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

January 13, 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 December 15, 2016 Commission Meeting

1. **Call to Order.** The meeting was called to order by Chair Wasserman at the Bay Area Metro Center, 375 Beale Street, Board Room, First Floor, San Francisco, California at 1:06 p.m.

2. **Roll Call.** Present were: Chair Wasserman, Vice Chair Halsted, Commissioners Addiego, Bates (represented by Alternate Butt), Chan (Represented by Alternate Gilmore), DeLaRosa (arrived at 1:15 p.m.), Gioia, Kim (represented by Alternate Peskin), McGrath, Nelson (represented by Alternate Ranchod), Pine, Randolph, Sartipi (represented by Alternate McElhinney), Sears, Spering (represented by Alternate Vasquez), Techel (arrived at 1:08 p.m.), Wagenknecht (arrived at 1:08 p.m.), Ziegler (represented by Alternate Brush) and Zwissler.

Chair Wasserman announced that a quorum was present.

Not present were Commissioners: Santa Clara County (Cortese), Department of Finance (Finn), Speaker of the Assembly (Gibbs), Sonoma County (Gorin), U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Hicks), State Lands Commission (Lucchesi).

Chair Wasserman delivered a welcome: I want to welcome everyone to this new regional center; the Metro Center Regional Headquarters Building. We look forward to moving our staff here next year and meanwhile we will borrow this room and occasionally the one next door as we did for the workshop. Thankfully, one of our two landlords, Steve Heminger of MTC, is encouraging us to do that. Steve, would you like to say a few words to us?

Mr. Heminger of MTC addressed the Commission: I think I am the only landlord you have. I am not here for MTC but if you do have any concerns, I am your guy. We are very happy to have the Board here. We are going to be building out BCDC staff space over the next few months. Hopefully they will be joining us around summer time next year so we will have all four regional agencies in the building.

You have probably noticed that the rest of the space is getting occupied as well. We have several commercial tenants in the facility. The idea is that they are here for us to make a little money. When the government agencies need to expand we will be moving down the building from the eighth floor to the bottom.

The neighborhood is under serious construction right now. As soon as we get the Trans-Bay Terminal Building done and move all those bus operations into the new Transit Center we are going to redevelop the land on top of where the temporary terminal is. The neighborhood is going to be in transition for some time and that is also true of this building. We have until the summer of next year before we fill the building up.

We have this big mud puddle behind us, which is going to turn into a park in a few months. One nice amenity for all of you will be that we will have a café opening in January.

Again, welcome and we look forward to seeing Larry and the gang in the summer time. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

3. Public Comment Period. Chair Wasserman called for public comment on subjects that were not on the agenda.

There were no public speakers present to comment.

Chair Wasserman moved to Approval of the Minutes.

4. Approval of Minutes of the December 1, 2016 Meeting. Chair Wasserman asked for a motion and a second to adopt the minutes of December 1, 2016.

MOTION: Commissioner Vasquez moved approval of the Minutes, seconded by Vice Chair Halsted.

VOTE: The motion carried with a vote of 16-0-2 with Commissioners Addiego, Butt, Gilmore, Gioia, Peskin, McGrath, Ranchod, Pine, Randolph, McElhinney, Sears, Vasquez, Techel, Wagenknecht, Ziegler, Zwissler, Vice Chair Halsted and Chair Wasserman voting, “YES”, no “NO”, votes and Commissioners Peskin and Ranchod abstaining.

5. Report of the Chair. Chair Wasserman reported on the following:

Chair Wasserman shared the following: We are going to have to figure out an award for John King who is doing yeoman publicity for our issues in his proper role as a reporter. Yesterday’s story continued the effort and I thought it was particularly important to note that this particular King Tide yesterday did not seem that bad. The story made clear that this is going to vary week by week, month by month and it is not going to change the fundamental issue which the other story on the front page of the Chronicle emphasized which is the Arctic ice continues to melt and the seas are going to continue to rise and hopefully we can do something about greenhouse gas emissions which will slow that but not stop it. Our efforts continue to be very important.

a. **New Business.** Does anyone have any new business to ask us to consider? (No comments were voiced) Commissioner Nelson is not here so we will skip the report on Bay Fill but we will ask Commissioner Zwissler to give us an update on Resilient by Design.

b. **Resilient by Design Update.** Commissioner Zwissler reported the following: I can report to you that on Monday we submitted, at the invitation of a major national foundation, a multi-million dollar grant application that we have been negotiating with them and we expect to have confirmation of its approval or fulfillment momentarily. I hope we can be less oblique at our next meeting.

c. **Next BCDC Meeting.** We will not need to hold our January 5, 2017 meeting but we will hold one on January 19th where we may consider the following matters:

(1) A further discussion regarding our Rising Sea Level Workshops.

(2) We may hear a briefing on the status of the sand mining in the Bay

(3) We may hear a briefing on issues surrounding anchor-outs in Richardson Bay in Marin County.

(4) We may hear a briefing on the update of the Suisun Marsh Local Protection Plan.

d. **Ex-Parte Communications.** That completes my report. This is the opportunity if anybody wishes to place ex-parte communications on the record. It is required to do so on adjudicatory or permit matters, not required on policy matters but that is always up to the Commissioners. The reports do need to be in writing even if you make them verbally here. (No comments were voiced by the Commissioners)

e. **Executive Director's Report.** That brings us to the Executive Director's Report.

Chair Wasserman moved to the Executive Director's Report.

6. Report of the Executive Director. Executive Director Goldzband reported: I also want to thank Steve Heminger of MTC for making time to greet us this afternoon. You will also meet Teri Green. She the Bay Area Headquarters Authority and she is making herself available a tour. I want to thank them for this.

