

Hamilton Wetland Restoration Project
Dredged Material Aquatic Transfer Facility
Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement / Report
Public Meeting
November 12, 2008

Bay Model Visitor Center

Multi-Purpose Room
2100 Bridgeway
Sausalito, CA 94965

6:00pm

1 P R O C E E D I N G S

2 Mr. Mull - Hey everybody, thank you for coming out
3 tonight. My name is Peter Mull. I am the Project Manager
4 for this project. We have got a good presentation for you
5 on this important project. I would like to remind everybody
6 to please sign in, either at the back, or outside. There
7 are some sign-ins. You have to fill out a little white
8 speaker card, I am told, if you wish to speak after the
9 presentation for your comments to be put into the formal
10 record. We will be having a Court Reporter for that purpose
11 here. So without any further ado, we are coming up right on
12 6:00, I would like to introduce Lt. Colonel Lawrence
13 Ferrell, our District Commander, and he has got some opening
14 remarks, and then we will move into the presentation. Thank
15 you.

16 Opening Remarks

17 Lt. Colonel Ferrell - Thank you, Peter. Ladies
18 and Gentlemen, good evening. Thank you for coming to this
19 public meeting. I am honored to be here tonight and to
20 represent the United States Army Corps of Engineers, San
21 Francisco District. The purpose of this meeting is to
22 present you with the findings of an important Environmental
23 Impact Study. This study is an in-depth analysis of the
24 most feasible alternatives for transporting the dredge
25 material from navigation projects around the Bay to the

1 nearby Hamilton Restoration Project.

2 The most challenging part of restoring the
3 Hamilton wetlands is to transfer an almost unimaginable
4 amount of dredge material from the bottom of the Bay over
5 the next 10 to 20 years. We can move this dredge material
6 more efficiently and more effectively, and faster, we can
7 complete the whole Hamilton Project in perhaps only eight
8 years, with a taxpayer savings of over \$200 million.

9 The study you are going to hear about tonight is
10 not complete without your comments, what you think is
11 important to us, and we will publish your comments and our
12 responses to the final version. In a little while, we are
13 going to tell you the process for giving your input. And by
14 the way, the commentary has been extended to 22 December.
15 Now, while tonight is not really about the whole Hamilton
16 Project, I would like to point out that a huge benefit of
17 Hamilton is that it beneficially uses the Bay's dredge
18 material, putting this dredge material to use and restoring
19 a vast wetland. Finding environmentally beneficial uses for
20 the dredge material is not just the goal of the United
21 States Army Corps of Engineers, but is the goal of the Long
22 Term Management Strategy, or the LTMS.

23 The LTMS is the strategy developed by the Corps of
24 Engineers and the sister federal agencies such as the
25 United States Environmental Protection Agency, the

1 E.P.A., and the Bay Conservation Development Commission, the
2 BCDC. So the more quickly we place the dredge material at
3 Hamilton, the better we are at meeting the LTMS goals.
4 These long term strategies and goals pay environmental
5 dividends such as rebuilding wetlands like previously
6 mentioned. But they also keep commercial navigation
7 channels open for ports, such as Marin, Redwood City,
8 Oakland, Richmond, and other ports within the Bay Area, all
9 combining for over 100 million tons of container goods
10 moving through the Bay Area ports, supporting a work force
11 of thousands and thousands of permanent highway jobs, and
12 creating over \$100 million within the regional economy.
13 Keeping those in mind this evening as you will hear from our
14 Aquatic Transfer Facility Program Manager, Peter Mull, who
15 you just met. We are also going to hear from Steve Goldbeck
16 of the Bay Conservation Development Commission, BCDC, sorry,
17 Steve, and from Brian Ross at E.P.A., and from Rich Walter
18 of the firm Jones & Stokes, who will present the main
19 environmental findings. Again, thank you very much for
20 coming to this meeting and participating in this process.
21 Your input is valuable to us. Thank you. Brian?

22 Mr. Ross - Thank you very much, Col. Ferrell. I
23 am Brian Ross with the Environmental Protection Agency, and
24 I want to thank whoever turned the lights off because it
25 makes it easier for me. The reason E.P.A. is here today

1 is to talk a little bit, not so much specifically about the
2 project -- you are going to hear a lot more about that from
3 the next speakers -- but about the context of this project
4 to the LTMS, the Long Term Management Strategy that the
5 Colonel just mentioned. There is a poster about the LTMS on
6 the back wall, closest to the exit, and I would be happy to
7 talk more about it with folk in the comment period, or
8 afterwards if you want to learn any more about LTMS, but I
9 am going to give a little bit of information about that now.

10 Many of you in this room have been working with us
11 in this inter-agency LTMS, Long Term Management Strategy,
12 for several years; but as a quick summary, and reminder,
13 after many years and about \$15 million worth of studies, the
14 Long Term Management Strategy was finalized with its own
15 programmatic EIS back in the late 90's, and a Management
16 Plan that was adopted and actually enacted into regulations
17 here by the state agencies in 2001. The goals of the Long
18 Term Management Strategy, you can see here in front of you,
19 the four main goals, were to make sure that necessary
20 dredging, in fact, gets done in an environmentally
21 appropriate, sound manner, that disposal of dredge material
22 is done in the most environmentally appropriate manner, and
23 one of the things that we are really focusing on tonight is
24 the third goal, to maximize the re-use of dredge material
25 as a resource; in other words, to decrease or ultimately

1 seriously reduce the amount of the dredge material that gets
2 generated, being disposed as a waste typically in the Bay or
3 the ocean and, rather, finding ways to recycle and re-use
4 the material for beneficial purposes, one of which is for
5 building new wetlands. And finally, the fourth goal was to
6 develop a cooperative interagency permitting framework,
7 which a lot of people call the one stop shop for dredging
8 permits, called the Dredge Material Management Office.

9 So LTMS has been organized, we have been running
10 along for quite a while now, and this slide shows you what
11 it is LTMS is managing. We manage and make permit decisions
12 and disposal decisions every year for about three to four
13 million cubic yards of dredge material, which is how much
14 dredging goes on in the Bay to keep the navigation channels
15 open that the Colonel mentioned. That equates to somewhere
16 between 25 and 45 individual projects every year. Almost
17 all of that material in the San Francisco Bay is clean
18 enough to re-use -- we are really lucky in that regard.
19 Folks on the East Coast would love to have the percentages
20 we do -- 98, 97 percent of our material is clean. If you go
21 to New York Harbor or Boston Harbor and it is reversed,
22 maybe 97-98 percent of it cannot be re-used or has to be
23 managed, especially because of contamination. So a lot of
24 our sediment is clean enough to be re-used. But the
25 small percentage we do have that is not clean enough to

1 be re-used beneficially has to be handled at appropriate
2 upland sites.

