



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

**From:** Center for Collaborative Policy

**Re:** Outcomes from November 29, 2006 Stakeholder Forum Workshop

---

**Background:** The South Bay Salt Pond Restoration Project held a public meeting on Wednesday, November 29, 2006 from 1:00 pm to 4:00 pm at the San Jose/Santa Clara Water Pollution Control Plant in San Jose. These meetings are convened to provide ongoing input to the South Bay Salt Pond Restoration Project Management Team (PM Team) and its technical consultants on the development of the South Bay Salt Pond restoration, flood management, and public access plan.

**Meeting Attendance:** Attachment 1 lists meeting participants.

**Meeting Materials:** At the meeting, Stakeholder Forum members received an agenda and the October meeting summary, along with PowerPoint copies of presentations.

**Substantive Meeting Outcomes:**

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

Steve Ritchie, Executive Project Manager, welcomed everyone and provided an overview of the meeting's objectives, and a review of the agenda. The meeting objectives were:

- Build a common understanding of the current projected funding sources available for implementing the Project;
- Brainstorm alternatives to fund Phase I;
- Understand long-term Project phasing.

**2. Video footage of October 26 Eden Landing Breach**

The group watched a news clip of the October 26 Eden Landing breach. John Krause, of the California Department of Fish and Game said that the breaches were done for the Eden Landing restoration project, opening the North Creek drainage area to tidal action. He also said that the slough channel for Mt. Eden Creek was restored to tidal action two miles inland from the mouth at the Bay and is expected to quickly restore vegetation in some areas.

Q: I saw the area was fairly dry then after the breach it showed a pond—is the intention to bring back the pickleweed?

A: John Krause: Yes, bring back the tidal marsh.

### **3. Total Project Funding Overview: Current and Known Sources**

Steve Ritchie provided an overview on funding and phasing for the Project. He indicated that there may not be a big pool of money in the future as the planning phase had, but that smaller pools of money may be available for smaller individual projects.

He reviewed the Project schedule with the public draft of the EIS/EIR coming in January 2007; the final EIS/EIR in the late summer of next year; the Record of Decision and Permitting (ROD) occurring in Fall 2007; Phase 1 Implementation beginning in 2008 and continuing in 2009; and Phase 2 following that.

Q: This outline shows phase I implementation in 2008. Haven't some of these projects started already?

A: Steve Ritchie: The blue boxes on map are things going forward earlier and they fall into two categories: the island pond restoration in March 2006 under ISP permitting, and the Eden Landing parcel John was talking about acquired in 1996 where restoration has been developed over time and is now reaching fruition. We've included that in the Project boundary because it's contiguous. There are no other actions going forward.

Ritchie described the overall Project costs and funding. They are working with consultants on cost estimating and the construction costs are roughly between \$600 million and 1 billion with about 60% for levees. Monitoring and research is estimated at about \$2-\$3 million a year to support the adaptive management program.

He said that Project management and administration has a larger organizational structure with about five FTEs (full-time employees) to manage the activities such as contracts, public communication, and other things.

Q: In last item, does that include brochures and materials for public outreach?

A: Steve Ritchie: We don't have a line item for those particular items. There are existing resources in the Conservancy that could accommodate those.

Q: Is O&M included in the field?

A: Steve Ritchie: No, it's not included in this. For the Refuge, that's something we've been looking at over the past couple of years.

A: Clyde Morris: Sen. Feinstein has been helpful in getting us additional funding. Next year I have an additional \$1 million over what we had in the Refuge budget before we phased the Cargill lands just for levee repair and maintenance. We need another \$1million to maintain the levees as Cargill did and we're working with elected officials to try to get this approved for the October 2007 to September 2008 Fiscal Budget.

Q: So that's \$2 million on the Federal portion and how much on the State?

A: Clyde Morris: The Refuge is in potentially better shape than the state side.

A: Steve Ritchie: There is definitely a short-fall in O&M funds on the state side.

Q: Under what the Refuge is bringing in, is visitor support funding services available?

A: Clyde Morris: The funding that we're trying to get would include another Outdoor Recreation person for the Refuge. We need to continue to work with our volunteers, and we're never going to have enough staff to do all of the work, so volunteers are essential to the success of the Refuge.

A: Steve Ritchie: We have a meeting scheduled for the Eden Landing area with the state and East Bay Regional Parks District to work some of that out.

