

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

July 13, 2018

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 21, 2018 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 1:05 p.m.

2. **Roll Call.** Present were: Chair Wasserman, Vice Chair Halsted, Commissioners Addiego, Ahn (arrived at 1:16 p.m.), Alvarado, Bottoms (represented by Alternate Galacatos - departed at 3:15 p.m.), Butt, Chan (Represented by Alternate Gilmore), Cortese (represented by Alternate Scharff - arrived at 1:48 p.m.), Gioia, Gorin (arrived at 1:11 p.m.), Jahns, McGrath (represented by Alternate Ajami), Peskin (arrived at 1:08 p.m.), Ranchod, Sears, Showalter, Spring (represented by Alternate Vasquez), Techel, Wagenknecht, Ziegler (departed at 2:30 p.m.) and Zwissler. Assembly Representative Ting (represented by Alternate Sweet) was also present.

Chair Wasserman announced that a quorum was present.

Not present were Commissioners: Department of Business Transportation & Housing (Davis), Department of Finance (Finn), State Lands Commission (Lucchesi), San Mateo County (Pine) and Governor (Randolph).

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

Dean Stanford addressed the Commission: I am a former resident of Alviso, former engineer at Tesla Motors and I would like to let you know about a park project I have been promoting. It is the California State Parks Project and the California Air Resources Board is very much interested in seeing this move forward.

It is on the sewage treatment plant land in the Santa Clara/San Jose sewage treatment plant. It would restore hundreds of acres of what are currently sludge drying ponds. The Park could also use the loop trail around Pond A18. The Restoration Plan destroys a nine-mile loop out on the Bay. That is going to be gone.

BCDC MINUTES
June 21, 2018



The Plan does not adequately mitigate because they plan to pave a couple of miles of trail next to the freeway and that will be a zig/zag trail between garbage dumps and the sewer plant.

I would like to see the trail around Pond A18 in mitigation for losing the nine-mile loop trail. The California Air Resources Board is interested because the theme of the Park is zero emission recreational vehicle and a multi-use park. It would have miles of paved biking and walking trails and a small dirt trail system for electric bikes and a BMX park.

Santa Clara has shown interest in being the local lead. They are losing their BMX track to development and with the passage of Prop 16 there are hundreds of millions of dollars of funding available.

The documents I have given you are a one-page Park Summary, expanded comments from today. The Park Proposal with a letter of support from Santa Clara County Supervisor Dave Cortese, Assemblyman Chiu, informational letters from the California Air Resources Board and the Water Board.

There is a letter from Santa Clara Vice-Mayor Cathy Watanabe. They have a petition with 621 supporters and hundreds of positive comments. There are also testimonials of how it was back in the day before this former recreation was evil.

Back in 1934 there was a flat track in Alviso. Thank you.

Chair Wasserman moved to Approval of the Minutes.

4. Approval of Minutes of the May 17, 2018 Meeting. Chair Wasserman asked for a motion and a second to adopt the minutes of May 17, 2018.

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

VOTE: The motion carried by a voice vote of 16-0-1 with Commissioners Addiego, Ahn, Alvarado, Butt, Gilmore, Gioia, Gorin, Jahns, Ajami, Peskin, Sears, Showalter, Vasquez, Techel, Wagenknecht, Ziegler and Zwissler, Vice Chair Halsted and Chair Wasserman voting, "YES", no "NO", votes and Commissioner Ranchod abstaining.

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

a. **Next BCDC Meeting.** We will not hold a meeting on July 5th. The next meeting will be on July 19th and at that meeting we may:

Hold a public hearing and vote on retention of several piers of the old East Span of the Bay Bridge.

Hold a public hearing and vote on certain legislative matters.

b. We also expect to have a panel discussion and series of question and answer on the latest news on rising sea level and how the State and BCDC are responding. This will include a briefing from the California Ocean Protection Council on the new rising sea level projections and the recently-issued guidance regarding how to adapt that science to our regulatory and planning program, a briefing from U.C. Berkeley Professor Mark Stacey on his new Bay model that analyzes how shoreline projects on one part of the Bay shoreline can affect other parts of the shoreline, the San Francisco Estuary Institute on how it segments the Bay shoreline to analyze its varying responses to sea level and an update from our staff on the Adapting to Rising Tides program. We hope they will begin to be knitted together to form a cohesive whole in support of our Action and Strategic Plan to address rising sea level.

c. We also hope to have a briefing on the new BCDC Flood Explorer rising sea level mapping tool and a staff briefing on the work plan for our Strategic Plan.

We are back into the news. In our packets is the article from the New York Times that Antarctica is melting at three times the projected rate. Our slow-moving emergency is starting to move a little bit faster.

There was one moderately-disturbing piece of news in the newspaper today; a Yale Climate Center national survey showing that there continues to be a significant division on the belief about how serious global warming is.

It is largely a difference on party lines. It is also a geographic difference. Only seven percent of one of the political parties believed that it was a serious concern.

We know we have a lot of education to do. The California statistics, the Bay Area statistics on the awareness are much, much better than that.

We are making progress on our educational task force and starting to focus on some ways that we believe we can effectively communicate.

The first issues that will come before you are the Financing the Future Working Group is now prepared to start workshops here. Larry will describe the first one coming up next month.

That is the end of my report and I will turn it over to our Executive Director.

d. **Ex-Parte Communications.** I didn't include ex-parte communications. If there anybody who wishes to put an ex-parte communication on the record here this is necessary in an adjudicatory matter not in a policy matter. You may do so now. You also do need to do it in writing. (No comments were voiced)

6. Report of the Executive Director. Executive Director Goldzband replied: Thank you. Today is the summer solstice – the longest day of the year. We'll have about 15 hours of daylight today which means that we have plenty of time for our meeting this afternoon! But don't worry – as Sir Walter Raleigh said, even the longest day has its evening.

a. **Budget and Staffing.** I want to let you know that we will end the year in the black and we're using our small surplus to purchase some capital equipment such as new computers and the like. Our Chief Budget Officer, Chenee Williams and I, would like to present a budget analysis during the next Commission meeting but, as you have heard from Chair Wasserman, it's a pretty full agenda. We'll either do it next month or in August.

Speaking of budgets, the budget that the Governor will sign by June 30th includes two new BCDC staff positions. The first is a new staff attorney who will take over the enforcement portfolio from Chief Counsel Marc Zeppetello so that he can concentrate on the issues that a Chief Counsel should be working on. The second is a new enforcement program manager. The budget authorizes BCDC to use Bay Fill account funds for three years for those positions. It's not ideal but it's better than nothing. Because it is so important that Marc be relieved of most of his enforcement legal duties as soon as possible, we'll hire the attorney first and then hire the program manager as funds become available. In addition, we'll provide the Commission and the State Legislature with an annual report on the status of our enforcement program.

I also want to note that the Coastal Conservancy will be awarded \$6M in to facilitate the beneficial reuse of dredged materials from Redwood City which could provide local match for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineer's beneficial reuse pilot program. This is the first time the State has provided such funding since the Hamilton Wetlands project. Assembly Member Kevin Mullin was instrumental in securing those funds.

I do want to introduce you to four people. The first one you know of – Sam Stewart (stood and was recognized) our newest permit analyst is here. You'll remember that Sam's from the United Kingdom and worked for Natural England for six years and earned his graduate degree in Conservation Science at University College, London. You will see Sam on the regulatory team providing you information about permits.

We also are fortunate to have three interns with us this summer and each already has demonstrated a great knack for the work that we do. First up will be Andreyaa Woo, (stood and was recognized) a third-year law student at Golden Gate University who is focusing on Environmental Law. Andreyaa is a True Blue, having earned her Bachelor of Science degree in Environmental Science from the University of Toronto. Prior to interning at BCDC she interned at a nonprofit organization that focuses on environmental justice issues in the Bay Area. She is working closely with our legal staff and is learning a great deal about the scut work that new lawyers have to do.

Second is Aviva Wolf-Jacobs (stood and was recognized). Aviva is a rising senior at Pitzer College (which appropriated Pomona College's Sagehen mascot). She is studying environmental analysis and policy and is providing invaluable research assistance to our planning team this summer on BCDC's two Bay Plan amendments. She is originally from Berkeley and she graduated from Berkeley High.

Last, but not least, is Samantha Lavan (stood and was recognized). Samantha is a Lowell High School Cardinal from San Francisco who will start her senior year in a couple months. Samantha became interested in BCDC due to her success in an Advanced Placement Environmental Science class. Samantha is working with our regulatory staff and recently took on the duty of trying to figure out how to make our website more accessible to the public. After she leaves us next month she'll travel to Africa where she will help build a school prior to starting her senior year.

This just came in over the transom or through Katmandu or however emails happen. You know that Sharon Louie will be retiring from state service in August after 44 years at BCDC. (Applause from participants)

We are fortunate to have selected Peggy Atwell to fill her spot. Peggy is currently the personnel officer at the California State School for the Blind and Deaf in Fremont.

Prior to that she was an organization-development manager at the State Compensation Insurance Fund where she led a team that specialized in change management, succession planning and employee development.

She comes to the state from a number of years in the private sector. Peggy holds an M.S. in organizational development from the University of San Francisco. So, she is a Don.

We ask that you confirm her appointment. (No comments were voiced) Silence gives consent.

Peggy will start with us in the middle of next month so that there will be a transition with Sharon.

b. **Policy.** BCDC has had a real good month in terms of policy. I want to let some of our staff to take some credit and know of some real tremendous successes.

First, Clesi Bennett will give you a short review of Tuesday night's multi-agency workshop on environmental justice issues.

Ms. Bennett addressed the Commission: On Tuesday in collaboration with the State Lands Commission and the Coastal Commission we hosted a joint workshop to showcase our agencies' environmental justice policy development processes.

