

# San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission

375 Beale Street, Suite 510, San Francisco, California 94105 tel 415 352 3600  
State of California | Gavin Newsom – Governor | [info@bcdcd.ca.gov](mailto:info@bcdcd.ca.gov) | [www.bcdcd.ca.gov](http://www.bcdcd.ca.gov)

December 1, 2023

**TO:** All Commissioners and Alternates

**FROM:** Lawrence J. Goldzband, Executive Director (415/352-3653; [larry.goldzband@bcdcd.ca.gov](mailto:larry.goldzband@bcdcd.ca.gov))  
Reylina Ruiz, Director, Administrative & Technology Services (415/352-3638; [reylina.Ruiz@bcdcd.ca.gov](mailto:reylina.Ruiz@bcdcd.ca.gov))

**SUBJECT: Draft Minutes of November 16, 2023 Hybrid Commission Meeting**

1. **Call to Order.** The hybrid meeting was called to order by Chair Wasserman at 1:04 p.m. The meeting was held with a principal physical location of 375 Beale Street, San Francisco, California, and online via Zoom and teleconference.

Chair Wasserman stated: Good afternoon, all, and welcome to our virtual, not hybrid today, BCDC Commission meeting. We have made this virtual because of the street closures and concerns about the APEC conference. Indeed, the Bay Bridge was blocked this morning until about noon, so it was a wise thing to do.

My name is Zack Wasserman, and I am Chair of BCDC. Before we get started let me state that Item 9 regarding a contract with the Port of San Francisco has been postponed, hopefully to our next meeting.

In addition, we will be changing the agenda from our printed version a little bit. We will start with consideration and vote on the Seaport Plan, go our budget discussion, then hear about Highway 37 and end with a description of the status of our Enforcement Program.

Chair Wasserman asked Ms. Ruiz to proceed with Agenda Item 2, Roll Call.

2. **Roll Call.** Present were: Chair Wasserman, Vice Chair Eisen, Commissioners Addiego, Ahn, Beach (represented by Alternate Williams), Burt, Eckerle (represented by Alternate Kimball), Eklund, El-Tawansy (represented by Alternate Ambuehl), Gorin, Gunther, Hasz, Lee (represented by Alternate Kishimoto), Lucchesi (represented by Alternate Pemberton), Mashburn (represented by Alternate Vasquez), Moulton-Peters, Peskin, Pine, Ramos, Ranchod (represented by Alternate Nelson), Showalter, Tam (represented by Alternate Gilmore) and Zepeda. Assembly Representative Ting (represented by Alternate John-Baptiste) was also present.

Chair Wasserman announced that a quorum was present.

Not present were Commissioners: Department of Finance (Benson), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (Blake), Contra Costa County (Gioia), Governor (Randolph)



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

Chair Wasserman added: I do want to remind everyone of the unfortunate increase in Zoom Bombing of local and regional public meetings. Everyone should note that as our opening video states, BCDC will not tolerate any form of hate speech or threats. As Chair, I want everyone to know that I will have a fairly quick trigger if anyone begins threats or hate speech or anything like that.

We do not have anybody in the building because we are not holding our meeting there. Reylina, do we have anybody online who wishes to make a public comment?

Robert Rogers commented: Hello. Good afternoon, Chair Wasserman and Members of the Commission. My name is Robert Rogers, and I am with Bay Planning Coalition (BPC).

I am here today on behalf of BPC to respectfully request your yes vote in support of updating the San Francisco Bay Area Seaport Plan, as our organization represents a diverse membership whose operations rely on the successful coordination of the region's seaport terminals, navigation and industrial waterfront. We believe the final Seaport Plan findings and policies will support the region's continued economic development.

Additionally, I would like to thank BCDC staff, specifically Cory Mann, for engaging with BPC and providing an opportunity for our members to learn more about the Plan's updates and provide feedback. Your continued collaboration with our organization is greatly appreciated. Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Chair Wasserman acknowledged and continued: Mr. Rogers, you are welcome. I let you proceed because we have got a moderately short agenda, it does not matter that much, but normally you should actually address that during the time when we are considering the Seaport Plan itself. That is a learning process, it is okay.

Chair Wasserman moved to Approval of the Minutes.

4. **Approval of Minutes of the November 2, 2023 Meeting.** Chair Wasserman asked for a motion and a second to adopt the minutes of November 2, 2023.

**MOTION:** Commissioner Peskin moved approval of the Minutes, seconded by Commissioner Showalter.

The motion carried by affirmation with Commissioner Kimball voting "ABSTAIN."

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

a. **Great to see so many Commissioners.** It is good to see so many on the screen. I particularly want to thank those Commissioners who made it to our last meeting and made it to our social.

We are working on a schedule of what has been referred to as anchor meetings where we do get as many people as possible actually in the room. As we have learned to exist in this hybrid world, there are unquestionably benefits to participating by Zoom on people's schedules, on the environment. But to some extent, there is nothing like actually getting together and being able to talk with each other both on and offline.

b. **APEC Conference.** I do want to note that although there have been protests and there is a fair amount of controversy over the APEC meeting, if any of you were around last night, they did put on a wonderful fireworks show. I happened to be going over to San Francisco for dinner and watched it crossing the Bay Bridge; it was quite amazing.

Of somewhat more importance, the discussions and potential progress between China and the United States on environmental matters, and particularly the potential reduction of fossil fuel use, is a very significant step forward. We, as you all know, are concerned with adaptation; but we are all concerned with mitigation and reducing greenhouse gases, so I at least applaud that.

Unfortunately, as we all know on the adaptation side, that is going to go on even if we stop greenhouse gases tomorrow. There have been recent articles about the reduction of the shelf around Greenland, continuing to demonstrate that this is a very real and accelerating problem.

But as we will hear, not as much in today's meeting but heard on the second and subsequent meetings, we are continuing to make progress on Bay Adapt and the adoption of a Regional Shoreline Adaptation Plan.

c. **Next Meeting.** Our next meeting will be held on December 7. At that meeting we expect to take up the following matters:

- (1) Finally, hopefully, consideration of a contract with the Port of San Francisco regarding the San Francisco Special Area Waterfront Plan that was postponed today;
- (2) A vote on an enforcement matter regarding Seaplane Investments in Sausalito;
- (3) A public hearing on the proposed Oakland turning basin expansion; and,
- (4) A briefing on the yet-to-be-released state of California revised guidance on rising sea levels.

