Mark and John with their duties.

In the absence of Chair Wasserman, I want to report out just a little bit on the launch of Resilient by Design, the design and implementation competition that seeks to place ten resilient projects on the Bay shoreline. Chair Wasserman participated in yesterday's press conference in Oakland to announce its launch and I had the difficult task of partaking in the after-launch party last night at the Exploratorium. We have distributed a pre-launch news article by John King that appeared in yesterday's Chronicle about RBD. While BCDC no longer sits as a member of the project's oversight board, we are continuing our consultative relationship with RBD. We will work with them and they want to work with us to ensure that we share data and we have consistent messaging. We want to make sure that the projects are innovative and stretch the planning and regulatory envelopes while maintaining a well-defined relationship with current state laws, regulations and policies. We believe that goal is mutual. We shall work together closely to provide the competition with our best efforts.

I also want to let you know about two other things that are in your packet. The first is that the Coastal States organization which hosts the national conference that Steve, I and Mark attended in February in D.C. is partnering with Restore America's Estuaries for the December 2018 summit on coastal and estuarine restoration and management. It will be held in Long Beach late next year. We will be very much involved in the planning of this. We look forward to giving you more information as it progresses.

Each of you received in the mail a copy of the San Francisco Public Press edition. It is a thought provoking series of pieces about the waterfront and how the public views the waterfront and how public agencies work on the waterfront. I encourage you to take a look at it and provide us your comments.

That concludes my report, Acting Chair Halsted, and I'm happy to answer any questions that may arise. (No questions were voiced)

7. **Consideration of Administrative Matters.** Acting Chair Halsted stated Jaime Michaels was available if Commissioners had any questions or concerns regarding the listing that was distributed on May 26th. (No questions were voiced)

11. **Briefing on Caltrans' Fall 2016 Controlled Implosions of Piers E4 and E5 of the Former East Span of the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge.** Chief of Permits Jaime Michaels introduced this item: In September 2016 the Commission issued to Caltrans an amendment to Permit Number 2001.008.00 for the demolition of piers at the former east span of the Bay Bridge.

The demolition involved controlled blasting of the piers.

Among other things, the permit requires Caltrans to monitor the activity. Last fall two piers were removed and today you will receive a briefing on that monitoring.

Caltrans will also discuss a proposed change to its demolition schedule. The original schedule that was in the permit involved demolition of the piers through 2018. Caltrans is now proposing to complete demolition in 2017.

At this time the scheduling change does not appear to conflict with the permit and thus it would not require an amendment to proceed.

Lastly, you will hear about Caltrans' concept to retain five piers and reuse them for the purpose of public access. At this time the idea is conceptual only and the work would require a material amendment to the permit and a public hearing and a vote by this Commission.

Today we have Stefan Galvez and Brian Maroney of Caltrans who will make presentations.

Commissioner McElhinney will make a brief introduction: This year the old east span is going to be out of the water. We said goodbye to the truss a couple of months ago. The partnership with BCDC and all the agencies has been fantastic and the presentation is going to talk about accelerating so we can finish all the underwater foundation removal this year.

I wanted to mention that the United States Department of Transportation, the Federal Highway Administration just recently awarded the project and all its partners the 2017 Environmental Excellence Award. It is a national award recognizing collaboration and partnership on complex environmental projects. With that I want to welcome the team and congratulate them. Stefan Galvez our Environmental Manager will address the Commission.

Mr. Galvez presented the following: We will report on the results of Pier E4 and E5. We had great results and this confirms the positive results that we had from Pier E3 that we imploded in 2015.

We have been using innovative methods to dismantle the piers. These are difficult foundations to remove and they have been there for over 80 years.

All the federal agencies as well as some of the local stakeholders helped make this project a success.

I will share with you some slides that show the dismantling of the original east span. We completed the dismantling and the lowering of these spans in March and it was a very complex job.

