

# 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@bcdc.ca.gov](mailto:info@bcdc.ca.gov) | [www.bcdc.ca.gov](http://www.bcdc.ca.gov)

## Meeting Minutes

August 20, 2024

**To:** All Commissioners and Alternates

**From:** Lawrence J. Goldzband, Executive Director

(415/352-3653; [larry.goldzband@bcdc.ca.gov](mailto:larry.goldzband@bcdc.ca.gov))

Sierra Peterson, Executive Manager & Commissioner Liaison

(415/352-3608; [sierra.peterson@bcdc.ca.gov](mailto:sierra.peterson@bcdc.ca.gov))

**Subject: Approved Meeting Minutes of August 15, 2024, 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 hybrid BCDC Commission meeting. My name is Zack Wasserman and I am the Chair of this Commission. I want to thank the Commissioners here at Metro Center for attending the meeting in person, as well as to acknowledge those that are participating virtually.

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

**2. Roll Call.** Present were Chair Wasserman, Vice Chair Eisen, Commissioners Addiego, Burt, Eckerle (represented by Alternate Kimball), Eklund, El-Tawansy (represented by Alternate Ambuehl), Gioia, Gunther, Lee (represented by Alternate Kishimoto), Lucchesi (represented by Alternate Pemberton), Mashburn (represented by Alternate Vasquez), Ramos, Ranchod, Randolph (joined after Roll Call), Showalter, and Tam (represented by Alternate Gilmore). Assembly Representative Ting (represented by Alternate John-Baptiste) was also present.

Chair Wasserman announced that a quorum was present.

Not present were Commissioners: Association of Bay Area Governments (Zepeda), Speaker of the Assembly (Ahn), USACE (Beach), Department of Finance (Benson), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (Blake), Sonoma County (Gorin), Marin County (Moulton-Peters), City and County of San Francisco (Peskin), San Mateo County (Pine), Governor (Hasz)

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

Bruce Beyaert commented: Chair Wasserman, Members of the Commission; my name is Bruce Beyaert, I am the chair of TRAC, Trails for Richmond Action Committee. I would like to let you know that the city councils of both Richmond and Albany have adopted resolutions stating the Richmond-San Rafael Bridge Trail should remain open 24 hours a day, seven days a week.

Moreover, the West Contra Costa Transportation Commission adopted a resolution asking the trail be kept open 24/7 until the open road tolling and HOV lane extensions can be completed on westbound I-580.

Contrary to the assertions of Bay Area Council form emails flooding you, the RSR Bridge Trail has not significantly increased traffic congestion on I-580 westbound, crashes on the Bridge, crash clearance signs or air pollutant emissions from vehicles.

Under contract to Caltrans, UC Berkeley's Partners for Advanced Transportation Technology Group produced an after-study on May 8 evaluating the impact of the pilot project and concluded, and I quote:

"...peak-hour travel times across the Bridge have only increased by less than a minute, due to slightly lower speeds on the Bridge, and been more variable due to inability of disabled vehicles to move out of a traffic lane. However, these impacts have not translated into significantly increased congestion upstream of the Bridge..."

Continue the quotes.

“There is no statistical evidence that the Bridge modifications are producing longer crash-related incidents or changing the location of where crashes tend to occur on the Bridge.”

“There is no statistical evidence that the modifications are increasing the time needed to clear crashes.”

And final quotes.

“Vehicle emissions along I-580 West. Depending on the pollutant and season, reductions in emissions varying between 0.2% and 13% are estimated to result from the Bridge modification, primarily due to a reduction in the share of vehicles traveling above 60 miles an hour.”

This demonstrates, this UC study demonstrates that the Bay access provided by the trail is feasible. Shutting down the Richmond-San Rafael Bridge Trail four days a week would be precipitous and unjustified. It would not qualify for the required permit amendment by BCDC because Bay Trail closure would be antithetical to BCDC’s legislative mandate of ensuring maximum feasible access to San Francisco Bay. Thank you for your time. I would be glad to answer any questions should you have any.

Skylar Sacoolas was recognized: Hi, thank you. My name is Skylar Sacoolas. I am an environmental justice organizer with Green Action for Health and Environmental Justice.

While I am eager to read the Regional Shoreline Adaptation Plan in September, there are some concerns I have.

From what I understand, the Regional Shoreline Adaptation Plan has jurisdiction over local government in the Bay Area because of Senate Bill 272, but not over privately or federally owned lands, which is a major concern for sites like the Hunters Point Naval Shipyard owned by the United States Navy.

The Hunters Point Naval Shipyard contains buried toxic and radioactive waste that is vulnerable to sea level rise and groundwater rise. The Navy’s latest five-year review report released last month continues to use capping and durable covers as an acceptable form of remediation in multiple parcels at the site, even though this will leave waste buried along the shoreline.

Will the Regional Shoreline Adaptation Plan include guidelines or standards specifically prohibiting capping waste along the shoreline? And if not, if that is not already included, it should be an essential addition that I hope to see in the final draft.

And also, how will we ensure that the areas of the shoreline that do not fall under the jurisdiction of Senate Bill 272, specifically the federally owned and privately owned lands with contamination vulnerable to sea level rise and groundwater rise, to be protected, including the surrounding communities? Thank you.

Jon Johnson spoke: Yes, hello. My name is Jon Johnson, and I captain a sailboat out of Alameda. I am a frequent user of Clipper Cove, which is really a jewel in the Bay.

But recently an organization Float Labs has put a experiment, they moved it from the Middle Harbor on the Estuary, and they placed it in Clipper Cove. While myself and virtually everyone I know and all of my friends that use Clipper Cove absolutely support the good work that Float Labs is doing and the important research that is going on; unfortunately, they have placed it directly in the middle of the North Channel, which is the only way to access Clipper Cove.

At low tide, Clipper Cove gets down to two or three feet. My boat drafts six feet, which is not uncommon for a sailboat.

I have friends that have reached out to Float Labs. They indicated that it was this Commission that specified where they should place it. So, on behalf of myself and the other users that frequently use Clipper Cove, the people that have to go in and out of Treasure Island Marina, I would respectfully submit that this Commission work with Float Labs to find, there's a hundred other places you could put that research thing. But that north channel is the only place that is deep enough for a large majority of the boats that use the Cove to get in and out.

Where it sits right now, it is a hazard to navigation and I think it would truly be a tragedy if a boat trying to avoid it hit the experiment, compromised the experiment, and damaged the boat, when it could have been placed somewhere else.

Again, I would strongly encourage you guys to work with Float Labs who seems amenable to moving it to find a different location that is safer and not a hazard to navigation. Thank you for your time.

Glen Dyszynski commented: My name is Glen Dyszynski, calling in actually for the same reason as Jon, calling in with regard to the Float Lab experiment.

I also operate a sailboat in the Bay and use Clipper Cove frequently for anchoring. And yes, I just wanted to point out the same concerns around the accessibility of Clipper Cove as a result of the experiment itself and the anchor lines going out from it, blocking the deep channel. I won't go any further. I think Jon put it pretty well but similarly concerned, thank you.

Max Perez stated: Hey, good afternoon. Hi. My name is Max Perez. I have been working, I have been speaking with the director of Float Lab and just wanted to reiterate what Jon and Glen had raised.

We definitely support the aims and the goals of Float Lab's research device, just that it does impact the only channel in and out of the Clipper Cove anchorage. I appreciate the fact that the director of Float Lab I believe is working with a representative from BCDC and the Treasure Island Sailing Center to come up with some sort of solution. I just wanted to put it on record and say that I appreciate all the work that everybody is doing to cooperate to resolve this issue. Thank you.

Chair Wasserman continued to the Report of the Chair.

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

**A. Bay Adapt Summit.** The first matter that I wish to report on is a review of our first Bay Adapt Summit held last Thursday at the San Francisco Exploratorium. It was a resounding success. There were 225 attendees and 100 people on the waitlist, so clearly it is a matter of interest and concern.

I do want to thank our partners, the state Coastal Conservancy and BARC for funding and the Green Belt Alliance for organizing the amazing event, and to thank the Exploratorium, which hosted us without charge in their observatory with a wonderful view of the Bay and access to the exhibits.

Morning tours to various sites throughout the Bay were sold out.

An environmental justice panel kicked it off with a range of interesting comments and observations about the concerns of impacted and underrepresented communities with rising sea level.

