

File No. 140707

Committee Item No. \_\_\_\_\_

Board Item No. 67

## COMMITTEE/BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

### AGENDA PACKET CONTENTS LIST

Committee: \_\_\_\_\_  
Board of Supervisors Meeting

Date \_\_\_\_\_  
Date June 24, 2014

#### Cmte Board

- |                          |                                     |  |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | Motion                                       |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Resolution                                   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | Ordinance                                    |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | Legislative Digest                           |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | Budget and Legislative Analyst Report        |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | Youth Commission Report                      |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | Introduction Form                            |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | Department/Agency Cover Letter and/or Report |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | MOU  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | Grant Information Form                       |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | Grant Budget                                 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | Subcontract Budget                           |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | Contract/Agreement                           |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | Form 126 – Ethics Commission                 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | Award Letter                                 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | Application                                  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | Public Correspondence                        |

#### OTHER (Use back side if additional space is needed)

- |                          |                                     |                                     |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <u>Grant Application</u>            |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <u>Grant Program</u>                |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <u>Grant Program Supplemental B</u> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <u>Project Info</u>                 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | _____                               |

Completed by: John Carroll Date June 19, 2014

Completed by: \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

1 [Apply for Grant - California Ocean Protection Council Local Coastal Program - Sea Level  
2 Rise Grant - Not to Exceed \$250,000]

3 **Resolution approving application for grant funds from the Ocean Protection Council**  
4 **Local Coastal Programs' Sea Level Rise Grant for an amount not to exceed \$250,000.**

5  
6 WHEREAS, The California Ocean Protection Council, under the authority of the Ocean  
7 Protection Act, approved a competitive grant program to provide financial assistance for local  
8 and regional vulnerability assessments and updates to Local Coastal Programs (LCPs) and  
9 other Coastal Act authorized plans to address sea-level rise, coastal hazards and other  
10 climate change-related impacts; and

11 WHEREAS, The goal of the grant program is to develop updates to LCPs or other  
12 Coastal Act authorized plans to address sea-level rise and other climate change impacts; and

13 WHEREAS, Grant proposals submitted under this grant program must address at least  
14 one certified LCP segment or other defined planning segment, such as a certified Port Master  
15 Plan or University Long Range Development Plan, or, in jurisdictions without certified LCPs,  
16 proposals must demonstrate that the applicable jurisdiction has committed to the process to  
17 complete an LCP (or other Coastal Act authorized plan) or that such process is underway;  
18 and

19 WHEREAS, The City and County of San Francisco has an effectively certified LCP;  
20 and

21 WHEREAS, The City and County of San Francisco, recognizing the problems and  
22 issues associated with climate change identified in the application and made part of this  
23 Resolution as if fully set forth herein, desires to pursue a project that would result in the  
24 completion and submittal for certification by the California Coastal Commission of an LCP  
25 Amendment (or Amendment to Other Plan), that would address such impacts; and

1           WHEREAS, The City and County of San Francisco will coordinate with the staffs of the  
2 California Coastal Commission, the State Coastal Conservancy and the Ocean Protection  
3 Council in undertaking the project, if approved; now, therefore, be it

4           RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors directs the Planning Department staff to  
5 submit the grant application to the Ocean Protection Council to provide financial and planning  
6 assistance, under authority of the Ocean Protection Act, in the amount not to exceed  
7 \$250,000 to fund the project more particularly described in the grant application package; and,  
8 be it

9           FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Director of Planning is authorized to execute, in the  
10 name of the City and County of San Francisco, all necessary applications, contracts and  
11 agreements and amendments thereto to implement and carry out the grant application  
12 package attached hereto and any project approved through approval of the grant application.  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

# Local Coastal Program Planning Grants Application Form

## GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS

Click in the shaded text fields to enter text, numbers and dates. The fields will expand to accommodate the data. Press the tab key to move between fields. Please note that the entire grant application will be public record upon submittal.

**Applications are due July 7, 2014. Application packets must be RECEIVED by 5pm July 7, 2014. Proposals must be emailed or mailed; faxed responses will not be considered.** Applications will not be deemed complete until an adopted resolution is received for each grant program. **Applications that do not contain the final, adopted resolution(s) by July 7, 2014 will not be considered for funding.** The Coastal Commission and Ocean Protection Council are expected to award grants in early fall 2014.

## APPLICANT INFORMATION

Indicate which grant programs you are applying for (can be one or both).

