

# 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)

## MINUTES

**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 & Commissioner Liaison (415-352-3608; [sierra.peterson@bcdc.ca.gov](mailto:sierra.peterson@bcdc.ca.gov))

**SUBJECT: Approved Minutes of May 21, 2026 Hybrid Commission Meeting**

**1. Call to Order.** The hybrid meeting was called to order by Chair Wasserman at 1:07 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, and welcome to our BCDC meeting, once again in hybrid form. My name is Zack Wasserman, and I am Chair of the Commission. I want to thank the Commissioners here at Metro Center for attending in person and to acknowledge those who are participating virtually.

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

**2. Roll Call.** Present were: Chair Wasserman, Acting Vice Chair Randolph, Commissioners Addiego, Ahn, Dumlao (represented by Alternate Pemberton), Eckerle (represented by Alternate Kimball), Eklund, Gonzalez, Gunther, Janoff, Lee (represented by Alternate Kishimoto), Moulton-Peters (represented by Alternate Cox), Ramos (represented by Alternate Manfree), Tam (represented by Alternate Gilmore), Taylor, and VACANT (Nelson). Legislative Appointee Catherine Stefani, appointee of the Speaker of the Assembly (represented by Alternate Falzon) 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), City and County of San Francisco (Dorsey), Governor (Eisen, Hasz), San Mateo County (Gauthier), Contra Costa County (Gioia), Sonoma County (Hermosillo), Solano County (Mashburn), Senate Rules Committee (Showalter - attended virtually from an unnoticed location, not counted towards quorum), Business, Transportation & Housing (VACANT),

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

(No members of the public addressed the Commission.)

Chair Wasserman continued to the Report of the Chair.

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

**a. June 4 Public Workshop Attendance:** As I did at our last meeting, I want to make a very strong request for our Commissioners to be present in-person here at our June 4th meeting. At that meeting, as we have discussed, we will hold a public workshop to discuss a possible Bay Plan amendment to increase beneficial reuse of sediment and soil for wetland restoration.

You will recall that BCDC staff have been working to develop potential changes to the Bay Plan to facilitate beneficial reuse in the Bay Area, along with strong help from the Army Corps, thank you.

This workshop will be an opportunity for Commissioners, stakeholders, and the public to help shape those policies. It will also be an opportunity to build on our previous stakeholder work that resulted in the Sediment and Soil Beneficial Reuse Action Plan which BCDC published last year.

This workshop will be held in-person across the hall. We will not be using Zoom access because it really does not work for workshops. Therefore, I want to encourage as much in-person attendance by our Commissioners, including Alternates, as possible.

**b. Public Access Discussion:** Later this summer we expect to hold a Commission discussion on public access; specifically, on how our staff determines the best way to work with and design with permit applicants the public access requirements for public projects. I think that we will all find the deep dive interesting.

I mention this because our staff and Commission rely very heavily on our voluntary Design Review Board for recommendations. The late Will Travis called the DRB “the most expensive design consulting firm that you could never afford.” We continue to thank them.

Four members of the DRB are completing their terms at the end of 2027. That is next year, not this year. Therefore, we are starting the recruitment process to appoint six new DRB members and Alternates, aiming for two rounds of applications and selections towards the end this year.

For the first round, we are looking to appoint another coastal engineer, a landscape architect, and an urban designer/architect. If you have any recommendations on potential candidates please contact our Board Secretary Ashley Tomerlin as soon as possible, or Executive Director Larry Goldzband, and we will be in touch with you.

**c. Note:** A brief note. Two items on our agenda today and a number of items throughout the rest of this year are really focused on, in many respects, our future. Today is on financing and some discussion on our Strategic Plan. Both these efforts and allied efforts not on today’s agenda, are going to be very important as we move forward in the next couple of years.

Some of us, of course, are hopeful that the November elections will start to presage a change in Washington. Even if our optimism is appropriate, it will not happen quickly, but we need to be prepared for it. That is not the only thing we need to be prepared for, but it is a significant part of it. So all of these efforts are indeed important in shaping the future of this agency and the future of our Bay.

**d. Next Meeting:** As I noted, our next meeting will be in two weeks on June 4. That business meeting will be very short, followed by the workshop. Please remember to be here.

A modification to what I said. We will have the business portion of the meeting by Zoom. So, if you cannot be there in person, we would appreciate you being there at the

beginning for a few minutes to make sure that we are able to conduct our official business. You would make Sierra happy.

**e. Ex Parte Disclosures:** This is the time if any Commissioners have had discussions with people outside of our BCDC public meetings about adjudicatory matters. Now is the time to disclose that, in addition to the requirement that you disclose them in writing through our portal. If you do have anything, please raise your hands for a brief oral discussion of any ex parte discussions. Are there any?

(No ex parte discussions were disclosed.)

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

American culture, and perhaps other cultures as well, are fascinated by streaks. In baseball, fans thought Joe Dimaggio's 56-game hitting streak seemed as though it would never end; but it did at the hand of a pitcher named Al Smith who lost more games than he won throughout his career.

The Democratic Party held power in the House of Representatives for 40 consecutive years, 20 consecutive national elections, until the Republicans gained control in 1995.

The great costume designer Edith Head was nominated for an Academy Award 35 times in 29 years; and lost 27 times.

Those are examples of why statisticians argue until they are blue in the face that a "hot streak" is but a blip in time.

However, the good news is that on May 21, 1999, 27 years ago today, after being nominated 19 times, the longest period of unsuccessful Emmy nominations in television history, "All My Children" star Susan Lucci finally won a Daytime Emmy Award. Streaks happen, but they are always broken.

I am pleased to report that we will have four undergraduate interns this summer. We will introduce them personally in June. For now, we will let you know that Sophia Garcia and Nicole Shkurovich from Cal, Sydney Quan from UCLA, and Ryan Roberson from Cal Poly Humboldt, will start with us in early June. They will be assigned to one or two managers so they can get a wide variety of assignments, they will interview various Commissioners and Resources Agency staff. They will join for lunch with Commissioner Ahn's Brightline interns, and you will hear a wrap-up of their summer during an August Commission meeting.

You will remember that the Trump Administration for the third consecutive year is proposing to eliminate NOAA's Coastal Zone Management Grants Program. Well, as we expected, the House of Representatives' Appropriations Committee has voted to sustain that program, and we should know of the Senate's action in June. But, until the Grants Program is enacted with a Presidential signature we will keep a zero in that budget line.

Just a couple of more things.

BCDC was very well represented last week in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, Iron City,

which was the host city for the biennial National Adaptation Forum. The Forum is the marquee conference for climate adaptation professionals, and BCDC sent several of our staff to make presentations. Cory Copeland, Dana Brechwald, Todd Hallenbeck, Schuyler Olsson, and Planning Director Jessica Fain each participated in the conference.

They talked about topics such as rising sea level funding, BCDC's Regional Shoreline Adaptation Plan, the RSAP Atlas, the Bay Adapt Currents metrics dashboard, and equity as part of adaptation. And I am proud to say Cory and Todd went to a Pirates game. I do not know why nobody else joined them.

Also, Brenda Goeden, our Sediment Manager, Brenda is speaking in New York City this week at the national Waterfront Alliance Conference, on lessons that we in the Bay Area have learned as we work to expand the beneficial reuse of sediment.

And, not to be outdone, our Juliette Chausson, whom you will remember presented on the RSAP at the most recent Commission meeting, was asked to present on that very topic last week in Santa Cruz at the California Shore and Beach Preservation Association Symposium. There's no Zabar's in Santa Cruz, unfortunately.

With that, Chair Wasserman, I am happy to answer any questions.

(No questions were posed to the Executive Director.)

## **6. Consent Calendar**

### **a) Approval of Minutes for the May 7, 2026 Meeting**

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:** Acting Vice Chair Randolph moved approval of the Consent Calendar, seconded by Commissioner Addiego.

**VOTE:** The motion carried with a vote of 16-0-0 with Commissioners Addiego, Ahn, Cox, Eklund, Gilmore, Gonzalez, Gunther, Janoff, Kimball, Kishimoto, Manfree, Nelson, Pemberton, Taylor, Acting Vice Chair Randolph 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 Assistant Regulatory Director Ethan Lavine regarding the Administrative Listing.

(No members of the public addressed the Commission.)

(No questions were posed to Mr. Lavine.)

**8. Public Hearing and Vote on Trans Bay Cable Maintenance Application.** Chair Wasserman announced: That brings us to Item 8, a public hearing and vote on Trans Bay Cable's application to conduct maintenance activities on segments of its existing submarine HVDC cable, consisting of placing protective coverings over a 0.5-acre area in East San Pablo Bay and the Carquinez Strait.

With that, our first action is to open the public hearing. It is so opened.

Sam Fielding of our Bay Resources Permitting Team will start the discussion.

Bay Resources Analyst Fielding presented the following: Good afternoon, Commissioners. Thank you, Chair Wasserman. My name is Sam Fielding; I am a Permit Analyst here at BCDC.

Today, you are scheduled for a public hearing and vote on the Trans Bay Cable Maintenance Project located in East San Pablo Bay and the Carquinez Strait.

I will provide a brief introduction before turning it over to the applicants for further details, and it will follow with the Staff Recommendation and the vote.

The Trans Bay Cable was originally constructed in 2009. It is an approximately 52-mile-long, submarine, high-voltage direct current transmission cable that runs along the Bay floor from the city of Pittsburg to San Francisco, where it supplies approximately 40 percent of San Francisco's power.

The Cable was initially buried for the majority of its length, however, has since experienced exposure from erosion along certain segments.

The purpose of this project here today is to apply protective coverings to these two segments of cable that were identified as being at risk of damage from exposure.

The current project is in fact the fourth amendment to the existing permit for the Cable, which was originally permitted in 2007 and has since had several amendments for further repairs and maintenance along its length, including two after-the-fact amendments for additional protective coverings and repairs due to an anchor strike from a vessel in 2015.

The most recent amendment was in 2020 which was a five-year maintenance program authorizing a set amount of allowable fill for additional protective mattresses and reburying of the Cable. That amendment was processed administratively due to the amount of fill involved and was determined to meet our definition of a minor repair or an improvement.

The current maintenance work is also for the placement of additional amounts of fill in order to provide additional protection to vulnerable segments of the Cable.

The work will entail installing protective sleeves along lengths of the Cable, as well as the additional protective mattresses placed on top of the Cable. The schematic on this slide is a representation of what a typical concrete mattress may look like with segments of concrete 9 or 12 inches thick connected by segments of cable into a flexible mattress.

The project is being brought before the Commission today as a material amendment due to the large quantities of fill involved, in contrast to the previous amendment.

Overall, the project will result in the placement of approximately 2,700 cubic yards of new fill over an area of approximately 0.5 of an acre along the subtidal areas of the Bay.

The main project impacts therefore are associated with these large amounts of fill, both in the volume of Bay water to be displaced, as well as the permanent alteration of Bay floor bathymetry and the conversion of subtidal habitats from soft

sediment to a hard substrate.

The project will therefore be conditioned to minimize and mitigate for these unavoidable adverse impacts resulting from the large amount of fill.

During project construction the Applicant will conduct work activities according to best management practices, including limiting work to the environmental work window of June 1 through November 30, as well as implementing measures to protect water quality.

They will also be required to submit a post-construction report, as well as three years of bathymetric monitoring of the locations where fill has been placed to evaluate the effectiveness of the protective mattresses and to monitor their effect on bathymetry, erosion patterns, and subtidal habitats.

Finally, to compensate for unavoidable impacts, and in coordination with the San Francisco Regional Water Quality Control Board, the Applicant has agreed to purchase mitigation credits from the San Francisco In-Lieu Program at a 1:1 ratio to compensate for the half-acre of impacts resulting from the fill, which they will provide proof of purchase to BCDC.

Given the location of the Cable along the Bay floor, there is no existing public access and no additional requirements for public access are being requested.

The primary issues raised by this project are its consistency with the McAteer-Petris Act and the San Francisco Bay Plan, including the policy areas listed here of Bay Fill, Subtidal Areas, Water Surface Area and Volume, Fish, Other Aquatic Organisms and Wildlife, and Mitigation.

I will now turn it over to the Applicants to provide further details on the project.

Ms. Bayer addressed the Commission: Before I begin I would like to thank BCDC staff Sam Fielding and Julie Garren for their work with us in processing this application and getting us to the point of being before the Commission for this approval and also thank the Commission for their consideration of this amendment request at this meeting. I am Kelly Bayer. I am with AECOM. I am a consultant representing the Applicant Trans Bay Cable for this amendment.

As Sam noted, the Cable was installed in 2009 and it connects Pittsburg to San Francisco, supplying approximately 40 percent of San Francisco's power.

Since the Cable was installed, it has been monitored annually, doing bathymetric surveys along the length of the Cable and they have seen changes in erosion over time. Sometimes portions of the Cable experience erosion in a year and the next year sediment comes back in and covers it, but there have been some areas over time where a progressive erosion pattern has emerged.

One of those is the East San Pablo Bay location depicted in the figure there, where due to changes in upstream conditions along the Napa River have created an erosive pattern in the section along East San Pablo Bay. The erosion that has occurred has resulted in an approximately 15-foot drop in the Cable from where it was originally buried in 2009.

The purpose of this protection project, this maintenance project, is to reduce the risk of damage at sections in the Cable in East San Pablo Bay and the Carquinez Strait where there has been a loss of cover, particularly these cables are within or adjacent to portions of the shipping channel.

The protection will occur through two types of protective measures.

The first being a protective polyurethane sleeve which acts as additional protection and stiffens the cable system and protects it from external impacts.

The second protective measure is the installation of the concrete block mattresses, which Sam had the diagram of in his presentation.

The fill placement is necessary because the Cable is at high tension and does not have the slack, which is required to perform reburial. When the Applicant undertook Amendment Three that was processed in 2020 it was initially envisioned that most of the maintenance of the Cable would occur through reburial to minimize fill. However, unfortunately, in 2024 when maintenance work was performed under that Amendment Three and the evaluation of the Cable, due to the drop that has occurred in East San Pablo Bay, any slack that would have allowed reburial of the Cable has been lost, so the only feasible engineering means to provide this additional protective cover is to place the protective coverings on top of the Cable.

