

# SAN FRANCISCO BAY CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION

50 California Street • Suite 2600 • San Francisco, California 94111 • (415) 352-3600 • FAX: (415) 352-3606 <http://www.bcdc.ca.gov>

May 6, 2011

**TO:** Commissioners and Alternates

**FROM:** Will Travis, Executive Director (415/352-3653 [travis@bcdc.ca.gov](mailto:travis@bcdc.ca.gov))  
Joe LaClair, Chief Planner (415/352-3656 [joel@bcdc.ca.gov](mailto:joel@bcdc.ca.gov))

**SUBJECT: Public Workshop on Key Outstanding Elements of Bay Plan Amendment No. 1-08  
Dealing with Climate Change**  
(For Commission consideration on May 19, 2011)

## Summary and Recommendation

On May 19, 2011, the Commission will hold a public workshop to discuss the latest draft of Bay Plan Amendment No. 1-08 dealing with climate change, which the staff developed with input from the public, local governments, representatives of business and environmental organizations, and members of the Commission. The goals of this workshop are: (1) to provide the Commission with the opportunity to directly engage with representatives of the business and environmental communities to better understand their perspectives on the outstanding policy issues, (2) to allow the public to provide additional input on the draft findings and policies, and (3) to allow the Commission to provide policy direction to the staff prior to the release of the fourth preliminary staff recommendation on July 29, 2011.

## Staff Report

In an effort to address the concerns raised during the fall 2010 public hearings on Bay Plan Amendment No. 1-08, the staff and members of the Commission have engaged in focused meetings with representatives of business and environmental organizations to better understand their concerns and to explore possible options for addressing those concerns. These extremely productive discussions have led to increased understanding among parties and progress toward a general agreement on policy direction. The staff has used these discussions, along with public input from the 2010 public hearings and direction from the Commission, to advance revised draft findings and policies for consideration and further direction from the Commission before formulating the staff's fourth preliminary recommendation.

At its April 21, 2010 meeting, the Commission developed a schedule for completing its work on Bay Plan Amendment No. 1-08, which includes a workshop at the May 19, 2011 Commission meeting. The Commission directed staff to invite the business and environmental communities to each designate three representatives to discuss the attached climate change findings and policies with the Commission at the workshop. The goals of this workshop are to provide the Commission with the opportunity to directly engage with these representatives to better understand their perspectives on the outstanding policy issues, and to allow the public to provide additional input on the draft findings and policies. The staff will rely on direction from the Commission, the workshop outcomes and public input to craft its fourth preliminary recommendation, which will be released on July 29, 2011, and considered by the Commission at a public hearing on September 1, 2011.



Making San Francisco Bay Better

Attached to this report are the latest draft findings and policies for the Commission and the public to consider at the workshop. Building on the September 3, 2010 preliminary staff recommendation, this latest draft incorporates language that the staff developed working with the business and environmental organization representatives and members of the Commission. Most of the language either remains unchanged from the September 3, 2011 draft or general consensus has been reached on revised language that is acceptable to most interests. However, differences of opinion remain on a relatively few key findings and policies, which are listed below. The staff believes the Commission should focus on these key issues at the workshop. This list is not intended to be exhaustive. Some may wish to expand the list to include other findings, policies or options for discussion.

Climate Change Findings	
Staff's September 3, 2010 Proposal	Latest Staff Proposal
<p><b>Add underlined language as follows:</b></p> <p>p. <u>Infill development is the economic use of underutilized or vacant land, or the rehabilitation of existing structures or infrastructure located in an area where supporting infrastructure is in place and that is surrounded by existing development that either is or will be served by transit. Infill development has been identified as an important strategy for reducing greenhouse gas emissions in the Bay Area by providing jobs and housing in locations and at densities that can be served by transit. Some vulnerable shoreline areas are already improved with development that has regionally significant economic, cultural or social value, and can accommodate infill development.</u></p>	<p><b>Changes to September 3, 2010 proposal are in bold:</b></p> <p>p. Infill development is the economic use of underutilized or vacant land or the rehabilitation of existing structures or infrastructure located in <b>an urbanized area on a site (i) that was previously developed or is immediately adjacent to existing urban development, and (ii) that is in close proximity to existing or committed transit, and (iii) for which supporting infrastructure exists to serve the project or would be provided as part of the project.</b> Infill development served by transit has been identified in state law as a type of development that is a critical component in a strategy for reducing greenhouse gas emissions. To further this policy objective, the Association of Bay Area Governments and the Metropolitan Transportation Commission initiated the FOCUS program to develop a regional strategy that promotes a more compact Bay Area land use pattern. In consultation with local governments, the FOCUS program has identified priority development areas for infill development in the Bay Area. These priority development areas, along with other infill sites, are anticipated to be key components of the Bay Area's Sustainable Communities Strategy that will be adopted and periodically updated pursuant to SB 375. One of the Commission's objectives in adopting climate change policies is to facilitate implementation of the Sustainable Communities Strategy. Some shoreline areas that are vulnerable to flooding are already improved with <b>public infrastructure and private</b> development that has regionally significant economic, cultural or social value and can accommodate infill development.</p>

<b>Climate Change Findings</b>	
Staff's September 3, 2010 Proposal	Latest Staff Proposal
<p>The September 3, 2010 preliminary staff recommendation did not include a reference to the California Climate Adaptation Strategy.</p>	<p><b>Changes to September 3, 2010 proposal are in bold:</b></p> <p><b>(New Findings)</b></p> <p>w. The California Ocean Protection Council has endorsed the guiding principles of the California Climate Adaptation Strategy, which recommends that state agencies pursue the following policy objectives in their adaptation planning:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• California must protect public health and safety and critical infrastructure;</li> <li>• California must protect, restore, and enhance ocean and coastal ecosystems, on which the State economy and well-being depend;</li> <li>• California must ensure public access to coastal areas and protect beaches, natural shoreline, and park and recreational resources;</li> <li>• New development and communities must be planned and designed for long-term sustainability in the face of climate change;</li> <li>• California must look for ways to facilitate adaptation of existing development and communities to reduce their vulnerability to climate change impacts over time; and</li> <li>• California must begin now to adapt to the impacts of climate change. The State can no longer act as if nothing is changing.</li> </ul>

<b>Climate Change Findings</b>	
Staff's September 3, 2010 Proposal	Latest Staff Proposal
<p>The September 3, 2010 preliminary staff recommendation did not include a reference to the California Climate Adaptation Strategy.</p>	<p>x. <b>The California Climate Adaptation Strategy establishes avoiding future hazards and protecting critical habitat as top priority actions to combat the impacts of sea level rise. The strategy recommends that state agencies should consider project alternatives that avoid significant new development in areas that cannot be adequately protected (planning, permitting, development, and building) from flooding or erosion due to climate change. The strategy indicates that the most risk-averse approach for minimizing the adverse effects of sea level rise and storm activities is to carefully consider new development within areas vulnerable to inundation and erosion, and to consider prohibiting development of undeveloped, vulnerable shoreline areas containing critical habitat or opportunities for habitat creation. The strategy recommends that state agencies should generally not plan, develop, or build any new significant structure in a place where that structure will require significant protection from sea-level rise, storm surges, or coastal erosion during the expected life of the structure. However, the strategy also acknowledges that vulnerable shoreline areas containing existing development or proposed for new development that has or will have regionally significant economic, cultural, or social value may have to be protected, and infill development in these areas should be closely scrutinized. The strategy recommends that state agencies should incorporate this policy into their decisions.</b></p>

<b>Climate Change Findings</b>	
Staff's September 3, 2010 Proposal	Latest Staff Proposal
<p>The September 3, 2010 preliminary staff recommendation did not include a reference to the California Climate Adaptation Strategy.</p>	<p>y. <b>To promote habitat protection in the face of sea level rise, the California Climate Adaptation Strategy recommends that the state should consider prohibiting projects that would place development in undeveloped areas already containing critical habitat, and those containing opportunities for tidal wetland restoration, habitat migration, or buffer zones. The strategy encourages projects that protect critical habitats, fish, wildlife and other aquatic organisms and connections between coastal habitats. The strategy recommends pursuing activities that can increase natural resiliency, such as restoring tidal wetlands, living shorelines, and related habitats; managing sediment for marsh accretion and natural flood protection; and maintaining upland buffer areas around tidal wetlands.</b></p>

<b>Climate Change Policies</b>	
Staff's September 3, 2010 Proposal	Latest Staff Proposal
<p>The September 3, 2010 preliminary staff recommendation did not include a statement of intentions regarding the application of the climate change policies in the preparation of environmental documents nor limiting the use of the climate change policies for consistency review, pursuant to the federal Coastal Zone Management Act.</p>	<p><b>Changes to September 3, 2010 proposal are in bold:</b></p> <p><b>(New Policy)</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>1. The Commission intends that the Bay Plan Climate Change findings and policies will be used as follows:</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>a. The findings and policies apply only to projects and activities located within the following areas: San Francisco Bay, the 100-foot shoreline band, salt ponds, managed wetlands, and certain waterways, as these areas are described in Government Code section 66610, and the Suisun Marsh, as this area is described in Public Resources Code section 29101;</b></li> <li><b>b. For projects or activities that are located partly within the areas described in subparagraph a and partly outside such area, the findings and policies apply only to those activities or that portion of the project within the areas described in subparagraph a;</b></li> <li><b>c. For the purposes of implementing the federal Coastal Zone Management Act, the findings and policies do not apply to projects and activities located outside the areas described in subparagraph a, even if those projects or activities may otherwise be subject to consistency review pursuant to the federal Coastal Zone Management Act; and</b></li> <li><b>d. For purposes of implementing the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), the findings and policies are not applicable portions of the Bay Plan for purposes of CEQA Guideline 15125(d) for projects and activities outside the areas described in subparagraph a and, therefore, a discussion of whether such proposed projects or activities are consistent with the policies is not required in environmental documents.</b></li> </ol> </li> </ol>

<b>Climate Change Policies</b>	
Staff's September 3, 2010 Proposal	Latest Staff Proposal
<p><b>Add underlined language as follows:</b></p> <p>3. <u>Undeveloped, vulnerable shoreline areas that currently sustain diverse habitats and species or possess conditions that make the areas especially suitable for ecosystem enhancement should be preserved, enhanced or permanently protected to allow for the inland migration of Bay habitat as sea level rises and to address the adverse environmental impacts of climate change.</u></p>	<p><b>Changes to September 3, 2010 proposal are in bold:</b></p> <p>4. <b>The California Climate Adaptation Strategy recommends that state agencies should consider prohibiting development of undeveloped, vulnerable shoreline areas containing critical habitat or opportunities for habitat creation. To advance this state policy objective along the Bay shoreline and to address the regional adverse impacts of climate change, undeveloped areas that are both vulnerable to future flooding and currently sustain critical habitats or species, or possess conditions that make the areas especially suitable for ecosystem enhancement should be given special consideration for preservation and habitat enhancement and should be encouraged to be used for those purposes. Development in these areas should be discouraged.</b></p>

## Climate Change Policies

Staff's September 3, 2010 Proposal	Latest Staff Proposal
<p><b>Add underlined language as follows:</b></p> <p>6. <u>Until a regional sea level rise adaptation strategy can be completed, when planning or regulating new development in areas vulnerable to future shoreline flooding, new projects should be limited to:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. <u>minor repairs of existing facilities or small projects that do not increase risks to public safety;</u></li> <li>b. <u>transportation facilities, public utilities or other critical infrastructure that is necessary for the continued viability of existing development;</u></li> <li>c. <u>infill development within existing urbanized areas that contain development and infrastructure of such high value that the areas will likely be protected whether or not the infill takes place;</u></li> <li>d. <u>redevelopment that will remediate existing environmental degradation or contamination, particularly on closed military bases, if the redevelopment will (1) provide significant regional benefits and meet regional goals by concentrating employment or housing near adequate transit service sufficient to serve the project, and (2) include the following elements: (i) an adaptation strategy for dealing with rising sea level and shoreline flooding with definitive goals and an adaptive management plan for addressing key uncertainties for the life of the project; (ii) measures that will achieve resilience and sustainability in all elements of the project; (iii) a permanent financial strategy that will guarantee the general public will not be burdened with the cost of protecting the project from any sea level rise or storm damage in the future;</u></li> </ul>	<p>7. The California Climate Adaptation Strategy acknowledges that vulnerable shoreline areas containing existing development or proposed for new development that has or will have regionally significant economic, cultural, or social value may have to be protected, and recommends that infill development in these areas should be closely scrutinized. To advance this state policy objective along the shoreline of the Bay, until a regional sea level rise adaptation strategy can be completed, the Commission should evaluate each project proposed in vulnerable areas on a case-by-case basis to determine the project's public benefits, resilience to flooding, and capacity to adapt to climate change impacts. The following specific types of projects have regional benefits, advance regional goals, and may be approved if their regional benefits and their advancement of regional goals outweigh the risk from flooding:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. remediation of existing environmental degradation or contamination, particularly on a closed military base;</li> <li>b. a transportation facility, public utility or other critical infrastructure that is necessary for existing development or to serve planned development; and</li> <li>c. a project that will concentrate employment or housing near existing or committed transit service, such as infill development, particularly within those Priority Development Areas that are established by the Association of Bay Area Governments and endorsed by the Commission, and that includes a financial strategy for flood protection that will minimize the burdens on the public and a sea level rise adaptation strategy that will adequately provide for the resilience and sustainability of the project over its designed lifespan.</li> </ul>