The event was well attended by over 50 people. After providing brief introductions to our agencies' missions and our environmental justice policy progress we focused on small-group discussions on policy topics that are addressed by all three agencies including shoreline protection, public access and public participation.

We want to give a special thanks to Commissioner Sherri Pemberton from the State Lands Commission for inviting BCDC and the Coastal Commission to participate for providing funding for the event resources. Thank you.

Executive Goldzband continued: I will also tell you that I received, totally unsolicited the next morning, an incredibly laudatory email from a 28-year veteran of the Department of Justice who has just recently returned to the land division who said that he was incredibly proud to be a state, civil servant and employee watching the three agencies work together and do what they did.

Second, I want to let Brad McCrea let you know of the founding of the BRRIT – the Bay Restoration Regulatory Integration Team. You each received a memo on this marvelous new commitment a couple of weeks ago.

Mr. McCrea addressed the Commission: I have five slides to walk us through this. The Measure AA parcel tax that was recently approved for wetland restoration provides the Bay Area with the opportunity to build a lot more wetlands in the Bay over the next 20 years.

As the 2016 Baylands Ecosystem Habitat Goals Science Update stated, tidal marshes that are established by 2030 are more likely to flourish and benefit when rising sea levels accelerate in mid-century and that planning, permitting and construction if restoration projects must be accelerated.

We have to build new tidal wetlands before the water starts coming up faster. Permitting is a big part of that goal because the existing regulatory process where one agency waits for another agency to act isn't working and it really wasn't designed to handle the climate change impacts that we are now facing.

In 2016 there were multiple conversations about the need for an inter-agency, regulatory process that could speed up permitting. You directed our Executive Director and the rest of the staff to undertake a process to develop multi-agency permitting and at the same time the Bay Area Council and the Silicon Valley Leadership Group were also focused on that need.

The idea really gained traction about a year ago when the Bay Area Council, the Silicon Valley Leadership Group and the Resources Legacy Fund with the help of their consultant DUDEK convened all parties to craft a proposal to coordinate permitting of multi-benefit wetland restoration projects.

The proposal has a lot of support. Many practitioners agree that the existing permitting process is not a well-oiled machine. There is sand in the gears. No single agency can solve the problem on its own.

What is really needed is a way to incentivize state and federal government agencies to work as a collaborative team and to share information faster and more easily. Together they can help permit applicants get wetlands built sooner.

This would all occur without any agency giving up its individual authority.

Earlier this month in this very room the San Francisco Bay Restoration Authority Governing Board did just that. It got the agencies to try something very different. The Governing Board authorized its staff to disperse up to \$650,000 of Measure AA funds annually over five years and to accept and disperse another \$600,000 of outside funding annually for five years to establish and operate the BRRIT and incentivize those agencies to work side-by-side.

The proposed approach involves two teams. One team would be the Bay Restoration Regulatory Integration Team and the Policy and Management Team. The BRRIT includes dedicated staff from each of those six agencies to work side-by-side about 10 days every month at the Army Corps' San Francisco office to conduct pre-application reviews together and to conduct site visits as a team to process permit applications and identify policy issues that need addressing.

The Policy and Management Team is comprised of upper management staff that has the authority to make decisions. They will provide guidance and get sticky issues unstuck and will tackle and solve policy issues that are known to historically slow down projects such as conversions of wetland types, short-term impacts on listed species and conflicts between public access and wildlife.

If all goes as planned the BRRIT will be up and running in about six months. The immediate next steps are to raise matching funds to complete the Restoration Authority's appropriation to execute the inner-agency agreements and to hire staff for the six-person team.

Following that the BRRIT will be evaluated annually by the PMT, the Restoration Authority and other funders.

There is a lot of enthusiasm and excitement around this to create a task force that is going to do permitting differently for restoration projects.

Executive Director Goldzband continued: And you know you are at a BCDC meeting if somebody says there is a lot of enthusiasm around permitting. (Laughter) It is very exciting. As a matter of fact, before the meeting I talked with Jim Davis who is the Interim Director of Caltrans District 4 and he wants to come on over to BCDC to see if Caltrans can adapt what BSF/BRA has done for its own purposes.

Commissioner Gioia commented: There are a few of us here at BCDC who are on the Bay Restoration Authority Board. I do want to note that we had a lot of vigorous discussion about this and thought this was a great idea.

There was some discussion and belief that agencies should be doing this anyway. How much do we actually put into it? And the money that we put into it would then leverage other dollars. It just seems that this should be institutionalized by all agencies on a regular basis.

The issue of trying to have this be something that is not an extra cost was discussed. In our case we decided to put money up.

Commissioner Jahns had a question: Will this process apply to all restoration projects coming through BCDC or is there a list of qualifications?

Executive Director Goldzband answered: There is a list and that will be ultimately decided by the BRRIT. Certainly, anything with AA funds will be part of that.

Next, I'd like Carey Batha to give you a short rundown of the successful ART Bay Area Regional Working Group meeting last Tuesday.

Ms. Batha presented the following: We also had a meeting this Tuesday the 19th. It was the fourth of 12 Regional Working Group meetings for the ART Bay Area Project which is a regional-scale sea level rise vulnerability assessment and adaptation planning project.

The main focus of our day was to showcase how we are integrating with other regional efforts going on around the Bay. We focused on how we are integrating with SFEI and SPURS Operational Landscape Unit Project which you will be hearing about in the second of the two July Commission meetings.

We also had Mark Stacey come in and give a presentation similar to what you will hear next month showcasing how adaptation measures in one part of the Bay can affect vulnerability in another. We are looking at that regional perspective.

We also had the Natural Capital Project partner come down and give us an update on their research. This is a group out of Stanford that is helping us quantify the ecosystem services that we get from open-space areas around the Bay which could be affected by sea level rise.

We look forward to hearing a lot about this in the second of your July meetings. Our next steps internally on ART Bay Area are to move forward with our vulnerability assessment. By fall/winter of this year we will be into our adaptation planning phase and the project wraps up around July of 2019.

Executive Director Goldzband added: We only have one meeting in July. We have cancelled the fifth of July meeting.

I also want to take a minute to invite you to an upcoming BCDC workshop. On July 19, the morning of our next Commission meeting, BCDC will co-host a public workshop with the Resilient by Design Program to help those nine projects get traction. Now the big question is - how do we get these projects started? This workshop will provide more detailed information for those projects about possible funding opportunities for local governments and community stakeholders to move those projects forward. We are going to provide a host of experts in public and private funding sources so that project proponents can learn about what funding may be

available and receive information about how to put together a possible funding strategy. You will each receive and have in your packets now a flyer for this event. I encourage the public officials here to ensure that planners from your organization and any other staff in your jurisdictions send representatives to accompany project proponents. We will have plenty of room and plenty of discussion. You will be reminded of this during the next couple of weeks.

Three more quick updates. First, construction is underway at several ferry terminals around the Bay – in Alameda, in Richmond and at Pier 2 here in San Francisco. In addition, construction has started at a number of recently-permitted projects, including projects in Hercules, at Oyster Point and at Burlingame Point.

Second, the Environmental Justice Commissioner Working Group met monthly during the spring to advise BCDC staff on the Bay Plan Amendment for social equity and environmental justice. The group is comprised of Commissioner Alvarado, the Chair, and Commissioners Pemberton, Showalter, Vasquez, and Ahn. At the first meeting staff covered the project background, the Bay Plan amendment process, and the project's community engagement plan. At the second meeting the group discussed definitions of terms relevant to the project. At the third, staff provided a summary of best practices in environmental justice policy development. We will ask Chair Alvarado or her substitute to bring the Commission up to speed at the Commission meetings that immediately follow the working group meetings.

Finally, we also have made progress on the Fill for Habitat Amendment. Staff has worked with the Bay Fill Working Group in March, April, and June to discuss project background and definitions, but that project has been delayed by staff turnover. We are continuing to search for a replacement for Isaac Pearlman who left BCDC in May.

That concludes my report, Chair Wasserman, and I'm happy to answer any questions anyone may have.

In your packet you will notice this copy of Estuary News. It is a remarkable edition. In addition to having RBD projects in it there is a lot of information about BCDC and some of our programs. I encourage you to take it on BART and read it at your leisure.

7. Consideration of Administrative Matters. Chair Wasserman announced: That brings us to Item 7, Consideration of Administrative Matters. We have received a listing of administrative matters. Brad is poised on the edge of his seat to answer questions; are there any? (No comments were voiced) You may sit back. (Laughter)

8. Public Hearing and Possible Vote on the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's South Bay Salt Pond Restoration Project, Phase Two Request for Consistency Determination No. C2017.008.00 (formerly C2003.010.00, Amendment No. Seven). Chair Wasserman announced: That brings us to Item 8. This is a public hearing and possible vote on the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's consistency determination for Phase II of the South Bay Salt Pond Restoration. Brenda Goeden will introduce the project. Sediment Program Manager Brenda Goeden addressed the Commission: Today you have before you the South Bay Salt Pond Restoration Project, Phase Two sponsored by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the California Coastal Conservancy.

The project is in the far South Bay and consists of four pond clusters that you see in the vicinity map on the screen, including the Alviso Island Ponds, Alviso Ponds A8 and A8S, the Alviso Mountain View Ponds, and the Ravenswood Ponds. Phase Two includes a combination of habitat enhancement and habitat restoration. Alviso Island Ponds and Pond A8 are proposed for habitat enhancement having been previously restored to tidal action. The Mountain View Ponds include tidal marsh restoration as does Ravenswood Pond R4. Ravenswood Pond R3, R5 and S5 propose improved managed and seasonal ponds.

There are three ponds in the Alviso Island Ponds group, including Ponds A21, A20 and A19 on the right. This set of ponds was restored as part of Phase One. There is some additional work that will improve the habitat here, including lowering some levees, filling in drainage ditches, widening a breach and adding two additional breaches. There is no additional fill being placed at this pond but rather moving material from one location to another.

