

MEETING
STATE OF CALIFORNIA
LANDS COMMISSION

CITY OF LONG BEACH
CIVIC CHAMBERS
411 WEST OCEAN BOULEVARD
LONG BEACH, CALIFORNIA

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 28, 2020
1:02 P.M.

JAMES F. PETERS, CSR
CERTIFIED SHORTHAND REPORTER
LICENSE NUMBER 10063

A P P E A R A N C E S

COMMISSION MEMBERS:

Ms. Betty T. Yee, State Controller, Chairperson

Ms. Eleni Kounalakis, Lieutenant Governor

Ms. Keely Bosler, Director of Department of Finance,
represented by Ms. Gayle Miller

STAFF:

Ms. Jennifer Lucchesi, Executive Officer

Mr. Colin Connor, Assistant Executive Officer

Mr. Seth Blackmon, Chief Counsel

Mr. Sam Blakesley, Sea Grant Fellow

Ms. Jennifer Mattox, Science Policy Advisor & Tribal
Liaison

Ms. Sheri Pemberton, Chief, External Affairs Division

ATTORNEY GENERAL:

Mr. Andrew Vogel, Deputy Attorney General

ALSO PRESENT:

Mr. Tony Budrovich, Santa Catalina Island Conservancy

Mr. Chris Cannon, Port of Los Angeles

Ms. Rachel Ehlers, Legislative Analyst's Office

Mr. Philip Gibbons, Port of San Diego

Dr. Mark Gold, Deputy Secretary, California Natural
Resources Agency

A P P E A R A N C E S C O N T I N U E D

ALSO PRESENT:

Mr. Todd Lemmis, Pacific6

Mr. Justin Luedy, Port of Long Beach

Dr. Joe Lyou, Coalition for Clean Air

Ms. Adrienne Newbold, Port of Los Angeles

Mr. Tyler Studds, EDP Renewables

Ms. Heather Tomley, Port of Long Beach

Mr. Lucas Zucker, CAUSE

I N D E X

	PAGE
I 1:00 PM - Open Session	1
II Public Comment	2
<p>Public comments will be heard at 1:00 pm for items not on the agenda, for no more than 30 minutes. At the discretion of the Chair, speakers will be given up to 3 minutes. For those unable to attend the early comment period, there may be additional comment time available later in the day. Note: Comments made during the general public comment period regarding matters pending before the Commission do not become part of the official record for those matters.</p>	
III Confirmation of Minutes for the December 6, 2019 and February 4, 2020 meetings	2
IV Executive Officer's Report	3
<p>Continuation of Rent Actions to be taken by the Executive Officer pursuant to the Commission's Delegation of Authority:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- AT&T Corp. (Lessee): Continuation of rent at \$130,880 per year for a General Lease - Non-Exclusive Right-of-Way Use located on sovereign land in the Pacific Ocean, offshore Monta a de Oro State Park, San Luis Obispo County. (PRC 8154.1)- CALNEV Pipe Line, LLC (Lessee): Continuation of rent at \$3,871 per year for a General Lease - Right-of-Way Use located on school land southwest of Valley Wells, San Bernardino County. (PRC 2702.2)- El Paso Natural Gas Company (Lessee): Continuation of rent at \$9,213 per year for a General Lease - Right-of-Way Use located on indemnity school land southeast of Barstow, San Bernardino County. (PRC 7527.2)- David Ingram and Mary Ingram (Lessee): Continuation of rent at \$269 per year for a	

I N D E X C O N T I N U E D

PAGE

General Lease - Recreational and Protective Structure Use located on sovereign land in Sacramento River adjacent to 7045 Garden Highway, Sacramento, Sacramento County. (PRC 5523.1)

- PC Landing Corp. (Lessee): Continuation of rent at \$274,822 per year for a General Lease - Non-Exclusive Right-of-Way Use located on sovereign land in the Pacific Ocean, offshore of the city of Grover Beach, San Luis Obispo County. (PRC 8152.1)
- SFPP, L.P. (Lessee): Continuation of rent at \$6,051 per year for a General Lease - Right-of-Way Use located on indemnity school land northwest of Niland, Imperial and Riverside counties. (PRC 8150.2)

V Consent Calendar 01-54

28

The following items are considered to be noncontroversial and are subject to change at any time up to the date of the meeting.

Land Management

Northern Region

- 01 JOHN H. BOTTOMLEY III AND MARION W. BOTTOMLEY, TRUSTEES (AND THEIR SUCCESSORS IN TRUST) OF THE BOTTOMLEY RESIDENTIAL TRUST U/A/D SEPTEMBER 24, 1997 (LESSEE); DAVID J. MOELLER AND ANN J. MOELLER (APPLICANT): Consider waiver of rent, penalty, and interest; acceptance of a lease quitclaim deed for Lease No. PRC 4483.1, a General Lease - Recreational Use; and application for a General Lease - Recreational Use, of sovereign land located in Lake Tahoe, adjacent to 4694 North Lake Boulevard, near Carnelian Bay, Placer County; for an existing pier and two mooring buoys, and reconstruction of a boat lift. CEQA Consideration: categorical exemption. (Lease 4483.1; A2173; RA# 2019018) (A 1; S 1) (Staff: S. Avila)

I N D E X C O N T I N U E D

PAGE

- 02 CALIFORNIA WATER SERVICE COMPANY (LESSEE): Consider revision of rent for Lease No. PRC 5852.1, a General Lease - Right-of-Way Use, of sovereign land in the Feather River within Sections 7 and 18, Township 19 North, Range 4 East, MDM, near Oroville, Butte County; for an existing water pipeline attached to the Table Mountain Boulevard Bridge. CEQA Consideration: not a project. (PRC 5852.1) (A 3; S 4) (Staff: N. Lee)

- 03 CITY OF POINT ARENA (APPLICANT): Consider application for a General Lease -Public Agency Use, of sovereign land located in the Pacific Ocean at Arena Cove, adjacent to 810 Port Road, Point Arena, Mendocino County; for an existing fishing pier and 17 mooring buoys previously authorized by the Commission; and use and maintenance of two existing boat hoists, two product hoists, small office with an adjoining public restroom and shower facility, stairs, gangway, adjustable boarding platform, and National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration weather and tidal station not previously authorized by the Commission. CEQA Consideration: categorical exemption. (Lease 194.1; RA# 39214) (A 2; S 2) (Staff: A. Franzoia)

- 04 GAIL COTTON HIGH, TRUSTEE OF THE GAIL COTTON HIGH TRUST UNDER AGREEMENT DATED APRIL 9, 2001; ROBERT L. SPENCE, AS TRUSTEE OF THE TRUST FBO ALEXANDER L. SPENCE UNDER THE KRISTI COTTON SPENCE QUALIFIED PERSONAL RESIDENCE TRUST; ROBERT L. SPENCE, AS TRUSTEE OF THE TRUST FBO BROOKSLEY SPENCE WYLIE UNDER THE KRISTI COTTON SPENCE QUALIFIED PERSONAL RESIDENCE TRUST; ROBERT L. SPENCE, AS TRUSTEE OF THE TRUST FBO KIMBERLY SPENCE SHAPIRO UNDER THE KRISTI COTTON SPENCE QUALIFIED PERSONAL RESIDENCE TRUST; KENNETH G. HIGH III, AS TRUSTEE OF THE TRUST FBO KENNETH G. HIGH III UNDER THE GAIL COTTON HIGH 2009 TAHOE QUALIFIED PERSONAL RESIDENCE TRUST; AND TANYA B. HIGH MILLER AS TRUSTEE OF THE TRUST FBO TANYA B. HIGH UNDER THE GAIL COTTON HIGH 2009 TAHOE QUALIFIED PERSONAL RESIDENCE TRUST (APPLICANT): Consider application for a General Lease - Recreational Use, of sovereign land located in Lake Tahoe, adjacent to 9872 and 9880 Pilot Circle, near Brockway, Placer County; for an existing joint-use pier, boathouse with boat hoist, boat lift, and two mooring buoys. CEQA Consideration: categorical exemption. (Lease 6526.1; A2353; RA# 2019130) (A 1; S

I N D E X C O N T I N U E D

PAGE

1) (Staff: L. Anderson)

- 05 DENNIS B. DAUGHTERS, TRUSTEE OF DENNIS AND NANCY DAUGHTERS FAMILY TRUST DATED FEBRUARY 18, 2000 (APPLICANT): Consider application for a General Lease - Recreational Use, of sovereign land located in Lake Tahoe, adjacent to 8445 Meeks Bay Avenue, near Meeks Bay, El Dorado County; for two existing mooring buoys. CEQA Consideration: categorical exemption. (Lease 7777.1; A 2344; RA# 2019122) (A 5; S 1) (Staff: L. Anderson)
- 06 DONALD EVERETT RHOADES, KAREN HOFFMAN GILHULY, AND SHEILA HOFFMAN LEE (APPLICANT): Consider an application for a General Lease - Recreational Use, of sovereign land located in Lake Tahoe, adjacent to 4260 West Lake Boulevard, near Homewood, Placer County; for an existing pier, boathouse, and boat hoist previously authorized by the Commission; and one existing mooring buoy, a sundeck with stairs, and one boat hoist not previously authorized by the Commission. CEQA Consideration: categorical exemption. (Lease 4225.1; A2340; RA# 31515) (A 1; S 1) (Staff: M.J. Columbus)
- 07 LORRAINE K. FURCHNER HOWARD, TRUSTEE, OR HER SUCCESSORS IN TRUST, OF THE LKFH TRUST, UNDER THE FURCHNER FAMILY REVOCABLE LIVING TRUST OF 1994, DATED FEBRUARY 23, 1994; AND NICHOLAS ALLEN FURCHNER, TRUSTEE, OR HIS SUCCESSORS IN TRUST, OF NAF TRUST, UNDER THE FURCHNER FAMILY REVOCABLE LIVING TRUST OF 1994, DATED FEBRUARY 23, 1994 (APPLICANT): Consider application for a General Lease - Recreational Use, of sovereign land located in Lake Tahoe, adjacent to 3250 Edgewater Drive, near Tahoe City, Placer County; for two existing mooring buoys. CEQA Consideration: categorical exemption. (Lease 8669.1); (RA# 31515); (A 1; S 1) (Staff: M.J. Columbus)
- 08 PETER GEREMIA, TRUSTEE OF THE GEREMIA FAMILY TRUST (APPLICANT): Consider application for a General Lease - Recreational Use, of sovereign land located in Lake Tahoe, adjacent to 3600 Idlewild Way, near Homewood, Placer County; for two existing mooring buoys. CEQA Consideration: categorical exemption. (Lease 8887.1; A2331; RA# 2019114) (A 1; S 1) (Staff: S. Avila)

I N D E X C O N T I N U E D

PAGE

- 09 TIMOTHY LEIGH HEYBOER AND LISA JO HEYBOER, TRUSTEES OF THE HEYBOER FAMILY 2018 REVOCABLE TRUST U/D/T DATED MARCH 27, 2018; VIRGINIA H. KNIGHT, TRUSTEE OF VIRGINIA KNIGHT LIVING TRUST; ASPEN CABIN LLC, A CALIFORNIA LLC; TAHOMA ASSOCIATES, A GENERAL PARTNERSHIP; W. HOWARD WELLS AND PATRICIA A. WELLS, CO-TRUSTEES OF THE W. HOWARD WELLS AND PATRICIA A. WELLS REVOCABLE TRUST; RUSSELL W. SKINNER AND TRACY K. SKINNER; JENNIFER FITZGERALD AND JAMES FITZGERALD, TRUSTEES OF THE JAMES D. AND JENNIFER E. FITZGERALD LIVING TRUST DATED SEPTEMBER 17, 2018; AND CHRISTOPHER W. KAHN AND FLOREINE R. KAHN (APPLICANT): Consider application for a General Lease - Recreational Use, of sovereign land located in Lake Tahoe, adjacent to 7442 and 7452 North Lake Boulevard, near Tahoe Vista, Placer County; for six existing mooring buoys not previously authorized by the Commission. CEQA Consideration: categorical exemption. (W20846; RA# 27612) (A 1; S 1) (Staff: A. Franzoia)
- 10 SHARON JENNINGS, TRUSTEE OF THE QUALIFIED EXEMPT TERMINABLE INT. PROPERTY TR CRT UNDER THE BRYAN C. & SHARON JENNINGS RVOC LIV. TR DATED 10/9/92; SHARON JENNINGS, TRUSTEE OF THE QUALIFIED NON-EXEMPT TERM. INT. PROPERTY TR CRT UNDER THE BRYAN C. AND SHARON JENNINGS RVOC LIV. TR 10/9/92; SHARON JENNINGS, TRUSTEE OF THE BYPASS TRUST CREATED UNDER THE BRYAN C. & SHARON JENNINGS RVOC LIVING TR 10/9/92; CHRISTOPHER B. JENNINGS, TRUSTEE OF THE CHRISTOPHER B. JENNINGS IRREVOCABLE TRUST DATED 5/16/11; AND MICHAEL C. JENNINGS, TRUSTEE OF THE MICHAEL C. JENNINGS IRREVOCABLE TRUST DATED 5/16/11 (APPLICANT): Consider application for a General Lease - Recreational Use, of sovereign land located in Lake Tahoe, adjacent to 8429 Meeks Bay Avenue, near Tahoma, El Dorado County; for an existing pier, boat lift, and two mooring buoys. CEQA Consideration: categorical exemption. (Lease 3871.1; A2313; RA# 2019104) (A 5; S 1) (Staff: S. Avila)
- 11 CARL JORDAN (APPLICANT): Consider application for a General Lease - Recreational Use, of sovereign land located in the Petaluma River, adjacent to 5638 Lakeville Highway, near Petaluma, Sonoma County; for an existing pier with covered berth and six unattached pilings. CEQA Consideration: categorical exemption.

I N D E X C O N T I N U E D

- PAGE
- (Lease 5693.1; RA# 22518) (A 10; S 3) (Staff: J. Toy)
- 12 TODD J. KINION AND PATRICE A. KINION, AS TRUSTEES OF THE KINION FAMILY TRUST UNDER AGREEMENT DATED JUNE 7, 2006 (APPLICANT): Consider application for a General Lease - Recreational Use, of sovereign land located in Lake Tahoe, adjacent to 8387 Meeks Bay Avenue, near Meeks Bay, El Dorado County; for an existing pier and two mooring buoys. CEQA Consideration: categorical exemption. (Lease 5554.1; RA# 10418) (A 5; S 1) (Staff: J. Toy)
- 13 BRUCE MCLELLAN AND JANET MCLELLAN (APPLICANT): Consider application for a General Lease - Recreational Use, of sovereign land located in Lake Tahoe, adjacent to 6230 West Lake Boulevard, near Homewood, Placer County; for two existing mooring buoys not previously authorized by the Commission. CEQA Consideration: categorical exemption. (A2315; RA# 2019106) (A 1; S 1) (Staff: S. Avila)
- 14 RECLAMATION DISTRICT 2140 (APPLICANT): Consider application for a General Lease - Public Agency Use, of sovereign land located in the Sacramento River, beneath the Gianella Bridge at Highway 32, Hamilton City, Glenn County; for installation, use, and maintenance of rock slope protection and restoration of habitat. CEQA Consideration: Environmental Impact Report, certified by the Reclamation Board (now the Central Valley Flood Protection Board), State Clearinghouse No. 2002122048, and Addendum adopted by Reclamation District 2140, and adoption of Mitigation Monitoring Program and Statement of Findings. (W27188; RA# 02318) (A 3; S 4) (Staff: S. Avila)
- 15 RMC PACIFIC MATERIALS, LLC, SUCCESSOR BY CONVERSION OF RMC PACIFIC MATERIALS, INC. (LESSEE): Consider acceptance of a lease quitclaim deed and termination of Lease No. PRC 1992.1, a General Lease - Industrial Use, of sovereign land located in the Sacramento River, adjacent to 1501 South River Road, City of West Sacramento, Yolo County; for a concrete wharf and appurtenant facilities. CEQA Consideration: not a project. (PRC 1992.1; RA# 04518); (A 7; S 6) (Staff: M.J. Columbus)

I N D E X C O N T I N U E D

PAGE

- 16 STEVEN J. TONSFELDT AND CHRISTINE D. TONSFELDT
 (APPLICANT): Consider application for a General Lease
 - Recreational Use, of sovereign land located in Lake
 Tahoe, adjacent to 8775 Rubicon Drive, near Tahoma, El
 Dorado County; for an existing pier, boat lift, and
 two mooring buoys. CEQA Consideration: categorical
 exemption. (Lease 5729.1; RA# 14216) (A 5; S 1)
 (Staff: J. Toy)

Bay / Delta Region

- 17 JOHN R. AREIAS AND JULIE NOEL SANDINO (APPLICANT):
 Consider delegating authority to the Executive Officer
 for consideration of an application for a General
 Lease - Recreational Use, of sovereign land located in
 the Sacramento River, adjacent to 13950 State Highway
 160, near Walnut Grove, Sacramento County; for an
 existing boat dock, personal watercraft float, and
 appurtenant facilities. CEQA Consideration:
 categorical exemption. (Lease 7692.1; A2158; RA#
 2019009) (A 11; S 3) (Staff: G. Asimakopoulos, E.
 Kennedy)
- 18 BRANNAN ISLAND, LLC, A CALIFORNIA LIMITED LIABILITY
 COMPANY (ASSIGNOR); 5 BROS MARINA, LLC, A CALIFORNIA
 LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY (ASSIGNEE): Consider
 assignment of Lease No. PRC 6855.1, a General Lease -
 Commercial Use, of sovereign land located in Seven
 Mile Slough, adjacent to 1200 Brannan Island Road,
 near Isleton, Sacramento County; for an existing
 commercial marina and appurtenant facilities. CEQA
 Consideration: not a project. (PRC 6855.1; A2249; RA#
 2019149) (A 11; S 3) (Staff: G. Asimakopoulos)
- 19 CALIFORNIA RESOURCES PRODUCTION CORP. (LESSEE):
 Consider revision of rent for Lease No. PRC 4270.1, a
 General Lease - Right-of-Way Use, of sovereign land in
 Roaring River Slough and Grizzly Slough at Van Sickle
 Island, Solano County; for an existing natural gas
 pipeline and water pipeline. CEQA Consideration: not a
 project. (PRC 4270.1) (A 11; S 3) (Staff: N. Lavoie)
- 20 DONALD THAD CLARK, TRUSTEE OF THE DONALD THAD CLARK
 TRUST, DATED JUNE 12, 2009 (LESSEE); CARA A.
 PELLEGRINI, TRUSTEE OF THE CARA A. PELLEGRINI LIVING
 TRUST (APPLICANT): Consider termination of Lease No.

I N D E X C O N T I N U E D

PAGE

- PRC 5378.1, a General Lease - Recreational Use, and an application for a General Lease - Recreational and Protective Structure Use, of sovereign land located in the Sacramento River, adjacent to 208 1st Street, Isleton, Sacramento County; for two existing boat docks, one debris deflector, four pilings, and ramp previously authorized by the Commission, and existing bank protection not previously authorized by the Commission. CEQA Consideration: categorical exemption. (Lease 5378.1; A2184; RA# 2019026) (A 11; S 3) (Staff: J. Holt)
- 21 DELTA MARINA YACHT HARBOR INC. (LESSEE): Consider revision of rent to Lease No. PRC 3141.1, a General Lease - Commercial Use, of sovereign land located in the Sacramento River adjacent to 120 Marina Drive, Rio Vista, Solano County; for an existing restaurant accommodation dock, fishing pier, appurtenant facilities, and bank protection. CEQA Consideration: not a project. (PRC 3141.1) (A 11; S 3) (Staff: L. Pino)
- 22 CHRISTOPHER C. FOGARTY AND MELISSA FOGARTY (APPLICANT): Consider application for a General Lease - Recreational and Protective Structure Use, of sovereign land located in the Sacramento River, adjacent to 6047 Garden Highway, near Sacramento, Sacramento County; for an existing boat dock, appurtenant facilities, and bank protection. CEQA Consideration: categorical exemption. (Lease 5949.1; A2286; RA# 02314) (A 7; S 6) (Staff: G. Asimakopoulos)
- 23 LINDA J. FOLEY, TRUSTEE OF THE FOLEY TRUST DATED JULY 26, 2019 (APPLICANT): Consider application for a General Lease - Recreational and Protective Structure Use of sovereign land located in the Sacramento River adjacent to 4181 Garden Highway, Sacramento, Sacramento County; for an existing boat dock, appurtenant facilities, and bank protection. CEQA Consideration: categorical exemption. (Lease 5788.1; A2292; RA# 2019089) (A 7; S 6) (Staff: L. Pino)
- 24 GEORGIA-PACIFIC GYPSUM, LLC (APPLICANT): Consider application for a General Lease - Dredging, of sovereign land located in the San Joaquin River, adjacent to 801 Minaker Drive, near Antioch, Contra Costa County; for maintenance dredging of a maximum of

I N D E X C O N T I N U E D

PAGE

- 53,000 cubic yards of sediment material with a single knockdown episode after the maintenance dredging episode. CEQA Consideration: categorical exemption. (Lease 8965.9; A2207; RA# 2019079) (A 11; S 7) (Staff: D. Tutov)
- 25 KATHRYN K. JACKSON, THOMAS B. KLEIN, AND STEVEN D. KLEIN, CO-TRUSTEES OF THE SURVIVOR'S TRUST C/U/T BUD D. KLEIN AND JANE G. KLEIN REVOCABLE TRUST AGREEMENT DATED OCTOBER 6, 2005 (APPLICANT): Consider application for a General Lease - Recreational and Protective Structure Use, of sovereign land located in the historic bed of the San Joaquin River, adjacent to 11 Atherton Island, Stockton, San Joaquin County; for an existing boat dock, appurtenant facilities, and bank protection. CEQA Consideration: categorical exemption. (Lease 8851.1; A2188; RA# 2019029) (A 13; S 5) (Staff: J. Holt)
- 26 BRITT LEE JOHNSON, TRUSTEE OF THE BRITT LEE JOHNSON REVOCABLE TRUST DATED DECEMBER 12, 2006 (LESSEE); MARK JUNGKEIT AND KAREN JUNGKEIT (APPLICANT): Consider acceptance of a lease quitclaim deed for Lease No. PRC 4621.9, a General Lease - Recreational and Protective Structure Use, and an application for a General Lease - Recreational and Protective Structure Use, of sovereign land located in the Sacramento River, adjacent to 7105 Garden Highway, near Sacramento, Sacramento County; for an existing boat dock, appurtenant facilities, and bank protection. CEQA Consideration: categorical exemption. (Lease 4621.1; A2164; RA# 2019015) (A 7; S 6) (Staff: G. Asimakopoulos)
- 27 KEVIN KAY AND KELLI A. KAY, AS TRUSTEES OF THE KAY REVOCABLE LIVING TRUST (LESSEE); EDDIE ALBERT SANCHEZ AND TAMMY LEE SANCHEZ (APPLICANT): Consider acceptance of a lease quitclaim deed for Lease No. PRC 6670.1, a General Lease - Recreational and Protective Structure Use, and an application for a General Lease - Recreational and Protective Structure Use, of sovereign land located in the Sacramento River, adjacent to 4229 Garden Highway, near Sacramento, Sacramento County; for an existing boat dock, appurtenant facilities, and bank protection. CEQA Consideration: categorical exemption. (Lease 6670.1;

I N D E X C O N T I N U E D

PAGE

- A2293; RA# 2019134) (A 7; S 6) (Staff: G. Asimakopoulos)
- 28 LAS GALLINAS VALLEY SANITARY DISTRICT (LESSEE): Consider amendment to Lease No. PRC 6201.9, a General Lease - Public Agency Use, of sovereign land located in and adjacent to San Pablo Bay, near San Rafael, Marin County; to include the use and maintenance of two existing outfall pipelines, replacement of an existing headwall structure, and restoration of a levee embankment behind the headwall structure. CEQA Consideration: categorical exemption. (PRC 6201.9; A2200; RA# 2019048) (A 10; S 2) (Staff: M. Schroeder)
- 29 JOHN C. MCGUINNESS AND KATHLEEN A. MCGUINNESS, AS CO-TRUSTEES OF THE JOHN C. MCGUINNESS AND KATHLEEN A. MCGUINNESS REVOCABLE LIVING TRUST DATED OCTOBER 20, 2008 (ASSIGNOR); TURNER CUT RESORT AND MARINA INC., A CALIFORNIA CORPORATION (ASSIGNEE): Consider assignment of Lease No. PRC 4080.1, a General Lease - Commercial Use, of sovereign land located in Whiskey Slough, adjacent to 12864 Neugebauer Road, near Stockton, San Joaquin County; for an existing commercial marina. CEQA Consideration: not a project. (PRC 4080.1; A2054; RA# 09118) (A 13; S 5) (Staff: J. Holt)
- 30 PORT OF STOCKTON (APPLICANT): Consider application for a General Lease - Public Agency Use, of sovereign land located in Burns Cutoff at Daggett Road, Rough and Ready Island, Stockton, San Joaquin County; for an existing non-operational swing bridge. CEQA Consideration: categorical exemption. (Lease 4376.1; RA# 15618) (A 13; S 5) (Staff: M. Schroeder)
- 31 JANICE A. RAMOS, AS TRUSTEE OF THE JANICE A. RAMOS REVOCABLE LIVING TRUST, DATED MAY 28, 2009, AND JANICE A. RAMOS (LESSEE); CHARMAINE RAMOS (APPLICANT): Consider termination of Lease No. PRC 5645.1, a General Lease - Recreational and Protective Structure Use; and an application for a General Lease - Recreational and Protective Structure Use, of sovereign land located in the Sacramento River, adjacent to 3017 Garden Highway, near Sacramento, Sacramento County; for an existing boat dock with railing, appurtenant facilities, and bank protection. CEQA Consideration: categorical exemption. (Lease