<b>Climate Change Policies</b>	
Staff's September 3, 2010 Proposal	Latest Staff Proposal
<p>e. projects or uses that are interim or temporary in nature where the use or structures: (1) can be easily removed or relocated to higher ground; (2) can be amortized within a period before removal or relocation of the proposed use is required; and (3) will not require shoreline protection during the life of the project; or</p> <p>f. public parks, natural resource restoration or environmental enhancement projects.</p>	<p><b>The following specific types of projects may be approved if they do not negatively impact the Bay and do not increase risks to public safety:</b></p> <p><b>d. repairs of an existing facility;</b></p> <p><b>e. a small project;</b></p> <p><b>f. a use that is interim in nature and either can be easily removed or relocated to higher ground or can be amortized within a period before removal or relocation of the proposed use would be necessary;</b></p> <p><b>g. a public park; and</b></p> <p><b>h. a natural resource restoration or environmental enhancement project.</b></p>

<b>Tidal Marshes and Tidal Flats</b>		
Existing Bay Plan Findings	Staff's September 3, 2010 Proposed Findings	Latest Staff Proposal, April 12, 2011
<p>g. The Baylands Ecosystem Habitat Goals report provides a regional vision of the types, amounts, and distribution of wetlands and related habitats that are needed to restore and sustain a healthy Bay ecosystem, including restoration of 65,000 acres of tidal marsh.</p>	<p><b>Add underlined language and delete struck-through language as follows:</b></p> <p>g. The Baylands Ecosystem Habitat Goals report provides a regional vision of the types, amounts, and distribution of wetlands and related habitats that are needed to restore and sustain a healthy Bay ecosystem, including restoration of 65,000 acres of tidal marsh. <u>These recommendations were based on conditions of tidal inundation, salinity, and sedimentation in the 1990s. While achieving the regional vision would help promote a healthy, resilient Bay ecosystem, global climate change and sea level rise are expected to alter ecosystem processes in ways that require new, regional targets for types, amounts, and distribution of habitats.</u></p>	<p><b>No changes to September 3, 2010 proposal.</b></p>
<p>i. Tidal marshes are an interconnected and essential part of the Bay's food web. Decomposed plant and animal material and seeds from tidal marshes wash onto surrounding tidal flats and into subtidal areas, providing food for numerous animals, such as the Northern pintail. In addition, tidal marshes provide habitat for insects, crabs and small fish, which in turn, are food for larger animals, such as the salt marsh song sparrow, harbor seal and great blue heron.</p>	<p><b>Add underlined language and delete struck-through language as follows:</b></p> <p>i. Tidal marshes are an interconnected and essential part of the Bay's food web. Decomposed plant and animal material and seeds from tidal marshes wash onto surrounding tidal flats and into subtidal areas, providing food for numerous animals, such as the Northern pintail. In addition, tidal marshes provide habitat for insects, crabs and small fish, which in turn, are food for larger animals, such as the salt marsh song sparrow, harbor seal and great blue heron. <u>Diking and filling have fragmented the remaining tidal marshes, degrading the quality of habitat and resulting in a loss of species and an altered community structure.</u></p>	<p><b>No changes to September 3, 2010 proposal.</b></p>

Tidal Marshes and Tidal Flats		
Existing Bay Plan Findings	Staff's September 3, 2010 Proposed Findings	Latest Staff Proposal
	<p><b>Add underlined language as follows:</b></p> <p>k. <u>Landward marsh migration may be necessary to sustain marsh acreage around the Bay as sea level rises. As sea level rises, high-energy waves erode inorganic mud from tidal flats and deposit that sediment onto adjacent tidal marshes. Marshes trap sediment and contribute additional material to the marsh plain as decaying plant matter accumulates. Tidal habitats respond to sea level rise by moving landward, a process referred to as transgression or migration. Low sedimentation rates, natural topography, development, and shoreline protection can block wetland migration.</u></p>	<p><b>No changes to September 3, 2010 proposal.</b></p>
<p>k. Sedimentation is an essential factor in the creation, maintenance and growth of tidal marsh and tidal flat habitat. However, scientists studying the Bay estimate that sedimentation will not be able to keep pace with accelerating sea level rise, due largely to declines in sediment entering the Bay from the Sacramento and San Joaquin Delta, thus potentially exacerbating shoreline erosion and adversely affecting the sustainability of future wetland restoration projects.</p>	<p><b>Add underlined language and delete struck-through language as follows:</b></p> <p><del>k</del>l. Sedimentation is an essential factor in the creation, maintenance and growth of tidal marsh and tidal flat habitat. <del>However, scientists studying the Bay estimate</del> <u>observed that sedimentation will not be able to keep pace with accelerating sea level rise, due largely to declines in the volume of sediment entering the Bay annually from the Sacramento and San Joaquin Delta is declining. As a result, the importance of sediment from local watersheds as a source of sedimentation in tidal marshes is increasing. As sea level rise accelerates, the erosion of tidal flats may also accelerate, thus potentially exacerbating shoreline erosion and adversely affecting the ecosystem and the sustainability of future wetland ecosystem restoration projects. An adequate supply of sediment is necessary to ensure resilience of the Bay ecosystem as sea level rise accelerates.</u></p>	<p><b>No changes to September 3, 2010 proposal.</b></p>

Tidal Marshes and Tidal Flats		
Existing Bay Plan Findings	Staff's September 3, 2010 Proposed Findings	Latest Staff Proposal
	<p><b>Add underlined language as follows:</b></p> <p>m. <u>Human actions, such as dredging, disposal, ecosystem restoration, and watershed management, can affect the distribution and amount of sediment available to sustain and restore wetlands. Research on Bay sediment transport processes is needed to understand the volume of sediment available to wetlands, including sediment imported to and exported from the Bay. Monitoring of these processes can inform management efforts to maintain an adequate supply of sediment for wetlands.</u></p>	<p><b>No changes to September 3, 2010 proposal.</b></p>
	<p><b>Add underlined language as follows:</b></p> <p>n. <u>Buffers are areas established adjacent to a habitat to reduce the adverse impacts of surrounding land use and activities. Buffers also minimize additional loss of habitat from shoreline erosion resulting from accelerated sea level rise and allow tidal habitats to move landward. Buffer areas may be critical for achieving the regional goals for the types, amounts, and distribution of habitats in the Baylands Ecosystem Habitat Goals report or future updates to these targets.</u></p>	<p><b>Changes to September 3, 2010 proposal are in bold:</b></p> <p>n. Buffers are areas established adjacent to a habitat to reduce the adverse impacts of surrounding land use and activities. Buffers also minimize additional loss of habitat from shoreline erosion resulting from accelerated sea level rise and allow tidal habitats to move landward. Buffer areas may be <b>important</b> for achieving the regional goals for the types, amounts, and distribution of habitats in the Baylands Ecosystem Habitat Goals report or future updates to these targets.</p>

Tidal Marshes and Tidal Flats		
Existing Bay Plan Findings	Staff's September 3, 2010 Proposed Findings	Latest Staff Proposal
<p>l. Plant and animal species not present in San Francisco Bay prior to European contact in the late 18th century, known as non-native species, which thrive and reproduce outside of their natural range have made vast ecological alterations to the Bay and have contributed to the serious reduction of native populations of certain plants and animals through: (1) predation; (2) competition for food, habitat, and other necessities; (3) disturbance of habitat; (4) displacement; or (5) hybridization. Many non-native species enter the Bay from commercial ship ballast water that is discharged into the Bay. Approximately 170 species have invaded the Bay since 1850, and possibly an additional 115 species have been deliberately introduced. By 2001, over 1,200 acres of recently restored tidal marshes have been invaded by introduced cordgrass species, such as salt meadow cordgrass, dense-flowered cordgrass, English cordgrass and smooth cordgrass. At present an average of one new non-native species establishes itself in the Bay every 14 weeks. Control or eradication is a critical step in reducing the harm associated with non-native species.</p>	<p><del>l.</del> <u>o.</u> Plant and animal species not present in San Francisco Bay prior to European contact in the late 18<sup>th</sup> century, known as non-native species, which thrive and reproduce outside of their natural range have made vast ecological alterations to the Bay and have contributed to the serious reduction of native populations of certain plants and animals through: (1) predation; (2) competition for food, habitat, and other necessities; (3) disturbance of habitat; (4) displacement; or (5) hybridization. Many non-native species enter the Bay from commercial ship ballast water that is discharged into the Bay. Approximately 170 species have invaded the Bay since 1850, and possibly an additional 115 species have been deliberately introduced. By 2001, over 1,200 acres of recently restored tidal marshes have been invaded by introduced cordgrass species, such as salt meadow cordgrass, dense-flowered cordgrass, English cordgrass and smooth cordgrass. At present an average of one new non-native species establishes itself in the Bay every 14 weeks. Control or eradication is a critical step in reducing the harm associated with non-native species.</p>	<p><b>No changes to September 3, 2010 proposal.</b></p>
<p>m. Fill material, such as rock and sediments dredged from the Bay, can enhance or beneficially contribute to the restoration of tidal marsh and tidal flat habitat by: (1) raising areas diked from the Bay to an elevation that will help accelerate establishment of tidal marsh; and (2) establishing or recreating rare Bay habitat types.</p>	<p><del>m.</del> <u>p.</u> Fill material, such as rock and sediments dredged from the Bay, can enhance or beneficially contribute to the restoration of tidal marsh and tidal flat habitat by: (1) raising areas diked from the Bay to an elevation that will help accelerate establishment of tidal marsh; and (2) establishing or recreating rare Bay habitat types.</p>	<p><b>No changes to September 3, 2010 proposal.</b></p>

Tidal Marshes and Tidal Flats		
Existing Bay Plan Policies	Staff's September 3, 2010 Proposed Policies	Latest Staff Proposal
	Policies 1 through 3—no changes	
<p>4. Where and whenever possible, former tidal marshes and tidal flats that have been diked from the Bay should be restored to tidal action in order to replace lost historic wetlands or should be managed to provide important Bay habitat functions, such as resting, foraging and breeding habitat for fish, other aquatic organisms and wildlife. As recommended in the Baylands Ecosystem Habitat Goals report, around 65,000 acres of areas diked from the Bay should be restored to tidal action. Further, local government land use and tax policies should not lead to the conversion of these restorable lands to uses that would preclude or deter potential restoration. The public should make every effort to acquire these lands from willing sellers for the purpose of restoration.</p>	<p><b>Add underlined language and delete struck-through language as follows:</b></p> <p>4. Where <del>and whenever possible</del> <u>feasible</u>, former tidal marshes and tidal flats that have been diked from the Bay should be restored to tidal action in order to replace lost historic wetlands or should be managed to provide important Bay habitat functions, such as resting, foraging and breeding habitat for fish, other aquatic organisms and wildlife. As recommended in the Baylands Ecosystem Habitat Goals report, around 65,000 acres of areas diked from the Bay should be restored to tidal action <u>to maintain a healthy Bay ecosystem on a regional scale. Regional ecosystem targets should be updated periodically to guide conservation, restoration, and management efforts that result in a Bay ecosystem resilient to climate change and sea level rise.</u> Further, local government land use and tax policies should not lead to the conversion of these restorable lands to uses that would preclude or deter potential restoration. The public should make every effort to acquire these lands <del>from willing sellers</del> for the purpose of <u>habitat restoration and wetland migration.</u></p>	<p><b>No changes to September 3, 2010 proposal.</b></p>
	<p><b>Add underlined language and delete struck-through language as follows:</b></p> <p>5. <u>The Commission should support comprehensive Bay sediment research and monitoring to understand sediment processes necessary to sustain and restore wetlands. Monitoring methods should be updated periodically based on current scientific information.</u></p>	<p><b>No changes to September 3, 2010 proposal.</b></p>

