MEMBERS PRESENT
Doug Bosco (Public Member) Chair
Marisa Moret (Public Member)
Ann Notthoff (Public Member)
Susan Hansch (Designated Representative, Coastal Commission)
Bryan Cash (Designated Representative, Natural Resources Agency)
Karen Finn, (Designated Representative, Department of Finance)

OVERSIGHT MEMBERS PRESENT
No oversight members attended

OTHERS PRESENT
Sam Schuchat, Executive Officer
Jack Judkins, Legal Counsel

Co-Chair Ann Notthoff opened the meeting pending arrival of the Chair

1. ROLL CALL

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
   Moved and seconded. Approved by a vote of 3-0-1. Susan Hansch abstained; Chair Bosco not present.

17. PUBLIC COMMENT:
   Paul Kamen, Coalition for Diverse Activities on Water, Grass and Sand (CDAWGS), spoke in support of dogs-off leash on Albany Beach and the concern that restoration of this historic site could result in restriction of dog use at Eastshore State Park.

3. CONSENT ITEMS
   A. STATE OF THE ESTUARY CONFERENCE
      Resolution:
“The State Coastal Conservancy hereby authorizes disbursement of an amount not to exceed $100,000 (one hundred thousand dollars) to the Association of Bay Area Governments for the purpose of organizing and presenting the State of the Estuary Conference in the Fall of 2011. No Conservancy funds shall be disbursed until the Executive Officer of the Conservancy has approved in writing a work plan, including a budget and schedule, the names and qualifications of any contractors proposed to be used to carry out this project, and a plan for acknowledging the Conservancy’s contribution.”

Findings:

“Based on the accompanying staff report and attached exhibits, the State Coastal Conservancy hereby finds that:

1. The proposed project is consistent with the current Project Selection Criteria and Guidelines.
2. The proposed authorization is consistent with Chapter 4.5 of Division 21 of the Public Resources Code, regarding the resource and recreational goals in the San Francisco Bay Area.”

B. WILD CHERRY CANYON PROPERTY

Resolution:

“The State Coastal Conservancy hereby amends its November 6, 2008 authorization for acquisition of the Wild Cherry Canyon Property, attached as Exhibit 3 to the accompanying staff recommendation, to change the transfer date in condition number #1(c) from December 31, 2025 to December 31, 2030. All other terms and conditions of the November 6, 2008 authorization remain in effect.”

Findings:

“Based on the accompanying staff report and attached exhibits, the State Coastal Conservancy hereby finds that this authorization remains consistent with the findings made by the Conservancy in its November 6, 2008 authorization and with the Conservancy’s updated Project Selection Criteria and Guidelines.”

C. EAST-SLOPE SONOMA MOUNTAIN RIDGE TRAIL

Resolution:

“The State Coastal Conservancy hereby authorizes disbursement of an amount not to exceed fifty five thousand dollars ($55,000) to the Sonoma County Agricultural Preservation and Open Space District to perform planning for the East-Slope Sonoma Mountain Ridge Trail in unincorporated Sonoma County. Prior to the disbursement of
any Conservancy funds, the Sonoma County Agricultural Preservation and Open Space District shall accept the trail easement necessary for the project and submit for review and approval of the Executive Officer of the Conservancy a work program, schedule and budget, and the names of any subcontractors that it intends to employ for this planning work.”

Findings:

“Based on the accompanying staff report and attached exhibits, the State Coastal Conservancy hereby finds that:

1. The proposed project is consistent with the current Project Selection Criteria and Guidelines.

2. The proposed authorization is consistent with the purposes and objectives of Chapter 4.5 of Division 21 of the Public Resources Code, regarding the improvement of public access to, within, and around the bay, coast, ridgetops and urban open spaces of the San Francisco Bay area.”

Consent items moved and seconded without change. Approved by a vote of 5-0. Chair Bosco not present.

4. EXECUTIVE OFFICER REPORT

The Executive Officer gave a brief history of Lake Temescal and the Conservancy’s support for the restoration of the Temescal Beach House, the building in which the meeting was taking place.

A. The Executive Officer provided a report on the Ocean Protection Council (report attached). At its March 2011 meeting, the Council adopted a resolution on Sea Level Rise, including the requirement that all state agencies and other entities using state funds or implementing projects on state lands consider the risks posed by sea level rise utilizing adopted interim guidelines. The next OPC meeting will be May 12 in Morro Bay.

[Chair Bosco arrived at the meeting]

B. Nadine Hitchcock of the Coastal Conservancy gave an update on Climate Change.

C. Matt Gerhart and Marilyn Latta of the Coastal Conservancy gave a PowerPoint presentation and update on San Francisco Bay Habitat Goals, the Conservation Land Network and future grants for land acquisitions.

D. Bonnie Lewkowicz gave a demonstration of the On-line Wheel Chair Guide which was launched in October. The website for the Guide is at www.wheelingcalscoast.org

E. Deborah Ruddock of the Coastal Conservancy gave a legislative report (report attached).

F. The Executive Officer gave a report on the Conservancy projects serving the
underserved (report attached).

SAN FRANCISCO BAY

5. HAMILTON WETLAND RESTORATION PROJECT

Tom Gandesbery of the Coastal Conservancy presented the Staff Recommendation.

Resolution:

“The State Coastal Conservancy hereby authorizes disbursement of an amount not to exceed four million dollars ($4,000,000) to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers for implementation of the Hamilton Wetlands Restoration Project. Prior to the disbursement of funds for this project, the Conservancy and WCB shall enter into a memorandum of understanding authorizing $4,000,000 in WCB funding for this project as an “approved project” under WCB Agreement WC-3032BT.”

Findings:

“Based on the accompanying staff report and attached exhibit, the State Coastal Conservancy hereby finds that:

1. The proposed authorization is consistent with the Project Selection Criteria and Guidelines last updated by the Conservancy on June 4, 2009.

2. The proposed authorization is consistent with the purposes and objectives of Chapter 4.5 of Division 21 of the Public Resources Code, regarding restoration and enhancement of natural habitats in the San Francisco Bay Area and public access improvements to and around the Bay, and with Chapter 6 of Division 21, concerning the enhancement of coastal and bay resources.”

Moved and seconded. Approved by a vote of 6-0.

6. INVASIVE SPARTINA PROJECT CONTROL PROGRAM

Marilyn Latta of the Coastal Conservancy presented the Staff Recommendation.

Resolution:

“The State Coastal Conservancy hereby authorizes the following:

1. Disbursement of up to $1,074,054 (one million seventy four thousand fifty four dollars), for ongoing invasive and hybrid Spartina treatment and eradication projects through 2012 (or subsequent), of which $261,679 (two hundred sixty one thousand six hundred seventy nine dollars) will be reimbursed under a grant awarded to the Conservancy through the Natural Resources Agency by the Minerals Management Service pursuant to the Coastal Impact Assistance Program (MMS CIAP grant). The grant funds for treatment and eradication projects may be used to augment existing grants to the California Wildlife
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Foundation, Friends of Corte Madera Creek Watershed, the East Bay Regional Park District, City of Alameda, City of San Leandro, the City of Palo Alto, the San Mateo County Mosquito Abatement and Vector Control District, the Alameda County Flood Control and Water Conservation District, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and the California Department of Parks and Recreation. Any grant of funds for treatment and eradication shall be subject to the following conditions:

a. Prior to implementing any treatment and eradication project and prior to disbursement of any funds to the grantee, the grantee shall submit for review and approval of the Executive Officer a plan detailing the site-specific work for 2011 and 2012, based on the outcome and extent of the 2010 treatment, and including a list of identified mitigation measures, a work program for 2011 and 2012 treatment and 2013 planning activities, if applicable, including a schedule and budget, and evidence that the grantee has obtained all necessary permits and approvals for the project.

b. In carrying out any treatment and eradication project, the grantee shall comply with all applicable mitigation and monitoring measures that are set forth in the approved site-specific plan, that are required by any permit, the amended Biological Opinion or any other approval for the project, and that are identified in the “Final Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report, San Francisco Estuary Invasive Spartina Project: Spartina Control Program” (FEIS/R), adopted by the Conservancy on September 25, 2003.

2. Disbursement of up to $3,815,893 (three million eight hundred fifteen thousand eight hundred ninety three dollars), of which $3,810,893 (three million eight hundred ten thousand eight hundred ninety three dollars) will be reimbursed by the Wildlife Conservation Board (WCB) and $5,000 (five thousand dollars) will be reimbursed under the MMS CIAP grant, for planning, management, treatment monitoring, water quality monitoring and revegetation activities for the ISP Control Program. Prior to disbursement of any Wildlife Conservation Board funds, the Executive Officer shall enter into a Memorandum of Understanding with the WCB, permitting the Invasive Spartina Project (ISP) Control Program work under this authorization as an approved phase of project work under WCB Agreement No. WC-3032BT, describing the budget and work to be performed, and providing for reimbursement of the Conservancy’s expenditures for the work.”

Findings:

“Based on the accompanying staff report and attached exhibits, the State Coastal Conservancy hereby finds that:

in the staff recommendations attached as Exhibits 1 through 8 to the accompanying staff recommendation.

2. The proposed authorization remains consistent with the Project Selection Criteria and Guidelines last updated by the Conservancy on June 4, 2009.