On the budget side of the house, I want to let you know that we were able to close last year's books last month, which is a solid six to eight weeks earlier than last year. We are now closing and reconciling the first quarter of this year which will enable the Department of General Services to provide us with monthly budget reports starting in January.

With regard to staffing, I'm pleased to report that Heather Dennis has accepted a position in our planning section. Heather earned her undergraduate degree in Geography/Environmental Studies from UCLA (so she's a Bruin, as is her boss, Lindy) and a Master's Degree in Environmental Science and Management from the UCSB (so we have yet another Gaucho). Heather most recently worked as a Sea Grant Fellow at the Coastal Conservancy where she provided project support for the Southern California Wetlands Recovery Project by performing technical analysis and GIS services. Prior to her fellowship, Heather worked at the World Wildlife Fund. Given this description, it will not surprise you to learn that Heather will become a key GIS analyst at BCDC and also will provide support to the Adapting to Rising Tides Program and other planning initiatives.

Regarding our digitization project, you will remember that I told you two weeks ago that we had about 100 boxes remaining to be shipped during this Christmas holiday. Since then, we have shipped 48 more boxes and we're on track to finish the project by the end of the year. I want to recognize our somewhat new Records Manager, Christine Nutile, for spearheading this project and thank all of our office techs for having the person power to get it done.

Two pieces of good policy news. First, and I recognize that this is a mixed bag, the House and Senate each approved the Conference Report on the new authorization for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (it used to be called WRDA, and now it's named "WIN") for Water Infrastructure Now or something like that. Included in the legislation is a ten-region pilot project that is designed to both speed up and help pay for increased beneficial reuse of dredged material. Our advocacy group of the Bay Planning Coalition, Save the Bay, the Bay Institute and the Coastal Conservancy can claim some credit for the language in the legislation, as we and others were able to help the legislators and their staffs craft it. As you probably know, at the end of the session Senator Boxer opposed the legislation (despite having written so much of it) because it included language to which she objected regarding California's water supply. And the Bay Institute had to withdraw its support of the legislation for the same reason. I shall provide you with an update early next year on how we shall work with our federal elected officials to get the Bay Area designated as one of those pilot projects. I think that we will be able to be a pilot project despite the fact that there seems to be a renewed-anywhere-but- California emphasis in D.C.

I do have another piece of good news to report from Sacramento. In your packet you'll see a press release from Governor Brown's office that describes his efforts to permanently withdraw federal waters off of California's coast from new offshore oil and gas leasing, to implement a new MOU with the federal Department of Interior to expand a joint commitment to develop more renewable power, including offshore clean energy, and to create a partnership with other west coast states and Chile and France to protect coastal communities from rising ocean acidification.

In addition you have copies of the John King article as well as a copy of the State Coastal Conservancy's Proposition 1 proposal solicitation which is a great grant program which public agencies can use to benefit of water quality supply and infrastructure improvements.

I do have one bit of sad news to report. Russ Abramson, BCDC's longtime Director of Administration who retired in 1997, passed away last month. While there are few in this audience who worked with or remember Russ, those of us who do remember his willingness to help new Commissioners and ensure that BCDC's books were always balanced will most definitely remember him.

That concludes my report, Chair Wasserman. I am happy to answer any questions that may arise.

Chair Wasserman asked: Any questions for the Executive Director? (No comments were voiced) The Chair moved on to Item 7.

7. Consideration of Administrative Matters. Chair Wasserman announced We have received a copy of the Administrative Matters. Does anybody have any questions? (No comments were voiced).

8. Commission Consideration of a Contract to Hire a Strategic Plan Facilitator. Chair Wasserman announced: Item 8 is Commission consideration of a contract for a Strategic Plan Facilitator. Executive Director Goldzband will make the presentation on this item.

Executive Director Goldzband presented the following: The staff recommends that the Commission authorize the Executive Director to enter into a contract for an amount not to exceed $25,000 for a six-month period to enable facilitation services to work with us to revise and update the Commission's current Strategic Plan. The staff further recommends that the Commission authorize the Executive Director to amend the contract as necessary including revising the amount or duration of the agreement so long as the amendment does not involve substantial changes in the services provided.

In May of 2013 the Commission adopted its current Strategic Plan after several months of discussions and public workshops. We believe the Strategic Plan has helped the staff and the Commission focus its attention on those things that are very important to us. After three and a half years it is time to revise and update that plan. In so doing we are proposing to the facilitator three goals as part of the revision. They are as follows:

First, analyze BCDC's work products and accomplishments to measure its progress toward fulfilling the Strategic Plan's goals and objectives and determine whether those goals and objectives reflect current priorities.

Second, we want to develop a work plan to integrate the recommendations that the Commission approved in early October into our day-today work. That needs to be folded into the Plan as a work plan.

Third, I want to make sure that the updated Strategic Plan has a new objective or two or perhaps a new goal or something that will reflect and improve BCDC's organizational health. We have had a myriad of budgetary, staff and workplace changes the past three and a half years. Because of those changes we need to look at the staff and the staff needs to look at its own requirements and needs and figure out how we can better the health of the organization. For example, how can we do more training, how can we attract and retain staff given salaries; anything that actually focuses on the health of the organization and the way we work is up for discussion.

We have issued a request for proposals. One facilitator or firm will be selected and we will make sure that the consultant has an understanding of past and current policy environments.

With that I ask that the Commission authorize the Executive Director to enter into a contract.

Commissioner Ranchod had a question: When we did this in 2013 I thought it was extremely valuable to have a facilitator. Can you elaborate a little bit on the timeline for that six-month period? When do you expect it will start and when would public workshops start?

