


San Francisco Bay Plan

San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission

January 1969

July 1979 as amended

This publication was prepared with financial assistance from the U.S. Office of Coastal Zone Management, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, under the provisions of the Federal Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972, as amended.



Letter of Transmittal

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

EDMUND G. BROWN JR., Governor

SAN FRANCISCO BAY CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION

30 Van Ness Avenue, Rm. 2011
San Francisco, California 94102
Telephone: (415) 557-3686

July 1, 1979

*To The People of the San Francisco Bay Region and
Friends of San Francisco Bay everywhere:*

The San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission takes great pleasure and pride in presenting this second printing of the San Francisco Bay Plan.

Since it was originally adopted by the Commission in 1968, the Bay Plan has served the people of the region and the state as the instrument conceived of in the McAteer-Petris Act passed by the Legislature in 1965: "a comprehensive and enforceable plan for the conservation of the water of San Francisco Bay and the development of its shoreline."

As foreseen by the original Commission, the Bay Plan has been amended from time to time within the intent of the McAteer-Petris Act to keep pace with the needs and desires of the public through the intervening years. Nevertheless, the essential substance and character of the Plan remains useable and relevant to the present day, both as a set of policies to guide the regulatory activities of the Commission and as a plan for the long range conservation and development of the region's most valuable resource, San Francisco Bay and its shoreline.

This present printing contains all of the Bay Plan map and text amendments that have been adopted by the Commission since 1969 to 1979. As further amendments may be made, the Plan volume can be converted to loose leaf form to allow the insertion of amended sections as they are issued. This will aid those who regularly refer to the Plan to keep their copies up-to-date at all times.

Since BCDC as a state agency was established in 1965, countless numbers of people have given their time and energy in the continuing efforts of Bay conservation and development. We regret, in this second printing of the Bay Plan, we are not able to acknowledge, by name, all of the individuals who have served at various times as Commissioners, alternates for Commissioners, members of the Citizens' Advisory Committee, Engineering Criteria Review Board, Design Review Board, members of the special study committees, consultants and staff. To all of them, and to the many interested citizens who have been supporters, critics and participants in this challenging work, a debt of gratitude is owed. Perhaps the only real reward for these efforts is to be found in the knowledge as well as the hope that San Francisco Bay and its shoreline will continue to enrich the lives of all who live in or visit the region.



JOSEPH C. HOUGHTELING
Chairman

Table of Contents

	Page
Commissioners and Alternates	i
Citizens' Advisory Committee	ii
Design Review Board	ii
Engineering Criteria Review Board	ii
BCDC Staff	iii
Part I— Summary	1
Introduction	1
Major Conclusions and Policies	1
Major Plan Proposals	2
Carrying Out the Bay Plan	3
Conclusions	3
Definitions	2
Foundations of the Bay Plan	3
Part II— Objectives	5
Part III—The Bay as a Resource: Findings and Policies	7
Fish and Wildlife	7
Water Pollution	8
Water Surface Area and Volume	8
Marshes and Mudflats	9
Smog and Weather	10
Shell Deposits	10
Fresh Water Inflow	10
Part IV—Development of the Bay and Shoreline: Findings and Policies	13
Safety of Fills	13
Dredging	15
Water-Related Industry	16
Ports	17
Airports	19
Recreation	21
Transportation	25
Salt Ponds and Other Managed Wetlands	25
Public Access	26
Appearance, Design and Scenic View	29
Other Uses of the Bay and Shoreline	31

	Page
Part V— Carrying Out the Bay Plan	33
The San Francisco Bay Plan	33
The Commission	33
Scope of Authority	33
Area of Jurisdiction	34
Control of Filling and Dredging in the Bay	34
Developing the Bay and Shoreline to Their Highest Potential	38
Applying and Amending the Bay Plan	39
Part VI—The Bay Plan Maps	41
Plan Map 1 Natural Resources of the Bay	
Plan Map 2 Proposed Major Uses of Bay and Shoreline	
Plan Map 3 Richmond to Berkeley	
Plan Map 4 Berkeley to Oakland	
Plan Map 5 San Leandro, Hayward	
Plan Map 6 Santa Clara and Southern Alameda Counties	
Plan Map 7 Coyote Creek	
Plan Map 8 Southern San Mateo County	
Plan Map 9 Northern San Mateo County	
Plan Map 10 San Francisco and Brisbane	
Plan Map 11 Southern Marin County	
Plan Map 12 Western San Pablo Bay	
Plan Map 13 Petaluma River	
Plan Map 14 Napa Marshes	
Plan Map 15 Eastern San Pablo Bay	
Plan Map 16 Carquinez Strait	
Plan Map 17 Suisun Bay	
Plan Map 18 Grizzly Bay	
Plan Map 19 Honker Bay to Collinsville	
Plan Map 20 Montezuma Slough	

Photo Credits

Michael Bry: Inside front cover, facing Letter of Transmittal, Pages 4, 32.
Rondal Partridge: Pages 34-35, 40.
Richard Persoff: Page 6.
Pacific Aerial Surveys: Facing Page 1 (1970 Mosaic) Page 12 (1972)

Commissioners and Alternates July, 1979

Public Representatives

Joseph C. Houghteling, Chairman,
appointed by the Governor
(Mrs. Hedy Boissevain, Alternate)

Mrs. Dean A. Watkins, Vice Chairman,
appointed by the Governor
(Mrs. Morse Erskine, Alternate)

Cynthia Kay, Vallejo,
appointed by the Governor
(Nicholas C. Arguimbau, Alternate)

Thomas S. Price, San Francisco,
appointed by the Governor
(David W. Allen, Alternate)

Hans J. Schiller, Mill Valley,
appointed by the Governor
(Alice L. Graham, Alternate)

Earl P. Mills, San Francisco,
appointed by the Speaker of the
Assembly (Harvey Berg, Alternate)

Elizabeth Osborn, Fremont,
appointed by the Senate Rules
Committee (Patricia G. Shelton,
Alternate)

Federal Representatives

Col. John M. Adsit,
U. S. Army Corps of Engineers
(Lt. Col. Raymond F. Jackson, Alternate)

Paul DeFalco, Jr.
U. S. Environmental Protection Agency
(Clyde B. Eller, Alternate)

State Representatives

Roy M. Bell,
State Department of Finance
(Charles C. Harper, Alternate)

Mrs. Barbara B. Eastman,
San Francisco Bay Regional Water
Quality Control Board
(John Kecker, Alternate)

Thomas R. Lammers,
Business and Transportation Agency
(Marlowe E. Hardin, Alternate)

Donald L. Lollock,
State Resources Agency
(Eugene V. Toffoli, Alternate)

William F. Northrop,
State Lands Commission
(Richard S. Golden, Alternate)

County Representatives

(appointed by the County Board
of Supervisors)

Supervisor Richard Brann,
Solano County
(Supervisor Larry L. Asera,
Alternate)

Supervisor Sam Chapman,
Napa County
(Councilwoman Dorothy Searcy,
Napa, Alternate)

Supervisor James V. Fitzgerald,
San Mateo County
(Paul M. Koenig, Alternate)

Supervisor John T. George,
Alameda County
(William H. Fraley, Alternate)

Supervisor John L. Molinari,
San Francisco County
(Dian Blomquist, Alternate)

Supervisor Tom Powers,
Contra Costa County
(Supervisor Nancy G. Fahden,
Alternate)

Supervisor Helen V. Putnam,
Sonoma County
(Supervisor Brian Kahn, Alternate)

Supervisor Denis Rice,
Marin County
(Mary Ann Sears, Alternate)

Supervisor Geraldine F. Steinberg,
Santa Clara County
(W. Eric Carruthers, Jr., Alternate)

City Representatives

(appointed by the Association of
Bay Area Governments)

Councilman Arthur Lepore,
City of Millbrae
(Supervisor Louise Renne,
San Francisco, Alternate)

Councilwoman Sherry C. Levit,
City of Belvedere
(Councilman Fred K. Sibley,
Vallejo, Alternate)

Councilman Frank Ogawa,
City of Oakland
(Mayor Val Gil, San Leandro,
Alternate)

Councilman Byron D. Sher,
City of Palo Alto
(Councilman Robert E. Norris,
Redwood City, Alternate)

Citizens' Advisory Committee

Walter Abernathy,
Port of Oakland

Mrs. Rose Beatty,
Peninsula Conservation Center

Henry Bostwick, Jr.,
San Mateo County Development
Association

Richard M. Boswell,
Pacific Inter-Club Yacht Association

Robert D. Brown, Jr.,
U. S. Geological Survey

Mrs. Ward Duffy, Chairman,
Civic Leader

Dale H. Fearn,
San Francisco International Airport

Mrs. Sylvia Gregory,
Civic Leader

Mrs. Esther Gulick,
Save San Francisco Bay Association

John S. Harnett,
East Bay Municipal Utility District

Dr. Michael Herz,
Oceanic Society

Shiraz Kaderali,
Pacific Gas & Electric Company

William Newton, ASLA
Landscape Architect

Philippe Nonet,
Professor of Sociology,
University of California

Burton Rockwell, AIA
Architect

Henry W. Simonsen,
IT Corporation

Dwight Steele,
Attorney

Richard Trudeau,
East Bay Regional Park District

Design Review Board

Mai Arbergast, Landscape Architect,
Berkeley (Alternate)

Edward C. Bassett, Architect,
San Francisco

Robert C. Cooper, Engineer,
Palo Alto

Garrett Eckbo, Landscape Architect,
San Francisco

Stanley Gould, Architect,
San Jose

William H. Liskamm, Chairman,
Architect-Urban Planner,
San Francisco

Jacob Robbins, Architect,
San Francisco

Kenneth Simmons, Architect,
Berkeley

Engineering Criteria Review Board

Rex W. Allen, Architect
San Francisco

Dr. John A. Blume, Structural Engineer,
San Francisco

Dr. Ray W. Clough, Jr., Chairman,
Professor of Civil Engineering,
Berkeley

Dr. Gerald W. Clough, Soils Engineer,
Palo Alto

Dr. Richard H. Jahns, Geologist
Palo Alto

Raymond Lundgren, Soils Engineer,
San Francisco

Alan L. O'Neill, Engineering Geologist,
San Francisco

John Rinne, Structural Engineer,
San Francisco

Dr. Robert E. Wallace, Geologist,
Menlo Park

A. E. Wanket, Civil Engineer,
San Francisco

Dr. T. Leslie Youd, Soils Engineer,
Menlo Park

BCDC Staff

Michael B. Wilmar
Executive Director

Alan R. Pendleton
Deputy Director

E. Clement Shute
Legal Advisor
Assistant Attorney General

Frank R. Broadhead
Staff Counsel

Norris H. Millikin
Senior Engineer

Kent E. Watson
Bay Design Analyst/
Landscape Architect

Robert J. Batha
Assistant Planner

Steven A. McAdam
Enforcement Investigator

Nancy W. Twiss
Conservation and Development Analyst

Edward F. Bielski
Conservation and Development Analyst

Myrna McCullough
Permits/Senior Stenographer

Stephanie Tucker
Permit/Enforcement Secretary

Patricia McFadden
Permit Secretary

Jeffry S. Blanchfield
Chief Planner

George E. Reed
Senior Planner

Robert B. Hickman
Associate Planner

Suzanne M. Rogalin
Conservation and Development Analyst

Margit Nickell
Conservation and Development Analyst

H. Paul Cowley
Junior Planner


Linda Giannini
Planning Secretary

Russell A. Abramson
Assistant Executive Director
Administration and Public Relations

Sharon Louie
Management Services Technician

Debra Cassinelli
Secretary to Director

Montano Dionisio
Administration
Accounting Clerk



Part I Summary

Introduction

San Francisco Bay is an irreplaceable gift of nature that man can either abuse and ultimately destroy—or improve and protect for future generations. The Bay Plan presented in this report recognizes that the Bay is a single body of water, in which changes affecting one part may also affect other parts, and that only on a regional basis can the Bay be protected and enhanced.

The Bay can serve human needs to a much greater degree than it does today. The Bay can play an increasing role as a major world port. Aroun­ds its shores, many job-producing new industries can be developed. And new parks, marinas, beaches, and fishing piers can provide close-to-home recreation for the Bay Area's increasing population.

But the Bay must be protected from needless and gradual destruction. The Bay should no longer be treated as ordinary real estate, available to be filled with sand or dirt to create new land. Rather, the Bay should be regarded as the most valuable natural asset of the entire Bay region, a body of water that benefits not only the residents of the Bay Area but of all California and indeed the nation.

Implementation of the Plan presented in this report will guarantee to future generations their rightful heritage from the present generation: San Francisco Bay maintained and enhanced as a magnificent body of water that helps sustain the economy of the western United States, provides great opportunities for recreation, moderates the climate, combats air pollution, nourishes fish and wildfowl, affords scenic enjoyment, and in countless other ways helps to enrich man's life.

Major Conclusions and Policies

From its studies of San Francisco Bay, the Commission has concluded that:

1. **The Bay.** The Bay is a single body of water, and a Bay Plan can be effectively carried out only on a regional basis.
2. **Uses of the Bay.** The most important uses of the Bay are those providing substantial public benefits and treating the Bay as a body of water, not as real estate.
3. **Uses of the Shoreline.** All desirable, high-priority uses of the Bay and shoreline can be fully accommodated without substantial Bay filling, and without loss of large natural resource areas. But shoreline areas suitable for priority uses—ports, water-related industry, airports, wildlife refuges, and water-related recreation—exist only in limited amount, and should be reserved for these purposes.

4. **Justifiable Filling.** Some Bay filling may be justified for purposes providing substantial public benefits *if* these same benefits could not be achieved equally well without filling. Substantial public benefits are provided by:

- a. Developing adequate port terminals, on a regional basis, to keep San Francisco Bay in the forefront of the world's great harbors during a period of rapid change in shipping technology.
- b. Developing adequate land for industries that require access to shipping channels for transportation of raw materials or manufactured products.
- c. Developing new recreational opportunities—shoreline parks, marinas, fishing piers, beaches, hiking and bicycling paths, and scenic drives.
- d. Developing expanded airport terminals and runways *if* regional studies demonstrate that there are no feasible sites for major airport development away from the Bay.
- e. Developing new freeway routes (with construction on pilings, not solid fill) *if* thorough study determines that no feasible alternatives are available.
- f. Developing new public access to the Bay and enhancing shoreline appearance—over and above that provided by other Bay Plan policies—through filling limited to Bay-related commercial recreation and public assembly.

5. **Effects of Bay Filling.** Bay filling should be limited to the purposes listed above, however, because any filling is harmful to the Bay, and thus to present and future generations of Bay Area residents. All Bay filling has one or more of the following harmful effects:

- a. Filling destroys the habitat of fish and wildlife. Future filling can disrupt the ecological balance in the Bay, which has already been damaged by past fills, and can endanger the very existence of some species of birds and fish. The Bay, including open water, mudflats, and marshlands, is a complex biological system, in which microorganisms, plants, fish, waterfowl, and shorebirds live in a delicate balance created by nature, and in which seemingly minor changes, such as a new fill or dredging project, may have far-reaching and sometimes highly destructive effects.
- b. Filling almost always increases the danger of water pollution by reducing the ability of the Bay to assimilate the increasing quantities of liquid wastes being poured into it. Filling reduces

both the surface area of the Bay and the volume of water in the Bay; this reduces the ability of the Bay to maintain adequate levels of oxygen in its waters, and also reduces the strength of the tides necessary to flush wastes from the Bay.

c. Filling reduces the air-conditioning effects of the Bay and increases the danger of air pollution in the Bay Area. Reducing the open water surface over which cool air can move in from the ocean will reduce the amount of this air reaching the Santa Clara Valley and the Carquinez Strait in the summer—and will increase the frequency and intensity of temperature-inversions, which trap air pollutants and thus cause an increase in smog in the Bay Area.

d. Indiscriminate filling will diminish the scenic beauty of the Bay.

6. Pressures to Fill. As the Bay Area's population increases, pressures to fill the Bay for many purposes will increase. New flat land will be sought for many urban uses because most, if not all, of the flat land in communities bordering the Bay is already in use—for residences, businesses, industries, airports, roadways, etc. Past diking and filling of tidelands and marshlands has already reduced the size of the Bay from about 680 square miles in area to little more than 400. Although some of this diked land remains, at least temporarily, as salt ponds or managed wetlands, it has nevertheless been removed from the tides of the Bay. The Bay is particularly vulnerable to diking and filling for two reasons:

a. The Bay is shallow. About two-thirds of it is less than 18 feet deep at low tide; in the South Bay and in San Pablo Bay, the depth of the water two or three miles offshore may, at low tide, be only five or six feet or even less.

b. Ownership of the Bay is divided. Private owners claim about 22 per cent of the Bay (including extensive holdings in the South Bay) as a result of sales by the State government 90 or more years ago. Cities and counties have received free grants of land from the State totaling about 23 per cent of the Bay. The state now owns only about 50 per cent of the Bay, and the Federal government owns about 5 per cent. The lands that are closest to shore, most shallow, and thus easiest to fill are held by either private owners or local governments that may wish to fill for various purposes irrespective of the effects of filling on the Bay as a whole.

7. Water Quality. Liquid wastes from many municipal, industrial, and agricultural sources are emptied into San Francisco Bay. Because of the work now under way by the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board, the Army Corps of Engineers, and the Bay-Delta Water Quality Control Program, the Bay Plan does not deal extensively with the problems of pollution control. But the entire Bay Plan is founded on the belief that water quality in San Francisco Bay can and will be maintained at levels sufficiently high to permit full public enjoyment and use of the Bay.

8. Fill Safety. Virtually all fills in San Francisco Bay are placed on top of Bay mud. The construction of buildings on such fills creates a greater number of potential hazards to life and property, during normal settling and during earthquakes, than does construction on rock or on dense, hard soil deposits. Adequate design measures can be taken, however, to reduce these potential hazards to acceptable levels.

An Engineering Criteria Review Board, appointed by the Commission, consists of leading geologists, soils engineers, structural engineers and architects. The Board reviews projects in pending permit applications for the purpose of evaluating the adequacy of safety provisions and proposed structural methods and specifications and, when necessary, makes recommendations for changes. This work complements the functions of local building and planning departments, none of which are presently staffed to provide soils inspections.

Major Plan Proposals

1. Port expansion should be planned for Benicia, Oakland, Redwood City, Richmond, and San Francisco.

2. Major shipping channels should be deepened from the Golden Gate to the Delta, and to Oakland, Redwood City, Richmond, and San Francisco.

3. Waterfront land now used by industries that require access to deep-water shipping should be continued in this use, and sufficient additional waterfront acreage should be reserved for future water-related industry.

4. New shoreline parks, beaches, marinas, fishing piers, scenic drives, and hiking or bicycling pathways should be provided in many areas. The Bay and its shoreline offer particularly important opportunities for recreational development in urban areas where large concentrations of people now live close to the water but are shut off from it. Highest

Definitions

As used in this Plan, San Francisco Bay means all the open water and slough areas from the Golden Gate and the southern end of the Bay to the eastern end of Suisun Bay and Montezuma Slough (a line between Stake Point and Simmons Point, extended northeasterly to the mouth of Marshall Cut), including submerged lands (which are always under water), tidelands (which are covered and uncovered by the daily tides), and marshlands (which are between mean high tide and five feet above mean sea level).

As used in this Plan, shoreline areas or shoreline lands are the uplands bordering the Bay.

As used in this Plan, salt ponds are areas diked off from the Bay and used for making salt by solar evaporation, and managed wetlands are marshes diked off from the Bay and managed as wildfowl habitat (generally under the ownership of duck-hunting clubs.)

As used in this Plan, Commission and BCDC refer to the San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission.

