



Meeting Summary
South Bay Salt Pond Restoration Project Stakeholder Forum
Public Access/Recreation Work Group
April 15, 2004 Meeting

1. Welcome, Introductions, and Meeting Objectives

Greg Bourne (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 lists meeting participants). The meeting objectives were:

- Discuss the alternatives formulation and evaluation approach presented by the technical consultants
- Review and comment on the detailed Public Access/Recreation objectives
- Present opportunities for salt pond tours

2. Discuss Alternatives Formulation and Evaluation Approach

Work Group participants proceeded to discuss the approach to alternatives formulation and evaluation as presented by Michelle Orr and David Blau during the Stakeholder Forum. Bourne noted one of the real challenges in the process was incorporating stakeholder interests into the alternatives development and evaluation processes, including the NEPA/CEQA process.

Before proceeding, Bourne noted three email communications submitted to EDAW prior to the meeting related to the objectives of the day. These were submitted from BCDC, Bay Trail and the East Bay Regional Park system. David Blau and Donna Plunkett, representing EDAW, briefly responded that they would consider each email as they move forward in the planning process but that there were specific reasons for the proposed approach.

The discussion of the alternatives formulation and evaluation approach followed the PWA PowerPoint presentation.

Overview

One Work Group member suggested changing the term “alternatives” as used in the context presented to “concepts,” since at this stage that seems to be a more realistic characterization. Many members of the group concurred with this suggestion. The question was raised as to whether planning activities will include initiatives in surrounding complexes and areas. For example, will existing plans for high-speed train corridors be included?

Action Item: Confirm if all known planning initiatives will be incorporated into analyses.

Evaluation Methodology

The question was raised concerning the prioritization of objectives. Some inferred that all six objectives were to be treated equally from discussions at the Forum. Others felt that Objective 1, focused on habitat, was the top priority with the remaining five having the same level of significance. Clarification was requested on this matter.

Action Item: Clarify priorities, if any, among the six primary objectives.

As noted in the February 18 Stakeholder Forum meeting summary (Page 4, Item 7), “The objectives are not listed in a ranked order. However, habitat restoration is of the highest priority, but all other objectives are of importance and will not be overlooked.”

Additional Evaluation Factors

It was noted by the PWA team representatives that the sole objective is not to find and pursue the least cost alternative. Many other factors will go into the selection of the preferred alternative. One comment made was that the cost of maintenance associated with different concepts or alternatives also needs to be addressed.

Five Landscape Concepts

For the most part, Work Group members felt this topic should be deferred to the Habitat Work Group. Insofar as the input of this group is helpful, however, some suggested that a pre-set ratio between tidal marsh and managed pond habitat should not be used. On the other hand, the 60/40 ratio established by the Habitat Goals Project was considered to be a good starting point by others.

Cost Effectiveness

It was noted that the Corps of Engineers has a specific, established approach to determining cost-effectiveness. Some Work Group members suggested, however, their methodology might need to be modified given the many variables and potentially creative approaches to restoration. When asked if the Corps approach can calculate the benefits of “recreation intangibles,” several people commented that the Corps does have methodologies for such analyses. Other comments were: 1) “hard” costs should not overshadow “soft” costs, and 2) analyses should include “willingness to pay” such as recreation fees.

Environmental Impact

The primary response to this slide was that in considering evaluation criteria, sheer numbers might not necessarily be a good measure. For some uses, smaller numbers would be a better indicator of the quality of an experience. In other instances, the primary basis for evaluation criteria should be more qualitative than quantitative.

3. Review and Comment on Public Access/Recreation Detailed Objectives

The discussion then turned to the specifics of the detailed objectives and associated evaluation criteria. A major point of discussion was the issue of whether the Work Group had been given the authority to define the major public access/recreation goals. After some discussion, John Krause, representing the Project Management Team for the project, responded that the primary Objectives had been agreed upon at the Stakeholder Forum and it was not the intent to debate these further. Rather, the intent was for the Work Group to address goals further in the detailed objectives. The facilitator concurred with this interpretation and asked the group to either refine the existing detailed objectives or create new ones as needed to achieve clarity on goals.