Executive Director Goldzband answered: The process will start in early January and it will end by the end of June. It will take place this fiscal year. The question we will have to figure out is how we incorporate the workshops we need to do for the Strategic Plan into your own schedule in a way that does not over-burden the Commissioners. We fully expect that you all will be participants actively in the development of the revision.

Commissioner Zwissler asked: Are you looking for recommendations for facilitators or do you already have it covered?

Executive Director Goldzband replied: Past it, but thanks.

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

VOTE: The motion carried with a roll call vote of 19-0-0 with Commissioners Addiego, Butt, Gilmore, DeLaRosa, Gioia, Peskin, McGrath, Ranchod, Pine, Randolph, McElhinney, Sears, Vasquez, Techel, Wagenknecht, Brush, Zwissler, Vice Chair Halsted and Chair Wasserman voting, "YES", no "NO", votes and no abstentions.

Chair Wasserman announced: We are going to return to the Executive Director's Report in order to have a special presentation by Commissioner McElhinney.

Executive Director Goldzband added: I want ask Dan to take center stage for a few minutes and describe what we are about to see.

Commissioner McElhinney addressed the Commission: This is about the update on the old east span of the Bay Bridge. I have a one and a half minute video to show you. Remember the old 1936 East Span Bridge? You won't be able to see it too much longer. A lot of the trusses have been removed over the last couple of years since the new bridge opened in 2013.

Earlier this year the 504 foot trusses were removed in a more mechanical method. We are working very innovatively with BCDC and Caltrans and all the resource agencies to find a way to accelerate the demolition of the old bridge and get us out of the water as early as we can.

Today I am presenting for the 288 foot long trusses; there are 14 of those and there are only nine left as of today. In the last few months we have gone with a very innovative method with our contractor in removing these 288 foot long, 65 foot wide and 38 foot high trusses.

Each of those trusses weighs over 1.7 million pounds and that is after the deck and a lot of the miscellaneous has been removed. It is a big opportunity to find a way to employ the Burk Halter method which is a very simple way of lowering the spans.

(Commissioner McElhinney showed a video and explained the steps as they were being shown on the screen}

Once those trusses are down and dismantled that the means the foundations are available for further implosions. We still have 9 through 23 to go. This will be an opportunity to accelerate it and avoid work in 2018.

Chair Wasserman continued the meeting: I want to recognize that Caltrans does some of the best graphic presentations to this Commission that we have seen. Thank you.

Commissioner McGrath added: That is actually the third time I have seen this. If you poke around on the MTC site they have another video, which shows the Bridge sections being recycled in Oakland which is fascinating. The bad news is that they closed the Trail for bicyclists when they are doing this. Engineers that are interested in demolition cannot get up there and watch.

Commissioner McElhinney commented: The new East Span Bike Trail is four and a half miles long from YBI to Emeryville and it is opened weekends and holidays on the Bridge with a shuttle from YBI down to Treasure Island that TIDA is providing for bicyclists.

Chair Wasserman moved to Item 9.

9. Consideration of 2015 Annual Report. Chair Wasserman announced: Item 9 is Commission adoption of the 2015 Annual Report. Steve Goldbeck will make the presentation.

Chief Deputy Director Goldbeck presented the following: You have before you a staff recommendation dated December 9th for the 2015 Annual Report.

The Annual Report is required by the McAteer-Petris Act to be submitted to the Governor and the Legislature summarizing the activities of the Commission during the previous calendar year. Since 2015 was BCDC's 50th Anniversary we added information on the Sink or Swim Summit and also included the San Francisco Business Times supplement that had good articles on BCDC and the climate change challenge we face.

The staff recommends that the Commission adopt the attached Annual Report, authorize the staff to make any editorial revisions needed for accuracy and clarity and direct the staff to submit the 2015 Annual Report to the Governor, the Legislature and to the public. With that I am happy to answer any questions.

Chair Wasserman asked: Questions about the Report? When I went through it I was a little bit worried in terms of covering the rising sea level until I got to the end and that is terrific. I think the inclusion of that material is very valuable. I thank staff for doing that. With that, I would take a motion to adopt the Annual Report.

MOTION: Commissioner Randolph moved approval of the staff recommendation, seconded by Vice Chair Halsted.

VOTE: The motion carried with a roll call vote of 17-0-0 with Commissioners Addiego, Butt, Gilmore, DeLaRosa, Gioia, Peskin, McGrath, Ranchod, Pine, Randolph, McElhinney, Sears, Vasquez, Brush, Zwissler, Vice Chair Halsted and Chair Wasserman voting, "YES", no "NO", votes and no abstentions.

10. Briefing on Commission's December 1 Rising Sea Level Workshop 5. Chair Wasserman announced: That brings us to Item 10 which is a briefing on the Commissioners' December 1st Rising Sea Level Workshop and Wendy will make the presentation.

Senior Planner Wendy Goodfriend addressed the Commission: I will be introducing Eliza Berry. She is one our most excellent coastal planners. She joined us about six months ago after getting her Masters from the Bren School at the University of California, Santa Barbara.

She will be making the presentation and we have the staff report, which you should have received and we can field any questions that you have after her briefing.

Planner Eliza Berry presented the following: I will be presenting a summary of the December 1st workshop on the Commission Workshop Series on rising sea levels.

That workshop was focused on scoping implementation of the regional adaptation actions approved by the Commission on October 6th of 2016. In presenting a review of the workshop I will go through the key content we covered, key feedback we received from workshop participants and the steps we will be taking to integrate that feedback moving forward.