Foundations of the Bay Plan

The Bay Plan was prepared during three years of study and public deliberation by the members of the San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission. This document presents the two essential parts of the Bay Plan: the policies to guide future uses of the Bay and shoreline, and the maps that apply these policies to the present Bay and shoreline. (The Bay Plan also includes procedures for amending the policies and maps in light of changing circumstances and new information in the future.)

In making its study of the Bay, the BCDC had the help of numerous consultants and received extensive and invaluable aid from city, county, state and federal agencies, and from specialists on university faculties and on the staffs of business organizations. In addition, the Commission was assisted by an Advisory Committee, whose 19 members contributed greatly in the review of the Commission's work.

The Commission's study resulted in the publication of 23 volumes of technical reports. Summaries of the studies are printed as a supplement to this plan, and the detailed reports are available for reference in numerous public libraries and in the offices of the Commission.

Also printed as a supplement to the Plan is an analysis of the hazards of building on filled land (hazards during normal settling of fills and during earthquakes), and of the engineering steps necessary to reduce these risks to acceptable limits. This supplementary report was prepared by a Board of Consultants appointed by the BCDC and consisting of some of the Bay Area's leading geologists, structural engineers, architects, and civil engineers specializing in soil mechanics.

priority should be given to recreational development in these areas, as an important means of helping immediately to relieve urban tensions.

5. Airports around the Bay serve the entire Bay Area, and future airport planning can be effective only on a regional basis. The Bay provides an open area for aircraft to take off and land without having to fly over densely-populated areas, and this is an excellent use of the water. But terminals and other airport facilities should be on existing land wherever feasible. Future airport development should be based on a regional airport plan, which should be prepared as soon as possible by a governmental agency with region-wide responsibilities for transportation planning. Studies leading to this airport plan should evaluate all reasonable alternatives for meeting the Bay Area's growing need for aviation facilities, and should specifically evaluate the needs of commercial, military, and general (small plane) aviation. Airport expansion or construction on Bay fill should be permitted only if no feasible alternatives are available.

6. Prime wildlife refuges in diked-off areas around the Bay should be maintained and several major additions should be made to the existing refuge system.

7. Private investment in shoreline development should be vigorously encouraged. For example, shoreline areas can be developed in many places for attractive, water-oriented housing.

Carrying out the Bay Plan

1. **General.** As required by the McAteer-Petris Act, the San Francisco Bay Plan was submitted to the Legislature and the Governor of California in 1969. During the legislative session that year revisions were enacted into the McAteer-Petris Act designating the San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission as the permanent agency responsible for carrying out the Bay Plan. The 1969 revisions to the Act further specified the area and scope of the Commission's authority and established the permit system for the regulation of the Bay and shoreline.

2. **Permits for Bay Filling and Dredging.** The Commission is empowered to grant or deny permits for all Bay filling or dredging in accordance with the provisions of the McAteer-Petris Act and the standards in the Bay Plan. Any public agency or owner of privately-held Bay property is required to obtain a permit before proceeding with fill or dredging. (Although Federal agencies would not legally be subject to the jurisdiction of the


BCDC, it is Federal policy to conform generally to State laws and plans if they do not unduly interfere with national purposes or objectives, and Federal cooperation in carrying out the Bay Plan should be sought and expected.) For purposes of this Plan, fill is defined to include earth or any other substance or material placed in the Bay, including piers, pilings and floating structures moored in the Bay for extended periods. Public hearings must be held on all permit applications except those of a minor nature.

3. **Permits for Shoreline Development.** The Commission has limited jurisdiction over development in shoreline areas. This is necessary (1) to insure that prime shoreline sites are reserved for priority uses—ports, water-related industry, airports, wildlife refuges, and water-related recreation, (2) to insure that public access to the Bay is provided to the maximum extent feasible, (3) to insure that if any saltponds or managed wetlands are proposed for development, consideration is given to public purchase and return of these areas to the Bay, or alternatively, that any development is in accordance with the guidelines recommended in the Bay Plan, (4) to insure that shoreline areas not needed for priority uses are developed in ways that do not preclude public access to the Bay, and (5) to encourage attractive design of shoreline development. The Commission's jurisdiction in shoreline areas, as defined in the McAteer-Petris Act, is limited to a band measured 100 feet landward of and parallel to the shoreline of the Bay.

Conclusion

The Bay is a single physical mechanism in which actions affecting one part may also affect other parts. The Bay Plan provides a formula for developing the Bay and shoreline to their highest potential, while protecting the Bay as an irreplaceable natural resource.

The San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission is the agency designated to carry out the Bay Plan.



Part II


Objectives

Objective 1

Protect the Bay as a great natural resource for the benefit of present and future generations.

Objective 2

Develop the Bay and its shoreline to their highest potential with a minimum of Bay filling.



Part III

The Bay as a Resource:

Findings and Policies

Fish and Wildlife

Findings and policies concerning Fish and Wildlife in the Bay

Findings

a. San Francisco Bay is by far the largest estuary along California's long coastline. It is an essential resting place, feeding area, and wintering ground for millions of birds on the Pacific Flyway from Canada to Mexico. Nearly one hundred species of fish are also supported by the estuarine environment that includes marshlands, mudflats, salt production lands, and open water.

b. Human benefit from the fish and wildlife of the Bay includes food, economic gain, recreation, scientific research, education, and an environment for living. No comprehensive estimate of the value of fish and wildlife for these purposes is available, but such value can only increase unless man diminishes the Bay. In future decades the Bay may become of inestimable additional value as a fish and marine plant "farm," augmenting the nation's and the world's food resources for a rapidly-growing population.

c. Maintaining fish and wildlife depends upon availability of: (1) sufficient oxygen in the Bay waters, (2) adequate amounts of the proper foods, (3) sufficient shelter space, and (4) proper temperature, salt content, and velocity of the water. Requirements vary according to the species of fish and wildlife. Maintenance of these habitat requirements is essential to insure for present and future generations of Californians the benefit of fish and wildlife in the Bay. The key elements of the Bay fish and wildlife habitat are: marshes and mudflats, total water volume and total surface area of the Bay, good water circulation, and some fresh water inflow.

d. Plan Map 1, Natural Resources of the Bay, indicates the shoreline areas of greatest value for shore birds and water fowl. All parts of San Francisco Bay are assumed to be important for the perpetuation of fish and other marine life because any reduction of habitat reduces the marine population in some measure.

Policies

1. The benefits of fish and wildlife in the Bay should be insured for present and future generations of Californians. Therefore, to the greatest extent feasible, the remaining marshes and mudflats around the Bay, the remaining water volume and

surface area of the Bay, and adequate fresh water inflow into the Bay should be maintained.

2. Specific habitats that are needed to prevent the extinction of any species, or to maintain or increase any species that would provide substantial public benefits, should be protected, whether in the Bay or on the shoreline behind dikes. Such areas on the shoreline are designated as Wildlife Areas on the Plan maps.

Water Pollution

Findings and policies concerning Water Pollution in the Bay

Findings

a. San Francisco Bay receives a variety of municipal, industrial, and agricultural wastes from sources throughout its tributary drainage area. Pollution occurs when waste discharges cause water quality conditions that damage or destroy varied uses of the Bay. Such conditions can result from toxic (poisonous) substances, from residues that unduly stimulate organic growth in the Bay, and from sewage that consumes oxygen in the water as it disintegrates. Polluted waters may be unsafe for human contact or use, offensive to the senses, damaging or lethal to marine life, and even unsuitable for industrial use.

b. Compared to rivers and estuaries in other parts of the country, San Francisco Bay is relatively unpolluted. In recent years, extensive improvements in the treatment of industrial and municipal wastes have greatly reduced the pollution that once existed in the Bay. But some parts, especially in the South Bay, are still polluted at certain times of the year. As long as the Bay continues to receive wastes from an expanding population and industry, there must be constant improvement in waste management to upgrade presently polluted areas and prevent pollution problems in the future.

c. While waste disposal poses a continuing threat to water quality in the Bay, this use of Bay waters will continue for some time. Pollution of Bay waters from these wastes can be prevented by: (1) transporting waste directly to the ocean (but without allowing waste discharges to damage the ocean's marine life); (2) prohibiting the discharge into the Bay of toxic wastes (poisons) that do not break down; (3) adequate treatment of wastes before discharge into the Bay; and (4) natural breakdown of any biodegradable wastes placed in the Bay, which can be encouraged by maintaining adequate flushing action and an adequate supply of dissolved oxygen in the Bay.

d. Key elements that affect flushing and the supply of dissolved oxygen are (1) the volume of water flowing in and out with the tides (and fresh water flowing into the Bay), (2) the temperature of Bay waters, and (3) the rates of oxygen interchange at the surface of the Bay, including the tidal flats.

e. Several governmental programs are now seeking to determine the best methods of controlling water quality and preventing water pollution in the Bay. The San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board has set water quality limits and time schedules for treatment facilities, so as to protect and enhance designated beneficial water uses of the Bay. The State's Bay-Delta Water Quality Control Program presented in 1969 its long-range plan for preventing Bay pollution. And the State Water Resources Control Board is studying the California laws on water quality control to determine whether they should be strengthened.

Policies

1. To the greatest extent feasible, the remaining marshes and mudflats around the Bay, the remaining water volume and surface area of the Bay, and fresh water inflow into the Bay should be maintained.

2. Water quality in all parts of the Bay should be sufficiently high to permit water contact sports and to provide a suitable habitat for all indigenous and desirable forms of aquatic life. It is assumed that this will be achieved, in time, as the result of measures taken in response to requirements and enforcement proceedings of the Regional Water Quality Control Board, and measures resulting from current governmental studies. (Because of the work of these agencies, this Commission has not dealt extensively with the problem of pollution control. But the entire Bay Plan is founded on the belief that water quality in San Francisco Bay can and will be maintained at levels sufficiently high to permit full public enjoyment and use of the Bay.)

3. The water quality laws and practices should insure that no project is built within the watershed of San Francisco Bay unless its liquid wastes will be treated, on the premises or in a public treatment plant having sufficient capacity, so that the effluent would not cause delay in compliance with applicable water quality standards anywhere in the Bay.

Water Surface Area and Volume

Findings and policies concerning Water Surface Area and Volume

Findings

a. Dissolved oxygen is needed to support marine life and to help break down pollutants in the water. The amount of oxygen in the Bay is largely determined by the surface area of the Bay because primary sources of oxygen are: (1) churning waves that trap oxygen from the air, (2) the water surface, which absorbs oxygen from the air, and (3) the exposed mudflats, which both produce and absorb oxygen while the tide is out and transfer it to the water when the tide comes in.

b. Water circulation might be greatly improved by some of the major barrier proposals that have been made for the Bay. But barriers affect—for better or for worse—the appearance and ecology of the Bay, sedimentation, flood control, and existing and proposed uses of the shores of the Bay. They are also very costly. For all barrier proposals fully evaluated thus far, disadvantages outweigh advantages.

c. About 40 percent of the original surface area of the Bay has been diked off or filled in since 1850. Because this has involved some of the most effective oxygenation areas, the ability of the Bay to take up oxygen has been sharply reduced.

d. The dissolved oxygen that is absorbed at the Bay surface or from the mudflats must be transmitted to the deeper waters by mixing of the water. The necessary mixing is accomplished by tidal interchange, by fresh water inflow from tributaries, and by circulation resulting from wind action upon the surface of the Bay. The strength of tidal flow and water circulation are greatly affected by the shape of the Bay bottom and the shoreline; fills, dikes, and piers can speed or retard water circulation, depending upon both the water circulation pattern in the affected area and the shape of the fill, dike, or pier.

Policies

1. The surface area of the Bay and the total volume of water should be kept as large as possible in order to maximize active oxygen interchange, vigorous cir-

ulation, and effective tidal action. Filling and diking that reduce surface area and water volume should therefore be allowed only for purposes providing substantial public benefits and only if there is no reasonable alternative.

2. Water circulation in the Bay should be maintained, and improved as much as possible. Any proposed fills, dikes, or piers should be thoroughly evaluated to determine their effects upon water circulation and then modified as necessary to improve circulation or at least to minimize any harmful effects.

3. Because further study is needed before any barrier proposal to improve water circulation can be considered acceptable, the Bay Plan does not include any barriers. Before any proposal for a barrier is adopted in the future, the Commission will be required to replan all of the affected shoreline and water area.

Marshes and Mudflats

Findings and policies concerning Marshes and Mudflats around the Bay

Findings

a. Salt marshes are extraordinarily fertile. Living marsh plants fix the energy of sunlight into their tissues through photosynthesis, and expel oxygen into the surrounding environment. One type of marsh plant, cord grass, has seven times the energy-generating capacity or food value of an equal acreage of wheat.

b. Large numbers of birds, including ducks and geese, come to the marshes to feed on the lush vegetation or on the brackish-water animals that thrive there. Their wastes, together with the decomposition products of plant decay and other elements of the complex food web, contribute nutrients from the marshes to the mudflats and the shallows of the Bay margin, supporting a vast marine-life nursery.

c. Most marine life in the Bay either depends directly on the marshes and mudflats for its sustenance or indirectly depends upon them by feeding upon other marine life so nourished. Shore birds depend upon the marshes and mudflats for both food and shelter.

d. Algae on the mudflats, exposed to abundant light alternating with abundant water, produce and expel oxygen into the water and into the air. This is an important source of oxygen that water must have both to support marine life and to combat water pollution.

e. The marshlands bordering the Bay now total about 75 square miles. In 1850, before diking and filling had been begun, marshlands covered some 300 square miles.

Policies

1. Marshes and mudflats should be maintained to the fullest possible extent to conserve fish and wildlife and to abate air and water pollution. Filling and diking that eliminate marshes and mudflats should therefore be allowed only for purposes providing substantial public benefits and only if there is no reasonable alternative. Marshes and mudflats are an integral part of the Bay tidal system and therefore should be protected in the same manner as open water areas.

2. Any proposed fills, dikes, or piers should be thoroughly evaluated to determine their effects on marshes and mudflats, and then modified as necessary to minimize any harmful effects.

3. To offset possible additional losses of marshes due to necessary filling and to augment the present marshes, (a) former marshes should be restored when possible through removal of existing dikes, (b) in areas selected on the basis of competent ecological study, some new marshes should be created through carefully placed lifts of dredged spoils, and (c) the quality of existing marshes should be improved by appropriate measures whenever possible.

Smog and Weather

Findings and policies concerning Effect of the Bay on Smog and Weather

Findings

- a. The Bay plays a significant role in determining the climate of the Bay Area.
- b. The waters of the Bay maintain a relatively constant temperature, and this helps to moderate extremes of heat and cold in surrounding areas. The Bay surface provides a cool pathway for summertime ocean winds, enabling them to help cool areas at the "ends" of the Bay (the Santa Clara Valley and the Carquinez Strait areas).
- c. Present research indicates that filling a substantial part of the Bay—as much as 25 per cent—would cause (1) higher summertime temperatures and reduced rainfall in the Santa Clara Valley and the Carquinez Strait-Suisun Bay area; and (2) increases in the frequency and thickness of both fog and smog in the Bay Area. Converting Bay surface to land would increase smog-producing temperature inversions in the Bay Area; in addition, the new land would probably be used for smog-producing concentrations of urban developments, including automobiles.

Policies

1. To the greatest extent feasible, the remaining water volume and surface area of the Bay should be maintained.

Shell Deposits

Findings and policies concerning Shell Deposits in the Bay

Findings

- a. Oyster shells are dredged from the Bay floor primarily for use as lime in the production of cement. A small portion of the shells are used as soil conditioner, as cattle feed, and as poultry grit by local poultry and egg producers.
- b. The shell deposits are an important mineral resource because the other principal source of lime, limestone, is more distantly located in Santa Clara, Santa Cruz, and San Benito Counties to the south. Cement is expensive to transport over great distances, so a nearby source of lime is important to the Bay Area economy.

Policies

1. Filling or diking that adversely affect known shell deposits, illustrated in Plan Map 1, Natural Resources of the Bay, should be allowed only for purposes providing more public benefit than the availability of the shells.

Fresh Water Inflow

Findings and policies concerning Fresh Water Inflow into the Bay

Findings


- a. Fresh water flowing into the Bay, most of which is from the Delta, dilutes the salt water of the ocean flowing into the Bay through the Golden Gate. The Bay waters thus provide a gradual change from the salt water of the ocean to the fresh water flows of the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers. This delicate relationship between fresh and salt water helps to determine the ability of the Bay to support a variety of marine life and wildfowl in and around the Bay.
- b. The gradual change in the salt content of the Bay appears necessary for the survival of anadromous fish such as king salmon, steelhead, striped bass, and American shad, as they progress upstream toward their spawning grounds, and for the survival of their fingerlings as they descend to salt water. An abrupt change in the salt content of Bay water would probably end the anadromous fish runs.
- c. The fresh water flow from the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers is an important (but not the major) source of the oxygen necessary in the waters of the Bay to support marine life and to abate pollution, and it assists in flushing parts of the Bay system, particularly during peak flows of the spring when the snows melt in the Sierra.
- d. Fresh water flow into the Bay during the winter and spring months is of particular importance in maintaining the health of the Suisun Marsh, the largest remaining marsh around the Bay and a wildfowl habitat of nationwide importance.
- e. The fresh water flows from the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers into the Delta and the Bay have been reduced in the past by diversions of Federal, State, and local governments for agricultural, industrial, and domestic uses. Additional diversions are being sought, and further substantial diversions could change the salt content of Bay water and thereby adversely affect the ability of the Bay to support a great variety of aquatic life.

- f. In periodically reviewing existing diversions under its reserved jurisdiction, the State Water Resources Control Board issued Decision 1485 and the Delta Plan in 1978. The Decision and the Delta Plan

set water quality standards for the Delta and the Suisun Marsh and continued to reserve jurisdiction over salinity control, fish and wildlife resources, and coordination of the Federal and State water projects so that the standards can be reviewed periodically. The Delta Plan noted that the protection of historical levels of fish and wildlife resources (1922-1967) should be the standard for future water diversions. In addition, the Delta Plan recognized for the first time, the Board's statutory responsibility to set standards for San Francisco Bay to protect beneficial uses of the Bay. Although the Board did not establish standards for the Bay because of a lack of information, the Board directed that studies be conducted to develop that information. The Board also determined that alternative water supplies must be found for the Suisun Marsh and completed by 1984. Although the Decision and the Delta Plan have certain flaws, such as their use of "without project" conditions as a standard at this time and their inability to stop the decline in the striped bass population, the Board has recognized the need to address these problems and has begun studies to that end. It is important that such studies be conducted expeditiously to preserve what remains of the fishery and to develop information about the Bay before vast sums of money are committed to water development projects that will reduce fresh water inflow to the Bay in the future.

Policies

1. Diversions of fresh water should not reduce the inflow into the Bay to the point of damaging the oxygen content of the Bay, the flushing of the Bay, or the ability of the Bay to support fish and wildlife.
2. High priority should be given to the preservation of Suisun Marsh through adequate protective measures including maintenance of fresh water inflows.
3. The impact of diversions of fresh water inflow into the Bay should be monitored by the State Water Resources Control Board, which should set standards to restore historical levels (1922-1967) of fish and wildlife resources. The Bay Commission should cooperate with the Board and others to ensure that adequate fresh water inflows to protect the Bay are made available.



