South Bay Salt Pond Restoration Project

Restoring the Wild Heart of the South Bay

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

From: **Center for Collaborative Policy**

Re: **Outcomes from the November 15, 2012 Stakeholder Forum & Working Groups Meeting**

Background: The Stakeholder Forum (Forum) and its three geographic working groups met on Thursday, November 15, 2012 from 2 to 4:30 p.m. at the Mountain View Community Center in Mountain View. The Forum is convened to provide ongoing input to the South Bay Salt Pond Restoration Project Management Team (PM Team) and its technical consultants on development and implementation of 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. At the meeting, Forum members received handouts including a printout of meeting slides, handouts of possible Phase 2 actions at each pond complex and the 2011 Stakeholder Forum meeting summary. The handouts and PowerPoint presentation slides, which give more details on presentations, are available on the SBSP Project website (www.southbayrestoration.org).

Substantive Meeting Outcomes:

1. Welcome, Introductions and Agenda Review

John Bourgeois, Executive Project Manager, welcomed Forum members, Working Group members and the public and led introductions. Lead Facilitator Mary Selkirk reviewed the agenda, which included:

- Tracking our Progress: Highlights of 2012
- Phase 2 in Alviso
- Phase 2 in Eden Landing
- Phase 2 in Ravenswood
- Fill for Transition Habitat
- Funding Climate for Restoration
- Update on the Shoreline Study
- Looking Ahead to 2013

2. Tracking our Progress: Highlights of 2012

John Bourgeois provided a status report on South Bay Salt Ponds Phase 1 actions to date with the aid of PowerPoint slides. The Project is taking action within a context of several scientific uncertainties, including the ecological trade-offs between tidal marsh and salt pond species. The Project is using adaptive management to guide actions; the adaptive management process, through scientific studies and monitoring of Phase 1 actions, will inform future phases and decisions on how much of Project acreage, in a range between 50% to 90%, becomes restored tidal marsh.

Phase 1 Actions

Goals for Phase 1 included completing easier projects to quickly establish habitat, and crafting experiments to gather information on some of the hardest questions about species, mercury and habitat, to inform future phases.

Most Phase 1 projects have been completed. Two remain to be completed:

Alviso Pond A16/17 Habitat Enhancement & Tidal Restoration

- Pond A17 was breached on October 31 to start the process of tidal marsh restoration. The day's ceremony also celebrated the 40th anniversary of the Don Edwards San Francisco Bay National Wildlife Refuge and honored key individuals and organizations who helped establish the Refuge, including Florence LaRiviere, the Citizens Committee to Complete the Refuge and Art Ogilvie. Construction at Pond A16 is underway to build nesting islands and will be completed by January 2013.

Eden Landing Ponds E12/13 Pond Enhancement

- Construction will start early next year to reconfigure the 230-acre area into a series of ponds with different salinities, to inform whether birds need higher salinity ponds. The E12-13 area will also include public access, including trails and a kayak launch. Bird use will be studied for one year after the trails are built, before they are opened to the public, to help gain information on trail impacts to species for design of future phases.

Questions/Comments:

Comment: Eden Landing had some high-salinity ponds originally, so it's not totally alien. Restoration is trying to reproduce what we had historically.
Response: You're right.

John Bourgeois said Project managers are proud that they will have implemented Phase 1 in 10-11 years. When Phase 1 is completed, 11% of the project area will be in tidal restoration, 10% in ponds reconfigured as enhanced shorebird and water bird habitat, and 5% in muted tidal ponds, with 75% remaining as managed ponds, for a cost of $30 million. It’s important to note that 69% of Phase 1 construction cost went to construction of managed ponds. Most of the cost goes to water management; shallow pond water is needed for optimal shorebird habitat, but large structures are needed to quickly move the water to avoid water quality problems.

Out of the 15,000 acres in the South Bay Salt Pond Restoration Project, when Phase 1 is complete, there would be 3,750 acres of restored and reconfigured ponds and 7 miles of trails. This is good progress in 10 years.

3. Phase 2: Overview of Latest Concepts

John Bourgeois said managers' goal in Phase 2 is to achieve close to 50% of acreage in tidal marsh, to progress toward the vision set out in the EIR of 50% tidal marsh and 50% managed ponds. Input at this meeting can help guide and direct the Phase 2 actions.

