

San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission

375 Beale Street, Suite 510, San Francisco, California 94105 tel 415 352 3600 fax 888 348 5190

State of California | Gavin Newsom – Governor | info@bcdc.ca.gov | www.bcdc.ca.gov

September 27, 2023

TO: Enforcement Committee Members

FROM: Matthew Trujillo, Enforcement Policy Manager (415-352-3633;
matthew.trujillo@bcdc.ca.gov)

SUBJECT: Draft Minutes of September 27, 2023 Enforcement Committee Meeting

1. Call to Order. The hybrid meeting was called to order by Chair Gilmore at 9:35 a.m. The meeting was held with a primary physical location of 375 Beale Street, 5th Floor - Redwood Room, San Francisco, California, and online via Zoom and Teleconference.

Chair Gilmore gave instructions to all attendees on procedures for participating in the meeting.

2. Roll Call. Mr. Trujillo called the roll. Chair Gilmore and Commissioners Belin and Vasquez were present. A quorum was achieved. Commissioner Ranchod joined after the Roll Call was taken.

Staff in attendance included Enforcement Policy Manager Matthew Trujillo, Principal Enforcement Analyst Adrienne Klein, Compliance Officer John Creech and Legal Secretary Margie Malan.

Chair Gilmore stated a quorum was present and the Committee was duly constituted to conduct business.

3. Public Comment Period. Chair Gilmore invited the general public to comment on items not on the day's Agenda.

Chair Gilmore gave instructions for members of the public to offer public comment.

No members of the public addressed the Committee.

4. Approval of Draft Minutes from the August 23, 2023, Enforcement Committee Meeting.

MOTION: Commissioner Belin moved approval of the August 23, 2023 Meeting Minutes; Commissioner Vasquez seconded the motion.

The motion carried by affirmation with no abstentions or opposition.

5. Enforcement Report. Mr. Trujillo updated the Commissioners on new activity since the August 23 meeting.

Mr. Trujillo stated: I have two items to report out today. The first one is a case update. Since our last meeting on August 23, in the last month we received 7 new cases and resolved 9 cases. That brings our total as of today to 79 unresolved cases which is a net difference of negative three from last month.

Second, an update on the status of compliance with issue orders by the Commission. This is in response to a request that we regularly update this Committee on the compliance status of Commission-issued orders.

We did receive a complaint yesterday of new homeless encampments being established within Union Point Park which is under a compliance monitoring for Commission Order Number CCD.2020.001.00. I referred that complaint to the Compliance Team for follow-up and you will see it today as general public comment.

At a future meeting we will update you on the compliance or legal actions that we may take to get them back into compliance with their order.

That concludes my report. I am available for questions.

Chair Gilmore asked: Do any Committee Members have any questions for Matthew? (No questions were voiced)

PUBLIC COMMENT

Anon commented: I am wondering why there has not been enforcement on the encampments in Union Park. There is one near the abandoned vessels that are near the rocks. This encampment has been here for over a year. It has gotten bigger. I have reported it several times and nothing has happened.

I was promised that things would be handled, and this has not been handled. I am wondering why.

6. Briefing on Oakland Alameda Estuary and Encampment Issue.

Chair Gilmore announced: We will move on to Item 6. This Committee will now receive a briefing on actions taken to address abandoned and derelict vessels and anchor-outs in the Oakland/Alameda Estuary by the cities of Alameda and Oakland.

Will the representatives for cities please identify themselves for the

record.

Sergeant Siver spoke: This is Sergeant Siever with the city of Alameda Police Department.

City of Oakland representatives spoke: I am LaTonda Simmons, Assistant City Administrator and Homelessness Administrator.

Mr. Joe DeVries spoke: I am Joe DeVries, Deputy City Administrator and I will be speaking about the nuisance vessels.

I do want to acknowledge that Officer Kaleo Albino is here to present as well.

Chair Gilmore continued: I will now invite Compliance Analyst John Creech to give his introduction.