There were breakout sessions on a range of topics, and the general comments that I heard from all of them were excellent.

We had Bay Adapt awards recognizing climate change leaders who are making significant strides in addressing the critical challenges posed by rising sea levels. The award winners included Violet Saena, who is a BCDC EJ Advisor, Dr. Kris May, who has been part of many permits and studies for us, and our own Supervisor and Commissioner Dave Pine.

And there was good networking amongst the people at the breaks and afterwards at the reception, where we had some wonderful natural wines from a woman who was formerly with FEMA here in the Bay Area and has a winery down in Mexico. And a few stayed on to enjoy After Dark at the Exploratorium, which if you have not done is just a fun evening. It is adults, not kids, playing with their array of exhibits and experiments.

**B. Climate Bond.** I want to recognize that Proposition 4 on the November ballot proposes to allocate \$10 billion to help prepare this state for the impacts of climate change. Included in the bond are provisions to protect water quality, increase water supplies, prevent wildfires and reduce fire impacts and help frontline communities access safe drinking water, shade and green space, and protect and expand natural habitats such as the wetlands throughout the Bay.

While BCDC as an entity is unable to take a position on the ballot proposition as a state agency, I know that many of you either have or are considering endorsing the bond measure, and certainly urge you as an individual to support that. If you do so, I remind you to do so as an individual and not as a BCDC Commissioner in terms of identification, so we are not using state assets in support of a bond measure.

**C. Future Meetings of Interest.** I want to let you know about a couple of meetings that are coming up that are listed on our website's new calendar function. Next Wednesday, the Sand Mining Studies Commissioner Working Group will meet virtually at 10:00 a.m. to continue their review and research into many of the issues that likely will arise during the consideration of future sand mining permits by all of us next year. All Commissioners are welcome to that, and the link can be found on the website.

The next meeting of our Rising Sea Level Working Group is provisionally scheduled for the morning of Thursday, October 17. We will be talking to staff and the public about how different types of challenges that can be faced by communities and how they relate to our authority and jurisdiction.

**D. Next Meeting.** We will not have a Commission meeting on October 3, because it is the first day of Rosh Hashanah. Our next meeting will be September 5, which is the Thursday immediately following Labor Day. At that meeting we expect to take up the following matters:

- A public hearing on the environmental assessment associated with a future permit and possible vote on Cargill's operations and maintenance permit in the South Bay.
- A briefing on the safety measures intended to protect the bridges within the Bay from vessel allisions in light of the Baltimore Bridge allision. I guess it is called an allision because it did not really hit, it just brushed. Is that the difference?

Ms. Peterson stated: I believe it is a nautical term, cars collide and boats allide.

Chair Wasserman acknowledged: Thank you.

**E. Ex Parte Communication.** If you have received an ex-parte communication that is outside of a Commission meeting about a matter that we are going to consider you do need to report that. You need to report it in writing. You may report it now; you do not have to. Please remember that the written report should be detailed enough so that the public has some sense of what was communicated to you during the conversations. Does anyone have ex-parte?

Commissioner Ranchod stated: I participated in meetings regarding MTC's application for modification of the operation of the bike-pedestrian lane on the Richmond-San Rafael Bridge. Those were meetings with Bay Area Council and East Bay Bicycle Coalition respectively, for and against the application's proposal.

Commissioner Pemberton stated: Thank you, Chair Wasserman. I also participated in a couple of meetings regarding the application involving the Richmond-San Rafael Bridge with proponents for the action and also individuals in opposition. Thank you.

Chair Wasserman continued: That brings us to the report of the Executive Director who is participating remotely and has to leave a little early, which is why our General Counsel is seated next to me to make sure I do not go too far off script.

**5. Report of the Executive Director.** Executive Director Goldzband reported: Thank you, Chair Wasserman, appreciate it.

The Nobel Prize-winning economist John Nash was fond of saying that "you don't have to be a mathematician to have a feel for numbers." This date demonstrates that. On August 15, 1620, 102 brave souls boarded the Mayflower in London for their trip to the New World. Exactly 345 years later on August 15, 1965, 55,000 screaming fans packed Shea Stadium in Queens to see, but not hear, the Beatles. And exactly four years later, 460,000 people braved the rain, mud and bad acid to participate in the Woodstock Music and Art Fair.

I was reminded of this last Thursday at the Bay Adapt Summit that Chair Wasserman discussed. Not that there was any bad acid, but that if BCDC had issued invitations to a rising sea level summit just six or seven years ago we likely could have hosted it in our backyard.

Last week, on the other hand, we had about 225 people at the Exploratorium and a wait list of 100 who could not attend. Combine that with the latest findings from the Public Policy Institute of California that upward of 80% of the Bay Area's likely voters are somewhat or very concerned about flooding, I hesitate to say that BCDC is riding a wave here, but we understand that more waves are coming, and our programs are striking a chord.



I am very, very, very happy to let you know that Rylan Gervase has agreed to become BCDC's first Director of Legislative and External Affairs. Rylan currently works in the senior leadership of the State Water Project at the Department of Water Resources where he manages projects in the intersection of engineering, legislation and public affairs, including implementing its strategic plan and managing project, public, and legislative communications. Rylan earned his undergraduate degree from Sacramento State, after which the Hornet became an Unruh Assembly Fellow and worked for then-Assemblymember Rob Bonta handling a variety of legislative issues. He left the building and spent two years lobbying for the California Special Districts Association prior to earning his gubernatorial appointment to DWR.

Ryan will handle BCDC's legislative portfolio, develop his skills as our Public Information Officer, and work closely with the planning and regulatory divisions to reach out to local governments and educate them about BCDC's authority and jurisdiction. Unless I hear otherwise, Rylan will start with us in September.

I am also pleased to announce that BCDC will hire Ben Dorfman for our Long-Range Planning Team as a Waterfront Planner. Ben comes to us from the Ocean Protection Council where he is a Sea Grant Fellow working on OPC's Climate Change Program. He also helped launch the OPC's Rising Sea Level Local Grants Program, assisted with developing the recent Rising Sea Levels Guidance, and has served as an OPC representative engaging with BCDC's Bay Adapt Initiative.

He is a Banana Slug once again with a degree in Environmental Studies; and a Panther from Middlebury, from which he earned his master's degree in international environmental policy.

Ben will help support our work with the State Lands Commission on the future of the public trust in the Bay, as well as on the upcoming San Francisco Waterfront Plan proposal.

I should note that a few of us had a very successful site visit to Fisherman's Wharf with Port of San Francisco staff as we move forward on that collaboration.

I also want to note that Steve Goldbeck's retirement party was originally supposed to be today; but as you know, it has been rescheduled for October 17 after the Commission meeting. Please save the date; we will remind you in a month or so.

However, the news is not pretty when it comes to the state budget. Like all departments, BCDC was required by the Department of Finance to list our unoccupied positions and then lose the funding associated with them.

Due to some great work by our managers and Anu in HR we had only 1.2 total vacant FTEs, which resulted in our losing less than \$100,000 in annual funding.

However, in addition to the vacancy sweep, each department will lose about 8% of its General Fund and other revenues this year. We are awaiting instructions regarding how this cut will work and we will keep you informed of its ramifications.

It was great to see Commissioners last Thursday at the Exploratorium where we held the first ever Bay Adapt Summit to highlight and celebrate all the great work that is being done around the region to advance the Bay Adapt Joint Platform. The morning was full of tours throughout the region, the afternoon panels and breakout sessions were terrific, the awards ceremony was fantastic, the day was capped off with an awesome reception.

I also want to send thanks to the Greenbelt Alliance, the State Coastal Conservancy and the Bay Area Regional Collaborative and the Exploratorium.

Finally, as I noted in February, this year the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Agency's Office for Coastal Management is reviewing California's Coastal Zone Management Program as required under Section 312 of the federal Coastal Zone Management Act. NOAA's 312 Evaluation occurs every five years. It analyzes the operations and management of all of California's three coastal zone management institutions, the Coastal Commission, the Coastal Conservancy and BCDC. It assesses the overall Program's accomplishments and needs and includes recommendations for improvements.

This year's evaluation will take place during the last week of August. NOAA will accept written comments by the public on the state of the program, and the week's examination will include a virtual public meeting on Wednesday, August 28th. BCDC will announce the details of the public meeting on our website and provide that information to all Commissioners and Alternates.