Ritchie went on to discuss how the Project will be funded. Our assessment of primary sources of funding is in federal there are different agencies participating that can be involved: USFWS, USGS, NOAA, and the Corps of Engineers. NAWCA (under USFWS) provides funding through grants. In state funding, we are primarily looking at bond measures.

Clyde Morris mentioned that the Refuge and others such as Fish and Game worked with Ducks Unlimited to secure a \$1 million NAWCA grant, which is the largest you can get. He said the Refuge used some to do restoration on Bair Island and will use some for Phase 1 projects in the Alviso area and there may be opportunities to do it again in the future. The rest will be used for ISP improvements at Eden Landing. The grant requires matching funds, so they used some funds for acquisition of the property and were able to bank some of the grant, so for future grants those matching funds will be available.

Ritchie continued that USGS has been providing a lot of work on the science front with its own resources and with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, foundations and others and that it is expected that USGS will keep doing this over time.

He said that NOAA brings to bear several different sources of funds; for example, they have a restoration center providing a grant to Save the Bay for community-based restoration. NOAA also added funds for fish sampling on the science side of the Project and for Bay surveys. He added that none bring big capital input, though.

Ritchie said that the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers is engaged with the Project on the Shoreline Study for project level analysis. The Project Team is working on language for inclusion in the Water Resources Development Act (WRDA), and is hoping to get federal funding to cost share the project with the Corps. There could be as much as 65% federal funding for certain aspects of the Project. This funding can be substantial, but it's a long, hard road to get there.

Q: Have you thought about the National Parks Service?

A: Steve Ritchie: No, we haven't.

Q: You could think about NPS for your historic sites.

Q: My thought is that Project attracts funding through the cultural landscape program. I have begun investigating this through my thesis project such as methodologies for identifying the landscape as culturally significant to yield a landscape so that pieces of can be designated and receive funding under the heritage tourism plan, public interpretation, and community-based economic assistance. One of most inspiring visits I had was to Lowell, MA. The Dept. of Transportation features a history of Lowell in transportation, identifying historic land use patterns, which enabled grants to come in and ended up leveraging resources from a number of agencies. We could bring in Dept. of Transportation funding since there is a legacy partnership fund.

Q: There is also the Land and Water Conservation Fund. I don't know the status right now, but it could be helpful in providing funds.

Q: There are EPA's State and Federal funds.

Q: We can get some funding through mitigation with Moffett Field, which is also connected through EPA.

A: Steve Ritchie: We need to get more specific than Moffett Field. They are doing some things with their own funding.

Q: There is the Breaux Act funded through Clean Water Act. The money is raised through excise taxes on hunting equipment.

Q: EPA also has a partnership with Coastal America. They have a corporate partnership program that has a couple of corporations that could provide more money. It's mostly small money like about \$5000.

Ritchie continued describing sources of funding. On the local front, he said, they had a lot of participation from the Santa Clara Valley Water District and the Alameda County Flood Control District because flood control is a central element of the program. These are local sponsors that work with the Corps of Engineers, and the two agencies continue to participate in other ways as well.

He said that the State bond measures would be the biggest input that the state has for the Project. Proposition 84 passed in November with funding going towards beaches, bays and coastal protection in one section. Another section is on integrated regional water management and a third on flood protection and habitat restoration combined with stream stewardship.

We have made sure our Project is on the list for this funding source, however, Ritchie said, this is just one project in a big state, spread out around the state and the Bay Area. We have to make sure we're vigilant and staying on top of this. Ritchie's expectation is that this Project might get \$10-\$30 million from Prop 84, as a rough estimate.

Another item Ritchie mentioned is that the Wildlife Conservation Board works integrally with the California Department of Fish and Game and is another source of funding.

Q: Keep in mind that it will take about two years for this money to become available.

A: Steve Ritchie: Yes, and some of it is continually available. The bond world looks rosy, but there are a number of potential complications.

Ritchie said that Proposition 1E, which also passed has \$3 billion allocated for the Central Valley and \$1 billion for the rest of California. It paid back flood districts and has almost caught up on this, so more money is available to pay back counties now.

Q: On Prop. 1E, it is an appropriation by the legislature, so we have to get our recommendations in.