That brings us to the wonderful time in each of our meetings when if you have an ex parte communication you wish to report orally, you may do so. I remind you that you do in any circumstance have to report them in writing on our website, or actual writing. These are intended to be communications on adjudicatory matters, public hearing matters that come before us.

Are there any who wish to make a brief disclosure of ex parte communications?

I do not see any.

That brings us to Item 6, the Report of the Executive Director.

6. **Report of the Executive Director.** Executive Director Goldzband reported: Thank you, Chair Wasserman.

On this day in 1981, November 16, Stephen Sondheim's greatest flop opened on Broadway. It was "Merrily We Roll Along," a musical based on the very successful Kaufman and Hart play whose plot unfolded in reverse chronological order. The Sondheim piece, while brilliant in almost every way, was so depressing that it ran for only 16 performances before closing. I bring this up because the same Sondheim musical is enjoying a great second run on Broadway as we speak, 42 years after it first appeared, and a year after Sondheim's death, with a new director and a new approach to this complex work of art.

Perhaps our version of the initial “Merrily We Roll Along” was the Howard Terminal Bay Plan Amendment. A terrifically interesting and complex piece of staff work whose ultimate result, despite an overwhelming BCDC vote, appears to be terribly depressing for Oakland as of today's reading.

But we also forecast that today, after only a 17-month interval, you will see a great long-term success as Cory Mann provides you with the staff recommendation to approve the full updated Seaport Plan. That beats a 42-year interval any day.

Something is happening today that we believe has never happened at BCDC before. There is a strike, and some of our staff are on strike. The California Association of Professional Scientists, the union that represents state employees who are environmental scientists, called for a rolling strike starting yesterday, that will affect about a dozen of our staff today and tomorrow.

The Newsom Administration argues that the strike is illegal and that is disputed by the union. In any event, I shall keep you informed should the strike materially affect BCDC's workflow or product.

Meanwhile, today you will hear from Sean Williamson, our head of financial services and outstanding budget guru, on what we hope will be a continuing positive budget outlook.

With regard to policy staff are pleased to report that the Oyster Point Marina compliance matter has been resolved favorably. As you will recall, starting at the July 7, 2022 Commission meeting, you began to receive public comments from individuals who would be affected by the sudden and imminent closure of Oyster Cove Marina in South San Francisco.

In response, Oyster Point Marina, which is owned by the City of South San Francisco, operated by the San Mateo Harbor District, and is located directly adjacent to Oyster Cove Marina, indicated its willingness to accept the displaced boaters and work with them to find permanent housing.

On September 29, 2022, BCDC staff stated publicly that we would forego any enforcement proceedings regarding the 10% liveaboard ceiling at Oyster Point Marina for one year if it accepted these displaced individuals and continued to adhere to the other terms of their permit.

In total, 48 boaters moved to Oyster Point Marina. South San Francisco hired a relocation expert to find permanent housing and reach full permit compliance by the deadline of October 31, 2023, one year from the start of the process.

We are pleased that we were able to work with the permittees to arrive at a creative solution to this temporary issue. Our compliance staff was very impressed by the ability and willingness of South San Francisco and the San Mateo Harbor District staffs to work so diligently to resolve this issue. I certainly want to thank Commissioner Mark Addiego for his support in this matter.

In addition, I am pleased to report that the Bay Area Council has joined with BCDC to sign a settlement agreement designed to resolve the Klamath public access issue. I want to thank Marc Zeppetello and Greg Scharff for their superb work with the Council's attorney, Keith Garner, who is a partner at Sheppard Mullin.

Two final issues on which I need your full and undivided attention, please.

First, 24 of you have confirmed that you will be present at our December 7 meeting and 22 of you for the Commission's December 21 meeting. Thank you. We need each of you there at each meeting for the full time and we will be reminding you of that.

Finally, I am going to be out of the country on vacation for two weeks after Thanksgiving. General Counsel Greg Scharff will be BCDC's Acting Executive Director. Later today I will send you a reminder email of that, which will include Greg's mobile phone number and contact details.

That completes my Report Chair Wasserman. I am happy to answer any questions.

Chair Wasserman asked: Are there any questions from Commissioners for our Executive Director? I do not see any. Thank you, sir.

**7. Consideration of Administrative Matters.** Chair Wasserman stated Commissioners had received the Administrative Listing and Regulatory Director Harriett Ross was available to answer questions regarding the administrative matters.

No questions were posed by Commissioners.

**8. Vote on the San Francisco Bay Area Seaport Plan Update, Bay Plan Amendment No. 1-19.** Chair Wasserman stated: That brings us to Item 8, a presentation and vote on the San Francisco Bay Area Seaport Plan Update, Bay Plan Amendment No. 1-19. We held a public hearing on this matter at our November 2 meeting. Principal Waterfront Planner Cory Mann will present the item.

Principal Waterfront Planner Mann addressed the Commission: Thank you, Chair Wasserman. Thanks, and good afternoon, Commissioners. I am going to make a brief presentation on the Final Staff Recommendation for the Seaport Plan Update, Bay Plan Amendment 1-19.

Last Thursday, in advance of this meeting, you received a final copy of the Seaport Plan, a final copy of the Environmental Assessment, and a staff report that includes the Final Staff Recommendation with a response to public comments and a couple of other things.

You also received a copy of the Commission Resolution, Number 2023.02, to adopt the new Seaport Plan and make other related changes that make up this Bay Plan Amendment.

I am going to review these materials pretty quickly. In contrast to my presentation a couple of weeks ago, this will only take about five minutes or so. But, of course, I am always happy to answer any questions afterwards if you have any.

First, I will just briefly summarize the Seaport Plan Update since you just heard about this a couple of weeks ago.

The Seaport Plan itself is a more specific application of the Bay Plan. The first Seaport Plan was published in 1982 and the existing Plan was published in 1996. The main purpose of the Seaport Plan is to coordinate the planning and development of port terminals to minimize Bay fill, and that applies specific findings and policies to Port Priority Use Areas across San Francisco Bay.

In January 2019, the Commission voted to initiate this Bay Plan Amendment to update the Seaport Plan.

Since then, staff have worked collaboratively with the Seaport Planning Advisory Committee and other stakeholders to develop a new plan.

There are a few key changes to the Seaport Plan that I previously presented on. But in brief, first, the entirety of the Plan, starting with a new introduction, has been rewritten for readability and clarity.

We introduced four new topic areas to the Plan, and those include a topic on the Seaport Planning Advisory Committee, Climate Change, Environmental Justice and Social Equity, and Regional Coordination and Future Seaport Plan Updates.