3. The California Wildlife Foundation and Friends of Corte Madera Creek Watershed are nonprofit organizations existing under Section 501(c)(3) of the United States Internal Revenue Code, whose purposes are consistent with Division 21 of the California Public Resources Code.”

Moved and seconded. Approved by a vote of 6-0.

7. **LAKE BERRYESSA ENVIRONMENTAL EDUCATION CAMP**

Sam Jenniches of the Coastal Conservancy presented the Staff Recommendation.

Speaking in favor of the Staff Recommendation: John Woodbury, Napa County Open Space District.

Resolution:

“The State Coastal Conservancy hereby authorizes disbursement of an amount not to exceed one million five hundred thousand dollars ($1,500,000) to the Napa County Regional Parks and Open Space District (the “District”) to construct the Lake Berryessa Environmental Education Camp (the “project”), Napa County, subject to the following conditions:

1. The project shall not commence and no Conservancy funds shall be disbursed for the project until the Executive Officer of the Conservancy has reviewed and approved in writing:
   a. A project work program, budget, and timeline.
   b. The names of any contractors that the District will retain to carry out all or part of the project.
   c. A signing plan that acknowledges Conservancy funding.
   d. Documentation that the District has obtained all permits and approvals required for the project under federal, state, and local law and, in particular, that the federal process under the National Environmental Protection Act has been completed and the project approved by the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation (“Reclamation”).
   e. An agreement executed between the District and Reclamation that authorizes the District to construct the project improvements and establishes adequate site control and operation and maintenance authority.

2. In carrying out the project, the District shall comply with all applicable mitigation and monitoring measures for the project that are identified in the *Mitigated Negative Declaration for Camp Berryessa* (“Negative Declaration”) and the *Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program for Camp Berryessa* (“Mitigation Monitoring Program”), both adopted by the District on February 14, 2011, attached to the accompanying staff
Findings:
“Based on the accompanying staff report and attached exhibits, the State Coastal Conservancy hereby finds that:
1. The proposed authorization is consistent with Public Resources Code Sections 31160-31164, regarding the Conservancy’s mandate to address the resource goals of the San Francisco Bay Area.
2. The proposed project is consistent with the current Project Selection Criteria and Guidelines.
3. The Conservancy has independently reviewed the Negative Declaration and Mitigation Monitoring Program adopted by the Napa County Regional Parks and Open Space District on February 14, 2011 pursuant to CEQA (Exhibits 4 and 5) and finds that the project, as mitigated, avoids, reduces or mitigates possible significant environmental effects and that there is no substantial evidence that the project will have a significant effect on the environment, as defined in 14 California Code of Regulations Section 15382.”

Moved and seconded. Approved by a vote of 6-0.

8. SAN FRANCISCO BAY AREA WATER TRAIL

Ann Buell of the Coastal Conservancy presented the Staff Recommendation.

Speaking in favor of the Staff Recommendation: Pedro Rosetto, Representing Senator Loni Hancock; Laura Thompson, Manager, San Francisco Bay Trail; Brian Wiese, East Bay Regional Park District; Sara Polgar, BCDC; Cecily Harris, Western Sea Kayakers and Bay Area Sea Kayakers; Paul Kamen, Bay Access and Berkeley Waterfront Commission.

Resolution:
“The State Coastal Conservancy hereby:

1. Certifies the San Francisco Bay Area Water Trail Plan Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR), attached to the accompanying staff recommendation as Exhibit 2, and authorizes the Conservancy to implement the Enhanced San Francisco Bay Area Water Trail Plan (Enhanced Water Trail Plan), attached to the accompanying staff recommendation as Exhibit 3, consistent with Alternative 3 of the FEIR, as modified by incorporation of all mitigation measures identified in the FEIR, and adopts the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (Exhibit 2).

2. Authorizes disbursement of up to $1,000,000 (one million dollars) to the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) to develop and implement various projects for the San
Francisco Bay Area Water Trail, directly or through subgrants, subject to the following conditions:

a. Prior to commencement of any work on the project, ABAG shall submit for the review and approval of the Executive Officer of the Conservancy a work plan for the project as a whole, including budget and schedule.

b. Prior to commencement of work on, disbursement of funds for, or entering into any contract or subgrant agreement for any specific project, ABAG shall submit for the review and approval of the Executive Officer of the Conservancy with respect to that project:

   i. A work plan, budget and schedule.
   ii. The names and qualifications of any contractors ABAG intends to retain to complete the project.
   iii. The proposed agreement with any subgrantee to whom ABAG intends to award grant funds to undertake the project.
   iv. Documentation that all permits and approvals for the project work have been obtained.

c. In developing and implementing projects, ABAG shall ensure compliance with all applicable mitigation and monitoring measures for the project that are identified in the FEIR and in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, both attached to the accompanying staff recommendation as Exhibit 2, or in any permits, approvals or additional environmental documentation required for the project.

d. For any project subject to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), no Conservancy funds shall be disbursed toward implementation until the Conservancy, through the San Francisco Bay Area Water Trail Project Management Team (“PMT”) (comprised of staff of the Conservancy, San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission, ABAG, and the Department of Boating and Waterways) has determined that the project requires no further environmental documentation beyond the FEIR under CEQA, or if additional environmental documentation is required, that the Conservancy or other appropriate public agency has undertaken the additional documentation required under CEQA and the Conservancy has reviewed that additional documentation.

e. ABAG shall ensure that Conservancy funding is acknowledged through the inclusion of the Conservancy logo, in a manner approved by the Conservancy’s Executive Officer, in signs installed at project sites and in all media produced and managed under this grant.

3. Adopts the Enhanced Water Trail Plan, attached as Exhibit 3 to the accompanying staff recommendation.”
Findings:
“Based on the accompanying staff report and attached exhibits, the State Coastal Conservancy hereby finds that:

1. The proposed project is consistent with the current Project Selection Criteria and Guidelines.

2. The proposed authorization is consistent with the purposes and objectives of the San Francisco Bay Area Conservancy Program, Chapter 4.5 of Division 21 of the Public Resources Code, Sections 31160-31165.

3. The Conservancy has independently reviewed and considered the information contained in the FEIR pursuant to its responsibilities under CEQA (CEQA Guidelines, 14 California Code of Regulations Section 15090). The FEIR has been completed in compliance with CEQA under the direction and supervision of the Conservancy and reflects the Conservancy’s independent judgment and analysis.

4. The FEIR identifies potentially significant effects from implementation of the Water Trail project in the areas of Recreation; Navigational Safety; Aesthetics; Biological Resources; Cultural Resources; Hydrology and Water Quality; and Transportation, Circulation, and Parking. As modified by incorporation of the mitigation measures identified in the FEIR (Alternative 3), implementation of the Enhanced Water Trail Plan will avoid, reduce, or mitigate all of the possible significant environmental effects of the project on these resource areas, as described in the accompanying staff report and the FEIR.

5. There is no substantial evidence that the implementation of the Enhanced Water Trail Plan, as mitigated, will have a significant effect on the environment.”

Moved and seconded. Approved by a vote of 6-0.

Meeting broke for lunch break.

9. ZINFANDEL LANE BRIDGE

Sam Jenniches of the Coastal Conservancy presented the Staff Recommendation.

Speaking in favor of the Staff Recommendation: Rick Thomas, Napa County Watershed Resolution:

“The State Coastal Conservancy hereby authorizes disbursement of an amount not to exceed four hundred thousand dollars ($400,000) to Napa County to retrofit the Zinfandel Lane Bridge in order to remove a barrier to anadromous fish passage on the Napa River, situated approximately two miles southeast of the City of St. Helena, Napa County. This authorization is subject to the following conditions:
1. The project shall not commence and no Conservancy funds shall be disbursed for the project until the Executive Officer of the Conservancy has reviewed and approved in writing:
   a. A project work program, budget, and timeline.
   b. A signing plan that acknowledges Conservancy funding.
   c. Documentation that Napa County has obtained all permits and approvals required for the project under federal, state, and local law.

2. The Conservancy and Napa County shall enter into an agreement sufficient to protect the public interest in any improvement or development constructed as part of this proposed project.

3. The County shall provide evidence to the Executive Officer of the Conservancy that the County has implemented the Mitigation Monitoring Program, Appendix A of the Mitigated Negative Declaration, adopted by the County of Napa Department of Public Works on June 17, 2010 (Exhibit 4).”

Findings:
“Based on the accompanying staff report and attached exhibits, the State Coastal Conservancy hereby finds that:

1. The proposed authorization is consistent with Public Resources Code Sections 31160-31165, regarding the Conservancy’s mandate to address the resource goals of the San Francisco Bay Area.

2. The proposed project is consistent with the current Project Selection Criteria and Guidelines.

3. The Conservancy has independently reviewed the Mitigated Negative Declaration and Mitigation Monitoring Program for the “Zinfandel Lane Bridge Fish Passage Project” adopted by the County of Napa Department of Public Works on June 17, 2010 (Exhibit 4) and finds that that the project as conditioned avoids, reduces, or mitigates the possible significant environmental effects to a level of insignificance and there is no substantial evidence that the project, as mitigated, will have a significant effect on the environment, as defined in 14 California Code of Regulations Section 15382.”

Moved and seconded. Approved by a vote of 6-0.

