

Shoreline Adaptation Plan Public Feedback

Public Comment period open September 3 to October 7, 2025

Community Workshop #3 held on September 10, 2025

23 Comments received using the online public feedback form

3 General letters received

Introduction Pages 8-19

- Page 6 - 43% of Sausalito's waterfront is city-owned? Is that including all the way out to the treatment plant (and I'm assuming a big chunk is the stretch of Bridgeway in Old Town)? While the figure presented may be factually correct, the "working waterfront" is largely privately owned and is unique in California...many people are surprised (and delighted) to learn that families own the businesses along the waterfront and not huge corporations.
- Page 10 - can we rearrange the principles as follows? 1) support working waterfront, 2) maintain active public waterfront, 3) principle 5...and principle 2 at the very end as an emergency measure.
- Page 20 and 21 - the photos identify "Economic Sustainability" and show tourists. Another photo states "Authentic Maritime Character" - but then doesn't show anything remotely associated with Sausalito's working waterfront. There is a fundamental disconnect and lack of understanding revealed in those pictures - the maritime sector in Sausalito is an economic engine AND a cornerstone of Sausalito's cultural fabric - that should be a huge focus (more to come in the alternatives)
- Would prefer bullet points of before and after.
- What is your opinion of the latest reports coming out of knowledgeable sources stating that the sea level rise that we've been warned up out is not happening?
- If this can be used it needs to be much bigger so that it is readable.
- On the introduction I am in agreement that we are going to be facing some major changes in the next 20-50 years, and beyond.
- There is little basis in fact or science for these alarmist sea level rise scenarios in Sausalito. Absolute sea level rise in SF has been about .02/inches per year over the past 100 years. If the trend of the past 100 years continues, Sausalito could expect to see sea levels increase by .5 inches over the next 25 years. The study scenarios,

drawn from the California Coastal Commission Sea Level Rise Policy Guidance, are relative to a 2000 baseline - half the time period has already passed with minimal observed sea level rise. These scenarios would depend on a sea level rise in the remaining period, accelerating to 20-50 times faster than observed data. The 2050 scenarios, according to the IPCC AR6, are in the ~90th percentile; in other words, there is a 90% percent chance sea level rise will be below these levels. The Coastal Commission cautioned against utilizing the alarmist scenario in 2100 High because of “deep uncertainties and ambiguities”.

- Over the past 100 years, relative sea level in the San Francisco Bay area has risen by 7.8 inches, at an average rate of 0.08 inches/year. San Francisco’s vertical land motion is -0.06 inches/year (sinking), producing a recent absolute rate of +0.02 inches/year. Portions of Treasure Island, San Francisco International Airport, and Foster City are sinking as fast as 0.4 inches/year (Shirzaei and Bürgmann, 2018). Problems in the San Francisco Bay area, including threats to the airport, are caused primarily by soil compaction in landfill zones that were formerly wetlands, not by the slow creep of global sea level rise.
- Basing any policy decisions on such extreme and implausible scenarios will lead to worse outcomes than any sea level rise could cause.
- I have a presentation available with the above data and references to the relevant sources.
- p. 6
Original: “As implementation becomes eminent...” Rewrite: “As implementation becomes imminent...”
- Page 7: Local roads such as Spinnaker Drive, Wateree, and Gate 6 Road are among the roads impacts. Should be "impacted"
- Page 19: is mislabeled "9"
- I have been reading the document on line; it is too many pages to print it. I don't have it in front of me as I'm trying to fill out the form, (or the computer skills to go back and forth between the document and this form) so it is hard to respond section by section. I am impressed by all the analysis that has gone into the study and by the public outreach efforts; I've attended the public forums.
- The plan correctly states the urgency of sea level rise adaptation (pp. 14–19). I recommend that the City explicitly consider hybrid, nature-based technologies such as bio-enhancing concrete. These solutions align with SB 272 requirements (p. 18)

and OPC guidance (p. 16) by delivering both structural protection and ecological uplift

- Page 17 – Should we consider adding these that are outside of the City’s jurisdiction to the “Other Planning Policy Alignment” ?
- Page 17 – Sausalito Storm Drain Assessment Report is completed, no longer “ongoing”

