



To: South Bay Salt Pond Restoration Project Team

From: Center for Collaborative Policy

Re: Outcomes from the October 4, 2006 Stakeholder Forum Meeting

Background: The South Bay Salt Pond Restoration Project held a public meeting on Wednesday, October 4, 2006 from 1:00 pm to 4:00 pm in Program Rooms A & B at the Sunnyvale Public Library in Sunnyvale. 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: Prior to the meeting, Stakeholder Forum members received a meeting agenda and directions, a final Project governance proposal, comments received on the first draft governance proposal, and a summary of the July 13 Stakeholder Forum meeting,

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:

- Consensus on revised proposal for Project governance and implementation;
- Feedback on the revised Adaptive Management Plan;
- Updates on the Initial Stewardship Plan activities, Shoreline Study and EIR/EIS schedule, and Public Outreach opportunities; and
- Report on community restoration and South Bay native oyster restoration project.

Steve Ritchie also welcomed new Forum members: John Howe, Councilmember of the City of Sunnyvale; Yoriko Kishimoto, Vice Mayor of the City of Palo Alto; and Michael Sweeney, Mayor of the City of Hayward.

2. Project Implementation: Revised Governance Proposal

Amy Hutzel of the State Coastal Conservancy reviewed the Conservancy's revised Governance Proposal for the Project beginning with a brief history of its evolution. She said that a goal of the Forum meeting was to achieve consensus on the proposal from the Stakeholder Forum members.

She mentioned that the proposal will then need final approval from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, the California Department of Fish and Game, and the State Coastal Conservancy. A description of the Project's organizational structure will be included in the draft EIS/EIR in January 2007 and in an Memorandum of Understanding signed by the three lead agencies, along with the Santa Clara Valley Water District and the Alameda County Flood Control District.

Hutzel said that the Conservancy's primary responsibilities outlined in the proposal are to work with Project land owners and flood control agencies in overseeing Project construction activities, as well as to oversee the adaptive management program, convene decision-making and advisory groups, and assist with funding and public outreach.

The Conservancy received a number of comments on the first draft of the governance proposal, said Hutzel, particularly concerning the make up of the Adaptive Management Team and how many stakeholders would be represented. The proposal has been revised to address those issues and she discussed in more detail about what different groups affiliated with the Project will be doing, how decisions will be made, and how the Science Management Team and others will make recommendations to the Project Management Team. She said that the Stakeholder Forum will remain structured as it is now and will meet approximately twice a year. Local Work Groups are expected to be formed late in 2007 and the first two would cover the upper Eden Landing ponds and the Alviso/ Santa Clara County portion of the Project, including the Shoreline Study. The Forum and Work Groups will make recommendations to the PMT.

Hutzel said the Work Groups would meet more frequently and be more geographic specific than the Stakeholder Forum. In addition, the PMT will continue to seek feedback from other groups such as the Alviso Water Task Force and the Lower Alameda Creek Stewardship Committee. Public input on adaptive management will be embedded in the Stakeholder Forum and Work Groups. Public outreach and funding will be overseen by the PMT. There will be an annual report on the Project that will be presented at one of the two annual Stakeholder Forum meetings, and the Science Management Team will organize a Science Symposium every two or three years. Hutzel said that the Local Government Forum will no longer exist, but there will be an increase of local government representation on the Stakeholder Forum and the Work Groups. The regulatory agencies will be invited to PMT meetings as needed, instead of having a separate Regulatory Agency group. An Information Management Team will organize and store data and conduct simple data analysis.

3. Revised Adaptive Management Plan

Lynne Trulio, lead scientist on the Project, discussed how the public input received on the governance proposal is being integrated into the adaptive management process. She reviewed basic elements of Adaptive Management Plan, which is laying the foundation for science and management processes during planning and implementation.

She reviewed the eight key project uncertainties that require research and data collection to reduce uncertainties, including the 21 applied studies questions. She noted that there

are a lot of technical and levee construction issues, different aspects of restoration, and global climate change that will affect where in the adaptive management ‘staircase’ the Project ultimately falls. Adaptive management provides a cycling process to learn as we go and adapt to conditions as they change, and project managers will use this information to determine what actions to take.

Trulio said that during Project planning they have collected monitoring data, done modeling, conducted applied studies—all to help lay the foundation for adaptive management. In the Adaptive Management Plan, the science part focuses on a couple of key components such as restoration targets that we want to achieve in the long-term, and we have management trigger points to indicate that the Project may be heading off course away from our restoration targets. This is where we may want to take management actions.

