

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

December 28, 2018

TO: Environmental Justice Commissioner Working Group

FROM: Steve Goldbeck, Chief Deputy Director (415/352-3611; steve.goldbeck@bcdc.ca.gov)

Jessica Fain, Planning Director (415/352- 3642; Jessica.fain@bcdc.ca.gov)

Shannon Fiala, Planning Manager (415/352-3665; shannon.fiala@bcdc.ca.gov)

Clesi Bennett, Coastal Planner (415/352-3613; clesi.bennett@bcdc.ca.gov)

SUBJECT: Draft Meeting Summary of December 6, 2018, Environmental Justice Commissioner Working Group Meeting

1. **Roll Call, Introductions, and Approval of Agenda.** The meeting was called to order by Chair Commissioner Alvarado at the Bay Area Metro Center, 375 Beale Street, Claremont Room, First Floor, San Francisco, California, at 11:21 a.m. Working Group members in attendance included Chair Teresa Alvarado, Commissioner Sheri Pemberton (via teleconference), Commissioner Pat Showalter. Not present were Commissioner John Vasquez and Commissioner Eddie Ahn. Staff in attendance included Chief Deputy Director Steve Goldbeck, Chief of Federal Consistency and Permits Erik Buehmann, Planning Director Jessica Fain, Planning Manager Shannon Fiala, Planner Clesi Bennett, Planner Megan Hall, Research Analyst Heather Dennis, and Enforcement Analyst Matthew Trujillo. Also in attendance was Lisa Domitrovich with the San Francisco Estuary Institute, Sumi Selvaraz of the Coastal Commission, Ann Cook with the Port of San Francisco, and Erica Rippe of the Center for Creative Land Recycling.

2. **Approval of the November 1, 2018 Environmental Justice Commissioner Working Group Meeting Summary.** Commissioner Showalter moved approval of the November 1, 2018 meeting minutes, seconded by Chair Alvarado. The motion passed by voice vote with no objections or abstentions.

3. **Environmental Justice and Social Equity Bay Plan Amendment Timeline Update.** Chair Alvarado continued: We are presenting today our status and our progress on the Environmental Justice and Bay Plan Amendments and Clesi Bennett will update us.

Planner Clesi Bennett presented the following: As far as the timeline is concerned everything is still the same as we presented to you at the last meeting with the touchstones being a public workshop at the Commission meeting the third Thursday in January, publishing a draft staff planning report in May and going to our first public hearing the third week of July. We could have a vote potentially in September of next year.

ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE COMMISSIONER GROUP SUMMARY
December 6, 2018

It looks like things are going to work out with the Resources Legacy Fund and the Environmental Justice Coalition for Water to bring in some community voices.

The hope is that they will participate in the workshop in January and they will also give us a recommendation and comment on our draft plan.

4. Discussion on BCDC's Bay Plan Policies Regarding Mitigation. Today's discussion is the last of the policy areas that we are discussing. We started with public access and then we talked about shoreline protection. Today we are going to talk about mitigation.

These were the three sections of the Bay Plan that were identified in 2017 to amend for incorporating environmental justice and social equity.

The project goal of this amendment is to amend the San Francisco Bay Plan to incorporate principles of environmental justice and social equity into the planning, design, and permitting of shoreline projects in and along the San Francisco Bay.

Today we will go through the basics of mitigation at BCDC, go through our policies, talk about the intersection of mitigation and environmental justice and then end with some questions and discussion for the group.

I want to give the opportunity for any of our regulatory folks or any our other staff members to add any anecdotes with their experience of working with these policies.

BCDC regulatory requirements require project proponents to lessen or to eliminate adverse environmental impacts. First, we prefer that folks avoid these impacts. Second, we would want them to minimize them. And if they can't avoid or minimize them, then they need to compensate for these environmental impacts with some kind of mitigation action.

For us, this typically refers to the creation, restoration, enhancement, or preservation of habitat.

