To: **South Bay Salt Pond Restoration Project Team**

From: **Center for Collaborative Policy**

Re: **Outcomes from the July 29, 2004 Stakeholder Forum Meeting**

==========

Background: The sixth meeting of the Stakeholder Forum (Forum) was held Thursday, July 29, 2004 from 1:00 to 4:30 pm at the San Jose/Santa Clara Water Pollution Control Plant located in San Jose. The Forum has been convened to provide ongoing input to the South Bay Salt Pond Restoration Project Management Team (PM Team) and its technical consultants on the development the South Bay Salt Pond restoration, flood management, and public access plan.

Meeting Attendance: Attachment 1 lists meeting participants.

Meeting Materials: In advance of the meeting, Forum members were provided a meeting agenda, the meeting outcomes memorandum for the June 24 Forum meeting, and selected maps from the Draft Opportunities and Constraints Report.

Substantive Meeting Outcomes:

1. Welcome, Introductions, and Agenda Review

Steve Ritchie, Executive Project Manager, welcomed everyone and asked both Forum members and public attendees to introduce themselves. Mr. Ritchie continued as facilitator of the meeting, and provided an overview of the meeting's objectives:

- Briefing, dialogue and feedback on the draft report of Opportunities and Constraints;
- Update on project Science Program
- Briefing on the South San Francisco Bay Shoreline Study

Mr. Ritchie noted the maps that were displayed on the walls, including maps of each pond complex area, the 100-year flood designations, elevations of each of the ponds, and a map of opportunities and constraints for public access and recreation that was generated by the Forum's Public Access and Recreation Work Group and Consultant Team.

In addition, he noted the two colored maps (one in infrared, one in normal color) of satellite photo imagery of the entire project area that were provided for the meeting by the GIS staff of the City of San Jose.

Also on view at the meeting were video clips of the television news coverage generated by the opening of Pond A3 to tidal action on July 19th. Mr. Ritchie pointed out that both press and broadcast media coverage for that event was extensive. Also on display were clips of newspaper articles including *The San Francisco Chronicle*, *The New York Times*, *The San Jose Mercury News,* and *The Contra Costa Times*.

Mr. Ritchie went on to review the project timeline, and mentioned that in the fall the project team will be convening a series of Forum Work Group meetings to consider initial project options by pond complex area (Eden Landing, Ravenswood, and Alviso).

2. Overview of the Draft Opportunities and Constraints Report

Michelle Orr of Phil Williams and Associates provided an overview to the Forum of the topics covered in the Draft Opportunities and Constraints Report. The purpose of this document was to assemble critical data known to date that will influence the restoration design options for the project. She posed the following questions to the Forum members for their consideration as she and her fellow design team members described key issues for each of the following major topic areas covered in the report: tidal marsh restoration, managed pond management, management of non-native and nuisance species, subsidence and sediment supply, flood protection and infrastructure, water quality (with focus on mercury), and public access and recreation.

The discussion questions for Forum members posed by Ms. Orr were:

1. Are the key opportunities and constraints correctly identified?
2. Are there opportunities or constraints that should be added, subtracted, or revised?
3. Are there any revisions to the maps?

Ms. Orr noted that this draft report was prepared before completion of the very comprehensive report on existing conditions, which is currently still in process. In response to a question from a Forum member, Steve Ritchie confirmed that all the data in the Draft Opportunities and Constraints Report, along with the report on existing conditions, would be synthesized and analyzed during the EIR/EIS process.

- **Tidal restoration and managed ponds—Ron Duke, H.T. Harvey & Associates**

Ron Duke of H.T. Harvey provided extensive information on tidal restoration opportunities in the project area. Using historic maps and providing examples from different restoration efforts already underway throughout the South Bay, Ron described the potentials and limitations for restoration of tidal marsh. Comments and discussion with Forum members focused on such topics as the ability to create continuous habitat corridors, opportunities for restoring diverse habitats, concerns over sediment availability, and the potential constraints posed by adjacent land uses, e.g., pollution and presence of non-native species. Discussion ensued regarding how the design team will be determining exact location and number of levee breaches in the ponds slated for restoration to tidal action.

