



# 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 October 28, 2010 Stakeholder Forum Meeting

---

**Background:** The Stakeholder Forum (Forum) met on Thursday, October 28, 2010 from 1 to 4 p.m. at the Menlo Park Library in Menlo Park. 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 the development 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, a Phase 2: Preliminary Options for Future Actions document, a roster and the 2009 meeting summary. At the meeting, Forum members received handouts including a printout of meeting slides. The PowerPoint presentation slides, which give more details on presentations, and handouts are available on the SBSP Project website ([www.southbayrestoration.org](http://www.southbayrestoration.org)).

## **Substantive Meeting Outcomes:**

### ***1. Welcome, Introductions, and Agenda Review***

John Bourgeois, Executive Project Manager, welcomed Forum members and the public, led introductions and reviewed the agenda. The meeting agenda included:

- Tracking our Progress: Highlights of 2010
- Tracking our Progress: Science in the Salt Ponds
- Phase 2: Overview of Preliminary Concepts
- Phase 2 in Ravenswood
- Phase 2 in Eden Landing
- Shoreline Study Update
- Phase 2 in Alviso
- Looking Ahead to 2011

### ***2. Tracking our Progress: Highlights of 2010***

John Bourgeois provided a status report on South Bay Salt Ponds management, funding and construction, with the aid of PowerPoint slides. He introduced himself as the new Executive Project Manager, having taken over at the beginning of 2010 from Steve

Ritchie, who now works at the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission. He is sharing leadership with Len Cardoza, who is serving as SBSP Project Manager for the South San Francisco Bay Shoreline Study.

In regards to funding, he reviewed the array of federal, mitigation/penalty, local and state bond funds that have supported the Project recently. These include \$7.4 million in federal stimulus funds provided through NOAA to the Project and invasive Spartina control, as well as federal appropriations for construction and science. Local funding has been provided from the Santa Clara Valley Water District and the Alameda County Flood Control District. In regards to Alameda County funding, at a board meeting that week, \$800,000 was approved for the project. State funding has been provided through the State Coastal Conservancy and the Wildlife Conservation Board.

### **Ravenswood Construction**

- In September, work was completed on nesting islands for birds and public access trails at Pond SF2. Senator Feinstein participated in the opening ceremonies on September 7.
- Interpretive signage has also been installed at Bedwell Bayfront Park in Menlo Park.

### **Questions/Comments:**

Q: There is a proposed composting facility in Palo Alto -- does that affect this?

A: That's outside our project area.

Q: Why are R3 and 5 dry?

A: They are left dry in the summer for snowy plovers. R1 and 2 are flooded in winter.

Q: This is very useful. Have you thought of doing an annual report?

A: We have periodic updates and a Track Our Progress page updated monthly on the website, and there was a status report in 2009. That's a good suggestion.

Comment: The annual report idea is a good point. You could use it when you go to Washington to raise money. It's a product that you can pass out.

### **Eden Landing Construction**

- Work has begun on a 630-acre tidal marsh project at Ponds E8A, E9 and E8X. Because there is a lot of dirt to move and work must be done around endangered species habitat, the construction cycle is two years.
- Final design is underway for a habitat reconfiguration project on 230 acres which will create a series of ponds with different salinities. Scientists will look at bird species and prey base to see if there are differences with different salinities.
- There is a large public access component, including cultural interpretation at the Oliver Saltworks, trails, viewing platforms and a kayak launch. Designs are completed and construction is waiting for completion of the restoration.

### **Questions/Comments:**

Q: When is the estimated start of construction?

A: E12-13 will take two years. Public access would be constructed after 2012-2013. The new habitat would be monitored for one year to get a new baseline so impacts from public access can be monitored.

### **Alviso Construction**

- At Alviso, the Island Ponds, Ponds A19, 20 and 21, which were breached in 2006, have had faster sedimentation rates than expected and vegetation has begun to grow.
- When the Project managers selected Phase 1 actions, the aim was to pick low hanging fruit to get habitat established, and also to address difficult questions. SF2 is aimed at answering whether we can manage ponds intensively for wildlife. Pond A8 construction is addressing the mercury contamination issue. The Guadalupe quicksilver mine is upstream. Construction has completed on a 40-foot armored notch with 4-foot bays, so we can slowly open up and not do damage from mercury or scour.
- At the 330-acre Pond A6, work has begun to develop tidal marsh. It will be breached in four locations, and construction is anticipated to be complete by the end of November.
- A 2.4 mile section of the Bay Trail by Moffett Field opened in September.
- A reconfigured pond project at A16 ran into engineering and hydrologic constraints, so we have gone back to the drawing board. We will have to scale down the number of planned islands. We will also include A17 as part of the tidal restoration, as we have to bring in water through that pond.