We are now working on the removal of 22 foundations. The time that it takes to take them down keeps getting shorter. This is the least damaging environmental alternative for removal of these structures.

The yellow boxes indicate piers that are in the water and there are 23 half in the water and half on the land that the Department is exploring actively with the region and BCDC to determine whether or not there is some opportunity for reuse.

We will be coming back to the Commission once we have more mature options that have been identified.

We continue to employ the avoidance and minimization measures that served us so well on the original project. The main measures used were: Seasonal Avoidance, Blast Attenuation System (BAS), Blast Plan Design, Bird Deterrence and Monitoring.

Our results for this round of implosions were as positive as the original project. You can see from these slides that specific parameters and acceptable levels of compliance with environmental requirements were met in all areas of concern.

Dr. Brian Maroney addressed the Commission: I enjoy working with your staff and I want to let you know that they are fun to work with.

I will give you a window into looking at the bottom of San Francisco Bay. The slides that you see in front of you are maps we created using low-power sonar. This creates a topography map that shows elevations at the bottom of the Bay.

The area around the piers is deeper because a scour hole develops around any structure that blocks the flow of water. This is completely expected and it is around every single marine structure in San Francisco Bay.

These piers were hollow and when we implode them the inside half of the reinforced concrete falls deep down into the hole that was the hollow part of the pier. The outside half falls outward.

We imploded Pier E3 in December 2015 and the Bay bottom has restored naturally. We have over 3,000 cubic yards of silt through natural flows of water and weather events. This shows that the Bay is healing itself as we predicted.

We will continue to monitor this until 2019 and if we need to go further; we will. I am expecting even better results this year because we had a lot more rain and storms.

(An implosion video was shown to the Commissioners.)

The Toll Bridge Program Oversight Committee and the PMT allowed us to do some unusual, bold things. They allowed us to move forward with a 100 million dollar demo contract to take down the cantilever bridge a year before the new bridge opened.

When the cantilever contractor was working on one side we were allowed to take 12 million dollars from the 504/288 contract and move it into the cantilever contract so the contractor would be working on two fronts.

They finished a year ahead of time on the cantilever. By having this happen we were able to advertise the 504/288 contract a year ahead of time. Through time/value money savings we actually saved that 12 million dollars back.

By working with the contractor and allowing them to be clever they accelerated the 504/288 contract by a year. Right now we are about two years ahead of schedule and we are under budget. It is all because engineers have been allowed to be engineers and contractors have been allowed to be contractors and environmental planners be environmental planners. This doesn't always happen.

This put us in a rare situation. We are two years ahead of schedule and under budget. We turned to the foundation contractor and said we are two years ahead of time; what can we do to ride this?

We challenged them - can you come up with a strategy to do two years of work in one? The basic idea here is; can we do multiple piers all at once? We are hitting all the resource agencies with the idea that as these piers get smaller we do not have as much concrete to remove. We can take three or four of the 288 piers, implode them in the same event and they are still smaller than the Pier E3.

We are still performing this work within our environmental windows. So far everyone has been open to listening.

These slides show a simulation of what we see in our future as far as this work is concerned. The video shows you what we envision as the typical work flow in removing a 288 pier.

NOAA was very concerned that if we had multiple blasts the waves would combine into a super wave. We came up with the idea of separating the implosions at each pier by time such that the last blast and the shock wave it creates will have cleared the next pier scheduled for implosion.

It takes 0.13 seconds for the compression wave to travel from one pier to the next. We asked the contractor to separate the last charge on one pier and the first charge on the next by something that is many times larger than the time it takes for that wave to pass.

That is about 0.11 seconds. If our contractor puts in 0.5 seconds then these waves can never combine and we satisfy the concern by making sure it never happens.

You are invited to be in the command centers during the blast event. You are also invited to come out and observe the process of the drilling and the placing.

We are here to answer any questions you might have.

Commissioner McGrath had questions: What is going to happen to E2 and when?