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

I do want to add, however, that I will be having some knee surgery next week. I will be out of the office through probably most of September, but I will be, just like we did in the pandemic, manning the BCDC kitchen counter here at the Goldzband Hilton every day, so I will certainly be available. Thank you very much.

Chair Wasserman asked: Are there any questions for our Executive Director? (No questions were voiced) The Chair moved to the Consent Calendar.

## **6. Consent Calendar**

- a) Approval of Minutes for the June 20, 2024, Meeting**
- b) Resolution of Appreciation and Gratitude - William (Bill) Holmes, Retired Engineering Criteria Review Board Member**
- c) Staff Recommendation: ECRB Membership Appointment and Promotion of Alternate to the Board**

Chair Wasserman reviewed the items on the Consent Calendar and called for public comment.

(No members of the public addressed the Commission.)

Chair Wasserman asked for a motion and a second to adopt the Consent Calendar.

**MOTION:** Commissioner Eklund moved approval of the Consent Calendar, seconded by Commissioner Showalter.

**VOTE:** The motion carried with a vote of 17-0-0 with Commissioners Addiego, Ambuehl, Burt, Eklund, Gilmore, Gioia, Gunther, Kimball, Kishimoto, Pemberton, Ramos, Ranchod, Randolph, Showalter, Vasquez, Vice Chair Eisen and Chair Wasserman voting, "YES", no "NO" votes, and no "ABSTAIN" votes.

**7. Commission Consideration of Administrative Matters.** Chair Wasserman asked if there were any questions for Regulatory Director Harriet Ross regarding the administrative listing.

(No members of the public addressed the Commission.)

(No questions were posed to Ms. Ross.)

**8. Public Hearing and Possible Vote to Initiate Regional Shoreline Adaptation Plan Bay Plan Amendment (BPA No. 1-24).** Chair Wasserman stated: That brings us to Item 8, which is a public hearing and possible vote to initiate a Regional Shoreline Adaptation Plan Bay Plan Amendment. This amendment would update the San Francisco Bay Plan by establishing guidelines to be followed by local governments as they prepare their subregional sea level rise plans required by the enactment of Senate Bill 272. The proposed Bay Plan Amendment would also update and clarify the Bay Plan's existing climate change policies in certain areas. Jessica Fain, our Director of Planning, will initiate the briefing.

But before that, I am opening the public hearing.

Director of Planning Fain presented the following: Thank you, Chair Wasserman. Good afternoon, Commissioners. I am Jessica Fain, Director of Planning here at BCDC, and I am pleased today to introduce today's presentation where we are requesting your approval to initiate a Bay Plan amendment process for the Regional Shoreline Adaptation Plan.

I am joined today by my colleagues Jackie Perrin-Martinez, who is joining us virtually, as well as Cory Mann, who will provide you with a brief update on the status of the RSAP, as we like to call it, followed by an overview of the process we are hoping to enter into this fall.

You may be asking yourself, why are we initiating the RSAP now? Haven't we been working on this for a while? The answer is yes, of course. We have briefed you a number of times on this process throughout the past year, and our team has been working really hard with stakeholders around the region to craft this plan to make it work.

The focus of today's presentation and the action before you is not on the content of this plan. There will be plenty of time to do that during the public comment and review period that is going to happen this fall. Rather, it is to seek your approval to initiate a Bay Plan amendment process and circulate a Descriptive Notice to do so, as required by our regulations.

You have received a number of thoughtful comment letters, for example, in your meeting package today. Rest assured that those public comments will be taken into account as we bring a draft and a final version of the RSAP to you later this fall.

Before I turn it over to Cory, I just wanted to put this plan into a little bit of context. BCDC has been doing a lot of work on sea level rise adaptation for quite some time, but really starting in 2011 when you adopted climate change policies into the San Francisco Bay Plan, and we were the first coastal management in the country to do so. These policies have guided our planning and permitting work to date.

One of these policies calls explicitly for the development of a regional shoreline adaptation strategy and that has been the foundation for our Bay Adapt efforts and for the Regional Shoreline Adaptation Plan that we are discussing today.

As shown us on this time timeline, BCDC has successfully developed a wide range of programs, related policy amendments such as our Fill for Habitat Amendment and Environmental Justice and Social Equity Amendments, resources and tools to advance sea level rise adaptation planning for the region.

The RSAP really follows this decade of work, which has consistently been based on collaboration, data and science-driven planning and increasingly including the best practices related to equitable engagement as well.

The RSAP is our latest effort to bring strong regional leadership to this issue of sea level rise adaptation. It is a highlight of your Strategic Plan. And with SB 272 it is also now required that BCDC complete this work by the end of the year.

I would also like to just remind you that the RSAP really comes from the Bay Adapt Joint Platform adopted by you, as well as 50 other public agencies, nonprofits and others, that lays out a consensus-driven strategy for how the Bay Area should adapt to sea level rise.

The RSAP is really implementing four key tasks listed here in the Joint Platform:

One, creating a long-term regional vision rooted in communities, Bay habitats and the economy.

Two, providing incentives for coordinated adaptation plans.

Three, incentivizing projects that meet regional goals.

And four, measuring regional progress.

With that, I am going to turn it over to Jackie, who is going to give you some context on the RSAP and its development to date.

Ms. Perrin-Martinez addressed attendees: Great. Thank you, Jessica.

I want to just remind us all why a regional approach to this challenge is so important. As you all know, our region is highly interconnected and we know that adaptation, or even a lack of adaptation in one location, can cause massive disruptions to areas far beyond a specific place of impact.

For example, flooding at one section of State Route 37 can lead to traffic delays that extend throughout the North Bay. Similarly, a disruption to a wastewater treatment plant caused by flooding can affect people both near to and far from the shoreline.

And the way we plan and prepare for sea level rise must be done with these relationships across our region in mind, not only to avoid the worst of these risks, but because there are more opportunities that arise when we come together.

Planning regionally ensures that adaptation responses are coordinated, that they provide priority resources to frontline communities, maintain the long-term health of our habitats and wetlands, support strategic implementation of projects, develop common standards and methods for planning, deliver funding to the places that need it most, and track how our collective progress is adding up.

In the simplest terms, the RSAP, the Regional Shoreline Adaptation Plan, is a region-wide plan for the Bay shoreline that guides the creation of coordinated, locally-planned sea level rise adaptation actions that work together to meet regional goals.

This project is being funded by the Ocean Protection Council and the State Coastal Conservancy and is envisioned to serve as a model for how other regions in California can collectively plan for climate impacts.

You have heard us talk about SB 272 often, but it is worth a reminder on what this bill requires for BCDC and how the RSAP is meeting these requirements.

Statewide legislation was passed in October last year that requires local jurisdictions to develop subregional resiliency plans and for BCDC to develop the guidelines that these plans must follow. BCDC then has the authority to approve or deny these plans based on consistency with the guidelines. Approved plans are eligible for prioritized state funding.

The bill further requires that BCDC adopt these guidelines by December 2024 and for local plans to be completed by January 2034.

When we were funded to initiate the RSAP last year the project was funded with this bill in mind, so we were already well on our way by the time this bill passed in October.

And as you will see on my next slide, the RSAP contains the guidelines as required by this bill, but it also goes above and beyond by including the tasks listed in the Joint Platform and the foundations of BCDC's climate change policies, as Jessica described earlier.

The bill sets some minimum requirements for what the guidelines should contain, including being based in best available science, having a vulnerability assessment with an emphasis on vulnerable communities, developing adaptation strategies, designating implementation leads, among others. These aspects are all incorporated into our guidelines.

I want to note that this bill applies to local governments within both BCDC and the California Coastal Commission's respective jurisdictions. It applies to both of the agencies and the jurisdictions within.

We have been meeting with the California Coastal Commission staff regularly to ensure that we are as aligned as possible, though it is important to note that our agency's approaches to meeting the requirements of this bill look a little bit different. The California Coastal Commission has different enabling legislation than we do, and they have an existing local coastal program. They are updating their existing guidance as a mechanism to meet the bill. Our approach is to include the guidelines as required by SB 272 into the Regional Shoreline Adaptation Plan.

I would like to give an overview of the multiple pieces of the RSAP and direct you to the scope of the proposed Bay Plan Amendment that Cory will discuss with you further.

This is the current phase of our work. We have been sharing updates to the Commission on these two pieces. The first is the regional approach, which represents the big picture, the regionwide One Bay Vision for what adaptation along the Bay's shoreline should look like. We identified strategic regional priorities for each vision that identifies a regionally significant issue that must be addressed in local planning to help align local and regional priorities.