### **Questions/Comments on Island Ponds:**

Q: What is happening to the channel geometry at the Island Ponds?

A: The borrow ditches are starting to fill in on the north half. Remnant channels are capturing some sediment. Borrow ditches are taking the flow on the south half. The ponds were only breached on the south side.

Q: One concern was the high gypsum content. Are there reference sites to look at vegetative vitality in comparison?

A: Eden Landing is the focus to study gypsum. There is not as much subsidence there, so it's more of a concern. That project will test mechanically breaking up the gypsum to address that issue.

Q: Are you trying for pickleweed?

A: Yes, that is the target.

### **Questions/Comments on A8:**

Q: Can you give an example of the mercury research?

A: We will investigate the ambient conditions in the food web, and will be monitoring tissues of a couple bird and fish species, as well as sediments, to see if it is entering the food web above ambient levels.

**Questions/Comments on A16:**

Q: Will it still have shallow enough water to work with shorebirds?

A: Yes -- it will be managed for shallow water, but probably deeper than 10-12 inches.

Comment: I'm concerned as we move forward not to be taking out shallow habitat for these species.

Response: We also added one third of Pond A17 -- we are trying to compensate. Because we haven't reached 30% design yet, I can't tell you the elevation.

Q: Is it going to get sediment and become shallower?

A: It could. Probably the borrow ditch is going to get most of the sediment.

Q: How will you manage the water flow?

A: One to two full breaks, and a new levee and water control structure to control water coming in.

Comment: I do think it's important to track into adaptive management how much habitat are we providing. The question is, does it matter enough to tinker with?

Response: We reconvened the original science team members involved in the design to work on this.

Comment: It should influence how we look at Phase 2.

**Questions/Comments on Public Access**

Q: Are you tracking public access?

A: One of our applied studies will look at public access impacts on birds and use. One of our proposals for Phase 2 is to do a comprehensive user survey on who is using what. Also, more in-depth studies are planned.

Comment: It would be good to track how many miles are constructed, what type and use.

Comment: My impression is you are saying you want to see what people want and give it to them. It's important to remind people that you will be giving people what they want within the constraints of the biological goals of the Project. People will expect what they are informed of.

Q: Who will you be asking about public access?

A: Ideally, the studies would be on the same level as biological studies, and that question would be answered by a researcher with a sociological background who would be looking at which groups to target. The State Coastal Conservancy is also considering doing a pretty broad survey of levels of interest of types of public access. This is particularly an issue in Eden Landing, where one trail operated by the East Bay Regional Park District may go away with restoration.

Comment: The public has to see enough of what is going on to support it. A question is how much of what is being restored is far from disturbance in where it is placed. The

focus has been to give up a little impact on the edges, given the metric of how much is disturbed versus undisturbed.

### ***3. Tracking our Progress: Science in the Salt Ponds***

Project Lead Scientist Laura Valoppi discussed key uncertainties the Science Program is seeking to address, as well as project-wide and pond-specific science studies that are underway

#### **Key Uncertainties**

- Wildlife use of changing habitats
- Habitat evolution and sediment dynamics - Is there enough to fill up the ponds, where is it going to happen, and is it going to come from the mudflats that provide shorebird habitat?
- Mercury methylation - impacts from the New Almaden mine
- Water quality - The ponds were not designed to be flow-through, so algal blooms and other problems can result.
- Invasive species, such as impacts from California gulls.
- Public access
- Infrastructure support
- Sea level rise and climate change

#### **Project-wide Studies**

- Once-a-year satellite imagery to track vegetation types.
- In regards to trail use, a user satisfaction survey with current facilities and research on trail use impacts on wildlife.
- Fisheries response -- how it is bringing in different fish species.
- The Project is in the baseline data stage, developing the "before" picture. In the next several months, it will be opening up areas to tidal action and beginning to develop information on the "after."

#### **Questions/Comments:**

Q: Who is doing the fisheries research?

A: Jim Hobbs at UC Davis.

Comment: Your spreadsheet says that when the kayak launch opens in 2015, there are no studies planned for impacts on birds or harbor seals.

Response: This spreadsheet is available on our website, the Key Uncertainties table. In some cases, there are gaps, because we haven't gotten there in our planning yet.