CENTRAL COAST

10. FITZGERALD MARINE RESERVE - This item was removed from the Agenda.
11. DOMANSKIS PROPERTY

Deborah Ruddock of the Coastal Conservancy presented the Staff Recommendation.

Resolution:

“The State Coastal Conservancy hereby authorizes the disbursement of seven hundred thousand dollars ($700,000) to the City of Laguna Beach (“City”) for acquisition in fee of the 7.8-acre Domanskis property, County of Orange Assessor’s Parcel Nos. 056-231-20, -21, -22 and -23; and up to $6,000 for estimated closing costs for the transaction, subject to the following conditions:

1. Prior to the disbursement of any Conservancy funds for the acquisition of the property, the City shall submit for the review and approval of the Executive Officer of the Conservancy (“the Executive Officer”):
   a. All relevant acquisition documents, including without limitation, an appraisal, purchase agreement, escrow instructions, environmental assessment, and title report.
   b. Evidence that sufficient funds are available to complete the acquisition.
   c. Evidence of commitment by the County of Orange to manage the property as part of the Aliso and Wood Canyons Wilderness Park for public access and for wildlife habitat.

2. The City shall pay no more than fair market value for the property, as established in appraisal approved by the Executive Officer.

3. The City shall permanently dedicate the property for open space, public access and habitat preservation, through an appropriate instrument approved by the Executive Officer.

4. The City shall acknowledge Conservancy and Proposition 12 funding by erecting and maintaining on the property signs, the design and location of which have been approved by the Executive Officer.

Findings:

“Based on the accompanying staff report and attached exhibits, the State Coastal Conservancy hereby finds that:

1. The proposed project is consistent with the current Project Selection Criteria and Guidelines.

2. The proposed authorization is consistent with the purposes and objectives of Chapter 9 of Division 21 of the Public Resources Code (Sections 31400-31409) with respect to public
access. The proposed acquisition will preserve a link in a trail network providing access along the Laguna Coast and to the coast from inland areas, as well as provide scenic coastal views.

3. The proposed project would serve a greater-than-local need.”

Moved and seconded. Approved by a vote of 6-0.

12. BAYSHORE BIKEWAY/SAN DIEGO COASTAL TRAIL

David Hayes of the Coastal Conservancy presented the Staff Recommendation.

Speaking in favor of the Staff Recommendation: Greg Cox, San Diego District Supervisor and Chair, Bayshore Bike Group; Stefan Vance, SANDAG, gave a power point presentation;

Resolution:

“The State Coastal Conservancy hereby authorizes disbursement of up to $2,500,000 (two million five hundred thousand dollars) to the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) for final design and construction of 2.8 miles of the Bayshore Bikeway, as a segment of the California Coastal Trail, in the cities of San Diego and National City as depicted in Exhibit 2, and subject to the following conditions:

1. Prior to disbursement of any funds for construction, SANDAG shall submit for the review and approval of the Executive Officer:
   a. An agreement between SANDAG and the cities of San Diego and National City authorizing SANDAG to construct the Bayshore Bikeway, and acknowledging the cities’ responsibility to operate and maintain the Bikeway as a segment of the California Coastal Trail.
   b. A work program for the construction of the Bikeway, including schedule and budget.
   c. The names of any contractors SANDAG intends to use to complete the project.

2. In carrying out the construction, SANDAG shall comply with all applicable mitigation and monitoring measures for the project that are identified in the Bayshore Bikeway Project (Segments 4, 5, 7, and 8A) Final Mitigated Negative Declaration/Initial Study, May 2009, and in the San Diego Association of Governments Mitigation, Monitoring, and Reporting Program, Bayshore Bikeway Project (Segments 4, 5, 7, and 8A), both adopted by SANDAG on May 1, 2009.

3. To the extent appropriate, SANDAG shall ensure that the project improvements are consistent with the Conservancy’s ‘Standards and Recommendations for Accessway Location and Development’ and with all applicable federal and state statutes, regulations and guidelines governing barrier-free access for persons with disabilities.
4. SANDAG, shall ensure that signs are installed and maintained along the Bayshore Bikeway, identifying the project as a segment of the “California Coastal Trail” and incorporating interpretive panels and acknowledgement of Conservancy funding, the design, number and placement of which has been approved by the Executive Officer.”

Findings:

“Based on the accompanying staff report and attached exhibits, the State Coastal Conservancy hereby finds that:

1. The proposed project is consistent with the current Project Selection Criteria and Guidelines.

2. The proposed authorization is consistent with the purposes and objectives of Chapter 9 of Division 21 of the Public Resources Code, regarding public access.

3. The proposed project serves more than local needs and will provide facilities that will serve major employment centers, be used and enjoyed by the regional population, and by visitors to the region from across the state and country.

4. The Conservancy has independently reviewed the Bayshore Bikeway Project (Segments 4, 5, 7, and 8A) Final Mitigated Negative Declaration Initial Study, and the San Diego Association of Governments Mitigation, Monitoring, and Reporting Program, Bayshore Bikeway Project (Segments 4, 5, 7, and 8A), attached to the accompanying staff recommendation as Exhibit 5 and Exhibit 6, respectively, and finds that the project avoids, reduces or mitigates the possible significant environmental effects and that there is no substantial evidence that the project will have a significant effect on the environment, as defined in 14 California Code of Regulations Section 15382.”

Moved and seconded. Approved by a vote of 6-0.

13. **COMPTON CREEK NATIONAL PARK**

David Hayes of the Coastal Conservancy presented the Staff Recommendation.

Speaking in favor of the Staff Recommendation: Melissa Guerrero, Compton National Park and Mountains and Recreation Conservation Authority.

Resolution:

“The State Coastal Conservancy hereby authorizes an amount not to exceed five hundred thousand dollars ($500,000) to the Mountains Recreation and Conservation Authority (MRCA) for final design and construction of the Compton Creek Natural Park, as described in the accompanying staff recommendation, subject to the following conditions:

Prior to the disbursement of any funds for construction, MRCA shall submit for review and approval of the Executive Officer of the Conservancy:

1. Evidence that MRCA has obtained all necessary permits and approvals.
2. A work program and budget for project final design and a final work plan including a project schedule and budget for project construction.

3. An agreement or agreements between the Conservancy, MRCA, Los Angeles Flood Control District, or the Compton School District to allow MRCA, to build, operate, secure public access, and ensure that the park will be maintained for a period of no less than twenty years from the date of its completion.

4. A signage plan for the project acknowledging Conservancy funding and content of the environmental interpretive sign program.”

Findings:

“Based on the accompanying staff report and attached exhibits, the Coastal Conservancy hereby finds that:

1. The proposed project is consistent with the current Project Selection Criteria and Guidelines.

2. The proposed authorization is consistent with the purposes and objectives of Chapter 7 of Division 21 of the Public Resources Code, regarding urban waterfronts and inland coastal watershed areas and Chapter 9 of the Code, regarding trails leading to and along the coast.

3. The proposed project will serve greater than local needs.”

Moved and seconded. Approved by a vote of 6-0.

14. **OJAI VALLEY TRAIL**

Bob Thiel of the Coastal Conservancy presented the Staff Recommendation.

Resolution:

“The State Coastal Conservancy hereby authorizes the disbursement of an amount not to exceed two hundred fifteen thousand dollars ($215,000) to the County of Ventura to replace a culvert crossing with a bridge along the Ojai Valley Trail at the confluence of San Antonio Creek and the Ventura River in Ventura County. This authorization is subject to the following conditions:

1. Prior to the commencement of work by the County, the Executive Officer of the Conservancy shall approve in writing a work program, schedule of completion, project budget, and any contractors to be employed on the project.

2. Prior to the disbursement of any funds by the Conservancy, the County shall provide evidence to the Conservancy’s Executive Officer that:
a. The County has obtained all necessary permits, as well as rights to the entire project site to allow construction, maintenance and monitoring of the project;

b. The County has implemented (or if the mitigation measure pertains to post-construction activities, the County will implement into the project) the mitigation monitoring and reporting program that is attached to the accompanying staff recommendation as Exhibit 6; and

c. The County has designed the project to include the best management practices (BMP) identified by Conservancy staff to address the potential (although insignificant) impacts of greenhouse gas emissions from the project.

3. The County shall implement post-project effectiveness monitoring of the project for five years following construction in accordance with a monitoring plan approved by the Conservancy’s Executive Officer.”

Findings:

“Based on the accompanying staff report and attached exhibits, the State Coastal Conservancy hereby finds that:

1. The proposed authorization is consistent with the purposes and objectives of both Chapter 5.5 and Chapter 6 of Division 21 of the Public Resources Code regarding integrated coastal and marine resources protection and coastal resource enhancement projects.

2. The proposed authorization is consistent with the current Project Selection Criteria and Guidelines.

3. The Conservancy has independently reviewed and considered the Mitigated Negative Declaration adopted by the County of Ventura on November 24, 2009, pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act, for the Ojai Valley Trail San Antonio Creek Bridge project (Exhibit 5). The Conservancy finds that there is no substantial evidence that the project, as mitigated, will have a significant effect on the environment, as defined in 14 California Code of Regulations Section 15382.”

Moved and seconded. Approved by a vote of 6-0.

NORTH COAST

15. “THE CEDARS” RAICHE-MCCRARY PROPERTY

Lisa Ames of the Coastal Conservancy presented the Staff Recommendation.
Speaking in favor of the Staff Recommendation: Ruskin Hartley, Executive Director, Save the Redwoods League.