We shared the One Bay Vision with the Commission back in February this year, and we have been working to develop the plan guidelines and the minimum standards, which include the requirements of SB 272.

The guidelines lay out a consistent process and standards for how to create subregional shoreline adaptation plans and develop adaptation strategies that meet minimum criteria and advance the region's priorities and outcomes of the One Bay Vision.

These two parts are what we intend to bring to BCDC's Commission for adoption in December this year.

Following the adoption of the guidelines, local jurisdictions will then begin the hard and important work of conducting adaptation planning along their shorelines with their communities and their neighbors.

BCDC staff will transition to providing technical and policy assistance to support local jurisdictions in meeting these guidelines.

But there is a lot more work that we know needs to be done to advance and implement strategies in these plans, from developing a regional investment strategy to building a roadmap for planning and regulatory alignment and more.

We are intending to continue the leadership that BCDC plays in this space by supporting adaptation regionwide.

And lastly just emphasizing again that the components to the proposed Bay Plan amendment would be these first two parts, the One Bay Vision and the Plan Guidelines.



As a final note before I turn it over to Cory, I want to emphasize the immense amount of outreach and engagement that we have been conducting as part of the RSAP. We have been leading an advisory group of over 40 experts across the region, we developed an equity strategy that has guided and driven our equitable outreach approach, and we have been all around the region at various events. We have held public and local planning practitioner workshops. We held five really wonderful in-person workshops in partnership with community-based organizations, we have been in communities talking to folks on the ground, and we have been meeting with local elected officials across the region to ensure that many folks are aware of this work and many voices have had the opportunity to help shape it.

The focus, as Jessica mentioned, of this presentation today is on the proposal to adopt the RSAP as a Bay Plan Amendment. At a future meeting I will be happy to share more details on the contents of the RSAP and the guidelines themselves, but for now I hope you have a greater sense of the project overall. And with that I will turn it over to Cory.

Mr. Mann presented the following: Thanks, Jackie. Now I will talk more about the process for establishing the RSAP as part of the Bay Plan and the timeline for completing this update by the end of 2024.

I know that Jackie already spoke about the requirements of SB 272 and that you have heard about it various times and at length. But I just want to start by noting that the bill does not actually speak to the process for the Commission's approval of the RSAP Plan. Based on consultation with BCDC's legal counsel, that means the expectation is that BCDC will use its existing laws, regulations and plans to implement the provisions of SB 272,

Here is an overview of those laws, regulations and plans. The McAteer-Petris Act created BCDC to limit filling of the Bay, promote public access to its shorelines, and to create the San Francisco Bay Plan.

The Bay Plan is a living document. It contains findings and policies on a wide range of topics from commercial fishing to managed wetlands to environmental justice and social equity, and, of course, on climate change.

Projects that require permits from BCDC must be consistent with the policies in the Bay Plan. When needed, the Bay Plan can also incorporate Special Area Plans that are specific to certain portions of the shoreline, or other plans addressing special needs.

For example, you will recall that the Seaport Plan has its own set of findings and policies for port areas. You can think of these plans as extensions of the Bay Plan. But any Special Area Plan, the Seaport Plan, et cetera, and the Bay Plan itself need to be consistent with the McAteer-Petris Act in order to be enforceable.

If you think of all that as the content that we work with, there is still the how. The substantive requirements under the McAteer-Petris Act are further fleshed out through regulations that the Commission has formally adopted in compliance with the Administrative Procedure Act and subject to approval by the Office of Administrative Law.

That includes everything from when and how the Commission meets to our permit and our enforcement procedures, to how we are allowed to adopt new plans and policies. The question then is, where does the RSAP and eventually the subregional shoreline adaptation plans, fit into this framework?

BCDC staff have concluded and recommend that the most straightforward approach to give the RSAP legal effect as envisioned under SB 272 is to adopt the RSAP through the Bay Plan amendment process, just as BCDC would adopt a Special Area Plan, a Seaport Plan, or any other more specific application of the Bay Plan.

As I mentioned on the last slide, BCDC's existing procedures provide a clear allowance for incorporating more specific plans like this one into the Bay Plan.

In addition to adopting the RSAP as a Bay Plan amendment, staff will recommend amending some of the relevant Bay Plan Climate Change Findings and Policies, particularly Climate Change Policy 6.

The existing Bay Plan Climate Change Policy 6 states in short that the Commission should develop a Regional Shoreline Adaptation Plan. Since that is what we are doing by establishing the RSAP and reviewing and taking action eventually on the required subregional shoreline adaptation plans, we are going to suggest updating this policy to acknowledge and establish the RSAP.

Updating the associated findings in the Climate Change section of the Bay Plan will also allow us to describe the requirements of SB 272 and help to connect that legislation directly to the Bay Plan itself. This would be a limited and targeted update to adopt and incorporate the RSAP rather than a wholesale revision of all of the Bay Plan Climate Change Policies.

Finally, and this is very important, adopting the RSAP as a Bay Plan amendment at the end of this year will not alter the permitting process for individual projects. This amendment would be limited to incorporating the RSAP into BCDC's planning program under SB 272, but it would have no effect on how individual projects are reviewed and permitted.

But of course, implementation of the RSAP as well as BCDC's review of subregional shoreline adaptation plans is going to be an ongoing process. The purpose of amending the Bay Plan in this manner is to formalize the Commission's adoption of the Plan, but beyond 2024 there is still much to do.

First, one thing to note about the Bay Plan amendment process is that it is somewhat cumbersome for when updates to plans are needed.

Therefore, an important step will be to seek legislative solutions that could exempt updates to the Plan from having to go through the entire Bay Plan amendment process to give them legal effect.

Some state agencies have legislative carveouts that allow those agencies to issue guidance that is not subject to the Administrative Procedure Act or review by the Office of Administrative Law. We would seek a similar kind of legislative carveout for updates to the RSAP and that would provide us with some more flexibility to make sure that we can update the Plan regularly and when needed.

But to be clear, we would be looking for a legislatively approved approach that would be more streamlined, but just as or more participatory and transparent to the public.

More broadly, BCDC will need to assess its authority and jurisdiction to consider how to best link sea level rise planning to our regulatory program.

You will likely remember this from previous presentations on BCDC's Strategic Plan. Goal 2 Objective 1 of the Strategic Plan is to: "Determine whether and how BCDC regulatory and planning authority and jurisdiction should be expanded to foster larger scale adaptation efforts." This is something that staff are already beginning to brainstorm on internally and we hope to start a series of conversations about these issues with the Commission and stakeholders across the region soon.

Adopting the RSAP at the end of this year is an important step, but this in and of itself does not alter BCDC's Permitting Program or underlying McAteer-Petris Act authority.

We are beginning to explore these possibilities, and we look forward to discussing this more at future Commission meetings. These initiatives could end up including future Bay Plan amendments or future legislation, or likely both, to more holistically integrate permitting and planning for sea level rise in the years to come.

Those are a few of the bigger picture things that staff are beginning to think about and we wanted to flag those to you now. But I should specifically say that none of the things before you today or that I am discussing on this slide would be part of this proposed Bay Plan Amendment.

Finally, here is some more concrete information about the Bay Plan amendment process and timeline. First, we circulated a draft Descriptive Notice, and a brief staff report to the Commission on August 2 in advance of today's public hearing and possible vote on whether to initiate the Bay Plan amendment process.

If the Commission votes to initiate the process, then we will mail the final Descriptive Notice out with a public hearing date to our list of interested parties.

Then in mid-September staff will circulate a staff report with a preliminary recommendation to the Commission. That is going to be a big mailing. The staff report will have the specific policy language that we suggest amending in the Bay Plan Climate Change Policies along with the draft Regional Shoreline Adaptation Plan itself.

That date September 13 is a big one and it also marks the beginning of the official public comment period in which BCDC will respond to every written comment received. But of course, we have been and will continue to engage stakeholders throughout this entire process, including holding an opportunity for public comment today to determine whether or not to initiate this process.

On October 17 we would hold a public hearing on the draft RSAP as well as the policy revisions in the Bay Plan that I just mentioned and then the official public comment period would likely close at the end of that meeting.

After that staff would make revisions based on public and Commissioner input prior to circulating a final recommendation and another meeting with a Commission vote on whether or not to adopt the RSAP and those related changes to the Bay Plan, tentatively scheduled for December 5.