We also combined some cargo-specific policies into a single topic area called Preserving and Enhancing Port Priority Use Areas.

And we revised our findings and policies related to the Cargo Forecast.

We removed two topic areas, one on Dredging and Navigation, and another on Ground Transportation. Not because those subjects are unimportant, but essentially because those specific policies had become outdated and redundant with other regional planning efforts, some of which are being led by BCDC.

Finally, in Part II of the Seaport Plan, which has the actual maps of the Port Priority Use Areas, we amended the boundaries of several of those areas in response to requests from individual ports, mostly reflecting on-the-ground shifts to where cargo activity has moved over the last few decades.

We also simplified how the Plan treats these marine terminal designations that allocate cargo volume, and we removed some port-specific policies from there too.

Taken together we believe that these changes are going to provide clearer and more streamlined guidance for ports and for BCDC staff, and a set of general policies that will stay up to date even as specific projects come and go.

On November 2, we held a public hearing for the Seaport Plan Update. I gave an in-depth presentation on the new Plan, the changes to the topic areas that I just mentioned, and the changes to the maps of the Port Priority Use Areas.

We received one written public comment letter in advance of the public hearing and heard from eight commenters at the meeting who spoke at the meeting. A response to each of those public comments is included in the Final Staff Recommendation.

Because six of those speakers at the meeting mentioned Howard Terminal, I wanted to just briefly touch back on that. These commentors stated that the Seaport Plan should include a stipulation regarding Howard Terminal being returned to Port Priority Use on January 1, 2025, per the terms of Assembly Bill 1191. We just wanted to confirm that the Final Seaport Plan includes Howard Terminal in the appropriate table of the Plan, which is Table 3, called Existing Marine Terminal Expansion Sites, with a footnote explaining its unique status that quotes Assembly Bill 1191.

Several Commissioners also had questions about the Seaport Plan, and we included a summary of those questions and the answers that we provided in the Final Staff Recommendation for your reference.

We received questions about the Plan's policies for new marine terminals and Bay fill, sea level rise and how vulnerability varies among the ports and ground transportation, and how BCDC and MTC should work together on related regional planning issues.

Additionally, Commissioner Gioia requested that the environmental-justice-related appointments on the Seaport Planning Advisory Committee should specify that the appointee should be from an organization or community close to and impacted by one of the ports subjects in the Seaport Plan.

In response, staff worked and incorporated a revision to that specific appointment that now appears in the final Seaport Plan. The new sentence is shown in underline on this slide but I will read the whole appointment. It says:

“Two members from community-based and/or environmental justice organizations designated by BCDC.”

And then the new part is:

“To the extent possible, BCDC should designate members from organizations that are located near port activities and/or engage with issues related to port activities.”

That sentence is the only revision to the version of the Seaport Plan that was sent to you in September prior to the November 2 public hearing. Otherwise, the rest of the Plan is the same and consequently the Environmental Assessment has also not changed.

Finally, I am just going to outline the last steps that we need to get through to finalize the new Seaport Plan.

Today is the Commission vote.

You have noticed that the final Plan you received is still a Word document. But after the content is finalized, we will professionally format the Plan to make it visually appealing and we are looking forward to sending it around again when that happens.

There are two administrative steps that we need to take as well.

First, we need to submit the Plan and a bunch of accompanying documentation to the Office of Administrative Law for their approval.

Second, because this constitutes a change to our Coastal Management Program, we also need to submit the Plan to NOAA for approval.

We still have a couple of steps to take before the Seaport Plan can be considered finalized, but we are nearing the end of this process.

I have got the Final Recommendation up on another slide, but I just wanted to say thank you again to everyone who contributed their time to this process. The feedback and support that we received along the way really improved this Plan in innumerable ways. We are excited to implement the new Seaport Plan soon and to continue working collaboratively with the ports and with other stakeholders on related issues and new ones into the future. That is it.

Chair Wasserman asked: Do we have any public speakers on this? We have heard one already.

Ms. Ruiz noted: No public comment.

Chair Wasserman continued: Questions or comments from Commissioners?

Commissioner Eisen chimed in: Just very briefly, I wanted to note that we had some SPAC members at our last meeting and one of them spoke in particular to the incredible work and collaboration of our staff. I am repeating what she said, but I think it bears repeating. Our staff has done an amazing job with respect to the Seaport Plan.

Chair Wasserman acknowledged: Thank you. I do not see any others.

Mr. Mann read the following into the record: The staff recommends that the Commission adopt the attached Resolution No. 2023.02, Appendix A, that would:

- a. Adopt the new San Francisco Bay Area Seaport Plan to replace the existing Seaport Plan;
- b. Approve the Final Environmental Assessment;
- c. Amend San Francisco Bay Plan Maps 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6, to modify existing Port Priority Use Area boundaries in the cities of Concord, Oakland, Redwood City, Richmond, San Francisco and the unincorporated community of Selby in Contra Costa County;
- d. Amend the San Francisco Bay Plan Part IV - Development of the Bay and Shoreline findings and policies for ports;
- e. Amend Resolution 16 to modify the above-referenced Port Priority Use Area boundaries within the shoreline band;
- f. Make necessary findings that the San Francisco Bay Plan (inclusive of the Seaport Plan) Amendment conforms to all applicable findings and declarations of policies in the McAteer-Petris Act;
- g. And authorize the Executive Director to execute an Addendum to abandon an historic Memorandum of Understanding, or MOU, between BCDC and the Metropolitan Transportation Commission regarding the Seaport Plan and the Seaport Planning Advisory Committee.

Chair Wasserman continued: I do not see any questions. May I have a motion please?

**MOTION:** Vice Chair Eisen moved approval of the Staff Recommendation, seconded by Commissioner Gunther.

**VOTE:** The motion carried with a vote of 22-0-0 with Commissioners Addiego, Ahn, Ambuehl, Burt, Gilmore, Gorin, Gunther, Hasz, Kimball, Kishimoto, Moulton-Peters, Nelson, Pemberton, Peskin, Pine, Ramos, Showalter, Vasquez, Williams, Zepeda and Vice Chair Eisen and Chair Wasserman voting, "YES", no "NO" votes, and no "ABSTAIN" votes.

Chair Wasserman announced: The motion passes. Thank you, staff and all of the others who have participated in this understandably long but important process. Hopefully, we will not have any problems with the Office of Administration or NOAA.