Vulnerability Assessment Pages 22-52

- pg 33 - picture is of Clipper Yacht Harbor...more accurate to say "...near Harbor Drive." as Liberty Ship Way is approximately 1/4 mile away.
- pg 38 - I think that is a picture of Bridgeway Marina from the edge of Dunphy Park
- pg 52 - the Richardson Bay Regional Agency and County of Marin have tons of information about eelgrass beds in the bay - why isn't that being shown?? Also, it's important to recognize that the truly important stands of eelgrass are out in the middle of the bay - wisps of grass in historically disturbed areas should not preclude maintenance and upkeep of marinas (if anything, it's a credit to the waterfront operations that eelgrass continues to grow - we are a part of the environment).
- Suggest showing a 2025 base condition, describing and showing the highest recorded tide, and the highest recorded storm surge . . completely real without SLR modeling. Much of the bayfront is vulnerable even before the projected 0.8' and 3.1' SLR. Also, suggest dropping the 2100 High scenario on maps . . confusing to have some scenarios with storm surge and some without, since storm surge is always a possibility. The complete range of 2100 projections could be described in the text.
- In mainstream climate discourse the words "adaptation" and "mitigation" have specific meanings. Specifically, "mitigation" is used in the context of reducing or eliminating the causes of climate change, such as the burning of fossil fuels, increasing vehicle and building efficiency and electrification. In numerous places in this document the word "mitigation or mitigate" is used in the context of flood or hazard mitigation, which is understandable, but could be somewhat confusing, given the several meanings of the word. Some might think that by mitigating hazards we are mitigating climate change, which is not the case.
- Page 22: Please define "ecotone-levee" in the document.
- Page +++ For the general reader, please define early in the document that "SLR" is an acronym for "Sea Level Rise". It does show up in the Glossary, but this point of confusion was raised at Community Meeting #3.

- Page 28: Could be better written: "City sewer infrastructure collects and transports wastewater from buildings to the treatment plant, preventing issues concerning public health and environmental contamination." Maybe: "...to the treatment plant, protecting public health and preventing environmental contamination."
- Page 29: "The transportation system in Sausalito comprises of roads, transit routes, transit stops, and the ferry terminal." Delete "of" or say "comprised of"
- p. 33: Original: "hazards that act as amplifier of sea level rise" Rewrite: "hazards that act as amplifiers of sea level rise"
- Page 34: This is confusing: "push water "uphill" into a higher water body" SLR effect on stormwater infrastructure could be better explained.
- p. 38 (Glossary version of subsidence) Original: "Land subsidence ... the gradual sinking or settling of the ground surface" Rewrite: "Land subsidence is the gradual sinking or settling of the ground surface"
- Page 38: LANDSLIDE SUSCEPTIBILITY ZONES outlining 4 zones is paired with a map of shoreline erosion with 4 zones. This is confusing.
- Page 47: Please include sidewalks and bike lanes as components of the transportation network. "...components of the transportation network in Sausalito: roads, piers, bus routes, bus stops, and ferry terminal." I think this list appears more than once.
- Page 53: Is eelgrass the only species with habitat changes? Is it worth mentioning that the decline of eelgrass has follow-on effects on herring that lay eggs in eelgrass, gulls and cormorants that feed on herring, etc?
- p. 57: Original: "land use... overlayed with building footprints" Rewrite: "land use... overlaid with building footprints"
- Original (tables): "TABLE 3" Rewrite: "Table 3"
- p. 58: Original: "assuming total damage to all flooded assets as might be expected..."
Rewrite: "assuming that all flooded assets would be considered total losses, as might occur in a major flood..."
- The assessment of the vulnerabilities seems realistic and based on the available data.