OPC LCP Sea-Level Rise Grant

Coastal Commission LCP Planning Grant

Applicant name (organization): San Francisco Planning Department

Address: 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, CA 94103

Contact name: Diana Sokolove Title: Senior Planner IV

Telephone: 415-575-9046 Fax: 415-558-6409 Email: diana.sokolove@sfgov.org

Federal Tax ID# 94-6000417

Application prepared by: Name: Sheila Nickolopoulos Title: Grants Manager

Person authorized to sign grant agreement amendment:

Name: John Rahaim Title: Director of Planning

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: July 3, 2014

## PROJECT INFORMATION

Project title (start with name of city or county): San Francisco Local Coastal Program Amendment

LCP/ LCP Segment: Land Use Plan

Project location: City / Geographic area: City of San Francisco County: San Francisco

Project timeline: Start date: February 1, 2015 End date: April 30, 2017

**Amount of Grant Proposal: \$196,950**

1. WORK PROGRAM AND SCHEDULE

SCHEDULE

Proposed starting date: February 1, 2015

Estimated completion: January 30, 2017

WORK PROGRAM

**Comment [DS1]:** Provide a work program and schedule for implementation of the project, including anticipated benchmarks for LCP or LCP amendment development and review for the project, using the template provided below. For work to be reimbursed using funds from the grant program, the start date must be after authorization is granted after execution of a grant agreement, which will likely be in April 2015 for grants from the OPC and February 2015 for grants from the Commission. For the proposals seeking funding from OPC, all work must be completed by June 30, 2017. For proposals seeking funding from Coastal Commission, work must be completed within two years of the grant agreement start date.

San Francisco Local Coastal Program Amendment	Projected Start and End Dates
<b>Task 1. Public and Agency Engagement</b>	
1.1 Develop public and agency engagement strategy <i>Deliverable: Draft and Final Public and Agency Engagement Plan</i>	2/15-3/15
1.2 Public engagement, meeting no. 1: existing conditions <i>Deliverables: Meeting materials and notes</i>	5/15-6/15
1.3 Public engagement, meeting no. 2: policy priorities <i>Deliverables: Meeting materials and notes</i>	8/15-9/15
1.4 Public engagement, meeting no. 3: present draft policy document <i>Deliverables: Meeting materials and notes</i>	9/15-10/15
1.5 Public engagement, meeting no. 4: present draft final policy document <i>Deliverables: Meeting materials and notes, Public Outreach Summary Report</i>	1/16-2/16
1.6 Interagency Advisory Committee meetings <i>Deliverables: Meeting materials and notes</i>	2/15-1/17
1.7 Ocean Beach Planning Committee meetings <i>Deliverables: Meeting materials and notes</i>	2/15-1/17
1.8 CCC staff meetings <i>Deliverables: Meeting materials and notes</i>	2/15-1/17
<b>Task 2. Existing Data and Analyses</b>	
2.1 Technical Memorandum Summarizing Existing Data and Analyses <i>Deliverables: Draft and final technical memorandum, maps, photos</i>	2/15-5/15
<b>Task 3. Policy Development</b>	
3.1 Draft policy document no. 1 <i>Deliverable: Draft policy document no. 1</i>	2/15-6/15
3.2 Interagency Advisory Committee Review <i>Deliverables: Draft policy document no. 2, comment summary</i>	6/15-7/15
3.3 Ocean Beach Planning Committee Review <i>Deliverables: Draft policy document no. 3, comment summary</i>	8/15-9/15
3.4 Public Review <i>Deliverables: Draft policy document no. 4, comment summary</i>	9/15-10/15
3.5 Draft Final LCP Amendment No. 1 and Consistency Analysis	10/15-2/16

<i>Deliverables: Draft final LCP Amendment no. 1, overall comment summary, California Coastal Act Consistency Analysis</i>	
<b>Task 4. Approvals Process</b>	
4.1 San Francisco Planning Commission approvals process <i>Deliverables: Draft final LCP Amendment no. 2, comment summary</i>	2/16-4/16
4.2 San Francisco Board of Supervisors approvals process <i>Deliverables: Draft final LCP Amendment no. 3, updated comment summary, Board resolution</i>	4/16-6/16
4.3 California Coastal Commission approvals process <i>Deliverables: Final policy document (including discussion of the amendment's relationship to and effect on the other sections of the certified LCP) and amendment, summary of public and agency engagement process</i>	6/16-1/17

**BENCHMARK SCHEDULE**

ACTIVITY	COMPLETION DATE
Final Public and Agency Engagement Plan	3/15
Existing Data Technical Memorandum	5/15
Public Outreach Summary Report	2/16
San Francisco Planning Commission Action	4/16
San Francisco Board of Supervisors Action	6/16
Draft LCP Amendment Submittal to California Coastal Commission	1/17

**Comment [DS2]:** Please list (1) all significant and pertinent project benchmarks related to the project for which funds are being requested, (2) expected dates for reaching or completing those steps. These will be used in monitoring grant progress and in grant reporting under approved grant agreement.