Q: On Prop. 84, the Bay Trail Project and the Conservancy have an agreement that funding will be available for construction of trails, interpretive signs and that kind of thing.

#### ***4. The Role of Mitigation***

Steve Ritchie continued that mitigation is another funding opportunity and we will make sure that the Project doesn't fall into any holes. The projects need to be appropriately permitted and our greatest need might be in the Ravenswood Area. We have moved forward with the Shoreline Study in that area. In the Eden Landing area, there is the ACFCD, which has already done substantial work and we're looking at how that might best integrate with restoration. In the Ravenswood area, it doesn't have a big driver for funds, but if there are significant mitigations, this might be a good area to target.

John Krause added that at the Eden Landing Ecological Reserve, the Department would consider mitigation. If Fish and Game agrees to allow mitigation, those entities would be required to providing funding to offset the cost of acquisition and for restoration actions. An endowment for operations and maintenance also would need to be provided. Monitoring for regulatory requirements may also be required, which has been done in the past.

Q: In the application process, I noticed that most of the mitigation money came from public entities, is there no exclusion for private partners?

A: John Krause: No.

Q: Let's say a private party wants to do mitigation, who is the contact?

A: John Krause: They come to the region. The acting person is Scott Wilson.

Q: Going back to the discussion on the original Mt. Eden Creek channel – how deep was it before restoration?

A: John Krause: Historically, it was a major channel, perhaps an elevation of -1 or -2. We excavated a number of channels and we anticipate that water will go back through remnant channels also.

Q: Six million got reimbursed? So you have another \$6 million potentially that could be mitigated for?

A: John Krause: It could work that way, but I'm not sure if I follow your question.

Q: It seems like it's another \$6 million someone else could match funds with. Do you retroactively have an account for this?

A: John Krause: It might go toward future restorations on property area, but I'm not sure about this Project.

Beth Dyer, of the Santa Clara Valley Water District, described mitigation on the Island Ponds near Alviso. She said that breaching the Island Ponds (A19, A20, and A21) was originally developed by the California Department of Fish and Game (DFG) and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) as part of the Initial Stewardship Plan. Because the three ponds form an island, there was no flood risk associated with them. They were breached in March along the Coyote Creek side to align with historic channels and sediment will accumulate through water borne sediment transfer and eventually tidal marsh species will colonize there.

She said that FWS and the Water District partnered on this project when FWS proposed to move the District's compensatory mitigation required by the regulatory agencies from Pond A4 to the Island Ponds. FWS policy prohibited conduct of compensatory funds in 2004, but there was an exemption to this policy to San Francisco Bay that allows approval of requests for mitigation on Bay Area properties. For Refuge property, it must be a public agency's project and there are several requirements for a mitigation plan. SCVWD's request for conducting mitigation on Refuge property was the first under this exemption and approval was reached last fall.

Dyer said this is a federal/local collaboration. FWS as the property owner had provided the planning services, including permitting and the Water District provided the detailed design work and funded construction costs of \$1.3 million. Mitigation for both agencies equaled 66 acres for the District and 9 acres for FWS and CDFG. A lot of the project area extends beyond the required mitigation acreage, but the desire was to restore all three ponds as part of the District's Clean, Safe Creeks program. Dyer said the approach is a win for all involved: the District, FWS, CDFG, the SBSP Restoration Project, and the tidal marsh species that stand to benefit from marsh restoration.

Dyer said that results so far have been that thousands of shorebirds started using the ponds within 12 weeks of breaching and two feet of sediment has accumulation in some areas and vegetation is starting to grow.

Q: Did you break cost down to increments per breach? Was there an extra cost to do all three ponds?

A: Beth Dyer: I'm not entirely certain of the cost per breach. There is, for example, a mobilization cost to get the equipment on site, so costs for the subsequent breaches would be somewhat less than the initial breaches if that is discounted.

Q: I see areas where channels have started to erode, so that's sediment within the pond. I can see some channels have lost area, but it depends on channel velocities and holes can also fill up.

Q: I don't think any of us would argue that mitigation couldn't play an important role, but I think we need to make sure that we're doing with most honorable intentions, not just for the money. Maybe this is an area where the Forum can have a greater say, be a sounding board for issues that may crop up.

A: Steve Ritchie: I agree.