3 We have a variety of in-Bay disposal sites, and
4 what I am talking about now is the current situation that we
5 have under the LTMS, but without the Hamilton Aquatic
6 Transfer Facility. Most dredge material is still being
7 disposed aquatically as a waste. Most dredge material is
8 not yet being re-used. But it is a little hard to see, but
9 it is in your hand-out, there are actually four disposal
10 sites that are in the water, that are shown here. One is up
11 in Suisun Bay, another is at Carquinez Strait, the third is
12 in San Pablo Bay, and you will see, I want you to notice
13 where that is, and I am going to point to it, I am going to
14 step away for a second -- I do not have a pointer,
15 unfortunately, but the little square up here -- San Pablo
16 Bay. I do have a pointer, thank you. Much better. You
17 will see in a moment that that is right in the same area we
18 are talking about the Aquatic Transfer Facility. And then
19 another disposal site down here near Alcatraz Island. We
20 also have offshore, way offshore, in the inset here, about
21 55 miles offshore, a deep ocean disposal site. That is one
22 of the big advances LTMS made in the mid-90's as an
23 alternative to dumping the material in the Bay if it could
24 not be re-used. We can at least get some of the material
25 -- we can afford to go that far offshore. And finally,

1 this SF8 site is not really a disposal site, per se, that is
2 sand from the ship channel that gets kept in the system,
3 that ultimately feeds Ocean Beach. So we do not include
4 that volume in our LTMS numbers. But when you take it
5 altogether, even today, and even with the progress we have
6 made in LTMS getting more material re-used, we are still at
7 least four disposal sites in the Bay, four aquatic disposal
8 sites, still managing about 2.5 million cubic yards per year
9 on average that is getting disposed as a waste. We would
10 like to see that number go way down, and see beneficial re-
11 use, so as much of that as we can go up.

12 Why do we want to see it go up? Well, to the
13 extent we are disposing dredge material in the Bay, even
14 though it is clean enough to be disposed in the Bay, it is
15 not toxic, we do a lot of testing of it, even so, there are
16 issues and concerns about continuing to dispose large
17 volumes of dredge material in the Bay as a waste. Suspended
18 sediment loads are increased more than they would be if we
19 could re-use the material; that, in turn, decreases water
20 quality and can affect fisheries and bird feeding habitat,
21 right at the disposal sites themselves, it does certainly
22 affect pelagic organisms, and Alcatraz, in particular, many
23 of you may remember from way back in mud lock days, as we
24 called them, Alcatraz mound formed itself, became a
25 navigation hazard, was at the top of the disposal mound,

1 which was only about 25 feet below the surface. And, as all
2 of you know, a lot of deep shipping goes right by there, so
3 that was not a good thing. So we want to reduce in-Bay
4 disposal as much as possible under LTMS.

5 And in fact, we have been making a lot of
6 progress. The bar chart here on the left shows the before
7 LTMS back in the 90's, and before 80 percent or more of all
8 the material that was dredged was being disposed in the
9 water as a waste, and only maybe 10 percent was being re-
10 used, and a very small amount also, maybe 10 percent, was
11 being disposed outside of the Bay, still disposal as waste,
12 but outside the Bay at an ocean site.

13 The LTMS goals, after a lot of study were to
14 reduce in-Bay disposal to no more than about 20 percent of
15 all the dredge material, and to have at least -- we are
16 looking for 40 percent as our goal for beneficial re-use of
17 all the material, this is overtime average. And the ocean
18 site, the new ocean site that we have, is way offshore, it
19 is sort of a safety valve for what cannot be beneficially
20 re-used at the time, but still that we can afford not to
21 have to dump it in the Bay. So the goal is to have -- this
22 became known as the 20-40-40 Plan, no more than 20 percent
23 in the Bay, 40 percent beneficial re-use, at least, and the
24 difference of about 40 percent being disposed in the
25 ocean.

1 I want to tell you some good news, is that as of
2 this last year, as of 2007, where our numbers are complete,
3 we have actually already come really close to meeting this
4 pattern. We almost met the 20-40-40 for the first time, we
5 have come the closest that we have, and we are really proud
6 of that. The reason is the Oakland deepening project that
7 you heard the Colonel mention. That is a special project,
8 it is not maintenance, it has got a separate Congressional
9 authorization in the deepening of Oakland Harbor is in fact
10 -- we are sending the first several million yards of
11 material, I think about 3 million yards of material, to the
12 Hamilton Wetlands Project now, as you will hear about in
13 just a moment, but that project is going to be coming to an
14 end.

15 When that project does come to an end, those
16 really good numbers we had last year go away. These are the
17 same numbers for 2007, and instead of being close to 40-40-
18 20, we are really more like 40-50 and less than 10.
19 Beneficial re-use, if you look at the routine, dredged every
20 year, maintenance dredging projects, if you take a way that
21 big federal project, there is very little re-use happening
22 if it is not the deepening project, the 50-50 deepening
23 project. So we in LTMS are really concerned that the
24 progress we have made in the region is going to come to a
25 halt if we cannot find an environmentally beneficial and

1 economically affordable way to get more beneficial re-use
2 happening and, in particular, focusing on beneficial re-use
3 of maintenance dredge material because, again, as I say, you
4 can see that very little maintenance material has been able
5 to afford to go into beneficial re-use.

6 So E.P.A., now, again, why am I here? I am here
7 to tell you the LTMS story, the context, but I am also here
8 as a regulatory agency. E.P.A. will be reviewing this EIS,
9 and we will be involved in issuing permits, and managing the
10 material that may go to this site. So we are quite
11 concerned about a variety of things, that materials continue
12 to be clean, and that the alternative that is chosen to get
13 material to Hamilton be an environmentally appropriate one.
14 So I am not here to advocate for any particular alternative
15 at this point. We will be commenting on the EIS and reading
16 the details just like you all are; but E.P.A. as part of
17 LTMS definitely has an interest in finding an alternative
18 that will allow us to get more material, more quickly, to
19 Hamilton in order to keep the LTMS going, and to keep the
20 progress going to the region.

21 So with that background, I am going to turn it
22 over to Peter Mull, who is the Project Manager. He will
23 start telling you about what is in the EIS that actually
24 goes into the details about the individual approaches for
25 the Hamilton Project. And then, again, we will be happy

1 to talk about more LTMS questions afterwards if anyone has
2 any. Thanks.

3 Mr. Mull - Thank you very much, Brian. That was a
4 great overview of the LTMS. I am going to give you a brief
5 overview of the Hamilton Project, in general, and the
6 alternatives that we examined in the EIS to transfer dredged
7 material to construct this important project. Can everybody
8 here me if I step away from the microphone? Thank you.

9 Here is an aerial shot of the Hamilton site. This
10 is the old former Hamilton Army Airfield. Just last year,
11 in 2007, Congress authorized the expansion of the project to
12 bring this important project to a much larger scale. Now we
13 are looking at including a Bel Marin Keys parcel, which
14 brings the total wetland restoration area up to
15 approximately 2,600 acres. So it is very much a large
16 landscape project that we are undertaking here.

17 A little history of this site. In the early
18 1900's, this site was diked off from the Bay, and used for
19 agricultural land. After the diking took place, the site
20 subsided, so this site is essentially very -- it is about,
21 on average, six feet below marine bay level at this point,
22 so six feet subsided. That is part of the reason we need
23 dredge material to construct the site, because if you just
24 breach the levees, it would take a very very long time
25 for wetlands to establish there. So by utilizing dredge

1 material, we can accelerate the wetlands development and,
2 hence, improve the habitat on the Bay.

3 So as we said here, where we start, 2,600 acres of
4 wetlands that have been subsided, we are going to restore
5 those back to baylands, we are going to be using 24.4
6 million cubic yards of dredge material to do that. Now, as
7 the Colonel mentioned, that is an enormous volume of dredge
8 material. Just to put that into terms that we can get our
9 arms around, figure that Interstate 101 is about 40 yards
10 wide. That would stretch about six feet high worth of
11 earth, about 173 miles. So we are talking about a huge
12 volume of material there. So that is our big challenge here
13 is, how dowe get all that material to the site so that we
14 can develop these wetlands.

15 Currently, as in our previous planning documents,
16 the needs that were examined were using a hydraulic off-
17 loader -- and I am going to talk a little bit about that
18 more, and part of the problems that we have with that, and
19 why we are expanding our alternatives to do this.