The workshop began with a presentation by Lindy Lowe in which she presented the preamble to the adaptation actions. That preamble was prepared by BCDC staff, at the request of the Commission, when the Commission approved the adaptation actions. That preamble was meant to provide a framework for the adaptation actions. Lindy also provided a timeline for implementing the adaptation actions through 2022. She also presented the key components of the adaptation actions approved.

We then moved into an engagement exercise in which we scoped desired outcomes, resources and key stakeholders for moving forward with two adaptation actions. Those were the actions on developing a regional adaptation plan and improving regional asset resilience.

Based on Lindy's presentation we received some overall feedback on the preamble from workshop participants. That feedback started with general agreement about the language that BCDC staff prepared. We also received some comments about how we can make a few revisions to improve the language.

A number of participants commented that we should re-evaluate our use of the term, "disadvantaged communities". It has a limited state definition. We are in the process of working with several community-based organizations about how we can most appropriately use this term or related terms. Several participants commented that, because we won't have all the answers to adaptation immediately available we need to emphasize the need for experimentation, phasing and urgent action in our preamble and principal language.

We also received feedback from participants about the timeline we suggested for moving forward with the actions. To begin with we received comments on our timeline for initiating action on exploring new institutional arrangements. We initially suggested initiating this action in 2019 and participants suggested that we initiate this in 2017. This is the action that will begin with case studies of successful governance approaches to addressing regional scale issues. Our staff has agreed to initiate this action in 2017.

The next timeline change and comment is regarding our regional education campaign. Staff had suggested initiating this work in 2018 and participants suggested that we get started on this as soon as possible. Staff is currently exploring the feasibility of initiating this sooner as it will depend on our ability to engage willing partners.

We received additional timeline feedback on our action to increase resilience of regional assets. Participants suggested that this needs to happen as soon as possible. Our staff response is that action at local, county and sector scales across the region can continue to advance as we work on the regional adaptation plan and plans to increase resilience of regional assets. It is imperative that we allow enough time for public engagement in those processes.

We also received comments that we should be completing the Regional Adaptation Plan faster or phase its implementation so that actions can take place prior to completion.

Our staff response is that the Adaptation Plan can be phased to the greatest extent feasible so that early actions consistent with the Plan's principles can advance as soon as possible. Our engagement exercise focused on the Regional Adaptation Plan and the action on improving the resilience of regional assets. We had eight groups discussing this and I would encourage you to review the full report back from each group in the Appendix to the staff report. We received interesting and diverse feedback. We are continuing to go through the feedback from each group so that we can incorporate it into our work plan.

We were able to pull out a few common themes. We received confirmation that BCDC is the logical lead for these actions. We should engage other regional partners and encourage broad participation. We also heard that there is a need for a collaborative, transparent and iterative approach to this work. Our work in these areas should address existing regional concerns such as housing, vulnerable communities and financing challenges.

We will be incorporating this into our next steps. BCDC staff will work on developing a work plan for the Regional Adaptation Plan based on this input. We will be presenting this to the Commission and other partners and stakeholders. We will be selecting a new name for the Regional Adaptation Plan. Some of the suggested name changes are, Rising Bay Adaptation Effort (R BAY), Plan for Adapting to Rising Tides (PART), Beyond the Band, Bay Area Sustainable Strategy (BASS), Adaptable Sea Level Adaptation Plan (ASAP), or Allied Sea Level Adaptation Partnership and finally, Rising Bay Plan.

We will continue our Commission Workshop Series. In January or February we will have our Financing the Future Workshop to talk about funding. In March we will have our projects on Parade Workshop in which we will be looking at the progress folks are making around the region and see how far they are in conducting county-scale assessments. Some of the projects we will be looking at are, the San Mateo Sea Change project, Marin BayWave and the ART projects in Alameda and Contra Costa.

I will be happy to take any questions you might have about this workshop or our next steps.

Chair Wasserman asked: Questions or comments?

Commissioner Gioia commented on terminology: I think this whole process has been really great and trying to move as a region on these issues is complicated and tough. I wanted to make a comment about use of terms. You used the term, "disadvantaged community." We should be certain that we are not linking that to the Cal EPA EnviroScreen definition of disadvantaged community.

As we all know the Bay Area has had some disagreements in how the definition has been crafted. It results in a more narrow reading of disadvantaged communities in the Bay Area. There is a difference between, "at risk" communities, which are at risk for sea level rise and then, "disadvantaged communities" as well. Given that Cap and Trade revenue has been focused on disadvantaged communities as defined under the CalEnviroScreen tool; how we define it needs to be a little different. I think that MTC, ABAG, the Air District and BCDC have used a broader definition. I wanted to be clear that this is what we will do when we use that term. I think Steve is aware of the joint letter that went out so that when we use that term it is a more narrow set of communities; sometimes it is related to Cap and Trade funding stream, which is a more narrow reading of the definition.

Chair Wasserman added: Perhaps we should say, "real" disadvantaged communities.

Commissioner Gioia replied: We want to be clear that it is the Bay Area's definition. Parts of West Oakland and the Port of Oakland did not get included in the CalEnviroScreen tool but are included in our local definition.

Chair Wasserman opined: The point is very important.

Ms. Berry commented: I think that as we move forward with our assessments we are aware of those different definitions. In the ART program what we have generally looked at are communities with characteristics that put them at greater risk of flooding.