Mr. Duke went on to describe the current understanding about potential re-operation of managed ponds to maximize benefit to plant and animal species. Forum members raised the question of how the proposed restoration actions may affect bird species, as some mudflats will return to pickleweed habitat. Design team members Orr and Duke responded that these and other related issues would be addressed in the design for both the short-term (Phase I) and the long-term plan. Ms. Orr pointed out that there is evidence that mudflat habitat in the Bay has already declined by 8000 acres in the past 50 years, due to other factors.

John Krause of DFG and member of the PM Team, pointed out that managed ponds may provide significant opportunity to support large number of birds in smaller areas, and that some enhancement can be achieved by managing the water levels in the ponds.

Forum comments: A Forum member asked that the design team consider adding the California Least Tern *(Sterna antillarum browni),* which is on the both the Federal and State Endangered Species Lists*,* specifically to the project's detailed objectives (metrics).

One Forum member suggested that the draft report be re-formatted/re-labeled to make it easier for readers to go to specific sections easily.

- **Non-native and nuisance species—Ron Duke, H.T. Harvey & Associates**

Ron Duke then addressed the issue of dealing with non-native and nuisance species, particularly the plant *Spartina alterniflora* (Eastern cordgrass). An invasive *Spartina* eradication project is already underway as a coordinated regional effort among local, state and federal organizations and as this project progresses, the non-native *Spartina* may be controlled at a greater level. Another species needing management is pepper grass (*Lipidium*), which occurs in more brackish marsh, and it is not completely known how to control it yet.

A Forum member asked about fragmites (a non-native water reed) encroachment and outfall from the control ponds and water pollution plant having additional impacts on plants further away from the wetlands.

Mr. Duke replied that the introduction of freshwater influence of water pollution control plant does influence the distribution of some of the plants, but after more marsh is restored it is expected that the tidal area will expand and there should be more salt marsh and less brackish marsh.

Forum comments: A few Forum members mentioned making restoration and engineering solutions and treatment costs for mosquito abatement a priority. Ron Duke said that there is someone on their team working on that issue since it is an important one, and that mosquito issues will be incorporated into the Final Opportunities and Constraints Report.

- **Subsidence and sediment supply—Michelle Orr, Phil Williams and Associates**

Michelle Orr pointed out one opportunity is that many of the ponds are only slightly subsided so that they will revegetate fairly rapidly. Some of the other ponds, which are more deeply subsided, will require sediment build-up and, depending on how much sediment demand there will be, this may affect the location and size of tidal restoration in order to slow the net loss of existing mudflat areas. She pointed to maps showing the different elevations of the ponds and the varying vegetation zones depending on the elevation levels. The most severely subsided ponds will be filled in with sediment, at first rapidly and then tapering off, as they get higher. She indicated that filling sediment in all the ponds from their current elevation to that of their natural habitat would equal about 120 million cubic yards (MCY) in comparison to the local watershed, which supplies about 35 MCY over a 50-year period. She added that the team does not know what the actual sediment demand is at this time—it is being looked at as part of the land assessment in the fall.

Some of the issues being dealt with are:

- How much new mudflat to create in the ponds (several decades) and in the Bay (long-term)?
- How many acres of managed ponds should be retained to offset any decline in mudflat?
- Where should tidal restoration be located?
- Do we want to fill ponds with sediment (dredge material)?

Ms. Orr said that some of the sediment needed to fill the ponds will come from the creeks that bring sediment naturally into the Bay and the rest will come from existing mudflat areas. She explained that there are both short-term and long-term methods of minimizing impacts to existing mudflat areas as well as creating new ones.

A Forum member asked about the impact of breaching levees and getting mudflats in the early years then having it change to vegetated marsh or bay, resulting in a loss of mudflats.

Ms. Orr replied that breached ponds provide a pretty good environment for mudflats if they keep pace with sea level rise, and one way to do that is to use coastal rollover so that mudflats would be more landward. That has been the natural process for past 10,000 years, although now development is adjacent to the Bay.

