



Meeting Summary
South Bay Salt Pond Restoration Project Stakeholder Forum
Flood Management Work Group
April 15, 2004 Meeting

1. Welcome, Introductions, and Meeting Objectives

Austin McNerny (Center for Collaborative Policy) welcomed meeting participants, provided an overview of the meeting agenda and meeting objectives, and asked attendees to introduce themselves (Attachment 1 provides a list of who attended the meeting). The meeting objectives were:

- In-depth dialogue and feedback to Project Team on the emerging Alternative Planning Framework, specifically on detailed project objectives and evaluation criteria; and
- Arrange tour dates for interested participants.

2. Review of Alternatives Planning Framework

Steve Ritchie (Coastal Conservancy) and Michelle Orr (Phil Williams & Associates) were present to answer questions and provide clarification on the Alternatives Planning Framework that was presented earlier in the day to the Stakeholder Forum (presentation is available on the Project website (<http://www.southbayrestoration.org/Documents.html>)). The following comments/questions were raised during the discussion:

- *How will the overall restoration project alternatives be developed?*
Response: Alternatives can be formulated at many distinct scales (i.e., landscape, pond complex, or individual ponds). Thus, we have a need for a process that will systematically identify, evaluate and contrast all “reasonable” alternatives. The process must provide a defensible basis for selection of range of alternatives and a preferred alternative. The Project Team will start by investigating five (5) landscape concepts:
 - No Project/Initial Stewardship Plan (ISP) with Minimal Operations and Maintenance
 - No Project/ISP with Full Operations and Maintenance
 - Maximize Managed Pond Habitat
 - Mix of Tidal Marsh and Managed Pond Habitat (assume 60/40 initially)
 - Maximize Tidal Marsh Habitat

From these broad landscape concepts, refined alternatives will be crafted and evaluated.

- *What information will be used to inform the development of alternatives?*
Response: The data acquisition process is well underway and is fully described in the Data Acquisition Plan that is available for review from the project website. All relevant and available information will be used to inform the various alternatives.
- *What exactly is the area included in the “South San Francisco Bay”?*
Response: While the project map very clearly defines which salt ponds are included in the restoration project, it is very clear that the overall project may affect areas immediately adjacent to the actual salt ponds. So, the “South San Francisco Bay” includes areas that are immediately adjacent to the actual restoration sites and, depending on the resource topic under review, may include other areas upstream of the bay.
- *How does the US Army Corps of Engineers’ Shoreline Study relate to the South Bay Salt Pond Restoration Project (SBSP)?*
Response: The proposed Water Resources Development Act (WRDA) legislation language states that the SBSP will provide the Corps’ Feasibility Study for the overall Shoreline Study. Thus, there is a very strong need for close integration between the two projects.

3. Detailed Project Objectives

McInerny asked meeting participants to provide suggestions for how to improve and/or clarify the detailed flood management related project objectives. Comments and/or suggestions raised by meeting participants for how to improve the various project objectives, detailed objectives, and evaluation criteria are presented below.

Objective 2 “Flood Management”: Maintain or improve existing levels of flood protection in the South Bay area.

Detailed Objectives	Evaluation Criteria
Maintain existing levels of flood protection in the South Bay area	Must not increase existing potential water inundation frequency, depth, and duration*
Improve existing levels of flood protection in the South Bay area	Decrease in potential water inundation frequency, depth, and duration

* EXCLUSION CRITERION, i.e., must be met by alternative to carry forward and receive further consideration

- *The FEMA flood insurance zones must be considered when discussing/determining what the “existing levels of flood protection” are.*