I N D E X C O N T I N U E D

PAGE

- 5645.1; A2275; RA# 2019074) (A 7; S 6) (Staff: J. Holt)
- 32 RECLAMATION DISTRICT NO. 1608 (APPLICANT): Consider application for a General Lease - Dredging, of sovereign land located in Fourteen Mile Slough, near Stockton, San Joaquin County; for maintenance dredging of a maximum of 60,000 cubic yards of sediment material. CEQA Consideration: categorical exemption. (A2117; RA# 30218) (A 13; S 5) (Staff: D. Tutov)
- 33 SACRAMENTO AREA FLOOD CONTROL AGENCY (APPLICANT): Consider application for a General Lease - Public Agency Use, of sovereign land located adjacent to the Sacramento River, within a portion of Assessor's Parcel Number 024-0081-019 and an unnumbered parcel west of Riverside Boulevard, Sacramento, Sacramento County; for right-of-way access and staging purposes. CEQA Consideration: Environmental Impact Report (EIR) and Supplemental EIR, certified by the Central Valley Flood Protection Board, State Clearinghouse No. 2005072046, and adoption of a Mitigation Monitoring Program, Statement of Findings, and Statement of Overriding Considerations. (A2343; RA# 2019136) (A 9; S 6) (Staff: J. Holt)
- 34 SOUTH BAY YACHT CLUB (APPLICANT): Consider application for a General Lease - Commercial Use, of sovereign land located in Alviso Slough, adjacent to 1491 Hope Street, near Alviso, Santa Clara County; for existing docking and mooring facilities. CEQA Consideration: categorical exemption. (Lease 3979.1; RA# 21117) (A 25; S 10) (Staff: D. Tutov)
- 35 FRED A STRAUSS-KELTNER, JEDEDIAH KELTNER, AND BASIL COLIN HAMBLIN (APPLICANT): Consider application for a General Lease - Recreational Use, of sovereign land located in Tomales Bay, adjacent to 19225 Highway 1, near Marshall, Marin County; for a proposed mooring buoy. CEQA Consideration: Negative Declaration, adopted by the California State Lands Commission, State Clearinghouse No. 2012082074. (A2242; RA# 13116) (A 10; S 2) (Staff: D. Tutov)
- 36 FRED E. WEIBEL, JR. AND JUDITH L. WEIBEL, AS TRUSTEES OF THE WEIBEL 1996 LIVING TRUST DATED 10/15/96

I N D E X C O N T I N U E D

PAGE

- (APPLICANT): Consider application for a General Lease - Recreational and Protective Structure Use, of sovereign land located in the Calaveras River, adjacent to 4151 Yacht Harbor Drive, near Stockton, San Joaquin County; for an existing boathouse with boat lift, appurtenant facilities, and bulkhead protection. CEQA Consideration: categorical exemption. (Lease 4361.1; A2364: RA# 2019139) (A 13; S 5) (Staff: G. Asimakopoulos)
- 37 MICHAEL WILSON (APPLICANT): Consider application for a General Lease - Recreational Use, of sovereign land located in Tomales Bay, adjacent to 12938 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard, near Inverness, Marin County; for an existing mooring buoy not previously authorized by the Commission. CEQA Consideration: Negative Declaration, adopted by the California State Lands Commission, State Clearinghouse No. 2012082074. (A2328; RA# 05418) (A 10; S 2) (Staff: D. Tutov)
- Central / Southern Region
- 38 CABRILLO POWER I, LLC (LESSEE): Consider amendment to Lease No. PRC 791.1, a General Lease - Industrial Use, of sovereign land located in the Pacific Ocean, adjacent to Agua Hedionda Lagoon, Carlsbad, San Diego County; to extend the lease term. CEQA Consideration: categorical exemption. (PRC 791.1; A2299; RA# 2019109) (A 76, S 36) (Staff: C. Hudson)
- 39 CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND WILDLIFE (APPLICANT): Consider application for a General Lease - Public Agency Use, of sovereign land located in the Goose Flats and Big Hole areas adjacent to the Colorado River, near Blythe, Riverside County; for habitat restoration, revegetation, and public recreation. CEQA Consideration: categorical exemption. (Lease 7191.9; RA# 23118) (A 56; S 28) (Staff: R. Collins)
- 40 CITY OF LOS ANGELES DEPARTMENT OF WATER AND POWER (LESSEE): Consider amendment to Lease No. PRC 8079.9, a General Lease - Public Agency Use, of sovereign land located on Owens Lake, Inyo County; for the continued use of water diversion ditches. CEQA Consideration: categorical exemption. (PRC 8079.9; RA# 2019140) (A

I N D E X C O N T I N U E D

PAGE

26; S 8) (Staff: D. Simpkin)

- 41 JANICE VEE GOSS, TRUSTEE OF THE JAN GOSS SURVIVOR'S TRUST, ESTABLISHED UNDER THE TERMS OF THE GOSS REVOCABLE LIVING TRUST, DATED MAY 7, 1996, AS THEREAFTER AMENDED AND RESTATED, AND ANY AMENDMENTS HEREAFTER MADE TO SUCH JAN GOSS SURVIVOR'S TRUST (ASSIGNOR); MATTHEW S. GOSS, TRUSTEE, OF THE MATTHEW S. GOSS REVOCABLE LIVING TRUST DATED 9/5/2018 (ASSIGNEE): Consider assignment of Lease No. PRC 8242.1, a General Lease - Recreational and Protective Structure Use, of sovereign land located in Huntington Harbour, adjacent to 16691 Carousel Lane, Huntington Beach, Orange County; for a boat dock, access ramp, cantilevered deck, and bulkhead protection. CEQA Consideration: not a project. (PRC 8242.1; A2177; RA# 2019022) (A 72; S 34) (Staff: K. Connor)

- 42 ARTHUR JAN, JR. AND BESS K. JEONG, TRUSTEES OF THE ARTHUR JAN, JR. AND BESS K. JEONG TRUST UDT DATED MAY 2, 1997 (APPLICANT): Consider application for a General Lease - Recreational Use, of sovereign land located in the Midway Channel of Huntington Harbour, adjacent to 16851 Marina Bay Drive, Huntington Beach, Orange County; for an existing boat dock and access ramp not previously authorized by the Commission. CEQA Consideration: categorical exemption. (A2155; RA# 2019006) (A 72; S 34) (Staff: K. Connor)

- 43 RONALD J. AND MELISSA P. SANDERS (ASSIGNOR); KENNETH M. WALKER AND TAMI L. WALKER, TRUSTEES OF THE KENNETH M. AND TAMI L. WALKER FAMILY TRUST DATED OCTOBER 14, 2003 (ASSIGNEE): Consider assignment of Lease No. PRC 8126.1, a General Lease - Protective Structure Use, of sovereign tide and submerged land located in the Pacific Ocean, adjacent to 3398 Pacific Coast Highway, near San Buenaventura, Ventura County; for a seawall. CEQA Consideration: not a project. (PRC 8126.1; A2336; RA# 2019129) (A 37; S 19) (Staff: K. Connor)

- 44 SANTA CATALINA ISLAND COMPANY (APPLICANT): Consider application for a General Lease - Commercial Use, of sovereign land located in Isthmus Cove and Catalina Harbor, Santa Catalina Island, Los Angeles County; for commercial and recreational piers and barge loading facilities. CEQA Consideration: categorical exemption.

I N D E X C O N T I N U E D

PAGE

(Lease 6438.1; RA# 14516) (A 70; S 26) (Staff: D. Simpkin)

- 45 SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA GAS COMPANY (APPLICANT): Consider application for a General Lease - Right-of-Way Use of sovereign land located in the South Fork of the Kings River, near State Highway 41, Kings County; for an existing natural gas pipeline. CEQA Consideration: categorical exemption. (Lease 4989.1; A2310; RA# 2019105) (A 32; S 14) (Staff: R. Collins)
- 46 ING LIONG WONG, TRUSTEE OF THE WONG 1986 FAMILY SURVIVOR'S TRUST (APPLICANT): Consider rescission of approval, and issuance of a General Lease - Recreational and Protective Structure Use, of sovereign land located in the Main Channel of Huntington Harbour, adjacent to 16891 Bolero Lane, Huntington Beach, Orange County; for an existing boat dock, access ramp, cantilevered deck, and bulkhead protection. CEQA Consideration: categorical exemption. (Lease 3254.1; A2174; RA# 2019017) (A72; S34) (Staff: K. Connor)

School Lands

- 47 GEYSERS POWER COMPANY, LLC (LESSEE): Consider revision of rent for Lease No. PRC 6793.2 a General Lease - Right-of-Way Use, of State indemnity school land located in a portion of Section 6, Township 11 North, Range 8 West, MDM, east of Cloverdale, Lake County; for a pipeline and an unimproved access road. CEQA Consideration: not a project. (PRC 6793.2) (A 4; S 2) (Staff: J. Porter)
- 48 SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY (LESSEE): Consider revision of rent for Lease No. PRC 2701.2 a General Lease - Right-of-Way Use, of 8.7 acres, more or less, of State-owned school lands located in portions of Section 36, Township 20 South, Range 42 East; Section 16, Township 21 South, Range 43 East; Section 16, Township 22 South, Range 43 East; Section 16, Township 23 South, Range 43 East; and Section 16, Township 24 South, Range 43 East, north of Trona, Inyo County; for an electrical distribution line. CEQA Consideration: not a project. (PRC 2701.2) (A 26; S 8) (Staff: J. Porter)

Mineral Resources Management

- 49 BUREAU OF OCEAN ENERGY MANAGEMENT (APPLICANT): Consider an application for a General Permit to conduct geophysical surveys on sovereign land, including granted and ungranted tide and submerged lands, under the jurisdiction of the California State Lands Commission. CEQA Consideration: Mitigated Negative Declaration, Mitigation Monitoring Program, and addendum, State Clearinghouse No. 2013072021. (A2357; RA#2019174) (A & S: Statewide) (Staff: R. B. Greenwood)
- 50 CALIFORNIA STATE LANDS COMMISSION (PARTY): Request authority for the Executive Officer to solicit proposals for consultant services, negotiate fair and reasonable prices, award and execute agreements, and take other steps necessary for the abandonment of legacy oil and gas wells, Santa Barbara and Ventura counties. CEQA Consideration: Environmental Impact Report certified by the Commission, State Clearinghouse No. 2016101008, and Addendum; adoption of a revised Mitigation Monitoring Program. (W 30214; Bid Log 2019-013) (A 37; S 19) (Staff: W. Scott, J. Fabel)
- 51 CINQUINI AND PASSARINO, INC. (APPLICANT): Consider an application for a General Permit to conduct geophysical surveys on sovereign land, including granted and ungranted tide and submerged lands, under the jurisdiction of the California State Lands Commission. CEQA Consideration: Mitigated Negative Declaration, Mitigation Monitoring Program, and addendum, State Clearinghouse No. 2013072021. (A2296; RA#2019111) (A & S: Statewide) (Staff: R. B. Greenwood)
- 52 RASCAL LITHIUM LLC (APPLICANT): Consider application for a prospecting permit for lithium and minerals other than oil, gas, or geothermal resources, sand and gravel, Assessor's Parcel Numbers 041-380-01 and 041-380-02, State Parcel Numbers 214-507 and 214-508, containing approximately 640 acres of State-owned 100 percent reserved mineral interest, school land, located within Section 36, Township 27 North, Range 4 East, SBM, about 8 miles northwest of Death Valley

I N D E X C O N T I N U E D

PAGE

- Junction, Inyo County. CEQA Consideration: categorical exemption. (Permit 9516.2, A2330; RA# 2019132) (A 26; S 8) (Staff: R. Lee)
- 53 THE REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, SAN DIEGO / SCRIPPS INSTITUTION OF OCEANOGRAPHY (APPLICANT): Consider an application for a General Permit to conduct geophysical surveys on sovereign land, including granted and ungranted tide and submerged lands, under the jurisdiction of the California State Lands Commission. CEQA Consideration: Mitigated Negative Declaration, Mitigation Monitoring Program, and addendum, State Clearinghouse No. 2013072021. (A2281; RA# 2019087) (A & S: Statewide) (Staff: R. B. Greenwood)
- 54 U.S. GEOLOGICAL SURVEY (APPLICANT): Consider an application for a General Permit to conduct geophysical surveys on sovereign land, including granted and ungranted tide and submerged lands, under the jurisdiction of the California State Lands Commission. CEQA Consideration: Mitigated Negative Declaration, Mitigation Monitoring Program, and addendum, State Clearinghouse No. 2013072021. (A2332; RA# 2019127) (A & S: Statewide) (Staff: R. B. Greenwood)

Marine Environmental Protection - no items

Administration - no items

Legal - no items

Kapiloff Land Bank Trust Acquisition - no items

External Affairs

Granted Lands - no items

VI. Informational Calendar

- 55 CALIFORNIA STATE LANDS COMMISSION: Legislative Report providing information and a status update concerning state legislation relevant to the Commission. CEQA consideration: not applicable. (A & S: Statewide) (Staff: S. Pemberton)

I N D E X C O N T I N U E D

PAGE

VII Regular Calendar 56-62

- | | | |
|----|--|-----|
| 56 | <p>CALIFORNIA STATE LANDS COMMISSION (INFORMATIONAL): Informational update on efforts to develop the Commission's 2021-2025 Strategic Plan and to solicit comments and suggestions from stakeholders. CEQA Consideration: not applicable. (A & S: Statewide) (Staff: C. Connor, J. Lucchesi)</p> | 29 |
| 57 | <p>PORT OF LONG BEACH AND PORT OF LOS ANGELES (TRUSTEES) (INFORMATIONAL): Presentation by the Port of Long Beach and the Port of Los Angeles on the San Pedro Bay Ports Clean Air Action Plan. CEQA Consideration: not applicable. (A & S: Statewide) (Staff: R. Boggiano, S. Pemberton)</p> | 48 |
| 58 | <p>LEGISLATIVE ANALYST'S OFFICE (INFORMATIONAL): Presentation by the Legislative Analyst's Office (LAO) on the recent report, Preparing for Rising Seas: How the State Can Help Support Local Coastal Adaptation Efforts. CEQA Consideration: not applicable. (A & S: Statewide) (Staff: J. Lucchesi)</p> | 82 |
| 59 | <p>CALIFORNIA STATE LANDS COMMISSION (INFORMATIONAL): Informational update on progress of AB 691 (Muratsuchi) Chapter 592, Statutes of 2013; Public Resources Code section 6311.5. State granted trust lands and sea-level rise. CEQA Consideration: not applicable. (A & S: Statewide) (Staff: S. Blakesley, M. Farnum)</p> | 104 |
| 60 | <p>CALIFORNIA STATE LANDS COMMISSION: Consider supporting the federal Regional Ocean Partnership Act (H.R. 5390 and S. 2166) that would formally authorize regional ocean partnerships as partners with the federal government and provide partnerships with more consistent funding. CEQA Consideration: not applicable. (A & S: Statewide) (Staff: S. Pemberton)</p> | 145 |
| 61 | <p>CALIFORNIA STATE LANDS COMMISSION: Consider sponsoring legislation in the 2019-20 legislative session that would repeal obsolete school land statutes and recast or modernize other school</p> | |

I N D E X C O N T I N U E D

PAGE

	land statutes. CEQA Consideration: not applicable. (A & S: Statewide) (Staff: S. Pemberton)	147
62	CALIFORNIA STATE LANDS COMMISSION: Consider sponsoring legislation in the 2019-20 legislative session to remove the \$300 million cap in the Oil Trust Fund, resuming monthly deposits of \$2 million from Long Beach oil operation revenues until the Fund reaches a balance that will cover the State's projected abandonment liabilities. CEQA Consideration: not applicable. (A & S: Statewide) (Staff: S. Pemberton)	148
VIII	Public Comment	151
IX	Commissioners' Comments	151
X	Closed Session	152

At any time during the meeting the Commission may meet in a session of Government Code section 11126, part of the Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act.

A. Litigation.

The Commission may consider pending and possible litigation pursuant to the confidentiality of attorney-client communications and privileges provided under Government Code section 11126, subdivision (e).

1. The Commission may consider pending and possible matters that fall under Government Code section 11126, subdivision (e)(2)(A), concerning adjudicatory proceedings before a court, an administrative body exercising its adjudicatory authority, a hearing officer, or an arbitrator, to which the Commission is a party. Such matters currently include the following:

I N D E X C O N T I N U E D

PAGE

- Baywood, LLC and California State Lands Commission v. DOES
- California Coastkeeper Alliance, California Coastal Protection v. California State Lands Commission
- California State Lands Commission v. Signal Hill Service, Inc.; Pacific Operators, Inc., dba Pacific Operators Offshore, Inc.; DOES 1-100
- California State Lands Commission, et al. v. Martins Beach 1 LLC, et al.
- Eugene Davis v. State of California and California State Lands Commission
- Hollister Ranch Owners Association v. Xavier Becerra, et al.
- In re: HVI Cat Canyon, Inc., Bankruptcy Chapter 11
- In re: PG&E Corporation and Pacific Gas and Electric Company, Bankruptcy Chapter 11
- In re: Rincon Island Limited Partnership Chapter 7
- In re: Venoco, LLC, Bankruptcy Chapter 11
- John W. Lebolt and Richard A. Lebolt v. City and County of San Francisco
- Madden v. City of Redwood City
- Martins Beach 1, LLC and Martins Beach 2, LLC v. Effie Turnbull-Sanders, et al.
- Oakland Bulk and Oversized Terminal, LLC v. City of Oakland
- Owens Valley Committee v. City of Los Angeles, Los Angeles Department of Water and Power, et al.
- People of the State of California, ex rel. the Regional Water Quality Control Board, San Diego Region v. International Boundary and Water Commission
- Public Watchdogs v. California State Lands Commission
- Renee Walton v. City and County of San Francisco; Port Commission of San Francisco, et al.
- Safe Embarcadero for All v. State ex rel. State Lands Commission, City and

I N D E X C O N T I N U E D

PAGE

- County of San Francisco
 - San Francisco Baykeeper, Inc. v. State Lands Commission
 - San Joaquin River Exchange Contractors Water Authority v. State of California; State Lands Commission
 - Seacliff Beach Colony Homeowners Association v. State of California, et al.
 - SLPR, LLC, et al. v. San Diego Unified Port District, California State Lands Commission
 - SOS Donner Lake v. State of California, et al
 - State of California v. International Boundary and Water Commission, et al.
 - State Lands Commission v. Plains Pipeline, L.P., et al.
 - United States v. Walker River Irrigation District, et al.
2. The Commission may consider matters that fall under Government Code section 11126, subdivision (e)(2)(b), under which;
- a. A point has been reached where, in the opinion of the Commission, on the advice of its legal counsel, based on existing facts and circumstances, there is a significant exposure to litigation against the Commission, or
 - b. Based on existing facts and circumstances, the Commission is meeting only to decide whether a closed session is authorized because of a significant exposure to litigation against the Commission.
3. The Commission may consider matters that fall under Government Code section 11126, subdivision (e)(2)(C), where, based on existing facts and circumstances, the state body has decided to initiate or is deciding whether to initiate litigation.
- B. Conference with real property negotiators. The Commission may consider matters that fall under Government Code section 11126, subdivision (c)(7), under which, prior to the purchase sale,

I N D E X C O N T I N U E D

PAGE

exchange, or lease of real property by or for the Commission, the directions may be given to its negotiators regarding price and terms of payment for the purchase, sale, exchange, or lease. At the time of publication of this Agenda, it is not anticipated that the Commission will discuss any such matters; however, at the time of the scheduled meeting, a discussion of any such matter may be necessary or appropriate.

C. Other matters.

The Commission may also consider personnel actions to appoint, employ, or dismiss a public employee as provided for in Government Code section 11126(A)(1).

Adjournment	152
Reporter's Certificate	153

P R O C E E D I N G S

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Good afternoon. I'll call this meeting of the State Lands Commission to order. All the representatives of the Commission are present. I'm State Controller Betty Yee and I'm joined today by Lieutenant Governor Eleni Kounalakis and Gayle Miller representing the Department of Finance.

For the benefit of those in the audience, the State Lands Commission manages State property interests in over five million acres of land, including mineral interests. The Commission also has responsibility for the prevention of oil spills at marine oil terminals and offshore oil platforms, and for preventing the introduction of marine invasive species into California's marine waters.

Today, we will hear requests and presentations involving the lands and resources within the Commission's jurisdiction.

We recognize that the lands we manage have been inhabited for thousands of years by California's native people and take seriously our trust relationship with these sovereign governments. Today, our gratitude goes to the Tongva people who have inhabited the lands on which we sit and fish these coastal waters for countless generations.

1 The first item of business will be -- let me just
2 see. I believe it is public -- oh, public comment, yes.

3 EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: Right, yes.

4 And I understand we have two speakers slips for
5 public comment. We're just gathering those right now.

6 CHAIRPERSON YEE: Okay. Great.

7 EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: So maybe as we wait,
8 maybe we could move to adoption of the minutes, while
9 we're waiting.

10 CHAIRPERSON YEE: Sure. Okay. All right then,
11 Commissioners, we will move on to item number 3. This is
12 to confirm the meeting minutes for December 6th, 2019 as
13 well as the minutes from February 4th, 2000 -- 2020.

14 COMMISSIONER KOUNALAKIS: So moved.

15 ACTING COMMISSIONER MILLER: Second.

16 CHAIRPERSON YEE: Okay. We have a motion by
17 Commissioner Kounalakis, second by Commissioner Miller.

18 Without objection, such will be the order.

19 EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: Yes. And actually,
20 we do not have any speaker slips for public comment.

21 CHAIRPERSON YEE: Okay. Very well. Okay. Thank
22 you.

23 EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: We will jump right
24 into the --

25 CHAIRPERSON YEE: Thank you, Jennifer. So we

1 will turn to you for the Executive Director's report.

2 Thank you.

3 EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: Excellent. I do
4 have a PowerPoint for my Executive Officer's report, if
5 that could be pulled up, please.

6 (Thereupon an overhead presentation was
7 Presented as follows.)

8 EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: Yeah. No worries.
9 Thank you.

10 All right. So I have a couple of things I want
11 to update the Commission and members of the public on.
12 First is on -- am I -- maybe I don't have -- there we go.

13 --o0o--

14 EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: The first is on
15 February 13th, 2020, the Commission, together with other
16 agencies, and the Leadership Counsel for Justice and
17 Accountability, an environmental justice advocacy group,
18 held a workshop on how to conduct meaningful community
19 engagement, primarily in the broader context of
20 environmental justice.

21 There are over 130 participants in attendance
22 representing eight State agencies. And I am pleased to
23 report that the workshop was a tremendous success. This
24 is the first workshop we have had in California of this
25 kind. State government is focusing more than ever on

1 environmental justice and community engagement, and we
2 realize that staff needs training about how to
3 meaningfully engage communities. The workshop was
4 incredibly comprehensive.

5 I am having trouble advancing. I'm not sure --

6 --o0o--

7 EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: There we go.

8 The workshop was incredibly comprehensive. And
9 based on initial survey responses, people were deeply
10 engaged and felt that the training was valuable. Folks
11 felt that they received the tools and foundation to
12 effectively engage with communities.

13 The workshop I -- thank you. The workshop idea
14 originated after the Commission adopted an Environmental
15 Justice Policy in 2018. After adopting the policy, our
16 staff partnered with CalEPA to develop and implement
17 environmental justice training for all staff. The
18 training consisted of three phases: a broad training on
19 environmental justice principles, how to use
20 CalEnviroScreen and other screening tools, and how to do
21 meaningful community engagement and outreach.

22 CalEPA and the Commission decided that the third
23 training on community outreach and engagement should be
24 undertaken as a multi-agency effort and offered to other
25 agency staff.

1 I want to also thank the Lieutenant Governor for
2 giving a powerful morning keynote. Your presence and
3 thoughtful, intelligent, and heartfelt remarks resonated
4 with all the participants and provided important context
5 that really set the stage for the day.

6 People were on the edge of their seat listening
7 and your remarks generated a tremendous amount of positive
8 energy. So again thank you so much for taking the time to
9 be there.

10 --o0o--

11 EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: We are now packaging
12 the curriculum and resources together to share with
13 participants for their continued use. And so they can
14 continue to build on this education effort with other
15 staff at their agencies.

16 On the subject of environmental justice, I also
17 wanted to update the Commission that we have put out a
18 notice for an environmental justice liaison position at
19 the Commission in the Sacramento office. The final
20 closing date is March 5th. And we have about five -- 11
21 applicants so far. So we will continue to keep the
22 Commission updated on that recruitment effort.

23 --o0o--

24 EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: Next, I want to
25 touch -- talk to the -- excuse me, update the Commission

1 on our efforts for developing the Hollister Ranch public
2 access program. In December 2019, our consultants that we
3 had hired, along with the Coastal Conservancy, State
4 Parks, and the Coastal Commission held stakeholder
5 interviews and surveys to identify the benefits and
6 concerns associated with public access out at Hollister
7 Ranch.

8 On February 20th, we held our first public
9 meeting at the Goleta Valley Community Center. There were
10 approximately 180 attendees, including the Hollister Ranch
11 property owners, stakeholders, and general public.

12 The -- the assembly member from that area,
13 Assembly Member Limón made opening remarks and stayed for
14 the entire workshop to hear all of the different ideas
15 that were generated from that workshop. The meeting was
16 facilitated by the public engagement consultants, KTUA,
17 with agency staff support.

18 The forum was called World Cafe, and it was a
19 small roundtable style of public engagement, which allows
20 equal opportunity for input from all participants. The
21 meeting participant -- was participant driven, interactive
22 engagement and brainstorming of benefits and concerns of
23 greater public access at the ranch coastline,
24 opportunities for access, where, what type of activity,
25 and how, and then sharing of the ideas from all the

1 participants.

2 --o0o--

3 EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: It was an incredibly
4 productive first meeting and we look forward to the next
5 steps, which include another survey, which includes a
6 draft vision statement, and items learned from the first
7 public meeting, which will occur in March, and then four
8 additional public meetings and surveys over the next year
9 to develop alternatives.

10 Our -- we still anticipate public hearings and
11 the program plan adoption in spring of 2021.

12 --o0o--

13 EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: The next is an
14 update on the Tijuana River pollution crisis. The
15 Commission has been deeply committed to supporting
16 solutions, because the crisis has had such a devastating
17 impact on Public Trust Lands and resources along the
18 southern border, including public health and safety,
19 coastal access, wildlife and natural resources
20 protection --

21 --o0o--

22 EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: -- beach recreation
23 and tourism, and the blue economy.

24 Currently, the pollution levels in the Tijuana
25 River Valley are extremely high. Millions of gallons of

1 pollution -- excuse me, millions of gallons of untreated
2 wastewater from Mexico are entering the main channel every
3 day due in part to overwhelmed and broken pumps.

