

Archived: Monday, June 28, 2021 4:06:5 PM

From: Alison Madden

Sent: Mon, 14 Jun 2021 01:46:24

To: Lucchesi, Jennifer@SLC; Boggiano, Reid@SLC; Kershen, Andrew@SLC; Lunetta, Kim@SLC

Subject: Fwd: Fw: Letter to council members re: East of 101, Docktown, Inner Harbor, etc. - not for lawyer referral and non responsive feedback

Sensitivity: Normal

Attention: This email originated from outside of SLC and should be treated with extra caution.

SLC, et al.

This is for your information and I would like to request that it be added to the June SLC meeting public record.

Would you please also forward it to the commissioners. Thank you also for replacing the landing page photos to the current Port, I believe the former photo was US Army Corps so it's understandable to have used it, it was just from the 90s or early 2000s, thank you very much for attending to that!

Regards,
Alison

Subject: Fw: Letter to council members re: East of 101, Docktown, Inner Harbor, etc. - not for lawyer referral and non responsive feedback
To: Ali Madden

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: alison madden

To: CLK-Yessika Dominguez <ydominguez@redwoodcity.org>; 4. City Clerk <paguilar@redwoodcity.org>; GRP-City Council <council@redwoodcity.org>; Mary Eleonor Ignacio <eignacio@redwoodcity.org>; <>

Sent: Sunday, June 13, 2021, 02:48:23 PM PDT

Subject: Fw: Letter to council members re: East of 101, Docktown, Inner Harbor, etc. - not for lawyer referral and non responsive feedback

Dear Clerk,

Would you pls put this into the public record for tomorrow's meeting? And ensure it is passed on to all council members?

Thank you!
Alison

From: alison madden <>

To: GRP-City Council <council@redwoodcity.org>; Dawn & Dan Slanker <>; Mary Eleonor Ignacio <eignacio@redwoodcity.org>; Ali Madden <>

Sent: Sunday, June 13, 2021, 02:48:23 PM PDT

Subject: Letter to council members re: East of 101, Docktown, Inner Harbor, etc. - not for lawyer referral and non responsive feedback

Dear Council Members,

This email is long but pls don't "TLDR" it. It is not sent for referral to the City Attorney or Manager, it concerns policy items for YOU.

1. The Cal. Relocation Assistance Act, or Law ("CRAL", as it is colloquially referred to), and Inverse Condemnation ("IC") lawsuit is set for Phase 1 on Aug. 2, 2021.

2. In the course of discovery for the CRAL/IC lawsuit, both Karen Frostrom of the San Diego based consumer and plaintiff Thorsnes Bartolotta law firm, as well as myself, have conducted discovery including depositions.

3. Both myself and Ms. Frostrom deposed Ms. Diaz, the City Manager of Redwood City, and Ms. Diaz was not aware, as of my depo of her on May 27, 2021 that "IC" was even at issue in the 17CIV05387 lawsuit. IC is a private lawsuit of a citizen against the government when there's been a taking but the government didn't do its own "eminent domain" or "takings" process. The IC thus is the flip side of the 5th Amendment takings issue.

4. The lawsuit is before the Hon. Judge Marie S. Weiner, of the Superior Court of Cal., San Mateo County, in Dept. 2,

2nd floor of the 400 County Center Superior Court "Hall of Justice" building.

5. What makes something CRAL and IC is whether it is a "public project" undertaken by a public entity.

6. (a) The removal of 100% residential liveaboards, (b) the election "not" to run Docktown as a going concern for nearly 10 years, (c) the election to allow docks, homes and slips go into disrepair is (i) legal "waste", a cause of action for allowing an asset go into disrepair, (ii) a breach of fiduciary duties under the public trust and (iii) overwhelming evidence that the City is "closing Docktown" and not just "eliminating residential use".

7. We also deposed Reid Boigianno of the State Lands Commission (SLC), who admitted that the # of residential liveaboards remaining at Docktown is consistent with past SLC practice to allow "safety and security" presence at a marina. SLC, like BCDC, allows this and even "requires" that the liveaboards be spread through the marina to maximize the safety and security default of the presence of the residential liveaboards.

