

Comments on Public Draft of Transition Plan 2.0

From: John Boesel
Subject: Comment on Richard Bay Plan
Date: April 8, 2022 at 1:11:55 PM PDT
To: Stephen McGrath <smcgrath@rgs.ca.gov>

Steve,

I've lived in Marin for the vast majority of my years since 1968. I know and fully appreciate the natural beauty and potential of Richardson Bay. Unfortunately, I've not had a chance to see or review the draft plan. I did just read the IJ article and wanted to share a few comments:

- 1) Your agency should continue with its good work to reduce the number of live aboard vessels that are docked in the Bay. I am not aware that any of them have any responsible process of managing their waste streams. When I was young boy, the water quality in the bay seemed much better and there were far fewer liveaboards.
- 2) Restoration of Eel grass is critical and essential for a healthy bay and the restoration of the ecosystem. Please make that a priority.
- 3) I hope you can work with other county and city agencies to find homes and that protecting the Bay is not dependent on a solution to the real homelessness crisis.

Thanks for your review and consideration of these thoughts.

John Boesel
Ross, CA

From: Scott Williams
Subject: Draft Transition Plan 2.0
Date: April 10, 2022 at 11:37:36 AM PDT
To: Stephen McGrath <smcgrath@rgs.ca.gov>

Dear Mr. McGrath,

I respectfully disagree with the subject plan's timeline for the removal of vessels in Richardson Bay that have and continue to adversely impact the bay ecosystem. This situation should have been dealt with and cleaned-up decades ago. I strongly urge the agency to move to permanently remove all vessels that degrade the bay ecosystem and to begin the restoration program as soon as possible.

The boat owners have known that efforts to clean-up their mess have been in the works for years and it's time to get this job done as soon as you can.

Thank you,

Scott Williams
Fairfax

From: jack krystal
Subject: Transition Plan 2.0 - Safe housing
Date: April 28, 2022 at 12:31:38 PM PDT
To: Stephen McGrath <smcgrath@rgs.ca.gov>

After reading the preliminary Transition Plan 2.0 I thought that you should be made aware of the 10.5 Acres of Richardson Bay Water blocks I own south of the Richardson Bay bridge, parallel to Railroad Avenue....Perhaps we can find a Non-profit that can build a houseboat marina to provide the badly needed safe housing, while also planting and protecting eel grass, and building solutions to future Sea Level Rise, flooding and climate change...

Best wishes, Jack

Date: April 29, 2022 at 11:38:40 AM PDT
From: Frank Shinneman
Sent: Friday, April 29, 2022 10:44 AM
To: smcgrath@rgs.ca.gov
Cc: Moulton-Peters, Stephanie <smoultonpeters@marincounty.org>
Subject: Public comment on RBRA 'Transition Plan 2.0'

Dear RBRA Board and Marin County Supervisors,

Transparency is critical to community acceptance of compulsory demands on the public. Publication of implementation plans is only the beginning of the needed transparency. Previous plans have not been followed by measurement and publication of results. A simple anchorage count is insufficient and indicates that the main purpose of RBRA plans is the eradication of the vilified "anchor-outs".

To comment on the new transition plan requires information that has been requested but never provided, if even measured. Considerable publication has been done of anchorage craft, their residents and the community fears and claims. Little evidence has

been presented but the complete and permanent removal of these craft is presented as an accepted essential element of the plan.

Regarding Eel Grass, the boats anchored in the bay seem to be the only focus. No measured comparison with the damage from the many bay marinas, housing developments with docks & channel dredging plus the regular seaplane use of the northern bay have been presented.

Sausalito City Council has publicly pointed out the danger to vessels anchored in the proposed new anchorage due to exposure to rougher water and wind conditions at the mouth of the bay. As an experienced boater and kayaker, I have often encountered the extremes of the mouth of the bay compared to those in the current anchorage location.

RBRA plans have often expressed concern and intent for residents of anchored vessels to be to obtain replacement housing and improved equipment. However, dedicated funding and measured results appear to be missing. Instead, policing, enforcement and confiscation have been funded resulting in residents becoming homeless. There is no carrot on the end of the RBRA stick!

Last, I join many others in denouncing the continual gentrification of Richardson Bay. The former vitality of the area is being replaced by a sterile tourist ambience surrounded by protected residential compounds. I do not accept the inevitability of the RBRA's simplistic and heavy-handed plan.