She said that the adaptive management process diagram emphasizes data input and that applied studies and monitoring programs will have RFPs go out to bid. Data will be synthesized and analyzed and put into formats that management can use and it will also go through peer review.

She noted that there will be a number of mechanisms used for public participation. The website will provide modeling outputs, applied studies, and monitoring data on a continual basis and stakeholders will receive informational alerts. For example, if a management trigger is reached, stakeholders and the public can learn about it very quickly. The Work Groups will meet as needed to understand what is going on and provide input into local activities. Science Team and PMT members will attend the Work Group meetings and Stakeholder Forum meetings will cover what the Project did, what decisions were made, and what the future plans are. Stakeholders will have input into Project decisions and future output.

Trulio said there are several time scales in which the Project is operating. Rapid action will occur if a management trigger is reached, an email alert will be sent to the stakeholders, and the PMT will make a decision to take actions, informing the public email and the website. Over the course of a year, the public will provide input primarily through the Work Groups and longer term input on future plans and actions depending on how frequently they are reviewed.

4. Consensus-seeking on Governance Proposal

Mary Selkirk, of the Center for Collaborative Policy, led a discussion on the revised organizational structure, and questions and comments were provided by Forum members.

Q/C: Regarding input and feedback, I don’t quite understand the decision-making process, and will there be any continuation of the National Science Panel?

A: Amy Hutzal: The National Science Panel will not continue as it is today, meeting twice a year. For long-term implementation, we will have a large-scale review of the

Project every five years and will convene national and possibly international experts and get feedback from them.

A: Steve Ritchie: The review process is modeled on the Regional Monitoring Program (RMP) approach with heavy local science involvement.

Q/C: How will people be chosen?

A: Hutzel: When we put together the National Science Panel, we worked with the Resources Law Group and Denise Reed, chair of the National Science Panel and worked through a list of who would meet the qualifications based on the topics we were facing. So we would identify someone to lead the review and recommend people to participate.

Q/C: You said the Work Groups and Stakeholder Forum would provide input into that process with formal comments or informal meetings. How do we know that those comments are being taken into account?

A: Mary Selkirk: It depends on the level of interest and expertise of Forum members and those in the Work Groups. Members of Science Management Team and PMT working in that area will also be part of those working groups. The Work Groups will be very on-the-ground with direct interaction. They could go to the level of applied studies if that's of interest to the groups or individuals.

Q/C: As an example, the adaptive management plan has endangered species against other birds and tidal action vs. managed ponds. Looking down the road, there's a management trigger; it won't be that fast, but if they notice something significant, they need to consider why. We are going to need an international perspective as well as Pacific coast and local, and we need Science Team looking at all that. We need a national team to look at the bigger picture, and then you would bring us in and call a special meeting, hopefully having gotten the facts together and some proposed scenarios.

A: Steve Ritchie: That's a good description of what might be a possibility because it could be totally unrelated, like climate change.

Q/C: In seven years, a certain amount of tidal marsh will be restored, and when putting it into the equation against the pressure to get endangered species recovery--when it gets to that stress level--think about how you would evaluate that and put it in the EIR/EIS to guide us in making decisions. How to measure success on endangered species elements.

A: Lynne Trulio: On the issue of migratory birds, it's not just a local issue; these are hemispheric issues, and we're going to be collecting information and studying why. The migratory bird target is a Bay-wide monitoring effort to understand the relationship of South bay to the whole Bay and to the Pacific Flyway. That will be reflected in the EIR/EIS and Adaptive Management Plan.

Q/C: As an outside participant, this provides feedback continuously so that there aren't surprises either way as adaptive management brings information of what is and is not feasible. There are other entities that will have to rely on this information, like local governments—flood control, mosquito abatement, etc. Work Groups gives them an avenue, but it should be flushed out more so there aren't dueling CEQA documents out there, and so there's more coordination.

A: Mary Selkirk: We're broadening the local government representation here, but what you're suggesting is that there are certain mandates or requirements for local government decisions and there has to be a way to embed their decisions, also.

A: Amy Hutzal: Flood control representatives will remain on the PMT, but others will need to participate.

Q/C: The Stakeholder Forum and Work Groups are on call through the life of Project, and should meet a minimum of two times a year and then as needed.