7A. In addition to the City's conduct since 2012/2013 when it pretty much forced Docktown Inc. and Fred Earnhardt to leave, and for the city to take over, the City engaged the SLC and asked the SLC to participate in the Inner Harbor task force. That invitation was referenced in the 2016 Berkeley meeting by Ms. Pemberton who stated the 2012/2013 time frame and the intent to "redevelop the waterfront area and look at relocating Docktown" (a public purpose). The Inner Harbor Task Force ensued under a Specific or Precise Plan that was never completed. However, it was a professional, diligent and public process, and the task force members deserved for their views and recommendations to have been heard and put into place. They recommended keeping Docktown and ADDING another marina in Ferrari Pond. Both marinas could have had multiple uses - recreational, commercial and residential) (Ferrari being out of the public trust and thus potential 100% floating homes, and Docktown having some # as well. At a minimum, there was decades to transition, no one was demanding urgency.

8. There is no legislation or rule, or policy, or AG opinion or "any" other source that says that the "safety and security" component is, or must be, a "very small #" of "moving vessels" etc. Nor is it capped or limited at 10% for SLC, like BCDC enforces. The driving consideration is the nature of the marina, its size and configuration (matrix vs. "string" of slips), location, whether docks are locked etc. Owl Harbor is only one example, many liveaboards are present in this Delta marina.

9. The decision to eliminate 100% residential use, to not allow the # that remains to stay for "safety and security", the abandonment of Docktown to looters and the ravages of time and the tides, while not operating the marina, and getting a quote for the cost of its removal, is all overwhelming evidence that the City is clearing Docktown because it wants to, not because it has to.

10. The # of break ins would not have occurred had you had (a) security and (b) all of us spread through the marina.

11. We have recently briefed to Judge Weiner for a stay in UD that you, Redwood City, were not authorized to take ANY step in furtherance of your public project without first (a) doing a CRAL plan, (b) by an authorized source (in house or outside firm/provider) that (c) references the General Plan and Housing Element and (d) involves participation of the public; and (e) expressly states the relo to be provided (including the displacement home and/or rent benefit payments) and (f) clearly states where these are coming from (which fund, etc.). You did not do ANY of this and the UDs will be dismissed with prejudice via either Motion to Strike Complaint or Demurrer. We will get our attorney fees.

12. Had you not filed UDs, the boats could have moved around to provide the security needed.

13. Also you allowed auctions to individuals for cents on the \$. These people were inexperienced and have damaged docks both in Redwood City at Docktown on Redwood Creek, as well as in Marin.

14. Here, a man named Dietrich, you allowed to buy up to 5 homes apparently. He appears to have moved one, the former "Heys" house, it is huge. It broke docks in Marin on a Creek behind a shopping center, which has one liveaboard slip and other non liveaboards. So much damage was done to the dock Dietrich had to tie the home in the creek, ostensibly at a piling, and everyone except the one liveaboard had to leave, and these others were evicted. That huge home then broke free from the piling and drifted loose and free in the waterway, crashing into docks and boats.

15. He is lucky if he does not get charges by the Marin D.A. (who I used to work for in law school as an aside). He and you, Redwood City, are lucky if you don't get lawsuits by people seeking damages. Redwood City sold huge assets to people with little to no experience, and as clearly foreseeable, massive carnage has occurred.

16. This carnage includes that a DPW in Redwood City appears to have had his leg broken, or nearly so, and was taken away in an ambulance in March or April of this very year, 2021. The DPW workers came out because the small yellow home (maybe Richard Aldridge's former home), broke free for a second time in Redwood Creek. This is because your people don't know how and where to dock and tie and secure these homes. They must be on the

cement pilings, with good docks, tight lines and supported by "not" removing all the structure of the boats in the slips and at the docks. Tides are harder on empty marinas than full ones that provide stability.

17. The yellow home apparently was bought by a man named "Anj", or Anju? This person was then rushed to move it out, in just May or June 2021, and they crossed the bay carelessly. The ferry created tides/waves near Treasure Island and destabilized the home, and it had to be cut loose and crashed into Treasure Island. This is reminiscent of the carnage of Pete's Harbor where people were made to tow and move non working boats on a short timeframe.