20 So here is the conceptual site design. This is
21 what we are shooting for when we are all done, nice tidal
22 wetlands with tidal channels, two breeches to San Pablo Bay,
23 and one breech to the bottom creek. Other upland habitat,
24 restoring levees for flood control -- this is the Bel
25 Marin Keys community. This is the old Army airfield. So

1 that is the goal here, is to restore that wetland. Next
2 slide, please.

3 Okay, some of the benefits of the Hamilton
4 Project, is to provide very valuable habitat for endangered
5 species, including the California Clapper Rail, and the salt
6 harvest mouse, as well as for shore birds, and water fowl,
7 it provides good fish habitat for early stages of the fish
8 life cycle, marshes are known to improve water quality, so
9 it will improve water quality in the San Francisco Bay. As
10 Brian indicated, it will take what is now a waste product
11 and beneficially use it so that dredge sediments actually
12 are doing some good for the environment. And what we are
13 trying to do is reverse a century long pattern of loss of
14 wetlands around San Francisco Bay by restoring the margins
15 of the Bay.

16 Some of the human benefits -- again sea level
17 rise, and it provides flood protection. You know from
18 experience in Louisiana, the loss of wetlands down there,
19 exacerbates storm induced flooding. So wetlands are
20 extremely valuable for a buffer against flood risks. There
21 is going to be a Bay trail around the wetlands, open to
22 access to the public to the Bay, so that people can enjoy
23 the wildlife habitat that is going to be created. And it
24 meets long term planning efforts that have been taking
25 place in the community to restore San Francisco Bay, the

1 habitat goals and the LTMS goals.

2 So, as mentioned, we are going to be restoring
3 this wetland with dredge material. And this is where the
4 rubber meets the road, this is the big challenge of this
5 project, is how to we move so much dredge material in an
6 environmentally sound and economically cost-effective means?
7 Well, what you need to do is pump the dredged sediments
8 through a pipeline in the slurry, that makes it 20 percent
9 dredge material and 80 percent Bay water, and you pump that
10 material along to the site. Then, you sculpt it with the
11 various testers and use sight ablation for elevations you
12 need to construct the various habitat features.

13 So this slide kind of gives you a good view of the
14 challenges that we are facing. Here is the Hamilton/Bel
15 Marin Keys area, the San Pablo Bay, very very shallow water
16 around the periphery of the San Pablo Bay, so that it makes
17 it very difficult for dredge equipment, dredge scows, we
18 will talk about how we are suppose to get directly to the
19 site. So we have a very long distance through which the
20 pipeline we need to pump the dredge material through. This
21 is SF10, as Brian pointed out, this is currently an open
22 water disposal site.

23 So what we are looking to do is different
24 alternatives where we can get dredge material to this
25 location and then get it efficiently and effectively to

1 shore. So if our primary study area for the CIS, for
2 locating an ATF basin is in this area, this is where the
3 off-loader would be located, and actually there is one
4 located there now, as you will see, for the Port of Oakland
5 material. And one of the other alternatives we looked at
6 was actually constructed the channel directly to the site,
7 and having a basin that we could store our sediments on-
8 site, and then move them around on-site for construction
9 activities as need be. But you can see that it is a big
10 challenge to get this dredge material -- a huge volume of
11 dredge material from all around San Francisco Bay where the
12 dredging activities take place, up to the wetland site.

13 Next slide, please.

14 Okay, so we recognize that an off-loader had some
15 serious constraints and problems with it, so we looked at a
16 number of alternatives. The four main alternatives that are
17 analyzed in the EIS is the no-action alternative, and that
18 is using a hydraulic off-loader, that is what previous
19 planning documents call for, and that is what Congress
20 authorized previously. The next alternative we looked at is
21 for a non-confined transfer facility, a basin, adjacent to
22 SF10, which you saw on the previous slide, in which dredge
23 materials would be placed and stored, and then subsequently
24 pumped ashore with a hydraulic dredge, and that is the
25 preferred alternative, as you will see later in this

1 presentation; it is also the environmentally preferred
2 alternative. We looked at a similar concept in this
3 alternative, Alternative 3. We put sheet piles around the
4 basin to really isolate the basin from the surrounding
5 marsh, so the dredge material placed in the basin would not
6 be affected by the currents, it would not be lost, as we
7 will show -- the sheet pile did not prove to be necessary
8 because we can locate the basin without sheet pile in an
9 area in the Bay where the currents are such that the
10 material will not be lost from the basin.

11 The fourth alternative, as I pointed out in the
12 previous slide, is to have a direct channel to this site,
13 and construct the basin on the Bel Marin Keys site; the
14 dredge barges would come in, release their sediments, and
15 leave, and then we would move the sediments from there onto
16 the site of the construction activities. Next slide,
17 please.

18 Okay, so Alternative 1, the dredge material off-
19 loader, this is the no-action alternative, this is what was
20 disclosed in our previous environmental documents for
21 Hamilton and Bel Marin Keys. It consisted of a piece of
22 floating plants and barges with a large pump placed on the
23 barges, dredge scows come up to this, and are emptied one by
24 one with the suction pump that is put into the scow, but
25 that is the key element here -- that is the key problem

1 is, you can only really -- with this system, you have to
2 empty one scow at a time, which means it is kind of like
3 trying to build a house and you are delivering one 2 X 4 at
4 a time, as opposed to bringing all your lumber that you need
5 into your construction activities. So this not only impacts
6 the dredging projects that are trying to get through this
7 through-put, it also impacts your construction activities on
8 shore. Because of the one-by-one nature that you are
9 limited to, to move a volume of material that you can handle
10 in any one given year, that is approximately 1.2 million
11 cubic yards; given the net volume that we need to achieve
12 here, that makes the construction period approximately 18
13 years. You also have equipment limitations with this
14 process. Not all types of dredge scows can be accommodated.
15 Barge and hopper dredges, which do dredge in the Bay in a
16 very efficient manner, and do several of our projects every
17 year. Next slide, please.

18 Right now, we have an off-loader in place that is
19 handling one project, the Port of Oakland deepening project.
20 In that scenario, an off-loader can work effectively. The
21 contractor controls the operation from the dredging site all
22 the way through the off-loader, up to the upland site.
23 However, you still do have the stand-by time, it is a large
24 piece of equipment, it is out there, man, ready to go,
25 waiting for these scows to arrive, so it is still a very

1 inefficient operation. Next slide, please.

2 It becomes more problematic as you are trying to
3 handle all the dredge material from different projects
4 around the Bay, so you have multiple dredging projects
5 trying to simultaneously use this piece of equipment. So
6 our dredging window is between June and November of every
7 year, so it is a month spreading (phonetic) window. All
8 those projects need to get their dredge material offloaded
9 through this facility, one scow at a time, it takes
10 approximately three to six hours to empty a scow, so you can
11 see it is a bottleneck, it is not very flexible to the
12 different projects that need to contribute to it, and it
13 also causes difficulty on your upland site because you are
14 just getting little chunks of material at a time. You saw
15 that long pipeline across the mudflats there -- after each
16 scow, you need to flush that pipeline with water. That
17 pipeline, five miles of two-foot diameter pipe is about
18 775,000 gallons of water -- that is a lot more extra water
19 you keep pumping on your site, so that is a big problem, as
20 well. Next slide, please.