Part IV Development of the Bay and Shoreline: Findings and Policies

Safety of Fills

Findings and policies concerning Safety of Fills in the Bay

Findings

a. To reduce risk of life and damage to property, special consideration must be given to construction on filled lands in San Francisco Bay. (Similar hazards exist on the poor soils throughout the Bay Area, including soft natural soils, steep slopes, earthquake fault zones, and extensively graded areas.)

b. Virtually all fills in San Francisco Bay are placed on top of Bay mud. Under most of the Bay there is a deep, packed layer of old Bay mud. More recent deposits, called younger Bay mud, lie on top of the older muds. The top layer of young mud presents many engineering problems. The construction of a sound fill depends in part on the stability of the base upon which it is placed.

c. Safety of a fill also depends on the manner in which the filling is done, and the materials used for the fill. Similarly, safety of a structure on fill depends on the manner in which it is built and the materials used in its construction. Construction of a fill or building that will be safe enough for the intended use requires (1) recognition and investigation of all potential hazards—including (a) settling of a fill or building over a long period of time, and (b) ground failure caused by the manner of constructing the fill or by shaking during a major earthquake—and (2) construction of the filling or building in a manner specifically designed to minimize these hazards. While the construction of buildings on fills overlying Bay deposits involves a greater number of potential hazards than construction on rock or on dense hard soil deposits, adequate design measures can be taken to reduce the hazards to acceptable levels.

d. There are no minimum construction codes regulating construction of fills on Bay mud because of the absence of sufficient data upon which to base such a code. Hazards vary with different geologic and foundation conditions, use of the fill, and the type of structures to be constructed on new fill areas. Therefore, the highest order of skilled judgment, utilizing the available knowledge of all affected disciplines, is required to (1) recognize and investigate all potential hazards of constructing a fill, and (2) design the fill and any construction thereon to minimize these hazards.


e. In the absence of adequate fill construction standards or codes, the BCDC appointed a Board of Consultants consisting of geologists, civil engineers specializing in soils engineering, structural engineers, and other specialists, to review, on the basis of available knowledge, all new fills that might be permitted in the Bay Plan, so that no fills would be included upon which construction might be unsafe. No specific fills are included in the Plan, but the Board of Consultants has completed an initial set of criteria (published separately as "Carrying Out the Bay Plan: The Safety of Fills") as a guide to future consideration of specific fill proposals.

f. Flood damage to fills and shoreline areas can result from a combination of heavy rainfall, high tides, and winds blowing onshore. To prevent such damage, buildings near the shoreline should be above the highest expected flood mark (nine feet above sea level is generally set as the safe mark except in the southern part of the South Bay, where the higher tides require almost a foot more elevation), or should be protected by dikes of an adequate height.

g. Excessive pumping from underground fresh water reservoirs has caused extensive subsidence of the ground surface in the San Jose area and as far north as Dumbarton Bridge (map of Generalized Subsidence and Fault Zones shows subsidence from 1934 to 1967). Indications are that if heavy groundwater pumping is continued indefinitely in the South Bay area, land in the Alviso area (which has already subsided about seven feet since 1912) could subside up to seven feet more; if this occurs, extensive dikes may be needed to prevent inundation of low-lying areas by the high tides.

Policies

1. The Commission has appointed the Engineering Criteria Review Board consisting of geologists, civil engineers specializing in soils engineering, structural engineers, and architects competent to and adequately-empowered to (a) establish and revise safety criteria for Bay fills and structures thereon, (b) review all except minor projects for the adequacy of their specific safety provisions, and make recommendations concerning these provisions, (c) prescribe an inspection system to assure placement of fill according to approved designs, and (d) gather, and make available, performance data developed from specific projects. These activities would complement the functions of local building departments and local planning departments, none of which are presently staffed to provide soils inspections.



2. Even if the Bay plan indicates that a fill may be permissible, no fill or building should be constructed if hazards cannot be overcome adequately for the intended use in accordance with the criteria prescribed by the Engineering Criteria Review Board.

3. To provide vitally-needed information on the effects of earthquakes on all kinds of soils, installation of strong-motion seismographs should be required on all future major land fills. In addition, the Commission encourages installation of strong-motion seismographs in other developments on problem soils, and in other areas recommended by the U.S. Coast and Geodetic Survey, for purposes of data comparison and evaluation.

4. To prevent damage from flooding, buildings on fill or near the shoreline should have adequate flood protection as determined by competent engineers. As a general rule, buildings near the shoreline should be at least nine feet above mean sea level (standard U.S.G.S. datum) or should be protected by dikes of an equivalent height and by any necessary pumping facilities. In the southern half of the South Bay, this height should be at least ten feet. Exceptions to the general height rule may be made for developments specifically designed to tolerate periodic flooding.

To minimize the potential hazard to dayside development from subsidence due to ground water withdrawal, all proposed developments at the lower end of the South Bay should be sufficiently high above mean sea level or sufficiently protected by dikes to allow for the effects of additional subsidence, utilizing the latest information available from the U. S. Geological Survey.

Dredging

Findings and policies concerning Dredging in the Bay

Findings

a. Much of the Bay bottom is covered with sediment—silt, sand, and clay—that has been carried by tributaries from dry land upstream. Sediment continues to flow into the Bay at the rate of about 6 million cubic yards a year; this amount is expected to decline, however, because of improved soil conservation programs and the diversion of silt-carrying waters from the Delta and Bay to other parts of the State. Only 30 per cent of the sediment entering the Bay is carried out the Golden Gate by the tides. The remainder settles to the bottom of the Bay, but may be picked up again by changing currents and carried to other parts of the Bay. Eventually, much of the sediment lodges in harbors and shipping channels from which it must be dredged at considerable cost.

b. Dredged mud is sometimes used as a fill material, and occasionally some is barged out to sea; but most often, the sediment is simply dumped in a part of the Bay where it is expected to cause as little harm as possible. Even at the best of these dumping grounds, near Alcatraz Island, only 47 per cent of the sediment is carried out to sea by the tides; at the Yerba Buena Island dumping area, only 30 per cent is carried out the Golden Gate; and at the dumping area in Carquinez Strait, probably less than 5 per cent ever reaches the ocean. The remaining sediment is simply recirculated in the Bay by the tides, and eventually settles to the bottom where it may have to be dredged again.

c. Dredged spoils dumped at sea could return to the Bay with tidal currents or could cause local damage to marine organisms or beaches near the dumping sites. These conditions are capable of being analyzed prior to dumping at sea.

d. To reduce the cost of dredging harbors and navigation channels, sedimentation resulting from upstream erosion and redumping of dredged materials should be reduced as much as possible.

e. Underground fresh water supplies are an important supplement to surface water now brought into the Bay Area by aqueduct from mountain reservoirs. Deep dredging of Bay mud, or excavation for tunnels or bridge piers, could strip the "cover" from the top of a fresh water reservoir under the Bay, allowing the salt

water to contaminate the fresh water, or allowing the fresh water (if artesian) to escape in large quantities and thus cause land to sink. The precise location of ground water reservoirs under the Bay is not yet well known, however.

Policies

1. To prevent sedimentation resulting from dredging projects, mud from future dredging should be disposed of in one of the following ways: (a) placement on dry land, (b) placement as fill in approved fill projects, (c) barging or piping to suitable disposal sites in the ocean, or (d) if no other alternative is feasible, dumping in designated parts of the Bay where the maximum possible amount will be carried out the Golden Gate on the ebb tides; areas should be designated for this purpose upon approval by both the Commission and the Army Corps of Engineers. This policy is intended to apply as soon as possible to all dredging in the Bay, whether to create new channels or to maintain existing ones, but it is recognized that Federally-assisted maintenance dredging projects under way as of January 1, 1969, may require discharge of spoils in open waters of the Bay where relatively little of the dredged material is carried out to sea.

2. Vigorous efforts should be made to find methods of spoils disposal that will provide for construction of vitally-needed shipping channels, such as the John F. Baldwin Ship Channel from the Golden Gate to the Delta, while at the same time protecting the Bay from unnecessary filling solely to dispose of dredged mud.

3. Pending the completion of studies into the feasibility of new or improved methods of spoils disposal, complete compliance with the spoils disposal policy will not be immediately possible. Additional areas for spoils disposal may thus be needed within the Bay system, for maintenance dredging as well as for new channels for shipping or for pleasure boating, but disposal areas should be selected with due consideration as to which feasible disposal methods will be least harmful to the ecology of the Bay. In no case, however, should spoil be used to create artificial islands in the Bay unless competent studies demonstrate that these fill islands would have no harmful effect on water quality or on air quality.

4. All proposed channels should be carefully designed so as not to undermine the stability of any adjacent dikes and fills.

5. The Commission should encourage increased efforts by soil conservation districts and public works agencies in the 50,000-square-mile tributary area to continuously reduce soil erosion as much as possible.

6. To protect underground fresh water reservoirs (aquifers), (a) all proposals for dredging or construction work that could penetrate the mud "cover" should be reviewed by the Regional Water Quality Control Board and the State Department of Water Resources, and (b) dredging or construction work should not be permitted that might reasonably be expected to damage an underground water reservoir. Applicants for permission to dredge should be required to provide additional data on ground water conditions in the area of construction to the extent necessary and reasonable in relation to the proposed project.

Water-Related Industry

Findings and policies concerning Water-Related Industry on the Bay

Findings

a. Certain industries use water for transportation, thereby gaining significant economic benefits by fronting on navigable water. These are defined as "water-related industries".

b. Water-related industry is basic to the economy of the Bay Area and of the western United States. Therefore, the needs of water-related industry must be given high priority in the Bay Plan.

c. Vacant or underutilized industrial waterfrontage, particularly with access to deep water, is scarce in the Bay Area. There is current and anticipated future demand for use of these remaining sites by water-related industries. Substantial regional public benefits can result from reservation of these sites for use by water-related industry, and from efficient and planned use of these sites by such water-related industries.

d. Many other industries compete with water-related industries for waterfront sites: (1) industries that use large volumes of water for cooling or processing purposes and therefore often seek sites near the shoreline; these are defined as "water using industries"; (2) industries that benefit from or support the operation of water-related industries and therefore seek locations near them; these are defined as "linked industries"; (3) other industries that simply seek locations close to freeways and railroads, or that seek a waterfront site because of favorable land costs.

Policies

1. Those sites designated as water-related industrial priority use areas in this Plan should be reserved exclusively for those industries which meet the following criteria: (a) the specific industrial project is determined by the Commission to be water-related, using the definition found in finding a. above, as well as any elaboration on this definition as found in Commission regulations; and (b) the project is determined to meet all other applicable policies of the Bay Plan and the McAteer-Petris Act.

2. Linked industries, water-using industries and industries which gain only limited economic benefits by fronting on navigable water, should locate in adjacent upland areas. However, pipeline corridors serving such facilities may be permitted within water-related industrial priority use areas, provided pipeline construction and use do not conflict with present or future water-transportation use of the site.

3. Land reserved for water-related industry will be developed over a period of years. Other uses may be allowed in the interim, as defined in Commission regulations.

4. Water-related industrial sites should be planned so as to avoid wasteful use of the limited supply of waterfront land. The following principles should be followed to the maximum extent feasible in planning for water-related industry:

a. Extensive use of the shoreline for storage of raw materials, fuel, products, or wastes should not be permitted on a long term basis. If required, such storage areas should generally either be at right angles to the main direction of the shoreline or be as far inland as feasible, so other use of the shoreline may be made possible.

b. Where large acreages are available for industry, site planning should strive to provide access to the shoreline for all future plants that might locate in the same area. (As a general rule, therefore, the longest dimension of plant sites should be at right angles to the shoreline.) Docking facilities at waterfront industrial concentrations should also be shared as much as possible among industries and, also, if appropriate, with public port agencies.

c. Waste treatment ponds for water-related industry should occupy as little land as possible, be above the highest recorded level of tidal action, and be as far removed from the shoreline as possible.

d. Any new highways, railroads, or rapid transit lines in existing or future water-related industrial areas should be located sufficiently far away from the waterfront so as not to interfere with industrial use of the waterfront. New access roads to waterfront industrial areas should be approximately at right angles to the shoreline, topography permitting.

5. Water-related industry should be planned so as to make industrial sites attractive (as well as economically-important) uses of the shoreline. The following criteria should be employed to the maximum extent possible:

a. Air and water pollution should be minimized through strict compliance with all relevant laws, policies and standards. Mitigation, consistent with the California Environmental Quality Act, should be provided for all unavoidable adverse environmental impacts.

b. When Bayfront hills are used for water-related industries, terracing should generally be required and leveling of the hills should not be permitted.

c. Important Bay overlook points, and historic areas and structures that may be located in water-related industrial areas, should be preserved and incorporated into the site design, if at all feasible. In addition, shoreline not actually used for shipping facilities should be used for some type of public access or recreation, to the maximum extent feasible. Public areas need not be directly accessible by private automobiles with attendant parking lots and driveways; access may be provided by hiking paths or by forms of public transit such as elephant trains or aerial tramways.

d. Regulations, tax arrangements, or other devices should be drawn in a manner that encourages industries to meet the foregoing objectives. In addition, if a sizeable area is to be obtained for public use in an existing industrial site, a public agency should be authorized, but not obligated, to assist the industry in obtaining suitable adjacent land to replace areas given over to public use. Once industry and public agencies agree on site development and design plans, the public agency should be firmly committed to (1) construct and maintain agreed-upon improvements, (2) enact and enforce controls to prevent encroachment of incompatible uses into the industrial area, and (3) refrain from making unreasonable additional demands on the industry that were not included in the original plan approval.

6. BCDC, together with the relevant local government(s), should cooperatively plan for use of vacant and underutilized water-related industrial priority use areas. Such planning should include regional, state and federal interests where appropriate, as well as public and special interest groups. Resulting plans should include: (a) a program for joint use of waterfront facilities where this is beneficial and feasible; (b) a regulatory or management program for reserving the entire water-

front site or parcel for water-related industrial use; and (c) a program for minimizing the environmental impacts of future industrial development. Such plans, if approved by relevant local governments and by BCDC, could be amended into the Bay Plan as Special Area Plans.

7. The Bay Plan water-related industrial findings, policies and priority use areas, together with any detailed plans as described above in 6., should be included as the waterfront element of any Bay Area regional industrial siting plan or implementation program.

Ports


Findings and policies concerning Ports on the Bay

Findings

a. San Francisco Bay is one of the world's great natural harbors, and maritime commerce is of primary importance to the entire economy of the Bay Area.

b. Adequate modern port terminals and ground access facilities and deeper shipping channels will be needed to preserve and enhance the standing of the Bay Area as a major world harbor and to keep pace with changes in shipping technology.

c. Of particular importance for Bay planning is the expected growth in containerized cargo handling, which requires large specially-designed terminals and supporting transportation facilities. Also important are the expected growth in automobiles, iron and steel, and dry bulk cargoes (requiring fewer,



Passenger Terminal in a Multipurpose Structure

generally smaller terminals than containerized cargo), and the continued surplus of break-bulk terminals expected as general cargo is increasingly containerized or handled at combination container/break-bulk terminals.

d. There are enough shoreline sites to accommodate currently projected cargo growth to the year 2020, with a minimum of Bay filling. However, to do so, new terminals must be built at the most suitable sites, Bay fill for new terminals must be minimized to conform to the provisions of the McAteer-Petris Act, the efficiency of existing and new terminals must continue to increase and all of the available sites must be reserved for terminals. This will require careful coordination of port development with other shoreline uses, local government protection of sufficient port lands to accommodate port-related uses and terminal back land expansions, redevelopment of some existing terminals and industry for new terminals, and deepening channels where it would increase the efficiency of existing terminals.

e. If some ports in the regional system do not have the funds necessary to complete facilities needed by the region, a regional agency may be required to finance or develop them. Otherwise, there will be tremendous pressure to allow the ports with the strongest finances to provide all of the regional facilities, even though this might result in pressures to fill the Bay unnecessarily.

f. No single port agency is responsible for coordinated planning and development of Bay port terminals. In the absence of a seaport plan for the Bay Area, there is a risk that new port facilities could be built by whichever individual port can command the necessary financing even though another site might serve regional needs equally well but with less Bay filling. In addition, a major investment by one publicly-operated port could be jeopardized by the unnecessarily duplicating actions of another publicly-operated Bay Area port. And, of particular importance to proper use of the Bay, parts of the Bay could be filled, and shoreline areas taken, for unnecessarily competing port uses.

To minimize these risks and to coordinate the planning and development of Bay port terminals, the San Francisco Bay Area Seaport Plan has been developed.

g. Bay Area ports are not supported completely by revenues from shipping, but also derive revenues from other uses of port-owned property.

Policies

1. Port planning and development should be governed by the policies of the Seaport Plan and other applicable policies of the Bay Plan. The Seaport Plan provides for:

a. Expansion and/or redevelopment of port facilities at Alameda, Benicia, Oakland, Redwood City, Richmond, San Francisco, and Selby;

b. Further deepening of ship channels needed to accommodate expected growth in ship size and improve terminal productivity;

c. The maintenance of up-to-date cargo forecasts and existing cargo handling capability estimates to guide the permitting of port terminals; and

d. Development of port facilities with the least potential adverse environmental impacts while still providing for reasonable terminal development.

2. Some filling and dredging will be required to provide for necessary port expansion, but any permitted fill or dredging should be in accord with the Seaport Plan.

3. Port priority use areas should be protected for marine terminals and directly-related ancillary activities such as container freight stations, transit sheds and other temporary storage, ship repairing, support transportation uses including trucking and railroad yards, freight forwarders, government offices related to the port activity, chandlers and marine services. Other uses, especially public access and public and commercial recreational development, should also be permissible uses provided they do not significantly impair the efficient utilization of the port area.

Airports

Findings and policies concerning Airports on the Bay

Findings

a. The shoreline of the Bay is a favored location for airports because the Bay provides an open space for takeoffs and landings away from populated areas. A Bayshore location is also conveniently close to present population centers.

b. The introduction of larger and faster aircraft has caused rapid rises in passenger volume and has made air transportation of cargo increasingly economical. Further sharp increases in passenger and cargo volume may be expected.

c. The growth of aviation in the Bay Area will require additional land area for (1) expansion of terminals, (2) aircraft operating, loading, and parking, (3) automobile parking, (4) surface transportation routes linking airports with major population centers, and (5) cargo storage. In addition, land near airports will be sought by industries that ship large quantities of products by air, and by warehousing concerns and others heavily dependent on air commerce.

d. Effective, long-term operation of airports requires that a buffer zone be created to keep tall buildings and residential areas at some distance from aircraft operations.

e. The aviation needs of the Bay Area are regional in extent, and effective planning to provide for the growth of aviation can only be done on a comprehensive, regional basis.

Policies

1. To enable the Bay Area to have adequate airport facilities, and to minimize the harmful effects of airport expansion upon the Bay, a regional airport system plan should be prepared at the earliest possible time by a responsible regional agency. The study should have the full participation of all governmental agencies having region-wide planning responsibilities and all other agencies, including private groups, having a substantial interest in the Bay Area's present or future aviation needs and facilities. The plan should include as a minimum:

a. An analysis of expected air traffic in the Bay Area, by types—commercial, military, and general (small plane).

b. An analysis of alternative sites for building new airports or expanding present ones, taking into account the effect of each site on the surrounding environment.

c. An analysis of the surface transportation necessary to serve the alternative sites for future airports.

d. An analysis of the effects of new airports upon the location of jobs and homes within the Bay Area.

2. Pending completion of a comprehensive airport system plan, and recognizing that various classes of airports must be included in any plan for the region or the Bay, it is assumed that:

a. A system of **reliever airports** will be created throughout the region instead of one or two very large facilities. Some short-range traffic (500 miles or less, e.g., San Francisco-Los Angeles), which is a major portion of total air carrier traffic, will be diverted to reliever airports, and improved ground and air transportation links will be provided among the airports in the system. Under this concept, it is assumed that San Francisco and Oakland International Airports will continue to service most long-distance flights and that pressures for continued expansion of these airports can be reduced by diverting a portion of the short-range and general aviation traffic to reliever airports in such cities as San Jose, Santa Rosa, and Napa.