Like any Bay Plan amendment, updating the Bay Plan requires a two-thirds affirmative vote of the total Commission, so 18 positive votes. This timeline will ensure that BCDC finalizes the guidelines for the RSAP by the end of the year per the requirements of SB 272.

If the Commission votes to adopt the amendment, staff would then need to submit the amendment for review by the state Office of Administrative Law and we may also submit the amendment to NOAA to incorporate the amendment into BCDC's Federal Coastal Management Program.

That brings us to the Staff Recommendation. The last thing to mention briefly is that in contrast to the two-thirds vote requirement for adopting a Bay Plan, the Commission only needs a majority vote to initiate the Bay Plan amendment process. But of course, before I read the Staff Recommendation I will stop, and we will be happy to answer any questions.

Chair Wasserman asked: Do we have any public comment?

Carin High commented: Good afternoon. Carin High, Citizens Committee to Complete the Refuge (CCCR). Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments.

We thoroughly support the adoption of the notice to initiate the process to amend the Bay Plan to include the RSAP. Since 2010, CCCR has actively participated in the climate change amendment, Adapting to Rising Tides and Bay Adapt processes, and we are currently on the RSAP Advisory Group.

We would just like to give a few higher-level comments regarding how we adapt to climate change. One, habitats of the Bay are vulnerable, are threatened by sea level rise, not just communities.

Bay habitats provide vital benefits for our communities including sea level resilience and should be considered important natural infrastructure in our efforts to plan for sea level rise adaptation. A holistic approach to planning for sea level rise resilience that includes protections of the Bay's existing and future habitats is crucial for Bay Area communities.

And with respect to the RSAP, we support language for strategic regional priorities pertaining to ecosystem health and resilience and we urge that the ecosystem services provided by Bay habitats be integrated as a thread that weaves throughout the RSAP Guidelines language in a document that will be used by many who may not have been exposed to the concept of ecosystem services and the important role natural infrastructure Bay habitats plays in providing climate change resilience.

It is important that the vulnerability and crucial resilience functions of the Bay's habitats is clearly identified as well as the need to protect these functions moving into the future and that this be woven throughout the RSAP.

We look forward to continued participation in this very important regional process and our appreciation goes out to staff who are dealing with this very complex issue. Thank you.

Hannah Okoreeh spoke: Good afternoon. I am Hannah Okoreeh on behalf of Shaw Yoder Antwih Schmelzer & Lange. Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments.

Just one quick question. As I understand it, the draft guidelines do not allow special districts to submit sea level rise plans or projects. Currently, only cities or local jurisdictions are able to exercise that authority. What abilities do special districts have in terms of addressing sea level rise within the guidelines and is there room for amending the guidelines to include special districts? Thank you.

Chair Wasserman continued: Thank you.

Comments or questions from the Commission?

Commissioner Eklund was recognized: Great presentation and a lot of good information. I have got a couple of questions. Actually, it is a series of questions.

First of all, have the local jurisdictions that are going to be required to develop this plan been notified that they are going to have to do so and that the guidelines that are going to be established to help in determining whether the plan will be approved or not by BCDC and the Coastal Commission is going to be decided upon between now and December?

The reason I ask that question is because I would assume that any city or county that touches the Bay at all would have to develop a plan. The city, my city, city of Novato, has not notified the council that we are going to be required to develop a plan. Just kind of curious as to what level of contact we have had and how or where the locals are relative to this process?

Ms. Fain replied: I can start with that one. We have been trying our hardest to work with as many local jurisdictions as possible. There's 41 cities and nine counties that touch the Bay so that's about 50 jurisdictions. We have done this in a variety of ways so far. We have been doing outreach meetings at mayors' conferences throughout the region. I think we have hit eight of the nine counties at this point, so we have used that as a forum to try to get the word out.

A few weeks ago, we hosted a workshop with planning directors. We reached out to every planning director of every jurisdiction in the Bay Area subject to this and invited them to participate in this workshop. It was a chance for them both to learn about this process and also for us to learn from them, to understand how this can really work best with cities.

Those have been our main efforts to date. We also have advisory committees and other forums where many local jurisdictions have participated but I would not say all, necessarily.

I think now as we are initiating the Bay Plan amendment process, this is a great opportunity for us to maybe more formally make sure that everyone is on notice, so that is something we can certainly look into.

Commissioner Eklund continued: Can we get a list of those 41 cities? Because I would like to know which ones are in the area that I represent so that I can make sure that those jurisdictions are aware of it.

Ms. Fain stated: Sure, happy to share that.

Commissioner Eklund added: These local governments that are going to be having to develop a plan, is there going to be any funding for them to be able to develop that plan?

Ms. Fain answered: Funding is currently available for cities through the Ocean Protection Council's SB 1 Grant Program. Justine Kimball one of our Commissioners is, I am sure, able to answer more specific questions about that grant program.

But in short, there is funding available now. It is open on a rolling basis so there's quarterly, I think, grant approval processes. It is a non-competitive grant, which means, as long as you do all the things that you are supposed to do, they will fund it, and several Bay Area cities have already received funding in anticipation of this coming and are using that program.

I would say if that is something that your city needs look into that, we are happy to connect you with those folks at OPC as well.

Commissioner Eklund noted: Since there's only 41 cities, then not every city that has connection to the Bay is required to develop a plan; is that correct?

Ms. Fain replied: That is correct. Only ones within BCDC's jurisdiction.

Commissioner Eklund asked: That are in BCDC's jurisdiction, okay, got it. Is Novato subject to this?

Ms. Fain answered: Yes.

Commissioner Eklund continued: We are. That's interesting. I really would like a list of the 41 cities as soon as possible so that I can make sure that the people that are at the governance level have some idea that this is being required.

I really would like to have that as soon as possible because this whole, you know, having worked for EPA for over 35 years, we developed guidelines, and we were very careful to make sure that all of the jurisdictions that had to comply with the guidelines were going to be involved in the development of them.



The fact that I did not know my city was going to be required to do this plan may be my fault, but regardless whose fault it is, we really need to get up to speak quickly, especially if they are supposed to be approved by the end of the calendar year.

Ms. Fain stated: The guidelines, our guidelines are required to be approved by the end of the year, cities have until 2034.

Commissioner Eklund continued: I understand that. But the development of the guidelines is going to be really critical to determine how the cities develop their plans. Some cities do not have that expertise. Like our city, we have a deficit, an annual deficit of three million minimum, and so we do not necessarily have all the resources that we need, and other cities are in the same condition as we are.

I am just really anxious to get that information so that then I can help start spreading the word so that we can make sure that our cities are prepared and are involved each step of the way.

Are we going to be notified of all of the public venues where we are going to be discussing the guidelines? Can we be notified in advance so we can put it on our calendars, and we can follow the process?

Ms. Fain replied: Absolutely. Yes, absolutely.

Commissioner Eklund acknowledged: Okay, great, great, because that is a very interesting process to me, having done it at the federal level for so long. It is going to be fun to be able to participate with BCDC. Thank you very much.

Commissioner Gioia was recognized: My understanding is that BCDC has done some outreach. I know we made a presentation. I personally did a presentation with Contra Costa County staff and BCDC staff at the Contra Costa mayors' conference a couple of months ago. I know you have been embarking on reaching out to county mayors' conferences. Haven't you been doing that?

Ms. Fain replied: Yes. I am trying to remember if it has been seven or eight of the counties that we have reached out to. But we have gone to mayors' conferences in Marin, Alameda, Contra Costa, I believe Napa, Sonoma, Solano. I think we have San Mateo, and I think we still have Santa Clara.

Commissioner Gioia continued: So really, it is up to the mayors from those cities who are at these conferences to report back to their jurisdictions about this requirement, right? Are you going to do any mailing as well? And also, my understanding is the cities, you have held regional meetings to get input on all of this.

Ms. Fain answered: Yes, we have had a number of regional meetings. As I mentioned, the planning directors' meeting that we held a few weeks ago. And we will continue as we enter this public comment phase to continue to do that work and continue to do that outreach as we enter this more formal part of the plan development process.

Commissioner Gioia asked: Presumably you have been taking input from these public meetings, including from cities?

Ms. Fain answered: Correct.

Commissioner Gioia noted: Okay, all right. Just getting due diligence there. Thanks.