21 So to kind of go through some of those issues
22 again, one scow at a time, three to six hours per scow, you
23 cannot capture as much dredge material as we would like, as
24 Brian mentioned in the LTMS goals; you have equipment
25 incompatibilities, hopper dredges, in particular, would

1 be set up to utilize this piece of equipment, you have a
2 very long construction period of 18 years, mechanical
3 breakdowns or constraints that you encounter on-site, become
4 very problematic to the dredging projects that are trying to
5 get the material here, which means you actually lose dredge
6 material from beneficial use because those scows will have
7 to go back to the historic open water disbursal sites --
8 Alcatraz and SF10.

9 Because of the constraints with the off-loader and
10 the scheduling, some dredging projects, it is envisioned,
11 would have to start working outside the work windows, which
12 has deleterious environmental impacts, as well. And the
13 very important point here, especially in our economic times
14 now, it gets to be very expensive. That off-loader is in
15 stand-by mode a lot of times. Our planning level estimates
16 now are -- this operation, just the transferring of the
17 dredge material, is between \$300 and \$450 million, possibly.
18 Next slide, please.

19 So the second alternative, this non-confined ATF,
20 so this is a dredge material basin, it is a shallow basin
21 that is dug near SF10, it would be 20-40-feet deep, about
22 1,500 feet long by 1,000 feet wide. Dredge scows would come
23 to this facility, place material where it would be stored
24 and effectively and efficiently pumped to shore in a 24/7
25 type operation, with a hydraulic cutter dredge. So that

1 storage would be temporary. Then we would use the hydraulic
2 dredge to empty the basin and provide storage capacity, and
3 under this methodology, it takes approximately ten years to
4 construct the site. Next slide, please.

5 This is a graphic of what we are talking about
6 here. The basin is going to be about ambient water depth
7 with approximately 20-25 feet, we would dig a basin to about
8 minus 45-65 feet to give us some storage capacity; we would
9 have a small access channel of about 250 feet wide, and
10 where we relocate it between 1,000 and 2,000 feet long.
11 Dredge scows would come in here, deposit their material and
12 go, so from the dredging side of this project, it would be
13 transparent. The wetland project would not impact the
14 dredging projects significantly, they would be coming to the
15 site, disposing the material just as they do now in open
16 water sites. We would have a hydraulic dredge. This shows
17 a hopper dredge, which is also able to use that site. A
18 hydraulic dredge would be in this vicinity, emptying the
19 basin, and pumping it ashore. The difference between this
20 and an off-loader is this piece of equipment now can work
21 around the clock very efficiently. It does not have to
22 flush its pipeline after each scow, so we have a lot less
23 processed water that needs to get pumped up to the site, and
24 when this piece of equipment is broken or bound, the
25 dredge material can still be stored, so we are not losing

1 dredge material for beneficial use; it is just stored and
2 placed and sits, and it is fine, it is good to go. And if
3 the upland site cannot handle it for some reason, that is
4 not a problem. It can still keep storing and holding dredge
5 material until you are ready to do construction activities
6 onshore.

7 So the size of the basin is approximately 34
8 acres, but when you dig a hole in the Bay, there is going to
9 be some side slopes around the periphery, so the total
10 active area that we would be working in is 34 acres, but
11 there would be Bay bottom impacted approximately 58 acres.
12 And additionally, about 10-15 acres for the access channel
13 to still be determined where exactly it will be placed. The
14 through-put capacity of this is up to four million cubic
15 yards per year. Brian gave you the annual dredging in the
16 Bay, it is about 3.5 to 4 million. The actual storage
17 capacity of the basin is approximately 2.2 million cubic
18 yards. So this is very beneficial, especially in the
19 federal environmental where we are waiting for Congressional
20 funds. Projects can still keep contributing here if for
21 some reason there is a hiccup in the budgeting process, and
22 we cannot get the cutter head out there, we have storage
23 capacity so that that material is not lost to wetland re-
24 use, and so we can capture the benefits of that resource.
25 Next slide.

1 So this table kind of is an outline of the
2 comparison, the two alternatives, 1 and 2, the competing
3 alternatives here. The acreage, the Alternative 1 has the
4 benefit of [inaudible] floating plant, and it is very small
5 acreage. We will be impacting 60-70 acres of Bay bottom
6 here in the footprint with an ATF. The operational capacity
7 of this is limited due to the scow by scow nature of it,
8 whereas this, we can capture 2-4 million cubic yards for
9 beneficial use for wetland construction, we can store that
10 sediment, we can significantly reduce the time to construct
11 the wetlands. That uses less energy than an off-loader
12 because of the fact it is not sitting around in stand-by a
13 lot of times. We maximize the beneficial re-use of dredge
14 material under this scenario, where that is not the case
15 here. You are still beneficially using dredge material, but
16 just not to the same degree, and not to the extent that meet
17 the LTMS goals. This is a severe bottleneck. That
18 bottleneck represents risk to the project, in general. So
19 there is a higher degree of uncertainty in terms of this
20 number and this number, than there is with this and this,
21 because of the bottleneck, we increases risk to the project.
22 That risk is also reflected in the price range. This is
23 approximately \$120 million, and there is less of a standard
24 deviation around that number. Okay, next slide, please.

25 The third alternative we looked at, as I

1 mentioned, was to confine this basin, the sheet pile
2 structure. This structure would deflect the floating field
3 around the basin, and the sediments would less likely escape
4 the basin, but as we study this problem in depth with the
5 hydro-dynamic modeling, we determined that the structure was
6 not what we needed; it causes additional expense, and
7 navigational safety issues because now you have a large
8 obstruction in the water. So that is why we ruled this
9 alternative out. Next slide, please.

10 The fourth alternative we looked at was to do a
11 direct access channel to the Bel Marin Keys site. This
12 would eliminate the bottleneck caused by an off-loader.
13 Scows would come through this access channel, deposit their
14 material at an upland basin, as opposed to a basin out near
15 SF10, and that goes a little longer travel time for the
16 scows, but the main thing with this is that this channel is
17 very large, and the impacts associated with that channel, we
18 felt, and the document concludes, are best avoided by
19 placing the basin here. Next slide.

20 We also analyzed other alternatives, but not to
21 the same degree of depth and detail. We also looked at a
22 direct channel utilizing the Petaluma River, across
23 [inaudible] Channel and Novato Creek. But there, there were
24 wetlands that would be very much impacted, so just like
25 the direct access channel that was ruled out. We looked

1 at the partially confined facility where it was not fully
2 confined to sheet pile, but just a windy break, if you will,
3 for the ebb flow tide. And there, again, we found that the
4 non-confine facility worked [inaudible], so we did not need
5 to put any sheet pile in. We also looked at trucking or
6 rail transportation, just to keep the volume of material in
7 mind here, 24.8 million cubic yards, that is approximately
8 2.5 million dump trucks. So that was ruled out.

9 With that, I am going to turn it over to Rich
10 Walter and he is going to give you the findings from the
11 document, and the environmental impacts. Thanks.

12 Mr. Walter - Before I start, if I could get a
13 raising of hands of people who plan to speak tonight? Just
14 for time management. Okay, we will have plenty of time,
15 then. Do fill out a speaker card and -- do you have four?
16 Okay, if you have not done so, please get a card to Seema,
17 right in the center there, just so we can call your name.

18 Ms. Barbara Salzman - I have to leave in about ten
19 minutes, so I will speak if you are going to take comments.

20 Mr. Walter - We do have a comment sheet. It is
21 going to take about 15 minutes. I will try to go through as
22 quickly as the presentation allows. Next slide, please.