Q: I was out at the ponds when they were breached last March and a couple of weeks ago, and the changes are striking. This time we saw pelicans, egrets, fish, all kinds of shorebirds, ducks, and pickleweed growing.

A: Steve Ritchie: The key thing is what can we learn from this. Is mitigation a good idea to support project activities in the future?

Q: What was the timeframe of breaching island ponds? The construction part?

A: Beth Dyer: About a month. The sedimentation data is from six months after the breaching. The big jump in shorebirds happened within two weeks.

A: Mendel Stewart: About the sediment. The bigger issue we are affecting is bringing mercury into the ponds. A big part was cooperation with the regulatory agencies.

Q: On funding and mitigation, how is the 66 acres determined and amount of money per acre determined? Is it relevant for future projects?

A: Beth Dyer: Thirty acres were tidal wetlands impacts associated with the District's Stream Maintenance Program, and 35.54 acres for impacts associated with the Lower Guadalupe River Flood Control Project. We entertained restoring the Island Ponds and got a figure of \$1.3 million for construction only. Up to \$900,000 will be needed for compliance monitoring by the Water District and FWS; that's in addition to the construction cost. Each site will be somewhat different, so costs may vary.

A: Steve Ritchie: There is a striking difference between the Island Ponds and Eden Landing Ecological Reserve. At Eden Landing, the City of San Jose wrote a check. With the Island Ponds, the District took on the project. The downside risk is that it only cost so much then have to write a bigger check if it cost more. We will have to deal with that in this Project. There are both upside and downside risks.

Q: Given these two projects, this is a good use of mitigation funding. There probably are some concerns when you get into mitigation banking and when impacting other wetland areas. When you begin transferring mitigation money from one project to another project in the Bay, it becomes a competitive situation.

### ***5. Corporate Funding Inquiries to Date.***

Deborah Clark, of the Center for Collaborative Policy, provided a summary of corporate grant inquiries and opportunities. She said that she had reviewed the grant programs of the top 150 Silicon Valley companies to introduce the Project to them, get a list of contacts, giving histories, focus areas, and grant application information. Of those, she determined that about 17 had strong environmental programs and looked like good candidates in the short term for the Project. Many companies do not have formal grant programs, but money can be requested more informally and others do no giving at all.

What she found out from doing the research is that giving seems to be down since around 2000, and that it is difficult to obtain contacts within the corporate grant community without specific employee contacts who can champion the Project within the company. The majority of companies do not take unsolicited proposals, so that having employee contacts would be very helpful if people have them.

She said that the companies usually provide grants between \$5000 and \$25,000 and many have restricted their focus to K-12 education or core human services. However, many companies focus on science and math education if they do not have an environment program, so science and education components of the Project may be of interest to them. She thought that companies that normally don't give to environmental programs may be interested in this Project as a regional effort and one that improves employees' quality of life in the Bay Area.

She added that to test the corporate community, she wrote a grant to Adobe for \$20,000 towards an interpretive exhibit in Pond A16 and was waiting to hear back from them after it went through their application process.

Q: Would any companies provide an endowment for the Project?

A: Deborah Clark: It's unlikely that they would, however, foundations or individual donors may be more likely to do this. Companies might be interested in providing some monitoring support, but more visible projects would probably be of interest to them.

Q: The Silicon Valley Leadership Group would be a good source of contacts.

### ***6. Phase 1 Actions: Projected Costs and Funding Sources***

Steve Ritchie discussed projected costs and funding sources for Phase 1 of the Project. He said that costs would be about \$25 to \$30 million, it will be more defined by mid-2007. The construction begins in 2008 and 2009 and they are working with the Consultant Team to develop cost estimates for each Phase 1 project. He described some possible target agencies of who would pay for each project. For Ponds E12 and E13 there is a \$6 million capital cost and the Wildlife Conservation Board seems a likely source for that. Tidal habitat restoration in the

Eden Landing area is \$6 million for construction and the Alameda County Flood Control District seems a likely contributor. For public access features such as trails and a kayak launch in the Eden Landing area is a little over \$1 million and the Conservancy's name was put by that because it's aligned with their mission. A viewing access point at Bayfront Park is about \$200,000 and again, the State Coastal Conservancy seems appropriate to fund this. Pond SF2 near the Dumbarton Bridge is slated to be made into a managed pond for about \$4.8 million and FWS could fund this because it's on their land. Then there is \$505,000 from the State Coastal Conservancy (through Caltrans mitigation funds) for a trail and viewing access near the Dumbarton Bridge.