Compliance Analyst Creech addressed the Committee: I am on the Enforcement Compliance Team. I have been working closely with Adrienne Klein, Principal Enforcement Analyst to meet regularly with the cities of Oakland and Alameda. We recognize that this issue has received a lot of attention. We are excited about progress that has been made.

I would like to have Sergeant Siever present.

Sergeant Siever addressed the Committee: We currently do not have any boats that are anchored out on the Alameda side of the Estuary. We also currently do not have any encampments that are along the shoreline.

Our boat was out of service for approximately two months for maintenance. We were back on the water Sunday, September 24. We can confirm that there are no anchor-outs or encampments along our shoreline.

We have \$100,000 of state grant monies for this issue. We have used that money and removed seven vessels from the water, and we also assisted the city of Oakland by removing five vessels that they had at the Aquatic Center.

We applied for state grants for the coming cycle, and we have just gotten approval for \$200,000. We plan to help the city of Oakland with removing some of the vessels that they need help with.

Mr. DeVries commented: When we met with staff, we wanted to cover shoreline encampments and anchor-outs. We have a PowerPoint that Ms. Simmons has, and she will start out talking about encampments and then I will

talk about what is happening with the anchor-outs. And then Office Albino can answer some of the operational questions.

Ms. Simmons commented: I will start this presentation and Mr. DeVries will engage another portion of it. Ms. Simmons noted that the presentation would cover the categories of Encampment Management Policy, Encampment Operations, Nuisance Vessel Policy, and Nuisance Vessel Operations.

Ms. Simmons covered factors pertinent to Encampment Management Policy and Encampment Operations.

Mr. Joe DeVries spoke: Mr. DeVries covered salient aspects and developments dealing with nuisance vessels and ramifications of current situations.

Ms. Simmons also covered aspects of next steps via a slide presentation.

Chair Gilmore continued: This committee wants to thank the cities of Alameda and Oakland for these very informative briefings today. I am going to ask if any members of the Enforcement Committee have questions for our guests.

Committee Member Ranchod spoke: I was encouraged to hear that a grant has been received and is going to be made available in the next month or so assuming the Council approves. Is there a likelihood of further grants or other funding being received in the near term; say, during 2024 at some point?

Mr. DeVries replied: We have the opportunity to apply for SAVE grant funding every year. In the past, Oakland has applied for funding based on our resources and our ability to execute. We realized that with the growth with the number of vessels that we needed to apply for more. So, this is a larger amount than we have applied for before. I imagine next spring we will apply for more.

Chair Gilmore commented: Okay, to follow up on the SAVE Grant, you said it was \$166,000. How many vessels do you think that this amount of money would cover in terms of renewal? Can you give a ballpark?

Officer Albino fielded this question: I do want to thank LaTonda and Joe for their in-depth reporting on this. The \$166,000 that I applied for was specifically for approximately 21 vessels.

And it will depend on what is exactly on those vessels as far as engines, hazardous materials that are costly to dispose of. It will be dependent on the

vessels, but I am assuming that 95 percent of the vessels that are out there now will be removed from the Estuary.

Chair Gilmore stated: That is excellent news. I am assuming that none of those vessels are in the navigable waters because if it were, then the Coast Guard would be involved. Is that correct?

Officer Albino replied: There can be a technicality on what is a navigable waterway. But, the majority of the waterways are cleared for barges and cargo ships.

But it is impacting recreational activity such as rowing and the youth sailing teams as well.

Chair Gilmore acknowledged: That is good to know. The other questions I have are in terms of both of your police boats. We have had a lot of complaints from people who live along the Estuary of incidents that originate on the water where people are coming down in boats and vandalizing or robbing the liveboards and the marinas.

How frequently do you patrol and are any of those patrols during the evening or early morning hours?

Sergeant Siebert chimed in: I can answer for the Oakland Police Department. The approximate hours that we are on the water because I am the only full-time maritime officer. A lot of my job is administrative of trying to gather funding for boats doing maintenance, doing training with other departments and the Coast Guard in the area.