We have the two repair locations under this amendment. The first is along a 3,000-foot segment of the Cable in East San Pablo Bay. There would be application of the polyurethane protective covering along approximately 300 linear feet of that segment, and then installation of mattresses up to 0.4 of an acre or approximately 2,200 cubic yards.

The second location is the Martinez site, which is in the Carquinez Strait just north of Martinez, where they would install approximately 1,000 linear feet of the polyurethane protective covering and approximately up to 0.10 of an acre or 500 cubic yards of the flexible concrete mattresses.

The drawing on the bottom shows what the Cable would look like with the added covering and the mattresses laying on top.

The maintenance work is scheduled to be done during a planned cable outage this summer. Obviously, because it is an energized cable the preference is to conduct all the work while the cable is deenergized. At a minimum the placement of the polyurethane protective covering needs to be done while the cable is deenergized.

The work would adhere to the in-water work windows for East San Pablo Bay of June 1 to November 30. For the Martinez site the work in Carquinez Strait would adhere to the window of August 1 to November 30.

If work cannot be completed during the scheduled outage due to tide/wind conditions, mattress placement may continue through the remainder of this year's in-water work windows or will need to be completed next summer during the work windows.

The protective covering and mattresses will be installed by coordinated precision

crane operations and divers. The materials are lowered from a barge to divers working in the water to hand place and guide the placement of those materials.

Standard BMPs will be used to prevent contaminants from reaching the water.

Again, to summarize, the total fill placement that would occur is 0.5 an acre, approximately 2,700 cubic yards.

The primary impact being the loss of subtidal habitat. The mattresses are likely to become buried over time and the benthic community may return to similar to the pre-existing conditions.

There would be no adverse effects to federal or state-listed species.

No impacts to hydrology or sediment transport are anticipated. And through the annual monitoring of the Cable where we have previously placed mattresses there has been no observed changes in erosion patterns or increased scour where mattresses have been placed across the alignment over the years.

Again, to summarize in conclusion, to compensate for the fill placement, Applicant has agreed to purchase 0.5 advanced estuarine credits from the San Francisco Bay In-Lieu Fee Program, representing mitigation at a 1:1 ratio. Thank you.

Chair Wasserman acknowledged: Thank you very much.

Do Commissioners have any clarifying questions?

Commissioner Gunther chimed in: I am just trying to understand. This Cable got laid and then the sediment has eroded to the point so that the Cable is in some places almost like suspended in midwater, in a way. You said it has no slack.

Ms. Bayer replied: Yes, it is no slack, so yes, it is slightly above the sea floor.

Commissioner Gunther continued: So now we are going to put concrete on top of it?

Ms. Bayer explained: It is not suspended, it lowers, so it is resting.

Commissioner Gunther acknowledged: Right. Despite it being currently suspended or right at the surface, you can push it back down, and then you are going to put concrete on top of it.

Ms. Bayer noted: Not necessarily pushing it, it lays over the top. Maybe Mike Mueller or Nick Howe on the engineering side for the Applicant.

Mr. Mueller commented: Sure, I would be happy to answer that Andrew. This is Mike Mueller, I am a consultant with TBC.

As Kelly had mentioned, the Cable is not in span. If it is in span it is sort of a tightrope and not connected to the bottom. It is resting on a ridge that has developed, and the sediment around it is being eroded away. So, there is support under it.

We are placing the mattress on top of it, which will help mitigate any further erosion in that area which is what we have observed in other areas where mattresses were placed 10, 15 years ago. It stabilizes the seabed; it stabilizes the cable. It does not put any additional vertical forces due to the weight of it onto the Cable, the Cable is supported by the sediment.

Commissioner Gunther replied: I think maybe you answered where I was going

with this, which is that at the end of your presentation you said it is expected that the mattresses will be buried, but I did not understand how that jibed with all the erosion that your first slide showed.

Ms. Bayer stated: I meant to say that they would be reburied in terms of the support accretion of sediment where the mattresses have been placed over time. So, it is not that there is new sediment put on top of. The mattresses are not buried during the installation.

Commissioner Gunther acknowledged: No, I understand that. But if the environment has been demonstrated to be erosional over time, which is, I thought, what you started your presentation with.

Ms. Bayer agreed: Yes, correct.

Commissioner Gunther continued: Then I am not quite sure why the mattresses. You are saying that the mattresses will stop the erosion in the area in which they are placed.

Ms. Bayer answered: Yes.

Mr. Mueller chimed in: I could take this, Kelly, if you would like. What has happened out there is there is an increase in currents in this area. We did a lot of hydrodynamic modeling, potentially due to some of the projects that were performed, some of the wetlands projects. You have more water flowing out of the river now and it is eroding this area. The softer sediments at the surface have been carved away over the years, and where the Cable is now it is a bit more of a hardpan area and there are sand wave fields that migrate, depending on the time of year, through the area.

So, what we are seeing is that when we place the mattresses down, these sand wave fields now are coming through this area and covering the mattresses. So, we are seeing that the mattresses during certain times of year are in fact covered by these sand wave fields now. Whereas 10 years ago, potentially you would have seen an area that had softer sediment that has been carved away.

So, we are now down closer to the hardpan. We are ready to stabilize that further. And then the sand waves are moving back and forth in this area and not focused on the Cable with this 11-foot-wide corridor as much.

Commissioner Gunther continued: The whole reason I am asking this is about the idea of how, if we are entering a two-year period where there is going to be a Super El Niño and we might have very high flow events in that region of the Bay, and we already have a dynamic problem we are trying to address. But you guys are confident that you are not going to have to go back in with some emergency effort to try and buttress the mattresses as the bottom gets eroded around them during very high flow events from the Napa River or the Delta.

Mr. Mueller stated: That is a good question, too. What we did is a study for other areas. The Carquinez Strait, we have mattresses that were installed on the Cable in 2010, and we have been monitoring those annually.

So, we did a depth difference grid. This is a one-foot by one-foot projected, a

vertical plan view grid with accuracies in the one-tenth of a foot in the vertical and horizontal. We have been monitoring these other mattress areas over the years and some of them are very high current speeds.

We actually compared it against the Davis Point 80 ADCP gauge, which we used over at the San Pablo Bayside, which we are looking at now. The other ones in areas that they have got even higher flow rates, and they have performed very well.

And the sediment types are similar in those areas, we have these sand waves areas. They change depending on the year, depending on the storm cycles, but in general, every year for the mattresses they show up. And I can show you the study that we did, afterwards. If you still have further questions I would enjoy showing it to you. They show up as being a stabilizing force. And we do not have eddies, we do not have a changing of the local larger area, or especially the local bathymetry in a way that you would see any scouring.

They have effectively stabilized the cable through heavy seasons, through El Niño seasons. We have seen this over the last 15 years, so we have a long span of time to compare this to.

Commissioner Gunther asked: And you will be monitoring going forward?

Mr. Mueller answered: Yes. Even more so now, even more so now. We are actually ramping up. TBC has ramped up to a quarterly mapping, and so in this area in particular, this is a quarterly cycle. We do at a minimum an annual, but this area will be mapped in a quarterly sense.

Commissioner Gunther acknowledged: Okay, thank you.

Larry, there is just one thing I would like to ask is that here we have a permittee who has some long-term knowledge about sediment movement in the Bay, and I have not heard this information integrated into our discussion in the Beneficial Reuse Working Group. And I am not sure whether it is or not, but it seems like we have sort of a long-term monitoring program here and I would be very interested. It seems to be verifying for us that the Bay has really shifted into an erosional state over the last 15 years, which is what everything else says to us too. But I would be very interested if the staff could peek over their shoulder and figure out what they have that might add to our knowledge.

Mr. Mueller added: I will say with some areas we have accretive behavior as well. It is very localized. With eTrac, a company I founded, we do a lot of the bathymetry mapping in the Bay Area. We have done all the work for Hanson, all the sand mining areas. So we are doing a lot of erosion studies I suppose in that sense. There is a lot of data around this to say that it is trending towards erosive. It is tricky, it depends on which bay. But it is very interesting to have such high-quality data and such a long period of time during which it has been collected.

Commissioner Gunther stated: The long period of time is the thing that I am really struck by. Thank you.

Executive Director Goldzband added: Commissioner Gunther, just so you know,

you clearly are making an impression upon this non-scientist. Because I had actually written down at the bottom of my cheat sheet, sand mining and beneficial reuse, what is the connection to this. I am sure that Brenda and her team, and certainly Julie as they work on stuff, will definitely be part of it.

Commissioner Eklund had questions: I have a couple of questions. First, did you look at other alternatives?

Mr. Mueller replied: Yes, we did look at other alternatives. Kelly called that out in her presentation. The general alternatives that is written into the original maintenance permit that was from 2007 included three measures.

The first one was reburial, so trenching.

The second one is to apply rock. Rock would typically be used to support a cable in span, a spanned cable that we had talked about earlier. The Cable has not been in span; we have not really had to use that over the years.

And the primary measure would be using mattresses.

All three of those options were considered in the site as was described.

In particular, this area of the Cable was installed under tension, so all of the Cable is in tension.

But in this area in particular it does not lend itself to trenching; in fact, trenching would remove sediment that is there and put it into suspension. That is the testing we did two years ago. We used jetting with divers, and we uncovered or we undermined, so to speak, just by a few inches the Cable very carefully, a precision exercise over a length of 40 feet, and we noticed the Cable did not deflect downwards more than about a half an inch. So, it told us if trench here, even if we do it over multiple thousands of feet, we would be putting a lot of material into suspension and it would not mitigate this, in fact it would cause more of a rupture.

This is actually, after a lot of consideration and engineering, this was the choice that we had. We had three choices, really, and this really lent itself well to it. And it is already established, has been used over the years, and we did more bathymetric surveys which confirmed that this was the best method.

Commissioner Eklund continued: Have you done any analysis of whether any benthic organisms were adversely impacted at all with this concrete mattress?

Ms. Bayer stated: We have not done any studies. The water in particular where the East San Pablo Bay is, is currently in 60 to 70 feet of water.

We do acknowledge like with dredging that there are temporary impacts to the benthic community. Most studies and through biological assessments, through previous actions which have involved these similar activities, has been concurred with by the US Fish and Wildlife Service as well as the National Marine Fisheries Service, that these are not likely to have adverse effects on the marine benthic community.

It is acknowledged that, as we talked about, that with accretion over time, that benthic community may return. There have also been some studies that indicate that these types of concrete mattress structures provide more beneficial habitat to certain

species of benthic organisms and fish.

Commissioner Eklund acknowledged: Thank you. Have you seen any deterioration of the concrete mattress in the other locations that you placed these?

Mr. Mueller fielded this question: The concrete mattresses, we have inspected them with divers over the years, and we have not noticed that they have changed in composition. Because they are on the seabed, the way that they are constructed; they are very simple. They are not monolithic; they form themselves to the surface down there. But they have not degraded or anything, they are rated for long life. These are used all around the world to support this type of infrastructure and they are highly engineered.

Commissioner Manfree was recognized: To follow on Commissioner Gunther's really helpful questions. It was mentioned in the presentation that the Napa River flows have increased due to the restoration projects. I am trying to understand how that might be, because to my knowledge the way those are constructed, they should be slowing down flows throughout the watershed. So, unless it is when the flood bypass is activated and that is somehow transmitting a lot more flow, like maybe. But there's also wetlands that have been reconnected to the river where that flow is intended to spread out and slow down before it gets to the Bay.

I guess my question is, based on the modeling, how sure are we that it is really due to the flood project versus really intensified storms that we have been seeing? Because, the flood project, to my knowledge, should be slowing down flows. It is nine miles long, we have reconnected all kinds of floodplains, and it just did not quite make sense to me, but maybe the model shows something I am not seeing. And then I have another question after that, but we will just start there.

Mr. Mueller commented: This was a study that was done. And this is by no means a published study and this is a hypothesis that was made. We used Mott MacDonald and Scott Fenical was involved with Coast & Harbor. They are PhDs running numerical modeling. And it was not run out and it is not to say that this is a definitive result; this is a concept that was brought up during the analysis.

The concept that was brought up was that with the modeling from when the Cable was installed in 2009/2010. The modeling they did was in 2020, so we have not revisited this since then, so whatever has happened since then is not considered in here.

The only thing that was really considered was there was a hypothesis that there is a larger reservoir of water that built in the estuary upstream, and that that is causing further strengthening of the outflow of the water. It did not go beyond that.

What you are describing is certainly very interesting and should be a part of a discussion. It is not something that we want to put a stake in the ground and say this is the reason for it. This was just a component that they brought up, and I did not mean to make it sound that way. Because what we have seen from a lot of the monitoring we have done through bathymetry, which is the most direct way of measuring - I mean - numerical modeling is fun and you get to see rainbow-shaped things go all around the

screen and it is very interesting. And it tells you lots of things. Scott would kill me if I just said that and he were here.

But the bathymetry is really what tells us what is actionable here and with this piece of infrastructure. We know where it is located in the area where the river is coming out and we can see how other areas that do have some inflow from river systems have been affected by storm cycles, and so I would be happy to look at some of those with you.

The difference grid, some of the models are very interesting. You can see it is so localized and it depends on the year. Some years you would see multiple feet of material come in and then the next year you see it disappear, and then the sand waves move back and forth, it depends on what time of year we are measuring it.

Now we are starting to build in a more normalized data set where we are doing it by quarter. Before it was always in December, that was the requirement. So, TBC is taking it up another notch and spending more and really trying to understand how seasonality plays into this. I would be happy to talk to you more about it afterwards. I am sorry if I made it sound like we had a smoking gun, it is not at all.

Commissioner Manfree responded: No, not at all. I just wonder if it was a way of simplifying. And I am sure if you are seeing sediment go away, that is because there is scour. That is really obvious. But I guess I am just saying I want to know, as a local, a person involved in local management, if we are getting more scour specifically because of the kinds of projects we are doing, we should bring that information back to our flood district who does that work because they should know that.