Tidal Marshes and Tidal Flats		
Existing Bay Plan Policies	Staff's September 3, 2010 Proposed Policies	Latest Staff Proposal
<p>5. Any tidal restoration project should include clear and specific long-term and short-term biological and physical goals, and success criteria and a monitoring program to assess the sustainability of the project. Design and evaluation of the project should include an analysis of: (a) the effects of relative sea level rise; (b) the impact of the project on the Bay's sediment budget; (c) localized sediment erosion and accretion; (d) the role of tidal flows; (e) potential invasive species introduction, spread, and their control; (f) rates of colonization by vegetation; (g) the expected use of the site by fish, other aquatic organisms and wildlife; and (h) site characterization. If success criteria are not met, appropriate corrective measures should be taken.</p>	<p><b>Add underlined language and delete struck-through language as follows:</b></p> <p><del>5</del> <u>6. Any ecosystem tidal</u> restoration project should include clear and specific long-term and short-term biological and physical goals, and success criteria, and a monitoring program to assess the sustainability of the project. Design and evaluation of the project should include an analysis of: (a) <del>the effects of relative</del> <u>how the system's adaptive capacity can be enhanced so that it is resilient to sea level rise and climate change</u>; (b) the impact of the project on the Bay's sediment budget; (c) localized sediment erosion and accretion; (d) the role of tidal flows; (e) potential invasive species introduction, spread, and their control; (f) rates of colonization by vegetation; (g) the expected use of the site by fish, other aquatic organisms and wildlife; <del>and</del> (h) <u>an appropriate buffer, where feasible, between shoreline development and habitats to protect wildlife and provide space for marsh migration as sea level rises</u>; <u>and</u> (i) site characterization. If success criteria are not met, appropriate <del>corrective</del> <u>adaptive</u> measures should be taken.</p>	<p><b>No changes to September 3, 2010 proposal.</b></p>

<b>Climate Change</b>		
(There are no existing Bay Plan findings and policies on climate change.)	Staff's September 3, 2010 Proposed Findings	Latest Staff Proposal
	<p><b>Add underlined language as follows:</b></p> <p>a. <u>Greenhouse gases naturally reside in the earth's atmosphere, absorb heat emitted from the earth's surface and radiate heat back to the surface causing the planet to warm. This natural process is called the "greenhouse effect." Human activities since industrialization have increased the emissions of greenhouse gases through the burning of fossil fuels. The accumulation of these gases in the atmosphere is causing the planet to warm at an accelerated rate.</u></p>	<p><b>No changes to September 3, 2010 proposal.</b></p>
	<p><b>Add underlined language as follows:</b></p> <p>b. <u>The future extent of global warming is uncertain. It will be driven largely by future greenhouse gas emissions levels, which will depend on how global development proceeds. The United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) developed a series of global development scenarios and greenhouse gas emissions scenarios for each development scenario. These emissions scenarios have been used in global models to develop projections of future climate, including global surface temperature and precipitation changes.</u></p>	<p><b>No changes to September 3, 2010 proposal.</b></p>

Climate Change		
(There are no existing Bay Plan findings and policies on climate change.)	Staff's September 3, 2010 Proposed Findings	Latest Staff Proposal
	<p><b>Add underlined language as follows:</b></p> <p>c. <u>Global surface temperature increases are accelerating the rate of sea level rise worldwide through thermal expansion of ocean waters and melting of land-based ice (e.g., ice sheets and glaciers). Bay water level is likely to rise by a corresponding amount. In the last century, sea level in the Bay rose nearly eight inches. Current science-based projections of global sea level rise over the next century vary widely. As new information on climate change becomes available and factors that have regional effects on sea level rise, such as the Pacific Decadal Oscillation, are better understood, future sea level rise projections are likely to change. Using IPCC greenhouse gas emissions scenarios, the California Climate Action Team developed sea level rise projections (relative to sea level in 2000) for the state that range from 11 to 18 inches at mid-century and 23 to 55 inches at the end of century. Although these are currently the best science-based sea level rise projections for California, recent observations of global greenhouse gas emissions show higher trajectories than the IPCC's most intensive emissions scenario. Moreover, melting of the Greenland and Antarctic ice sheets is not currently well reflected in sea level rise projections. Therefore, to minimize flood risk, it is prudent to rely on higher projections in the range of possible future sea level rise.</u></p>	<p><b>Changes to September 3, 2010 proposal are in bold:</b></p> <p>c. Global surface temperature increases are accelerating the rate of sea level rise worldwide through thermal expansion of ocean waters and melting of land-based ice (e.g., ice sheets and glaciers). Bay water level is likely to rise by a corresponding amount. In the last century, sea level in the Bay rose nearly eight inches. Current science-based projections of global sea level rise over the next century vary widely. Using the IPCC greenhouse gas emission scenarios, the California Climate Action Team (CAT) developed sea level rise projections (relative to sea level in 2000) for the state that range from <b>10 to 17 inches by 2050, 17 to 32 inches by 2070, and 31 to 69 inches at the end of the century.</b> The CAT has recognized that it may not be appropriate to set definitive sea level rise projections, and, based on a variety of factors, state agencies may use different sea level rise projections. <b>Although the CAT values are generally recognized as the best science-based sea level rise projections for California, scientific uncertainty remains regarding the pace and amount of sea level rise.</b> Moreover, melting of the Greenland and Antarctic ice sheet <b>may not be</b> reflected well in current sea level rise projections. <b>As additional data are collected and analyzed, sea level rise projections will likely change over time.</b> The National Academy of Sciences is in the process of developing a Sea Level Rise Assessment Report that will address the potential impacts of sea level rise on coastal areas throughout the United States, including California and the Bay Area.</p>

Climate Change		
	Staff's September 3, 2010 Proposed Findings	Latest Staff Proposal
	<p><b>Add underlined language as follows:</b></p> <p>d. <u>Climate change will alter key factors that contribute to shoreline flooding, including sea level and storm frequency and intensity. During a storm, low air pressure can cause storm surge (a rapid rise in water level) and increased wind and wave activity can cause wave run up, which will be higher as sea level rises. These storm events can be exacerbated by El Niño events, which generally result in persistent low air pressure, greater rainfall, high winds and higher sea level. The coincidence of intense winter storms, extreme high tides, and high runoff, in combination with higher sea level, will increase the frequency and duration of shoreline flooding long before areas are permanently inundated by sea level rise alone.</u></p>	<p><b>No changes to September 3, 2010 proposal.</b></p>
	<p><b>Add underlined language as follows:</b></p> <p>e. <u>Shoreline areas currently vulnerable to a 100-year flood event may be subjected to inundation by high tides at mid-century. Much of the developed shoreline may require new or upgraded shoreline protection to reduce damage from flooding. Shoreline areas that have subsided are especially vulnerable to sea level rise and may require more extensive shoreline protection. The Commission, along with other agencies, is responsible for protecting the public and the Bay ecosystem from flood hazards. This can be best achieved by using higher emissions scenarios, which correspond to higher rates of sea level rise. In planning and designing projects for the Bay shoreline, it is prudent to rely on the most current science-based and regionally specific projections of future sea level rise, develop strategies and policies that can accommodate sea level rise over a specific planning horizon (i.e., adaptive management strategies), and preclude development that cannot be adapted to sea level rise.</u></p>	<p><b>Changes to September 3, 2010 proposal are in bold:</b></p> <p>e. Shoreline areas currently vulnerable to a 100-year flood event may be subjected to inundation by high tides at mid-century. Much of the developed shoreline may require new or upgraded shoreline protection to reduce damage from flooding. Shoreline areas that have subsided are especially vulnerable to sea level rise and may require more extensive shoreline protection. The Commission, along with other agencies <b>such as the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, the Federal Emergency Management Agency, the United States Army Corps of Engineers, cities, counties, and flood control districts</b>, is responsible for protecting the public and the Bay ecosystem from flood hazards. This can be best achieved by using a <b>range of scientifically based scenarios, including projections</b> which correspond to higher rates of sea level rise. In planning and designing projects for the Bay shoreline, it is prudent to rely on the most current science-based and regionally specific projections of future sea level rise, develop strategies and policies that can accommodate sea level rise over a specific planning horizon (i.e., adaptive management strategies), and <b>thoroughly analyze new development to determine whether it can</b> be adapted to sea level rise.</p>

Climate Change		
	Staff's September 3, 2010 Proposed Findings	Latest Staff Proposal
	<p><b>Add underlined language as follows:</b></p> <p>f. <u>Natural systems and human communities are considered to be resilient when they can absorb and rebound from the impacts of weather extremes or climate change and continue functioning without substantial outside assistance. Systems that are currently under stress often have lower adaptive capacity and may be more vulnerable or susceptible to harm from climate change impacts. Human communities with adaptive capacity can adjust to climate change impacts by taking actions to reduce the potential damages, taking advantage of new opportunities arising from climate change, and accommodating the impacts. Understanding vulnerabilities to climate change is essential for assessing climate change risks to a project, the Bay or the shoreline. Risk is a function of the likelihood of an impact occurring and the consequence of that impact. Climate change risk assessments identify and prioritize issues that can be addressed by adaptation strategies.</u></p>	<p><b>No changes to September 3, 2010 proposal.</b></p>

Climate Change		
	Staff's September 3, 2010 Proposed Findings	Latest Staff Proposal
	<p><b>Add underlined language as follows:</b></p> <p>g. <u>In the context of climate change, mitigation refers to actions taken to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, and adaptation refers to actions taken to address potential or experienced impacts of climate change that reduce risks. Adaptation actions can include relocating structures out of flood and inundation zones, protecting shorelines, and designing new construction to be resilient to sea level rise. Some actions can integrate adaptation and mitigation strategies, such as restoring tidal marshes that both sequester carbon and provide flood protection. Adaptation and mitigation measures that are implemented before sea level rises may be cost effective and may protect lives, property and ecosystems.</u></p>	<p><b>Changes to September 3, 2010 proposal are in bold:</b></p> <p>g. In the context of climate change, mitigation refers to actions taken to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, and adaptation refers to actions taken to address potential or experienced impacts of climate change that reduce risks. Adaptation actions <b>that protect existing development and infrastructure</b> can include protecting shorelines, <b>promoting appropriate infill development</b>, and designing new construction to be resilient to sea level rise. <b>Another option is</b> relocating <b>structures</b> out of flood and inundation zones. Some actions can integrate adaptation and mitigation strategies, flood protection. Adaptation and such as restoring tidal marshes that both sequester carbon and provide mitigation measures that are implemented before sea level rises may be cost effective and may protect lives, property and ecosystems. <b>Identifying appropriate adaptation strategies requires complex policy considerations. Implementing many adaptation strategies will require action and funding by federal, state, regional and local agencies with planning, funding and land use decision-making authority beyond the Commission's jurisdiction.</b></p>

Climate Change		
	Staff's September 3, 2010 Proposed Findings	Latest Staff Proposal
	<p><b>Add underlined language as follows:</b></p> <p><u>h. In the context of sea level rise adaptation, innovative approaches will likely include financing mechanisms, design concepts and land management practices. Effective, innovative adaptation approaches minimize public safety risks; maximize compatibility with and integration of natural processes; are resilient over a range of sea level, potential flooding impacts and storm intensities; and are adaptively managed. Developing innovative adaptation approaches will require financial resources, testing and refinement to ensure that they effectively protect the Bay ecosystem and public safety before they are implemented on a large scale.</u></p>	<p><b>Changes to September 3, 2010 proposal are in bold:</b></p> <p>h. In the context of sea level rise adaptation, <b>it is likely that myriad</b> innovative approaches will emerge, likely including financing mechanisms <b>to spread equitably the costs of protection from sea level rise</b>, design concepts and land management practices. Effective, innovative adaptation approaches minimize public safety risks <b>and impacts to critical infrastructure</b>; maximize compatibility with and integration of natural processes; are resilient over a range of sea levels, potential flooding impacts and storm intensities; and are adaptively managed. Developing innovative adaptation approaches will require financial resources, testing and refinement to ensure that they effectively protect the Bay ecosystem and public safety before they are implemented on a large scale. <b>Developing the right mix of approaches would best be accomplished through a comprehensive regional adaptation strategy developed though a process involving various stakeholders and local, regional, state and federal agencies.</b></p>

