

# San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission

375 Beale Street, Suite 510, San Francisco, California 94105 tel 415 352 3600 fax 888 348 5190  
State of California | Gavin Newsom – Governor | [info@bcdc.ca.gov](mailto:info@bcdc.ca.gov) | [www.bcdc.ca.gov](http://www.bcdc.ca.gov)

October 27, 2023

**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))  
Reylina Ruiz, Director, Administrative & Technology Services (415/352-3638; [reylina.Ruiz@bcdc.ca.gov](mailto:reylina.Ruiz@bcdc.ca.gov))

**SUBJECT: Draft Minutes of October 19, 2023 Hybrid Commission Meeting**

1. **Call to Order.** The hybrid meeting was called to order by Chair Wasserman at 1:10 p.m. The meeting was held with a principal physical location of 375 Beale Street, San Francisco, California, and online via Zoom and teleconference.

Chair Wasserman stated: Good afternoon, all, and welcome to our hybrid BCDC Commission meeting. My name is Zack Wasserman, and I am the Chair of BCDC. Before we start, I do want to let everybody know that we will postpone our discussion of the state's new Rising Sea Level Guidance because the Ocean Protection Council has not yet published its draft of that policy. We hope to learn about that forecast and how BCDC may implement it before the end of the year.

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

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

Chair Wasserman announced that a quorum was present.

Not present were Commissioners: Department of Finance (Benson), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (Blake), Association of Bay Area Governments (Eklund), Contra Costa County (Gioia), Regional Water Quality Control Board (Gunther), State Lands Commission (Lucchesi), San Mateo County (Pine), Alameda County (Tam).

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

Chair Wasserman stated: Prior to starting public comment, I want to reemphasize one of the comments in the video introduction and want to make sure that everyone is aware of the increase in a phenomenon that unfortunately now has its own name, Zoom Bombing.

It is making racist or hate comments by Zoom at public local and regional meetings. As stated in that video, we will not tolerate any form of hate speech or threats against any group or any individuals. As Chair I want to let everyone know that I will enforce that rigidly. I hope not to have to do so.

Alison Madden commented: Yes, I am really sad about the Zoom Bombing too.

I wanted to be there in person today because I wanted to thank you and I really wanted to, you know, show that extra effort to be there in person, not only because I am interested in all of the content of your meetings, but due to how compassionate your discussion was on September 7, Agenda Item 11, about Liveboards and not just the Oyster Cove situation, but the liveboard policies in general.

I also think that the discussion that happened after the presentations was a really sophisticated policy analysis that shows the level of understanding you all have of the public trust as policymakers, both elected and appointed. And of the nuances not just of the public trust but the BCDC underlying policies, and so we were really encouraged by that.

During this year, which is kind of bookended by September 15th of 2022, when we started looking at Oyster Cove and talking about the liveboard policies, and September 7th of this year, you know, we have tried to show up and speak not too much and not too little but to ask for that public process, because so much of the information that it seems like the Commissioners were asking about the data really would come forth in a public process that includes the public, upland owners, liveboards, the harbor, and marina owners and operators, harbor masters, et cetera.

And those of us that have been speaking, we are an unincorporated association of dozens of liveboards. We have been meeting for over a year and some of us working on this for even over a decade. And really wanting to parse out in that public process how much liveboard communities serve the public trust. Which is why I am kind of sad how primarily it is tied to the recreation policy, because a lot of liveboards have a separate recreational boat that they take out, so there is so much information to convey.

But one of the things I want to say is, one of the last things that President Obama did, the last bills he signed before he left office, was a funding bill for the Coast Guard and the Army Corps of Engineers that preserved 1500 houseboats on the TVA properties on 13 southeastern states in the United States.

And at first it was the Republicans that came to the aid of the people that were going to be dispossessed and then the Democrats did too and it was this bipartisan, it was members of Congress, and it's really worth looking up, and it was just almost unanimous and overwhelming. And they grandfathered and preserved all of that, which avoided the kind of carnage that has happened with our loss of marinas.

So, we are offering to be a conduit of the information. We have been collecting all the information about the marinas and liveboards over the last year, so we would really appreciate continuing the discussion that you had last time. Thank you very much.

Chair Wasserman moved to Approval of the Minutes.

4. **Approval of Minutes for the September 7, 2023 Meeting.** Chair Wasserman asked for a motion and a second to adopt the minutes of September 7, 2023.

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

The motion carried by a voice vote with no votes of opposition, and Commissioners Eckerle and Zepeda voting “Abstain.”

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

a. **Introduction of New Commissioners:** My first item is to recognize two new Commissioners. Commissioner Jesse Arreguin will no longer be representing the East Bay on behalf of ABAG and ABAG has appointed Richmond City Council Member Cesar Zepeda as his replacement.

Council Member Zepeda is no stranger to BCDC. He is a member of our Local Electeds Task Force that has been helping BCDC prepare our Regional Shoreline Adaptation Plan starting with our guidelines. I would also note that his Alternate is Richmond City Council Member Soheila Bana and we will be hearing more about the Regional Shoreline Adaptation Plan later in the meeting.

Cesar, if you would like to introduce yourself or say a few words, you are welcome to do so. You do not have to do so. I do not want to put you on the spot. But the time is yours if he would like it.

Commissioner Zepeda stated: I will just say hello, everybody, and I look forward to working together with everyone. Richmond does have 32 miles of shoreline, the most out of any other Bay Area city. I look forward to working together. Thank you.

Chair Wasserman acknowledged and continued: Thank you.

The Department of Finance has appointed Stephen Benson as its new Commissioner. Mr. Benson is the Department's Principal Program Budget Analyst for the section that includes BCDC. We look forward to working closely with him and his staff. He cannot attend this meeting, but I am sure he will attend future ones.

b. **Senator Feinstein:** I want to take a moment of some sadness, but not totally sad, to say a few words about Dianne Feinstein. With her passing, we have lost a true public servant. One of her many contributions to the Bay and its people was her involvement in Measure AA, to the frustration of some of its supporters. She pushed to make it better, and she did make it better. And she supported it and helped to pass it and it is a very important part of our efforts to both preserve the Bay and to protect it.

I also want to recognize some less recognized contributions that she made over the years to a number of Black organizations. She hosted the first annual retreat for Black Women Organized for Political Action, one of the strong local and long-involved organizations, which has been a strong voice for Black women throughout our communities. And she was one of the original supporters of the Black American Political Association of California, founded by Percy Pinkney who worked on her staff.

But most of all I want to recognize her steady, committed, and dedicated leadership as San Francisco's mayor and as our United States senator. To some she was not as aggressive or progressive as they would like. And yet she was not only the author but really the champion of the 1994 Federal Assault Weapons Ban, and heaven knows we need more of those. She broke through so many glass ceilings; /we cannot count them. She was a champion of the people, and she will be missed.

c. **SB 272:** As you all know, the governor signed the Laird Bill SB 272 and I want to thank all of you and your organizations who helped support that and persuade the governor that this time around he really should sign it. It worked. We will be hearing more about that in this meeting and in future meetings. It is going to give us some very needed help in both providing guidance, but also being able to push local jurisdictions to adopt the plans that are very necessary to protect our Bay.