Alviso A8 and A8S are also already restored to tidal action and is now a muted, tidal pond. The main activity here is adding fill for transitional habitat in two locations.

The Mountain View Ponds, A1 and A2W, are being restored fully to tidal action. Fill is being added for transitional habitat but also to improve flood protection levees. In this area habitat islands are proposed, which also requires fill added to the site. There are public access trails being added and improved and viewing platforms that will also be added.

In the Ravenswood Pond area, Pond R4 is being restored to tidal marsh, including two transitional habitat zones that will require fill, as will reinforcing and improving the existing levees in this area. Pond R3 will be improved for listed bird species, primarily kept seasonally dry, for snowy plover and least tern nesting and breeding areas. In the managed ponds, R5 and S5, there will be some levee removal to improve tidal connectivity, water control structure placement and a habitat island built out of the middle of the current levee dividing the two ponds.

These are the primary actions proposed, representing approximately 843,000 cubic yards of fill in salt ponds. There is also a small amount of tidal marsh being removed as a result of breaching the different levees to allow tidal access to the ponds. In the staff recommendation we raised several issues. One issue is whether the proposed fill in the salt

ponds and in the Bay is appropriate, whether the amount of public access is the maximum amount feasible, whether the natural resources including the tidal marshes and water quality are being protected, whether the shoreline protection is sufficient and how this project will adapt to climate change and the safety of fills.

In the staff summary, the second table is incorrect. I was trying to convey the changes in habitat types resulting from the proposed project in the different pond areas. This slide on the screen is the correct assessment of that habitat conversion. In the managed, seasonal ponds area ponds A1 and A2 are being converted to tidal marsh. In the Ravenswood area one of the four managed ponds is also being changed to tidal marsh, so overall there is loss of managed ponds. The Alviso Pond A8 and A8S and the Island Ponds A20 and A21 the habitat is the same type. That is my brief summary of the project. I would like to introduce Anne Morkill who is the manager of the San Francisco Bay Wildlife Refuge. After she speaks John Bourgeois will present some additional information.

Ms. Anne Morkill addressed the Commission: I manage the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's San Francisco Bay National Wildlife Refuge Complex which includes seven refuges in San Francisco and Monterey Bay, and in the Farallones Islands. I am honored to be here today with our state partner, the Coastal Conservancy to present Phase Two of the Salt Bay Salt Pond Restoration Project on the Don Edwards National Wildlife Refuge.

We have made tremendous progress in restoring the Bay's historic Baylands resulting in benefits to a suite of fish and wildlife species from migratory water, fowl to threatened and endangered species, as well as enhancing the public's enjoyment of these resources through hunting, fishing, wildlife observation and environmental education as well as other outdoor recreational uses.

The Refuge took on the responsibility for some 70 miles of earthen levees and 40 water control structures when it was established in 1972 and considerably expanded with the acquisition of the salt ponds in 2003. Beyond some early financial investments by the Fish and Wildlife Service, we have not received any substantial funding for the projects since 2010. Since then, the condition of our levees and our water control structures, which have served as defacto flood protection levees, even though they weren't built for that purpose, have only continued to age and deteriorate while the costs of materials and labor has increased. As we face ever-increasing rates and intensities of storms and rising sea levels that continue to batter our aging structures, this project is more important than ever.

Today I have some rare but very good news on the federal, funding front. Thanks to the efforts and tireless support, especially from the State Coastal Conservancy and other agencies here in the Bay Area, several members of the Bay Area Congressional Delegation have been successful in convincing the Department of the Interior to allocate nearly \$20 million in federal appropriations over three phases in the next several years to the Don Edwards Refuge to address these significant, deferred, maintenance issues. This year, and fiscal year 2018, we have received \$6.4 million out of a total of \$50 million in construction

projects that have been allocated to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service nationally by the Administration just a few weeks ago. Much of this first phase of maintenance and rehabilitation for levees and water control structures will actually advance the habitat restoration, public recreation and the flood-risk management goals of the Phase Two of the South Bay Salt Pond Restoration Project. We will also be coming back to the Commission to renew our 10-year levee operation and maintenance consistency determination and associated regulatory permits to allow us to continue to maintain those infrastructures. I am really pleased that we can finally be able to provide a sizable, cost-share towards the substantial investments that the State Coastal Conservancy, many other partners and granting organizations have made to date on this project.

With that, I would like to invite John Bourgeois up to present on the project scope.

Mr. Bourgeois presented the following: I want to give a special thanks to Brenda Goeden for her depth of knowledge and her great collaboration with us in working on this. I am going to give you the big picture of where we have been, where we are going, and look forward a little bit. I know there are a lot of concerns about sea level rise and the sustainability of some of these systems. I am going to address that a little bit later and then I will be happy to answer any questions.

Anyone who looks at the South Bay understands why this is a significant project, because the salt ponds really dominate the landscape. We have talked about the landmark, public/private partnership that took place in 2003 to put a majority of these salt ponds into public ownership for the restoration of these habitats. We have two different landowners in this area. This is why we come to you separately. Today we are working with our federal partner, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service in the areas in green on this slide which is part of the Don Edwards San Francisco Bay National Wildlife Refuge. The other is California Department of Fish and Wildlife.

The project has three goals. One of them is habitat restoration, but we also have public access and recreation, and flood-risk reduction goals as a part of this project. We have been implementing this project over time in a series of phases. That is how it was designed. Each phase has scientific experiments built into it so that we can learn. Working at this scale is a real challenge. We are coming back to you constantly with new phases and new information so that we can correct course when needed. The Project started with an intensive, five-year, public process to plan. This is a 50-year project, we started implementing that first phase of projects very early on. We completed Phase One of the Project in April of 2016. We actually got a lot done in that time period. We have thousands of acres that are now restored. We have 1,600 acres fully restored to tidal action, over 1,400 acres partially restored; that partial restoration is because of the significant, mercury contamination that exists in the South Bay. We will be coming back to the agencies with a consolidated, mercury report summarizing close to 10 years of research that we have been doing on mercury. We have some good news coming your way on that. That is going to be an interesting report.

During this time the habitats have continued to progress. We have seen tremendous progress in habitat development far exceeding our expectations based on all the modeling and projections we've done. Things are happening faster than we expected. That is good news especially for endangered species. At one of the first projects, we actually have breeding clapper rails or Ridgeway's rails and salt marsh harvest mice. These are our two primary, endangered species that are our targets, and we projected that it would take 20 to 25 years before we would see anything like this. It actually happened in less than a decade. This is really rocket-fast for these sorts of ecological systems.

We are also trying to reconfigure some of these ponds. There are groups of species that like the salt ponds. We don't want to neglect them. The ponds are just bathtubs designed to evaporate water. We have reconfigured significantly some of these in an experimental manner looking at different salinity ranges, depth ranges, habitat features such as these nesting islands in an attempt to get the wildlife to respond so that we can restore more tidal marsh that we are after. Just by changing the water management on these ponds we have been able to double the number of birds on these ponds. So, these first two, 2003 and 2004 graphs were before the Fish and Wildlife Service took over. Just by changing water management we have really been able to improve the carrying capacity of these ponds.

We also have protected species responding to some of these enhancements we've made. The snowy plovers population is increasing despite the fact that we are decreasing the amount of habitat available to them. We also have nesting, least terns and other protected species showing up on site.

As a part of our recreation goals we've completed seven miles of new trails along the edge of the Bay including features such as ADA-accessible, kayak launches, interpretive features out into the historic salt works. We have some really great, public access features as part of these projects.

We have accomplished a lot in this first phase of the project, but we have only restored about 10 percent of this project. We have our work cut out for us. Phase Two is about getting us up to at least 50 percent restoration mark as rapidly as we can. While we were constructing Phase One we were not resting on our laurels. We were starting the process of planning Phase Two, which brings us to where we are today.

Everything that we have been doing is consistent with the guidance that was set forth in the Baylands Ecosystem Goals Update for Climate Change; restoring complete processes, restoring as soon as we can and trying to find places for these Baylands to migrate. These were the main take-home points for the Baylands Goals Update and it is exactly what we are trying to do with this project.

There are a lot of moving parts on this project and a lot of things have come before you. The Corps of Engineers requested a consistency determination for about four miles of levee in the South Bay Shoreline Project, which frees up about 3,000 acres of ponds for restoration. What is before you today are the South Bay Salt Pond Restoration Phase Two projects, which are enhancement projects here in the Island Ponds, at Pond A8, and large blocks of restoration in Menlo Park and Mountain View.

What is coming down the pike next, we just closed a public comment period on an EIR for the southern half of Eden Landing. So, we've got another 2,000 acres in planning. We are really trying to race sea level rise here.

Are the marshes going to be sustainable in the long-run? This is something that we think a lot about. We keep close tabs on those sea level rise projections. There are three lines of thinking about why these marshes are sustainable. The first is history. This graph from the Santa Clara Water District shows us that there is a large degree of subsidence in the South Bay. The community of Alviso is 10 to 15 feet below sea level and this comes from historic pumping of groundwater. The subsidence of the South Bay did not stop at the city boundary. That extended on into the Bay. These salt ponds that we are trying to restore and these marshes that are out there experienced that same level of subsidence. Marshes are in a dynamic equilibrium with the tides. They receive tidal water and they receive sediment and they can keep pace with changes in sea level rise. Whether the seas are rising, or the ground is sinking beneath them it is the same thing to a marsh.

During this period of extreme subsidence what did the marshes do in the South Bay? This is something we can look to for how they might behave in the future. If you look at the marshes in 1850 versus this Google map of 1989; most of it has been converted to salt ponds. If you look closely there are remnants; at Dumbarton Marsh and others that have little, tiny features of little blips that have been remarkably consistent from 1850. Despite this period of extreme subsidence in the far South Bay the marshes that were left were persistent. If you look beyond that at Calaveras Marsh you can see in the 1850s that levee was built right at the edge of the marsh. The marsh continued to grow. If you look at from 1889 to 2012 hundreds of acres of new marsh have formed naturally. In an area where we were seeing several feet of subsidence the Marsh has not only kept pace with sea level rise it actually expanded during this period. That is an analog that we can look to as to how marshes might behave in the South Bay.

