



Estuary Blueprint 2016

Public Comments

	Date Received	Name & Affiliation	Comment on Draft CCMP (09/17/2015)
General Comments	11/14/2015	Sandra Scoggin San Francisco Bay Joint Venture	<p>TOC – SIDEBARS/BOXES – Major Plans – I think the SFBJV Implementation Plan should be included. I think that the more we can cross reference one another's efforts, the clearer our areas of overlap and unique niches will be for our audiences. Pg 8, Goal 2 e. "Increase resilience of communities at risk..." is this referencing natural communities or human communities or is it left vague because it is meant to address both? It seems this set of goals is focused on wildlife species and habitat resiliency and ecological function, but I don't know if I'm just coming from my bias. This goal sounds like you may actually be referring to human communities and if so, that should be made clear. In general, I think it could be emphasized that there are many collaborative efforts are working closely together to move these actions forward. I think it is obvious to those of us immersed in it and if that is the main audience, disregard the suggestion. But if this will also be a tool to reach out to new partners or there are other audiences, please consider. Pg 8, Goal 2 e. "Increase resilience of communities at risk..." is this referencing natural communities or human communities or is it left vague because it is meant to address both? It seems this set of goals is focused on wildlife species and habitat resiliency and ecological function, but I don't know if I'm just coming from my bias. This goal sounds like you may actually be referring to human communities and if so, that should be made clear.</p> <p>Side note - Maybe there are other places it could be made clear that there are many collaborative efforts are working closely together to move these actions forward. I think it is obvious to those of us immersed in it and if that is the main audience, disregard that suggestion.</p>
General Comments	11/13/2015	Katherine Smith UC Davis	<p>Table Of Contents: None of the Suisun plans are listed as planned for Sidebars/Boxes. Make sure to include them, especially since they are classifying Suisun as Poor habitat. Introduction: Plan will be reviewed every five years, make sure action-specific monitoring happens on an appropriate time scale. Findings: What are the criteria used to classify the conditions of the Lower and Upper Estuaries? Is it fair to lump Suisun with the Delta? Why is Suisun considered poor? The vast majority of the acreage is managed for wildlife.</p>
General Comments	10/09/2015	Becky Tuden City of Oakland Public Works – Watershed Division	<p>Put name San Francisco Estuary on Cover Riparian Goals need work. Should include more milestones beyond assessment and data gaps. How about guidance on setbacks and model ordinances on creek protection. Could there be a purchase of riparian acreage into public ownership/protection (similar to wetlands?) Carbon sequestration – good idea but it is not just in wetlands – consider green infrastructure, tree planting etc. as options for sequestration.</p>
General Comments	11/13/2015	Pat Mepelli Cargill	<p>Under the Introduction/Background, the document states that "we know we can never recover that estuary..." (referring to the Estuary prior to European settlement). It should be acknowledged that there are thousands of acres of former salt ponds in need of funding for restoration, and once restored, will arguably create a thriving ecology along the edge of the Bay. Although the document hints to this point under some of the Action items, it should highlight the progress that has been made since the original CCMP was adopted. SFEP should take this opportunity to recognize the successes and lands that have been both acquired and restored since 1992. Unfortunately this document fails to do that.</p> <p>With the new emphasis being the need to plan and adapt to climate change, future restoration projects need to incorporate design features as part of the adaptive management approach that will allow for either natural or assisted adaptation. The statement under "WHAT WILL IT TAKE TO ACHIEVE A HEALTHY ESTUARY?" stating that we need to "allow for tidal wetlands to migrate landwards" is not only not necessary, but could be viewed by those adjacent land owners as a taking if mapped or shown for this use in future plans.</p>

General Comments	11/10/2015	Nicole Dobroski State Lands Commission	<p>Overall, the document seems very scattered. It would be easier to read if there was a preamble that discussed important concepts and provided a map to relevant "Goals." There are multiple cross-cutting issues that are spread throughout the CCMP, but there is no section within the document linking the seemingly disparate goals together. The CCMP also needs a plan for prioritizing the actions and tasks within each action. There are simply not enough resources to tackle all of these goals at once. Finally, there is little accountability incorporated in the CCMP as it stands. Very few "Goals" have responsible agencies associated with them. We understand this will be incorporated into Section IV, but without this level of detail the document seems more like a "grand plan" than something that will be useful and actually implemented.</p> <p>Page 6, section "How Healthy is the Estuary" - Mention that artificially controlling freshwater outflow impacts naturally occurring seasonal changes in the salinity of the estuary.</p> <p>Page 6, section "Can we improve the health of the estuary?" - The response doesn't address the question</p> <p>Page 7, section "What will it take to achieve a healthy estuary" - What are the components of a healthy estuary? List them and address each component individually, even if there is overlap. What is meant by a "bolder" approach?</p> <p>Page 8, section "GOAL 1," subsection b - "Eliminate threats" seems too ambitious. This should either say "Reduce threats" or "Eliminate and/or reduce threats." The way it is currently stated could be interpreted to suggest that all threats are to be eliminated, rather than some threats (or as many threats as possible). It is likely not possible to eliminate all threats.</p> <p>Page 8, section "GOAL 2," subsection e - Does "communities" refer to people who live near/by the SF Estuary or to the flora and fauna that live in and around it?</p>
General Comments	11/13/2015	Janet Cox	<p>2. The Actions are all well and good but a little baffling (see above) in the absence of any sense of who is going to take the initiative and get all this done. Perhaps you have consulted with all of the potential actors and no one will be as surprised reading this as I was reading Action 34, but I think ANY reader will be wondering who is going to be responsible for doing the work and meeting the milestones. The original CCMP had the advantage of all those signatories — there was some sense of who the players were. In general I think the document needs discussion of whom the partners are, who the members of the IC are, etc. etc.... Perhaps you could list all the partners you can think of (call it "partial list") group them into categories, and then assign actions to categories. Maybe this will come out in the "Implementation schedule and funding analysis" — in any case it seems to me that if the document is going to have credibility you going to have to make some assignments, show you have some buy-in. Otherwise it's purely aspirational, and as we know, it's a little late for that.</p> <p>3. Finally, it's not clear, reading through the draft, how the Actions relate to the Goals and Objectives. In my opinion, referring to "the matrix at the end of this chapter" in the paragraph introducing the Implementation section isn't enough. (And the table isn't at the end of the chapter, it's in Appendix A.) In fact, Appendix A is really the key to understanding the document. Somehow or other I think you need to get this critical information out of the appendix and into the body of the CCMP.</p> <p>4. It could use some copy editing. Especially for punctuation, but the writing is a little florid — I think it could be punchier without losing heft.</p> <p>5. Please do a global search and replace and replace "%" with "percent" every time. The percent sign is really only for charts and maybe powerpoints.</p>
General Comments		Pat Mepelli Cargill	<p>The statement under the Background section that agencies are prevented from effectively addressing population growth is quite disturbing. Population growth is not governed by any agency, nor should it be. Population growth is driven by many factors, including that fact that regionally we provide a welcomed and appreciated balance between urban needs and open space. Rather than population growth being listed as a "threat", it is and should be embraced as a "fact" that is incorporated into the plan. I also find it disturbing that population growth is considered a "tradeoff". Since the original CCMP, the Bay Area population has increased by approximately 1.5 million people, yet the Bay is healthier and larger than it has been in nearly a hundred years. In fact, some bird populations have nearly doubled in just the past 10+ years due to a significant</p>