I want to also note that Larry and I have been working with the leaders of MTC and ABAG and the California Coastal Conservancy to talk about how we can coordinate efforts in seeking additional funding for adapting to rising sea level.

The goal is to make us more effective and to ensure, as much as possible, that local competition does not hurt us. We had a successful example of this with the application to NOAA for local funds that we are hopeful will be successful, so we know it can work. But we need to make it much more vigorous and much more thoughtfully coordinated. You will be hearing more about these efforts at future meetings.

d. **November 2 Get-Together:** I hope we will get a majority of our Commissioners here in physical presence for our November 2 meeting. I will be hosting a get-together here at 375 Beale Street after our Commission meeting for our Commissioners and senior staff so that we can talk a little and socialize and renew our bonds with each other as we more or less come out of COVID. So hopefully you can come for that.

e. **Next BCDC Meeting:** Our next meeting will be on November 2. At that meeting we expect to take up the following matters:

(1) Consideration of a contract with the Port of San Francisco regarding the San Francisco Waterfront Special Area Plan;

(2) A public hearing on the updated Draft Seaport Plan;

(3) A briefing and status report on developments concerning Highway 37.

f. **Ex Parte Communications:** This is the moment in time when Commissioners may report any ex parte communications that you have not reported in writing, remembering that you do need to report them in writing anyway. If any Commissioners wish to make a report on communications they have received from outside on matters before the Commission now is the time to do so. I do not see any hands.

That brings us to Item 6.

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

I want to add something to Chair Wasserman's remarks on the passing of Senator Feinstein. As many of you know, I was a senior member of Senator Pete Wilson's gubernatorial campaign in 1989 and 1990, so I learned a great deal about Mayor Feinstein then. Without telling a few longer stories I can say that each candidate had tremendous respect for the other, given that they were very successful big city mayors of very different cities. And we all greatly respected Mayor Feinstein's ability to govern through tremendous change and upheaval.

My favorite Senator Feinstein story, however, occurred four years ago when I was last in Washington, D.C. I was waiting for our flight back to San Francisco when the Senator came into the gate area. She was greeted by the Virgin America staff, who obviously knew her travel habits very well. While we were waiting to board our delayed flight, I screwed up my courage and I walked over to her and I introduced myself as BCDC's Executive Director and as a former Coro Fellow. Not a second after I did so and thanked her for being such a visible supporter of the Commission, she broke into a big smile and let me know in no uncertain terms how much she admired BCDC and how much she enjoyed being a Commissioner.

She obviously loved the Bay and asked me a couple questions about our work. During the past twenty years I have met with, and worked with, several of her former staff members. And answering those questions helped me understand immediately the reports that her staff had to work very hard to keep up with her. She was tremendously gracious that evening. May her work and her devotion to what we do keep her as a blessed memory for all associated with BCDC.

For the first time in BCDC history, our staff has collaborated with the California Conservation Corps to place Corps member Rosie Velazquez at BCDC as an intern to be paid for by the Conservation Corps.

Rosie has been a Corps member for about 18 months, during which she has gained experience in trail building, salmon restoration, and fuel reduction, and now is on the fire crew. Maybe we could have used her during this morning's earthquake drill. Rosie is a Hornet, a first-generation college grad from Sacramento State University, from which she earned her Bachelor of Science in Environmental Studies with a minor in Spanish and a certificate in Healthcare Spanish.

Rosie will be working with our Bay Adapt and Environmental Justice programs and will help us grow our small social media presence concurrently, and we are very pleased that she has volunteered to join us.

I also want to point out a new staff member whose face you might remember from her work as the head of climate change policy for the Delta Stewardship Council. Harriet Ross, as you know, has joined BCDC as our new Regulatory Director. You will see her in just a moment as she wonders whether there will be any questions about our Administrative Listing.

BCDC was proud to partner with the Coastal Conservancy, Save the Bay, the Bay Restoration Authority, the San Francisco Estuary Program, the Estuary Institute, Ducks Unlimited, and the Bay Joint Venture to issue a collaborative and comprehensive statement after Senator Feinstein's passing. It has been distributed to each of you and is on our website as well.

I do want to note that Commissioner Jenn Eckerle has become a member of NOAA's new Marine and Coastal Area-based Management Advisory Committee. That national body advises the Under Secretary of Commerce for Oceans and Atmosphere on science-based approaches to area-based protection, conservation, restoration, and management in coastal and marine areas.

Its membership represents a wide spectrum of perspectives on America's ocean, coastal, and Great Lakes and the communities that rely on them, including resource managers, commercial and recreational users, scientific experts, Indian tribes and indigenous communities, philanthropic and nonprofit organizations, and educators. In short, it is a terrific place for a California policymaker to be and we look forward to hearing about its work.

Last month, BCDC was pleased to support the Coastal Conservancy's request to the Congress that the U.S. Army Corp of Engineers authorize a comprehensive study of the nine-county shoreline of the San Francisco Bay, which would help the region prepare for and adapt to rising sea levels. We shall keep you informed as we work together in the hope that it is included in the 2024 federal Water Resources Development Act.

On October 9, in the absence of Chair Wasserman, Vice Chair Eisen approved an emergency permit application from the owners of a house built on piles over the Bay in Tiburon. While doing other work on the house, engineers found that the rock sea wall under the house has been destabilized along its entire length due to wave action and may fail completely at any time, which would likely result in catastrophic failure of the house foundation.

The engineers also advised the owners to vacate the house immediately. The emergency permit enables the engineers to reseal the existing rock wall, then excavate behind that wall to build a new concrete wall.

Additionally, the piles and beams under the house need repair, but that is less urgent, and the owners will apply for a separate administrative permit for those repairs for completion next year. I want to thank Vice Chair Eisen for her willingness to step into the Chair's figurative shoes so that the repairs could begin.

Finally, I am very pleased to let the Commission know that the BCDC Bocce Team, The Mean High Tides, emerged as victors in the Wednesday Ferry Building Bocce League playoffs. BCDC's team, which included stalwarts such as Todd Hallenbeck, Cody Aichele-Rothman, Jenn Hyman, Katharine Pan, and Steve Goldbeck, among others, won playoff games against the Metropolitan Transportation Commission and the Port of San Francisco. But they were not grudge matches or anything. Steve is actually showing the medal that everybody received after winning.

I am also happy to report that our friends who play for the Coastal Commission team, now there is a grudge match, loaned BCDC their support in a terrific statewide display of coastal zone management collaboration, which no doubt presages such collaboration as we move forward together to implement SB 272.

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

Chair Wasserman asked: Are there any questions for the Executive Director on his report?

Commissioner Moulton-Peters chimed in: Not a question but a compliment. I want to compliment our Executive Director for coming out to our Marin County mayors and council members gathering last month and giving a fabulous BCDC one-on-one and then engaging with all the council members afterwards. It was just fantastic, Larry, thank you.

Chair Wasserman added: I want to make a brief comment on the emergency permit. I have had some conversations with some contractors and others, and I think the problem that caused the need for that emergency permit is not uncommon and I am not sure there is a lot we can do. But a lot of the people who have purchased houses over the water, particularly in Marin, not exclusively, there are some in Contra Costa and elsewhere, do not even know they have permits from BCDC or that they are required; and they may well not know that the work that was done pursuant to those permits may have been undermined. So, I think we need to give a little bit of thought about how we can publicize that and alert them so that we do not face a rash of emergency permits.