4 Another source of polluted waters is a blockage
5 on the canyon collector up Matadero Canyon which could
6 lead to a massive breach and spill if heavy rains come
7 before it's fixed.

8 From Imperial Beach up through Coronado beaches
9 and State parks have been closed over 70 days since late
10 November. State Lands Commission staff is working closely
11 with other State agencies, led by CalEPA, to share
12 information and coordinate action. We also represent the
13 Commission on the Border Water Infrastructure Working
14 Group, led by the U.S. EPA, which will have its next
15 meeting on March 9th.

16 On behalf of the Commission, I also sent a letter
17 to the U.S. EPA Region 9 Administrator in early February
18 to request that they take immediate steps to stop the most
19 recent contaminated flows. And we are still pursuing
20 litigation with our local partners against the
21 International Border and Water Commission for violating
22 their permits under the Clean Water Act and therefore the
23 terms of their lease with the State Lands Commission.

24 There is some good news to share. At our last
25 meeting in December, the Commission passed a resolution in

1 support of the federal budget appropriation of \$300,000
2 for water infrastructure improvements along the southern
3 border. That federal funding was secured this January and
4 will be available to implement much needed projects here
5 in the United States to manage the river's water quality.

6 Governor Newsom also announced \$35 million in
7 this year's State budget for the Department of Water
8 Resources to contribute to the Tijuana River pollution
9 control projects. There will be Assembly and Senate
10 Budget Subcommittee hearings on that in early March.

11 --o0o--

12 EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: On the subject of
13 the budget, on January 10th, 2020 Governor Newsom released
14 his fiscal year 2020-2021 Governor's budget, which
15 includes a total of over \$67 million for the State Lands
16 Commission. This budget is significantly lower than in
17 two previous years, as temporary general fund
18 appropriations for plugging and abandonment activities at
19 Platform Holly drops off after fiscal year 2019. The
20 plugging and abandonment funding for Rincon Island drops
21 to just \$10.46 million in fiscal year 2020.

22 Other major changes in our budget this year
23 include \$5 million from the general fund in one-time
24 funding for feasibility studies and EIRs at both Platform
25 Holly and Rincon Island to analyze the ultimate

1 decommissioning options for those offshore facilities.

2 This funding also includes special provision for an
3 additional year of an encumbrance availability, which will
4 allow the Commission enough time to complete the full
5 contracting cycle without losing access to the funds.

6 A little over \$4.7 million from various funds in
7 fiscal year 2020, and about \$358,000 ongoing to support
8 the Commission's increased office space lease costs were
9 included in the Governor's budget. This includes one-time
10 funding for tenant improvements, restacking, and moving
11 expenses, plus additional monies for increased lease
12 costs.

13 In addition, the budget also includes \$1.23
14 million from various funds and nine new permanent
15 positions to augment our Administrative Services Division,
16 and address the severe staffing shortfalls caused by the
17 FI\$Cal implementation and build a more sustainable
18 management structure.

19 This proposal was complemented by the conversion
20 of 2.5 positions from the temporary help blanket to
21 permanent positions, which were added to our Human
22 Resources Unit to address recruitment backlogs.

23 And finally, we also were provided \$2 million
24 from the Environmental License Plate Fund to account for
25 another year of maintenance and operations funding for the

1 Bolsa Chica Lowlands Restoration Project. These funds
2 will pay for the dredging contract required to keep the
3 inlet open, as well as other maintenance activities.

4 The Commission expects to propose short-term
5 alternatives to the status quo after a study concludes
6 this spring, which will hopefully eliminate the need to
7 request this temporary funding each year in the future.

8 --o0o--

9 EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: Next, I want to
10 update the Commission on our work at Platform Holly and
11 related infrastructure. We began the first phase of the
12 plugging and abandonment of the wells on Platform Holly
13 cementing the off -- cementing off the oil producing
14 Monterey zone on October 31st of last year.

15 As of today, we have finished 12 of the 15 wells
16 that are to be done using this technique of coil tubing,
17 which is the technique that we use to plug and abandon --
18 plug and abandon the production zone. Safety is the main
19 concern, and no major personnel injuries or platform
20 upsets have occurred to date.

21 On the beachfront wells, these are the Piers 421
22 wells, the next phase for these two wells is to do the
23 proper environmental documentation to remove the well bays
24 and well support structures, the caissons and the
25 contaminated soil within the caissons, and to restore

1 beach to its natural state. An environmental contractor
2 has been secured and the initial reviews and planning are
3 underway.

4 As for the Ellwood Onshore Facility, we have no
5 new operations planned at this time. And currently, the
6 facilities are only in service for the support of Platform
7 Holly, supplying the platform with the required utilities
8 for electric and gas services, and stripping the small
9 amounts of hydrogen sulfide from the gas sent in from the
10 platform.

11 --o0o--

12 EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: An update on Rincon
13 Island. On the island, 29 of the 50 offshore wells have
14 been cemented back to the mud line. Onshore, 24 of the 25
15 State wells have been abandoned and the removal of the
16 wellheads and concrete well cellars is underway. The
17 project costs are approximately \$3.7 million under our
18 planned forecast, at \$26.9 million.

19 We have also completed the causeway repairs,
20 which has allowed the capacity of the causeway to be
21 restored. And we continue to make significant progress on
22 the onshore infrastructure, including removing more than
23 1,900 tons of concrete from those operations. So we're
24 making a significant amount of progress on the Rincon
25 Island and onshore facilities in terms of decommissioning

1 those.

2 And, in fact, on February 18th, the new Director
3 of the Department of Conservation and the new State Oil
4 and Gas Supervisor went out and met with our teams out
5 there and conducted a site visit of the operations,
6 because we do work so closely with CalGEM on the plugging
7 and abandonment activities out on the island and onshore.

8 EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: Next, I want to
9 update the Commission on our Marine Invasive Species
10 Program. Specifically, at our December 6th, 2019 meeting,
11 the Commission -- I informed the Commission that the Ocean
12 Science Trust was going to conduct an independent peer
13 review of the Commission's report, the *2018 Assessment of*
14 *the Efficacy, Availability, and Environmental Impacts of*
15 *Ballast Water Treatment Technologies for Use in California*
16 *Waters*.

17 This was to verify that the Commission's
18 scientific review and decision-making progress -- process
19 is grounded in sound science. And I'm happy to report
20 that the Ocean Science Trust recently completed their
21 review process. The OST engaged three independent
22 reviewers from throughout the United States with expertise
23 in invasive species, technology assessment, environmental
24 engineering, and wastewater treatment, and provided them
25 with a copy of the report and the underlying data and

1 information.

2 In general, the reviewers found the majority of
3 the analysis and conclusions in the report to be pragmatic
4 and appropriate, given the current technology and
5 analytical approaches available.

6 And they were largely satisfied with the
7 scientific rigor in the analysis. The reviewers also
8 concurred that large scale con -- the large-scale
9 conclusions and recommendations in the report were
10 warranted. The scope of the work and the final summary
11 memo of the OST peer review is posted on the OST website
12 and will shortly be linked from our website as well.

13 I want to thank the Ocean Protection Council for
14 funding this review and the Ocean Science Trust for a
15 smooth, effective, and enjoyable collaboration. We hope
16 this project will be just one of many cooperative projects
17 among the Commission and other State agencies and
18 organizations dedicated to protecting our ocean
19 environment, and particularly preventing marine invasive
20 species from our waters.

21 --o0o--

22 EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: Next, just a couple
23 more items -- fun items for the Commission.

24 One thing I wanted to acknowledge, especially
25 this being our first regular meeting of the year, is the

1 significant amount of philanthropic work that our staff
2 does, especially over the winter holidays. We, over a
3 period of three to four months, we conduct bake sales, we
4 do holiday auctions, we collect canned foods and turkeys
5 all in the name of donating to the Sacramento Food Bank.

6 And what you're seeing on the slides there is
7 with a staff of 242 people, half of those are in the
8 Sacramento office, we were able to donate over \$5,500 to
9 the Sacramento Food Bank making us I think the second of
10 all the State agencies. And given our size, especially
11 the fact that half -- only half of us are in Sacramento
12 collecting and generating these types of donations, it's a
13 significant accomplishment. And I'm so proud of the team
14 that leads this on our staff.

15 So we've never really talked about that before at
16 a Commission meeting, but I thought it was really
17 important to reflect the hard work that goes on behind the
18 scenes, in terms of us contributing to our community in
19 Sacramento.

20 Next, both really great news and a little bit of
21 sad news. As you know, every year, we are lucky enough to
22 bring on Sea Grant Fellows, and this year is no different.
23 I would like to introduce our two new Sea Grant Fellows
24 this year. Kristina Kunkel received -- and if she could
25 stand up and say hi -- received her Master's of Science in

1 Environmental Systems with a focus on energy, technology,
2 and policy from Humboldt State University. For her
3 graduate research, she worked closely with the
4 disadvantaged rural community of King Salmon, California
5 in Humboldt County, which is expected to experience the
6 highest rate of relative sea level rise on the United
7 States west coast.

8 She has done work in support of the Humboldt
9 County's local coastal plan update, and organizing
10 workshops for communities at risk of sea level rise, and
11 is a founding committee member of Humboldt State
12 University's Sea Level Rise Institute.

13 Outside her sea level rise work, she has also
14 managed and fundraised tens of millions of dollars in
15 economic development grants and contracts over the past
16 ten years.

17 Our second Sea Grant Fello is Mark Danielson.
18 And there he is. He comes to us from the Scripps
19 Institution of Oceanography in San Diego, where he studied
20 marine biodiversity and conservation. His primary work
21 focused on marine protected areas and stakeholder
22 engagement and outreach, which culminated in developing a
23 management plan for a newly designated marine protected
24 area in Curacao.

25 Before his graduate work, he spent five years in

1 Maui working for an environmental nonprofit as a marine
2 biologist and naturalist, specializing in outreach and
3 education. And Mark is excited to bring his experience to
4 a variety of projects here at State Lands.

5 And as you know, our Sea Grant Fellows bring such
6 a tremendous value to our work, both in terms of the types
7 of information and analytical approaches that we bring to
8 the Commission, so that you all can make the best
9 decisions based on the best information and the best
10 analysis. And they provide such a tremendous amount of
11 help and support for all of us staff. So it's just a real
12 joy to bring new Sea Grant Fellows on every year.

13 But with that, comes a little bit of sadness,
14 because we do have to say goodbye to some of our Sea Grant
15 Fellows that were with us for the previous year. And with
16 that, I would like to take a moment to acknowledge the
17 amazing work of Sam Blakesley, one of our 2019 Sea Grant
18 Fellows. And if Sam you could stand up. Thank you.

19 You're going to --

20 (Applause.)

21 EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: You're going to hear
22 from him a little later in the agenda where he'll provide
23 you with an update about AB 691 and our implementation of
24 that law. But first, I want to tell you a little bit
25 about him and why we're so grateful for all he's done

1 throughout his fellowship.

2 Sam has worked tirelessly on a number of critical
3 focus areas. And he has been an excellent team member and
4 team leader. He and our other incredible Fellow, Katie,
5 led our staff through climate and sea level rise learning
6 sessions -- oops, sorry -- he -- learning sessions,
7 focusing on the findings of the California's Fourth
8 Climate Change Assessment. He supported our
9 multi-divisional work on marine renewable energy. He
10 assisted with climate-related bill analyses and research.
11 And most significantly, he led and helped to manage our AB
12 691 project about preparing our granted lands and assets
13 for sea level rise.

14 He did all the heavy lifting for the Commission
15 in reviewing the assessments, collaborating with our
16 consultant, corresponding with grantee local governments,
17 and communicating with stakeholders, the public, and other
18 agencies at events like the California Association of
19 Harbor Masters, and Port Captain's Conference, and the Sea
20 Level Defense Conference.

21 In addition to all of this, Sam has just been a
22 great person to work with and get to know. He is
23 easygoing, but also incredibly dedicated. Before this
24 fellowship, he spent many years working on the water in
25 many of our harbors and with the fishing community. We

1 know he's excited to get back to the coast and get back on
2 his surf board. We were really, truly fortunate to work
3 alongside him this past year and are so excited for his
4 bright future.

5 And we wish him all the best in his future
6 adventures.

7 So please join me in thanking Sam.

8 (Applause.)

9 EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: And before I
10 conclude, I would like to introduce the Ocean Protection
11 Council Executive Director and the Undersecretary for
12 Oceans Policy at the California Natural Resources Agency,
13 Mark Gold to the podium to talk about the incredible
14 accomplishment that his agency had just yesterday.

15 Hi, Mark.

16 DR. GOLD: Hi.

17 CHAIRPERSON YEE: There you go.

18 DR. GOLD: There we go.

19 All right. Good afternoon. And first of all,
20 thank you for everything that all of you have done to get
21 us to this point of having the strategic plan approved a
22 couple days ago. It's a pretty bold plan. And I think
23 you, in particular State Lands Commission, really put in a
24 heck of a lot of time in really trying to strengthen the
25 plan. And I appreciate that collaboration, because I

1 think if you look at the plan itself, there's no way this
2 works, unless all State Agencies work together and we work
3 together with stakeholders far beyond just within the
4 State. So here we are in Long Beach working with cities,
5 working with ports, working with NGOs, other community
6 leaders. It is really going to be a critical part of
7 actually making the strategic plan more than a just real
8 nice plan sitting on a shelf, but actually making a
9 difference in how we're managing California's coast --
10 coastal resources.

11 Rather than me spending any more time on this,
12 because when you were going through your strategic plan, I
13 gave a brief overview of what was in it, I'm already on to
14 the next thing. I think we all are on to the next thing.
15 And I really wanted to just refer to that. And so one of
16 the boldest targets within the plan itself is on sea level
17 rise, as you know. And to that regard, we're really
18 trying to hit the ground running on this target, in
19 particular, in starting first with -- with State
20 government.

21 And so we're going to have our second meeting
22 with about a dozen different agencies, the heads of those
23 agencies, on Monday afternoon. And we've already pretty
24 much agreed to principles on how we should all work
25 together, and how we should deal with sea level rise as a

1 State. And it's about two pages and hopefully this will
2 be made public, I hope, within a week of that meeting, but
3 we'll see -- we'll see how it all goes. But there's so
4 much action going on in the Legislature. I think the
5 sooner this gets out, the better from the standpoint of
6 informing -- informing those issues.

7 Just basically without me going through this in
8 detail, some of the things by category are developing and
9 utilizing the best available science, building coastal
10 resilience partnerships on strengthening the alignment
11 around coastal resilience. For example, there was no
12 disagreement among any of the agencies in utilizing the
13 sea level rise guidance. I actually personally thought
14 there was going to be a great deal of discussion on that,
15 and there's just an understanding that we will use the
16 best available science.

17 We're going to redo that guidance in 2023. But
18 for now, this is what we have and the target is to make
19 the State of California resilient to sea level rise. And
20 again, it's a target. It's not a regulation. It's not a
21 requirement. It's just what we all should be shooting for
22 on the three and a half feet by 2050.

23 So a rather bold goal, but something that I can't
24 even tell you how pleased I was to see, whether it was
25 Caltrans, or Office of Emergency Services, not the usual

1 suspects. You would expect support from State Lands
2 Commission, or the Coastal Commission, or the Coastal
3 Conservancy. But to really get all those other agencies
4 that are managing infrastructure and doing those sorts of
5 things on board, I thought was actually -- it was really
6 critical on the science part of this.

7 Improving our coastal resilience communication is
8 another critical part. To that end, there's been some
9 effort. We've actually -- working with, I think, your
10 agency as well as numerous others - Coastal Commission,
11 Conservancy, et cetera - we're putting together a
12 communications plan on sea level rise. It should be done
13 probably in the next few months or so. Implementation is
14 one thing, but at least we'll have a plan and a strategy
15 in how to move forward. And there was a very successful
16 meeting -- half day meeting on that on Monday.

17 So this is just to show you that we're not just
18 sitting around. We're actually trying to make this a
19 reality as soon as possible.

20 Supporting local leadership in addressing local
21 conditions. You can't do a one-size-fits-all in sea level
22 rise. I think we all know that. What you're going to do
23 in a port is a lot different than what you're going to do
24 at a beach. And so that's -- that's something that we
25 just acknowledge up front. We don't want to have projects

1 go forward that are great for that particular parcel, but
2 that are going to cause harm in nearby parcels. And
3 that's something that -- that was critical to everybody as
4 well.

5 Implementing and learning from coastal resilience
6 projects. There's a lot that have already been out there.
7 Of course, I'm sure you're following the climate
8 resilience bond, the ocean section of that climate
9 resilience bond about \$500 million from Governor Newsom's
10 proposal. About 435 million of the 500 million is on
11 coastal resilience. So you can tell that's really the
12 highest priority for standpoint of climate stressors in
13 how the state itself is really looking at the issue. And
14 of that, 320 million is proposed to go towards coastal
15 wetland creation and restoration, and then on top of that,
16 infrastructure protection, using nature based solutions to
17 provide resilience, those sorts of things sort of make out
18 the rest of that.

19 And that's really all I had to say today, unless
20 you had any questions specifically about the plan or the
21 principles that we've put together. But I really think
22 that the good news is is we're all on the same page in the
23 direction that we need to go. Now, the hard work is let's
24 get going and make it happen.

25 Thank you.

1 CHAIRPERSON YEE: Thank you. Thank you, Mark,
2 for being here.

3 Commissioners, any comments at all?

4 Congratulations. And I want to thank my
5 colleague, Lieutenant Governor Kounalakis, for really
6 launching this effort when she was on the OPC. And I
7 think it's been such a robust process that -- and it
8 should be a plan that we're all very proud of, the
9 boldness and certainly the ambition.

10 Could you just spend like maybe a minute, there
11 is one target and action, because we're going to have an
12 informational item, a presentation by the Port of Long
13 Beach and the Port of L.A. But there is -- I think it was
14 4.5.1 in the plan about emissions reductions and
15 decarbonization. So can you just speak to that a little
16 bit?

17 DR. GOLD: So, Controller Yee, you pretty much
18 picked my vulnerability right off the bat.

19 (Laughter.)

20 DR. GOLD: So I appreciate that humbling
21 question. It's actually one of the reasons I'm still here
22 today is because I really want to see, from the ports'
23 perspective, that particular issue. I have to tell you
24 this has been sort of a new area for the OPC to venture
25 into. But this is what happens when you really try to

1 make this a State document rather than an OPC document.
2 And this was something that was strongly recommended. I
3 have been following this issue for quite some time, but it
4 was really more from my previous position as Associate
5 Vice Chancellor for Environment and Sustainability at
6 UCLA --

7 CHAIRPERSON YEE: Yes.

8 DR. GOLD: -- and following what's happened at
9 the Port of L.A. and Port of Long Beach from the
10 standpoint of turning into a net -- a net zero greenhouse
11 gas emission port and what that takes into account.

12 And so it's a critical issue. We want -- we want
13 to find out from the ports themselves really how the
14 proceeding with those -- with that particular target and
15 make sure that we're doing it in a -- you know, a
16 consistent fashion that's really the bottom line is
17 reducing greenhouse gas emissions and doing it in a way
18 that's protecting public health for the community that's
19 affected by port emissions.

20 CHAIRPERSON YEE: Okay. Great. Thank you. Now,
21 something, obviously a long-standing interest of this
22 Commission. We look forward to the partnership with OPC
23 on this particular area of action. And I wanted to just
24 highlight it, because I know one of the points that I
25 raised at the OPC meeting this week was, you know,

1 obviously a lot of planning and a lot of activity going on
2 locally. And I want to be sure that this kind of
3 overarching target that's been articulated in the plan
4 really is kind of the reach that I hope the ports can get
5 to. And there's been a lot of planning going on with the
6 San Pedro Bay Clean Air Action Plan.

7 DR. GOLD: Right.

8 CHAIRPERSON YEE: And so I'm hopeful that if
9 we're all moving in the same direction, that we will get
10 there.

11 DR. GOLD: Yeah. And I was very pleased, as I'm
12 sure you were as well, and I'm sure the Lieutenant
13 Governor would be pleased to hear, Port of San Diego
14 actually came up to actually support this, and
15 specifically even brought up this issue and the challenge
16 of it, as well as the sea level rise issue, and sort of
17 acknowledging how important it is, and -- but how they
18 look forward to working together with all of us and making
19 it happen.

20 CHAIRPERSON YEE: That's terrific. Thank you,
21 Mark.

22 DR. GOLD: All right.

23 CHAIRPERSON YEE: Other?

24 Yes, Commissioner Kounalakis.

25 COMMISSIONER KOUNALAKIS: Well, let me just say

1 it's incredibly important that the State provide
2 leadership, because we have a long and beautiful coast
3 that is an incredibly important part of our state for many
4 reasons, the environmental value, the habitat value, the
5 communities, the people who live there, and, of course,
6 the economic health of our State. And having the ability
7 to provide leadership at the State level, helping
8 jurisdictions learn from each other, getting guidance, I
9 think is going to be absolutely essential in this process.
10 So thank you very much and to everyone over at OPC for the
11 work that you're doing here.

12 DR. GOLD: Oh, you're very welcome. And the
13 first of many things I'm sure we're going to be
14 collaborating on a lot moving forward. And to really
15 bring -- drive home the point, and I'm sure Controller Yee
16 would agree to this, I never thought I would be sitting up
17 there and actually hearing a bunch of unemployed urchin
18 divers basically almost in tears thankful that we're
19 actually investing in trying to bring back bull kelp and
20 restore their fisheries up in Northern California.

21 And I was almost brought to tears, because really
22 working with that community, it was a great -- great model
23 to show really what this is all about, which is State
24 leadership developing collaborations and then actually
25 putting our money where our mouth is and trying to make a

1 difference. And so good example for us moving forward.

2 Thank you.

3 CHAIRPERSON YEE: Thank you. Thank you very
4 much, Mark for joining us.

5 All right. Ms. Lucchesi, anything else on the
6 report?

7 EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: No. That concludes
8 my Executive Officer's report.

9 CHAIRPERSON YEE: Very well. Thank you very much
10 for the comprehensive report. Next order of business,
11 Commissioners, will be the adoption of the consent
12 calendar. Let me just ask each of the Commissioners, are
13 there any items that you would like removed from the
14 consent calendar?

15 COMMISSIONER KOUNALAKIS: No.

16 ACTING COMMISSIONER MILLER: No.

17 CHAIRPERSON YEE: Okay. Ms. Lucchesi, any items?

18 EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: Yes. I would like
19 to remove consent items 30, 42, and 52 from the agenda,
20 and they'll be considered at a later time.

21 CHAIRPERSON YEE: At a later date. Okay. So
22 items 30, 42, and 52 removed from the consent calendar to
23 be presented at a later date.

24 With the remainder of the consent calendar, is
25 there a motion?

1 ACTING COMMISSIONER MILLER: So moved.

2 CHAIRPERSON YEE: Motion by Commissioner Miller.

3 COMMISSIONER KOUNALAKIS: Second.

4 CHAIRPERSON YEE: Seconded by Commissioner
5 Kounalakis.

6 Without objection, the consent calendar is
7 adopted. Thank you.

8 Okay. The next order of business will be the
9 regular calendar. And first up is item 56, which is an
10 informational item. This will be an update on the efforts
11 to develop the Commission's 2021 to 2025 strategic plan.
12 And we have a presentation.

13 EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: Yes. So I'll make
14 it quick, because the -- really, the intent and genesis of
15 having a standing agenda item related to our strategic
16 plan update is to solicit, and facilitate public input,
17 and perspective to help inform our next strategic plan.

18 So just as a quick recap, the Commission adopted
19 its first ever five-year strategic plan in 2015. And that
20 plan does end at the end of this year. So we are using
21 this year to develop our next five-year strategic plan,
22 which will cover the years 2021 through 2025.

23 On February 4th, the Commission held a special
24 public meeting in Sacramento to facilitate a public
25 discussion and solicit input and engagement from various

1 stakeholders to help inform this next strategic plan. It
2 was a new type of format for us. We had two panels made
3 up of representatives from our leasing community, our
4 ports, our business community along with our environmental
5 advocacy community, our environmental justice community,
6 and our tribal governments community.

7 And it -- I believe the meeting went -- lasted
8 for about four hours and included a really robust
9 discussion and dialogue between the Commissioners and all
10 of the panel members, and really highlighted a number of
11 different themes that we'll be looking into and using to
12 help inform and update our strategic goals and objectives,
13 and really trying to build out the strategic plan and
14 implementation plan moving forward.

15 And one other item related to this. We are in
16 the middle of hiring a consultant to help us both conduct
17 some of the much needed engagement and outreach outwardly
18 to the public in various communities that we serve, but
19 also to help guide and solicit input and ideas from our
20 240 staff members, so that as we start to develop
21 strategic goals and objectives, we can, at the same time,
22 develop the implementation plans that are going to be
23 needed to meet those goals and objectives through the
24 staff work and engagement.

25 So we hope to have a consultant on board by

1 mid-March. And in terms of the greater draft of the next
2 strategic plan, we are continuously receiving input, and
3 public and verbal comment -- excuse me, written and verbal
4 comments. We hope to develop a draft and circulate it for
5 public comment during the third quarter of 2020 with
6 potential adoption by the Commission in December of 2020.

7 So with that, we do have a number of speakers on
8 this item. And my recommendation is to get to those
9 speakers --

10 CHAIRPERSON YEE: Okay.

11 EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: -- unless there are
12 any questions from the Commissioners on status of the
13 strategic plan effort.

14 CHAIRPERSON YEE: Okay. Any questions,
15 Commissioners, at this point?

16 Okay. Why don't we turn to our public speakers.
17 Let me call you up at a -- a few at a time. First, we
18 have Lucas Zucker with CAUSE, if you'll come forward.
19 You'll each have three minutes to address the Commission,
20 followed by Tyler Studds.

21 MR. ZUCKER: Good afternoon, Commissioners. My
22 name is Lucas Zucker. I'm the Policy Director at CAUSE,
23 Central Coast Alliance United for a Sustainable Economy,
24 based in Ventura and Santa Barbara counties. We were part
25 of the environmental justice working group that worked

1 extensively to help support the development of the great
2 Environmental Justice Policy the Commission adopted.

