

APPENDIX C

PUBLIC SCOPING

This page intentionally left blank

Scoping, or early consultation with persons or organizations concerned with the environmental effects of the project, is required when preparing a joint EIS/R. NEPA regulations Section 1506.6 requires that agencies make diligent efforts to involve the public in preparing and implementing their NEPA procedures. Pursuant to NEPA, a Notice of Intent to prepare an EIS/R for the South Bay Salt Pond Restoration Project, Phase 2 at Eden Landing was published in the Federal Register on June 20, 2016. Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15082, a Notice of Preparation was distributed to responsible agencies and the public on May 24, 2016. These notices announced a public comment period during which comments were received on the appropriate scope of the EIS/R. A public scoping meeting was held on June 30, 2016 to solicit comments on environmental issues to be addressed in the EIS/R. Scoping comments received during the scoping period, which ended July 20, 2016) are presented here.

I. Scoping Comment Letters Received (letters follow)

- Gayle Totton, Native American Heritage Commission
- Stacy Moskol
- L. Goldzband, Long-term Management Strategy
- Karen Vitulano, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region IX
- Mike Giari, Port of Redwood City
- John Coleman, Bay Planning Commission
- Sandra Hamlat, East Bay Regional Parks District
- Carin High, Citizens Committee to Complete the Refuge
- Jeffrey Volberg, California Waterfowl
- Brenda Goeden, San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission
- Lee Chien Huo, Bay Trail
- Erika Castillo, Alameda County Mosquito Abatement
- Ngoc Nguyen, Santa Clara Valley Water District

II. Summary Table of Scoping Comments

#	Commenter	Topic(s)
1	Gayle Totton, Native American Heritage Commission	Suggests including AB 52 and SB 18 consultation.
2	Stacy Moskol	Concerns about diving duck populations at E1 & E2, invasive plants islands clustering the marsh species and making them vulnerable to predators. Supports habitat transition zones.
3	L. Goldzband, LTMS; for other LTMS agencies and people	Supports beneficial reuse of dredge material, especially using Port of Redwood City and Port of Oakland material. References the Moffatt and Nichol feasibility study.
4	Karen Vitulano, EPA	Include sea-level rise (SLR) explicitly in the alternatives analysis. Include habitat transition zones. Place levee breaches at tidal marsh channels. Include beneficial reuse of dredged material. Identify and quantify all wetlands and waters of the U.S. and evaluate impacts on them. Discuss existing water quality conditions and how they would change: discuss runoff of sediments and pollutants, effects on fisheries, possible use of herbicides (including volumes, frequencies of application, etc.). Detailed discussion of ambient air conditions, NAAQS and nonattainment areas, estimate emissions from all project phases. Include evaluation of climate change effects from the project. They want details of invasive species control including costs. Requests details of funding costs for all project phases.

#	Commenter	Topic(s)
5	Mike Giari, Port of Redwood City	Supports beneficial reuse of dredge material, especially using Port of Redwood City. References the Moffatt and Nichol feasibility study.
6	John Coleman, Bay Planning Commission	Supports beneficial reuse of dredge material, especially using Port of Redwood City. References the Moffatt and Nichol feasibility study.
7	Sandra Hamlat, EBRPD	Points us to several applicable Master Plan policies that we need to include and address. Also expressed serious concern about the alternatives going onto city streets. They prefer the routes with bridges and then note that the bridges need to be drivable for 6,000-lb. maintenance trucks. The bridges that cross OAC and AC FCC need to have removable center sections so that the channels can be dredged.
8	Carin High, Citizens Committee to Complete the Refuge	General support; request to include the following information: baseline data of all species; mapping showing depths and salinities of ponds; existing management challenges that may affect the Phase 2 actions; species that may be displaced by the Phase 2 actions and possible places for them to go. Recommend phased tidal marsh restoration (Alt Eden D), along with an implementation timeline. Request details on how managed ponds would be managed; invasive species management; outboard levee; and root wads. Address species near the proposed public access trails and what measures could be used to protect those species.
9	Jeffrey Volberg, California Waterfowl	Would like to maintain or increase hunting opportunities at Eden Landing.
10	Brenda Goeden, BCDC	Clarifies BCDC jurisdiction at Eden Landing. Refers to the Bay Plan and its guidance. Fill in the bay for restoration. Encourages maximum feasible public access. Encourages beneficial reuse of dredged material. Recommends alternatives that consider SLR adaptation and other aspects of it. Public access features should be built to avoid future impacts from SLR. Include habitat features that protect shorelines.
11	Lee Chien Huo, Bay Trail	Support for Bay Trail inclusion at southern Eden Landing. Wants the Bay Trail as close to the bay as possible, has views of the bay, that is separated from streets, and that has connection with shoreline parks. To that end, they like the Route 1 trail through Eden Landing, and they want the bridge over the AC FCC.
12	Erika Castillo, Alameda County Mosquito Abatement	Support for including vector control in the EIS/R. Provided several measures to reduce possible future impacts from mosquitoes. Prefers unphased tidal marsh restoration (Alt Eden B) for best avoidance of mosquito issues.
13	Ngoc Nguyen, Santa Clara Valley Water District	Supports beneficial reuse of dredge material, especially using Port of Redwood City. References the Moffatt and Nichol feasibility study.

III. June 30, 2016, Scoping Meeting: Agenda and Sign-In Sheet