- **Flood protection and infrastructure—Michelle Orr, Phil Williams and Associates**

Michelle Orr stated that the primary opportunity of the project was to improve flood protection and the major constraint was not to worsen flooding. The current levees do not meet flood protection criteria, but have been effective through frequent maintenance by Cargill. Many of the berms and levees associated with the salt ponds will require improvement or replacement if they are to meet FEMA standards for flood protection.

There was a question by a Forum member about why the project would try to meet FEMA standards and why it was considered a constraint and not a goal? It was pointed out that there is a difference between the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) standards for maintaining levees and those of FEMA, and for this project it was important to meet the USACE standards and then address those of FEMA.

Dr. Judy Sheen from the USACE responded that there was an assumption in the question that the levees would be maintained as Cargill Salt maintained them, and that the goal was to maintain them even more substantially.

Michelle Orr responded that maintaining the FEMA standards is one of the detailed objectives (now called "metrics"), and in the evaluation it will be determined how far to go with those. She said she saw a great opportunity to decrease the flooding in the South Bay by breaching the tidal wetlands and breaching along the creeks. The flood benefits from that action would increase tidal flows to scour out channels, and can increase flood storage and conveyance through the tidal ponds. Removing or breaching and lowering of bayside levees will allow ponds to experience the full tidal range. This is all positive from a flood management perspective.

Managed ponds can supply some of those same benefits by creating spillways, so if the water level gets very high it will create a flood flow diversion. Also, when marsh is restored wave attenuation is one of the benefits, reducing wave energy and erosion of the flood protection levees.

Ms. Orr said that some of the constraints would be that restoration must not worsen flooding and that existing levels of flood protection must be maintained in the South Bay, along with a plan compatible with the existing flood management facilities. Other constraints are that levee reconstruction may be costly, that upland tidal flooding may increase due to increased groundwater levels or pond run-off, and an increased flow velocity may introduce erosion in some places and may destabilize adjacent or in-channel infrastructure.

Forum comments: A question was asked about alternate ways to submit changes to the maps and Steve Ritchie said that they are available on the website. Based on some discussion at the meeting, he asked if the Forum members would like additional time to provide comments on the Draft Opportunities and Constraints Report. The members agreed, and Steve extended the deadline to Wednesday, August 4 at 5:00 pm.

- **Overview of Mercury Issues and Direction—Cindy Paulson, Brown and Caldwell, Inc.**

Cindy Paulson's presentation focused on mercury because of its tendency to bioaccumulate and adversely affect biota. The design team assembled a sub-group to focus on a mercury strategy for the project. Members of this sub-group include 15-20 mercury experts as well as other interested parties, including some members of the

Stakeholder Forum. The sub-group developed a technical report, which is expected to be released this week.

Ms. Paulson referred to a chart outlining the complexity with which mercury is converted into methylmercury. During its movement among the atmosphere, land and water, mercury undergoes a series of complex chemical transformations. One of the products of these transformations is an organic form called methylmercury. Methylmercury is easily absorbed into the living tissue of aquatic organisms and is not easily eliminated. The degree to which mercury is transformed into methylmercury and transferred up the food chain through bioaccumulation depends on many site-specific factors (such as water chemistry and the complexity of the food web) through processes that are not completely understood.

Ms. Paulson then pointed to the South Bay Salt Pond Conceptual Model, a model that defines what is known about mercury processes in different habitats that are within the restoration project. She said that a biological component was also added to the model showing the different biota and the process they go through during bioaccumulation. She then outlined the key differences between the different habitats and showed charts depicting varying mercury levels in different ponds within the project area, including methylmercury and bioaccumulation.

Forum comments: There were questions and comments by some Forum members about why some salt ponds showed higher or lower levels of methylmercury, even within ponds with higher salinity levels where you would expect to find less of it. Ms. Paulson said that is true and they have not yet figured out why. She added that mercury is not a 'fatal flaw' for this restoration process; that adaptive management and mercury management measures can be applied. She said that perhaps some areas can be retained as salt ponds and aerated, and that the Science Team is moving forward to create a testable hypothesis.