**7. Consideration of Administrative Matters.** Chair Wasserman stated: That brings us to Item 7, Consideration of Administrative Matters.

We received a posting of Administrative Matters. As Larry said, our new head of regulatory matters, Harriet Ross, is here, eager to answer any questions you may have.

No questions or comments were voiced.

**8. Consideration of an Environmental Justice Advisors Organizational Development Contract.** Chair Wasserman introduced Item 8: That brings us to Item 8, which is Consideration of a Contract to Provide Organizational Development Support for the Environmental Justice Advisors Program. Phoenix Armenta, our Senior Manager for Climate Equity and Community Engagement will present the item.

Senior Manager for Climate Equity and Community Engagement Armenta presented the following: Thank you, Chair. Commissioners, again, I am Phoenix Armenta, Senior Manager for Climate Equity and Community Engagement. Today I am coming before you for your consideration of an Environmental Justice Advisors organizational development contract.

The EJ Advisors Program recently completed its second year. The Program was developed after the creation of our EJ and social equity policies in 2019. BCDC created the Program because we wanted to make sure that our EJ policies were properly implemented with the help of our partners. This EJ Advisors Program is a pilot program and is a unique model that is now being emulated by other agencies across the state.

The Program was codeveloped with the EJ advisors, and over the two years has seen many successes, which include helping us to develop our Racial Equity Action Plan, advising us on how to create a more equitable permitting process, and supporting our Bay Adapt work. They have also seen challenges over the years, as exemplified by the recent resignation of three advisors.

With any program it is important to evaluate how things have been going and assess where you would like to move in the future. To that end, BCDC issued an RFP for an organizational development consultant to conduct an analysis of the EJ Program and help design the Program for maximum impact.

Through a competitive bidding process, staff has selected MIG, Inc. in collaboration with Benchmarq Consulting, LLC.

MIG has over four decades of planning, research, and strategy support to a diverse array of partners. Their background includes working with public agencies and community-based organizations to facilitate these institutions' understanding of equity, diversity, and inclusion, while leading collective cultural shifts to a collaborative dynamic between government and community-based organizations. The team working directly with BCDC and the EJ Advisors has professional, cultural, and familial ties in the Bay Area.

Benchmarq Consulting has over 20 years of experience in implementing specialized training solutions focused on change management strategy, organizational development, diversity and inclusion, and operational performance measures. Benchmarq Consulting is a Black-owned consulting firm partnering on this contract.

With that I will open it to any questions.

Chair Wasserman asked: Are there any questions on this matter?

I do not have a question; I would make one comment. Not so much recently been over the years with a number of public agencies that I have represented I have worked with MIG and found them to be one of the most effective and creative organizations assisting public agencies, so I look forward to their work on this project.

Seeing no questions; public?

Ms. Ruiz noted: No public comment.

Ms. Armenta continued: The staff recommends that the Commission authorize its Executive Director to enter into an up to \$45,000 contract with MIG, Inc. in partnership with Benchmarq Consulting, LLC to provide the Commission facilitation in organizational development for the Environmental Justice Advisors Program over a period from October 19, 2023 through March 1, 2024. The staff further recommends that the Commission authorize the Executive Director to amend the contract as necessary, including revising the amount or duration of the agreement, so long as the amendment does not change the amount more than 10 percent or involve substantial changes to the services provided.

**MOTION:** Commissioner Moulton-Peters moved approval of the Staff Recommendation, seconded by Commissioner Ahn.

**VOTE:** The motion carried with a vote of 17-0-1 with Commissioners Addiego, Ahn, Ambuehl, Burt, Eckerle, Gorin, Hasz, Lee, Moulton-Peters, Nelson, Peskin, Ramos, Showalter, Vasquez, Zepeda, Vice Chair Eisen and Chair Wasserman voting, "YES", no "NO" votes, and Commissioner Beach voting "ABSTAIN".

Chair Wasserman announced: The motion passes, thank you.



Ms. Armenta acknowledged: Thank you.

Chair Wasserman stated: We look forward to the work going forward.

**9. Briefing on Updates to the California Sea Level Rise Guidance.**

Item 9 was postponed.

**10. Regional Shoreline Adaptation Plan Presentation and Discussion.** Chair Wasserman stated: That brings us to Item 10 since Item 9 has been postponed. This is an update on the Regional Shoreline Adaptation Plan's vision and goals phase. Jackie Mandoske, our Senior Climate Adaptation Planner, will present the item.

Executive Director Goldzband interjected: Before Jackie starts. I have received questions from three Commissioners now saying, when are we going to talk about 272? Pay attention to Jackie, please.

Senior Climate Adaptation Planner Mandoske continued:

All right, thank you, everyone. Good afternoon, Chair Wasserman, and Commissioners. My name is Jaclyn Mandoske. I am a Senior Climate Adaptation Planner here at BCDC and the Project Manager for the Regional Shoreline Adaptation Plan.

I am here today to share an update on our progress towards developing guidelines for a Regional Shoreline Adaptation Plan.

You last heard an update on this project back in February when we introduced the Regional Shoreline Adaptation Plan and we have been doing a lot of exciting work since then. But before I dive in, I want to remind us why we are here and what we hope to achieve.

As we all know, rising sea levels and shallow groundwater rise will affect all of us who live near and even far from the Bay shoreline. And while local adaptation is occurring, it is happening unevenly. Different parts of the shoreline face different risks and have different resources to respond. Some jurisdictions are well on their way, while others have not yet begun.

And all the while, flooding does not care about jurisdictional boundaries. Protecting our communities now and into the future will require us to act together, as the connected region that we are, in ways that are coordinated and consistent. This is why we are developing a Regional Shoreline Adaptation Plan.

As a reminder, this project is one of many ways that we are implementing the Bay Adapt Joint Platform. It is funded by the Ocean Protection Council and the State Coastal Conservancy, and is envisioned to serve as a model for how other regions in California can collectively plan for climate impacts.

As Commissioner Wasserman and Executive Director Larry Goldzband said in their opening remarks, we have some very exciting news. On October 7 the governor of California passed SB 272, known as the Laird Bill, and it has some pretty big implications for BCDC and specifically for this project.

So, what is in this bill? How does it affect our work? What does it change? These are all great questions, and we will answer these questions and more a bit later in the presentation, so stay tuned. For now, I am going to provide an update on the work that we have already been doing to develop these guidelines.

While we use the term Regional Shoreline Adaptation Plan, what we mean by that is a plan with three main parts.

The first part is creating guidelines. This is the work that we are doing right now and will include standards and criteria that will be required in sub-regional plans.

Following the adoption of the guidelines, the next step is supporting local jurisdictions through policy and technical assistance in creating their own sub-regional plans.

And lastly, we will be developing an online mapping platform to support local jurisdictions and communities to access the guidelines and allow us to track progress on adaptation so that we can understand how and where the region is working together to achieve shared success.

Where are we in this process to develop the guidelines?

We are here in late October, and we have been spending the last two months conducting outreach with practitioners, planners, residents and more, to ask people about their visions and values for the future of the Bay shoreline. We have held meetings with our expert advisory group, attended local community events, and currently have a survey out to gather feedback on this vision phase. Next Thursday we will be hosting our first public workshop to help us wrap up this visioning phase, which I will touch on more a bit later. In looking ahead, you can see that we will be transitioning to developing the guidelines in the coming months.