It is assumed that three years will be needed to complete an adequate regional airport system plan, and as many as five to seven years thereafter to build facilities proposed in the plan. Therefore, pending completion of the comprehensive airport system plan, capital investment in, and any Bay filling for, major airports in the Bay region should be limited to improvements needed within the next 10 years (i.e., before 1979).

b. Airports for **general aviation** can and should be at inland sites whenever possible. New airports for this purpose should be constructed away from the Bay; Bayshore sites and Bay filling should be allowed only if there is no feasible alternative. Expansion of existing general aviation airports should be permitted on Bay fill only if no feasible alternative is available.


c. **Heliports** may in some instances need to be located on the shores of the Bay to be close to a traffic center with minimum noise interference. In general, existing piers should be used for this purpose and new piers, floats,

or fill should be permitted only if it is demonstrated that no feasible alternative is available.

3. Airports on the shores of the Bay should be permitted to include within their premises terminals for passengers, cargo, and general aviation; parking and supporting transportation facilities; and ancillary activities such as aircraft maintenance bases that are necessary to the airport operation. Airport-oriented industries (those using air transportation for the movement of goods and personnel or providing services to airport users) may be located within airports designated in the Bay Plan if they cannot feasibly be located elsewhere, but no fill should be permitted to provide space for these industries directly or indirectly.

4. If some airports in the regional system do not have the funds necessary to complete facilities needed by the region, a regional agency may be required to finance or develop them. Otherwise, there will be tremendous pressure to allow the airports with the strongest finances to provide all of the regional facilities, even though this might result in unnecessary filling of the Bay.


5. To enable airports to operate without additional Bay filling, tall buildings and residential areas should be kept from interfering with aircraft operations. The Commission should prevent incompatible developments within its area of jurisdiction around the shoreline.



Levee Scene

tramway or narrow road
Hiking & Horse trail

Levee Details Salt Pond Levee (Strengthened) Slough



Salt Ponds

Slough

Marina

Salt Pond

Bay Channel

Bayside Park In South Bay Salt Pond Area

Recreation

Findings and policies concerning Recreation on and around the Bay

Findings

a. In 1963, only about four miles of the approximately 1,000-mile Bay shoreline were being used for waterfront parks. Since then, increased interest in the Bay has resulted in development of additional parks, marinas, and other forms of water-oriented recreation. But the full recreational potential of the Bay has by no means been reached.

b. The demand for recreational facilities, including parks, marinas, launching ramps, fishing piers and beaches, in the Bay Area will increase even more rapidly than the population increases, and will be accelerated if the work week shortens and spending power per capita increases. Many more recreational facilities will be needed.

c. Planning for park uses along the Bay and shoreline should anticipate needs as far into the future as possible. For parks, there is no practical estimate of the acreage that should be provided on the shoreline of the Bay, but it is assumed the largest possible portion of the total regional requirement should be provided adjacent to the Bay. All sites near the Bay that may be needed for parks in the future should be reserved now; otherwise, most of this land will have been taken for other uses by the time it is needed. At the present time, 50 years appears to be the farthest into the future that needs can be projected reasonably, so park needs to the year 2020 should be considered.

d. Boating allows residents to take advantage of the unique opportunities provided by the Bay. As of July, 1981, the Commission had authorized approximately 6,500 new berths, bringing the regional total to approximately 19,200 berths. Additional berths and launching ramps will be needed in the future. Some locations are unsuitable for marinas or launching facilities because of high rates of sedimentation, valuable habitat, and insufficient upland for support facilities.

e. A major supplement to parks, marinas, and other forms of water-oriented recreation are the several areas of water-oriented commercial recreation and public assembly that have been developed around the Bay, such as the Ghirardelli Square-Fisherman's Wharf-Northern

Waterfront area in San Francisco, Jack London Square in Oakland, and the downtown waterfronts of Sausalito and Tiburon.

f. Additional commercial recreation and public assembly are desirable uses of the shoreline if they permit large numbers of persons to have direct and enjoyable access to the Bay. These uses can often be provided by private development at little or no direct cost to the public.

Policies

1. As the population of the Bay Region increases, more people will use their leisure time in water-oriented recreational activities. Water-oriented recreation facilities such as marinas, launch ramps, beaches, and fishing piers should be provided to meet those needs. For parks, there is no practical estimate of the acreage that should be provided on the shoreline of the Bay, but it is assumed the largest possible portion of the total regional requirement should be provided adjacent to the Bay.

2. The Commission should also allow additional marinas, boat-launching lanes, and fishing piers elsewhere on the Bay, provided they would not preempt land or water areas needed for other priority uses and provided they would be feasible from an engineering viewpoint, would not have significant adverse effects on water quality and circulation, would not result in inadequate flushing, would not destroy valuable marshes or mudflats, and would not harm identified valuable fish and wildlife resources.

3. The Bay Plan maps include about 5,000 acres of existing shoreline parks and 5,800 acres of new parks on the waterfront. In addition, 4,400 acres of military establishments (especially around the Golden Gate) are proposed as parks if and when military use is terminated.

4. The following general standards have been used in determining locations for each type of recreational facility (and should be used as a guide in allowing additional ones):

a. **General.** Each type of facility should be well distributed around the shores of the Bay to the extent consistent with more specific criteria below. Any concentrations of facilities should generally be as close to major population centers as is feasible. Recreational facilities should not preempt sites needed for ports, waterfront industry, or airports, but efforts should be made to integrate recreation into such facilities to the extent they might be compatible.

Different types of compatible public and commercial recreational facilities should be clustered to the extent feasible to permit joint use of ancillary facilities and provide greater range of choice for users.

b. **Marinas.** (1) Marinas should be allowed at any suitable site on the Bay. Unsuitable sites are those that tend to fill up rapidly with sediment; have insufficient upland; contain valuable marsh, mud flat, or other wildlife habitat; or are subject to unusual amounts of fog. At suitable sites, the Commission should encourage new marinas, particularly those that result in the creation of new open water through the excavation of areas not part of the Bay and not containing valuable wetlands. (2) Fill should be permitted for marina facilities that must be in or over the Bay, such as breakwaters, shoreline protection, berths, ramps, launching facilities, pump-out and fuel docks, and short-term unloading areas. Fill for marina support facilities may be permitted at sites with difficult land configurations provided that the fill in the Bay is the minimum necessary and any unavoidable loss of Bay habitat, surface area, or volume is offset to the maximum extent feasible, preferably at or near the site. (3) No new marina or expansion of any existing marina should be approved unless water quality and circulation will be adequately protected and, if possible, improved. (4) In addition, all projects approved should provide public amenities such as viewing areas, restrooms and public parking; substantial physical and visual access; and maintenance for all facilities. Frequent dredging should be avoided.

c. **Launching Lanes.** (1) Launching lanes should be placed where wind and water conditions would be most favorable for smaller boats. (2) Some launching lanes should be located near prime fishing areas and others near calm, clear water suitable for waterskiing. (3) Additional launching facilities should be located around the Bay shoreline, especially where there are few existing facilities. These facilities should be available free or at moderate cost. Launching facilities should include adequate car and trailer parking, restrooms and public access. (4) In marinas, launching facilities should be encouraged where there is adequate upland to provide needed support facilities. (5) Fill for ramps into the water, docks and similar facilities should be permitted. Other fill should not be permitted.

d. Fishing piers should not block navigation channels, nor interfere with normal tidal flow.

e. Beach sites. (1) Beaches for swimming and sun-bathing should generally be in warm areas protected from the wind. (2) Some new beaches could be planned adjacent to power plants or other industrial plants that warm the nearby waters as they discharge heated water that has been used to cool industrial machinery.

f. Water-oriented commercial-recreational establishments, such as restaurants, specialty shops, theaters, and amusements, should be encouraged in urban areas adjacent to the Bay. Some suggested locations for this type of activity are indicated on the Plan maps. Effort should be made to link commercial recreation centers (and major shoreline parks) by a fleet of small, inexpensive ferries similar to those operating on some European lakes and rivers.

5. Features to be included. To assure optimum use of the Bay for recreation, the following facilities should be encouraged in shoreside parks and in or near yacht harbors or commercial ferryboat facilities.

a. In shoreside parks. (1) Where possible, parks should provide some camping facilities accessible by boat, and docking and picnic facilities for boaters. (2) To capitalize on the attractiveness of their Bayfront location, parks should emphasize hiking, bicycling and riding trails, picnic facilities, viewpoints, beaches, and fishing facilities. Recreational facilities that do not need a waterfront location, e.g., golf courses and playing fields, should generally be placed inland, but may be permitted in shoreline areas if they are part of a park complex that is primarily devoted to water-oriented uses. (3) Where shoreline open space includes areas used for hunting waterbirds, public areas for launching rowboats should be provided so long as they do not result in overuse of the hunting area. (4) Public launching facilities for a variety of boats should be provided in shoreside parks where feasible. (5) Where open areas include ecological reserves, access via catwalk or other means should be provided for nature study to the extent that such access does not excessively disturb the natural habitat. (6) Limited commercial recreation facilities, such as small restaurants, should be permitted within waterfront parks provided they are clearly incidental to the park use, are in keeping with the basic character of the park, and do not obstruct public access to and enjoyment of the Bay. Limited commercial development may be appropriate (at the option of the park agency responsible) in all parks shown on the Plan maps except where there is a specific note to the contrary.

b. In or near yacht harbors or commercial ferryboat facilities, private boatels and restaurants should be encouraged where adequate shoreline land is available. Public docks for visiting boaters should be provided where feasible in order to give public access from the water.

c. Access to marinas, launch ramps, beaches, fishing piers and other recreation facilities should be clearly signed and easily available from parking reserved for the public or from public streets.


6. All the waterfront land needed for waterfront parks and beaches by the year 2020 should be reserved now, because delay may mean that needed shoreline will otherwise be preempted for other uses. However, recreational facilities need not be built all at once; their development can proceed in accordance with recreational demand over the years.

7. In addition to the major recreational facilities indicated on the Plan maps, public access should be included wherever feasible in any shoreline development, as described in the policies for Public Access to the Bay. That policy is intended to result in much more access to the Bay than can be provided by public parks alone, especially in urban areas, and to encourage private development of the shoreline.


8. Further study should be given to the feasibility of dredging a network of channels paralleling the shoreline in shallow areas, for use by small boats and recreational ferries. Channels could open up large areas, particularly in the South Bay and San Pablo Bay, for recreational boating, could make possible the development of marinas and launching lanes at more frequent intervals, and could add visual interest to shoreline areas. In addition, the channels could separate marshes and mudflats from dry land, thus enhancing the wildlife value of these areas.

9. To enhance the appearance of shoreline areas, and to permit maximum public use of the shores and waters of the Bay, flood control projects should be carefully designed and landscaped and, whenever possible, should provide for recreational uses of channels and banks.


10. Because of the need to increase the recreational opportunities available to Bay Area residents, small amounts of Bay filling may be allowed for shoreline parks and recreational areas that provide substantial public benefits and that cannot be developed without some filling.



Commercial Recreation at Waterfront



1 Ferry Stop at Waterfront Park



2 Ferry Stop in an Urban Area

Transportation

Findings and policies concerning transportation on and around the Bay

Findings

a. At present, there is no regional coordination of all the means of moving people and goods that make up the total transportation system of the Bay Area. Transportation planning for the Bay Area is divided among highway agencies, transit agencies, planning agencies, and regulatory agencies. The only comprehensive transportation planning agency in the Bay region is the Bay Area Transportation Study Commission, which was created by the State Legislature and which will present its transportation plans in early 1969.

b. Primary emphasis in recent years has been placed on freeways, which in some instances have been built on fill in the Bay because acceptable routes could not be found ashore. Little attention has been given in recent years to using the waters of the Bay for modern boat transportation.

Massive use of the automobile during a time of rapid population growth in the Bay Area endangers the environment both because of the air pollutants emitted by automobiles and because of the space required by automobiles for roadways and for parking.

d. Primary reliance on the automobile for surface transportation in the Bay Area means further pressures to use the Bay as a route for future freeways. Therefore, a primary goal of transportation planning, from the point of view of preserving and properly using the Bay, should be substantial reduction in dependence on the automobile. While the private car will still be needed and used for many types of travel, the goal should be development of new systems of transportation that can carry large volumes of people and goods without damaging the environment of the Bay Area.

Policies

1. The Bay represents a great but, at present, little-used resource for transportation within the region. New types of water barges may be able to move trucks and freight from point to point within the region at low cost and without adding to surface congestion. Also, a system of modern ferries (capable of high speeds with minimum noise and

waves) may be able to provide service between major traffic generators (e.g., between downtowns, or between downtowns and airports) and eventually to provide scheduled service from one end of the Bay to the other for both commuting and pleasure use. The Bay Plan maps indicate possible sites for commuter ferry terminals and shallow-draft ports.

2. Because of the continuing vulnerability of the Bay to filling for freeways, an effective program should be created to develop, test, and inaugurate new methods of transportation within the Bay Area. This should be undertaken by a regional transportation agency, preferably one that is part of a limited regional government.

3. If any additional freeway or bridge route is proposed in or across the Bay other than those indicated on the Bay Plan maps, adequate research and testing should determine whether new methods of transportation could overcome the particular congestion problem without a route in the Bay and, if not, whether a tunnel beneath the Bay is at all feasible.

4. If a route must be located over the Bay, the following provisions should apply:

a. The freeway or other crossing should be placed on bridge-like structures, not on fill.

b. Structures should provide adequate clearance for commercial ships, Navy ships, and pleasure boats to have uninterrupted passage at all times.

c. Toll plazas, service yards, or other ancillary features should be located on new fill only if there is no feasible alternative.

d. To provide maximum ultimate capacity on any new major facility that is allowed over the Bay (and thus to minimize the number that might have to be allowed in the Bay), the design of the structures should anticipate future mass transit facilities (unless they are adequately paralleled by such facilities) and subsequent installation of automatic power and guidance elements for vehicles.

Salt Ponds and Other Managed Wetlands

Findings and policies concerning Salt Ponds and Other Managed Wetlands

Findings

a. Salt ponds total some 36,000 acres in the South Bay and some 10,000 acres in the North Bay. About 4,200 acres of salt ponds have been removed from salt production and are now being converted into the Redwood Shores community, which will ultimately house some 60,000 persons.

b. The salt ponds are an economically important and productive use of the waters of the Bay (for extracting salt), and the salt is an important raw material for the Bay Area chemical industry.

c. The ponds provide 15 percent of the total Bay and pond water surface. This large pond surface area supplements the water surface of the Bay and thus helps to moderate the Bay Area climate and to prevent smog.

d. The ponds are used as a habitat by shore birds.

e. More than 50,000 acres of managed marshland, adjacent to the Bay but diked off from it, are maintained as duck hunting preserves, game refuges, and occasionally as farming areas. In most of these areas, tide gates permit occasional intakes of Bay water.

f. The diked marshlands are as important to wildlife as the tidal marshes. Substantial further diminution would result in a proportionate reduction in the amount of wildlife the Bay system can support.

g. The ponds and other wetlands provide some of the open space character of the Bay.

Policies

1. As long as is economically feasible, the salt ponds should be maintained in salt production and the wetlands should be maintained in their present use. Property tax policy should assure that rising property taxes do not force conversion of the ponds and other wetlands to urban development. In addition, the integrity of the salt production system should be re-

spected (i.e., public agencies should not take for other projects any pond or portion of a pond that is a vital part of the production system).

2. If, despite these provisions, the owner of the salt ponds or the owner of any managed wetland desires to withdraw any of the ponds or marshes from their present uses, the public should make every effort to buy these lands, breach the existing dikes, and reopen these areas to the Bay. This type of purchase should have a high priority for any public funds available, because opening ponds and managed wetlands to the Bay represents man's last substantial opportunity to enlarge the Bay rather than shrink it. (In some cases, if salt ponds are opened to the Bay, new dikes will have to be built on the landward side of the ponds to provide the flood control protection now being provided by the salt pond dikes.)

3. If public funds do not permit purchase of *all* the salt ponds or marshes proposed for withdrawal from their present uses, and if some of the ponds or marshes are therefore proposed for development, consideration of the development should be guided by the following criteria:

a. Just as dedication of streets, parks, etc., is customary in the planned unit development and subdivision laws of many local governments, dedication of some of the pond or marsh areas as open water can and should be required as part of any development. Highest priority to such dedication should be given to ponds that (1) would, if opened to the Bay, significantly improve water circulation, (2) have especially high wildlife values, or (3) have high potential for water-oriented recreation.

b. Depending on the amount of pond or marsh area to be dedicated as open water, the public may wish to purchase additional areas. Plans to purchase any ponds or marshes should give first consideration to the priorities in paragraph a. above.

c. Development of the ponds or marshes should provide for retaining substantial amounts of open water, should provide for substantial public access to the Bay, and should be in accord with the Bay Plan policies for non-priority uses of the shoreline.

4. As soon as possible, recreational developments such as marinas and small parks should be built in appropriate areas outboard of the present salt ponds, or in sloughs; but these developments should in no way jeopardize the salt production system or be so located as to prevent opening of ponds to the Bay at any future time.

5. The Commission should study the possibility of public purchase of "development rights" to the ponds. If these rights were bought by the public, the owner of the ponds would remain fully able to continue using them for salt production but would not be able to fill the ponds for urban development. Similar study should be given to acquisition of "development rights" to the duck clubs and other diked wetlands, to continue them in their present uses.

Public Access

Findings and policies concerning Public Access to the Bay

Findings

a. San Francisco Bay is a dominant feature of the nine county Bay Area. It provides an environment for numerous forms of public enjoyment including viewing, photography, nature study, fishing, wading, walking, bicycling, and jogging, or just sitting beside the water. As an outstanding visual resource, the Bay is an important focal point for the entire region that serves to orient people to its various parts.

b. Public access required by the Commission usually consists of pedestrian access to and along the shoreline and beaches of San Francisco Bay. It may include certain improvements, such as paving, landscaping, and street furniture; and it may allow for additional uses, such as bicycling, fishing, picknicking, nature education, etc. Visual access to the Bay is a critical part of public access. The Design Review Board was formed in 1970 of professional designers to advise the Commission on the adequacy of public access of proposed projects in accordance with the Bay Plan.

c. Although public access to the approximately 1000-mile Bay shoreline has increased significantly since the adoption of the Bay Plan in 1968, there is still only a small part of the shoreline open to the public. The full potential for access to the Bay, particularly along urban waterfronts, has by no means yet been reached.

d. Public agencies have contributed to improved Bay access by providing a substantial number of the parks shown in the Bay Plan maps. In addition, many agencies and communities continue to examine the waterfronts in their jurisdictions and have proposed new points of public access to the Bay. However, other demands for governmental services will necessarily limit funds for the provision of shoreline access by these agencies. Clearly, additional public access to the Bay is needed, and this can be provided, in part at least, by private capital in a wide variety of shoreline developments.

e. Although opportunities for views of the Bay from public access areas have increased since the Bay Plan was adopted in 1968, there are still a significant number of shoreline areas where there exists little or no visual access to the Bay.

f. Public access areas obtained through the permit process are most utilized if they provide physical access, provide connections to public rights-of-way, are related to adjacent uses, are designed, improved, and maintained clearly to indicate their public character, and provide visual access to the Bay.

g. In some cases, certain uses may unduly conflict with accompanying public access. For example, uncontrolled public access may adversely impact sensitive wildlife areas, or some port or water-related industrial activities may pose a substantial hazard to public access users.

Policies

1. In addition to the public access to the Bay provided by waterfront parks, beaches, marinas, and fishing piers, maximum feasible access to and along the waterfront and on any permitted fills should be provided in and through every new development in the Bay or on the shoreline, whether it be for housing, industry, port, airport, public facility, or other use, except in cases where public access is clearly inconsistent with the project because of public safety considerations or significant use conflicts. In these cases, access at other locations, preferably near the project, should be provided whenever feasible.