Other steps being taken are using ISP monitoring to address mercury data gaps, coordinating with other pilot projects, and refining the conceptual model and the sediment quality guidelines.

- **Public access and recreation—Donna Plunkett, EDAW, Inc.**

Donna Plunkett of EDAW addressed the opportunities and constraints for public access discussed in the draft report. Ms. Plunkett referred to the map produced for the draft report, which included extensive detail on both existing and potential recreational and public access opportunities. The extensive detail had been provided by the Project Management Team, the consultant team and the Public Access Work Group. She noted that the Forum Work Group on Public Access and Recreation had found that there are more opportunities than constraints for public access and recreation activities. She added that because the Draft Opportunities and Constraints Report is not yet complete, it is likely that there are a number of additional opportunities that have not been identified yet.

Ms. Plunkett pointed out that some opportunities include the ability to connect areas regionally using the South Bay Trail, developing partnerships with other adjacent organizations, using existing infrastructure, fostering environmental education, stewardship, and interpretation, as well as long-term stewardship, incorporating historical and cultural resources, and accommodating a diversity of users for the highest quality experience that can be produced.

Constraints include species habitat limitations such as time of year and access, physical limitations (such as infrastructure and cost), and management and legal limitations due to the mandates of certain organizations such as Fish & Wildlife Service and Fish & Game, as well as staffing and other considerations.

Forum comments: Some Forum members emphasized issues such as winter conditions, hunting, and nesting seasons. Ms. Plunkett acknowledged that those would fit under the constraints.

One Forum member recommended that new facilities be included in the plan to maximize public access within and adjacent to the site.

Ms. Plunkett responded that the group is talking more about sharing existing resources and facilities, and that she will look at the map and asked everyone to look at the maps for completeness. She will also look at the wording in the report, as it was not the group's intention to reduce trails.

Another Forum member stressed that protecting critical infrastructure was very important, and gave the example of the Hetch Hetchy Reservoir work with the Santa Clara Valley Water District's commission on a capital improvement plan.

One Forum member asked if water recreational opportunities have been discussed and Ms. Plunkett said they were and that they were being further developed. Another member commented that there is a "water trail" study in Berkeley that may be useful to determine boating access and waterfowl issues.

John Krause of DFG and member of the PM Team, commented that there is a North Basin Study (part of the Eastshore State Park implementation) that includes data on flushing birds incorporated at the request of the Department of Fish & Game.

Another Forum member stated that there might be more opportunities for habitat transition corridors by linking adjacent parcels together.

A Forum member asked if dredging is going to be the solution for sediment quality?

Steve Ritchie agreed that digging into the numbers more makes a lot of sense in the sediment issue and the same with the mercury issue, in order to have more complete data.

A Forum member asked how vegetation forming on the islands used by nesting birds is prevented, especially for the Least Terns in managed ponds.

Clyde Morris of the US F&WS and member of the PM Team, replied that one technique to keep unwanted vegetation off islands in the ponds is to build the islands out of high salinity mud, which would prevent vegetation from growing until the salinity leached out. Morris added that keeping vegetation off the islands might also require active management.

3. Public Comment:

One member of the public commented that the meetings are very helpful and that the website is very useful as well. He said that the community of Alviso and the SCVWD want to continue studies on mercury in open Pond AA and asked if the team was still open to pursue this investigation?

Steve Ritchie said yes, and that there are some possibilities that may work—it is a clear case for developing testable hypotheses and studied for period of time to see what happens.

Marge Kolar of the US F&WS and member of the PM Team, said that as landowners, the Fish & Wildlife Service is very concerned about mercury in the Alviso Slough and its potential to enter Pond A8, leaving FWS with the responsibility to manage the mercury.

Another member of the public asked if the team is going to identify some of the lands most appropriate for acquisition and what has the greatest value in terms of environmental protection?

Steve Ritchie said there is a map of currently publicly-owned lands next to the restoration site. A member of the public said that by identifying areas for acquisition outside of this project, certain agencies might not want to make that public and recommended not go too far outside the boundaries of this project.