Best Regards,

Frank Shinneman
Strawberry

From: Anne Libbin
Sent: Monday, March 07, 2022 12:31 PM
To: Malcolm, James <jmalcolm@marincounty.org>
Cc: Barbara Salzman
Subject: Public Comment re Draft Transition Plan 2.0

My main concern with the Draft Transition Plan 2.0 is that it does not contain interim actions, priorities, and target dates for moving vessels out of the Eelgrass Protection Zone, either by relocating them into the authorized Anchorage Area, or removing them from the bay. The draft plan seems to contemplate that most of the 63 vessels currently in the Eelgrass Protection Zone will remain there until October 15, 2023. Given the RBRA's past pattern of delaying enforcement actions until, and beyond, deadline dates, it appears there will be no relief from the ongoing damage to the eelgrass beds until the end of 2023, if then.

The Safe Housing portion of the draft plan also should include plans for requiring occupants of non-seaworthy vessels to move off the Eelgrass Protection Zone

once they have been offered land-based housing (or shelter, once COVID-19 restrictions on group shelter end). A vessel occupant who is not interested in pursuing land-based housing should not be entitled to remain in the Eelgrass Protection Zone until October 15, 2024 (or 2023 for vessels that arrived after August 2019).

The RBRA has made progress in reducing the number of vessels digging up the eelgrass with their vessels and anchor gear. However, there needs to be a plan for ongoing reductions. The efforts to prepare and implement the ARMP for eelgrass habitat will be futile unless there is a plan to greatly reduce the number of vessels in the eelgrass during the period before December 15, 2023.

Anne Libbin
Tiburon

Edits/comments submitted by Barbara Salzman, Marin Audubon Society (taken from the submitted edited draft)

Comments and proposed edits in ~~strikeout~~ or **bold**:

Eelgrass Habitat:

Strategic Action 2e: ~~Upon securing funding,~~ prepare, adopt, and implement an ARMP for eelgrass restoration that will be consistent with the San Francisco Bay Plan & the Richardson Bay Special Area Plan, that will incorporate the best available science on eelgrass habitat restoration and the California Eelgrass Management Plan (CEMP), and outcomes from restoration study scenarios. Complete ARMP development and begin implementation by December 15, 2023.

Strategic Action 3c: ~~Pending availability of funding,~~ conduct monitoring and surveying of eelgrass habitat pursuant to the EPMP; consider revising the boundaries of the EPZ if warranted by monitoring and surveying.

Safe Housing:

Strategic Action 1d: *Add boldface wording:* Obtain an evaluation of the level of interest in pursuing housing, **and/or the capacity to adjust to housing**, noting impediments when known.

Strategic Action 5a: *Add:* **Pathways may include mental health services that could be provided by the governor's new mental health program.**

Resources: *Add:* **Governor's mental health program**

Vessel Enforcement:

Goal 4: Wherever possible, avoid ~~minimize the~~ risk and hazards of vessels running adrift, running aground, or sinking.

Objective 1: No new vessels stay on the bay in contravention of RBRA rules and regulations. My reference should have been to this Objective 1, minus “new.” The other objectives are relevant and subservient to this one.

Strategic Action 2c: Encourage the voluntary departure of vessels by the end date of their authorized time limit. I ask that measures that will be used be identified. I can’t say because I don’t know what is planned.

Strategic Action 2d: Provide vessel occupants requesting social services or housing assistance with information on how to access agencies or organizations that provide services and assistance. Provide mental health services when there is a clear need.

Strategic Action 3: ~~Upon request,~~ support outreach personnel from other agencies/organizations to contact vessel occupants to encourage their pursuit of safe housing on land or in a liveaboard marina slip.

Strategic Action 4a: Vessels which are an imminent hazard for sinking, have run aground, or otherwise present an immediate risk to public safety or the environment are a priority for removal, pursuant to current practice. I think that vessels that are a public safety risk should have more urgency for removal, like immediately. Maybe that is what is meant by “priority for removal” but that seems on the passive side to me.

Strategic Action 4d: All floating homes will be provided with legal notice to depart or else be subject to removal by December 31, 2023. Upon review of this it seems to be two steps not an “or” situation: 1. providing legal notice and 2. the removal is subject to vessels not leaving in response to the legal notice.

Strategic Action 5b: Carry out the removal of vessels that fail to comply with legal notification, as prioritized and to achieve the timelines in the settlement agreement. I expect this would be physical removal by action of the harbormaster, sheriff? Can you say that?

Strategic Action 6: Develop incentive programs for removal of vessels from the anchorage. I can only assume financial incentives being considered are paying people to move. But because of the vagueness I am not sure. It would be helpful to describe such a program so the public can know what incentives are being considered.

Strategic Action 7: Urge vessels that are safe & seaworthy to move out of the Eelgrass Protection Zone and into the Anchorage Zone as soon as feasible, and consider for placement on RBRA moorings. This element calls for urging vessels to move out, but the only actions below are to contact vessels, determine their interest in moving and facilitate placement for those that do. My question is what actions are anticipated dealing with vessel owners who still refuse to move?