Questions/Comments:

Q: Is the Department of Fish and Game involved in this Project?
A: They are one of the landowners in the South Bay Salt Pond Restoration Project.

Q: Is Audubon involved?
A: Audubon has a seat on the Stakeholder Forum, although that representative is not here today.

4. Phase 2 in Alviso

John Bourgeois reviewed Phase 2 projects for the Alviso area. The projects include:

Island Ponds Restoration Enhancement

The Island Ponds were breached in 2006 to restore tidal marsh, but additional breaches on the north side could speed establishment of vegetation and tidal marsh. As scientists are seeing many small fish in ponds A21 and A20, managers are leaning toward breaching only Pond A19, and possibly connecting it to Pond A20, to restore historical connections.

Questions/Comments:

Q: What will the effect of breaching Pond A17 be on this?
A: It will only improve it.

Q: You already have the programmatic EIR. Will there be an additional EIR?
A: Yes, we don't have to start from scratch. There will be two project EIRs, one for each landowner. Ravenswood and Alviso, owned by the US Fish and Wildlife Service, will be ahead of Eden Landing, owned by the state Department of Fish and Game, by about a year, if we find funding. The Eden Landing proposal is far more complex.

Q: Are there any differences in the abundance and assemblages of fish at the three ponds?
A: The data is not broken down specifically for each of the three ponds.

Tidal Restoration of Ponds A1, A2W and City of Mountain View's Charleston Slough

The Project approached the City about a joint restoration project to increase efficiencies and reduce cost, by avoiding the need to build up a levee between the Project's Pond A1 and the City's Charleston Slough, which would both be restored to tidal marsh. The City inherited a mitigation requirement from Cargill that it restore 53 acres of tidal marsh at the Slough. After 30 years, no marsh has developed there yet. The planned action would

improve the levee between urban areas and the ponds; breach Ponds A1 and A2W; build upland transition zones to create a marsh transition area in case of sea level rise; and construct nesting islands for birds, for use during at least 10 years of sediment accretion.

For public access, spur trails and possibly a boardwalk are planned. One trail location might be along the east side levee of Pond A2W, which PG&E needs maintained for driving access to its utilities.

Questions/Comments:
Q: Would you impact the forebay?
A: No.

Comment: That's a nice birding area.
Comment: Losing some of the most popular birding sites at Charleston Slough will be a serious issue
Response: I know that this is an extremely popular birding area, but the City needs to go ahead with Charleston Slough.

Q: Would it be possible to make it part marsh and part pond?
A: It might be possible. There are compromises. There are a lot of different things we are balancing.

Comment: I'm sympathetic about the birding issue. When this project was first proposed, there had been a loss of 90% of Bay wetlands, and a lot of work went into getting a comfort zone for people. Hopefully that will be talked about in the environmental document. What's most important is for birds to have a place to go. With the change, intertidal mudflat would become marsh. It will be important to identify where the trade-off is going. A lot of salt ponds don't duplicate what we have here. This community always wanted Charleston Slough to go ahead.
Response: That's why we tried to do Ponds SF2 and A16 in Phase 1, to enhance the pond habitat for shorebirds and waterbirds.
Comment: They don't mitigate for this.

Response: Project science hasn't looked at the bird-watching experience, but since 2003 there have been 10 years of monthly bird surveys. We can report that, starting in 2005 when the Project began decreasing pond salinities, there was a significant increase in bird use in our ponds. Shorebirds and dabbling ducks increased by 150%. Overall bird use has increased 125%. Diving ducks numbers remain the same. The only species that have lower populations are eared grebes and phalaropes, which use higher salinity ponds. We hope to address their needs with ponds E12 and E13.

Response: Maybe the Project can look at intertidal mudflat habitat.

Comment: Santa Clara Valley Audubon is bringing hundreds of underprivileged children to Charleston Slough every year to see birds. Charleston Slough is an educational resource.

Comment: The back history is that Charleston Slough was one of the prime habitats of the Clapper rail. The mitigation is required because the Slough was destroyed by an unauthorized activity. It has since become this important mudflat habitat. It's an issue separate from the South Bay Salt Pond project. It's in the City of Mountain View.

Comment: I appreciate the history. Can you confirm that Charleston Slough is lower than Pond A1?
Response: No, it is several feet higher than Pond A1.