The second is data. We have been collecting a lot of data. The sediment composition of the South Bay is very important to their sustainability. We have been working with folks at U.S. Geological Survey and the University of San Francisco. In this graph, which is sediment concentrations at the Dumbarton Bridge, you can see how alarming that decline in sediment supply is, starting in about 1999/2000. When we started monitoring this again, in 2014 to 2016, there seemed to be a little blip upward. However, this is still an alarming trend for sediment supply in the South Bay. If we look at what is actually coming into the South Bay, we can see that hundreds of kilotons per year of sediment are still moving into the South Bay. We do have a very sediment-rich environment. So, this is what is happening on a macro-scale.

On the micro-scale we have been tracking what has been happening in our restored marshes. The more marshes are subsided the faster they are going to accumulate sediment. And this is exactly what we are witnessing in the restored ponds. They are behaving exactly like what we expected if they are not sediment-limited.

These extreme rates of accretion can allow these marshes to keep pace with sea level rise. We do have empirical data to support this. Pond A12 is one of our most, deeply subsided ponds. That is a worst-case, scenario pond. It is extremely, deeply subsided. The community of Alviso is to the edge of it. When we model projections of sea level rise it is still becomes a viable marsh in a relatively short period of time. However, if we start later, if we push out our start date another decade, it might not catch up. And if we have a loss of sediment supply, the situation is dire across the board.

Fortunately, the sediment supply is something we can manage for. We can import dredged sediment. We can artificially feed the mudflats or something down the road to help achieve that. The bottom line is that our model predictions show that these marshes can be established and get into a sustainable place given current knowledge on sea level rise. And finally, even if they don't; even if there are some areas that do not quite make it to tidal marsh there is still a lot of ecological value in these inter-tidal mudflats to bird species. They are very important, interim habitats and habitats in and of themselves.

That is the summary and I want to thank, again, Brenda and all of our partners in making this happen. I am happy to answer questions.

Chair Wasserman announced: We will open the public hearing. We have one speaker, Dean Stanford.

Mr. Stanford addressed the Commission: This whole restoration project is going to result in nine miles of loop trail that is going to be lost. According to the McAteer-Petris Act BCDC requires locations for water-oriented land uses and increased public access to shoreline and waters and encourages the provision of maximum, feasible, public access. As mitigation for the lost trail the new park trail around Pond A18 should be allowed while breaching and bridging the existing levee. Mitigation for allowing new pond trails could be satisfied by the park being responsible for creating more waterbird nesting islands in Pond A18, and by providing species and habitats stewardship staff, and funding for the pond in perpetuity.

The pond trail would be an important aspect of the park to get families and the elderly and disabled out into nature on the Bay. Having a loop trail as part of an official park would allow for a controlled use such as seasonal closures and park staff or law enforcement and environmental stewardship. Recreation is the third most important goal of the Restoration Project but is lacking in the plan. Where were stakeholders for this aspect of the plan? Recreation is mentioned hundreds of times in the plan and increasing recreation is part of almost all the stakeholders' general plans. Why were there no city, county, state or national

park agencies as stakeholders? The plan does not retain the level of existing recreation and the water places are inadequate. The plan had no stakeholders representing recreation and only four citizens commented in the chart I saw. The lead agency should prepare a supplement to the EIR with a changed situation of potentially having a new, loop trail on Pond A18, as per CEQA guidelines 15163.

Public outreach and input were inadequate. California State Parks would entertain stakeholder status. The chief and deputy director for the Division have offered to meet with any local officials. I have talked to several leaders of environmental groups, including David Lewis of Save the Bay, and he was enthusiastic about this whole park idea. CARB is also looking at supporting these types of parks throughout California directly with dedicated funding. Thank you.

Chair Wasserman asked: Any questions from the Commission?

Vice-Chair Halsted inquired: I had the preliminary presentation of the U.C. Engineering School Study about the effect of rising sea levels on tides and its effect on the South Bay which increases a lot. I wonder if you could comment on whether that has been integrated into this project in any way. Have you integrated any of that into your thinking and the planning for this?

Mr. Bourgeois replied: We have worked closely with Mark Stacey on some of his work, and you dig into his work, what it shows is that because of the funnel effect of the South Bay and the tidal amplification, if by creating more space for the tides in the South Bay it actually improves water surface levels in the North Bay. You can actually provide a flood benefit for the entire Bay by focusing on making the “bathtub” bigger. By doing that in the far South Bay, you are actually going to amplify the benefit in the North Bay. It definitely is something that we have been exploring with him. Vice-Chair Halsted had a follow-up question: And it is actually not putting anything more at risk in the South Bay? Mr. Bourgeois answered: No. It is actually the opposite.

Commissioner Zwissler inquired about sediment: You made a comment about that if there wasn't enough natural sediment coming in that you would find sediment to supplement. What is the source of that supplemental sediment? What happens if you can't find enough of it? Mr. Bourgeois explained: We are pursuing two avenues right now; one is upland sources. We have been working with the Water Board. We have a quality-assurance plan to bring in upland material. A lot of this upland material that is happening in either stream maintenance situations or construction ends up in landfills. It is a valuable resource if it is clean and meets our criteria we want to use that material. The second is dredged material. Getting dredged material to the far South Bay is logistically quite challenging. In our Eden Landing EIR, our state property that we just closed the public comment period on, we are actually proposing an offloader be located between the Dumbarton and the San Mateo Bridges in the Bay. So, to have that be the gateway, and the money that Larry was talking about going to the Port of

Redwood City, we would be the recipient site of that dredged sediment. Once that infrastructure is in the Bay, our hope is that we can then turn “the hose” down toward the South Bay in future phases. We get the offloader dredged material started at Eden Landing and then eventually move south. Commissioner Zwissler continued his inquiry: But you are satisfied that this will produce or provide enough sediment? Mr. Bourgeois replied: These projections have a lot of big error bars on them. I would be foolish to say that I am confident that this will solve everything, but it is a huge step in the right direction.

Chair Wasserman commented: Let’s go back to the slide with the sloping time graph in blue. I appreciate that these are brought together from a bunch of different places. This is one of the best slide presentations that I have seen on this kind of issue. They are very effective. I wanted to come back to this because this kind of slide we ought to be using for every project we are looking at. Certainly, major projects in keeping this kind of thing in mind because it helps to educate us and then it becomes part of the broader education process.

Commissioner Sears had questions: I love this project and I encourage everyone to visit who hasn’t already. I really appreciate your addressing the sustainability piece of it. My question comes out of having read the recent article that Antarctica is melting three times as fast as it was a decade ago. You really focused on the race between sea level rise and the incredible response of species. What if seas rise just much faster than our models have anticipated and that we hope happens doesn’t, and the Bay ends up overtopping your horizontal levee? What happens in terms of the impact on the environment and the project, but also for us as a regulatory agency we have consistency determinations and permits that have a whole host of conditions attached to them? What if sea level rises so quickly that it makes complying with those conditions impossible or it makes the compliance that has occurred no longer effective? What do we do, as regulators, in thinking about that? What happens John? Can you answer that? (Laughter) Mr. Bourgeois replied: That is the question of our time. The way that we are thinking about it is, we are thinking about it from the context of our project and what we can do to make the most sustainable marshes in the long-term. We have positioned those upland transition zones and we are asking for a large amount of Bay fill. We are trying to build them along the very few spots in the South Bay where there are uplands on the back side. Unfortunately, in the South Bay we are juxtaposed right up against the built environment. A lot of our upland spaces that are left undeveloped are landfills. We end up trying to build these marshes grading up into what are now closed landfills. Our goal is to try and get those elevations right, over-estimate them and so that those marshes can have in the most catastrophic scenarios that we at least have some fringing marsh left so these endangered species can hold on, and they do provide some buffer against wind waves. We are also working trying to reconnect what small watersheds are left in the South Bay. A lot of sediment is trapped behind dams. We are trying to reconnect those so that we can create lots of little, mini deltas so that under these extreme scenarios we could at least have a fringing marsh and interspersed, micro deltas around. That is what the worst-case scenario looks like from the project’s standpoint. From the policy standpoint I am going to let someone else handle that one.

Ms. Goeden commented: From the regulatory perspective we have been looking at this question fairly recently and fairly seriously regarding another project that has promised some habitat over time that has been delayed. You could extend the thinking to habitat that does not develop. Remember that we are authorizing a restoration project, not requiring a restoration project. They are asking to do it and we are telling them how to be consistent with our law and policy. We are not requiring them to do a restoration project. The other piece is the federal consistency determination has conditions in it. If they were to not comply with those conditions, we have very limited directions that we can go. From our recent work with the Army Corps of Engineers is that you can amend the consistency determination such that it is consistent with the project as proposed at that time. This is very paperwork intensive. Another option is to go back to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and say, we expected these things from this project and you have this impact and we haven't seen those benefits and so we will be requesting remedial action. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has the potential to tell us whether or not they will undertake the remedial actions that we request, or that they think are more appropriate actions, or to tell us no. We can ask for mediation with the Department of Commerce through NOAA, and then we can sue them. Those are our legal options under federal consistency determination actions. That the scale of how we can deal with these projects. Of course, we would never want to sue the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. We would want to work collaboratively with them to find a remedy that provides habitat benefits and protections as proposed.