Resolution:

“The State Coastal Conservancy hereby authorizes the disbursement of an amount not to exceed two hundred forty-thousand dollars ($240,000) to Save the Redwoods League (“SRL”) to complete the acquisition of approximately 500 acres of the “Raiche-McCrory Property” (Assessor’s Parcel Number 123-250-002) and add it to the Area of Critical Ecological Concern managed by the federal Bureau of Land Management within the approximately 11 square mile area known as “The Cedars” in western Sonoma County. This authorization is subject to the following conditions:

1. Prior to the disbursement of funds for acquisition, SRL shall submit for the review and approval of the Executive Officer of the Conservancy (“the Executive Officer”):
   a. All relevant acquisition documents, including but not limited to an appraisal, environmental assessments, agreement of purchase and sale, escrow instructions, and documents related to title.
   b. Evidence that SRL has obtained all funds necessary to complete the acquisition.
   c. Evidence that the SRL has obtained permanent egress and ingress rights to the Raiche-McCrory Property for public access purposes consistent with natural resource protection of the property.

2. SRL shall pay no more than fair market value for the property as established in the appraisal approved by the Executive Officer.

3. SRL shall permanently dedicate the property in a manner acceptable to the Executive Officer for the purpose of protecting, restoring and enhancing habitat and open space, and the provision of public access compatible with this purpose.

4. SRL shall acknowledge Conservancy funding by erecting and maintaining a sign on the property that has been reviewed and approved by the Executive Officer.

5. SRL may transfer its interests in the Raiche-McCrory Property to the federal Bureau of Land Management or another public entity or nonprofit organization acceptable to the Executive Officer, provided the public agency or nonprofit organization agrees to hold, manage and operate these interests in the manner set forth in condition number three above.”

Findings:

“Based on the accompanying staff report and attached exhibits, the State Coastal Conservancy hereby finds that:
1. The proposed authorization is consistent with the purposes and objectives of Chapter 4.5 of Division 21 of the Public Resources Code, regarding the protection of natural habitats and resources of regional importance as described in Section 31162.

2. The proposed authorization is consistent with the current Project Selection Criteria and Guidelines most recently updated by the Conservancy on June 4, 2009.

3. Save the Redwoods League is a private nonprofit organization, existing under the provisions of Section 501 (c)(3) of the U.S. Internal Revenue Service Code whose purposes are consistent with Division 21 of the Public Resources Code.”

Moved and seconded. Approved by a vote of 6-0.

16. CONSERVANCY MEMBER COMMENT
    There were no member comments

18. CLOSED SESSION
    There was no closed session

19. ADJOURNMENT
    Meeting was adjourned at 2:04 pm
Ocean Protection Council meeting - March 11, 2011

TO: California Ocean and Coastal Community
FROM: John Laird, Secretary for Natural Resources
DATE: March 23, 2011
SUBJECT: March 2011 OPC Meeting Highlights

Dear Ocean and Coastal Community,

On March 11, we had the first Ocean Protection Council (OPC) meeting of 2011 here in Sacramento. The first order of business was the annual election of the Council chair; I am honored that I was elected to that position. I look forward to serving both the Council and the people of California as we address the many challenges facing our ocean resources and the economy they support.

**Climate Change Adaptation Policy:** This meeting focused on climate change, one of the greatest challenges facing our state and nation. The Council took significant action by unanimously adopting a resolution that provides guidance for how state agencies should prepare for sea-level rise as well as science-based sea-level rise projections they should consider in their management activities. Sea-level rise is one of the most significant impacts that California faces from climate change. A study funded in part by the OPC has shown that a 55-inch sea-level rise combined with a 100-year storm event along the California coast would place approximately 480,000 people and nearly $100 billion of property at risk.

The recent tsunami provided a tragic reminder that coastal flooding, inundation, and erosion can have significant impacts to public safety, the economy, and our natural resources. The OPC recommendations, if followed, will reduce these impacts and will help protect coastal and bay communities. The resolution recommends that state agencies incorporate sea-level rise and impacts from storms into their decision making, ensuring careful investment of public funding and avoiding decisions that could place economic and environmental resources at risk. This forward-looking resolution on sea-level rise builds on guidance developed and agreed upon by 16 state agencies through a process led by OPC staff and informed by the OPC’s Science Advisory Team.

**Climate Change Science:** Another highlight of the March 11 meeting was the presentation of a position statement on climate change by Dr. Gary Griggs, Director of the Institute of Marine Science at UC Santa Cruz and member of the OPC-Science Advisory Team. This statement, signed by 23 prominent scientists of the OPC-Science Advisory Team, highlights the urgent need for action on climate change.

Dr. David Pierce of the Scripps Institution of Oceanography provided an excellent presentation to the Council describing the scientific consensus regarding climate change, its impacts, and its causes. His presentation summarized years of data and information in a succinct and understandable way to make a simple point: climate change is happening and we need to take action to address it.

**Funding for Science and Monitoring:** The Council unanimously supported continued funding for the comprehensive and cost-effective program to monitor the emerging system of marine protected areas along the California coast. In addition, the Council also unanimously supported funding to support the OPC Science Advisory Team, and the continued independent peer review of OPC proposals and reports, among other science services. By investing these funds, the Council is helping to ensure the scientific integrity of all OPC projects.

For more meeting details, please visit: [http://www.opc.ca.gov/category/meetings/](http://www.opc.ca.gov/category/meetings/)

Please join us at our next meeting on May 12, 2011 in Morro Bay where we will focus on sustainable fisheries.
State Coastal Conservancy

March 17, 2011 Legislative Report

---

**AB 92**  
*Blumenfield D*  
2011-12 Budget.  
Introduced: 1/10/2011  
Status: 3/1/2011-Referred to Com. on BUDGET.  
Location: 3/1/2011-A. BUDGET  
Summary: This bill would make appropriations for support of state government for the 2011-12 fiscal year. This bill contains other related provisions.

---

**SB 68**  
*Leno D*  
2011-12 Budget.  
Introduced: 1/10/2011  
Location: 2/28/2011-S. B. & F.  
Summary: This bill would make appropriations for support of state government for the 2011-12 fiscal year. This bill contains other related provisions.

---

**SB 588**  
*Evans D*  
Introduced: 2/17/2011  
Calendar: 3/22/2011 9:30 a.m. - Room 112 SENATE NATURAL RESOURCES AND WATER, PAVLEY, Chair  
Summary: The California Coastal Act of 1976 requires a person undertaking development in the coastal zone to obtain a coastal development permit in accordance with prescribed procedures. Existing law authorizes the superior court to impose civil liability on a person who performs or undertakes development that is in violation of the act or that is inconsistent with a previously issued coastal development permit, and on a person who violates the act in any other manner. This bill would provide that a person who violates the act is subject to an administrative civil penalty that may be imposed by the California Coastal Commission by a majority vote of the commissioners, upon consideration of various factors, in a public hearing, and in an amount no less than $5,000 and no more than $50,000 for each violation. This bill contains other related provisions and other existing laws.

---

**AB 565**  
*Monning D*  
Conservation: State Coastal Conservancy.  
Introduced: 2/16/2011  
Status: 3/3/2011-Referred to Com. on NAT. RES.
**Location:** 3/3/2011-A. NAT. RES.

**Summary:** Existing law establishes the State Coastal Conservancy in the Natural Resources Agency with prescribed powers and responsibilities for implementing a program of agricultural land protection, area restoration, and resource enhancement within the coastal zone, as defined. Existing law authorizes the conservancy, for the purpose of implementing the provisions governing the conservancy, to fund and undertake plans and feasibility studies, and award grants to public agencies and nonprofit organizations. This bill would additionally authorize the conservancy, for the purpose of implementing the provisions governing the conservancy, to award a grant to a for-profit entity to accomplish removal or alteration of a dam under specified conditions.

**Subject**
- Coastal Conservancy

---

### conservation easements

**SB 328** *(Kehoe D)* Eminent Domain Law: conservation easement.

**Introduced:** 2/15/2011  
**Status:** 2/24/2011-Referred to Com. on JUD.  
**Location:** 2/24/2011-S. JUD.

**Summary:** Existing law authorizes various agencies to acquire land for purposes related to conservation. Existing law provides for a conservation easement to retain land predominantly in its natural, scenic, historical, agricultural, forested, or open-space condition. Existing law establishes procedures for the independent appraisal review of land to be acquired for conservation and establishes a conservation easement registry. Existing law prohibits, with a specified exception, the sale of conservation lands to another owner or the transfer of possession and control of conservation lands to another agency, unless specified actions occur. This bill would revise the Eminent Domain Law to establish requirements for acquisition of property subject to a conservation easement. The bill would require the person seeking to acquire the property to give the holder of the conservation easement a notice containing specified information and an opportunity to comment on the acquisition. The bill would require the holder of the conservation easement to provide notice, under certain circumstances and as specified, of the proposed acquisition to each public entity that helped fund the purchase of the conservation easement or that imposed conditions on approval or permitting of a project that were satisfied, in whole or in part, by the conservation easement, and other information, as specified. The bill would require a person seeking to acquire the property subject to the conservation easement to respond to any comments in writing and provide by first-class mail the response to each easement holder or public entity that filed comments. The bill would require the notice of the hearing on the resolution of necessity to be sent to any holder of the conservation easement and public entity, as specified, and to contain information regarding the effect of failing to file a written request to appear and be heard. The bill would require that a resolution of necessity to acquire property subject to the conservation easement refer to specific authority for the acquisition of the property. The bill would specify that the holder of the conservation easement is entitled to compensation under the Eminent Domain Law, as specified. This bill contains other related provisions and other existing laws.

