

December 22, 2003

To: South Bay Salt Pond Restoration Project Stakeholder Forum

From: Center for Collaborative Policy

Re: Outcomes from the December 4, 2003 Stakeholder Forum Meeting

Background: The first meeting of the Stakeholder Forum (Forum) was held Thursday, December 4, 2003 from 1:00 to 5:00 pm at the Palo Alto Art Center. This Forum has been convened to provide ongoing input to the South Bay Salt Pond Restoration Project Management Team (PMT) and its technical consultants on the restoration project's objectives and on elements of the restoration plan itself. The Forum will by no means be the only way to participate in the planning process. There will be several working groups formed to work on specific issues and a host of public outreach events to broaden the scope of public input. The Forum will provide a regular venue for discussing the direction of the restoration plan and for fostering collaboration among a diverse array of stakeholders.

Forum membership was selected by the Project Management Team (PMT) through an application process. Individual participants were selected to represent the following categories of stakeholders:

- Local business
- Environmental organizations
- Public access and recreational groups
- Public infrastructure entities
- Community advocates and organization
- Local governments bordering the Bay
- Public works and public health agencies

Meeting Attendance: Attachment 1 lists meeting participants.

Meeting Materials: In advance of the meeting, Forum members were provided a meeting agenda; draft Agreements in Principle; and a draft Charter and Operating Protocols. At the meeting, each Forum member was provided a Meeting Materials Binder, which included:

- Project map
- Forum member roster
- Project timeline detailing key milestones for stakeholder input and consensus-seeking;
- Draft Project Charter and Operating Protocols;
- Draft Agreements in Principle;
- Project organizational structure diagram;
- South Bay Salt Pond Long-Term Restoration Plan Mission, Goal, Guiding Principles, and Objectives (as of May 2003);
- Brief description of relevant permits, approvals, or consultations that are known to be required for the restoration project; and
- Copies of assorted slideshow presentations that were given during the meeting.

All materials were also made available to the public.

Substantive Meeting Outcomes:

1. *Welcome, Introductions, Agenda Review, and Group Exercise*

Marge Kolar, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), welcomed everyone and thanked meeting attendees for coming out in the rain to the first Stakeholder Forum meeting. After a brief introduction of the representatives from the PMT, Kolar gave a slideshow presentation to orient everyone to the geographic scope and long-term goal of the restoration project (presentation is available at <http://www.southbayrestoration.org/Events.html>). She briefly discussed the technical issues that need to be addressed in order to develop a restoration project that both provide adequate habitat protection and public access.

Mary Selkirk (Center for Collaborative Policy) was introduced as the facilitator of the Forum. She asked all Forum members to introduce themselves and the organization they represented. She provided an overview of the meeting's objectives:

1. Review and possibly adopt Stakeholder Forum Charter and Protocols;
2. Adopt Stakeholder Forum Agreements in Principle;
3. Set the planning context: Briefing and discussion of Project Partner agencies' missions, mandates and constraints;
4. Seek consensus on Restoration Project Goals and Objectives; and
5. Joint education on key scientific uncertainties and the emerging Project Science Strategy.

Selkirk asked each Forum member to pair with another member and identify their top issue for consideration in developing the restoration plan. Each participant was asked to write the other individual's issue on a post-it note and place the notes on a large poster which was affixed to the side wall of the meeting room. The following issues were expressed (listed in random order):

- Long-term mosquito control
- Balance between ecology and recreation
- Ensure that good science is undertaken to answer questions before decisions are made
- Facilitate long-term funding
- Success of the restoration program – we want it to work!
- Flood protection
- Open space preservation and ecological restoration
- Public access and habitat restoration
- Ecological restoration with flood protection
- To represent stakeholder interests of Stevens and Permanente Creeks
- Integrate current and proposed recreational and restoration projects
- Protection of open space
- Public education
- Improve quality of life now and into the future

- Bring the Bay Trail behind Moffett Field on existing levees
- Continuity with regular trail system and to provide interim access
- Endangered species habitat, water quality, and flood protection
- Sediment contamination and dynamics
- Meaningful inclusion of low income communities and communities of color in water issues
- Public access for waterfowl hunting
- That the restoration is completed in accordance with the Shoreline Planning Agency in Hayward
- Maintenance of water supply pipelines/facilities and that the salt pond restoration efforts are undertaken in relationship to the Alameda Creek restoration efforts
- Flood management and integration into overall San Francisco Bay restoration planning
- Net gain in overall health of the San Francisco Bay