- *Many of the levees are very difficult to maintain at this time due to the increased urban development and resulting poor access to the levees. The levees are not currently designed for heavy traffic or for winter use.*
- *Who will make the decision as to whether or not the various restoration alternatives increase or decrease the level of flood risk? ”?*
Response: By using various computer models, the Project Staff will be able to simulate flood situations to determine whether or not the FEMA flood insurance zone has been enlarged or reduced for various restoration design alternatives.
- *Actions within the restoration project area have the potential for reducing flood risk in areas outside of the immediate project area. Project planners need to consider the implications of flood management actions within the restoration areas to areas farther upstream or immediately adjacent, but outside of the actual restored ponds.*
- *The Eden Landing project by DFG may provide informative lessons regarding methods for increasing flood management.*
- *Why are the detailed objectives for habitat more detailed than those for flood management?*
- *Should the benefit to cost ratio be identified as a specific detailed project objective or as a possible evaluation criteria?*
Response: The PM Team will discuss the best methods for integrating this suggestion into the project objectives and will also work with the Corps to ensure that their planning needs are fully integrated into the restoration planning process.
- *How is the US Army Corps of Engineers directly participating in the restoration project?*
Response: The Corps has been interacting with the PM Team and conversations are underway to determine if the Corps should participate in the Flood Management Work Group.

Objective 6 “Infrastructure”: Protect the services provided by existing infrastructure (e.g., power lines, railroads).

Detailed Objectives	Evaluation Criteria
Maintain the services provided by existing infrastructure	Must not increase risk of failure or service degradation due to physical changes (e.g., from scour or sedimentation, water inundation, increased environmental loads, reduced access, direct construction impacts, etc.)*

- *There are three wastewater treatment plants in the project area that need to be considered under Objective 6. The objective might be modified to specifically identify wastewater treatment plants.*
- *Will the exclusion criteria be evaluated as either being met/not met or will there be a low to high scale depicting the range for which the objective is being met?*
Response: The detailed project objectives that have exclusion criteria will be evaluated as either meeting/not meeting the specific criteria. For those that don't meet the criteria, the alternative will be deemed "not viable."
- *PG&E representative explained that they spent approximately \$1.6 Million to retrofit 11-12 transmission towers in the A6 salt pond and that the cost for retrofitting all the towers in the larger restoration project area could be very high. As such, PG&E would like to know, at the earliest possible time, exactly which ponds will be restored so they can plan accordingly. Due to endangered species concerns, regulatory approval for maintenance work can take a very long time.*
- *Who provides for public access on flood control levees?*
Response: SCVWD indicated that it does sometimes provide access. ACFCD indicated that it provides access, but it is managed and maintained by EBRPD.
- *Twin sewer pipes in the Eden Landing area provide serious constraint.*

Objective 4 "Water and Sediment Quality": Protect or improve existing levels of water and sediment quality in the South Bay, and take into account ecological risks caused by restoration.

Detailed Objectives	Evaluation Criteria
Maintain existing levels of water quality (surface and groundwater)	Within the range of background concentrations of key indicator constituents (<i>e.g.</i> , mercury, metals, nutrients, algae)
Assess and manage ecological risk associated with mercury methylation and bioaccumulation	Targets or thresholds to be determined
Assess and manage mobilization of existing contaminants present in sediments	Higher concentration sediments stabilized and protected from erosion or transport

- *Consider revising the first detailed objective to state, "maintain or improve levels of water quality (surface and groundwater)."*
- *"Sediment quality" needs to be carried through all the detailed objectives. Consider stating, "Maintain or improve existing qualities of sediments."*

The Project Team also presented a preliminary additional evaluation criterion for cost effectiveness and environmental impacts that is summarized below.

Additional Consideration “Environmental Impact”: Promote environmental benefit and reduce impacts in areas other than biology.

Detailed Objectives	Evaluation Criteria
Preserve cultural resources, including important archaeological and historical sites	Number of cultural resource sites impacted Number of opportunities for interpretation and education
Provide public services to accommodate projected demand	Number of police patrols needed Response times for fire, police and ambulance services
Promote compatibility with surrounding land plans and uses	Level of land use compatibility
Provide safe, convenient access to the project area while managing congestion on nearby streets	Number of vehicle trips Number of parking spaces Number of bicycle lanes Level of service on nearby roads
Enhance air quality for proposed and surrounding uses	Air pollutant levels Potential for creation of objectionable odors
Manage noise levels for proposed and surrounding uses	Decibel levels Number of noise-generating activities Distance between noise-generating activities and nearby sensitive receptors

- *The evaluation criteria for the detailed objective “provide public services to accommodate projected demand” is very important in the Alviso area as there are many “homesteaders” who are living on their boats in the Bay. These boat residents illegally dock against power transmission lines and use various services without paying.*

Additional Consideration “Cost Effectiveness”: Consider costs of implementation, management, and monitoring so that planned activities can be effectively executed with available funding.