**2. BUDGET**

**APPLICATION BUDGET INFORMATION**

**Funding Request: \$165,742      Total Project Cost: \$389,556**

**Comment [DS3]:** Please provide a proposed budget, including the funding request, total project cost, estimated costs per task, funding sources, and in-kind services.

**PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES**

**Comment [DS4]:** If multiple funding sources are being used, in the funding sources matrix below, list the major tasks of the proposed project and indicate the estimated cost of each, including the source of funding for each task. These tasks should correlate with your overall Work Program. An example follows the matrix. Note that in-kind services are covered separately below.

Task Number	Task Name	Total Cost	Applicant's Funding	LCP Grant Funding	OPC SLR Grant Funding	Other Funds (define below)
1	Public and Agency Engagement	\$207,486	\$100,536	\$53,475	\$53,475	
2	Existing Data and Analyses	\$170,536	\$100,536	\$35,000	\$35,000	
3	Policy Development	\$110,536	\$100,536	\$5,000	\$5,000	
4	Approvals Process	\$110,536	\$100,536	\$5,000	\$5,000	
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>\$599,095</b>	<b>\$402,145</b>	<b>\$98,475</b>	<b>\$98,475</b>	<b>\$0</b>

**OTHER FUNDING SOURCES (NOT INCLUDING IN-KIND SERVICES)**

Source of funds	\$ Amount	Status (Committed, Applied, etc)
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$</b>	

**In-kind Services: \$402,144.60**

**Comment [Diana5]:** In-kind services or contributions include staff time, volunteer time and materials contributed to the project. Please describe and estimate value, and differentiate between expected in-kind contributions and contributions (work or other types of contributions) already obtained/completed.

**BUDGET SUMMARY**

**Grant Application Budget Form**

**Comment [DS6]:** Please use the following form to fill in your estimated budget. Double click on the table to open in excel. Fill in the fields shaded in blue.

<b>Salaries and wages<sup>1</sup></b>				
Diana Sokolove, Planner IV (0.25 FTE * 2 yrs * \$120,000)	\$ 60,000.00			
Chris Kern, Envir Planner IV (0.05 FTE * 2 yrs * \$120,000)	\$ 12,000.00			
Planner II (0.5 FTE * 2 yrs * 87,000)	\$ 87,000.00			
GIS/Graphis (0.1 * 1 yr * \$87,000)	\$ 8,700.00			
SFPUC Staff (140 hrs * \$100/hr)		\$ 5,000.00	\$ 5,000.00	
SFMTA Staff (140 hrs * \$100/hr)		\$ 5,000.00	\$ 5,000.00	
SFDPW Staff (140 hrs * \$100/hr)		\$ 5,000.00	\$ 5,000.00	
City Attorney (100 hrs * \$250/hr)		\$ 12,500.00	\$ 12,500.00	
Benefits (49.5% of Planning Dept staff costs)	\$ 83,011.50			
<b>Total Personnel</b>	<b>\$ 250,711.50</b>	<b>\$ 27,500.00</b>	<b>\$ 27,500.00</b>	<b>\$ -</b>
<b>Consultants<sup>3</sup></b>				
TBD Consultant: Outreach Facilitator		\$ 30,000.00	\$ 30,000.00	
TBD Consultant: Data Synthesis, Response to Comments		\$ 30,000.00	\$ 30,000.00	
SPUR		\$ 7,500.00	\$ 7,500.00	
<b>Total Consultants</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 67,500.00</b>	<b>\$ 67,500.00</b>	<b>\$ -</b>
<b>Operating Expenses</b>				
Printing & Postage for meeting notification (15,000 * .25)		\$ 1,875.00	\$ 1,875.00	
<b>Supplies/Materials<sup>4</sup></b>				
facility rental (8 meetings * \$250)		\$ 1,000.00	\$ 1,000.00	
refreshments (8 meetings * \$150)		\$ 600.00	\$ 600.00	
Indirect Costs (90.3% of Planning Dept staff costs)	\$ 151,433.10			
<b>Total Operating Expenses</b>	<b>\$ 151,433.10</b>	<b>\$ 3,475.00</b>	<b>\$ 3,475.00</b>	<b>\$ -</b>
<b>Total Budget</b>	<b>\$ 402,144.60</b>	<b>\$ 98,475.00</b>	<b>\$ 98,475.00</b>	<b>\$ -</b>

**Total Project Cost \$ 599,094.60**

<sup>1</sup>Attach an explanation of rate(s) and hours for each position for which funds are being requested.

<sup>2</sup>Amount requested for benefits not to exceed 40% of amount requested for salary or wage.

<sup>3</sup>All subcontractors must be selected pursuant to a competitive bidding process that seeks at least three (3) bids from responsible bidders.

<sup>4</sup>Include a list of the major supplies and materials and how much they cost.

<sup>5</sup>Travel reimbursement rates are the same as similarly situated state employees.

<sup>6</sup>Indirect costs include, for example, a pro rata share of rent, utilities, and salaries for certain positions indirectly supporting the proposed project but not directly staffing it.

## SUPPLEMENTAL FORM B – OPC LCP SLR GRANT PROGRAM

Comment [SN1]: 5 page limit

### Potential Impacts from Sea-Level Rise – Preliminary Assessment

#### 1. Need

San Francisco's LCP was certified nearly thirty years ago, in 1986, and has not been updated since that time. In the past 28 years, the uses, needs, and challenges of this area have changed significantly. Most importantly, shoreline erosion has resulted in the loss of beach area and public access south of Sloat Boulevard. San Francisco's existing LCP does not address this pressing issue.

Comment [Diana2]: Preliminary assessment of potential impacts from sea-level rise and climate change using NOAA's [Sea-Level Rise Viewer](#) or other readily available planning tools is required as part of the application. This assessment should be included and referenced in the project description below to explain the purpose, benefit and need for the proposed project.

Comment [SN3]: Provide sufficient background information for reviewers to independently assess the significance of the proposed project.

Summarize the problem to be addressed and the status of ongoing efforts to address the identified needs.

Based on a preliminary assessment of potential impacts from sea-level rise and climate change using the Our Coast Our Future Project interactive sea-level rise mapping tool, few if any developed areas in San Francisco's Coastal Zone appear to be vulnerable to coastal flooding with sea-level rise as projected through 2100. This is because most developed areas within San Francisco's Coastal Zone are set back from the shoreline and are at elevations that are well above future flood levels. At primary risk however, are San Francisco's beaches and coastal access and recreation facilities. With sea-level rise, the type of shoreline erosion issues that the City experiences south of Sloat Boulevard are likely to threaten other areas of San Francisco's Pacific shoreline.

#### 2. Benefit

The proposed LCP amendment would provide the following public benefits:

Comment [SN4]: Applicants should describe how the projects will maximize public benefits of the coast as articulated in the [Coastal Act](#) and [California Ocean Protection Act](#). These benefits can include preserving and enhancing habitat such as coastal wetlands and natural lands, conserving biodiversity, protecting, providing or enhancing public access, protecting priority land uses such as coastal dependent development and recreational opportunities and protecting visitor serving amenities.

##### Coastal Access and Recreation

- Reestablishment of the sandy beach south of Sloat Boulevard
- Removal of shoreline protection structures that obstruct public access and create a hazard to beach users and surfers
- Increased public access benefits resulting from erosion management strategies

##### Coastal Habitat

- Removal of shoreline armoring and restoration of sandy beach and erodible bluffs would preserve and enhance habitat for cliff swallows and shorebirds

##### Climate Change Adaptation

- Long-term managed retreat of existing infrastructure in response to shoreline erosion, sea-level rise and increased storminess due to climate change
- In addition to implementing the provisions of the Ocean Beach Master Plan that address shoreline erosion and sea-level rise for the area between Sloat and Skyline Boulevards, the proposed LCP amendment would include sea-level rise adaptation policies applicable throughout the affected areas of the City's Coastal Zone.

Through continued outreach and engaging with the public, the proposed LCP amendments will also result in increased awareness and education. They will also help to enhance community resilience by promoting advanced planning for existing and future impacts of sea-level rise. Furthermore, the proposed LCP amendments will enhance San Francisco's adaptation capacity because members of the public will have increased knowledge regarding natural hazards, coastal issues such as coastal erosion, flooding and inundation and how natural systems can protect communities from anticipated climate change impacts.

This is important and much needed work to ensure that our LCP accounts for the significant changes along our coastline related to sea-level rise. An amendment will chart a path forward to the long-term management and protection of San Francisco's coastal resources.

### 3. Transferability

As discussed in the Project Description, the proposed LCP amendment would protect and, in some instances, remove public infrastructure and restore previously armored beach and bluff areas in response to shoreline erosion south of Sloat Boulevard. Although highly preferable from the standpoint of preserving coastal resources and public access, this type of managed retreat is rarely implemented on California's coast where shoreline armoring continues to proliferate. As the effects of sea-level rise exacerbate shoreline hazards and accelerate erosion, alternatives to armoring must be pursued to preserve the State's priceless beaches and shorelines. Adoption of a long-term plan to remove armoring, protect/relocate public infrastructure and restore the beach and bluff at San Francisco's Ocean Beach will serve as an important example to other jurisdictions.

**Comment [SN5]:** Projects that address issues in a manner that may be useful as a model for other communities will be given priority. The potential transferability of analysis, strategies, or draft ordinance language will be considered in evaluation of proposals.

In addition, by incorporating the FEMA pilot study, which is analyzing future coastal flood risks accounting for sea-level rise, into our sea-level rise adaptation planning and policies, the City will demonstrate the benefits of this project for local government hazard planning and reinforce the importance of acknowledging sea-level rise in floodplain management policies in all coastal flood hazard areas.

Finally, the SFPUC's sea-level rise study under the Sewer System Improvement Program, which the LCP amendment will rely on as a primary data source for sea-level rise adaptation planning and policy development, will serve as a useful example to other jurisdictions of a state-of-the-art sea-level rise mapping and modelling tool.

### 4. Implementation

The San Francisco Planning Department will lead the effort to amend our LCP and, working closely with stakeholders, build off of the investment SPUR and the City and County of San Francisco made during the development of the 2012 Ocean Beach Master Plan, and from the FEMA and SFPUC sea-level rise studies. The overall intent of the project is to improve local coastal planning and response to climate change impacts by leveraging existing planning efforts and policy frameworks, including the decision-making structure and consensus reached as part of the Ocean Beach Master Plan effort. We want to improve on the network established during the Ocean Beach Master Plan process to bolster public support for appropriate policies to address sea-level rise.

**Comment [SN6]:** Identify, with a high degree of specificity, how the work funded by the grant will help the community to update its LCP.

Applicants should describe the complete planning process and identify how the work funded by this grant advances that process.

Applicants should identify the specific elements of their LCP that they expect to update through this work.

We expect the planning process to commence in early 2015. The first year of the project will be dedicated to public engagement, with numerous public workshops and one-on-one meetings with stakeholders. The second year will focus on shepherding the draft amendments through the approvals process, which includes the San Francisco Planning Commission, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, and the California Coastal Commission. A detailed timeline and list of benchmarks with deliverables is included in this application's Project Description section.

We recognize that successful management and planning for San Francisco's western shoreline requires even greater strategic communications and engagement of our coastal stakeholders. There is a complex array of federal, state and local agencies that oversee the western shoreline, each with different responsibilities and priorities. Therefore, the first year of the amendment process will be dedicated to public and agency engagement, with numerous public workshops and one-on-one meetings with stakeholders. The grant will in part support an outreach facilitator, who can act as a neutral voice in the public engagement process. This consultant will help staff develop a detailed public and agency engagement plan to ensure the appropriate level of public and agency involvement, focus the discussions, and help reach consensus. Lastly, the grant would support our work with existing partners, like SPUR, to use consensus-driven strategies to inform our policy language.

To complement this engagement effort, we will hold regular meetings with an Interagency Advisory Committee, which will represent local, state and federal agencies, as well as regular meetings with the Ocean Beach Planning Advisory Committee, which will represent key community stakeholders. We also recognize the importance of frequent communication with California Coastal Commission (CCC) staff and will meet regularly with CCC staff throughout the process to provide plenty of opportunity for preliminary review and ensure that we are headed down the right track. We will also regularly engage decision-makers along the way. The grant will support these efforts through the hire of an experienced outreach consultant.

In regards to specific elements of the LCP that will be amended through this process, we propose to add overarching sea-level rise policies that would be applicable to the entire coastal zone. Currently, San Francisco's certified LCP consists of overarching transportation policies for the entire coastal zone and specific policies relating to the ten geographic subareas. It includes 11 objectives, many of which are still relevant, while others are outdated. The proposed amendment would add overarching sea-level rise policies as well as update the policies in the applicable geographic subareas, including the Ocean Beach and The Great Highway geographic subareas. A wholesale update is not recommended at this time but will be proposed once this time-critical amendment is approved by the CCC.

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

**Comment [Diana1]:** Up to 5 pages

**Introduction**

San Francisco's Coastal Zone extends approximately six miles from Fort Funston in the south to Lands End in the north. The majority of the Coastal Zone, including Ocean Beach, the Great Highway, Lands End, Sutro Heights Park, Golden Gate Park, the San Francisco Zoo, Lake Merced and Fort Funston, is public property. An estimated ##### visitors per year use the diverse array of public recreational facilities in the Coastal Zone.