Commissioner Showalter stated: I was just going to follow up about the special districts. Really what sea level rise is, is coastal flood protection, or we used to call it coastal flood protection, and frankly very little was done. But now we call it sea level rise and we are doing lots, which is great.

But anyway, flood protection is covered by a patchwork quilt of agencies here, it is not all done by the cities. I thought the idea of including the special relevant districts, particularly in Santa Clara, Santa Clara Valley Water District is really germane. It seems like all the things I have worked on with BCDC, we have been very open to that, and we have done that, so I just wanted to confirm that indeed, we were really reaching out to everybody who is in the flood protection space. Is that right?

Ms. Fain agreed: That is correct. The legislation itself says that local jurisdictions must adopt these subregional plans, so that is within the legislation. But as we are developing these guidelines, we know that who manages our shoreline is really diverse, it is a mix of special districts and flood control districts and private properties and public properties. It is a whole mess of different entities that are responsible and own and manage that land.

So, what our guidelines are trying to do is call out how do we make sure that those entities are coordinating with one another, and special districts are called out as one of the key entities that needs to be part of that process.

Commissioner Showalter acknowledged: Thank you, I think that is really important. My other question which just got answered was, when were the plans going to have to be written? I think it is 2034. That is a number we should all put in our heads and keep there because people are really going to want to know about that. It is one thing to get the guidelines. But, that is ten years to think about it. That is really a long, long time.

I am hoping that we can provide incentives to get those plans done much faster and I wondered if you had a few words of wisdom about incentives we might provide.

Ms. Fain stated: Sure. I think of the legislation, that is probably the part of it that makes us a little unhappiest but that is what the legislation says. But we think and we hope that we can rally the Bay Area to do these plans faster.

A lot of cities already have plans, and we want to make that process easy for them. We also are going to be developing a technical assistance program as the next phase of this. I think that will be a way we can really work with cities and help push these along.

As I mentioned, the OPC funding is available, and so that hopefully incentivizes folks.

And then lastly, the legislation itself says that cities who have these plans in place that are approved by BCDC, and the Coastal Commission will be prioritized for state funding and that is where the real dollars are in terms of project implementation. Hopefully we can just keep messaging that the sooner you get these plans in place the sooner your projects can really be incentivized for that bigger ticket.

Commissioner Showalter added: I know in Mountain View we are going to sign up as fast as possible because the money is really an issue. We are in the process of building our sea level rise protection program. We have 14 projects in it, and we are really busy building them, but they get more expensive every year, so the money will be very, very enticing. Thank you so much. This is very, very valuable work.

Commissioner Gunther spoke: Jessica, I want to congratulate you on your very first slide, which set that context for how long we have been working on this issue. I think that is a really important drum to beat constantly. It goes back even earlier than that, because Trav was working on it earlier than that. I think that as time goes on, that is going to become more and more impressive, and it is going to become a valuable piece of information for convincing people that we have thought this out.

We are virtually at the first generation already retiring and the next generation picking this up.

I have been very, very influenced by Tony Leiserowitz's references to climate change adaptation like cathedral building in the Middle Ages and the people who built the foundations knew they were never going to see the completed structure. But that did not matter, that was part of what they were signing up for.

I really think that we need to build this into everything we do, even if it is half a sentence in a memo you write, referring back to 2011 or 2008 or wherever you want to pick up the story. But somewhere back there. You can start when Zack asked me to come talk to the Commission about sea level rise, whenever that was, in 2007 or something.

And secondly, I just want to verify today is not the day for me to be beating a drum about something that I want in the RSAP. There will be time for that serenade at a later moment. But I have some very fundamental thoughts, so I want to make sure I get in on the ground floor with the staff to throw ideas at you. Thank you.

Commissioner Kishimoto commented: I wanted to weigh in a little bit on this question about outreach. As all elected and city and government agencies know, outreach is just so difficult to reach everyone and get their attention. And it is true, reaching every county is different from actually reaching each city council and city. I do agree it is worth a little outreach if it is a limited number of cities, to contact each city specifically.

And then on the special districts. Actually, I serve on the Board of Midpen Open Space and then there is Valley Water, of course, and such. And even I am a little confused about what our role for the special districts is because we do own land on the shore actually.

Maybe the question would be, are we going to have at an least FAQ on there for which entities are going to be responsible and also the cost of doing the plan. Then the resources for getting the funding for actually doing the actual projects.

Commissioner Eklund added: I just wanted to thank staff again for all the work that you are doing on this. I think since there are only 41 cities out of the 101 in the Bay Area, I think personal contact may be very helpful.

I will definitely go back and inform all the cities in Marin and Sonoma and Solano and Napa. As soon as I get the list, I will personally contact them so that they can make sure that they are aware that there is an actual plan that needs to be developed.

I think people know that we are working on Bay Adapt and sea level rise, but I am not sure how much it sunk in that we actually have to develop a plan that meets state guidelines, BCDC's guidelines, and that there may or may not be funding available. I think that is important. Thank you very much in advance.

Chair Wasserman noted: I think all of these comments are important. I would also note that there is a responsibility on staff of the local jurisdictions to inform. And a lot of the effort that we have made, that our staff has made, is reaching out to staff. It is not exclusively that, as has been pointed out. There have been meetings with the mayors' councils in each of the counties, so it is not focusing simply on a county but trying to limit the jurisdiction so that you can effectively communicate. And as Commissioner Gioia indicated, we have also for those mayors' councils done a wider reach for people who may be available.

I think the special district discussion is an important one. Staff has certainly been aware of that in reaching out to them. They are not required to have plans pursuant to SB 272. At the same time, particularly some flood control districts, and some other special districts do have significant responsibilities.

I would actually be willing to wager that those that have those responsibilities are at least as if not more aware of this than some city staff. But the outreach has been significant and will continue to be.

Seeing no other comments will you put up the Staff Recommendation, please.

Mr. Mann: The staff recommends that the Commission:

- Vote to adopt the notice to initiate an amendment to the San Francisco Bay Plan to establish the Regional Shoreline Adaptation Plan (RSAP), including guidelines for the preparation of Subregional Shoreline Adaptation Plans by local governments within BCDP's jurisdiction, as required by Senate Bill 272 "Sea Level Rise: Planning and Adaptation" and the Bay Plan; and
- Schedule a public hearing to consider the proposed amendment.

**MOTION:** Commissioner Kishimoto moved to close the public hearing, seconded by Commissioner Gunther. The motion carried by affirmation with no abstentions or objections.

Chair Wasserman asked for a motion and a second to approve the Staff Recommendation.

Commissioner Eklund stated: I would like to move the motion, but I would also like to have that motion include that every city and county who is subject to developing a plan be given a copy of the notice to initiate this amendment, both the elected officials and the city manager.

Chair Wasserman added: Pat, I am going to ask you not to do it to all the elected officials because I think that is going to put a burden on staff. Certainly, someone at the city may be reasonable.

Commissioner Eklund replied: Okay, the city manager.

Ms. Fain stated: Staff can review our Interested Parties List prior to mailing the Descriptive Notice to make sure that there is a city contact at each jurisdiction that will be receiving the Descriptive Notice as well as the Draft Plan when it gets mailed out.

Commissioner Eklund stated: That's perfect, that's perfect. Thank you very much.

Chair Wasserman asked: Is there a second for the motion?

Mr. Scharff sought clarification: Let's clarify. Is the motion exactly what is up here, and we have just agreed that staff will do that, right?

Commissioner Eklund replied: Yes.

Mr. Scharff continued: There's no changes to the actual motion.

Commissioner Eklund stated: No change to the motion.

**MOTION:** Commissioner Eklund moved approval of the Staff Recommendation, seconded by Commissioner Randolph.

**VOTE:** The motion carried with a vote of 17-0-0 with Commissioners Addiego, Ambuehl, Burt, Eklund, Gilmore, Gioia, Gunther, Kimball, Kishimoto, Pemberton, Ramos, Ranchod, Randolph, Showalter, Vasquez, Vice Chair Eisen and Chair Wasserman voting, "YES", no "NO" votes, and no "ABSTAIN" votes.

Chair Wasserman announced: Thank you for that. We will move forward with this important process.

**9. BCDC Intern Presentations.** Chair Wasserman announced: That brings us to Item 9, a briefing for us by the BCDC summer undergraduate interns. These are people who have been working with staff this summer. This is BCDC's fourth summer cohort, and I am sure you will agree that hosting and paying interns is an important part of any public agency's function, particularly to help train and encourage future public servants. I would like to now hand the microphone over to the interns.