Detailed Objectives	Evaluation Criteria
Manage construction costs to achieve project goals and objectives with available funding	Dollars
Manage long-term operations and maintenance costs	Dollars, 50-year time frame
Manage monitoring costs to support project goals and objectives	Dollars, 10-year time frame
Institute a long-term viable funding strategy	Assessment of institutional complexity and achievability
Increase partnerships and alliances to institute the long-term funding strategy	Participation by multiple entities (<i>e.g.</i> , Corps, SCVWD and others) in long-term funding
Achieve a favorable benefit/cost ratio	Calculation of b/c ratio, using Corps procedures
Limit costs of delay	Assessment of institutional and legal complexity/controversy

- *How far do we “draw the net” around the project area when attempting to determine the estimated costs resulting from various project impacts?*
- *What steps will be taken to minimize the overall costs of restoration?*
- *How will the project evaluate the costs of invasive species (i.e., Spartina in and around Alameda Creek) and hazardous materials (i.e., mercury from the Guadalupe River)?*

4. Proposed Approach to Displaying the Evaluation of Various Alternatives Against the Detailed Objectives

McInerny asked meeting participants to provide suggestions for how to improve and/or clarify the proposed approach to displaying the evaluation of the various alternatives against the detailed objectives. Presently, the PM Team is proposing to use a nine-point rating scale from “low –“ to “high +” and to graphic display the results to facilitate comparison and identify differences. Initially, the PM Team proposes to treat all detailed objectives equally and then explore varying the relative importance of selected detailed objectives.

Comments and/or suggestions raised by meeting participants for how to improve the evaluation display are presented below.

- *How has the proposed evaluation display been used before and has it been helpful for other projects?*
- *What is the timeframe over which the rating would be considered? Some impacts may result immediately from construction activities while other benefits and/or impacts may take time to be realized. Thus, the evaluation system needs to somehow consider the temporal aspect of the factor that is being evaluated.*

5. Salt Pond Tour Dates

The PM Team encourages Work Group participants to join Clyde Morris of the US Fish and Wildlife Service and Carl Wilcox and John Krause of the Department of Fish and Game for tours of the South Bay Salt Pond restoration sites they are offering in April and May.

Tours are expected to take about 3 hours each, except where a full day is indicated. Below is a list of tour dates and times and interested parties are asked to confirm their interest in specific tours by contacting Tracy Grubbs at trgrubbs@sbcglobal.net or (415) 564-1976.

USFWS Refuge Ponds

5/12 Wednesday all day (Alviso, Fremont, West Bay)

5/20 Thursday 1/2 day (Alviso- please indicate which half of the day is better for you)

DFG Ponds (Baumberg)

4/24	Saturday afternoon	5/17	Monday morning
4/27	Tuesday morning	5/18	Tuesday morning
5/6	Thursday morning	5/22	Saturday morning

6. Next Steps

**Next Meeting of the Flood Management Work Group:
Mary 25, 10:00 – 3:30 pm, location to be determined**

Draft Agenda:

- 1. Review/feedback on revised detailed project objectives and evaluation criteria**
- 2. Update on data sources/summary plan**
- 3. Review of revised Alternatives Planning Framework**

Attachment 1: April 15, 2004 Meeting Attendance

First Name	Last Name	Company	Email
Bob	Douglas	Cargill Salt	robert_douglass@cargill.com
Beth	Dyer	Santa Clara Valley Water District	bdyer@valleywater.org
Eric	Hansen	PG&E	EGH5@PGE.COM
Alice	Ringer	Santa Clara Basin Watershed	alice.ringer@cityofpaloalto.org
Steven	Ritchie	URS Corporation	steve_ritchie@urscorp.com
Richard	Santos	Santa Clara Valley Water District	rsantos@valleywater.org
Kirsten	Struve	City of San Jose, Santa Clara	kirsten.struve@sanjoseca.gov
Don	Weden		weden@ix.netcom.com