**Subject**
- conservation easements

---

### conservation lands

**AB 484** *(Alejo D)* Land use: natural resources: transfer of long-term management funds.

**Introduced:** 2/15/2011  
**Status:** 3/3/2011-Referred to Coms. on W., P. & W. and L. GOV.  
**Location:** 2/15/2011-A. W.,P. & W.

**Summary:** The Planning and Zoning Law authorizes a state or local public agency to authorize a nonprofit organization to hold title to, and manage an interest in, real property that the state or local public agency requires a property owner to transfer to the agency to mitigate an adverse impact upon natural resources caused by permitting the development of a project or facility, provided the nonprofit organization meets specified conditions. That law also authorizes an agency that, in the development of its own project, is required to transfer an interest in real property to mitigate an adverse impact upon natural resources, to transfer the interest to a nonprofit organization that meets the specified conditions. This bill would authorize funds set aside for the long-term management of any lands or easements conveyed to a nonprofit organization pursuant to the
above provisions to also be conveyed to the nonprofit organization. The bill would also authorize the nonprofit organization to hold, manage, invest, and disburse the funds in furtherance of managing and stewarding the land or easement for which the funds were set aside.

**AB 703**

*(Gordon D)* Property taxation: welfare exemption: nature resources and open-space lands.

*Introduced:* 2/17/2011

*Status:* 3/7/2011-Referred to Com. on REV. & TAX.

*Location:* 3/7/2011-A. REV. & TAX

*Calendar:* 4/4/2011 1:30 p.m. - State Capitol, Room 126 ASSEMBLY REVENUE AND TAXATION, PEREA, Chair

*Summary:* Existing property tax law, in accordance with the California Constitution, provides for a welfare exemption under which property used exclusively for religious, hospital, scientific, or charitable purposes and owned and operated by funds, foundations, or corporations meeting certain statutory requirements is exempt from taxation. Existing law also provides that property used exclusively for the preservation of specified nature resources or open-space lands meeting other specified criteria shall be deemed to be included within the welfare exemption. Existing law makes the inclusion of this property within the welfare exemption inoperative on the lien date in 2012, which is January 1, 2012, and repeals this provision on January 1, 2013. This bill would eliminate the January 1, 2012, inoperative date, and the January 1, 2013, repeal date, thereby extending the inclusion of this property within the welfare exemption indefinitely. This bill contains other related provisions and other existing laws.

**SB 800**


*Introduced:* 2/18/2011

*Status:* 3/10/2011-Referred to Com. on E.Q.

*Location:* 3/10/2011-S. E.Q.

*Summary:* The California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 requires the State Air Resources Board to adopt regulations to require the reporting and verification of emissions of greenhouse gases and to monitor and enforce compliance with the reporting and verification program, and requires the state board to adopt a statewide greenhouse gas emissions limit equivalent to the statewide greenhouse gas emissions level in 1990 to be achieved by 2020. This bill would create the Voluntary Greenhouse Gas Emission Offset Program Fund, and would provide that funds received by the state on a voluntary basis from the federal government, individuals, businesses, organizations, industry, or other sources for the mitigation of climate change impacts related to greenhouse gas emissions be deposited in this fund. The moneys in the fund would be available, upon appropriation, for expenditure by the Natural Resources Agency for specified projects through a competitive grant process. The bill would require that moneys from the fund be directed to the California Conservation Corps and local conservation corps for specified projects. The Natural Resources Agency would be required, by January 1, 2013, to adopt guidelines for the distribution of moneys from the fund and to develop strategies for the sale of voluntary greenhouse gas emission offsets by the state and other opportunities for contributions by the public to the Voluntary Greenhouse Gas Emission Offset Program Fund.

**SB 436**

*(Kehoe D)* Land use: mitigation lands: nonprofit organizations.

*Introduced:* 2/16/2011

*Status:* 2/24/2011-Referred to Com. on RLS.

*Location:* 2/24/2011-S. RLS.
Summary: The Planning and Zoning Law authorizes a state or local public agency, if the agency requires a property owner to transfer to the agency an interest in real property to mitigate an adverse impact upon natural resources caused by permitting the development of a project or facility, to authorize a nonprofit organization to hold title to and manage that interest in real property, provided that the nonprofit organization meets specified requirements. This bill would state the findings and declarations of the Legislature with respect to the preservation of natural resources through such mitigation, and would state that it is the intent of the Legislature to enact legislation to allow state and local public agencies and nonprofit organizations to utilize the tools and strategies they need for improving the effectiveness, cost-efficiency, and durability of mitigation for California's natural resources.

Subject
mitigation

AB 42 (Huffman D) State parks.
Introduced: 12/6/2010
Status: 12/7/2010-From printer. May be heard in committee January 6.
Location: 12/6/2010-A. PRINT
Summary: Existing law gives control of the state park system to the Department of Recreation. This bill would declare the intent of the Legislature to address the need to fully fund the state park system with stable, reliable, and adequate funding sources.

Subject
state parks

AB 1123 (Harkey R) State projects: risk analysis.
Introduced: 2/18/2011
Status: 2/20/2011-From printer. May be heard in committee March 22.
Location: 2/18/2011-A. PRINT
Summary: Existing law provides for the funding, operation, and administration of state projects relating to varied state and local activities. This bill would declare the intent of the Legislature to enact legislation requiring that a risk analysis be undertaken for any state-funded project costing $500,000,000 or more.

Subject
state-funded projects

AB 587 (Gordon D) Public works: volunteers.
Introduced: 2/16/2011
Status: 3/3/2011-Referred to Com. on L. & E.
Summary: Existing law defines "public works," for purposes of regulating public works contracts, as, among other things, construction, alteration, demolition, installation, or repair work that is performed under contract and paid for in whole or in part out of public funds. Pursuant to existing law, all workers employed on public works projects are required to be paid not less than the general prevailing rate of per diem wages for work, except as specified. This bill would extend that repeal date to January 1, 2017, and make technical, nonsubstantive changes to that provision. This bill contains other related provisions and other existing laws.

Subject
volunteer labor
**SB 644**  
(Hancock D) Public works: volunteers.  
Introduced: 2/18/2011  
Status: 3/3/2011-Referred to Com. on L. & I.R.  
Calendar: 3/23/2011 9:30 a.m. - Rose Ann Vuich Hearing Room (2040) SENATE LABOR AND INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS, LIEU, Chair  
**Summary:** Existing law defines "public works," for purposes of regulating public works contracts, as, among other things, construction, alteration, demolition, installation, or repair work that is performed under contract and paid for in whole or in part out of public funds. Pursuant to existing law, all workers employed on public works projects are required to be paid not less than the general prevailing rate of per diem, except as specified. This bill would extend the repeal of this provision to January 1, 2017. This bill contains other existing laws.

Subject  
volunteer labor

---

**water bond**

---

**AB 157**  
(Jeffries R) Safe, Clean, and Reliable Drinking Water Supply Act of 2012.  
Introduced: 1/19/2011  
Status: 2/24/2011-Referred to Coms. on W., P. & W. and E.S. & T.M.  
Location: 1/19/2011-A. W., P. & W.  
**Summary:** Existing law creates the Safe, Clean, and Reliable Drinking Water Supply Act of 2012, which, if approved by the voters at the November 6, 2012, statewide election, would authorize the issuance of bonds in the amount of $11,140,000,000 pursuant to the State General Obligation Bond Law to finance a safe drinking water and water supply reliability program. This bill would reduce by 25% the total amount of bonds authorized to be issued pursuant to the Safe, Clean, and Reliable Drinking Water Supply Act of 2012, and would make conforming reductions to amounts specified to be allocated from these bond funds for certain purposes. This bill contains other related provisions.

Subject  
water bond

---

**AB 1283**  
(Berryhill, Bill R) Safe, Clean, and Reliable Drinking Water Supply Act of 2012.  
Introduced: 2/18/2011  
Status: 2/22/2011-From printer. May be heard in committee March 22.  
Location: 2/18/2011-A. PRINT  
**Summary:** Existing law creates the Safe, Clean, and Reliable Drinking Water Supply Act of 2012, which, if approved by the voters, would authorize the issuance of bonds in the amount of $11,140,000,000 pursuant to the State General Obligation Bond Law to finance a safe drinking water and water supply reliability program. Existing law provides for the submission of the bond act to the voters at the November 6, 2012, statewide general election. This bill would declare the intent of the Legislature to enact legislation relating to the Safe, Clean, and Reliable Drinking Water Supply Act of 2012.

Subject  
water bond

---

**williamson act**

---

**SB 668**  
(Evans D) Local government: Williamson Act.  
Introduced: 2/18/2011  
Status: 3/3/2011-Referred to Com. on RLS.  
Location: 3/3/2011-S. RLS.  
**Summary:** The California Land Conservation Act of 1965, otherwise known as the Williamson Act, authorizes cities and counties to enter into contracts with landowners whereby the landowner agrees to restrict the use of his or her land in exchange for a reduced property taxation rate. Under existing law, the city or county receives a subvention for the property tax revenue lost as a result of these contracts. This bill would express the intent of the Legislature to enact legislation that would authorize local governments to accept donations from private entities to offset any reduced amount the local government receives in subvention payments for Williamson Act
contracts.