23 Okay, before I get to the technical studies, I do
24 want to emphasize that this document is a supplemental
25 EIS/EIR, so it is being prepared under both the Federal

1 and the State Environmental Impact requirements under both
2 NEPA and CEQA. It is a supplemental because there are two
3 key environmental documents that have been done previously
4 for the Hamilton Wetland Restoration Project. The original
5 one, which covered the Hamilton Airfield and a few attached
6 parcels to that, was completed in 1998, and covered the
7 restoration of the site onshore and, as Peter mentioned, at
8 that time it included an off-loader, which is part of the
9 authorized project.

10 In 2004, the Army Corps and the State Coastal
11 Conservancy completed a supplemental EIS/EIR to add Bel
12 Marin Keys Unit 5 Parcel 2 to the Hamilton Project, that
13 1,600 acres that was added, and that was a supplemental, and
14 it also analyzed the onshore impacts of restoration and it
15 also included a dredge material off-loader, a hydraulic off-
16 loader, and discussed that. So what we are doing now on
17 NEPA and CEQA is we are looking at alternatives to that
18 adopted off-loaders, the no-action. And so the focus of
19 this is not the entirety of the Hamilton Project, but those
20 impacts associated with the changes between different
21 methods of transferring dredge material onshore. So if
22 there is a lot of focus offshore on the various impacts, and
23 then onshore as far as they are different between the off-
24 loader; but we do not go into aspects such as the design
25 of the project or where the trails are located. Those

1 issues were addressed in the prior documents.

2 So leading up to the EIS-EIR, we did a series of
3 technical studies that were necessary for this kind of
4 project, and also went out and got a number of different
5 experts, both in government and in private consulting, and
6 these are the five studies. They are located in Appendix A
7 of the EIS/EIR, in detail, the full studies are there, lots
8 of graphics. There are some posters over on the right side.
9 There is one poster with a very detailed study, so I am just
10 going to hit them briefly.

11 The first one was looking at history of deposition
12 and erosion, and also looking at hydraulic mining debris.
13 This was done by Bruce Jaffe and Theresa Fregoso at the U.S.
14 Geological Survey out of Menlo Park, and it looked back at
15 the patterns and changing patterns in San Pablo Bay from
16 1856 all the way to 2006, a new 2006 bathymetry survey was
17 done to support this project. And once you understand what
18 parts of San Pablo Bay are eroding, where deposition is
19 occurring, and also to look at the fate of that hydraulic
20 mining debris that came down from the gold fields, and
21 washed down into the Bay at that time in the late 1800's,
22 that layer is disbursed throughout the Bay, but depending on
23 erosion and deposition, it is found at different levels. In
24 some places it is eroded entirely, in some places it is
25 deeply buried. So we want to get an idea from those

1 studies whether we have this material in the ATF sites and,
2 if so, to get some idea of how much. So the study concluded
3 that there could be hydraulic mining debris, which we call
4 HMD, but it would likely be a very small portion of the site
5 that we would have to excavate for an Aquatic Transfer
6 Facility. There are some estimates in there between 3,000
7 and perhaps as much as 100,000 cubic yards. That is based
8 on looking just at modeling of the deposition patterns. The
9 Army Corps of Engineers is presently implementing a sampling
10 plan to pull specific cores from the site, to really look at
11 it in more detail, and test it, and get an even more fixed
12 idea of what we have out there. Because that material, if
13 it is high enough in mercury, it may not meet our quality
14 requirements to be used at this wetland, and it would have
15 to go to another site.

16 Sediment transport in San Pablo Bay was also
17 studied by David Schoelhammer, Neil Ganju, and Gregory
18 Shellenbarger, also of U.S.G.S. This was really to
19 understand the dynamics of deposition in the Bay on a
20 specific level in terms of turbidity and suspended
21 sediments, and how they are working in the Bay. And that
22 set up our background, our existing conditions. Hydro-
23 dynamic modeling was done at the Aquatic Transfer Facility,
24 both the confined and the unconfined, and we are looking
25 at a number of things there, but we are specifically

1 looking at velocities and the potential for these new
2 features out in the Bay to change circulation. And the sum
3 total, there is a lot in there, they use this untrimmed
4 model, and they had some interesting graphs there. The
5 velocity changes with the unconfined Aquatic Transfer
6 Facility, which is without being a sheetrock pile, are
7 barely small. There are some velocity changes right at the
8 edge of the basin, as you would expect, you know, when water
9 comes over an edge, it tends to want to work that edge down.
10 So you do have some velocity changes, but those attenuate
11 very quickly as you get further away from the ATF, and do
12 not effect, you know, they affect the circulation very
13 minimally in San Pablo Bay as a whole. The confined ATF, as
14 you would expect, if you stick a big wall out there, it does
15 affect circulation a lot more. And the effects of that are
16 farther reaching. They reach out quite a distance in terms
17 of changing some of the circulation pattern in that part of
18 the San Pablo Bay. It is not the entire part, but it is
19 much bigger than the one that does not have the sheet wall.

20 Sediment transport modeling was also done, looking
21 at some of the dynamics with core sampling, of what the
22 material is, and how it works when it is disbursed, and also
23 doing some dye tracer studies to look at where might
24 material go from the site if you are placing it in open
25 water condition, even though you are also putting it kind

1 of in the basin, rather than in a disbursement environment,
2 and that was done by Craig Jones of Sea Engineering
3 (phonetic). And I did not mention before, the hydro dynamic
4 modeling was done by Mike McWilliams, who is here tonight,
5 and Ralph Cheng, at USGS. And then, finally, there was some
6 short term ST fate modeling done by the Corps' Engineering
7 and Research Development Center, and that was taking
8 material and looking specifically about the initial
9 deposition event, and replacement into the basin, and how
10 much material might be lost, and I think they looked at
11 conditions of what the currents are like, and they are
12 looking at around five to six percent under most conditions.
13 In a lot of conditions, it would be actually less than five
14 percent, if you have got a really really strong 3-knot tide
15 right at that peak, you will have, I think, up to nine
16 percent, I think, and those numbers are on the slide. So
17 these were very useful in doing the EIS/EIR. Next.

18 So as you would expect for these types of
19 documents, if you have seen them before, they are very
20 lengthy and very detailed. These are all the subjects that
21 are covered in the document. Tonight I am just going to hit
22 some of the highlights. I cannot go through all of those,
23 or we would not get to comments. But as you can see, these
24 are all mandated by statute and we have gone through
25 them, and they are on the document. Next slide.

1 So water and sediment quality, of course, very key
2 concerns any time you are dealing with the Bay and where we
3 are looking at using an open water placement site. So the
4 technical studies, as I discussed, demonstrate that there is
5 some loss of suspended sediment, but it is a small portion -
6 - five percent, perhaps less, overall. And we have got to
7 look at the existing conditions now. You are using SF10,
8 which is right about there, and the ATF would be very close
9 to it. That is fully dispersive. It is not accumulating in
10 SF10. All that material goes into the Bay, and then it
11 disburses around to other parts of the Bay. So you are
12 looking at volumes that are being disbursed around the Bay
13 that are much larger than the losses that we would be
14 looking at from the small percentage placed in the ATF. And
15 that is, you know, to use a common term, just because we
16 have a basin that captures it, and also because of the
17 location where we are at does not produce a lot of erosion
18 of that material once it gets placed.

19 We are only going to use suitable material, so the
20 material that is temporarily placed into the ATF, and then
21 brought on shore for the wetland restoration will need some
22 fairly stringent requirements of the U.S. Fish & Wildlife
23 Service, and the Regional Water Quality Control Board.
24 There is a very long list of the criteria that is
25 specific for this site. All that material has to meet

1 that quality of material, or it will not be placed in the
2 ATF, it will not come onshore.