We have been requiring mitigation since the 1970s. We had our first Bay Plan mitigation policies in 1985 and these were amended in 2002. There is also a mitigation amendment that was identified at the end of the Commissioner workshops series on rising sea levels in 2017.

Our authority to require mitigation is derived from the different laws that govern us especially the McAteer-Petris Act. The part of the Act that gives us this authority is through our ability to condition our permits for placing fill in the Bay.

Bay Plan mitigation policy one goes through our preference of minimizing or avoiding impacts before we mitigate them. The second section defines what the environment is. It typically refers to habitat.

Our second policy explains that mitigation should be informed by the Baylands Ecosystem Habitat Goals Report that is put out by the restoration community of the Bay Area.

The third policy explains that the commission should consider benefits to society that Bay natural resources provide when requiring mitigation.

The fourth policy explains that type of mitigation should be based on a rationale that includes probability of success, timing as well as quality of functions.

The fifth policy is to ensure sustainability over time. And the sixth policy is about the timing of the mitigation. We prefer mitigation to occur prior or concurrently to any project impacts.

The next policy gets into what a mitigation program should include. This includes goals and standards as well as long-term plans for the mitigation projects.

We have a policy about coordinating with the other agencies who would be involved in the mitigation including local, state and federal agencies.

Policy 9 talks about the Commission's need to considering the different costs of alternatives if more than one alternative is presented.

The tenth policy allows the Commission to require mitigation banking for a small project if mitigation at the site is not possible and the last policy allows fee-based mitigation if we can't do mitigation measures at the site.

You can see some different types of mitigation that we have required in the past on the screen.

In the past, most of our mitigation work has been done on site which we prefer. Most of our mitigation is occurring concurrently up until 2000. We don't have data about when mitigation is occurring after that. We are working on researching this.

An intersection of mitigation and environmental justice could be the location of the mitigation. Is it close to the impacted site or close to the impacted community? Is there any community involvement in determining the mitigation from the site selection, the design, the construction, or the monitoring and evaluation into the future? And, lastly, an intersection of environmental justice and mitigation could include the consideration of any social or community impacts? Could the mitigation itself be social in nature and not necessarily just habitat creation or restoration but instead something like a community benefit program.

Here you see a few examples of social mitigation on the screen. DTSC recently had legislation to consider environmental justice and equity in their permitting process. One of the things that they have been looking at is mitigation. They are considering having a community-developed clearinghouse for mitigation projects that were prioritized by the communities that may be affected. They are also taking into consideration community vulnerability.

In another example, Chevron is providing community benefits over a 10-year period to the city of Richmond. These are examples of community and social benefits to mitigate this project.

Our next steps that we could take with the mitigation policies are to amend the current policies, to add policies to the section, and to improve our coordination with local governments and other appropriate agencies depending on our ability to incorporate social impacts into our mitigation work.

I would like to open it up to any questions you might have or any comments that regulatory staff would like to make about what it's like working with these policies.

Chair Alvarado commented: Something that has come up a lot is how improvements to public infrastructure add to displacement pressures. How do we look at our work and the impacts it has on economic and other social dislocation?

Ms. Bennett asked for clarification: You are asking, could we take that into consideration in our mitigation – the displacement?

Chair Alvarado explained: I didn't necessarily go there; I'm just saying that we did an approval recently for those buttresses that were from the old Bay Bridge. Maybe we should be looking at it from the standpoint of the surrounding communities and doing an analysis. An example is the 11th Street Bridge Project in Washington, D.C. It is going to link a very old, economically-challenged community over the Anacostia River to another part of D.C. that is very, very wealthy. They are looking at one mile from the bottom of the Bridge. They are going to funnel lots of community-benefit monies from the project as part of the mitigation. It was the issue of the radius that they used from the end of their project that was interesting.