2. *Review of Forum Charter and Operating Protocols*

Selkirk provided a brief overview of the proposed Forum Charter and Operating Protocols. She stressed the need for “multi-local thinking” in order to assure success in this challenging restoration project. Selkirk defined “multi-local thinking” as the process of “looking beyond your own interests and to those interests of the others around the table.” Selkirk highlighted a number of the operating protocols, including:

- The need for strong mutual trust;
- The desire to achieve unanimity in decisions;
- Anticipated meeting frequency (once per month for next 3 months followed by quarterly meetings);
- Commitment to active two-way conversations between Forum members and their respective organization’s general membership;
- Role of neutral facilitation for both Forum and Work Group meetings;
- Extensive public participation opportunities are sought and desired; and
- Safeguards for participation, including the right to withdraw from the Forum, information sharing and media contact protocols, and need for full disclosure of activities that might be seen as adversarial by other Forum members (e.g., filing a lawsuit against a Forum member organization).

Forum members raised a number of questions, which were responded to by either Selkirk or one of the PMT members. Questions and the responses included:

- How will the need for providing development mitigation opportunities be expressed in the overall project mission and charter?
Response: Selkirk stated that the Project’s Guiding Principles, which will be reviewed later in the meeting, should capture this concern.
- How will meetings be chaired? What is the process for selecting/rotating the chair responsibilities?
Response: Kolar explained that the chair responsibilities will rotate amongst the PMT members and that this will be detailed in the Operating Protocols.

- How will the Forum meeting deliberations and outcomes be presented to the PMT?
Response: Many, if not all, PMT members will attend the Forum meetings and detailed meetings summaries will also be prepared and widely distributed.
- What if the PMT rejects the Forum's advice?
Response: This is a possibility, but the PMT is committed to working with the Forum to understand all advice that the Forum provides and will explain and provide responses to all recommendations the Forum provides.
- How much "power" does the Forum really have?
Response: The Forum has been convened to provide ongoing input to the PMT and its technical consultants on the restoration project's objectives and on elements of the restoration plan itself and, considering the membership of the Forum, the PMT will take this input very seriously.
- How detailed will the notes from Forum meetings be?
Response: While the notes will not be a transcript of exactly who said what, they will report the substantive discussions and decisions made at each meeting.
- Will enough time be permitted between meetings to allow members to consult with their parent organizations?
Response: Yes. Forum members will always be provided adequate time to share information with their respective organizations before having to provide advice.
- For how long will the Stakeholder Forum be meeting?
Response: As shown in the Project Timeline that was distributed at the meeting, the PMT hopes to develop final restoration alternatives by the fall of 2005 and anticipates the Forum's participation until at least that time.
- Will funding be provided to support joint fact-finding undertaken by the Work Groups?
Response: The PMT will provide a list of all available technical support to the Forum in the near future. This expertise will be provided to support the work of the Forum's Work Groups.
- How will minority opinions be recorded and reported to the PMT?
Response: Yes, all opinions will be presented in the meeting outcome memos.

A member of the Forum expressed his support for the Charter and the Operating Protocols and moved that the Forum adopt them as written. All Forum members concurred.

3. *Review of Forum Agreements in Principle*

Selkirk referred to a poster of the five preliminary Agreements in Principle. Forum members raised a number of questions, which were responded to by either Selkirk or one of the PMT members. Questions and the responses included:

- What does wildlife-oriented recreation mean?
Response: Clyde Morris (USFWS) responded by providing a description of a number of activities that are considered by USFWS to be wildlife-oriented (e.g., bird watching, interpretive trails, etc.).
- The project will enhance more than just the South San Francisco Bay and, thus Principle # 1 should be modified to accurately reflect the significance of the South Bay restoration to the entire San Francisco Bay ecosystem.
Response: Principle #1 was modified to reflect this suggestion.
- The project area is huge and, thus, should be able to accommodate multiple interests. Clearly, the preferred restoration design must not result in flooding and must provide for health and human safety first, but habitat protection and restoration should be the second most important goal. A major reason for spending significant public monies to acquire the salt ponds was to provide for threatened and endangered habitat protection and the Agreements in Principle should reflect this.
Response: A new Principle #6 will be considered to reflect the importance of habitat protection and restoration.
- Will the restoration project seek to increase tidal marsh or brackish habitat?
Response: Carl Wilcox (Dept. of Fish and Game) responded that while the project will not stop the City of San Jose from discharging treated water from its water treatment plant, the project will significantly increase the amount of salt marsh habitat.
- Suggestion was made to replace “wildlife-oriented” with “wildlife-compatible” in Principle #1.
Response: Modification was supported by some Forum members and will be considered.
- Early integration of public access opportunities and habitat protection should be pursued during the restoration alternative development.
Response: A new Principle #7 will be considered to highlight this concern.
- Pursuit of “public safety” can sometimes be interpreted broadly to argue against safe waterfowl hunting and, thus, the principles need to clearly state that one of the USFWS “priority uses” for refuge lands is hunting.
Response: Newly created Principle #6 would be revised to explicitly acknowledge the legally permitted USFWS Priority Uses.
- The project needs to keep the long-term in mind in terms of overall balance of elements in the plan, and in terms of maintenance and operability.
Response: A new Principle #8 will be considered to highlight this concern.

Selkirk stated that the *Agreements in Principle* would be revised per the discussion and distributed to Forum Members for their review and discussion at the next Forum meeting. The revised principles are included as Attachment #2 to this memo.

4. Phase Out and Initial Stewardship Plan

Kolar (USFWS) presented two slides (available at the project website) that provided a brief description of the process Cargill is following to phase out salt production in the acquired ponds. She explained that this Initial Stewardship Plan (ISP) will be in place until the long-term restoration planning process is completed. The ISP's objectives are:

- Cease commercial salt operations;
- Introduce tidal hydrology to ponds where feasible;
- Maintain existing high quality open water and wetland wildlife habitat, including habitat for migratory and resident shorebirds and waterfowl;
- Assure ponds are maintained in a restorable condition to facilitate future long-term restoration;
- Minimize initial stewardship management costs; and
- Meet all regulatory requirements; especially discharge requirements to maintain water quality standards in the South Bay.

A Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Report will be released shortly. The full ISP is available from the project website (<http://www.southbayrestoration.org/Documents.html>).

5. *Landowning Agencies' Missions and Mandates: Implications for the Restoration Plan*
Speaking on behalf of USFWS, Morris (USFWS) provided a slideshow entitled "Don Edwards San Francisco Bay National Wildlife Refuge – Where Wildlife Comes First!" Carl Wilcox (DFG) presented an overview of the factors guiding planning for lands administered by the California Department of Fish and Game. Both presentations, which are available at the project website, provided a thorough overview of each agencies' mission and mandate and corresponding constraints that apply to developing a legally sound restoration plan. Following the presentations, Forum members raised the following questions:

- What about the mission and mandate of the California Coastal Conservancy?
Response: Nadine Hitchcock (California Coastal Conservancy) explained that the Conservancy is concerned with protecting threatened and endangered species while looking for opportunities to increase wildlife-compatible public access. Amy Hutzler (California Coastal Conservancy) added that the Conservancy is not a land-owning agency and is providing facilitation and staff support to the restoration planning process.
- Hunting access is currently being denied at various areas around the South Bay and there needs to be much greater access to the shores. Moreover, the public boat launch ramp in Alviso is in terrible condition. The only other South Bay ramp is in Redwood City and there is a terrible need for increased access for the physically challenged.
Response: Russ Robinson (South Bay Yacht Club) explained that Santa Clara County Parks Department will be fixing the Alviso ramp in the near future with state funds.
- From the presentation provided by the land-owners it appears that "a box has been put around what the Forum can really do."
Response: Morris (USFWS) stated that while "legal sideboards" do exist for the project, there is "plenty of room for creative design and recreational opportunities." He went on to explain that while a Compatibility Determination will have to be

undertaken for compliance with USFWS regulations, there is plenty of flexibility in how the restoration project can be designed.

A Forum member supported Morris' response that the Forum was not intended to be a "decision-making" body, but can provide significant and substantive advice regarding the restoration plan. He suggested that the Forum's charge is "express and identify various interest's desires while understanding the assorted constraints. There is a strong need for collaboration and for education."