I am able to get out on the water approximately 20 to 30 hours a week. I also adjust my schedule to try and give the perception that we are out there during all hours of the day. So, I have been doing night patrols. I am trying to get eyes on all hours of the day, not just 6 a.m. to 4 p.m.

Chair Gilmore acknowledged: Thank you. Alameda?

Officer Albino spoke: The city of Alameda, our marine unit is an ancillary duty for everybody involved. So, we do not have any full-time officers on the marine unit.

At this point in time when we put our boat back into full-time service starting next month, we are being allowed 60 personnel hours per month. We staff our boat with a minimum of two persons at all times. That will allow us to put our boat back in the water three days a month.

And we do vary our patrols. We will stay out as late as 2:45 in the morning.

Chair Gilmore acknowledged: Thank you. I want to be really sensitive to the challenges that the city of Oakland is facing in terms of the homeless crises and the homeless encampments and how that spills out into people thinking that boats are a method of housing.

Clearly, the problem has vastly outstripped your current resources to deal with it. That being said, I understand the frustration of the people who actually live on the water because it is impacting them in their daily lives and there is this tendency that if something affects us, we are laser-focused on it. Whereas the city of Oakland has to focus on the entire City not just the waterfront.

But having said all of that, I am wondering if there is anyway that the cities of Oakland and Alameda can partner together in terms of sharing resources, obtaining more resources to put more patrols out on the water? Especially during the evening hours where it seems like a lot of vandalism and everything else tends to occur based on the reports and the complaints that we have heard.

The city of Oakland mentioned that they were looking for more resources to help with the encampments and the homelessness issue. Is it possible to give us a brief synopsis of what kind of resources you are looking at and what the timeline might be for finding out if you are successful?

Officer Albino spoke: In regard to patrols and increasing our footprint on the waterway, I have been training approximately 10 maritime officers who are dedicated to another assignment, but the marine unit is an auxiliary assignment for them.

So, I am physically teaching them how to drive the boat, how to safely operate it on a waterway, how to approach an anchored-out vessel safely.

What I am hoping to do is have the boat available on a 24/7 basis based off of these officers spread out. Most of them are working patrol. So, they are able to take a break from patrol and go down to the boats and do a short patrol of the Estuary and we are able to expand our footprint.

We have already collaborated with the Alameda Police Department and the Coast Guard as well. The Alameda Police Department has graciously given us \$30,000 in the last six months to help eradicate some of the anchor-out

vessels that have already been out there.

And then the Chief of Alameda Police, Chief Joshi contacted me last week and offered part of their SAVE Grant to help combat all the vessels that we have on our side of the estuary. I am grateful for that funding.

And Commander Shupe is also listening in from the Coast Guard. She has reached out and recently sent an email to collaborate with all law enforcement assets in the area to specifically handle these anchor-out issues in a team effort approach to this.

Sergeant Siebert commented: I think you covered everything. We always try to partner with Albino as much as we can as well as Sergeant Matthews with the San Francisco Marine Unit.

We are limited as far as personnel hours. And we are all ancillary as well on our marine unit. But anytime that there is an operation that needs to take place, we can always get our boat out there and team up with Oakland with the Coast Guard or San Francisco.

Chair Gilmore continued: Thank you. I am very gratified to hear about the close cooperation between the law enforcement offices. That is the kind of thing that we want to see happen all across the board.

I have read and I understand that this is no different in Alameda and Oakland, that it has been very difficult to hire police officers for a variety of different reasons, particularly since everybody everywhere is looking for police officers. It is not just an issue of finding the money. It is also an issue of finding the personnel. I want to commend you for your joint efforts. Thank you.

Ms. Simmons was recognized: With respect to the City, we will start talking about the authorities and the resources within our control. I indicated that the Encampment Management Team would be working with the units of Oakland Public Works, DOT, and OPD.

With respect to Public Works, we are working with them with their cleaning teams and their Watershed Division to examine the code authorities that would allow for the closure of encampments under emergency conditions whereby we can see and catch people in the act of performing specific things that would provide notification to the appropriate teams and they would be able to mobilize more swiftly to close those encampments.