18. In addition to the Heys and Aldridge debacles, for which individuals and government entities may indeed come after Redwood City for criminal negligence, recklessness and certainly participatory contributing negligence, the former "Chartain" home was towed out of Redwood Creek away from Docktown. It could have torque'd the police boat, you put their lives in danger. It was not properly moved. It sank at the Port docks (across from Muni and Spinnaker and adjacent to the old Stanford Rowing complex). You, Redwood City, caused the careless loss of a home that you spent nearly \$700K of taxpayer money on. It tipped and sank and remained submerged for days if not a week. You then, Redwood City, paid a salvage diver likely 10s of 1000's if not \$100K to dive and rip it apart IN THE WATER, and throw it onto the upland in chunks that were then disposed of. Totally wasteful carnage for a designer home that was lovingly built. It NEVER had to be moved, nor should it have been moved. We reached out to you "urgently" to put it back. When it was moved it buckled the docks, which are now still damages. When you moved it, it put PD lives in danger, and then it sank and was dismantled and polluted the water.

19. All of the above carnage is respecting 3 boats (Heys, Aldridge and Chartain). Many others were crushed or moved under sketchy circumstances, putting lives in danger. The Heys home is still putting people in danger.

19A. "ALL" of the above was news to Ms. Diaz. There appears to be a real gap in communication. Moreover, some of the Dietrich and Anj moving boats referenced above (i.e. moving them from closer to 101 where there are cement pilings, to the docks more northerly that do not have cement pilings) appears to have been done because Ted Hannig complained. The old McDonnell super large home was next to me, breaking the dock and threatening to crush my \$350K Higgins designer home. The Bohemia has been valued at \$250-350K depending on its location, and is a WW2 ship to shore vessel with a designer cabin on top. Dietrich's home nearly broke free, broke docks and would have crushed my home and killed anyone inside. It likely would have harmed Bill Fleming, an elderly man who lives in his sailboat upstream northerly. It took Dan Slanker over a MONTH of activity to get TK to agree it must be moved closer to 101, and all efforts were to put it in the 70s slips. This would have put Nina in danger of death or injury. It got moved to a slip with a cement piling.

19B. This push of Mr. Hannig appears to be because he thinks the Mayor is his "friend". The document production revealed an email saying he did not know if he was writing more as "friend" or citizen. Mr. Hannig does not have the right to leverage friendships to put people's lives in danger. Enough with that troll. He is putting people's homes and lives in danger by advocating moving vessels to the non-cement-piling slips. Moreover, Ms. Diaz could not identify any reason to complain about the brown home being put in the 70s (formerly owned by Mr. Germano), which Mr. Hannig complained about. Someone also called about the "doll house" listing. None of these would be in disrepair if the City had handled all of this in accordance with the most basic competency in property and marina management.

20. It has come to my attention that Joe Lemon, who operates the Sausalito Shipyards and Marina (former Arques Shipyard) offered to go to SLC and BCDC and work with the City to keep people and homes intact and seek waivers for moving additional homes to Marin, and was rebuffed by the City Attorney and treated poorly by the City Attorney and Manager's office, and/or DPW. He couldn't believe the lack of willingness to try to avoid the human and environmental carnage that did come to pass.

21. All of the above boils down to this: (a) the UD's were wrongly filed, as they were an act in furtherance of a public project that was done without "first" adopting a CRAL plan; (b) both CRAL and IC will be proven at trial, as this is clearly a public project, to fully remove Docktown, all uses, the docks and slips and marina, for overall planning purposes; (c) you will owe CRAL and/or IC damages, which is a replacement home in the area, or rent for 42 months, in the area, for a comparable home; yet (d) the SLC allows liveaboards for safety and security so they NEVER said 100% have to go, certainly not for no CRAL or IC payments, and certainly not within 1-2 years of their DAG Vogel informal advice of counsel letter (not an AG Opinion). Although more years are now down the creek, so to speak, they were speaking on decades of time, not months or short years.

22. Ms. Frostrom and I also deposed the expert that the City produced on CRAL. She had not reviewed the housing element, nor the General Plan. She thought it "seemed" to be code enforcement or landlord-tenant issues, but could cite no code. She was unaware of public trust law and the unique nature of public trust land and the dual "own/lease" nature of floating homes.

23. In the documents produced by the City, there was many duplicates, logos, blank pages, etc. The production was a real pile. Sifting through it there was a reference to Alison Madden seeking legislation re: allowing liveaboards through Sen. Becker's office, but this is not true. I spoke to his aides about PRC 6009.1(c)(13), which is a section of the public resources code, that the City appears to believe prohibits independent ports. The email from Ms. Diaz

reporting to Council also referred to me speaking at Port meetings, and this was on the same Port issue, that the PRC does not have preclusive effect over local City and County charters, in which (under the home rule doctrine in the Cal. Constitution, which provides for Charter cities and counties) the VOTERS, the VOTERS adopt and create independent Port authorities. I am not seeking overall legislation re; liveaboards at Docktown at the present moment, although I would be open (along with others) to a "De Anza" approach of a single sentence that says "these people can stay for 38 years" (that was the one line, maybe two lines, of De Anza that gave them that timeframe, the remainder of a 50 year lease term). We seek 50 years, renewable at option, like Pete had in the 1983 Pete's Harbor legislation. Or at least to go to the table.