**Comment [Diana2]:** Ben/Shannon – do you have this number?

Only 14 percent of the total land area within the Coastal Zone is privately owned. Of that area, 9 percent is open space (the Olympic Club Golf Course) and the remaining 5 percent is fully built-out with existing residential and commercial development. The Olympic Club owns the only privately held lands lying between the first public road and the sea; these lands are open to the public under a public access and open space easement granted to the Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA). As a result, San Francisco does not experience the development pressures and related resource protection and public access challenges typical in other coastal communities.

**Comment [Diana3]:** Ben/Shannon – can you confirm?

As discussed below, San Francisco's coastal zone management issues are limited primarily to: (1) maintenance and improvement of existing public recreational facilities and related infrastructure; (2) protection and maintenance of public wastewater infrastructure; and (2) erosion of the beach and bluff in the area south of Sloat Boulevard. The LCP amendments proposed under this grant application would address all of these challenges.

**Shoreline Erosion**

Severe erosion of the beach and bluff at Ocean Beach in the area south of Sloat Boulevard has resulted in the loss of beach parking and periodic closures of The Great Highway. Continued erosion of the shoreline in this area threatens to damage major wastewater infrastructure complex beneath and adjacent to The Great Highway, including the Lake Merced Tunnel and the Oceanside Water Pollution Control Plant. This infrastructure plays a vital role in providing public services to the City (see sidebar). For example, the control plant treats 20 percent of the City's wastewater and is at the early stages of its operating cycle. Sea-level rise, and increased frequency and severity of storms anticipated as a result of climate change, will likely exacerbate the shoreline erosion problem.

To date, the City's efforts to stabilize the shoreline south of Sloat Boulevard and protect public infrastructure, including The Great Highway and critical wastewater infrastructure, have proven ineffective. Constructed dunes and sand berms have been quickly washed away during winter storms, and rubble and riprap revetments impede public access, present a hazard to surfers, displace sensitive habitat, and degrade the scenic quality of our shoreline. A better approach to managing shoreline erosion in this area – one that minimizes adverse effects on public access and coastal recreation,

**Wastewater Infrastructure**

San Francisco is the only major city on the California coast with a city-wide combined sewer system. The wastewater load fluctuates depending on weather conditions. In dry weather sewage travels through a network of pipes to the Westside Transport Box, a rectangular tube under the Great Highway between Lincoln and Sloat Boulevards. From there it flows to the Westside pump station at Sloat Boulevard, where it is pumped to the Oceanside Water Pollution Control Plant for treatment. The secondary-treated effluent is discharged 4.5 miles out to the ocean through the 80 feet deep Southwest Ocean Outfall. When the plant's capacity is overwhelmed in extreme wet weather conditions, the transport box and the Lake Merced Tunnel fill up and retain the combined flow. Overflow there is decanted and pumped to the deep ocean outfall. Only when that system's capacity is exceeded do combined discharges occur, through two large outfall structures on Ocean Beach.

protects sensitive habitat and preserves scenic quality while maintaining critical City infrastructure – is clearly needed.

**Sea-Level Rise**

The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) selected San Francisco’s Pacific coast for a pilot study to analyze future coastal flood risks that takes into account sea-level rise and the associated changes to wave hazards, depth and extent of inundation, and storm induced erosion as part of the California Coastal Analysis and Mapping Project Open Pacific Coast Study. San Francisco will use the study, anticipated to be completed in the summer of 2014, to increase public awareness and develop floodplain management standards that account for future sea-level rise.

In parallel, the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) is conducting a detailed sea-level rise vulnerability analysis under the City’s Sewer System Improvement Program. This analysis, also due to be completed in the summer of 2014, uses a 1-meter horizontal grid resolution digital elevation model based on the 2010/2011 California Coastal Mapping Program LiDAR, and incorporates FEMA water level and storm surge data and coastal hazard analysis methods that consider shoreline types (i. e. , sandy beaches, dunes, bluffs), presence of coastal structures, and erosion potential. The inundation maps will include a range of sea-level rise estimates from 12 inches to 66 inches, and will account for the dynamic overland water levels associated with sea-level rise-driven changes to the 100-year coastal storm surge and wave hazards.

**Ocean Beach Master Plan**

Working in cooperation with a host of federal, state and local agencies, community stakeholders, and the public, SPUR, a San Francisco nonprofit think-tank, spent over 18 months developing a plan for the stewardship of Ocean Beach. The Ocean Beach Master Plan, released in 2012, is a non-regulatory document that recommends six “key moves” that chart an ambitious and proactive vision for managing a changing coastline, protecting critical sewer infrastructure, and upgrading public access to the beach over a nearly 40-year period. The City and County of San Francisco has embraced this plan and is committed to implementing its recommendations.