This has also risen to the attention of the City Administrator's Office to

the extent that the City Administrator is working with our team to plan a second team and expansion of the team to be able to mobilize given the number of encampments that we have and.

The current team's capacity certainly limits their ability to respond swiftly and to actually abate encampments more swiftly and to clean them more swiftly.

We are also meeting with Alameda County who has come to the table recognizing that with Oakland having more than 50 percent of the encampments in the entire County, that there is a need to change the proportionate share of resources.

The Oakland population in terms of the unhoused, 46 percent have issues with mental health and/or severe emotional issues. Another 41 percent have PTSD. Another 12 percent have a traumatic brain injury. And this means that when you are engaging the unhoused, you have to be prepared for de-escalation and all the tools for trauma-informed circumstances.

So, those contributions from the County are going to be significant. The County's declaration of a local emergency expands their ability to release more resources and to get support from federal agencies.

And most recently you may have heard that the County did issue their declaration of a local emergency last week. So, we are anticipating hearing more from them in terms of the timeline and the strategy by which they would deploy resources. And we will report back perhaps what that would look like.

The other thing that the County has been able to do – obviously, it takes more beds and more housing to be able to close encampments based on the federal requirements. The City earlier this year committed Measure U dollars to focus on the development of affordable housing units that would fall within the spectrum of the needs of the unhoused.

Those units would be at about 30 percent of the area median income and below because the unhoused community typically does not have high incomes.

Alameda County is also advancing a housing bond. The significance of this is that it would raise capital to be able to capitalize more projects and that would be a contribution to city of Oakland projects. That means we would increase the amount of affordable housing development as a target.

The City is also meeting directly with the Governor's Office. The loss of the Redevelopment Agency funding for cities across the state has been

significant. The city of Oakland lost approximately \$376,000,000 as an annual allocation of Redevelopment Agency funds.

We are now in year 11 of not having \$376,000,000 of what would be the calculus each year. That divestment has had a correlating impact on the ability to advance affordable housing development and we also see that there is a correlation in the increase in homelessness since these dollars went away.

We are not going to be able to address these situations robustly. Some of our sources of money are being questioned in terms of their ability to continue for the next few years based on the deficit that the state is facing.

We need a greater commitment from state and federal resources. We are also looking at the federal All In Plan which proposes a reduction in homelessness by 2025. They are issuing competitive dollars and it is more money than we have seen coming from the federal government in a long time.

Chair Gilmore acknowledged: Thank you very much. Speaking of the demise of Redevelopment, it has certainly had many unintended consequences.

I thought the presentations were very informative and very well done. Are there any members of the Committee who have questions? (No comments or questions were voiced)

Ms. Malan stated: We have received four written comments for Item 6.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

Brock de Lappe was recognized: A decade ago in 2013 there was a near \$8 million multi-agency clean-up of all illegal anchor-outs on the Oakland Estuary.

BCDC was an important partner in this project. When it was over, all of the participating agencies that provided funding said that it would not be repeated.

If the Estuary were to remain clean, it would be dependent upon diligent monitoring and enforcement. This did not occur.

The consequences of this failure are clear to see. The Oakland shoreline of the Estuary is littered with sunken wrecks and derelict, end-of-life vessels.

Crime has risen to truly intolerable levels. Multiple vessels have been stolen and ransacked. Victims have had to resort to personally confronting the criminals to recover their property without the benefit of police support.

Is this an appropriate activity for a 79-year-old senior?

The Oakland Estuary is populated by marinas with over 3,000 slips. All of these boat owners pay annual property taxes to Alameda County. The shoreline also has several new multi-million and in one case, multi-billion-dollar residential developments.

One can only imagine the tax revenue that these produce. And yet, what law enforcement services are provided to the Estuary?

The Alameda County Sheriff's Department has disbanded the County's Marine Patrol Unit. The Oakland Police Department has only one dedicated marine patrol officer. The Port of Oakland at the mouth of the Estuary is the fourth largest port on the West Coast.