But my sense of the environment here, I am a geographer, I have done natural resources work for like 25 years, my sense is that it would have more to do with the nature of storms changing than it would with restoration projects that by and large were aimed at slowing down flow.

But we have just seen storms, as I am sure you know, in the last few years, that kind of behave differently than what a lot of these systems are designed to handle or that we have known them to experience in the last 150 years. So that is two parallel possibilities there.

And then relatedly, how is sediment delivery, and where or what sources of more sediment might be helpful in thinking about this part of keeping the Bay healthy? Because sediment does not just keep this piece of infrastructure in place, it is also an important part of the whole Bay functioning. But as far as it pertains to this project, are there places where you think sediment delivery might be constrained where it would help to look at that on the upstream end?

Mr. Mueller replied: It is great to have this discussion. We have such interesting data, it would be great to connect to look at it. I am sure TBC would be very open to it, because we are working with a system that I think I would agree to the comment earlier, I think it was that Andrew made, that we are seeing a net decrease, we are seeing accretion. We are seeing accretion in some areas but it is very localized, and we

are seeing a net erosional effect, and in certain areas it is more extreme. Some areas are very stable.

But there is definitely a longer-term discussion to be had here, what is the most responsible way to protect this very important asset. As energy becomes more and more important, especially electrical energy, how do we look at the TBC protection long term. And if there is a net erosion, how do we affect a positive protective regime against this and still stay aligned with what the needs are for the environment and still stay very conscious with that.

That is something we would love to have as a separate conversation, maybe after the fact, and we are very much looking forward to that. This was a, we need to get out there and upgrade this area and respond to it. But now TBC is looking at a longer-term program to align with the environmental side, to align with the needs of the San Francisco power users, and to really have a longer term discussion that is thoughtful.

Commissioner Eklund asked: How long does it take for you guys to apply this concrete mattress over the Cable?

Mr. Muellera answered: We have two efforts planned for this summer. One is planned in Martinez for about seven days. There will be divers in the water with a safety system, a large system. We will have a crane, and we place these mattresses during the slack water period, so it will be several hours.

Commissioner Eklund continued: So, you are putting segments down?

Mr. Mueller replied: Yes, yes. It is 20-foot by 8-foot segments.

Commissioner Eklund continued her questioning: So then to do the whole extent of the Cable, how long is it going to take you to do that?

Mr. Mueller cited workflows and timelines: This summer we plan on doing two to three weeks total with two trips out into the field, and if we have overflow potentially next summer we would do something similar. It all depends on the way the tides, the weather. We have to shoot for a window to do the work in during, then we would adapt as the time gets closer and resource availability. We can plan just so much and then we go out.

But the short answer to your question is it takes a few weeks to do this. It is not an ongoing project. We are not looking at doing it for all 53 miles of the Cable, we are focusing on some of these very small focused.

Commissioner Eklund asked: Are you going to do any monitoring over the years after this is placed?

Mr. Mueller responded: Yes, yes. We are ramping up the monitoring from the required annual effort for the entire 53 miles, which has been a requirement. We have ramped it up. TBC has started to do certain areas that are more dynamic, like this one, like these two areas, to quarterly monitoring.

Commissioner Eklund asked about dredging: Has any of this area been dredged at all in the past?

Mr. Mueller answered: This area has not been dredged. In the East San Pablo Bay

site there is a local dredge disposal site just adjacent to it, it is either SF8 or SF10, I think it is 10, that is an in-bay disposal site. But the dredging, this is deep, this is 60 feet, 70 feet and very high current, so there is not dredging being performed in this area.

Commissioner Janoff commented: I am glad that you addressed the last point because I was going to ask that about whether it crosses any federal navigation channels or non-federal dredging areas and whether those project proponents had been coordinated with. I understand it is deep water.

One question that I have is, so some of it we are surmising that the Napa River outflow is resulting in enhanced scour in those areas. Is some of it a result of ship traffic and how would these mattresses hold up to the continual, the potentially enhanced flow as a result of more extreme conditions and high-use areas, ship traffic?

Mr. Mueller answered: That is a good question too. We installed the 700 feet of mattresses that Kelly highlighted, in 2024, and we have been monitoring that since. We presented that data as part of our packet for this meeting. And those mattresses have done a really good job of stabilizing the Cable through storm cycles, through winter storm events, and with ships passing over it. It is a heavily trafficked area right in front of the Phillips 66 dock and it has performed very well.

We have, again, very high accuracy multibeam and RTK bathymetry equipment that we use. We see repeatability in the tenth of a foot, horizontal and vertical, and we are seeing that those mattresses have stabilized the sediment. There have been areas that the sand waves have actually covered these mattresses. So, you are seeing that not only has it stabilized it, but as the sand waves propagate throughout this area they become a part of the seabed.

Commissioner Janoff continued: I also wonder if, in addition to extreme events it is also a result of reduced sediment input into the system and the fact that the flow is staying the same, potentially, or enhancing, that is resulting in lowering of the seabed in that area. Just a thought.

On the other side of how it holds up over time I am wondering, as a hard substrate do you see these mattresses in other parts of the Bay where they have been installed as basically an attractor for marine life and attachment to that hard substrate? Does that make it harder to maintain or permit if there needs to be maintenance in the future?

Ms. Bayer stated: In terms of the maintenance, I think the Cable itself, the reason maintenance was not included in the original permit for the Cable was that the Applicant at the time were thinking of just the Cable itself, they were not thinking of the loss of erosive cover. So, the Cable itself, unless it gets struck by an anchor or some sort of physical force that damages it, the Cable itself does not typically require maintenance. So, the only real maintenance is for the amount of cover over the Cable. So, to the extent that the mattresses continue to stabilize that, we would not see the need to go back and change the covering where mattresses have been placed.

Mr. Mueller added: You know, it is an interesting topic. With the enhanced monitoring that we are doing I think if we were to see that some of these mattresses were not performing the way that that we hope for multiple reasons, for the protection of the Cable, for erosion - what we have seen so far is very stable. In fact, they blend into the seabed and really provide a close, almost like a blanket. They are called mattresses because they are heavy and they are articulating, but it is almost like you put a very heavy blanket over the Cable and it protects it from strikes, and it also stabilizes the seabed.

With the enhanced monitoring that we are doing, if we are observing that in an area that is not performing well we would have a quick indicator and we would be able to address that.

We are also seeing, Kelly had mentioned it earlier, that there is a new type of mattress and this is being placed in the Bay. We are working with Ellen Johnck as well who has got a project. And not just this one project she was working on.

There is an EConcrete product which creates more of a substrate. It is soaked in fresh water, so the lye is pulled out of it. There is a real intentionality to this product to actually create more of a biological uplift; so, it is a flipping of the putting a piece of fill, putting fill yardage in the Bay to making it be a beneficial.

There were some conversations we had where the term self-mitigating was used. Now that is neither here nor there, it all depends on what area it is, but that is another concept we are looking at. And with Trans Bay Cable, we are looking at custom designs for mattresses and potentially talking to this group here about that technology. So, between those two things we are really trying to push this towards a thoughtful long-term program.

You have two things going on. You need to protect the Cable from an anchor strike. You need to protect the Cable from erosion so that the Cable does not become put in-span, so it does not go in-tension without being supported. And then we want to support the sediment around it. So, the mattresses are a tool that allows, it supports all of those needs and it is the most environmentally, we find, appropriate way to support the Cable.

And there will be some areas where we place the mattresses down not on exposed Cable, but the Cable is during certain times of here could be 6 inches, it could be buried 6 inches or 18 inches and then it becomes exposed during certain times of year. So, we will be placing some of these mattresses on potentially just the sand which covers the Cable. I do not know if that answered exactly your question but hopefully give some color.

Ms. Bayer chimed in: Your question started with if we have observed any marine life or mattresses have been placed. We have not done any specific studies of mattresses that were placed of the Cable for that purpose. Generally, the consensus, as I mentioned earlier, of National Marine Fisheries and US Fish and Wildlife is that these effects are generally negligible, especially in the greater context of the Bay, temporary

to the extent that additional accretion occurs.

And we have seen some studies, not here in the Bay but in other locations, where they placed these types of mattresses. That they do support or provide enhanced ecological benefit for certain benthic species.

Commissioner Janoff acknowledged: Thank you for that. I am happy that you all brought up the mattresses, the EConcrete, and potentially other companies have worked on to enhance marine life.

On that topic, and this will be my last question: Have you considered, because EConcrete has done, I just know this because I have communicated with them, that they have done a pilot where they have used dredge material. So, it is an innovative use of dredge material to create infrastructure. So, have you all considered that in your alternatives? Is that something you would consider in the future?

Ms. Bayer deferred to Mr. Mueller: Mike, I will allow you to speak to it, but I believe that would be something we would be willing to look into for the future. It is not something that we can implement as part of this year's project because the material is already available that need to be placed. But, Mike?

Mr. Mueller stated: The answer is unequivocally yes. I have got a long history in dredging and have been in that field. And to flip it on end for it to actually be a beneficial reuse for something like this would absolutely be something we would be interested in talking about.

I think it takes a team to try to align all the needs around a critical piece of infrastructure. So, any discussions we could use, any technology from the electronic side or imaging, I think the sharing of that, that is the culture that TBC is trying to bring, and what Kelly and I are trying to bring together here as well. So, I would like to hear more, yes.

Commissioner Eklund chimed in: That raises another question is that are they going to have to add more material in the future? Assuming that these are going to be there for the next 20, 30 years. Are you going to need to get some more sediment or use of dredge material to keep that covered?

Ms. Bayer answered: The plan is to have the mattresses stabilize the area and help to naturally have sediment accrete there over time. I do not know in the East San Pablo Bay location, especially with the forces through there, of bringing in new sediment. It would likely be, as loose sediment, be washed away pretty quickly. It might be something that we can consider for other areas just depending on site-specific conditions.

Mr. Fielding added: Just to further add on that point, the current BCDC permit for the Cable is authorized through 2031. So, regardless of what maintenance may or may not be required up to and beyond that, they will need to come back for additional authorization from BCDC before 2031. Thank you.

Commissioner Eklund continued: Then, does it make sense for us to at least put something in the document, because I am not sure how many of us will be here in 2031,

that there should be a study that possible use of dredge material should be at least looked at prior to the next round.

Mr. Fielding replied: At that time Trans Bay Cable will need to come back to us with a proposal for how to envision their plans for the Cable going forward. There were talks during this authorization as well about alternatives, including EConcrete, and so that is definitely going to be a key component of the analysis at that time.

Commissioner Eklund asked additionally: But then how do we remind folks in 2031 to possibly consider the use of dredge material? Because we are always looking for ways to beneficially use that material. I just think that we need to put something in the documents, and I am not exactly sure how or where to do that. At EPA we would actually make that a condition, when I worked at EPA.

Chair Wasserman interjected: We will let the Executive Director answer that.

Executive Director Goldzband commented: I get where you are going, Commissioner Eklund. I would hate to have to try to figure out on the fly how to do an amendment.

But what we will do is we will make sure there is an exchange of communication that is in the file between BCDC and the Permittee saying, during the next few years as you figure out how you are going to come back to us, please ensure that you consider the following issues: one, two, three, four. It will be in our file. It will be in their file. I do not know if Sam is going to be here in 2031, or Julie. But I can assure you that whoever follows them will have that bright and in bold, in italics, in the file, and we will make sure we get it.

Commissioner Eklund added: Well, as long as it does not get lost.

Executive Director Goldzband stated: It will not get lost, especially with the new database. There you go.

Commissioner Eklund mentioned: I just know from experience, having worked for the EPA for 35 years, that things do get lost in transition.

Executive Director Goldzband reiterated: We will make sure we will track it.

Chair Wasserman asked: Do we have any public comment?

Pat Showalter offered public comment: Hi, this is Pat Showalter and I am sorry I was not able to come in person; I found out I had a medical issue at the last minute. But I do have a couple of questions.

One, does BCDC have any divers that we use to do inspection?

Two, how are the mattresses attached to the bottom? Are they just held in place by their weight or is there some sort of stakes that are used like a geofabric or something?

And then three, I wanted to comment that O&M is really always an important issue, and we did include monitoring in the permit, which was great, and it has led to knowledge about what maintenance was needed. But I just wanted to ask, isn't it standard practice now to always include something about O&M in our permits? That is it.

Executive Director Goldzband replied: I will take the first part, then I will go to Julie who I think wants to talk and Sam who wants to talk.

We do not have any divers who at least are supposed to be diving for BCDC. I know we have a couple of divers who do it on their own. If what you are talking about, Commissioner Showalter, is how do we make sure that they are doing it correctly or whatever, we are going to have to rely upon analysis that is provided for us going forward.

We also do not have a BCDC boat, no matter how many times the Enforcement staff may ask me for one. We just do not have that capability.

But I think either Julie or Sam wants to handle some of the rest.

Mr. Fielding commented: On the question of O&M, operations and maintenance, BCDC does not really have a separate category of permits for operations and maintenance but evaluate projects that come to us on a project-by-project basis, many of which may be classified as operations and maintenance and would be over a set amount of time and a set amount of activities.

So, for this specific permit, the previous amendment, which was handled administratively, was a five-year maintenance program and it authorized a set amount of fill that could be placed for the protective coverings on this cable and set activities and time over five years.

So, this particular amendment here is for discrete repair activities for identified segments that need repairs and would not really be an operations and maintenance permit but does also include monitoring of the repair locations.

Ms. Bayer continued: I think the remaining question that was posed was, the mattresses are held in place by their own weight, they are not staked to the sea floor.

Commissioner Kishimoto commented: I think most of my questions have been answered. I had thought originally, wondering if the fill was going to try to compensate for that 50-foot drop, but it sounds like that is not the case.

I guess my last question which you have not discussed yet is how do the mattresses get delivered and such? Because you mentioned the crane. But does the crane go on the side of the Bay or does it get delivered by boat? Because one thing I have learned is a lot of the impact of any project is the delivery of the project material.