6. *Public Comment Period #1*

Non-Forum members in attendance provided comments to the Forum on a number of topics including:

- Expansion of recreation to include windsurfing,
- The need for the Project to consider the quality and health of adjacent residents and existing wildlife,
- The overarching need for the Project to provide habitat protection and restoration
- The need for the Project to be fair in considering the needs of all people, including those who hunt with dogs

7. *Restoration Project Mission, Goals, and Objectives*

Referring to a handout entitled "South Bay Salt Pond Long-Term Restoration Plan Mission, Goal, Guiding Principles, and Objectives (as of May 2003)"; Selkirk (CCP) presented the overarching mission – "To prepare a scientifically sound and publicly supported restoration and public access plan that can begin to be implemented within five years." In addition, "The overarching goal of the Long-Term Restoration Plan is the restoration and enhancement of wetlands in the South San Francisco Bay while providing for flood management and wildlife-oriented public access and recreation."

Selkirk then facilitated a discussion on the restoration project's Guiding Principles. The following comments and/or questions were raised:

- Principle #2 is important as existing ponds provide quality habitat now.
- What are the specific actions that will constitute restoration?
Response: Restoration activities will include a wide range of construction and natural processes that will be developed with the assistance of the Forum. It is too early to detail exactly what will constitute the restoration.
- Where will funding for restoration implementation come from?
Response: Most likely a combination of private and public funding sources. It is likely that a significant source of funding will be from the Water Resources Development Act, which is administered by the US Congress.
- Will the Stakeholder Forum be making suggestions for how to secure funding?
Response: Yes. In addition, a Funding/Implementation Work Group will be working to identify potential funding sources.

- What is the timeline for undertaking the restoration?
Response: The planning process is envisioned to last up to five (5) years followed by implementation which will extend over many years.
- This project is of national and hemispheric importance and this point should be reiterated often as it will help in securing funding.
- Stakeholder Forum members and the community-at-large should review the Baylands Ecosystem Habitat Goals Report (available online at <http://www.sfei.org/sfbaygoals/>).
- Plants are often overlooked in habitat restoration efforts and there is a strong need for protecting various sensitive plant species in the South Bay.
- What is the baseline ecological condition of the South Bay Salt Ponds? What about the health of lands and habitats adjacent to the ponds?
Response: USGS has been undertaking analysis of the health of wildlife around the existing sloughs. Water quality, hydrodynamic analysis, and a bathymetric study are all underway.
- What does “infrastructure” refer to in Principle #8?
Response: “Infrastructure” refers to a variety of built structures that exist within the project area, including, but not limited to: PG&E transmission lines, Hetch-Hetchy aqueduct, railroad lines, etc.
- What about the old Navy facilities at Moffett Field?
Response: Some old water control structures along Moffet Field exist and will be analyzed as part of the restoration planning process.
- Suggestion was made to refer to the San Francisco Water Transit Ferry Environmental Impact Report for information on South Bay bathymetry (more information is available online at: <http://www.watertransit.org/>).
- Are the objectives and principles listed in order of priority?
Response: No, but the Forum could consider prioritizing the various objectives and principles at a later time.
- The principles should not be prioritized or ranked at this time as the Forum should strive to accommodate all principles equally.
- Principle #7 – the Forum needs to keep in mind that this project should not be funded by mitigation needs for the San Francisco Airport expansion project.
- Vector control should not be considered a constraint. By addressing vector control early in the restoration design process, the issue will become much easier to address.

- The outer levees around Alviso need to be maintained if flood protection is going to be provided for the residents of Alviso.

8. *What We Know and Don't Know: Key Science Questions and Approaches, Part 1*

Lynne Trulio, Ph.D. (San Jose State University) was introduced as the Lead Scientist for the project. Professor Trulio's research investigates human impacts on species and habitats and seeks effective methods to mitigate or eliminate those impacts. Her specific research has included studies of tidal salt marsh restoration in the San Francisco Bay, the effects of trail use on shorebirds and waterfowl, and the ecology and recovery of the western burrowing owl in California.

Professor Trulio oversees the work of the newly formed Project science team. (See Attachment 3 for a list of the current members of the Project Science Team.)