Q/C: I think we should have 4-6 meetings per year, because nothing should slide by the stakeholders. There are crucial things happening.

A: Mary Selkirk: It is conceivable that we need to call a special meeting if something happens. We had three very active working groups during the planning process.

Q/C: To avoid lawsuits and problems from local governments that haven't participated in the Project, I agree I'd like to see more meetings to keep all in tune with what's going on.

A: Amy Hutzal: With the Stakeholder Forum and Work Groups combined, you are getting up to six meetings per year.

Q/C: The Alviso community has a lot at stake in 2008.

Q/C: We should be up to date on what's going on, and everybody here should know what's going on and not be blindsided. I was told stakeholders will make a lot of the decisions.

Q/C: I need to see how this works, but maybe we can have the Work Groups meet more often with PMT updates, so it may work out that way. Let's make sure we get the information. Work Groups start convening at the end of 2007?

A: Mary Selkirk: We're envisioning starting Work Groups in the late summer of 2007 when the ROD is done, however, we may want to rethink that and convene the groups sooner.

Q/C: We have the ISP going on as well, so we could implement this (governance) structure consistent with the ISP and see how it works.

Q/C: About the outreach and fundraising activities of the PMT--when thinking of the level of support necessary, the outreach and fundraising part will be very important. What type of resources are you envisioning?

A: Amy Hutzler: We intend to have a staff member or consultant lead each of those efforts, having at least a part-time funding person and part-time outreach person. We also need the members of the PMT to be fully engaged on the funding side and I know that there people on the Stakeholder Forum and others who can be assisting with those activities. We will be recruiting more support for funding side. What I would imagine is that the funding staffer will be having regular meetings of some sort of funding group.

Q/C: We need something like a San Francisco Bay-specific slogan that can pull people's awareness to this Project, like "Save Mono Lake" and "Keep Tahoe Blue."

A: Mary Selkirk: As each of you from different areas of the Bay have different funding measures coming up, the working assumption of what will be essential is making sure there is a proactive effort to integrate activities and use all the expertise we have to help in that effort.

Q/C: Don't forget us on the San Francisco Bay Joint Venture when you're talking about fundraising. There needs to be more integration among our efforts and those back in Washington. Going back to the meetings, when the EIR is out you're going to get a response to comments and we could have a meeting to discuss those. Also, when you get monitoring results, which could be yearly, this could be a reason to call a meeting. Under the EIR you're suggesting significant management actions and you could have a Stakeholder Forum meeting prior to doing that.

Q/C: Another meeting could be when significant actions are needed, such as when you need us to help campaign for funding issues and things like that. Communications is going to be key. It sounds like you're relying a lot on the Information Management Team to get information out and we need to go through those and see if we have questions or concerns.

Mary Selkirk then summed up the group discussion and asked the Forum members to use the gradients of agreement chart to show their support of the governance proposal. Forum members indicated by a show of hands that they strongly support or support/can live with the proposal.

5. Update on the Initial Stewardship Plan

Clyde Morris of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service said that ownership of Pond SF2 was not part of the original land from Cargill because of lead contamination, but Cargill has removed the lead within a couple months that land will be added to Refuge.

He said that they have raised the low spots in Pond A12, which enhances flood protection along Alviso Slough. He continued that Pond AB1 has been overtopped in extreme high

tides the last two winters. The Refuge is working with and has not been raised up and that the Water District has an easement and is working with the Water District, which has an easement on the levee to correct the problem. Eric Mruz with Fish and Wildlife is evaluating the levee system to determine the highest priority flood control issues. Sen. Feinstein has proposed an extra \$1 million in the budget, which would be used to correct these high priority maintenance projects. Morris said that Fish and Wildlife is in discussions with the City of San Jose and the Water District to manage high runoff into New Chicago Marsh. They are trying to find a way to have tidal marsh and to keep the water level down so it won't be a problem for nearby landowners. They may move water into other ponds.

He said that last year they were not able to raise salinity levels to provide habitat for brine shrimp and brine flies in Ponds A13, 14, and 15, but this year they were able to operate as planned. He said that some wildlife need brine shrimp and brine flies and they have had outstanding success with many shrimp-dependent birds using these ponds, particularly in Pond A13. He mentioned that the island ponds that were breached in March have sediments coming in at a greater rate than expected, and they are having a great diversity and number of wildlife in those ponds. Waterfowl hunting season starts October 21 and ends in January. They plan to repair the broken water control structure in Pond A7 before it rains.