Mr. McCrea added: Brenda has answered the question from a wetlands restoration and Bay restoration perspective, particularly as it pertains to federal work. But we ask ourselves this question a lot in the context of development all around the San Francisco Bay. It is the question of our time. How do we look into the future and make the best decisions we can now with knowing with what we think is going to happen, and then have mechanisms in place to deal with that uncertainty? The way I have come to think about it is we are going to make the best decisions we can based on the best, available science, and the educated guesses with regard to where we think the water would be given at any given development site. What really is important is to give ourselves room to adapt. Whether we require it, or we encourage developers to think about it that way; along the shoreline we have to give ourselves room to deal with more water. And last, we have to figure out how to pay for it. Treasure Island had an assessment district in place where all the people that move into it are going to be paying into a fund to be able to pay for future work that is needed decades from now. That also is vital. There are lots of ways to answer that question but that is how I think about it.

Mr. Bourgeois commented: I appreciate Mr. Stanford's comments. The pond he is referring to is Pond A18 that is owned by the city of San Jose. It is not part of the Salt Bay Pond Restoration Project. It is part of the Corps Shoreline Study which this body has acted on the consistency determination. That was an extensive outreach program of over a decade working on planning on that project. I am sorry that Mr. Stanford was not aware of that planning process earlier. It would literally require an act of Congress to change that project.

It was congressionally approved. The reason there is no loop trail proposed on Pond A18 is because that pond is slated for restoration which means levee lowering, breaching but the backside of that is proposed for new public access to complete the Bay Trail spine from the community of Alviso all the way to Coyote Creek. We work closely with the Bay Trail, and the Coastal Conservancy is a major funder of the Bay Trail. We definitely have had Bay Trail advocacy involvement in that process and there is removal of some trails out on the refuge ponds as part of that project. But we worked closely with the Bay Trail folks to come up with a solution that may result in a small, net loss of mileage but a vastly, improved connectivity between regional trail systems.

Ms. Morkill was recognized: I actually just want to jump back to Commissioner Sear's question. In the Bay Fill Working Group, we talked about this a little bit. We design these projects somewhat with a fixed end-point in mind but in nature nothing is a really, fixed, static point. It is trying to think about the dynamics. If we have designed a project for 20 or 30 years; if the rates of sea level rise far accelerated whatever we predicted, and things aren't as we expected we do need to be open to looking at, what are the new benefits we are realizing? There will still be fish and wildlife and environmental benefits from this whether it becomes a tidal marsh or a mud flat or some other system; from the perspective of the Fish and Wildlife Service it is still very valuable as far as wetland conservation – it's just, what wetland type will that be? I think it is a great challenge for both policy and conservationists to think about that challenge.

Ms. Goeden added: On the note of the Bay Trail; in January when the Commission approved the first phase of the South Bay Shoreline Project the project was literally constrained to the levee improvement for a portion of the site. We anticipate the South Bay Shoreline Project coming back two or three times to the Commission as they design each additional leg of the levee and the public access associated with it; and then, finally, the pond restoration. I wanted to remind you that you will be seeing it again and you will be seeing additional public access features which you will have an opportunity to comment and approve or request additional information.

Commissioner Ranchod commented: Thanks for clarifying that. The public access is an important issue and the conditional concurrence that is proposed here includes special conditions that specifically address improving public access. And there is a fair amount of discussion of public access issues in the documents we reviewed.

Chair Wasserman announced: I would entertain a motion to close the public hearing.

MOTION: Vice Chair Halsted moved to close the public hearing, seconded by Commissioner Alvarado. The motion carried by a voice vote with no abstentions or objections.

Ms. Goeden presented the staff recommendation to the Commission: The staff recommends that the Commission vote to concur with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's recommendation to conduct the South Bay Salt Pond Restoration Project, Phase Two as conditioned in the staff recommendation that you have received.

Ms. Morkill announced: Yes, I concur with the recommendation.

MOTION: Commissioner Showalter moved, as her great honor, approval of the staff recommendation, seconded by Commissioner Alvarado.

VOTE: The motion carried with a roll call vote of 20-0-0 with Commissioners Addiego, Ahn, Alvarado, Butt, Gilmore, Scharff, Gioia, Gorin, Jahns, Ajami, Peskin, Ranchod, Sears, Showalter, Vasquez, Techel, Wagenknecht, Zwissler, Vice Chair Halsted and Chair Wasserman voting, "YES", no "NO", votes and no abstentions.

9. Public Hearing and Possible Vote on an Application by Seawall Lot 337 Associates, LLC and Port of San Francisco for Mission Rock Mixed-Use Development Project at Seawall Lot 337 in the City and County of San Francisco; BCDC Permit Application No. 2017.004.00. Chair Wasserman announced: That brings us to Item 9 which is a public hearing and possible vote on the proposed Mission Rock Mixed-Use Development at Seawall Lot 337 along the San Francisco Waterfront. Ethan Lavine will introduce the project.

Chief of Bay Resources and Permits Ethan Lavine addressed the Commission: On June 8th you were mailed a summary of an application by the Port of San Francisco and Seawall 337 Associates, LLC which is a subsidiary of the San Francisco Giants for a new mixed-use neighborhood on the San Francisco Waterfront.

The project proposed is known as the Mission Rock Project. It would involve work within and outside of the Commission's jurisdiction including construction of up to 1,600 units of residential housing, up to 1.4 million square feet of office and retail, commercial space and approximately 6.61 acres of new or improved public access areas.

The 21-acre project site is located in the Mission Bay neighborhood of the City and County of San Francisco. It is bounded by Mission Creek to the north, the Bay to the east and Third Street to the west.

The project site is known as Seawall Lot 337. Seawall lots are lots that were created atop fill tidelands when San Francisco built the Great Seawall around the turn of the 20th Century. The site is owned by the Port.

Today the seawall lot is primarily used for surface parking.

There is some existing public, shoreline access at the site and that is required pursuant to previously-issued, BCDC permits.

At the north end of the site is the two-acre China Basin Park which is a shoreline park constructed in association with the Giant's Ballpark.

Public access is also provided on a small marginal wharf. The Mission Rock team calls it the Knuckle Wharf just north of Pier 48.

The new Warrior Arena is called the Chase Center which is under construction a little less than half a mile south of the project site.

Events at AT&T Park and the Chase Center would be held regularly throughout the year. They are expected to bring thousands of people to and through the project site including its public, access areas in a time shortly before and after a game or event.

Also, of note are Piers 48 and 50 which are directly adjacent to the project site. Pier 50 is in active use for maritime, industrial activities by West Star Marine which provides harbor services and berthing and by the Port as a maintenance, operations center. Pier 48 is primarily used today for overflow parking for Giant's games.

It is worth noting that the applicants inform us that they intend to rehabilitate Pier 48 as a future phase of the overall, Mission Rock Project.

Much of the planning for this project was predicated on the future reuse of that pier; and now it is a matter of finding a tenant.

Should that part of the project materialize it would come back before you for your review at that time.

The proposed project is located within the planning area of the Commission's, San Francisco Waterfront Special Area Plan at the intersection of what the plan defines as the northeastern and southern portions of the waterfront.

The northeastern waterfront which runs from China Basin north to Pier 35 is considered a regional recreation and scenic resource and is characterized by the remaining, historic Port of San Francisco pier sheds as well as all the attractions along the Embarcadero that make it a regional and even international draw for visitors to San Francisco Bay.

The southern waterfront is where you find today the greatest concentration of maritime industry in the city and county of San Francisco with facilities for major, cargo handling, ship repair and other seaport uses.

And the southern waterfront is in a period of real transformation. As a result of the concentration of maritime industry it has historically had somewhat restricted, public access to the Bay shoreline. However, this has been changing slowly but surely in recent decades with numerous, new, shoreline parks and open spaces being opened and developed and others are along the way in various stages of development.

Bayfront Park is the last major, shoreline park associated with the Mission Bay Redevelopment Project which was approved by the Commission back in 2000. It recently went back to your Design Review Board for its final blessing and construction begins on that soon.

Most Commissioners will recall seeing an application by the Port to construct Crane Cove Park which was approved last year.

In addition, a large amount of new, residential units and commercial space has been developed or is currently proposed along the southern waterfront.

The Mission Rock Project is located directly adjacent to the larger, Mission Bay redevelopment that encompasses several hundred acres and has been built out now over a number of years.

You can expect to see applications for other mixed-use, shoreline neighborhoods appearing before you in the near future and those include at Pier 70 the site of the former Potrero Power Plant at India Basin and Hunter's Point.

The project before you today represents one of the densest, large, urban, in-fill projects ever considered by the Commission. It would be built in phases over a period estimated at approximately 10 years.

At build-out there would be approximately 9,000, new residents and workers at the site daily as well as additional visitors at the retail shops and the shoreline parks associated with the project.

All of the residential and commercial space associated with the project with the exception of some limited retail and café areas are located outside of the Commission's jurisdiction.

The project would result in construction of approximately 6.61 acres of new or improved, public access inside and outside of the Commission's jurisdiction.

Of the six and a half acres, about two acres would be in the form of improvements to the existing China Basin Park. And the remaining 4.5 acres would be new public-access areas.

The following public access would be provided. First, China Basin Park is an existing, two-acre, shoreline park and it would be redeveloped and roughly doubled in size. Program elements at the existing park like the Bay Trail, a shoreline promenade and likely a small, baseball diamond would be retained though reconfigured on the site.

New public amenities would include public plazas, a public restroom and a public-access dock and boat launch.

Terry A. Francois Boulevard would be redesigned as a shared street that would allow for restricted, vehicular access-primarily vehicles would be there to drop off or make deliveries. When not being used for vehicles this street would double as an expanded walkway suitable for pedestrians and bicyclists.

There would also be a separated, dedicated, 16-foot wide Bay Trail that would remain available at all times.

Terry A. Francois would be redeveloped in the final phase of the project. So in the interim the public-access route along the street would be established through restriping and repaving of the pavement.

A portion of the marginal, wharf structure that is located between Piers 48 and 50 called Pier 48½ would be redeveloped as Channel Wharf public-plaza area consisting of simple improvements such as seating and other site furnishings.