			increase in land made available for their use. So to say that there will be “tradeoffs” in the ecosystem because of population growth is a fallacy.
General Comments	09/04/2015	John Andrew Department of Water Resources	As well, and in general, each action should have a clearly committed owner(s), realistic resources, and well-defined performance measures.
General Comments	11/10/2015	Michael Vasey San Francisco Bay National Estuarine Research Reserve	<p>We particularly endorse the points made about “What will it take to achieve a healthy estuary” (p. 7). All of these points are foundational for the future sustainability of this ecosystem. We might suggest that an additional point be added, however, along the lines of a key NOAA Coastal Ocean Service priority; .i.e. promoting ‘Coastal Intelligence’. This priority notes the importance of gathering timely data on ecosystem functions and processes and utilizing these data to analyze and forecast alternative scenarios for future conditions that might inform coastal management decision-making. New remote sensing technologies and monitoring devices make this activity more feasible than ever and the importance of tracking uncertain trajectories in key estuarine ecosystems on a real-time basis to inform management choices that affect the future can scarcely be over-emphasized.</p> <p>Goal 1 (c) of the draft CCMP highlights the importance of “research and monitoring to measure the status of natural communities”; however, this is in the context of “sustaining and improving habitats and living resources within the estuary”. While we agree with this premise, we would submit that the research and monitoring foundation of “coastal intelligence” is also fundamental to Goal 2 concerning sustaining resilience of the SFE, as suggested above.</p>
General Comments	11/11/2015	Barbara Salzman Marin Audubon Society	<p>I’m unclear what the 35 year vision is supposed to indicate. If it is supposed to be the length of time the CCMP is valid, think 35 years is way too long. I realize it is burdensome doing updates, but there are likely to be major changes way before then that would warrant revision. You could allow for doing a revision earlier if recommended by the 5 year review. I think in the general, the document is quite thorough – except for the Living Resources section, which continues to have the same a glaring omission it has had through the last months. How any Plan that declares it is addressing Living Resources can be devoid of any mention of the actual living resources – fish, birds and other wildlife, is beyond me. The only mention of any creatures is oysters.</p> <p>Focusing on the actual habitats is fitting, and those actions generally cover the major issues, although I recommend additions below. Wildlife are integral parts of the natural communities, they must be recognized as such and there are other threats to wildlife that are not picked up. In particular, not even mentioning endangered species is a serious omission. I have brought this up numerous times, and it has been discussed at the last two-three meetings and, as I remember, there was agreement at the last one to address endangered species. Frankly, I was tempted to not even comment because it does not appear anyone is listening. Even if other planning efforts are focusing on them, does not mean the CCMP should ignore them.</p>
General Comments	11/13/2015	Sue Tippets Santa Clara Valley Water District	<p>The following actions are all needed and must work together to make the restoration succeed. Action 5 - Maximize habitat benefits of wetlands/managed ponds; Action 12 - Increase Carbon Sequestration through wetland restoration; Action 14 -Manage sediment on a regional scale and advance beneficial use; Action 15 - Demonstrate how restored habitats serve as “natural infrastructure” that provides multiple benefits; and Action 18 - Improve Regulatory processes regarding permitting and monitoring innovative multi-benefit projects. Managing sediment on a regional scale and encouraging dredge materials to be used to built wetlands is particularly crucial to protecting our region from the impacts of sea level rise . Additional Santa Clara Valley Water District comments organized by CCMP Goals and Actions are provided below:</p> <p>Goal 3 g. Suggest the following word change: Increase drought-resistance and water efficiency and reduce reliance on imported water</p> <p>Section IV, Tracking Progress, states that each action in the CCMP has an identified owner or owners responsible for leading the tasks. Identifying owners, along with identifying funding, are critical steps to ensuring progress is made on the many worthwhile actions identified in the CCMP. However, neither of those are actually identified in the current</p>

