



**Meeting Summary**  
**South Bay Salt Pond Restoration Project**  
**Habitat Restoration Work Group**  
**March 26, 2004, 9:30 a.m.-12:30 p.m.**  
**Conference Room, Santa Clara/San Jose Pollution Control Plant**

*Participants:*

See Attachment A.

*1. Welcome and Introductions—Steve Ritchie*

The South Bay Salt Pond Restoration Project's new Executive Project Manager, Steve Ritchie, welcomed participants. Ritchie provided an overview of the project and highlighted when and how the Project partners were seeking and would integrate, input from the public into the plan development.

*2. Setting the historical context for restoration in the South Bay—Robin Grossinger, San Francisco Estuary Institute (SFEI)*

Robin Grossinger, environmental scientist from SFEI, provided an in-depth look at historic conditions and environment in the South Bay. Using historical map and survey data, displayed in a series of detailed maps, Robin built the story of the development and composition of the different marsh and near-shore areas throughout the South Bay, including physical features, zones of salinity and associated types of channel patterns.

Grossinger focused on the potential for how his kind of historical data can help restoration planners to make better decisions about what type of restoration to do where, e.g. by illustrating areas that have been accreting (accumulating), or eroding sediment over the past 150 years.

*Question:* How will this evidence get tracked into scientific inquiries for the restoration Planning?

*Response:* Steve Ritchie and Lynne Trulio, Project Lead Scientist, stated that the current project science strategy has a process for peer review, has identified key uncertainties and opportunities for research on potential pilot projects, which will incorporate historical evidence and other information.

*Question:* What about the issue of sediment? Do historical trends help us understand what might happen when we add sediment to certain areas?

*Response:*

Participants agreed that this issue provides a good opportunity for experiment, this is the kind of issue that the PWA team will be addressing in their development of alternatives and specific pond-level recommendations.

*3. Current status of the salt ponds and potential opportunities and constraints to restoration—Carl Wilcox, California Department of Fish and Game (DFG)*

Carl Wilcox, California Department of Fish and Game, provided an in-depth presentation on the current status of conditions and potential for restoration throughout the South Bay ponds. He pointed out, for example, that there are different restoration opportunities depending on the ability to bring water in, or get it out, relative to the tides. He stated that the greatest difficulty in the South Bay would be in restoring the transitional areas between tidal wetlands and adjacent upland areas, because so much has been lost to development. As a result, the project partners will be looking especially closely at areas that provide potential for restoration of wetland/upland transitions.

He went on to discuss the sediment requirements of the more subsided ponds, especially those in Alviso.

Overall, according to Wilcox, channels in the South Bay are still shrinking, and marsh areas increasing, indicating a net increase in sedimentation in the South Bay, especially south of the Dumbarton Bridge. He observed that this is different from parts of the North Bay, where a net erosional condition poses more of a problem;.

Discussion ensued as to whether there was much upland or transition zone within the project area. Wilcox stated that although there were only limited uplands areas in the project area, the project partners want to ensure that restoration planning opportunities for any contiguous uplands areas outside the project are consistent with the planning for the areas within the salt ponds project area, to maximize overall transitional uplands restoration.

Wilcox also raised the issue to the group that the remaining Cargill ponds are still in production, and asked the group to consider how the project partners should take those ponds into account as they plan the overall restoration.

*4. Data collection to date—Ron Duke, H.T. Harvey*

Ron Duke of H.T. Harvey, PWA team member, described the breadth of the data acquisition currently underway for the overall restoration project, under the PWA team contract. He reviewed the topics that are being investigated and asked Work Group members to identify any additional data sources that they could suggest. Some Work Group members provided feedback on forms provided at the meeting. All Work Group members were encouraged to e-mail their suggestions to the PWA team as soon as possible.

5. Discussion of Detailed Project Objectives—Ron Duke, HT. Harvey

Ron Duke introduced Work Group participants to the overall approach that the PWA team is taking to develop the most appropriate detailed project objectives. These detailed project objectives should both adequately describe the types of restoration actions needed to accomplish the broad restoration goals, and allow the PM Team and the public to be able to distinguish between different restoration alternatives. A productive discussion ensued, during which participants raised many good questions, and provided specific feedback to Duke. The group had time to address only one of the detailed Objectives, Objective 1A, as follows:

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	Scale*
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

Note: L = Landscape      PC = Pond Complex      P = Individual Pond

(Ron Duke’s complete Powerpoint presentation, will be available for viewing on the project website, [www.southbayrestoration.org](http://www.southbayrestoration.org), under the Documents section). Mary Selkirk, Center for Collaborative Policy (CCP) facilitator, facilitated the dialogue. She emphasized that this kind of detailed review and dialogue on the project objectives will also be the focus of the April Work Group meeting, which will take place on April 15<sup>th</sup> in the afternoon, following a morning plenary meeting of the entire Stakeholder Forum.