Is it reasonable that there is only one law enforcement officer to provide on-the-water protection for this critical regional resource?

It is unfortunate that it has required international press coverage to generate a focus on this problem. I have asked BCDC if there is any other issue that currently proposes a greater threat to San Francisco Bay than what is occurring in the Estuary. I was told, no.

This is the top problem that BCDC faces.

So, my final question is, given that the current conditions did not occur overnight but rather have grown over many years; is BCDC doing all that it can to protect this precious resource on San Francisco Bay?

And my concern is, if we have another repeat clean-up which I am hopeful will occur, if there is no follow-up with ongoing enforcement, we will repeat this cycle endlessly.

I would also emphasize that housing unhoused people in derelict, end-of-life vessels is a threat to them. It is a threat to the environment. And it is a threat to the general public. And it should not be allowed. Thank you.

Kame Richards, Alameda Community Sailing Center spoke: I learned today that a homeless encampment is apparently defined as just one person sleeping in a sleeping bag.

That seems like a bad use of the term, "encampment" and we were on a delightful late-afternoon sail on the Oakland Estuary yesterday on a little, 20-foot sailboat and we sailed by Estuary Park where Jack London is and I cannot imagine what would be required to remove all those people.

If one person is there it is a homeless encampment. Our business, Pineapple Sails, used to be at 123 Second Street in Oakland. We would go down there for lunch, and it was a nice park. We had clean tables. I can't imagine taking my granddaughter there.

The whole place is just infested, and I have great sadness for people who do not have housing, but I have zero respect for people who just make a complete mess of things.

Alameda Community Sailing Center is an organization for teaching young kids how to sail. We have a group of eight safety boats which are required.

In one night, we had four of those boats stolen and that is half of our fleet. We had an all-hands-on-deck call to go and retrieve this stuff. It took 36 hours to get a police report number from the Alameda Police Department. We called them right after the thing and they said, well wait – we will send an officer. An officer did not arrive until lunch time the next day to get a report filed.

And the police said, you know, we really can't help you. Our best advice is, if you find your boats don't approach the perpetrators.

The boats cost \$25,000 to \$35,000 apiece. We cannot imagine a way where we can just be handing off \$35,000 boats to thieves and doing nothing about it.

We called the Oakland Police. The Oakland Police said, well if the boats were stolen from Alameda it is an Alameda problem. The Alameda Police say, well, if the boat is in Oakland, we were at Union Point looking at our boats tied up to derelict boats, 50 yards off of the beach and the Alameda Police say, well that is an Oakland problem because you are in Oakland.

The Coast Guard is 200 yards away at Coast Guard Island, and it is not their problem either. So, it becomes our problem. We eventually just simply got out in other motor boats, went around and we collected all four of our stolen boats.

And we collected them by confronting the people who said, well that is my boat because I found it adrift. Well, yes, of course you did.

Steven Orosz, Harbor Master at Marina Bay Yacht Harbor in Richmond spoke: I have been following this situation with great concern. I would emphasize that it would be critical as the Commission works with its partners on solutions that they consider this on a regionwide basis.

This is not just an Estuary problem just as it was not just a Richardson Bay problem. We don't want a situation that we just move it from one part of the Bay to another and so forth.

Industry wide, keep in mind that this has the potential to become a growing issue as boats get older there could be economic downturns to become a flood of abandoned derelict boats.

Tracy Reigelman, resident of Marina Village in Alameda commented: I work in Marina Village, and I am the Rear Commodore at Oakland Yacht Club. I would like to thank Officer Albino and Siebert and Ms. Simmons for their work in a challenging and difficult situation.

The issue of the anchor-outs and the boats is a very, very large part of this issue. It is probably about 50 percent of the problem.

The encampments are a large part of the problem as well. However, there is also some work going on through the county of Alameda to provide support for unhoused individuals in facilities that are not permitted for that use and that are not up to current building codes and compliance.

And those unhoused individuals are at risk of losing their lives and they are creating problems with the public. So, the fears are not just the liveaboards. The fears are the residences, businesses, users of the Bay Trail, and the residents of Eddy's Place.