Climate Change		
	Staff's September 3, 2010 Proposed Findings	Latest Staff Proposal
	<p><b>Add underlined language as follows:</b></p> <p>i. <u>Adaptive management is a cyclic, learning-oriented approach that is especially useful for complex environmental systems characterized by high levels of uncertainty about system processes and the potential for different ecological, social and economic impacts from alternative management options. Effective adaptive management requires setting clear and measurable objectives, collecting data, reviewing current scientific observations, monitoring the results of policy implementation or management actions, and integrating this information into future actions.</u></p>	<p><b>No changes to September 3, 2010 proposal.</b></p>
	<p><b>Add underlined language as follows:</b></p> <p>j. <u>The principle of sustainability embodies values of equity, environmental and public health protection, economic vitality and safety. The goal of sustainability is to conduct human endeavors in a manner that will avoid depleting natural resources for future generations and producing no more than can be assimilated through natural processes. Efforts to improve the sustainability of natural systems and human communities can improve their resilience to climate change by increasing their adaptive capacity.</u></p>	<p><b>Changes to September 3, 2010 proposal are in bold:</b></p> <p>j. The principle of sustainability embodies values of equity, environmental and public health protection, economic vitality and safety. The goal of sustainability is to conduct human endeavors in a manner that will avoid depleting natural resources for future generations and producing no more than can be assimilated through natural processes, <b>while providing for improvement of the human condition for all the people of the world.</b> Efforts to improve the sustainability of natural systems and human communities can improve their resilience to climate change by increasing their adaptive capacity.</p>

Climate Change		
	Staff's September 3, 2010 Proposed Findings	Latest Staff Proposal
	<p><b>Add underlined language as follows:</b></p> <p>k. <u>Shoreline development and infrastructure, critical to public and environmental health and the region's economic prosperity, are vulnerable to flooding from sea level rise and storm activity. Public safety may be compromised and personal property may be damaged or lost during floods. Important public shoreline infrastructure and facilities, such as airports, ports, regional transportation facilities, landfills, contaminated lands and wastewater treatment facilities are at risk of flood damage that could require costly repairs, result in the interruption or loss of vital services or degraded water quality. A lack of funding to address projected impacts from sea level rise will limit the Bay Area's ability to meet environmental, public health, equity and economic goals.</u></p>	<p><b>Changes to September 3, 2010 proposal are in bold:</b></p> <p>k. Shoreline development and infrastructure, critical to public and environmental health and the region's economic prosperity, <b>may be, or may become</b>, vulnerable to flooding from sea level rise and storm activity. Public safety may be compromised and personal property may be damaged or lost during floods. Important public shoreline infrastructure and facilities, such as airports, ports, regional transportation facilities, landfills, contaminated lands and wastewater treatment facilities are at risk of flood damage that could require costly repairs, <b>or</b> result in the interruption or loss of vital services or degraded water quality. A <b>current</b> lack of funding to address projected impacts from sea level rise <b>necessitates a collaborative approach with all stakeholder groups to find strategic and innovative solutions to advance</b> the Bay Area's ability to meet environmental, public health, equity and economic goals.</p>

Climate Change		
	Staff's September 3, 2010 Proposed Findings	Latest Staff Proposal
	<p><b>Add underlined language as follows:</b></p> <p>l. <u>Waterfront parks, beaches, public access sites, and the Bay Trail are particularly vulnerable to flooding from sea level rise and storm activity because they are located immediately adjacent to the Bay. Flooding of, or damage to these areas would adversely affect the region's quality of life, if important public spaces and recreational opportunities are lost.</u></p>	<p><b>No changes to September 3, 2010 proposal.</b></p>
	<p><b>Add underlined language as follows:</b></p> <p>m. <u>The Bay ecosystem contains diverse and unique plants and animals and provides many benefits to humans. For example, tidal wetlands provide critical flood protection, improve water quality, and sequester carbon. Tidal high marsh and adjacent ecotones are essential to many tidal marsh species, including endangered species. The Bay ecosystem is already stressed by human activities that lower its adaptive capacity, such as diversion of freshwater inflow and loss of tidal wetlands. Climate change will further alter the ecosystem by inundating or eroding wetlands and ecotones, changing sediment dynamics, altering species composition, raising the acidity of Bay waters, changing freshwater inflow or salinity, altering the food web, and impairing water quality, all of which may overwhelm the system's ability to rebound and continue functioning. Moreover, further loss of tidal wetlands will increase the risk of shoreline flooding.</u></p>	<p><b>Changes to September 3, 2010 proposal are in bold:</b></p> <p>m. The Bay ecosystem contains diverse and unique plants and animals and provides many benefits to humans. <b>For example, tidal wetlands improve water quality, sequester carbon and can provide flood protection.</b> Tidal high marsh and adjacent ecotones are essential to many tidal marsh species including endangered species. The Bay ecosystem is already stressed by human activities that lower its adaptive capacity, such as diversion of freshwater inflow and loss of tidal wetlands. Climate change will further alter the ecosystem by inundating or eroding wetlands and ecotones, changing sediment dynamics, altering species composition, raising the acidity of Bay waters, changing freshwater inflow or salinity, altering the food web, and impairing water quality, all of which may <b>impair</b> the system's ability to rebound and <b>function</b>. Moreover, further loss of tidal wetland will increase the risk of shoreline flooding.</p>

Climate Change		
	Staff's September 3, 2010 Proposed Findings	Latest Staff Proposal
	<p><b>Add underlined language as follows:</b></p> <p>n. <u>Some Bay Area residents, particularly those with low incomes or disabilities and the elderly, may lack the resources or capacity to respond effectively to the impacts of sea level rise and storm activity. Financial and other assistance is needed to achieve regional equity goals and help everyone be part of resilient shoreline communities.</u></p>	<p><b>Changes to September 3, 2010 proposal are in bold:</b></p> <p>n. Some Bay Area <b>communities</b>, particularly those <b>whose residents have low incomes, disabilities or are elderly</b>, may lack the resources or capacity to respond effectively to the impacts of sea level rise and storm activity. Financial and other assistance is needed to achieve regional equity goals and help everyone be part of resilient shoreline communities.</p>
	<p><b>Add underlined language as follows:</b></p> <p>o. <u>Approaches for ensuring public safety in developed vulnerable shoreline areas include: (1) protecting existing development; (2) accommodating flooding by building structures that are resilient (3) discouraging permanent new development; (4) allowing only interim new uses that can be removed or phased out as inundation threats increase; and (5) removing existing development.</u></p>	<p><b>Changes to September 3, 2010 proposal are in bold:</b></p> <p>o. <b>Approaches for ensuring public safety in developed vulnerable shoreline areas</b> through adaptive management strategies <b>include</b> but are not limited to: <b>(1) protecting existing</b> and planned appropriate infill <b>development; (2) accommodating flooding by building or renovating structures</b> or infrastructure systems <b>that are resilient</b> or adaptable over time; <b>(3) discouraging permanent new development</b> when adaptive management strategies cannot protect public safety; <b>(4) allowing only new uses that can be removed or phased out</b> if adaptive management strategies are not available <b>as inundation threats increase; and (5) over time and where feasible and appropriate, removing existing development</b> where public safety cannot otherwise be ensured. Determining the appropriate approach and financing structure requires the weighing of various policies and is best done through a collaborative approach that directly involves the affected communities and other governmental agencies with authority or jurisdiction. Some adaptive management strategies may require action and financing on the regional or sub-regional level across jurisdictions.</p>

Climate Change		
	Staff's September 3, 2010 Proposed Findings	Latest Staff Proposal
	<p><b>Add underlined language as follows:</b></p> <p>p. <u>Infill development is the economic use of underutilized or vacant land, or the rehabilitation of existing structures or infrastructure located in an area where supporting infrastructure is in place and that is surrounded by existing development that either is or will be served by transit. Infill development has been identified as an important strategy for reducing greenhouse gas emissions in the Bay Area by providing jobs and housing in locations and at densities that can be served by transit. Some vulnerable shoreline areas are already improved with development that has regionally significant economic, cultural or social value, and can accommodate infill development.</u></p>	<p><b>Changes to September 3, 2010 proposal are in bold:</b></p> <p>p. Infill development is the economic use of underutilized or vacant land or the rehabilitation of existing structures or infrastructure located in <b>an urbanized area on a site (i) that was previously developed or is immediately adjacent to existing urban development, and (ii) that is in close proximity to existing or committed transit, and (iii) for which supporting infrastructure exists to serve the project or would be provided as part of the project.</b> Infill development served by transit has been identified in state law as a type of development that is a critical component in a strategy for reducing greenhouse gas emissions. To further this policy objective, the Association of Bay Area Governments and the Metropolitan Transportation Commission initiated the FOCUS program to develop a regional strategy that promotes a more compact Bay Area land use pattern. In consultation with local governments, the FOCUS program has identified priority development areas for infill development in the Bay Area. These priority development areas, along with other infill sites, are anticipated to be key components of the Bay Area's Sustainable Communities Strategy that will be adopted and periodically updated pursuant to SB 375. One of the Commission's objectives in adopting climate change policies is to facilitate implementation of the Sustainable Communities Strategy. Some shoreline areas that are <b>vulnerable to flooding</b> are already improved with <b>public infrastructure and private</b> development that has regionally significant economic, cultural or social value and can accommodate infill development.</p>

Climate Change		
	Staff's September 3, 2010 Proposed Findings	Latest Staff Proposal
	<p><b>Add underlined language as follows:</b></p> <p>q. <u>When planning or regulating development within areas vulnerable to flooding from sea level rise, allowing small projects, such as minor repairs of existing facilities, and interim uses may be acceptable if they do not significantly increase overall risks to public safety.</u></p>	<p><b>No changes to September 3, 2010 proposal.</b></p>
	<p><b>Add underlined language as follows:</b></p> <p>r. <u>In some cases, the regional goals of encouraging infill development, remediating environmentally degraded land, redeveloping closed military bases and concentrating housing and job density near transit may conflict with the goal of minimizing flood risk by avoiding development in low-lying areas vulnerable to flooding. To minimize this conflict, infill or redevelopment in low-lying areas can be clustered on a portion of the property to reduce the area that must be protected; an adaptation strategy for dealing with rising sea level and shoreline flooding can be formulated with definitive goals and an adaptive management plan for addressing key uncertainties for the life of the project; measures can be incorporated that will achieve resilience and sustainability in all elements of the project; and a permanent financial strategy can be developed to guarantee that the general public will not be burdened with the cost of protecting the project from any sea level rise or storm damage in the future.</u></p>	<p><b>Changes to September 3, 2010 proposal are in bold:</b></p> <p>r. In some cases, the regional goals of encouraging infill development, remediating environmentally degraded land, redeveloping closed military bases and concentrating housing and job density near transit may conflict with the goal of minimizing flood risk by avoiding development in low-lying areas vulnerable to flooding. <b>Methods</b> to minimize this conflict, <b>include, but are not limited to: clustering</b> infill or redevelopment in low-lying areas on a portion of the property to reduce the area that must be protected; <b>formulating</b> an adaptation strategy for <b>dealing with rising sea level and shoreline flooding with definitive goals and an adaptive management plan for addressing key uncertainties for the life of the project;</b> incorporating <b>measures that will</b> enhance project <b>resilience and sustainability; and</b> developing a project-based <b>financial strategy</b> and/or a public financing strategy, as appropriate, to fund future flood protection for the project, which may also protect existing nearby development. Reconciling these different worthy goals and taking appropriate action requires weighing competing policy considerations and would be best accomplished through a collaborative process involving diverse stakeholders, similar to that being undertaken by the Joint Policy Committee to develop the Sustainable Communities Strategy.</p>

Climate Change		
	Staff's September 3, 2010 Proposed Findings	Latest Staff Proposal
	<p><b>Add underlined language as follows:</b></p> <p>s. <u>Some undeveloped low-lying areas that are vulnerable to shoreline flooding contain critical habitat or provide opportunities for habitat enhancement. Allowing development in these areas would preclude important habitat enhancement opportunities. Some developed areas may be suitable for ecosystem restoration if existing development is removed to allow the Bay migrate inland, although relocating communities is very costly and may result in the displacement of neighborhoods.</u></p>	<p><b>Changes to September 3, 2010 proposal are in bold:</b></p> <p>s. Some undeveloped low-lying areas that are vulnerable to shoreline flooding contain <b>important</b> habitat or provide opportunities for habitat enhancement. <b>In these areas, development that would have regional benefits could preclude wetland enhancement that would also have regional benefits.</b> Some developed areas may be suitable for ecosystem restoration if existing development is removed to allow the Bay <b>to</b> migrate inland, although relocating communities is very costly and may result in the displacement of neighborhoods.</p>
	<p><b>Add underlined language as follows:</b></p> <p>t. <u>There are multiple local, state, federal, and regional government agencies with authority over the Bay and shoreline. Local governments have broad authority over shoreline land use, but limited resources to address climate change adaptation. Working collaboratively can optimize scarce resources and create the flexibility needed to plan amidst a high degree of uncertainty.</u></p>	<p><b>Changes to September 3, 2010 proposal are in bold:</b></p> <p>t. There are multiple local, state, federal, and regional government agencies with authority over the Bay and shoreline. Local governments have broad authority over shoreline land use, but limited resources to address climate change adaptation. Working collaboratively <b>with local governments, including agencies with responsibility for flood protection is desirable to</b> optimize scarce resources and create the flexibility needed to plan amidst a high degree of uncertainty.</p>