Total Measures: 16

Total Tracking Forms: 16

Subject
willamson act
Memo To: Coastal Conservancy Board and Oversight Members

From: Sam Schuchat, EO

Date: 3/10/11

RE: SCC Projects that Serve the Underserved

At our last board meeting, several members expressed an interest in understanding to what extent the Coastal Conservancy’s projects provide benefits for low-income or ethnic communities. This is an important question given the ever growing diversity of California’s population, as well as the historically recent spike in income inequality. It is also an interesting question to try to answer, since we do not have systems in place to measure this particular variable.

In this memo I propose taking three “passes” at answering the question. First, I have asked my regional managers to simply, and off the top of their heads, give me a list of the projects in their region that they believe serve the underserved. These lists are attached, and run from north to south. The lists include the most basic information: project name, location, when you approved it, how much we funded it (not necessarily the total cost of the project), a brief description, and an argument as to why each project counts.

It is important to note that this is not a comprehensive survey; we did not troll through our database or peruse our files to make a complete list. Nevertheless, it is quite a long list and spans the full range of activities the Coastal Conservancy engages in, from land acquisition to nature centers to wetland restoration, urban water fronts, and so on. Since I like to add things up, here is a summary table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th># of Projects</th>
<th>SCC Investment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>$17,638,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>$29,925,281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$8,318,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>$7,960,247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>$63,842,228</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I am reasonably sure that if I had given them more time, our regional managers would have thought of more projects!

Part two of this analysis will take more time and effort on our part, but can be carried out largely in house. We are very close to having the locations of all of our projects since 2010 represented as points on a map. Once all of our projects are geocoded, it should be possible to use the most recent census data and determine the characteristics of the population living within any particular radius of the project. (Since this will involve computers, I am sure it will not be as simple as I make it sound, and you
can rest assured that I don’t have the foggiest idea how to do this myself!) We will obviously need to
determine what the radius is around each project, and what demographic characteristics we are
interested in.