3 And we really see the strategic plan as an
4 opportunity to implement that and really make it real
5 where the rubber hits the road.

6 So, as you know, one of the biggest concerns of
7 environmental justice communities in California is
8 emissions associated with our ports. Logistics is one of
9 the fastest growing sectors in our state economy. And
10 that means expansion at ports and freight corridors. And
11 many of California's most notorious environmental justice
12 communities from Wilmington, to West Oakland, to Barrio
13 Logan are clustered around those ports and freight
14 corridors, and with the diesel exhaust associated with
15 them.

16 That diesel exhaust is the biggest cancer risk of
17 any toxic air contaminant in California. And some
18 estimate that 70 percent of the cancer risk for the
19 average Californian comes from diesel exhaust from toxic
20 air contamination.

21 And so we really want to see the Commission take
22 bold steps to address the emissions associated with, you
23 know, diesel freight and move to zero-emissions technology
24 through partnerships with CARB, CEC, as well as -- as well
25 as NGOs, community organizations, and industry to build

1 out zero-emissions freight corridors starting at
2 California ports, and, you know, lease negotiations or,
3 you know, any other kind of tools available to move that
4 forward.

5 Another major priority for environmental justice
6 communities is just transition of the Commission's
7 portfolio of energy leases from fossil fuels to
8 renewables. We really encourage seeking opportunities to
9 develop new job opportunities in renewables with high
10 labor standards, local hire, as well as the removal and
11 remediation of old fossil fuel infrastructure. There's
12 really great job opportunities there as well, and, you
13 know, ensuring that there's great job standards for those
14 kind projects.

15 So other environmental justice priorities include
16 restoration for public access and open space in
17 environmental justice communities. And so, you know,
18 access to the coast in California really can often fall
19 along racial and economic lines with some communities
20 having, you know, beautiful public access to their beaches
21 and other communities kind of blocked by a wall of heavy
22 industry. And so that's a really important place for the
23 State Lands Commission to -- to begin moving -- moving
24 that to a more equitable access for all.

25 We also think it's important for the Commission

1 to invest in proactive outreach strategies, you know,
2 funding, you know, innovative strategies to reach
3 communities who often face barriers to participation
4 through, you know, door-to-door outreach, community
5 meetings, essentially going to where people are,
6 especially in -- you know, in projects that are impacting
7 the EJ communities.

8 And last, you know, as was just being talked
9 about sea level rise, addressing contamination of sea
10 level rise, especially, you know, cleaning up legacy oil
11 wells a big issue in our area and making sure that, you
12 know, that cost isn't just falling on the public.

13 Thank you.

14 CHAIRPERSON YEE: Thank you very much, Lucas.
15 And we look forward to working with you both here at this
16 Commission and at the Ocean Protection Council on those
17 issues.

18 Thank you.

19 Tyler Studds. And Tyler will be followed by Joe
20 Lyou.

21 MR. STUDDS: Thank you. My name is Tyler Studds.
22 And I am the Offshore Wind Development Director for EDP
23 Renewables on the west coast. And I am project manager
24 for the Redwood Coast Offshore Wind Project proposed off
25 of Humboldt County, California.

1 I commend the Commission for its recognition of
2 the impacts of climate change and the need to drastically
3 change the way that we, as a state, renew -- use and
4 produce energy.

5 A recent study found that California will need
6 150 gigawatts of new renewable energy in order to meet the
7 ambitious targets set out by SB 100. We believe that
8 offshore wind will play a key role in helping to meet
9 those targets. Not only will it help meet California --
10 help California meet its clean energy climate goals, but
11 it can also help deliver jobs and economic development
12 benefits.

13 Now, offshore wind is a technology that's been
14 proven elsewhere, but it is new to California. Offshore
15 wind can be developed and operated in a manner that is
16 environmentally responsible and a net benefit to the
17 environment, but doing so requires collaboration amongst
18 State and federal agencies, stakeholders, and offshore
19 wind developers.

20 Our focus though is on offshore wind in federal
21 waters, which is where we believe it can be developed at
22 scale to meet California's clean energy goals. That being
23 said, there still will be an important role for the State
24 Lands Commission to play.

25 First and foremost, cables that come ashore from

1 an offshore wind will require permits from State Lands.
2 But again, harkening to what Mark Gold had said, there is
3 incredible coordination and collaboration that's required
4 amongst agencies, and stakeholders, and industry.

5 So with that in mind, I want to provide a couple
6 of recommendations for how the State Lands Commission
7 could consider a role that they could play in offshore
8 wind. First and foremost, I recommend that they -- that
9 you coordinate with other agencies to map out a permitting
10 process. There is an unfortunately dizzying array of
11 State and federal permits, and nexus of permitting
12 agencies required. It's very important to be able to
13 understand those interfaces among State and federal
14 agencies to support responsible development.

15 Secondly, for the Commission itself, to take a
16 look at what information is required in granting permits
17 that you will provide, you know, for developing offshore
18 wind projects.

19 It's helpful for us as an industry to understand
20 what questions will need to be answered and how data --
21 what data we can collect in order to answer those to --
22 again, to ensure that resources are developed to ensure,
23 you know, proper stewardship of Public Trust and public
24 resources.

25 Lastly, I'll say that -- to go back to your

1 mention in the plan of a need to change how we produce and
2 use electricity, I view wind as a renewable resource as
3 many ways a public resource, and so it is in the Public
4 Trust. And so we as developers and an industry are
5 committed to developing the resource in a manner that
6 avoids, mitigates, or minimizes any adverse impacts to
7 those Public Trust.

8 So we look forward to continuing to work with the
9 Commission to ensure that we're doing our job to support
10 responsible renewable energy development and look forward
11 to continuing our work together.

12 CHAIRPERSON YEE: Thank you very much. Really
13 appreciate the recommendation.

14 Okay. Next, we have Joe Lyou who will be
15 followed by John Molina.

16 DR. LYOU: Hello, Commissioners. Thank you for
17 the opportunity to address you on this issue.

18 We are very glad that you continue to assert your
19 authority and jurisdiction over the harmful pollution
20 that's generated at the ports and to protect the people of
21 California. Under the Public Trust Doctrine and your
22 other responsibilities, you continue to have authority
23 over all granted sovereign lands, to investigate, audit,
24 review the administration of land grants or compliance of
25 the granting statutes and other laws. And we would like

1 to see you have a greater role to ensure the Public Trust
2 lands are used in the public's interest. And the
3 strategic plan can be the -- one of the ways in which you
4 do that.

5 In your current strategic plan, you established
6 what was a new and very interesting, and we strongly
7 supported an outcome goal of ensuring that port policies
8 and programs are consistent with the Governor's Executive
9 Order on freight, including the California Freight
10 Mobility Plan, the sustainable freight pathways to zero
11 and near-zero emissions, and the Energy Commission's
12 Integrated Energy Policy Report.

13 I'm sad to say that I think compared to other
14 outcomes that you put in your current strategic plan, this
15 one hasn't quite gotten as far as you'd hoped it had --
16 would. And I think that that calls for, in this new round
17 of planning, to have more direct involvement, engagement
18 in trying to reduce emissions from port activities and
19 their harmful consequences.

20 Also, this list of policies and plans that your
21 strategic plan should be consistent with should be updated
22 and expanded to include the Air Resources Board's
23 Strategic Implementation Plan, which was adopted as part
24 the Clean Air Act requirements, SB 32 and ARB's Scoping
25 Plan, the Governor's carbon neutrality executive order,

1 and the State's Sustainable Freight Action Plan.

2 We are working very hard in making some progress,
3 and in partnership with the ports on new technologies,
4 zero and near-zero emission technologies to get us to
5 where we need to go. We are making lots of progress. The
6 solutions are either there or at hand. And the impacts of
7 what you do in the strategic plan will have meaningful
8 environmental justice benefits, if done right, because the
9 impacts of these ports is disproportionate upon low-income
10 communities of color along the logistics corridors.

11 So thank you.

12 CHAIRPERSON YEE: Thank you very much, Joe.

13 John Molina, followed by then Tony Budrovich

14 MR. LEMMIS: Do you have the slides?

15 Hi. My name is Todd Lemmis with Pacific6. John
16 Molina just got called away --

17 CHAIRPERSON YEE: Okay.

18 MR. LEMMIS: -- so I'll be doing his -- his
19 presentation.

20 CHAIRPERSON YEE: All right. Thank you.

21 (Thereupon an overhead presentation was
22 Presented as follows.)

23 MR. LEMMIS: Thank you very much for the
24 opportunity to speak today. I'm Todd Lemmis from
25 Pacific6. We're a local Long Beach based partnership with

1 a mission to invest in development of projects that
2 positively in fact -- impact people in communities.

3 Our projects are quite diverse.

4 --o0o--

5 MR. LEMMIS: They include historic renovation of
6 buildings to help revitalize our community --

7 --o0o--

8 MR. LEMMIS: -- exploring low-income student
9 multi-generational housing to provide much needed
10 accommodations --

11 --o0o--

12 MR. LEMMIS: -- and expanding local media sources
13 to better inform our communities.

14 --o0o--

15 MR. LEMMIS: Like the Commission, we're also
16 exploring new opportunities in the blue economy. Our
17 close association with the Aquarium of the Pacific and
18 scientific communities have taught us the importance of
19 aquaculture in the future of our -- the global food
20 supply.

21 --o0o--

22 MR. LEMMIS: The population is growing rapidly.
23 We need food and protein -- the need for them is growing
24 exponentially and terrestrial production simply cannot
25 meet the growing demand without significant environment --

1 environmental impact. Seafood is the most healthful form
2 of animal protein and aquaculture is the most efficient
3 way to produce it. It requires far less area to farm,
4 less vital resources, such as fresh water, and less energy
5 and fossil fuel production. And it generates the least
6 amount of climate threatening gases.

7 --o0o--

8 MR. LEMMIS: So we're working with key
9 stakeholders develop -- to develop responsible ocean-based
10 aquaculture with diligent commitment to protecting the
11 environment. Our aquaculture projects include scientific
12 program to breed more resilient shellfish, support for the
13 development of offshore mussel farms in exploring the
14 immense potential of seafood for both feed and fuel.

15 --o0o--

16 MR. LEMMIS: We've also partnered with the Hubbs
17 Institute -- the Hubbs-SeaWorld Research Institute to
18 develop a model for sustainable offshore finfish farming
19 in federal waters.

20 --o0o--

21 MR. LEMMIS: Hubbs has over 55 years of
22 experience in coastal and ocean conservation and has over
23 35 years in aquaculture experience. They're a leader in
24 the hatchery production of marine finfish, and the only
25 California entity to successfully demonstrate ocean --

1 open ocean aquaculture.

2 --o0o--

3 MR. LEMMIS: Together, we are in the complex
4 process of permitting a farm to raise California
5 Yellowtail off the California coast. Utilizing proven
6 science, advanced technology, and best industry practices,
7 we hope to energize domestic seafood protection, create
8 jobs, contribute to coastal economies, and provide healthy
9 food for generations to come.

10 --o0o--

11 MR. LEMMIS: We're committed to working with
12 government agencies and regulatory oversight for a
13 well-informed and transparent permitting process to ensure
14 proper practices in the protection of the environment.

15 --o0o--

16 MR. LEMMIS: And we're working with ports, like
17 the Port of San Diego, to promote and revitalize the
18 working waterfront and develop the blue economy -- develop
19 blue economy -- economy initiatives.

20 --o0o--

21 MR. LEMMIS: We believe our venture is
22 synergistic with that of the State Lands Commission to
23 promote responsible economic development in our coastal
24 areas, to champion environmentally sustainable management
25 of resources, to address climate change, water

1 conservation, and greenhouse gas emissions, and ways to
2 minimize environmental impact, and to make science-based
3 decisions in the public's best interest and ensure the
4 public's health and safety.

5 --o0o--

6 MR. LEMMIS: We intend to serve as the model for
7 the development of safe and sustainable offshore
8 aquaculture in California, the U.S., and the world. We
9 believe there's a moral imperative to do this, to do it
10 here, to do it right, and to do it now.

11 Thank you again for your time and we look forward
12 the -- for the opportunity of discussing this further in
13 the future.

14 CHAIRPERSON YEE: Great. Thank you very much for
15 your presentation.

16 MR. LEMMIS: Pleasure.

17 CHAIRPERSON YEE: Okay. Then we have Tony
18 Budrovich, please come forward.

19 CHAIRPERSON YEE: Good afternoon.

20 MR. BUDROVICH: Good afternoon. Thank you,
21 Commissioners.

22 I wanted to -- Tony Budrovich. I'm here from
23 Santa Catalina Island Conservancy. And speaking of the
24 strategic plan, I just wanted to talk about strategy 1.3,
25 which is to protect, expand, and enhance appropriate

1 public use and access to and along the state's inland and
2 coastal waterways.

3 So on Catalina Island, as an example, we have
4 over 60 miles of untouched coastline. It's quite
5 beautiful. We are a nonprofit who believes in
6 accessibility. We want people to enjoy our property. So
7 what I wanted to have consideration in the strategic plan
8 is that maybe there was some sort of a granting mechanism
9 to improve access, such as trails, or roads, or that type
10 of thing, because many people with private lands don't
11 like people to go across their lands. We're quite the
12 opposite. We encourage people. We have over a million
13 people that visit Catalina Island. We probably have about
14 60,000 of those that go into the interior of the island.

15 And as they're on the interior of the island,
16 they would love to go to all these beautiful coastal
17 frontage. And there's just no safe way to get there.
18 We're a very vertical island and things like that. So I
19 thought it was something that would add to the strategic
20 plan. We work with your Commission just related to piers
21 for access and also for moorings around the island.

22 But here's a way to get more people to enjoy some
23 of the only Southern California coastline that's been
24 untouched. It's absolute natural beauty stands out. One
25 of the nicest places I've ever visited and I get the

1 pleasure to work there.

2 So that was my point. I thought it would enhance
3 the strategic plan.

4 CHAIRPERSON YEE: Thank you very much.

5 All right. Commissioners, any comments on the
6 strategic plan?

7 Yes, Commissioner Miller.

8 ACTING COMMISSIONER MILLER: Thank you. Again, I
9 wanted to acknowledge the State Lands Commission staff and
10 how incredible the process has been, and what a great
11 learning opportunity. And to Mr. Zucker, I had a huge
12 privilege of learning from him. In Oxnard, we went
13 actually to the very place he's talking about, where
14 there's industry and a Superfund site, and this lagoon,
15 right before you get to this incredibly beautiful
16 coastline. And the question of access was certainly
17 something I didn't know that much about and am really
18 grateful that you came all the way out here to really
19 teach us and talk to us about, not only access, but how to
20 accommodate folks that are looking forward to that access.

21 So Mr. Zucker used the example of someone working
22 for 16 hours a day, maybe needs more shade, for example on
23 a -- on the beach. And walking through a bunch of
24 industry to get to the beach can be really difficult for
25 people. So it's a really good perspective, certainly one

1 that I didn't fully understand. And it's just another
2 example, in addition to everything we learned from the
3 other speakers, of how much not only we can do with the
4 strategic plan, but the opportunity to learn a lot. So I
5 wanted to express my gratitude again for that.

6 Thank you.

7 CHAIRPERSON YEE: Thank you, Commission Miller.

8 Anything else?

9 Ms. Lucchesi.

10 EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: I don't have
11 anything really more to add at this point.

12 CHAIRPERSON YEE: Okay.

13 EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: One thing I did want
14 to mention, as part of just our outreach for the strategic
15 plan, is not only are we outreaching to some of our -- to
16 a number of our stakeholders that we are consistently
17 working with whether it be our grantee ports and harbor
18 districts and local governments, our environmental justice
19 community advocates in the locations that we're going to
20 be meeting in, but we're also sending letters out to all
21 of our lessees in the region that we're meeting at to be
22 able to solicit their input, in terms of their experience
23 working with us on their lease negotiations and ideas that
24 they have.

25 And so I was very appreciative of our last

1 speaker from the Catalina Island Conservancy, because it's
2 those kinds of ideas that are going to be really important
3 in how we shape our strategic plan for the next five
4 years. So I'm grateful for that time. And we'll continue
5 to do that in each of the locations that we'll be meeting
6 in, as well as conduct outreach in between our meetings,
7 of course, and get some of that more informal feedback and
8 discussion to facilitate discussion about really the meet
9 of that plan, so...

10 CHAIRPERSON YEE: Great. Thank you very much.
11 And I really appreciate that incorporation to the work.

12 EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: Yeah. And I just --
13 yeah. I just had one additional thing to mention, kind of
14 in the really in the spirit of transparency and
15 accessibility --

16 CHAIRPERSON YEE: Yes.

17 EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: -- that I failed to
18 mention in our -- my Executive Officer's report, but I
19 think it fits well in our strategic plan, because that
20 accessibility and transparency is such a major pillar of
21 our existing strategic plan and will continue to be, I
22 suspect, in our next one. This is the first meeting
23 that -- where we are broadcasting via webcast with closed
24 captioning. And so that is something new that we're doing
25 and we're grateful to our audio/visual consultants and

1 contractors to help making this work. We can't see it on
2 the screen here, but the folks watching us on their
3 computers from home or their office are seeing that closed
4 captioning.

5 So just in terms of the way that we make our
6 meetings accessible, not only for people that want to be
7 here in person. We live webcast now with closed
8 captioning, and we also have transcripts developed for
9 each meeting as well. And so all of those are accessible
10 on our website for future reference.

11 CHAIRPERSON YEE: Thank you. Thank you. That's
12 really great news in terms of continuing to broaden our --
13 the accessibility of this Commission.

14 Before we move on to item number 57, I neglected
15 to just publicly thank the City of Long Beach for hosting
16 us today. And this is always a beautiful part of the
17 state to be in and the Commission has a pretty good sized
18 footprint in this area, so we are very happy to be here,
19 which also then facilitates the next item on the agenda,
20 which is to have an informal presentation by the two ports
21 here, the Ports of Long Beach and the Ports of Los
22 Angeles.

23 So if I would have -- could have the
24 representatives of both of those ports come forward. And
25 this item was placed on the agenda really to have the

1 ports -- each of the ports update the Commission about
2 progress on the San Pablo[SIC] Bay Clean Air Action Plan.
3 The -- the -- for the speakers, you've heard a little bit
4 about just the continued focus of this Commission on air
5 quality, certainly is a key piece of the strategic plan
6 that was just adopted by the Ocean Protection Council with
7 respect to looking at sources of air pollution that are
8 contributing to our greenhouse gas hot spots, and
9 hopefully to look at, you know, getting enough information
10 and all moving forward together to decide and determine a
11 date by which we will be realizing decarbonization, and
12 hopefully in 2023, to be able to determine what that date
13 will be.

14 So I want to welcome you and look forward to your
15 presentation and please come forward.

16 (Thereupon an overhead presentation was
17 Presented as follows.)

18 MR. CANNON: Thank you, Commissioners. Chris
19 Cannon, Port of Los Angeles. I'm here with Heather Tomley
20 of the Port of Long Beach. I'm going to talk to -- give
21 you kind of a brief overview of our Clean Air Action Plan
22 and progress to date. And look forward to any questions
23 or comments you may have afterwards.

24 So how do I advance?

25 CHAIRPERSON YEE: We'll get you set up.

1 EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: Oh, it's that one.
2 Yeah, sorry. Keeping you on your toes.

3 (Laughter.)

4 --o0o--

5 MR. CANNON: No worries.

6 Here we go. Okay. So our Clean Air Action Plan
7 is something that is known by you and your Commission.
8 Something that started in 2006. It is an effort on the --
9 of the ports to identify ways to reduce emissions from the
10 major source categories at the ports, the trucks, trains,
11 ships, cargo handling equip -- cargo handling equipment
12 and harbor craft. Our goal is really to -- when we
13 started was to reduce emissions of health -- of criteria
14 pollutants, and most notably health risks on environmental
15 justice communities in the area around the ports. So
16 we -- we've been able to identify a number of programs and
17 we were very successful.

18 --o0o--

19 MR. CANNON: As you can see here, this is the two
20 ports together. Those are pretty good numbers, especially
21 when you look at the 2023 goals that we've set for
22 ourselves. For two out of the three goals, we've met, and
23 the other one we're just short of.

24 It doesn't mean that we don't still have to work
25 hard. Because as cargo volumes increase and -- which we

1 hope will increase, then we'll have to have additional
2 emission reductions to offset those increases. But we're
3 very proud of the success that we've had over the last
4 time since 2016.

5 But we believe that our -- we can't rest on our
6 laurels. And, you know, in my opinion, the most important
7 crisis -- environmental crisis facing the world today,
8 aside from this virus, is climate change.

9 --o0o--

10 MR. CANNON: And we have set now new climate
11 change goals for ourselves and are starting to focus on
12 zero emissions. The reason is because - I think the Mayor
13 of Los Angeles has put it very well - he believes that the
14 decade of the 2020s is the decade of action. We'll either
15 look back on that time and see it as a time that we took
16 action to save our way of life or what we'll look back and
17 see that we didn't do enough. And so we want to be the
18 ones to do enough. And so these goals here for ourselves
19 are consistent with it's -- set by the State and we've set
20 them for ourselves as well.

21 --o0o--

22 MR. CANNON: So just giving you kind of an
23 overview. In 2017, we did an update to our Clean Air
24 Action Plan. In addition to identifying those greenhouse
25 gas goals, we also identified goals and incentive programs

1 for ocean-going vessels, harbor craft, on-road trucks,
2 terminal equipment, and efficiency improvements. Heather
3 is going to talk about some of the details. But just, in
4 general, we're certainly focused on reducing emissions
5 from the largest source categories - ships and on-road
6 trucks are two of the biggest ones - and so there are
7 areas that we want to really focus on, but things like
8 efficiency get overlooked.

9 Certainly moving cargo in and out of the ports
10 faster and more efficiently with the least number of
11 touches for each boxes -- for each box, frankly has a huge
12 impact on environmental effects of the ports and on
13 emissions generated by port activity. And so not just
14 putting a device on a tailpipe, sometimes just being more
15 efficient with the way we make moves is also just as
16 important.

17 --o0o--

18 MR. CANNON: I mentioned the zero-emission goals.
19 And I'll just stop for a moment here before I turn it over
20 to Heather and talk about them. Zero-emission trucks by
21 2035, that's the drayage trucks, and zero-emission
22 terminal equipment by 2030.

23 We -- the thing that is difficult about these
24 goals is that the technology is still very much in its
25 emerging stage. We're really looking at zero-emission

1 technologies that are in the pilot phase right now. The
2 equipment itself is very expensive. The battery life and
3 the other kinds of things that are required for operation
4 are still in the development stage, but that doesn't mean
5 that we don't believe this isn't important or that we
6 shouldn't move forward. And so a lot of what the ports
7 are going to do in the coming years is really serve as a
8 test bed for the development of this technology to get it
9 out there, get it in -- get it going, and demonstrate that
10 a market exists beyond just here, but that this type of
11 equipment can operate anywhere.

12 And so we believe that that's important and we
13 believe that that is our role. And we hope to use
14 oncoming Clean Truck Program elements to begin that
15 element, as well as working with our terminal operators to
16 demonstrate and deploy zero-emission terminal equipment.

17 And by the way, the equipment that we have been
18 demonstrating and deploying at our terminals, the
19 equipment we demonstrated is equipment that have people
20 operating them. So that's been an interest of a number of
21 people. So with that, I'll turn this over to Heather.
22 She's going to talk about some of the details.

23 MS. TOMLEY: All right. Thank you, Chris.

24 And first before I start, let me welcome you to
25 Long Beach. You mentioned that you're happy to be here.

1 We're very happy to have you here. We moved into this new
2 facility, last summer. And it's been a great facility.
3 It's great to be back downtown. And so we very happy to
4 be able to host good events like this as well. So thank
5 you for having your meeting here.

6 --o0o--

7 MS. TOMLEY: What I wanted to talk a little bit
8 about is some of the specific activities that we've been
9 engaged in under the guidance of the 2017 Clean Air Action
10 Plan update. For the Clean Truck Program, one of the
11 first activities that we did was to update both of the
12 requirements at each port to require that any new trucks
13 entering our drayage truck registry be model year 2014 or
14 newer. And both ports moved forward with that requirement
15 in October of 2018. The model year 2014 trucks were an
16 important target for us to get more of those into the
17 fleet.

18 They fully meet the 2010 emission standard. All
19 of the emissions crediting had been worked out by then, so
20 every truck that was on the road by 2014 had those engines
21 that met at least the 2010 standard. Those trucks also
22 have onboard diagnostics, and they also meet efficiency
23 requirements that help to reduce greenhouse gas as well.

24 And so since that requirement came into effect,
25 and existing trucks that were already in service were

1 grandfathered and continued to operate. But for any new
2 trucks that came into the service or any trucks that
3 changed out and were replaced, they needed to meet the
4 2014 standard. And this has been a really successful way
5 of modernizing the truck fleet that operates here at the
6 ports very quickly.

7 Since October of 2018, 4,339 trucks now have come
8 in as model year 2014 or newer. So in a fairly short
9 amount of time, it's resulted in a significant improvement
10 in the trucks that are operating in the fleet.

11 We also have engaged in early deployments and
12 technology demonstrations. Chris mentioned the importance
13 of really testing these technologies. We're pushing
14 forward in an area with technologies that really haven't
15 been commercialized or deployed yet, but we're working
16 hard to try to accelerate those and get them into service
17 here as quickly as possible. We've been partnering with
18 the South Coast Air Quality Management District. We've
19 been working on securing grant funds from the State
20 California Air Resources Board and California Energy
21 Commission to help us to demonstrate and do early
22 deployments of these technologies.

23 We also partnered with the South Coast Air
24 Quality Management District on providing \$2 million from
25 each port towards the purchase of the low NOx natural gas

1 trucks to get 140 of those into service in the area and to
2 try to dedicate as many of those to drayage service as
3 possible. And so we're looking at those types of
4 partnerships to get as much early emission reductions as
5 possible and to continue to advance the technology.

6 One of the big areas that we're engaged in right
7 now is establishing a clean truck fund rate. And this is
8 really a critical milestone in our progress towards
9 achieving our goals to get emission reductions and
10 ultimately get on the path to zero emissions for trucks.