Amy Hutzel of the California Coastal Conservancy and member of the Project Team, said that the Conservancy identifies general priority areas, but not specific pieces/parcels on a map or in a report, and that she would be very interested in working with the Santa Clara Open Space Authority, Santa Clara County Land Trust, Mid-Peninsula Open Space Trust, and others in Santa Clara County to continue to identify priority acquisition areas.

Another member of the public suggested that in addition to *Spartina*, the upland plants that have already colonized should be added. She also commented that the downloaded graphics from website are hard to read.

4. Update on Science Program – Dr. Lynne Trulio, Lead Scientist

Dr. Trulio provided a briefing on the response from the Science and Project Management Teams to the recommendations from the National Science Panel (NSP) meeting of April 20, 2004. The NSP asked the Science Team to:

- Develop specific goals for the science portion of the project
- Develop scientific formulations of the project objectives
- Develop a Science Plan to meet both the science goals and help achieve the project objectives
- Develop an adaptive management plan
- Develop a budget
- Define funding for the science components
- Inform the public of the science goals and funding

Dr. Trulio stated that the Science Team is working on the science plan right now and will coordinate that with the Consultant Team. The Science Plan provides the active science direction for the project to help answer questions such as: What aspect of the restoration do you have confidence in? What are the uncertainties? How are we going to address what we don't know?

She added that the science structure for this project is not quite complete at this point and that in researching other large-scale projects around the country, they all have some common elements that this project is currently missing.

Two functions that would be added to the structure are science coordination and dissemination. This would include a person or people who would find out what related research is currently going on and get that into the process, and coordinate workshops, conferences and other efforts, so that the team is equipped with the information it needs and information is coordinated and disseminated.

The Science Team will also be identifying research questions and testable hypotheses that need to be answered for this project and then implementing the adaptive management plan, as well as the monitoring work and meeting project objectives. There is also an awards process and peer review process to incorporate.

Along with developing the Science Plan and Adaptive Management Plan, the Science Team is undertaking a literature review focused on the nine key science issues that are tied directly to the project objectives:

- Maintain/Improve Ecosystem Function
- Understand Sediment Budget/Dynamics
- Restore Tidal Marsh/Associated Habitats
- Recover Special Status/Indicator Species
- Manage Ponds for Migratory Birds
- Effects of Hydrological Modifications

- Pollutant Effects
- Impact of Invasive and Nuisance Species
- Effects of Human-Related Activities and Infrastructure

Dr. Trulio went on to say that the Science Team has collected a lot of information and will use that information in the Science Plan and in the literature review. She stated that the Science Team will be taking "a step back" in the literature review process, for example, to assess whether mercury is the only pollutant of real concern, what evidence is there that there may be other pollutants that compromise the system as well, and other important issues. Dr. Trulio added that the team would be identifying research questions for the short- and the long-term.

The Science Team and science support effort will need funding recommended at $500,000 per year, and increasing over time to $2.5 million per year as recommended by the National Science Panel. Steve Ritchie said that the figure $2.5 million for this project was derived from 10% of the total project cost--a percentage generally recommended for the science portion of a project like this--and that the National Science Panel Report will be on the website in a few weeks.

The current schedule for the Science Team is as follows:

- Scientific Synthesis Report estimated ready by 9/4/04
- Developing the Adaptive Management Plan in early 2005
- Proposal and research process in early 2005

Forum comments: A Forum member asked how this science plan would compare to the CalFED or Everglades science plans?

Dr. Trulio replied that she had studied a number of science plans for other large restoration efforts around the country and pulled common elements from them, such as developing hypotheses, bringing in research and other information to help direct the restoration. She also looked at the funding for other similar science programs and found that the best information is from the Everglades project--its current science budget is $4 million a year. When the Everglades project was reviewed by the National Research Council, the Council actually recommended a $12 million annual budget.

Another Forum member asked if the proposal process would be administered by an outside agency. Steve Ritchie replied in the affirmative—that another agency or entity will administer proposal process.