Comment: If you are creating an upland transition zone, you are trying to re-create some of the Clapper rail habitat. Since it hasn't developed as we wanted, it's now the best place to get up close and intimate with birds – it's not just a smelly waterfront area. Whether it's Charleston Slough – if there is one place we could get close to birds and keep it that way. Ponds A1 and A2W are places you can't get close to the birds. So it would be helpful if Charleston Slough could stay as mudflats, if you could consider renegotiation of that mitigation.
Response: You are asking the Fish and Wildlife Service to take on a regulatory burden that belongs to the City of Mountain View.

John Marchant of the City of Mountain View said that City officials understand that the Slough has become a great birding area, but also understand that the City has the mitigation responsibility. The City has started discussions with the Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC), which imposed the mitigation requirement, to determine if another location might be possible.

John Bourgeois said the requirement is that the 53 acres has to happen in Charleston Slough, which is less than 100 acres in size. BCDC is not willing to move the mitigation requirement to another location.

Comment: We have an interest in increasing transition habitat, mudflat and tidal habitat, on the west side. Charleston Slough is pretty unique, and includes the shallow habitat that would sustain the shorebirds.

Eric Mruz of the US Fish and Wildlife Service said that, once managers breach the ponds, they expect shorebird and waterfowl use to increase.

Comment: The habitat could be replicated elsewhere. The Project's involvement is not connected to the City of Mountain View's mitigation.

Comment: The Citizens Committee to Complete the Refuge has a photo that Florence LaRiviere took of Charleston Slough in the 1970s. We will scan it in and put it on the web.

Comment: The buildings and parking lot next to the Charleston Slough trailhead were Charleston Slough. They are part of the 90% of wetlands that were lost. That's why it's so important.

5. Phase 2 in Eden Landing

John Bourgeois reviewed Phase 2 projects at Eden Landing. There would be tidal marsh restoration on more than 2,000 acres. If bird use became an issue during the restoration, managers could stop and phase it. The restored ponds would help with fish passage. A bridge would be built to keep the Flood Control Channel trail intact.

In addition, the Project is working closely with the Alameda County Flood Control District, which is considering flood protection for the area. The salt pond berms were never intended as flood protection, but have served that way. The Flood Control District is looking at constructing what it calls a "landmass" on the outboard side of the ponds. It would be 100 foot wide, one foot above the 100-year tide, and provide the same level of flood protection as an inner levee. Alameda County is conducting modeling to see if there would be enough tidal flow under this concept to sustain tidal marshes.

A question for stakeholders is, what criteria should be used in looking at this concept?

Questions/Comments:

Q: What is the current vision for public access?
A: Completing the Bay Trail through the area and not precluding future access to Turk and Cargill islands.

Q: If you move the Bay Trail, are you interfering with the original vision?
A: Laura Thompson of the Bay Trail said the change brings the trail closer to the Bay. In the original concept, it was along Union City Boulevard.
Q: Are you delaying?
A: No, this is the process for completing the Bay Trail.

Q: Does the fact that you breach make a difference in flood protection?
A: The landmass is put at the edge of the Bay to dampen the impact of storm tides. The dampening occurs early, and the breaches allow the system to drain quickly, to use the marsh as storage capacity. The key need is to make sure the approach would allow for a functioning marsh.

Q: It doesn't preclude tidal marsh restoration later?
A: No.

Q: Could you have an inboard levee and the upland transition zones?
A: You would have a $40 million levee, and would lose the wetlands flood storage capacity.

Comment: The Alameda Creek Alliance looks at the restoration as a great opportunity for steelhead smolt habitat. We want to make sure the fisheries work group and Alameda County is working with you. We don't want to create great tern and gull habitat at the mouth of the stream.

Response: One of the main reasons tidal marsh restoration is planned here is for flood protection and fisheries habitat.

Q: Don't lose opportunities for dredge fill. How long would it take for the landmass concept to get approval?
A: The FEMA process could take one year.

Comment: A landmass and tidal marsh concept is pretty counterintuitive. It would be pretty muted.
Response: This area naturally drained the way we're planning – that's why there were the natural salt ponds there. This concept could include habitats such as a shell beach.
Comment: I like the shell beach idea.

Comment: On the maps, it would be nice to photo reference the historic channels as a communication tool to the public.

Q: Do you anticipate interim habitats? How would you manage public access impacts on the birds?
A: The changes would not occur all at once. We would be looking at existing bird use, and that would play into the decision. The key question is how to manage ponds for suites of birds. The project at Ponds E12 and E13 will help inform these actions.