11 We are working through the effort of developing a
12 proposal. We've had significant stakeholder engagement
13 for at least the last year, if not longer, through the
14 development of the Clean Air Action Plan process on how we
15 would establish this rate, what the amount would be, and
16 how we'll use that to help transition the truck fleet.

17 --o0o--

18 MS. TOMLEY: The process that we've been engaged
19 in specifically is looking at a variety of different
20 critical pieces of information as we develop the proposal.
21 First, we needed to know what the status of the
22 technologies are, how many of these low NOx trucks are out
23 there, zero-emission trucks are out there. And we
24 completed a feasibility assessment in April of last year.

25 We conducted several public workshops, including

1 public workshops that were specifically dedicated towards
2 the development of this proposal, but also discussions at
3 our ongoing quarterly Clean Air Action Plan stakeholder
4 meetings.

5 We released an economic study for the rate in
6 December. And we are moving towards the consideration of
7 the proposed rate amount at a joint board meeting on March
8 9th. And so in a little over a week, our boards will be
9 considering the proposal. We're recommending propo -- a
10 rate of \$10 per TEU, which on average works out to be \$18
11 per loaded container.

12 And we estimate that at a rate of that amount,
13 we'll be able to generate a fund of \$90 million a year
14 initially, that we can then use towards incentives for the
15 purchase of those new cleaner trucks and get them into the
16 fleet.

17 The implementation for the rate would be
18 contingent on the State moving forward with establishing
19 the low NOx engine manufacturing requirement. We
20 anticipate after the State takes that action this upcoming
21 summer that we'll bring the implementation tariff back to
22 our boards and move forward with implementing the rate by
23 the end of the year.

24 --o0o--

25 MS. TOMLEY: On the cargo handling equipment side

1 and equipment in the terminals, both ports have been very
2 actively engaged in developing demonstration projects to
3 work with our terminal operators and technology developers
4 to develop some of these pieces of equipment for use in
5 the ports. These are pieces of equipment that don't exist
6 today, but we are starting to build them and get them put
7 into use.

8 And we're working with a variety of different
9 terminal operators, because we want the operators here to
10 gain the comfort level and understanding of how these
11 technologies can work. So the Port of Long Beach has been
12 successful in receiving nearly \$80 million to move forward
13 with these projects. And the Port of Los Angeles also has
14 received a similar amount of funds. That's being matched
15 by funding from the ports and the operators --

16 --o0o--

17 MS. TOMLEY: -- the utilities, and others too
18 really put a lot of focus on developing these
19 technologies. Over a hundred pieces of zero-emission
20 terminal equipment will be tested here over the next year.
21 And it will really give us a good understanding of how
22 these technologies can perform and how we can get them
23 deployed to meet our zero-emission goals by 2030.

24 --o0o--

25 MS. TOMLEY: On the vessel side, Chris mentioned

1 these are our largest -- this is our largest source of
2 emissions. We have several activities underway as well to
3 reduce emissions from vessels. Both ports have had very
4 successful vessel speed reduction programs. This is --
5 falls into the category that Chris mentioned of efficiency
6 improvements. By slowing the vessels down on their
7 approaches and departure from the port, we get significant
8 nitrogen oxide and greenhouse gas emission reductions.
9 And we offer an incentive for the shipping lines that
10 participate in this program.

11 On a voluntarily basis, we see 97 percent of all
12 vessel calls at the Port of Long Beach slowing down within
13 20 nautical miles of the port, and 92 percent of all
14 vessel calls within 40 nautical miles. So through an
15 incentive voluntary program, we're seeing really
16 successful participation in emission reductions.

17 Both ports have also taken an incentive approach
18 for trying to target the cleanest ships to call at these
19 ports. We've taken a slightly different approach between
20 the two ports, but our goals are aligned that we're trying
21 to get ships with the cleanest engines, and the cleanest
22 operations to preferentially call here. And we're doing
23 that by offering incentives.

24 On the Long Beach side, we offer \$2,500 per call
25 for a ship that has a tier 2 engine or \$6,000 per call for

1 a ship that as a tier 3 engine. We need to see more of
2 those cleaner ships calling here to really see the
3 emission reduction benefits that we want to see from the
4 ship category. And so continuing on those programs will
5 be a critical part as we move forward with continued
6 implementation.

7 Low sulfur fuel is also an area, we've had a rule
8 in the state of California for quite a while for ships to
9 use low sulfur fuel. We now also have an emission control
10 area throughout North America that requires cleaner --
11 cleaner fuel down to 0.1 percent sulfur. And the global
12 sulfur cap came into effect at the beginning of this year,
13 requiring lower sulfur fuel to be op -- for ships that
14 operate throughout the entire world. And that will
15 continue to produce significant emission benefits.

16 Shore power is also an area. These ports have
17 pioneered the use of shore power for these ships. There
18 is a regulatory requirement and place for container ships
19 and cruise ships since 2014. But prior to that, the ports
20 had moved forward with requirements for shore power
21 through our leases. The State is looking at ways to
22 continue increased requirements for shore power for the
23 existing vessels, but also expanding to other vessel
24 types. And this will require additional development of
25 other alternatives for reducing emissions. And that's an

1 effort that both ports have also been very engaged in
2 technology development in that area as well.

3 --o0o--

4 MS. TOMLEY: And provides an overview of some of
5 the activities that we've been involved with, really
6 trying to move forward with implementation of our Clean
7 Air Action Plan and meeting our long-term emission
8 reduction goals.

9 And with that, both Chris and I would be happy to
10 take any questions.

11 CHAIRPERSON YEE: Thank you very much for the
12 presentation.

13 Questions, Commissioners?

14 Anything?

15 I have a couple. And one is I want to go back to
16 the first slide about the achievements that you've made to
17 date.

18 MS. TOMLEY: Sure. Thank you.

19 CHAIRPERSON YEE: And I don't recall -- so the
20 plan which was initially put in place in 2006 and there
21 have been a couple of updates since then. I didn't know.
22 I mean, I guess, first of all, thank you for the
23 tremendous improvements that are shown here. But it
24 seemed like a lot of these were kind of done in the early
25 years. And so obviously, the tough stuff happens now.

1 And so I wanted to see how we can -- I mean, I
2 guess what are the metrics I guess going forward with
3 respect to how we kind of elevate our ambition to reach, I
4 guess, the next set of goals, because those are going to
5 be much tougher and really dependent on a lot of other
6 factors as you've outlined.

7 MR. CANNON: Well, I can start, and Heather maybe
8 you can add to this as well, that first of all, in some of
9 the areas the emissions benefits happened right away. And
10 in some of them, they've continued to happen. That's
11 actually been raised by some of the stakeholders. They've
12 wanted to know, you know, did you really just have a lot
13 of success through 2010 and then after that it's been
14 slow.

15 The fact is that there are some areas, NOx, where
16 we've had less success in recent years than we did in the
17 early years. But there are other areas, such as diesel
18 particulate matter, where we've continued to have a lot of
19 success. And so it just depends upon the category of
20 emissions and also in some cases the type of the category
21 of equipment. With some of them, we've had success and
22 some of them we haven't.

23 But there's no question about the fact that one
24 of the motivations for us to do the update in 2017, and to
25 look for new programs, and to push ourselves to reduce

1 greenhouse gas and so forth, is because some of our
2 programs, the success has not been as great in recent
3 years as it has been in the previous years.

4 Our targets are the same. We will continue to
5 focus on those 2023 goals. It sounds like, oh, that's
6 easy, you've made them, but it's not.

7 CHAIRPERSON YEE: Right.

8 MR. CANNON: As I said, as cargo volumes
9 hopefully grow -- we had actually decreased last year.

10 CHAIRPERSON YEE: Right.

11 MR. CANNON: As cargo volumes actually hopefully
12 grow, that means the amount of emissions per unit of cargo
13 has to go down, down, down, down, down just to keep us at
14 the levels that we have here.

15 So while it looks easy, it's really not.

16 CHAIRPERSON YEE: Um-hmm.

17 MR. CANNON: So that's a first thing that needs
18 to be done. And then there's greenhouse gas. And what
19 you can see -- actually, this -- it's only 13 percent --
20 well, if you go back, you see there's only been a 13
21 percent reduction in greenhouse gas in that time period.
22 And it's because the program was really designed to focus,
23 as I said, on criteria pollutants and health risk. And
24 greenhouse gas was considered, at that time, a co-benefit.
25 Well, now we've flipped it and we want to focus more on

1 greenhouse gas, and try to get ourselves to reduce
2 emissions. So 13 percent now. Forty percent is what we
3 want to get to by 2030. So we've got quite a ways to go.
4 That's a big, big jump.

5 So as far as metrics, those are the things we're
6 going to measure, we're going to continue to measure
7 against our goals that we set here for ourselves, continue
8 to have these report cards that we do every year, but
9 we've got a lot of work to do to get at those greenhouse
10 gas numbers. And that's why we're trying to work on zero
11 emissions.

12 CHAIRPERSON YEE: Yeah. And I appreciate that.
13 Heather, I'm sorry.

14 MS. TOMLEY: I was just going to add. Some of
15 the -- some of the keys to our success early on were the
16 fact that there were new cleaner technologies, new clean
17 engine standards that were established by the EPA and by
18 CARB, so that we could continue to incorporate in-use
19 requirements moving towards those cleaner engine
20 standards. We've now gotten essentially to the end of the
21 line on a lot of the new cleaner standards that are out
22 there.

23 And so we're really pushing beyond that and
24 getting into the zero-emission technologies and working
25 with the technology developers, so that we can have those

1 as tools in our toolbox to put into implementation. These
2 are -- these are pushing beyond the standards and the
3 available equipment and really looking for new innovative
4 ways to get those reductions. And that does take an
5 investment in time and development to be able to get
6 there.

7 But to Chris's point of why we needed to update
8 the Clean Air Action Plan was because we recognized we
9 needed to go further, and we needed to push beyond, and we
10 needed strategies laid out to help us get there, and
11 that's what we've been focused on.

12 CHAIRPERSON YEE: Okay. No, and I appreciate
13 that. And, I mean, obviously there's some things that I
14 think are kind of -- I don't know if it's easy by any
15 means, but that are kind of more of your low-hanging
16 fruit, if you will. And then obviously, the tougher steps
17 are ones that are going to require much more time.

18 And I ask this really in the spirit of trying to
19 figure out how the State can best support your efforts to
20 obviously achieve clean air and reduce the burdens on,
21 particularly the affected communities. And that's my next
22 question is I guess what's the -- speak to us a little bit
23 about kind of the stakeholder engagement, particularly
24 with the affected communities, with the air quality
25 issues.

1 MS. TOMLEY: That's been an effort that I think,
2 you know, many years ago, before we launched the Clean Air
3 Action Plan process in 2006, our relationship with the
4 local communities was -- was not where it should have
5 been. And I think that that's something that both ports
6 have taken very seriously over the years and making sure
7 that we're listening to the communities, and that we're
8 addressing the impacts to the local communities, and
9 making sure that we're being -- open to hearing from them,
10 but also being responsive to the concerns that they have.

11 So over the years, we've really put a lot of
12 efforts into making sure that we've got good, open
13 discussion, and dialogue, and forums for us to have those
14 conversations.

15 On the Long Beach side, we have a monthly meeting
16 with the local environmental and community groups, where
17 they set the agenda. We have a chance to sit down and
18 talk about where we are on progress of all of our
19 projects. And I think it's through those types of forums
20 that we've built a better relationship.

21 On the Clean Air Action Plan itself, we have
22 quarterly stakeholder meetings, where we provide updates
23 of where we are on progress, but also where we're going
24 with implementation of the strategies going forward, so we
25 can provide ongoing dialogue with interested stakeholders

1 about where we are. Also through one of the efforts that
2 we have thanks to your staff, with our community grants
3 program, this was a program that started several years ago
4 as a part of some of our capital improvement programs, but
5 it's something that we established as a larger fund to
6 work with the community on how we could address impacts
7 that the ports were having on the local communities for
8 air quality, water quality, traffic, noise, greenhouse
9 gases.

10 And we're providing grants to the community
11 addressing the areas that they identify for us are their
12 top priority where their needs are, under the guidance of
13 what we're limited and being able to spend our funding.
14 But we've been able to be very proactive in working with
15 the community on specifically addressing implementation of
16 projects to help address those impacts directly.

17 CHAIRPERSON YEE: Okay.

18 ACTING COMMISSIONER MILLER: Madam Chair, can I
19 ask a question?

20 CHAIRPERSON YEE: Yes, please, Commissioner
21 Miller.

22 ACTING COMMISSIONER MILLER: Thank you. I
23 appreciate it and I appreciate all your work. Just on the
24 community outreach --

25 MS. TOMLEY: Um-hmm.

1 ACTING COMMISSIONER MILLER: -- a couple of
2 questions. One, do you go out into the community or do
3 you just invite the community to you? And then the second
4 follow-up is if you offer any community outreach in other
5 languages perhaps?

6 Thank you.

7 MS. TOMLEY: Um-hmm. Those are great questions.
8 And it's -- and it's both, right? We want to offer a lot
9 of different forums, because different forums work well
10 for different group. We have a very active community
11 engagement group that attends throughout the entire local
12 area at each of the council districts throughout the city,
13 as well as through our community grants program, we
14 actually go beyond our city boundaries into some of the
15 other neighboring communities as well. And we'll have
16 meetings out in those communities to get feedback from
17 them of their priorities for the programs.

18 But the community engagement staff and our own
19 environmental staff will go out into the community and
20 attend meetings and provide updates of where we are. The
21 CAAP stakeholder meetings, we host -- we trade between the
22 two ports. It's a joint effort and we'll host those at
23 our port buildings and invite folks in. But we try to
24 offer a variety of different outreach and engagement,
25 because we recognize that not one approach works correctly

1 for everyone.

2 ACTING COMMISSIONER MILLER: I really appreciate
3 that. I would encourage both of you, maybe before you
4 leave, to talk to Mr. Zucker who's done this sort of in a
5 multilingual community and see sort of maybe how that
6 going door to door and having folks that can be maybe a
7 little less threatening sometimes, because some of us
8 aren't used to going to large forums.

9 Really appreciate the work you're doing and maybe
10 just expanding that ability for the community --

11 MR. CANNON: Appreciate that.

12 ACTING COMMISSIONER MILLER: -- to give input
13 while you're doing all the work you're doing, recognizing
14 how challenging it is and how difficult it is.

15 MR. CANNON: I just wanted to add one thing. We
16 shouldn't forget the work of the AB 617 folks. And we're
17 actually on the board, the steering committee, the one
18 that is the local one for here. And we attend all the
19 meeting. We're also on the technical steering committee.

20 And we are particularly interested in the work of
21 those groups -- or that group, because of its relationship
22 to our Clean Air Action Plan. We talked about it. I
23 mean, they sort of are developing plans of their own. And
24 so one of the reasons we're very focused on that is to try
25 and see to it if there are synergies between the work that

1 they're trying to do, as well as the work that we're
2 doing. And that's an example of we go to those meetings
3 and we attend those meetings, and try to be a part of.
4 We've also hosted folks from the Air Resources Board, as
5 well as the AQMD to do tours of the environmental justice
6 communities here and to -- that are a part of the 617
7 process.

8 CHAIRPERSON YEE: Thank you, Commissioner Miller.
9 Great question.

10 I wanted to -- I'm seeing these states and I'm --
11 in my mind, you know, when I see kind of potential
12 synergy, I want to see if it's possible. So obviously you
13 have targeted improvements with the 2023 date, which
14 happens to coincide with the date of the OPC strategic
15 plan about hopefully determining a date for
16 decarbonization.

17 So -- and you've done much of this work that I
18 think will feed into that determination point, in terms of
19 identifying major air pollution sources in and around the
20 port that are feeding into greenhouse gas hot spots. So
21 that work I think we don't want to have repeated, in terms
22 of what you've already done relative to that, so that can
23 inform our effort at the State level.

24 But I think I want to just encourage you to use
25 the avenues that are available to you, whether it's

1 through this Commission's strategic plan, Ocean Protection
2 Council's strategic plan just to have another level of
3 elevating these issues for just public awareness, one;
4 two, for any appropriate State response. I think there
5 are oftentimes -- I mean, I've felt this way about ports
6 for a long time, you know, just an important engine of our
7 economy and commerce here in California. And yet when it
8 comes down to infrastructure spending or transportation
9 spending, it seems to be kind an orphan. And so I
10 definitely want to be sure that you're part of the larger
11 discussions about how we allocate some of those resources.

12 But then also, as we look at 2023, just -- you
13 know, when I talk about metrics, I'm really talking about
14 kind of a before and after, like what can we demonstrate
15 with respect to the fact that we are actually, you know,
16 removing some of the, you know, the pre-2010 engine
17 trucks, and that we're, you know, really -- I don't have a
18 sense of like, you know, how many of those are still going
19 to be out there, how many are actually going to be
20 replaced. As you said, Heather, the technology is
21 constantly, you know, evolving.

22 And so I think just rather than having it be a
23 moving target, if we could -- and I'd like to offer, you
24 know, both of our State entities to be, you know, a place
25 where we can, you know, highlight some of that progress,

1 because I think we're kind of all in this together. And
2 the more that we can, you know, just put some transparency
3 around that, the better.

4 My last question really has to do with my own
5 misunderstanding, maybe lack of understanding about the
6 clean truck fund rate, and which you're in the -- is in
7 the process of being set. And so is this a rate that will
8 be paid by the cargo owner, right?

9 MS. TOMLEY: Yes. That's correct yes.

10 CHAIRPERSON YEE: Okay. And then to incentivize
11 hopefully using low NOx type equipment. And is it a
12 rebate program or how does that work in terms of the
13 incentive?

14 MS. TOMLEY: The details of the actual allocation
15 of the incentive, and the mechanics, and exactly how it
16 will be allocated, we want to work through a stakeholder
17 process over the next couple months to work through what's
18 the best way to get the best benefit.

19 CHAIRPERSON YEE: Okay.

20 MS. TOMLEY: But the intent is that the funding
21 that we collect -- so it will be charged to the beneficial
22 cargo owner for the movement of loaded containers in and
23 out of the terminals --

24 CHAIRPERSON YEE: In and out, right.

25 MS. TOMLEY: -- that are moved by trucks, with

1 exemptions for trucks that meet low NOx or zero-emission
2 standards. So the fund that we'll generate will be used
3 to transition those trucks into those cleaner
4 technologies.

5 CHAIRPERSON YEE: I see. Okay.

6 MS. TOMLEY: The exact mechanism for is it a
7 voucher, is it a grant, is it a lease subsidy, all of
8 these details we want to work with the stakeholders and
9 really understand what's the best way to get those funds
10 out there to maximize the benefits.

11 In the near term, in the next couple of years,
12 the focus on the -- getting the low NOx trucks into the
13 fleet, because that's the technology that's feasible and
14 commercially available today --

15 CHAIRPERSON YEE: Uh-huh.

16 MS. TOMLEY: -- that's the best way to get the
17 maximum emission reductions in the near term. But this is
18 a zero-emission program, and we want to be able to
19 transition to providing funding specifically for
20 zero-emission trucks to meet our 2035 goal. And the
21 earliest that we can make that transition, we're
22 anticipating that we may achieve that point around 2023,
23 but it's going to be dependent on the feasibility
24 assessment of is that truck -- are those trucks
25 commercialized and feasible -- feasible to put into

1 operations? We want to make that transition to funding
2 zero-emission trucks at that point.

3 CHAIRPERSON YEE: Okay. Great. That's --

4 MR. CANNON: We wanted to just -- I wanted to
5 just add that the amount of money that we have identified
6 that could be raised by the initial proposal that has been
7 discussed is this -- it's \$10 a TEU, \$20 a fully loaded
8 container, somewhere in the neighborhood of \$90 million --

9 CHAIRPERSON YEE: Ninety million, uh-huh.

10 MR. CANNON: -- and -- in the first year. That's
11 a pretty sizable amount of money. And the hope is that
12 that, along with money from other agencies in the state,
13 could create a pretty sizable fund, just in that first
14 year, to help replace trucks.

15 And so zero-emission trucks -- the near zero are
16 the ones that are more available. You can get those, you
17 know, from a commercial dealer. The zero-emission trucks
18 are still, as I said, in the pilot phase --

19 CHAIRPERSON YEE: Um-hmm.

20 MR. CANNON: -- but we want to see those out
21 there as well. And frankly, we'd like to see -- you know,
22 our program is ultimately a zero-emissions program. So
23 ultimately, that's what we want to see is we want to move
24 toward incentivizing the use, the development, and
25 ultimately deployment and use of zero-emission

1 technologies.

2 CHAIRPERSON YEE: Okay. Good. Great. And then
3 I just wanted to be sure that -- so truck drivers are not
4 going to be implicated in any fashion, right, in terms of
5 paying the rate?

6 MR. CANNON: No. And that's -- that's -- we hope
7 not. I mean our program is designed, and we made a
8 particular effort to focus on the process that will be
9 used to charge the cargo owners to see to it that the
10 charge actually goes to the cargo owners.

11 CHAIRPERSON YEE: Uh-huh.

12 MR. CANNON: To some extent, there's some --
13 there's only limitations on what we can do, because there
14 are contracts that exist between cargo owners and trucking
15 companies, and so it's hard for us to insert ourselves in
16 that process. But we very much, both of our boards, have
17 spoken very, very clearly about not wanting to have any
18 impacts on the drivers themselves.

19 The last Clean Truck Program, there were reported
20 impacts on the drivers. Fees were being imposed on them.
21 And they are the last people that we want this to have
22 happen to. They're the least powerful in the chain of
23 goods movement entities, and so they're the least able to
24 protect themselves against those kinds of predatory
25 things.

1 CHAIRPERSON YEE: Great. Thank you.

2 And my last question -- I'm sorry. This is like
3 such a great opportunity. I'm trying to like put all the
4 pieces together with our planning and certainly the
5 planning of the Ocean Protection Council as well.

6 My first, I guess, overture to the Port of Los
7 Angeles, when I first got on this Commission, related to
8 communication that I made around the China shipping
9 terminal. And I just wanted to see if you could give us
10 an update with respect to just what's been happening in
11 terms of the Port's fulfillment of some of the mitigation
12 requirements.

13 MR. CANNON: Well, the first step that occurred,
14 there was -- as you know, there were 10 mitigation
15 measures that had not been -- they'd only been partially
16 implemented or not been implemented. This was identified
17 in 2015. The first step was to go through an
18 Environmental Impact Report, a Supplemental Environmental
19 Impact Report. The purpose of which was to determine
20 whether or not the mitigation measures that were not able
21 to be implemented is it -- were they not feasible, is
22 there any other sort of problem, is there -- is it not
23 available, what is the situation?

24 That was completed this fall -- this past fall,
25 and it was presented to our board. And there is a list of

1 mitigation measures that our board has now determined are
2 feasible and are capable of being implemented. And the
3 next step would be to go and have the tenant accept these
4 mitigation measures and they would have to go into a
5 lease.

6 That hasn't happened because there was -- there
7 was an appeal filed. And so the appeal to the Board's
8 action will be heard by the City Council of Los Angeles
9 sometime this spring. And so once that happens, then
10 we'll follow the direction of the city council.

11 CHAIRPERSON YEE: Okay. Do you see the
12 incorporation of any action on this into the Clean Air
13 Action Plan ultimately?

14 MR. CANNON: Not really. The idea is to make
15 sure that any work we do in the development at a terminal
16 is consistent with the Clean Air Action Plan. There are
17 two different things through, the Clean Air Action Plan is
18 really a great example of the two ports setting goals
19 that, in some cases, go beyond what technology is. I said
20 the technology doesn't always even exist for the goals
21 that we set.

22 And it's been very successful, because we've been
23 able to push and work with our partners to develop and
24 expand technology for reducing emissions. We've got
25 technology advancement that Heather talked about and some

1 of the other things.

2 CEQA is different. You have to identify
3 mitigation measures that are doable at the time that you
4 approve your project or approve the environmental
5 document. They have to be feasible from a commercial,
6 technology, and operation -- or, excuse me, and
7 environmental perspective. And so it's a little
8 different. So the mitigation measures are certainly the
9 cleanest available and the cleanest that is feasible,
10 that -- and based on today's technology. They're not the
11 same as the CAAP goals, but we've got measures in that
12 lease that will require this terminal to update its
13 equipment and to ultimately reach the same goals that
14 we've set for the CAAP.

15 CHAIRPERSON YEE: Okay. Thank you.

16 Other questions, members?

17 Okay. I believe we have a speaker. Did you have
18 a question. Okay.

19 I believe we have a speaker on this item. Joe
20 Lyon, come forward.

21 DR. LYON: Thank you, Commissioners.

22 I guess if you've been welcomed to Long Beach as
23 a nearly 12-year member of the South Coast AQMD governing
24 board, I also have to welcome you to the worst smog air
25 basin in the entire country, because that's where you are

1 right now. So that's in the context of all of this. This
2 is what's going on.

3 You mentioned a couple things I think I should
4 talk to, first of all. With regard to investments of
5 transportation spending you mentioned, Controller Yee, as
6 the new appointee of the Speaker to the California
7 Transportation Commission, I'd love to work with you on
8 that --

9 CHAIRPERSON YEE: Please.

10 DR. LYOU: -- because I agree with you. We need
11 to invest in our ports and our goods movement
12 infrastructure and we need to invest transportation
13 dollars into it.

14 I haven't had my first meeting yet, but when I
15 get around to it, I'm definitely going to -- you're going
16 to -- I'm going to lean on you for some help on that.

17 CHAIRPERSON YEE: I'm happy to help.

18 (Laughter.)

19 DR. LYOU: Okay. Secondly, I want to make clear,
20 there has been a lot of community outreach activities done
21 by both ports. However, I also want to make very clear
22 that no community organization, no environmental justice
23 organization, no environmental organization, no public
24 health organization supports a \$10 per TEU rate. Every
25 one of them have -- has asked for a higher rate. I want

1 to make that really clear. I don't want you to
2 misunderstand that.

3 You mentioned China shipping. Don't just trust
4 me, I'm the head of an organization that's a plaintiff in
5 an ongoing lawsuit that occurred in the early 2000s trying
6 to make sure that this terminal was operated properly, and
7 didn't have an impact on the community. But take a look
8 at the appeal letters that came in from South Coast AQMD
9 and the California Air Resources Board on this matter and
10 see whether the Port of Los Angeles is actually complying
11 with CEQA.