Ritchie said that pond habitat development in the Pond A16 area is roughly \$5.4 million potentially from the Conservancy. For Pond A8's reversible tidal restoration they are still working on trying to figure out what type of water exchange structure to use and the Water District received approval of \$1.1 million from the Regional Water Board to date. Tidal habitat restoration for Pond A6 is roughly \$2.2 million and FWS would be a likely candidate; opening the Bay Trail behind Moffett Field is about \$100,000 because it requires gate realignment and Moffett will do this; a viewing access platform in Pond A16 FWS could put funds into.

Ritchie said they will need a distribution of funds among different agencies to try to carry this forward and that these are the leading candidates. They will need to have a lot of discussions on the policy level in order to make this happen.

Q: What is the bottom line of the total in the shortfall?

A: Steve Ritchie: There is no funding gap in this. The total is about \$29+ million and only FWS is the least certain source of funds.

### ***7. Brainstorm Session: Funding Phase 1***

Mary Selkirk, of the Center for Collaborative Policy, along with Steve Ritchie, lead the group in a discussion of potential Phase 1 funding sources. She said that one question as a matter of policy is does the Forum want to look to the Conservancy to commit a good chunk of Prop. 84 money to Phase 1? We know Parks District will have another parcel tax in two years. Santa Clara will have its Clean Safe Creeks and Flood Protection Program on the ballot again. From your knowledge and familiarity with your own communities, what can you bring to the table with budget uncertainties, both federal and state? Let's investigate all kinds of creative alternatives.

Q: I think the more first five portfolios we can have, the better. This is the second largest restoration project in the county. We can't look at the Project in isolation; this is part of bigger Bay projects going on. If they give it to you, they'll say we gave you what you wanted so don't come to us for a while. The more we can diversify the funding opportunities that will help this project as well as the Bay as a whole.

Q: There's a business reason to reach out to Republicans. Endangered species regulation has a business cost. The larger strategy is to restore enough habitat to relieve those constraints to organized business groups and seek their help in federal investments.

Q: I've been doing an analysis of all the different projects seeking funding around the Bay and what I recognized was that there are projects going to the same well, but there are others. We are trying to diversify the federal sources through different federal budgets. What aspects of the project could be targeted for these?

A: Steve Ritchie: Do you have recommendations for particular wells?

Q: There are several pots of funding within NOAA and a couple of those projects we will target for one and not the others, there are interior appropriations as well. We want to work with you on this project.

Q: There are messages we need to take back to Washington and Sacramento. Ecosystem system services is going to resonate more and more and will go a long way to helping us identifying those pots of money.

Mary Selkirk: So one step is to get with Joint Venture.

Q: We can also look locally. Alameda County's Measure B for non-motorized transportation is well funded. There is \$5 million in 2008. How you scope your project is important—it will only fund capital improvements and will be there annually for 18 years. Fund a feasibility study for us, fund planning and design as well as capital construction.

Q: We need to be careful when we put this back--if we chop it up, no one is going to help us very much.

Q: Show how nimble the project can be. Some sources have a federal mandate, then there are more traditional non-profit fundraising techniques like soliciting donations from the public such as through direct mail. There might be ways to go through fundraising efforts, benefit concerts, etc. The Bay Area has one of the most vibrant non-profit industries out there and a lot of money isn't being tapped into. There is also the National Register for Historic Places and other government agencies that solicit donations directly.

Q: Some of the work being done to develop interpretive displays on the (Lowell) train system could look at Depts. of Transportation and Commerce and tie into our National Park Service. Every department of the federal government has responsibility to carry out a legacy program.

Q: Do you have a list of grants for trails, local, regional and federal? There are regional benefit assessment districts and I'm wondering if you could use this as a tool?

A: Steve Ritchie: It's definitely worth considering, not just for this Project, but to incorporate other projects around the Bay.

Q: The overall needs are quite large, but it could be presented in context of the whole Bay Area and have a greater regional appeal as part of a package.

A: Steve Ritchie: The notion of global climate change and sea level rise affects the whole Bay shoreline and we will have to confront that as a region and some discussions have started already.

Q: There is a linkage to flood projection already and this underscores that need.