There are encampments in Alameda if you look along Main Street. There are encampments along the Main Street Ferry Terminal. There are also encampments in front of the Alameda Community Sailing Center at Encinal Harbor.

All of this needs to be addressed and looked at. And it is unfathomable to me that the lack of maintenance and the destruction of the shoreside facilities and infrastructure would be left to the point where a lawless and Wild West environment could occur.

People are at risk of hurting themselves. People are at risk of confrontation. The police departments are under-staffed but we need more help and more support. The overall Oakland and Alameda Estuary is ignored.

And that ignorance is creating a hazard to the public. I do appreciate the limited efforts of APD and OPD. It needs to be more. Thank you very much.

Anon spoke: I would like to testify anonymously because I live here at

Union Point and the anchor-outs know who I am. They know my name. They know my car. I have fear of retaliation.

I really appreciate the presentations given today. We all understand that the problem is enormous.

I live here on the Estuary and I also row in the Estuary daily. I see the Alameda Marine Patrol Unit out here often. I never see the Oakland Police Patrol unit.

I have personally given up calling the Oakland Police about harassment and fights on the water and incursions into the Marina. I have filed at least two dozen reports and never had anything done.

If they come out here, they say, well, it is out on the water. There is nothing we can do.

I live with generators going at all hours of the day and the night. I live with raw sewage floating past my vessel several times a month.

I called around and tried to report the raw sewage. I remember one time I called the Coast Guard and reported the raw sewage, and they gave two numbers. One of them I left a message and never heard back. And the other one said, thank you very much for reporting this. We are going to call the Coast Guard.

Late at night in pitch black I hear faint calls coming from the Estuary and somebody is yelling, help me, please, please, anybody help me. And I go out there in my kayak with a headlamp and there is a sailboat drifting down the Estuary and with my kayak I towed it to shore.

There was a panicked and terrified young man on that boat who told me that he had a horrible fight and been yelled at and abused by one of the other anchor-outs who then cut his line.

If there had been any wind at the time, I would not have been able to go out there and rescue this young man who had no motor and no ability to sail that boat.

I have at least a dozen times had boats pull their anchors and crash into me during storms. Winter is coming again. Last winter resulted in so many sunken and stranded vessels each one of which is an enormous cost and does enormous environmental damage.

Peoples' lives are at risk who are living out there on the boats, in these

winter storms. I beg the city of Oakland to handle this completely before the winter storms return.

Deborah Lunn, Property Director, Alta Star Harbor addressed the Committee: Alta Star Harbor is a new complex that opened up at the old Del Monte Canning Warehouse.

The issues are not just on the water but now they are on land. And they are impacting the businesses up and down the Estuary.

We opened our doors here on December 19, 2022. As of August 6, we have had stolen three trucks, three cars, one U-Haul and four bicycles within our facility.

One of these trucks actually was found at a chop house in the High Street encampment area in Oakland.

A lot of our residents moved here from Oakland and from San Francisco because of safety issues. They think it is quiet here. It is safe here and we want them to keep feeling that way. And we pay a lot of tax dollars, and we just want our residents to feel safe here.

Brad Gross, Executive Director, Richardson Bay Regional Agency (RBRA) addressed the Committee: I want to commend everybody for their presentations today. I want to thank Mr. DeLapp for putting this out into the public space and to industry so that we can address these issues.

It seems like all areas in the Oakland/Alameda area seem to be suffering from the same homeless problems whether it be land side or water side. I want to encourage everybody to treat their illegal liveboards the same as they are planning to treat these landside encampments.

I do not believe the SAVE Grant is the panacea that you believe it may be. I have not heard anything as far as housing programs working side-by-side with addressing these illegal anchor-outs.

The grant program is wonderful for removing abandoned vessels and debris you may find on the shore side but you still have people illegally living and anchoring on their vessels in the Estuary.

I am also concerned that the 90-day enforcement and abatement program that was discussed will simply shift the Oakland/Alameda problems to other jurisdictions specifically Richardson Bay.