Ms. Bayer explained: Trans Bay Cable has its own work barge. The mattresses are loaded from a shoreside location onto the barge and then transported by the barge out to the work location in the Bay, where then the materials are lowered down by the crane to the divers in the water.

Commissioner Kishimoto asked: The crane is on the barge?

Ms. Bayer replied: The crane is on the barge.

Chair Wasserman called on staff: Sam, would you please present the Staff Recommendation.

Mr. Fielding read the following into the record: Staff recommends approval of the Trans Bay Cable Maintenance Project, BCDC Permanent Application Number

2006.005.04MD, with the conditions described in the Staff Recommendation and summarized on this slide, including:

- To implement measures to protect natural resources and water quality during construction.
- To monitor the site location after fill placement.
- And to provide compensatory mitigation via purchase of Estuarine Enhancement Credits at a 1:1 ratio.

As conditioned, the staff believe the project is consistent with the requirements of the McAteer-Petris Act and the San Francisco Bay Plan.

Commissioner Eklund asked: How can we put in this motion for them to look in the future as dredge material as an option? I just want to make sure that we not lose that.

Executive Director Goldzband stated: We will not lose it. It is recorded, it is said. Sam and Julie totally heard it. It will be done and we will then come back to you and show you the letter or email that we sent and their response, and we will go from there.

Commissioner Eklund replied: But couldn't we also put it as something in the document itself?

Executive Director Goldzband explained: I would prefer not to open up a permit and write something, candidly, on the fly that would do that, if we can do this in this way. It is just the Executive Director preference and you all have votes and I do not.

Commissioner Eklund stated: Well, I respect you. Well, maybe you and I can talk offline in the future of how we can add something here. My biggest concern is that in 2031 it would not necessarily elevate to the surface. That is my concern.

Chair Wasserman added: And I assume it will be written in the file.

Mr. Fielding agreed: Yes. That will be included in the permit file.

Chair Wasserman asked: Does the Applicant agree with the Recommendation?

Ms. Bayer replied: The Applicant agrees. And to Commissioner Eklund's point, I will say that staff were able to pull back materials from the permit file from the previous thing over five years ago in addressing some of the items on this thing, so I will say the recordkeeping is thorough.

Chair Wasserman stated: The motion I am asking for is to close the public hearing.

**MOTION:** Commissioner Cox moved to close the public hearing, seconded by Commissioner Gonzalez. The motion carried by a voice vote with no abstentions or opposition.

Chair Wasserman continued: Assuming there are no further comments from Commissioners or staff, may I have a motion to approve the Staff Recommendation.

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

**VOTE:** The motion carried with a vote of 15-0-0 with Commissioners Addiego,

Ahn, Cox, Eklund, Gilmore, Gonzalez, Gunther, Kimball, Kishimoto, Manfree, Nelson, Pemberton, Taylor, Acting Vice Chair Randolph and Chair Wasserman voting, “YES”, no “NO” votes, and no “ABSTAIN” votes.

**9. Briefing on BCDC/MTC/ABAG SLR Funding and Investment Strategy.** Chair Wasserman announced: That brings us to Item 9, a briefing on the BCDC/MTC/ABAG sea level rise funding and investment strategy, crafting a new tool for the Bay region.

The presentation will update us on those efforts, show how their feedback was incorporated into the project, and give the Commission a preview of the launch of this tool this summer. BCDC’s Cory Copeland will kick off the briefing.

Adapting to Rising Tides Data & Science Manager Copeland presented the following: Thank you, Chair and Commissioners. I am actually co-presenting today with Kate Lyons, a Climate Resilience Planner from MTC/ABAG; and we are joined with Chirag Rabari, Assistant Director of Major Plans from MTC/ABAG, who will be able to answer questions where needed.

BCDC staff have been leading the development of this tool, but have had wonderful ongoing support and partnership from MTC/ABAG in its development, and we are very excited to update you all on the progress we have made on the sea level rise adaptation and investment strategy since we last briefed the Commission in June of last year.

We know that sea level rise is an enormous threat to our region and the way of life that makes the San Francisco Bay so special. The work ahead is enormous, with a recent estimate as a part of the Plan Bay Area 2050+ showing that cost for a resilience project list could be up to \$96 billion.

But this large number obviously pales in comparison to the cost of inaction. Even just a partial estimate of the cost of inaction identifies \$230 billion of property at risk. That is much higher than the estimated cost of sea level rise adaptation.

I am not an economist. Actually, like Commissioner Manfree, I am a geographer, but I do not think you have to be an economist to know that buying \$2 for \$1 is a pretty good deal. But, of course, the real world is never that easy.

Aligning a vision on what to build, where to build it, who pays for it, and many other big questions takes effort and time. BCDC along with our partners, including MTC/ABAG, have helped lead that effort.

We have worked on a number of initiatives in the region, which point to the need for greater regional coordination and organization on funding sea level rise adaptation. These include the Bay Adapt Joint Platform, a multi-agency Memorandum of Understanding on Sea Level Rise, and the RSAP and its associated Bay Plan Amendments. All of those point to the need to develop a regional strategy to fund resilience.

In order to advance that goal in the region, in 2023 BCDC and MTC/ABAG released the Sea Level Rise Investment Framework, which estimated the total cost of adaptation through 2050 based on locally submitted projects and estimates for areas with no

projects and planning yet.

The estimates were refined and built on in Plan Bay Area 2050+. The improvements included more detailed information about the timing of sea level rise hazards, as well as the Plan Bay Area 2050+ Resilience Project List, which evaluates projects based on what areas have vulnerable assets critical to the Plan's goals for the region.

As a special bonus for those of you in person, hot off the presses, you were handed a copy of Plan Bay Area 2050+. Anyone who is online and wants one of those, feel free to connect with me and I will make sure one of those ends up in your hands as well.

We also brought a copy of our Regional Shoreline Adaptation Plan Guidelines.

Anyway, all of these reports and efforts are important. I am a state worker so God knows I love a good report. But today we are excited to talk about one of the ways we are moving beyond the humble report into creating a live application that will have the best available data to support funding initiatives.

How are we doing this?

We are now developing an online investment strategy application that is a living resource. It will provide estimates that are up to date and driven by user interactions in an online environment. Users can sort, analyze, and learn about locally submitted projects.

This information allows funders to view projects that could be applicable to their programs, allows jurisdictions with great projects to elevate them regionally, and allows agencies and advocates to learn about regional needs.

Critically, we plan to keep updating the data and improving the features of this application over time. This will mean that in the future we will be able to show ever evolving and improving estimates for the cost of adaptation.

We will not just have these snapshot estimates of funding gaps, like \$110 billion or \$96 billion from past reports, but actual live information at your fingertips.

At a high level I feel like this may sound nebulous, but the product is grounded in great work being done by local jurisdictions and others developing projects throughout the region.

We have a project database called the Shoreline Adaptation Project Map, or SAPMap if you want to be snappy, that we update annually, along with SFEI and other regional agencies.

The information from these updates comes from local jurisdictions and other project implementers who generously submit information to the database or sometimes are forced to in permits or funding requirements. In the future, projects identified in the RSAP Subregional Plans will also be included in the database.

Additionally, we have a data set that estimates resilience cost for areas with sea level rise risk but without locally submitted projects yet. This data set was created for the Funding and Investment Framework and updated and improved for Plan Bay Area

2050+.

Combined we have a lot of information on adaptation. And this tool, we also combine that information with information on coastal hazards, assets and communities, community characteristics, and more. It is a lot of great information, and we are excited to get it so that it is not just sitting on our hard drives and can be put to work.

I want to give an example of the kind of use case for this information, inspired by real collaboration we are doing with a significant funder of resilience projects. This work is in early stages so apologies I am not naming them because the project details are not completely finalized, but I hope it is instructive on who may use this information and why.

In this case we have a funder with resources available to provide technical assistance to local jurisdictions on funding opportunities in the region. Based on their project goals, they are interested in resilience projects that could include nature-based solutions, would significantly reduce coastal flood risk, and are still in project planning phases.

Without the tool we could give them a list of 453 projects in the EcoAtlas database. They could click through those one by one.

However, 90 percent of them are not applicable to their needs. They need a method to refine the list to discover projects and prioritize their efforts where they can have a big impact.

Using the tool we are developing they could sort the project list down and learn about the assets near those projects, which local jurisdiction is responsible for it, the current status of the projects, and more.

This tool will allow users to rapidly; almost instantly identify information in the region to prioritize efforts and make sure they have a maximum impact.

With that context out of the way I want to pass it over to Kate Lyons who is joining us online to describe what we have done to achieve this vision.

Ms. Lyons addressed the Commission: Thank you, Cory. Hello to the Commission. Thank you for having me. My name is Kate Lyons, I am a Resilience Planner at MTC/ABAG, and it is a pleasure to co-present this item as part of the MTC/ABAG team that has been supporting this project. As Cory mentioned, Chirag Rabari, Assistant Director of Major Plans at MTC/ABAG is also present in the room in person.

The slide in front of you shows our overall project timeline. I will walk you through our progress to date on the tool and then later Cory will finish out the timeline and tell you where we are going next.

On the bottom left of this slide you will see a list of key milestones we have achieved so far.

To kick this project off we developed a background memo where we interviewed agencies both within California and across the country that have worked on similar projects that involve adaptation or infrastructure project sorting and prioritization. This memo informed the development of our project goals and scope.

From there we launched a Steering Committee, which has met every few months throughout the project. I will tell you more about the Steering Committee on the next slide.

We have also completed all of the data set and technical behind-the-scenes work for the project. That has included identifying our methods for integrating multiple databases into the tool, as well as processing and implementing any data improvements needed to make the tool function well.

Now that the scope and goals of the project have been established, our ongoing efforts are focused on refining the interface, functionality, and user experience.

This includes user testing of our beta version.

As part of this, we will be bringing the beta tool to the Steering Committee for their input this Tuesday, May 26.

Our Steering Committee has really been a key feature of this project. Because the tool has specific targeted users that Cory mentioned earlier, we wanted to assemble a committee that could help us understand not just what features, data, and functionality they need for their work, but also to create something that is approachable and easy for them to use.

With that in mind, we brought together the agencies and organizations you see here. These members bring a wide array of expertise to the table, some with technical backgrounds, some funders, some involved in local project development, and others who serve as regional advocates for sea level rise funding in the area.

Some of the key questions we brought to our Steering Committee throughout this process have included what kinds of data are most important or of interest to display, how many filtering and sorting features should the tool have, and what pages or products would be useful. Their input has really shaped the direction of the tool, and we will continue leaning on them in the next stages of the project and beyond.

What will users actually be able to do with this tool?

First, they will be able to sort and filter projects to get regional data summaries. These summaries are available at the regional level, but can also be filtered down by county or other project characteristics.

Users will see summaries for funding needs and gaps for projects, which assets are near projects within a selection, and the amount of key habitat around selected projects.

The tool also includes a wide range of data and filters, and we have pulled in various details about projects from the SAPMap including geography, project status, cost, habitat features, and more. And you can filter by these fields as well.

We have also taken things a step further by identifying which key assets near projects are at risk, so you can also filter by key asset categories you are interested in. For example, habitat types or transportation assets.

On another page users can focus on specific projects from the database. Users will find key project information including location, description, nearby vulnerable

assets, flood protection height, habitat features, and more.

The project details page will also link directly to the source data posted on EcoAtlas.

This tool also includes a number of features, including exporting data, exploring projects in a project map, and also providing live feedback on the tool for ongoing improvements and data quality improvements.

Here you are seeing an in-progress screenshot of the investment strategy tool. Emphasis on the in-progress. I want to note that the layout features, colors, and overall style are very much in development and will be refined with the help of our Steering Committee and user testing groups over the next three months, before we come back to you with our Version 1.0 in August. Therefore, this is not how the final tool will look, but we wanted to show you some ideas and the progress that we have made so far.

What you are seeing here is what we call the Regional Roll-Up page, which features the regional summaries that I mentioned a few slides ago.

On the top you see tabs to switch between the different views and pages that we have set for users.

You can also see the Explore Data tab on the top right where you can filter the data that the Regional Roll-Up page is pulling from and it will refresh live based on your preferences and sorting.

On the left side of the screen, you will see a progress circle that shows the funding needed and the funding secured to date, as well as the total number of projects.

On the right side you will see a summary of many of the assets at risk including population, jobs, socially vulnerable communities, and among many others that our Steering Committee helped us identify. These are assets nearby to projects that are at risk and if projects are constructed, they may benefit those assets.

Lower on the page you will also find a filtered list of projects that changes with the filters as well.

This page is also still in development. It shows what we are calling the Project Details page.

The Project Details page provides a project level snapshot about any project in our Regional Adaptation Projects database.

On the top left of the screen, you can select a project from the dropdown, and the details will refresh accordingly. In the section, you can see the funding details about the project, and a short description of the project, called the Abstract.

You can also see a summary of the nearby assets to the project on the right-hand side. This can be interpreted as summarized assets that may benefit from the project's construction.

Importantly, a site-specific vulnerability assessment must be done to accurately identify the site's impacts and benefits.

Finally, at the bottom of this page there is a table with site-specific information,

a map, and a link out to the EcoAtlas page for the project.

That concludes my overview of our project progress to date and I will pass it back to Cory to finish us out.

Mr. Copeland continued: Thanks, Kate. I also wanted to highlight to this body how the feedback we received last year shaped the efforts that you have seen today before laying out our plans for what is coming next.

In June the Commission told us that it is not enough just to show the projects, we need to show the consequences of inaction and need to have that up front.

As a result, we have done project-level evaluations of local assets at risk from sea level rise. It allows us to show risk to population, jobs, critical infrastructure, public access, transportation infrastructure, and more, at a regional scale. Users will not just see the cost, but they will also see what is at risk from inaction without these projects.

Additionally, we were told to ensure strong communication with locals around the inclusion of projects.

In fall of 2025, EcoAtlas administrators, which includes us, did a significant push to reach out to locals to update the data and educate them on the benefits of it and its inclusion in this tool in the future. We will be doing the same again this fall, and we will be doing significant post-launch outreach to teach local jurisdictions, organizations, and agencies about the tool.