Q: I am working in the Menlo Park area looking at the potential for economic benefits, and have been able to get a good response from elected officials by pointing out industrial areas and converting them to hotels with restaurants on top and more tax base for the cities. There is the possibility of Menlo Park when reviewing its general plan with that in mind. Each area has a different dynamic, but show down the road the potential that serves that community such as a wildlife refuge, etc.

Q: Talk about a regional bond measure or eighth of a cent sales tax. I know opportunities wane and ebb. But you might want a public opinion survey of the Bay Area.

Q: In Alameda County, everything polled badly except a sales tax.

A: Steve Ritchie: I know some groups are polling now and we're interested to see what the results are.

Q: The most recent major fundraising effort for habitat restoration was Crissy Field, so there might be some project staff expertise to tap to craft a campaign, and successful private fundraising.

A: Steve Ritchie: It gets me into discussions of the Bay and perceptions of the Bay, such as showing a picture of the Golden Gate Bridge. It's a different story down here and how we connect those feelings.

Q: It might be a good idea to include the communities and doing that in a way to reach people through the schools. We might to have environmental education programs where schools are connected to the Bay. Young people might be missing this, there's so much to be learned about our environment. We can be connected also with colleges and high schools and maybe get college grants.

A: Steve Ritchie: A number of people are engaged in that and it's only limited by the people available to do that.

Q: There is the importance of personal contacts and people who work in these corporations and that small contributions can be big in leveraging other money. Gap employees come out and volunteer and it leads them to give. The Entrepreneurs Foundation is another one in the South Bay, they are all small, pre-IPO, but a non-profit links them together through corporate culture. Also using university graduate students and getting funding for them--it all adds up.

Q: We have a great news clip and no where in there did I hear about where we're going to find more money. We need events and public access activities, this gets people out seeing the Project area and helps to build support for further actions.

Q: When I was a Peace Corps volunteer in Uganda, I got small amounts of money that I didn't know previously was available.

Q: What about the descendants of the original salt producers, people who have a personal history to the Bay? Tapping into those personal connections. Does Cargill have any funding aspect now to the Project?

A: Steve Ritchie: Cargill has been a good partner with the agencies in getting things done out there, so they are doing some funding in that way.

Q: NOAA does have fellowships and possibly fundraising for this Project could be done,

Q: NPS has a program, and if you want to write a grant, a person can help you move through that process.

Q: A number of community foundations have support initially for getting fundraising program started.

Q: How can we get PG&E to fund a viewing access in Menlo Park?

Q: I support that process internally, so I'm listening intently.

Q: Look at a capacity building grant from a local foundation for seed money for a grant writer.

Q: The National Fish and Wildlife Foundation is a potential partner here and may match non-federal funds.

Q: They have multiple pots of money.

Q: They certainly are connected and could lead us to bigger sources of money.

A: Steve Ritchie: SCVWD put money into the mercury study down in the Alviso area. One topic is an endowment for science and adaptive management portions. Capital funding is almost easy by comparison to raise.

Q: A neighbor in this area is Moffett Field and NASA. So they could be approached. They have an astrobiology lab and people suggested to me they would be interested in this Project.

A: Steve Ritchie: NASA has talked to us a couple of times—they might be interested in some remote sensing support. It takes cultivation.

Q: As far as monitoring the water quality in the City of San Jose, it gets to a point where we know who's looking at what data and general estuary and stream issues and we can put all the data together and share and not have as many people looking at as many things. Leveraging existing testing infrastructure.

SR: The San Jose/Santa Clara Water Pollution Control Plant and those in Sunnyvale and others could do a more coordinated water monitoring effort. There are similar opportunities in the East Bay as well to improve data gathering capability.

Q: USGS is putting together a huge matrix and doing some of that.

Q: What about the Union City Sanitary District as well?

A: Steve Ritchie: Yes, on back side of the ponds.

Q: Fremont is going to have some mitigation projects, they're building on wetlands.

Q: does BCDC have any role to play in this?

A: Steve Ritchie: They're looking for funding. They have some leverage with their permitting activities for funding. All mitigations will have a monitoring program associated with them providing a lot of knowledge. It requires a significant conversation with the regulatory agencies to see what would work better.

Q: Seebee's(?) IRT program, they need sites to practice bulldozing. That's something to consider, someone else to do the work.