- The assessment identifies hundreds of millions of dollars in risk by mid-century, rising to billions under higher SLR scenarios (p. 59). I recommend that the City incorporate a life-cycle and avoided-cost framework into its analysis. Ecological uplift technologies, such as bio-enhancing shoreline structures, living breakwaters, and hybrid levees, can extend the lifespan of assets, reduce scour, and lower regulatory mitigation expenses. By accounting for these avoided costs, the City will strengthen its decision-making, attract external funding, and reduce the long-term financial burden on residents.
- Utilities (sewer, stormwater, power, telecom) traverse private waterfront parcels, often without formal easements. With no force main on Bridgeway, submerging these systems would impose extreme maintenance and reliability risks citywide. This is one of many reasons why the shoreline itself must be maintained as existing.
- Much of the waterfront includes historic paper streets with fee title extending into the Bay. Unlike most California waterfronts, the parcels along Sausalito's waterfront are largely privately owned, not State-owned. Any realignment must account for private rights and access.

Communities Priorities Pages 61-72

- page 64 - while these community forums are very informative and necessary, the consultant should have gone further and contacted waterfront business operators (and arguably prioritized the waterfront's concerns and comments as they are directly impacted by SLR).
- page 68 - to build on the point above, the project goals seem uninformed and miss the point that over half the waterfront is privately owned. The goals never mention the working waterfront and don't consider how marinas, boat yards and waterfront businesses operate.
- page 70 - again, the plan mentions "authenticity" but never really considers the maritime sector - it seems to operate on assumptions about marinas and never actually digs into the reality of what it takes to operate a marina or boat yard
- Same comment about readability
- Listen to the residents. And businesses. I've been to all the meetings but this is really too vague.

- The page numbers on this form do not match the page numbers in the pdf. For instance, Community Priorities is on pages 61-72.
- p. 63–65 (Workshop comments)
Original: “Floating more properties, infrastructures, and facilities”
Rewrite: “Exploring more floating options for properties, infrastructure, and facilities”
- p. 70
Original: “The elements compared in the tradeoff analysis, informed the by project goals...”
Rewrite: “The elements compared in the tradeoff analysis, informed by the project goals, are listed below.”
- Original: “These criteria form the basis of decision-making key stakeholder conversations...”
Rewrite: “These criteria form the basis of decision-making in key stakeholder conversations...”
- p. 71
Original: “as the city moves towards toward a cohesive...”
Rewrite: “as the city moves toward a cohesive...”
- The evaluation criteria seem appropriate.
- Beyond the community workshops, what direct outreach from the consultant team occurred in the development of this plan? Of the 110 industrial buildings, 110 commercial buildings, and 40 residential buildings that will be impacted by sea level rise, how many building owners were contacted? How many provided feedback or input? Will the compiled feedback be provided in an appendix?
- The priorities do a strong job of reflecting community values, especially around maritime character, ecology, and collective action. From a technical perspective, I recommend elevating nature-based shoreline protection and ecological uplift as a cross-cutting priority. Approaches such as eelgrass restoration, living shorelines, and bio-enhancing infrastructure can provide both structural resilience and measurable ecological benefits. Including performance metrics for ecological outcomes (e.g., biodiversity gains, carbon sequestration potential) would strengthen accountability and long-term monitoring.
- Page 67 – “Appendix XXX” should revise to include the Appendix and reference pages here.

- Regarding the depiction on p. 92, what are these proposed buildings? Who will implement this, over what time and process?
- Also, regarding the possibility of "floating parking," please, no more parking! We have enough parking in prime property in Sausalito without putting more on the water. Please protect us from more views of parked cars!!
- page 96 - delete Anderson's Boatyard and replace with KKMI - Anderson's has been gone for over a decade. It's stuff like this that undermines the credibility of the consultants and makes me wonder if they ever really looked at the waterfront (and have no idea what a working waterfront needs to thrive).
- pages 98 through 103 are painful to read. The diagrams don't accurately depict the limits of the shoreline. The options completely disregard private property rights and would functionally destroy the majority of Sausalito's most productive maritime businesses.
- Why not build a board walk and protect people and land.
- What are the commercial and financial priorities that are leading to this concept.
- This section shows levees as the solution to protecting all lowlying areas along the bayfront. Since most of Sausalito is on high ground, and much of the bayfront is on piers and piles, Sausalito could adapt in a different way, than an all-lowlying city or region. A potential different way would be to identify peninsulas and finger streets and piers from high ground out to the Bay, a pattern unique to Sausalito. Take this opportunity to create a more visionary adaptation unique to Sausalito's topography and bayfront uses.
- Love the various resilient edge concepts. I am not an expert so have no opinion on what would work best.
- Page 76: Please finish this sentence: "In the bridgeway promenade example on the right, a recommended height of 2.8 feet for scenario 2, or 5.1 feet of for scenario 3 is shown, proportional to the width of a shoreline path and a pedestrian."
- p. 85–87
Original: "The cost of promenade and seawall options ranges from \$55M to \$405M."
Rewrite: "The estimated cost of promenade and seawall options ranges from about \$55 million to \$405 million, depending on the design and features selected."