Executive Director Goldzband chimed in: Chair Wasserman if I can just throw in, especially Cory, but certainly Erik and Cody and Catharine, everybody who worked on this, deserves the tremendous praise that they got two weeks ago. I know that Cory is probably still having anxiety dreams about this, but we are looking forward to certainly positive from OAL and NOAA.

In addition, I just want to make sure that the record shows that although Pat Eklund could not vote that she did send that note to me saying she would have voted yes had she been able to.

Chair Wasserman noted: The record shall so reflect.

**9. Commission Consideration of a Contract with the Port of San Francisco to Fund Planning Activities.** Item 9 was postponed.

**10. Briefing on Fiscal Year 2023 Budget.** Chair Wasserman stated: That brings us to Item 10, a Briefing on our Fiscal Year 2023 Budget. Sean Williamson, head of our Financial Services Program and our Budget Officer will present the item.

Budget Officer Williamson presented the following: I am Sean Williamson. I am the Budget Officer at BCDC. I am the Financial Services Manager. This will be an overview of our fiscal year 2023-24 Budget.

I will be providing information regarding the annual budget provisions and regarding the grants and contracts that the agency has received from external sources. That could be other state agencies or federal agencies.

This year's appropriations are mostly General Fund dependent; at \$8.4 million that makes up the bulk of our budget.

We also have the Bay Fill Clean Up and Abatement Fund at about a half million dollars. That pays for two of our enforcement positions and at times part of one of our attorneys.

We have the Federal Trust Fund, which is relatively new. Our first appropriation was last fiscal year, FY22. From last fiscal year it has increased from \$152,000 to \$227,000.

Our Reimbursements appropriations, on the other hand, has reduced from last year. We had a one-time expansion of our authority to the tune of about \$2 million dollars. That has since expired, so we are back down to our normal baseline of \$2.1 million.

The Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund is administered by the Air Resources Board, and we get roughly \$1.9 million annually. This is a small increase from last year's funding, but mostly due to annual budget adjustments as opposed to a new large appropriation for any program.

That brings the total to \$13.3 million.

This does not include the fall adjustments that are part of the normal budget process, which would add an additional \$300,000; two-thirds of which would go to General Fund and the remaining third would go to the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund. But as that will not be included in our budget until probably the May revision and pending any executive orders from the Department of Finance, we are not spending that money that we do not have yet.

For the General Fund, roughly broken down, we had a slight decrease of our labor costs from '22 to '23 of a half million dollars. Mostly that is because those labor costs have been shifted to external funds, grants that we received from other agencies.

Our Operating Expenses are up a little bit. A significant cause of that was the costs that are due to the Department of Justice legal fees. We had an emergency request last fiscal year to add additional funding, which was approved by Department of Finance. Based on that request, they have also increased our baseline amount of funding a half million dollars a year for this year and going out to five years into the future. So it will be at that new allocation, as far as we know, unless we need to request more, I guess.

For The Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund, as I said, we have had a slight increase compared to last year. Mostly that is due to the fall adjustments, which include increased costs of employee retirement and benefits.

There is a slight reallocation toward Operating Expenses, mostly because it is being used to pay some of our lease agreement fees.

For the Bay Fill Clean Up and Abatement Fund, we have actually been doing very well about preserving that fund. We started last year with about \$940,000. We received \$250,000 in revenues and spent about \$140,000. We always project that we are going to spend the full amount, the \$525,000 as you see in 23-24.

However, it is BCDC policy to preserve these funds as much as possible, so we are using other external funds before this fund unless it is absolutely needed. We are responsible for stewarding this fund, we are the fund administrator. Generally speaking, it looks like our revenues are outpacing our costs for the near term.

As to Violation Fines Collected, these would all be going into the Bay Fill Fund as we just discussed. Historically, we have been collecting around \$200,000, sometimes less. There are certain years here that were pretty lean. Through September of this year, the first quarter, we have already collected \$202,000. We are actually on pace to collect substantially more than we have in the past six or seven years. So there again, the revenue that is projected in the previous slide of \$261,000, we have almost collected that already in the first quarter, so we should be looking very good for the future of that fund.

These appropriations of Reimbursement and Federal Trust Fund authority are related to external grants that the agency receives from federal agencies, from state agencies, from local governments. This is our capacity to receive funds. At the moment our baseline is \$2 million for Reimbursements and roughly a quarter of a million dollars for the Federal Trust Fund. We have one EPA grant that is using the Federal Trust Fund. We have the capacity to receive more since we receive these on an annual basis. Those awards typically run for three to five years so they would not use all of this baseline authority in one year, generally speaking.

Our Permit Fees Collections, these would all go to the General Fund as opposed to the Bay Fill Fund. Historically, we have collected about \$3.6 million in revenues, and we have had to refund around \$79,000 over the past six years or so.

We have collected about \$212,000 this year through September. We are on pace for a normal year in terms of permit fee collection unless something unusual comes down the pipe.

That is my final slide. I don't know if you have any questions for me, but I am happy to answer.

Chair Wasserman asked: Are there any public comments?

Ms. Ruiz stated: No public comment.

Commissioner Showalter was recognized: I think you used the term "capacity to receive funds" with respect to the grants. I have never heard it expressed quite that way before. Would you go into that a little more.

Mr. Williamson replied: Yes. Reimbursement authority and Federal Trust Fund authority are mostly like an empty bucket you can pour funds into. The legislature has granted BCDC the authority to receive external funds up to this amount.

So, we can apply to other state agencies, we can apply to the federal government, to local governments, to nonprofits. Those grants would be the actual source of the funding for the agency.

If we were to receive a grant that was above the allocated authority to the agency, we could go back to Department of Finance and make a request to them to say, we did not anticipate that we were going to get this \$10 million dollar grant from a federal agency, we will need you to go back to the legislature and request additional authority based on this award that already exists. It should be looked at as a soft ceiling for what we can receive in a given year. If we actually have a signed award between us and another agency, then we can request additional authority based on that existing agreement.

Commissioner Showalter acknowledged: Thanks for explaining that. That makes perfect sense now.

Chair Wasserman asked: Any other comments?

Executive Director Goldzband added: If there are not any, Chair, I would like to comment on a couple of things, if that is possible?

Chair Wasserman stated: It is, after I make a comment.

Just a comment on the fines, not a specific and detailed question. Not the permit fee collection, the fines. We always like more income, so increasing fines are good.

We want to demonstrate, both as a matter of deterrent and for generating public trust, that we are being diligent in holding people to the rules and fining them when they do not.