The full, marginal wharf is anticipated to be redeveloped as part of the redevelopment of Pier 48 in the future should that materialize as a project.

An approximately, one-acre park and plaza called Mission Rock Square would be constructed near the center of the project site.

The Park would have views to the Bay between Piers 48 and 50 as well as a lawn, plaza areas, site furnishings and a public restroom.

The final space is called Channel Lane which would be a pedestrian-only plaza connecting Mission Rock Square to Terry A. Francois and the Channel Wharf Plaza at the water's edge.

There are a few items of note for the Commission related to the public-access areas. First we have special events. The applicant proposes to hold special events in the public-access areas constructed as part of the project. Their proposal would likely result in one of the most intensely- programmed, shoreline, public-access areas on San Francisco Bay.

Under the plan smaller events could occur every day throughout the year and larger events on more than 100 days each year.

Most events would be open to the public although some would require advanced registration or potentially purchase of a ticket. A smaller share of events would be private, invitation-only events.

The applicants have proposed certain limitation on special events to provide for circulation through the site at all times. The applicant will provide for unrestricted, public-access uses in at least a portion of each park at all times even during events.

Another item is the plan for sea level rise adaptation and for the public-access areas. The applicant has proposed to monitor flooding and rates of sea level rise in order to implement necessary adaptation measures in advance of anticipated flooding of the site.

They propose intermediate and long-term measures for flooding. The intermediate measures would be mainly along Terry A. Francois Boulevard such as the installation of low-lying walls or other barriers that would guard against inundation from flood waters.

The longer-term measures would be designed to prevent more extreme flooding anticipated closer to the end of the century. Those measures could include raising the grade of the Bay Trail, other pedestrian circulation areas and possibly Terry A. Francois to establish a new line of defense that would prevent flooding of the public-access areas.

The applicants' monitoring would identify when certain triggers for adaptation planning had been reached allowing for a period of about seven to nine years during which they would implement adaptation measures before regular inundation of the site would be expected to occur.

The application summary that was mailed to you identifies issues raised by the project including allowable Bay fill and this is because there is a small public-access dock provided as part of the project.

Public access including sea level rise, recreation, appearance, design and scenic views and public trust are issues involved in this project. The core question for the Commission is whether the project provides maximum, feasible, public access provided consistent the project.

That concludes the staff presentation. To present the project on behalf of the applicants we have Phil Williamson from the Port of San Francisco and Jack Bair representing Seawall Lot 337 Associates/The San Francisco Giants.

Mr. Phil Williamson addressed the Commission: I am Phil Williamson, Senior Project Manager with the Port of San Francisco before you to present the culmination of much hard work with your staff. With me today from the Port is Ming Yeung and Diane Oshima and from our development partner the San Francisco Giants Jack Bair, Julian Pancoast and their Consultants Justian Simian from WRA and Dilup Travetti from Moffitt & Nichol.

Our team would like to thank the efforts of Director Goldzband, Brad McCrea, Ethan Lavine and Andrea Gaffney. We have had a collaborative and efficient relationship and are proud of the permit before you today.

Over the next few minutes I will be providing background on the site context and an overview of the project from a high level. And then I will invite Jack Bair up to go a little deeper into the public-access areas that you are considering today.

From 1859 we show a progression of the site's evolution from what was underneath Mission Bay to today before Mission Rock was covered by Pier 50. It was mostly filled in at that time and used for rail yards and industrial purposes.

With the assistance of the community and a special sub-committee, development objectives were created that became the foundation of an RFQ and RFP that ultimately led to the Port selection of the Giants as its development partner for this location.

Since selecting the Giants our combined teams has worked diligently to develop a land-use plan honoring the community-backed objectives for the site.

Extensive collaboration and negotiation with many agencies including BCDC, State Lands, San Francisco Public Works, San Francisco PUC and the San Francisco Planning Department culminated in a city-wide election where voters overwhelmingly supported the project.

We now have a certified EIR and a project that has been unanimously approved by the Planning Commission, the Port Commission, the Board of Supervisors and signed into law by the mayor this past March.

In April the State Lands Commission also unanimously approved the project and now we are before you for the project's final step in the long, approval process.

Today we seek approval for the first of two applications. Today we are before you for approval of the open-space plan and the permit for Seawall Lot 337. Another application will be submitted for Pier 48 once a long-term user has been identified for this facility.

The land-use program shown here is proposed to be built over four phases and will include housing with 1,400 units estimated with 40 percent of that being affordable across a range of AMI levels from 45 percent to 150 percent which addresses a wide range of housing needs in the community.

Approximately 1.3 million square feet of new commercial space will be developed on this site resulting in approximately 5,000 on-site jobs.

Ground-floor retail is programmed to be a cornerstone of new and vibrant neighborhood and addresses a real need in the greater, Mission Bay community for retail that serves residents that have moved into the area over the last 15 years.

And finally, approximately eight acres of new and expanded open-space which includes the space around Pier 48 for a future project will be part of this development. It also includes the northern terminus of the blue/green way pedestrian and bicycle pathway that stretches down the waterfront all the way to Hunter's Point.

All actively programmed and managed with funding from a community-facilities district will be maintained as well to be an attractive place for locals and visitors to experience the Bay front.

With your support today, the project will be fully entitled and we begin Phase 1 work to transform this important, waterfront asset.

I would now like to call up Jack Bair to provide greater detail on the public-access areas.

Mr. Bair presented the following: I am Jack Bair with the San Francisco Giants and Mission Rock Development Project. I was before you 21 years ago seeking approval for the ballpark at China Basin. This slide shows that 70 million people have attended games and events at the ballpark since we opened in the year 2000.

As part of that permit we incorporated public-access areas such as the Port Walk and it frames China Basin Channel also known as McCovey Cove which becomes quite a theatre on game days. The China Basin Park that exists there now is also well used.

There are several public-access areas proposed in this development project. I am going to walk through each of them in a little bit more detail.

The China Basin Park is being greatly expanded at the water's edge. We are also reconfiguring Terry A. Francois Boulevard and adding the Bay Trail and different pedestrian walkways along Terry A. Francois Boulevard. There will also be the Channel Wharf at the water's edge. Channel Lane will be a non-vehicular pathway between Mission Rock Square and the water. In the middle of the project you will have Mission Rock Square.

As Pier 48 is addressed we will then add aprons all around Pier 48 so that the open space adds up to eight acres.

Terry A. Francois Boulevard now goes along the edge of China Basin Park. We are vacating the street at Pier 48 to allow for a grand-waterfront, open space and the expansion of China Basin Park.

This park has been extensively planned and discussed over a decade. The Park is designed to meet a lot of different needs and different interests. It has different rooms and encourages different experiences when they use the Park.

The first room you see on this slide south of the ballpark is a gateway plaza, hardscape with trees, seating areas, a kiosk for food service where people can congregate and meet up with their neighbors or people headed to the ball game or events at the ballpark.

The second major room is defined by the Junior Giant's Baseball Field which currently exists in China Basin Park. That room is meant to be for active-recreation uses and aimed towards kids and children.

The Great Lawn area which is meant to be a place where you could recreate, you could have an art festival and a movie night in the Park.

Surrounding the open space, you have the Bay Trail which is 16-foot wide and other pedestrian walkways. You have an overlook with benches. You have a public dock. You have the Knuckle Pier with the picnic area and you also have raised, stormwater, treatment gardens as well.

We envision the Great Lawn being used for casual recreation such as flying kites, picnics and the like. It could also be used for events such as film night in the Park.

Also, in the Park is a family-friendly, café restaurant which will animate the Park which will be close to the children's play area in the Park.

China Basin Park also has the Stormwater Gardens and they also give texture to the pathways that run around them and between them.

The only fill in the project is 1,500 square feet for a public launch for kayaks and non-motored boats.

There was a lot of interest in maintaining the character of the industrial part of the waterfront. We are trying to accomplish a lot of things along Terry A. Francois Boulevard.

There will be vehicular access that gets to Pier 48 but it is framed by the 16-foot wide Bay Trail along the water's edge. There is the Channel Wharf between Pier 50 and Pier 48. There are pedestrian walkways along the other side of the shared, public way and elevated, pedestrian walkways along the building frontage.

As we build our Pier 48 we will have the full Channel Wharf Park. But as an interim condition we will have seating and attractions at the interim installation at Channel Wharf.

The heart of the project is Mission Rock Square. Mission Rock Square is meant to be the living room for the community. It is surrounded by buildings and it creates a certain amount of intimacy.

On two sides there is no street that separates the Park from the built environment. It creates a sense of intimacy on the Park.

Mission Rock Square will be connected to the water by a non-vehicular street called Channel Lane. It is a paseo-type of environment. You have a place where the public would like to hang out and experience the area.

This project has been thought through very carefully from a sea level rise perspective. The majority of the site is being raised by 66 inches which is well above the water line. The project meets and exceeds sea level rise in the most aggressive calculations at year 2100.

The Bay Trail elevation is increased in the China Basin Park and then it slopes up to the 66 inches that we are adding to the site elevation.

It is projected that the site will be perfectly protected within that timeframe. With respect to the edge of the Park itself at a hundred-year storm with aggressive sea level rise we could get into a situation in the year 2075 or it may have some overtopping that is significant so we will be measuring sea level rise every five years. As we reach certain thresholds we will then begin the planning process of how we will create adaptations to meet sea level rise which we don't anticipate in this project until the very end of this century. To the extent that it does occur we have a mechanism for that. We have a funding mechanism for it outlined through our CFD. We also have adaptations that make sense and are readily accessible and that we can increase the height of the pathway or we could create seating walls and other adaptations that will enhance and improve the Park but also serve as adaptations.

That concludes our presentation and we are happy to answer any questions that you might have. And thank you to the staff that worked very hard with us over many, many years.