Q: We are most interested in the Bay Trail and linking to Turk Island. How will a decision be made about the alignment?
A: Through this process and the traditional EIR process.
Q: Why does the handout say "potential" construction of portions of the Bay Trail spine?
A: There's no hidden meaning, it's just early in the process. Funding has not been identified for these features at this time

6. Phase 2 in Ravenswood

John Bourgeois reviewed the identified projects for the Ravenswood ponds. They include:

- Restoring Pond R4 to tidal marsh
- Enhancing ponds R5 and S5, possibly improving the tidal prism

He told the group he'd love to hear ideas on how to manage these ponds.

Pond R5/S5

The Project was approached by the City of Redwood City about temporary storm water retention. Managers would need to make sure that water quality would not be a problem for species. This area would not be a good option for snowy plover habitat because trails and highways are close. One possibility is creating a willow sausal.

Questions/Comments:

Comment: If there are willows, you'd have to be really careful about seasonal standing water, and avoid thick stands of trees, as it will have to be treated for mosquitoes. You

would have hordes of mosquitoes, and it's next to a neighborhood. Please don't create mosquito sources that we can't go in and treat.

Comment: This spot is close to where people come in. They can see birds. It's the only spot like it between Redwood Shores and Palo Alto Baylands. It would be good to preserve the birding opportunities.

Comment: Are there ways to collaborate with Bedwell Bayfront Park? It would be good to develop the transition there, connect to Flood Slough and the new tidal area. They already have a mitigation pond.

Comment: Maybe this could be made another Charleston Slough, with intertidal mudflat. It's next to a park.
Response: That's a great idea.

Q: Is this in line with the original plans for Pond R4?
A: Yes, the intention was to have an upland transition zone to Bayfront Park.

Comment: A concern is the potential for feral cats from urban areas, and how to protect the refuge from those urban impacts.

7. Fill for Transition Habitat

John Bourgeois reviewed ideas for using upland and dredged material to build upland transition zones. There could be issues, such as traffic and cost.

Comment: We want to support the use of Redwood City's clean maintenance material, which has already been placed at Bair Island. We are looking for South Bay sites. Could we create a small working group? The Army Corps of Engineers has a nationwide funding gap and we are fortunate that the Port of Redwood City is on the high track list of active studies for channel deepening. It would need to be less than three years and $3 million. It has to be permitted within two years.
Response: Our consultant, Moffat-Nichol, is developing our dredge material plan. We have sent the Army Corps of Engineers a letter of intent. There are a lot of hurdles to get through.

Q: Do the upland transition zones have independent utility?
A: Yes.
Comment: Maybe you could do a pilot project to test the concept out.

8. Funding Climate for Restoration

Amy Hutzel, Bay Program Manager for the State Coastal Conservancy, described the history of funding for the Project and the future funding outlook for San Francisco Bay restoration and South Bay flood protection.

The Project in its first 10 years has been able to piece together funding from several sources, she said. The $100 million cost of salt ponds acquisition was paid for by $72

million came from the State of California, $8 million came from the US Fish and Wildlife Service and $20 million from private foundations. Project planning was funded by state bond money, the state Wildlife Conservation Board and the State Coastal Conservancy. Phase 1 construction, which cost $40 million, was funded by the federal government through the Fish and Wildlife Service, NOAA and stimulus monies; state bonds; and local agencies, such as the Santa Clara Valley Water District.

The outlook, however, is not as rosy in the next 10 years. The Project does not have all the necessary funding for Phase 2 planning and implementation. It's not clear when there will be another state water and parks bond. However, the Project does have a lot of friends who are very concerned about flood protection in the South Bay and the health of the San Francisco Bay.

Save The Bay Political Director Stephen Knight, with the aid of PowerPoint slides, discussed the status of the organization's Greening the Bay campaign and efforts to raise local monies for Bay restoration. He noted the recent second Katrina-like event with the Sandy storm on the East Coast, a second city drowning from lack of flood and storm protection. Save The Bay has identified the lack of funding, the need to make a case for it and recommended creating a special district to allow for local funding. The organization identified that $1.43 billion over 50 years would finish restoring the Bay, at a cost of $4 per person over those 50 years.