Having said that, our ultimate goal is, there are not any funds because everybody is obeying the rules. This is a small note that this is an area in which there is inherent cognitive dissonance, but it is also an area where we have had some disputes with the state auditor, so overall this is a good trend. Go ahead, Larry.

Executive Director Goldzband commented: Thank you very much, Chair Wasserman. When I started at BCDC I think our budget was somewhere between \$7-8 million. Rent was a little lower, that's for darned sure. We have grown tremendously, I think, over the past decade or so. We have done so, I think, in a pretty, I am not going to quite say conservative way, because it is hard to say, if you are 80 percent, higher than you were 10 years ago that that is truly conservative, as much as I think, thoughtful way.

I think the one thing that I think is still concerning is that the Bay Adapt Program is running on grant funds, as opposed to permanent funding by the state. We certainly hope that with the advent of 272, knock on wood, that will end up shifting.

We certainly are very, very pleased, I think as you are, with the Bay Fill Fund and the Enforcement Program and how that is working.

With that, Chair Wasserman, I just wanted to thank Sean, who is doing an absolutely superb job. We poached him from the Coastal Conservancy, and he has more than lived up to his reputation. Thank you.

Chair Wasserman acknowledged: Thank you all.

**11. Briefing on Resilient State Route 37 Projects.** Chair Wasserman stated: That brings us to Item 11, which many Commissioners have been anticipating, a Briefing on Resilient State Route 37 Projects. The Executive Director will start the briefing.

Executive Director Goldzband spoke: Thank you very much, Chair Wasserman. As you all know, earlier this year BCDC along with the California Natural Resources Agency and the California Department of Fish and Wildlife signed a partnership agreement with the California State Transportation Agency, Caltrans, and the Metropolitan Transportation Commission, to work together on the rebuilding, restructuring, rethinking about Highway 37 in the North Bay which of course is a critical transportation corridor, really of statewide significance, that needs to integrate superior traffic circulation, ecological and public access benefits, must be resilient to flooding and rising sea level. And it has to be done equitably because the traffic along Highway 37 simply does not work for any community. We were very pleased to be invited to be part of that.

Over the past several months what we have figured out is that we need to take it essentially a step further; and that step further is to evolve the partnership into a real accountability structure.

What we are going to talk about today is really the beginning of essentially a more public discussion about how we plan to do that. Nothing has been set in stone with the exception of a few major things like a Leadership Committee. But more important, what we are doing really is institutionalizing the partnership to make sure that the transportation, mobility, environmental and equity components of what has been a series of projects really move into being an entire program.

We have received tremendous support from Toks Omishakin, the Secretary of the California State Transportation Agency, as well as, of course, from Secretary Wade Crowfoot of the Natural Resources Agency and we are very, very thankful for that.

How does this actually work? We will get to that. But I think the real thing to think about is this provides an awful lot of inclusion for basically the stakeholders that depend upon Highway 37, both those who drive, those who can essentially communicate with us, and the environmental aspects that we need to most definitely take care of.

It is all about essentially Bayland connectivity so we are going to be collaborating with a large group of folks and we will make sure that the structure that we put together, which will be composed of the signatories, et cetera, will meet very publicly, have public agendas, and will report out to our friends who are stakeholders, who are legislators, et cetera, to make sure that there is definite inclusion and transparency with regard to how we are going to work to both have near-term and long-term success for Highway 37.

That is my introduction. We are going to turn this over to three other folks who have been tremendously important in figuring out this new structure.

The first is Sara Aminzadeh, who is Deputy Secretary for External Relations for CNRA.

She will then hand it over to Suzanne Smith. Many of you know Suzanne in her former role as head of the Sonoma Transportation Agency and is now working as a consultant to the Metropolitan Transportation Commission. We do not consider her a fill-in in any way. You would ordinarily see Andrew Fremier, but Andy is, I think, at least 10 hours ahead of us at this point somewhere in Europe, so Suzanne was able to join in.

Then battling cleanup is going to be our own Commissioner David Ambuehl from Caltrans.

Then we are happy to answer questions.

Ms. Aminzadeh chimed in: I am very happy to be here today. As Larry said, I serve as Deputy Secretary in the California Natural Resources Agency. I also use Highway 37 on a weekly basis to commute to Sacramento, so this project is near and dear to my heart.

As Larry said, we recognize it not only as a crucial transportation corridor for the region but also an important opportunity to show what a climate resilient piece of transportation infrastructure can be, recognizing vulnerabilities to sea level rise and extreme weather. I have driven that road during king Tides, for example, and we are already seeing flooding in some cases. Looking at the habitat connectivity needs of the Baylands underneath it, considering public access issues and other biodiversity concerns.

We want to move into a leadership structure and a form of regular engagement that really reflects the way that the Newsom Administration views this project, which is not only an essential corridor for mobility, but also a key, could be an iconic project for climate resilience, not only in the Bay Area, but nationally.

We believe that doing so will make us more competitive for federal funding. As we all know, we are seeing historic federal infrastructure funds for exactly this kind of work. And will also improve our ability to be accountable and transparent to the public and to affected communities.

As Larry said, we have been having secretary-level conversations around this. There is a great deal of alignment between our transportation and our environmental agencies. We really look forward to this next phase of work where the environmental and equity dimensions of this project can be considered right alongside the mobility and transportation needs and look forward to more work on this.

Thank you so much. I will hand it over to Suzanne to talk through a couple of specifics about the new structure.

Ms. Smith spoke: Great, thank you. Thank you and appreciate the opportunity to be with you again today. I have had the opportunity to speak with the Commission a couple of times in the past on this project in a different role, but I am pleased to represent MTC here today in Mr. Fremier's absence.

Coming at this from the transportation side, the 37 Corridor has been something we have been working on in the four North Bay counties for a number of years in partnership with BCDC, SFEI, a number of environmental and regulatory agencies, as we explore what improvements can happen and how to address rising sea levels as well as transportation hurdles. There is no transit in the corridor right now. There is major congestion in a commute pattern out on that corridor that significantly impacts people every day. But we have this really amazing opportunity to merge those things together where you have got transportation needs and resource restoration needs, and we have been talking about that for quite a while.

But what we are doing now or proposing now is a formalization of that approach that provides clarity on decision-making and leadership because you really have a lot of moving parts here there. It is not just a transportation project.

Tolay Creek restoration is an example, there is a Strip Marsh restoration project, there are plenty of other restoration projects that really are not even related to the roadway. But we are all in this together and so I think the ability. There is also a train out there, there is a railroad.

