



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

1. Welcome, Introductions, and Meeting Objectives

Mary Selkirk, Center for Collaborative Policy facilitator, opened the meeting, welcomed participants and reviewed the meeting objectives:

- Provide in-depth dialogue to the project team on the draft Alternatives Planning Framework, with specific focus on the detailed project objectives and evaluation criteria
- Arrange salt pond tours for interested participants

Ron Duke of H.T. Harvey, member of the consultant design team, was present to respond to questions and provide clarification to participants. He also gave a brief introduction to the purposes of the landscape level analyses.

2. Questions/comments on the overall planning approach

Participant questions and comments focused first on the Alternative Planning Framework that was presented to the Forum at the morning plenary meeting. Selkirk asked participants to provide comments on the strengths, weaknesses, and/or to make suggestions for revisions to the overall approach.

General comment/questions on overall approach:

Several participants raised the importance of including adjacent lands in any mapping or alternative selection process. Some pointed out that this information would help the Forum and planners by establishing another important evaluation criterion that identified habitat areas adjacent to ongoing projects outside the project area. At the same time it would provide information to owners of public lands, e.g. cities, adjacent to the project, for their own potential restoration planning.

- Participants requested that adjacent public lands, and other open, undeveloped land be added to the current project maps.
- One participant asked for clarification about how the consultant team would take into account the effects of any changes in use of the ponds still owned by Cargill.
- One participant stressed that the flood management objectives appeared to be inflexible, and wanted to be confident that all of the different objectives would be integrated early on.

- One participant suggested that team orient proposed habitats of most sensitive species away from area where likely greatest potential human contact/impacts.

Landscape concepts

The consultant team had proposed approaching the alternative selection first at the “landscape level,” at which they proposed five possible options:

- Option A: No project/Initial Stewardship Plan (ISP) with minimal operations and maintenance
- Option B: No project/ISP with gull operations and maintenance
- Option C: Maximize managed pond habitat
- Option D: Mix of tidal marsh and managed pond habitat (assume 60/40 initially)
- Option E: Maximize tidal marsh habitat

Comments from participants on these initial “landscape concept” selection included the following:

- A number of participants asked if it was necessary to have two “No Project” alternatives; was it really realistic that the project would let the levees fail? Others expressed that they thought having two No Project concepts was confusing.
- Other participants commented that they needed clarification about the difference between landscape concepts B and C.
- Several Work group members suggested that they not spend a lot of time on the landscape concepts, and there seemed to be general consensus that Concepts A” and “D” were the most likely alternatives and that the planners should instead be focusing on those two alternatives
- *Response:* Ron Duke said that they will have additional species and geomorphic data by late summer that will drive their selection of the overall landscape approach.
- A Forum member and work Group participants suggested that as an alternative, the team look at constraints, e.g. mercury risk, suitability of remnant systems, and cost to select the landscape approach.

Comments on Detailed Objectives

Overall comments:

- NOAA participant supported using suites of species that use similar habitat, rather than trying to capture comprehensive species lists. That approach supports watershed wide planning. Others supported his view.
- Another participant suggested using indicator plant and bird species as evaluation metrics.
- Others asked for a better description of the evaluation criteria.
- One participant stated that he thought the team should “admit it’s a zero-sum game” for competing habitats and species.

- Another participant suggested adding a detailed objective: “Maintain/enhance winter waterfowl populations in the South Bay.”
- One participant asked why water quality was not considered an “exclusion criterion,” like basic flood protection.

Specific comments on objectives:

- *Comment on Objective 1a:*
 - Add California least tern
- *Comments on Objective 1b:*
 - Need species numbers here, for adaptive management experiments/performance measurements.
 - Leave as they are
- *Comments on Objective 1c:*
 - Add to transitional detailed objective, e.g., mention red-legged frog.
 - Add steelhead
- *Comments on Objective 5:*
 - Should specifically call out “minimize *Lepidium*.”
 - Should include mitten crab

Comments on Cost Effectiveness and Evaluation Factors:

- Re proposed Cost Effectiveness and Environmental Impact evaluation factors; a number of participants suggested parsing out these factors in each objectives area
- Another stated that the team should simply go for the lowest cost alternative.

Comments on the Evaluation Display:

- A number of participants wanted to see the proposed “evaluation factors,” Cost Effectiveness and Environmental Impacts be treated as filters, not as objectives. Therefore, they wanted them removed from the ranking “wheel.”
- One participant suggested that Cost Effectiveness and Environmental Impacts could be of particular interest to the Local Government Forum.
- Finally, a number of participants asked to see current geographic data on locations of bird species, ASAP.