Today, there is not yet a consensus, but there is wide support for raising local monies. The Bay Restoration Authority was created four years ago with the mandate of focusing on wetlands, flood protection and public access. The authority is considering a $10/$20-per-year parcel tax measure in the nine-county Bay Area, which would raise $150 million over a decade. It would require a two-thirds vote, and the question is how to get 66.7% voter support. Six years of polling shows that Bay Area residents love San Francisco Bay, have broad and deeply felt concern about its health, and want to see it cleaned up. On the other hand, polls do not show significant concern about flood risk. Overall, the last poll in mid-2011 shows slightly less than two-thirds support for a ballot measure. Save The Bay is poised to launch a campaign with the goal of building a higher floor of support, aiming for a November 2013 ballot measure. Please spread the word within your organizations about these upcoming initiatives.

Mandy Ford, Program Associate for the Marine Conservation Initiative of the Gordon and Betty Moore Foundation, discussed the Foundation's recent efforts on Bay restoration and flood protection. In spring 2012, Foundation Executive Director Steven McCormick and Sen. Diane Feinstein pulled together a group of thought leaders to consider ways to improve policy and increase funding. The group includes Carl Guardino, President and CEO of the Silicon Valley Leadership Group; Chuck Reed, the Mayor of San Jose; Jim Wunderman, President and Chief Executive Officer of the Bay Area Council; Sam Schuchat, State Coastal Conservancy Executive Officer; and David Lewis, Executive Director of Save The Bay. The group would like to take the message to the business community and the Bay Area about the connection between wetlands and

flood control issues, and that the Bay Area is just as much at risk as the East Coast. They are working with Save the Bay.

Questions/Comments:
Comment: You are not meeting people who don't see the need. You have a big task in education – you need to get in the schools and colleges.
Response: We do need to do a lot of education. However, the focus groups in Sunnyvale indicated there is a resounding level of support for San Francisco Bay. People don't understand salt ponds, marshes, acres, maps. But there is a huge love of San Francisco Bay. They said, "This is our home," "We have responsibility for the Bay." We can build on that.
Response: We've found that the public is not parochial about the Bay. They don't need the funding to be in local expenditures.
Comment: They do care that it be local in that funding remains close to the Bay, and not end up in Sacramento.

Q: Rather than a 20-year initiative, which requires you to go back to the voters, is it possible to get a longer funding stream, so it could support maintenance and other long-term needs?
A: We found from talking to "opinion leaders," such as editorial boards of newspapers, that they care about a sunset. Another important issue for them is having an independent oversight committee.

Q: What types of voters were polled?
A: There were different populations in the different polls. If the ballot measure is going forward in 2013, there will be a tighter poll.

Q: Is the Steering Committee looking at funding the South Bay Salt Pond restoration and the Speier legislation [The San Francisco Bay Restoration Act introduced by Congresswoman Jackie Speier]?

A: We are looking at funding from all sources. In the near term, we are looking at local funding. We are also looking at what can be done at the state and federal level. All options are on the table. The goal is to bring together the thought leaders.

Comment: The Restoration Authority Board yesterday discussed that outreach needs to happen now to newspaper editorial boards. Outreach partners will be coordinating with each other and Save The Bay.
Response: We'll be working to go out and find people where they are, rather than having them come to us.

9. Update on the Shoreline Study
Because of time constraints, the presentation on this topic was skipped. John Bourgeois said the draft EIS and feasibility study will be out early next year. He urged any attendee with questions or comments to contact him after the meeting.

10. Science Update
Lead Scientist Laura Valoppi gave the following summaries of recent Phase 1 science studies:

Sediment
Scientists for the last three years have looked at the amount of Bay suspended sediment coming south past the Dumbarton Bridge and from Coyote Creek and Guadalupe River. The third year, there was as much mud that went out of the South Bay as came in during the first two years, possibly due to the unusually wet year in 2012. The Science Team consensus is that, to capture the mud that is in the system, it is best if the Project undertakes tidal restoration sooner rather than later, so that marshes are given a head start in relation to sea level rise.

Birds
Scientists looking at the nesting islands constructed in 2010 at Ravenswood Pond SF2 found very high island use the first year after construction, with all but two of the 30 islands hosting nests. When the new mud dried and cracked, some fledglings were lost. In 2012, there was much less nesting on the islands. The reason is not clear, but could be because of mud cracking or predation from California gulls.

Questions/Comments:
Q: Were they foraging around the islands?
A: Yes, there was a lot of foraging.