			draft.
Action 1	11/13/2015	Katherine Smith UC Davis	This section makes me think of the need for range-level coordination among folks working on SMHM. There is almost no coordination or collaboration among the various entities monitoring the mouse, not sure if there is a way to incorporate these thoughts into any kind of useful comment on this action but I guess it's one example of where a watershed approach could really benefit efforts.
Action 1	11/10/2015	Nicole Dobroski State Lands Commission	Page 9, section "ACTION 1" - We suggest focusing on only one or two pilot projects in order to bump up the completion date(s) of the watershed profiles. Time is critical in light of climate change and sea level rise predictions.
Action 1	11/13/2015	Cindy Messer Delta Stewardship Council	Task 2 calls for conducting a pilot project in one to three watersheds to develop habitat profiles, map alternative future profiles, and identify regulatory mechanisms that encourage and allow environmental health improvements, while Task 3 calls for developing a Northeast Delta Landscape Framework to generate a vision for integrated flood protection, restoration and water recharge, and inform the design of habitat restoration projects. The Delta Conservancy expects to complete pilot projects in both the Northeast Delta and Cache Slough. We have consulted with Conservancy staff, and they have suggested merging these two tasks, raising the number of watersheds to four, and calling out these two Delta locations.
Action 1	11/11/2015	Barbara Salzman Marin Audubon Society	Action 1 - Fish and wildlife species should be included here as they are important natural resources. This action also needs at least one action implementation task, not just studies.
Action 2	11/14/2015	Rachel Wigginton UC Davis	Where will restoration acres be located, and how will land area be prioritized? Though reintroduction of tidal flow to some managed marsh lands is a type of restoration worth exploring, a comprehensive plan should also prioritize more substantiation recuperation of habitat with less ecosystem value (salt pond restoration, etc.).
Action 2	11/13/2015	Francesca Demgen Demgen Aquatic Biology	These targets of 15,000 acres breached and 500 acres of acquisition seem very achievable, particularly if the baseline for comparison was 2013.
Action 2	11/13/2015	Katherine Smith UC Davis	The goal of 8000 acres of tidal habitat restored is pulled from the salmoniod BO. There is a similar amount called for in the Suisun Marsh Plan (4000-7000) and the Mouse/Rail recovery plan (5000-7000). One of the issues I have when dealing with management throughout the bay is that there are all these different plans with different numbers and its unclear how they are connected. It seems that if there were 8000 acres of tidal restoration to happen in Suisun/Delta that it would satisfy all of those? But I guess what is a more relevant question is did they all come to these similar conclusions about acreage needs independently or are they just all referencing each other? This should also acknowledge potentially the difference in value of restoration in various context. The increase in habitat value when you restore a salt pond to a tidal wetland is much higher than if you just breach a levee in a managed wetland that has been managed for high quality wildlife habitat for the last 100 years (i.e. a duck club).
Action 2	11/13/2015	Pat Mepelli Cargill	Under Task 2, the statement "Protected land may include acquiring additional land within the approved acquisition boundary of the San Francisco Bay National Wildlife Refuge Complex" needs clarification. In 1988, Public Law 100-556 increased the Service's acquisition authority from 23,000 acres to a total of 43,000 acres. Unlike the original legislation (PL 92-330), Congress did not specify a Boundary for the 20,000 acre expansion. Two years following PL 100-556, the Service finalized and Environmental Assessment whereby they created a map labeled <i>Potential additions to the San Francisco</i>

			<p><i>Bay National Wildlife Refuge, Alameda, San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties, California.</i></p> <p>Although this map identified 24,500 acres as "Potential additions", it also acknowledged that not all of the lands would be added to the Refuge for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) No more than 20,000 acres out of the 24,500 acres identified would be added to the refuge under existing authorities 2) Service plans for acquisitions do not preclude lawful, environmentally sound development, as determined by local government 3) The acquisition cost of some of the lands may be prohibitive 4) The amount of available funding for acquisition is unknown 5) Some landowners indicated that they would not be willing sellers <p>This statement under Task 2 should reference the Refuges Final CCP which clarifies this point</p>
Action 2	11/13/2015	Cindy Messer Delta Stewardship Council	<p>Task 2 calls for protecting land to support preservation and enhancement of tidal habitats. We suggest adding a statement that protected land may also include potential sites that may be acquired and developed as regional shorelines by the East Bay Regional Park District, as discussed in their Master Plan 2013.</p> <p>The Task 2 milestone of acquisition or protection of 500 acres of tidal habitat by 2021 seems very low. Is this task meant to include land that may be acquired for mitigation, e.g., for the construction of the WaterFix tunnels? The WaterFix website (http://www.californiawaterfix.com/solution/details) estimates that mitigation for WaterFix construction and operation will include about 2,300 acres of habitat restoration. This acreage is in addition to the 8,000 acres required by the biological opinions, which are mentioned in the Task 1 milestone.</p>
Action 2	09/04/2015	John Andrew Department of Water Resources	<p>Action 2: CNRA should probably be added as an 'owner' because of the reference to Cal EcoRestore (but check with them first, obviously). The word "condemnation" should be dropped.</p>
Action 2	11/11/2015	Barbara Salzman Marin Audubon Society	<p>Action 2 Task 2 - This action and tasks should be more inclusive. I think it is fine to EMPHASIZE protecting the sites in the Refuge boundaries but why would we not want to restore all of the former tidal marshes if the opportunity arises. While "key" parcels is somewhat more inclusive, it is not clear what "key" How would you identify key parcels? Is there a definition somewhere? Why would you limit protecting tidal marsh and places capable of being restored to tidal habitat to only "key" parcels?</p>
Action 3	11/14/2015	elizabeth wilkie Resident	<p>Include the cyclic and migratory transition zone in the water habitat the salt water and fresh water interface. The "horizontal levee" work of marshes and resiliency of their habitats may well be influenced by the actions in the water column of the null zone (former term for the salt/fresh water interface). Actions 2-9 focus on land habitats without reference to potential influence from the estuarine "null zone." Action 3, 26, and 33 would have reciprocal relationship to each other, and these three actions provide foundation to tidal to upland marsh lands.</p>
Action 3	11/14/2015	Sandra Scoggin San Francisco Bay Joint Venture	<p>Just FYI - the JV Science Steering Committee is going to be working on this. Nothing to add to the content unless you will be referencing specific work being done. I'd be happy to give you text on the actions identified in the SSC work plan that address this.</p>
Action 3	11/13/2015	Katherine Smith UC Davis	<p>The Mouse/Rail (Tidal Marsh Recovery Plan) is referenced in this section but not in the Action that is specifically about Tidal restoration (Action 2), is this a purposeful omission because they copied their estimates for acreage needs? Is it because they actually forgot to mention it? Seems like a pretty big mistake if so.</p>
Action 3	11/13/2015	Pat Mepelli Cargill	<p>The Action Description should focus on creating transition zones on lands already under public domain. Thousands if not tens of thousands of acres of land are already under public ownership and are in need of restoration. Creating transition zones on land already in public ownership should be the priority. Acquiring more land prior to restoring land already in public ownership is an irresponsible use of public funds.</p>

			The SBSPRP has been estimated at being a 50-year project and is currently in its 12 th year. The only Task under this action item should be to create transition zones as part future restoration projects.
Action 3	11/10/2015	Nicole Dobroski State Lands Commission	Page 11, section "ACTION 3," subsection "ACTION DESCRIPTION" – Which sea-level rise scenarios will be used? It makes the most sense to select the highest sea level projections for given timelines, but intermediate timelines (prior to 2050 and/or between 2050 and 2100) could be used for incremental adaptation purposes.
Action 3	10/14/2015	David Thomson San Francisco Bay Bird Observatory	Action 3, Task 1: Since the CCMP won't be finalized until 2016, and assuming milestones are usually not set for shortly after a plan's release, does this mean the task is already in progress?
Action 3	11/11/2015	Barbara Salzman Marin Audubon Society	Action 3 – High tide refugia should be added to the list in the first sentence of the Action description.
Action 4	11/14/2015	Rachel Wigginton UC Davis	Many groups already exist within the Bay Area who are working towards different bits of this overall goal. The Living Shoreline's Project is working toward native oyster restoration, the Invasive Spartina Project is restoring native Spartina foliosa within multiple marsh units, especially in the southeast Bay. In addition, many other agencies and academics could be linked into this goal. It might be best to establish a committee or organizing group to bring these different entities together for the purpose of this action.
Action 4	11/10/2015	Nicole Dobroski State Lands Commission	Page 12, section "ACTION 4," subsection "Task 1" – Eelgrass bed restoration experiments are not always very successful. The milestone of 25 acres seems overly ambitious. Perhaps incremental goals with smaller acreage would be best. Page 12, section "ACTION 4," subsection "Task 2" – The goal to increase the native oyster population to 25 acres is admirable, but non-native fouling organisms will settle on the hard substrate that these oyster reefs provide. A significant increase in the amount of oysters will mean an increase in available habitat for fouling organisms. Given the large abundance of non-native fouling species in the San Francisco Bay-Delta, this likely means more habitat for these non-native species.
Action 4	11/11/2015	Barbara Salzman Marin Audubon Society	Action 4 – The discussion of mudflats should also recognize and aim to protect and enhance mudflats for shorebirds. Mudflats are essential foraging habitat for shorebirds. They are not just important for oysters and eelgrass
Action 5	11/14/2015	Rachel Wigginton UC Davis	This act claims interest in looking at the ecosystem values of managed pods and wetlands from a multi-species perspective, yet it repeatedly calls out a focus on birds. Beyond the need to focus on the multiple other vertebrate and invertebrate species that might be utilizing these managed habitats, a focus on the numerous unique, endemic, and endangered plants that may or may not occur in these locations is critical.
Action 5	11/13/2015	Katherine Smith UC Davis	Here they reference the recovery plan again. The keep referring to "birds" or "waterbirds" but there is a difference in habitat use between shore birds and waterfowl. The fact that they mention the recovery plan makes me wonder if they are really just worrying about clapper rails? They should acknowledge that if it is the case. Also in the background they fail to mention that many mammals use managed wetlands as well, notably SMHM (See Smith et al 2013, Sustaaitia et al 2012). By acknowledging that mice use managed wetlands it may shift thinking about how much open water vs. dense vegetation vs. land we want to manage for in the managed wetlands.
Action 5	11/10/2015	Nicole Dobroski	Page 13, section "ACTION 5" – How will these reports be used to improve future management methods based on lessons learned? Perhaps they ought to be presented at

		State Lands Commission	the State of the Estuary conference. It is important to ensure that reports are written for specific purposes, and not just written for the sake of writing a report.
Action 6	11/14/2015	Sandra Scoggin San Francisco Bay Joint Venture	Page 14 Action 6 - I believe tasks should be flipped from their current order, 2, 3 and then 1. We don't have anything to upload until the tech advisory group develops the criteria and assessment tool. We may even consider removing #1 for now as it is not definite that this will be the place to house this information. I'd suggest removing the paragraph about the JV, unless something similar can be added to the tidal marsh habitat action. If it stays, it does need to be edited. I can provide updated language. Actions 6 and 7. It says these two should be combined. I don't agree that they should be combined. 6 focuses on functional habitat - ways to define and track success towards restored riparian ecosystems. 7 focuses on flows. I think they are quite distinct and each warrants an action.
Action 6	11/10/2015	Nicole Dobroski State Lands Commission	Page 14, section "ACTION 6," subsection "Task 3, Milestone" - What is meant by "20,000' of riparian habitat?" Are the units supposed to be square feet? Suggest writing out.
Action 6	11/13/2015	Cindy Messer Delta Stewardship Council	Given the recent effort to merge the San Francisco Bay and Central Valley Joint Venture project tracking tools with EcoAtlas, we suggest revising Task 1 as follows: "Upload relevant riparian assessment findings, constructed riparian project information, and potential future riparian project information to the SF Bay Joint Venture's Project Tracking Tool linked to project layer of EcoAtlas (done by individual project proponents)."
Action 7	11/10/2015	Nicole Dobroski State Lands Commission	Page 15, section "BACKGROUND" - We recommend that the institution that will host the database be identified before the CCMP is finalized, or, at a minimum, some potential hosts should be identified.
Action 8	11/13/2015	Cindy Messer Delta Stewardship Council	<p>We support this action to plan and implement a Bay-Delta Watershed Monitoring and Assessment Program, which is consistent with Action 4.2.2 in the Delta Science Plan: 4.2.2 Build a comprehensive Delta monitoring strategy for an integrated program. Use the strategy to work toward an integrated Delta monitoring program with a shared purpose to systematically inform adaptive management of multiple stressors on the ecosystem and report on Delta environmental changes to policymakers and the public. Primary Responsibility: Delta Science Program Action Participants: Delta Regional Monitoring Steering Committee, IEP, CWQMC, BDCP; federal, State, and local agencies; NGOs</p> <p>Expected Outcomes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development of a collaborative and comprehensive monitoring strategy based on clear conceptual models • Regular monitoring information feedback for adaptive management • Improved availability of data for assessing outcomes of water quality protection, water and land management, and habitat restoration actions • Improved availability of data for use in regulatory oversight <p>The Delta Science Program and partner agencies (e.g., the Interagency Ecological Program, EcoRestore and others) intend to conduct a comprehensive assessment of monitoring efforts in the Delta to inform development of a more comprehensive Delta monitoring strategy. The timing of Task 1, the formation of a Bay-Delta regional steering committee by 2016, may be premature prior to the completion of this assessment. Delta Science Program staff would be happy to discuss revisions to the tasks and milestones with the agencies proposing the action.</p>
Action 8	11/10/2015	Michael Vasey San Francisco Bay National Estuarine Research Reserve	Regarding Action 8 under Goal 1, while the action called out the need to "establish a regional wetland and stream monitoring and assessment program", Task 1 focuses on establishing a steering committee for "Regional Watershed Monitoring and Assessment Program". Again, while thoroughly supporting the importance of landscape connectivity among watershed, flood plains, marsh plains, sub-tidal, and open water habitats, we suggest that this would read "Regional Watershed and Wetland Monitoring Assessment Program" so that the importance of tidal wetland ecosystems (including sub-tidal and transition habitats) not be obscured. With this minor addition, making the tasks

			consistent with the language of the action, the rest of the tasks fall into line nicely and we fully support them.
Action 8	11/13/2015	Sue Tippets Santa Clara Valley Water District	Action 8, to establish a regional wetland and stream monitoring and assessment program, would benefit from shared learning with a similar effort being undertaken in the Delta. The Interagency Ecological Program has an established work team, the Tidal Wetlands Monitoring Project Work Team, that has been developing guidance for monitoring of wetland restoration projects. Alice Low with CA Department of Fish and Wildlife is leading the effort. The group is developing guidelines for monitoring the effectiveness of tidal wetland restoration to apply to restoration projects in the Delta to encourage consistency and comparability across the region.
Action 9	09/04/2015	John Andrew Department of Water Resources	Action 9: Background section refers to the 'unauthorized' conversion of rangeland—in the case of private lands, it's unclear what authorization is needed in this regard? Also, how would the proposed 5,000 acres of vernal pool landscape, to be protected in the Delta, coordinate with Cal WaterFix/EcoRestore? Perhaps coordination with Cal WaterFix/EcoRestore could be included in this action.
Action 9	11/11/2015	Barbara Salzman Marin Audubon Society	Action 9 - The tasks for this action are focused on the Delta. Seasonal wetlands in the Bay also be promoted either in this Action or a separate one.
Action 10	11/14/2015	Rachel Wigginton UC Davis	Increasing awareness and monitoring for invasion is key, but might be a funding challenge, especially when early action is often underfunded, despite the fact that it is most critical in preventing invasion. In addition, when considering control and even eventual eradication, the impacts of removal of large amounts of biomass, habitat structure, or augmented ecosystem functions must be critically analyzed. Without an eye to the importance of incorporating funded restoration plans into invasive species management plans, we could easily visit unintended consequences on native biota. Take for example the Ridgeways Rail, which began utilizing invasive hybrid <i>Spartina</i> for habitat. When the hybrid was eradicated, Rideways Rail populations suffered, as native <i>Spartina foliosa</i> recruited back in more slowly than anticipated. Control and eradication of harmful invaders is critical, but taking an ecosystem approach to eradication and subsequent restoration is also pivotal.
Action 10	11/13/2015	Katherine Smith UC Davis	Might be cool to have an app that recreational users could use to report invasive species sightings, ie boaters, hikers, kayakers, hunters, fishermen. They cover a whole lot more ground every day than all of us biologists.
Action 10	11/13/2015	Nicole Dobroski State Lands Commission	Page 18, section "ACTION 10" – Recommend splitting this Action Item into terrestrial and aquatic "Actions." Terrestrial and aquatic programs require different approaches to management, including prevention efforts, early detection, rapid response, control, and eradication. For instance, terrestrial property managers, such as the National Wildlife Refuge system, focus on responding to individual invasive species concerns over the land that they are responsible for. A refuge would consider a species eradicated if it was no longer established on its property. In contrast, for aquatic systems such as the bay delta, there is much greater connectivity, and generally no individual entity that is responsible for managing invasive species. An aquatic species would only be considered eradicated from the delta if it no longer existed anywhere in the delta (not just in a particular reserve or locality). For aquatic invasive species management, there must be greater coordination among programs and projects. We suggest a new action "Action: Minimize the impacts of aquatic invasive species" and two new tasks, including: o New Task 1: Develop a Bay-Delta specific coordinating team o New Task 2: Develop a bay-specific aquatic invasive species management plan (which could likely tier off of the existing California Aquatic Invasive Species Management Plan).
Action 10	11/13/2015	Sue Tippets Santa Clara	Action 10, to minimize the impact of invasive species, describes several important tasks to improve early detection, prevention, and control of invasive species. The Amur River

		Valley Water District	Clam (<i>Potamocorbula amurensis</i>), has had extensive impacts on food resources in Suisun Bay and elsewhere in the Bay-Delta, for delta smelt, longfin smelt, and other fish species of concern. However, this invasive species is not acknowledged in the CCMP and does not appear to be the target of any control programs. The CCMP should include an additional task to identify funding sources for research or pilot testing of innovative control measures that could be employed to control this invasive species.
Action 11	11/10/2015	Nicole Dobroski State Lands Commission	Page 19, section "ACTION 11" – The action would be more powerful if the types of predators were identified. For example, "terrestrial nuisance species that prey upon threatened and endangered species and species of special concern." As written, the action is vague, could point to too many species, and would therefore be difficult to implement and complete. Page 19, section "ACTION 11," subsection "Task 1, point 2" – The word "including" is repeated (typo).
Action 11	11/11/2015	Barbara Salzman Marin Audubon Society	Action 11 – This action is largely planning/mapping activities. It should have more action tasks such as educating the public about problems with feral cat colonies, supporting/promoting governments in getting rid of the colonies, and working with non-profits to address cat colonies. The impact of dogs should also be addressed.
Action 12	11/14/2015	Rachel Wigginton UC Davis	Similar to my comments on Action 2, I am concerned about which lands will be allocated for conversion to wetland habitat, and if these conversions will take into account the overall ability of conversion to increase the habitat value of the Bay at the landscape scale.
Action 12	11/13/2015	Cindy Messer Delta Stewardship Council	Please add a Task 3 that matches the Delta Plan by referencing carbon markets. E.g., "Support the development of the carbon market for wetlands by developing reference sites and standard management practices that reduce the monitoring and reporting costs for participants." In the Background section, please note that a draft California wetland protocol for carbon credits was submitted to the American Carbon Registry for review earlier this year. Please make the following edits, shown in underline and strikethrough, to the Background section. The rationale for each edit is provided in brackets following the item. 1. "USGS and DWR have partnered on a pilot projects on totaling approximately 2000 acres that shows that it is highly feasible to use managed wetlands to sequester carbon and reduce subsidence...." [I believe only the first 15-acre project is considered a "pilot project", while others might be considered "demonstration projects."] 2. "Through the California Natural Resources Agency, California EcoRestore is an initiative to help coordinate and advance critical habitat restoration in the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta over the next four years. California EcoRestore's initial goal includes creation of 3,500 acres of managed wetlands, specifically for subsidence reversal and carbon management, on Sherman Island and Twitchell Island and Staten Island." [Staten Island is targeted for sandhill crane habitat enhancement, not carbon sequestration.] 3. "Challenges to that goal include land acquisition and resources for creation and management. The action includes a slightly reduced outcome milestone of 3,000 acres converted over five years, both on public and private lands (based also on goals in the Delta Stewardship Plan)." [DWR already owns the land in question.]
Action 12	09/04/2015	John Andrew Department of Water Resources	Action 12: Likewise, how would this action work with respect to Cal WaterFix/EcoRestore? For example, some of the 3,000 acres of wetlands may also be some of the land needed for the tunnels project or mitigation thereof. Perhaps coordination with Cal WaterFix/EcoRestore could be included in this action, too.
Action 13	11/10/2015	Nicole Dobroski State Lands Commission	Page 21, section "ACTION 13," subsection "Task 1, Milestone" – What is the "regional 'toolbox'?" Adding an explanatory sentence would be helpful.

Action 13	11/13/2015	Cindy Messer Delta Stewardship Council	Thank you for including Task 5, which Council staff originally suggested. Over the past few months, the effort to coordinate flood protection and habitat enhancement in the Yolo Bypass has evolved. Please revise as follows: "Task 5: Improve coordination between Yolo Bypass flood risk management efforts and the implementation of the Yolo Bypass Salmonid Habitat Restoration and Fish Passage Project (2009 NMFS Biological Opinion), ensuring maximized public benefits and efficiencies. Wherever beneficial, integrate flood risk management and floodplain restoration objectives and projects, including the incorporation of specific Yolo Bypass habitat restoration objectives into the 2017 Central Valley Flood Protection Plan. Milestones: • By 2017, establish a common vision for Yolo Bypass multi-benefit improvements that are supported by affected local, state, and federal agencies. • Incorporate measurable habitat restoration objectives into the 2017 Central Valley Flood Protection Plan. • Initiate and/or begin construction of multiple Biological Opinion fish passage improvement projects within the Yolo Bypass by 2017."
Action 13	11/11/2015	Barbara Salzman Marin Audubon Society	Action 13 - Wildlife movement corridors and refugia should be added to the list of benefits of watershed connections.
Action 13	11/13/2015	Sue Tippets Santa Clara Valley Water District	Action 13 Task 4 aims to secure funding from responsible parties. Suggest rewording as "responsible" implies a regulatory approach rather than a collaborative or interested approach.
Action 14	11/10/2015	Nicole Dobroski State Lands Commission	Page 22, section "ACTION 14," subsection "Task 1" - Be more specific with sea-level rise projections.
Action 15	11/13/2015	Katherine Smith UC Davis	Here again they can acknowledge that the difference in value of restoration in various context. The increase in habitat value when you restore a salt pond to a tidal wetland is much much higher than if you just breach a levee in a managed wetland that has been managed for high quality wildlife habitat for the last 100 years (i.e. a duck club).
Action 15	11/10/2015	Nicole Dobroski State Lands Commission	Page 23, section "ACTION 15," subsection "Task 3" - Will the vision for the "expected evolution of the Estuary" account for climate change? Is this the expected evolution without human intervention, or the expected evolution with adaptation to climate change? Needs more detail.
Action 16	11/10/2015	Nicole Dobroski State Lands Commission	Page 24, section "ACTION 16," subsection "Task 3, Milestone" - Is it necessary to create a new task force? Perhaps it would be worthwhile to conduct a scoping study to determine the necessity of creating a new group vs. expanding or drawing on resources from groups that already exist.
Action 17	10/09/2015	Becky Tuden City of Oakland Public Works - Watershed Division	list water quality as one of the co- benefits, and water conservation e.g. large detention basins near bay
Action 17	11/13/2015	Cindy Messer Delta Stewardship Council	We suggest revising this action so that it can include reference to the Delta Levee Investment Strategy that the Council is currently developing, which includes natural resources as an asset category. This may be done by changing the title as follows: "Integrate natural resource protection into state and local government hazard mitigation, response, and recovery planning." Secondly, "Completion of the Delta Levee Investment Strategy by 2016" may be added as a second milestone under Task 1

Action 18	11/10/2015	Nicole Dobroski State Lands Commission	Page 26, section "ACTION 18," subsection "Task 3" – Is "long time frame" in reference to the decision-making process or the length of time that the projects will take for completion? CSLC would like to be included in efforts to improve permitting efficiency. Page 26, section "ACTION 18," subsection "Task 3, Milestone" – Hosting a workshop requires a great deal of work. Are biannual meetings really necessary? Perhaps once a year would be sufficient.
Action 18	11/13/2015	Sue Tippets Santa Clara Valley Water District	Action 18 describes tasks to improve regulatory processes regarding permitting multibenefit projects including task 1, to identify opportunities and recommendations for improved regulatory processes for multi-benefit flood control and habitat restoration projects through the Flood Control 2.0 project, and task 3, to bring major permitting agencies together to develop a decision-making process that helps reduce time and conflicts for multi-species and multi-benefit projects. If it is not already identified in Flood Control 2.0, addressing the conflict between vegetation on levees for habitat and vegetation-free levees for flood control is a key challenge that would benefit from improved regulatory processes and should be included in this action.
Action 19	11/13/2015	Cindy Messer Delta Stewardship Council	<p>This action to revise urban water management plans to include a water shortage contingency is consistent with the Delta Plan, but the Delta Plan contains a recommendation that goes further:</p> <p>WR R4. Expanded Water Supply Reliability Element Water suppliers that receive water from the Delta watershed should include an expanded water supply reliability element, starting in 2015, as part of the update of an urban water management plan, agricultural water management plan, integrated water management plan, or other plan that provides equivalent information about the supplier's planned investments in water conservation and water supply development. The expanded water supply reliability element should detail how water suppliers are reducing reliance on the Delta and improving regional self-reliance consistent with Water Code section 85201 through investments in local and regional programs and projects, and should document the expected outcome for a measurable reduction in reliance on the Delta and improvement in regional self-reliance. At a minimum, these plans should include a plan for possible interruption of water supplies for up to 36 months due to catastrophic events impacting the Delta, evaluation of the regional water balance, a climate change vulnerability assessment, and an evaluation of the extent to which the supplier's rate structure promotes and sustains efficient water use.</p> <p>You may want to expand Action 19 to include this recommendation by revising the title to something that encompasses both drought and a possible interruption in water supplies from the Delta, e.g., "Develop water shortage contingency plans."</p> <p>The action description contains three elements, but the third element, "document efforts to implement programs and investments that will help the Estuary respond to future extended droughts..." does not have an associated task or milestone. We recommend adding them.</p>
Action 19	09/04/2015	John Andrew Department of Water Resources	Action 19: Commits DWR to new aspects of the SWP Delivery Reliability Report and the 2020 UWMP guidance. Unsure that we would agree to do either, at least not via the CCMP, and with respect to the UWMPs, there would need to be a stakeholder process. Thus please eliminate the DWR commitment here.
Action 19	11/13/2015	Sue Tippets Santa Clara Valley Water District	<p>Action 19 is to develop long term drought plans. Most agencies already have plans for drought so perhaps this goal should focus on refining or adaptively managing drought plans.</p> <p>This action describes revisions to Urban Water Management Plans to include a water shortage contingency plan (WSCP) for multi-year drought planning. The WSCPs are not limited in timeframe. They describe the actions the urban water suppliers will take in response to shortages, regardless of the duration of the shortages, with a focus on water use reduction efforts.</p> <p>The action describes DWR's UWMP requirements, include drought planning that addresses the hydrologic conditions of the service area and includes planning for multiple scenarios, including multi-year droughts of 5-10 years. Water supplier efforts to respond to future extended droughts are typically in our long-term water supply plans. The UWMPs may not reflect an agency's long-term plans.</p>