We have also incorporated within the tool a form for someone to submit if they want to correct information, submit new information, or give us any other feedback as necessary.

Once we have the tools we do not think we are done. We think the work continues. This is not just a tool but a jumping off point to help drive change for policy and funding in the region.

We will use the tool to help us glean insights on funding needs in the region.

With those insights we will be involved in regional conversations on shaping funding with best available information.

Using this information, we will coordinate on any future regional funding proposals where applicable.

This will translate into action.

The tool will, in the future, identify projects that are in subregional plans that have been found consistent with the RSAP Guidelines by this body.

State law requires prioritizing these projects for state funding, and this tool will be the centralized home for discovering projects that are in those plans.

Additionally, there are growing regional efforts and convenings to identify sea level rise investment pathways. The information from this tool can hone regional efforts and fit them into the realities of locally developed projects to help guide real action.

For the rest of the year here is what you can expect to see.

Our team will continue user testing and development of the project.

We are making rapid improvements to the functionality and user interface every

day. In fact, what you have seen has already been improved upon, if you were to click our internal live version.

You will be able to get your hands on Version 1.0 of the tool at the end of the summer and we will be probably shouting from the rooftops to do that. Anybody who wants us to come to their jurisdiction or anywhere else, please let us know. We will also probably be beating down your door.

Following the release we will be doing a big outreach push. We will be training people to use the tool and developing webinars, meeting with local jurisdictions who are interested, going to other agencies and interagency forums, presenting at conferences, and leveraging our new growing social media reach to ensure the tool ends up in the hands of people who need it.

Finally, we will be coordinating with the EcoAtlas administrators for outreach to local governments and other project proponents to get the data and the tool as up to date as possible.

With that I want to thank our project team. Really, everyone on this team is a rock star, but I wanted to give special credit to Ujay Siddharth, whose work on this project as the Technical Lead has been essential to its success. It is the distinct curse of being a Project Manager on a technical project, knowing that most of the compromises are your fault in order to meet milestones, and most of the successes are because of your staff. That is certainly true here and I want to thank our excellent technical staff for their work on this and hopefully making me look good.

With that, we are open for questions.

Chair Wasserman asked: Do Commissioners have any clarifying questions?

Commissioner Cox chimed in: Thank you for a great presentation and a lot of work; and thank you also for making mention of reaching out to additional regional partners, and that is really the basis for my question.

I noticed that your Steering Committee includes TAM, which is obviously focused on infrastructure in Marin. but I am wondering if you have considered including BayWAVE, formerly known as BayWAVE, and C-SMART, which really focuses more on shoreline communities, which are focused on issues beyond infrastructure.

Mr. Copeland replied: They have not been included on our Steering Committee, but I think it would be excellent for us to connect with them. It sounds like they might have really valuable feedback.

Commissioner Cox stated: I think they would have a lot of insight. And they do represent a coalition of Marin County cities, shoreline cities, obviously, which are part of the mix affected by sea level rise.

Acting Vice Chair Randolph commented: I had a question on the funding and the sources of funding, so what groups or audiences you are addressing as possible users of this. I assume that would include federal, state and other agencies. Does it include potential private sector partners, or will it include them?

Mr. Copeland stated: The funding as it is tracked is whatever a user puts into the

EcoAtlas database, so that could be public or it could be private. I will say in general it has mostly been public funding as we have looked at it, and so, yes, I think that there are great ongoing initiatives around activating private funding that are occurring at BCDC and beyond, and so I think it would be interesting to talk through some of the opportunities to use this tool for that purpose.

Acting Vice Chair Randolph noted: Yes, it is a bit tricky, but there is probably a lot of potential out there for different kinds of public-private partnerships.

Executive Director Goldzband added: If I could say, I think of this tool as being agnostic. Wherever the money is coming from, so long as it is legal it will be in there.

And yes. As you know, Commissioner Randolph, we are deep in discussions with trying to create milieus about venues for the way that private sector funding can stream in. And we will make sure it is in there if that is part of a project.

Commissioner Gonzalez was recognized: It sounds for all intents and purposes that this is on a very clear glide path to getting finished. You said August. Did I hear you correctly?

Mr. Copeland replied: Yes.

Commissioner Gonzalez continued: It sounds like the real work will then be in that next phase, the iteration, et cetera. Tell me a little bit about what you see happening there post-August.

Mr. Copeland replied: Yes, that is a great question. In addition to all of the outreach that we have talked about, we are very interested in working hard to make sure the data is up to date and as high quality as possible.

So, the first big push will be in the fall as we do outreach to local jurisdictions to try to update information that is in the SATMap already, so new projects or updates to existing projects.

The other really big initiative that we are thinking hard about is creating a really clear pipeline between the subregional plan projects as they come in and this tool, so that as locals develop project concepts as a part of subregional plans in alignment with RSAP that those are also getting fed into this so that we are continually improving that.

And then I will say we have a number of features in a big list that have been requested that did not fit into our scope up to this point, and I think we plan to talk with our Steering Committee on how to prioritize those next after we get our initial launch. But we plan to do a lot of user testing and let that guide some of our future work as well.

Commissioner Gonzalez had additional questions: I think the second question, really, is what you commonly might call the technology roadmap. Do you see some next iteration happening by a specific date or is that just way too abstract at this point in time?

Mr. Copeland stated: I will say the first update that we anticipate would be winter of either this year or next year following that fall data update. We plan to push the new data onto it and it would make a lot of sense to align some of our feature

updates with that new data. But yes.

Commissioner Gonzalez emphasized the following: I think one of the one of the biggest challenges that individual cities or jurisdictions face when agencies say, I want to come and talk to you, I want to spend time with you. There is always this question, okay, well, what is in it for me? Everyone is time constrained. Everyone is budget constrained. Everyone is just running around.

My comment really is to focus on why is it useful for the city of San Leandro, the city of Alameda, the city of Oakland, like literally why is it to their benefit? Not what do we get out of it as an agency, but what do they get out of it in that meeting? So, if you can just frame your thinking in those asks I think you will be more successful.

Executive Director Goldzband interjected: Can I respond to that for a second? Because it is a great comment by Mayor Gonzalez. About two months ago we had a meeting here at BCDC that Chair Wasserman convened with a bunch of friends and neighbors, as it were, talking about rising sea level. And one of them was Steve Kinsey, the former supervisor from Marin County who is a consultant, and he said something which really, really stuck with me and I know that it stuck with Chair Wasserman. Which is that the whole purpose of BCDC in dealing with the RSAP right now, as Steve would say, is becoming cities and counties' best friends. Giving them as much help as we possibly can based upon what the resources are that we have; and thinking about how they use it and how we can then respond as we learn more from them about how we can do better as well.

We actually had a coffee klatch this morning for staff that was led by our RSAP team, Jackie and the gang, and she talked about how, and you heard about this a couple weeks ago, our folks have started to figure out how can we create a learning community. How can we actually learn from the cities and counties and the consultants, and how can we teach them and make sure that it is a two-way street so everybody benefits. That really as we look at the RSAP and as we look at technical assistance, needs to be our north star, and I think that our folks definitely understand that. It is not just we are from the government, we are here to help; it is a little deeper than that.

Planning Director Fain chimed in: I would just like to add one more thought. That is a really great set of questions and discussion here. When the Commission passed the Bay Plan Amendment two years ago for the Regional Shoreline Adaptation Plan you amended our climate change policies to include a strategy to create a regional funding strategy for sea level rise. So, this tool is a fundamental piece of developing that strategy.

Now, a tool is not a strategy. A strategy needs to include the actual things that we as the Bay Area Region collectively will be doing to try to address this funding and financing issue if we are going to come close to solving that nearly \$100 billion problem. Some of that is about raising new funds, some of that is about using the funds we have today in more efficient ways, some of that is about collective action and prioritization, some of that is about reducing the costs of projects. All of these things

can contribute to a regional funding strategy.

We are not there yet, but I think this tool is going to provide those critical insights that we can do to put those strategies down on paper so that we as a region have a roadmap. Not just for BCDC but to our friends at MTC/ABAG, to our friends at the Coastal Conservancy, across the state, across the region, to our counties.

So, that we can all show up together and try to really say, hey, we know this is the problem as a region and now we are really going to have the data to back that up. I think it is going to be a really powerful tool in that way. I hope that cities and counties can see that and how it is going to benefit them. But I think that is also one of the things that is to come in the next period.

Commissioner Eklund had questions: The first question, on the slide about the cost. Did you factor in these estimates of what it is going to cost the cities and the counties doing their plans but also implementing those plans? Is that what was included in this estimate?

Mr. Copeland answered: The estimate does not include the cost of planning; it is the cost of project implementation.

Commissioner Eklund continued: So it is only implementation, it is not actually planning what needs to be done. How did you then factor in what the cost of the implementation was if you did not necessarily know what the cities and the counties were trying to do in order to deal with sea level rise?

Mr. Copeland explained: The costs are from estimates for implementation that cities and counties provided to us. We do not do a lot of questioning of that unless something looks exceptionally weird.

Commissioner Eklund asked: So, did all cities and counties identify what they are proposing to do for sea level rise?

Mr. Copeland replied: I do not know that I would be willing to say all of them, but fairly significant coverage. I think the map on Slide 5 gives you some sense of the scale of engagement we had from local jurisdictions, that it is hundreds of projects across the entire Bay Region.

Commissioner Eklund stated: That would be very interesting. I would love to see what Novato submitted.

Assistant Planning Director for Climate Adaptation Brechwald chimed in: Commissioner Eklund, the costs also include placeholder projects. Over time as people do their subregional plans they will be submitting all of the information on the actual projects to us, and so over time all of those placeholder projects will hopefully be replaced by actual projects with actual costs.

Commissioner Eklund asked: Do all the cities and the counties around the Bay Area know that this is a requirement?

Ms. Brechwald answered: There is a requirement in the RSAP Guidelines themselves. It is an element called the Project List, and they will need to submit all that data.

Commissioner Eklund continued: So, all cities got a copy of a letter or something saying that this is required for you to do, correct?

Ms. Brechwald replied: We have been doing significant outreach since the Guidelines were adopted and we have reached I think about 96 percent of the cities and counties, or we have had a conversation and heard from them and know that they are aware of the requirements. And we are reaching out to all the remaining cities that we have not engaged with yet to try to make contact with them.

Commissioner Eklund continued: That is interesting. Whenever I was allowed to be a representative on a regional body or a county-wide body I would always write a written report. I have written a report about this with BCDC since I have been on the Commission. I also write a report for ABAG and the other organizations that I represent the city or the county on, or multiple counties like I do on this one.

I am not sure that a lot of the elected officials really are aware of what the requirements are going to be and what the potential costs could be on this and so I think that there may be an opportunity. Each county has a mayors and council members organization, so have you used that avenue to try to reach out to the different cities and the counties?

Ms. Brechwald stated: Yes, we have. We have attended at least one mayor or council members gathering in all nine counties over the past year or so. But if you have another forum that you think could benefit from a presentation, we are happy to do so.

Commissioner Eklund asked: And so, you have contacts now in each of the cities and the counties?

Ms. Brechwald answered: Yes, we do.

Commissioner Eklund acknowledged: Okay, great. It would be helpful for us to know who the contact was in each of our jurisdictions, so if we could get a list throughout the Bay Area that would be very helpful.

Ms. Brechwald stated: Yes, I can follow up for each Commissioner.

Commissioner Eklund continued: Okay, great. Because I just want to make sure, at least with the cities and the counties that I am familiar with. And because I am Past President of the League of California Cities, I do have connections actually throughout the state, but specifically around the Bay Area.

So, when is this tool going to be available for folks to use?

Mr. Copeland replied: The target release for 1.0 is in August.

Commissioner Eklund sought clarification: The middle part of August or end or you do not know? Just by the end of August.

Mr. Copeland replied: Yes, can we just go with August.

Commissioner Eklund acknowledged: Okay then, that is fine.

And what is this Eco database?

Mr. Copeland explained: The EcoAtlas, it is a statewide database but it has a specific section for the Bay Area and it is hosted by SFEI. For a little bit of context for the data ask and people worried about this being a new data ask, it is actually a data

ask that is already being made of them. And so, this is more of an effort to provide more value to people when they have been participating in that, rather than us generating a new data ask.

Commissioner Janoff commented: This is really great work and exciting to see. My question is building on the funding piece. I saw in your presentation there is guidance on funding pathways. I assume that it focuses on grants, but I am wondering if it also includes partnerships with agencies that implement projects such as the Army Corps of Engineers and others?

Mr. Copeland answered: Yes, that is a great question. We are working to connect it to an organization called Coastal Quest that puts out requests for proposals, for grants, kind of up to date, so that it enhances discoverability for projects of those funding sources.

As far as coordination with someone like the Army Corps, we see that more as wraparound technical assistance. The example that I gave is the kind of thing that we would be doing with the Army Corps of Engineers where we might connect with them on an effort to try to see how we can use something like this tool to enhance some of their ongoing efforts and make those connections.

Commissioner Janoff acknowledged: Yes, thank you. I think there is technical assistance that the Corps can provide, but also there are project authorities that it might fall under, or smaller scale projects like CAP projects. So yes, just something to consider.

And then I was also wondering if there is prioritization that is built in, in terms of addressing sea level rise. What are the near-term needs versus the long-term needs. Smaller scale low-hanging fruit versus the really big projects.

Mr. Copeland replied: If I can borrow Larry's term, it is sort of agnostic in that regard, but it puts tools in the hands of users to make those prioritizations themselves. If a user is only interested in projects that cost less than \$10,000. I don't know, that would be nothing, probably. Let's say it costs less than \$1 million. They could select that and it would give the subset of just those projects. If they are only interested in projects that cost more than \$10 million and benefit a transportation asset, those are things that a user could select and just see those projects.

And so, the goal was to, instead of us trying to impose Cory Copeland's prioritization on the region, is to be as flexible for as many funders' own existing priorities as possible, and so that is the kind of effort that we have attempted to achieve.