Professor Trulio presented the first of a two part slideshow entitled "What We Know and Don't Know: Key Science Questions and Approaches" (available from the project website). Following the presentation, Forum members raised the following questions:

- How can the public learn more about the Science Team?
Response: More information regarding the Science Team will be posted on the project website as the process evolves. Work is underway to provide the National Science Panel with relevant research and questions by April 2004. A draft report from the Science Panel will be released by March 2004.
- The Science Team should have an expert on shorebirds, especially Clapper Rails.
Response: While Professor Trulio has undertaken extensive work on shorebirds, she encouraged Forum members to recommend other shorebird specialists who might be able to assist the with the Science Team's work.
- Has the project area been surveyed for cultural resources?
Response: Yes, a general survey was undertaken as part of the San Francisco International Airport study. Many of the existing levees qualify as historic resources as they were constructed over 50 years ago. The Science Team will consider adding a cultural resource specialist.

9. *Next Steps: Public Outreach, Forum Work Groups, and Future Meetings*

Public Outreach: Selkirk described the public outreach strategy that will be used to reach beyond the Forum to help keep the broader public apprised of the restoration planning process. The strategy is being managed by Tracy Grubbs (Center for Collaborative Policy) in concert with several partners who have agreed to take on specific roles, including:

- The San Francisco Bay Joint Venture (speakers bureau)
- San Francisco Estuary Institute (web site)
- Pelican Media (documentary)
- Other NGO's and organizations that would like to assist with site tours, restoration work days, etc.

The strategy includes several mechanisms for keeping the public informed, including:

- The project web site
- A quarterly electronic newsletter
- Regular communication with the media
- Annual public workshops
- A Volunteer Speakers Bureau

Tracy will e-mail a copy of the Public Outreach Strategy to all Forum members. Selkirk explained that in order for the strategy to work the PMT is counting on Forum members to assist with specific outreach activities and to identify community organizations that should be contacted and kept informed about the Project.

To help with this process, Selkirk distributed a blue form and asked that all Forum members complete and return the form to Tracy. The form will also be e-mailed to all Forum members.

Work Groups: As an outcome of the interviews conducted with interested parties over the past summer, the Center for Collaborative Policy recommended that Work Groups be established to support the deliberations of the Forum. The Work Groups will engage in detailed, open public discussions of specific elements of the plan development. Suggested Work Group topics include: Habitat Restoration; Flood Management Integration; Public Access/Recreation; and Funding and Long-term Project Implementation. It is likely that additional Work Groups will be formed on an as-needed basis.

The Lead Scientist will assign Science Team members to the appropriate Work Groups on an as needed basis to provide advice and ensure scientific consistency. Every Work Group should include a representative from a local regulatory agency (EPA, BCDC, RWQCB, or USACE). Members of the Stakeholder Forum, agency staff, and other interested members of the public are encouraged to participate in the Work Groups and to make recommendations to the PMT regarding how the Work Groups should operate and function.

The schedule for the first meeting of the various Work Groups will be determined in early 2004. Brad Olson offered meeting space for Work Groups at the East Bay Regional Park District facilities.

Tour Dates: Selkirk asked Forum members to complete a form indicating preference for a number of future meeting dates. Possible meeting dates included:

- Wednesday, January 21, 2004, -10 a.m.-3 p.m.
10 a.m.-12 Collaborative Skills Workshop
12:30-3 p.m. Forum meeting
- Wednesday, February 18, 2004, 10 a.m.-3 p.m.
10 a.m.-12 Collaborative Skills Workshop
12:30-3 p.m. Forum meeting

Potential Collaborative Skills Workshop/Salt Ponds Tour Dates (USFWS refuge ponds)

- Saturday, January 17, 2004
- Saturday, February 7, 2004

Potential CDFG Salt Ponds Tour Dates:

- January 8, 9, 10, 2004
- February 5, 6, 2004
- March 11, 12, 2004

Some of the days of the week did not correspond to the actual dates on the form and, thus, Selkirk promised to e-mail an accurate version of the form to Forum members for them to complete and return by either e-mail to mseirk@ccp.csus.edu or by fax to 510/981-1123.