3 As Peter mentioned, because we do not have to have
4 a barge pull up, pull the mud out of there, and bring it
5 onshore, and then clear the line, waiting for the next barge
6 to come, we are going to be putting less processed water
7 overall. Now, we will still be doing hydraulic dredging in
8 the ATF, and there will be water coming with that while you
9 are dredging, but overall when you have got to flush that
10 line every time, you just have [inaudible] going as the
11 water on the site, so that is a water quality issue on-site.
12 The ATF would also limit in-Bay disposal at other dispersive
13 in-Bay disposal sites. This is a key point. You know, as
14 Peter discussed, there are operational limits on the off-
15 loader, and so you can only capture perhaps as much as 1.5
16 million cubic yards per year, we think probably more like
17 1.2 million cubic yards, whereas any of the other
18 alternatives can capture anywhere from 1.6 to 2.0, all the
19 way up to nearly 4 million cubic yards in a year, all that
20 material that is not captured in a year, if it does not go
21 to another beneficial re-use site, is going to go either in
22 the Bay, or it is going to go out to DODS. And so there
23 will be higher -- the EIS uses a very conservative number, I
24 think it would probably be higher in reality -- of about
25 400,000 cubic yards that is likely to be disbursed around

1 the Bay because it is not being captured, because we cannot
2 bring it onshore. Comparing the action alternatives to the
3 off-loader. Next slide.

4 This kind of captures that picture, redirecting
5 dredge material, because that is really what this project is
6 doing, is taking material from -- and this one only shows
7 federal projects -- there are other permitted projects that
8 could be accommodated by the ATF, and that is discussed at
9 length in the document. But this is just the larger Federal
10 projects that are shown here. But instead of this material
11 going to Alcatraz, or SF10, or maybe for some of these up
12 here to SF16, which is up in Suisun Bay, or out to DODS, we
13 are redirecting a lot of that material to come here, to an
14 ATF, and depending on the alternative ultimately adopted,
15 transferring that to site. And so that is really what we
16 are doing when we are doing that. So we are lowering
17 impacts at all these other dispersive sites, and bringing
18 that to our ATF location. Next slide.

19 Moving on from water quality and sediment and,
20 like I said, I am just going to hit a few of the highlights,
21 I know there are many other issues, but that is what the
22 document is for. Air quality -- on a year to year basis,
23 the air quality emissions, because of the stringent
24 requirements of ozone controls and BAQMD, would probably
25 be about the same. The one difference that would happen

1 as far as criteria pollutants -- and these are the things
2 that have health effects, like oxides of nitrogen, pm,
3 particulate matter, carbon monoxide, these are things that
4 affect our health. Because the action alternatives would
5 all be completed faster, we will not have those impacts in
6 the additional years it would take to complete the project
7 with the hydraulic off-loader; it can be done faster and
8 more efficient. That has a benefit in the out years.
9 Annually, because we are really well controlled on air, you
10 know, it will probably be roughly similar, but in those out
11 years, it would be dramatically different, and tons of
12 pollutants. Next, with climate change and on a lot of
13 people's mind, of being regulated now in California, in
14 particular, we also looked at greenhouse gases, focusing
15 primarily on carbon dioxide, and Alternatives 2, 3 and 4
16 would emit substantially less greenhouse gas emissions over
17 the lifetime of the project, which is always the way you
18 analyze greenhouse gases, and then the off-loader, and a lot
19 of that has to do with stand-by and the length of time that
20 the project is operating. And then, kind of in any
21 alternative, there would be benefits, we think, and the
22 science of this is getting better and better, that tidal
23 wetlands are a net sequester of carbon, and a pretty
24 substantial one, a very important one. And so expanding
25 tidal wetlands will sequester carbon in time. We have

1 some calculations in the EIS about what that benefit will
2 be. All the alternatives will do that, but we will get
3 those benefits earlier if the project is completed earlier.
4 Next slide.

5 Fish and wildlife impacts, there is a lot in there
6 where we analyze both offshore impacts and some of the
7 onshore ones. We talked about the wetland habitat being
8 established sooner, that is really good for both listed and
9 non-listed species. We also, in the Bay as a whole, we are
10 looking at reduced -- and in the San Pablo Bay, we are
11 looking at reduced suspended sediment impact because we are
12 locating this in a non-dispersive basin, as opposed to
13 replacing some material in dispersive sites. We think we can
14 keep the dredging within the environmental work windows for
15 all the projects that will be using this site, and that is
16 terribly important, as well. We are working in the Bay, so
17 there are going to be some impacts to both common and
18 uncommon species in the Bay, when you place material,
19 period. That is something that occurs today, but when we
20 have an Aquatic Transfer Facility, we will have some impacts
21 and the biology section is very thick, and it goes through
22 each of those species and discloses those impacts. One of
23 those that is identified in the document is adverse impacts
24 on green sturgeon, which is known from San Pablo Bay and
25 could occur at the Aquatic Transfer Facility. We have

1 some mitigation to reduce those impacts, but there is the
2 possibility that they could be affected, particularly during
3 the placement of the material itself, you know, more as a
4 physical impact, and also during dredging, which could
5 impact them if they are present at the time. Next one.

6 Recreational fisheries are also a concern that is
7 addressed. This map, which may not come out as well, but is
8 in the EIS, is based on some fishing maps of San Pablo Bay,
9 that were used by local fishers, and you can see down in
10 here, this is where the Aquatic Transfer Facility would be
11 located; this is where the onshore basin in Alternative 4
12 would be located. And with this map, you probably cannot
13 see it at that distance, but it shows some of the targeted
14 fishing areas, by no means is it comprehensive, everybody
15 has their own place to go; one of the places that is
16 identified, that people talk about, is referred to as the
17 sturgeon triangle, and it is kind of this triangle area, and
18 we have a small portion of the ATF that could be located
19 within that area. I do not think sturgeon exactly obey this
20 triangle just because we put it on the map, but
21 nevertheless, it is an area that is targeted and known for
22 white sturgeon, and white sturgeon, green sturgeon often can
23 co-locate. So that is one of our concerns. The analysis in
24 the EIS notes that there would be impacts in this area
25 because you would have some turbidity right over in the

1 immediate area of the ATF, so that could affect some fishing
2 in here, but because of the turbid nature of San Pablo Bay,
3 because of the studies we have that show that it attenuates
4 very quickly as you get away from it, we do not see
5 widespread impacts to San Pablo Bay fishing as a whole. So
6 there are some impacts that are disclosed, but there is a
7 scale factor to it. That is a very brief summary of that
8 impact, and I encourage you to look in the document for more
9 on that.

10 So very briefly, you have heard of some of these
11 before, I will note a few of the new ones, the sub-tidal
12 impact would be greater with the Aquatic Transfer Facility
13 compared to an off-loader, because of that disturbance in
14 the ATF itself. The direct channel would be much more
15 massive; that channel would have to be maintained and would
16 have far greater impacts -- that is Alternative 4. There is
17 some maintenance dredging that would have to happen with
18 Alternatives 2 and 3, with the ATF and with the onshore. I
19 talked previously -- there are some of those numbers about
20 greenhouse gas emissions, and oxides of nitrogen.

21 Navigationally, I have not talked about before. Alternative
22 1, you know, is operating and out there, and we think that
23 an off-loader can operate with minimal concerns about
24 navigation. You have got to let everybody know, you have
25 got to label it, you have got to light it, you have got

1 to prepare for that. The real discriminator here is that
2 Alternative 3 would have sheet piles surrounding this 58-
3 acre area. And you can mark it, you can let everybody know,
4 but that is a much bigger footprint than the two-acre off-
5 loader. And so that is identified as a potential hazard.
6 You can manage that hazard to some extent, but it is a big
7 obstacle right next to the channel. And so we did identify
8 some concerns with that alternative. The onshore one does
9 not have that.