Commissioner Gunther was recognized: Yes, two things. I am really glad to see you start with those estimate of costs, right, but I do not believe them for a second. I think that it is important to keep repeating them, but it is also important to try and figure out how we can keep improving them.

I think that the idea that the \$96 billion is compiled from what people have told us is, okay. So that proves it is an underestimate, as does the fact that no one is

estimating costs for anything associated with the groundwater rise yet.

And I am sure on the other side, on the cost of not doing anything, we have also underestimated.

And I think that when you present those, and like I said, I think it is important to repeat them, but you should qualify them by saying, if you agree with me, that you consider them to be an underestimate.

Secondly, so between this and EcoAtlas, if I was online and wanted to find out what is going on with relation to development of projects to adapt to sea level rise, you would want me to come through this portal, is that right?

Mr. Copeland replied: I think there are use cases for EcoAtlas with this existing, but I think most users would.

Commissioner Gunther continued: But you said EcoAtlas, there is like a connection here in terms of the data.

You have a great list of collaborators, I assume there is not somebody else doing something similar in the region.

Mr. Copeland replied: I do not think there is anyone else crazy enough to do this.

Commissioner Gunther acknowledged: Yes, yes, okay, good. So, as I looked at it, and having built some things like this in the past, you have bit off an enormous O&M budget to keep this thing up to date. From what you said it appears updating will be dependent on people submitting updated information to you. It is not clear to me why that would behoove me to do that, unless BCDC will get mad at me and maybe I won't get a permit or something.

So, it seems to me like you might want to consider making sure everything on that page that was just like exploding with information is really essential for achieving the goal of engaging people. If you can get people to flow in through this, it is obviously enormously valuable. But it seems like there is an awful lot. You are attempting to deliver an awful lot of information.

I just have this nagging feeling like it will get out of date given that we will be asking you guys to do all sorts of other things too. And as a consequence, user experience will cause engagement to just sort of fall off because it is not up to date. Whereas if people are looking for the general top line information, that stuff does not change as often and so that it would be better able to supply the needs.

I think we are going to have a lot of other things that we are going to want to be doing, particularly as the regional plans come in, and so I am not quite sure how we afford to maintain this thing at a level that projects completeness and the fact that it is up to date. You do not need to answer that to me now, but I want you to consider that because it seems like we are biting off an enormous amount here to try and maintain and update.

Mr. Copeland replied: Yes. I will say that a lot of that feedback on the user experience, we started doing our user testing and really fantastic feedback. I will say you are not the first person that we have heard that from and so that is an insight that

we have already started to really internalize and are working towards. Appreciate that your insight there is very aligned.

And I will just say that a lot of this is, as far as maintainability, we have done a lot of work to automate our data processes so that in the future our updates are swapping in and hitting a button on the script or things like that, so that as much as possible it is highly maintainable. And also taking advantage of existing project work. Like this data push is a big multiagency effort, we are just one user of EcoAtlas among many throughout the state, and so we partner with a lot of regional agencies on that.

And then lastly to link it to RSAP plans so that we are just taking advantage of already existing work that has to be done, rather than adding new stuff.

Commissioner Eklund chimed in: Question. How are we going to help work with cities and counties to help them to remember or integrate some of the other state and federal organizations that have some impact or have some resources, like the Army Corps of Engineers with use of dredge material.

I know one of the things that we did in Novato and I was very much involved in the whole issue of the levee construction along Hamilton, which we actually built a levee. There may be some other cities or counties along the waterfront that may need to do that. And so the use of that dredge material, which is a really valuable asset, I think, could possibly be used as an alternative material other than from land and moving it elsewhere.

So, how are we at BCDC going to help other cities and counties that may not have that bandwidth and know what other organizations are available? How are we going to help them and guide them to incorporate some of those additional thoughts?

Ms. Fain chimed in: I would say that is a question even bigger than this one individual tool that Cory is talking about. What you are speaking about is really the need for regional technical assistance to support cities to do this kind of work and do it well. It is something that we are really focused on in Dana's team as we do these plans. We have been rolling out a whole series of webinars and different types of things, starting with the early phases of planning, and we will get more complex as we go on. So, I think topics like you mentioned are certainly ones that are ones where we are plotting out with SFEI a series around nature-based solutions and how to think about those in the context of RSAP planning. Those are resources that will be available to cities.

And I think it is also about regional partnerships. We are really fortunate to work with our regional partners. In this building, for example, the great folks at SFVP that are doing great work around similar types of issues.

And so just continuing to leverage all of our regional agencies' work in this area and see where we can support cities as their different levels of capacity.

Commissioner Eklund offered suggestions: Just for your information, maybe we can talk more offline about this, is that most of the counties have a city managers group, and that would be a real good opportunity for you guys to attend those

throughout the Bay Area to start working with the city managers to let them know they are probably going to need to hire a consultant to do this. Very little would want to do it in-house. We also have mayors and council members in each county as well.

I have been keeping Marin County informed, but not all city managers go to it and not all city council members do. We might want to have some discussion, especially with ABAG, and what is the best way for us to do some reach-out to the cities and the counties. Because I think we are doing our best to help move things along, but it is not moving as well as I think it should be. But I always have high expectations for myself and others. Anyway, just a comment from the peanut gallery in Marin County.

Chair Wasserman commented: I have a couple of questions following Commissioner Gonzalez's comments. Remind me, please, how we estimate placeholder projects cost.

Mr. Copeland responded: Yes. Those were a methodology derived as a part of the Funding and Investment Framework. There was an evaluation of possible projects, nothing is planned, just for the purpose of coming up with an estimate.

Chair Wasserman asked: Based on staff's brainstorming, input from others? A brief description of that process.

Mr. Copeland answered: I will say that was actually before my time at the agency so I do not know if I can look to.

Chair Wasserman stated: You can pass the baton.

Ms. Lyons commented: I can jump in. For the Funding and Investment Framework what we did was we inventoried the current list of projects that we have and the costs associated with them, bin them by type, and then we also used SFEI's Adaptation Atlas to match what type of project. Which SFEI had already done that analysis. What kind of project would best suit that area that is vulnerable, especially using green and hybrid infrastructure, if possible.

So yes, it was a staff analysis, but it also was informed by the Technical Advisory Committee that was on that project, some of whom are on the Steering Committee for this project as well. And that methodology also was carried through for Plan Bay Area 2050+ and for this project as well.

So, we have been iterating on it. The placeholders get updated if projects are proposed in EcoAtlas. We have real projects from locals that are in those areas. We delete them or edit them accordingly. So, it is a kind of living data set that we have updated over time based on that methodology.

And the methodology is, to be honest, it is quite crude. But the point was to be able to have that regional adaptation number, which has been the goal for both the Framework and Plan Bay Area 2050+. But I think moving forward we are hoping that through the RSAP process those question marks will really get filled in over the shoreline.

Chair Wasserman continued: Cory, you have described the information on cost is self-reporting. But wouldn't it be more accurate to say it is a combination? In the sense

that as part of the description that was just made, staff, not just BCDC staff, MTC staff, and perhaps other agencies, as they look at the RSAP, as they look at the ECO map, as they look at these things. If there is a change or if something is added, you check to see that it is added. So, it is a constant. I do not mean every moment, but iterative process that is ongoing, is that accurate?

Mr. Copeland agreed: Yes, that is correct. And for your reference, it is about a 2-to-1 local submitted versus from those modeling estimates.

Chair Wasserman continued: It is helpful, thank you. I think those are my questions; I have a couple of comments.

I would put Commissioner Gunther's comment, and his observation was very apt, but I would put his comment in a slightly different context. I do not think we can afford not to afford to keep using this very valuable tool.

As we develop our responses to rising sea level, have a number of large issues and challenges, the biggest is probably financing. And having information about it, as accurate information as possible, is critical. So, we are going to have to figure out how to keep this as a living document that continues to evolve and provide information. I think it is terrific, and I also think it is going to have to go through lots of changes, but you know that.

On the issue of priorities.

I have often compared the RSAP process and some of our predecessor concepts that have led to it as being modeled a little bit on the Metropolitan Transportation Commission's Regional Transportation Plan, which does set priorities. It is an iterative process. Information coming up from localities, being processed at the county level, the regional level, the MTC level, going to the state, going to the federal government, to the extent they are still participating in these activities.

Our process is similar in the iterative. MTC has a very significant advantage in setting priorities that we do not have. They have and they control money. We neither have nor do we control, nor are we likely to control money, even if it starts flowing. Nonetheless, in that context we are going to have to start setting as guidelines, priorities, and there are going to be lots of factors that go into them. It is going to be urgency, it is going to be shovel-ready, it is going to be availability of funds, it is going to be how critical the impacted service is. And there are going to be conflicts there, because lots of major infrastructure services from roads to railroads to subways to utilities to hospitals are all going to be impacted. So, it is going to be an ongoing process.

And I am saying that because today, not a chance we can set priorities. We do not have enough information, we do not have enough of it gathered. But this tool is a very critical piece of moving forward towards that.

I think one of the things I would like you to do as you continue getting input on how it works is very, very much how easy to use it is. It is a hugely complex set of information out there. And all of those issues need to be out there, we need to figure

out. But please continually keep in mind accessibility. In part because it gets back to Commissioner Gunther's point about people being willing to use it. Obviously, the simpler it is, the more likely they are going to be able to use it. And as we figure out some of the more important carrots in the RSAP process, hopefully, we can tie those in as well.

Now I am going to jump way out ahead. My hope, but I have to tell you all, it is not a fear it is a hope, but it is going to be a critical one - is, we are going to have to connect all of this to the visual, visceral mechanisms that we do not yet have.

As I was thinking about this, I cannot remember whether I talked about this two weeks ago or not. Over the time at BCDC we have seen a number of visualization projects. None of them have gone to significant scale. Some of you, a few of you may remember the old Owl projects, and I cannot remember the name of the company that had it, maybe it was Owl, the sort of video things you see on the piers that let you see out. Except that what you looked at was not what was actually there, but what would be there under various sea rise scenarios.

We had a much more modern and to some extent, accessible example of that at our last summit last fall. The professor, I think it was from Davis, who had created an app on your phone that could do something similar, and it actually raised historical ones as well as current as well as future.

The reason I was talking about this with Larry is that I think we are going to have to figure out how to corral some resources to move to the next stage of those things to figure out how to scale. Because if we cannot do that, then I think we are going to fail in our ability to mobilize the resources, the will of the elected politicians, the will of the people, the will of the taxpayers, to fund what we are going to need to fund.

But all I have to say, this is a critical element of that effort. I thank you very much for the work. A number of comments have been made that I am sure you will take in and start considering. We are making progress.

Commissioner Eklund agreed: I totally agree with your comments. I guess my fundamental concern, though, is that, and I will just speak about Novato. Novato is a poor property tax city. We do not have enough funds to even do what we are supposed to be doing to keep the people safe and the streets safe, and I could go through the list. Having been president of the League I have talked to a lot of small cities and a lot of big cities, and there is a fundamental issue of lack of funding.

My humble opinion is that it is going to be really hard for cities and counties to come up with the money to even try to hire a contractor to do these RSAPs. I think at some point we need to have some discussion about that because I just do not know where it is going to come from. We might be able to get a few dollars put together to try to do something, but I there are some cities that are even poorer than Novato and they are fundamentally having concerns about even paying the salary of their employees.

I think at some point I would like to have a discussion about what can we do to

help cities and counties get the funds that they need to do this RSAP correctly, not only to develop it but to also start implementing aspects of it. Because sea level rise, as we all know, is already here, and so we need to figure out what we can do together to protect all of our cities and counties. Anyway, that is comment from the peanut gallery again.

Chair Wasserman acknowledged: You are absolutely right, and we have had discussions about how to help, and we will continue to have them. And I know that our staff as they are doing this research is making sure that when they do talk to the city managers, the city administrators, the planners, and it is probably primarily at this point the planners, about what resources we know including the state grant funds, which are the primary source right now of supplementing whatever scarce local resources there may be. And you remind me, thank you, about one other comment I wanted to make.

Can you pull up the very first slide. I can start without it, but it is an important visual. The cost estimate has come down. I want to tell you I share Commissioner Gunther's skepticism about that number. I do want to make sure.

So, it is now 96 billion, it used to be 110. At one level that difference may not be important, because those numbers are so huge, so unachievable. On the other hand, if it is really 110 or more, because I think there have been underestimates on the other side as well.

We know the 230 number is low, because we know in part it is based on assessed property value, which is not an accurate assessment of actual property value.

I do think it is important that when that number changes, and it will, because of more information, more estimates, refining things, we need to explain it each time. And it will be a little redundant in that. But we need to build credibility about that number because it is a crushing number, but it is also a number we need to figure out how to achieve.

I appreciate it is there, and I think you not only need a footnote, you need a star, you need several footnotes on it, but we have got to explain, particularly when it changes, because that affects our credibility, which is going to be of critical importance here.

Is there any public comment, Sierra?

(No members of the public addressed the Commission.)

Chair Wasserman stated: I am truly disappointed. There is no vote on this matter.

**10. Briefing on BCDC's Strategic Plan.** Chair Wasserman stated: That brings us to Item 10, a briefing on the progress of BCDC's Strategic Plan. We will hear about the status of various objectives and receive a report on moving forward with a new plan.

Executive Director Goldzband will kick off the briefing.

Executive Director Goldzband presented the following: Thank you very much, Chair Wasserman. You will remember that the Commission chose to extend the Strategic Plan by a year, which is why it now says 2023 to 2026.

You have seen these first five or six slides many times. We have not changed them. We have no plans to change them.

I show this photo wherever I go and I always say, this is not Photoshopped. This actually occurred. It was taken by a staff member who was in a kayak, and it is in Marin County right near Mill Valley, et cetera, and we all know where that is.

Our mission has not changed: Protect and enhance San Francisco Bay and advance the Bay's responsible, productive, and equitable uses for this and future generations as we face a changing climate and rising sea levels.

We have these five core values, which we try to work on every day in all sorts of different ways.