Dr. Maroney replied: Our permits say we are supposed to remove all the marine piers. The Toll Bridge Program Oversight Committee has asked Mr. Galvez and me to explore with the community the potential for retaining some of those piers which would include E2 as well as E19 through E22 which are marine piers. We have initiated that conversation with BCDC staff and with the Corps and with the Coast Guard.

We've actually had two full meeting where we got all of the resource agencies together and right now we are hearing that there is interest in a potential future public access.

Commissioner Butt asked: The debris that is dredged up after the implosion; where does it end up?

Dr. Maroney explained: It has to be tested so that we understand what level it is. So far we have not brought up any hazardous material. Based on this the contractor is allowed to dispose of it as he can find places to do it.

All of the reinforcing steel in there is like gold; it is worth money. They will pull it up and put it on a barge and separate it and the rebar will be recycled.

With respect to the concrete, it is pretty good concrete. It is on the order of high 4,000 psi concrete. That is the kind of thing that can be washed and then crushed and recycled.

Commissioner Zwissler inquired: On the Oakland side are the piers structurally sound?

Dr. Maroney replied: These piers were designed to carry two trains and a lot of car traffic and 300 foot double-deck trusses. World War I bridges are where the engineers put a lot in and were not as sharp with the pencil. With respect to pedestrian public access these things are in great shape.

Acting Chair Halsted announced: We have been joined by our quorum-making Commissioner and we can go back to roll call.

2. Roll Call: Present were: Acting Chair Halsted, Commissioners Addiego, Butt, Chan (Represented by Alternate Gilmore), Gibbs, Lucchesi (reported by Alternate Pemberton), McGrath, Nelson, Ranchod (Arrived at 1:31 p.m.), Sartipi (represented by Alternate McElhinney), Sears, Techel, Wagenknecht and Zwissler.

Acting Chair Halsted announced that a quorum was present.

Not present were Commissioners: Association of Bay Area Governments (Showalter), Santa Clara County (Cortese), Secretary for Resources (DeLaRosa), Department of Finance (Finn), Contra Costa County (Gioia), Sonoma County (Gorin), Governor (Randolph, Wasserman), U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Hicks), City and County of San Francisco (Peskin), San Mateo County (Pine), Solano County (Spering), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (Ziegler).

9. Commission Consideration of Geographic Information Systems, Graphics and Technical Services Contract. Acting Chair Halsted announced: Item 9 is Commission authorization for the Executive Director to enter into a contract for graphics. Todd Hallenbeck will provide the staff recommendation.

GIS Specialist Hallenbeck presented the following: I am here to present a recommendation for awarding of a technical services contract. This is to provide geo-spatial data development, web application development and graphics publication support and technical expertise for various projects that we have.

The staff recommends that the Commission authorize the Executive Director to enter into a \$200,000.00 contract with the San Francisco Estuary Institute to provide us with these services over a two year period from July 1st of this year through June 30th of 2019.

Further, we recommend that the Commission authorize the Executive Director to amend this contract as necessary including revising the amount or duration of the agreement as long as the amendment does not involve substantial changes to the services provided and to enter into similar contracts in the future subject to the availability of funds and that the Commission has ongoing and continuous needs for these services.

Commissioner Pemberton had a request: If we approve this item can we get a report back in the next six months to a year on the status and the work that has been achieved through the funding?

Mr. Hallenbeck answered: Absolutely. We intend to come back especially on some specifics of the bigger projects that will be taking advantage of the support services and getting Commission input on those.

Commissioner McGrath had a financial question: The amount that is listed is \$200,000.00 and the Estuary Institute is a great organization. What I am a little bit confused about is the, "amend the contract as necessary including revising the amount and duration." How much of an increase over \$200,000.00 might that allow without returning to the Commission?

Mr. Hallenbeck explained: I believe in the past it has been used as an extension of services within the existing budget. It is my understanding that we've rarely actually used the full amount.