I also want to mention the work that we have been doing as part of our equity strategy. This has been developed in partnership with our Environmental Justice and Equity Subcommittee. This strategy allows us to transparently document the practices of equity that we are following in this work.

It contains two parts. The first part is on our process. How we pay our equity representatives, conduct our outreach, and work in partnership with communities to develop the guidelines. The second part is ensuring that we are evaluating at each stage of the process how and where equity is being integrated across the outcomes of our work.

Right now, we are developing a regional vision for the future. Why is this so important? We want to ensure that the guidelines reflect our values as a region and that our collective actions throughout these sub-regional plans add up to the shared outcomes that we have defined.

On this slide you see a list of topics. These are the issues that we are planning to address in the guidelines, and these include people and health, ecosystem resilience, development, and more.

We will be developing vision statements for each individually and for the region as a whole. For each vision statement we will identify means to measure success and the guidelines will be written to get us towards these measures.

Across each component we will be continuing to elevate equity along with elevating priorities such as improving nature-based adaptation and adaptation that achieves multiple benefits.

I talked a lot about our visioning phase. What have we been hearing from the people who call the Bay Area home and how is it shaping our work ahead?

We have attended nine community events in the last two months, and we have one more coming up this weekend. This means that we have been out in communities every single weekend since September. We have really been all over from the North Bay to the Central Bay and the South Bay.

And I want to note that we were invited to participate in each of these events through partnerships including through the support of many of our Commissioners as well as Advisory Group members and members of our Local Electeds Regional Task Force. So, thank you so much to everybody who helped us get into the events. They have been really special and important experiences.

You should have all hopefully received an email from us this morning through our Bay Adapt email with a link to this survey. This is another way that we are capturing feedback on the vision. If you did not get that email, please let me know and I am happy to resend.

I will maybe pause for one moment and ask folks if they would like to take their phones out and scan the QR code. Save it for later, the survey is about five to seven minutes, so maybe after the meeting today. We encourage all of you to take it and share it with your networks and communities. We will be closing the survey at the end of this month on October 31.

What have we been doing at all of these events? We have talked to hundreds of people. We have had over 250 individual people interact or engage on our interactive board. On this board, which you can see a bit in these photos, we asked people, what is important to you. We provided a series of value statements and asked people to identify the top three most important things to them right now, and we also asked them the most important things to them for future generations.

We use this activity to initiate conversations and share the context that sea level rise will have long-term generational impacts and that our choices today will affect what opportunities we leave for future generations.

On this slide I have included the top priorities that came up across all nine communities, both for right now and for the future. Unsurprisingly, we found that right now, people are thinking about the day-to-day issues including cost of living and housing affordability. We also saw that people value the physical health and well-being of Bay Area residents, and it was a high priority for them both today and for future generations. As we look at the priorities held for future generations, we see that people's values changed a bit. Yes, folks are still concerned about cost of living. But the highest priority for the future, by far, is protecting natural habitats and wildlife. I think it is remarkable that nearly every community prioritized this for the future.

And while this activity was not intended to be an official survey, we will use these results to help us verify our vision statements.

Throughout these events we interacted with a very broad range of people with varying levels of familiarity with the topic, some of whom had never heard of sea level rise. We talked to kids and adults. We had our materials available in English and in Spanish. And we formed new relationships, which we hope will now be part of our process moving forward.

We have also been gathering feedback through our online survey, which you should all have the QR code for on your phone. Among many questions on the survey, we ask people to share in their own words their vision for the future of the shoreline. I will not read all of them, but I will draw on a couple of themes here that stood out to me.

People are envisioning “a comprehensive approach that addresses the problem at all levels”. That “government agencies work together towards the same set of bold objectives”. And that “sea level rise and climate change offer an opportunity to rethink our current systems and to foster human relationships with one another and the natural world”.

So far, the survey has generated over 170 responses, and as I mentioned earlier, this will be available until the end of October. This information is also being used to confirm our vision statements and validate and gather voices from people around the region.

Lastly, we will be hosting our first public workshop next Thursday, October 26, on Zoom. Please attend. In this morning’s email you also received a Zoom registration link for this.

This workshop will be a great opportunity to learn about different aspects of the project. We will be debuting an animated video that shares our region’s story, our challenges and opportunities for Bay Area adaptation. And we will be sharing more results from all the feedback we have been gathering in this phase, including vision statements for the region. This workshop will serve to help us close out the visioning phase of the project as we begin transitioning into the next phase, which is defining sub-regional adaptation plans.

What is a sub-regional adaptation plan? We have been asking questions about this through three major buckets.

The first is, what is in the plan? What needs to be in there and what are good plans that other jurisdictions have already been doing that we can learn from?

Next, we are thinking about what is the process for how these plans should be developed? An important part of this question is what is the scale of the plan or sub-region? Who leads and implements it? There are a lot of ideas for how we might consider the scale of the plans.

For example, we will be exploring multiple scales: cities and counties, operational landscape units, and evaluating the tradeoffs of different approaches.

Lastly, we are thinking about how the plans would be evaluated, locally adopted, and locally implemented. We have a subcommittee of Advisory Group members who will be meeting next week to start tackling these questions with us. We will also be bringing these questions to our Rising Sea Level Commissioner Working Group meetings, as well as considering focus groups to ensure that the way we define these plans is responsive to the challenges at hand.

Now we are here to talk a little bit more about the Laird Bill. Our next step in sub-regional plans is all the more exciting with the passage of SB 272.

What does it actually do?

It requires local jurisdictions along the San Francisco Bay shoreline to develop sub-regional shoreline resiliency plans. These are not defined in the Bill but are being defined through our project.

This is a statewide bill. For the outer coast, the California Coastal Commission has equivalent responsibility through their Local Coastal Program and we have been working closely with the Coastal Commission to ensure that we are in alignment.

This Bill requires BCDC to develop guidelines by the end of 2024, which we are currently doing, and specifically calls out that the guidelines will be built on Bay Adapt's guiding principles. It requires that sub-regional plans are submitted to BCDC for review and approval based on consistency with the guidelines. And it sets up an important carrot: Projects and strategies contained within approved plans will be prioritized for state funding. It also sets a timeline for completion of sub-regional plans by January 2034, although we are hoping we can exceed that timeline in the Bay Area.

What are the benefits of SB 272 for advancing sea level rise adaptation? It helps us achieve our goals for regional preparation. As I mentioned earlier, a rising Bay does not follow jurisdictional lines and decisions in one location can have cascading negative impacts across the Bay Area. Bay Adapt and SB 272 will help solve these threats by establishing common regionwide standards and support for plans that transcend jurisdictions and issue areas.

It helps us achieve coordination. Across the Bay Area local planning is uneven, underfunded, and not always a top priority. The same is true across the entire California coast. This Bill compels all communities across California to prepare adaptation plans that prioritize disadvantaged communities, is based on science, and protects critical infrastructure, without endangering their neighbors or habitats.

It creates a priority for sea level rise adaptation and funding. A recent BCDC/MTC report estimates that it will cost at least \$110 billion in the Bay Area alone to adapt to midcentury sea level rise and flooding. But inaction will cost far more, over \$230 billion in estimated damages.