5. Update on South San Francisco Bay Shoreline Study—Steve Ritchie, Executive Project Manager

Steve Ritchie, the project's Executive Project Manager, provided a background briefing and update on the South San Francisco Bay Shoreline Study. A 1992 study by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers about flooding in South San Francisco Bay concluded that the Cargill levees were sufficient for flood control. The acquisition of the ponds from

Cargill has brought about a need to revisit the adequacy of the existing levees and to address how the flood control portions of this project will ultimately be developed and funded over the long-term. There is a lot of work that needs to go into developing a project that can be funded. Earlier this year, authorization was provided by the House Resources Committee to re-visit the last of the Corps studies concluded in 1992. There were three interim studies: Interim I for Southern Alameda and Santa Clara Counties, was completed in 1988; Interim II for San Mateo and Northern Alameda, was completed in 1989, and Interim III for Napa and Sonoma, completed in 1992. All three were conducted under a Water Resources Development Act of 1976 authority.

This study, the South San Francisco Bay Shoreline Study, will dovetail with the South Bay Salt Pond Restoration Project. The study is looking at flood damage reduction, environmental restoration, and related purposes along the shorelines of San Mateo, Santa Clara and Alameda Counties. The USACE has commissioned a Reconnaissance Study, which is very short and determines if there is a Federal interest in going forward with this project. There is $350,000 in the House Budget allocated for FY 2005 for the USACE to begin the Feasibility Study Phase.

This year the Water Resources Development Act is up for consideration by Congress, and proposed language put forth by the Conservancy and the Santa Clara Valley Water District provides local strength in moving forward with the project. Mr. Ritchie reported that the Conservancy and the Water District have been working with the USACE to try to pull this project together in a way that works for all parties. The shared goal of the project and of the USACE is to provide an integrated plan for environmental restoration of the salt ponds and tidal and fluvial flood protection for the South San Francisco Bay Shoreline from San Francisquito Creek to Highway 92, to achieve a mix of tidal marsh and managed ponds that include wildlife-oriented public access, recreation and system navigation improvements. Mr. Ritchie went on to say that the hope is there will be one project, but it's not yet clear if that will turn out to be the case.

According to Mr. Ritchie, during the Feasibility Study with USACE, the Coastal Conservancy will be the local partner, but if the project moves forward into construction the local partner may shift. He then introduced Dr. Judy Sheen with the USACE. She wanted to know if people were aware that the USACE is working on the South San Francisco Bay Shoreline Study Integration/Coordination Plan. Not many in attendance were aware of this. Dr. Sheen discussed ways in which the two groups can work together and described her substantial background in dealing with this type of project.

Forum comments: A Forum member welcomed Judy and said that we don't know what Congress will approve or if it will be approved by September 30. She asked that if we don't get the funding is there a back-up plan in place?

Amy Hutzel with the CCC and the PM Team, responded by saying that the Conservancy has a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the USACE and will provide the funding to the USACE, even if the Federal budget doesn't pass on schedule or include sufficient funds.

6. Next Steps

Steve Ritchie mentioned upcoming tours of the salt ponds: Alviso Ponds, August 11 with USFWS and Eden Landing Ponds, August 24 with DF&G. If you're interested, please contact Tracy Grubbs at (415) 564-1976 or t.grubbs@sbcglobal.net.

Steve Ritchie commented that in the fall the Forum members will discuss initial project concepts in a series of Work Group meetings. [Note: The dates for these meetings have been finalized as of August 10, 2004, as follows:]

Eden Landing Ponds: Initial ideas for restoration
Wednesday, September 29, 2004
1:30PM to 4:30PM
Location: East Bay, to be determined

Alviso/Ravenswood Ponds: Initial ideas for restoration
Thursday, September 30, 2004
1:30PM to 4:30PM
Location: South Bay, to be determined

Entire Project Area: Initial ideas for restoration
Wednesday, October 27, 2004
7:00PM to 10:00PM
Location: Mid-Peninsula, to be determined

(Locations and times will be finalized and members will be notified.)