Finally, I think it would be useful and interesting to reach out to our project partners and find out to
what extent they have collected data on who uses their land, trails, facilities, and so on. This will require
a fair amount of work, and we will have to give some thought as to how to best array the data. I am
pretty sure that there is a high degree of variability among our partners as far as data collection goes.
Therefore, this will not be a comprehensive survey. However, if we put the three pieces together, I think
we will have a reasonably well rounded understanding of who benefits from our projects.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Board Authorization</th>
<th>SCC Funds</th>
<th>Brief Description</th>
<th>Why this serves the underserved?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paradise Creek</td>
<td>National City</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>2001, 2005</td>
<td>$1,200,000</td>
<td>Funding to clean up and restore a creek, establish environmental education program at neighborhood elementary school</td>
<td>Low income community, majority Hispanic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington Elementary</td>
<td>Compton</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>expected May 2011</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>Funding to construct a community park on the grounds of an elementary school in Compton.</td>
<td>Low-income community with extremely inadequate parks and open space.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Point Nature Ed Center</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>$135,000</td>
<td>Funded reuse/rehabilitation of former Nike site missile building for educational program classroom and exhibit hall.</td>
<td>Urban low-income inland communities are targeted by Palos Verdes Peninsula Land Conservancy through LA schools for educational programs and tours in this facility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ocean Discovery Institute</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>Funding for final design, engineering, and pre-construction planning for the Living Lab</td>
<td>Located in the low-income City Heights community. Living Lab will host over 20,000 low-income students each year, encouraging them to pursue careers in science.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado Lagoon</td>
<td>Long Beach</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>2011, 2007, 2002</td>
<td>$1,390,997</td>
<td>Funding to develop a plan and implement restoration of Colorado Lagoon</td>
<td>Colorado Lagoon is extensively used for swimming by low-income LA County residents but has a history of poor water quality. Restoration will significantly improve water quality to benefit people and the lagoon habitat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunken City Overlook</td>
<td>Los Angeles, San Pedro</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>Converted street-end on coastal bluff into a landscaped mini-park with view of the ocean and the historic &quot;Sunken City.&quot;</td>
<td>Open space in low-income, park-poor San Pedro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeForest Wetlands</td>
<td>Long Beach</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>2000, 2004, 2005, 2011</td>
<td>$2,400,000</td>
<td>Funding to design and construct a 38-acre wetland/upland open space area along the LA River with trails and passive public park activities including environmental education</td>
<td>Low-income, minority west Long Beach community impacted by heavy freeway air pollution and social problems including lack of open space, crime, and poverty. The project will create a large new park in an area with few parks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Monica Pier Aquarium</td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>2000, 2006</td>
<td>$900,000</td>
<td>Funding to improve exhibits and infrastructure and to assess the feasibility of expanding the aquarium.</td>
<td>The Santa Monica Pier aquarium is designed for public education about Santa Monica Bay, and half of the elementary school children (7,000/year) come from Title 1 schools in LA County.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compton Creek Enhancement Feasibility Study</td>
<td>Compton</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>2007, 2008</td>
<td>$153,000</td>
<td>Funding for conduct data collection, preliminary engineering, cost and feasibility analysis for implementation of creek enhancement and trail access improvement projects along Compton Creek in Los Angeles County</td>
<td>Compton is a very poor city with little natural resource areas or open space.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquatic Adventures In Science Education Van</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>$55,000</td>
<td>Funding to purchase a 15-passenger minivan for transporting students from schools in low-income neighborhoods to after-school marine science program.</td>
<td>Program targets students from inner-city schools with a majority low-income Hispanic population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower LA River project Development</td>
<td>Compton/LA</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>2005, 2007</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
<td>Organization training and project development</td>
<td>Targeting inner city areas w/o environmental oriented organizations; includes a high school Environmental Training program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swan Canyon Restoration</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>2008 and 2010</td>
<td>$126,250</td>
<td>Habitat Restoration in Swan Canyon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Watershed Garden</td>
<td>Beverly Hills</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>Funding for development of an environmental education feature, the Urban Watershed Garden, as part of the new Center for Urban Forestry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Name</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Date of Board Authorization</td>
<td>SCC Funds</td>
<td>Brief Description</td>
<td>Why this serves the underserved?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pebble Beach Del Norte Coastal Trail</td>
<td>Crescent City</td>
<td>Del Norte</td>
<td>Jun-08</td>
<td>$641,000</td>
<td>Implement 1.86 Miles of Coastal Trail</td>
<td>Poverty level is 20% for Del Norte and 34% for Crescent City (2000 Census). For comparison the poverty level for Alameda County is 11% and the Statewide rate is 13% (American Community Survey 2009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crescent City Harbor Promenade Design</td>
<td>Crescent City</td>
<td>Del Norte</td>
<td>Aug-10</td>
<td>$685,000</td>
<td>Create design guide and coastal trail designs through the Crescent City Harbor.</td>
<td>Provides Coastal Access and helps the Tolowa Tribe in managing the cultural resources on the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Point Saint George Acquisition</td>
<td>Crescent City</td>
<td>Del Norte</td>
<td>Apr-02</td>
<td>$1,317,000</td>
<td>Acquire the 339 acre Point Saint George Property</td>
<td>Provides Coastal Access and helps the Tolowa Tribe in managing the cultural resources on the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Point Saint George Phase I enhancement</td>
<td>Crescent City</td>
<td>Del Norte</td>
<td>Jun-05</td>
<td>$340,000</td>
<td>Implementation plans for public access and cultural resource protection.</td>
<td>Provides Coastal Access and helps the Tolowa Tribe in managing the cultural resources on the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redwood Hostel Feasibility Study</td>
<td>Del Norte</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jan-11</td>
<td>$144,500</td>
<td>Fund design and permitting of a new Youth Hostel to improve low cost accommodation to the California Coast.</td>
<td>Allows lower income visitors the ability to visit the California coast.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Point Reyes Hostel Expansion</td>
<td>Marin</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sep-08</td>
<td>$230,000</td>
<td>Construct additional family accommodations at the Point Reyes Youth Hostel.</td>
<td>Allows lower income visitors the ability to visit the California coast.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elephant Seal Overlook Trail Rehabilitation</td>
<td>Marin</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jan-05</td>
<td>$88,000</td>
<td>SCC funding was used to rehabilitate coastal trail to the Elephant Seal Overlook in Pt Reyes NRA.</td>
<td>Work was performed by the Marin County Conservation Corps. Trail accommodates disabled individuals. Viewing platform allows schools from around the bay area to observe wildlife and learn about the Elephant Seals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairhaven T' Beach Access</td>
<td>Manila</td>
<td>Humboldt</td>
<td>Dec-05</td>
<td>$57,500</td>
<td>Funding to rebuild/rehabilitate the beach access parking, and install signage, on north spit of Humboldt Bay, at the Fairhaven T access point.</td>
<td>Provides Coastal Access in Manila, a community consisting largely of very low income households.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stamps Property Acquisitions</td>
<td>Manila</td>
<td>Humboldt</td>
<td>Jun-06</td>
<td>$525,000</td>
<td>Acquire approximately 38 acres of dune property in Manila.</td>
<td>Provides Coastal Access in Manila, a community consisting largely of very low income households.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachofer and Watson Property Acquisitions</td>
<td>Manila</td>
<td>Humboldt</td>
<td>Jun-08</td>
<td>$225,000</td>
<td>Acquire approximately 53 acres of dune property in Manila.</td>
<td>Provides Coastal Access in Manila, a community consisting largely of very low income households.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humboldt Coastal Nature Center</td>
<td>Manila</td>
<td>Humboldt</td>
<td>Sep-08</td>
<td>$750,000</td>
<td>Develop the Stamps/Bachofer - Watson properties into the Humboldt Coastal Nature Center, a coastal education center.</td>
<td>In addition to access in the Manila area, the Center will provide coastal education and outreach to Humboldt County school children through the Friends of the Dunes 'Bay to Dunes' program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manila Dunes Recreation Area Access Implementation</td>
<td>Manila</td>
<td>Humboldt</td>
<td>Oct-02</td>
<td>$246,250</td>
<td>Implement infrastructure improvements for public access at the Manila Dunes Recreation Area, Manila</td>
<td>Provides coastal access at the Manila Community Center, which provides community based coastal education opportunities to Manila youth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinidad Pier Reconstruction</td>
<td>Trinidad</td>
<td>Humboldt</td>
<td>Oct-06</td>
<td>$931,250</td>
<td>Plan and construct the replacement of the public fishing pier in Trinidad Humboldt County.</td>
<td>Provides public fishing opportunities to a lower income community some of whom conduct substance fishing on the pier.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Name</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Start-End</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mendocino Access Improvements</td>
<td>Mendocino County</td>
<td>Aug-10</td>
<td>$393,000</td>
<td>Construction and opening of 7 public access easements in central Mendocino County, ongoing operation and maintenance of existing coastal access trails and planning for four additional trail easements. Work was performed by the Mendocino County Conservation Corps. These trails allow lower income residents and visitors to visit the California coast.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eureka Waterfront Access</td>
<td>Humboldt</td>
<td>Jan-11</td>
<td>$525,000</td>
<td>Final designs and construction of the Elk River trailhead, cleanup of homeless encampments along the Elk River trail and vicinity, and a feasibility study of trail development and natural resource enhancement on a nearby coastal open space parcel. Trail is located near West Eureka's high concentration of low-income and carless residents and is accessible by bike or bus. Up to 38% of households in Census Block Groups in the immediate project vicinity are carless compared to 9% for the County overall. Eureka is a severely disadvantaged community by state definition (&lt;60% of statewide median household income)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humboldt Bay Natural Areas Public Access Enhancement</td>
<td>Humboldt</td>
<td>Jun-09</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>Conduct cleanups of homeless encampments in natural and public access areas around Humboldt Bay Cleanups focused in PALCO Marsh provided access to residents of Eureka, a severely disadvantaged community. Cleanups were conducted by homeless and formerly homeless individuals in a job training program. Residents of encampments were connected to available social services.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eureka Waterfront Boardwalk Phase I</td>
<td>Humboldt</td>
<td>Sep-00</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>Construct a waterfront boardwalk and public access improvements between C and F Streets Provide access for low-income and carless residents of this severely disadvantaged community, as well as supporting economic development and attracting tourists to the community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eureka Waterfront Boardwalk Phase II</td>
<td>Humboldt</td>
<td>Jun-02</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
<td>construct a commercial fishing dock, pedestrian accessways, and a pedestrian plaza at and along the foot of C Street, Eureka, Humboldt County. Provide access for low-income and carless residents of this severely disadvantaged community, as well as supporting the fishing industry and economic development generally and attracting tourists to the community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian Island- Tuluwat Site Enhancement Project</td>
<td>Humboldt</td>
<td>Oct-05</td>
<td>$61,000</td>
<td>Funds the Table Bluff Reservation - Wiyot Tribe to restore natural habitat at the Tuluwat village site on Indian Island in Humboldt Bay The tribe had 29% unemployment and 36.0% poverty rate in 2004. The grant aids the tribe in the rehabilitation of an important cultural site which will be used for the World Renewal Ceremony.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Bragg Waterfront Acquisition, Phase I</td>
<td>Fort Bragg</td>
<td>May-05</td>
<td>$4,165,000</td>
<td>acquire approximately 35 acres of waterfront headlands on the Georgia-Pacific former mill site in Fort Bragg Provides coastal access to low-income and carless residents of Fort Bragg, an economically disadvantaged community (mean household income is 60% of state MHI)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Name</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Impacts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noyo Center Site Acquisition</td>
<td>Fort Bragg, Mendocino</td>
<td>10/21/2010</td>
<td>$288,000</td>
<td>acquire approximately 12 acres of waterfront headlands on the Georgia-Pacific former mill site.</td>
<td>Provides site for environmental education and coastal access for low-income and carless residents of Fort Bragg, an economically disadvantaged community (mean household income is 60% of state MHI)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pomo Bluffs Park Access Improvements - Construction</td>
<td>Fort Bragg, Mendocino</td>
<td>12/2/2004</td>
<td>$631,200</td>
<td>construct access improvements at the Pomo Bluffs Park</td>
<td>Provides coastal access to low-income and carless residents of Fort Bragg, an economically disadvantaged community (mean household income is 60% of state MHI)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jughandle Creek Farm and Nature Center Enhancement, Phase II</td>
<td>Caspar, Mendocino</td>
<td>10/21/2010</td>
<td>$275,000</td>
<td>Funds architectural designs for new facilities, such as trails and cabins, to enhance educational programming and affordable lodging</td>
<td>Provides environmental education and coastal access for students in Fort Bragg public schools. Fort Bragg is an economically disadvantaged community (mean household income is 60% of state MHI)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt River Ecosystem Restoration Project</td>
<td>Ferndale, Humboldt</td>
<td>03/08/07, 10/21/10</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td>Feasibility studies and final design funding to complete design for the Salt River Ecosystem Restoration Project. This is a multi-benefit project designed to restore and enhance salmon habitat while alleviating chronic flooding in the Ferndale area.</td>