12 Now, I can get to the rest of the stuff.

13 It's important to know that the Clean Air Action
14 Plan establishes goals and not requirements. And that
15 doesn't guarantee everything that we need it to guarantee.
16 When you talk about the development of the technology,
17 that's not going to happen unless we create a market. We
18 give certainty to businesses that if they invest in
19 developing this new technology, there will be a customer.
20 By setting these goals and not making them requirements,
21 you want to create that market. So that's an important
22 thing that you have to keep in mind.

23 Part of this is also wrapped up in the Air
24 Resources Board regulations for in-use trucks that on
25 January 1st 2023, all the pre-2010 model year trucks have

1 to be off the road in California. When that happens,
2 there's 7,600 trucks that are using these ports now that
3 are in the port registry, 2007 to 2009 trucks, that need
4 to go away.

5 And the way that the policy is set up now they
6 can be replaced by 2014 diesel trucks. We're asking that
7 the ports immediately say that any truck replaced on the
8 registry needs to be a truck that meets the low NOx
9 standard or better, either a near-zero or zero-emission
10 truck. And otherwise, we're going to end up with these
11 2014 trucks forever.

12 Forever 21 is sending a lot of stuff through
13 these ports, but we're going to have forever '14 diesel
14 trucks moving that stuff. So that's absolutely important,
15 because there's an opportunity that's about to be missed
16 here.

17 You also need to know that investing in emission
18 reductions and in public health is the best economic
19 investment you can make. The costs of operating these
20 ports is being borne as an externality upon the public.
21 We have to quit doing that. And if you look at the
22 economic analysis and you take into account the public
23 health impacts, then you see that the most economically
24 reasonable policy is the one that protects public health
25 and reduces emissions.

1 I have one ask of the State Lands Commission. On
2 March 9th, the joint ports board of harbor commissioners
3 will be getting together, and talking about, and deciding
4 upon this -- this truck rate. I would ask that you be
5 involved. I'd ask that you join the California Air
6 Resources Board, the South Coast Air Quality Management
7 District in helping have a higher rate that could, at just
8 \$35 to \$50 per TEU, turn over the entire fleet to 0.02 or
9 better trucks. Those -- 0.02 NOx, it's a standard that is
10 90 percent cleaner than the existing 2010 standard.

11 I would like you to be involved. And if you're
12 going to do that, you need to talk to the mayors of Los
13 Angeles and Long Beach and you need to address the harbor
14 commissioners in order to get that done.

15 I appreciate the opportunity to talk to you about
16 this issue today.

17 Thank you.

18 CHAIRPERSON YEE: Thank you, Mr. Lyou.

19 All right. Any other speakers on this item? I
20 believe that is it.

21 Any comments or questions, Commissioners?

22 Okay. Seeing none. We'll move on to the next
23 item.

24 Our next item is item number 58. This is also an
25 informational item. And we will be receiving a

1 presentation by Rachel Ehlers. Thank you for joining us
2 and very much appreciate the work that you're doing in
3 this area.

4 (Thereupon an overhead presentation was
5 Presented as follows.)

6 MS. EHLERS: Good afternoon.

7 CHAIRPERSON YEE: Good afternoon.

8 MS. EHLERS: Thank you.

9 Rachel Ehlers with the Legislative Analyst's
10 Office. So I'm really excited to be here to talk about a
11 report that our office put out in December. Hopefully,
12 you have a copy of the report and the two-page executive
13 summary there on the dais. It's also available on our
14 website.

15 --o0o--

16 MS. EHLERS: So this report we took on by
17 ourselves, as you -- as you may know. Sometimes the
18 Legislature tells us what we should write about and
19 sometimes we kind of identify issues on our own, and that
20 we think would be of value to our bosses in the
21 Legislature and the public. And this is in that latter
22 category.

23 And it really -- the genesis was really we
24 noticed a broadening of the conversation in Sacramento
25 beyond just a focus on mitigation and greenhouse gas

1 reduction to really say, well, we still -- we keep an eye
2 on that ball, but we know that there will be some impacts
3 from climate change and we need to start getting ready for
4 that and broadening that conversation to include not just
5 mitigation, but adaptation as well.

6 The report focuses on how the state can help
7 support local efforts. So the scope did not include how
8 can we organize our State agencies better, how can we work
9 on protecting State assets as State departments. It was
10 really -- most of the work is going to have to happen at
11 the local level, what can the Legislature do to help
12 support that.

13 So we talked to over a hundred people. We did as
14 much research review as we could. We relied some on some
15 statewide surveys that have been done to develop our
16 findings and recommendations. So the report has three
17 primary categories or sections.

18 --o0o--

19 MS. EHLERS: First, some background, which I'm
20 going to zoom through for your benefit, since you know --
21 are quite familiar with these issues. And then what are
22 the challenges that local governments are facing, and what
23 should the Legislature do about it.

24 --o0o--

25 MS. EHLERS: And I'll just note on my

1 transitional slides that, as you mentioned accessibility,
2 this presentation is designed to be accessible for your
3 website, so that's why you'll notice some plain text.

4 But this picture is an image from the report.
5 It's from the San Francisco Bay. It's a relatively
6 conservative, I would say, flood scenario of two feet of
7 sea level rise in a ten-year storm. And you can see a lot
8 of dark blue here. The bottom image is Foster City,
9 pretty dark blue. And the pull-out on the top right is
10 Oakland Airport, pretty dark blue. So again, that's just
11 an image from the report, but intended to highlight for
12 those that aren't as familiar as you are about what some
13 of the risks we're facing.

14 --o0o--

15 MS. EHLERS: So again, again this is the
16 background I'm going to zip through. Sea level rise is
17 coming. It's going to have a lot of impacts, not just on
18 mansions on the beach, but also on public infrastructure,
19 natural resources, very large costs attached to it. And
20 most of the work has to happen at the local level. But
21 that doesn't mean the state should wash its hands and say
22 good luck to you, locals. We have a lot of investment and
23 a big role to play too.

24 And we know that taking early action has a lot of
25 benefits. It can allow us to be more phased in our

1 approaches, to be more strategic, to try things to see
2 what works, while we have time, to be able to spread costs
3 across many years, instead of -- to really just be more
4 proactive rather than reactive.

5 --o0o--

6 MS. EHLERS: So as we looked across the state and
7 at the research that is found, there is a lot of work
8 going on now, getting ready for this -- this coming
9 climate challenge. But we would say -- characterize it
10 really as being in the early stages of preparation.
11 There's vulnerability assessment work going on. And
12 you'll hear about some of that in your next agenda item.
13 Kind of some high-level adaptation plans, starting to
14 think about what we might do, but very few projects
15 underway, very few kind of shovels in the ground, if you
16 will, undertaking the work that's going to be needed.
17 Really more in the planning and preparation phase of
18 activities.

19 --o0o--

20 MS. EHLERS: So if we know that this challenge is
21 coming and it is going to be very costly. We know that
22 there is a great benefit from early action, but we know
23 we're only in the early phases, why? Why are we not
24 further along?

25 --o0o--

1 MS. EHLERS: Well, we found that there are really
2 six key challenges that local governments are facing, that
3 are inhibiting making greater progress in their adaptation
4 efforts along the coast. And the first is probably not a
5 surprise. It's funding - that came up repeatedly -
6 funding for both planning and for projects.

7 The second was capacity limitations. And some of
8 that was just number of staff, which is also related to
9 funding, but also capacity of expertise that even local
10 governments that had a budget perhaps to hire some
11 adaptation experts. There really aren't that many in the
12 state, or nation, or even in the world, because it is such
13 a new field. So we heard that kind of lack of capacity
14 and expertise as a big challenge across everyone we talked
15 to.

16 Also, a lack of information. And this was sort
17 of a surprise. It wasn't that they were lacking
18 information about kind of flood maps or scenarios, it was
19 that I think folks felt like, yeah, they might need to do
20 a little bit more local work. But there really has been a
21 lot of work done already on that kind of flood scenario
22 mapping. It's more the next step, what do I do about
23 that? Who has undertaken some of these actions? How can
24 I talk to them?

25 And then a big piece, which I think you'll hear

1 about in your next agenda item as well, is what are the
2 economic trade-offs of some of the different options? How
3 do I know how much it would cost to relocate a facility,
4 versus armor that facility, versus adapt and elevate that
5 facility? Who can I talk to to weigh this off? What will
6 be the economic implications for my community? That that
7 kind of work kind of isn't really happening yet and folks
8 are lacking resources to know how to undertake that next
9 step.

10 --o0o--

11 MS. EHLERS: The fourth challenge we found was a
12 lack of forums for being able to get together across
13 jurisdictions, and share this kind of information, and
14 learn from each other, but also to be able to plan
15 together. And as we know, the water doesn't stop at the
16 city border. And what the actions that one community
17 takes can really impact what happens in the neighboring
18 community. So that cross-jurisdictional planning is
19 essential and hard, a lot of challenges, but necessary.

20 And there really -- you know, there's -- there
21 are pockets of this work happening around the state, but
22 really kind of an organizational structure to facilitate
23 that is really still lacking.

24 The fifth challenge is that responding to sea
25 level rise is not yet a priority for local communities,

1 and therefore, as would be expected, from their local
2 electeds as well.

3 They're worried about homelessness, and housing,
4 and cost of living, and traffic, and education, and
5 problems that really feel pressing today. And this feels
6 really far off in the future.

7 And so I think one of the messages that we heard
8 and are -- we're trying to communicate in the report is
9 the benefits of trying to escalate this topic as an issue
10 of more urgency now, even though it feels really far away
11 compared to some of the other challenges.

12 --o0o--

13 MS. EHLERS: And then the sixth challenge is not
14 as flashy as some others, regulatory permitting.
15 Although, maybe in this community -- in this room, it
16 feels a little more flashy than in others.

17 (Laughter.)

18 MS. EHLERS: But this was really highlighted as a
19 barrier to getting some of the projects underway. It
20 takes an average of a year to get through all of the
21 permitting processes. And we just don't have that time to
22 undertake some of these types of projects, especially if
23 we want to pilot and learn from them.

24 And part of it is that these are new projects.
25 That some of the regulatory agencies have been set up to

1 kind of evaluate the potential harmful impacts of
2 development, like a new hotel. Well, that's different
3 from a living shoreline project or a dune restoration
4 project, but our regulatory agencies haven't really been
5 set up to evaluate the merits of those. So that's taking
6 a little bit longer too. So these delays from these
7 processes are inhibiting some of the projects.

8 --o0o--

9 MS. EHLERS: So what do we recommend our bosses
10 do about these challenges?

11 --o0o--

12 MS. EHLERS: We have 12 recommendations. They're
13 on the back of your one-pager. They're in four different
14 categories. I won't go into detail about all of them, but
15 I'll kind of talk about the themes of each of the four
16 categories.

17 --o0o--

18 MS. EHLERS: And the first is really to help set
19 up facil -- forums for this regional planning, and
20 decision making, and information sharing. So we recommend
21 that the Legislature provide funding for establishing
22 regional climate adaptation collaborative groups, really
23 enough funding to hire a staff person or two and provide
24 some funding for logistics, like to pull people together.

25 There are some of these groups happening around

1 the state at a grassroots level, but we think it makes
2 sense for the State to help put some backbone behind
3 those. We weren't specific about what organizations
4 should do those. We think -- we think that probably
5 varies around the state.

6 So provide funding for those groups to come
7 together, provide some funding for planning, and then
8 provide some funding to implement those plans as well.

9 --o0o--

10 MS. EHLERS: Second category. Even if we do a
11 lot of that regional work, that doesn't mean that there
12 still won't need to be work done by individual
13 jurisdictions as well. And we think there's a role for
14 the State to help support that and continue supporting
15 that.

16 We think, in terms of supporting projects, the
17 State should be careful about really making sure that
18 public dollars are going into projects that have
19 widespread public benefits, and that we can learn from, so
20 we can share that information. And part of that learning
21 will necessitate monitoring. A lot of times when we give
22 funding for projects, we kind of give it to the local
23 entities and say, you know, good luck with your project
24 and it's yours now. And we think to make sure that the
25 state is really getting the benefit and other entities

1 across the state are getting the benefit, that we make
2 sure that there is scientific monitoring, adaptive
3 management, and information sharing about how those
4 projects are working under changing conditions.

5 --o0o--

6 MS. EHLERS: The third category, a really
7 important role for the state, is providing information
8 assistance and support. This we heard over and over
9 again. I just need somebody to call to talk to me about
10 these issues. A website is not enough to go through a
11 website. So we recommend establishing a center of
12 expertise on climate issues. This would be beyond just
13 coastal adaptation issues, but -- if we're going to go
14 through the effort and spend the money, we think it makes
15 sense to focus on other climate challenges as well, and
16 have some regionally located folks too, so that
17 communities have someone they know, someone who's familiar
18 with their local issues, someone who can come to their
19 city council meeting with them to help explain what some
20 of the trade-offs and choices are.

21 This second recommendation I think may be will
22 align with some of what you'll hear from your staff in
23 your next agenda item as well. We think it makes sense
24 for the State to put in some funding to develop a standard
25 methodology for doing some of these economic analyses of

1 impacts. The local jurisdictions will still have to
2 tailor them for their own issues. But having a standard
3 template, not only ensures the we're getting comparable
4 information from different areas, that we can then
5 aggregate at the State to get a statewide picture, but
6 also can help provide some certainty at the local level
7 that that methodology is sound and will give them helpful
8 information.

9 --o0o--

10 MS. EHLERS: We think focusing on public
11 awareness and enhancing public awareness is a really
12 important role for the state. One of the things we
13 recommend in the first bullet there is that the
14 Legislature pass a statute requiring coastal flooding
15 disclosures for real estate transactions. This would be
16 comparable to what the state already has for earthquakes,
17 for areas of high wildfire, and for historical flooding.

18 We think the cases -- there's even more certainty
19 about what we are going to see from sea level rise than
20 there is around earthquakes. So we think, as a public
21 policy, it makes sense to make sure that that information
22 is out there for informed buyers and just again to
23 increase the public awareness.

24 Director Gold talked a little bit about the work
25 on that third bullet that's already being done on a public

1 awareness campaign, so we think that that's a great
2 beginning step, but we may need to do even more as a -- as
3 a state, again to provide resources to the local
4 governments, so that not everyone is recreating the wheel
5 and we're really helping the public understand that even
6 though this feels like a far-off challenge, it's coming
7 soon.

8 --o0o--

9 MS. EHLERS: So I think finally --

10 --o0o--

11 MS. EHLERS: -- I'll con -- we conclude the
12 report and I conclude here today with the message that
13 even if we adopt all of our recommendations, we won't be
14 done and there's more work on the horizon. Some of the
15 issues we didn't address in the report, but we heard
16 repeatedly, is a lot of legal uncertainties about what
17 constitutes a takings, what is a community's -- local
18 government's responsibility to continue providing services
19 to properties that are going to be flooded. Do they have
20 to keep running the sewer system in a -- in a zone that's
21 going to be under water. When do they stop? How does
22 that work?

23 Thinking about where we're going to build, and
24 how we're going to build, what kinds of -- and how we're
25 going to rebuild? Where does the State want to focus its

1 priorities and responsibilities? The issue of insurance
2 markets we're seeing already in the fires zone, that
3 that's really changing as the risk gets higher. That's
4 coming in this area as well. And then, of course, sea
5 level rise isn't the only climate-related risk and
6 challenge. It's just what we focused on in this report.

7 So a lot of -- a lot of kind of legal, looming
8 questions that we didn't get into in this report, but we
9 do think that these are some good first steps that the
10 State could take.

11 --o0o--

12 MS. EHLERS: With that, happy to answer any
13 questions.

14 CHAIRPERSON YEE: Thank you very much, Rachel,
15 for a wonderful report.

16 Questions, members, or Commissioners?

17 Yes, Commissioner Miller.

18 ACTING COMMISSIONER MILLER: Thank you. That was
19 really great and really well done. Thank you Ms. Ehlers.
20 I really appreciate it. In terms of the recommendation
21 around kind of establishing this forum and having folks
22 communicate more, I do think that's been such a big
23 challenge for so long. Do you have any specific -- did
24 you look at any sort of international examples, or ways
25 that you've seen it work well that we could maybe emulate

1 in a way?

2 MS. EHLERS: On the -- on the regional
3 collaboratives?

4 ACTING COMMISSIONER MILLER: Yeah. Just how
5 to -- how to -- the regional and having the State be more
6 helpful in terms of getting those folks together --

7 MS. EHLERS: Yeah.

8 ACTING COMMISSIONER MILLER: -- without sort of
9 being the ones to direct it necessarily.

10 MS. EHLERS: Right. Yeah, I mean, we -- our
11 recommendation really focuses on the carrots rather than
12 the sticks approach of providing funding for staff and --
13 you know, there are already a lot of incentives for these
14 local governments to do this, because even if they do
15 everything right and are ready if their neighbors are
16 armoring or aren't, the flooding will erode their beaches
17 or impact the highway that their residents need to take to
18 get to work.

19 So, you know, we have some examples across the
20 state, where we have done this, and provided some funding
21 transportation is a good example of regional planning.
22 Integrated regional water management is another program
23 where we've done this, where we've provided funding for
24 planning. I think one of the things that we heard that
25 was really key is not only money for planning, but the

1 certainty that there will be some money to implement
2 projects at the end, and making the funding for those
3 projects contingent on a good plan, and participation in
4 the plan, that it's less likely that folks will feel like
5 it's worth their time to participate, if there isn't that
6 certainty that it will be worth their while with project
7 funding on the back end.

8 So I think our recommendation was really
9 structured around those types of carrots.

10 ACTING COMMISSIONER MILLER: Thank you very much.

11 CHAIRPERSON YEE: Yes, Commissioner Kounalakis.

12 COMMISSIONER KOUNALAKIS: So that was a great
13 report. And thank you to you and to your team for doing
14 this work. You mentioned at the beginning that sometimes
15 you're directed by the Legislature to do analysis and
16 sometimes you take it upon yourself, and that, in this
17 case, it was the latter.

18 So what kind of process do you expect going
19 forward now that you have this work and these
20 recommendations?

21 MS. EHLERS: So our job is to put thoughtful
22 analysis in front of our bosses to help them make their
23 decisions. So that's what we've attempted to do here.
24 We've been presenting in some hearings from the
25 Legislature. There are some -- there's been a lot of

1 really great engagement actually on this report. There
2 has been some legislation that's been introduced,
3 including from Senator Atkins, the Senate Pro Tem, around
4 sea level rise.

5 So I think the next steps from our office's
6 perspective will just to be support the Legislature as
7 they move forward with technical assistance should they
8 want to implement any of those ideas to try and help them
9 kind of work through some of the more tech -- technical
10 tricky decisions and issues.

11 As you know, there is a climate resilience bond
12 also being discussed. There's been a version proposed by
13 the Governor. But both the Senate and the Assembly are
14 also working on versions. So I would anticipate that that
15 funding for responding to sea level rise would be a piece
16 of any compromise package that might come together. So --
17 so I think -- I think there's a lot that's sort of being
18 chewed on in various corners and really hopeful -- hopeful
19 and optimistic about the level of engagement.

20 CHAIRPERSON YEE: Rachel, I had a question. And
21 that is -- and I'm really happy that you focused on the
22 role of the State in terms of supporting our regions,
23 and -- and I was curious about the recommendation about
24 creating a new State entity. I mean, it just seems like
25 there's so many State entities focusing on this and --

1 MS. EHLERS: Yeah.

2 CHAIRPERSON YEE: So the -- I guess just weighing
3 kind of the option of whether we want to contemplate
4 creating a new State entity or whether it's really about
5 expanding the capacity of existing State agencies.

6 MS. EHLERS: Yeah. Yeah, I think our
7 recommendation actually wasn't to create a new department.

8 CHAIRPERSON YEE: Okay.

9 MS. EHLERS: We had suggested it be housed under
10 OPR --

11 CHAIRPERSON YEE: Okay.

12 MS. EHLERS: -- the Office of Planning and
13 Research -- Governor's Office of Planning and Research,
14 because they're doing this work. But I think there is --
15 there is a lot of climate work happening at the state, but
16 not a lot on adaptation. That's really nascent, I would
17 say. And there's some proposals in the Governor's budget
18 to try and expand some of that work through OPR and the
19 Strategic Growth Council.

20 So that's -- it's great that the focus is
21 expanding. But it's not that have we have a natural place
22 where a lot of adaptation work is happening in State
23 government that we could easily just start to expand,
24 because it really is just beginning at this time.

25 CHAIRPERSON YEE: Okay.

1 MS. EHLERS: So I think that's why we thought
2 housing it within OPR, but -- but it would need to be kind
3 of a brand new enlarged effort compared to what we have
4 now.

5 CHAIRPERSON YEE: Okay. Okay. And I think --
6 and hopefully in the spirit of the partnerships that have
7 been such a hallmark of this Commission's strategic plan,
8 as well as the Ocean Protection Counsel's strategic plan
9 just to really gain all of the great work that's been done
10 to date obviously by the existing State entities.

11 I was happy to see you highlight the real estate
12 industry, certainly with respect to disclosure. And I
13 think there is more that the insurance industry can do as
14 well.

15 Now, I was curious about your calling out the
16 insurance industry with respect to really paying attention
17 to what's happening in the insurance markets, but I think
18 there's probably even more of a role that we can have as a
19 State relative to the whole kind of body of issues around
20 insurance. So I hope that gets built up.

21 MS. EHLERS: Yeah. In the fire zone, we have the
22 FAIR Plan, which is --

23 CHAIRPERSON YEE: Yes.

24 MS. EHLERS: -- kind of the State as the insurer
25 of last resort. We don't have that along the coast --

1 CHAIRPERSON YEE: Right.

2 MS. EHLERS: -- for flooding. So I think it will
3 be something the State is going to have to grapple with is
4 if -- if the insurance industry starts pulling out of some
5 high risky areas, what role does the State want to play?

6 CHAIRPERSON YEE: Right. Right. No, we're
7 seeing -- I mean, it's -- whether it's floods, or
8 earthquakes, or anything else. So it seems like that's a
9 ripe discussion to have about what more do we need to
10 focus on in that regard.

11 Great. Thank you.

12 We do have a speaker on this item, so hang tight,
13 Rachel. We have Philip Gibbons from the Port of San Diego
14 who's here.

15 Good afternoon.

16 MR. GIBBONS: Good afternoon, Commissioners.
17 This Phil Gibbons with the Port of San Diego, one of your
18 trustees down in San Diego. And I want to thank you for
19 bringing this item today. It really is a great summary of
20 the problem that we're going to face into the future and
21 have some thoughtful recommendations.

22 I wanted to focus today on regional
23 collaboration. As Ms. Ehlers said, you know, that's one
24 of the most important things that we're going to need to
25 do and a great starting point. And I wanted to highlight

1 some of the things that we are doing down in San Diego,
2 that the port is involved with, and then our broader
3 region is involved with.

4 First and foremost, the Port of San Diego and the
5 U.S. Navy are the largest land managers around San Diego
6 Bay, as you know. In 2018, our two agencies signed a
7 Memorandum of Agreement to align our initiatives when it
8 comes to planning for sea level rise in San Diego Bay.
9 And this has really been a great collaboration between our
10 two agencies. This has allowed us to do data sharing
11 together, to conduct research, and really to protect us in
12 the future from doing maladaptation. That's something
13 that we don't want to do. We don't want to install
14 something on our side of the fence that's negatively going
15 to affect them.

16 So this is a great partnership. And, in fact,
17 just recently both of our agencies are partnering with
18 Scripps Institution of Oceanography to put out wave
19 sensors in San Diego Bay to really understand the wave
20 activity and how that may impact our infrastructure into
21 the future.

22 But beyond just San Diego Bay, I want to tell you
23 what's happening in San Diego. The Port of San Diego was
24 one of the founding members of our San Diego Regional
25 Climate Collaborative. These collaboratives have sprung

1 up across California. There's one in L.A., the central
2 coast, Bay Area, north coast. There's even collaboratives
3 inland in the Sierras, and in the capital region, of
4 course.

5 But down in San Diego, this has really become a
6 really important forum or venue for people to get together
7 to talk about climate change, whether it's mitigation or
8 adaptation. Our collaborative includes local
9 jurisdictions, academia, nonprofit groups, philanthropy.
10 So it's a great assortment of people that are thinking
11 about adaptation.

12 We've had a sea level rise working group for at
13 least the past five years. And we were awarded funding a
14 few years ago to the tune of around \$700,000 from NOAA to
15 facilitate planning for sea level rise in our region. So
16 these collaboratives are really important to advance
17 adaptation. And then all of the collaboratives are
18 collaborating, of course, under the banner of the Alliance
19 of Regional Collaboratives for Climate Adaptation. I'm an
20 executive member of that group and this really brings
21 together all the collaboratives throughout the state. So
22 we like the joke that it's called the collaborative of
23 collaboratives.

24 So I bring this up just to let you know that
25 there is this soft infrastructure in place throughout the

1 State to promote collaboration and to advance adaptation.
2 And I would encourage the Commission to utilize the
3 collaboratives on your next steps when you're thinking
4 about sea level rise. I think it's a really important
5 group of folks to touch base with.

6 Thank you.

7 CHAIRPERSON YEE: Thank you very much.

8 All right. Seeing no other speaker on this item,
9 I think we will move on.

10 Thank you very much.

11 All right. Our next item is Item 59. And that
12 is also an informational item on the progress of AB 691
13 implementation on sea level rise and we have a staff
14 presentation.

15 Mr. Blakesley.

16 (Thereupon an overhead presentation was
17 presented as follows.)

18 MR. BLAKESLEY: Yes. Good afternoon, Madam Chair
19 and Commissioners. My name is Sam Blakesley. I'm a
20 California Sea Grant Fellow at the Commission. And I've
21 spent the past year assisting Commission staff with the
22 proactive planning for sea level rise on legislatively
23 granted Public Trust Lands through the implementation of
24 Assembly Bill 691.

25 Today, I'll provide an update on the Commission's

1 progress since the bill went into effect in July of 2019.
2 But before I do, I quickly just want to thank you all for
3 supporting the Sea Grant Program. This past year has been
4 a -- an amazing educational experience for me, and it's
5 been an honor to learn from and work with your amazing
6 staff on such an important project.