Ms. Cassidy addressed attendees: Good afternoon, Commissioners. We are BCDC's summer 2024 interns, and we are very pleased to be here today at the Commission meeting. We have today a presentation culminating the end of our internship here, talking about summer projects we have worked on as well as going over our internship highlights, strengths and recommendations as well. We will go around first with our names. My name is Jasmine Cassidy.

Mr. Witeck identified: My name is Ben Witeck

Ms. Chao identified: My name is Gabriella Chao.

Ms. Lamb identified: My name is Olivia Lamb.

Ms. Anoshiravani identified: And I am Atessa Anoshiravani.

Mr. Witeck acknowledged: Thank you, Jasmine, for the introduction.

This summer, I have been an Adapting to Rising Tides intern for the Data and Science Team which is led by Cory Copeland; and I have received a great deal of help from Katie Fallon so I would like to give her some acknowledgement as well.

I am a rising fourth year at UC Berkeley. I study conservation and resource studies, and I have a minor in GIS. Academically, my interests are primarily natural resource management, environmental planning, as well as economics. Outside of work and school I am a jazz pianist, I play guitar, I DJ a little bit, and I really enjoy hiking and camping. My love of the outdoors is partially why I am here.

Over the course of the summer, I have been focusing on building an inventory of sea level rise policies found in general plans from across 55 cities and all nine Bay Area counties.

Past inventories created by BCDC, and other organizations have considered Vulnerability Assessments as well as other planning documents in pursuit of adapting to sea level rise. However, our inventory, we covered specifically general plans because of the broad focus in subject matter that they tend to cover by California law.

The inventory looked at individual policies as well as the different sorts of scientific outcomes that each city is planning for.

The way that we conducted this work is really based off of prior studies from UC Davis as well as a current study being conducted by the Ocean and Coastal Policy Center at UCSB, who we have directly interfaced with multiple times over the summer, and we are looking forward to their work product finally being released in September. It covers a lot of the same subject matter that we do, except for the entire state, for the entire coast.

For each policy they were sorted into one or more policy categories, if any were applicable to the policy. You can see a little graphic, a little screenshot of the monstrous spreadsheet I was editing for most of the summer. Larry caught me a couple times looking at that and he was taken aback a little bit.



These policy categories are developed from the One Bay Vision, a foundational document for the Regional Shoreline Adaptation Plan, and ultimately these were used to generate metrics for the Bay Adapt Dashboard, which will be released later this year and will allow residents and jurisdictions in the Bay Area alike to look and see how their city, how their jurisdiction, how their county is doing in adapting to sea level rise.

A large component in how we communicate that is through visualizations like these maps that I have created. On the left you can see the different sea level rise projections that cities are using within their General Plans specifically to think and consider while they are creating sea level rise policies.

And then on the right you see specifically the policies, the different sorts of adaptation strategies that cities are laying out within their General Plans, within the context of all the other elements of city governance and city planning that jurisdictions have to consider while they are creating these General Plans.

What are the different sorts of adaptation pathways that they are considering. Are they considering gray infrastructure such as sea walls, are they attempting to restore tidal marshes, tidal wetlands, or are they doing a mix of both. You can see that there are great disparities between jurisdictions in both the scientific aspects of planning as well as the different pathways that they are selecting.

With that, I will hand it over to Gabriella.

Ms. Chao spoke: Thank you so much. My name is Gabriella. I was on the Bay Resources Team this summer in the Regulatory unit and my team leads were Ashley Tomerlin and Julie Garren. My major is also conservation and resource studies at UC Berkeley, and I will be going into my junior year.

Some of my academic interests include indigenous and environmental justice and also forestry. Outside of school I like to read, paint, hike, and I love reptiles, so that is a little picture of my gecko Miso on the right.

This summer my main project was to create Special Status Species Reports, which are basically any species that might be impacted by different permits and could have habitat or conservation concerns. I also created a template out of what you see on the right in Word so that other species that come up in the future can be added to the file.

The main purpose of this project was so that permit analysts and other staff at BCDC have a one-stop shop for checking the environmental consequences and effects that different development projects or permits could have on endangered species or species of concern in some other way.

Some of the things that these sheets highlighted included basic information in the sidebar on the right. That includes the current endangered or threatened status of the species, a little bit about the appearance and the life history of the species, and then also its range and its habitat.

I also focused on work windows and mitigation ratios for different development projects in the past and pulled out some of the relevant policies in the Bay Plan and Suisun Marsh Plan.

My secondary project was to work with BayRAT, which is a GIS tool used by BCDC staff to access permit information and jurisdictional information. My goal with that project was basically just to input any of the missing permits or amendments that have already been issued to keep the map accurate and up to date. I also added missing types, locations and URLs to clean up the data and make it a little bit more accessible. Through this I was able to familiarize myself a lot more with the permit structure and the application of GIS and mapping tools in a policy organization.

Ms. Cassidy spoke: Thank you, Gabriella. My name is Jasmine Cassidy. I am a part of the Adapting to Rising Tides Team and my supervisor was Todd Hallenbeck, and I also got a lot of help from my mentor Kate Lyons. I am also part of the CSU COAST Internship Program as well as being an intern at BCDC. COAST stands for the Council of Ocean Affairs Science and Technology, and this is a competitive internship program for students that attend the California State University system, and I was selected to be 1 of the 21 interns this summer. A little bit more about me.

I am a rising fourth year at Cal Poly San Luis Obispo. I am an environmental management protection major there with a minor in sustainable environments. Some of my interests include environmental planning and urban resilience specifically related to sea level rise. Some of my hobbies include hiking, traveling, volunteering and learning about geography. And you can see some pictures of me on the right and that is a picture of me holding my pet bunny Bronco. He is massive, 12 pounds.

My main project this summer was to help move along the Shoreline Adaptation Project Map, also known as the SAP Map. The SAP Map is a compilation of all the ongoing and completed shoreline adaptation projects in BCDC's jurisdiction, that's the nine counties in the Bay Area.

My main project was to use a database, an online, publicly accessible database called EcoAtlas, to add new projects and also update existing projects that are part of BCDC. I was able to use a tool through EcoAtlas called Project Tracker to do this and you can see an example of Project Tracker on the top right.

That is what the dashboard looks like, and this is a project that I added. It is the Redwood City Ferry Terminal Project. I used data that was collected in early 2024 from local outreach that was in collaboration with MTC's Plan Bay Area project, and I also did some research to create all of the project abstracts for the new projects.

This data was stored in a spreadsheet that I managed to track all the progress and also keep track of all my questions for revisiting projects.

As well as this I facilitated communication with other entities in the Bay. This is San Francisco Bay Joint Venture, San Francisco Bay Restoration Authority, Caltrans, and the Water Board. I helped them update any of the projects and just kept in close communication with them.

The reason why this project is important is because it is central input for BCDC's major projects, the RSAP, as well as the funding and investment strategy.

The last map is BCDC's SAP Map projects, all of the ongoing and completed ones. They are organized by site status, so all the ones in green are completed.

Just to get a scope of my input, I added 66 new projects, and I updated 21 existing projects, so that was what I did this summer.

Some of the other projects and highlights of my summer was I got to go on a field trip to the Bay Model in Sausalito. It was my first time going and got to learn about the Bay's history. I went with the Adapting to Rising Tides Data and Science unit, so I got to network with them a little more and get to know them.

And today before this Commission meeting, I attended the EcoAtlas Project Tracker Data Administrators and Users Workshop. I used Project Tracker this entire summer, so it was great to attend this meeting. I helped make sure the workshop ran smoothly. I managed a Jam Board and took notes.

And then lastly, as a COAST intern, I had professional development workshops once a week online with the other 20 interns. We got opportunities to network with panelists from NOAA, Cal State agencies, NGOs, and also grad students.

Tomorrow I will present at the Second Annual COAST Symposium so that the other COAST interns as well as their supervisors and anyone that they invite can hear about what we all worked on this summer.

Here are some pictures of the Bay Model, the ferry to Sausalito, and then a screenshot from one of the COAST meetings.

I will pass it on to Olivia Lamb, thank you.

Ms. Lamb spoke: Thank you, Jasmine. My name is Olivia Lamb. I was working with the Public Access Team under the Regulatory unit as the Shoreline Development Intern with Ashley Tomerlin and Viktoria Kuehn.