Commissioner McGrath replied: So if the amount is firm I have no concerns with extending the duration. In the future if you want to have a minor ability to increase it slightly that's okay too. In general I think public contracts should be --

Acting Chair Halsted interjected: Not open ended.

Commissioner McGrath added: -- transparent and yes --

Chief Deputy Director Goldbeck stated: The staff would request that you allow a 10 percent overage because sometimes you just need a little bit more to get something done. Would that be acceptable to the Commission?

Acting Chair Halsted replied: It sounds alright to me.

Commissioner McGrath responded: It is perfectly fine with me.

Acting Chair Halsted clarified: That 10 percent would make it \$20,000.00 over a two year period. A not-to-exceed is a good idea. Let's amend the motion to say, not to exceed.

Commissioner Pemberton chimed in: Correct. To amend the motion not to exceed 10 percent over the \$200,000.00.

Acting Chair Halsted asked: And does the seconder agree with that?

Commissioner Nelson replied: He does.

MOTION: Commissioner Pemberton moved approval of the staff recommendation, amending the motion to an amount of not to exceed \$220,000.00 over a two year period, seconded by Commissioner Nelson.

VOTE: The motion carried with a roll call vote of 14-0-0 with Commissioners Addiego, Butt, Gilmore, Gibbs, Pemberton, McGrath, Nelson, Ranchod, McElhinney, Sears, Techel, Wagenknecht, Zwissler and Acting Chair Halsted voting, "YES", no "NO", votes and no abstentions.

10. Commission Consideration of Contract for Regulatory Unit Organizational Review.

Item 10 is Commission authorization of the Executive Director to enter into a contract for facilitation services to help assess and maximize the Regulatory section's effectiveness and efficiency. Brad McCrea will provide the staff recommendation.

Regulatory Director Brad McCrea addressed the Commission: I am here to recommend that you authorize the Executive Director to enter into a small contract with CPS HR Consulting for an amount not to exceed \$15,000.00 for up to a six month period for facilitation services for our regulatory unit so that we can address internal and external needs. The hired consultant will help us review the regulatory unit's procedures, culture and organizational structure. We will assess what works and consider eliminating or improving what doesn't work. We will evaluate staff capacity, external inputs and regulatory products. And we will review the responsibilities of the three regulatory teams and determine whether and how we should work differently. The contract with CPS HR Consulting will enable us to get started on that work.

We also recommend that the Commission authorize the Executive Director to amend the contract as necessary including revising the amount or duration of the agreement perhaps not to exceed 10 percent increase in the total amount of the contract so long as the amendment does not involve substantial changes in the services provided. Thank you.

Acting Chair Halsted inquired: Will we be consulting with permit holders or people who have been exposed to enforcement process?

Mr. McCrea replied: Yes. The scope of the contract as drafted identifies working with outside stakeholders. We haven't yet determined who the stakeholders are.

Acting Chair Halsted added: A sensitive issue I'm sure. But I do think we should be getting some input from people who have been dealing with our enforcement people.

Commissioner Ranchod had two questions: Have we utilized external resources for this type of role before for the regulatory unit? And second, can you elaborate on whether other firms or options were considered?

Mr. McCrea asked for clarification: If you could define, "external resources" for me.

Commissioner Ranchod explained: Contracting for a service like this.

Mr. McCrea answered: No. We've handled it internally. When we look inward and look at our own program we have used our own staff resources.

Executive Director Goldzband added: When we did this with the planning unit last year we did use an external consultant, Gina Bartlett who had helped us with the previous Strategic Plan. The reason the Commission did not have to consider that contract is that it was for under \$5,000.00 with a shorter timeframe and less people.

When we were discussing this we said, it needs to be larger and it needs to go on longer.

Acting Chair Halsted opined: It is somewhat more difficult; the enforcement role – the regulatory role.

Mr. Goldbeck commented: This consultant is on the list of state-approved contractors. The way the rules work is the state pre-approves a list. They have already been vetted.