7 --o0o--

8 MR. BLAKESLEY: There we go. I'll start with an
9 overview of Assembly Bill 691 before focusing in on the
10 work that's been done leading up to and since the July of
11 2019 submission deadline, including our submission review
12 process and an update on our progress.

13 I'll then highlight some challenges of sea level
14 rise planning that we've seen throughout this process.
15 I'll show some examples. And I'll wrap with our plans for
16 next steps in moving forward.

17 --o0o--

18 MR. BLAKESLEY: All right. Passed in 2013, AB
19 691 requires local trustees of legislatively granted
20 Public Trust Lands who generate an average of \$250,000 or
21 more in annual Public Trust revenue to prepare an
22 assessment that looks at what impacts projected sea level
23 rise will have on the State's Public Trust resources,
24 assets, and values under their management through the year
25 2100.

1 Trustees were asked to address the four main
2 criteria that you see here. Assessments were due to the
3 Commission on July 1st of 2019. And this project
4 represents a first-of-its-kind coordinated effort to
5 comprehensively address and prepare for the effects of sea
6 level rise on the state's ports, harbors, and other
7 valuable coastal areas.

8 --o0o--

9 MR. BLAKESLEY: There are 32 trustees subject to
10 AB 691. Some trustees, such as the County of San Mateo,
11 which has harbors within the San Francisco Bay Area, as
12 well as on the outer coast, are required to submit more
13 than one granted land sea level rise assessment, making
14 the total number of granted land submissions 35, which are
15 listed here on this slide.

16 The AB 691 submission review process first began
17 before the submission deadline by categorizing these 35
18 granted land areas into four different land type
19 categories, based on their physical characteristics and
20 Public Trust uses or asset types, in an effort to compare
21 similar assessments to one another.

22 We've grouped them as small harbors and ports,
23 small airports and harbors with an open coastline, large
24 ports, and piers and wharves with coastlines. And to
25 date, we have received 28 out of 35 submissions and are

1 working with the remaining trustees to expedite their
2 assessment development.

3 --o0o--

4 MR. BLAKESLEY: In July of 2019, the Commission
5 hired a small business consulting firm, Revell Coastal, to
6 assist the Commission in synthesizing the information
7 contained within the assessments into a summary report,
8 with the findings being used to subsequently develop, in
9 collaboration with local trustees and agency partners,
10 recommendations to the State on the best ways to support
11 implementation of local adaptation strategies.

12 And as part as our -- as part of our initial
13 review plan, the team began by reviewing each assessment
14 and summarizing key information on vulnerabilities,
15 adaptation strategies, and cost information to satisfy the
16 criteria. And after experiencing some challenges, the
17 team quickly realized that a supplemental approach would
18 be required. And much in line with the findings of, and
19 recommendations of the LAO report, we are now working to
20 identify trends and reporting gaps in areas where the
21 State can assist with strategies for local solutions.

22 --o0o--

23 MR. BLAKESLEY: And despite some challenges,
24 which I will point out on the following slides, Commission
25 staff and the consulting team have continued to lay the

1 groundwork for this project. We meet monthly as a team to
2 review the assessments and develop our analysis and
3 deliverables, and we are well poised to move forward.

4 Commission staff continues to connect with
5 trustees and we've presented on our AB 691 work at a
6 number of recent conference, where many trustees were
7 present, including the Harbor Masters and Port Captains
8 Annual Conference and the Propeller Club of Northern
9 California's Storms, Flooding, and Sea Level Defense
10 Conference. And staff have also attended interagency sea
11 level rise meetings and provide updates to our sister
12 agencies about AB 691.

13 We've also updated our website with resources
14 that are helpful to trustees and the public. And this is
15 where the assessments that we have received are now
16 posted. And we are working to assure -- ensure that they
17 are ADA compliant, though I want to note that work is not
18 yet complete.

19 And this slide just also highlights the diversity
20 of Public Trust uses on these granted lands that may be
21 vulnerable to sea level rise. And they range from
22 recreation and tourism, to shipping and commerce, to
23 coastal habitats and facilities, that support marine
24 research and conservation, such as the Monterey Bay
25 Aquarium, down there in the bottom right.

1 --o0o--

2 MR. BLAKESLEY: The AB 691 team has experienced a
3 number of challenges in our collective analysis of these
4 assessments. And these challenges, in how they relate to
5 each criteria, are comprehensively discussed in the staff
6 report. But throughout the assessments, the ambulatory
7 nature of the Public Trust boundary, and the uncertainties
8 surrounding its upland movement is an overarching question
9 when it comes to assessing impacts to granted lands.

10 Because the Public Trust boundary is ambulatory,
11 the line between State owned sovereign tidelands and
12 private uplands moves back and forth at the seasonal
13 accretion and erosion of the shoreline. Rising seas
14 exacerbate this conundrum, because as the ambulatory
15 boundary travels landward of its general present location,
16 more land will become subject to the Public Trust and
17 presumably more assets.

18 Yet, many existing upland assets, such as
19 residential homes, are not compatible with the Public
20 Trust as they are private property.

21 The decision of what to include and not include
22 in a vulnerability assessment significantly affects how
23 risks are prioritized, the economic values of that risk,
24 and what adaptation and protection strategies to employ.

25 --o0o--

1 MR. BLAKESLEY: Compounding this issue, per
2 Public Resources Code Section 6311.5 subdivision (b), the
3 geographic scope of a local trustee's assessment of the
4 impacts from sea level rise is not required to go beyond
5 the boundaries of the local trustee's granted Public Trust
6 Lands.

7 Many trustees found it difficult, and were likely
8 reluctant to account for impacts adjacent to Public Trust
9 Lands in 2030, 2050, and 2100, because even though rising
10 seas will indeed inundate and encroach upon these adjacent
11 uplands, a trustee currently has no jurisdiction over
12 them, and the current uses are not compatible with the
13 Public Trust fairly often.

14 And this issue is exemplified in this slide and
15 photo of Newport Beach's assessment, which shows 4.9 feet
16 of sea level rise. Newport Beach acknowledged this
17 interpretation challenge in their report, and ultimately
18 looked only at impacts to their current Public Trust
19 Lands.

20 --o0o--

21 MR. BLAKESLEY: And this is what Newport Beach
22 might actually look like under 4.9 feet of sea level rise,
23 if you look beyond the current boundary, according to the
24 Coastal Storm Modeling System, or CoSMoS. And the
25 challenges the team has identified in its initial

1 assessment reviews will be considered in the summary
2 report, and advance the understanding of the unique
3 considerations faced by individual local trustees in
4 protecting and adapting their Public Trust lands and
5 assets.

6 The team will use the lessons learned from
7 reviewing the assessments, along with interviews and
8 discussions with individual grantee trustees to develop
9 recommendations for how the State can address these
10 challenges in recognizing that there is no
11 one-size-fits-all solution offer a greater level of
12 support to local trustees for planning and implementing
13 effective strategies to reduce site-specific impacts of
14 sea level rise.

15 --o0o--

16 MR. BLAKESLEY: And before I wrap up, I quickly
17 want to cover a few of the next steps for the review team.
18 Among the first steps, the team will finalize a template
19 and complete one-page summaries for each assessment, while
20 expanding the resources of the AB 691 webpage to enhance
21 communication, interaction, and engagement with the
22 public, trustees, and other stakeholders. And this is an
23 example of our draft template and one-pager Coyote Point
24 in San Mateo County.

25 --o0o--

1 MR. BLAKESLEY: The AB 691 team is also in the
2 process of developing a survey and holding follow-up
3 discussions with trustees to assess the extent of their
4 needs and identify trends amongst trustees groups, and to
5 address some site-specific challenges of individual
6 trustees. And this information will feed into the
7 development of a forthcoming interim progress report, and
8 will bolster the recommendations of our final summary
9 assessment report.

10 --o0o--

11 MR. BLAKESLEY: And that brings us to an end. So
12 thank you again, and I am happy to take any questions.

13 CHAIRPERSON YEE: Great. Thank you very much,
14 Sam.

15 Questions?

16 Commissioner Miller.

17 ACTING COMMISSIONER MILLER: Thank you and
18 congratulations.

19 MR. BLAKESLEY: Thank you.

20 ACTING COMMISSIONER MILLER: This is a huge
21 accomplishment.

22 MR. BLAKESLEY: Thank you.

23 ACTING COMMISSIONER MILLER: And I know how much
24 work it is to do one of these fellowships. On the -- that
25 Newport Beach picture that's like pretty remarkable, will

1 you do that for all of the sites, that type of visual,
2 showing what sea level could do on your one-pagers? I
3 think it's really --

4 MR. BLAKESLEY: If there's space --

5 ACTING COMMISSIONER MILLER: It's a profound
6 example -- just visual.

7 MR. BLAKESLEY: Yeah. We're aiming for a fairly
8 standardize template for the one-pagers. But in a case
9 like that, it may be very helpful to include a photo like
10 that and just sort of explain, put a picture to the words
11 what is really happening, you know, the challenges of
12 assessing sea level rise amongst all the
13 cross-jurisdictional boundaries.

14 ACTING COMMISSIONER MILLER: Great job and
15 congratulations again.

16 MR. BLAKESLEY: Thank you.

17 CHAIRPERSON YEE: Thank you, Sam.

18 So this challenge about kind of how much all
19 these things are going to cost and how we prioritize
20 funding down the road, do you have any thoughts about how
21 we can get better data on these -- get a better handle on
22 costs --

23 MR. BLAKESLEY: Yeah.

24 CHAIRPERSON YEE: -- after having looked at
25 all -- yeah.

1 MR. BLAKESLEY: I would -- I would totally agree
2 with LAO report recommendation --

3 CHAIRPERSON YEE: Uh-huh.

4 MR. BLAKESLEY: -- to support the development of
5 a somewhat standardized template for, you know, doing
6 vulnerability analyses and, you know, economic analysis,
7 you know, looking at things such as public serving --
8 public serving goods or, you know, natural non-market
9 value type assets. It's pretty important. I like to
10 think that, you know, if properly done, an economic
11 analysis will provide the right answer, because numbers do
12 not lie. But it's just a matter of doing it right in that
13 way. Supporting the LAO recommendation of developing a
14 template for these assessments I think would be very, very
15 helpful.

16 CHAIRPERSON YEE: Good. Good. I can't wait to
17 see all of the submissions. Just from gleaning what
18 you've seen, are there some common adaptation options that
19 have been put forth?

20 MR. BLAKESLEY: There are many adaptation
21 options. But we did not see as large of a variety as we
22 would like to. You know, I think that speaks to the
23 challenge of funding constraints in, you know, going
24 through the effort of developing a plan without actually
25 having the assurance that there will be funding to

1 implement it.

2 So we saw a lot of, you know, the usual
3 protective structures sort of thing. There was a mention
4 of a lot of beach nourishment for the smaller grantees.
5 And some mention of living shorelines, but primarily
6 conventional methods were not necessarily prioritized, but
7 mentioned as, you know, the most -- most viable solutions,
8 at least in the near term.

9 CHAIRPERSON YEE: Uh-huh. All right. Thank you.
10 Commissioner Kounalakis.

11 COMMISSIONER KOUNALAKIS: Just to follow up on
12 that, in terms of the most common ways that jurisdictions
13 are thinking about what the future might look like.
14 You're saying that barriers, seawalls, is that --

15 MR. BLAKESLEY: Due to the fact that many of, you
16 know our AB 691 trustees are fairly heavily developed
17 waterfronts, such as the Port of Long Beach right here.
18 You know, until I think there's direction from the State
19 and what to do about, you know, the policy and legal
20 constraints of boundaries, the main -- the main strategy
21 was to continue to build up in more of, you know, vertical
22 retreat I'll say. But as far as, you know, widespread
23 managed retreat options, that wasn't mentioned as a viable
24 strategy.

25 COMMISSIONER KOUNALAKIS: Okay.

1 CHAIRPERSON YEE: All right. Thank you.

2 We have two public speakers on this item. So sit
3 tight. We've Phil Gibbons with the Port of San Diego
4 followed by Adrienne Newbold with the Port of Los Angeles.

5 MR. BLAKESLEY: Okay. And I actually believe we
6 were going to introduce Justin Luedy from the Port of Long
7 Beach first.

8 CHAIRPERSON YEE: Oh. Okay.

9 MR. BLAKESLEY: Justin will be presenting about
10 their AB 691 assessment.

11 CHAIRPERSON YEE: Oh, wonderful. Okay. Please.

12 MR. BLAKESLEY: Yeah.

13 CHAIRPERSON YEE: Thank you.

14 EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: It's me. As Justin
15 is coming up to the podium, I did want to just add a
16 couple of thoughts on the questions around the economic
17 analysis.

18 CHAIRPERSON YEE: Yeah.

19 EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: And as Sam
20 mentioned, we're going to be conducting a survey of our
21 trustees to identify what challenges they saw in
22 completing and complying -- completing their assessments,
23 complying with AB 691. And I think what we hope to get
24 out of those surveys and discussions with our individual
25 trustees is -- are looking at what specific challenges

1 they had in terms of assessing the economic impacts to
2 their assets. And it could be anywhere ranging from they
3 didn't have the expertise or the resources within their
4 own staff or their own teams to do that kind work.

5 As Sam mentioned in his presentation, it's also
6 getting a better understanding of what's currently in
7 their jurisdiction and what could be in their
8 jurisdiction, based on the modeling of where the sea level
9 will be rising to. And finally, also better understanding
10 their comfort level in sharing some of that economic
11 analysis with a public agency, and really kind of teasing
12 that out to figure out how we might be able to work better
13 together on understanding those economic impacts.

14 CHAIRPERSON YEE: Yeah. You raise the point,
15 Jennifer, that's always kind of been on my mind with
16 respect to this work by our public agencies, and that is,
17 I mean, they're essentially identifying risk. And so
18 there are -- they're assessed for risk on a whole number
19 of fronts, including, you know, bond ratings and
20 everything else.

21 EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: Exactly.

22 CHAIRPERSON YEE: And so there is some
23 vulnerability with respect to disclosing some of this. So
24 I think the challenge is really how do you -- you kind of
25 create a little bit of a, for lack of a better word, a

1 safe harbor --

2 EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: Right.

3 CHAIRPERSON YEE: -- in terms of getting that
4 information, but not having it really be, you know, used
5 against them.

6 EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: Exactly. Exactly.

7 CHAIRPERSON YEE: Yeah. Okay. Great. Thank
8 you. Good. We'll hear from the Port of Long Beach.
9 Great. Thank you.

10 Good afternoon.

11 (Thereupon an overhead presentation was
12 Presented as follows.)

13 MR. LUEDY: Good afternoon, Commissioners. Thank
14 you for having me today. My name is Justin Luedy,
15 Environmental Specialist with the Port of Long Beach and
16 working on the Port's climate change effort -- climate
17 change adaptation efforts.

18 --o0o--

19 MR. LUEDY: So I always like to start with the
20 importance of resiliency to the port. I think the other
21 ports can probably echo this as well. But we're already
22 seeing climate impacts within the Port of Long Beach.
23 That goes everything from sea level rise, frequency of
24 storms, and a greater number of hot weather days. So
25 those are, per our model, days over 90 degrees Fahrenheit

1 AGP VIDEO: Could you speak more into the
2 microphone?

3 MR. LUEDY: Sure.

4 AGP VIDEO: You don't have to get real close.

5 MR. LUEDY: Okay.

6 AGP VIDEO: Just make sure it's aimed at you.

7 MR. LUEDY: All right. Got it. Thank you.

8 So and the resiliency efforts really drive
9 this -- this decision making for ports for us as staff,
10 for our stakeholders, and tenants, and really allows sound
11 science-based planning solutions to investing in our
12 maritime infrastructure. And I always like to bring up
13 Hurricane Maria. This is a grate case study for us.

14 In August of 2014, a hurricane over 400 miles off
15 of our coast brought a storm surge in causing significant
16 impacts in the harbor. We saw damage at our Navy mole and
17 pier at shorelines. Over seven million in repairs there.
18 Significant damages to the breakwaters. We have three
19 segments of breakwater out here in the harbor.

20 Three large breaches, over 80 actually smaller
21 breaches, and over 21 million in repairs. So it just
22 really highlighted the need for resiliency planning, and
23 catalyzed the process internally.

24 Oh, we also saw access restricted to rail
25 operations and some of our critical facilities. And so it

1 was -- it was an impact of business continuity. And
2 that's really where we want to go with our adaptation
3 planning.

4 --o0o--

5 MR. LUEDY: So I won't go through all of these,
6 but basically that we wanted to look at, after the
7 hurricane and having conversations for over a year within
8 planning -- our planning team, we determined that we
9 needed to go forward with an adaptation plan. The goal
10 really is again business continuity, in the face of a very
11 rapidly changing climate, long-term sustainable
12 development, and then really more forward-looking outward
13 looking adaptation strategies.

14 Mostly infrastructure, and that came up in the
15 last presentation, is that the ports tend to be
16 infrastructure enhancement focused. And that's true,
17 simply because we don't really have the option to retreat.

18 --o0o--

19 MR. LUEDY: And then onto AB 691 compliance. So
20 I should note that our -- our plan was complete before the
21 AB 691 compliance requirement came upon us, so we ended up
22 doing an appendix to our plan. And that really addressed
23 all of these requirements, everything from looking at the
24 cost of repairs, value of lost assets, costs of adaptation
25 strategies - and those were done at a planning level only

1 for purposes of our adaptation plan - anticipated benefits
2 from those strategies, and then a very general overview of
3 market values that could be impacted.

4 And then like many other seaports, we -- you
5 know, we have a standard methodology of looking at a
6 qualitative tiered approach, so this assigning a low,
7 medium, and high cost threshold to the various sea level
8 rise scenarios. Actually, we have six in our plan, which
9 I'll address next slide. And then each of those three
10 scenarios of the 100-year storm event or worst case
11 approach.

12 And I think, if I remember correctly, we are the
13 first seaport to provide an adaptation plan to the State
14 Lands Commission for approval. So something to be proud
15 of there.

16 --o0o--

17 MR. LUEDY: A general approach to our adaptation
18 plan. Obviously, we had to start with the very basics of
19 what climate science was available. At the time, the 2012
20 NRC model was what we had to work with, so we've started
21 there. Did a very robust inventory of our port assets,
22 everything we own, everything we lease, and then onto
23 inundation mapping.

24 I'll address the inundation mapping in the next
25 slide. But what came of that were really vulnerability

1 profiles looking at essentially assets by system. So
2 we -- through the planning process, we determined what our
3 assets would be, and we divided them into a set of
4 systems. And those are piers; the transportation network
5 within the harbor; critical facilities, so those
6 facilities critical to business continuity within the
7 harbor district; all utilities; and then our breakwater
8 with sort of stand-alone assessment.

9 And moved on to working with all the various
10 stakeholders within the port. It was a very internal
11 process at first, where which ones would be prioritized.
12 Where was -- where was our greatest vulnerability and our
13 greatest need.

14 And then on to five strategies that were brought
15 forth as a conceptual design, and then into a final actual
16 adaptation plan for review.

17 --o0o--

18 MR. LUEDY: So looking -- this is just two
19 examples here on the map. This is a least and worst case
20 scenario. So we -- we assessed a 16, 36, and 55 inch
21 scenario. And then each of those scenarios with a
22 100-year storm event, so a worst case scenario.

23 And so this is -- if you look at the map here,
24 you'll see the shades of blue represent inundation in
25 feet. And so we'll address on the next slide sort of

1 where our vulnerabilities lie. But we really look to the
2 16- to 36-inch scenarios as the most appropriate to use
3 within our planning process, simply because those best
4 align with the -- number one, the life span of the assets
5 within the harbor, but also the horizon on which we
6 develop and redevelop. So that seemed to make the most
7 sense.

8 --o0o--

9 MR. LUEDY: We had many vulnerabilities,
10 certainly from our inundation mapping excise. But we saw
11 the greatest vulnerability and really the most urgent need
12 at our Pier S shoreline. And so Pier S, this is an area
13 of the harbor that's considerably old. Our port is over
14 100 -- I think 112 years old by now. And this is an area
15 that just hasn't been redeveloped in a very long time.

16 And in addition to that, this area saw
17 significant subsidence -- land subsidence during the oil
18 extraction activities of the 1940s and '50s. And so this
19 area is just notoriously below sea level, and is certainly
20 a vulnerability. So we did an overtopping analysis of all
21 of our assets. And if you look at the map you'll see kind
22 of a reddish orange color there circled as -- and labeled
23 as the overtopped seawall. This is the access point for
24 inundation at Pier S. And we see over ten feet of sea
25 level rise -- excuse me, over ten feet of seawater

1 inundation.

2 And this is just at the 16-inch scenario. And
3 this is without a 100-year storm, sort of worst case
4 scenario. So that was certainly alarming to us. And so
5 we've prioritized this as one of our greater
6 vulnerabilities.

7 I note the Southern California Edison substation
8 on this map as well, because that's an example of a
9 critical facility. This specific substation delivers
10 power to a significant portion of Piers S and Pier T. And
11 so that has again only amped up the need for adaptation
12 there on the Cerritos Channel.

13 --o0o--

14 MR. LUEDY: And so basically, we're in the
15 current phase of a feasibility study. So we kick off next
16 month with a 12-month -- roughly 12-month feasibility
17 study for a Pier S shoreline enhancement project. And so
18 this right now looks like about three components. So this
19 is an enhancement or retrofit existing seawall, which you
20 see pictured here. Then raising the rock dike to the
21 north and west, along the shoreline there, closer as you
22 approach the boundary of Port of Los Angeles.

23 And then again that, we have to account for
24 that -- the potential inundation at the electrical
25 substation. We see this as a potential short-term element

1 of our feasibility study. That study could easily come
2 back and show us that, you know, by enhancing the seawall,
3 we protect the backland assets and it may not be an issue.
4 But as those projects move forward, as development and
5 construction occurs, then we may want to do some
6 temporary, or maybe even permanent, solutions around that
7 substation.

8 And so at this point, we're looking at probably
9 about 3.5 million in costs. But I suspect that that will
10 go above. And this photo here on the right here will show
11 kind of a very simple design of what we propose for that
12 seawall.

13 --o0o--

14 MR. LUEDY: And then this just shows our -- the
15 potential for a temporary or a permanent solution there at
16 the substation. So we determined that Tiger Dams is a
17 temporary solution would be best, and then maybe a
18 cantilevered wall, reinforced concrete wall. And again,
19 these are just planning -- the numbers you see here in
20 green are planning level cost estimates.

21 --o0o--

22 MR. LUEDY: So that concludes my presentation. I
23 didn't want to take a lot of time discussing all of our
24 adaptation strategies, but really focused on the
25 infrastructural enhancements we might see.

1 CHAIRPERSON YEE: Thank you very much for the --
2 for your presentation.

3 Questions, Commissioners?

4 Great.

5 Yes, Commissioner Kounalakis.

6 COMMISSIONER KOUNALAKIS: Actually, can I just --
7 can I just confirm, from what I just saw, that primarily
8 this is enhancing the seawall?

9 MR. LUEDY: For that specific part of Pier S,
10 certainly that would be the approach. We would do a
11 seawall enhancement to protect the shoreline there and
12 then all of the critical infrastructure behind it.

13 COMMISSIONER KOUNALAKIS: Okay. And so when --
14 when you think about other assets adjacent to you --

15 MR. LUEDY: Um-hmm.

16 COMMISSIONER KOUNALAKIS: -- is it your
17 estimation, just having gone through this process --
18 because I'll tell you this is one of the first ones I've
19 seen. I know we're going to hear from others. But just
20 to conceptualize, what is the most likely way forward to
21 protect our coast, our seawalls most likely --
22 particularly in ports, but also in heavily urbanized
23 area -- areas, is that likely going to be the way forward?

24 MR. LUEDY: I would suspect so. When I talk to
25 other colleagues at other California seaports, I think we

1 all agree that we don't have that option to retreat. You
2 know, managed retreat is just not an option for us. Beach
3 nourishment obviously not an option in an industrial
4 seaport. And so in terms of the harbor boundary -- harbor
5 district boundary --

6 COMMISSIONER KOUNALAKIS: Um-hmm.

7 MR. LUEDY: -- which is the geographic scope of
8 this project, infrastructural enhancements, seawall --
9 seawall enhancements and upgrades really are the best
10 solution for us going forward to protect the assets that
11 we have.

12 COMMISSIONER KOUNALAKIS: And as you were doing
13 this exercise, did you get any sense of how high you can
14 go before your ability to protect these assets is limited?

15 MR. LUEDY: Yeah, we did address that. And, in
16 fact, on the slide here, when you see at the schematic on
17 the bottom right here --

18 COMMISSIONER KOUNALAKIS: Um-hmm.

19 MR. LUEDY: -- this we designed -- this was so 15
20 feet above mean -- mean lower low water. This design
21 accommodates a 36-inch scenario plus 100-year storm surge,
22 which we see as the 2070 to 20 -- roughly 2100 --

23 COMMISSIONER KOUNALAKIS: Okay.

24 MR. LUEDY: -- sort of planning horizon. So it
25 really takes us closer to end of century, and to your

1 point, would hopefully address that. And then, of course,
2 we would redevelop over time, and so that area of the port
3 could very well be redeveloped and 2070 or beyond.

4 COMMISSIONER KOUNALAKIS: Sure. Thank you.

5 MR. LUEDY: Sure.

6 CHAIRPERSON YEE: Thank you, Commissioner. Thank
7 you very much for the presentation.

8 Okay. Next, we will have Philip Gibbons from
9 Port of San Diego followed by Adrienne Newbold.

10 EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: Chair Yee, as Mr.
11 Gibbons is making his way --

12 CHAIRPERSON YEE: Please.

13 EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: -- may I just add a
14 couple of comments, please --

15 CHAIRPERSON YEE: Of course, yes.

16 EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: -- especially to
17 Commissioner Kounalakis's questions about protective
18 structures and what's most appropriate where. As -- as we
19 have acknowledged, I think, for a number of years at Ocean
20 Protection Council at State Lands, working with the
21 Coastal Commission on their sea level rise guidance
22 document as well, the entire coast of California is
23 obviously so dynamic and there are unique individual
24 sections and pockets that are going to require a very
25 unique approach.