Q: Is there going to be prioritization of these studies?

A: This is something we will have to talk about as the Project Management Team. That's part of this process, meetings like this, to hopefully get consensus on projects. Could it be a Phase 2 or Phase 3 study? Absolutely.

#### **Pond-Specific Studies Ravenswood**

- SF2 studies are looking at different island shapes and the islands, which should enhance roosting and foraging habitat; trail and platform impacts to wildlife; bathymetry; benthic invertebrates; and how birds are using benthic invertebrates as food sources.

**Questions/Comments:**

Q: On your chart, #16 says no studies are planned and there is no information. There is information. Jules Evans and others have done studies on the impact of boating. You have to look at that at Eden Landing.

A: We were looking at getting studies on the ground on the early Phase 1 actions. Our focus has been so far to get the "before" studies for early actions.

Q: Least terns need barren islands. Do you have money to look at vegetation management if the islands become vegetated? That issue needs to be considered.

A: We haven't ruled out future management at SF2. We will monitor it and see what kind of vegetation we get and make decisions once we see what happens. The whole adaptive management process is to do something, study it, and then make decisions. We might get very unexpected results. We fully expect vegetation management will be an issue, and we feel we have three to four years before it becomes a problem. The approach is phased, and the first question will be, do birds prefer one type of island? Then we may look at different substrates or treatments. Also, we are beginning to work on a draft weed management plan. There is time to think about this and work on it.

Comment: Obviously this is an issue with a lot of interest. I have a lot of experience with least terns.

Comment: Some of us would be very interested in a dialogue on what you're looking at.

**Alviso**

- We will be looking at sediment and sea level rise issues more intensively. A study of sediment flux under the Dumbarton Bridge shows the South Bay is sediment-rich and there is enough sediment coming in to fill up the ponds in the next 50 years. We feel we need to get ahead of the curve and do restoration as quickly as we can to capture this sediment.
- Sediment accretion in A6 will be studied.
- California gulls have been preying on nesting shorebirds and eating chicks, including snowy plovers. Last year, we banded more than 500 chicks and will watch where they go. Chick predation will continue to be monitored.
- For mercury at Pond A8, we will study eggs, fish species, prey food, water and sediment in the pond, Alviso Slough and two control areas.
- We are also looking at bathymetry and bird use on shoals and Alviso Slough.

**Questions/Comments:**

Q: Will you be measuring the mud outside A6?

A: Yes.

Q: Mercury can be clumped. Any knowledge of how it accumulates?

A: Mercury is coming in and it is in the pond. As Alviso Slough opens, it will scour Alviso Slough and go into the pond. How that will redistribute mercury is unknown. We will look at how much mercury is in the sediment and how much is in the wildlife.

Q: Was the study of TMDL in the Bay useful?

A: It's hard to predict mercury in biota based on its presence in sediment.

Q: Are there any studies related to the SCVWD project to dredge Alviso Slough on impacts?

A: That project is currently in design and won't begin for some time. I would expect there would be monitoring of impacts and scouring.

Q: Will you be working with the South Bay Salt Ponds?

A: I would recommend that -- it would be useful to have information sharing on both sides. Representatives from the two organizations will be meeting about that in the next month.

Q: Are there any results so far for mercury studies?

A: The South Baylands mercury report is posted on the website. There are not yet results from Phase 1 Mercury Studies -- they have been gathering baseline data prior to ponds A6 and A8 breaches.

Q: Is anyone looking at source reduction for mercury?

A: It's historic, it's in the ponds. SCVWD has been removing hardened mercury deposits. Also, County Parks may be doing something. At the ponds themselves, we are not doing that.

### **Eden Landing**

- Monitoring of snowy plover predation has been underway and will continue.
- Public access impacts on nesting snowy plovers are being looked at. Preliminary results show the average flush distance is 145 yards.
- The project is also looking at waterbird and shorebird foraging in nesting. So far, there is no decrease in bird numbers foraging in areas with trails. There are fewer birds on weekends when more people are at the ponds.

### **Questions/Comments:**

Comment: In regards to the snowy plover public access impacts, disturbing birds can have a large population impact because eggs can get cold and die or be predated.

Response: And this is a listed species.

Comment: A San Jose State study showed that ducks responded to disturbance.

Comment: It can be difficult to track information on the website. Results of studies could be linked in the key uncertainties document.

Comment: Shorebirds are not as sensitive to trails. Ducks and grebes are sensitive. One study showed flushing at 150 feet.