Chair Wasserman continued: Thank you for the presentation. Are there burning questions before we open the public hearing? (No comments were voiced) The public hearing is now open. We have three public speakers. The first speaker is Bruce Agat.

Mr. Agat addressed the Commission: My name is Bruce Agat and I am speaking in support of the items associated with the Mission Rock Development. I am a native San Franciscan and a nine-year resident of Mission Bay. I am on the Board of the South Beach Rincon Mission Bay Neighborhood Association.

Over the past six years I have had the opportunity along with my neighbors and other community leaders to be involved in the planning process for the Mission Rock Development. Together we shared our insights and provided input to the project which will help transform this part of the eastern waterfront into a vibrant and complete community.

This community and stakeholder engagement helped shape the project we see today striking a delicate balance on the amount of parks, waterfront access, housing, neighborhood serving retail and restaurants and office space.

This project brought together an amazing and diverse group of experts to find the optimal mix of land uses while providing some flexibility to ensure success and delivery of the project.

As important as the elements of the project the developers are key. The San Francisco Giants organization is a good neighbor and truly listens. The open space is a perfect example of this. We as a community provided input into the components of the open space and to ensure that it was included in the first phase of the development.

The Giants listened and found a way to make it happen.

Mission Bay is a developing community. Housing is being built but it is the active, open-space, retail services and activities and restaurants which creates community. We are beginning to see this with the Sparks Social area which is temporary in nature with its food trucks, yoga classes, trivia nights, soccer fields et cetera. It is located in the south part of Mission Bay and it is already crowded and at times reaching capacity.

When Mission Bay and Mission Rock are built out we will have approximately 8,000 residences. The six and a half acres of activated, open space provided in the Mission Rock Development will truly fill a need helping to create and enhance the development of our vibrant community. We see diverse activities throughout the City with movie nights, farmer's and holiday markets, sports activities, food tasting, space for children and other activities that enhance the areas where they are taking place.

In this area today, we have a parking lot and a community desert along this section of the waterfront. Please provide the necessary approvals allowing the Mission Rock Development to move forward. Thank you.

Ms. Alice Rogers commented: I am President of the South Beach Rincon Mission Bay Neighborhood Association. Our Neighborhood Association neither supports nor opposes development projects. We do work very hard to provide our neighbors a conduit of information.

I am here to say that the Giants outreach and their methods of engaging the neighborhood really have been the gold standard. They have done sketches from every point of the view of the City. They have had the community help build models. They have spent a considerable amount of time on the retail component which is something very important to us.

Our three neighborhoods, South Beach, Rincon and Mission Bay are all redevelopment neighborhoods and are sorely in need of building community and building neighborhoods. The aspects that are most important to me and to most of our neighbors are really the community-building aspects here.

We really think that they have set the standard for all developments in terms of their engagement and their thoughtfulness. Thank you.

Ms. Corinne Woods addressed the Commission: My name is Corinne Woods and I am a neighbor of this project. I live two blocks from it. I am a 30-year member of the Mission Creek Conservancy. I chair the Mission Bay Citizen's Advisory Committee. I am a member of the Port Central Waterfront Advisory Group and also a member of the Waterfront Plan Working Group.

I can't tell you how many meetings, how many conversations, how many discussions we've had with the Giants on this project.

They agreed to put China Basin Park in Phase 1 of the project even though it cost them a lot of money to do it. When we discovered that the future Pier 48 was uncertain they decoupled the boat launch from the Pier 48 part of the project and moved it into Phase 2.

They have really, really listened to the community. One of the things that we have been struggling with in the Waterfront Plan Update is how to activate waterfront, open space to really attract people not to just come and sit and look at the water but to come and stay and come back. We feel that this project really does activate the waterfront and really does what the community has been asking for the last 10 years. I urge you to support it. Thank you.

Chair Wasserman continued: That concludes the speakers' cards. May I have a motion and a second to close the public hearing?

MOTION: Commissioner Peskin moved to close the public hearing, seconded by Vice Chair Halsted. The motion carried by a voice vote with no abstentions or objections.

Commissioner Butt commented: First of all, that was a great presentation. The project is a great project but whoever put together the presentation – I commend you. It was entertaining, and you should have put a commercial or two in there. (Laughter)

I am sure it is covered in the EIR, but could you talk just briefly a little bit about mobility and transportation serving this project? You are going from a situation where you have hundreds of cars on a surface parking lot that are going to go somewhere else or go away. And then you got 8,000 new residents coming in and have to get hither and tither. I am just curious how it all works.

Mr. Bair explained: I neglected to mention that there is a parking structure on this site as well. (Laughter) This is a site that we are trying to solve a lot of issues with. There is parking on the site in a garage. So, we basically took all of the acreage of the current site and collapsed it into a smaller footprint so that we could add all the other benefits involved.

It is also an urban, in-fill site. It is on Third Street with transit serving the site. There is a Mission Rock stop on Muni already at the site. It is close in proximity to CalTrain and connections to BART. There are also ferries and there is a movement underway to have ferries come to the southern part of Mission Bay as well as the dock at the ballpark. This site is extremely well served by all kinds of mode of transit.

It is an ideal location to put jobs and housing along the public corridors in the urban environment which is the effort that many of us have been working on for a long time for a better environment.

We do take care of all the modes. We have public transportation access, vehicular access. We also have bicycle lanes dedicated through the project and lots of different pedestrian ways to go through the site. It is very porous with the different streets right now. It is just one, big, parking lot. After this is done there will be lots of different and interesting ways to move through the site.

Vice Chair Halsted had a question: I think this is a fabulous project. I am going to support it no matter what. I have a few questions that are really from my history.

I remember when H&H was located on this site. It was a toxic, dump facility and it was all capped. How does that hold up with sea level rise? Can you tell me how that works?

Mr. Bair responded: We addressed that when we built the parking lot and it will also be addressed as the buildings and the parks are built. There is separation between the soil and where humans can come in contact. That issue we feel like is addressed and we have been working with DTSC on that issue. It only affects a small part of the site. There is a land-use covenant that we need to modify in combination with this project.

Most of the site and all of Mission Bay sites and waterfront sites have the same general characteristics that involve some environmental remediation.

Vice Chair Halsted continued her inquiry: I am really concerned that in the long-run about having water access for small boats and having people be able to get to those places. I am delighted that you have a dock. I don't know whether someone could get close to that with a car hauling a kayak. How long do they have to walk to bring their kayak there?

Mr. Bair explained: We don't expect people with a kayak on the roof to park in the structure and walk with the kayak on their back from one side of the site to the other. We actually have the end of Terry A. Francois Boulevard as it terminates at Pier 48 and the Park; we have a drop-off and unloading areas, so people could unload their equipment there and then park their cars. We have thought of that aspect to make sure that people can get their kayak or canoe or what-have-you close to the dock.

Vice Chair Halsted had a comment for the Port: We have been unsuccessful at providing any haul-out facilities for slightly, larger boats along the waterfront either at South Beach Marina or here; I am hoping that the Port is attentive to that in the future particularly maintaining a boat yard somewhere nearby.

Mr. Williamson commented: There is a boat ramp slightly south of the project that is used today to take boats in by car. We have invested in that and plan to maintain it going forward.

Commissioner Zwissler was recognized: This is a fabulous project, A+. I am curious why we are imposing restrictions on programming the space. Public access if it's a festival, if it's a farmer's market, if it's a movie night; why are we imposing limits on the definition of public access?

Mr. Lavine replied: The Commission has advisory, design guidelines that do promote activation of the shoreline through special events in places where it is appropriate. They also recognize that there is a counter-point to that in that some parts of the shoreline it is appropriate to have more contemplative, passive recreation.

The over-arching goal is to provide both. As a Commission there have been a number of projects where we have imposed controls in one shape or form whether it is on the duration, the type of event, the timing of event that aimed to hit that sweet spot.

In addition to the controls that we have imposed which are primarily check-ins we have proposed a 10-year authorization with reporting on how the public space is functioning and requesting if modifications are needed along the way that the permittees come back and we will work with them to help make modifications to ensure the space is well utilized.

The project actually came with limitations baked in. And that was part of the negotiations between the Port as the landlord and the Giants as the developer.

Commissioner Zwissler added: I would just encourage us to think more creatively. I understand there may be other limitations here, but certain places call for contemplative, quiet things. This calls for a party. (Laughter)

Chair Wasserman commented: One of the concerns which I don't think applies to this project but to some similar things is that there can be over-use for private events, charged or uncharged. I think that is part of what is behind the overall policy. I don't think it is an issue at this location.

Commissioner Alvarado commented: This is very impressive, public-access facilities and beautiful renderings. You referenced the squares and piazzas in Europe. I want to mention that there are plazas all over Latin America that are gorgeous spaces and also important, public, gathering places for the community. I wanted to put that on your radar screen.

With regard to private use and access is there an opportunity to look at a sliding scale of fees for those that are lower or limited-income for individuals and groups who might want to use the facilities for their own private use?

Mr. Bair commented: The Park itself is free and is open to the public. We also have as part of our commitment with the City to have discounted office for non-profits and neighborhood groups and space for community meetings in our project. Forty percent of the housing is affordable that ranges from 45 percent of AMI to 150 which is more towards nurses and non-profit workers and such. The project is meant to be readily accessible and open for the people that live there and the whole community and it is designed with an open invitation to be a place where the City congregates. From my perspective it is very open.

The private events we are talking about we negotiated with the City and there is a maximum of 18 private events to a relatively, confined footprint that can occur each year and can take no more than 30 percent of the China Basin Park for those 18 days.

BCDC and the City took their responsibility very seriously to make sure that these spaces always feel very open to the public.

By having all of these events and these farmer's markets and art fairs and movie nights this will become a place where people really do feel welcomed and will come.

Commissioner Peskin commented: Do I have to vote on this any more times? I think this is like the fifth time I've had to vote on it. (Laughter) To my former next-door neighbor and to all of the folks at the Port I don't have any questions and I am happy to make a set of findings based on your presentation and all of the documentation and congratulate you. It has been a long road. There have been a few bumps along the way.