**a. Goals and objectives**

The goals and objectives of the proposed LCP amendment will reflect the vision presented in the Ocean Beach Master Plan to improve public access and coastal recreation, preserve and enhance sensitive habitat and scenic resources, and protect critical infrastructure in the area between Sloat and Skyline Boulevards. The plan calls for closure of the Great Highway south of Sloat Boulevard, rerouting of traffic around the inland side of the Zoo and Oceanside Wastewater Pollution Control Plant, pedestrian, bicycle and streetscape improvements along Sloat Boulevard and at key intersections, public beach parking, restoration of the beach and bluff, new trail connections linking Ocean Beach to Fort Funston and Lake Merced, and protection of the City’s wastewater infrastructure. The proposed LCP amendment would develop this vision into actionable City policies under the certified LCP. In addition, the City proposes to develop and adopt a more general set of policies addressing sea-level rise adaptation throughout San Francisco’s Coastal Zone based on the FEMA and SFPUC sea-level rise and coastal flood hazard studies described above. The proposed work plan for the LCP amendment is as follows:

**Comment [SN4]:** Describe the specific project goals and objectives to be achieved. Goals and objectives should be specific for each year of the work plan presented. Recipients will be required to submit progress reports in which progress against these goals and objectives will be reported. Include a description of how you will accomplish each objective, and how your objectives will accomplish your goals.

**YEAR 1**

**Engage the Local Community and Western Shoreline Coastal Hazard Stakeholders**

- Build on community and stakeholder engagement to date to ensure that the LCP amendment reflects the interests of the myriad stakeholders and users of San Francisco’s coastal resources.

- Provide ample opportunity and atmosphere for public input and engagement through a series of public workshops and media tools (e. g. , web site, surveys, social media).

**Ensure Interagency Coordination**

- Build on interagency engagement to date to ensure that the LCP amendment reflects the interests of the myriad public agency stakeholders of the western shoreline.
- Provide ample opportunity for interagency input through regular advisory committee meetings and one-on-one consultations.

**Develop Draft LCP Goals, Objectives, and Policies**

- Summarize existing conditions based on existing data and maps.
- Develop draft goals, objectives, and policies that reflect the priorities of the public and vested agencies.

**YEAR 2**

**Refine LCP Goals, Objectives, and Policies**

- Incorporate comments from stakeholders (community members and public agencies) into a final draft set of LCP goals, objectives, and policies.
- Work closely with CCC staff to reach consensus.

**Receive Approval for LCP Amendment**

- Present LCP Amendment to San Francisco Planning Commission and receive approval.
- Present LCP Amendment to San Francisco Board of Supervisors and receive approval.
- Present LCP Amendment to CCC for certification.

**b. Approach**

**Task One: Public and Agency Engagement**

**Technical Approach:** Based on the International Association of Public Participation (IAP2) framework for engagement, a detailed public and agency involvement strategy will be developed to consider the views of the stakeholders affected by or concerned with sea-level rise along the western shoreline. The strategy will clearly identify public engagement goals and appropriate engagement techniques that are specifically targeted to individual stakeholder needs and interests. Each stakeholder group, or audience, does not require or even desire the same level of information or interaction. These considerations will be incorporated into the strategy.

We will hold four rounds of public meetings and each round will be held at different days/times to capture the widest audience. The first round will present existing conditions, the second will prioritize policies and strategies, the third will present the proposed draft LCP amendments, and the fourth will demonstrate how public comments were incorporated into the final amendments for submittal to the Planning Commission. Given the number of stakeholders and their diverse interests, we propose contracting with a professional facilitator to assist with this process.

We will also meet regularly with an Interagency Advisory Committee made up of local public agency stakeholders to ensure that project staff are up-to-date on other projects in the area and are able to integrate new information as it becomes available. These meetings will also be the means through

**Comment [SN5]:** Identify specific tasks to be accomplished; explain the technical approach needed to accomplish the tasks; identify the roles of partners and cooperators; and identify potential obstacles to successful completion of the goals and objectives. Describe how stakeholders will be involved in the planning or assessment process. If the project includes partners, the roles and responsibilities of the partners must be clearly identified

which we will develop a coordinated City voice around our approach to sea-level rise as well as our common sources of data, analysis and contacts.