I am a rising senior at Loyola Marymount University in Los Angeles where I am working towards two degrees in Environmental Studies and Political Science. Some of my interests relating to this industry are the intersection between policy and the environment, environmental justice, and sustainable development. Some of my hobbies outside of work and school is I love traveling. I spent about five months before coming to BCDC living in London, traveling, and studying in Europe, that was amazing. I also love singing, cooking, reading, and photography.

The bulk of my summer I spent analyzing a set of permits with special events provisions and extracting information such as whether these events are controlled or uncontrolled, if they are private events, and how often and frequent events are allowed to take place based on their permits. I tried to take note of any trends that I noticed that could be used for future permitting so I am going to be sharing some of the trends that I had noticed through my permit analysis.

Firstly, over half of the permits that were analyzed have multiple spaces for events. By having multiple public access spaces for special events, it ensures that the same public access spaces are not being continuously used for special events. Going forward, we should aim to find additional spaces for events when authorizing special events in permits.

The reason why this is extremely relevant is because by having constant shutdowns of public access spaces it may deter the public from utilizing and circulating within public access spaces.

By analyzing the maximum allowed public impact of permittees with special events permissions, 33% have higher levels of public impact during special events. But on average, those are also properties that are smaller in terms of acreage, but also in the amount of public access space on their properties.

This means that properties with less public access space, those closures are likely less detrimental to public circulation abilities. Going forward with future permitting, we may actually be able to use the size of a property to determine the level of impact that they should be authorized to have as written in their permits.

I have also been working heavily within BayRAT and I have been updating and filling in the information gaps within our internal GIS system BayRAT to keep it as up to date as possible. This entails mapping public access spaces associated with existing permits as seen in that top image, and adding new and missing permits related to public access as you can see in that lower image. Ultimately, this is very helpful for BCDC staff because it helps to make information much more accessible to them so that they do not have to search through our internal database to extract each permit and find general information.

I am going to hand this over to Atessa and thank you.

Ms. Anoshiravani spoke: Thanks, Olivia. I am Atessa again. I was the Environmental Justice intern with BCDC this summer working with Phoenix Armenta. I am an incoming sophomore at Stanford University, and I am planning on majoring in earth systems. My interests include climate justice, health equity, water management, and climate communication. In my free time, I love all things outdoors. I really enjoy photography and reading and also paddleboarding.

This summer my main project was running BCDC's Instagram, and my major goals were to promote communication and education about the agency and sea level rise issues, so my posts kind of fell into three buckets.

I did some educational posting, which included information on environmental justice, BCDC's permitting activities, and then things like the social vulnerability mapping resource as well. I also did another bucket, Introductions to New Staff at BCDC, which was really fun. I reached out to new staff and then posted their little blurbs about themselves with photos. And then the last bucket is Miscellaneous. I included reels about what was happening at BCDC, highlights from various site visits. Jasmine did A Day in the Life reel, which was awesome, highly recommend watching.

I can play this video here just scrolling through. I personally do not have Instagram. So, of all of the people in Gen Z that BCDC could have chosen for this role they chose, yes, interesting choice. I learned a lot.

I also did a variety of smaller projects this summer. Several of these are on the slide. One of these was I interviewed and visited some of the Environmental Justice Advisors for BCDC, which was a great opportunity to learn more about their roles, both inside the agency and outside.

I also did a staff training teaching about the history of environmental justice. I supported the Regional Shoreline Adaptation Plan and the Racial Equity Action Plan. And then as BCDC is planning on doing a couple of Shoreline Leadership Academies in the upcoming year I helped with some outreach. I watched the previous trainings from the pilot program, and I also helped with a glossary for that Academy.

Now we are going to move into the next phase of our presentation. This is some program recommendations that the interns came up with. Most of these have to do with onboarding.

The first one, we all noticed that as a state agency, BCDC uses a lot of acronyms and technical terms, and that made a little bit more of a challenge to get into the program. We would have really appreciated a stronger onboarding process with acronym definitions and help understanding the language of a government agency.

We also noticed that it is hard when you are first starting out to really understand the bigger picture of a lot of what BCDC is working on and why our specific projects were important. Communication about why meetings are important, and then also our own projects and the role that they have in the Bay and in the agency would have been super helpful.

We also had to do a lot of policy material reading, especially as part of our onboarding. More guidance on how to read policy would have been really great and some time to ask questions about things that we did not understand.

Lastly, we all really, really loved our site visits and we all did those separately. I think in the future it would be great if all of the interns can tag along with each other on all of the site visits to learn about what everyone is doing and get to see what BCDC is doing outside of the office as well.

Ms. Chao continued: Now I will be talking a little bit about the strengths of the program. The first thing that all of us really appreciated was that all of the staff, regardless of whether they were part of our team, were super willing to meet and talk about their work. A lot of us have interests that were outside of just our particular project so any of the intersections that we noticed other staff had projects that aligned with, they were willing to talk to us about career development and how their job works, and their role in the organization.

That leads us into our second strength of the program, which was that Executive Director Goldzband did a lot of professional development with us. He helped us look through our résumés and figure out what our career goals might be based on the experience that we came in with and also what we liked about the internship that we did. He also helped us construct elevator pitches. It can be super difficult to articulate exactly who you are and what you have been doing for ten weeks, it goes by so quickly. It was super useful to be able to figure out how we want to present ourselves in the future.

And then the last strength was that the workday was very flexible, and meetings were flexible. Check-ins with supervisors could be moved to allow us to go to as many events and site visits as possible, and a lot of us ended up going and seeing what the company does outside of the office in a more practical sense, which was very interesting for all of us.

Ms. Lamb spoke: I am going to be speaking about some of our program highlights as seen through these lovely photos. Firstly, we were able to attend Commissioner Eddie Ahn's book talk to learn more about his nonprofit work, but also the creative process to creating his graphic novel *Advocate*. We were also able to learn more specifically about his work as a Commissioner. And similarly, learn from other key figures in the environmental landscape through a series of intern-led interviews with various agencies including CNRA, NRDC, the DOJ, and of course BCDC.

We were also able to attend several site visits, which enabled us to have more firsthand experiences and hands-on experiences of being out in the field and see the real-life outcomes of the work that we have been helping with for the past ten weeks.

Also, several of our interns had the opportunity to attend and volunteer during the Bay Adapt Summit and meet people outside of BCDC working in this field, and ultimately be able to participate in one of BCDC's most significant events.

Mr. Witeck continued: We would just like to take this time to thank you, Commissioners, for listening to our presentation. Thank you BCDC staff as well for being here and giving us all guidance and support throughout the summer. It has really been an honor for all of us to have worked here and grown here and learned from all of you. Thank you once again for listening in. You can find our contact information here. If anyone has any questions about our experiences this summer or anything else we said, feel free to ask away.

Chair Wasserman acknowledged: Thank you very much. Questions, comments from Commissioners?

Commissioner John-Baptiste stated: Hi, everybody. Thank you so much for that presentation, it was super informative. I just wanted to really congratulate you on the quality of this work. Having worked in organizations for many, many years where interns have been brought in on different cycles, it is actually sometimes hard to make sure that the work that the interns are doing is both something that is developmental for you all as well as useful to the organization.

Just from the basis of your presentation, it is clear that a lot of thought went into the projects that you executed, and it was really high quality, and it looks very much like this is something that BCDC staff will be able to incorporate. Just want to congratulate all of you on what appears to be a very job well done and hope that we will see you all in these policy spaces in the years to come. You make me very excited about the future so thank you.



Chair Wasserman continued: Thank you. I want to share Alicia's comments and compliment all of you on the work you have done. I also want to compliment staff on the work they do with the interns because it is a very important part of the process.

I would note that assuming your recommendations are followed, the list of acronyms and abbreviations would probably be very useful for Commissioners as well.

Thank you. Go forth and do well.

**10. Adjournment.** There being no further business, upon motion by Commissioner Showalter, seconded by Commissioner Kishimoto, the Commission meeting was adjourned at 2:53 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

DocuSigned by:  
*Larry Goldzband*  
FD166E908010417...

**LAWRENCE J. GOLDZBAND**

**Executive Director**

**Approved, with no corrections, at the  
San Francisco Bay Conservation and  
Development Commission Meeting  
of September 5, 2024**

Signed by:  
*Zack Wasserman*  
96E55B446CEE481...

**R. ZACHARY WASSERMAN, Chair**