Communication and collaboration in the corridor is what this improved structure is going to hopefully bring. I do not have a fancy graphic to show you, but the structure is such that we are layering on traditional project management approaches to transportation, but including in that a coordination team that is similar to what was done with the Bay Bridge when that partnership happened across the state and region, regional agencies and also a Policy Committee and a Leadership Committee to help really provide that guidance.

The Policy Committee that exists right now is made up of local elected officials from the four North Bay Counties. But we also have been working very closely over the last year to two years on a regular basis with our state and federal representatives, and so potentially including them in a Policy Committee. Tribal leaders, that opportunity I think is great to ensure that there is good communication from the policymaker perspective.

And then the Leadership Committee builds on what Mr. Goldzband just mentioned, which is this partnership between the state and the region and how that Secretary-level executive level decision-making can help implementation.

Because that is the critical juncture where we are right now is we have done some of the big picture planning on the Corridor, and we have done some of the initial environmental work on the Corridor, and we have got to implement. And we have got to do that quickly. Not just transportation implementation but resource restoration. We need to do it quickly to address the ever-increasing drumbeat of sea level rise.

That is what we are hopeful that a revised structure will help expedite implementation and really expand on the coordination and collaboration across the various interests, whether it is resources, mobility, equity, public access.

Thank you for letting the transportation folks be before you today and I will turn it over to our partners at Caltrans. Dave and Dina have been involved in this discussion from the beginning. They are the owner/operator, obviously, of Highway 37, and critical partners to delivery.

Commissioner Ambuehl addressed the Commission: Yes, thank you very much, Suzanne. Of course, it is always a tough act to follow Sara and Suzanne, but I will give you my perspective from Caltrans.

I am the Chief Deputy District Director for the Bay Area here at Caltrans and over the last few years, Caltrans has shifted the way we look at transportation projects. As noted, Secretary Omishakin and Caltrans Director Tony Tavares have created four foundational principles that we use when developing and constructing our projects. They are safety, equity, climate action and economic prosperity to our communities. These principles over the last few years are what guide our plans and projects.

We have State Route 37 replacement. Once conceived only as a transportation project, I think through engagement and listening we now see a much larger opportunity here that will eventually open up the entire area for environmental restoration.

The purpose has been clearly stated. The organizational structure is to have transparent communication, share information among the partners, stakeholders and the public. It is in draft form now and will continue to evolve as we see opportunities to improve it. But it becomes the framework for us to make well-informed decisions as we move forward. Caltrans certainly supports the collaboration. I think this is a really prime example of a building block of what we will see to come in the future on a lot of these large projects. Thank you for that. Back to you, Larry.

Executive Director Goldzband continued: Thanks, David.

I do want to say one thing that I think Andy Fremier would say if he were here. Andy has always started our discussions by saying, back when we were building the eastern span of the Bay Bridge and it became very, very difficult to get stuff done, in large part I gather because of funding and the like. They created, meaning MTC, Caltrans, and the CTC, the Transportation Commission, created this executive level team that met basically quarterly or three times a year. David, you were certainly part of feeding that system. And it worked.

It worked because it provided everyone with a sense of knowing what really was going on. What money was being spent how. What risks were involved, et cetera. And it was a great way to communicate the way that the Bridge was being constructed and the way that the Bridge was going to be completed.

That is essentially what we are doing here with a little bit larger group, because it is certainly a different project. We are going to take the best part of what that group did and transport it over to what we are doing.

I will end by saying that Secretary Omishakin and was very clear when Andy and Commissioner El-Tawansy and I were in Secretary Crowfoot's conference room and he said, look, I think we I think I like where we are going but there are two things you have to convince me of. Number one, equity has to be in there. We talked through that, and it certainly is, as everybody has said. And he said, second, the new structure cannot slow it down, it has to speed it up. We said, that is what this is going to do because it is going to solve questions, answer questions and solve problems before they become larger questions and larger problems. We are going to be able to work together in a collaborative way to make sure that stuff gets done and gets done as quickly as possible.

So, we are not adding another layer of bureaucracy. What we are doing is essentially making sure that we are the filter to get stuff done, get it up and get it out to the stakeholders. I think that is really what will help us move this project along, both for the near-term and for the long-term.

With that, I am seeing Sara nod, so I think I said the right stuff. With that, I am happy to answer questions as are Sara or Suzanne or David.

Chair Wasserman stated: Before going to Commissioners, I am going to ask whether there are any public comments.

Ms. Ruiz answered: No public comment.

Commissioner Gorin chimed in: Thank you, Executive Director Goldzband and great big thank yous to Suzanne Smith, Sara, and certainly all of the folks from Caltrans.

I want to give you a little brief background. When I was elected as supervisor for the First District, that's Sonoma Valley in Sonoma County, the supervisors for the four Bay Area counties came together in Napa. It was the first time that that had happened in a very, very long time and we identified a number of priorities that were specific to the various counties.

But Highway 37, as you know, was almost the top priority for all of us. We knew that we would get to this point of getting to solutions sooner rather than later. It has taken us a long time to get to this point. I have been part of the Policy Committee since that time, meeting monthly sometimes, quarterly now.

Suzanne has been absolutely instrumental to the progress that we have made and thank you for hiring her as a consultant. We are really sad that she has left the Sonoma County Transportation Authority but on to bigger and better things.

And I will just end, and a number of the supervisors and Caltrans officials have attended the Policy Committee throughout that tenure and indeed we have come a long way. We would all like to see the ultimate project constructed. However, the enormous price tag of the ultimate project is extremely high and going up even higher.

So, we have developed an interim project which is less expensive, but still very expensive. It will be no surprise to Suzanne to hear me say, if we can identify elements of this project that are very expensive, like the bridge over Tolay Creek, maybe we can find the extra funding to construct them once rather than construct them now and have to replace them in 30 years.

But the ultimate goal and the beauty of this project is that it will raise the infrastructure necessary to accommodate rising tides, hopefully relieve congestion, introduce multimodal transit to this core critical network of transportation, and get on with the business of restoring the wetlands to continue to act as the giant sponges, as we have started to see with the Baylands strategy in Sonoma County and Solano County.

So, thank you, Larry. That was not questions, that was a comment. But Larry, you know that I have already talked to you about, can we just build that bridge once and not twice? So, Suzanne, good luck to that, you know I am going to continue to harp on that. Thank you.