Director of Administrative and Technology Services Sharon Louie commented: They are not quite a state agency but they work with the state agencies.

Commissioner McGrath commented: I think this is an extraordinarily good idea to look outside and look for that. Giving the staff some level of discretion in increasing a contract to deal with unforeseen circumstances is a good idea. It just has to be defined. I am comfortable to taking this up to 25,000 dollars if that should be needed.

I assume in a contract this small you are going to be careful with it. I also do not want you having to come back to the Commission for relatively small amounts.

Commissioner Zwissler stated: As a practitioner, if we take it up to 25 I guarantee you that's where it is going end up. I suggest maybe a more prudent adjustment.

Acting Chair Halsted added: I like the 10 percent idea. Do you think we could live with 10 percent?

Executive Director Goldzband answered: Yes.

Mr. Goldbeck continued the conversation: There may be follow-up work but, if so, we will bring it back to the Commission.

Commissioner Techel commented: I agree. I think 10 percent is a good amount. I would rather have you bring me a bigger number and bring it in under. I don't care if it is done in six months or a year. If you can bring it up to the outside range of what you are going to need; stay within that.

MOTION: Commissioner Techel moved approval of the staff recommendation, seconded by Commissioner Ranchod.

Acting Chair Halsted clarified: That includes the 10 percent and for six months.

VOTE: The motion carried with a roll call vote of 14-0-0 with Commissioners Addiego, Butt, Gilmore, Gibbs, Pemberton, McGrath, Nelson, Ranchod, McElhinney, Sears, Techel, Wagenknecht, Zwissler and Acting Chair Halsted voting, "YES", no "NO", votes and no abstentions.

4. **Approval of Minutes of the May 18, 2017 Meeting.** Acting Chair Halsted asked for a motion and a second to adopt the minutes of May 18, 2017.

MOTION: Commissioner Zwissler moved approval of the Minutes, seconded by Commissioner McGrath.

VOTE: The motion carried with a vote of 13-0-1 with Commissioners Addiego, Butt, Gibbs, Pemberton, McGrath, Nelson, Ranchod, McElhinney, Sears, Techel, Wagenknecht, Zwissler and Acting Chair Halsted voting, "YES", no "NO", votes and Commissioner Gilmore abstaining.

8. Commission Consideration of the Strategic Plan. Acting Chair Halsted announced Item 8 is discussion and possible adoption of the latest draft of the proposed Strategic Plan update. Executive Director Goldzband and our consultants Eric Poncelet and Matt Marvin of Kearns & West will first briefly walk us through the draft.

Executive Director Goldzband commented: You will remember that BCDC contracted with Kearns & West, Eric and Matt to facilitate our update of the Strategic Plan as well as help us form a drafting team of four staffers to do the hard work of coalescing but deciding what should and should not be included in the update.

We have worked hard to finalize a draft for your consideration. We have a PowerPoint to go through quickly that Eric will lead us through.

Mr. Eric Poncelet addressed the Commission: We have been working with the Commission and staff since the beginning of the year. We are now entering the end of the arc of the strategic planning process. This is the fourth time that we have met with the Commission.

Today we are going to be presenting and discussing the final draft of the Strategic Plan. It is up for adoption. Our focus today will be on how things have changed in the draft since you discussed it at your May 4th meeting.

We will discuss a number of things today. I will recap the process that has taken place that has led to the development of the current draft final. And then I will turn it over to the drafting team that Larry just introduced to discuss some of the key changes that have taken place over the past month. And then we will move to discussion and potential of adoption. We will finish with a discussion of, Next Steps, because the Strategic Plan is a step in the process and implementing the plan is the next one.

Mr. Poncelet discussed a number of steps in the process that has allowed them to progress to the current point in the development of the plan.

Executive Director Goldzband discussed the introductory section of the draft plan: Within the introduction there was one major addition that was made based upon Commissioners' recommendation which is that we wanted to make sure that the readers of the plan recognize that much of the policy basis going forward on the planning side as well as some on the regulatory side has grown out of the work that you all have done.