## Science Symposium

- The Science Symposium will be held February 3 at the USGS offices in Menlo Park. I encourage people to attend if they want to hear directly from the scientists.

### *4. Phase 2: Overview of Preliminary Concepts*

John Bourgeois said project managers will be working over the next 1.5 years to develop Phase 2, and would really like input from the Stakeholder Forum on the initial thinking reflected in the Phase 2: Preliminary Options for Future Actions working document. Participants are welcome to provide input at a later date by e-mailing or calling project managers.

One of the principles is "Do no harm." Some ponds can't be restored until flood control levees are erected. In addition, the Project cannot restore more than 50% of ponds until the science program provides sufficient information to indicate that restoring more ponds would not adversely affect pond-dependent species.

Phase 2, as currently envisioned, would include three across-the-board actions: a program to accept beneficial re-use of dredge materials so that the Project could respond to opportunities; a pilot eelgrass or shellfish restoration in concert with the Subtidal Habitat Goals Project; and a public access and recreation study.

Facilitator Mary Selkirk asked meeting participants if there are any key issues missing from the document, and if the guiding principles make sense. Any other ideas?

### **Questions/Comments:**

Q: Will Phase 2 be all the rest of the ponds?

A: No.

Comment: One of the reasons we think there are least terns in Alameda is because of the proximity of the eelgrass, so you might consider creating it by SF2, for example.

Response: Yes, we need to figure out the specific areas.

Comment: We ask that you stay in touch with the mosquito abatement districts. If you create mosquito habitat, we would have to go in to treat, and we don't have that much funding. If you create pickleweed and impounds, there could be thousands of mosquitoes coming into the cities, which would violate your "do no harm" principle.

Response: Maybe it's time to hold more meetings on coordination.

Comment: In relation to dredge materials, you could be competing with other projects – you should move fast. It would be helpful if you are ready to accept dredge materials for a great cause.

Response: We agree. We want to have the testing criteria available. We will need to be talking to the ports as well.

Comment: Having done that, there are cost issues. I would suggest you tie it with grain size. It drives me crazy when sediments that could be used for upland habitat are hauled away. Creek systems sort by size. There is probably not a big amount of material, but flood control channels are regularly maintained and you get the resource at a different grain size -- you would get the right substrate for eelgrass.

Response: We are working with the Port of Redwood City and SCVWD. Now we have to work with regulators and identified the sites for dredge spoils.

### ***5. Phase 2 in Ravenswood***

John Bourgeois explained that until flooding near the Dumbarton Bridge is resolved, the Project cannot proceed with restoration of ponds R1-2. Managers are working with Menlo Park and Caltrans to resolve flooding.

Lead Scientist Laura Valoppi discussed possible applied studies at this complex (listed on page 29 of the Phase 2 document). They include looking at how much *Spartina* hybridization is occurring; eelgrass/shellfish habitat restoration; upland transition zones; possibly mercury studies; the effects of trails on upland transition zone species such as clapper rails; bird use of salt pannes; and enhancement of snowy plover habitat at SF2.

#### **Questions/Comments:**

Comment: Menlo Park is revegetating Bayfront Park. I hope the Project works with them on the kind of vegetation that is appropriate. Their vegetation choice was "urban forest."

Q: Is there a gypsum issue in R4?

A: No.

Comment: The managed ponds in your map are totally encircled by trails. Where will the birds roost if the trails are there? Shorebirds are less sensitive to access, but somewhat. You should put in an island -- they need roosting habitat, and so do ducks.

Response: Good point. One reason we thought R3 might not be a good choice for Phase 2 is that we want study results before putting in the loop trail. "Do no harm" means really understanding the permutations of public access wildlife impacts.

Comment: Dogs are on leash at Bayfront Park -- that issue needs to be resolved. Also, we don't control the trail by Highway 84. What would be reasonably close to the trails?

Response: If it is Refuge property, it will be closed to dogs and there will be law enforcement.

Comment: You should talk to the GGNRA, which has done law-enforcement for off leash dogs.

Comment: One approach that might inform the process is to have an area on the website where we are able to add tidbits of knowledge.

Response: That's a good point. You can help us think about how best to do that.

Q: Will these actions require an EIR?

A: Each action or suite of actions might have its own environmental assessment or EIS tiered off of the existing document.

Comment: In terms of flooding, Sun Microsystems should be significant enough to require protection eventually.

Response: This is San Mateo County, which is not in the current part of the Shoreline Study.

Comment: As stakeholders, we need Caltrans and San Mateo County. Is there any conflict?