Commissioner Gioia continued: Part of it is all these definitions getting thrown around. We have to be careful. I think, "at risk" communities is a really good way to describe communities that are at risk of flooding. There is a term of art on, "disadvantaged communities" that is used in a different way because it is based upon pollution load, income and those kinds of things. Since it is so clearly defined in state law to have a policy to get more Cap and Trade revenue we need to be aware of the distinctions and then use our definition. I am not sure that you want to use, "disadvantaged" for communities at risk of flooding because there are disadvantaged communities in the Bay Area that are not at risk of flooding and we need to be clear so that people do not get confused among all these agencies. Isn't it more useful to use the term, "at risk;" "at risk for flooding." There are communities that are disadvantaged that are not at risk for flooding but are deserving of other kinds of efforts. We need to be clear on our terms.

Ms. Berry replied: We are in the process of chatting with some of our partners and getting really clear on those terms.

Commissioner Gioia responded: I serve on the California Air Resources Board and when we use the term, "disadvantaged communities" it is a term of art. I want to be really clear here that if you were to use that term, folks at agencies looking at funding are going to view it differently than maybe you are viewing it. So we need to be consistent.

Ms. Goodfriend commented: We have not talked that much about the Caltrans grant which is kicking off in the New Year. You will be pleased to see that one of the main focusses of that grant is to look at what ART has done which we have called the, "communities at risk from flooding" or "communities with characteristics at risk from flooding" which we developed with ABAG and with the stakeholder working groups to really come up with characteristics that we feel define communities at risk of flooding.

One of the nice things that will come out of the Caltrans grant is really comparing our communities at risk of flooding with all of the other kinds of mapping, analysis and tools that are tied to funding and regulatory requirements so that local governments can understand what the overlapping levels of communities are and how they affect funding.

We are definitely not going to use the other definitions of communities at risk but we will be doing some comparisons between them because we understand that local governments need to tie their requests for funding to what other agencies and what other funding pools are looking at.

Commissioner Gioia stated: But you are not calling all communities at risk for flooding, "disadvantaged."

Ms. Goodfriend concurred: Absolutely not. This Commission and our stakeholders are incredibly concerned and worried about communities that are at risk of flooding. It was really great that this caused a lot of conversation. The preamble will be rewritten and you will see some really nice analysis of what kind of communities are at risk of flooding and the other kinds of risks they face. This work is groundbreaking and you will be very pleased once you see some of the results.

Commissioner Pine had questions: I participated in the workshops and they were very valuable. If you kind of look at it backwards when this adaptation plan is complete; what is actually in this document? What are the sections? What does it really show? When you look through the comments of desired outcomes, they are very diverse. For example, the timeline; how far out do you look? To what degree does each section of the Bay reflect the input from that community versus a hypothetical adaptation strategy that we think makes sense? To what degree is this trying to push people out of their comfort zone? When the report is done, what is in the table of contents? It is not clear to me what that is.

Executive Director Goldzband replied: There are two ways I would respond. The first is that the report is not going to be done. The Regional Adaptation Plan is going to be an iterative process. There will be stages. I do not think it is going to be, "done" any more than the Regional Transportation Plan is ever, "done." The way that we are looking to start it ; and we have not had huge discussions about this yet at the staff level. The way you start this is by developing a framework. What is it that you really want to try to get out of it? You do work backwards. You have to create a framework in order to figure out what it is you are actually going to include and how you are going to include it.

I do encourage you all to look at the desired outcomes in the Appendix. They are all over the place. Everybody is looking to BCDC to be the leader. We are going to have to figure out how to develop a framework that includes that which you all think is the most important stuff. It is not going to include other stuff. That is just the way it is going to be. Decisions are going to have to be made. We are not there yet but that is how we will start it.

Chair Wasserman commented: I was very pleased to see a very good attendance at the workshop on the first but many of the people who were there had been at the previous workshops so we are building a real continuity of people who care and are thinking about these issues. I think that the summary is very good and we are making real progress.

I absolutely agree with Larry's comments and responses. We have started the Regional Adaptation Plan. ART is the building block of this plan. It is not as though we are waiting to get everything in place to start.

I most certainly want to emphasize the urgency of moving and moving faster than we believe we can. We are going to make great demands on staff and on ourselves. We are also going to have to work to find more resources in order to do this in a timely fashion because we do not have them today. Larry and staff are working on that with the state and other sources and the Caltrans grant is a significant piece and the MTC support is moving that along. We are going to need a lot more money.

As the Resilient for Design project goes forward we are going to have to be very cognizant, vigilant and active in using all of those things to promote additional funding sources for this effort to protect our natural and built environment from what we know is coming. A terrific job by staff and I thank you. And a terrific job by workshop participants and Commissioners.

11. Briefing on the Contra Costa ART Project. Chair Wasserman announced: Item 11 is on one of the building blocks, the Contra Costa ART Project.

Senior Planner Wendy Goodfriend addressed the Commission: Commissioner Gioia requested that we make this presentation since it is in his home territory. Your staff have developed a very credible and highly-trusted ART Program which will be a framework for the Regional Adaptation Plan.

The Regional Adaptation Plan and the work that is going start leading towards it through the Caltrans grant is going to be built on what the ART program developed with our stakeholders in terms of process, engagement, trust building, communication and all of those pieces.

It will also leverage all of the great work that is happening around the region and in the counties and localities that are taking up adaptation planning. It is starting on a base of a very well recognized and highly successful program.

I am going to talk to you about our second county-scale adaptation planning project, the ART Project in Contra Costa County. This project was kicked off almost two years ago and it is an ART Program project.

It started with the Working Group in March of 2014. We started scoping with county staff and Supervisor Gioia's office.

We went through the Adapting to Rising Tides five step process. At our first meeting we scoped the project. At our second meeting we started talking about the assessment. In the third meeting we started talking about the assessment outcomes and how to communicate them. In our fourth meeting we focused on how we wanted to define, communicate and summarize the outcomes of this county-wide project. And then we moved into a phase of thinking about the plan step where we develop adaptation responses and thinking about refining our resilience goals that we set.