Climate Change		
	Staff's September 3, 2010 Proposed Findings	Latest Staff Proposal
	<p><b>Add underlined language as follows:</b></p> <p>u. <u>Government jurisdictional boundaries and authorities in the Bay Area are incongruent with the regional scale and nature of climate-related challenges. The Joint Policy Committee, which is comprised of regional agencies, provides a framework for regional decision-making to address climate change through consistent and effective regionwide policy and to provide local governments with assistance and incentives for addressing climate change.</u></p>	<p><b>Changes to September 3, 2010 proposal are in bold:</b></p> <p>u. Government jurisdictional boundaries and authorities in the Bay Area are incongruent with the regional scale and nature of climate-related challenges. The Joint Policy Committee, which is comprised of regional agencies, provides a framework for regional decision-making to address climate change through consistent and effective regionwide policy and to provide local governments with assistance and incentives for addressing climate change. <b>The Commission can collaborate with the Joint Policy Committee to assure that the Bay Plan Climate Change policies are integrated with the emerging Sustainable Communities Strategy and other regional agencies' policies that deal with climate change issues.</b></p>
	<p><b>Add underlined language as follows:</b></p> <p>v. <u>The Commission's current legal authority and regulatory jurisdiction, which were created to allow the Commission to advance the State goals of preventing unnecessary filling of the Bay and increasing public access to the Bay shoreline, limit the Commission's ability to successfully conserve the Bay and guide the wise development of the Bay and its shoreline in the face of current and future rates of sea level rise. However, through its Bay Plan policies the Commission can provide guidance to developers, the general public, local governments, and other governmental agencies that have broader authority over the use and development of areas that are vulnerable to inundation.</u></p>	<p><b>Changes to September 3, 2010 proposal are in bold:</b></p> <p>v. The Commission's legal authority and regulatory jurisdiction <b>were created to address the Legislative findings and advance the declarations of state policy established in the McAteer-Petris Act and the Suisun Marsh Preservation Act of 1977. Climate change and sea level rise were not considerations when this authority and jurisdiction were established.</b></p>

<b>Climate Change</b>		
	Staff's September 3, 2010 Proposed Findings	Latest Staff Proposal
		<p><b>Changes to September 3, 2010 proposal are in bold:</b></p> <p><b>(New Finding)</b></p> <p>w. The California Ocean Protection Council has endorsed the guiding principles of the California Climate Adaptation Strategy, which recommends that state agencies pursue the following policy objectives in their adaptation planning:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• California must protect public health and safety and critical infrastructure;</li> <li>• California must protect, restore, and enhance ocean and coastal ecosystems, on which the State economy and well-being depend;</li> <li>• California must ensure public access to coastal areas and protect beaches, natural shoreline, and park and recreational resources;</li> <li>• New development and communities must be planned and designed for long-term sustainability in the face of climate change;</li> <li>• California must look for ways to facilitate adaptation of existing development and communities to reduce their vulnerability to climate change impacts over time; and</li> <li>• California must begin now to adapt to the impacts of climate change. The State can no longer act as if nothing is changing.</li> </ul>

Climate Change		
	Staff's September 3, 2010 Proposed Findings	Latest Staff Proposal
		<p><b>Changes to September 3, 2010 proposal are in bold:</b>  <b>(New Finding)</b></p> <p>x. <b>The California Climate Adaptation Strategy establishes avoiding future hazards and protecting critical habitat as a top priority action to combat the impacts of sea level rise. The strategy recommends that state agencies should consider project alternatives that avoid significant new development in areas that cannot be adequately protected (planning, permitting, development, and building) from flooding or erosion due to climate change. The strategy indicates that the most risk-averse approach for minimizing the adverse effects of sea level rise and storm activities is to carefully consider new development within areas vulnerable to inundation and erosion, and to consider prohibiting development of undeveloped, vulnerable shoreline areas containing critical habitat or opportunities for habitat creation. The strategy recommends that state agencies should generally not plan, develop, or build any new significant structure in a place where that structure will require significant protection from sea-level rise, storm surges, or coastal erosion during the expected life of the structure. However, the strategy also acknowledges that vulnerable shoreline areas containing existing development or proposed for new development that has or will have regionally significant economic, cultural, or social value may have to be protected, and infill development in these areas should be closely scrutinized. The strategy recommends that state agencies should incorporate this policy into their decisions.</b></p>

<b>Climate Change</b>		
	Staff's September 3, 2010 Proposed Findings	Latest Staff Proposal
		<p><b>Changes to September 3, 2010 proposal are in bold:</b>  <b>(New Finding)</b></p> <p>y. To promote habitat protection in the face of sea level rise, the California Climate Adaptation Strategy recommends that the state should consider prohibiting projects that would place development in undeveloped areas already containing critical habitat, and those containing opportunities for tidal wetland restoration, habitat migration, or buffer zones. The strategy encourages projects that protect critical habitats, fish, wildlife and other aquatic organisms and connections between coastal habitats. The strategy recommends pursuing activities that can increase natural resiliency, such as restoring tidal wetlands, living shoreline, and related habitats; managing sediment for marsh accretion and natural flood protection; and maintaining upland buffer areas around tidal wetlands.</p>

Climate Change		
	Staff's September 3, 2010 Proposed Findings	Latest Staff Proposal
		<p>Changes to September 3, 2010 proposal are in bold: (New Policy)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <u>The Commission intends that the Bay Plan Climate Change findings and policies will be used as follows:</u> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. <u>The findings and policies apply only to projects and activities located within the following areas: San Francisco Bay, the 100-foot shoreline band, salt ponds, managed wetlands, and certain waterways, as these areas are described in Government Code section 66610, and the Suisun Marsh, as this area is described in Public Resources Code section 29101;</u></li> <li>b. <u>For projects or activities that are located partly within the areas described in subparagraph a and partly outside such area, the findings and policies apply only to those activities or that portion of the project within the areas described in subparagraph a;</u></li> <li>c. <u>For the purposes of implementing the federal Coastal Zone Management Act, the findings and policies do not apply to projects and activities located outside the areas described in subparagraph a, even if those projects or activities may otherwise be subject to consistency review pursuant to the federal Coastal Zone Management Act; and</u></li> <li>d. <u>For purposes of implementing the California Environmental Quality Act, the findings and policies are not applicable portions of the Bay Plan for purposes of CEQA Guideline 15125(d) for projects and activities outside the areas described in subparagraph a and, therefore, a discussion of whether such proposed projects or activities are consistent with the policies is not required in environmental documents.</u></li> </ol> </li> </ol>

Climate Change		
	Staff’s September 3, 2010 Proposed Policies	Latest Staff Proposal
	<p><b>Add underlined language as follows:</b></p> <p>1. <u>When planning shoreline areas or designing larger shoreline projects, a risk assessment should be prepared, based on the estimated 100-year flood elevations that take future sea level rise into account. A range of sea level rise projections for mid-century and end of century, including at least one high estimate, that is based on the best science-based projections currently available, should be used in the risk assessment.</u></p>	<p><b>Changes to September 3, 2010 proposal are in bold:</b></p> <p>2. When planning shoreline areas or designing larger shoreline projects, a risk assessment should be prepared <b>by a qualified engineer and should be based on the estimated 100-year flood elevation that takes into account the best estimates of future sea level rise and current flood protection and planned flood protection that will be funded and constructed when needed to provide protection for the proposed project or shoreline area.</b> A range of sea level rise projections for mid-century and end of century based on the best <b>scientific data</b> available should be used in the risk assessment. <b>Inundation maps used for the risk assessment should be prepared under the direction of a qualified engineer. The risk assessment should identify all types of potential flooding, degrees of uncertainty, consequences of defense failure, and risks to existing habitat from proposed flood protection devices.</b></p>
	<p><b>Add underlined language as follows:</b></p> <p>2. <u>To protect public safety and ecosystem services, within areas vulnerable to future shoreline flooding, all projects—other than minor repairs of existing facilities, small projects that do not increase risks to public safety, interim projects and infill projects within existing urbanized areas that likely will be protected whether or not the infill takes place—should be designed to be resilient to a mid-century sea level rise projection based upon a risk assessment conducted for the project. If it is likely the project will remain in place longer than mid-century, an adaptive management plan should be developed to address the long term impacts that will arise based on a risk assessment using the best available science-based projection for sea level rise at the end of the century.</u></p>	<p><b>Changes to September 3, 2010 proposal are in bold:</b></p> <p>3. To protect public safety and ecosystem services, within areas <b>that a risk assessment determines are vulnerable to future shoreline flooding that threatens public safety,</b> all projects—other than repairs of existing facilities, small projects that do not increase risks to public safety, interim projects and infill projects within existing urbanized areas—should be designed to be resilient to a mid-century sea level rise projection. If it is likely the project will remain in place longer than mid-century, an adaptive management plan should be developed to address the long-term impacts that will arise based on a risk assessment using the best available science-based projection for sea level rise at the end of the century.</p>

<b>Climate Change</b>		
	<b>Staff's September 3, 2010 Proposed Policies</b>	<b>Latest Staff Proposal</b>
	<p><b>Add underlined language as follows:</b></p> <p>3. <u>Undeveloped, vulnerable shoreline areas that currently sustain diverse habitats and species or possess conditions that make the areas especially suitable for ecosystem enhancement should be preserved, enhanced or permanently protected to allow for the inland migration of Bay habitat as sea level rises and to address the adverse environmental impacts of climate change.</u></p>	<p><b>Changes to September 3, 2010 proposal are in bold:</b></p> <p>4. <b>The California Climate Adaptation Strategy recommends that state agencies should consider prohibiting development of undeveloped, vulnerable shoreline areas containing critical habitat or opportunities for habitat creation. To advance this state policy objective along the Bay shoreline and to address the regional adverse impacts of climate change, undeveloped areas that are both vulnerable to future flooding and currently sustain critical habitats or species, or possess conditions that make the areas especially suitable for ecosystem enhancement should be given special consideration for preservation and habitat enhancement and should be encouraged to be used for those purposes. Development in these areas should be discouraged.</b></p>
	<p><b>Add underlined language as follows:</b></p> <p>4. <u>Wherever feasible and appropriate, effective, innovative sea level rise adaptation approaches should be encouraged.</u></p>	<p><b>No changes to September 3, 2010 proposal.</b></p>

Climate Change		
	Staff's September 3, 2010 Proposed Policies	Latest Staff Proposal
	<p><b>Add underlined language as follows:</b></p> <p>5. <u>The Commission, in collaboration with the Joint Policy Committee, other regional, state and federal agencies, local governments, and the general public, should formulate a regional sea level rise adaptation strategy for protecting critical developed shoreline areas and natural ecosystems, enhancing the resilience of Bay and shoreline systems and increasing their adaptive capacity.</u></p>	<p><b>Changes to September 3, 2010 proposal are in bold:</b></p> <p>6. The Commission, in collaboration with the Joint Policy Committee, other regional, state and federal agencies, local governments, and the general public, should formulate a regional sea level rise adaptation strategy for protecting critical developed shoreline areas and natural ecosystems, enhancing the resilience of Bay and shoreline systems and increasing their adaptive capacity.</p>
	<p><u>The strategy should incorporate an adaptive management approach, be updated regularly to reflect changing conditions and information, and include maps of shoreline areas that are vulnerable to flooding based on projections of future sea level rise and shoreline flooding. The maps should be prepared and regularly updated in consultation with government agencies with authority over flood protection.</u></p> <p><u>The regional strategy should determine where existing development should be protected and infill development encouraged, where new development should be permitted, where existing development should eventually be removed to allow the Bay to migrate inland.</u></p>	<p><b>The Commission recommends that: (a) the strategy incorporate an adaptive management approach; (b) the strategy be consistent with the goals of SB 375 and the principles of the California Climate Adaptation Strategy; (c) the strategy be updated regularly to reflect changing conditions and scientific information and include maps of shoreline areas that are vulnerable to flooding based on projections of future sea level rise and shoreline flooding; (d) the maps be prepared under the direction of a qualified engineer and regularly updated in consultation with government agencies with authority over flood protection; and (e) particular attention be given to identifying and encouraging the development of long-term regional flood protection strategies that may be beyond the fiscal resources of individual local agencies.</b></p>