SB 272 will help us plan where and when to make smart investments that prioritize at-risk, low-income communities, natural areas and critical infrastructure, as well as link those plans to state funds to implement them.

What are the actual requirements laid out in the Bill? The Bill sets minimum standards including the use of best available science, a local vulnerability assessment that includes efforts to ensure equity for at-risk communities, the development of sea level rise adaptation strategies and recommended projects, identification of lead planning and implementation agencies, a timeline for updates as needed and as determined by the local government in agreement with BCDC or the Coastal Commission, and an economic impact analysis of at least costs for critical public infrastructure and recommended approaches for implementing the adaptation strategies and projects.

Through our current work we intend to not only meet these requirements, but also exceed them. We are including a broader range of topic areas in our guidelines, working collaboratively with stakeholders and elevating equity and nature-based adaptation solutions.

The good news, as I am sure you have gathered, is that we have already started, and we are well on our way. BCDC's Regional Shoreline Adaptation Plan Guidelines will address these minimum standards and more.

Bay Adapt, the Regional Shoreline Adaptation Plan and SB 272 are aligned, on track and linked to funding.

We are aligned with this Bill.

BCDC worked closely with Senator Laird and a variety of stakeholders to develop SB 272. The Commission and many others around the region took support positions on the Bill and we thank you for that.

We anticipated the adoption of SB 272 and we started meeting these requirements even before the Bill was signed. The Regional Shoreline Adaptation Plan developed last year, as you can see, mirrors the basic blueprint of SB 272.

Over the past few years, we have worked collaboratively and voluntarily with Bay Area local governments and regional partners to develop Bay Adapt and we will continue to do so as we implement the requirements of this Bill.

Moving forward, we will align the sub-regional plan guidelines with grant funders like the Ocean Protection Council so that local governments can participate collaboratively and successfully in the development of these plans.

We will also be providing policy and technical assistance support to support local governments as they apply the guidelines and develop these plans.

We are on track to develop the guidelines by the end of 2024 in alignment with the Bill requirements.

And importantly, this Bill is linked to funding. This is not an unfunded mandate for local jurisdictions. Grant funding for developing Bay shoreline adaptation plans will be available starting at the end of 2023 from the Ocean Protection Council, and other pots could be applied for this purpose as well.

OPC has \$95.9 million in currently available funding for planning and implementation. We worked with OPC on their current grant criteria. Once these guidelines are complete, we will work with OPC to update those for future rounds. There are historic levels of funding for adaptation, so it is in jurisdictions' best interest to get these plans developed soon.

The state has allocated \$690 million in multiyear funding for climate change adaptation between now and 2050.

At the federal level, there is more than \$6 billion available across program areas such as for habitat, transportation, environmental justice, and more, including both competitive and noncompetitive funds.

What does this mean for us? SB 272 presents challenges and opportunities for BCDC and the Bay Area. We will continue to develop the guidelines and we now have SB 272 behind it.

While the Bill calls for sub-regional plans to be completed by 2034, we think the region cannot wait that long to plan for its shoreline.

Therefore, a challenge for us is how can we collectively work together to adopt plans sooner? One way is that BCDC will establish, as I mentioned, a supportive and flexible policy and technical assistance program to meet cities and counties where they are, connect them to funding, and reduce the burden of additional planning costs.

We will continue to define what a sub-regional plan is and ensure that our local plan approval process is clear and codified so that governments know what to expect. We will be working with our legal team to begin to define the steps and process for how local governments submit and how BCDC reviews and approves these plans.

Finally, BCDC's Strategic Plan foresees a more unified and consistent regional approach across BCDC's planning and regulatory functions in light of rising sea level and directs the Commission to determine whether and how BCDC's regulatory and planning authority and jurisdiction should be expanded to foster larger scale adaptation efforts.

So, as BCDC implements SB 272 we will hold public discussions to determine whether and how to change our laws and policies to best implement this new Bill.

Thank you all for your time this afternoon. I am sure you have a lot of questions. I am happy to answer them. Also, I will go ahead and turn it back over to Commissioner Wasserman. Thank you.

Chair Wasserman continued: Questions from the Commissioners? Vice Chair Eisen.

Acting Chair Eisen was recognized: Thank you, Jackie, that was fantastic. The 272 refers to, quote, "local jurisdictions" and you said in one of your earlier slides that a sub-regional plan could be based on the city, the county or an OLU I think is the term we are now using.

Who decides that question? Oakland and Alameda could each have their own plan, or they could do it on a countywide basis, or as part of an OLU. Who makes that decision?

Ms. Mandoske replied: Right now we're working with our Advisory Group members, Rising Sea Level Commissioner Working Group and focus groups, to make those decision in this process: to define what a sub-regional plan is and if that includes any kind of multijurisdictional aspects.

Our intention at this point is not that everybody gets to decide for themselves, although in defining what a subregional plan is we want to ensure that the approach we define really supports the necessarily implementation, and that there is some consistency and ability to track and monitor that.

At this point we are not intending that everybody gets to choose on their own approach. But we are going through a phase in the project to evaluate different options. Before we actually get into developing the guidelines, we will have a recommended approach that we will be using.

Assistant Planning Director for Climate Adaptation Brechwald chimed in: Can I just add to that? We will include in the guidelines what the definition of sub-region is. We will not leave it open. And we will bring that back to you as Commissioners to weigh in on as well.

Commissioner Showalter commented: First, I would like to thank Jackie and Todd Hallenbeck for coming to Mountain View's birthday party for Shoreline Park. It was our 40th anniversary. For those of you that do not know, Shoreline Park was built upon about a 30-year landfill that was built with San Francisco garbage. It is really quite an interesting public works success story. It is a beautiful 750-acre regional park now.

But we do have forever to take care of this landfill that is underneath it. But on the good side, it raised the surface elevation of the area of Mountain View adjacent to the Bay by nine feet. So, what we have to do to protect the rest of the way is a little less than some other people might, other areas may have to do.

First of all, I wanted to thank them for coming. People were having a great time. Todd took some folks on tours of the restorations that are going on and Jackie was very, very busy asking questions so we really appreciated that involvement in our community celebration.

Then I also wanted to ask some more about what is sub-regional. The city of Mountain View developed a plan in about 2013 and we have revised it a few times. It has 14 projects that we need to do. We coordinate with Palo Alto and Sunnyvale and the Santa Clara Valley Water District and the Coastal Conservancy and all sorts of organizations, Fish and Wildlife Service. I think it is very important to build on that plan.

So, I am really interested in seeing how this sub-region gets defined and to make sure that we build on what has already been done, even though I know the planning is quite uneven throughout the area. My question really is just generally how are we planning to do that?

Ms. Brechwald answered: This is Dana Brechwald, Assistant Planning Director for Climate Adaptation. We are just at the beginning phases of defining that right now. I just want to reassure people that we do not have any final outcome in mind at the moment. It will be a collaborative process. We have a working group. We will bring it back to the Rising Sea Level Working Group, we will bring it here to the Commission. And we will have some focus groups to help define what that is.

A big question of that, as Jackie showed on the slide, is, what does this plan process look like? And a sub-question of that is, how do we build on the planning that people have already done? We do not have any final answer for you at this time. But you do raise really good points and that is what we are going to be considering as we come up with a definition of what a sub-regional plan is.