We certainly try to be equitable and inclusive.

You can tell that we deal with science and data an awful lot.

We try to be proactive, and I think we are pretty good at it.

We certainly try to be collaborative and trusted. I should mention that yesterday Secretary Crowfoot was down in Half Moon Bay with Caltrans and the Coastal Commission at a conference or at a site visit, and you will be pleased to know, Commissioners, that Caltrans lauded BCDC for its collaborative work on the Highway 37 Project, which you approved two weeks ago saying that it was tremendously helpful, and the collaboration worked. It was nice to hear that from Kate, who called me later in the day.

These goals also have not changed. I am not going to read them. They deal with planning, regulatory, equity, communications, and then how we deal internally with our resources.

Here is the fun part, which is that almost 100% of the tasks are either on track or completed; and over the past 20 months we have, as you can see, actually reduced the number On Track. But that is because, as you can see, we have vastly increased the number that have either been Completed or are Completed and Ongoing.

Completed and Ongoing, what does that mean? Well, it means implement the RSAP. Well, we have implemented the RSAP. We are implementing the RSAP every day. The next time we do this, and we will talk about it a little bit at the end, figure out better ways of actually describing this. But Completed or Completed and Ongoing I think is really, really impressive. And we have moved from Not Starting 15 to actually only one that has not started and probably will not start this year.

What we want to do is run somewhat quickly through the five goals. We have asked each staff member in charge of the goal to pick out one or two different objectives, and where we are at and what has changed and what we think are the next steps. So, I will send this off to Jessica first.

Ms. Fain addressed attendees: Thank you, Larry. Our first goal is about regional planning and policy with a focus on successful and equitable planning, specifically with a focus on sea level rise adaptation. I am going to be highlighting two areas that we have made progress, and also where we will be focusing our attention for the remainder

of the year.

This strategic objective, as we have talked about a lot today and in recent meetings, is around improving regional sediment management and increasing beneficial reuse of sediment.

As you all know, just two weeks ago you voted to initiate the Sediment Bay Plan Amendment.

Our next challenge is really nailing down the actual policy language so that we can take these concepts and put them into the Bay Plan.

What is next is a workshop at our next meeting on June 4, a public hearing and vote, and also a financing strategy, which is part of our grant with the EPA.

I will say that by the end of this summer/fall, we are all going to be so much more knowledgeable around beneficial reuse in the region. It is an exciting topic, and I think it is one that we will all be able to do some really great things around.

The next objective I will highlight is around proactively and regularly updating the Bay Plan to reflect changing policy needs.

Since 2023 you have approved three major Bay Plan Amendments: the Seaport Plan, the Regional Shoreline Adaptation Plan, and the San Francisco Waterfront Special Area Plan; and last month you approved number four, a cartographic update to the Bay Plan Maps. So, that is about one per year, and I think that really reflects our goal to be proactive and to regularly update the Bay Plan to reflect these changing policy needs.

But it is time to ask ourselves what's next. What are the new priorities?

For those Commissioners that were around in 2016, you probably participated in multi-session workshops where we identified a whole chart of issue areas that we as a Commission wanted to take on.

We finished that, so we need to start thinking ahead to what are the major issues facing the Bay moving forward? How is the Bay Plan serving us? Are there areas of the Bay Plan that are no longer serving us? And how should we think about moving forward with prioritizing those amendments?

Our staff is going to be first taking an internal look at those policies for the remainder of the year. Talking to our regulatory team around what is working and what is not working. And then we are excited to bring those discussions to you probably in early 2027.

And now I will pass it to Ethan.

Assistant Regulatory Director for Climate Adaptation Lavine addressed the Commission: Thank you. I will get us started on Goal 2.

Strategic Objective 2.1 is to determine whether and how BCDC's regulatory and planning authority and jurisdiction should be expanded to foster larger scale adaptation.

We have had five Rising Sea Level Commissioner Working Group meetings on this topic since February of 2025; and since November, Lisa Herron and Kat Riley from BCDC's Planning Unit have ramped up external engagement on the issue with 25

external stakeholders on this topic.

Through this outreach, we have identified a common problem statement with our existing authority and jurisdiction that are categorized into three main categories:

- We want to be effective in our outcome of any changes we make.
- We want to be efficient in making adaptation faster while protecting the Bay and its resources.
- And be funded with the resources we need to make this happen, getting the money to the right places in an equitable way.

Through this lens, we have refined our message and intent for the overall effort. The biggest challenges are going to be the current regulatory climate at all levels of government and getting buy-in from stakeholders.

Discussions are ongoing with the Rising Sea Level Commissioner Working Group to help define the next steps relating to policy and legislative recommendations.

And we are working towards a workshop with the Commission this fall.

Strategic Objective 2.3 is to increase the capacity of the Regulatory Division to execute its core functions more efficiently.

In terms of recent accomplishments:

The Office of Administrative Law on May 4 approved the Commission's package of regulation changes aimed at making BCDC's Permitting Program more efficient. That package, as many Commissioners will remember, will modernize the Regionwide Permit Program, BCDC's most efficient form of permit that takes 10 days to get.

It will provide that program with clear rules and a new application.

It also eliminates the need to even get a permit for 20 categories of low-impact activities within the shoreline band.

The new rules take effect on July 1.

Secondly, as reported at our Commission meeting last month, BCDC has selected Salesforce as its vendor to provide a one-stop shop digital platform that will support project management for staff, online application submission, and expanded public transparency through a new public portal.

The challenges, of course, will include getting this new platform set up and rethinking many of our business practices for a digital first approach.

As far as what is next, we are in the process of outlining a new outreach effort about BCDC Permitting Program focused on local governments, whose building permits and planning desks often field questions about BCDC; as well as workshops for small-time applicants like homeowners and business owners who may be intimidated about applying for a permit.

Now that we have the new simplified rules for a Regionwide Permit Program in place that I just mentioned which are taking effect on July 1, we are planning to begin work on an effort to create a whole new suite of regionwides that can help expedite new categories of work.

We are especially interested in finding ways to make certain restoration activities

and living shoreline elements fit within the program to align with regional priorities to adapt our Bay habitats to rising sea levels.

And I will pass it off to Greg.

General Counsel Scharff spoke: Thank you, Ethan.

The Strategic Objective was to integrate BCDC's new Compliance functions seamlessly into the Regulatory and Planning programs.

As most of you know, Compliance was a new program during our Strategic Plan. The way we interpreted this was to seamlessly integrate Compliance into Enforcement and Regulatory, as Compliance sits at the intersection of both of them.

So, what we did is we basically came up with protocols to talk about how Compliance intersects and interfaces with both Regulatory and Enforcement.

For Enforcement what we did is we put Compliance under the Enforcement and Compliance Manager, which was really a new position because before that there was an Enforcement Manager and Compliance reported directly to me. So now they are integrated and they work together pretty much seamlessly. They have meetings together, they hand things back and forth, and it is actually going really, really well. So that was really important.

And the other thing, obviously, is for the first time this year we actually fully staffed both Compliance and Enforcement. So, we have a full team. It is going really well and they work seamlessly.

The next part about that was integrating that with Regulatory, and I think we have done a really good job. They talk all the time. There do not seem to be any problems. For a while there were hiccups and stuff. And part of that was we sat down and over probably a seven- or eight-month process we literally wrote out how they intersect. We had long discussions between the two teams to make sure that all the issues were pretty thought out.

Then the next thing we did is one of the sticking points has been after-the-fact permitting. That is when someone goes and builds something without getting a permit at BCDC.

And we have two choices: one, we can basically tell them, go get an after-the-fact permit for this, or remove it. Some of the things are not permissible, we tell them to remove it. Other things are permissible and we tell them to get an after-the-fact permit.

After-the-fact permitting has been a real burden on Regulatory, shall we say. So, we have taken that in-house into the Compliance and Enforcement Division and we will be doing after-the-fact permitting to lessen the burden on Regulatory. We have now gone through, we shadowed, understood, learned from Regulatory, and now have brought that in-house.

We have integrated the after-the-fact permitting into Enforcement and now the thing is, as we fully integrate that we will see what hiccups come up, what things happen, and we will fine tune the program working with Regulatory to make sure that

eventually becomes smooth without issues.

The next challenge we have is Abandoned Derelict Vessels, which are becoming and have been a huge problem in the Bay. Probably for the next Strategic Plan you will see a lot of stuff about how we are going to solve that problem.

So, the next challenge for us is to create an ADV program to facilitate the removal of abandoned and derelict vessels throughout the Bay. Anyway, thank you. So, with that I will turn it over to Jessica.

Ms. Fain continued: Thanks, Greg. I will speak to Goal 3, which is about equity throughout BCDC. Normally Dalila Adofo, who is our Senior Manager for EJ and Equity would be here speaking to this goal. Dalila is off the grid outside of Sacramento at a statewide tribal training, a multi-day tribal training, so I will be sharing on her behalf.

I will focus on two objectives.

The first is around formalizing and strengthening Commissioner and staff equity-based awareness and education.

Some recent accomplishments have included a really great Coastal Tribal Consultation Training in February, which we did in partnership with the Coastal Commission, Coastal Conservancy, and BCDC staff. It was a full day, it was led in Oakland and facilitated by an expert in this area called Kauffman and Associates, and I think we all got a lot out of it.

Some other recent accomplishments have been things that have been on our EJ Team's work plan for quite some time and we really have been able to finish them over the last month or so.

The first is to create and train staff on what we are calling Guidance on BCDC's "EJ and Social Equity Policies" and "Meaningful Community Engagement." These documents were developed over several years working with staff, working with our EJ Advisors, to really think about how do we take those EJ policies that we adopted several years ago and turn them into practical guidance for our permitting staff as they are trying to understand how to apply them to permits. Those are now available and we have been working with our Regulatory staff to understand how to use them.

In addition, we have been doing some onboarding and trainings on our EJ Program with new staff as they have been coming on.

Challenges here are we have had some staff turnover and so we are rebuilding our team again.

What is next is we are going to continue to think about the next suite of trainings.

Objective 3.5 is to develop long-term relationships and partnerships between and among BCDC and Bay Area tribal communities.

Accomplishments based on a statewide CNRA Tribal Consultation Policy that was developed late last year which really sets out a really nice framework for how to engage early, often, and meaningfully with tribes.

BCDC recently created a Tribal Consultation Addendum, specifically thinking

about how we apply that within the context of the work that we do and the context of the Bay Area. That is posted and live now on our website.

We have also been training staff on how to use it.

And also applying it. We have had some early consultations with tribes specifically around the SWAP Project, the Beneficial Reuse Bay Plant Amendment, and are even setting up some consultations and have gotten interest from tribes who are interested in engaging with us on this work.

Again, those challenges are here as well with the staff turnover.

But we are excited for the next chapter of this, which is really engaging more deeply with tribes, holding some listening sessions, meeting tribes where they are at, to really deepen those relationships, so that we are not just approaching them when something comes up or we need to consult with them, but we have those underlying relationships to work from.

Mr. Gervase continued: Thank you, Jessica. Goal 4 is all about communications.

In January, I am happy to report that we hired Alyssa Plese as BCDC's Public Affairs Specialist. She brings a lot of skills to the table including managing our social media accounts, graphic design, experience with plain language, and also something huge which is storytelling here at BCDC.

She has gotten right to work, and I am happy to report that we have had a few viral BCDC social media posts over the last couple of months, including one in March which was part of Women's History Month. It really tied the connection between BCDC's origin story of being created by a couple of activists in the East Bay to the challenges facing the Bay today. As a result of that we have really gotten some traction increasing our reach on social media which is, of course, one of the most cost-effective ways to get our messages out there.

We have also had success in drafting and starting to implement a Public Affairs Plan for BCDC. What that really does is it connects the goals of the Strategic Plan that require public affairs work and really sets out a pathway about how we are going to accomplish those.

As a part of that we have updated our strategy for social media. We are now focusing a lot more on high-quality as well as high-engagement posts, and we are starting to see traction on that as well.

We have also put out a couple of new products. For instance, last month we issued our first Media Roundup, which is going to be a monthly series focusing on stories of interest to BCDC as well as stories that have mentioned the Commission. That should have all popped into your inbox in early May. Look forward to the next edition sometime in early June which will cover the stories that came out on us in May.

Also, we published the 2025 Annual Report, which I think is one of the most comprehensive annual reports we have put out to date. That went out last month. Again, check around in your inboxes. Highly recommend to read, catching up on all the work you all did in the past year.

As far as challenges go, capacity is definitely still an issue. BCDC has two people who specialize in comms and we are doing more communications than ever.

Also, the new position we have established is a limited term position, like many at BCDC, so that is something we are going to have to take a look at how we continue to fill those communication needs in future years.

As far as what is next, it is definitely going to be a busy summer on the communications front.

I wanted to highlight that we will be putting together a unified strategy for outreach at BCDC. Something that really looks to make sure that we are communicating the same messages when we are speaking to a planning audience, with maybe local government staff, planning staff, as well as to project applicants. Really tying together what are the common themes that we should be speaking to and how we can reinforce the different types of work going on at the agency.

And then also not we will be providing communication support for some new high-profile initiatives. You all should be familiar with the ongoing initiative about examining how we can better adapt the Bay to sea level rise, looking at BCDC's authority and jurisdiction, and also Greg mentioned abandoned derelict vessels. That will definitely be an initiative which requires a lot of public communication, and we will be providing communication support to that.

With that I will turn it over to Larry.

Executive Director Goldzband continued: BCDC has had a lot of growing pains over the last year and we are going to continue to have some growing pains.

SB 272 authorized 14 additional positions.

We have just hired a third IT person, or are about to, and you will hear about them two weeks from now.

We have an Operations staff that has grown.

And this is the big deal: We have had 35 new hires and/or changes to positions in the past year, which is actually more than half of the number of people we actually have on staff. We have done that with a very minimal HR staff which depends upon the Coastal Commission for a lot of those transactions. It has been a huge year for BCDC. And I will be the first to admit that I still walk around the office and look at a couple nameplates to make sure I know who actually the new people are.