Not only did the Board of Supervisors vote for this unanimously the voters of San Francisco approved this in the form of Proposition D back in November of 2015.

So, you have done your homework and I am proud to support this and happy to make a motion when the time is right.

Chair Wasserman commented: I want to join in the commendations. Just as you showed slides of things that inspired what you have designed I have absolutely no doubt we are going to see slides of this inspiring others to model you for the comprehensiveness of it but also the way this will activate and make it a much better, livelier place.

Commissioner Peskin was recognized: I think we can find that the proposed fill which is de minimis in the form of that dock in Phase 2 is consistent with the McAteer-Petris Act and Bay Plan Policies on allowable fill. I think as demonstrated in the presentation of documents the public access is the maximum, feasible consistent with the Act and Bay Plan Policies on public access including those related to sea level rise. The proposed project is consistent with Bay Plan Policies on recreation and is consistent with policies on appearance, design and scenic views and is consistent with the public trust and the terms of the Burton Act as indeed the Port of San Francisco holds this property in trust for the people of the great state of California. And I would move that we approve the project with staff recommendations.

Mr. Lavine stated: The staff has also recommended approval of the project with conditions as they are outlined in the staff recommendation.

Chair Wasserman asked: Are the applicants willing to accept the recommendations and conditions?

Mr. Bair replied: Yes, we are.

Mr. Williamson replied: As is the Port.

Commissioner Sweet commented: Michael Sweet speaking on behalf of Representative Phil Ting. We are very excited about the project. Assembly Member Ting wanted me to thank the Giants and express appreciation and the recognition of the fact that this project brings much needed housing, the use of open space, shore access as it addresses the concerns of sea level rise and personally is a former resident of the neighborhood before the ballpark was built and a neighbor of the Giants for the first 10 years that it was open I have no doubt that this will also be a huge success and that I am pleased to see that they are continuing to work with the neighbors and to listen to the community and to do the right thing and make this an energetic and lively and exciting project that will be to great benefit of all; those who live there now and those who will live there in the future and recreate there.

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

VOTE: The motion carried with a roll call vote of 18-0-1 with Commissioners Addiego, Ahn, Butt, Gilmore, Scharff, Gorin, Jahns, Ajami, Peskin, Ranchod, Sears, Showalter, Vasquez, Techel, Wagenknecht, Zwissler, Vice Chair Halsted and Chair Wasserman voting, "YES", no "NO", votes and Commissioner Alvarado abstaining.

10. Briefing on NOAA's Marine Debris Removal Grant. Chair Wasserman announced: That brings us to Item 10.

Mr. McCrea addressed the Commission: Brad McCrea speaking on behalf of Adrienne Klein who is unable to be here today.

I am happy to introduce Sherry Lippiatt but I want to give you a little bit of background and remind you of a few things about abandoned vessels and marine debris.

Five years ago, you received a briefing on abandoned vessels and marine debris in the San Francisco Bay. At that meeting in 2013 you heard presentations from three different organizations: The Division of Boating and Waterways presented its grant funding program called SAVE, the Contra Costa Sheriff's Office described its efforts to manage its Abandoned and Derelict Vessel Program in the Delta, and Richardson Bay Regional Agency presented information about its efforts to remove vessels from and manage the anchorage in Richardson Bay and Marin County.

The following year in 2014 you received a briefing from the California Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery otherwise known as CalRecycle and the U.S. EPA on an inter-agency, six-million-dollar abandoned and derelict vessel cleanup in the Oakland/Alameda Estuary.

Well, today in 2018 abandoned and derelict vessels abatement remains an ongoing challenge in our region.

Today I am pleased to introduce Sherry Lippiatt the California Regional Coordinator for the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's Marine Debris Program.

NOAA's Marine Debris Program is authorized by Congress to work on marine debris through the Marine Debris Research Prevention Reduction Act signed into law in 2006 and amended in 2012. The Act requires the program to "identify, determine sources of, assess, prevent, reduce and remove marine debris and address the adverse impacts of marine debris on the economy of the United States, marine environment and navigation safety."

Sherry will brief you on one element of this comprehensive program; an annual, grant-funding opportunity that can assist with removal of abandoned and derelict vessels and other types of marine debris.

Ms. Lippiatt addressed the Commission: I am going to speak on our community-based, marine debris removal grant program. First, a brief introduction to our program; we were established in 2006 by the Federal Marine Debris Act and our mission is to investigate and prevent the adverse impacts of marine debris.

We address this issue through five main program pillars. The first and most important is prevention. We have another bi-annual, grant opportunity targeting prevention of marine debris through behavior change. It is going beyond just education and outreach and actually trying to change public behaviors.

The second is removal which I will speak about today.

The third is research. We also have a bi-annual, research, grant opportunity to help us better understand the impacts of marine debris.

The fourth is emergency response. Our legislation mandates that we help to coordinate the response to what are called severe marine-debris generating events. This can be things like the earthquake and tsunami in Japan in 2011 and the debris generated by that which was arriving on U.S. shorelines as well as major storms and hurricanes.

Then lastly, regional coordination. I am one of 10 regional coordinators that are situated around the country and work with local partners to address local, debris issues.

Our official definition of marine debris is any solid, man-made material that is in the marine environment that is not meant to be there. This ranges from tiny pieces of micro-plastics and micro-beads to consumer items, everyday litter, lost fishing gear and abandoned or derelict vessels.

The Removal Grant Program is a national program. Our recipients are anyone other than the federal government. Federal, government agencies can be a partner on projects and projects can occur on federal lands, but the recipients have to be a non-federal entity.

Since 2006 we have had more than 100 different projects nationwide and have removed more than 5,500 metric tons of debris.

This past year in fiscal year '18 we received 38 different proposals which requested over \$4.3 million. On a nationwide basis we awarded about \$1.4 million in funding to 12 different proposals. So, it is about a 1 in 3 success rate this year.

The awards typically range from about \$50,000 to \$150,000. That amount can be increased with habitat monitoring which I will talk about in a moment. It does require a 1 to 1, in-kind match. It doesn't have to be cash but there is in our legislation it requires that our grant funding has a 1 to 1 match.

The priorities of the program are debris removal to benefit coastal habitat, waterways and NOAA trust resources so it is essentially any living, marine resources and their habitats.

It does target lost fishing gear and other medium or large-scale debris. We have had a number of abandoned and derelict vessel projects, but this isn't typically a grant opportunity for your day-to-day beach cleanup or other items that can be removed by hand.

Most awards do include a component of outreach to foster increased awareness on the impacts of marine debris.

We are interested in research to better understand the recovery of habitats after debris is removed to be able to incorporate debris into more restoration funding. For projects that are proposing to monitor the habitat post-debris removal we do allow for award extensions up to three years or more and up to an additional \$100,000.

We have a couple of examples in California to give you a flavor of the types of projects. One is down at San Diego Bay at the A8 anchorage. This is a project with the Port of San Diego and it was a three-phase project.

They received funding in fiscal years 2007, 2009 and 2012. In total they removed 447 tons of debris which included a number of vessels, various boat parts, appliances – they actually removed a kitchen sink. (Laughter)

The methods were commercial, skilled divers and a ship-based crane to lift stuff out of the Bay.

We had a local project with the San Francisco Bay Keeper at Point Molate. This was in fiscal year '12. They removed 100 tons of debris from the Point Molate Beach Park and this contributed to the reopening of the Park. A lot this debris was creosote pilings that had washed up as well as other larger items like tires and metal pieces.

At the U.S./Mexico border at the Tijuana National Estuarine Research Reserve we have been supporting them for a few years now. In the Tijuana River most of the watershed is in Mexico and there is a tremendous amount of sediment and trash that washes down from the canyons in Tijuana on to the U.S. side into the Reserve.

They have constructed these sediment basins and a spoon system to capture a tremendous amount of the sediment and the trash that is washing down. We have supported maintenance and clean out of these sediment booms as well as some volunteer cleanups in the riparian, upstream areas. They have removed more than one million pounds of debris since 2014.

And then another more recent project with Save Our Shores down in Monterey Bay was funded. This is a fiscal year '17 project. They expect to remove seven tons of debris from three different watersheds that feed into the sanctuary. This is kayak-based cleanups that allow them to get to hard-to-reach areas. They are removing some small debris but also larger, agricultural debris as well as illegally-dumped debris that is typically left behind by migrant workers when they are moving out of the region.

The timeline for our fiscal year '19 grant opportunities is that the federal, funding opportunity is expected to be published online in August of this year and the proposals would be due in October.

There is a thorough selection and negotiation process that would go through about March of 2019 and then funds becoming available in August. So, it is kind of a full year process.

And that is all I have, and I am happy to take any questions.

Executive Director Goldzband commented: First of all, it's too bad that Adrienne is not here and that she couldn't make it today because she really wanted you all to hear about this because she and we firmly believe that as counties and cities you all should think about the possibility that you can apply for these funds.

And when you consider that 1 out of 3 applications the last time around were accepted it is a pretty darn good opportunity in terms of the odds.

We want to make sure that you got this information and you brought it back to the folks on your staff because we do think it is an excellent opportunity.

Chair Wasserman added: I share in that and would encourage people to do that. The fundamental issue was driven home to me earlier this year when we were snorkeling off the coast of New Guinea in Indonesia and we would be on gorgeous water, beaches far away from anything that would be covered with all kinds of debris including shoes, clothing and a lot of very bad, small things that are very dangerous for sea birds.

I thank you very much for the presentation and the effort and that concludes this presentation. Unless anybody has something burning to say I would entertain a motion to adjourn.

11. Adjournment. Upon motion by Commissioner Vasquez, seconded by Commissioner Wagenknecht, the Commission meeting was adjourned at 3:25 p.m.