24. None of this email would be necessary if Redwood City were not so hostile to its voters and taxpayers. Redwood City fought tooth and nail the jurisdiction suit 17CIV00316, then on Appeal A156288, and all that happened was that REDWOOD CITY pretty much fought for the right of Redwood City to have paid Ted Hannig \$1.5 million. Shameful. The issue of an "independent Port", which was the basis for the A156288 unpublished ruling, is only "law of the case" (that case), it does not even apply to ANY other assertion that the Council has overreached the Port, thus violating the Charter.

25. The One Marina 10 acre Peninsula Lake is state public trust land. It was licensed by the COUNTY to a teachers' union to build Peninsula Marina (TMI was the Teachers Maritime, Inc. or some such name). TMI operated the marina until the early 2000s, when it had to vacate for the Pauls Corp. and One Marina, which (Pauls Corp.) ripped out the 400 slip marina and the lake stood empty until 2013. In the meantime, from the adoption by Council in about the year 2002 of the Marina Shores "P" planned community development, until 2013, the following happened: (a) the voters voted down the 2002 "P" Ordinance in 2003-04, (b) the Pauls Corp had paid likely \$30M to \$50M if not more for the two "One Marina" and "Blu/Pete's" parcels, (c) the market crashed in 2008, (d) the new General Plan was done in 2010, calling East of 101 off Whipple "Waterfront Residential", and (e) in 2013 they started building One Marina (so the 400 slip marina was gone over 10 years, as well as the breakfast cafe that was there), and (f) in 2012, they came for Pete's, in a sneak attack with Ted Hannig lying to the planning dept. to get the "Blu" development on the planning commission agenda. This lie was attested to by Jennifer Luchessi and Shelli Haaf, who stated that Ted lied when he told Blake Lyon that he had visited SLC and "filed a form" and "paid a fee" to secure their approval. He did no such thing. In fact, the SLC, Ms. Haaf and Luchessi, advised they had never paid rent nor had insurance, were out of compliance, and had to pay \$500K to come current.

26. Thereafter Ms. Uccelli hired the Singer PR firm and Mr Adam Alberti, who engaged in a concerted PR campaign to spin doctor the threats and lies that the marina/harbor harbormaster and Ms. Uccelli had engaged in. We kept the inner harbor and slowed down and scaled back the development. We discovered the ownership by POST and then US Fish & Wildlife, of the road in (a nonexclusive easement that Pete wrongly called "Uccelli Blvd." (it has been Leslie Salt land, they gave a non exclusive easement, then sold it (with more land) to POST, who then donated it to the Don Edwards preserve.

27. All of this backstory is relevant to ALL of what has happened East of 101. The hubris of the Pauls Corp. and Mr. and Mrs. Uccelli created a railroad of a situation - marinas were ripped out that should be there, there should be a waterfront area that is mixed use all over, not "Waterfront Residential". ALL residential should have BMR and include low- to very low-income housing. ALL marinas (Blu inner, Bair, One Marina, Docktown, BIAC, Muni, Port, Westpoint) should have liveaboards and this should remain in the housing element of the General Plan, of course with sufficient upland low- to very-low income.

28. The entire area East of 101, whether off Woodside/Seaport, off Maple or off Whipple, should be mixed use, and include BMR, liveaboards, affordable upland units, and be a Precise or Specific Plan area. At a MINIMUM, a community process should be occurring to have transparency into land swaps, land acquisitions, upland parks, and Docktown should REMAIN. Alameda and Oakland have marinas along their developed upland, with all uses (park, bike lanes, Bay Trail, upland condos/apts, yacht clubs, marina, restaurants, etc.) ALL of Oakland and Alameda has this mixed use.

29. Specifically along Redwood Creek along the 1500 block of Maple, you should have a "Historic District". There is almost nothing more historic about Redwood City than this area, you should have markers, the tank, plaques, a "walk", etc.