Previous Action items:

TASK	LEAD	STATUS
Add adjacent public lands to the current project maps.	Project team	Pending from March 26 meeting
Plot bird species on map	Project team: Lynne Trulio and PWA team	Pending
Integrate discussion of cost effectiveness and environmental impacts into next Local Government Forum agenda	CCP	Pending

Action items from April 15 meeting:

TASK	Lead	STATUS
As data collection proceeds show the Work Group any illustration of the transitional zones and upland edge zones	Project team	Pending
Work Group members suggested that publicly held lands adjacent to the ponds should be added to the map.	PWA team	Pending

Attachment A: Detailed Project objectives for Habitat (4/2/04 version)

**PROPOSED SET OF DETAILED OBJECTIVES, EVALUATION
CRITERIA & SCALE OF CONSIDERATION**

**PWA Team
Revised 4/2/04**

BIO HABITAT

Objective 1. Create, restore, or enhance habitats of sufficient size, function, and appropriate structure to:

Objective 1A. Promote restoration of native special-status plants and animals that depend on South San Francisco Bay habitat for all or part of their life cycles		
Detailed Objectives	Evaluation Criteria	Scale¹
Recover the south bay subspecies of the salt marsh harvest mouse	Aerial extent of complete salt marshes, with broad marshplain (<i>i.e.</i> , pickleweed) habitat and broad upland/peripheral halophyte transitional zones, and interconnected restored marsh areas.	L PC P
Meet the South Bay portions of the recovery plan for the California Clapper Rail	Aerial extent of broad tidal marshes with extensive, dendritic channel systems and appropriate vegetation structure.	L PC P
Re-establish populations of <i>Cordylanthus maritimus</i> ssp. <i>palustris</i> and <i>Sueda californica</i>	Aerial extent of high marsh/upland transitional zones	L PC P
Meet recovery goals for Snowy Plovers	Aerial extent of suitable breeding habitat (salt pan)	L PC P

Objective 1B. Maintain current migratory bird species that utilize existing salt ponds and associated structures such as levees.		
Detailed Objectives	Evaluation Criteria	Scale
Maintain current populations of birds breeding at the salt ponds	Estimate of numbers of breeding birds	L PC P
Maintain habitat for salt pond specialized birds (<i>e.g.</i> , Wilson's Phalaropes)	Area of pond habitat with somewhat elevated salinities	L PC P
Maintain current population levels for foraging shorebirds	Estimate of foraging habitat area	L PC P

Objective 1C. Support increased abundance and diversity of native species in various South San Francisco Bay aquatic and terrestrial ecosystem components, including plants, invertebrates, fish, mammals, birds, reptiles and amphibians		
Detailed Objectives	Evaluation Criteria	Scale
Maintain or enhance the populations of shorebirds currently using intertidal mudflat habitat	Area of mudflat habitat available in the South Bay through the life of the project	L

¹ L = Landscape PC = Pond Complex P = Individual Pond

Enhance South Bay fish populations	Area of tidal channel habitat within marshes	L PC
Enhance habitat for intertidal invertebrate populations by contributing to the detrital food web.	Area of intertidal habitat.	L
Enhance harbor seal habitat for foraging and isolated haul-out areas	Area of new, large tidal channels	L PC

WATER & SEDIMENT QUALITY

Objective 4. 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	Scale
Maintain existing levels of water quality (surface and ground water).	Within the range of background concentrations of key indicator constituents (e.g., mercury, metals, nutrients, algae).	PC P
Comply with TMDL requirements for South Bay (i.e., mercury and other).	To be determined with Regional Board staff.	PC
Assess and manage ecological risk associated with mercury methylation and bioaccumulation.	Targets or thresholds to be determined.	PC P
Assess and manage mobilization of existing contaminants present in sediments.	Higher concentration sediments stabilized and protected from erosion or transport.	P

NUISANCE SPECIES MANAGEMENT

Objective 5. Implement design and management measures to maintain or improve current levels of vector management, control predation on special status species, and manage the spread of non-native invasive species		
Detailed Objectives	Evaluation Criteria	Scale
Minimize colonization of mudflats and marshplain by non-native <i>Spartina</i> and its hybrids	Area of potentially colonizable mudflat	PC P
Maintain or improve the current levels of vector management	Area of potential mosquito habitat	PC P
Improve protection from predators and reduce need for Predator Management	Area of isolated tidal marshes	PC P