One of the things that we are doing is in hiring another HR person who is starting on Friday, that person's job will be to create actual long-term institutional processes to do onboarding and to improve different types of flow. That is because BCDC as what has been an historically small organization, just has not done that and we have not had the capacity to do it. So now we have more capacity, and we need to do it, and that is what I mean by a growing pain.

We, of course, will always have difficulty retaining staff because the state pay is very low compared to regional and local government. We continue to lose a couple of people every year, it seems to regional and local governments, which is great for them.

It is actually not necessarily bad for us because it means that when they go, as Kate Lyons did, to MTC, you have a person there who actually understands BCDC and that is actually helpful. But on the whole, we would rather keep them.

So, what is next?

We have the new HR staff who will establish Onboarding, Training, and Mentorship programs.

We are in the midst of evaluating our current organizational structure as a precursor to what I will talk about next, which is the next Strategic Plan.

So, where do we go from here?

Two things:

Number one, we will be in the next couple of weeks sending out a new and improved RFP to get a facilitator and consultant to help us with our next Strategic Plan. That work will start during the summer, continue through the fall, and we hope will be done by the end of the year, certainly if not then in January.

We have learned a lot over the past four years from this Strategic Plan, including how to make it better in terms of metrics and in terms of measurement.

A lot has actually happened technologically over the past four years, which we think will allow us to graduate perhaps from an Excel spreadsheet that we use now to actually something which is easier to use, and candidly, more transparent to track how we actually work.

We also are working with the managers, senior staff, and managers, to try to figure out what we need to do internally to capture more effectiveness and more efficiency. We have had a couple meetings so far, we are going to have a couple more. And all that will be thrown into the Mixmaster as part of the Strategic Planning process so that we can actually end up working better over the next few years.

You all need to be part of that. As always, when we develop a new Strategic Plan, we will hold at least one public workshop.

Chair Wasserman will, I am sure, create a working group to deal with this and to help us because you all are going to be leading the process. We will certainly be behind you 100 percent, but we need the Commissioners, as always, to be very much a part of this.

You will see probably by the end of June if not early July in the Consent Calendar a contract for that Strategic Planning consultant and we will get started right away.

So, with that we are happy to answer questions.

Chair Wasserman continued: I am going to check if there is any public comment, first.

(No members of the public addressed the Commission.)

Chair Wasserman asked: Questions or comments from Commissioners?

Commissioner Gunther chimed in: Larry, I just wanted to say that the idea that we may set out quantitative goals and then we are evaluating how we have met those is really important. You can have strategic language up one side and down the other, but

really holding yourself quantitatively accountable to something I think makes all the difference.

We seemed to have cleared the bar quite effectively, which makes me just ask whether maybe we could set the bar just a little bit higher in the next Strategic Plan. But I just think that is really important. That is a story that we can tell in terms of how we communicate.

And I also just want to make sure somehow or another that you are continually saying that we asked the Department of Finance to come in and look over our shoulder and tell us what we were doing wrong. Submitting ourselves to peer review I also think was just an incredibly important piece of showing that we are willing to hold ourselves accountable.

Executive Director Goldzband responded: Two responses to that. When you all approved and created this Strategic Plan in 2023 we had about 45 staffers. We are now at about 65. It is amazing what you can do when you get an influx of people and money. I would argue that we would not be where we are at now if that had not happened.

On the other hand, as senior staff know, we basically bet the farm that we would get more money. And we not only kept the farm, we expanded the acreage, and so we can be pretty happy with that.

The second response to you is yes. And as a matter of fact, there are at least a couple of things in the Department of Finance mission-based review that we have not done yet.

One of them, for example, is a Workforce Plan, which is actually part of the Wicks Bill, AB 2051. Thank you, Rylan, I will never get that straight. Which basically argues, because Assembly Member Wicks has looked at Rylan and me straight on in her office and said, nobody who does regulatory has enough staff to do it well and to do it as efficiently as possible. So, so we have to look at that. So, there is more to do from the mission-based review.

Commissioner Gunther added: One other thing. Jessica, you probably already know this, but the Water Board has a whole process they do to prioritize Basin Plan Amendments and it involves scoring them and we get this whole report, because we do the triennial Basin Plan Review. You might want to check with Xavier and just see if any of that makes sense for us.

Executive Director Goldzband chimed in: Yes, I want to actually say a couple things. Jessica talked about the Bay Plan process that we need to think about what the next steps are. I want to remind everybody that the Bay Plan covers everything even though it says Plan. You heard Sam today talk about the five aspects of the Bay Plan that Regulatory, that the Permitting folks have to actually not only understand but understand really well to understand how that permit actually applies or how the Bay Plan applies to that permitting process. So, we are working hard to make sure that the Regulatory folks as well as the Planning folks are part of how we are going to do or how we are going to look at an updated Bay Plan. It is really important that we include

everybody.

Commissioner Cox commented: I was particularly intrigued by Greg's slide because Sausalito, of course, has a very successful track record dealing with derelict boats out on the water and so I just wanted to offer to share our ticketing and removal plan with you if that would be helpful.

Mr. Scharff acknowledged: Thank you so much for that, Commissioner Cox, we will be in touch.

Executive Director Goldzband continued: About ADV, the Vessel Program. When I was in DC for the Coastal States Organization meeting in March, I happened to be sitting in front of Chris Sprout who is my peer in South Carolina. And when everybody had to stand up and give two minutes on the most exciting thing that was going on in your program, Chris said, well, we just got a bill passed, the governor signed, creating an abandoned and derelict vessel program. About six weeks ago I contacted Chris when Isabel Chamberlain who is the head of Enforcement said, I want to really start working on this. So, she has already contacted, I gather, Chris's staff to learn what statutorily they did, which I think is really, really important when you consider how big this problem really is.

Commissioner Cox replied: Yes, that is where Sausalito started was with researching what law applies to our waters because we are a refuge area for purposes of lights during storms, but not for purposes of mooring derelict boats. So, we had to do that research. Then we updated our ordinances.

Well, you know, all this, Greg, because you worked with us as part of the Enforcement Committee for years.

Mr. Scharff agreed: That is correct.

Commissioner Cox acknowledged: Yes.

Mr. Scharff stated: We got all boats gone.

Commissioner Cox continued: In Richardson's Bay we went from over 200 boats down to 5 without ever forcing a boat dweller to leave their boat without alternative housing provided.

Commissioner Nelson commented: I have a general comment and then a question about Goal 4.1; so if you could bring that slide up I will start with the general comment.

I just want to thank the staff for their hard work on implementing this plan and for such a comprehensive and efficient report. I work with a lot of federal agencies that are really struggling to get their basic functions done. It can be a vicious cycle that agencies struggle to get their work done and they support and that gets harder in the future. I just wanted to flag how important it is for BCDC and all agencies to demonstrate that they can function effectively and be responsive, in order to build public confidence and maintain long-term support. So, thank you for that, this is really important.

For 4.1, I am just curious about What's Next, the unified strategy for outreach at the bottom of that slide. We work with very different audiences, deeply knowledgeable

regional agency staff and members of the community that do not know very much about BCDC. So, we have a wide variety of work and different audiences we reach out to. I was hoping you could just help me understand what a unified strategy for outreach means in that context.

Mr. Gervase responded: Thank you, Commissioner Nelson, that is a great question. Let me start by saying we are doing a lot of different types of outreach at BCDC.

For instance, our HR Team might be going to job fairs, talking to potential applicants or students nearing graduation.

Our RSAP Team is, of course, reaching out to local governments and counties around the Bay to talk about how they can do their plans.

Our Regulatory Team is looking to start up outreach to potential project applicants to basically educate them on how to engage with BCDC through the application process.

So really the outreach strategy, the idea is that we need to answer some key questions as we do all this work. I think the most important one is what are the common themes to all this outreach. How are we talking about the organization. Whether it is Planning staff or Regulatory staff or Human Resources staff, we all should have some common themes and common messages there.

Also, particularly when we are talking about the interaction between those local sea level rise plans and the permitting of the projects that has to happen down the road, we should be making sure that there is a handoff between our Planning side and our Regulatory side so people are able to easily know exactly what our processes are, the staff they will be working with when it comes to implementation of those plans.

So those are a few of the key questions. I think there's also other ones like what role is each part of BCDC playing in this outreach and how as an overall communications team we can best serve the people doing that. So those are some of the things we are thinking about.

Commissioner Nelson continued: Okay. I just wanted to make sure, and you confirmed that, that represents a comprehensive strategy. A unified strategy does not mean that we have the same messages and the same language to all audiences, because they start in very different places.

Mr. Gervase agreed: Exactly, yes. Some of it would be tailored.

Commissioner Pemberton spoke: I want to echo Commissioner Nelson, thank you for that terrific, well-organized, and engaging presentation from staff; and I really loved how each staff person responsible for each area spoke on their area.

I had a question. Larry, you talked about the new hires and staffing and next steps, and I am just curious, what is BCDC's annual budget, just operating budget?

Executive Director Goldzband replied: It sort of depends on the month, Sheri. But I think the way to think about it is that we have grown to probably, and I have not looked at it for the last three months and I have not looked at the Governor's May

revise yet, but probably overall we are between \$13-15 million, which is about 33 percent more than when I started, maybe a little less, maybe a quarter more than when we started.

We had the big influx with SB 272 with 14 people, but we have also had over the past few years a number of very large grants, which have enabled us to do work.

So, for example, before SB 272 we received two grants, one from Ocean Protection Council and one from the State Coastal Conservancy, which allowed us to create programs basically on both the Regulatory and Planning sides.

And when I say we bet the farm, we basically moved those people into permanent positions without permanent funding. And that was my decision, because we were not going to hire limited-term people to do long-term jobs. Basically, I put it out there that we need to make sure we get permanent funding and we did through SB 272. So, we have moved those people over to different positions, which accounts for some of those 35 position switches, and that is why HR has been so incredibly strained.

We rely on General Fund, we rely on a little bit of federal funding, and we rely on some Greenhouse Gas Reduction Funds, and we rely on some grants. Now the question is going to be over the next couple years as those grants go away, do we replace them, how do we replace them, how does that then restructure the way we look at our operations.

Commissioner Pemberton acknowledged: Thank you. I have one other question and also wanted to say I really thought that the 2025 Annual Plan was amazing, such just kudos on that. I also love the focus on developing communications, public outreach strategy and plan, and having uniform ways that all of the BCDC staff communicate.

My last question is on the facilitator for the new Strategic Plan or Updated Strategic Plan. I was just curious if you were able to what the cost is to retain a facilitator for that work?

Executive Director Goldzband replied: We sent out an RFP and we are actually drawing it back because we realized we did not get all the answers to the questions that I thought I put in but we did not and so we are going to have to go back out, but it is fine.

We put up a budget of up to \$100,000, which is about two and a half times more than what we started when we first did this, Chair Wasserman, back in late 2012, 2013. The cost has gone up but there is more work to do, and it is just the way life goes. I think that we will for that amount of money get really, really robust responses.

One of the things that we have realized is that as we have grown over the past two to three years, we have also through the Bay Adapt Summit and various other things, have become basically more top-of-mind to folks. And so, we will, I imagine, receive somewhere between, say, six and a dozen responses to the RFP, and we will put together a group to whittle that down before we interview.

Commissioner Pemberton acknowledged: Thank you. I fully support retaining a facilitator for this effort.

Chair Wasserman asked: Any other questions or comments?

Commissioner Eklund chimed in: I too am very impressed with this Strategic Plan and really have a broader perspective of all the different things that BCDC is doing and how well we are doing, actually, I am really impressed.

It raises another question to me in my mind because I did not see tribal nations as much as I did today, for some reason. I worked with the tribal nations, obviously, when I was with EPA, very closely. And my question here, are the tribes going to be part of the planning effort, or do cities have to incorporate the tribes when we do our plans? And I see your head shaking yes.

Executive Director Goldzband explained: There are a couple things going on here. And I will look at Jessica, and I will also look at Sheri because gosh knows the State Lands Commission has a lot of experience in this.

There are at least one or two or three state laws that require local governments to consult with tribes. I cannot tell you exactly what they are, I just know that they exist. There are also laws and executive orders from Sacramento that require us to do the same thing.

And so, Jessica, I am looking at you and hoping you can fill in the RSAP portion of that, if that is okay.

Ms. Fain asked for clarification: So, the question is, how does the RSAP integrate tribal?

Commissioner Eklund responded: And who does it? Does BCDC, and if it is the cities and the counties.

Ms. Fain continued: And I will have to pull it up, but there is a requirement in the RSAP for the local governments as part of developing their local plan to do tribal consultation; and it is modeled off of the same state requirement for any local planning that cities are required to do. So, it is using the same language so it should be a process that is familiar to them.

There's a lot of state resources that are available, there's lists of tribes that are in that area or that might have resources in that area, and so we can support folks in terms of accessing those types of resources as they are doing their planning.

Commissioner Eklund continued: And so have we notified all the cities and the counties as part of the RSAPs that that is a requirement?

Ms. Fain replied: It is in there. I am not sure if we specifically notified them about that, in the sense that we notified them about RSAP planning. That was certainly part of the conversation when we adopted the RSAP. We certainly got some public comment on that particular issue, which is why we thought it was very important to include.

Executive Director Goldzband added: Just so you know, page 77 of the RSAP:

“Assets to be included in Subregional Shoreline Adaptation Plans”

“Required to assess:”

Boom, boom, boom, boom.

“Tribal governments” and “Special districts”.

In addition:

“The list of required assets can also be found in the minimum Categories and Assets Standard”.

It is in here, it is in bold type, and I would argue that I would be shocked if any city in the Bay Area that touches the Bay does not recognize that part of their planning process has to include tribal governments, because the state law requires it.

Commissioner Eklund suggested: We might want to highlight that page when we send this out because I am not convinced that all cities would be able to do that without it being called to their attention by BCDC. Comments from.

Chair Wasserman stated: With that, I do not see any more hands. I thank you all for your participation and the staff presentations.

**11. Adjournment.** There being no further business, the Commission meeting was adjourned at 4:15 p.m.