Morris said that the Navy at Moffett Field/NASA Ames is removing contaminated soil and raised sections of the levee that we hope to turn into part of the Bay Trail. This work has made the trail much more suitable now.

Q/C: Would it be an advantage to have New Chicago Marsh be part of the restoration project?

A: Clyde Morris: New Chicago Marsh is an example of what we don't want to do since it is very subsided. It is now only habitat for the salt marsh harvest mouse, not for the clapper rail, and the largest mosquito producer in Santa Clara County. We are building a water control structure between Pond A16 and the educational center and we will maybe open up a tide gate and ensure the water level doesn't get too high.

A: Steve Ritchie: New Chicago Marsh is not part of the salt pond project because it was not part of the acquisition, but it is a part of the Shoreline Study. New Chicago and Alviso won't be left behind. That's one area we're examining for early implementation.

Q/C: What's the salinity in those three ponds and are there brine shrimp in them? How did water get into New Chicago Marsh?

A: Clyde Morris: The salinity in Ponds A13, 14, and 15 is between 80 ppt and 120 ppt, which is excellent for brine shrimp and fly production. Most of the water coming into New Chicago Marsh is from rains and runoff in the winter. During the dry summer, the Refuge uses a water control structure to bring saline water from the Bay into New

Chicago Marsh, but we close the intake structure in October when expect the beginning of the rainy season.

Q/C: Will you put the tidal gates back?

A: Clyde Morris: We're proposing building a new water control structure for A16 to use it as a managed pond and take down high water in New Chicago Marsh.

John Krause of the California Department of Fish and Wildlife said that winter storms caused levee damage in Pond 10 and along the Bayfront. They met with FEMA to discuss covering storm damage and hoping to get funds for levee reconstruction next year.

He said that they were hoping to complete the original Eden Landing restoration segment into Eden Shores this year as the final phase of Eden Landing, but since the money is coming from CalTrans and there have been some delays from their agency, the project will go out to bid in winter/spring and constructed next summer/fall. They stockpiled dirt along backside of the levee, and if they restored tidal action in upper Eden Landing right now, there is concern that that sediment will erode away.

They will conduct a breach by Pond 10 and restore Mt. Eden Creek out to Eden Landing Road. Last year, they breached North Creek into Old Alameda Creek and they will breach the North Creek levee into the marsh restoration site the week of October 26. They are moving forward on partial tidal restoration and the Bay Trail segment and the final marsh restoration breach will be completed next year.

Krause said that the water control structure in Pond 10, for both Ponds 10 and 11, will be completed this year and they will fill the pond system up for open water management. This is good for Foresters' terns and perhaps Caspian terns. They are managing the Pond 6A system for snowy plover breeding, and they saw about 50 pairs nesting in Eden Landing this year. They will be refining this area for the coming years with water control structure changes.

Krause noted that it has been hard to maintain a standard dissolved oxygen system, so periodically the Pond 8A system is going below standard and the 2C system has been having problems since June. The Pond 2 system is fluctuating as well, so in summary, while DO continues to be a management issue, the ponds continue to provide good habitat.

He said there are a lot of wells from the 1800s and 1900s, and that Cargill had to close most of them as part of the purchase agreement. Cargill is still working on closing some other wells. They are going to construct a new culvert from 2C into 5C, which Cargill is putting in and covering the cost. DFG also had some batch ponds and are attracting target species, including phalaropes and eared grebes, feeding on the ponds producing high amounts of brine shrimp and flies. Winter waterfowl are coming back in and overwintering and shorebird migration is continuing as well. DFG is beginning

transitioning into deeper water levels for winter operations and reflooding ponds. Water levels are going up in the seasonal ponds as well.

There will be a breach event at Eden Landing on October 26, and a breach to the Bay is scheduled for November. A six-day hunt will be held again this year limited to 100 hunters each day.

Q/C: You said there are about 50 breeding pairs of plovers—are there any measures of success of breeding you've seen?

A: John Krause: Yes, PRBO, SJSU and others are monitoring these. I don't have the numbers off the top of my head.

Q/C: All of these events are opportunities to keep enthusiasm going and do public outreach.

A: Steve Ritchie: And it also relates to funding. If we look at different funding sources on construction, it's pretty easy to figure out where the money will come from, but monitoring is the hard part. Adaptive management will rely on getting money for people doing sediment measuring and bird counting, and that's what we need the most help on.