2. Public access to some natural areas should be provided to permit study and enjoyment of these areas (e.g., by boardwalks or piers in or adjacent to some sloughs or marshes). However, some wildlife habitats may be sensitive to human intrusion. For this reason, projects in such areas should be carefully evaluated in consultation with appropriate agencies to determine the appropriate location and type of access to be provided.

3. Whenever public access to the Bay is provided as a condition of development, on fill or on the shoreline, the access should be permanently guaranteed. This should be done wherever appropriate by requiring dedication of fee title or easements at no cost to the public, in the same manner that streets, park sites, and school sites are dedicated to the public as part of the subdivision process in cities and counties.


4. Public access improvements provided as a condition of any approval should be consistent with the project and the physical environment, including protection of natural resources, and provide for the public's safety and convenience. The improvements should be designed and built to encourage diverse Bay-related activities and movement to and along the shoreline, should permit barrier-free access for the physically handicapped to the maximum feasible extent, should include an ongoing maintenance program, and should be identified with appropriate signs.

5. In some areas, a small amount of fill may be allowed if the fill is necessary—and is the minimum absolutely required—to develop the project in accordance with the Commission's public access requirements.

6. Access to the waterfront should be provided by walkways, trails, or other appropriate means and connect to the nearest public thoroughfare where convenient parking or public transportation may be available.



1 Industries Requiring Direct Water Access




2 Industries Not Requiring Direct Water Access
Public Access to the Bay in Industrial Areas

7. Roads near the edge of the water should be designed as scenic parkways for slow-moving, principally recreational, traffic. The roadway and right-of-way design should maintain and enhance visual access for the traveler, discourage through traffic, and provide for safe, separated, and improved physical access to and along the shore. Public transit use and connections to the shoreline should be encouraged where appropriate.

8. Federal, state, regional and local jurisdictions, special districts, and the Commission should cooperate to provide new public access, especially to link the entire series of shoreline parks and existing public access areas to the extent feasible without additional Bay filling or adversely affecting natural resources. State, regional and local agencies that approve projects should assure that provisions for public access to and along the shoreline are included as conditions of approval, and that the access is consistent with the Commission's requirements and Guidelines.

9. The Public Access Supplement to the Bay Plan should be used as a guide in determining whether a project provides maximum feasible public access. The Design Review Board should advise the Commission regarding the adequacy of the public access proposed.



**Walkways for Wildlife Observation
in Marsh and Shallow Water Areas**

Appearance, Design and Scenic Views

Findings and policies concerning Appearance, Design, and Scenic Views of Development around the Bay

Findings

- a. Much too often, shoreline developments have not taken advantage of the magnificent setting provided by the Bay. Some shoreline developments are of poor quality or are inappropriate to a waterfront location. These include uses such as parking lots and some industrial structures, which neither visually complement the Bay nor take advantage of a waterfront location. Over time, existing shoreline development of poor quality and inappropriate uses will be phased out or up-graded by normal market forces and by public action, or by a combination of both.
- b. Unsightly debris, such as plastic bottles, old tires, and other refuse continues to mar the appearance of the shoreline, particularly of marshes, mudflats, and sloughs.
- c. The appearance of the Bay, and people's enjoyment of it as a scenic resource, contribute to the enjoyment of daily life in the Bay Area. As a special kind of open space, the Bay acts as both the unifying element of the entire Bay region and as a physical divider of its parts. The wide surface of the Bay, and the distant vistas it affords, offer relief from the crowded, often chaotic, urbanized scene and help to create a sense of psychological well-being.
- d. Probably the most widely enjoyed "use" of the Bay is simply viewing it— from the shoreline, from the water and from afar. For example: a Bay view can add substantially to the value of a home, office, or apartment building in San Francisco and other Bayside communities. Also, the Bay is a major visitor attraction for the tourist industry.
- e. As a world-renowned scenic resource, the Bay is viewed and appreciated from many locations in the region. However, advantage has not been taken of the scenic view potential from the hills and other inland locations surrounding the Bay, often because of poor road and street layout and poorly located buildings or landscaping. While some jurisdictions

have adopted controls on building heights and locations, there is still no general attention to maximizing views from streets and roads and to obtaining public view areas. In particular, along many urban waterfronts, man-made obstructions such as buildings, parking lots, utility lines, fences, billboards and even landscaping have eliminated or severely diminished views of the Bay and shoreline.

f. One of the visual attractions of San Francisco Bay is its abundance of wildlife, particularly birds which are constantly moving around the Bay waters, marshes, and mudflats in search of food and refuge.

Policies

1. To enhance the visual quality of development around the Bay and to take maximum advantage of the attractive setting it provides, the shores of the Bay should be developed in accordance with the Public Access Design Guidelines and the General Development Guide.
2. All Bayfront development should be designed to enhance the pleasure of the user or viewer of the Bay. Maximum efforts should be made to provide, enhance, or preserve views of the Bay and shoreline, especially from public areas, from the Bay itself, and from the opposite shore. To this end, planning of waterfront development should include participation by professionals who are knowledgeable of BCDC's concerns such as landscape architects, urban designers, or architects, working in conjunction with engineers and professionals in other fields.
3. In some areas, a small amount of fill may be allowed if the fill is necessary—and is the minimum absolutely required—to develop the project in accordance with the Commission's design recommendations.
4. Structures and facilities that do not take advantage of or visually complement the Bay should be located and designed so as not to impact visually on the Bay and shoreline. In particular, parking areas should be located away from the shoreline. However, some small parking areas for fishing access and Bay viewing may be allowed in exposed locations.
5. To enhance the maritime atmosphere of the Bay Area, ports should be designed, whenever feasible, to permit public access and viewing of port activities by means of (a) view points (e.g., piers, platforms, or towers), restaurants, etc., that would not interfere with port operations, and (b) openings between buildings and other site designs that permit views from nearby roads.
6. Additional bridges over the Bay should be avoided, to the extent possible, to preserve the visual impact of the large expanse of the Bay. The design of new crossings deemed necessary should relate to others nearby and should be located between promontories or other land forms that naturally suggest themselves as connections reaching across the Bay (but without destroying the obvious character of the promontory). New or remodeled bridges across the Bay should be designed to permit maximum viewing of the Bay and its surroundings by both motorists and pedestrians. Guard rails and bridge supports should be designed with views in mind.
7. Access routes to Bay crossings should be designed so as to orient the traveler to the Bay (as in the main approaches to the Golden Gate Bridge). Similar consideration should be given to the design of highway and mass transit routes paralleling the Bay (by providing frequent views of the Bay, if possible, so the traveler knows which way he is moving in relation to the Bay). Guardrails, fences, landscaping, and other structures related to such routes should be designed and located so as to maintain and to take advantage of Bay views. New or rebuilt roads in the hills above the Bay and in areas along the shores of the Bay should be constructed as scenic parkways in order to take full advantage of the commanding views of the Bay.
8. Shoreline developments should be build in clusters, leaving open area around them, to permit more frequent views of the Bay. Developments along the shores of tributary waterways should be Bay-related and should be designed to preserve and enhance views along the waterway, so as to provide maximum visual contact with the Bay.
9. "Unnatural" debris should be removed from sloughs, marshes, and mudflats that are retained as part of the ecological system. Sloughs, marshes, and mudflats should be restored to their former natural state if they have been despoiled by human activities.
10. Towers, bridges, or other structures near or over the Bay should be designed as landmarks that suggest the location of the waterfront when it is not visible, especially in flat areas. But such landmarks should be low enough to assure the continued visual dominance of the hills around the Bay.
11. In areas of the Bay where oil and gas drilling or production platforms are permitted, they should be treated or screened, including derrick removal, so they will be compatible with the surrounding open water, mudflat, marsh, or shore area.

12. In order to achieve a high level of design quality, the Commission's Design Review Board, composed of design and planning professionals, should review, evaluate and advise the Commission on the proposed design of developments that affect the appearance of the Bay in accordance with the Bay Plan Findings and Policies on Public Access, Appearance, Design and Scenic Views; the General Development Guide; and the Public Access Design Guidelines. City, county, regional, state and federal agencies should be guided in their evaluation of Bayfront projects by the above guidelines.

13. Local governments should be encouraged to eliminate inappropriate shoreline uses and poor quality shoreline conditions by regulation and by public actions (including development financed wholly or partly by public funds). The Commission should assist in this regard to the maximum feasible extent by providing advice on Bay-related appearance and design issues, and by coordinating the activities of the various agencies that may be involved with projects affecting the Bay and its appearance.


14. Views of the Bay from vista points, from roads, and from other areas should be maintained by appropriate arrangements and heights of all developments and landscaping between the view areas and the water. In this regard, particular attention should be given to all waterfront locations, areas below vista points, and areas along roads that provide good views of the Bay for travelers, particularly areas below roads coming over ridges and providing a "first view" of the Bay (shown in Plan Map 2, Proposed Major Uses of the Bay and Shoreline).

15. Vista points should be provided in the general locations indicated in the Plan maps. Access to vista points should be provided by walkways, trails, or other appropriate means and connect to the nearest public thoroughfare where parking or public transportation is available. In some cases, exhibits, museums, or markers would be desirable at vista points to explain the value or importance of the areas being viewed.



Residential Area on Hilly Site

Residential Area on Flat Site



Public Access to the Bay

Other Uses of the Bay and Shoreline

Findings and policies concerning Other Uses of the Bay and Shoreline

Findings

a. In addition to the foregoing uses of the Bay and its shores, there are at present many others including:

- Housing
- Public facilities (prisons, military installations, etc.)
- Public utilities (power transmission lines, pipelines, etc.)
- Industry not related to the Bay
- Recreation facilities not related to the Bay
- Commercial facilities not related to the Bay
- Refuse disposal sites

b. Some uses of the shore take no advantage of the water as an asset, and some current uses abuse and despoil the water frontage.

Policies

1. Shore areas not proposed to be reserved for a priority use should be used for any purpose (acceptable to the local government having jurisdiction) that uses the Bay as an asset and in no way affects the Bay adversely. This means any use that does not adversely affect enjoyment of the Bay and its shoreline by residents, employees, and visitors within the site area itself or within adjacent areas of the Bay or shoreline.

2. Accessory structures such as boat docks and portions of a principal structure may extend on piles over the water when such extension is necessary to enable actual use of the water, e.g. for mooring boats, or to use the Bay as an asset in the design of the structure, only if such structure would not adversely impact sensitive wildlife habitats or public access.

3. Wherever waterfront areas are used for housing, (a) the amount of shoreline and the surface area of the Bay should be increased to the maximum extent feasible by dredging additional channels inland from the Bay, and (b) whenever feasible, high densities should be encouraged to provide the advantages of waterfront housing to larger numbers of people. Houseboats (floating homes useable as year-round residences) may be

permitted in some areas of the Bay provided the boats (a) would not adversely affect the ecology of the Bay, (b) would not cause a harmful amount of sedimentation, (c) would either be connected to a shoreline sewage treatment system or have on-board treatment facilities acceptable to public health and water quality control agencies, (d) would require no fill except for a pedestrian walk on pilings, and (e) would be acceptable to local governments having jurisdiction over the areas in question.

4. High voltage transmission lines should be placed in the Bay only when there is no reasonable alternative. Whenever high voltage transmission lines must be placed in the Bay or in shoreline areas:

- a. New routes should avoid interfering with scenic views and with wildlife, to the greatest extent possible.
- b. The most pleasing tower and pole design possible should be used.

High voltage transmission lines should be placed underground as soon as this is technically and economically feasible.

5. Power distribution and telephone lines should either be placed underground (or in an attractive combination of underground lines with streamlined overhead facilities) in any new residential, commercial, public, or view area near the shores of the Bay.

6. Whenever waterfront areas are used for sewage treatment or waste water reclamation plants, the plants should be located where they do not interfere with, and are not incompatible with, residential, recreational, or other public uses of the Bay and shoreline.


7. New AM and short-wave radio transmitters may be placed in marsh or other natural areas. Whenever possible, however, consolidation of transmitting towers should be encouraged.

8. Desalinization and power plants may be located in any area where they do not interfere with and are not incompatible with residential, recreational, or other public uses of the Bay and shoreline, provided that any pollution problems resulting from the discharge of large amounts of heated brine into Bay waters, and water vapor into the atmosphere, can be precluded.

9. Pipeline terminal and distribution facilities near the Bay should generally be located in industrial areas but may be located elsewhere if they do not interfere with, and are not incompatible with, residential, recreational, or other public uses of the Bay and shoreline.

10. To eliminate any further demand to fill any part of the Bay solely for refuse disposal sites, new waste disposal systems should be developed; these systems should combine economical disposition with minimum consumption of land. Pending development of new waste disposal systems, immediate waste disposal problems should be solved through full utilization of existing dump sites and through development of new dump sites, if needed, in acceptable inland locations.

11. Types of development that could not use the Bay as an asset (and therefore should not be allowed in shoreline areas) include: (a) refuse disposal (except as it may be found to be suitable for an approved fill), (b) use of deteriorated structures for low-rent storage or other non-water related purposes, and (c) junkyards.



Part V

Carrying Out the Plan

The San Francisco Bay Plan

The San Francisco Bay Plan was completed and adopted by the San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission in 1968 and was transmitted to the California Legislature and the Governor in 1969. In those actions the Commission completed the original charge given to it in the provisions of the McAteer-Petris Act of 1965. That Act created the Commission and mandated its study of the Bay and the preparation and submittal of a final report to the California Legislature in 1969. The Commission's final report, the San Francisco Bay Plan, covered the following matters as specifically required by the law:

- (a) The results of the Commission's detailed study of the Bay;
- (b) The comprehensive plan adopted by the Commission for the conservation of the water of San Francisco Bay and the development of its shoreline;
- (c) The Commission's recommendation of the appropriate agency to maintain and carry out the Bay Plan;
- (d) The Commission's estimate of the approximate amount of money that would be required to maintain and carry out the provisions of the Plan for the Bay;
- (e) Other information and recommendations the Commission deemed desirable.

The California Legislature received and acted upon the Commission's report and recommendations in 1969. The revised McAteer-Petris Act, adopted by the Legislature and signed into law by the Governor, designated the Commission as the agency responsible for maintaining and carrying out the provisions of the law and the Bay Plan for the maintenance and protection of San Francisco Bay. The San Francisco Bay Plan was designated as the Commission's Plan for the Bay until otherwise ordered by the Legislature. The Commission may amend the Bay Plan from time to time so long as the changes are consistent with the findings and declarations of policy in the law. Consistent with that provision, the Commission has adopted a number of amendments to the Bay Plan Policies and Maps and such amendments to date have been incorporated in this document. The McAteer-Petris Act also specified the composition of the Commission, the scope of its authority and the area of its jurisdiction over San Francisco Bay and the shoreline. Since 1969 the Legislature has amended the McAteer-Petris Act several times, but the general character, scope of authority, and area of jurisdiction remain. The amendments to the law have dealt, for the most part, with refining or making more specific jurisdictional lim-

its and with representation of governmental agencies on the Commission. Other amendments have included: provisions classifying violations of the McAteer-Petris Act as misdemeanors; procedures for dealing with claims of exemption from BCDC jurisdiction; and provisions for the issuance of cease and desist orders by the Commission or its Executive Director and to provide civil penalties for violations of such orders.

The Commission

The San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC) consists of 27 members who represent various interests in the Bay, including federal, state, regional and local governments and the public of the San Francisco Bay region. Seven public representatives, required to be residents of the San Francisco Bay area, are appointed, five by the Governor, one by the Senate Committee on Rules, and one by the Speaker of the Assembly, all subject to confirmation by the California Senate. The Chairman and Vice-Chairman are selected by the Governor from the five public members subject to his appointment. Local governments in the Bay region are represented by one Commissioner from each Board of Supervisors in the nine counties and by four representatives of bayside cities appointed by the Association of Bay Area Governments. State representatives on the commission are appointed from the staffs of the Department of Business and Transportation, the Resources Agency, the Department of Finance, and the State Lands Commission. One member of the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board is appointed by that Board to serve on the Commission. One Commissioner represents the United States Army Corps of Engineers and one the United States Environmental Protection Agency. Each Commissioner has an alternate representative designated to attend meetings and vote in his absence.

In addition to the regular Commission representation described above, two members of the California Legislature, one senator and one assemblyman, are appointed to meet with the Commission and participate in its activities to the extent such participation is not inconsistent with their duties as legislators.

Scope of Authority

Protection of the Bay and enhancement of its shoreline are inseparable parts of the Bay Plan. Clearly what happens to the shoreline helps determine what happens to the Bay; if, for example, the relatively few shoreline areas suitable for water-oriented industry are used for

housing, pressures will develop to provide new industrial land by filling the Bay. Therefore, in the public interest, the Commission is authorized to control both (1) Bay filling and dredging, and (2) Bay-related shoreline development.

Area of Jurisdiction

The area over which the Commission has jurisdiction for the purpose of carrying out the controls described above is defined in the McAteer-Petris Act and includes:

(a) **San Francisco Bay**, being all areas that are subject to tidal action from the south end of the Bay to the Golden Gate (Point Bonita-Point Lobos) and to the Sacramento River line (a line between Stake Point and Simmons Point, extended northeasterly to the mouth of Marshall Cut), including all sloughs, and specifically, the marshlands lying between mean high tide and five feet above mean sea level; tidelands (land lying between mean high tide and mean low tide); and submerged lands (land lying below mean low tide).

(b) **A shoreline band** consisting of all territory located between the shoreline of San Francisco Bay as defined in subdivision (a) of this section and a line 100 feet landward of and parallel with that line, but excluding any portions of such territory which are included in subdivisions (a), (c) and (d) of this section; provided that the Commission may, by resolution, exclude from its area of jurisdiction any area within the shoreline band that it finds and declares is of no regional importance to the Bay.

(c) **Saltponds** consisting of all areas which have been diked off from the Bay and have been used during the three years immediately preceding the effective date of the amendment of this section during the 1969 Regular Session of the Legislature for the solar evaporation of Bay water in the course of salt production.

(d) **Managed wetlands** consisting of all areas which have been diked off from the Bay and have been maintained during the three years immediately preceding the effective date of the amendment of this section during the 1969 Regular Session of the Legislature as a duck hunting preserve, game refuge or for agriculture.

(e) **Certain waterways** (in addition to areas included within subdivision (a)), consisting of all areas that are subject to tidal action, including submerged lands, tidelands, and marshlands up to five feet above mean sea level, on, or tributary to, the listed portions of the following waterways:

- (1) Plummer Creek in Alameda County, to the eastern limit of the saltponds.
- (2) Coyote Creek (and branches) in Alameda and Santa Clara Counties, to the easternmost point of Newby Island.
- (3) Redwood Creek in San Mateo County, to its confluence with Smith Slough.
- (4) Tolay Creek in Sonoma County, to the northerly line of Sears Point Road (State Highway 37).
- (5) Petaluma River in Marin and Sonoma Counties to its confluence with Adobe Creek, and San Antonio Creek to the easterly line of the Northwestern Pacific Railroad right-of-way.
- (6) Napa River, to the northernmost point of Bull Island.
- (7) Sonoma Creek, to its confluence with Second Napa Slough.
- (8) Corte Madera Creek in Marin County to the downstream end of the concrete channel on Corte Madera Creek which is located at the United States Army Corps of Engineers Station No. 318 + 50 on the Corte Madera Creek Flood Control Project.


Where necessary particular portions of the Commission's jurisdiction may be further clarified by the Commission's regulations.