There is a new paragraph that frames the use of those Commissioner workshops and working groups and refers to the policy recommendations that this Commission adopted last October which all have found their way into the Strategic Plan.

Sediment Program Analyst Anniken Lydon addressed the Commission: I will present to you updates we made to Goal 1 based on your feedback and from staff. Objective 1.1 updated actions related to Wetlands Habitat Assessment Team (WHAT) and collaborations with other agencies on requirements for habitat projects.

The last action in this objective was updated to task staff to better integrate data and information from restoration projects and lessons learned to future restoration projects.

In Objective 1.2 the first two actions were rearranged and now include inventorying existing public access and improving the tracking system and then, second, to evaluate the diversity of uses and then identify opportunities to enhance public access and public amenities.

Objective 1.3 was updated to include updating key practices.

In Objective 1.4 we made only minor word changes from the last version of the Strategic Plan that you saw on May 4th.

GIS Team Member Todd Hallenbeck presented the following: For Goal 2 we made small changes based on the Commission's input. Essentially one the changes that came about from discussions that occurred with staff and input from the Commission was related to 2.1 which is focused on the development of a regional adaptation plan.

We added a task related to the completion of the county-level ART assessments as key component of that regional plan.

In 2.4 related to the idea that we wanted to change out the term, "green infrastructure" because of its broad nature. We have switched it out in a couple of places in the plan in 2.4 as it related to the description of beneficial reuse of sediment. We switched that reference to, "shoreline adaptation projects".

In 2.6 which was the objective related to encouragement of green infrastructure we've replaced the terminology there with, "living shorelines". This was done to refine the focus of the objective on these shoreline adaptation projects and have subsequently changed the definition in the footnote. It is in better agreement with some of the terminology used by other agencies.

Records Manager Christine Nutile spoke: At the May 4th Commission meeting you did not have any significant concerns or questions with Goal 3 and its objectives. We have only considered staff input in the wording of a few of the proposed actions.

Under Objective 3.1 we modified the second bullet slightly under the proposed actions. In the previous version it said, "Attract a more diverse applicant pool than traditionally seeks employment at BCDC by using non-traditional channels".

In the new version you have before you it now reads, "Use traditional and non-traditional channels to attract a more diverse applicant pool than historically seeks employment at BCDC".

Under Objective 3.3 we also made minor updates in the wording of the first two and the last two bullets under proposed actions. For example, we removed extra phrases such as, "Implement a data base" and we added new language that is easier to understand such as, "Modernize the BCDC website" and "Continue ongoing documentation".

The last change we made is under Objective 3.4 where we decided to separate the second bullet in the previous version into two separate bullets in the revised version.

Executive Director Goldzband continued: We do want to make sure that you know that how you label something means a lot. We all recognize that. We came into this process thinking, well, we need a new strategic plan. Then we ended up talking with Eric and Matt and said, no, you don't need a new strategic plan, you are going to have to revise the Strategic Plan.

After we had gotten through this process we looked at it and we have decided this is really an update of the Strategic Plan.

There are differences between revisions and updates. I like the term, update, because it demonstrates progress and it demonstrates time.

The real difference between this strategic plan update and what you all did with our help and with the help of the public three and a half years ago is that this plan is based so much upon the work that you all have done. It is so much more directive. It includes rising sea level as a goal in and of itself that is very different from the previous one.

That is why I like the term, update because it really demonstrates the progress that BCDC has made.

Commissioner Pemberton made some wording suggestions: On page two I wanted to propose in the first bullet changing, "manmade" to "human made" because it is more gender-neutral and that is more appropriate.

On page five, the last bullet regarding outreach, "Improving outreach to non-traditional audiences". I think one of our goals would be also improving outreach to all of our audiences. I wonder if we could broaden that.

I am also curious what, "non-traditional audiences" means.