Commissioner Peskin was recognized: It really may be a question tiering off of Commissioner Gordon's question-good to see you, Sara Aminzadeh, my old Coastal Commission colleague-for Sara, or maybe for Caltrans. Following up on what Susan said, beyond better agency coordination and collaboration. What are we ultimately doing to speed up the longer-term fix rather than the interim couple of decade fix that would also allow for more wetland restoration in the near term?

Ms. Aminzadeh responded: Hi, Aaron, good to see you. I can offer a couple of comments and then would turn it over to others. I think part of what we want to do in this next phase, particularly with more formal involvement by CNRA, BCDC and CDFW, is exactly that. Look at the project design and scope in terms of the long-term needs and prioritize federal funding that allows for that long-term work that is needed, as Commissioner Gorin also pointed out. Suzanne, what would you add to that?

Ms. Smith stated: A couple of things and I will turn to David as well. One, so the good news is Caltrans is proceeding with the first phase of the ultimate project at Novato Creek. That project, the final environmental document will be out the beginning of the year, the design will be underway, and there is construction funding available for that.

I think that is a good demonstration of how in a corridor this long, and frankly, this expensive, it will happen in phases. So being able to deliver on those phases quickly is really going to be critical. The ultimate project out in Marin County on Novato Creek Bridge is in our sights for sure.

I think the other component is then analyzing as we go forward. There is only one interim phase of work, and that interim phase is between Sears Point and Mare Island, which will include the lengthening of Tolay Creek Bridge and a restoration of the salt marsh out there. That project will have a finite lifetime and we will use that lifetime to pull together the resources to build the ultimate project out there. But there is also a number of other phases of work that are going to be happening in the interim with advancing design and environmental work. Dave, would you add more to that?

Commissioner Ambuehl commented: I think you really covered it, Novato Creek Bridge being the first of the final design or ultimate design projects. As Suzanne mentioned, we hope to have the environmental document out at the beginning of the year.

One of the questions I heard is how do we speed this up? We certainly are looking at alternative construction methods, using CMGC possibly, to speed up the process. You can bring the contractor on board early, they can help with the design, then it goes out to bid. It ends up being a much better process, we find, on these large projects, so we are going to try that. Anything else, Suzanne?

Executive Director Goldzband chimed in: Can I add one thing? Supervisor Peskin, it is a great question. I look at the leadership structure that is being developed as an expansion of advocacy. That is, if you have got Caltrans and CTC doing what they are really good at, it is marvelous. If you add CNRA, BCDC, Fish and Wildlife to that, then you have advocates that are not necessarily that it nests that actually by necessity are talking perhaps to other people or in different ways. Because this series of projects needs to be a real program, I would argue that by having CNRA be part of this we will be able to advocate for new and different types of funding that can be associated with Highway 37, with building a road, that can then help alleviate and help actually have, and I hate to use the word, have a synergy with the construction time, so that you can actually do environmental work concurrently with the highway work and they can actually work together.

Commissioner Peskin chimed in: Larry, and I am sorry if this is an ignorant question, but who is actually charged with looking for that funding now to figure out the scope and plan beyond the Novato section for the longer-term fixes?

Executive Director Goldzband stated: It is going to be all of us.

Ms. Aminzadeh added: I would just add to that, Aaron, one example is that NOAA recently had their Regional Resilience Climate Challenge, which we participated in on behalf of 37. I do not know that that grant award will move forward. But the fact that we are now literally visualizing and seeking funding for this project as a climate resilience opportunity in need is significant, and we expect to see additional federal funding opportunities associated with that.

Ms. Smith chimed in: I would just add that you also have transportation advocates working with the Coastal Conservancy or BCDC or other grant opportunities for those restoration projects. In Sonoma County the Sonoma Land Trust is an NGO partner that we work with very closely and have supported efforts, both with funding but also in supporting them as they pursue funding. Interesting partners, I guess, across those policy areas.

Commissioner Nelson was recognized: I am not sure who this question is for. I will start with staff but, Sara, maybe it is for you or, Dave, for you.

As a couple of people have mentioned, this is a complex project. A lot of state agencies, local agencies. We have got multiple county jurisdictions and multiple objectives we are trying to achieve with the project, which means there is going to be a ton of really diverse public input.

This briefing has mostly been focused on a new approach at the leadership level. I am hoping that you can help us understand the strategy and make sure that this does not become an insulated approach. That this approach is really designed to make sure that it facilitates the public engagement, public involvement and other stakeholders that we know is going to be needed to succeed with a project this complex.

Ms. Smith asked to field this question: If I could, Mr. Chair, respond to that?

Chair Wasserman replied: You may.

Ms. Smith continued: That is an excellent point. The Policy Committee is a Brown Act committee; it is a public meeting and will meet with regularity. But one of the new aspects that we are proposing, and again is somewhat modeled on the Bay Bridge Project, is to have regular reporting that is formalized and touches on the key aspects so that every quarter BCDC can get an email that shows you here is what has happened and here is how things have progressed, or here is the grant that we have gotten, or here is how this environmental document is happening. The idea is to formalize that reporting process to make the information more readily available and, frankly, digestible, because there is a lot happening right now, but it is not coalesced into a single reporting or single document, and that makes it harder, I think, for the public to really track. That is definitely one of the goals of this new approach.

Ms. Aminzadeh chimed in: If I could just add to that, Mr. Chair.

I just want to say, transparency and accountability, and ensuring greater transparency and accountability, was one of our key objectives by doing exactly what Suzanne described which is daylighting agency decision-making and priorities, to your point, Barry.

Commissioner Nelson continued: I just want to make sure that this is not a body that is going to have a different set of public meetings or mailing list, it is going to be coordination at the leadership decision-maker level and the public involvement is going to happen through the separate participating agencies.

Ms. Smith explained: There is an existing Policy Committee. The proposal is that this will be expanded. That Policy Committee does meet quarterly. Supervisor Gorin and Supervisor Moulton-Peters are two of the representatives who sit on that. That will continue, the theory is, in a more expanded fashion. Three or four times a year is what they will meet.

Chair Wasserman asked: And those are public meetings?

Ms. Smith replied: Correct.

Commissioner Nelson acknowledged: Okay.

Chair Wasserman continued: Larry, you had something?

Executive Director Goldzband commented: I was just going to say, those are public meetings, just like any meeting of the leadership team will be a public meeting. We are not going to do anything that would not be that.

Commissioner Nelson acknowledged: Okay, thank you.

Commissioner Gorin added: Indeed, the Policy Committee is a hybrid meeting so you do not have to physically attend, you could Zoom on and get the information that way; so it is a good format.