30. IT IS NOT GOOD ENOUGH WHAT YOU ARE DOING RIGHT NOW AND HOW YOU ARE DOING IT.

31. It is "not" good enough to leave the public out, to have closed door meetings with County negotiators, to not have the Inner Harbor Task Force reconstituted, or some other public, transparent process. That Task Force was professional and cooperative. It had recommendations and stakeholders, the public represented. You MUST do something similar again here. A river walk, an upland park, the tank, historic plaques, a history interactive center, so much could be done here. And the remaining homes and boats can stay, some are very nice, others can be upgraded or swapped out. River businesses (kayak, cafe) can occur.

CONCLUSION:

The above is mainly informative. At a minimum, stop evictions. Allow us to be moved throughout the creek to

minimize damage and break-ins. Allow our nonprofit to run the marina, so we can fix docks. Allow commercial and recreational use, and usage for all public access that makes money that is put BACK INTO the trust. Act with due care with regard to forcing people to relocate large homes, there is real danger of death or disability. Keep the ones that are here, here. Allow the ones languishing out there to return for commercial and allowable residential use. Work with legislators to reaffirm that PRC 6009.1(c)(13) does NOT invalidate Redwood City's Charter and Port Dept. Stop kow-towing to troll Hannig who has no decency and non expertise in these issues. He advocates for the locked, "HOA" controlled oversight of a 10 acre public lake. We are going after that next, and shall prevail by brining in the AG and SLC to seek declaratory relief over the ownership and nature of Peninsula Lake and to have the AG state its position whether PRC 6009.1(c)(13) invalidates all Ports statewide (lol-not).

Do the right thing.

Thanks,
Alison

Archived: Tuesday, June 29, 2021 7:46:01 AM

From: Francis Coats

Sent: Sun, 27 Jun 2021 15:28:19 +0000ARC

To: CSLC CommissionMeetings

Subject: Lists of Former State School and Indemnity Lands Subject to the Public Right to Fish; Public Access at Fremont Weir.

Sensitivity: Normal

Attention: This email originated from outside of SLC and should be treated with extra caution.

(PUBLIC COMMENT FOR MEETING OF JUNE 29, 2021)

I spoke about these two issues at the Commission's meeting in October 2018, and little has happened, other than the Commission's lending its name and money to the litigation of a quiet title / Implied Indemnity lawsuit to establish a public right of access at Martin's Beach, so I will bring them up again.

LISTS OF FORMER SCHOOL AND INDEMNITY LANDS SUBJECT TO THE PUBLIC RIGHT TO FISH:

The State Lands Commission should make available to the public the lists of school and indemnity lands prepared in connection with the offering of the lands for a sale or lease. These lands are either still owned by the state or were transferred out after November 8, 1910, and so were required to be subject to a reservation in the people of the absolute right to fish thereupon under section 25 article I of the California Constitution. The express reservation was apparently included in every patent of school or indemnity lands issued after November 15, 1910. The Commission, as trustee for the people of these reserved rights to fish, is sitting on existing lists of a million acres or more of state-owned land and formerly state-owned land open for public fishing. The Commission has these lists. It would take little or no effort to make them available to the public. In 2018 Commission staff said it would be difficult to compile these lists. It would not be difficult. They already exist. They were compiled by the staff of the commission and its predecessors at the time the lands were being offered for sale.

PUBLIC ACCESS TO THE SACRAMENTO RIVER, WEST END OF THE FREMONT WEIR:

In the spring of 2014 the Edson family blocked public access to a portion of the Sacramento River near the Fremont Weir and the Fremont Weir Wildlife Area by gating and posting no-trespassing signs on an easement for public road which had been reserved by the state when it transferred the underlying land to the Edson's predecessors in 1978; and which had been open for public use for 35 years since 1978. This was an area heavily used for public fishing for at least 35 years. I don't see how the Commission, if it feels obligated to pursue the protection of public access to public trust lands at Martins Beach and Hollister Ranch by esoteric theories and difficult facts, can not feel obligated to defend the public's right to fish on the Sacramento River with a plain language reservation of an easement for a public road providing access to the most navigable river in the state flowing over a state-owned river bed (in this case purchased, as the river was relocated to the current route as part of the construction of the Yolo Bypass in 1918 – 1924.)

Fishing from the river bank is a popular pastime, and a source of food, for people, particularly for people who are from disadvantaged groups.