Ms. Lydon replied: The first part of that action was to evaluate our public-engagement process generally. This action in a previous version was specifically related towards targeting environmental justice communities and engaging with them and getting them to attend our meetings. And there are some suggestions of ways that this can happen that came out of the policies for a rising Bay process.

This was included to evaluate our meeting process and public engagement generally and then we added this other note to target us towards environmental justice community engagement as well.

Vice Chair Halsted stated: I find the use of "non-traditional" a little bit confusing.

Executive Director Goldzband chimed in: If you go to a BCDC meeting you see the same people. What this is trying to do is just trying to get BCDC out there in front of more people and have more people actually understand what BCDC does.

Of all the things that the policies for a rising Bay project did the greatest thing it did was expose BCDC to different groups of people who live around the Bay. This is designed to try to make sure that we continue to do that.

Acting Chair Halsted suggested: I would prefer that we say something like, audiences not sufficiently reached in the past or something like that.

Ms. Lydon stated: We could also change it to say, improve outreach to a broader audience.

Acting Chair Halsted added: As broad an audience as possible.

Commissioner Pemberton continued: On page nine under Objective 3.2 the last bullet, "Conduct periodic employee surveys". I thought that could benefit from some context or examples. I mean, what are the purposes of the surveys?

Enforcement Analyst Matt Trujillo commented: The purpose of the survey would be job satisfaction, how well things are working; but it also has a purpose of making employees feel more engaged and more valued that their opinions are taken into consideration and used.

Acting Chair Halsted added: To assess morale.

Commissioner Pemberton commented: I had a comment on the first page in the update summary. On the third paragraph on the human resources problems; I assume that means with staff – it might be confusing on what that means. What are human resources problems?

Acting Chair Halsted continued: I think we could consider the comments presented by the Commissioners to be generally integrated into the final document.

Commissioner Nelson asked: I wanted to ask Larry if we need specific language now to act on this?

Executive Director Goldzband sought clarification: You mean specific language in regards to Commissioner Pemberton's suggestions?

Commissioner Nelson answered: Yes.

Executive Director Goldzband continued: I don't think so. We've heard exactly what we need to hear and we can figure out how to do it. We will make sure to get to Commissioner Pemberton what those changes will be before it gets published.

MOTION: Commissioner McGrath moved approval of the staff recommendation with the understanding that minor changes to address Commissioner Pemberton's comments will be incorporated without coming back to the Commission, seconded by Commissioner Ranchod.

VOTE: The motion carried with a roll call vote of 14-0-0 with Commissioners Addiego, Butt, Gilmore, Gibbs, Pemberton, McGrath, Nelson, Ranchod, McElhinney, Sears, Techel, Wagenknecht, Zwissler and Acting Chair Halsted voting, "YES", no "NO", votes and no abstentions.

Executive Director Goldzband commented: What we will do after this gets posted is that we will then go out with an RFP to solicit proposals to develop the work plan that is associated with this. That work plan will have deadlines. It will allow us to put together a three-year plan in order to implement the actions that we have as well as other actions.

When we propose that contract we will come back to the Commission so that you can see what it is we are asking for and we will gain your knowledge and your suggestions with regard to how to make it as good as we can.

We will then let the contract out and the first thing that will happen is we will bring the consultant back into you with examples of how previous work plans have been done at other organizations and staff will give you suggestions about how we think it ought to be done.

Commissioner Ranchod commented: I want to underscore the importance of what you were just saying which is that the work plan is really how we implement this and hold ourselves accountable over time. This should be a living document that is revised and updated on a periodic basis to make sure that we are guiding our actions and resources with the plan.

I fully support the process of developing that work plan with appropriate resources externally.

Executive Director Goldzband added: Chair Wasserman has said that he is considering putting together a small team of Commissioners to be the reviewer of the work plan as it moves forward.

12. **Adjournment.** Upon motion by Commissioner Nelson, seconded by Commissioner McGrath, the Commission meeting was adjourned at 2:53 p.m.