**Partners and Cooperators:** Through strategic communication planning, our engagement efforts will recognize and appropriately plan for engaging a diverse range of stakeholders, as follows:

- **Decision-makers**, including the Mayor's Office, local elected supervisors and planning commissioners;
- **Ocean Beach Planning Advisory Committee**, an already formed group of community stakeholders and environmental activists, who have been involved in the Ocean Beach planning process for many years; and
- **Interagency Advisory Committee**, including representatives from the Public Utilities Commission, Department of Public Works, Municipal Transportation Agency, Recreation and Parks Department, Capital Planning Commission, Zoo, GGNRA, and the Planning Department. We will also involve the U. S. Army Corps of Engineers periodically to brief them on policy options and status.

Planning Department staff will also continue to work closely with SPUR throughout this task. SPUR built important relationships with stakeholders during the development of the Ocean Beach Master Plan, and we want to build on those relationships to support this next step. Planning staff will meet in person with SPUR biweekly in the first few months of the project and on a regular basis after that to ensure understanding of stakeholder concerns and engagement outcomes to date.

We will also meet regularly with CCC staff and Ocean Protection Council staff, based on their desired level of involvement.

**Potential Obstacles:** There are many users of this urban coastal area and their individual priorities will, at times, conflict. For example, although re-routing and reducing the number of lanes of the Great Highway can provide ways to increase shoreline protection and beach access, many stakeholders are concerned with the resultant impacts on neighborhood traffic. The need for compromise will be emphasized at the outset and proper techniques and atmosphere will be employed to promote consensus.

In addition, each agency has its own political and administrative process, so coordinating and reaching agreement could be challenging. We will address this by: (1) continuing to involve SPUR, who established an atmosphere of collaboration and consensus; (2) ensuring that each City agency designates a single staff member with decision-making authority to the Interagency Advisory Committee and (3) communicating regularly and frequently with interested agencies and stakeholders.

#### **Task Two: Existing Data and Analyses**

**Technical Approach:** Planning Department staff will rely on the SFPUC sea-level rise study described above to identify, at a plan level of detail, areas and facilities south of Sloat Boulevard that are vulnerable to hazards related to future sea-level rise. This assessment will inform the development of sea-level rise adaptation policies proposed to be included in the City's LCP.

**Partners and Cooperators:** We will work with the Interagency Task Force, along with SPUR and a consultant very familiar with the best available science to accomplish this task.

**Potential Obstacles:** The science associated with sea level rise is continually being updated, revised, and strengthened. Although there is no doubt that sea levels have risen and will continue to rise at an accelerated rate over the coming century, it is difficult to predict with certainty what amount of will occur at any given time in the future. To address this uncertainty, the City will propose policies that

provide flexibility in updating sea-level rise adaptation plans and policies as needed based on the release of new information.

### **Task Three: Policy Development**

**Technical Approach:** Planning Department staff will integrate public comments, agency priorities, and the recommendations of SPUR's Ocean Beach Master Plan into a draft set of policies that will address sea-level rise on San Francisco's western shoreline. We will also include recommendations from other policy documents and relevant work, such as the National Research Council Report, CCC Draft Guidance, and the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change 5th Assessment Report. Planning Department staff will establish a detailed review calendar to coordinate draft review by agencies well in advance of the public comment period(s).

**Partners and Cooperators:** We will work closely with SPUR, our consultant, and the Interagency Task Force to define the structure and organize the content of the policies, as well as establish the review calendar. We will also work iteratively with the Ocean Beach Planning Advisory Committee, decision-makers, and members of the public to ensure that the policies reflect their comments.

**Potential Obstacles:** Ocean Beach is a national park, a popular urban open space, the site of a major infrastructure complex and a beloved San Francisco landscape. It faces a wide range of complex challenges—including severe erosion, jurisdictional issues, a diverse array of beach users and points of view, and the looming challenge of climate-induced sea-level rise. Although the Ocean Beach Master Plan achieved a high level of consensus amongst stakeholders, given the challenges and complexities of the coastal zone, additional consensus building techniques will need to be employed.

### **Task Four: Approvals Process**

**Technical Approach:** The amendments will be presented for approval to the Planning Commission, the Board of Supervisors, and the California Coastal Commission. Because of the existing level of consensus amongst stakeholders, we anticipate this process will take approximately 12 months.

**Partners and Cooperators:** We will partner with all decision-makers and stakeholders.

**Potential Obstacles:** Depending on the questions and concerns of CCC staff and the approving bodies, it can be difficult to anticipate how long the process will take. We anticipate a year, although acknowledge that it could take longer. The City will ensure that adequate staff time is budgeted to acquire all of the necessary approvals.