Francis Coats; ; (

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows 10

Archived: Tuesday, June 29, 2021 12:58:15 PM

From: [sabrina brennan](#)

Sent: Tue, 29 Jun 2021 19:47:10

To: Lucchesi, Jennifer SLC; CSLC Commission Meetings

c: Pemberton, Sheri SLC; arrett, Jamie SLC; Fran oia, Al SLC; Schroeder, Marlene SLC; Connor, Colin SLC; riggs, Pamela SLC; lac mon, Seth SLC; Crun, Warren SLC; Sim in, re SLC; ugsch, rian SLC; ato, race SLC; Foster, enneth SLC; udson, Cheryl SLC; Ramire, essica SLC; Matto, Jennifer SLC; Abby olden

Subject: ender discrimination at Ma eric s in San Mateo County: Public Comment: June 29, 2021 SLC Meeting

Sensitivity: Normal

Attention: This email originated from outside of SLC and should be treated with extra caution.

I'm Sabrina Brennan and I represent Surf Equity and Sport Equity.

It's our understanding that Mavericks beach and tidelands are managed by the California State Land Commission. At your Feb 2021 meeting, I provided you with a [presentation](#) about on going gender discrimination at Mavericks in San Mateo County.

Over the past five months I brought the Coastal Commission regular updates on gender discrimination at Mavericks.

At their May meeting,

I provided results from the

[2021 Mavericks Surf Awards](#) contest. It was sad news for women athletes, surf

contest organizers Jeff Clark and Chris Cuvelier selected 2 women finalists and 14 men finalists and prize money was awarded to 4 men and only 1 women.

In 2021, the State Lands Commission and the Coastal Commission neglected to protect women athletes from gender discrimination within State Lands jurisdiction and authority and within the Coastal Commission's jurisdiction.

It appears that passivity by Commissioner representing both state agencies resulted in a rollback of hard-won inclusion and equity advancements made by previous staff and Commissioners and some current Commissioners. We are concerned about the loss of momentum and equitable coastal access for women.

On the bright side, here's an update on a film project inspired by advocacy and past oversight efforts.

Before the ink was dry,

[Variety](#) reported that Filmmaker Niki Caro and A-list celebrity and producer Charlize Theron are teaming up to develop a feature film about the fight for gender equality in big wave surfing for Netflix

Caro will direct the film from a screenplay adapted by Becky Johnston. Caro wrote and directed "Whale Rider" and Johnson wrote a screenplay for "The Prince of Tides.

In June 2021, Theron's production company Denver and Delilah signed a deal with Netflix to produce a narrative film about the Committee for Equity in Women's Surfing, also known as Surf Equity. The feature is based on the 2019 New York Times Magazine article

[The Fight for Gender Equality in One of the Most Dangerous Sports on Earth](#)

and five Surf Equity co-founders — Paige Alms, Sabrina Brennan, Keala Kennelly, Andrea Moller and Bianca Valenti — who are fighting for the inclusion of women athletes in surf competitions held at Mavericks in Northern California and equal prize money for women professional surfers.

In 2015, when I began fighting for equality in big wave surfing, women athletes were excluded from competitions in California, at the time equal pay wasn't an option. With support from a small group of professional athletes, help from activist friends and state oversight from the Coastal Commission and State Lands Commission we won the fight for inclusion and equal pay in 2018. I never imagined a narrative film based on our work would be developed by Charlize Theron's team and Netflix. Social empathy expands when stories are shared and activism is celebrated. The fight isn't over yet, roll backs have occurred and battles for equity across all sports deserve attention and I'm hopeful this film will help bring it.

Going forward, please direct your staff to take concerns about gender discrimination seriously and provided consistent oversight by requiring a State Lands Lease for all surf contests held at Mavericks.

Thank you

-
-
-

Photo from Mavericks Beach: State Lands Commission leases the beach and tidelands to some but not others.

In the spirit of inclusivity, the Committee for Equity in Women's Surfing changed its name to 'SurfEquity' in June 2020 to better serve all races, ethnicities, abilities, socioeconomic backgrounds, sexual orientations, cultures, and genders, including those who identify as nonbinary and transgender.

Sabrina Brennan
Founder, SurfEquity & Sport Equity
Co-Founder, Committee for Equity in Women's Surfing
Cell 415-816-6111

[SurfEquity.org](https://www.surfequity.org)

Instagram: @SurfEquity, <https://www.instagram.com/surfequity/>

Twitter: @SurfEquity, <https://twitter.com/SurfEquity>

Facebook: @SurfEquity, <https://www.facebook.com/SurfEquity/>