We developed many, many adaptation responses. We had two open houses for adaptation responses with the Working Group. They really appreciated this approach. We had our final meeting in November and that was our implementation and monitoring meeting. We walked the group through our Adapting to Rising Tides process and they helped us customize this approach and process for their county.

One of the things that we are proud of when we work with folks on a local level is that we build a diverse and highly capable stakeholder working group. They are now a working group and they are not necessarily representing their individual agencies. They have started to have the real conversations that are necessary to move adaptation action forward.

This project was guided by eight project resilience goals. They were very strong and they were very grounded in the interest, values, visions and functions in Contra Costa County. When we looked at them at the end of the assessment they were only slightly revised and they were made slightly stronger.

We also developed the locally refined sea level rise and shoreline overtopping maps for Contra Costa County. The rest of the region will be completed by the end of the winter. Marin County has been finalized. They have map books and the geo database.

We also developed a robust vulnerability and consequences assessment for 30 asset categories across 11 sectors. We added a lot of new information about the energy sector. We looked more in depth at stormwater and at communities at risk from flooding. We have developed a new process for community characteristics and applied it at the county scale in Contra Costa.

We developed 15 asset-specific profiles that characterize the risks faced by these specific assets. We worked closely with the asset manager or the community and they provided us enough information to identify the critical issues for those assets and the information about them.

We developed an understanding of the consequences of flooding on all four frames of society. That is a tenant of the ART Program. We always think about society and equity, environment, governance and economy. We did the same in this project and we developed some very interesting findings about consequences to all of those four frames of sustainability.

Another framework we use is the identification of key planning issues. These are the kinds of issues that rise up; 30 asset categories is a lot and when you see the final project report you will see that each asset category has its own chapter.

The ART Program define step allows us to summarize the information about the assessment and to start looking for cross cutting or overarching issues and to come up with key planning issues or those things that really should be addressed together and not independently.

These six key planning issues are different from what we found in Alameda County. In Alameda County we identified communities with special characteristics, certain types of land uses, network infrastructure, information challenges; those issues were also found in Contra Costa but because of the kinds of land use and the way that the shoreline is laid out over the west and central county we found that there were issues with water-dependent industry, employment sites, creekside communities, access to services, ad hoc flood protection and parks and open space.

Many of these issues will be applicable to other counties around the region.

The water-dependent industries is an issue that is somewhat localized to Contra Costa County. They have large industrial sectors that sit on the waterside of the Bay and they rely on the network of railroad, pipelines, energy and then water mobility seaports and marine terminals. That is slightly unique to our region. That nexus around getting goods and services and people in and out of these water-dependent industries is going to put them at greater risk from sea level rise. While those facilities are large and in some ways have resources to protect their own facility on site, it will be challenging for them to remain connected. That really resonated with the folks in the working group about how we can maintain input and outputs out of these large facilities that help run the region.

That key planning issue is also tied to employment sites. There are many folks living in Contra Costa County that commute out but they also commute in the County to get to job sites. And folks from outside of the County commute into the County to employment sites mostly by personal vehicle.

Because of the way the shoreline transportation system is organized in the County, if we have flooding of that system it is going to be really challenging for folks to get to employment sites. Many of these sites really do rely on critical supply chains. They rely on the road and the rail networks to get them goods and materials. They rely on the airport to get just-in-time materials and some of them rely on water-dependent transportation.

Additionally, the number of people that live along tidal creeks and channels in the County is a key issue because many of them are at risk. They live near flood control channels with very limited funding; with very dedicated staff but with very little capacity to maintain those channels and to continue to improve them.

Folks we found living in creekside communities run the gamut but in certain locations there are communities that are disadvantaged economically, that are disadvantaged by linguistic isolation, they are elderly and in some cases they live in mobile homes which are not very resilient to flooding.

There is one public hospital in Contra Costa County and that is in Martinez. This is going to have a significant impact on people who need to access public services. It is not only access to health services; it is access to schools, other public services and support networks. This access

will be disrupted by loss of the transportation system. And then if the localities where these facilities are located are flooded folks that rely on them will not be able to get the services they need.

The next key issue is where the shoreline is not specifically designed for flood protection. We saw this in Alameda County but it is definitely true in Contra Costa County. There are assets that protect inland assets, folks and natural areas from flooding that were never designed or intended to do so; that is the road network, the rail network and the natural areas like wetlands that may be natural or restored but none of them are maintained as flood protection, none of them are intended to do so. Those that own and manage them neither have the regulatory authority, the jurisdiction or the funding to act as flood control managers.

One of the key things that is very important is to think about, is what shorelines protect you and for how long and how can those shorelines be strengthened to provide the function that they currently provide as well as improve their ability to provide resilience to flooding.

One of the lovely things about Alameda and Contra Costa County is there are a lot of shoreline parks and open spaces. Those provide opportunities for adaptation. These early opportunity sites are themselves at risk. In Contra Costa in particular these shoreline parks will not necessarily be replaced and this will limit folks' access to free public recreational opportunities. This can really have strong negative effects on public health.

Those are the six key planning issues we identified. We went through extensive development of adaptation actions along with implementation options. We developed adaptation responses for all 30 asset categories and the six key planning issues and the actions address all of the vulnerabilities that we identified with the Working Group.

One of the things that we wanted to do is identify the actions that will cut across the different key planning issues as well as the asset categories, the jurisdictions, the localities and some of our larger challenges; and local planners asked, can you help us work on implementation pathways for a couple of the issues in order to move resilience forward.