<td>Provides a significant investment in a capital improvement project in an economically disadvantaged but economically important part of Humboldt County. Ferndale is the center of the dairy industry of Humboldt County, and its prosperity depends in many ways upon the success of this proposed $16 million project.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Counties Fish Passage Improvement</td>
<td>Weaverville, Trinity</td>
<td>8/1/03, 3/2/06, 11/6/08</td>
<td>$1,400,000</td>
<td>Funding for fish passage improvement projects (design and implementation) in the counties of Siskiyou, Del Norte, Trinity, Humboldt and Mendocino</td>
<td>Improves access to forest for carless and low-income residents of Arcata, a severely economically disadvantaged community (mean household income was 47% of statewide MHI in 2000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arcata Forest Addition</td>
<td>Arcata, Humboldt</td>
<td>10/21/2010</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>Funds acquisition of 16 acres of forestland for public access and resource enhancement</td>
<td>Funds the assessment of the feasibility of removing four dams on the Klamath River to improve Klamath river water quality, restore Klamath salmon populations, and revitalize tribal cultures that subsist off those fisheries.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Klamath Dam Studies</td>
<td>Klamath, Humboldt/DeNorte/Siskiyou</td>
<td>2006-2010</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Name</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Board Authorization</td>
<td>SCC Funds</td>
<td>Brief Description</td>
<td>Why this serves the underserved?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watsonville Slough Acquisition</td>
<td>Unincorporated</td>
<td>Santa Cruz</td>
<td>Nov-08</td>
<td>$6,500,000</td>
<td>Funds for the acquisition of several parcels surrounding Watsonville Sloughs for wetland protection, restoration, and public trails.</td>
<td>City of Watsonville is low-income, majority latino, and offers limited natural spaces for recreation and or wildlife interaction. Watsonville Sloughs is location of high school and offers environmental education/career development through hands-on restoration activities with Watsonville Wetlands Watch program. WWW is partner in slough acquisitions and will be using parcels for ongoing restoration activities with students. Acquisition also supports an ongoing effort to develop bike/ped trails from city of Watsonville out and through sloughs. Parcels offer increased opportunity to develop trail linkages.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guadalupe-Nipomo Dunes Visitor Center</td>
<td>Guadalupe</td>
<td>Santa Barbara</td>
<td>Mar 91, Apr 99, Apr 03</td>
<td>$443,000</td>
<td>Acquisition and renovation of the Guadalupe-Nipomo Dunes Visitor Center</td>
<td>Guadalupe is one of the lowest-income communities along the coast with a predominantly latino population. The Dunes Center serves approximately 9,000 school kids each year. It offers many bilingual resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wetlands Educational Resource Center</td>
<td>Watsonville</td>
<td>Santa Cruz</td>
<td>May-05</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
<td>The Watsonville Wetlands Watch, in conjunction with the City of Watsonville and the Pajaro Valley Unified School District (PVUSD), constructed a wetlands educational resource center at the Pajaro Valley High School near the Watsonville Slough System.</td>
<td>The WERC serves all students in the PVUSD as well as students from the surrounding region of northern Santa Cruz, San Benito, and Monterey Counties. The PVUSD is one of the largest school districts in Northern California and is presently serving a K-12 population of approximately 19,000 students. The District has one of the largest migrant education programs in the nation, serving over 5,000 students. The majority of the population in Watsonville is Latino (75%). The schools closest to the WERC are in the lowest socioeconomic zones in the District.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBNMS Exploration Center Interpretive Display Construction</td>
<td>Santa Cruz</td>
<td>Santa Cruz</td>
<td>Dec-10</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>Grant to the City of Santa Cruz for the construction of interpretive exhibits to complete the Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary Exploration Center in the Santa Cruz Boardwalk and Wharf area.</td>
<td>Located next to the Santa Cruz Boardwalk and Wharf, not far from downtown, this part of the City draws over 4 million people per year from the very diverse regions of California’s Bay Area and Central Valley, as well as many tourists from other states and countries. It is estimated the bilingual Exploration Center, which will be open to the public free-of-charge, will attract over 200,000 people per year, including many from California’s growing Latino population. The interactive exhibits will introduce visitors to the Sanctuary, its significance, the importance of watersheds, and the role people have in protecting the ocean.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O’Neill Sea Odyssey Visitor Center</td>
<td>Santa Cruz</td>
<td>Santa Cruz</td>
<td>Aug-03</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>$250,000 grant to the O’Neill Sea Odyssey's marine education facility to construct disabled access to its marine education center that offers guided boat tours serving youth interested in learning about the ocean resources of Monterey Bay.</td>
<td>Increases opportunities for coastal and marine education for kids with disabilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Name</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Date of Board Authorization</td>
<td>SCC Funds</td>
<td>Brief Description</td>
<td>Why this serves the underserved?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eco-Center at Heron’s Head</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>October, 2003</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>In October 2003, the Conservancy granted $400,000 of Proposition 50 funds to Literacy for Environmental Justice to construct an EcoCenter, a model sustainable building and educational facility, at Herons Head Park in the Bayview Hunter's Point area of San Francisco.</td>
<td>Low income neighborhood, primarily African American and Latino, serves kids from local schools, provides internships for teenagers in Bayview Hunter's Point.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecovillage Farm Acquisition</td>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>Contra Costa</td>
<td>October, 2002</td>
<td>$700,000</td>
<td>This project included the acquisition of 5.59 acres in a semi-rural area of Richmond for an environmental education and sustainable agriculture program to be administered by Earth Island Institute. The program teaches youth how to restore, value, and protect ecological systems. There is a strong emphasis on sustainable agriculture and involvement of students’ families.</td>
<td>The program aims to involve at least 20 schools from the region. There is little first-hand knowledge in the community about growing one's own food. Students may reach this site by public bus. The founders designed the program specifically to serve youth from Richmond.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond Greenway Planning and Outreach</td>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>Contra Costa</td>
<td>February, 2003</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
<td>The Coastal Conservancy grant of $45,000 allowed the Rails-to-Trails Conservancy (RTC) to assist the City of Richmond (City) in its efforts to obtain a $1.1 million federal grant for the construction of a 2.5-mile bicycle and pedestrian trail called the Central Richmond Greenway (Richmond Greenway).</td>
<td>Part of the Richmond Greenway, which, when complete, will connect San Pablo Avenue at the Richmond/Ell Cerritos border through Richmond to the western waterfront. It will be a public transportation alternative for those without cars or the funds to ride BART or take a bus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baxter Creek Restoration - Booker T. Anderson Jr. and Park</td>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>Contra Costa</td>
<td>June, 2000</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
<td>This project re-shaped and revegetated approximately 800 linear feet of Baxter Creek, a severely degraded, over-widened stream that flows through Booker T. Anderson, Jr. Park in inner-city Richmond near San Francisco Bay. By revegetating the creek’s damed banks, the project improved habitat for wildlife that inhabit and migrate through the park, including birds and amphibians, and improved the quality of the water that flows into San Francisco Bay, which is nearby. It also provided a more aesthetic, interesting environment for residents in this low-income, minority community, many of whom had expressed a desire to see the creek restored and improved.</td>
<td>This project brought knowledge of natural environments, opportunities for environmental education, and a sense of pride to southeast Richmond, a severely underserved community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastshore State Park</td>
<td>Berkeley, Emeryville, Albany, Richmond</td>
<td>Alameda</td>
<td>2000, 2007 (2), 2009</td>
<td>$1,970,000</td>
<td>Circa 2000 the Conservancy funded process to complete a general plan for the new state park. In 2007 grants given to Cal DPR for park design and EBBRPD for implementation of wetland restoration. In 2009 Conservancy gave a grant to EBBRPD for planning of Albany Beach.</td>
<td>Low income areas exist immediately east of the Park in both Berkeley and Emeryville. The Cities marinas are locations for youth programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco Bay Area Community Based, Educational, Environmental Restoration and Trails Projects Grant Round</td>
<td>Bay Area</td>
<td>All 9 Bay Area Counties</td>
<td>November, 2007</td>
<td>$1,774,681</td>
<td>The Bay Program ran a grant round for hands-on, community based trail building and ecosystem restoration. $1.77m was authorized for 20 nonprofits and public agencies doing projects throughout the Bay Area and involving approximately 22,000 students and volunteers.</td>
<td>The hands-on projects involve students and other volunteers. Many were in low-income communities, including Oakland, Southeast San Francisco, and Richmond or were for programs that focused on involving at-risk students, such as North Bay Conservation Corps, Golden Gate National Parks Conservancy, Literacy for Environmental Justice, and Urban Creeks Council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunters Point Shoreline Master Plan</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>September, 2004</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>This grant provided funding to Arc Ecology to prepare a master plan for a park along the shoreline on property known as Parcel E at Hunters Point Naval Shipyard.</td>
<td>Hunters Point is a low-income primarily African American community in southeast San Francisco, with relatively little parkland.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guadalupe River Park</td>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>Santa Clara</td>
<td>May, 2002</td>
<td>$1,733,600</td>
<td>The Conservancy provided funds to the City of San Jose for the creation of recreational enhancements within the Guadalupe River Park in downtown San Jose. These enhancements are part of a master plan to transform a flood control project with riparian habitat components into an outstanding urban park. The park provides downtown San Jose residents, workers, and visitors with a spacious and green oasis in an otherwise fully urbanized area. The park receives over one million visitors annually.</td>
<td>San Jose is a very diverse city, with the largest population of any city in the Bay Area. This park is in the middle of downtown and serves a diversity of users.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Break Regional Shoreline Interpretive Exhibits</td>
<td>Oakland</td>
<td>Contra Costa</td>
<td>December, 2007</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>A grant to East Bay Regional Park District for the final design, construction, and installation of exhibits at Big Break Regional Park on the Contra Costa-Shoreline in Oakley.</td>
<td>Oakley has a significant Latino population and was a rapidly growing community (although the recent recession has hit this part of the Bay Area hard). Big Break Regional Park is a new park in a park poor region and will serve many local schools and the community college, with an estimate of 25,000 schoolchildren served per year.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Five block grants to the Association to Bay Area Governments for planning, design, and construction of the San Francisco Bay Trail, a planned 500-mile loop trail around San Francisco Bay. ABAG has provided grants to numerous local governments and nonprofits to conduct the planning and construction of segments of the trail.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amysio Viejo Creek Restoration</td>
<td>Oakland</td>
<td>Alameda</td>
<td>May, 2001</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Conservancy provided funds to the Alameda County Flood Control District, which, in cooperation with the City of Oakland, removed failing structures, stabilized creek banks, restored native vegetation, installed new paths and a pedestrian bridge, installed lights, replaced a concrete amphitheater, created new picnic and access areas, and improved a parking lot. Goals of the project included restoring ecological balance and riparian habitat while enhancing public access and safety.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union Point Park</td>
<td>Oakland</td>
<td>Alameda</td>
<td>2000 and 2001</td>
<td>$1,670,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This project involved the creation of a 7-acre waterfront park on the Oakland estuary. Project partners included: Port and City of Oakland, The Unity Council, and the Trust for Public Land.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitacion Valley Greenway</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>August, 2001</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservancy funds were used for planning and construction of the public access and recreation improvements at Alviso Marina County Park. Improvements include a shoreline trail, a new boardwalk through the marsh, removal of heavily silted marina docks, seating, vegetation, tables, benches, viewing platforms, interpretive signage, and a reconfigured parking lot. The transformation of the marina into a park, with wildlife watching and recreational opportunities, has greatly benefited the community of Alviso and the South San Francisco Bay.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alviso Marina County Park</td>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>Santa Clara</td>
<td>1999, 2000, 2004</td>
<td>$800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The project provides recreational and educational opportunities for an underserved population of East Oakland. The project site is located adjacent to a recreational center that serves children and families in East Oakland. Plants were supplied by the City of Oakland’s Native Plant Propagation Program, established in collaboration with the Wilburn Sweeney Juvenile Detention Center in neighboring San Leandro, where a plant growing facility was built.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The community of Alviso in San Jose is primarily Hispanic. Alviso is the site of a large water pollution control plant and garbage dump/recycling center.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Bay Trail passes through all nine bay area counties and 47 cities around the Bay, including numerous low-income communities. ABAG has made an effort to spread the block grant funds throughout the Bay Area and to work with local governments to make these projects happen.
## Summary: Serving the Underserved

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th># of Projects</th>
<th>SCC Investment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>$17,638,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>$29,925,281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$8,318,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>$7,960,247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>$63,842,228</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>