Q/C: There is a program called the ISMI fellowship for elementary school teachers where corporate sponsors provide stipends for teachers to work over summer to do something in math and science. It could be a way of providing hands-on skilled professionals for data analysis or bird counts.

6. Community Restoration Partnerships and Native Oyster Restoration in the South Bay

Marilyn Latta, of Save the Bay, gave a presentation on community restoration partnerships. She said that the South Bay Salt Pond Restoration Project is a great example of urban habitat restoration in San Francisco Bay. It is a lot of work to educate people about what used to exist; trying to synthesize the science and planning that's gone on for years. The funding needs are a huge issue in implementation and the general public can step in and help a lot with that.

She said that they have come up with priorities by region and have established partnerships with agencies working in wetlands, creek restoration projects, island sites, oyster monitoring work, and eelgrass restoration. The projects involve a variety of stakeholders and leverage funding,

They are working with Fish and Wildlife Service at Bair Island, she said, and with Fish and Game at Eden Landing. She said that their staff level is small and they have a lot on their plates. Save the Bay also works closely with BCDC to get support to move projects forward and works with agency staff to plan volunteer projects. For plant restoration, they have established native plant nurseries with seeds collected from the sites.

Save the Bay has numerous sites around the Bay, with about 5000 volunteers annually, (3000 kids, 2000 adults) and they monitor results and project success. She said they lead monthly canoe trips to Middle Bair Island and are conducting restoration in the upper zone to provide a seed source and nesting areas for shorebirds.

Latta then discussed the restoration best practices they use such as:

- Developing clear goals
- Focusing on small project areas
- Targeting invasive plant control
- Conducting site specific revegetation
- Planting densely and following up
- Doing site monitoring
- Getting the community involved

Sumudu Walaretna, a graduate student at San Jose State University, discussed a project that she is working on in conjunction with Save the Bay called the San Francisco Bay Native Oyster Recruitment Study. She discussed the important role of oysters as a keystone species in the Bay and that they interact with other species and provide habitat for fish and crab breeding. Both oysters and eelgrass filter large amounts of water and remove suspended organics to improve water quality.

She said that this project includes seven sites with natural oyster populations in both the north bay and south bay. They are putting four treatments out at each site and to see how many oysters settle on each and look at reproduction rates. The work will help determine ultimately if oysters can be restored in the Bay on larger scales.

7. Shoreline Study Update

Ann Draper, of the Santa Clara Valley Water District, said that the Corps is beginning work on hydrology and hydraulic analysis and had a kick-off meeting on September 22. A key question is how high the levees should be and where should they go? She said that there is some restoration we can do, but the rest can't go in until we have flood protection in place and that requires federal cooperation with FEMA.

She said that Senator Feinstein's office has proposed help to focus on interagency cooperation and that on October 16 they will have a meeting with FEMA. The Water District and the Corps want to have continuous progress on the Shoreline Study, but although there is good support for the study, it may not go as quickly as they want due to federal appropriations. Have ROD on SBSR but then have to stop until 2017 we had ROD and report so we could do flood work. Early implementation have to do through non-federal sponsor, need all of us to raise the funds to do it, and try to use Section 104 Crediting. Tier from SBSP Project EIR/EIS.

A: Steve Ritchie: The Project does not have really good levees, so we have to construct some. He showed a map of the Alviso pond area designating alignment on levees for flood protection. It's doable if we break it into chunks and have a number of different projects, then do some preliminary assessments. If we go to the Without Project

Conditions (F3) milestone in spring 2008, we will be able to say which projects look promising enough to go forward with on a local basis.

A: Yvonne LeTellier: This is consistent with Corps policy for work to start prior to finishing the feasibility study.

Q/C: Are hydrology studies going on now in each of those areas?

A: Steve Ritchie: Yes.

A: Ann Draper: We kicked it off on September 22 and the Corps is leading that.

Q/C: Do you have a general sense of how high the levees need to be at this point?

A: Steve Ritchie: We think a range of 15-20 feet.

A: Ann Draper: That's why we need to make sure that FEMA is involved in order to match the Corps and FEMA criteria.

Q/C: I have some ideas about selection for priority. Some work the Bay Planning Coalition did to propose the bonds on the November ballot states that post-Katrina should be new paradigm with what to finance. We came up with some criteria on where to target what should be done first, it's a source of good information.