Control of Filling and Dredging in the Bay

1. Permit Procedures for Filling and Dredging

Bay filling (including placement of piers, pilings, and floating structures moored in the Bay for extended periods of time) and dredging are controlled through the permit system established by the McAteer-Petris Act. The Commission is authorized to issue or deny permits for any filling and dredging in the Bay. Any public agency or owner of privately-held lands is required to obtain a permit before proceeding with fill or dredging.

Permits are granted or denied only after public hearings (except for permits for emergency or minor repairs to existing installations or minor improvements as provided in the Commission's regulations, which may be approved by the Executive Director) and only after the city or county having jurisdiction over the area of the proposed project has made its views known to the Commission (or has failed to do so within 90 days after notification).





The McAteer-Petris Act requires the Commission to take action on a permit matter within 90 days after it has received the report from the city or county or within 90 days after it has received and filed an application from the applicant, whichever date is later. These and other requirements and procedures for permit processing are specified in the McAteer-Petris Act (Title 7.2 of the California Government Code) and in the Commission's regulations (Title 14, Division 5 of the California Administrative Code).

The Commission's decisions on permit matters are governed by the provisions of the McAteer-Petris Act and the policies of the Bay Plan. The Commission should approve a permit application if it specifically determines that a proposed project meets the following conditions, each of which is necessary for effectively carrying out the Bay Plan.

a. **Fills in Accord With Bay Plan.** A proposed project should be approved if the filling is the minimum necessary to achieve its purpose, and if it meets one of the following five conditions:

(1) The filling is in accord with the Bay Plan policies as to the Bay-related purposes for which fillings may be needed (i.e., ports, water-related industry, and water-related recreation) and is shown on the Bay Plan maps as likely to be needed; or

(2) The filling is in accord with Bay Plan policies as to purposes for which some fill may be needed if there is no other alternative (i.e., airports, roads, and utility routes); or

(3) The filling is in accord with the Bay Plan policies as to minor fills for improving shoreline appearance or public access; or

(4) The filling would provide on privately-owned property for new public access to the Bay and for improvement of shoreline appearance—in addition to what would be provided by the other Bay Plan policies—and the filling would be for Bay-oriented commercial recreation and Bay-oriented public assembly purposes, with a substantial part of the project built on existing land. The Commission should issue permits under this criterion provided:

(a) The proposed project would limit the use of area to be filled to: (i) public recreation (beaches, parks, etc.), and (ii) Bay-oriented commercial recreation and Bay-oriented public assembly,

defined as facilities specifically designed to attract large numbers of people to enjoy the Bay and its shoreline, such as restaurants, specialty shops, and hotels.

(b) The proposed project would be designed so as to take advantage of its nearness to the Bay, and would provide opportunities for enjoyment of the Bay in such ways as viewing, boating, fishing, etc., by keeping a substantial portion of the development, and a substantial portion of the new shoreline created through filling, open to the public free of charge (though an admission charge could apply to other portions of the project).

(c) The proposed private project would not conflict with the adopted plans of any agency of local, regional, state, or federal government having jurisdiction over the area proposed for filling, and would be in an area where governmental agencies have not planned or budgeted for projects that would provide adequate access to the Bay.

(d) The proposed project would either provide recreational development in accordance with the Bay Plan maps or would provide additional recreational development that would not unnecessarily duplicate nearby facilities.

(e) A substantial portion of the project would be built on existing land, and the project would be planned to minimize the need for filling. (For example, all automobile parking should, wherever possible, be provided on nearby land or in multi-level structures rather than in extensive parking lots.)

(f) The proposed project would result in permanent public rights to use specific areas set aside for public access and recreation; these areas would be improved at least by filling to finished grade and by installation of necessary basic utilities, at little or no cost to the public.

(g) The proposed project would, to the maximum extent feasible, establish a permanent shoreline in a particular area of the Bay, through dedication of lands and other permanent restrictions on all privately-owned and publicly-owned property Bayward of the area approved for filling.

(h) The proposed project would provide to the maximum extent feasible for enhancement of fish, wildlife and other natural resources in the area of the development.

(5) The filling would provide on privately-owned or publicly-owned property for new public access to the Bay and for improvement of shoreline appearance—in addition to what would be provided by the other Bay Plan policies—and the filling would be limited to replacement piers for Bay-oriented commercial recreation and Bay-oriented public assembly purposes, covering less of the Bay than was being uncovered. The Commission should issue permits under this criterion provided:

(a) The proposed replacement fill in its entirety, including all parts devoted to public recreation, open space, and public access to the Bay, would cover an area of the Bay smaller in size than the area being uncovered by removal of piers (pile-supported platforms), and those parts of the replacement fill devoted to uses other than public recreation, open space, and public access would cover an area of the Bay no larger than 50 per cent of the area being uncovered (or such greater percentage as was previously devoted to such other uses that were destroyed involuntarily, in whole or in part, by fire, earthquake, or other such disaster, and will be devoted to substantially the same uses).

(b) The volume (mass) of structures to be built on the replacement pier (pile-supported platform) would be limited to the minimum necessary to achieve the purposes of the project.

(c) The replacement fill would be limited to piers (pile-supported platforms), rather than earth or other solid material, and, wherever possible, a substantial portion of the replacement project would be built on existing land.

(d) The pier (pile-supported platform—not a bridge) to be removed from the Bay must have:

(i) been destroyed involuntarily, in whole or in part, by fire, earthquake, or other such disaster, or

(ii) become obsolete through physical deterioration, or

(iii) become obsolete because changes in shipping technology make it no longer needed or suitable for maritime use.

If the platform itself, or the structures on it, have become obsolete, but the pilings that support the platform are structurally sound, consideration must be given to using the existing pilings in any replacement project.

(e) The proposed project must be consistent with a comprehensive special area plan for the geographic vicinity of the project, a special area plan that the Commission has determined to be consistent with the policies of the San Francisco Bay Plan, except that this provision would not apply to any project involving replacement of only a pier that had been destroyed involuntarily.

(f) The proposed project would involve replacement fill and removal of material in the same geographic vicinity (as set forth in the applicable special area plan).

(g) The proposed replacement pier would not extend into the Bay any further than (i) the piers (pile-supported platforms) to be removed from the Bay as part of the project, or (ii) adjacent existing piers.

(h) The proposed project would limit the use of the replacement pier to: (i) public recreation (beaches, parks, etc.), and (ii) Bay-oriented commercial recreation and Bay-oriented public assembly, defined as facilities specifically designed to attract large numbers of people to enjoy the Bay and its shoreline, such as restaurants, specialty shops, and hotels.

(i) The proposed project would be designed so as to take advantage of its nearness to the Bay, and would provide opportunities for enjoyment of the Bay in such ways as viewing, boating, fishing, etc., by keeping a substantial portion of the development, and a substantial portion of the new shoreline created on the replacement pier, open to the public free of charge (though an admission charge could apply to other portions of the project).

(j) The proposed project would not conflict with the adopted plans of any agency of local, regional, state, or federal government having jurisdiction over the area proposed for the replacement piers, and would be in an area where governmental agencies have not planned or budgeted for projects that would provide adequate access to the Bay.

(k) The proposed project would either provide recreational development in accordance with the Bay Plan maps or would provide additional recreation development that would not unnecessarily duplicate nearby facilities.

(l) The project would be planned to minimize the need for filling. (For example, all automobile parking should, wherever possible, be provided on nearby land or in multi-level structures rather than in extensive parking lots.)

(m) The proposed project would result in permanent public rights to use specific areas set aside for public access and recreation; these areas would be improved at least to finished grade and by installation of necessary basic utilities, at little or no cost to the public.

(n) The proposed project would, to the maximum extent feasible, establish a permanent shoreline in a particular area of the Bay, through dedication of lands and other permanent restrictions on all privately-owned and publicly-owned property Bayward of the area approved for piers.

(o) The proposed project would provide to the maximum extent feasible for enhancement of fish and wildlife and other natural resources in the area of the development, and in no event would result in net damage to these values.

b. Safety. A proposed project should be approved by the Commission if its Engineering Criteria Review Board determines that the proposed project is in accordance with the policies for Safety of Fills (page 13). The Engineering Criteria Review Board, appointed by the Commission in accordance with the policies for Safety of Fills, consists of 11 members who are leading professionals in the fields of geology, structural engineering and civil engineering (with specialty in soils engineering).

c. Public Access. A proposed fill project should increase public access to the Bay to the maximum extent feasible, in accordance with the policies for Public Access to the Bay (page 26).

d. Effects on the Bay. A permit for a proposed fill, dike, or pier, should be approved if it has been evaluated on the basis of the policies on Water

Pollution (page 8), Smog and Weather (page 10), Water Surface Area and Volume (page 8), and Marshes and Mudflats (page 9), and modified as necessary to minimize any harmful effects. Proposed dredging should be in accordance with the Dredging policy (page 15).

e. Valid Title. Because there is some question as to the conditions under which some private parties originally received lands in the Bay, a private claimant should be required to show that he has a valid title to any Bay lands proposed for filling. Ordinarily, this could be done by submission of a current title insurance report including the derivation of title from original sale by the State. Where titles are disputed, the legal issues should be resolved as soon as possible by court action or other appropriate steps.

f. Public Trust. Many private owners of Bay lands hold title subject to rights of the public, derived from English common law and the California Constitution, as to use of waterways for commerce, navigation, and fishing. These rights, sometimes called the "public trust" for commerce, navigation, and fishing, are the subject of considerable legal debate, and court tests may be required to determine their practical significance. Any necessary court tests should be completed as soon as possible; in the meantime, an applicant for a fill permit should be required to show either that the public trust does not apply to his lands, or that the filling would be consistent with the trust.

g. Appearance. Plans for a proposed fill project should be submitted to the Design Review Board appointed by the Commission and consisting of professionals in the fields of urban design, architecture, and landscape architecture. The Design Review Board should determine whether the proposed project is in accordance with the policies for Appearance, Design, and Scenic Views of the Bay and shoreline (page 29), and should report its recommendations to the Commission before a permit is issued. The jurisdiction over appearance and design is advisory, and the Commission encourages local governing bodies to exercise their controls in accordance with the commission's policies on Appearance, Design, and Scenic Views, and the Design Review Board's recommendations.

2. Permit Decisions. If a permit application meets the standards listed above, a permit should be granted. If the proposal does not meet these standards,

a permit should not be issued. In some cases, however, a permit could be conditionally approved subject to the applicant's later meeting clearly-specified requirements relating to one or more of the seven standards above. In other cases, an applicant might be able to change his proposal to conform to the Bay Plan policies, and he could then reapply after 90 days have elapsed since the date the original permit application was denied.

Developing The Bay and Shoreline To Their Highest Potential

In addition to the controls over filling and dredging in the Bay the Commission has limited control over the Bay shoreline as specified in the McAteer-Petris Act. Such limited shoreline jurisdiction is necessary to reduce pressures for Bay filling that would result from poor use of available shoreline land, and to assure that public access to the Bay is provided wherever feasible. The Commission's shoreline jurisdiction, as defined in the McAteer-Petris Act, consists of the area between the Bay shoreline, as defined in the Act, and a line 100 feet landward of and parallel to the shoreline. The Act further specifies that certain water-oriented land uses should be permitted on the shoreline, including ports, water-related industries, airports, wildlife refuges, water-oriented recreation and public assembly, desalinization plants and powerplants requiring large amounts of water for cooling purposes. Priority use areas designated for such uses in the Bay Plan are to be reserved for them in order to minimize the need for future filling in the Bay for such uses. Within the 100-foot shoreline jurisdiction but outside of the areas designated for priority uses the Commission may deny an application for a permit for a proposed project only on the grounds that the project fails to provide maximum feasible public access, consistent with the proposed project, to the Bay and the shoreline.

The Commission also has, under the McAteer-Petris Act, limited jurisdiction over saltponds and managed wetlands.

1. Permit Procedures for Shoreline Development. The permit system for controlling development within the Commission's shoreline jurisdiction is essentially the same as the system established for the control of filling and dredging in the Bay. Any public agency or private owner holding shoreline lands is required to obtain a permit from the Commission before proceeding with development. Permits may be granted or denied only after public hearings (except

for emergency or minor repairs or minor improvements which may be granted by the Executive Director) and after the process for review and comment by the city or county has been completed.

2. Purposes for Which a Permit for Shoreline Development May Be Issued

The Commission should approve a permit for shoreline development if the agency specifically determines that the proposed project is in accordance with the standards listed below for (a) use of the shoreline, (b) provision of public access, and (c) advisory review of appearance.

a. Use of Shoreline

(1) **Priority Uses.** The Commission has designated on the Plan Maps those areas which should be reserved for priority land uses on the Bay shoreline. Within those areas, in accordance with provisions of the McAteer-Petris Act, the Commission has set and described the specific boundaries of the 100-foot shoreline band within which it is authorized to grant or deny permits for shoreline development. Permits for development within the priority boundary areas of the 100-foot shoreline band should be granted or denied based on the appropriate Bay Plan development policies:

(a) Ports (in accordance with policy on page 17).

(b) Water-related Industry (in accordance with policy on page 16).

(c) Water-oriented Recreation (in accordance with policy on page 21).

(d) Airports (in accordance with policy on page 19).

(e) Wildlife Areas (in accordance with policy on page 7).

(2) **Salt ponds and other managed wetlands** (as shown on the Bay Plan maps) should be used in accordance with the policies on page 25.

(3) **All Other Shoreline Areas** should be used in any manner that would not adversely affect enjoyment of the Bay and shoreline by residents, employees, and visitors within the area itself or within adjacent areas of the Bay and shoreline, in accordance with the policies for Other Shoreline Uses on page 31. The McAteer-Petris Act specifies that for areas outside the priority use boundaries, the

Commission may deny a permit application for a proposed project only on the grounds that the project fails to provide maximum feasible public access to the Bay and shoreline.

b. **Public Access.** The Bay agency should insure that each new shoreline development increases public access to the Bay to the maximum extent feasible, in accordance with the policies for Public Access to the Bay on page 26.

c. **Appearance.** The Commission has appointed a Design Review Board made up of representatives of the design professions including architecture, landscape architecture and engineering. The Board reviews and makes recommendations to the Commission on the appearance and design of proposed projects, evaluating them in light of the policies for Appearance, Design, and Scenic Views on page 29. Its recommendations are advisory only and are not of themselves grounds for denying a permit.

3. Inland Advisory Role. Outside the area of the Commission's jurisdiction where permits for development from the Commission are not required, the McAteer-Petris Act specifies that the provisions of the Bay Plan pertaining to such areas are advisory only.

4. Regional Development Policies. Many regional matters, such as air pollution control, regulation of water quality, planning and construction of waste disposal facilities, airport development, and regional transportation, are directly related to the future of the Bay. Some of these regional matters are now within the jurisdiction of state and regional agencies, but others are not now being dealt with at all on a regional basis. Some or all of these regional matters could be made the responsibility of a limited regional government, which would in addition carry out the Bay Plan, but obviously they could not be made the responsibility of a single-purpose Bay agency. In any event, however, it is essential that many regional policies directly related to the Bay be carried out if the Bay Plan is to be effective. For example:

a. Water quality should be maintained in accordance with the policy on Water Pollution (page 8).

b. Port planning and development should be carried out in accordance with the policy on Ports (page 17).

c. Airport planning and development should be carried out in accordance with the policy on Airports (page 19).

d. Views from vista points and from public roads should be protected and scenic roads and trails should be built in accordance with the policy on Appearance, Design and Scenic Views (page 29).

e. Inland industrial sites should be provided in accordance with the policy on Water-related Industry (page 16).

Applying and Amending The Bay Plan

The McAteer-Petris Act specifies that the Commission may make amendments or other changes to all or any part of the Bay Plan consistent with provisions of the Act. The Act further directs that in exercising its power to grant or deny permit applications the Commission shall do so in conformity with the provisions of both the McAteer-Petris Act and the San Francisco Bay Plan. Thus the Commission is directed to carry out the Bay Plan, i.e., to guide the development of the Bay and shoreline in accordance with the Bay Plan policies and Bay Plan maps.

Because the policies and maps are necessarily general in nature, the Commission, as indicated above, is authorized to clarify, interpret and apply them as necessary. The Commission is empowered to issue regulations

including more detailed standards and procedures based on the Plan policies, to assist in preparation of specific plans for shoreline areas, and to publish information to assist planners, architects and engineers in the design of projects affecting the Bay.

In those instances where it is desirable to amplify and to apply Bay Plan Maps, recommendations and policies to specific shoreline areas, the Commission should do so through a special area plan. These plans should be separate, numbered documents and should be referred to on the appropriate Bay Plan Maps. In all cases, special area plans should be read in conjunction with the provisions of both the Bay Plan and the McAteer-Petris Act.

In amending the Bay Plan policies and maps or making other changes in the Plan, the Commission acts in accordance with the provisions of the McAteer-Petris Act, including:


1. The Commission is directed to make continuing studies of any matters related to the Bay that, in the Commission's judgment, are necessary to keep the Bay Plan policies and Bay Plan maps up to

2. The Commission is required to conduct a public hearing on any proposal to change the Bay Plan policies or the Bay Plan maps.

3. The Commission may amend the Bay Plan policies upon the affirmative vote of two-thirds of the members of the Commission, such vote not to be taken less than 90 days following public notice of the hearing on the proposed policy amendment. The Commission may amend the Bay Plan maps upon the affirmative vote of a majority of the Commission, such vote to be taken not less than 30 days following notice of the hearing on the proposed change.

Special Area Plans, as described above, are subject to the same procedures for public notice, hearing and voting as other amendments or changes in the Bay Plan policies and maps. Special Area Plans that have been adopted by the Commission are listed on page 41 and are specified by area on the appropriate Bay Plan Maps.

The Suisun Marsh Protection Plan was adopted by the Commission in 1976 and submitted to the Legislature and the Governor as required under provisions of the Nejedly-Bagley-Z'berg Suisun Marsh Preservation Act of 1974. The Suisun Marsh Protection Plan has as its objectives the preservation and enhancement of the quality and diversity of the 85,000-acre aquatic and wildlife habitats of the area and to assure retention of upland areas adjacent to the Marsh in uses compatible with its protection. The Protection Plan was designed to be a more specific application of the general, regional policies of the San Francisco Bay Plan and to supplement such policies where appropriate because of the unique characteristics of the Suisun Marsh. The Suisun Marsh Preservation Act of 1977 established primary and secondary management areas and directed the establishment of procedures for carrying out provisions of the Plan and the Act in those areas. The Act specifies that appropriate policies of the San Francisco Bay Plan and the Suisun Marsh Protection Plan shall apply to the Commission's area of jurisdiction and that if a conflict occurs between the two Plans the policies of the Suisun Marsh Protection Plan shall control. References to the Suisun Marsh Protection Plan are noted on Bay Plan maps. 17-20.



Part VI

The Plan Maps

The maps that follow are an integral part of the Bay Plan. They are based on—and show how to apply—the Bay Plan policies.

All areas of the Bay subject to tidal action (and thus subject to the jurisdiction of the Commission for control of filling and dredging) are shown on the maps in light blue. Similarly shown in light blue are certain tributaries in which filling and dredging are also controlled because of their ecological importance. (Note: The Commission's legal jurisdiction is described in the McAteer-Petris Act and the Commission's Regulations, and has been affected by certain court decisions. BCDC staff should be consulted concerning questions of precise jurisdiction.)

All shoreline sites designated for priority uses (as identified in the Bay Plan policies) are indicated on the Plan maps. Development of these sites should be governed by the Bay Plan policies for each specific use. Development of shoreline areas not proposed for any specific use should be consistent with the Bay Plan policies for Other Shoreline Uses.

Bay Plan policies for which precise areas cannot be mapped—for example, policy statements as to proposed Bay or shoreline freeways—are printed on the maps in bold type.