For the endangered snowy plovers, studies show depredation has increased and hatching has decreased. Fledging was not as successful in the last year. California gulls seem to be a major predator. The shell plot enhancement project had moderate success.

Questions/Comments:
Q: What were the gull numbers?
A: Last year there was a dip to 47,000. This year, it was up to 53,000.

Fish
Fish studies counted many native species, more than 30, and found no steelhead. We are seeing the newly restored ponds heavily used by fish, fish that are prey and thus provide food for birds.

Questions/Comments:
Q: What are the sea level rise aspects?
A: The Science Team is telling us it's important to move quickly to get the ponds restored, balancing other aspects.

Q: What about mercury?

A: We did open the Pond A8 tide gate two more notches, because evidence showed it was safe for species. Preliminary studies show that avocets' tissue mercury levels did not increase, but Forster tern levels did. We think it was because tern nesting occurred before the tide gates were opened wider, with the benefits that change would provide.

11. Looking Ahead to 2013

John Bourgeois said the new year will see the completion of Phase 1 at Eden Landing, the draft environmental documents for Phase 2 Alviso and Ravenswood, alternatives development for Eden Landing Phase 2, and continued monitoring and adaptive management.

Meeting participants are invited to contact him with questions and concerns at jbourgeois@coastalconservancy.ca.gov. Lead Scientist Laura Valoppi is available at laura_valoppi@usgs.gov, Eric Mruz, Don Edwards Refuge Manager, is available at Eric_Mruz@fws.gov and John Krause, Eden Landing Ecological Reserve Manager, is available at jkrause@dfg.gov.

Announcements: Cynthia Denny of the Sierra Club noted that 2013 is the 50th anniversary of the Wilderness Act. Anyone interested in joining with the national Sierra Club to share information about the importance of the Act can contact her at cindyadenny@yahoo.com.

Attachment 1: November 15, 2012 Meeting Attendance

Name	Organization/Affiliation
Ariel Ambruster	SBSPR Facilitation Team
Donna Ball	Save The Bay
John Bourgeois	SBSPR Executive Project Manager
Len Cardoza	Weston Solutions
Steve Carroll	Ducks Unlimited
Anne Clarke	NASA
Evelyn Cormier	Ohlone Audubon, CCCR
Ken Davies	City of San Jose
J.P. De la Montaigne	City of Mountain View
Cynthia Denny	Sierra Club, Loma Prieta Chapter
Gita Dev	Sierra Club
Ron Duke	H.T. Harvey
Arthur Feinstein	CCCR
Mike Ferreira	Sierra Club
Jim Foran	SCCOSA
Mandy Ford	Moore Foundation
Neil Fujita	SFPUC
Craig Garner	Ducks Unlimited
Mike Giari	Port of Redwood City
Sue Graham	League of Women Voters
Tim Grillo	Union Sanitary District
Dave Halsing	URS
Diane Heinze	Port of Oakland
Margaret Henderson	Questa Engineering Corporation
Jennifer Heroux	USFWS
Lee Huo	Bay Trail
Amy Hutzel	State Coastal Conservancy
Carin High	CCCR
Ellen Johnck	Environmental consultant
Ralph Johnson	Flood Control Expert
Shani Kleinhaus	SCVAS
Stephen Knight	Save The Bay
John Krause	CDFG
Libby Lucas	California Native Plant Society
John Marchant	City of Mountain View
Ryan Mayfield	City of San Jose
Eileen McLaughlin	CCCR
Mike Mielke	SVLG
Susan Moffat	San Jose State University
Betty Moose	HASPA Citizens Advisory Committee
Anne Morkill	USFWS
Jane Moss	Don Edwards docent
Eric Mruz	USFWS

Ellen Natesan	SFPUC
Martin Neitzel	issi/NASA
Austin Payne	Ducks Unlimited
Chindi Peavey	ACMAD
Jeff Peters	Questa Engineering
Russ Robinson	RBOC/SBYC
Brian Sak	SFPUC
Chris Seijger	University Twente
Mary Selkirk	SBSPR Lead Facilitator
Howard Shellhammer	H.T. Harvey
Pat Showalter	SCVWD
Cheryl Strong	USFWS
Charles Taylor	Alviso
David Thomas	PG&E
Laura Thompson	ABAG
Laura Valoppi	SBSPR Lead Scientist