7. Public Comment

A member of the pubic asked if there is a report from the Finance Working Group?

Steve Ritchie said not yet, that we're just at the point where we're seriously grappling with developing the Science Program and identifying the components we need, and then developing a funding needs strategy.

A member of the public thought it would be helpful to more specifically identify the structure of how the Science Team works with the Consultant Team and their work, as well as with the Management Team and other groups.

Eileen McLaughlin of Wildlife Stewards said that their Salt Pond Tours will be extended in upcoming months and if anyone would like to take a tour or learn how to lead a tour, please see her.

Steve Ritchie then adjourned the meeting.

Attachment 1: Meeting Attendance

First Name	Last Name	Organization
Stakeholder Forum		
Craig	Breon	Santa Clara Valley Audubon Society
Margaret	Bruce	Silicon Valley Manufacturing Group
Kristine	Buccholz	PG&E
Lorrie	Gervin	City of Sunnyvale, POTW
Ana	Ruiz	Midpeninsula Regional Open Space District
Mark	Hennelly	California Waterfowl Association
Melissa	Hippard	Sierra Club, Loma Prieta Chapter
John	Rusmiel	Alameda County Mosquito Abatement District
Richard	Santos	Santa Clara Valley Water District
Carol	Severin	Hayward Area Shoreline Planning Agency
Denise	Stephens	Mayne Elementary School
Kirsten	Struve	City of San Jose, Santa Clara POTW/Env. Services
Laura	Thompsen	ABAG, San Francisco Bay Trail
Mondy	Lariz	Stevens & Permanente Creeks Watershed Council
Jane	Lavelle	San Francisco Public Utilities Commission
Ellen	Johnck	Bay Planning Coalition
Eric	Watkins	NASA Ames Research Center
Tom	Laine	Alviso resident
Jim	McGrath	Port of Oakland
Arthur	Feinstein	Golden Gate Audubon Society
Peter	Dunne	Eden Shores Homeowners
Felicia	Borrego	Save San Francisco Bay Association
Members of the Public		
Andree	Breaux	SF RWQCB
Jim	Foran	Santa Clara County Open Space Authority
Frank and Janice	Delfino	Citizens Committee to Complete the Refuge
John	Gibb	City of San Jose
Meredith	Hall	UC Berkeley
Anne	Harrington	Citizens Committee to Complete the Refuge
Carin	High	Citizens Committee to Complete the Refuge

First Name	Last Name	Organization
Randy	Kirby	Shaw Environmental, Inc.
Libby	Lucas	League of Women Voters
Kristy	McCumby	City of Sunnyvale, POTW
Eileen	McLaughlin	Wildlife Stewards
Elizabeth	Nixon	Geomatrix Consultants
Debra	O'Leary	City of East Palo Alto
Chindi	Peavey	San Mateo Mosquito Abatement District
Dan	Pollak	California Research Bureau
Antoinette	Romeo	Santa Clara County Parks & Recreation Department
Lisa	Sniderman	BCDC
Daniel	Strickman	Santa Clara County Vector Control District
Kale	Stream	RMC
George	Trevino	Alviso Water Task Force
Neal	Van Keuren	City of San Jose, Env. Services
Stuart	Weiss	
Project Team		
Steve	Ritchie	South Bay Salt Pond Restoration Project
Amy	Hutzel	State Coastal Conservancy
Clyde	Morris	US Fish and Wildlife Service
John	Krause	California Department of Fish and Game
Marge	Kolar	FWS -Don Edwards SF Bay National Wildlife Refuge
Ralph	Johnson	Alameda County Flood Control District
Cynthia	Paulson	Brown and Caldwell
Ron	Duke	HT Harvey
Michelle	Orr	Phil Williams and Associates
Beth	Dyer	Santa Clara Valley Water District
Donna	Plunkett	EDAW, Inc.
Judy	Sheen	USACE
Mary	Selkirk	Center for Collaborative Policy
Tracy	Grubbs	Center for Collaborative Policy
Deborah	Clark	Center for Collaborative Policy