Comments and questions on the detailed project objectives included the following:

- How do we deal with trade-off’s across objectives?
- How will water quality (e.g. mercury effects on clapper rail eggs) be integrated into overall final project objectives?
- How are you incorporating temporal factors (including timing of objectives, e.g. early protection of endangered species)?

- Be sure to address the sustainability reach of types of habitat
- Evaluation criteria for clapper rail should include more than just aerial extent
- Please show how you are grouping species, and consider adding additional species including: least tern, colonizing nesting birds (or clarify rationale for identifying the ones you have specified, are they representative of other species as well?)
- Some shorebirds also user higher elevations—take that into account as well.
- While objective is not to restore to some specified historical condition, the plan should give higher priority to actions that sustain historical features/processes.

Additional follow-up comments:

John Krause, California Department of Fish and Game, encouraged participants to e-mail any additional comments to the PM Team.

**Action items for follow-up:**

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

<p><b>Next meeting of the Work Group:</b>  1-3:30 p.m. Thursday, April 15, NASA Ames Research Center,  Moffett Field, Mountain View</p>
---

## Attachment A: May 26, 2004 Meeting Attendance

First Name	Last Name	Company/Organization	Email
Chris	Alderete	NASA	calderete@mail.arc.nasa.gov
Bill	Bousman		barlowi@earthlink.net
Andree	Breaux	SF RWQCB	ab@rb2.swrcb.ca.gov
John	Brosnan	SF RWQCB	jtb@rb2.swrcb.ca.gov
Frank and Janice	Delfino	Citizens Committee to Complete the Refuge	
Arthur	Feinstein	Citizens Committee to Complete the Refuge	afeinstein@goldengateaudubon.org
Carin	High	Citizens Committee to Complete the Refuge	howardhigh1@comcast.net
Melissa	Hippard	Sierra Club, Loma Prieta Chapter	melissa.hippard@sierraclub.org
Lynne	Hosley	CH2MHILL	lhosley@ch2m.com
Don	Johnson	Towill, Inc.	dawn.johnson@towill.com
Marge	Kolar	FWS -Don Edwards SF Bay National Wildlife Refuge	Margaret_Kolar@r1.fws.gov
Thomas	Laine	Alviso Resident	
Mondy	Lariz	Stevens & Permanent Creeks Watershed Council	coordinator@spcwc.org
Shelby	Lathrop	Shaw Environmental, Inc.	shelby.lathrop@shawgrp.com
Jane	Lavelle	San Francisco Public Utilities Commission	jlabelle@sfgwater.org
Cynthia	Lipford		eco13@earthlink.net
Libby	Lucas	League of Women Voters	jucas1099@aol.com
Kristy	McCumby	City of Sunnyvale, POTW	kmccumby@ci.sunnyvale.ca.us
Jim	McGrath	Port of Oakland	jmcgrath@portoakland.com
Kevin	Murray	San Francisquito Creek Joint Powers Authority	KMurray@menlopark.org
Briggs	Nisbet	Save The Bay	briggs@savesfbay.org
Elizabeth	Nixon		enixon@sbcglobal.net
Sandy	Olliges	NASA Ames Research Center	solliges@mail.arc.nasa.gov
Chindi	Peavey	San Mateo Mosquito Abatement District	cpeavey@smcmad.org
Antoinette	Romeo	Santa Clara County Parks & Recreation Department	Antoinette.Romeo@prk.sccgov.org
Ana	Ruiz	Midpeninsula Regional Open Space District	aruiz@openspace.org
John	Rusmiel	Alameda County Mosquito Abatement District	acmad@mosquitoes.org
Richard	Santos	Santa Clara Valley Water District	rsantos@valleywater.org
Lenny	Siegel	Center for Public Oversight	lsiegel@cpeo.org
Daniel	Strickman	Santa Clara County Vector Control District	daniel.strickman@deh.co.scl.ca.us
Kirsten	Struve	City of San Jose, Santa Clara POTW/Env. Services	kirsten.struve@sanjoseca.gov
Caitlin	Sweeney	BCDC	caitlins@bcdc.ca.gov
Luisa	Valiela	US EPA, Region 9	valiela.luisa@epa.gov
Neal	Van Keuren	City of San Jose, Env. Services	neal.vankeuren@sanjoseca.gov