Commissioner Showalter continued: Great, that's great. And then the other thing I wanted to mention is that around the Bay, who has jurisdiction for flood protection, which is what sea level rise protection is really, it is coastal flood protection, protection from coastal flooding.

It varies all over the map. It is like a patchwork quilt. So, I am sure you are including the flood protection agencies as well in this group, right, that you are talking to? You did not mention them specifically in the presentation, but I am sure they are a part of the mix; is that correct?

Ms. Mandoske replied: Yes, we have an expert Advisory Group of over 40 individuals that span a gamut of practitioners and we do have flood control agency representatives on that.

And as we mentioned, we are also looking at opportunities to have more focus groups and to make sure that we are capturing those expert voices at different parts to ensure and creating spaces in this process to have those conversations.

Commissioner Showalter acknowledged and added: Yes, thank you for reminding me of that. I know several people who are serving on that expert Advisory Group. That fills that bill. Thanks very much.

Commissioner Nelson chimed in: I just wanted to thank staff for the briefing and to congratulate staff, especially Larry and Steve and the Chair as well.

SB 272 is a real step forward for the Commission. Just a milestone I think we should recognize. We have had a couple of conversations over the last several years about the sort of legislation that would help us with adaptation effort and 272 really ticks a lot of those boxes. So, it is a really important step forward.

And as these regional adaptation plans come together and we think about going back to the legislature, and to the governor, but especially the legislature, whether it is for policy legislation regarding implementation, or especially next steps on financing and funding adaptation efforts, the fact that we are doing all of this work in response to a mandate from the state legislature as opposed to doing it just because the Commission thinks it is good idea, is really important.

I just wanted to acknowledge the importance of this step and really thank staff and congratulate staff for making sure that this Bill is so closely aligned with our thinking and our existing efforts and I think it will really give us a boost. Thank you.

Commissioner John-Baptiste also thanked staff: Thank you to the staff. It was a really excellent, comprehensive presentation and obviously this is a really exciting moment to be in.

As I am thinking about this question of sub-regional, how to define the sub-regional. There is obviously, I think you have heard, people already identifying different starting points, different resource bases, different priorities among all of the different actors. And frankly, I think in some cases, differing levels of trust between different components of who might constitute what a sub-regional jurisdiction looks like.

What occurs to me that you might also be thinking about as you are considering how to define sub-regional is also how to think about ensuring integrity across sub-regional plans so that we have a secondary way to backstop any gaps in the system.

Which, I think that this legislation is so important because it gives BCDC the authority to actually hold the whole picture. So, considering how you can do that in a way that matches up with defining sub-regional areas, I think will be important. Thank you.

Chair Wasserman commented: I have a question for Commissioner Eckerle related to this. That is if you can give us any sense of the timing of the rollout on the funding from OPC for these planning efforts?

Commissioner Eckerle explained: Yes, thank you for the opportunity, Chair. Just to give an overarching overview of the program. And thank you for the presentation, it was excellent. This point was hit on, but I will reiterate here.

The Ocean Protection Council's SB 1 Grant Program, which is where this \$95 million will live, is going to offer two different tracks for funding, one for planning and one for project implementation.

Examples of planning projects include community visioning, vulnerability assessments, data collection and adaptation plans. Eligible implementation projects include nature-based and green-gray hybrid adaptation projects, feasibility studies and project design.

You heard that this program includes a set of adaptation criteria, which are the standardized set of minimum requirements that we want to see in these adaptation plans and projects.

That criteria, at least the draft criteria as it stands right now, really aims to establish best practices and consistency across our adaptation efforts. We developed that in close coordination with staff from BCDC, the Coastal Commission and other member agencies of our state's Sea Level Rise Collaborative.

The final criteria for that will be included in our grant program solicitation, which we anticipate releasing by the end of this year.

Once the solicitation is released, we intend to accept and approve planning projects through a rolling, quarterly, non-competitive process, provided that they satisfy the requirements in that final sea level rise criteria. We are going to begin accepting implementation projects through a competitive process in mid to late 2024.

And then one other note that is really important for our equity work. To ensure that we have equitable access to this funding, OPC is simultaneously launching a technical assistance program that will provide direct grant application services to local, regional and tribal governments that represent environmental justice communities.

To qualify for that technical assistance applicants must meet specified criteria. That criteria is currently under development, but the goal is to prioritize funding to communities that are under-resourced and are lacking necessary capacity to compete for this funding. Interested local, regional and tribal jurisdictions who meet that technical assistance criteria can apply for and receive that technical assistance support.

I am committed to keeping this Commission apprised on next steps. I encourage anyone who is interested in learning more or being notified about when our funding becomes available to visit OPC's website at [www.opc.ca.gov](http://www.opc.ca.gov). With that, I am happy to answer any follow-up questions.

Chair Wasserman acknowledged and recognized Commissioner Burt: Thank you. Commissioner Burt.

Commissioner Burt commented: Thank you. I just want to echo Commissioner Showalter's point about making sure that we are engaging with flood control agencies.

For example, the San Francisquito Creek Flood Control Agency represents both San Mateo and Santa Clara County and the cities of East Palo Alto, Palo Alto and Menlo Park. Because south of the creek in Santa Clara County, Palo Alto Valley Water and Mountain View are in a collaboration together. North of the creek in San Mateo County, East Palo Alto did not have the resources and San Mateo County does not have essentially a flood control district and funding.

So, the Flood Control Joint Power Authority has assumed the lead role on the Bay shoreline adaptation initiative for East Palo Alto.

So, the complexity of the different jurisdictions that are working together has been morphing based upon organic circumstances and it will not be easy sorting all that out. But the flood control agencies certainly are, I think, maybe more important players than we appreciated. Thanks.

Chair Wasserman asked: Any other questions?

I have got a couple before we go to the public. One, I certainly echo those remarks and I have been talking on and off to the staff about involving the flood control districts. Not an easy task, just to note, but a critical one.

Including the fact that over the long range, they may be an important part of the funding gap. Because as some of you may remember, there has been an effort in the past to put a measure on the statewide ballot to change the way they collect fees to make them more like the utilities requiring only a majority vote instead of a two-thirds vote. For a range of reasons, they are very important.

I want to emphasize Commissioner Eckerle's remarks as well as the staff presentation. The funding that is out there is not coming all at once. It is going to be rolling. The process is being put in place and formulated. Some of the efforts regarding that go back to what I said in my opening remarks about working to better coordinate the process of the various jurisdictions going after that funding so that we are helping each other and not hurting each other.

Do we have questions from the public, Reylina?

Ms. Ruiz stated: No public comment.

Executive Director Goldzband chimed in: Thank you, Chair Wasserman, and thank you, Commissioners and Alternates.

You should know that when the governor signed 272, Steve somehow found that out almost immediately and emailed me and I think the rest of senior staff at the same time. I want to say, first of all, that this Bill would not be what it is without Steve. He did an absolutely superb job leading the effort and working with Senator Laird's staff, working with Committee staff, making sure that the Coastal Commission knew what we were doing, making sure that we knew what the Coastal Commission was doing. He had a lot of help from Jessica and Dana and Jackie and some from me and certainly from Michael and Greg, but Steve deserves tremendous praise for his work on this. We would not be here without what he did.