10 Community disruption -- the facilities that are
11 different here, in Alternatives 1, 2 and 3, which are the
12 off-loader and the ATF, most of the facilities are offshore.
13 There is onshore restoration activities, but not new
14 facilities onshore. If you did this direct channel to Bel
15 Marin Keys, Unit 5 basin, you would have some onshore
16 facilities. You would have the basin, you would have the
17 dredge operating there, that would be closer to the Bel
18 Marin Keys community. There is some distance. So we
19 analyzed some of the impacts there. It would not be right
20 next to the community, but it would be onshore and would be
21 more visible, and would be closer, so you have those
22 construction effects to consider.

23 Water quality -- I have talked a lot about this,
24 about the difference of sediment where it is placed and
25 that it is non-dispersive to place it in the ATF, in

1 general; whereas, we would have this material that is not
2 captured by an off-loader, and then cost is in there.

3 So the conclusion of the EIS, and this is a draft,
4 and we are seeking comment on it, is that the
5 environmentally preferred is Alternative 2, and we give you
6 some of those reasons in here. Relative to Alternative 1, I
7 think we have talked about a lot of these details already.
8 I just want to point out a few relative to the other
9 Alternatives, which we are required to consider in full
10 detail. So we have less circulation and navigation impacts
11 between an unconfined and a confined. I talked about
12 circulation, I talked about some of the potential navigation
13 hazards of having that sheet pile area out there. And then,
14 relative to Alternative 4, less community disruption if you
15 have the facilities located offshore five miles, you know,
16 miles from any houses or anything like that. And less
17 disruption to aquatic habitat. What this is, you know, we
18 have to have that basin onshore and barges coming right past
19 some tidal mudflats and wetlands that would be more
20 disruptive than being out in the open water. Next slide.

21 So some of the next steps. Tonight is our public
22 meeting. The comment period has been extended to December
23 22nd, so you have a little bit more time to get your comments
24 in. Response to comments will be prepared by the Corps.
25 and Conservancy in the first quarter of 2009. The final

1 SEIS EIR would be prepared hopefully in the second quarter.
2 And the record of decision in the second or third quarter of
3 '09 is what we are shooting for. And the ATF construction
4 for whatever is selected in 2010. Yes, and also, at the
5 same time, as Peter just reminded me, we are going to be
6 working on all these state and federal permits for the
7 project that are necessary to try and bring this online in
8 2010. Next slide.

9 Okay, so that is the presentation. So now we are
10 going to go through comments, and I think we have four, and
11 the folks -- I can give you up to five minutes each, so if
12 we only have four, we can get through all those folks and
13 finish the comments. I do want to note that we want to take
14 your comments because we have a Court Reporter right here
15 who is recording all of these, because we are going to
16 respond to all the comments that are put forth during this
17 part of the presentation in writing, in the final EIS/EIR.
18 We are going to just go through those comments, we are not
19 going to do that part as question and answer, and then we
20 will close the formal part of this. If you do have
21 questions, the technical team is here, we do have the room
22 until 8:00, you are welcome to ask specific questions, and
23 if we can answer them, we will. On the substantive issues,
24 the way we deal with this is we take all those in, and we
25 have a very big team that works on this, and we get the

1 best answers we can, and we put those in the final. So we
2 will not be providing responses to issues tonight, but we
3 will absolutely be responding to them. And there are also
4 forms in the back if you do want to submit written comments
5 tonight, we will collect those, as well, if you do not want
6 to speak. And we will respond to those just the same.

7 Unidentified Male Speaker - Will those be
8 available for everyone to see, the responses to those
9 questions that are submitted electronically or...

10 Mr. Walter - Yeah, so all comments that are
11 submitted, whether they are orally submitted tonight, or
12 whether they are written on those sheets, or submitted by
13 mail, or e-mail, will be responded to in writing and they
14 will be available in the final EIS/EIR, which will be
15 distributed like the Draft, and will be placed on the
16 project website. And so you will see all the comments and...

17 Unidentified Male Speaker - Not prior to that.

18 Mr. Walter - Not prior to that, no. That is the
19 NEPA process and CEQA process. Do you want to bring those
20 up? And if you could use the microphone, that will make it
21 easier for our Court Reporter to accurately -- and also
22 please state your name when you are up. Barbara
23 unfortunately had to leave, so thanks for the lights. Okay,
24 so I only have three. I have Keith Frasier, Barbara
25 Salzman, and Ellen Johnck. Anybody I missed? Barbara

1 left, I know. So we have two. So Keith Frasier.

2 Mr. Frasier - Let the young lady go first.

3 Mr. Walter - Ellen.

4 Ms. Johnck - Young lady, well. Okay.

5 Mr. Walter - You are welcome to use the mike.

6 Ms. Johnck - Okay, sir.

7 Mr. Walter - You can stand close to the Court
8 Reporter, then we will make sure to get your comments. And
9 please state your name.

10 Ms. Johnck - Yes, and spell it. Thank you for the
11 "young lady." I am Ellen Johnck, J-o-h-n-c-k, Executive
12 Director of Bay Planning Coalition, Founding Executive
13 Director, 25 years ago. Bay Planning Coalition has two
14 roles at the hearing tonight, our planning role and also our
15 funding advocacy role and support. Our planning role is
16 focused on successful management of the San Francisco Bay
17 for arriving commerce, recreation, and a healthy
18 environment. And we have been very active, as many of you
19 know, in the ensuring the safety and reliability of the
20 navigation channels in the Bay, and we are very active in
21 the origin of the Long Term Management Strategy, and its
22 implementation over the last -- has it been 20 years, I
23 think, maybe, almost -- not quite. Maybe 16 or 17. And one
24 of our main goals here with the Long Term Management
25 Strategy is to have as many disposal options available as

1 possible, both for environmental considerations, as well as
2 for economic considerations. So when it comes to looking at
3 the Aquatic Transfer Facility, our thought is 1) we are
4 supportive of the concept of the Unconfined Aquatic Transfer
5 Facility, as it has a great opportunity to maximize our goal
6 and support for the beneficial re-use of dredged sediment;
7 we have several projects in the Bay that we are working on,
8 from Mare Island in the South to Hamilton in the North.
9 And, of course, working on seeing the successful completion,
10 too, of the Middle Harbor Eelgrass Habitats area. And there
11 is more to come, we are sure.