Comments that are not part of the Bay Plan policies—for example, suggestions for further study, clarification of policy and alternative proposals—are printed in italic type. Comments in italic type are not intended to be enforceable policies of the Bay agency.

Special Area Plans, which apply Bay Plan Policies in greater detail to specific shoreline areas, are identified on the Plan Maps. The purpose of Special Area Plans is to more precisely guide public agencies and private parties as to what fill, dredging, or change of use of a shoreline area would be consistent with the McAteer-Petris Act and the Bay Plan Policies. Special Area Plans adopted by the Commission are:

Special Area Plan No. 1: San Francisco Waterfront (adopted April, 1975)—applies to the San Francisco shoreline from the east side of the Hyde Street Pier to the south side of India Basin.

Special Area Plan No. 2: Benicia Waterfront Special Area Plan (adopted April, 1977)—applies to the Benicia shoreline from West Second Street to the Benicia-Martinez Bridge.

Special Area Plan No. 3: South Richmond Special Area Plan (adopted May, 1977)—applies to the Richmond shoreline from the west side of Shipyard Three to the southeastern city boundary.


The Suisun Marsh Protection Plan is described on page 39.



Plan Map 1

Notes to Plan Map 1 Natural Resources of the Bay


Habitat Values. Plan map shows fish and wildlife areas rated as "high value" and "medium value" by State Department of Fish and Game. Other areas have value as habitat, but lesser value than the portions marked.

Shell Deposits. Oyster shells dredged primarily for use in manufacturing cement.





Plan Map 1 Natural Resources of the Bay




Plan Map 2

Notes to Plan Map 2 Proposed Major Uses of the Bay and Shoreline

General. This map shows all areas proposed for priority uses—ports, water related industry, waterfront recreation, ports, and wildlife areas. These areas are shown in greater detail on following maps. Also shown on this map are: (1) salt ponds and other managed wetlands; (2) proposed main ship channel depth and possible supertanker terminal in accordance with the policy on Ports; and (3) important vista points and "entrance views" (first views of the Bay from road through passes in hills) that are intended for protection in the same manner as other view points shown on the detailed maps, 3-20.

Along the shoreline in San Francisco and Marin Counties, BCDC's jurisdiction extends 100 feet inland and does not include any area within the jurisdiction of the California Coastal Commission west of the line between Pt. Bonita and Pt. Lobos.



LEGEND

- WATER-RELATED INDUSTRY
- PORT
- AIRPORT
- WATERFRONT PARK, BEACH
- WILDLIFE AREA
- TIDAL MARSH
- SALT POND, MANAGED WETLAND
- SHIP CHANNELS
- VISTA POINT
- 'ENTRANCE' VIEW FROM ROAD
- FREEWAY



San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission

September 1983 as amended

Plan Map 2
Proposed Major Uses of the Bay
and Shoreline

**Plan Map 2
Proposed Major Uses of the Bay
and Shoreline**



Key to Maps 3-20

Plan Map 3



**Notes to
Plan Map 3
Richmond to Berkeley**

Point Pinole Regional Shoreline to Wildcat Creek. Public access to the Bay for recreation is needed in this area although existing shoreline conditions make this difficult. All development in the area should include provision for substantial public access.

Naval Supply Center, Point Molate. Plan maps indicate recommended use for Bayfront military installations if one or more of these bases is ever declared surplus by the military. The Bay Plan does not advocate the closing of any military installation.

George Miller Jr. Regional Park. Use and landscaping of the private lands adjacent to the park should be coordinated by owners and city for compatibility with park.

South Richmond Shoreline Special Area Plan. The South Richmond Shoreline Special Area Plan (Special Area Plan No. 3) was adopted by the Commission (May, 1977) and the City of Richmond to provide detailed planning and regulatory guidelines for the Richmond Shoreline from the west side of Shipyard Three to the southeastern border of the city, including Brooks and Bird Islands and all areas that are subject to tidal action. Refer to the maps policies and recommendations of the special area plan for specific information for this area.



(Map 15)

(Map 4)

Plan Map 3 Richmond to Berkeley

Plan Map 4


Notes to Plan Map 4 Berkeley to Oakland

Oakland North Harbor Area. The Oakland North Harbor has not been included on the Seaport Plan Maps as a port priority use area because need for it has not been substantiated and it has been found to be less desirable for port development than other sites based on environmental, land use and access considerations. In addition, other uses having public benefits, such as conservation and recreation, have been proposed for this site. Future studies will be necessary to determine the use of this area.

Oakland Army Base, Naval Supply Centers, Alameda Naval Air Station and Reserve Shipyard. Plan maps indicate recommended use for Bayfront military installations if one or more of these bases is ever declared surplus by the military. The Bay Plan does not advocate the closing of any military installation.

San Leandro Bay Regional Shoreline. Regional Shoreline to be developed by East Bay Regional Park District—emphasizing ecology and increased recreation use of the shoreline.

Bay Farm Island. The site is adjacent to Oakland Airport, and may be suitable for airport-oriented industry. Bay Farm Island development should not interfere with aircraft operations at Oakland Airport.



Key to Plan Maps 3-20

(Map 3)

ALAMEDA COUNTY-EMERYVILLE
Develop public and commercial recreation areas. Some fill may be needed to create usable shoreline areas, protected water areas and park space.

No freeway in Bay west of present shoreline unless all reasonable alternatives are found infeasible and need for Bay route is clearly shown.

EMERYVILLE CRESCENT WILDLIFE AREA
(proposed)

Berkeley

SAN FRANCISCO BAY

San Francisco Oakland Bay Bridge

Outer Harbor

Middle Harbor

OAKLAND-ALAMEDA PORT AREA

See Seaport Plan. Redevelop Outer, Middle and Inner Harbors for modern marine terminals. Some fill may be needed.

OAKLAND ARMY BASE AND NAVAL SUPPLY CENTER

Some fill may be needed for Army Base. If and when not needed by military, should be developed for port and related industrial uses. See Seaport Plan.

OAKLAND

JACK LONDON SQUARE

Expand commercial recreation facilities as needed. Provide continuous public access along Estuary to Lake Merritt Channel

BROOKLYN BASIN

Expand commercial fishing and recreational facilities

GOVERNMENT ISLAND

If and when not needed by Coast Guard, redevelop for public and commercial recreation uses.

NAVAL AIR STATION

Some fill may be needed for Navy Operations. Keep runway approach and takeoff areas clear of tall structures and incompatible uses. If and when not needed by Navy, should be developed for port and related industrial uses. See Seaport Plan.

NAVAL SUPPLY CENTER AND RESERVE SHIPYARD

If and when not needed by Navy should be developed for port and related industrial uses. See Seaport Plan.

ROBERT W. CROWN MEMORIAL STATE BEACH

Alameda

ALAMEDA BEACHES

Some fill may be needed for beach and marina protection.

SAN LEANDRO BAY

Valuable wildlife habitat; great recreation potential. Develop boating facilities and parks, but preserve wildlife habitat. Provide continuous public access to northeastern and southern shoreline. Some fill may be needed.

SAN LEANDRO BAY REGIONAL SHORELINE

LEGEND

- PORT
- AIRPORT
- WATERFRONT PARK BEACH
- WILDLIFE AREA
- TIDAL MARSH



EXISTING PROPOSED

- MARINA
- FISHING PIER
- RECREATIONAL FERRY
- LAUNCHING RAMP
- COMMERCIAL RECREATION
- VISTA POINT
- SCENIC DRIVE
- FREEWAY
- RAILROAD
- BARTD

COMMISSION POLICY: PRINTED IN BOLD TYPE
COMMISSION SUGGESTION: PRINTED IN ITALICS

Protect and provide public access to shellfish beds offshore.

SAN FRANCISCO BAY

Bay Farm Island

BAY FARM ISLAND

Undeveloped areas may be suitable for airport-related industry.

OAKLAND AIRPORT
Further expansion into the Bay only if clear need is shown by regional airport system study. Keep runway approach and takeoff areas clear of tall structures and incompatible uses.




Plan Map 4

Berkeley to Oakland

San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission

September 1983 as amended

**Plan Map 4
Berkeley to Oakland**




Key to Plan Maps 3-20

Plan Map 5

**Notes to
Plan Map 5
San Leandro, Hayward**

Bay Farm Island. The site is adjacent to Oakland Airport and may be suitable for airport-oriented industry. Bay Farm Island development should not interfere with aircraft operations at Oakland Airport.

Hayward Area Waterfront. The Hayward Area Shoreline Plan, a detailed plan for the Hayward area shoreline between the San Leandro city limits on the north and Fremont and Union City city limits on the south, was prepared by the Hayward Area Shoreline Planning Agency. The plan, adopted by the City of Hayward, Alameda County, East Bay Regional Park District and the Hayward Area Recreation District provides for marsh restoration and shoreline recreation use.



Alameda
Bay Farm Island
CR

BAY FARM ISLAND
Undeveloped areas may be suitable for airport-related industry.

OAKLAND

SAN LEANDRO BAY REGIONAL SHORELINE

SAN LEANDRO BAY
Valuable wildlife habitat; great recreational potential. Develop boating facilities and parks, but preserve wildlife habitat. Provide continuous public access to northeastern and southern shorelines. Some fill may be needed.

Possible extension of scenic drive.

OYSTER BAY REGIONAL SHORELINE (proposed)

OAKLAND AIRPORT
Further expansion into the Bay only if clear need is shown by regional airport system study. Keep runway approach and taxiway areas clear of tall structures and incompatible uses.

SAN LEANDRO SHORELINE PARK SYSTEM
Protect and provide public access to shellfish beds offshore.

San Francisco Bay

LEGEND

AIRPORT

WATERFRONT PARK BEACH

TIDAL MARSH

SALT POND MANAGED WETLAND


EXISTING	PROPOSED
	CR
	*

COMMISSION POLICY **PRINTED IN BOLD TYPE**

COMMISSION SUGGESTION *PRINTED IN ITALICS*



**Plan Map 5
San Leandro, Hayward**



Key to Plan Maps 3-20

Plan Map 6

**Notes to
Plan Map 6
Santa Clara and Southern
Alameda Counties**

Toll Plaza. Best site for toll plaza for new Dumbarton Bridge is on east shore on dry land and located so as to avoid cutting into the Coyote Hills.


Water Quality. Water at extreme south end of Bay is often polluted so as to discourage recreational use of sloughs and Bay. Greater recreational use will require improved water quality. Some improvements in the quality of water in the South Bay are now being made pursuant to requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board, and studies underway by waste discharges will lead to further improvements. The recommendations for long-range improvements to water quality contained in the Water Quality Control Plan for the San Francisco Bay Basin, prepared by the State and Regional Water Quality Control Board, should be followed.

Subsidence. Area subject to possible subsidence. Construction in or near Bay should be carefully planned, taking into account effects of future subsidence.

Moffett Naval Air Station. Plan maps indicate recommended use for Bayfront military installations if one or more of these bases is ever declared surplus by the military. The Bay Plan does not advocate the closing of any military installation.

San Francisco Bay National Wildlife Refuge. The U.S. Department of the Interior is to acquire approximately 23,000 acres of Bay, marshes, and salt ponds to be included in a national wildlife refuge. Three units, totaling approximately 18,000 acres of the proposed four unit system are on Map 6. The inclusion of the salt ponds and marshes south of Coyote Hills Slough, and those between Coyote Creek and Guadalupe Slough in Santa Clara County would be consistent with Bay Plan policies. The terms of acquisition should permit the salt ponds to continue in operation as long as desired by the owner of the ponds. Acquisition of the national wildlife refuge is strongly recommended.

Santa Clara County Shoreline. The Santa Clara County Planning Policy Committee has adopted a Policy Plan for the Baylands of Santa Clara County (July, 1972) which establishes conservation and development goals and policies for the Santa Clara County Shoreline.



LEGEND

AIRPORT
 WATERFRONT PARK, BEACH
 TIDAL MARSH
 SALT POND, MANAGED WETLAND

EXISTING	PROPOSED
	CR

COMMISSION POLICY: PRINTED IN BOLD TYPE
 COMMISSION SUGGESTION: PRINTED IN ITALICS

If not needed for salt production, ponds west of Coyote Hills should be acquired as permanent wildlife area.

Breach dikes and return area to Bay.

DUMBARTON BRIDGE
 Design proposed high-level bridge to have slim profile and minimum supporting structure and to enable motorists to see Bay and shoreline. Approaches should provide for fishing and wildlife observation. Toll plaza site under study.

DUMBARTON POINT WATERFRONT PARK (proposed)
 Boundaries to be determined. Water-oriented uses only. Some fill may be needed.

If not needed for salt production, pond between Cooley Landing and railroad bridge should be developed for recreational use. Expand Cooley Landing marina northward.

NEWARK SLOUGH TO COYOTE CREEK
 Protect harbor seal nursery and hauling grounds. No direct public access.

If not needed for salt production, ponds between Stevens Creek and Charleston Slough should be added to North County Shoreline Park Complex as recreation lakes or wildlife area.

PALO ALTO BAYLANDS PARK (proposed expansion)

NORTHERN SANTA CLARA COUNTY SHORELINE REGIONAL PARK COMPLEX (proposed)

... for sewage treatment oxidation ponds should be developed as permanent wildlife area.

MOFFETT NAVAL AIR STATION
 If and when not needed by Navy, site should be evaluated for commercial airport system study. (Moffett NAS not within BCDC permit jurisdiction)



**Plan Map 6
Santa Clara and Southern
Alameda Counties**



Key to Plan Maps 3-20

Plan Map 7


**Notes to
Plan Map 7
Coyote Creek**

San Francisco Bay National Wildlife Refuge. The Salt Ponds, marshes, and water areas between Coyote Creek and Guadalupe Slough are to be acquired by the U. S. Department of the Interior for inclusion in the federal San Francisco Bay National Wildlife Refuge. This proposal would be consistent with Bay Plan Policies. The terms of the acquisition should permit the salt ponds to continue in operation as long as desired by the owner of the ponds. Acquisition of the national wildlife refuge is strongly recommended.

Alviso-San Jose Waterfront. Detailed planning is needed to determine most desirable waterfront design and to overcome subsidence problems. Proposals should emphasize the great recreation potential of this area.

Water Quality. Water at extreme south end of Bay is often polluted so as to discourage recreational use of sloughs and Bay. Greater recreational use will require improved water quality. Some improvements in the quality of water in the South Bay are now being made pursuant to requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board, and studies underway by waste dischargers will lead to further improvements. The recommendations for long-range improvements to water quality contained in the Water Quality Control Plan for the San Francisco Bay Basin, prepared by the State and Regional Water Quality Control Board should be followed.

Moffett Naval Air Station. Plan maps indicate recommended use for Bayfront military installations if one or more of these bases is ever declared surplus by the military. The Bay Plan does not advocate the closing of any military installation.



**Plan Map 7
Coyote Creek**

Plan Map 8


Notes to Plan Map 8 Southern San Mateo County

Greco Island. Largest remaining marsh in South Bay. Marsh and adjacent mudflats are important feeding area for birds. Area used by California Clapper Rail, rare species of bird endangered by loss of habitat.


San Francisco Bay National Wildlife Refuge. Greco Island and a portion of Bair Island are to be acquired by the U. S. Department of the Interior as part of the San Francisco Bay National Wildlife Refuge. This proposal is consistent with Bay Plan policies provided that acquisition and operation of the refuge does not interfere with commercial shipping and recreational boating in Redwood Creek.

Hayward Area Waterfront. The Hayward Area Shoreline Plan, a detailed plan for the Hayward area shoreline between the San Leandro city limits on the north and Fremont and Union City city limits on the south, was prepared by the Hayward Area Shoreline Planning Agency. The plan adopted by the City of Hayward, Alameda County, East Bay Regional Park District, and the Hayward Area Recreation District provides for marsh restoration and shoreline recreation use.


Deepwater Slough. The Port of Redwood City's Deepwater Slough property (Bair Island site) has not been included on the Seaport Plan maps as a priority use area because need for it has not been substantiated and it has been found to be less desirable for port development than other sites based on environmental, land use and access considerations. In addition, other uses having public benefits, such as conservation and recreation, have been proposed for this site. Future studies will be necessary to determine the use of this area.



Key to Plan Maps 3-20



Plan Map 8
Southern San Mateo County



Key to Plan Maps 3-20


Plan Map 9

**Notes to
Plan Map 9
Northern San Mateo County**

Burlingame Waterfront. Developing waterfront requires detailed planning to determine the most desirable waterfront design emphasizing recreation and public access with a minimum of Bay filling.

San Mateo (City) Waterfront. Presently undeveloped. Detailed planning needed to determine most desirable waterfront design emphasizing recreation with minimum of Bay filling.

Possible Shoreline Channel. Dredging shallow-draft channel parallel to shore would greatly increase recreational opportunities for small boats and recreational ferries. This could be done so as to separate valuable marshes and mudflats from the shoreline, without damage to ecology. Dredged mud could be carefully placed to create new marsh, but dredging might be costly.



Plan Map 10

Notes to Plan Map 10 San Francisco and Brisbane

San Francisco-Marin Crossing. The Central Bay is the most widely enjoyed part of the entire Bay and this attractive setting should be protected. Transportation agencies have reached general agreement that traffic congestion problems can best be solved by establishing fast, modern complete bus system. Therefore, Plan makes no provision for second deck on Golden Gate Bridge, or for any additional vehicular crossing. Increased auto capacity on Golden Gate Bridge, or a new vehicular crossing, could require new or enlarged toll plazas, service areas, access ramps, and freeways on both the San Francisco and Marin sides, with possible disruption of scenic areas on both sides of the Bay.

San Francisco Waterfront Special Area Plan. Special Area Plan No. 1: San Francisco Waterfront was adopted by the Commission (April 3, 1975) to provide detailed planning and regulatory guidelines for the waterfront of San Francisco from east side of Hyde Street Pier to south side of India Basin. Refer to the maps, policies and recommendations of the Special Area Plan for specific information for this area.


San Francisco Waterfront. Suggested scenic transit system (special bus, elephant train, cog railway, etc.) could be major waterfront attraction, could eventually operate entire distance from Golden Gate Bridge (or even Ocean Beach) to Ferry Building (or south to China Basin).

Hunters Point Naval Shipyard. Plan maps indicate recommended use for Bayfront military installations if one or more of these bases is ever declared surplus by the military. The Plan does not advocate the closing of any military installation.

Hunters Point Freeway at Candlestick Point. Connection to U. S. 101 south of Candlestick Point requires further study. If connection is close to Candlestick Cove, large overpass structure will be required, marring present spectacular views of Bay for motorists heading south on Bayshore Freeway to Bayview Hill. If connection is farther south, in Brisbane, long structure in Bay will be required. Other considerations include effects upon future development on shoreline of Candlestick Cove, and future U. S. 101 connections to proposed Geneva Avenue and Guadalupe Parkway extensions.

Jurisdiction note. Along the shoreline in San Francisco and Marin Counties, BCDC's jurisdiction extends 100 feet inland and does not include any area within the jurisdiction of the California Coastal Commission west of the line between Point Bonita and Point Lobos.






LEGEND


PORT

WATERFRONT PARK BEACH

	EXISTING	PROPOSED
MARINA		
FISHING PIER		
RECREATIONAL FERRY		
LAUNCHING RAMP		
COMMERCIAL RECREATION		CR
ENTRANCE VIEW FROM ROAD		
VISTA POINT		
SCENIC DRIVE		
FREEWAY		
RAILROAD		
BARTD		

COMMISSION POLICY **PRINTED IN BOLD TYPE**
 COMMISSION SUGGESTION *PRINTED IN ITALICS*





Key to Plan Maps 3-20

Plan Map 11

Notes to Plan Map 11 Southern Marin County

Point San Quentin—Possible Commuter Ferry Terminal. No fill for parking beyond existing dikes.