Commissioner Showalter commented: I keep coming back to the idea of creating small-business opportunities. There seems to me there is a lot of opportunities for snack shops and kayak rentals and little boat rentals; lots of little enterprises that are pretty sparse. That would be something that would be valuable. Improvements to small businesses like that are important because they are recreational and public-access related.

Some day when the Bay Trail and the Water Trail are completed, there will be tour groups that come out and have people bicycle around the whole Bay Area and they will need to have places to stay and places to have lunch and those sorts of things.

Chair Alvarado added: The Atlanta Beltline has been grappling with this. They have developed 60 miles of trails and they have put in place some policies around EJ and community improvement.

Chief Deputy Director Goldzband asked: Clesi, did you mention public benefits/public detriments in the McAteer-Petris Act because I keep looking at it wondering if we can find some basis for mitigation there. It states that fill should be authorized only when public benefits from fill clearly exceed public detriment from the loss of the water areas and should be limited.

Public benefits definitely include those environmental justice members of the public and also it furthers the public good for environmental justice to be served. That is where a lot of our mitigation policies find a basis in the Act in terms of requiring mitigation for impacts to habitat. I'm wondering if there is some room there to look at social impacts as well. That is something that we might want to talk further on.

Ms. Bennett responded: Right. One of the issues I have been thinking about is that is not only true for fill projects but how can we do that for shoreline projects? We have less authority in the shoreline band than we do in the Bay water. In the shoreline band we can only deny a permit if it fails to provide maximum feasible public access or is inconsistent with our Priority Use Area designations.

Mr. Erik Buehmann commented: The Commission has a lot more authority in the Bay. A project has to have more benefits than detriments, it has to be the minimum amount of fill necessary, it has to be sound and adhere to safety standards and you have to minimize impacts to resources.

In the shoreline band if you have some kind of species or something in an upland area the Commission wouldn't have any authority there.

Chair Alvarado inquired about jobs: To what extent can we recommend local hire provisions? As these improvements are made you have to hire firms. Have you guys looked at that legally?

Commissioner Showalter replied: We have looked at this in Mountain View and I don't know the outcome. I know that we provide that as a condition of approval particularly on city-owned land. We encourage it, but I am not sure how strong that is.

Ms. Bennett added: I know that the San Francisco Bay Restoration Authority who gives out the Measure AA funding for restoration; one of the prioritization criteria talks about local benefits and local hire. They had some representatives from environmental-justice communities speak to them at their Advisory Committee meeting a few months back and that was big topic. It was discussed, can we ensure or how can we bolster the amount of local labor that is involved in the designing and the construction itself but also the long-term maintenance and monitoring of the project? I don't know if they have done any specific guidelines around that, but I know that it is an issue that has come up.

Ms. Ann Cook with the Port of San Francisco commented: The City has pretty extensive levels for this and the Port has its own pools as well. The system for local hires on the waterfront is pretty well developed.

Commissioner Showalter stated: I think the idea of having volunteer monitoring be part of some of the monitoring plans is a really good way to involve the community.

Chair Alvarado continued: So, on this question of can or should BCDC require mitigation for social impacts; can you talk a little bit more about that?

Ms. Bennett replied: Obviously cities can do it as seen in the example with Chevron and the city of Richmond. We should have a discussion on what BCDC can regulate and what we can include for our mitigation.

Mr. Buehmann explained: Any mitigation has to be related to certain effects. Those impacts have to be impacts that BCDC actually has the authority to regulate.

In the Bay there is broad authority to regulate safety of fills and the impacts and possibly the full benefits and the detriments of the fill.

In the shoreline band the authority is much more limited. You are talking about mostly public access. Any project has to provide maximum feasible public access consistent with the project. Sometimes there is an element that will impact existing access, so they will have to offset that. On top of that any public access that is lost needs to be offset.

The policies are talking about that mitigation has to be geographically close to the impact. The benefits of the mitigation should go to the community that is being impacted. That sort of fits in with this.