To answer Commissioner Showalter's question and also Commissioner Burt's and pretty much everybody else, how are we going to do this in terms of regional shoreline planning and all that? My answer is, with great alacrity.

There is just a tremendous amount of complexity along the shoreline. We understand that. We will be the first to admit that there will be surprises during the next year or year and a quarter as we do this. But we are getting our ducks in a row internally to make sure that we know how we can forecast as many of them as possible so that there are as few surprises as possible.

With regard to the OPC's funding, I think Commissioner Eckerle would expect me to say this, but I have not cleared it with her. Thank God she is smiling. Let it be stated here that as soon as we hear anything about funding being available, you will hear about funding being available, because we will no doubt distribute it just as the OPC will.

I have also just written myself a note to put the OPC website on my Commission Meeting Summary today so that you all can just click and find out as much as you may want to know about such funding.

Finally, I want to say with a little bit of historical context that the Commission approved the Climate Change Amendments back in 2011, so that was a dozen years ago. It has taken us a dozen years to get to 272, but I do not think that, candidly, is necessarily too long. I think that so much has happened over the past four to five years that has changed the context in which people view climate change and rising sea level that we probably could not even have thought about having a 272 back in 2017 or 2018. I want to thank all of the folks who have been with us over the past dozen years.

I was reminded of this yesterday as I was driving and listening to, of all things, Bruce Springsteen and Thunder Road. There's a marvelous line in there when he looks at Mary and says, as they want to escape that town, the door is open but the ride ain't free.

We have earned this door being opened. But the ride is going to be complex and it is going to take a while and it ain't going to be free, but we as staff will assure you that we are going to get it done. We are going to get it done with your help individually and collectively. We want to thank you for always coming to BCDC and putting on your regional hat, because that is what this is really going to take.

So, with that, Chair Wasserman, I want to thank you for your patience and your leadership for helping us get to 272 and this point. Thank you.

Chair Wasserman acknowledged: As impatient as I normally am, I am almost inclined to agree with you on the timing of 272.

I do want to repeat my thanks to all of you and all of the organizations that supported getting 272 signed this round, including the two organizations who in many ways represent the largest, most organized part of what I view as our constituencies, Save the Bay and the Bay Planning Coalition. But it was a united and community effort that got that done so I thank you all.

With that we will turn to Item 11.

Thank you very much, Jackie, for an excellent presentation. Thanks, staff, for the work. Yes, the ride ain't free and it ain't over yet.

**11. Briefing on Commission Strategic Plan Progress.** Chair Wasserman stated: Item 11 is a Briefing on the Progress of work to implement the Commission's 2023-2025 Strategic Plan. Executive Director Goldzband we will start the briefing.

Executive Director Goldzband introduced Agenda Item 11: This really flows right from 272. Believe it or not, it really does, and it flows from Bay Adapt.

We promised you when you all adopted the Strategic Plan in spring that we would come at you in the next few months and give you an update. Well, August did not happen because we could not meet in August and then we only had one meeting in September. So, we are here in October and we will be back at you in either December or January with an update as well.

But this is, I think basically due to in great part Chair Wasserman's insistence, a real way for us to provide you with an update on just different parts of the Strategic Plan that we think you might well be most interested in and that we certainly are interested in, as well as giving you a larger scale update. I do want to thank Jessica Fain a lot because she has been a tremendous help in putting this together.

You will remember that you all with our help created a new vision. We have five goals, each with anticipated outcomes. This is not news to you. Nothing has changed with regard to the goals or anticipated outcomes.

The core values remain equitable and inclusive, science-based, and data-driven, agile, and proactive. Alacrity is in there. Collaborative and service-oriented, trusted, and accountable. We want to live up to that on a daily basis.

We have had a lot of progress on the Strategic Plan. You will remember that we have 5 goals and something like 24 or 25 different objectives within them.

You see a histogram here of what we think is on track, a few that have been delayed or that there are basically issues, a couple that have actually been completed, and then a bunch that have not even been started yet.

These are based upon each of the goals' objectives, which then have underneath them a series of actions that we want to take. This histogram is not the goals, it is not the objective, it is the actual actions that will complete those objectives and get us to that goal.

So that is why you see 65 or 70 different actions. We are not going to take you through 65 or 70 actions, God forbid, because we want you to stay awake. But what we will do is lead you through a couple of those different objectives, each of those five goals, so you can see how we are progressing.

Let's go to that next slide, which is Strategic Objective 1.1, so that is where I throw it over to Jessica.

Planning Director Fain continued: Thanks, Larry. Strategic Objective 1.1 is about how we successfully lead our Bay Adapt Program.

Accomplishments over this past quarter include actually completing one of the tasks in the Bay Adapt Joint Platform. We published with MTC a report called the *Sea Level Rise Adaptation Funding and Investment Framework* that we briefed you on.

We have also kicked off leadership groups to guide Bay Adapt implementation, including our Elected Official Task Force and an implementation Coordinating Group.

We have been able to provide funding to encourage diverse participation in the various Bay Adapt groups.

And we really focused on our communications. We have updated our website. We started a blog, thanks to some support that we have from some consultants to really up our communications game.

Some of the next challenges that we will be facing are coming out of that Funding and Investment Framework. How do we actually pull together an interagency process and agreement to help fill that gap? We are working with our partners at the Bay Area Regional Collaborative, MTC/ABAG and the Coastal Conservancy, as Chair Wasserman mentioned, to develop a memorandum of understanding across our agencies to try to solve this.

We also want to be able to measure how well we are doing on Bay Adapt and so our team is developing metrics on how to measure progress.

And then finally, one thing we are really looking forward to next summer is to host an annual forum on regional sea level rise adaptation. This will be a new event. We are just starting to scope it out. If you have ideas, let us know, but that is something we are looking forward to doing.

Another strategic objective of Goal 1 is around our Regional Shoreline Adaptation Plan. I am not going to go into much detail here, you just heard a lot from Jackie on this. Needless to say, we have done a lot of engagement. We are hosting a public workshop next week. We have made a lot of progress around this Phase I, which is background, vision and measuring our success.

Moving forward, as we enter into the next phase is, as we have discussed, defining what these sub-regional adaptation plans are and developing those guidelines and integrating SB 272 into this.

I think I turn it over to Harriet.

Regulatory Director Ross presented the following: Strategic Objective 2.1. That really speaks to determining if and how BCDC's authority and jurisdiction should be expanded to foster these larger scale adaptation efforts, which we have been talking about today. Lucky me, I am new, so I get to share the great work and the accomplishments that my Regulatory Team has been working on.

Some of our accomplishments working towards the strategy really includes undertaking a comprehensive review of our permitting program. We reviewed 15 major studies looking at regulatory challenges posed by adaptation; and we have identified over 30 major recommendations for BCDC and our regulatory partners to consider.

We will be taking the lessons learned from these studies and really using them to inform specific projects the Regulatory Team can pursue in the coming years.

We have also devoted a significant amount of time on the Department of Finance led mission-based review for our permitting program, which you heard about in the last meeting.

Almost every member of our Regulatory Team is providing their input and expertise on that review. The project will result in a list of recommendations from the Department of Finance staff on how BCDC can become a more efficient and effective permitting agency, really ready to tackle the major adaptation projects coming ahead of us.