- P. 92
"Because the shoreline is moving outward, the Joinery is no longer hanging over the water- it's behind a levee, and the public shoreline is elsewhere." Elsewhere?
- p.93
"Buildings along the west side of Bridgeway are raised or rebuilt" Should be east side???
- p. 94
"While the levee build in the water offer opportunities for a new shoreline trail,..."
levees built???
- p.94
"The Turney Street ramp and public docks are highly valued and noted to be currently in poor condition." might add the city's current plans to replace with an adaptable ramp and public dock.
- p. 94
Original: "Priority is given to preserving arts an cultural events"
Rewrite: "Priority is given to preserving arts and cultural events"
- p.99
"Existing land could be transformed into living breakwaters to reduce wave action and enhance aquatic habitat. Existing land lying on the water-side of the resilient edge could be transformed into living breakwaters to reduce wave action and enhance aquatic habitats and recreational value. Detention ponds are added behind the wall." Unneeded repetition.
- The resilient edge concept is a new one for me, but I began to understand it because of both the document and the presentation at SCA.
- 4.2.1 - why were concepts C and D not rated in Table 12? What was the justification for their omission?
- 4.2.3 - what was the feedback from existing Marinship businesses on proposed options A, B, C?
- 4.2.4 - the floating homes in this section are outside the city's limits and are not in the jurisdiction of the City of Sausalito. Why did this plan for the city include land outside the city limits?

- 4.2.4 - Option A - where does the parking for the floating homes go? The plan does not address the impact eliminating the parking of non-city residents can have on the City of Sausalito and its infrastructure.
- The alternatives provide a thoughtful range of options, from inland setbacks to floating adaptations. Community concerns about large seawalls disrupting the working waterfront are well founded. Technical experience shows that hybrid systems such as living breakwaters, eco-engineered seawalls, and levee-ecotone combinations can achieve flood protection while enhancing habitat and maintaining waterfront character. Incorporating these types of nature-based hybrids into the concepts would help balance resilience, ecological function, and community identity.
- I do not see how the possibly of Option A, on page 106, is a realistic choice, due to the amount of construction for the additional floating piers designed to carry automobiles. Option B, on page 107, strikes me as much more possible.
- p. 108
Original: "Cost estimates... assumed that , the challenges..."
Rewrite: "Cost estimates... assumed that the challenges..."
- p. 108
"Any reduction in quantity [parking?] as part of elevating the parking area would be challenging."
Is reducing parking challenging? Or, is it: maintaining quantity of parking would be challenging?
- Offshore levees and "living breakwaters" parallel to marina entrances would obstruct fairways and slip access while providing limited wave attenuation. Effective breakwaters must be oriented correctly to wave approach and preserve ingress/egress geometry.
- Eelgrass locations east of channel are incorrect via most recent surveys.
- Parking removal/relocation conflicts: For example, the Clipper Yacht Harbor figure places a breakwater over existing required parking, critical for ADA and emergency access. Loss of this land and parking would directly threaten more than 145 maritime jobs here alone.
- Breakwaters are drawn inside Marina Plaza Harbor private marina basins, blocking egress for over 100 slips and the Fjord floating Sauna.