Commissioner Showalter commented: I wonder about that principle that mitigation should be close to the project and if that is really a good one scientifically. I have worked a lot on habitat conservation plans. From a biological sense you put the mitigation where it is going to do the most good. In many old-school, city projects of the past mitigation were just beautification. They didn't do much for the environment.

I wonder in the context of the Bay is putting the mitigation adjacent to the project always or often the best outcome? I doubt it.

Mr. Buehmann chimed in: That is interesting because we have had discussions about a big, wide mitigation plan allocating really good places to do restoration and establishing mitigation-priority areas. We could fill in one place and mitigate across the Bay in some other location and there could be some sort of accounting of how those impacts offset each other.

Commissioner Showalter added: I know that is not the current system that we have. Within a social-justice, point-of-view the mitigation might not be adjacent or really close or it might be.

Ms. Bennett stated: And if we were to create some kind of region-wide plan with priority areas we would want to make sure that the communities that are going to be impacted are in favor of these measures. We also want to make sure that there isn't displacement that is going to occur with the project.

Mr. Buehmann continued: Mitigation is pretty broad and it's not just wetlands restoration. It can also be fill removal because the mitigation is supposed to be similar to the impact.

A couple of years ago we had the project at the Ferry Building to redo the Ferry Plaza. The mitigation for that fill was fill removal in Richmond. And some of the Commissioners asked, why is it going all the way over to Richmond? Why is it not here in this community? And that was a good question.

Mr. Goldbeck stated: The concern was that there was not some fill removal project that was cost effective nearby. That is an issue and there is also an issue with the Bay Bridge funds that were used in the North Bay to help acquire one of the islands. There was some concern that the community that might have been impacted wasn't seeing the benefit or the benefit was being seen somewhere else.

It seems like in terms of what we could do within our existing law and policies would be to have something that discusses that. Mitigation should look at the impacts to the adjacent, affected communities. We need to make sure that they are down with what happens and also what happens isn't somewhere else and they are just seeing the impacts.

Chair Alvarado commented: The path that you are going down about identifying priority development areas or priority investment areas could be a way for us to start the conversation with communities about what kind of mitigations make sense in those areas.

There are three different things that are pulled together. One is the geographic focus areas. Two is that then that can be the basis of conversations with those communities. And then three, during mitigation actually specifying where we want mitigation to take place; maybe we look at other factors like where we can leverage other funding opportunities, where there are other things that we can leverage and build on.

Ms. Bennett added: Another thing I thought about is coordination with the other agencies who may be requiring these types of community benefits or different mitigation projects that may have gone through a robust community process. Could we coordinate with them to align our requirements? This might be something to explore.

Commissioner Showalter stated: That is a really good idea. BCDC could build on the existing mitigation. I think you do that occasionally. That could be very valuable.

Mr. Buehmann added: Another thing that we don't do is alternative mitigation like funding a volunteer monitoring corps or something like that.

Ms. Erica Rippe commented: I am with a non-profit in Oakland called the Center for Creative Land Recycling. I came by to see what was going on. We do consulting on contaminated sites. We are looking at displacement in our 2019 planning. We have collaborated with DTSC on some capacity-building training mostly with their southern California offices.

Ms. Sumi Salvaraj with the California Coastal Commission commented: We are thinking about a lot of safety issues. The way we do permitting regulation is different from BCDC. We are in a very similar phase in thinking about where are the legal barriers.

The way our laws were amended it is not in our standard of review. Environmental justice is in a separate section. The Commissioners can consider environmental justice when acting on a permit, but we have been thinking a lot about how do we look at environmental justice or community impacts and how do they link to our existing policies.

On some levels it is all about a shift in how we do our analysis. The way we look at or analyze impacts is because we are focusing on a certain area or a certain scale, so it is the way the process is designed is what we are hearing from environmental justice communities or disadvantage areas; in some cases, we don't know where our mitigation fees should go. If the impact from coastal development is happening in another area and we have findings to show that linking its public access maybe we might be able to condition it in a way that results in public access mitigation that is benefitting these sorts of impacts.