Response: No.

Q: Just an impediment?

A: Yes.

Comment: You could send out an e-mail saying, here is what we are proposing, please give us your suggestions.

Comment: It might be helpful to have an informational meeting for hunters in R2. It's very complicated, but it could be a place for public access boating for hunters and non-hunters.

Response: Good suggestion. We will talk to Eric.

Q: For Phase 2, you are looking at actions that are not dependent on precedent actions. What are those precedent actions?

A: Here, it is the flooding issue and R3 applied studies. For each complex, precedent actions are different. They are listed in the Phase 2 document.

Q: Is there pond elevation data for the ponds, something that the public could easily access?

A: The USGS has some data that is on the website. Look at Table 1 in the Short-Term Data Needs report by Takekawa et al.

Q: I'd like to get more information on how this project relates to the San Francisquito Creek JPA flood control project.

A: There was coordination with the JPA early in the process. The Shoreline Study is adjacent to the JPA and we are trying to integrate them. The scope would address fluvial flooding, and in the Shoreline Study, we want to understand coastal flooding. In regards to the question about Sun Microsystems, we are trying to establish whether we need the same amount of detail in San Mateo County as in the first phase of the Shoreline Study -- we hope less is required so it is faster and cheaper. It would be under the San Francisquito Creek project.

Comment: Being visual, some sort of graphics would be helpful - it would be helpful to expand the map to include the JPA.

Response: It will be about one year before that is ready.

Comment: Phase 1 was geared at capturing public attention. I hope we will see the same with Phase 2, and that at each complex, people have one new place to go to.

Response: One of our criteria is to balance between the complexes. Senator Feinstein saw that an advantage of SF2 is that it would be a very visible project to people commuting on Dumbarton Bridge.

Comment: Bayfront Park has recently had an issue with ground squirrels getting into the buried waste from the old landfill. It could have impacts on species.

Response: That is a good point, and something we will have to consider there as we move forward.

### ***6. Phase 2 in Eden Landing***

John Bourgeois said Phase 1 actions have focused on the top half of the complex, creating about a 50-50 split between ponds and tidal marsh. Phase 2 would probably focus on the south half, restoring tidal marsh between Old Alameda Creek and the Alameda Creek Flood Control Channel. Breaching ponds will have flood control benefits, but there will need to be flood protection on the east side. The Project has been working with Alameda County and the East Bay Regional Park District on how to move forward. One question is whether to start restoration by the Bay or by Old Alameda Creek to the north.

Lead Scientist Laura Valoppi mentioned that possible applied studies would look at impacts to fisheries in the creeks, and the effect on eelgrass beds near the whale's tail marsh of opening up the tidal prism.

#### **Questions/Comments:**

Q: Would an upland transition zone help with flood control?

A: Yes.

Comment: Our mosquito spots are around the old slough, not in the green area. Our big issue is access if you take out the north Alameda Creek levee.

Response: in the next 1 1/2 years, we will involve the Mosquito Abatement District and the SFPUC, which is involved in fish restoration, and look at the costs and benefits of opening up the marsh. Would opening up to tidal restoration help with mosquitoes?

Comment: It would help. It could make different mosquitoes, which are generally better for us, as long as there is no water that stagnates. It would be a major opportunity for us to benefit.

Comment: I am happy to hear about the subcommittee dialogue. EPA has provided \$10.2 million for trails, including the Bay Trail and the Iron Horse Trail. One element is the connection between Old Alameda Creek and the Alameda Creek Flood Control Channel. The money has to be obligated by 2012.

Response: the East Bay Regional Park District is interested in extending the Bay Trail to Old Alameda Creek and out to city streets, and integrate it with the G1 levee.

Comment: The material coming down the flood control channel is a potential resource. With sea level rise, there will be more wave energy. SFEI is looking at sorting of grain size and the Alameda Creek Flood Control Channel filling up with sediment and losing capacity. This would be a very nice match to mimic natural processes. At the mouth of every tidal slough was a little sand delta as part of the natural system. This could be a good mineral source for the edge of your marsh. It would be really nice to have the barrier beaches or bars. The sediments would create habitat benefits rather than being hauled away. I am worried about this system and sea level rise.

Q: Are you looking at kayak trails - the sloughs they should and shouldn't go down?

A: That's a good idea. The Water Trail EIR just came out.

Q: What is east of ponds E5-6?

A: The G1 levee, the channel and detention areas for flood storage capacity.