1 And what fits for certain ports -- excuse,
2 portions of Port of Long Beach isn't necessarily going to
3 be the right fit for other sections of the coast. And I'm
4 hoping Mr. Gibbons will talk a little bit about the Port
5 of San Diego. Some examples that they are pursuing,
6 initiatives, in terms of being a very complex waterfront
7 that has active industrial and shipping activities,
8 obviously activities with the Navy, but also kind of open
9 bay areas with natural habitat, and a lot of tourism and
10 public access elements.

11 And so I think one of the takeaways is that --
12 that we are coming away with, as well as talking with our
13 grantees, and other partners in our State family is one
14 size does not fit all, and really to go through that
15 analytical approach at -- for each area of a port, or a
16 harbor, or a waterfront, and really look at what are the
17 best adaptation strategies, and so going through that
18 analytical approach for each portion. And so you just
19 don't try to fit a one size to every situation there is.

20 Certainly, in our most industrialized commercial
21 ports, hard infrastructure to help protect against sea
22 level rise is one of the most common approaches. But I
23 think we should also have an open mind and be innovative
24 in terms of trying to encourage innovative adaptation
25 strategies. And I think you might hear of one of those,

1 if I could just tee that up for you, Mr. Gibbons.

2 So I just wanted to highlight that as well.

3 We're learning so much all the time --

4 CHAIRPERSON YEE: Right. Right.

5 EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: -- about how to do
6 things better.

7 CHAIRPERSON YEE: Good. Thank you.

8 Thank you.

9 MR. GIBBONS: Sure. So again, this is Phil
10 Gibbons with the Port of San Diego. And I think you stole
11 my thunder.

12 (Laughter.)

13 MR. GIBBONS: But I'll provide some examples, if
14 I can. But I did want to start with saying that this is
15 really an important report for us. And to be fully
16 transparent, it's important to me. I'm biased, because I
17 spend two to three years of my life working on this thing.
18 But I will say, it probably was one of the most
19 fascinating, intellectual pursuits that I undertook for
20 this period.

21 You know, when -- it's probably clichéd to say
22 nowadays that climate change and sea level rise is an
23 existential threat. But when we think about our public
24 trust resources, when we think about State tideland areas
25 that are low lying, they are at threat. And it's our job

1 as one of your trustees to make sure that we are
2 protecting the Public Trust uses. And so going through
3 this endeavor was, I think, foundational for us.

4 I will say though it's definitely not the end of
5 the story. You know, doing this vulnerability assessment
6 essentially, thinking about adaptation strategies in 2019,
7 it's going to change into the future.

8 And I think one of the most important things that
9 our report outlines is a process for how we're going to
10 think about sea level rise moving forward, and that it is
11 adaptive all the time. I mean, not just the strategies
12 themselves, but even our mindsets. And thinking about
13 vulnerability, thinking about new protections as the
14 science changes is going to be really important for us.

15 So there are a lot of next steps for us. And
16 it -- as I said, this is not the only vulnerability
17 assessment we're going to be doing. We're committing to
18 do these every five years or so and setting up the
19 infrastructure internally to do that.

20 Moving forward, as I keep saying, there's lots at
21 of things that we're going to do. I think, as we've
22 talked about now, there really -- you know, our bays, and
23 harbors, and ports are really unique environments, as
24 we've heard. We have a lot of different uses. A lot of
25 those are coastal-dependent uses, our marine terminals,

1 our shipyards, our boat repair facilities, even marinas.

2 And as we've heard, a lot of those are going to
3 require seawalls and hard infrastructure. I mean, they
4 belong on the coast. They can't move away from the coast.
5 They need to be protected in place. But I think there are
6 opportunities for natural and nature-based solutions,
7 particularly in San Diego Bay, where we have a variety of
8 uses around the bay.

9 So just to share a couple of things that we're
10 working on right now, we're working with a company called
11 EConcrete through our blue incubator program at the Port.
12 And what these are are like concrete tide pools that we
13 can put into the revetment. And the goal of that is to
14 enhance the habitat value of that revetment while
15 supporting the structural integrity of that shoreline.

16 We're in the process right now of putting those
17 in. Hopefully, they'll be installed during the spring.
18 And then we're going to go through about two years of
19 testing to see how those do.

20 We've also been designing living shorelines
21 oyster reefs in San Diego Bay, which is sort of a hybrid
22 nature-based solution. It has infrastructure in it. We
23 seed it with these oysters. And they will grow on it.
24 And that could act as a structure that can attenuate the
25 wave activity and hopefully lessen our erosion along a

1 shoreline.

2 There's some permitting problems with those. I
3 think the permit process needs to catch up, needs to adapt
4 as well to this topic. And so we're -- we're hopefully
5 going to have something like that put into the south part
6 of our bay.

7 I did want to highlight too that we do a lot of
8 restoration in San Diego Bay. We've restored hundreds of
9 acres of salt marsh in the south part of San Diego Bay
10 with a lot of partners, Fish and Wildlife, et cetera. So
11 we do have the capacity internally to do this type of
12 work. There's lots of other areas around the bay that can
13 be restored. And I think, you know, we're trying to think
14 holistically about how we can restore sections of the bay
15 with these more natural solutions.

16 I do think that, again, when we think about this
17 in-a-bay context, especially for our public access and
18 recreation, we administer over 22 parks around the bay,
19 miles of public promenades, and walking trails. And I
20 think we do need to think seriously about how we're going
21 to protect those. I mean, right now, today, those parks
22 are in place, because they do have hard infrastructure.
23 They have revetment that protects them. Without that
24 revetment, they probably would erode into the bay.

25 Now, we're starting to evaluate whether we can

1 soften those shorelines a bit. I'm sure in locations
2 the -- those shorelines are overhardened and we can use
3 softer solutions. And we're definitely willing to
4 demonstrate those and practice those. Again, I think that
5 we need to think differently on how we design our
6 shoreline, especially in San Diego Bay.

7 I just want to say -- oh, and I want to say one
8 of the biggest challenges though is really building the
9 internal capacity within our organization. You know,
10 there's people like me who are kind of planners, in a
11 sense, and we understand this. But there's a lot more
12 capacity building that needs to occur, our engineers, our
13 finance people our maintenance folks. You know, people
14 who you may not think are going to play a role in climate
15 adaptation, need to be brought up to speed.

16 And I just want to say, you know, we're willing
17 to work with the State Lands Commission of course, as you
18 go through your next steps. We enjoy our partnership and
19 we're happy to keep talking.

20 Thank you.

21 CHAIRPERSON YEE: Thank you. Thank you very much
22 for the great report. Look forward to our continued work
23 together.

24 Thanks.

25 Yes, Commissioner Kounalakis.

1 COMMISSIONER KOUNALAKIS: Thank you so much. I
2 actually have a question, if you don't mind coming back.
3 So again, it sounds like one of the other alternatives to
4 a seawall is this oyster bed-like enhanced concrete
5 barrier. But it does sound like, ultimately, what the
6 engineering effect would be is to stop erosion and to
7 create some kind of a barrier.

8 So did you analyze the -- the impact and the
9 efficacy of this proposal or any others at different
10 levels of sea level rise. And if you were to sort of
11 think of the vision of this, is it creating barriers like
12 this around the sensitive areas or developed areas,
13 whether it's areas of marsh lands and open space, or
14 whether it's facilities, and is that, again in this case,
15 the most likely way forward is with barriers?

16 MR. GIBBONS: I think it's a really good
17 question. And I think there's going to be different types
18 of solutions for different types of shorelines and
19 different types of uses behind them.

20 A nature-based solution, like an oyster reef, may
21 be a suitable place, where there's habitat behind it. It
22 may be suitable in a place maybe where there is park
23 space. But, of course, when you're trying to protect a
24 marine terminal, the only adaptation strategies that I'm
25 aware of right now probably would be our -- your more

1 hardened infrastructure.

2 Now, our analysis didn't go into the detail where
3 we're actually comparing the different strategies against
4 each other, and seeing what the efficacy would be. That's
5 something that we propose. And actually through our
6 partnership with the Navy, they actually have some really
7 solid guidelines on how one could go through the effort
8 and compare different types of strategies, whether they're
9 hard, whether they're soft.

10 Again, that's part of our next steps is really to
11 understand what are the adaptation strategies that can be
12 utilized almost by a shoreline-by-shoreline analysis to
13 see what can be used.

14 Oh, and if I can just comment on one more thing.
15 You know, right now, the water is already lapping against
16 revetment and hardened infrastructure, you know. So it's
17 not like we have these big sandy beaches in front of us
18 where we have that space. We just don't have that space.

19 So one of the things that I would encourage the
20 State Lands Commission to do is to really help us and work
21 with the trustees to come up with those unique strategies
22 that will be useful in a bay environment. I think a lot
23 more research needs to be done in that space.

24 COMMISSIONER KOUNALAKIS: But generally speaking,
25 a combination of these more natural kinds of barriers, but

1 still barriers and hardened areas, do you think those
2 kinds of improvements can then, you know, be an overall
3 engineering solution to protect against significant sea
4 level rise?

5 MR. GIBBONS: Sure. Yes, I do. I think they can
6 be. And I think there are examples from around the east
7 coast right now where cities, like Boston and New York,
8 are trying to update their waterfronts. And, you know,
9 they're doing sort of a combination, softer solutions and
10 hardened solutions.

11 COMMISSIONER KOUNALAKIS: I guess what I'm saying
12 though is again that they tend to be more barriers. So,
13 for instance, when we think about the potential for
14 flooding in the Sacramento Valley, where I grew up, you
15 think about things like upstream detention as a solution.

16 When you're talking about the ocean, I imagine
17 you can't really think about detention or overflow areas,
18 right? Am I right about that?

19 EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: I got caught up on
20 what's under.

21 Well, I think -- this isn't my expertise, so I
22 might be speaking out of turn, so I'm going to look at Sam
23 and Jen for some help. But in that kind of concept, they
24 are looking at wetlands -- coastal wetlands as a way to
25 help adapt to flooding and inundation. And that sort of

1 way, there's the living shorelines, different types of
2 living shorelines can act in that same sort of way, not
3 from a detention type of aspect --

4 COMMISSIONER KOUNALAKIS: Um-hmm.

5 EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: -- that you're
6 familiar with in the central valley, but more as giving
7 space for sea level rise to occur, flooding to occur, the
8 King tides to occur in a way that does not put
9 infrastructure and assets at risk.

10 COMMISSIONER KOUNALAKIS: But even in a case like
11 that, like creating wetlands, you would probably want to
12 have it elevated maybe, is that -- so that it -- again, it
13 would have sort of a dual purpose to be something of a
14 barrier, but also be habitat. Again, I'm just trying to
15 understand.

16 CHAIRPERSON YEE: Yeah, Rachel or, yeah,
17 Jennifer.

18 SCIENCE POLICY ADVISOR & TRIBAL LIAISON MATTOX:

19 Hi. Jennifer Mattox, Science Advisor. I think
20 Rachel might also be able to speak more eloquently than I.
21 But again, what -- a little bit of what you're talking
22 about is something that we are grappling with, both
23 ourselves and also other agencies -- I know we're down
24 here in L.A., but you know one of -- one of the issues
25 that, for instance, the San Francisco Bay Conservation

1 Development Commission has had to deal with is
2 modifications to their bay plan for their fill -- their
3 bay fill policies, because we do see that in -- we talk a
4 lot about protecting assets, as things like terminal
5 shipyards, things like that.

6 But then there's also protecting things like our
7 ever-shrinking sort of habitat and ecosystem diversity.
8 As the water moves in, we start transitioning the
9 different sort of steps backward -- back, and back, and
10 back, and so we're losing some of that.

11 So you're absolutely right, there is a place to
12 talk about fill, and sediment, and raising levels in order
13 to keep certain shallow subtidal or intertidal wetlands
14 from basically drowning to keep habitat available for
15 nesting and feeding coastal birds, things like that.

16 But, you know, yes, there's sort of that
17 impoundment, softening, can-it-help aspect. But
18 there's -- some of this stuff, there is -- there's no
19 place for them to go. You know, you can't relocate it to
20 the other side of the freeway, right? So it really is
21 that sort of all options are on the table.

22 And we did work a few years ago with the
23 California fourth climate change assessment team, and did
24 some technical review, and participated on a TAC for
25 talking about natural coastal infrastructure, and looking

1 to develop, and I believe it's still planned for this to
2 rollout, at some point, is sort of decision support tool
3 to help people look at what's right in what circumstance
4 and what location.

5 So almost like keying out through a decision tree
6 what's my situation, what -- and what's -- so choose the
7 most appropriate shoreline, I will say, protection
8 softening, sort of shoreline adaptation. And so that I
9 think could really help.

10 The place that's so -- there's a lot of us who
11 live and breathe this. Living shorelines, natural
12 infrastructure, hybrid solutions, shellfish wave
13 attenuation, that's -- we understand that. But in the
14 bigger world, if you're a coastal homeowner and you don't
15 want your house to fall off the bluff, you just want to
16 slap up that wall as fast as you can. And you know you
17 can get it insured, you know you can get it rated by the
18 actuary, and you know you can say this is going to be my
19 30-year or my 100-year protection.

20 You're going to have folks come in scratching
21 their head. I don't know -- I'm an actuary. I don't know
22 how to rate this shellfish wave attenuator, or this beach
23 nourishment to protect somebody's home on their
24 homeowner's insurance, not to mention that those types of
25 solutions, need to be implemented on a much larger scale

1 than a -- so -- and that's where you start getting into
2 larger regional sort of asset manager, like a port or
3 harbor versus some of the areas of our coast that they're
4 residential and how do we look at those types of things
5 too. That's where I point back to Rachel talking about
6 regional solutions.

7 CHAIRPERSON YEE: Yeah.

8 COMMISSIONER KOUNALAKIS: Thank you very much.

9 CHAIRPERSON YEE: Yeah. Rachel, other thoughts?

10 MS. EHLERS: Yeah. I mean, it's a great
11 question. There are really three options for responding
12 to sea level rise. There's armoring. And the armoring
13 can be hard armoring or soft armoring, when we talk about
14 building up wetlands and, you know, that can kind of serve
15 as sponge, but it's still trying to buffer the waves from
16 going up further.

17 So armoring, accommodating. So saying the water
18 is going to come, let's elevate the building, let's have
19 a -- build it so there's a parking garage on the bottom
20 that can flood. Let's think about bike path along the
21 shore that will be able to flood. And then the third is
22 relocate or move back.

23 So those are the options. There's no kind of
24 holding the ocean behind a dam, the way there is with a
25 river, right? So it's really thinking about those in

1 combination. And as was just noted, if you think about
2 some of the infrastructure that we're going to have to
3 hard armor, like Oakland, San Francisco airports that are
4 right there on the bay. If we're hard armoring those
5 facilities, that water needs to go somewhere.

6 And so thinking regionally about, all right, so
7 if we're going to make the call that that's what we're
8 going to do, protect these facilities, what about those
9 neighboring communities, what are we doing there?

10 Luckily in the bay, we've got a lot of wetlands,
11 where there hasn't been development, partly because of the
12 salt pond. So there is some room for trying to create
13 some sponges there to accommodate some of that water. But
14 along the open coast, it's even more complicated, because
15 you're not all staring at each other the way you are in
16 the bay.

17 So really encouraging you all to think
18 regionally. And if you're going to approve and be okay
19 with a hard armoring, where is that water going to go and
20 what are the other strategies you're going to use in
21 combination with that, because there will be implications.

22 COMMISSIONER KOUNALAKIS: That is really helpful.
23 Thank you so much.

24 Thank you, Madam Chair.

25 CHAIRPERSON YEE: Thank you for the questions.

1 All right. Adrienne Newbold. Welcome.

2 MS. NEWBOLD: Good afternoon, Commissioners and
3 thank you for the opportunity to speak. I'm Adrienne
4 Newbold, the project manager for the AB 691 for the Port
5 of Los Angeles.

6 We submitted our plan in the fall of 2018. And I
7 wanted to just give you a very general overview of our
8 plan. We first started with an asset inventory. The Port
9 of Los Angeles has 7,500 acres and over 270 berths. So it
10 was necessary for us to narrow it down into five major
11 categories. This includes terminals, critical facilities,
12 transportation, including rail and road, and vital
13 bridges, our community assets, and natural habitats.

14 Next, we created the inundation maps for year
15 2030, 2050, a mid-level year for 2100, and a high range
16 for 2100, and also included the hundred-year storm tide on
17 top of those maps.

18 Next, we did a vulnerability assessment. And
19 based on that, we came up with resiliency strategies and
20 prioritized our strategies. From -- since that time,
21 we've implemented our three major categories of
22 resiliency. That includes both governance, initiative,
23 and infrastructure.

24 In terms of governance, we've started updating
25 our policies, including updating -- including sea level

1 rise in our Port Master Plan, which is currently being
2 updated. We're considering sea level rise in our capital
3 funded projects.

4 In terms of initiative, we're continuing to
5 collaborate with all the other California ports, cities,
6 and our tenants.

7 And in terms of infrastructure, we looked at both
8 armoring and accommodating were the most typical
9 resiliency strategies.

10 And we're very similar to the Port of Long Beach,
11 so I won't go into detailed resiliency strategies, but I
12 just wanted to say thank you very much to the State Lands
13 Commission staff. I really appreciate the AB 691 and I
14 look forward to receiving comments and working together in
15 the future.

16 CHAIRPERSON YEE: Thank you very much.

17 MS. NEWBOLD: Thank you.

18 CHAIRPERSON YEE: Questions, members,
19 Commissions?

20 Anything else, Jennifer, on this item?

21 EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: No.

22 CHAIRPERSON YEE: I really appreciate the
23 tremendous expansive thinking about this. Obviously, a
24 work-in-progress on so many fronts. But I'm struck by
25 this whole issue of the economics and how, in some ways,

1 we're constrained with respect to thinking about
2 innovation, because cost is always kind of top of mind.
3 But hopefully, some of the guidance going forward in terms
4 of standardizing analysis can open up some room for
5 additional thinking.

6 Thank you.

7 All right. Commissioners, we will move on to the
8 next item. Item 60 is to consider supporting the federal
9 Regional Ocean Partnership Act that would formalize ocean
10 partnerships with the federal government. And hopefully
11 this is a means to provide more consistent funding and
12 we'll get a report on this.

13 Thank you.

14 EXTERNAL AFFAIRS DIVISION CHIEF PEMBERTON: Thank
15 you, Madam Chair and Commissioners. This item recommends
16 that the Commission take a support position on a pair of
17 federal bills that would formally authorize regional ocean
18 partnerships and provide a funding mechanism. Regional
19 ocean partnerships are an excellent way to manage coastal
20 and ocean resources. In California, the west coast
21 alliance is the alliance for California, Oregon, and
22 Washington. And the State Lands Commission is co-chair,
23 along with the Ocean Protection Council.

24 These two bills introduced this past year would
25 set up a structure, a process for governors to petition

1 for designation, and again funding opportunities that
2 don't exist now.

3 There's no opposition. Both of the bills are
4 still in their house of origin and have widespread support
5 among the existing ocean partnerships and other
6 environmental groups. And so we recommend that the
7 Commission also take a support position on these two
8 bills.

9 CHAIRPERSON YEE: Okay. Very well. Thank you
10 very much for the presentation.

11 Any comments, Commissioners?

12 Hearing none.

13 Is there any public comment on this item?

14 All right. Seeing none.

15 Is there a motion?

16 COMMISSIONER KOUNALAKIS: So moved.

17 CHAIRPERSON YEE: Motion by Commissioner
18 Kounalakis to support the federal partnership act --
19 Regional Ocean Partnership Act.

20 Is there a second?

21 I will -- I will second that motion, yes.

22 And Commissioner Miller abstaining. Okay. All
23 right.

24 With that, without objection, such will be the
25 order. Thank you very much.

1 EXTERNAL AFFAIRS DIVISION CHIEF PEMBERTON: Thank
2 you. The next item, Item 61 is -- is recommending that
3 the Commission sponsor legislative[SIC], in this
4 legislative -- State legislative session to simply repeal
5 obsolete and redundant school lands statutes. School
6 lands are lands that California and other states received
7 at statehood to manage for the benefit of public schools.
8 The grant of school lands happened in 1853. And in
9 assessing the statutes over this past year, we've
10 identified some language enacted in the early 1940s that
11 we think is obsolete and redundant.

12 So we're recommending that that obsolete language
13 be repealed, and also for existing statutes related to
14 what's known as indemnity lands, which are lands that the
15 State didn't receive when it received its school land
16 grants that it still owed. They're kind of scattered
17 throughout different code sections. And we want to gather
18 those together in a unified area.

19 So this is really a noncontroversial code
20 clean-up proposal for our school land statutes. And we
21 recommend that the Commission sponsor this legislation and
22 propose including it in an omnibus bill in the Natural
23 Resources Committee.

24 CHAIRPERSON YEE: Great. Okay. Very well.
25 Thank you.

1 Any comments from Commissioners?

2 Any public comment on this item?

3 Hearing none.

4 Is there a motion?

5 COMMISSIONER KOUNALAKIS: So moved.

6 CHAIRPERSON YEE: Okay. Motion by Commissioner
7 Kounalakis to support -- to sponsor this clean-up
8 legislation.

9 Is there a second?

10 I will second that motion.

11 With Commissioner Miller abstaining, that motion
12 passes. Thank you.

13 EXTERNAL AFFAIRS DIVISION CHIEF PEMBERTON: Thank
14 you. And the last legislative item is Item 62. This
15 relates to the City of Long Beach, the Long Beach Oil
16 Operations. There is significant State liability for the
17 eventual decommissioning and well plug and abandonment
18 cost that the State incurs, primarily through the State
19 Lands Commission. There's a special fund in the State
20 treasury to fund the State's share of liability. It's
21 capped at \$300 million, which at the time it was
22 established, was estimated to be the de -- the abandonment
23 liability cost for the State.

24 Estimates over the years have increased that
25 estimate and now it's around \$900 million, leaving the

1 State with a shortfall of around \$600 million.

2 So we propose that the Commission sponsor
3 legislation this year, that Assembly Member O'Donnell
4 introduced, to lift that cap. And the way that would work
5 is that what the revenue that the State gets through the
6 Long Beach oil operations, we'd be able to divert about
7 two million per month into this fund, which now goes to
8 the general fund. And that would build the fund back up
9 to a point where it was sufficient to fund the
10 Commission's -- the State's liability.

11 CHAIRPERSON YEE: All right. Okay. Thank you.
12 And this is similar to previously sponsored legislation by
13 the Commission.

14 EXTERNAL AFFAIRS DIVISION CHIEF PEMBERTON: Yes.

15 CHAIRPERSON YEE: And I want to thank the
16 administration for its openness to just have discussions
17 around this issue and hopefully we can get to some
18 agreement about some change. But in the meantime, this
19 legislation is before us.

20 Any comments from Commissioners?

21 ACTING COMMISSIONER MILLER: Madam Chair, may I
22 just give --

23 CHAIRPERSON YEE: Please.

24 ACTING COMMISSIONER MILLER: -- some context. So
25 this was put forward by the State Lands Commission as a

1 budget request. It was denied. It was deferred in our
2 process to what's called a spring letter. So just as long
3 as we are all working together, keeping agency in the
4 loop, I think that's a really important aspect to all of
5 these really highly --

6 CHAIRPERSON YEE: Absolutely.

7 ACTING COMMISSIONER MILLER: -- pieces of
8 legislation.

9 So I -- we really appreciate that.

10 Thank you.

11 EXTERNAL AFFAIRS DIVISION CHIEF PEMBERTON:

12 Absolutely.

13 CHAIRPERSON YEE: Absolutely. Thank you.

14 Any comments from the public on this?

15 Okay. Hearing none.

16 Is there a motion?

17 COMMISSIONER KOUNALAKIS: So moved.

18 CHAIRPERSON YEE: Motion by Commissioner
19 Kounalakis. I will second that motion.

20 Commissioner Miller abstaining. And thank you,
21 Commissioner Miller for the comments. And, yes, we will
22 definitely all be coordinating and having our discussions
23 move forward together with the administration and with
24 agency.

25 With out objection, that motion carries.

1 Ms. Lucchesi, what is our next order?

2 EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: Technically, we have
3 another public comment time period, but we have not
4 received any public comment slips.

5 So at this point, we can move forward with closed
6 session.

7 CHAIRPERSON YEE: All right. Very well. Thank
8 you. Thank you to members of the public who have joined
9 us today. We are now going to adjourn into closed
10 session. And we ask the members of the public to please
11 clear the room.

12 Thank you.

13 EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: I'm sorry, Chair
14 Yee. We actually don't need to clear the room. We have a
15 room to go to.

16 CHAIRPERSON YEE: Oh, we do. Okay. You all may
17 stay. We will clear the room.

18 (Laughter.)

19 CHAIRPERSON YEE: We will exit.

20 Thank you.

21 (Off record: 4:03 p.m.)

22 (Thereupon the meeting recessed
23 into closed session.)

24 (Thereupon the meeting reconvened
25 open session.)

1 (On record: 4:14 p.m.)

2 CHAIRPERSON YEE: All set. Okay. Thank you.

3 We will now reconvene in open session. The
4 Commission met in closed session.

5 Ms. Lucchesi, anything to report out of closed
6 session?

7 EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: Not at this point.

8 CHAIRPERSON YEE: Okay. Thank you very much.
9 Thank you, all. Thank you, Commissioners.

10 With that, this meeting is adjourned.

11 Thank you.

12 (Thereupon the California State Lands
13 Commission meeting adjourned at 4:14 p.m.)

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 C E R T I F I C A T E O F R E P O R T E R

2 I, JAMES F. PETERS, a Certified Shorthand
3 Reporter of the State of California, do hereby certify:

4 That I am a disinterested person herein; that the
5 foregoing California State Lands Commission meeting was
6 reported in shorthand by me, James F. Peters, a Certified
7 Shorthand Reporter of the State of California;

8 That the said proceedings was taken before me, in
9 shorthand writing, and was thereafter transcribed to the
10 best of my ability, under my direction, by
11 computer-assisted transcription.

12 I further certify that I am not of counsel or
13 attorney for any of the parties to said meeting nor in any
14 way interested in the outcome of said meeting.

15 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand
16 this 9th day of March, 2020.

17
18
19 
20
21

22 JAMES F. PETERS, CSR
23 Certified Shorthand Reporter
24 License No. 10063
25