I would suggest that this reformulation and expansion of the Policy Committee is an attempt to replicate or at least model the approach of the regulatory agencies in forming the BRRIT. It is a way for different agencies to come together to streamline the approval process. Hopefully, she says with a question mark. And allow the bodies to comment on things that have not been included in the Policy Committee to date.

And I would thank my colleague, Supervisor/Commissioner Dave Pine for chairing the San Francisco Bay Restoration Authority and indeed we continue to fund wetland restoration in the North Bay as well as around the Bay, and they will be part of the funding solution for the environmental work going forward.

Chair Wasserman asked: Any other comments?

I have a very quick one. It is not precisely on Highway 37. It is, in part, recognition of Suzanne Smith and recognition of what her previous agency has done and the importance it may have as a model for other agencies and for some of our outreach work in its combination of a transportation agency and a climate sustainability agency. I think we as a region still have a lot to learn from that model.

All right. That I think concludes this matter. No vote is required. Thank you very much for the briefing and more importantly for the work that you have done and that you will do.

**12. Briefing on the BCDC Enforcement Program.** Chair Wasserman stated: That brings us to item 12, a Briefing on our Enforcement Program. Matthew Trujillo, our Enforcement Policy Manager, will provide the briefing.

Enforcement Policy Manager Trujillo presented the following: Good afternoon, Commissioners; and greetings to the members of the public who are in attendance today. Thank you all for your interest and concern for the activities of the BCDC Enforcement Program. Its dedicated staff works hard every day to protect the precious resources of the Bay, preserve the public's access to the Bay and the shoreline, and to hold violators to account for their actions. I am Matthew Trujillo and I am the Enforcement Policy Manager.

Today I am going to report on the Enforcement Program's activities in the third quarter of the year. That is from July 1 through the last day of September. This presentation will cover reports on the number of new cases we received in Q3, the number of cases or case files that we closed, the amount of penalties or fines collected from the enforcement activities and deposited into the Bay Fill Clean-Up and Abatement Fund, and we will take a look finally at the pending matters that we are working on in this Q4.

Starting with the new cases received. Between July 1 and September 30 we received 23 new reports through our Online Violation Report Form. This is a decrease of 2 reports over the number of new reports we received last quarter. Looking at the numbers from the point of view of new reports received per month, it averages to approximately 8 new reports per month this quarter, which is slightly higher than the year-to-date average of 7 per month overall.

In this slide I divided the numbers by the type of violator. We opened 9 cases where the alleged violator is a commercial entity, 8 cases where the alleged violator is a private entity such as an owner of a single-family residence, and then 6 cases where the alleged violator is a public entity such as a city or nongovernmental organization.

Looking further at the new case data from the third quarter we see the majority of new cases involve alleged violators who are not permit holders, 57 percent in fact.

Also worthy of note is the location of the alleged violations received this quarter. This pie chart breaks down the number of new reports received from each of the nine Bay Area counties in your jurisdiction. The majority of reports this quarter were received from Alameda, Marin and Solano counties. And for the second quarter in a row, no reports were received from Napa County.

This slide reports the number of case files that were closed in the third quarter. Coincidentally, it was also 23. The histogram on the right illustrates the number of cases we closed this quarter broken out by the years in which the cases were opened. The majority of these cases, that is 20, that were closed pursuant to our reinvigorated enforcement case management procedures that we apply to every case open since 2020, were opened in 2023; while the remaining 3 cases that were closed were from 2022 and 2021.

In Q3 we collected \$71,000 to be deposited into the Bay Fill Clean-Up and Abatement Fund. This is actually an installment payment that was paid to resolve penalties assessed by an order that you issued in the first quarter. That should read 2023.001 issue to the Family Gun Club, which is a managed wetland located in Fairfield.

Finally, I will end my report with a review of the issues that we are working on in Q4, which as I said extends from the beginning of October through the end of December.

First, we are still short-staffed on the Enforcement Team, and this has been an ongoing issue since last November of 2022. Additionally, over the summer we lost our staff attorney, our enforcement attorney.

We have two proposed orders pending a Commission hearing on December 7.

We have two formal enforcement cases that are pending an Enforcement Committee hearing and that is tentatively scheduled for December 14.

As of last check this morning there are approximately 70 open cases total in the queue, which is a new low since the beginning of the reinvigorated Enforcement Program in 2020.

That concludes my report. Thank you for your attention and I will gladly entertain any questions now.

Chair Wasserman asked: Reyлина, any questions from the public?

Ms. Ruiz stated: No public comment.

Chair Wasserman continued: Questions or comments from Commissioners?

Commissioner Gilmore chimed in: This is just a quick comment. I really want to stress the number of open enforcement cases being at 70. That is a far, far cry from where we started a few years ago; I think we had in excess of 270 cases. This marks just an incredible effort by staff putting in the procedures and processes in place so that we could work these cases. This is just a fabulous effort by staff, and I think they are to be greatly congratulated for this. Thank you.

Chair Wasserman agreed: Indeed. It almost wants to make me thank the state audit.

Executive Director Goldzband added: I was actually going to suggest congratulations to staff as well as to the Enforcement Committee, because the Enforcement Committee handles a lot of the, I am not going to say the tougher cases because none of them is easy, but certainly the ones that reach the Enforcement Committee are complex and difficult and we could not be doing this without you.

I want to stress two things here and I know I am a broken record. We have two vacancies. We have a vacancy that has been around for a year for essentially an entry level policy staffer, a CPA I, who wants to learn about Coastal Zone Management.

There is no better way to learn about Coastal Zone Management, in my opinion, than being a member of the Enforcement staff, because you see it all. If any of you have networks that you can use to broadcast that, if any of you have recent college graduates who are interning on your staff, if any of you have friends, family, neighbors, who have people just entering the workforce and they are interested in this, let us know, because we can certainly use the help.

And then second, with the fact that the queue is down to 70. Absolutely remarkable work compared to where we were. A lot of that is because Matthew and his predecessor have really set up real, real good processes that work. And we have and are continuing to learn as a staff what requires more of our attention and less of our attention, so that is always going to be a learning process. But I really want to say that where we are now compared to where we were three years and five years ago, it is a fundamentally different place.

Chair Wasserman agreed and moved on to Adjournment: Second the motion. That concludes this item. Thank you very much for the presentation, and more importantly, the work.

13. **Adjournment.** Upon motion by Commissioner Nelson, seconded by Commissioner Peskin, the Commission meeting was adjourned at 2:30 p.m.