The last working group meeting focused on four over-arching actions. One of the actions was to help them start thinking about a resilient transportation system. We also need integrated shoreline management so that we are not working in pieces and parts across the shoreline. Targeted education outreach is also important. It was very clear that targeted education outreach to business and industry, especially those that are using hazardous materials or have contaminated waste sites that they are cleaning up, is incredibly important.

There is a huge opportunity in the County for improved emergency and hazard planning. They are working on their county-wide hazard mitigation plan. They've got ongoing updates to their emergency plans and many of the businesses and industries have their own emergency operations and hazard plans. There is an opportunity to start integrating adaptation actions into ongoing planning efforts.

Contra Costa County now has a capable and diverse working group and we hope they have found new relationships and have created new trust building amongst them so they can move ahead with our assistance and guidance.

We have the broad resilience goals which are going to help the County move forward.

We have the locally-refined sea level rise and the shoreline analysis.

We have a very robust vulnerability assessment.

We have helped them understand how flooding is going to impact the four frames of sustainability. They helped us understand that as well.

We have a lot of detailed adaptation responses that give us a lot of choices for taking actions.

We have made a clear and compelling case for taking action together and individually.

We have laid a path forward for the County on building resilience.

There is a project website and it will be updated when we finalize the project report. All the materials that have been available to the Working Group site will be moved to the public site because now they have been reviewed and validated.

With that I am happy to take any questions.

Commissioner Gioia commented: Wendy, thank you. You have exhibited a lot of great leadership. The approach to helping the County has been very successful. As anything we always wish there was more involvement from some jurisdictions who did not participate as much but that is something to work toward.

It would be nice to present this to the Board of Supervisors as a joint presentation. It is really important to get the other County elected leaders up to speed on this.

Commissioner Pine replied: We plan to do this in San Mateo and that is an interesting question as how you roll out all the information.

Commissioner Gioia continued: We know about it but it is how to get our other elected colleagues and folks from cities informed as well.

Ms. Goodfriend added: We had a conversation with the Working Group more than once about the communication strategy and the communication roll out plan. We asked them to invite us to speak at whatever commissions and boards they thought appropriate.

Commissioner Gioia replied: I will invite you to come and speak to the Board of Supervisors. That has to be the starting point.

A lot of counties including our own have adopted climate action plans. Typically the climate action plan is, what steps we can take to minimize GHG emissions? I'm wondering how we build resilience strategies into our climate action plans. I don't think we have really incorporated resiliency measures into our plan in Contra Costa. I would think that would be a good thing to do. It is an entrée into some local plans.

Ms. Goodfriend agreed: I would agree completely. I think the climate action plan was about to be adopted when we started this project. One of the things that did happen is the city of Richmond was working on their first climate action plan. We were able to provide them every bit of information we had on Richmond assets and issues. They have the Climate Adaptation Study as an appendix.

There are other counties and cities that are now bringing adaptation into the climate action plan. That would be an excellent next step for an update to the Contra Costa Climate Action Plan that would bring the information in from the ART Project.

Commissioner Gioia replied: And maybe we can talk about that when it comes to our Board for a presentation.

Executive Director Goldzband had a question for Wed Goodfriend and Steve Goldbeck: It seems to me that the legislation that was approved by the Governor last year which requires local general plan hazard elements to include information on climate change risks and adaptation is relevant here.

Ms. Goodfriend added: So the Jackson Bill is requiring that local communities update their safety elements to include climate adaptation and hazards or they can work on their local hazard plan.

We have talked to the city of Hercules, which I want to recognize here. The city has one planner, Holly Smith, and she has been a very active and supportive member of the ART Program. Her intention is when they update the safety element in 2018 she will include all of the work we did in ART and hopefully she will come back to us for support.

This is an opportunity and in the future it will be a requirement. Safety elements, general plans and Hazard Mitigation plans are also places where this information can get nested.

Commissioner Gioia stated: Looking down here at the Mayor of Richmond Tom Butt, maybe Tom you can have a presentation before the Richmond City Council on this and that would be great.

We could have had some private sector folks more involved including the refineries who were not as involved as we would have liked them to be. We understand that San Francisco and Oakland airports are vulnerable and we forget that the jet fuel used at those airports is all refined by these refineries and then goes by pipeline directly to Oakland and San Francisco. It is also linked to transportation to the extent there are vulnerabilities for these facilities that links our air traffic in the Bay Area. I think we need to strategize in every county how we more actively engage the private stakeholders to be involved.

You showed the Bay Trail and the concern about some of the public access. A lot of that Bay Trail is in BCDC permit conditions. If BCDC required this trail isn't it ultimately up to the entity, the permittee, to be responsible for maintaining the Trail and therefore taking action on resiliency for the Trail.

Mr. Brad McCrea replied: Generally, yes. The conditions of approval that are put into BCDC permits places ongoing responsibility for maintenance and upkeep of public access areas.

Commissioner Gioia added: And with all those wonderful miles of Richmond Bay Trail, it puts a burden on potentially the City to maintain it on a regional issue.

Commissioner McGrath commented: Wendy it appears from looking at the methodology that the mapping of flood-prone areas was a kind of elevation mapping; it did not actually route flow through devices that might increase or decrease flooding. Is that correct?

Ms. Goodfriend answered: That is absolutely correct.

Commissioner McGrath continued: So it is simple mapping which is probably good enough, at least at the surface level, and would tend to identify those areas. The follow up question becomes, in some cases there are constrictions, either tide gates or just simply the friction of the nature of the tidal channel that will affect that and generally reduce it; I just want to flag that for John and Tom that you need to take that a little bit further before you start to figure out exactly what might be done about it because they're accurate enough but they're not there yet.