Several comments were made on the detailed objectives. General comments were that further clarification would be helpful on the evaluation criteria. As they stand, they appear more as a system of measurement for success. How will they be used to actually evaluate the objectives? It was suggested for the evaluation criteria that users be identified and that both quantity and quality factors be identified.

Detailed Objective #1 - it was suggested that DFG and USFWF missions be listed so that appropriate “sideboards” could be explicitly noted. It was noted, however, that these organizational missions apply only to the project area and not to adjacent areas held by other jurisdictions. As such, compatibility at these interfaces should be addressed. When asked if the “compatible uses” term under the evaluation criteria should be modified, another Work Group member noted that “compatible uses” is a term of law and has significance so should be retained.

Detailed Objective #2 – what is meant by “priority uses” and what do they specifically include or exclude?

Detailed Objective #3 – the objective should be modified to read, “Provide and promote recreation for a variety of users and modes.” Under the evaluation criteria, application of the number of “user types” accommodated needs to be clarified. For a given land parcel and activity, optimal conditions for some activities would be linked to fewer “user types” whereas in other cases the total might be a sufficient indicator.

Detailed Objective #4 – linkages to transportation needs to be incorporated into this objective.

Detailed Objective #5 – after some discussion, the group agreed that “visual experiences” should be modified to “aesthetic experiences” to include the value of other sensory experiences. The evaluation criteria should be expended to include other measures, including multi-modal access points.

Detailed Objective #6 (New) – based on the earlier discussion about the Work Group more clearly defining public access and recreation goals, either through the primary or detailed objectives, the recommendation was made to add a detailed objective to address this concern. This would read, “Create, enhance or restore public access opportunities and benefits.” The

primary purpose is to have an overarching detailed objective that acknowledges and emphasizes the inherent values of public access and recreation.

Action Item: As this was the final substantive topic of discussion at the meeting, confirmation and closure on this issue should occur at the next Work Group meeting.

4. Salt Pond Tour Dates

John Krause noted several possible dates for salt pond tours. As time was running short, the facilitator suggested the dates would be emailed for reservations. The group concurred. (These were subsequently updated through an email requesting confirmation from those who wished to attend.)

5. Mapping Public Access and Recreation

As there were several Work Group participants who did not have the opportunity at the previous meeting to map locations for desired public access and recreation, all those who had not do so were given the opportunity. The meeting was then adjourned.

6. Next Steps

**Next Meeting of the Public Access/Recreation Work Group:
Mary 25, 10:00 – 3:30 pm, Centennial Hall, Hayward, CA**

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 |
|-------------------|------------------|---|--|
| Paula | Bettencourt | City of Mountain View, Mountain View Shoreline Park | paula.bettencourt@ci.mtnview.ca.us |
| Craig | Breon | Santa Clara Valley Audubon Society | craig@scvas.org |
| Joan | Cardellino | Coastal Conservancy | jcard@scc.ca.gov |
| John | Cicarelli | Transight LLC / Bicycle Solutions | johnc@bicyclesolutions.com |
| Bill | Gaines | California Waterfowl Association | bill_gaines@calwaterfowl.org |
| Lorrie | Gervin | City of Sunnyvale, POTW | LGervin@ci.sunnyvale.ca.us |
| Cecily | Harris | City of San Mateo, Park Planning & Development Division | Cecily999@aol.com |
| Joseph | LaClair | BCDC | joel@bcdca.gov |
| Janet | McBride | San Francisco Bay Trail | Janetm@abag.ca.gov |
| Eileen | McLaughlin | Wildlife Stewards | WildlifeStewards@aol.com |
| Julia | Miller | City of Sunnyvale | juliacitycouncil@aol.com |
| Donna | Plunkett | EDAW, Inc. | plunkettd@edaw.com |
| Russ | Robinson | California Recreational Boaters of California | russ1011@ix.netcom.com; robinson@rboc.org |
| Antoinette | Romeo | Santa Clara County Parks & Recreation Department | Antoinette.Romeo@prk.sccgov.org |
| Ana | Ruiz | Midpeninsula Regional Open Space District | aruiz@openspace.org |
| Denise | Stephens | Mayne Elementary School | denise_s@pacbell.net |
| Caitlin | Sweeney | BCDC | caitlins@bcdca.gov |