COST EFFECTIVENESS

Consider costs of implementation, management, and monitoring so that planned activities can be effectively executed with available funding. Form partnerships and alliances to develop and institute a long-term viable funding strategy.		
Detailed Objectives	Evaluation Criteria	Scale
Manage construction costs to achieve project goals and objectives with available funding.	Dollars	PC P
Manage long-term operations and maintenance costs.	Dollars, 50-year time frame	PC P
Manage monitoring costs to support project goals and objectives	Dollars, 10-year time frame	PC P
Increase partnerships and alliances to institute a long-term funding strategy.	Participation by multiple entities (e.g., Corps, SCVWD, and others) in long-term funding	PC
Achieve a favorable benefit/cost ratio.	Calculation of b/c ratio, using Corps procedures.	L PC
Limit costs of delay	Assessment of institutional and legal complexity/controversy	PC

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT

Promote environmental benefit and reduce impact in topics other than biology.		
Detailed Objectives	Evaluation Criteria	Scale
Preserve cultural resources, including important archaeological and historical sites	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Number of cultural resource sites impacted ▪ Number of opportunities for interpretation and education 	PC P
Provide public services to accommodate projected demand	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Number of police patrols needed ▪ Response times for fire, police and ambulance services 	PC P
Promote compatibility with surrounding land plans and uses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Level of land use compatibility 	PC
Provide safe, convenient access to the project area while managing congestion on nearby streets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Number of vehicle trips ▪ Number of parking spaces ▪ Number of bicycle lanes ▪ Level of service on nearby roads 	PC P
Enhance air quality for proposed and surrounding uses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Air pollutant levels ▪ Potential for creation of objectionable odors 	PC
Manage noise levels for proposed and surrounding uses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Decibel levels ▪ Number of noise-generating activities ▪ Distance between noise-generating activities and nearby sensitive receptors 	PC

Attachment B: Participants in April 15 Habitat Restoration Work Group meeting

First Name	Last Name	Company	Email
Chris	Alderete	NASA	calderete@mail.arc.nasa.gov
Phil	Bobel	City of Palo Alto, Public Works Dept.	phil_bobel@city.palo-alto.ca.us
Felicia	Borrego	Save The Bay	felicia@savesfbay.org
Bill	Bousman		barlowi@earthlink.net
Andree	Breaux	SF RWQCB	ab@rb2.swrcb.ca.gov
Dan	Bruinsma	City of San Jose, Env. Services	dan.bruinsma@sanjoseca.gov
Joan	Cardellino	Coastal Conservancy	jcard@scc.ca.gov
Steve	Carroll	Ducks Unlimited	scarroll@ducks.org
Joe	Dillon	NOAA -National Marine Fisheries Service	joseph.j.dillon@noaa.gov
Peter	Dunne	Eden Shores Community	pdunne@stanpac.com
Arthur	Feinstein	Citizens Committee to Complete the Refuge	afeinstein@goldengateaudubon.org
Dave	Fundakowski		dfun47@comcast.net
Carin	High	Citizens Committee to Complete the Refuge	howardhigh1@comcast.net
Nadine	Hitchcock	Coastal Conservancy	nhitchcock@scc.ca.gov
Marc	Holmes	Bay Institute	holmes@bay.org
Thomas	Laine	Alviso Resident	Hard Copy
Florence	LaRiviere	Citizen's Committee to Complete the Refuge	florence@refuge.org
Mondy	Lariz	Stevens & Permanente Creeks Watershed Council	coordinator@spcwc.org
Jane	Lavelle	San Francisco Public Utilities Commission	jlavelle@sfwater.org
Kirk	Lenington	Midpeninsula Regional Open Space District	klenington@openspace.org
David	Lipsetz	San Francisco Bay Trail	DavidL@abag.ca.gov
Libby	Lucas	League of Women Voters	jucas1099@aol.com
Jim	McGrath	Port of Oakland	jmcgrath@portoakland.com
Elizabeth	Nixon		enixon@sbcglobal.net
Sandy	Olliges	NASA Ames Research Center	solliges@mail.arc.nasa.gov
Margaret	Orr	City of Petaluma	morr@ci.petaluma.ca.us
Terry	Palmisano	DFG	tpalmisano@dfg.ca.gov
Ed	Penny	Ducks Unlimited	cpenny@ducks.org
John	Rusmiel	Alameda County Mosquito Abatement District	acmad@mosquitoes.org
Michael	Sellers	National Audobon Society	msellers@audubon.org
Lisa	Sniderman	BCDC	lisab@bcdc.ca.gov
Louisa	Squires	Santa Clara Valley Water District	lsquires@valleywater.org
Daniel	Strickman	Santa Clara County Vector Control District	daniel.strickman@deh.co.scl.ca.us
Cheryl	Woodward	Acterra	woodwardcheryl@fhda.edu