Shoreline Parks. Shoreline parks could be built in several areas between existing or proposed shoreline roads and the shore from Tiburon Peninsula to Point San Pedro. Further study needed.

Tiburon—Possible Commuter Ferry Terminal. To minimize traffic and parking problem, should be served by mass transit, or else designed to serve southern Marin only with another terminal built to serve northern Marin.

Tiburon Boulevard Widening. Minimize fill by using existing roadbed as part of new right-of-way. Preserve hilltop vista point.

Richardson Bay. Under study. Problems: (1) substantial dredging required because of siltation, (2) access needed to upper reaches west of U. S. 101 Freeway for potential marinas, (3) complex ownership pattern.

Sausalito Recreational Ferry. Ferry terminal could be connected to central area by "elephant train" along waterfront or Bridgeway. Or terminal could be placed in central area if parking can be provided.

Sausalito—Commuter Ferry Terminal. To minimize traffic and parking problem, should be served by mass transit or else designed to serve Sausalito and Mill Valley only with other terminals serving rest of Marin.


Appearance and Design. Housing density in hills of Sausalito, Tiburon, and Belvedere should respect the topography, cluster development appropriate in some areas.

Forts Baker, Barry, and Cronkhite. Surplus Army land now being transferred to the Golden Gate National Recreation Area.

San Francisco—Marin Crossing. The Central Bay is the most widely enjoyed part of the entire Bay and this attractive setting should be protected. Transportation agencies have reached general agreement that traffic congestion problems can best be solved by establishing fast, modern complete bus system. Therefore, Plan makes no provision for second deck on Golden Gate Bridge, or for any additional vehicular crossing. Increased auto capacity on the Golden Gate Bridge, or a new vehicular crossing could require new or enlarged toll plazas, service areas, access ramps, and freeways on both the San Francisco and Marin sides, with possible disruption of scenic areas on both sides of the Bay.

Jurisdiction note. Along the shoreline in San Francisco and Marin Counties, BCDC's jurisdiction extends 100 feet inland and does not include any area within the jurisdiction of the California Coastal Commission west of the line between Point Bonita and Point Lobos.

(Map 12)



RICHMOND SANITARY LANDFILL
 Proposed Park. Give priority consideration to beach development. Some fill may be needed for beach outside existing dikes.

MARIN ISLANDS
 Protect wildlife value.

POINT SAN PABLO
 As not needed for marine terminals, redevelop for recreational uses.

THE BROTHERS
 Preserve islands and lighthouse. Access by boat only.

NAVAL SUPPLY CENTER
 If and when not needed by Navy, acquire and develop for park. Existing underground fuel storage tanks may be used by industry.

POINT MOLATE BEACH
 Extend beach from Point Molate to Castro Point. Some fill may be needed.

POINT SAN QUENTIN TO POINT SAN PEDRO
 In connection with shoreline parks and scenic drives, develop system of riding and hiking trails.

Protect and provide public access to shellfish areas offshore.

CORTE MADERA SHORELINE PARK (proposed)
 Develop 60-100 acre shoreline park as part of future development.

RED ROCK
 Preserve island. No development.

CASTRO ROCKS
 Protect harbor seal hauling ground. No public access.

Protect and provide public access to shellfish beds offshore.

GEORGE MILLER JR. REGIONAL SHORELINE

POINT MOLATE TO POINT RICHMOND
 Develop riding and hiking trail. Some fill may be needed.

TIBURON OCEANOGRAPHIC CENTER (former Navy Net Depot)
 If and when not needed by Federal Government, acquire and develop for park.

MOUNT TAMALPAIS WATERFOWL REFUGE

KEIL COVE—BLUFF POINT PARK (proposed)

ANGEL ISLAND STATE PARK
 Use only for camping, picnicking, water-oriented recreation. Access by boat only. No commercial uses except for convenience needs of park visitors.

GOLDEN GATE NATIONAL RECREATION AREA
 As not needed by Army, acquire and extend park. Preserve and protect rugged character, especially on Golden Gate and Pacific Coast sides. Limit access to water (at coves) to foot trails, possible funiculars. No commercial uses except for convenience needs of park visitors.

GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
 Encourage improved public transportation. No second deck or new crossing for automobiles.

LEGEND

- PORT
- WATER-RELATED INDUSTRY
- WATERFRONT PARK BEACH
- WILDLIFE AREA
- TIDAL MARSH

- | | EXISTING | PROPOSED |
|-------------------------|----------|----------|
| MARINA | | |
| FISHING PIER | | |
| RECREATIONAL FERRY | | |
| LAUNCHING RAMP | | |
| COMMERCIAL RECREATION | | CR |
| ENTRANCE VIEW FROM ROAD | | Y |
| VISTA POINT | | * |
| SCENIC DRIVE | | |
| FREEWAY | | |
| RAILROAD | | |

COMMISSION POLICY PRINTED IN BOLD TYPE
 COMMISSION SUGGESTION PRINTED IN ITALICS



Plan Map 11
Southern Marin County

Plan Map 12

**Notes to
Plan Map 12
Western San Pablo Bay**


Hamilton Air Force Base. Plan maps indicate recommended use for Bayfront military installations if one or more of these bases is ever declared surplus by the military. The Bay Plan does not advocate the closing of any military installation.

Park Proposal for Area South of Hamilton AFB. Large, undeveloped area between Hamilton AFB and Galinas Creek is possible site for major county park. Due to extensive offshore mudflats, would not be suitable for water-oriented recreation.

Possible Shoreline Channel. Dredging shallow-draft channel parallel to shore would greatly increase recreational opportunities for small boats and recreational ferries. This could be done so as to separate valuable marshes and mudflats from shoreline without damage to ecology. Dredged mud could be carefully placed to create new marsh, but dredging might be costly.




Key to Plan Maps 3-20



LEGEND

- WATER-RELATED INDUSTRY
- AIRPORT
- WATERFRONT PARK, BEACH
- WILDLIFE AREA
- TIDAL MARSH



EXISTING PROPOSED

- MARINA
- FISHING PIER
- RECREATIONAL FERRY
- LAUNCHING RAMP
- COMMERCIAL RECREATION
- VISTA POINT
- SCENIC DRIVE
- FREEWAY
- RAILROAD

COMMISSION POLICY: **PRINTED IN BOLD TYPE**
 COMMISSION SUGGESTION: *PRINTED IN ITALICS*

ROBERT LEE SIMS PRESERVE
 Develop riding and hiking trails along levees.

SAN PABLO BAY

Marshes and mudflats are valuable wildlife habitat; may be encroached upon only for fishing piers, small-boat and barge channels, wildlife observation facilities, and piers necessary for industry. Design onshore development to protect wildlife value of offshore areas.

HAMILTON AIR FORCE BASE

If and when not needed by military, retain as a general aviation reliever airport. Limit runway length and impose additional constraints to ensure general aviation use only. Areas valuable for wildlife habitat or potentially restorable wetlands should be developed and managed for those purposes in a manner assuring general aviation use. Other areas not needed for aviation, and surrounding areas, should be developed for uses compatible with general aviation use and with restoration of wetlands and wildlife habitat.

Possible small-boat channel along shoreline from Petaluma River to Gallinas Creek.

CHINA CAMP STATE PARK

Create continuous shoreline recreational area, including beaches, marinas, picnic areas, fishing piers, and riding and hiking trails.

Protect and provide public access to shellfish beds offshore.

RAT ROCK
 Preserve island; No development.


THE SISTERS
 Preserve islands; no development.

The Sisters
 Pt. San Pedro

POINT SAN QUENTIN TO POINT SAN PEDRO
 In connection with shoreline parks and scenic drives, develop system of riding and hiking trails.

MARIN ISLANDS
 Protect wildlife value.

Pt. San Pablo




Plan Map 12
Western San Pablo Bay


Plan Map 13

**Notes to
Plan Map 13
Petaluma River**

San Pablo Bay National Wildlife Refuge. The marshes and mudflats of San Pablo Bay east of the mouth of the Petaluma River, including Lower Tubbs Island, are being acquired by the U. S. Department of the Interior for the federal San Pablo Bay National Wildlife Refuge. This program would be consistent with Bay Plan policies.



Key to Plan Maps 3-20



LEGEND

WATER-RELATED INDUSTRY [Solid black box]


WATERFRONT PARK, BEACH [Horizontal line pattern box]

WILDLIFE AREA [Dotted pattern box]


TIDAL MARSH [Stippled pattern box]

	EXISTING	PROPOSED
MARINA	[Icon of a pier]	[Icon of a pier]
RECREATIONAL FERRY	[Icon of a ferry]	[Icon of a ferry]
LAUNCHING RAMP	[Icon of a ramp]	[Icon of a ramp]
COMMERCIAL RECREATION		<i>CR</i>
VISTA POINT		*
SCENIC DRIVE	[Icon of a road]	[Icon of a road]
FREEWAY	[Icon of a road]	[Icon of a road]
RAILROAD	[Icon of a railroad]	[Icon of a railroad]

COMMISSION POLICY: **PRINTED IN BOLD TYPE**
COMMISSION SUGGESTION: *PRINTED IN ITALICS*



Plan Map 13
Petaluma River



Key to Plan Maps 3-20



Plan Map 14

**Notes to
Plan Map 14
Napa Marshes**

Salt Ponds and Other Managed Wetlands. Large area, high-value wildlife habitat.

Skagg Island Security Group Activity (U. S. Navy). Plan maps indicate recommended use for Bayfront military installations if one or more of these bases is ever declared surplus by the military. The Bay Plan does not advocate the closing of any military installation.

San Pablo Bay National Wildlife Refuge. The marshes and mudflats of San Pablo Bay west of Vallejo and south of State Highway Route 37 are being acquired by the U. S. Department of the Interior for the federal San Pablo Bay National Wildlife Refuge. This program would be consistent with Bay Plan policies.




**Plan Map 14
Napa Marshes**

Plan Map 15


**Notes to
Plan Map 15
Eastern San Pablo Bay**

Salt Ponds and Other Managed Wetlands. Large area, high-value wildlife habitat.

Mare Island Naval Shipyard. Plan maps indicate recommended use for Bayfront military installations if one or more of these bases is ever declared surplus by the military. The Bay Plan does not advocate the closing of any military installation.



Key to Plan Maps 3-20



NAPA BAY
 Encourage recreational development of areas adjacent to shoreline
 Provide continuous public access to shoreline.

ROUTE 37
 Access to Bay side for viewing and fishing only.

Provide continuous public access to shoreline from Napa Bay to existing park. Protect views of Strait from freeway and hills.

Design Proposed freeway to provide substantial pedestrian and vehicular access to waterfront and to protect views from hills.

VALLEJO WATER-RELATED INDUSTRIAL AREA
 Some fill may be needed.

SAN PABLO BAY
 Marshes and mudflats are valuable wildlife habitat; may be encroached upon only for fishing piers, small-boat and barge channels, wildlife observation facilities, and piers necessary for industry. Design onshore development to protect wildlife value of offshore areas.

MARE ISLAND NAVAL SHIPYARD
 If and when not needed by Navy, give first consideration to port and water-related industry. Port use should be limited to shallow-draft shipping unless the channels serving the site can be maintained at a cost that is reasonable in relation to other regional dredging needs. See Seaport Plan.

CARQUINEZ STRAIT, BRIDGE AND SHORELINE
 Enhance scenic qualities, preserve views and increase public access.

SELBY
 See Seaport Plan. Some fill may be needed for port use.

RODEO
 Develop beach northwest of railroad. Provide safe, easy pedestrian access. Some fill may be needed.

PINOLE-HERCULES SHORELINE PARK (proposed)
 Raise level of dry land, but preserve adjacent marshes. Provide safe pedestrian access across railroad tracks. Landscape existing sewage treatment plant.

WILSON POINT
 Proposed beach and park. Preserve rugged character of point. Provide safe, easy pedestrian access. Some fill may be needed. Protect and provide public access to shellfish beds offshore.

HERCULES
 Design future development west of bridge to maximize and protect Bay Views.

LEGEND


PORT	
WATER-RELATED INDUSTRY	
WATERFRONT PARK BEACH	
WILDLIFE AREA	
TIDAL MARSH	
SALT POND MANAGED WETLAND	

EXISTING	PROPOSED
MARINA	
FISHING PIER	
RECREATIONAL FERRY	
LAUNCHING RAMP	
COMMERCIAL RECREATION	CR
ENTRANCE VIEW FROM ROAD	
VISTA POINT	
SCENIC DRIVE	
FREEWAY	
RAILROAD	

COMMISSION POLICY **PRINTED IN BOLD TYPE**
 COMMISSION SUGGESTION *PRINTED IN ITALICS*



Plan Map 15
Eastern San Pablo Bay



Key to Plan Maps 3-20

Plan Map 16

Notes to Plan Map 16 Carquinez Strait

Benecia Beach State Park. Proposed park expansion should encompass principal overlooks and ridges on north side of strait, to preserve rugged and scenic character of hills, presently undeveloped.

Scenic Area South Side of Carquinez Strait. The scenic area includes principal overlook ridges and scenic road between Crockett and Martinez. To preserve presently undeveloped rugged and scenic hills, zoning should provide for extremely sparse development with control over tree removal and location of all structures; scenic easements should be acquired by East Bay Regional Park District, county, or other public body as necessary to guarantee permanent protection. Some park development may be appropriate in valleys leading to Bay.

Benecia Waterfront Special Area Plan. Special Area Plan No. 2 was adopted by the Commission (April, 1977) and the City of Benecia to provide detailed planning and regulatory guidelines for the Benecia Shoreline between West Second Street and the Benecia-Martinez Bridge. Refer to maps, policies, and recommendations of the special area plan for specific information for this area.

West Benecia Waterfront. Detailed planning is needed to determine most desirable waterfront design west of West Second Street, emphasizing "urban" recreation uses with a minimum of Bay filling (and housing on existing private land).

Martinez Waterfront. Largely undeveloped at present, City has prepared specific plan for waterfront design and recreation uses.



LEGEND

- WATER-RELATED INDUSTRY
- PORT
- WATERFRONT PARK BEACH
- TIDAL MARSH
- SALT POND MANAGED WETLAND


EXISTING PROPOSED

- MARINA
- FISHING PIER
- RECREATIONAL FERRY
- LAUNCHING RAMP
- COMMERCIAL RECREATION
- ENTRANCE VIEW FROM ROAD
- VISTA POINT
- SCENIC DRIVE
- FREEWAY
- RAILROAD

COMMISSION POLICY PRINTED IN BOLD TYPE
COMMISSION SUGGESTION PRINTED IN ITALICS



Plan Map 16
Carquinez Strait



Key to Plan Maps 3-20


Plan Map 17

**Notes to
Plan Map 17
Suisun Bay**

Suisun Marsh. Thousands of acres of controlled marshes are maintained by duck-hunting clubs as wildfowl habitat. Areas are diked, but dikes are opened for periodic flooding. Suisun Resource Conservation District protects and enhances marshland areas.

Port Chicago Naval Weapons Station. Plan maps indicate recommended use for Bayfront military installations if one or more of these bases is ever declared surplus by the military. The Bay Plan does not advocate the closing of any military installation.

Suisun Marsh Protection Plan. The Protection Plan is a more specific application of the policies of the Bay Plan because of the unique characteristics of the Suisun Marsh. The policies of both the Bay Plan and the Protection Plan apply within the Marsh, however, in event of policy conflict the policies of the Protection Plan control. Refer to maps and policies of the Protection Plan and the Suisun Marsh Preservation Act of 1977, for more specific information.




**Plan Map 17
Suisun Bay**

Plan Map 18


**Notes to
Plan Map 18
Grizzly Bay**

Suisun Marsh. Thousands of acres of controlled marshes are maintained by duck-hunting clubs as wildfowl habitat. Areas are diked, but dikes are opened for periodic flooding. Suisun Resource Conservation District protects and enhances marshland areas.

Suisun Marsh Protection Plan. The Protection Plan is a more specific application of the policies of the Bay Plan because of the unique characteristics of the Suisun Marsh. The policies of both the Bay Plan and the Protection Plan apply within the Marsh, however, in event of policy conflict the policies of the Protection Plan control. Refer to maps and policies of the Protection Plan and the Suisun Marsh Preservation Act of 1977, for more specific information.



Plan Map 18
Grizzly Bay



Key to Plan Maps 3-20



Plan Map 19

**Notes to
Plan Map 19
Honker Bay to Collinsville**

Recreational Potential. Extensive, valuable recreational potential in river and island areas (e.g. Sherman Island—"Sherman Lake" area popular for boating, fishing) Recreational use should be encouraged.

Collinsville Area. The Collinsville-Montezuma Slough area is adjacent to the deep-water shipping channel, has rail service, and consists of flat land. It is one of the largest available sites anywhere in the Bay Area for water-related industry. The shoreline fronting on the main shipping channel is limited, however, and this relatively small frontage should be carefully planned and shared for maximum industrial development.

Suisun Marsh Protection Plan. The Protection Plan is a more specific application of the policies of the Bay Plan because of the unique characteristics of the Suisun Marsh. The policies of both the Bay Plan and the Protection Plan apply within the Marsh, however, in event of policy conflict the policies of the Protection Plan control. Refer to maps and policies of the Protection Plan and the Suisun Marsh Preservation Act of 1977, for more specific information.



LEGEND

	WATER-RELATED INDUSTRY
	WILDLIFE AREA
	TIDAL MARSH
	SALT POND MANAGED WETLAND
	EXISTING
	PROPOSED
	MARINA
	FISHING PIER
	LAUNCHING RAMP
	COMMERCIAL RECREATION
	FREEWAY
	RAILROAD

COMMISSION POLICY PRINTED IN BOLD TYPE
COMMISSION SUGGESTION PRINTED IN ITALICS

Map 17

Map 20


Plan Map 19
Honker Bay to Collinsville

Plan Map 20

**Notes to
Plan Map 20
Montezuma Slough**

Suisun Marsh. Thousands of acres of controlled marshes are maintained by duck-hunting clubs as wildfowl habitat. Areas are diked, but dikes are opened for periodic flooding. Suisun Resource Conservation District protects and enhances marshland areas.

Suisun Marsh Protection Plan. The Protection Plan is a more specific application of the policies of the Bay Plan because of the unique characteristics of the Suisun Marsh. The policies of both the Bay Plan and the Protection Plan apply within the Marsh, however, in event of policy conflict the policies of the Protection Plan control. Refer to maps and policies of the Protection Plan and the Suisun Marsh Preservation Act of 1977, for more specific information.



Key to Plan Maps 3-20

FAIRFIELD

Suisun City

Denverton

Suisun Hill

Potrero Hills

Potrero Hills

MONTEZUMA AND SUISUN SLOUGHS
May be dredged for small-boat
and shallow-draft industrial uses.

Bradmoor
Island

GRIZZLY ISLAND
WILDLIFE AREA
Joice Island Unit

Montezuma Slough

Nurse Slough


Reby Hill


GRIZZLY BAY


Hammond Island


GRIZZLY ISLAND
WILDLIFE AREA
Grizzly Island Unit.


LEGEND

WATER-RELATED INDUSTRY 



WATERFRONT PARK, BEACH 



WILDLIFE AREA 



TIDAL MARSH 


SALT POND, MANAGED WETLAND 


EXISTING **PROPOSED**


MARINA  

FISHING PIER  

LAUNCHING RAMP  

VISTA POINT  *

FREEWAY 

RAILROAD 

COMMISSION POLICY **PRINTED IN BOLD TYPE**

COMMISSION SUGGESTION *PRINTED IN ITALICS*



San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission

September 1983 as amended

Plan Map 20
Montezuma Slough

(Map 19)

(Map 17)

Plan Map 20
Montezuma Slough