Comment: There is a problem with transition habitat by the ponds and off-leash dogs. Think of putting that habitat where there are not trails. People love to let their dogs run into water. We need to look at putting it where there would be no impacts.

### ***7. Shoreline Study Update***

Brenda Buxton of the State Coastal Conservancy gave an update on the Project's related effort, the South San Francisco Bay Shoreline Study. The Project is undertaking a feasibility study with the Army Corps of Engineers. The Santa Clara Valley Water District and State Coastal Conservancy are non-federal sponsors sharing the cost. They go through the Army Corps' planning process with the hope that eventually there is a recommendation for a project that can obtain Congressional funding. The Army Corps is the nation's levee-building agency. The hope is to get funding for the South Bay Salt Ponds. If tidal habitat is to be restored, there needs to be an engineered flood control system in place. This year the project had a major milestone in September, a Feasibility Scoping Meeting that looked at what flooding would look like in 2017 without a project, and under sea level rise - primarily tidal flooding, not fluvial. The floodplain maps are not final because they have not finished QA/QC. The good news is that flooding is not as bad as feared. The bad news is if you are going to build an expensive project, you need to show its necessity.

Highest damages would be in the Alviso area, which has substantial subsidence, as well as the Moffett area and parts of the City of Palo Alto.

It's fair to say, since it has taken longer and has cost more, that the Shoreline Study has some issues now. The question is how to make the project quicker and less costly.

### **Questions/Comments:**

Q: Is your issue with the process, not the report?

A: With both.

Q: Do you mean that the Shoreline Study has stopped?

A: It hasn't stopped; it has gone on standby to consider what to do next. We could focus on high damage areas, pursue federal legislation to make the process more streamlined or change the planning assumptions on how flooding is modeled, for example, if we were to remove the outboard levees, flooding would look different. There are a lot of complex problems with the schedule and budget to work through. I hope next year to be able to report to you that we are moving forward.

Comment: Alviso is 15 feet below sea level. It is critical to keep the process moving along.

### **8. Phase 2 in Alviso**

John Bourgeois said that the 50-50 scenarios might involve:

- Breaching the Island Ponds on the north side
- At Pond A3W, adding new structures to improve habitat management
- Restoring Pond A3N to tidal marsh
- Restoring ponds A1 and A2W as tidal. Because it is high, it might be a place for an upland transition zone, although it has a lot of public use. Talk with Mountain View. The restoration project nearby at Charleston Slough has vegetation slowly establishing there.

Lead Scientist Laura Valoppi said possible studies would be on Spartina hybridization, eelgrass or shellfish habitat restoration, public access use, and upland transition zones.

#### **Questions/Comments:**

Comment: Slow – it's epic!

Response: We agree.

Because the meeting ran short on time, facilitator Mary Selkirk invited participants to send their thoughts on Phase 2 in Alviso to John Bourgeois at [jbourgeois@coastalconservancy.ca.gov](mailto:jbourgeois@coastalconservancy.ca.gov).

**Attachment 1: October 28, 2010 Meeting Attendance**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Organization/Affiliation</b>
Patricia Berryhill	HNTB
Elizabeth Caldwell	Department of the Interior
Steve Carroll	Ducks Unlimited & SD, Inc.
Jill Demers	San Francisco Bay Bird Observatory
Cynthia Denny	Sierra Club, Loma Prieta Chapter
Stephanie Ellis	SFBBO
Arthur Feinstein	CCCR
Lorrie Gervin	City of Sunnyvale
James Gorham	CH2M Hill
Carin High	CCCR
Laura Hollander	USGS
Stephen Knight	Save The Bay
Jane Lavelle	SFPUC
Jeff Liechty	USGS
Karin Lin	Department of the Interior
Libby Lucas	California Native Plant Society
John Marchant	City of Mountain View
Ryan Mayfield	City of San Jose
Jim McGrath	
Eileen McLaughlin	CCCR
Stacy Moscal	USGS
Jane Muss	Don Edwards docent
Mike O'Hagan	HNTB
Michele Orr	PWA
Andrew Otsuka	ACPWA
Chindi Peavey	San Mateo County Mosquito Abatement
Maya Perkins	Office of Supervisor Rose Jacobs Gibson
Chris Potter	USGS
Gail Raabe	Friends of Redwood City
Russ Robinson	Recreational Boaters of California
John Rusmisl	ACMAD
Renee Spenst	Ducks Unlimited
Joe Teresi	City of Palo Alto
David Thomas	PG&E
Laura Thompson	Bay Trail Project
Dave Whittum	City of Sunnyvale