12 Now, the other benefit to the ATF that we support
13 is for several in the Bay, we think it will be less
14 expensive given the proximity of the ATF and the Hamilton
15 Restoration Site, for those who are dredging nearby and have
16 easy access to take material to Hamilton. So, you know, we
17 think the ATF has several benefits and we will document
18 those into some writing. Now, one of the things, though,
19 that we think must be considered in a much more extensive
20 way in the EIS, in the Draft EIS, is this consideration of -
21 - we think all disposal sites in-Bay should be kept open,
22 and one of the main reasons is, not just from an economic
23 point of view, but the point was made that this site will
24 minimize the impacts of in-Bay disposal. I would say
25 this is backwards. As we know, the condition of the

1 needs for sediment in the Bay today, and for those of you
2 who are interested, or who were not at the annual meeting of
3 the San Francisco Estuary Institute early in October, David
4 Schoelhammer, a Sedimentologist in the Bay, presented some
5 very interesting information about the sediment needs in the
6 Bay, and how we have actually reduced sedimentation in the
7 Bay. So I would ask that the EIS look into the sediment
8 needs of the Bay and that we do consider why we need to keep
9 sediments in the Bay. So we would recommend here again that
10 all dispersive in-Bay sites should remain open. Now, just
11 second, and I will conclude here, in our role as advocacy
12 for funding, we go to Congress each year and support the
13 entire dredging and disposal program in the Bay, including
14 all the wetland restoration sites. The cost -- this is -- I
15 am going to say extravagant. It is huge. It is monumental,
16 I should say that, on the cost to implement this. We are
17 very concerned about this, as to whether this is achievable,
18 not just the Federal program, which we advocate for, but
19 also there is a lot of uncertainty as to how the cost will
20 be for private dredging in the Bay, what the mechanism will
21 be to actually make it work. So we have to spend some more
22 time analyzing how we are really going to implement this
23 because, right now, many of you know, we have quite a
24 significant economic downturn. The Army Corps of
25 Engineers' budget has been flat in the Operation and

1 Maintenance category for 30 years, and it is going to be
2 quite a struggle to try to secure money for this project.
3 That does not mean that it could not be done if we can all
4 get together and figure out how to do it. So thank you very
5 much. We think you have done a good job, so far, on moving
6 this along, and we will look forward to working more closely
7 with you on it as we go forward.

8 Mr. Walter - Okay. Thank you. And then Keith
9 Frasier.

10 Mr. Frasier - Thank you. You are going from a
11 young lady to a much older semi-gentleman. My name is Keith
12 Frasier. I am the co-owner of the Loch Lomond Bake Shop in
13 San Rafael. I was the Founding President of United Anglers
14 of California and the Bay has been my playground for as long
15 as I can remember, a playground for swimming, waterskiing,
16 fishing, and just enjoying the beauty of a gorgeous estuary,
17 or what was once a gorgeous estuary.

18 I am a bait man. I have been a lowly bait man for
19 38 years. During my tenure, I have seen our once
20 magnificent Bay Delta Estuary abused over and over and over
21 again. Most of those who abuse our estuary could care less
22 about the Delta Smelt, the endangered Delta smelt, that is,
23 the winter run salmon, or the Clapper Rail. Greed and
24 ignorance are the most obvious traits of the abusers.

25 If we were to concoct a recipe for the demise

1 of an estuary, water export would be the main ingredient.
2 The water grabbers thus get top billing on our abuser list.
3 Their constant lust for northern water is unabated. The
4 consequences for the Bay Delta Estuary are catastrophic.
5 These culprits live in the south, and they plot daily how
6 they can beg, borrow, or steal as much of our water as
7 possible. Now add pollution, both industrial and
8 agricultural, to this recipe, and that will be a deterrent
9 to us ever again enjoying a pristine, vibrant estuary.
10 Then, mix in an occasional oil spill, and a plethora of
11 sewage spills like we endured in local waters this year.

12 Another integral part of this recipe for disaster
13 has been the dumping of vast amounts of dredge spoils at
14 three dump sites inside the Bay, including Alcatraz, three
15 dump sites that were used many years ago. I have seen many
16 summers where both San Pablo and San Francisco Bays and the
17 ocean waters far out the Gate were brown due to the massive
18 dumping of contaminated spoils. Almost all marine life
19 avoided these waters. Angling success was an impossibility.

20 It was front page news around much of the country
21 when between 100 and 150 party boats and private skiffs
22 demonstrated at Alcatraz one weekday morning in the early
23 80's. The barges came out to do their dumping, but left
24 without releasing the crud when they saw the scope of the
25 demonstration. Things have greatly improved in this

1 category in recent years. Limits were placed on the amount
2 of dredged spoils that could be dumped at the sites. Much
3 of the muck was either taken far out the gate to an ocean
4 disposal site, or used for landfill.

5 But now comes another ingredient for our path to
6 disaster -- the proposed game plan calls for the excavation
7 of a huge hole in the Bay bottom near China Camp, to hold
8 massive amounts of dredge spoils that are ticketed for the
9 Hamilton Field Restoration Project. In other words, the
10 muck will be dumped at the China Camp holding pit, and then
11 sent to Hamilton Field.

12 Like most observers, I am a big fan of the
13 Hamilton Field restoration project. The benefits for that
14 part of the Bay and the resident creatures are tremendous.
15 This new game plan, which has been previewed for you here
16 tonight will undoubtedly save millions and millions of
17 dollars and hasten the completion of this worthwhile
18 project. But what about the ramifications for our Bay, for
19 the next decade or so, while this new plan is in operation?
20 I am not a hydrologist, or an engineer, or an expert on
21 sediment, turbidity, or muck, but I think I am knowledgeable
22 enough to predict with some accuracy the demise of our local
23 waters as a recreational playground if this new plan is
24 instituted. The expression about the final nail in the
25 coffin comes to mind. I have talked with numerous people

1 far more knowledgeable than myself, including John Butler,
2 Executive Director for the California Sport Fishing
3 Protection Alliance. John calls the project "a potential
4 disaster for all aquatic life in local Bay waters."

5 The new plan could serve as a death sentence for
6 much of San Pablo and San Francisco Bays, the lower reaches
7 of the Delta, and probably some of our ocean waters. I
8 would guess that the muddy water that will undoubtedly
9 result from the advent of this new strategy will most likely
10 cause the demise of most of the local fishing related
11 businesses. I believe it is a legal necessity for a
12 mitigation plan to be part of the environmental review
13 process, to take care of the sport fishing industry that
14 will almost certainly be devastated by the start of a
15 massive dumping into a 40-foot deep hole the size of three,
16 four, five or six football fields, for the muck that will
17 eventually be taken to the Hamilton Field area. With abuse
18 like this, no wonder bad news hangs over this once mighty
19 estuary like a black cloud. Just check the facts.
20 Endangered species, decreasing fish populations, no salmon
21 fishing, constantly changing fish regulations, restricting
22 the size and take of our prized sport fish and limiting the
23 availability of fishing locations. Woe is me. And
24 incidentally, the green sturgeon is not the coveted
25 sturgeon. The green sturgeon is an endangered species.

1 They are very very few and far between. Obviously, you
2 cannot take a green sturgeon.

3 I am all for the wetlands project as it stands
4 today, but I have great reservations about the new plan if
5 the turbidity in this water, in our waters, is increased at
6 all, then I will do everything I possibly can to fight the
7 project. I thank the Corps and the other agencies who are
8 here tonight for the opportunity to speak to you. Thank
9 you, and I am sorry I went too long. [Applause]

10 Mr. Walter - All right, thank you, Keith and
11 Ellen, for your comments. And I encourage those who did not
12 speak tonight, but have concerns, to definitely get your
13 comments in. You have until right before the Christmas
14 holidays, December 22nd, to get those in. Make sure and do
15 so, so that we can provide responses to all concerns, pro
16 and con, and everything.

17 Although a preferred alternative is shown tonight,
18 that has been identified, no decision has been made. The
19 NEPA and CEQA process require that we finish that process,
20 and respond to all comments and agencies, individuals,
21 organizations, and consider all those comments before either
22 the Corps or the Conservancy make their decision on which
23 alternative would ultimately go forward. So I do encourage
24 you to be involved if you have concerns. And I thank you
25 for the wonderful turnout tonight. And the technical

1 team will be here. We did finish a little early, if you do
2 have specific questions, you are welcome to come up and that
3 would be an informal part of tonight. Thank you.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25