A: Yvonne LeTellier: That's what we're using.

Q/C: The money is going to come through subventions.

A: Steve Ritchie: Subventions are where the state agrees to pay money to local entities for flood control projects. It currently owes Santa Clara County \$40-\$60 million. What happened in last year's budget will be paying this back and also in Proposition 1E and in Proposition 84.

Q/C: One of board alternates to the Joint Powers Authority is looking for early implementation as well. How does the height compare of levees?

A: Steve Ritchie: To remove people from the flood plain is increasing levees by about 5 feet roughly.

Q/C: Are you considering these levees as potential public access trails as well?

A: Steve Ritchie: Yes.

8. Public Outreach Opportunities

Tracy Grubbs, of the Center for Collaborative Policy, reminded the Stakeholders that the Project is relying on each of you to give updates about the SBSP Project to your

communities. She said that they are interested in going more broadly into the communities and provided a variety of Project materials for Stakeholders to use. She has them to list all the organizations that they report back to because she has developed a worksheet to make sure they are associated with right organizations. Project materials that can be used include a 6-minute DVD, a 12-page *Bay Nature Magazine* insert, the website information with interactive maps, a PowerPoint presentation, TV and print media clips, a new Project brochure, the quarterly electronic newsletter, docent-led tours, and volunteer restoration days in Eden Landing with Save the Bay.

Q/C: For the public tours, contact Carmen Minch at the Don Edwards Wildlife Refuge.

Q/C: On the Project governance, how that is that plan communicated? I hope the public may be looking to see the priorities for the PMT and is comfortable with that. Pay attention to funding and outreach efforts with greater clarity to the public.

Q/C: In the key questions, where's one about money? Unless you have money, you don't have key questions asked and answered. Spend some time on this in your outreach. On the organizational charts, it is not clear where the input from the public is or going to the public. It also doesn't tell where data is going to be, where would someone from the public go to find it?

9. EIR/EIS Schedule, Funding, and Next Steps

Steve Ritchie gave the schedule for the upcoming EIR/EIS process:

- Draft EIR/EIS in January 2007, with a 45-day comment period
- Final EIR/EIS in July 2007
- Phase 1 implementation: Spring 2008-Dec. 2009

Q/C: We could have the next stakeholder meeting after EIR/EIS draft is done.

Steve Ritchie said that that would be a good possibility and the meeting was adjourned.

Attachment 1: October 4, 2006 Meeting Attendance

Name	Organization/Affiliation
Sharim Asiong	Sen. Feinstein's Office
John Brosnan	Sonoma Land Trust
Margaret Bruce	Silicon Valley Leadership Group
Dan Bruinsma	City of San Jose
Kris Buchholz	PG&E
Deborah Clark	Center for Collaborative Policy
Arthur Feinstein	Citizens Committee to Complete the Refuge
Lorrie Gervin	City of Sunnyvale
Tracy Grubbs	Center for Collaborative Policy
John Gurley	Audubon California
Melissa Hippard	Sierra Club
John Howe	City of Sunnyvale
Beth Huning	San Francisco Bay Joint Venture
Amy Hutzell	California State Coastal Conservancy
Ellen Johnck	Bay Planning Coalition
Ralph Johnson	Alameda Co. Flood Control & Water Dist.
Matt Kaminski	Ducks Unlimited
John Krause	California Dept. of Fish and Game
Marilyn Latta	Save the Bay
Tom Laine	Alviso Water Task Force
Jane Lavelle	San Francisco Public Utilities Commission
Yvonne LeTellier	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Libby Lucas	California Native Plant Society
Jack Lueder	Silicon Bicycle Coalition
Jim McGrath	Port of Oakland
Austin McNerny	Center for Collaborative Policy
Eileen McLaughlin	Wildlife Stewards
Clyde Morris	U.S Fish and Wildlife Service
Eric Mruz	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Sandy Olliges	NASA Ames
Steve Ritchie	Executive Project Manager
Ana Ruiz	Mid-Peninsula Open Space District
Richard Santos	Santa Clara Valley Water District
Chris Schwarz	Rep. Mike Honda's Office
Mary Selkirk	Center for Collaborative Policy
Michael Sweeney	City of Hayward
Charles Taylor	Alviso Water Task Force
Laura Thompson	ABAG Bay Trail
Lynne Trulio	San Jose State University
Kevin Woodhouse	City of Mountain View