WELCOME! MEETING PURPOSE & OBJECTIVES

- Introducing USACE & Port of SF Coastal Storm Risk Feasibility Study
- Complying with National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA)
  - Solicitation for public input – scoping
- Explaining Corps Planning Process
  - Aligning study with other Port activities
- Staying informed and engaged
PRESENTERS

Jessie Mizic, USACE
Co-lead Planner

Jessica Ludy, USACE
Co-lead Planner

Anne Baker, USACE
Environmental Lead

Lindy Lowe, Port of San Francisco
Resilience Officer

Ruzel Ednalino, USACE
Cultural Resources Lead
VIRTUAL MEETING PROCEDURES

• If you have any comments during the presentation, please type them into the chat box.
  • Chat Box can only be viewed by the facilitator
• If you wish to make a verbal comment or ask a question, please hold your question to the end of the presentation.
• During the open forum for public comments, please use the “hand raise” icon to request to speak. We will notify you when it is your turn.
• The meeting and all comments are being recorded.
SF WATERFRONT FLOOD RESILIENCY STUDY

STUDY OVERVIEW & PROCESS

- Federal & local partnership between USACE and the Port of San Francisco
- ~3-5 years, 50/50 cost share
- Team evaluates coastal storm risk to study area, develops and assesses alternatives
- Team recommends a plan to Congress
- Design/construction of recommended plan cost shared 65% fed / 35% local
WHY ARE WE HERE?

COASTAL STORM RISK AND SEA LEVEL RISE

- Overtopping - 1 ft. SLR
- Overtopping - 2 ft. SLR
- Overtopping - 4.3 ft. SLR
- 2100 OPC Most Likely: 3.4 ft. SLR + 100 YR Flood (84 in)
- 2100 USACE High Curve: 5 ft. SLR + 100 YR Flood (108 in)
- Envision Boundary / 2100 OPC 1:200: 7 ft. SLR + 100 YR Flood (122 in)
- Port of San Francisco
STUDY AREA

7.5 miles along the waterfront

Many neighborhoods

15 Subareas
CORPS PLANNING PROCESS

1. Identify problems & opportunities
2. Inventory & forecast conditions
3. Formulate alternatives
4. Evaluate alternatives
5. Compare alternatives
6. Select recommended plan

**Goal:** Confirm **Federal Interest** in addressing the coastal storm risk problems or identify if it is best left to local interests

Planning process happens in parallel with environmental review process
NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT

- What are the existing conditions in the area?
- What alternatives are under consideration?
- What are the impacts of the alternatives?
  - Environmental? Human? Cultural/Historical?
- What are the benefits of the alternatives?
  - Public Safety? Other environmental conditions?
- How do you minimize or compensate for impacts of the alternatives?
- How are you complying with Federal Environmental Laws?
- Public involvement & disclosure
NEPA & FEDERAL ENVIRONMENTAL LAWS

- Clean Air Act
- National Historic Preservation Act
- Coastal Zone Management Act
- Noise Control Act
- Clean Water Act
- Endangered Species Act
- E.O. 11990 Protection of Wetlands
- Marine Mammal Protection Act
- E.O. 11988 Floodplain Management
# PLANNING AND NEPA CROSSWALK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning steps</th>
<th>NEPA requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>▪ Scope for Project</td>
<td>▪ Scope for NEPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Specify Problems &amp; Opportunities, Objectives &amp; Constraints</td>
<td>▪ Describe Purpose &amp; Need consistent with project scope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Inventory and Forecast Conditions (Future Without)</td>
<td>▪ Describe existing conditions, trends, No Action alternative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Formulate alternative plans to address Objectives</td>
<td>▪ Include reasonable range of alternatives that address Purpose and Need</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Evaluate effects of alternative plans</td>
<td>▪ Evaluate alternatives’ effects to resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Compare alternative plans</td>
<td>▪ Compare alternatives to No Action, ID the Environmental Alternative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Select a Tentative Selected Plan</td>
<td>▪ Identify the Agency Preferred Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Release for Public Review</td>
<td>▪ Release for Public Review</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STUDY PROBLEMS

Low-lying community assets are at risk of damage from coastal storms and extreme high tides

- Sea-level rise in SF Bay expected to increase frequency of coastal storm flooding along SF waterfront
- Access to critical infrastructure, emergency services, and evacuation could be limited or cut-off during storm flooding
- Century-old seawall has outlasted its design life and could fail due to age or earthquake
1. Reduce **economic damages** from coastal storm risk to business, residents and infrastructure

2. Reduce risk to **human health and safety** from coastal storm impacts

3. Improve the **resiliency of the local economy** to impacts from coastal storms
STUDY CONSTRAINTS

- Maintain, preserve *maritime facilities & function*; avoid impacts on Port infrastructure & operations

- Avoid actions that violate authority of the Port Commission to fulfill *public trust responsibilities* (Burton Act)

- Maintain required *public access and regional and citywide mobility corridors* such as the Embarcadero Roadway and the SF Bay Trail

- Maintain SF Bay *ecological function*
THIS STUDY IS PART OF THE WATERFRONT RESILIENCE PROGRAM
Agency collaboration

The Port continues to build close partnerships with city, regional, and federal agencies to ensure accuracy and innovation in the program.