We also want to be careful about tying it to our standard of review. Part of it is coming down to where we are getting our information from. A developer may leave out certain aspects of the impacts of development that affect the community where the project is going in.

Ms. Fiala commented: The Coastal Commission already does public-access mitigation for impacts to beaches. Even that could be something that we could explore.

Ms. Lisa Domitrovich of SFEI commented: I had a comment about the social fund to encourage participation and how that could be useful. Funding people economically to be able to attend meetings is good.

Chair Alvarado added: The San Jose City Council voted on the Google land sale deal which is a huge story. I was there from 2:30 until 12:30 a.m. It was a noticeably different crowd after the 5:30 break. The chambers were very full and a lot more community voices were there. It was very different from the 2:30 to 5:00 p.m. crowd. This speaks to peoples' ability to participate.

Ms. Cook spoke: I came across a program that the Regional Quality Water Control Board has. When they have a discharge, they have a list of projects where they seek out fines. We are trying to get this list because this seems like a great way to say, you did this bad thing and we will take your money and we're going to do good things with it. It is something to look into.

Commissioner Showalter added: California Fish and Wildlife Service keeps that list. I worked on a project once that got some of that money. It is a project-fined list.

Ms. Selvaraj added: I know that Point Blue has been working to update a similar list for shovel-ready restoration projects throughout the area.

Mr. Buehmann stated: We have an account with the Coastal Conservancy and that fund is used for ongoing projects that qualify for the monies. Funds from Enforcement go into the Bay Fill Clean-up and Abatement Fund which is used to fund certain staff on a temporary basis.

Mr. Goldbeck commented: When Eric says that the Coastal Conservancy can do what they like with these monies they already know the kinds of projects that we want them to spend it on. So, it isn't like they can do anything they want with it, but they don't have to pick some specific project. It can go to a good deserving project that is shovel-ready.

Commissioner Pemberton commented: I am having trouble hearing everybody unless it is Clesi. So, I haven't heard a lot of what has been said.

I didn't get a chance to see the presentation that Clesi emailed and I am actually driving right now to the meeting. I will have a few minutes to look it over when I get there.

Ms. Bennett asked Commissioner Pemberton: Do you all do mitigation work? Are you thinking about incorporating environmental justice into your work?

Commissioner Pemberton replied: I am not sure. I know we do some mitigation work. With our new policies, we will be considering incorporating environmental justice into it. We are transitioning into implementing this. We are going to be learning more as we go during this first year. I think the answer would be – yes.

Mr. Trujillo commented: There may be an opportunity in this conversation to talk about mitigation for social impacts and how they might affect EJ communities. Shouldn't we be looking at the needs of the particular community that may not necessarily be in the Bay or in the shoreline where things like funding or support can go to stabilize and help develop the community?

This could be things like infrastructure improvements or educational initiatives – all kinds of stuff. These communities have very specific needs and that is why they are in states of disrepair and disadvantage. Maybe there are ways to provide more resources to address the special needs of that particular community.

We could help them prepare for sea level rise or climate change impacts – things like that.

Chair Alvarado stated: That goes back to our ability to fund outside of our core.

Ms. Bennett continued: The idea of helping communities prepare for sea level rise seems like it would be more possible.

Ms. Fiala added: We are already doing that in eastern Contra Costa County where we have an Adapting Rising to Tides project. It is outside of our jurisdiction.

Chair Alvarado asked: And how was that approved? Was there any concern about that?

Ms. Fiala explained: It is a partnership with the Delta Stewardship Council and they wanted to bring our expertise toward the Delta with a potential for an expansion to Adapting to Rising Tides Delta. They are trying to apply BCDC's methods outside of our jurisdiction.

Mr. Goldbeck added: Our planning program isn't limited to our jurisdiction. We are looking at the bigger picture of how the Bay affects communities, so we can look beyond our jurisdictions. In fact, most of the Adapting to Rising Tides program is looking at inundation areas that are beyond the Bay and the 100-foot shoreline band.

There is no question about using these funds outside of the Bay. There is nothing that would preclude us from doing that. My guess is we would probably want to do something with communities that are adjacent but most of the communities are outside of the immediate, 100-foot, shoreline band.

Chair Alvarado continued: And then we could look to prospective partners like the Water District or even philanthropic. We should add those other agencies and funders to our list when we are ready to roll this out and start identifying potential opportunities.

Ms. Bennett added: I think it would be worth it to get conversations with some of these groups who may be developing these lists. We should ask, what are their criteria? Are they taking equity into consideration? Have they done any community engagement or even just conversations with communities about those projects? Maybe that is a potential next step on this specific subject for us internally.

Ms. Selvaraj asked: Going back to the ART Project and the planning scope being outside of the shoreline band and the jurisdiction; how much have local governments used the ART work in incorporating this into their general plans? Has there been any sort of connection because there is a possibility for general plan updates on environmental justice with certain conditions?

Ms. Fiala replied: We've been in touch with OPR and talking about the most recent information that has just come out. Another project update is that we are actually devoting another round of NOAA funding to this project and as a part of that we have added on some additional deliverables which will achieve some of our Strategic Plan objectives. We will be able to not only train our internal staff on the outcomes of this process but also to train local governments on how BCDC regulations have changed and to think about how we could improve our engagement in general with these communities through our permitting and planning.

Beyond those things that we have committed to it would be incredible if we could connect the work of the ART Program more into the work of local governments and the general plans and zoning because in lieu of expanding our jurisdiction in the shoreline band that would be a way to try implement some of BCDC's work.

Chair Alvarado inquired: How extensively are these shoreline inundation and climate issues incorporated into general plans? Are there specific plans for Alviso or for east Mountain View that take into consideration climate impacts?

Commissioner Showalter explained: In Mountain View and Palo Alto there are certain things incorporated. I don't know that they are necessarily part of the general plan. I would assume that they are. There are plans that have been done to protect from sea level rise.

What there isn't, is that connected tissue between the communities. That is something that I worry about.

Ms. Cook stated: The state Office of Planning and Research (OPR) has new guidelines for general plans that they put out last year. They have done a fairly broad overview of how you could incorporate environmental justice and climate change into the general plan.

Chair Alvarado asked: Can we have a presentation on that at some point?

Ms. Bennett replied: We did it a few months ago. We went over the SB 1000 general plan requirements for environmental justice. I am happy to send around those slides again.

Ms. Cook stated: We are updating our Waterfront Plan and they give examples of policies that other jurisdictions have done. I found it really helpful.

Ms. Fiala spoke: And the city of San Francisco will be implementing SB 1000. They haven't decided yet whether they would try to integrate EJ into their existing elements or whether they would create a stand-alone, EJ policy. They are just starting on that.

Ms. Dennis asked: Was your question about how local general plans incorporate sea level rise, climate change, and EJ? In the Adapting to Rising Tides Program, we spent a lot of time looking at all of these plans. It varies widely and vastly throughout the region.

Sometimes it is in the general plan and sometimes it is in the hazard mitigation plans. It is often in the hazard mitigation plans. Sometimes there is sort of an action plan. It really varies throughout the region.

Something that we have actually found in the ART Bay Area project is oftentimes we will find vulnerable communities are an exception. Those are often the areas where climate change, flooding, and sea level rise are not addressed in the general plan or the hazard mitigation plan.

So, for the Adapting to Rising Tides project that we are doing now which is a regional project, we are looking at 12 defined vulnerable communities based on certain characteristics. Through this project several of those communities end up being in areas that the general plans don't address.