10. *Public Comment Period #2*

Non-Forum members in attendance provided comments including

- Support for the Forum and expression of interest in the Work Groups
- The legitimacy of waterfowl hunting as an activity that needs to be incorporated into the restoration plan

In addition, members of the public asked the following questions:

- When will the technical consultants selected to assist with the effort be announced?
Response: Amy Hutzler (Conservancy) stated that many specialists will be involved in the process and that the lead technical consultants selected to assist with developing the restoration alternatives will be publicly announced once a final scope of work is negotiated with the preferred consultant team. She added that the selected team will work very closely with the Army Corps of Engineers in order to secure permits and potential federal funding.
- One member of the public expressed that there should be more opportunity for local government participation in the process.

Response: Selkirk referred to the project organizational structure describing a Local Government Forum that will be held periodically throughout the year to brief local government officials on the project and to provide an opportunity for dialogue between local governments and the PMT.

- When will the Working Groups begin meeting?
Response: Selkirk responded that these groups would probably start meeting in February 2004.

Attachment 1: Meeting Attendance

Project Management Team

Organization	Representatives
California Coastal Conservancy	Nadine Hitchcock, Amy Hutzal,
California Department of Fish & Game	Carl Wilcox
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	Marge Kolar, Clyde Morris
Center for Collaborative Policy	Mary Selkirk, Austin McInerney, Greg Bourne
California State University, San Jose	Lynne Trulio

Stakeholder Forum

Organization	Representatives
Alameda County Mosquito Abatement District	John Rusmiser
Audubon, SF Bay Restoration Program	Mike Sellors
Bay Planning Coalition	Heather Gustafson
California Waterfowl Association	Mark Hennelly
Cargill Salt	Robert C. Douglass, Barbara Ransom
Citizens Committee to Complete Refuge	Arthur Feinstein
City & County of SF-Public Utilities Commission	Jane Lavelle
City of Hayward	Joseph Hilson
City of Palo Alto	Phil Bobel
City of San Jose	Kirsten Struve
City of Sunnyvale	Hon. Julia E. Miller
East Bay Regional Park District	Brad Olson
Eden Shores Community	Peter Dunne
Environmental Justice Coalition for Water	Rochelle Johnson
Federation of Fly Fishers; Flycasters Inc.	Mondy Lariz
George Mayne Elementary	Denise Stephens
Laine Co. Bait Sales; South Bay Yacht Club	Tom Laine
Mid-Peninsula Regional Open Space Trust	Ana Ruiz
NASA Ames Research Center	Sandra Olliges
Port of Oakland	Jody Zaitlin
San Francisco Bay Trail	Janet McBride
Santa Clara Valley Audubon Society	Craig Breon
Santa Clara Valley Water District	Richard P. Santos
Save The Bay	Felicia Borrego
Sierra Club, Loma Prieta Chapter	Melissa Hippard
Silicon Valley Manufacturing Group	Margaret V. Bruce
South Bay Yacht Club	Russell H. Robinson
The Bay Institute	Marc Holmes

Interested Public

Name	Organization
Armstrong, John L.	
Baily, Tom	URS
Bousman, Bill	
Brar, Judge	J.C. Brar Co.
Chen, Nelson	Menlo High School
Chung Andrew	
Ciccarelli, John	
Clark, Deborah	
Closson, Michael	Acterra
Cudrnak, Dida	DDI / OEPC
DeVico, Susan	
Douglas, Richard	
Duke, Ron	H.T. Harvey & Assoc.
Dyer, Beth	Santa Clara Valley Water District
Eddy, Matt	Menlo School
Fiedler, Jim	Santa Clara Valley Water District
Fundakowski, Dave	
Galal, Lynne	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Harrington, Anne	Citizens Committee to Complete the Refuge
Hearn, Jerry	Acterra
Hilleary, Tim	Tim Hilleary Construction
Johnson, Ralph	Alameda County Flood Control District
LaRiviere, Florence	Citizens Committee to Complete the Refuge
Little, Jane Braxton	freelance journalist
McLaughlin, Eileen	Wildlife Stewards
Mulvey, Trish	
Nichol, Fred	USGS (Retired) Science Team
Nones, Philip S.	
Schmidt, John	Resources Legacy Fund
Strickman, Dan	Santa Clara Valley Vector Control District
VanderWoerd, Jennifer	DUI / OEPC
Woodhouse, Kevin	City of Mountain View