- Proposed detention basins between Bridgeway and the shoreline would require massive excavation of public and private land (including Bay Trail and park areas) or, if offshore, would eliminate marina access.
- The Plan lacks any described pathway for incremental elevation of buildings and walkways.
- The stated cost/benefit analysis is non-transparent and materially understated. Key issues include:
 - Valuation basis: Clarify whether figures are based on assessed, market, or replacement value.
 - Pricing basis and escalation: State the base year, cost indices, and escalation factors.
 - Asset inventory and unit pricing: Provide detailed unit costs (levees, breakwaters, docks, utilities, dredging, etc.) with contingencies and soft costs.
 - Business interruption and tax base impacts: Include lost revenues and taxes, not just capital costs. This is critical. Common sense dictates this to be one of most powerful reasons why preserving existing shoreline is absolutely necessary.
 - Utilities and constructability: Account for sewer, power, stormwater, emergency access, seasonal work windows, and biological monitoring as well as maintenance of now submerged utilities in the “abandon” plan.
 - Legal costs: Include easement acquisition and litigation exposure for anything not protecting the existing shoreline.
 - Discount rate and probability assumptions: Disclose real/nominal rates, horizons, sea level rise scenarios, storm probabilities, and sensitivity tables. Publish the underlying cost model spreadsheets with assumptions, P50/P90 sensitivities, and methodology for public review.

Adaptation Strategies Pages 112-149

- I'm not sure where to place this question, but the City Council refers to the "Bridgeway Marina" project. How does that term relate to this work, please?
- page 134 - "Reprogramming" no.
- page 135 - MS-4 "Working Waterfront" - this is insulting. Change the title to say "Marina Plaza and Sausalito Shipyard and Marina" - the real working waterfront encompasses a much larger area, and continuing to romanticize one limited portion of the waterfront encourages misinformation, causes confusion and does a disservice to all the other hard working maritime businesses in Sausalito.

- pages 138 and 139 - so I guess we are just writing off one of Sausalito's biggest marinas? And writing off any sort of businesses in the area? This is really hard to read.
- Listen to the residents. Be thoughtful about expenditures, now and in the future
- Since our office and building is located in Marinship, commenting mostly on Marinship (p 134). Adding to my earlier comment, seems like the challenge of SLR should be harnessed to transform unique and amazing Sausalito into something better, rather than just adding levees/seawalls along the existing condition.
- 5.4.1 discusses raising, hardening, reducing and living at SW-4 and SW-5. Yet there are no proposed solutions or recommendations in 4. SW-4, and SW-5 are a major economic center and vital for the city and yet were omitted as focus areas. Why did the plan omit proposed plans for a critical and central part of the city?
- Raising and maintaining Bridgeway and 101 is vital for everyone! Brigeway is the lifeline of Sausalito for residents and visitors alike. When 101 and Manzanita floods it impacts and denies access to residents and commerce of Marin City and Mill Valley. I live on Issaquah Dock and my biggest personal concern is being able to access my home during high water events.
- p.123
"Eelgrass beds and subtidal rocky habitat are expended." expanded?
- p.127 "course beaches" coarse?
- I'm not sure if this is where the Options were or in the previous section. I focused on the first three areas (Bridgeway Promenade, New Town, and Marinship) For the Bridgeway Promenade, I favor Option B2. For New Town, I favor Option B and for the Marinship Option B also.
- Longterm adoption 1 and 2 for the Marinship propose "Live With Water" as the plan. The plan lacks details explaining how this was the best approach and decision for this vital section of town. What was the criteria to determine that was the best solution for this area? What is the economic impact to the City of Sausalito for this approach? What feedback was there from the Working Waterfront and existing waterfront businesses in the Marinship for the longterm adoption plan 1 and 2?
- Hi, let's swap land with the GGNRA and give them a Sea Level Rise Retreat Experimental Demonstration Zone along the shore as part of the park (with adapting access as sea level rises). The freeway is a rather arbitrary boundary, the ridge up behind the freeway is a more logical place to draw the line between park and city

(there is not much value in the way of either park or habitat between the freeway and the ridge. MUCH less habitat value, anyway, than would be provided by letting the Bay, the sea, reclaim its wetlands). We can build tall and dense above the freeway (our best big chance to create a Structurally Equitable Community, a ZIP Code Village, FOREVER, instead of the glorified Monopoly board we've allowed our town to become at present) -- the freeway itself will be the climate change datum -- and gracefully retreat from sea level rise down at the shoreline. There's no reason that Bridgeway need go through, we already have the freeway. I can't think of a better "traffic calming strategy" than letting the tide cut it off from time to time, and finally, for good, giving Sausalito back to pedestrians and people in small craft, as it was for millennia with the First Peoples.