Finally, I do want to offer to those that are working on the vessel and

debris abatement if RBRA can be of any assistance we are always willing to lend what we have learned over the years with programs like this.

Mary Spicer, I Heart Oakland-Alameda Estuary, commented: Ms. Simmons and our marine patrol I want to say thank you. I am one of the founders of I Heart Oakland-Alameda Estuary. We have been cleaning the Oakland/Alameda Estuary since 2017. We started on kayaks and stand-up paddle boards going to the shorelines that are deeply impacted by extreme garbage and getting that garbage via partnerships with California Canoe and Kayak and East Bay Row Club out of the Estuary.

We are a large community. We have participants from both sides of Oakland and Alameda and people really come out to clean and really care about the Estuary.

Last year we in two and a half hours cleared 3,000 pounds of garbage. And that is only a fraction of the amount of garbage that is along the Estuary.

We also cleaned Jack London Aquatic Center and Estuary Park. And unfortunately, we cancelled the clean-up this year because of safety concerns at one of the unhoused communities, one of the encampment sites at J-LAC. There has been some violent incidences there. And unfortunately, I do not feel comfortable bringing children to the site until those are addressed by the city of Oakland.

I am currently talking to people about that via the City. I am asking for a holistic solution because besides just the crime and the sunken boats and the unhoused issues which usually during our clean-up the unhoused join our clean-ups. Our shorelines are paying the price.

Via the storms last February a lot of the boats got smashed into the shoreline. And then all of that debris literally ends up on the shore. And I feel like everyone is so busy worrying about the sunk boats and the crime – nobody is really even paying attention to the amount of garbage and marine debris on the shores of the Oakland Estuary.

I have been working with some people at the port, some people at the City to find out who do I call if I can't go and clean some of the shorelines – who do I call to get the shoreline garbage enforced?

There is the NOAA Marine Debris grants that was just recently released and they are huge. I took the Cal representative for NOAA out and she said that she thinks Oakland is a great candidate for some of these huge million-

dollar grants. I hope that the City might consider going for those.

Chair Gilmore asked: Do any other Committee members have any comments?

Commissioner Ranchod was recognized: I want to thank the members of the public who came here today. Your experiences are concerning and disturbing. They continue to reflect to me an unacceptable situation that needs additional resources from local governments. And to the extent that our Committee can support any of those efforts we are ready to and we appreciate suggestions on how we can do more within our jurisdiction.

Mr. DeVries spoke: I wanted to ask that last public speaker that she reach out to me directly by email about that grant opportunity because our Sustainability Team could look at it. We have some great grant writers and I would love to have that. I want to thank her for noting the importance of a holistic approach.

I am meeting with a club that is looking at potentially using our old Cryer Building site to try to create some positive activity there which would dissuade negative activity.

Chair Gilmore added: I definitely want to concur with Commissioner Ranchod's comments and sentiments. I do have a question for staff. We have had complaints and incidences about sewage and other undesirable things being put into the Bay. Is that an issue for the Water Board? Who should people be calling when they see something like this?

Mr. Matthew Trujillo replied: The Water Board does have jurisdiction for that. We should be aware of any reports that they make. So, they should continue to submit reports to us. They should definitely loop in the Water Board when it comes to water quality issues.

Chair Gilmore continued: Is there a way to publicize contact information where members of the public, if they see something, they can say something to the relevant authority?

I think it would be just as effective if not more effective if they could contact the Water Board or whoever is responsible for this directly.

Mr. Trujillo added: We can look into maybe putting links on the website. We certainly do make those recommendations to reporters when they call in. I will make recommendations to them as to what agency to call.

Ms. Klein added: I wanted to forecast what staff has for Next Steps which is to come back to you at your first December meeting to hear an update from the City regarding the status of the effort on the water and also to plans for long term management and prevention going forward.

7. Adjournment. Upon motion by Commissioner Belin, seconded by Commissioner Ranchod, the Enforcement Committee meeting was adjourned at 11:09 a.m.