Community and advisory engagement

Port led 100+ events waterfront-wide, including over 115 presentations to community members and advisory groups. The goal was to solicit community input, concerns, and preferences for defining a vision and solutions for waterfront resilience.
Community ideas on an “inspiring an adaptable waterfront” highlight key considerations for evaluating alternatives:

• Do they connect us to the shoreline?
• Is the waterfront accessible?
• Do some measures preserve and promote jobs, housing, seniors & youth more than others?

Community feedback on priority assets most loved by the community help the study team:

• Understand consequences of taking no action
• Select projects that responsibly use tax dollars
• Consider alternatives that preserve and protect community character

Community feedback on evaluation criteria affirmed the team should prioritize life safety and disaster response, and to “put people first”, with special attention to:

• housing, disaster recovery facilities, utilities, and businesses
• transportation assets and waterfront mobility
COMMUNITY INPUT WILL INFORM MEASURES AND ALTERNATIVES

Measures are a plan or course of action to achieve a particular purpose

Physical Measures

Ecological Measures

Earthquake-resilient Measures

Emergency Response, Land Use

Alternatives are sets of measures intended to reduce coastal storm risk and respond to the problems and objectives in the study area
Human Environment

- Aesthetics
- Air Quality
- Environmental Justice
- Hazardous Waste
- Land Use
- Noise
- Recreation
- Socioeconomics
- Transportation
- Utilities
NEPA ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS

Ecological Environment

- Threatened and Endangered Species
- Vegetation
- Water Quality
- Wildlife

Heron's Head Park in southern San Francisco—a bit of wild in the city (photo by Cris Benton)
10 built-environment resources identified

NRHP Historic Properties:
• **6 Historic Districts**
  • 2 that are also National Historic Landmarks

• **4 Historic Structures**
  • Including underground contributing components for a historic water supply system (piping, cisterns, pumping station)
ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES

• The study team is consulting with tribal bands identified by the Native American Heritage Commission

• Documented historical and prehistoric archaeological sites are located further landward where the historic shoreline once existed

• Deposits that underlie Reach 1 and 2 consists of landfill

• Alternatives formulated will guide the need for additional archaeological/tribal monitoring, subsurface testing, and any other planning efforts

Archeologist and construction crews diligently combing through dirt at a site along San Francisco's waterfront. Photo from: https://abc7news.com/san-francisco-shipwreck-buried-ships-wharf-pier/5273329/
WE WANT TO HEAR FROM YOU

Port presentations, collaboration, and seeking input from Agency partners and the Community for the Port’s Waterfront Resilience Program (2018-2020)

- Perspectives on study problems, objectives, and constraints of Coastal Storm Risk Feasibility Study
- Ideas for measures and alternatives
- Assets or resources that are particularly important or of concern
- Comments about the NEPA or Corps Planning processes
VIRTUAL MEETING PROCEDURES

• If you have any comments during the presentation, please type them into the chat box.
  • Chat Box can only be viewed by the facilitator

• If you wish to make a verbal comment or ask a question, please hold your question to the end of the presentation.

• During the open forum for public comments, please use the “hand raise” icon to request to speak. We will notify you when it is your turn.

• The meeting and all comments are being recorded.
PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT OPPORTUNITIES
SAN FRANCISCO WATERFRONT FLOOD RESILIENCY STUDY

Scoping comments due by October 21, 2020:
Relevant Chat Box comments provided today will be considered as written comments.

Or, submit emails to: SFWFRS@usace.army.mil

Or, send mail to:
Ms. Anne Baker
450 Golden Gate Avenue, 4th Floor
San Francisco, California 94102

Public Review of Draft Report and NEPA Document:
• 45 day public review and comment timeframe
• Includes public meeting and concurrent agency and other reviews

Contact the Port of San Francisco:
Lindy Lowe
Port Resilience Officer
Port of San Francisco
lindy.lowe@sfport.com
sfportresilience.com

Webpage for study information: