Even referring to all these sections, the reader will still not understand the jurisdiction and authority of the SLC, or how the SLC, as well as other agencies, relate to the LTMS organization and to the recommended changes in permitting and regulating. To make the document a better reference source, as well as promote the LTMS goal of improving coordination of the regulatory process, it should include a more thorough description of the current regulatory and funding environment. For example, the SLC's jurisdiction over sovereign lands is governed by statute as well as the common law Public Trust Doctrine, all of which may affect programs of dredging and disposal, including the processing fees or royalties which may be charged for these activities. We would be happy to work with the document preparers on specific language in the many sections which apply to the SLC to improve the document as an important information source for decision makers. 2b

Ratings for Benefits and Impacts

We understand that this document is only intended to guide policy development and thus does not contain much of the detail as more typically contained in EIS/EIRs. However, the document attempts to numerically rank benefits and impacts to the environment for the various alternatives (Chapter 6). We feel it is important to explain the criteria the preparers used in assigning the rankings, i.e. high, moderate, low, negligible. Further, it is not always clear when and why the rankings represent an evaluation of the net or absolute benefit or impact. For example, for sensitive fish species, the impacts of in-Bay disposal are rated "negligible" because the windows suggested by LTMS policies FH 1,2,3 page 1-26, would mitigate impacts. By contrast, for fish and wildlife generally, impacts for high volume upland disposal are rated "high", despite the fact that LTMS policies HC 1,2 would arguably also mitigate impacts. 2c

One solution could be to reformat the ranking tables in the final document to be more like a traditional EIR, identifying impacts, mitigations, and residual impacts after mitigation is applied. The advantage of this method is that it emphasizes the importance of the mitigation measure(s) and at the same time shows the consequences if mitigation measures for some reason are infeasible or otherwise cannot be applied in the future.

Specific Comments: 3

1. Certain parts of the document are inconsistent as to the definition of the planning region. The map on page 1-4, Figure 1.3-1 excludes the Delta in the LTMS Planning Area, but later in the document the potential for upland disposal, especially on levees, is identified for the Delta. It would also be interesting to consider adding a "watershed" map showing the current thinking as to upstream sources of sediment. Lastly, the habitat map on page 4-89, Figure 4.4-1 is erroneously labeled as including Delta habitat types, which it does not. 3a

2. Delta levees themselves provide habitat, although it is often marginal in value, as the document describes. Levees also function in maintaining essentially all the other most valuable habitat types in the Delta, including in the channels and on the islands. If the levees are not maintained, the ultimate result would likely be an inland embayment of mostly deep water habitat, eliminating most of the existing emergent wetland, seasonal wetland, upland, riparian, and shallow water habitats. The document may wish to ascribe more environmental benefits to maintaining levees in the Delta, or in other locations, than just the habitat on the structures themselves. 3b

3. The Red-legged frog status under the federal endangered species act has been changed to Threatened (Table 4.4-1, page 4-101). Such changes in listing status will undoubtedly always be the case, so it may be prudent to change the LTMS policy-level mitigations regarding sensitive fish species (FH 1,2,3; Table 1.10-1, page 1-26) to be more generic. This would also allow for changes as more information is learned about individual species' requirements. 3c

4. The Swainson's hawk is a state-listed species, not federal (see page 4-114). Also, it should be added to the species list in Table 4.4-1. Swainson's hawks may nest in riparian and other tall trees in the Delta, and forage in grasslands and croplands of the region. 3d

Thank you for the opportunity to comment. If you have any questions, please contact Diana Jacobs at (916) 574-1877.

Sincerely,

MARY GRIGGS
Environmental Services
Division of Environmental
Planning and Management

cc: Robert C. Hight
Dwight E. Sanders
Jane Sekelsky
Diana Jacobs
OPR

Responses to the CSLC — California State Lands Commission, letter dated July 18, 1996

1. Statement noted. The issue of sovereign lands will need to be evaluated on a case-by-case basis as required by local, state, and federal requirements. See also the new discussion of State Lands Commission policies in section 4.8.1.3.

2. Please see the responses immediately below to SLC comments 2a through 2c.

2a. Sedimentation processes in the Bay are extremely complex, as discussed in Chapter 3. Currently, modeling techniques are not adequate to precisely predict short-term or long-term sedimentation patterns at specific dredging locations. However, it is clear that dredged material discharged at dispersive sites within the Bay is likely to spread widely throughout the system. Even so, this dredged material accounts for only a small percentage of material deposited. Even though dredging and disposal may affect sediment budgets within an embayment, we know that, overall, resuspended sediments are by far the greatest source and that the Estuary-wide sediment budget is not significantly affected by dredged material. From a dredging standpoint, perhaps the best information at present is the past history of each project's actual dredging needs. The LTMS agencies have taken this information into account to the extent possible in developing the revised dredging volume estimates (see section 3.1.2 and Appendix E) and ultimately in the selection of the preferred alternative. For the purpose of the programmatic decisions being made at this time, the LTMS agencies do not believe that an extensive effort to develop more precise information on Bay sedimentation patterns is necessary. However, as such information becomes available from other sources, it will be reflected as appropriate in periodic updates to the LTMS Management Plan.

2b. The Final EIS/EIR has been revised to include a summary of the authorities and responsibilities of the CSLC (see section 4.8.1.3), as well as to reference CSLC in the discussions on the pages referenced in the comment.

2c. The criteria used to numerically rank the risks/impacts and benefits for the various alternatives are explained in section 6.1. In addition, Table 6.1-7 shows the ratings given to the various placement alternatives for each of the criteria. Specifically, Table 6.1-2 shows the ratings for fish and wildlife habitat. It shows that at high placement volumes, the impact to in-Bay fish and wildlife habitat is moderate. In comparison, the impact to UWR fish and wildlife habitat is high. As explained in section 6.1, these ratings are relative, for comparison purposes. The reasons for these specific ratings are described in sections 6.1.2.2 and 6.1.2.3.

3. Please see the responses immediately below to SLC comments 3a through 3d.

3a. Figure 4.4-1 was borrowed from the San Francisco Estuary Institute and the title is as the Institute recommended. It is replaced with a new figure from the Institute. Please see the responses to CDWR comment 4; CVRWQCB comments 4, 5, and 13; and DPC comment 2.

3b. Statement noted. The concept of indirect benefits associated with beneficial reuse was applied to the generic analysis presented in Chapter 6 of the EIS/EIR.

3c. Statement noted; this correction has been made in the Final EIS/EIR. As discussed in section 2.1.3.5 of the Draft EIS/EIR, the LTMS Management Committee envisions the LTMS to be an ongoing program that will necessitate updates in many areas of the Management Program. The changes in the listing status of individual species of special concern will be reviewed periodically by the LTMS and updated management practices will be implemented as needed. This issue will be further addressed in the LTMS Management Plan document.

3d. Statement noted; this correction has been made in the Final EIS/EIR.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
PETE WILSON, *Governor*

DELTA PROTECTION COMMISSION
14215 RIVER ROAD
BOX 530
WALNUT GROVE, CA 95690
PHONE: (916) 776-2290
FAX: (916) 776-2293

June 19, 1996

LTMS/EIS/EIR Coordinator
c/o U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Region 9 (W-3-3)
75 Hawthorne Street
San Francisco, CA 94947

Subject: Long-Term Management Strategy (LTMS) for the Placement of Dredged Material in the San Francisco Bay Region, Draft Policy Environmental Impact Statement/Programmatic Environmental Impact Report, April, 1996

Dear LTMS Coordinator:

I am writing regarding the above-named report, received in the Commission's office in April, 1996. These comments have not been reviewed by the Commission, so they are staff comments only.

The Delta Protection Commission is a State regional planning agency with land use authority and limited regulatory authority in the 500,000 acre Delta Primary Zone, a subset of the Legal Delta. The Commission has had an interest in the LTMS process since the Commission started its work in 1993. The Commission has received briefings on the status of the program and received documents as they have been prepared and released. The Commission's interest is based on the need in the Delta for material for long-term levee maintenance, for increasing the levee cross-sections for long-term stability and reliability, and for possible riparian habitat restoration. 1

To this end I sent a letter to Mr. Robert Tufts, dated September 9, 1994, with specific comments regarding reuse of dredged material in the Delta for levee maintenance and improvement. Three of the four topics were not addressed in the DEIR: the need for additional information about dredging in the Delta, the need for additional information about the characteristics of material dredged in the Delta, and the need for more specific information about the volume of material needed for levee maintenance and improvement. The DEIR <u>does</u> include additional information about the experimental levee maintenance projects that have been carried out in the Delta. 2

The DEIR differentiates between the Delta as an area which needs dredging and supplies certain volumes of dredged material from time to time to maintain shipping channels, recreational marinas, water lines, and other uses, and the Delta as an area for upland disposal/reuse of dredged spoils from the Bay Area. While the DEIR states the "planning area" studied in the document is west of Sherman Island, thus excluding the Delta, the DEIR does include a great deal of information about the Delta in Chapter Four which describes "Affected Environment" because it is a possible upland disposal site.

3 The most important information in the DEIR, in terms of Delta levees, is the limited volume of material deemed suitable for reuse in the Delta. The DEIR states on page 4-121 "it is assumed that maximum Delta levee reuse would be limited to 1 mcy during the 1 to 5-year period, 5 mcy during the 5- to 15-year period, and 20 mcy during the 15- to 50-year period due to water quality concerns such as the presence of metals and salinity, and constraints caused by levee-side barge access."

The delineation of these volume figures seems to have been prepared without a full analysis or study. However, if there is concurrence by the other agencies of concern, such as the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board, this is a much smaller volume that was predicted in the past. On page 4-128, the DEIR states "Based on COE designs and DWR calculations, an estimated 55 mcy of material would be required to rehabilitate substandard Delta levees."

Currently the Delta levees are maintained to an "interim" standard agreed to by the State and the Federal Emergency Management Agency, called the Hazard Mitigation Plan (HMP) standard. The Commission's adopted Plan urges strengthening and raising the levees to a safer, more stable standard, such as the Corps' PL-99 agricultural standard, or other agreed upon standard. Substantial volumes of material would be needed to reconfigure levees to meet this standard and to maintain the levees annually. The Commission's Plan recommends study of the appropriateness of materials from other sources, such as the Bay area, for these needs.

In addition, it should be noted that the value of the Delta islands is not merely their value for agriculture but their value as part of the State and federal water projects directing water toward the project pumps, for flood control, and the value of the wildlife habitats on the islands behind the levees and on the levees themselves.

4 In summary, the LTMS program and studies should be expanded to more fully evaluate the "match" between dredged materials from the Bay Area and the need for material for levee maintenance and enhancement in the Delta. The conclusions in the DEIR are made from fragmented data

and assumptions which limit possibilities for reuse of these materials in the Delta. More specific studies with participation by the Central Valley Regional Water Control Board may result in guidelines which would allow additional materials to be reused, as well as protection of Delta resource values. 4

The Commission supports the research and work carried out to date and supports additional research toward the goal of reuse of dredged material for Delta levee maintenance and strengthening.

Sincerely,

Margit Aramburu
Executive Director

cc: Delta Protection Commission

Responses to the DPC — Delta Protection Commission, letter dated June 19, 1996

1. Statement noted.

2. Statement noted. As explained in section 4.1, the LTMS planning area does not include the Delta region. This does not preclude the potential beneficial reuse of material in this area. Rather, the reuse of dredged material for Delta levee repair and stabilization is considered by the LTMS agencies to be quite feasible. However, the dredging and associated disposal activities in the Delta region were not included in this document. Delta region dredged material characteristics were also not examined. The LTMS agencies agree with the Delta Protection Commission that such analyses are necessary and support such endeavors. In regard to evaluation of potential volumetric material needs in the Delta region, the LTMS agencies used the best available information at the time, provided by the DWR. It was clear that the levee repair and stabilization needs in the Delta far exceed the availability of suitable material generated in the LTMS planning area.

   Section 2.6.2 of the Final EIS/EIR has been expanded to note that LTMS is not, itself, directly making decisions about sediment quality or other specific dredging-related issues in the Delta, which is outside the official LTMS study area. However, please see the responses to CDWR comment 4 and CVRWQCB comments 4 and 5.

3. As section 4.4.4.5 recognizes, the potential dredged material reuse volume estimates (capacities) were developed for the LTMS for planning purposes only. These estimates are speculative, based on available information. They are not intended to predict with any degree of certainty the actual breakdown percentages of reuse volumes by reuse type. Rather, these estimates were developed as potential reuse scenarios over the 50-year LTMS planning period. In regard to the estimates derived for the potential reuse of dredged material for levee maintenance and stabilization, the estimates were developed to emphasize the current limitations of dredged material reuse in the Delta region due to water quality concerns. It was not intended to imply that levee maintenance and stabilization using dredged material could not occur in other areas of the Estuary where such water quality concerns would likely be less of a concern.

   The reuse scenarios described in section 4.4.4 were based on analyses presented in LTMS (1995d) ("Reuse/Upland Site Ranking, Analysis and Documentation") and in Appendix N. They were developed to be reasonable examples (as opposed to actual expected volumes), in that specific sites (and therefore the specific volumes of dredged material that could be accommodated at those sites) are not known at this time. Sections 4.4.4 and 4.4.4.5 have been revised in the Final EIS/EIR to reflect additional potential opportunities for dredged material reuse in the Delta.

4. Section 4.4.4.2 of the Draft EIS/EIR recognizes the potential need for large volumes of material for levee maintenance and stabilization activities in the Delta region over the 50-year LTMS planning period. However, this section of the document also acknowledges that existing regulatory statutes and environmental concerns greatly limit the current use of dredged material in this region. Although the use of dredged material in the Delta region would help offset the need to acquire material from other sources, the environmental concerns that currently limit such use of dredged material cannot be ignored. Projects such as the Jersey Island Dredged Material Reuse Project demonstrates the ability to safely use dredged material from areas of the San Francisco Bay Estuary for Delta levee maintenance and stabilization, but additional demonstration projects and associated water quality impact analyses will be necessary before wide-scale dredged material reuse in the Delta could be implemented.

   As discussed in the responses to other comments, the LTMS is not a finite program. Rather, it is ongoing and designed to allow for management updates based on the availability of information. This would include data derived from any ongoing or future analysis of beneficial reuse of dredged material or demonstration projects in the Delta region.

AUG-21-'96 WED 08:24 ID: TEL NO:

Notice of Completion

Appendix F

SEE NOTE below
SCH # 96052007

Mail to: State Clearinghouse, 1400 Tenth Street, Sacramento, CA 95814 916/445-0613

Project Title: Long-Term Management Strategy (LTMS) for the Placement of Dredged Material in the San Francisco Bay Region

Lead Agency: State Water Resources Control Board — Contact Person: Jim Sutton, Sr. Environmental Spec.

Street Address: 901 P Street, P.O. Box 2000 — Phone: (916) 657-2190

City: Sacramento — Zip: 95812-2000 — County: Sacramento

Project Location

County: Bay Area and Delta Counties — City/Nearest Community: San Francisco, Oakland, Redwood City, Vallejo, Martinez, San Rafael, Antioch, etc.

Cross Streets: N/A — Total Acres: N/A

Assessor's Parcel No.: N/A — Section: N/A — Twp.: N/A — Range: N/A — Base: N/A

Within 2 Miles: State Hwy #: N/A — Waterways: all San Francisco Bay Region shipping channels

Airports: N/A — Railways: N/A — Schools: N/A

Document Type

CEQA: _ NOP _ Supplement/Subsequent _ Early Cons _ Neg Dec X Draft EIR

NEPA: _ NOI _ EA X Draft EIS _ FONSI

OTHER: X Joint Document _ Final Document _ Other

Local Action Type

_ General Plan Update _ General Plan Amendment _ General Plan Element _ Community Plan

_ Specific Plan _ Master Plan _ Planned Unit Development _ Site Plan

_ Rezone _ Prezone _ Use Permit _ Land Use (Subdivision, Parcel Map, Tract Map, etc.)

_ Annexation _ Redevelopment _ Coastal Permit _ Other

Development Type

_ Residential: Units ____ Acres ____

_ Office: Sq.ft. ____ Acres ____ Employees ____

_ Commercial: Sq.ft. ____ Acres ____ Employees ____

_ Industrial: Sq.ft. ____ Acres ____ Employees ____

_ Educational: ____

_ Recreational: ____

_ Water Facilities: Type ____ MGD ____

X Transportation: Type Shipping (policy)

_ Mining: Mineral ____

_ Power: Type ____

_ Waste Treatment: Type ____

_ Hazardous Waste: Type ____

_ Other: ____

Project Issues Discussed in Document

_ Aesthetic/Visual
_ Agricultural Land
X Air Quality
_ Archeological/Historical
_ Coastal Zone
_ Drainage/Absorption
X Economic/Jobs
_ Fiscal
_ Flood Plain/Flooding
_ Forest Land/Fire Hazard
X Geologic/Seismic
_ Minerals
_ Noise
_ Population/Housing Balance
X Public Services/Facilities
X Recreation/Parks
_ Schools/Universities
_ Septic Systems
_ Sewer Capacity
_ Soil Erosion/Compaction/Grading
_ Solid Waste
_ Toxic/Hazardous
_ Traffic/Circulation
_ Vegetation
X Water Quality
_ Water Supply/Groundwater
X Wetland Riparian
X Wildlife
_ Growth Inducing
_ Landuse
_ Cumulative Effects
_ Other

Present Land Use/Zoning/General Plan Use

Project Description

This document was jointly prepared by the State Water Resources Control Board, San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board, San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Region IX and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. It describes three acceptable options for disposal of approximately 320 million cubic yards of sediment which must be dredged from Bay area shipping channels in the next 50 years. These options include: 1) using sediment for wetland reseration, landfill cover and levee repair; 2) disposing it at designated sites in San Francisco Bay; and 3) disposing it at a designated ocean site off the continental shelf. Each disposal option would result in different degrees of environmental benefits, impacts, and economic costs; some of these benefits, impacts and costs may be significant. The draft EIS/EIR develops a set of alternative policies which represent different ways of distributing dredged material among the three disposal environments. The final policy alternative will be selected after review of public comments. The proposed policies will not affect any listed toxic site in the region.

State Clearinghouse Contact: Ms. Dana Lidster (916) 445-0613

State Review Began: 5-1-96

Dept. Review to Agency 6-7

Agency Rev to SCH 6-12

SCH COMPLIANCE 6-14

Please note SCH Number on all Comments

96052 007

Please forward late comments directly to the Lead Agency

AQMD/APCD 2 Resources: 5, 3

96052 007

Project Sent to the following State Agencies

X Resources
___ Boating
___ Coastal Comm
___ Coastal Cnsrv
___ Colorado Rvr Bd
X Conservation
X Fish & Game # 3
___ Delta Protection Commission
___ Forestry
X Parks & Rec/OHP
___ Reclamation
___ BCDC
X DWR
___ OES
___ Bus Transp Hous
___ Aeronautics
___ CHP
X Caltrans # 4
___ Trans Planning
___ Housing & Devel
___ Health & Welfare
___ Drinking H2O
___ Medical Waste

State/Consumer Svcs
___ General Services
___ Cal/EPA
X ARB
___ CA Waste Mgmt Bd
___ SWRCB: Grants
___ SWRCB: Delta
X SWRCB: Wtr Quality
___ SWRCB: Wtr Rights
X Reg. WQCB # 2
___ DTSC/CTC

Yth/Adlt Corrections
___ Corrections
___ Independent Comm
___ Energy Comm
___ NAHC
___ PUC
___ Santa Mn Mtns
X State Lands Comm
___ Tahoe Rgl Plng
___ Other: ____

This facsimile is not a comment on the Draft EIS/EIR, so no response is needed.

Letters from City and County Agencies

City of Alameda • California

July 16, 1996

Ms. Karen Mason
LTMS EIS/EIR Coordinator
c/o U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Region 9
75 Hawthorne Street (W-3-3)
San Francisco, CA 94105-3901

RE: **Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement/ Environmental Impact Report (EIS/EIR) - Long Term Management Strategy for the Placement of Dredged Material in the San Francisco Bay Region**

Dear Ms. Mason:

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on the above EIS/EIR. The City of Alameda has the following comments:

1. Alameda Borrow Pit The Alameda Borrow Area adjacent to Bay Farm Island has been suggested in the past as a possible in-Bay disposal site. While it represents an attractive, economical disposal site, it also has the potential for significant environmental impacts. In particular, Alameda is concerned about sedimentation impacts along the City's shoreline, impacts on ferry operations both during disposal and in the long term, impacts from the disposal of contaminated materials, and the impacts on biological resources, such as the eelgrass beds, both during disposal and in the long term. 1a

Alameda does not oppose the use of the Borrow Area, but will not support its use unless we are convinced that all impacts have been completely and accurately assessed, that the Borrow Area is the best alternative considering costs and consequences, that the mitigations are practical and will be fully implemented, and there is commitment for environmental monitoring to confirm that the mitigations have been effective and there are no adverse impacts. 1b

2. Alameda Naval Air Station Alameda would only support the use of property at the Naval Air Station Alameda for a NUAD rehandling facility if the facility were found consistent with the policies of the Community Reuse Plan and long-range goals of the City for economic development. Alameda does not oppose the concept of a rehandling facility at the station, particularly as an interim use, but will not support such a use unless we are convinced that all impacts have been completely and accurately assessed and there are no adverse impacts and the use will not impact other objectives of redevelopment of the site. 2

Office of the City Manager

East Wing, Historic Alameda High School
2250 Central Avenue, Room 300 • 94501
510 748.4505 • Fax 510 748.4504 • TDD 510 522.7538

3 | 3. Dredge Materials Projections The Mid- and High-range projections for estimating disposal material should include dredging by the Port of Oakland to -50 feet, not -45 feet, since your discussion notes that dredged channels in excess of -50 feet are not uncommon and the Port of Oakland has already expressed a desire for additional deepening.

4 | 4. Corrections to Figures Please revise various figures throughout the document to depict location of Alameda island. See Figures 3.2-22 and 23 for examples of omissions.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment.

Sincerely,

William C. Norton
City Manager

WCN:CE

xc: City Attorney
Planning Director
Executive Director, ARRA
Public Works Director

G:\ENVIRREV\LTMSCOM.LTR
FILE: ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW - LTMS

Responses to Alameda — City of Alameda, letter dated July 16, 1996

1a. Statement noted. The Draft EIS/EIR attempted to address the issues the City of Alameda raises in regard to in-Bay disposal of dredged material. A discussion regarding the environmental consequences of the alternative disposal environments appears in Chapter 6 of the EIS/EIR. In addition, the preferred alternative requires the greatest decrease in in-Bay disposal of all of the final alternatives. This alternative should reduce the potential impacts the City is concerned about.

1b. Statement noted. The LTMS agencies are not considering any new multi-user disposal sites at this time. Although the Alameda Borrow Pits have been evaluated as a potential alternative in some EIS/EIRs for specific disposal projects, they cannot be used without a project-specific NEPA/CEQA evaluation.

2. Statement noted. The issue of local approval of individual dredged material placement projects is implicit with required siting and environmental review for each project on a case-by-case basis in accordance with CEQA and NEPA regulations.

3. It is true that the dredging volume planning estimate used in the EIS/EIR does not specifically include the proposed project to deepen the Port of Oakland to -50 feet (this project could involve up to ~20 mcy of dredging). However, the estimate did include the J.F. Baldwin Phase III project (9 mcy), which now may involve substantially less dredging than originally thought. In addition, the dredging estimate assumed that the actual new-work dredging volume would be twice as much as estimated by the currently foreseeable specific projects, i.e., currently unknown future new-work projects would occur. Therefore, the LTMS agencies believe that the dredging volume estimate used in the EIS/EIR for planning purposes is robust enough that it does not need to be revised based on the possibility of the Port of Oakland deepening to -50 feet. Please refer to section 3.1.2 and Appendix E for additional information.

4. Figures 1.3-1, 2.2-1, 3.2-22, and 3.2-23 have been revised to indicate the location of Alameda Island.

THE CITY OF BENICIA CALIFORNIA

CITY HALL • 250 EAST L STREET • BENICIA, CA 94510 • (707) 746-4212 • FAX (707) 747-8120

Public Works Department

July 17, 1996

Ms. Karen Mason, LTMS Coordinator
U. S. EPA, Region IX
75 Hawthorne Street
San Francisco, CA 94105

Re: **Long-Term Management Strategy for Dredged Material Disposal (LTMS) - Draft EIS-EIR**

Dear Ms. Mason:

We have reviewed the referenced document and offer the following comments.

1. The need to restrict access or close the Carquinez Strait disposal site from October 15 to May 31 is unsubstantiated. Adequate supporting evidence has not been provided to demonstrate that adverse impacts result to either the winter-run chinook salmon juveniles or the migrating steelhead trout. 1

2. Sufficient in-Bay disposal capacity must remain available to the owners and operators of small recreational boat marinas, such as the Benicia Marina, in order to maintain economic viability of those operations. Moreover, from a practical standpoint, maintenance dredging equipment capable of ocean disposal cannot maneuver in shallow draft marinas. 2

3. The cost of upland disposal is exorbitant and will be for the foreseeable future. The timely development of suitable upland sites does not appear possible in light of the extensive environmental and other regulatory hurdles which will need to be overcome. Again, sufficient in-Bay disposal capacity must remain available for small maintenance dredging activities. 3

4. The alternatives examined did not include an analysis of other, or additional, in-Bay disposal locations. Recognition of the significant drawbacks of the alternatives presented, particularly in terms of economic feasibility, dictates that such options be considered. 4

5. 5 | Based upon the information given, we appear to be trading negligible or non-existent, and above all else undocumented, environmental impacts for ones of proven detrimental significance. Of note are the increased fossil fuel consumption and air quality impacts that will result due to the greater distances over which dredged sediments will have to be transported to reach either the ocean or upland sites.

6. 6 | The evaluation of the suggested alternatives is subjective and wanting in many areas for detailed analysis of the impacts, particularly economic practicability.

7. 7 | From a global perspective, we are concerned that the costs associated with transitioning from current conditions to Alternatives 1, 2, or 3 will seriously jeopardize the Bay area's competitive position in shipping and West Coast trade, resulting in the loss of jobs and economic vitality.

8. 8 | The document totally ignores the issue of sediment testing. What needs to be addressed is how testing is to be used to evaluate the acceptability of sediment for disposal. There is a lack of agreement on what the chemical and biological results mean for the purpose of determining environmental harm, and there appear to be no consistent effects-based evaluative criteria. Scientifically justified interpretive guidelines must be prepared.

9 | In closing, we ask that the Draft EIS-EIR and the selection of a policy alternative **not** be finalized until the environmental impacts of a range of alternatives, including alternative in-Bay disposal sites, have been thoroughly evaluated; the necessary economic evaluation has been performed to identify those alternatives which are feasible; and justifiable interpretive guidelines have been developed for sediment testing.

Sincerely yours,

Chris Tomasik
Management Assistant II

cc: Public Works Director
Assistant Public Works Director
Benicia Harbor Corporation

Responses to Benicia — City of Benicia, letter dated July 17, 1996

1. The period of restriction for the Carquinez disposal site has been reduced to January 1 through May 31. The NMFS has indicated that steelhead trout need to be protected in the Carquinez Strait area from January 1 through May 31 instead of October 15 through December 31. The Carquinez disposal site is located in an area through which fish protected by the Endangered Species Act migrate.

2. Statement noted. A small dredger policy-level mitigation measure is discussed in the EIS/EIR (see section 6.3.1). Special socioeconomic consideration will be given to small dredgers to ensure feasible disposal options are available. Techniques that minimize potential economic impact will be incorporated, as appropriate, into the Management Plan and in specific Site Management and Monitoring Plans (SMMPs) for the in-Bay sites. Techniques may include reserving some of the available capacity at the least expensive disposal or reuse sites. The situation of the small dredger is also discussed in the new discussion of the transition to Alternative 3 (section 6.5) in the Final EIS/EIR.

3. Statement noted. Achieving the preferred long-term disposal distribution will require disposal options that promote a reduction in the use of in-Bay sites. Special socioeconomic consideration will be given to small dredgers to ensure feasible disposal options are available (see section 6.3.1). Small dredger provisions will be outlined in greater detail in the LTMS Management Plan.

4. Alternative sites for dredged material have been addressed previously in other LTMS documents such as "Work Element H — Evaluation of In-Bay Disposal Sites." In addition, Appendix E of the Draft EIS/EIR describes some of the in-Bay sites evaluated such as the Bay Farm Island Borrow Pit, Golden Gate Bridge Site (North Tower), and San Francisco Bar Channel Site. However, no new disposal sites are contemplated. Please see the response to Alameda comment 1b.

5. The LTMS is weighing tradeoffs to determine the best balance overall for the distribution of dredged material among the three placement environments, while maximizing environmental benefits to the extent practicable. This is balanced by not allowing high volumes in any one disposal environment. Impacts associated with in-Bay disposal are not undocumented in the Draft EIS/EIR, and are discussed in a "generic analysis" in section 6.1. Please see also the response to Krone comment 5.

   Studies have been conducted on the behavior and fate of sediments in the Estuary, the bioavailability of contaminants released by the disposal of dredged material, and how dredging and disposal activities can be better managed to have a minimal adverse impact on the in-Bay environment. The information collected has revealed that dredge and disposal activities do impact Bay resources, however, the relative significance of these impacts is unclear in some cases. Studies have shown, however, that the more volume that is disposed in-Bay and the greater the frequency of disposal events, the more adverse effects are likely to occur (see Chapter 6).

   As section 2.2.3 indicates, the San Francisco Bay is already facing a growing number of environmental impacts as a result of (1) intensified land use, (2) decline of biological resources, (3) freshwater diversion and altered flow regime, (4) increased pollutants, and (5) dredging and waterway modification. Recently, many programs, such as the Estuary Program on a national level, are focusing on the health of waterways and the need to better manage our resources. Managing dredging and disposal activities to minimize adverse effects to the environment is one step in improving the conditions in the San Francisco Bay. Although some of the disposal management techniques proposed in this EIS/EIR may result in increased air pollution or other environmental impacts, a balance of environmental impacts and tradeoffs based on their ability to be mitigated or avoided will result from the examination conducted through this document.

6. Please see the responses to Oakland comments 24, 29, 33a, and 33c.

7. Please see the responses to BDAC comment 3, BPC comment 18, Redwood comment 5c, and Krone comment 8.

8. Scientific guidelines exist now. However, these guidelines are not as simple as a list of standards, for the reasons discussed in section 3.2, and in the response above to DOC comment 5. We expect that sediment testing requirements will change over time as the state of science advances. However, test requirements do not vary by alternative and do not affect the selection of an alternative in the EIS/EIR. Please see the responses to Benicia comments 4 and 6; Foster City comment 5; and BPC comment 3c.

9. Please see the responses to BPC comments 1, 3c, and 4.

City of Foster City

ESTERO MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT

610 FOSTER CITY BOULEVARD
FOSTER CITY, CA 94404-2299
(415) 349-1200
FAX: (415) 574-3483

July 17, 1996

Ms. Karen Mason, LTMS Coordinator
U.S. EPA, Region IX
75 Hawthorne Street
San Francisco, CA 94105

SUBJECT: LTMS DRAFT EIS-EIR COMMENTS

Dear Ms. Mason:

The City of Foster City joins with other organizations such as the Northern California Marine Association, the California Marine Affairs and Navigation Conference, the California Marine Parks and Harbors Association, and the Bay Planning Commission in supporting the Long Term Management Strategy (LTMS) process to develop and implement a strategy that will result in the predictable and economical management of dredging and placement of dredged materials without significant adverse environmental impacts.

Required dredging to support navigation to and within small harbors and marinas can be considered insignificant compared to large new work and maintenance projects in support of Federal channels and ports. Smaller dredging activities cannot take advantage of the economy of scale enjoyed by larger projects. Therefore, an economical option, such as continued in-bay disposal, is required for municipalities, water dependent properties, small harbors, and recreational marinas. Although Section 1.6.2 of the Executive Summary discusses special consideration for "minor dredger" projects, it fails to define a minor dredger. Smaller projects should be defined on the basis of amounts of material dredged rather than depths attained. | 1

Paragraph 3.1 of the document implies that dredging may only be required to support slips in marinas. This section should be expanded to reflect the need to dredge areas for maintaining storm drainage capacities and supporting recreational lagoons, launch ramps, and navigation channels that provide access between small harbors, marinas and open waters. | 2

Demonstration projects for beneficial reuse, described throughout the document, have been relatively expensive compared to aquatic disposal. These projects, including Jersey Island and Sonoma Baylands, continue to incur unpredictable costs in terms of maintenance and monitoring. They do not provide practicable alternatives for smaller, discrete dredging projects. | 3

Sediment quality testing is another problematic dredging element. Although the Dredged Material Management Office (DMMO), as described in Section 3.2.5.4, is a vast improvement in obtaining | 4

T:\PWLTR\071796A.SL

4 early comments on a proposed Sampling and Analysis Plan (SAP), the process itself is still unpredictable and subjective. The consolidated Regional Implementation Manual, including more systematic use of the tiered approach to dredging, particularly for Tier I exclusion for projects showing a history of maintenance dredging of clean material, would be a vast improvement over the current situation. Sampling, testing and analysis often exceeds $1.00 per cubic yard in relatively small projects.

5 Foster City's primary concerns are to have flexibility of disposal options. An array of cost-effective disposal solutions is necessary to meet various project requirements and financial constraints. These alternatives need to be evaluated based on the results of the sediment evaluation. Thus, we strongly recommend the development of consistent interpretive guidelines for sediment testing and sampling which drives the selection of disposal options that are environmentally sound.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on the Draft EIS-EIR for the LTMS. Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Charles F. Loucks
Director of Public Works

cc: Subject
Chron

T:\PWLTR\071796A.SL

Responses to Foster City — City of Foster City, letter dated July 17, 1996

1. The definition of "small dredgers" used in the EIS/EIR is given in section 4.6.2.1. This definition is based not only on volume, but also on dredging depth, because depth generally separates smaller facilities (e.g., recreational marinas) from larger commercial facilities that often have more opportunities for recouping or passing along any increased dredging-related costs. Socioeconomic effects on "small dredgers" are discussed in section 6.2.3.2, and section 6.3.1 discusses a special policy-level mitigation measure based on the EIS/EIR finding that, as a group, "small dredgers" are relatively the most susceptible to potentially significant economic consequences under any of the alternatives. In the occasional cases of "small dredger" projects generating large volumes, these are usually dredged infrequently such that their average annual volumes are not typically very great. Most "small dredger" projects generate less than 50,000 cubic yards of dredged material per year on average and, as stated in section 4.6.2.1, the total volume for all "small dredger" projects combined ranged from 150,000 to 267,060 cubic yards in the years 1991 through 1993.

2. The very general statements in section 3.1 include all dredging associated with navigational dredging of both large commercial ports and smaller facilities including recreational marinas, and the channels supporting them. Dredging to maintain or increase storm drains or flood control channels is outside the scope of LTMS and is not specifically addressed by this EIS/EIR.

3. The issue of practicability of implementing a reuse alternative on small dredgers is understood by the LTMS member agencies. This issue was introduced in Chapter 6 (section 6.3.1) of the Draft EIS/EIR and will be addressed in the LTMS Management Plan. A small dredger set-aside is also described in the new discussion of how the transition to the preferred alternative, Alternative 3, will be implemented (see Chapter 6). See also the responses to Benicia comment 2 and GLDDC comment 5.

4. Chapter 3 of the EIS/EIR (section 3.2.5.4) discusses opportunities to streamline sediment testing. These may include expanded use of "Tier I" evaluations: this is where sufficient information exists from previous sediment evaluations such that disposal decisions can be made with little or no additional testing. Decisions about the sufficiency of information at Tier I are made by the LTMS agencies on a case-by-case basis; however, the LTMS Management Plan and Regional Implementation Manual will address this issue in more detail.

5. Flexibility of disposal options is needed on a regional basis and all the alternatives include disposal of dredged material in three different environments (in-Bay, ocean, and UWR). Alternative 3, the preferred alternative, involves 20 percent in-Bay disposal and 40 percent disposal in both the ocean and UWR environment. Distributing the dredged material among the three placement environments, in a manner that minimizes environmental impacts and maximizes environmental benefits in an economically sound manner, will maintain flexibility (see section 5.2, Alternatives Development, for more details on disposal options).

   With respect to sediment testing/evaluation, there are testing methods and guidelines exist for each disposal environment now, but they have not necessarily been coordinated with each other in the past. A Regional Implementation Manual (RIM) is planned which will specify consistent testing guidelines for each environment. One goal for the RIM will be to make in-Bay and ocean test requirements as consistent as possible (as is occurring nationally). The LTMS agencies have proposed a Sediment Classification Framework that is expected to be incorporated in the Management Plan; this will make the various upland testing requirements more consistent, as well.

City of San Leandro
Civic Center, 835 E. 14th Street
San Leandro, California 94577

July 18, 1996

LTMS EIS/EIR Coordinator
c/o U.S. Environment Protection Agency
Region 9 (W-3-3)
75 Hawthorn Street
San Francisco, CA 94105-3901

Dear Sir/Madam:

The City of San Leandro has reviewed the LTMS Draft EIS/EIR and wishes to commend the authoring agencies on reaching this important stage in examining the long-term dredged material management needs of the San Francisco Bay Estuary. Thank you for the opportunity to review and respond to the document as the City has a significant amount of experience relating to the issues of concern in the LTMS Draft EIR/EIS.

The Draft EIS/EIR states on page 1-10 that the document, and comments received in response to it, will be used as a basis for selecting a preferred alternative management strategy. The City recommends Alternative 1 (Emphasize Aquatic Disposal) be the preferred alternative with the caveat that the LTMS committee show that this is financially feasible . We request that the EIS/EIR include actual case histories, and consider experiences such as San Leandro's, which do not confirm the financial feasibility of upland disposal. The City supports the approach for minimizing the economic impacts to minor dredgers such as the City of San Leandro. 1

Under any of the action alternatives considered in the document, the strategy would be to substantially increase the quantities of dredged material disposed of at upland locations, including disposal coupled with wetland habitat creation and/or restoration. As one of the few active upland disposal site operators in the Bay Area, the City wishes to share for the benefit of agency decision-makers its recent experience in managing a "rehandling" site for ultimate upland disposal. 2

As noted on page 3-10 in the Draft EIS/EIR, the City of San Leandro has been among the relatively few operators of a re-handling site in the Bay Area. The City's onshore site was established in 1973 and has been used for dredged material placement in 1973, 1977, 1984, 1989 and 1993. Approximately 200,000 to 300,000 cubic yards of material are dredged during each four-year maintenance dredging cycle to maintain the San Leandro Marina and federal entrance channel.

The City has recently implemented a comprehensive management plan for its existing 100-acre site as part of a mitigation package developed to satisfy regulatory requirements. The management plan was developed for the overall purpose of enhancing the value of the City's Dredged Material Management Site (DMMS), working in conjunction with adjacent wetlands, as seasonal shorebird and other water bird habitat in a manner compatible with its primary function of dredged material drying and temporary storage.

2 At an initial cost of over $2 million in 1989, the City reconfigured the site by constructing new levees, removing previously deposited dredged material to achieve suitable elevations for habitat enhancement. The site reconfiguration project also constructed islands within the site to increase shoreline edge and provide resting habitat for water birds, and installed a number of weirs and culverts to enable appropriate water circulation, including ability to flood the site seasonally with tidal waters from the San Francisco Bay. In addition, as mitigation for the original establishment of the dredge disposal site in 1973 in an area that was once wetland, the City restored tidal action to approximately 172 acres of adjacent diked wetlands at a cost in excess of $1 million.

The San Leandro DMMS will begin its first full season of operation as a shorebird habitat in the fall of 1996. Dried dredged material removed from the site has thus far been re-used beneficially as cover material for nearby sanitary landfills and also in the City's adjacent wetland restoration project. While implementation of the City's DMMS management plan is expected to demonstrate that dredged material management and habitat management can beneficially coexist, the City faces considerable economic pressures as it copes with the high cost of disposing its dredged material upland. The requirement to "double handle" the material and truck it offsite has resulted in significant expenditures on the City's part. The unit cost for upland disposal of dredged material using the on-shore DMMS has been as high as $12.00 per cubic yard in addition to the cost of dredging, site monitoring, environmental documentation, ground water monitoring and City administration costs. This unit cost is substantially higher than in-bay disposal.

3 Traffic, air quality and noise impacts must also be considered. The previous two disposal episodes completed by the City moved approximately 200,000 cubic yards of dried dredged material requiring in excess of 12,000 semi-end dump truck trips through residential areas between the City's re-handling site and the upland deposit sites.

As noted in Section 7.3 of the Draft EIS/EIR, current federal financing policies provide economic disincentives for local entities such as San Leandro to develop and maintain upland reuse sites. The City strongly supports efforts to revise policies so that they provide financial incentives for upland discharge of dredged material.

To summarize, the City has spent over $3 million to construct and mitigate a 100 acre dredged material re-handling site. Additionally, the City has spent in excess of $12.00 per cubic yard to dry, condition and transfer the material to final deposit sites.

4 In conclusion, the City urges the agencies to carefully consider the long-term feasibility of doubling to quadrupling the upland/wetland reuse as a dredged material management mechanism. While the San Leandro experience appears likely to demonstrate that this disposal approach may be environmentally desirable and beneficial, there remain serious questions with regard to the financial feasibility and practicability of this approach, particularly for the smaller ports and harbors of the Bay Area.

Sincerely,

William K. Algire, Director
Engineering and Transportation

WKA:GPM:as
g:\engineer\gregm\eir-com.doc

Responses to San Leandro — City of San Leandro, letter dated July 18, 1996

1. Statement noted. The agencies have selected Alternative 3 as best meeting the overall needs of the region and the overall goals of the LTMS. Any individual upland or beneficial use project must still be determined "practicable" on its own merits. See the new discussion of how the transition to Alternative 3 will be implemented over time (section 6.5). Even the "small dredger policy" will allow in-Bay disposal only for projects for which upland or beneficial reuse projects are not practicable. Please see the response to DOC comment 2.

2. The LTMS Management Plan will address the issues identified in the comment.

3. Statement noted. Chapter 6 of the EIS/EIR provides comparisons and analyses of traffic, air quality, and noise impacts associated with the three placement environments and the final alternatives. Impacts associated with these issue areas would also be evaluated on a site-specific basis, as mandated by CEQA and NEPA. Section 7.3 (Financing Options to Promote Beneficial Reuse) addresses potential options for financial incentives.

4. Statement noted. Revised Chapter 6 (section 6.5) discusses how a transition from current disposal practices to increased upland/wetland reuse would occur. A transition period would be required to identify and prepare upland sites (e.g., permitting and planning), as well as to determine the economic feasibility of sites and funding mechanisms that could be used to support projects. Please see the responses to Foster City comment 3 and San Leandro comment 1.

City and County of San Francisco

Department of Public Works
Project Management

June 17, 1996

LTMS EIS/EIR Comments
c/o US Environmental Protection Agency
Region 9 (W-3-3)
75 Hawthorne Street
San Francisco, CA 94947
Attn: Brian Ross

Re: City and County of San Francisco comments related to the draft EIR/EIS entitled *Long-term Management Strategy for the Placement of Dredged Material in the San Francisco Bay Region.*

Reference: Moffet & Nichols Engineers. *Sediment Transport Processes Study, Ocean Beach San Francisco, California.* Report prepared for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. San Francisco, CA. July 31, 1995.

Dear Mr. Ross,

The City and County of San Francisco has several comments regarding the draft EIS/EIR proposing revisions to current San Francisco Bay dredging practices. In particular, our concerns are how such changes might affect Ocean Beach on San Francisco's western shore. 1

Ocean Beach is a valuable public resource, providing many recreational opportunities and unparalleled scenic vistas for citizens and tourists alike. Ocean Beach is one of the City's most popular destinations, receiving approximately 3 million visits per year. In addition the beach provides scarce wildlife habitat for numerous species of plants, animals and birds, including such endangered species as the western snowy plover and the bank swallow.

The City of San Francisco Bureau of Engineering has worked on issues related to beach erosion on the City's Ocean Beach for many years. Recent erosion on the beach south of Sloat Boulevard. has damaged protective dunes and beach access points, eliminated useable beach above the surf line and threatened major, city-owned infrastructure. Recent evidence suggests that beach erosion processes may, in part, be linked to dredging activities. Consequently, the City is concerned with proposed changes in dredging policy that may effect mechanisms for sand erosion and transport in the vicinity of the City's western shore. Specifically, the City and County of San Francisco has the following comments: 2

30 VAN NESS AVENUE, SAN FRANCISCO, CA (415) 558-4000 / FAX (415) 558-4519

- 3 Ocean Beach is linked by sand transport mechanism to the San Francisco Bar and to sand deposits inside the Bay. A recent study by Moffet and Nichols Engineers, Inc. states that "Ocean Beach is within a cell that includes the ebb and flood bars of San Francisco Bay, the tidal exchange through the Golden Gate and the sandy waterfront on the north side of San Francisco." The study also suggests that Ocean Beach sand was derived from the Bay channel west of Carquinez Strait and may still receive significant quantities of sand from this source in the future. Dredging in the Bay could impact these sand transport mechanisms, resulting in unknown, negative consequences for Ocean Beach. In addition, several locations inside San Francisco Bay have eroding shorelines (e.g. west shore of Alameda Island). Diversion of dredged silts or clays from in-Bay disposal would probably not exacerbate these problems. However, diversion of sandy material to disposal outside of the Bay system could have an adverse effect on shoreline stability. There is virtually no discussion of this issue in the EIS. Therefore, while sand transport mechanisms throughout the Bay are not well understood, the city feels that they should be considered in any future policy regarding bay dredging.

- 4 San Francisco Bar Channel dredging practices seem to have an impact on sand deposition at Ocean Beach. The Moffet and Nichols study states that the bar is "linked to Ocean Beach as a sand source." The study also suggests that dredging of the bar channel and disposal offshore of the bar prior to 1971 may have disrupted the natural sand supply to the beach. Moffet and Nichols conclude that escalated shoreline erosion between 1948 and 1971 may have been related to these dredging and disposal practices. The study goes on to state that the "post-1971 dredging practice of disposal on the Bar is hypothesized to have restored the natural supply of sand to the beach." In light of the above information the City would oppose any future changes to the dredging policy that would remove large amounts of dredge spoils from the area.

- 5 It is the City's opinion that Ocean Beach has, indeed, benefited from the current practice of disposal of dredging spoils on the near-shore side of the bar. This opinion is also shared by the California Coastal Commission.

The above comments do not represent the full policy of the City and County of San Francisco. If you have any questions regarding this matter please call David Radke at 558-4525. Thank you.

Sincerely yours,

Karen Kubick

Karen Kubick
Project Manager