Ms. Goodfriend responded: Patrick Phelan who is one of the stormwater gurus at Public Works in the city of Richmond did an analysis looking at the inundation maps in their own stormwater system. It was a good first step looking at elevations of the stormwater system. It provided them with a lot of really good information to start with.

One of the things that is important to realize, is that these inundation maps do look at overland flow paths but they do not look at the connected drainage infrastructure that carries water in and out of the Bay.

There is a very bright modeler that just joined UCLA and this is what she does. She models connected drainage systems. You cannot do it at a regional scale because it is too much information.

In locations where it is a concern if you have low-lying neighborhoods like North Richmond or East Oakland it would be highly valuable to try to seek some funding and get someone to help us understand getting closer to what some of the real risks are.

Commissioner McGrath agreed: Exactly. And in EJ communities such as North Richmond it is that subsequent level of monitoring because armoring of the shoreline could make flooding in EJ communities dramatically worse. And that is my concern to make sure that this is carefully taken into consideration.

Commissioner Gilmore was recognized: When we were talking about Contra Costa's update of their Hazard Mitigation Plan it was mentioned that a lot of the private industries that have hazardous materials or haul it back and forth are also doing their own hazard mitigation plan. If working together we could somehow help the private entities and the County look at those hazard mitigation plans in concert this would be helpful. Having an oil tanker or something blow up is a lot more concrete to people than sea level rise. That might provide a roadmap for working together on sea level rise. It is just a thought. It might be a hook.

Commissioner Butt commented: I want to thank you for working with our staff to get climate adaptation into our Climate Action Plan even though it was an appendix. We just adopted it six weeks ago. When you head out to Martinez to do the Board of Supervisors maybe

you can stop in Richmond on the way back and put us on your schedule. We would appreciate that and we will find a time for you.

Ms. Goodfriend replied: We would love that and Richmond has been such a great partner with us. We've been tagging along on some of the other efforts that are happening with Trust for Public Lands. We are working with them on their climate mapping and some of the other efforts as well.

Commissioner Butt continued: I would note that Richmond owns 32 miles of that Contra Costa shoreline; as a matter of fact, more shoreline than any city on San Francisco Bay.

Commissioner Zwissler had questions: Could you say a bit more about the transition on the leadership of the Working Group? Who owns it now and how it is it going to be carried forward?

Ms. Goodfriend answered: When we complete one of our county-wide projects we try to leave on the note of, this is your information. We are here to help and support you. You should contact us. We will no longer be convening you but we would like to be supporting you. What we have seen in Alameda County and some of the other projects is that there are a few key people; key champions that want to move this forward and that they want to keep working together and they are starting to think about how that is going to happen.

In the counties that we have been in we found that there is a department or a group of departments that are real leaders. I would say that Contra Costa Health Services has been an incredible leader in this project. Their Hazardous Materials Commission is going to take up the types of issues that Commissioner Gilmore identified about working with the business community on hazardous materials.

I think that we will see that we will need to encourage them to continue to participate with us at the regional scale. That will give us an opportunity to keep checking with them about how they are doing on the county and local issues.

Executive Director Golzband commented: When Commissioner Gilmore talked about the private sector doing their own thing I wrote down a note which says, ART plus WSPA; wondering if the Western States Petroleum Association as a convener and a trade association could actually be helpful in this. I will end up working with our staff on this and try to engage them on this.

Commissioner Gioia stated: I reached out to Chevron since they are the industrial facility in the County to be involved and I think they had some involvement but were not regular. What may work better in Contra Costa is there is a local group called, "The Committee for Industrial Safety" which is the four refineries who share practices and meets regularly. That would be the way because it is the local group of the four and it getting before the refinery managers.

Ms. Goodfriend added: I also wanted to recognize Tesoro Refinery. Tim Fitzpatrick is a super guy and an amazing Working Group member and someone who is really pushing them to be a leader in thinking about environmental considerations and sea level rise and flooding.

He has been great to our staff and they took us on a tour. They work very closely with Contra Costa Flood. I think championing his involvement and Tesoro as a refinery involved in the program; if he could convince the others that it was painless and helpful to him and that we did

not intrude on their private business, I think that would be really helpful. We have to start that way. They have to convince each other to start talking to us and talking to each other.

Executive Director Goldzband continued: This is unfortunately the last time you are going to see Wendy in front of you. She has accepted a position with the City and County of San Francisco working on their climate program, which is bad news and good news for us because it is always great to have friends in other places. We shall miss her. Her talents are enormous and we will continue to use her whether she likes it or not. (Laughter and applause)

Chair Wasserman commented: The timeline that you started with; it is important to remember that although the arrow at the end goes up it does go up to the regional adaptation plan and it also goes back around because this is an iterative process and it will keep going. Wendy's point is a very important one; for these to succeed we are going to have to find, identify and nurture champions particularly until we get additional funding because that is the way they are going to stick together and move. There is also a synergy between what we are moving towards in the Regional Adaptation Plan between the Jackson Bill that requires each locality to include this and with Plan Bay Area as we creep into Plan Bay Area in terms of rising sea level.

All of it is working together. It is going to take a whole lot of sustained, long-term effort. I thank you Wendy and everybody for doing this. I will ask for a motion for adjournment. This is our last meeting of the year. I encourage all of you in this holiday season to be kind to family and friends, to be kind to strangers and to be gentle with yourselves.

12. Adjournment. Upon motion by Commissioner Zwissler, seconded by Commissioner Vasquez, the Commission meeting was adjourned at 2:32 p.m.