### ***8. Looking Ahead: Beyond Phase 1***

Steve Ritchie went over a list of criteria for Phase 1 Project identification. He said as they looked forward to what they would do next, the criteria would be the same as Phase I, plus readiness to proceed (someone that has a project that's ready to go), the ability to utilize results from earlier applied studies, dependency on precedent actions (particularly applies to levee actions—some projects can't happen until we have enough protections in place), and dependency on adaptive management progress. There may be some things we do collectively as a phase or individual little actions to do by themselves.

Flood management in the Alviso area is using the work of the Shoreline Study and the Eden Landing area is using the work of the Alameda Flood Control District. On the public access front, the Bay Trail spine seems very clearcut, but various spur trails including some that are in Phase I—those will be judged on how they relate to the development of habitat restoration at the same time. Other access—a good example is the fuel dock road behind Moffett field owned by Cargill, the Navy and Moffett--will need to have a lot of negotiations to make it work.

Ritchie reemphasized some issues talked about at the last Forum meeting; the Shoreline Study evaluating areas of levees behind the Alviso ponds to more aggressively move forward with tidal

restoration there. They won't wait for the completed Shoreline Study to build segments of trail, for example. They will lay out how phasing might occur through the Project area, and we will take into account all these factors.

Q: (Mary Selkirk): Is there the possibility of there being discrete sections of levees built over the next eight years, to potentially receive Prop. 1E money?

A: Steve Ritchie: Potentially.

Q: Emphasize what are the positive results of our Phase 1 actions—the positive impact on flood control. This is a quantifiable benefit to leverage for more money. Tie those together for more justification of further actions.

Q: Prop. 1E funding would be best if the Project could identify what a project is in a timely manner, so it would be incorporated into the Governor's budget in a timely manner.

Mary Selkirk concluded the workshop by saying that each person that has their name next to the idea they submitted will be followed up. She said that they are anticipating a meeting of the Forum probably in mid-February. They will also will be hosting another Local Government Forum meeting prior to the release of the EIS/EIR.

**Attachment 1: November 29, 2006 Meeting Attendance**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Organization/Affiliation</b>
Patrycja Bossak	ABAG Bay Trail
Margaret Bruce	Silicon Valley Leadership Group
Brenda Buxton	State Coastal Conservancy
Deborah Clark	Center for Collaborative Policy
Janet Cobb	California Wildlife Foundation
Luther Dow	PG&E
Beth Dyer	Santa Clara Valley Water District
Jim Foran	Santa Clara Co. Open Space Authority
Tracy Grubbs	Center for Collaborative Policy
John Gurley	Audubon California
Kathleen Henderson	USGS
Carin High	Citizens to Complete the Refuge
Lynne Hosley	CH2M Hill
John Howe	City of Sunnyvale
Beth Huning	San Francisco Bay Joint Venture
Ellen Johnck	Bay Planning Coalition
Ralph Johnson	Alameda Co. Flood Control & Water Dist.
John Krause	California Dept. of Fish and Game
Matt Krupp	City of San Jose
Tom Laine	Alviso Water Task Force
Marilyn Latta	Save the Bay
Jane Lavelle	San Francisco Public Utilities Commission
Libby Lucas	California Native Plant Society
Jack Lueder	Silicon Bicycle Coalition
Jim McGrath	Port of Oakland
Austin McInerny	Center for Collaborative Policy
Eileen McLaughlin	Wildlife Stewards
Clyde Morris	U.S Fish and Wildlife Service
Stacy Moskal	USGS
Seamus Murphy	RWC Saltworks
Terry Noonan	East Bay Regional Parks District
Kate O'Brien	West Valley Clean Water Program
Sylvia Quast	Resources Law Group
Barbara Ransom	Cargill Corp.
Steve Ritchie	Executive Project Manager
Russ Robinson	South Bay Yacht Club
John Rusmisl	Alameda Co. Mosquito Abatement
Richard Santos	Santa Clara Valley Water District
Chris Schwarz	Rep. Mike Honda's Office
Mary Selkirk	Center for Collaborative Policy
Denise Stephens	Mayne School Alviso
Mendel Stewart	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
George Trevino	Alviso Water Task Force
Laura Thompson	ABAG Bay Trail
Lynne Trulio	San Jose State University