Climate Change		
	Staff's September 3, 2010 Proposed Policies	Latest Staff Proposal
		<p><b>Changes to September 3, 2010 proposal are in bold:</b></p> <p>Ideally, the regional strategy will determine where <b>and how</b> existing development should be protected and infill development encouraged, where new development should be permitted, and where existing development should eventually be removed to allow the Bay to migrate inland.</p>
	<p>The goals of the strategy should be to:</p> <p>a. <u>advance regional public safety and prosperity by protecting most existing shoreline development, especially development that provides regionally significant benefits, and by protecting infrastructure that is critical to public health or the region's economy, such as airports, ports, regional transportation, wastewater treatment facilities, major parks, recreational areas and trails;</u></p>	<p><b>The entities that formulate the regional strategy are encouraged to consider the following strategies and goals:</b></p> <p>a. advance regional public safety and <b>economic</b> prosperity by protecting, <b>to the maximum extent feasible:</b> (i) existing development that provides regionally significant benefits; (ii) <b>new shoreline development that is consistent with other Bay Plan policies;</b> and (iii) infrastructure that is crucial to public health or the region's economy, such as airports, ports, regional transportation, wastewater treatment facilities, major parks, recreational areas and trails;</p>

Climate Change		
	Staff's September 3, 2010 Proposed Policies	Latest Staff Proposal
	<p><u>b. enhance the Bay ecosystem (e.g., Bay habitats, fish, wildlife and other aquatic organisms) by identifying both developed and undeveloped areas where tidal wetlands and tidal flats can migrate landward; assuring adequate volumes of sediment for marsh accretion; identifying priority conservation areas that should be considered for acquisition, preservation or enhancement; developing and planning for flood protection; and maintaining sufficient transitional habitat and upland buffer areas around tidal wetlands;</u></p>	<p>b. <b>to the extent feasible and compatible with subparagraph (a)</b>, enhance the Bay ecosystem by identifying areas where tidal wetlands and tidal flats can migrate landward; assuring adequate volumes of sediment for marsh accretion; identifying conservation areas that should be considered for acquisition, preservation or enhancement; developing and planning for flood protection; and maintaining sufficient transitional habitat and upland buffer areas around tidal wetlands;</p>
	<p><u>c. integrate the protection of existing and future shoreline development with the enhancement of the Bay ecosystem, such as by using feasible shoreline protection measures that incorporate natural Bay habitat for flood control and erosion prevention;</u></p> <p><u>d. encourage innovative approaches to sea level rise adaptation;</u></p> <p><u>e. identify a framework for integrating the adaptation responses of multiple government agencies;</u></p> <p><u>f. integrate regional mitigation measures designed to reduce greenhouse gas emissions with regional adaptation measures designed to address the unavoidable impacts of climate change;</u></p>	<p>c. integrate the protection of existing and future shoreline development with the enhancement of the Bay ecosystem, such as by using feasible shoreline protection measures that incorporate natural Bay habitat for flood control and erosion prevention;</p> <p>d. encourage innovative approaches to sea level rise adaptation;</p> <p>e. identify a framework for integrating the adaptation responses of multiple government agencies;</p> <p>f. integrate regional mitigation measures designed to reduce greenhouse gas emissions with regional adaptation measures designed to address the unavoidable impacts of climate change;</p>

Climate Change		
	Staff's September 3, 2010 Proposed Policies	Latest Staff Proposal
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>g. <u>advance regional sustainability, encourage infill development and job creation, and provide diverse housing served by transit;</u></li> <li>h. <u>address any existing contamination and the implications of the contamination on water quality;</u></li> <li>i. <u>support research that provides information useful for planning and policy development on the impacts of climate change on the Bay, particularly those related to shoreline flooding;</u></li> <li>j. <u>identify actions to prepare and implement the strategy, including any needed changes in law; and</u></li> <li>k. <u>identify mechanisms to provide information, tools, and financial resources so local governments can integrate regional climate change adaptation planning into local community design processes.</u></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>g. <b>address environmental justice and social equity issues;</b></li> <li>h. <b>integrate hazard mitigation and emergency preparedness planning with adaptation planning by developing techniques for reducing contamination releases, structural damage and toxic mold growth associated with flooding of buildings, and establishing emergency assistance centers in neighborhoods at risk from flooding;</b></li> <li>i. advance regional sustainability, encourage infill development and job creation, and provide diverse housing served by transit;</li> <li>j. <b>encourage the remediation of shoreline areas with existing environmental degradation and contamination in order to reduce risks to the Bay's water quality in the event of flooding;</b></li> <li>k. support research that provides information useful for planning and policy development on the impacts of climate change on the Bay, particularly those related to shoreline flooding;</li> <li>l. identify actions to prepare and implement the strategy, including any needed changes in law; and</li> <li>m. identify mechanisms to provide information, tools, and financial resources so local governments can integrate regional climate change adaptation planning into local community design processes.</li> </ul>

Climate Change	
Staff's September 3, 2010 Proposed Policies	Latest Staff Proposal
<p><b>Add underlined language as follows:</b></p> <p>6. <u>Until a regional sea level rise adaptation strategy can be completed, when planning or regulating new development in areas vulnerable to future shoreline flooding, new projects should be limited to:</u></p> <p>a. <u>minor repairs of existing facilities or small projects that do not increase risks to public safety;</u></p> <p>b. <u>transportation facilities, public utilities or other critical infrastructure that is necessary for the continued viability of existing development;</u></p> <p>c. <u>infill development within existing urbanized areas that contain development and infrastructure of such high value that the areas will likely be protected whether or not the infill takes place;</u></p> <p>d. <u>redevelopment that will remediate existing environmental degradation or contamination, particularly on closed military bases, if the redevelopment will (1) provide significant regional benefits and meet regional goals by concentrating employment or housing near adequate transit service sufficient to serve the project, and (2) include the following elements: (i) an adaptation strategy for dealing with rising sea level and shoreline flooding with definitive goals and an adaptive management plan for addressing key uncertainties for the life of the project; (ii) measures that will achieve resilience and sustainability in all elements of the project; (iii) a permanent financial strategy that will guarantee the general public will not be burdened with the cost of protecting the project from any sea level rise or storm damage in the future;</u></p> <p>e. <u>projects or uses that are interim or temporary in nature where the use or structures: (1) can be easily removed or relocated to higher ground; (2) can be amortized within a period before removal or relocation of the proposed use is required; and (3) will not require shoreline protection during the life of the project; or</u></p> <p>f. <u>public parks, natural resource restoration or environmental enhancement projects.</u></p>	<p>7. The California Climate Adaptation Strategy acknowledges that vulnerable shoreline areas containing existing development or proposed for new development that has or will have regionally significant economic, cultural, or social value may have to be protected, and recommends that infill development in these areas should be closely scrutinized. To advance this state policy objective along the shoreline of the Bay, until a regional sea level rise adaptation strategy can be completed, the Commission should evaluate each project proposed in vulnerable areas on a case-by-case basis to determine the project's public benefits, resilience to flooding, and capacity to adapt to climate change impacts. The following specific types of projects have regional benefits, advance regional goals, and may be approved if their regional benefits and their advancement of regional goals outweigh the risk from flooding:</p> <p>a. remediation of existing environmental degradation or contamination, particularly on a closed military base;</p> <p>b. a transportation facility, public utility or other critical infrastructure that is necessary for existing development or to serve planned development; and</p> <p>c. a project that will concentrate employment or housing near existing or committed transit service, such as infill development, particularly within those Priority Development Areas that are established by the Association of Bay Area Governments and endorsed by the Commission, and that includes a financial strategy for flood protection that will minimize the burdens on the public and a sea level rise adaptation strategy that will adequately provide for the resilience and sustainability of the project over its designed lifespan.</p>

Climate Change		
	Staff's September 3, 2010 Proposed Policies	Latest Staff Proposal
		<p>The following specific types of projects may be approved if they do not negatively impact the Bay and do not increase risks to public safety:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>d. repairs of an existing facility;</li> <li>e. a small project;</li> <li>f. a use that is interim in nature and either can be easily removed or relocated to higher ground or can be amortized within a period before removal or relocation of the proposed use would be necessary;</li> <li>g. a public park; and</li> <li>h. a natural resource restoration or environmental enhancement project.</li> </ul>
	<p><u>8. To effectively address sea level rise and flooding, if more than one government agency has authority or jurisdiction over a particular issue or area, project reviews should be coordinated to resolve conflicting guidelines, standards or conditions.</u></p>	<p><b>No changes to September 3, 2010 proposal.</b></p>

Safety of Fills		
Existing Bay Plan Findings	Staff's September 3, 2010 Proposed Findings	Latest Staff Proposal
<p>f. Flood damage to fills and shoreline areas can result from a combination of heavy rainfall, high tides, and winds blowing onshore. To prevent such damage, structures on fill or near the shoreline should be above the highest expected water level during the expected life of the project or should be protected for the expected life of the project by levees of an adequate height.</p>	<p><b>Add underlined language and delete struck-through language as follows:</b></p> <p>f. Flood damage to fills and shoreline areas can result from a combination of <u>sea level rise, storm surge,</u> <del>heavy</del> rainfall, high tides, and winds blowing onshore. <u>The most effective way to prevent such damage, is to locate projects and facilities</u> <del>structures</del> on fill or near the shoreline <del>should be above the a highest expected water level</del> <u>100-year flood level that takes future sea level rise into account,</u> during the expected life of the project. <del>or should be protected for the expected life of the project by</del> <u>Other approaches that can reduce flood damage include protecting structures or areas with levees, of an adequate height seawalls, tidal marshes, or other protective measures, employing innovative design concepts, such as building structures that can be easily relocated, tolerate periodic flooding or are adaptively designed and managed to address sea level rise over time.</u></p>	<p><b>Changes to September 3, 2010 proposal are in bold:</b></p> <p>f. Flood damage to fills and shoreline areas can result from a combination of sea level rise, storm surge, rainfall, high tides, and winds blowing onshore. The most effective way to prevent such damage is to locate projects and facilities on fill or near the shoreline above a 100-year flood level that takes future sea level rise into account during the expected life of the project. <b>Other effective</b> approaches that can reduce flood damage include protecting structures or areas with levees, seawalls, tidal marshes, or other protective measures; <b>and</b> employing innovative design concepts, such as building structures that can be easily relocated, tolerate periodic flooding or are adaptively designed and managed to address sea level rise over time.</p>

Safety of Fills		
Existing Bay Plan Findings	Staff's September 3, 2010 Proposed Findings	Latest Staff Proposal
<p>g. Bay water levels are likely to increase in the future because of a relative rise in sea level. Relative rise in sea level is the sum of: (1) a rise in global sea level and (2) land elevation change (lifting or subsidence) around the Bay. If historic trends continue, global sea level should increase between four and five inches in the Bay in the next 50 years and could increase approximately one and one-half to five feet by the year 2100 depending on the rate of accelerated rise in sea level caused by the "greenhouse effect," the long-term warming of the earth's surface from heat radiated off the earth and trapped in the earth's atmosphere by gases released into the atmosphere. The warming would bring about an accelerated rise in sea level worldwide through thermal expansion of the upper layers of the oceans and melting of some of the earth's glaciers and polar ice packs. Land elevation change caused by tectonic (geologic including seismic) activity, consolidation or compaction of soft soils such as Bay muds, and extraction of subsurface groundwater or natural gas extraction, is variable around the Bay. Consequently, some parts of the Bay will experience a greater relative rise in sea level than other areas. For example, in Sausalito, the land area has been gradually lifting while in the South Bay excessive pumping from underground fresh water reservoirs has caused extensive subsidence of the ground surface in the San Jose area and as far north as Dumbarton Bridge (map of Generalized Subsidence and Fault Zones shows subsidence from 1934 to 1967). Indications are that if heavy groundwater pumping is continued indefinitely in the South Bay area, land in the Alviso area (which has already subsided about seven feet since 1912) could subside up to seven feet more; if this occurs, extensive levees may be needed to prevent inundation of low-lying areas by the extreme high water levels.</p>	<p><b>Add underlined language and delete struck-through language as follows:</b></p> <p>g. <del>Bay water levels are likely to increase in the future because of a relative rise in sea level. Relative rise in sea level is the sum of: (1) a rise in global sea level and (2) land elevation change (lifting or subsidence) around the Bay. If historic trends continue, global sea level should increase between four and five inches in the Bay in the next 50 years and could increase approximately one and one-half to five feet by the year 2100 depending on the rate of accelerated rise in sea level caused by the "greenhouse effect," the long term warming of the earth's surface from heat radiated off the earth and trapped in the earth's atmosphere by gases released into the atmosphere. The warming would bring about an accelerated rise in sea level worldwide through thermal expansion of the upper layers of the oceans and melting of some of the earth's glaciers and polar ice packs. Sea level is rising at an accelerated rate due to global climate change. Land elevation change caused by tectonic (geologic, including seismic) activity, consolidation or compaction of soft soils such as Bay muds, and extraction of subsurface groundwater or natural gas extraction, is variable around the Bay. Consequently, some parts of the Bay will experience a greater relative rise in sea level than other areas. Relative rise in sea level is the sum of: (1) a rise in global sea level and (2) land elevation change (lifting or subsidence) around the Bay. For example, in Sausalito, the land area has been gradually lifting while in the South Bay excessive pumping from underground fresh water reservoirs has caused extensive subsidence of the ground surface in the San Jose area and as far north as Dumbarton Bridge (map of Generalized Subsidence and Fault Zones shows subsidence from 1934 to 1967). Indications are that if heavy groundwater pumping is continued indefinitely in the South Bay area, land in the Alviso area (which has already subsided about seven feet since 1912) could subside up to seven feet more; if this</del> <u>Where subsidence occurs, more</u> extensive levees <u>shoreline protection and wetland restoration projects</u> may be needed to <u>minimize prevent inundation flooding</u> of low-lying areas by the extreme high water levels.</p>	<p><b>No changes to September 3, 2010 proposal.</b></p>