Attachment 2: Revised Agreements in Principle

1. We have an historic opportunity to restore and enhance a vibrant San Francisco Bay through development of a broadly supported plan for South Bay ecosystem restoration, flood management, and wildlife-compatible public access and recreation.
2. We commit to gaining a thorough, shared understanding of the potential opportunities and limitations of a restored South Bay that includes habitat, improved flood management, and improved public access.
3. We will seek consensus solutions that address all perspectives, interests, and needs in providing input to the Project Management Team as the restoration plan is developed.
4. We will support and contribute to broad public outreach, involvement, and education during the planning effort.
5. We will assist the Project Management Team in identifying sustained funding for the continued planning and implementation of the preferred long-term restoration plan for the South Bay.

Additional Agreements in Principles to be considered.

6. After public safety, we acknowledge the primacy of habitat restoration in the restoration plan.
7. Early integration of all interests.
8. Keep the long-term in mind while developing recommendations to the Project Management Team.

Attachment 3: Members of the Project Science Team

- **Lynne A. Trulio, Ph.D., Lead Scientist**, is an associate professor and the chair of the Department of Environmental Studies at San Jose State University, where she has taught and conducted research since 1991. Dr. Trulio teaches courses in environmental impact assessment and environmental restoration, as well as graduate seminars and undergraduate courses. Her research investigates human impacts on species and habitats and seeks effective methods to mitigate or eliminate those impacts. Specific research has included studies of tidal salt marsh restoration in the San Francisco Bay, the effects of trail use on shorebirds and waterfowl, and the ecology and recovery of the western burrowing owl in California. From August 1999 to December 2000, as an American Association for the Advancement of Science Environmental and Engineering Fellow, she was an environmental scientist in the Wetlands Division, Office of Wetlands, Oceans & Watersheds of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency in Washington, DC. Her work focused on scientific and policy issues related to wetland monitoring, wetland restoration, and wetland wildlife issues. She holds a Ph.D. in Ecology from the University of California, Davis (1988) and an undergraduate degree in biology from Goucher College in Towson, MD (1979).
- **John Callaway, Ph.D.** is an expert in wetland restoration and ecology and is currently an Assistant Professor in the Environmental Science Department at the University of San Francisco. Previously he served as Associate Director of the Pacific Estuarine Research Laboratory (PERL) which specializes in coastal wetland restoration in southern California. Dr. Callaway's recent research projects include evaluating the relationship between plant diversity and ecosystem function in restored coastal wetlands, assessing impacts of sedimentation on coastal wetlands, and evaluating the importance of tidal creek networks for the development of restored wetlands.
- **Edward S. Gross, Ph.D.** is an environmental consultant specialized in numerical modeling of environmental flows. He has been involved in studies of San Francisco Bay hydrodynamics and water quality for 13 years. During this period, he has developed state-of-the-art hydrodynamic models and validated them using detailed hydrodynamic and water quality data.
- **Jessie Lacy, Ph.D.** is an oceanographer with the Coastal and Marine Geology Team of the U.S. Geological Survey. She conducts field research in sediment transport and estuarine hydrodynamics. She has worked on problems in water quality, hydrodynamics, and sediment transport in South San Francisco Bay for the past 15 years as a regulator, technical consultant, and research scientist.
- **Frederic H. Nichols Ph.D.** is a retiree from his position as a U.S. Geological Survey Research Oceanographer. Upon completion of the Ph.D. degree in Oceanography in 1972 from the University of Washington, Dr. Nichols joined the USGS as part of an interdisciplinary research team studying San Francisco Bay. Dr. Nichols' role in the study was to describe the ecology of the benthic invertebrate community of San Francisco Bay and to distinguish, where possible, between the effects of natural

variations (e.g., effects of climate) and human activities (e.g., effects of water management or waste disposal). More recently he examined the ecological effects of introduced exotic invertebrates on the bay's foodweb.

- **John Takekawa Ph.D.** has been a federal research wildlife biologist in California for 17 years. He is a principal investigator for the U. S. Geological Survey at the San Francisco Bay Estuary Field Station, Western Ecological Research Center in Vallejo. His research focuses on the wintering and migratory ecology of waterbirds through radio and satellite telemetry, and ecological processes in the San Francisco Bay ecosystem. He is one of the lead scientists in the USGS program providing science support for salt pond restoration.