- The strategies to explore “living with water,” raising infrastructure, hardening edges, and reducing impacts. A technical recommendation is to make clearer how these strategies can be combined. For instance, “hardening” approaches can be integrated with ecological uplift through bio-enhancing materials and structural forms that support marine life. Similarly, floating and amphibious approaches can be coupled with shoreline habitat creation. Explicitly calling out hybrid pathways would provide flexibility, reduce long-term maintenance costs, and align the plan with regional and state guidance encouraging multi-benefit solutions.
- The Plan lists, for example, the Swede’s Beach Homeowners Association, but omits SSWA the organization representing the waterfront’s economic engine, tax base, and jobs. Requested edit: Add SSWA under “City and Community Partners,” with roles in alignment selection, feasibility and land use review, constructability input, marina access and building and parking standards, and phased implementation etc.

Implementation

- Lots of talk about art, tourism and public use...not enough about supporting Sausalito's maritime sector. We really need to see more of a commitment to maritime in Sausalito.
- p. 137
"Flood parks should be located within the district to collect and detain stormwater before it is pumped bay to the Bay over the levee." Delete bay
- Glossary (p. 161+)
Suggestion: When acronyms first appear in the body text, add plain-language definitions.
Example:
“Mean Higher High Water (MHHW)” instead of just “MHHW.”

“National Vertical Datum of 1988 (NAVD88, a national standard for measuring elevation)” instead of just “NAVD88.”

“Enhanced Infrastructure Financing Districts (EIFDs, a local funding tool for infrastructure projects).”

- I'm not sure if this is where a variety of approaches used around the world were laid out, but I believe we should be creative in drawing on the applicable implementation techniques wherever we find them--nature based solutions, floating buildings, etc.
- General comments - since there isn't a place to put those in this feedback form.
 - It is great to see the thoroughness and thoughtfulness that went into the development of this plan. SLR is a real concern and threat to the City of Sausalito and needs to be taken seriously. However, in developing a plan it is crucial that there is extensive direct 1:1 outreach to those affected by SLF (beyond the workshops and group focus meetings). The Plan indicates several community workshops survey and focused meetings occurred. But does not indicate there was direct outreach. Did direct outreach for 1:1 meetings occur? The report broadly (using etc) indicates who was invited to the focused meetings. But there is not clarity on who actually attended or provided input. The report should include the names of the businesses/individuals who provided input not only for transparency but in recognition of those who contributed to the creation of the plan. Submitting a plan without acknowledgement all of those who contributed raises more questions on if the plan had consensus or was driven by a select few under the guise of democratic engagement.
 - Furthermore some of the plan's proposed solutions do not seem rooted in reality. Yes, allowing the Mainship to flood is a possible solution, but should that be an actual proposed solution? The damage and impact seems greater than the benefit to the City and the working waterfront. What is the cost and feasibility of raising Bridgeway? Would the businesses and homes on Bridgeway support a plan with it being raised? What is the impact on the neighborhoods that abut Bridgeway? The plan, while detailed, does not indicate what impact there would be in the City of Sausalito beyond the areas of study. It would have been helpful and informative to have that included in the plan proposals.
- The implementation principles rightly emphasize collective action and funding. A technical refinement would be to include performance-based monitoring and adaptive management as core elements. This ensures that ecological and engineering goals are tracked and adjusted over time. Funding strategies could also consider public-private partnerships where ecological uplift offsets mitigation costs, reducing the burden on local governments. Aligning the implementation framework with state and federal programs that prioritize nature-based solutions

(e.g., NOAA NCRF, DOT PROTECT grants) will increase eligibility for external funding. Finally, identifying near-term pilot projects for hybrid shoreline measures would build early momentum and provide proof-of-concept for larger investment.