Some of our upcoming work includes scoping out a proposal for reimagined BCDC jurisdiction that will allow the Commission to really implement the Regional Shoreline Adaptation Plan, as we have talked about. Obviously, that plan is still in development, but that work to develop that plan includes a great deal of time from regulatory staff as well.

The goal is for our ultimate recommendations on the Commission's future regulatory program to reflect the priorities and desired outcomes of that plan.

Lastly, we will be working with our regulatory partners to scope out a proposal for improved multiyear agency adaptation over the coming year.

General Counsel Scharff continued: I am next. As you know, we have a new group, Compliance, and Compliance really sits between Permitting and Enforcement. The goal of this is to integrate Compliance between those two and into the regulatory program. I have got to say, the good news is that Compliance is up and running, Compliance is doing a great job.

We have successfully integrated them between Enforcement and Permitting. Positive results have been seen in compliance and by permittees and in diversions from formal enforcement. We are having less enforcement activity and more compliance, which is the goal here.

It is an interesting discussion at times, when we send something to Compliance. Compliance has been looking at our permits, which have a whole range of things over time that have to be done. And it is the over time that makes Compliance have to look at it. And when things start to fall off, compliance can often get things back on track and I would say that is going really well.

We have weekly coordination meetings between Enforcement and Compliance, which is great. It is really like one team operating there. And then we have bimonthly meetings between Compliance and Regulatory to work out some of the permitting issues that come up and how to better make them enforceable, and how to make things more compliant and also how to take some of the load off Permitting.

Our next challenge is really closer integration with Permitting and Enforcement to make it a little more seamless at times. There's a bunch of gray areas that we run into. And basically, documenting the process and resolving those gray areas.

And then the last part of this is how to measure those efficiency gains to see that we are actually getting the benefits from having our Compliance Team and being able to show measurable benefits to those. So that's where we really are in Strategic Objective 2.4.

Ms. Armenta chimed in: Strategic Objective 3.2 highlights the work on BCDC's Racial Equity Plan. Since last we came to you, we have had a review from senior staff and have been working to integrate their comments. We also have been reviewing the actions with subject matter experts.

Even though the plan has not been finalized we have made a lot of progress on several actions including increasing funding to the EJ Advisors and beginning a biannual assessment of their program.

We are currently working on the final draft, and we aim to bring it for public comment in December of this year and to the Commission for approval in the winter of 2024.

Strategic Objective 3.3 focuses on strengthening Commissioner and staff equity-based awareness and education. To that end, we have been coordinating with the California Coastal Commission and the State Coastal Conservancy to bring EJ and Tribal Affairs training to all of the Coastal Zone Management Agency (CZMA) staff.

The senior staff at our agencies have registered and are planning to go to the training Going Beyond Land Acknowledgement put on by the Redbud Resources Group. If they approve of that training, we are going to invite the Redbud Resources Group to give the training to all of our staff.

We also continue to have EJ office hours for staff every two weeks and a monthly Racial Equity Media Club, where we are currently reading this book, *Evolution of a Movement*, about the history of the California EJ movement.

We are also planning a series of EJ and tribal engagement trainings in the next few months.

Our next challenge is to co-develop a two-year training workplan with the Coastal Commission and the State Coastal Conservancy for all Coastal Zone Management Agency staff.

Executive Director Goldzband continued: As you can tell, most senior staff members have a particular goal for which they are responsible, plus Phoenix on the EJ; mine is Goal 4. You will remember that Strategic Objective 4.1 basically says we have to do a better job with our stakeholders in terms of communication. We need to be more accessible. We need to increase awareness and we have to foster successful community dialogues.



We have had a number of accomplishments. As part of Bay Adapt, we have held two Elected Official Task Force meetings and we have had a series of pop-up community events. You saw the results of that earlier today when Jackie showed you the comments on visioning and the like.

We have been working hard with a great group of staff on developing a new website that will be far more user focused.

We just found out this week that the migration has actually occurred, which does not mean you are going to see a new website tomorrow, but it does mean that at least the website will be up and running, we certainly think, within November.

We have developed the first ever translation services contract, which you have approved, to provide more language-specific access to Commission documents.

Our next challenge is essentially to finish that first part of the new website, put it up and then correct it because we know it is not going to be perfect.

We will continue to do briefings at the county and city levels about BCDC and the Bay, whether they be in Marin or in the city of Richmond or wherever they are, and we accept all invitations.

We will continue to ask more of you in assisting with outreach because you are great proselytizers and great vehicles for us to get places.

Strategic Objective 4.2 was really simple, hire a Public Information Officer (PIO). Well, we have not.

But what we have done is we have requested that CNRA, the Resources Agency, approve a draft senior level new position called BCDC's Director of External Affairs. That duty statement basically says that person will be a part-time PIO, a part-time legislative liaison, and a part-time CZMA expert, basically ensuring that as we look outside of BCDC we have a person who understands how to connect those dots.

We are looking forward to working with CNRA to get that funded and that is the next challenge. We actually have started discussions with them, and we assume that we will continue those discussions. Next slide and heading off to Goal 5.

Ms. Ruiz continued: Thank you. One of our objectives for Goal 5 was to have our staff reflect the diversity of the Bay Area.

We have been able to move towards this goal by continuing to offer telework and flexible work hours.

As vacancies occurred, we are able to recruit great talent for those positions. And we were also recently successful in obtaining special salary increases for several classifications used at BCDC.

In this next quarter, we are working on conducting an organizational health survey and including a separate survey on racial equity.

Another objective of Goal 5 is to implement technological upgrades to improve our processes.

Our Chief Information Officer Andrew Chin did an excellent job of working with the Natural Resources Agency to onboard to their security Operations Center, which enhances our overall cybersecurity by proactively identifying security threats and vulnerabilities.

Andrew also worked with the California Military Department to complete our biennial IT security assessment, which is a technical analysis to measure the cybersecurity, including vulnerability, firewall analysis, phishing susceptibility, and more.

Lastly, we initiated website hosting service, as Larry said, with the Department of Technology, which provides us with a standardized state website template and enhanced security and improves our content maintenance.

This quarter we are reviewing the findings from the IT assessment to ensure we address any concerns.

We will also be working on finalizing the new website, which will also include a payment portal to allow for online payment of fines and permit fees.

Executive Director Goldzband stated: That is an overview. We will be happy to provide you with, if you would like it, the full action plan with all 75, 85 different actions, each of which has been color-coded green, yellow, red, or blue, if you are certainly interested. But we are happy to answer any questions that you might have.

Chair Wasserman asked: Questions from Commissioners?

Commissioner Moulton-Peters chimed in: Larry, I just want to thank you and your staff. You are making tangible progress on all these goals, and it was great to see how you all broke it down today, so thank you. Good to see the progress.

Chair Wasserman asked: Any questions or comments from the public?

Ms. Ruiz noted: No public comment.

Chair Wasserman continued: Thank you. I share in the congratulations to everybody for the presentation. But more importantly than the presentation, the work on the Strategic Plan and evaluating it and monitoring it. I think we are making great strides.

We may have to think about a letter-writing campaign similar to what we did for 272 For our PIO funding. I say that only semi-facetiously because, in fact, it is a very important part of our being able to move all of this forward.

**12. Adjournment.** There being no further business the Commission meeting was adjourned at 2:42 p.m.