<b>Safety of Fills</b>		
<b>Existing Bay Plan Findings</b>	<b>Staff's September 3, 2010 Proposed Findings</b>	<b>Latest Staff Proposal</b>
<p>3. To provide vitally-needed information on the effects of earthquakes on all kinds of soils, installation of strong-motion seismographs should be required on all future major land fills. In addition, the Commission encourages installation of strong-motion seismographs in other developments on problem soils, and in other areas recommended by the U.S. Coast and Geodetic Survey, for purposes of data comparison and evaluation.</p>	<p><b>Add underlined language and delete struck-through language as follows:</b></p> <p>3. To provide vitally-needed information on the effects of earthquakes on all kinds of soils, installation of strong-motion seismographs should be required on all future major land fills. In addition, the Commission encourages installation of strong-motion seismographs in other developments on problem soils, and in other areas recommended by the U.S. <del>Coast and Geodetic</del> <u>Geological</u> Survey, for purposes of data comparison and evaluation.</p>	<p>No changes to September 3, 2010 proposal.</p>
<p>4. To prevent damage from flooding, structures on fill or near the shoreline should have adequate flood protection including consideration of future relative sea level rise as determined by competent engineers. As a general rule, structures on fill or near the shoreline should be above the wave runup level or sufficiently set back from the edge of the shore so that the structure is not subject to dynamic wave energy. In all cases, the bottom floor level of structures should be above the highest estimated tide elevation. Exceptions to the general height rule may be made for developments specifically designed to tolerate periodic flooding.</p>	<p><b>Add underlined language and delete struck-through language as follows:</b></p> <p>4. <u>Adequate measures should be provided to prevent damage from sea level rise and storm activity flooding, that may occur</u> structures on fill or near the shoreline <u>over the expected life of a project.</u> <del>should have adequate flood protection including consideration of future relative sea level rise as determined by competent engineers. As a general rule,</del> <u>The Commission may approve fill that is needed to provide flood protection for existing projects. New projects</u> structures on fill or near the shoreline should <u>either be above the wave runup level or sufficiently</u> set back from the edge of the shore so that the <u>project structure is will not be</u> subject to dynamic wave energy; <u>be built so in all cases,</u> the bottom floor level of structures <u>should will be</u> above a <u>the highest estimated tide 100-year flood elevation that takes future sea level rise into account for the expected life of the project,</u> <u>be</u> <del>Exceptions to the general height rule may be made for developments specifically designed to tolerate periodic flooding, or employ other effective means of addressing the impacts of future sea level rise and storm activity. Rights-of-way for levees or other structures protecting inland areas from tidal flooding should be sufficiently wide on the upland side to allow for future levee widening to support additional levee height so that no fill for levee widening is placed in the Bay.</del></p>	<p>No changes to September 3, 2010 proposal.</p>

<b>Safety of Fills</b>		
<b>Existing Bay Plan Findings</b>	<b>Staff's September 3, 2010 Proposed Findings</b>	<b>Latest Staff Proposal</b>
<p>5. To minimize the potential hazard to Bay fill projects and bayside development from subsidence, all proposed developments should be sufficiently high above the highest estimated tide level for the expected life of the project or sufficiently protected by levees to allow for the effects of additional subsidence for the expected life of the project, utilizing the latest information available from the U.S. Geological Survey and the National Ocean Service. Rights-of-way for levees protecting inland areas from tidal flooding should be sufficiently wide on the upland side to allow for future levee widening to support additional levee height so that no fill for levee widening is placed in the Bay.</p>	<p><b>Add underlined language and delete struck-through language as follows:</b></p> <p>5. <del>To minimize the potential hazard to Bay fill projects and bayside development from subsidence, all proposed developments should be sufficiently high above the highest estimated tide level for the expected life of the project or sufficiently protected by levees to allow for the effects of additional subsidence for the expected life of the project, utilizing the latest information available from the U.S. Geological Survey and the National Ocean Service. Rights of way for levees protecting inland areas from tidal flooding should be sufficiently wide on the upland side to allow for future levee widening to support additional levee height so that no fill for levee widening is placed in the Bay.</del></p>	<p><b>No changes to September 3, 2010 proposal.</b></p>

Safety of Fills		
Existing Bay Plan Policies	Staff's September 3, 2010 Proposed Policies	Latest Staff Proposal
<p>6. Local governments and special districts with responsibilities for flood protection should assure that their requirements and criteria reflect future relative sea level rise and should assure that new structures and uses attracting people are not approved in flood prone areas or in areas that will become flood prone in the future, and that structures and uses that are approvable will be built at stable elevations to assure long-term protection from flood hazards.</p>	<p><b>Add underlined language and delete struck-through language as follows:</b></p> <p>6. Local governments and special districts with responsibilities for flood protection should assure that their requirements and criteria <del>reflect</del> <u>address</u> future relative sea level rise <del>and should assure so</del> that new structures and uses attracting people are not approved in <u>current or future</u> flood prone areas, <del>or in areas that will become flood prone in the future</del>; and that structures and uses that are <u>approved</u> <del>approvable</del> will be built at stable elevations and are properly designed to assure long-term protection from <del>flood hazards</del> <u>shoreline flooding</u>.</p>	<p><b>Delete Safety of Fills Policy 6.</b></p> <p><del>6. Local governments and special districts with responsibilities for flood protection should assure that their requirements and criteria reflect future relative sea level rise and should assure that new structures and uses attracting people are not approved in flood prone areas or in areas that will become flood prone in the future, and that structures and uses that are approvable will be built at stable elevations to assure long-term protection from flood hazards.</del></p>

<b>Protection of the Shoreline Protection</b>		
Existing Bay Plan Findings	Staff's September 3, 2010 Proposed Findings	Latest Staff Proposal
	<p><b>Add underlined language as follows:</b></p> <p>a. <u>Well designed shoreline protection projects, such as levees, wetlands, or riprap, can prevent shoreline erosion and damage from flooding.</u></p>	<p><b>No changes to September 3, 2010 proposal.</b></p>
<p>a. Erosion control projects are often needed to protect shoreline property and improvements from erosion. Because so much shoreline consists of soft, easily eroded soils, protective structures are usually required to stabilize and establish a permanent shoreline. These structures often require periodic maintenance and reconstruction.</p>	<p><b>Delete struck-through language as follows:</b></p> <p>a. <del>b. Erosion control</del> <u>Because vast shoreline areas are vulnerable to flooding and because much of the shoreline consists of soft, easily eroded soils, shoreline protection projects are often needed to protect reduce damage to shoreline property and improvements from erosion. Because so much shoreline consists of soft, easily eroded soils, protective structures are usually required to stabilize and establish a permanent shoreline. These structures</u> <u>Structural shoreline protection, such as riprap, levees, and seawalls, often requires periodic maintenance and reconstruction.</u></p>	<p><b>No changes to September 3, 2010 proposal.</b></p>
<p>b. Most erosion control projects involve some fill which can adversely affect natural resources such as water surface area and volume, tidal circulation, wildlife use, marshes, and mudflats.</p>	<p><b>Add underlined language and delete struck-through language as follows:</b></p> <p>b. <del>c. Most erosion control</del> <u>structural shoreline protection projects involve some fill, which can adversely affect natural resources, such as water surface area and volume, tidal circulation, and wildlife use. marshes, and mudflats. Structural shoreline protection can further cause erosion of tidal wetlands and tidal flats, prevent wetland migration to accommodate sea level rise, create a barrier to physical and visual public access to the Bay, create a false sense of security and may have cumulative impacts. Physical and visual public access can be provided on levees and other protection structures. As the rate of sea level rise accelerates and the potential for shoreline flooding increases, the demand for new shoreline protection projects will likely increase. Some projects may involve extensive amounts of fill.</u></p>	<p><b>No changes to September 3, 2010 proposal.</b></p>

<b>Protection of the Shoreline Protection</b>		
Existing Bay Plan Findings	Staff's September 3, 2010 Proposed Findings	Latest Staff Proposal
<p>c. Shoreline protection structures, such as riprap and sea walls, are most effective and less damaging to natural resources if they are the appropriate kind of structure for the project site and erosion problem, and are properly designed, constructed, and maintained. Because factors affecting erosion vary considerably, no single protective method or structure is appropriate in all situations. When a structure is not appropriate or improperly designed and constructed to meet the unique conditions of and the erosion forces at a project site, the structure is more likely to fail, require additional fill to repair, have higher long-term maintenance costs because of higher frequency of repair, and cause greater disturbance and displacement of the site's natural resources.</p>	<p><b>Add underlined language and delete struck-through language as follows:</b></p> <p>e. <u>d. Structural S</u><del>shoreline protection structures, such as riprap and sea walls, are</del> <u>is</u> most effective and less damaging to natural resources if <del>they are</del> <u>it is</u> the appropriate kind of structure for the project site and erosion <u>and flood</u> problem, and <del>are</del> <u>is</u> properly designed, constructed, and maintained. Because factors affecting erosion <u>and flooding</u> vary considerably, no single protective method or structure is appropriate in all situations. When a structure is not appropriate or <u>is</u> improperly designed and constructed to meet the unique <u>site characteristics, flood conditions of,</u> and erosion forces at a project site, the structure is more likely to fail, require additional fill to repair, have higher long-term maintenance costs because of higher frequency of repair, and cause greater disturbance and displacement of the site's natural resources.</p>	<p><b>No changes to September 3, 2010 proposal.</b></p>

<b>Protection of the Shoreline Protection</b>		
<b>Existing Bay Plan Findings</b>	<b>Staff's September 3, 2010 Proposed Findings</b>	<b>Latest Staff Proposal</b>
	<p><b>Add underlined language as follows:</b></p> <p>e. <u>Addressing the impacts of sea level rise and shoreline flooding may require large-scale flood protection projects, including some that extend across jurisdictional or property boundaries. Coordination with adjacent property owners or jurisdictions to create contiguous, effective shoreline protection is critical when planning and constructing flood protection projects. Failure to coordinate may result in inadequate shoreline protection (e.g., a protection system with gaps or one that causes accelerated erosion in adjacent areas).</u></p>	<b>No changes to September 3, 2010 proposal.</b>
<p>d. Nonstructural erosion control methods, such as marsh plantings, are typically effective only in areas experiencing mild erosion. However, in some instances, it may be possible to combine marsh restoration with structural approaches to control shoreline erosion, thereby minimizing the erosion control project's impact on natural resources.</p>	<p><b>Add underlined language and delete struck-through language as follows:</b></p> <p><del>d</del> f. <u>Nonstructural erosion control shoreline protection methods, such as tidal marshes marsh plantings, can provide effective flood control but are typically effective for erosion control only in areas experiencing mild erosion. However, i</u> In some instances, it may be possible to combine <del>marsh</del> <u>habitat restoration, enhancement or protection with structural approaches to provide protection from flooding and</u> control shoreline erosion, thereby minimizing the <del>erosion control shoreline protection</del> project's impact on natural resources.</p>	<b>No changes to September 3, 2010 proposal.</b>
<p>e. Loose dirt, concrete slabs, asphalt, bricks, scrap wood and other kinds of debris, are generally ineffective in halting shoreline erosion and may lead to increased fill. Although providing some short-term shoreline protection, protective structures constructed of such debris materials typically fail rapidly in storm conditions because the material slides bayward or is washed offshore. Repairing these ineffective structures requires additional material to be placed along the shoreline, leading to unnecessary fill and disturbance of natural resources.</p>	<p><b>Add underlined language and delete struck-through language as follows:</b></p> <p>e.g. Loose dirt, concrete slabs, asphalt, bricks, scrap wood and other kinds of debris, are generally ineffective in halting shoreline erosion <u>or preventing flooding</u> and may lead to increased fill <u>or release of pollutants</u>. Although providing some short-term shoreline protection, protective structures constructed of such debris materials typically fail rapidly in storm conditions because the material slides bayward or is washed offshore. Repairing these ineffective structures requires additional material to be placed along the shoreline, leading to unnecessary fill and disturbance of natural resources.</p>	<b>No changes to September 3, 2010 proposal.</b>