Mr. Goldbeck added: There is state legislation that is requiring that cities and counties provide a climate plan and it is supposed to be in the hazard plan or their general plan update. It has to be done when they update.

As Commissioner Vasquez said at the last meeting some folks don't update their plans for decades. Part of the dynamic is change as these climate impacts are becoming more obvious.

Ms. Fiala added: What Planning staff can do is write comments on general plan updates as they happen.

Commissioner Showalter commented: In Mountain View, I don't know how well EJ is incorporated into the general plan. We have a very extensive climate action plan. We put together an environmental sustainability short-term action plan that is three years long to carry out the climate action plan. We are about to start our fourth one.

Chair Alvarado asked: Clesi is there anything that we should be thinking about? This is the final item on the agenda.

Ms. Bennett continued: We may not get to it depending on how long the closed session goes. I am happy to give a review of what we are going to say. We are going to go through a little bit of the history of how BCDC has progressed on this topic.

Chair Alvarado announced: Council member Showalter is leaving the Mountain View Council, but we are hopeful that we are going to find another way for her to continue to be involved in this committee and serve as my alternate on the Commission.

You are incredibly valuable not only here on this committee but on the Commission as well.

Chair Alvarado stated: If we do have this item today at the Commission meeting I will be gone because I have a flight at 4:30. Would you mind chairing this item?

Ms. Bennett continued: I am going to talk a little bit the different processes that BCDC went through that led to the identification of this amendment as something that the Commission wanted to do. Then we will get into a little bit of a vague timeline of the upcoming amendment.

I will give some future dates. Like I said in the beginning the January 17th workshop, the staff planning report in May and then our first hearing in July.

We will give a little overview about some of the things that we have already done in terms of scoping and organizing and background research. We will talk about BCDC's role around the Bay and why this is an issue that we should be looking at and go over the project goals.

We will talk about the sections that were identified from the Bay Plan. Today we talked about mitigation. I will dive into each of those based on the conversations that we had in these meetings as well as research I have done, conversations with staff and conversations with environmental justice groups and communities. So, we'll be covering public access, shoreline protection, and mitigation. We'll talk about some of the other issues that have come up that don't necessarily fit into those three sections.

It will be a brief overview to let folks know what we have talked about so far as well as get those dates on their calendars.

Chair Alvarado stated: And one of the questions that might come up is clarity around what is BCDC's authority around these issues. So, somebody will be teed up to talk about that?

Ms. Bennett answered: Yes, our Chief Counsel Marc Zeppetello will be able to talk about that from a legal standpoint.

Ms. Fiala added: And at our next Commissioner Working Group meeting we were hoping to start talking with you all how we will run our first workshop.

Ms. Bennett stated: And that actually brings me to the question of are you guys going to be here on the third of January? We will keep that meeting on the calendar.

Chair Alvarado continued: And then if it looks like it is running tight who is going to make the call? I assume it is Larry. I just don't want it to be a rush. It really deserves the full airing. There has been an incredible amount of work and it could be a new topic for many or they might have their own expertise to share from other jurisdictions that would be valuable for our staff to capture. I just hope it is not a rushed item.

Ms. Bennett added: Perhaps it then would be pushed to the third since we are not having a meeting on the 20th.

Mr. Goldbeck stated: I will talk with Larry and Zach and if it is way at the end then everybody is leaving. That sometimes happens to these presentations. I guess it would be better for us to do it on the third because January 3rd at this point is not a very crowded agenda.

Commissioner Showalter opined: I think it needs at least 10 or 15 minutes at the very least.

Chair Alvarado asked: Any other things that you need us to respond to?

Ms. Bennet replied: I want to thank everyone for coming.

Chair Alvarado closed: Thank you everyone.

5. Public Comment. This item was not discussed.

6. Adjournment. There being no further business, Chair Alvarado adjourned the meeting at 12:26 p.m.