<b>Protection of the Shoreline Protection</b>		
Existing Bay Plan Policies	Staff's September 3, 2010 Proposed Policies	Latest Staff Proposal
<p>1. New shoreline erosion control projects and the maintenance or reconstruction of existing erosion control facilities should be authorized if: (a) the project is necessary to protect the shoreline from erosion; (b) the type of the protective structure is appropriate for the project site and the erosion conditions at the site; and (c) the project is properly designed and constructed. Professionals knowledgeable of the Commission's concerns, such as civil engineers experienced in coastal processes, should participate in the design of erosion control projects.</p>	<p><b>Add underlined language and delete struck-through language as follows:</b></p> <p>1. New shoreline <del>erosion control</del> <u>protection</u> projects and the maintenance or reconstruction of existing <del>erosion control facilities</del> <u>projects</u> should be authorized if: (a) the project is necessary <u>to protect existing shoreline development from flooding or erosion</u>; (b) the type of the protective structure is appropriate for the project site, <u>the uses to be protected</u>, and the erosion <u>and flooding</u> conditions at the site; <del>and</del> (c) the project is properly <u>engineered to provide erosion control and flood protection for the expected life of the project based on a 100-year flood event that takes future sea level rise into account</u>; (d) <u>the project is properly designed and constructed to prevent significant impediments to physical and visual public access</u>; and (e) <u>the protection is integrated with current or planned adjacent shoreline protection measures</u>. Professionals knowledgeable of the Commission's concerns, such as civil engineers experienced in coastal processes should participate in the design.</p>	<p><b>Changes to September 3, 2010 proposal are in bold:</b></p> <p>1. New shoreline protection projects and the maintenance or reconstruction of existing projects should be authorized if: (a) the project is necessary to provide flood or erosion protection for <b>(i) existing development or infrastructure, or (ii) proposed development or infrastructure that is consistent with other Bay Plan policies</b>; (b) the type of the protective structure is appropriate for the project site, the uses to be protected, and the erosion and flooding conditions at the site; (c) the project is properly engineered to provide erosion control and flood protection for the expected life of the project based on a 100-year flood event that takes future sea level rise into account; (d) the project is properly designed and constructed to prevent significant impediments to physical and visual public access; and (e) the protection is integrated with current or planned adjacent shoreline protection measures. Professionals knowledgeable of the Commission's concerns, such as civil engineers experienced in coastal processes should participate in the design.</p>

<b>Protection of the Shoreline Protection</b>		
Existing Bay Plan Policies	Staff's September 3, 2010 Proposed Policies	Latest Staff Proposal
<p>2. Riprap revetments, the most common shoreline protective structure, should be constructed of properly sized and placed material that meet sound engineering criteria for durability, density, and porosity. Armor materials used in the revetment should be placed according to accepted engineering practice, and be free of extraneous material, such as debris and reinforcing steel. Generally, only engineered quarrystone or concrete pieces that have either been specially cast or carefully selected for size, density, durability, and freedom of extraneous materials from demolition debris will meet these requirements. Riprap revetments constructed out of other debris materials should not be authorized.</p>	<p><b>Add underlined language and delete struck-through language as follows:</b></p> <p>2. Riprap revetments, the most common shoreline protective structure, should be constructed of properly sized and placed material that meet sound engineering criteria for durability, density, and porosity. Armor materials used in the revetment should be placed according to accepted engineering practice, and be free of extraneous material, such as debris and reinforcing steel. Generally, only engineered quarrystone or concrete pieces that have either been specially cast, <u>are free of extraneous materials from demolition debris</u>, <del>or and are</del> carefully selected for size, density, <u>and</u> durability, <del>and freedom of extraneous materials from demolition debris</del> will meet these requirements. Riprap revetments constructed out of other debris materials should not be authorized.</p>	<p><b>No changes to September 3, 2010 proposal.</b></p>
<p>3. Authorized protective projects should be regularly maintained according to a long-term maintenance program to assure that the shoreline will be protected from tidal erosion and that the effects of the erosion control project on natural resources during the life of the project will be the minimum necessary.</p>	<p><b>Add underlined language and delete struck-through language as follows:</b></p> <p>3. Authorized protective projects should be regularly maintained according to a long-term maintenance program to assure that the shoreline will be protected from tidal erosion <u>and flooding</u> and that the effects of the <del>erosion control</del> <u>shoreline protection</u> project on natural resources during the life of the project will be the minimum necessary.</p>	<p><b>No changes to September 3, 2010 proposal.</b></p>

<b>Protection of the Shoreline Protection</b>		
Existing Bay Plan Policies	Staff's September 3, 2010 Proposed Policies	Latest Staff Proposal
<p>4. Shoreline protective projects should include provisions for nonstructural methods such as marsh vegetation where feasible. Along shorelines that support marsh vegetation or where marsh establishment has a reasonable chance of success, the Commission should require that the design of authorized protective projects include provisions for establishing marsh and transitional upland vegetation as part of the protective structure, wherever practicable.</p>	<p>4. <u>Whenever feasible and appropriate</u>, shoreline protective projects should include provisions for nonstructural methods such as marsh vegetation <del>where feasible</del> <u>and integrate shoreline protection and Bay ecosystem enhancement, using adaptive management</u>. Along shorelines that support marsh vegetation, or where marsh establishment has a reasonable chance of success, the Commission should require that the design of authorized protective projects include provisions for establishing marsh and transitional upland vegetation as part of the protective structure, wherever <del>practicable</del> <u>feasible</u>.</p>	<p><b>No changes to September 3, 2010 proposal.</b></p>
	<p><b>Add underlined language as follows:</b></p> <p>5. <u>Adverse impacts to natural resources and public access from new shoreline protection should be avoided. Where significant impacts cannot be avoided, mitigation or alternative public access should be provided.</u></p>	<p><b>No changes to September 3, 2010 proposal.</b></p>

<b>Public Access</b>		
<b>Existing Bay Plan Findings</b>	<b>Staff's September 3, 2010 Proposed Findings</b>	<b>Latest Staff Proposal</b>
	<p><b>Add underlined language as follows:</b></p> <p>f. <u>Accelerated flooding from sea level rise and storm activity will severely impact existing shoreline public access, resulting in temporary or permanent closures. Periodic and consistent flooding would increase damage to public access areas, which can then require additional fill to repair, raise maintenance costs, and cause greater disturbance and displacement of the site's natural resources. Risks to public health and safety from sea level rise and shoreline flooding may require new shoreline protection to be installed or existing shoreline protection to be modified, which may impede physical and visual access to the Bay.</u></p>	<p><b>No changes to September 3, 2010 proposal.</b></p>
<p>h. Public access areas obtained through the permit process are most utilized if they provide physical access, provide connections to public rights-of-way, are related to adjacent uses, are designed, improved and maintained clearly to indicate their public character, and provide visual access to the Bay.</p>	<p><b>Add underlined language and delete struck-through language as follows:</b></p> <p><del>h</del> i. Public access areas obtained through the permit process are most utilized if they provide physical access, provide connections to public rights-of-way, are related to adjacent uses, are designed, improved and maintained clearly to indicate their public character, and provide visual access to the Bay. <u>Flooding from sea level rise and storm activity increase the difficulty of designing public access areas (e.g., connecting new public access that is set at a higher elevation or located farther inland than existing public access areas).</u></p>	<p><b>No changes to September 3, 2010 proposal.</b></p>

<b>Public Access</b>		
Existing Bay Plan Findings	Staff's September 3, 2010 Proposed Findings	Latest Staff Proposal
<p>k. Studies indicate that public access may have immediate effects on wildlife (including flushing, increased stress, interrupted foraging, or nest abandonment) and may result in adverse long-term population and species effects. Although some wildlife may adapt to human presence, not all species or individuals may adapt equally, and adaptation may leave some wildlife more vulnerable to harmful human interactions such as harassment or poaching. The type and severity of effects, if any, on wildlife depend on many factors, including physical site configuration, species present, and the nature of the human activity. Accurate characterization of site, habitat and wildlife conditions, and of likely human activities, would provide information critical to understanding potential effects on wildlife.</p>	<p><b>Add underlined language and delete struck-through language as follows:</b></p> <p><del>k</del> <u>l</u>. Studies indicate that public access may have immediate effects on wildlife (including flushing, increased stress, interrupted foraging, or nest abandonment) and may result in adverse long- term population and species effects. Although some wildlife may adapt to human presence, not all species or individuals may adapt equally, and adaptation may leave some wildlife more vulnerable to harmful human interactions such as harassment or poaching. The type and severity of effects, if any, on wildlife depend on many factors, including physical site configuration, species present, and the nature of the human activity. Accurate characterization of <u>current and future</u> site, habitat and wildlife conditions, and of likely human activities, would provide information critical to understanding potential effects on wildlife.</p>	<p><b>No changes to September 3, 2010 proposal.</b></p>

<b>Public Access</b>		
Existing Bay Plan Findings	Staff's September 3, 2010 Proposed Findings	Latest Staff Proposal
<p>I. Potential adverse effects on wildlife from public access may be avoided or minimized by siting, designing and managing public access to reduce or prevent adverse human and wildlife interactions. Managing human use of the area may include adequately maintaining improvements, periodic closure of access areas, pet restrictions such as leash requirements, and prohibition of public access in areas where other strategies are insufficient to avoid adverse effects. Properly sited and/or designed public access can avoid habitat fragmentation and limit predator access routes to wildlife areas. In some cases, public access adjacent to sensitive wildlife areas may be set back from the shoreline a greater distance because buffers may be needed to avoid or minimize human disturbance of wildlife. Appropriate siting, design and management strategies depend on the environmental characteristics of the site and the likely human uses of the site.</p>	<p><b>Add underlined language and delete struck-through language as follows:</b></p> <p>‡ <u>m.</u> Potential adverse effects on wildlife from public access may be avoided or minimized by siting, designing and managing public access to reduce or prevent adverse human and wildlife interactions. Managing human use of the area may include adequately maintaining improvements, periodic closure of access areas, pet restrictions such as leash requirements, and prohibition of public access in areas where other strategies are insufficient to avoid adverse effects. Properly sited and/or designed public access can avoid habitat fragmentation and limit predator access routes to wildlife areas. In some cases, public access adjacent to sensitive wildlife areas may be set back from the shoreline a greater distance because buffers may be needed to avoid or minimize human disturbance of wildlife. Appropriate siting, design and management strategies depend on the environmental characteristics of the site, <del>and the likely human uses of the site,</del> <u>and the potential impacts of future sea-level rise climate change.</u></p>	<p><b>No changes to September 3, 2010 proposal.</b></p>

<b>Public Access</b>		
Existing Bay Plan Findings	Staff's September 3, 2010 Proposed Findings	Latest Staff Proposal
	<p><b>Add underlined language as follows:</b></p> <p>5. <u>Public access should be sited, designed, managed and maintained to avoid significant adverse impacts from sea level rise and shoreline flooding.</u></p>	<p><b>No changes to September 3, 2010 proposal.</b></p>
<p>5. Whenever public access to the Bay is provided as a condition of development, on fill or on the shoreline, the access should be permanently guaranteed. This should be done wherever appropriate by requiring dedication of fee title or easements at no cost to the public, in the same manner that streets, park sites, and school sites are dedicated to the public as part of the subdivision process in cities and counties.</p>	<p><b>Add underlined language and delete struck-through language as follows:</b></p> <p><del>5</del> 6. Whenever public access to the Bay is provided as a condition of development, on fill or on the shoreline, the access should be permanently guaranteed. This should be done wherever appropriate by requiring dedication of fee title or easements at no cost to the public, in the same manner that streets, park sites, and school sites are dedicated to the public as part of the subdivision process in cities and counties. <u>Any public access provided as a condition of development should either be required to remain viable in the event of future sea level rise or flooding, or equivalent access consistent with the project should be provided nearby.</u></p>	<p><b>No changes to September 3, 2010 proposal.</b></p>
	<p><b>Renumber public access policies 6 through 13 to 7 through 14.</b></p>	<p><b>No changes to September 3, 2010 proposal.</b></p>