			<p>Suggest refocusing Task 1 on looking at long-term water supply plans, which will give a better picture than UWMPs of how agencies are planning for drought. The intent of Task 2 seems to be to ensure agencies are planning for long-term drought. The UWMPs are not necessarily the best way of documenting this work. In addition, water suppliers are reluctant to see new requirements for UWMPs. We encourage SFEP to take a more collaborative approach of talking with agencies about their extended drought plans and developing recommendations, if they are needed, based on those discussions.</p> <p>The Background section describes requirements for urban water report its progress on 20% reduction in per-capita urban water consumption by the year 2020 as required in the Water Conservation Bill of 2009. This requirement only applies to retail agencies. It does not apply to wholesale agencies such as SCVWD.</p> <p>The draft guidance document calls for an analysis of district plans in the event of a year multi-year drought of up to 36 months. The requirement is to analyze a multiple dry year period of at least 3 years.</p>
Action 21	11/13/2015	Francesca Demgen Demgen Aquatic Biology	Task 3: seems like it could be more efficient to conduct regional feasibility studies.
Action 21	11/13/2015	Sue Tippets Santa Clara Valley Water District	<p>Action 21- Suggest rewording to "Increase nonpotable water recycling". Bring Action 23 regarding potable reuse forward to follow Action 21, so that these two actions are back-to-back. Potable reuse may be a more-effective method for achieve recycled water targets than non-potable reuse.</p> <p>Task 2 discusses a long-term regional strategy as part of the next Bay Area Integrated Regional Water Management Program (IRWMP) to reach the identified potential of 25% reuse of current wastewater discharges by 2020 and 50% reuse by 2030 for the Estuary region. These goals are 2 to 5 times more than current uses. Also these goals should be included for both the nonpotable water recycling and potable reuse goals described in Action 23. The last line: Identify potential emerging issues with increase reuse of treated wastewater, such as increases in reverse osmosis concentrate and unknown constituents. should also be reflected in Action 23</p>
Action 22	09/04/2015	John Andrew Department of Water Resources	Action 22: Commits DWR to a new public information campaign. Again, notwithstanding the potential merit of such an action, doubtful we will commit to doing this, without additional funding or staffing to go along with it. My suggestion would be to qualify this action so that is based upon adequate resources.
Action 23	11/13/2015	Francesca Demgen Demgen Aquatic Biology	The task 1 report should also evaluate the ecological repercussions of removing the POTW's freshwater discharge from the receiving waters.
Action 23	09/04/2015	John Andrew Department of Water Resources	Action 23: The action description appears fine (mentions only indirect potable reuse) but its title and background include reference to direct potable reuse. DPR has not only issues with respect to public acceptance, but also public health. I'd thus suggest limiting the action to just indirect potable reuse, and rather than advocate for DPR, the CCMP should instead acknowledge, defer to, and support the existing SWRCB process on this matter.
Action 23	11/13/2015	Sue Tippets Santa Clara Valley Water District	<p>Action 23: Spelling correction –change NOG's to NGO's. Comment regarding Task 1– The State completed and finalized regulations for indirect potable reuse for groundwater replenishment- finalized and became regulation on June 18, 2014. Surface Water Augmentation (use of advanced treated recycled water to augment drinking water reservoir supplies) regulations are planned to be finalized by the SWRCB by December 31, 2016.</p> <p>Suggested edits in the Background section shown in red below.</p> <p>Indirect potable reuse (IPR) refers to the use of treated and purified wastewater using</p>

			<p>advanced treatment technologies to augment drinking water supplies through an environmental buffer, such as injection into an underground aquifer or to a surface water drinking supply reservoir.</p> <p>Direct potable reuse (DPR) refers to the introduction of purified water, derived from treated municipal wastewater after further extensive advanced treatment and monitoring to assure that strict water quality requirements are met, directly into a municipal water supply system. Such purified water could be blended with source water for further water treatment at a drinking water treatment plant or even direct pipe-to-pipe blending of purified water and potable water. DPR offers the opportunity to significantly reduce the distance that purified water would need to be pumped thereby reducing costs. It also has the potential to dramatically expand use of recycled water. Public acceptance is the most important element of adoption of DPR and key to getting public acceptance is aggressive source control of pharmaceuticals and other Constituents of Emerging Concern (CECs) – also covered in Action 29. In 2011, the State Water Resources Control Board contracted the Southern California Coastal Water Research Project to establish and manage a team of investigators to develop bioassays to identify known and unknown CECs that may potentially be found in recycled water titled Development of Bioanalytical Techniques for Monitoring CECs in Recycled Water Applications for the State of California.</p> <p>Ensuring that the use of purified recycled water treated wastewater does not result in adverse health effects requires a systematic science-based approach and a thorough evaluation of the best practices that will protect public health, and consideration of environmental and sociocultural concerns.</p>
Action 23	11/13/2015	Sue Tippets Santa Clara Valley Water District	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Action 23. Task 1. Include the California Department of Drinking Water as part of the listed agencies. 2. Last paragraph in Action 23. Include potential DPR use as part of the description of the SVAWPC provided as an example. A potential DPR project being sourced from an expansion of the SVAWPC is now included in the District’s plans and application for funding. 3. Under the Background section of Action 23, mention that the IPR regulations (using recycled water for groundwater replenishment) became effective June 18, 2014.
Action 25	11/13/2015	Sue Tippets Santa Clara Valley Water District	Action 25 – Other coordination entities should include the San Francisco Bay Area Integrated Regional Water Management Coordinating Committee.
Action 26	11/14/2015	elizabeth wilkie Resident	Connect this action to Action 3, regarding transition zones that includes the fresh/salt water interface of the estuary.
Action 26	09/04/2015	John Andrew Department of Water Resources	Action 26: Text refers to the ‘SWRCB’s Delta Plan’– this should be changed to ‘SWRCB’s Water Quality Control Plan (Bay-Delta Plan) to avoid confusion with DSC’s Delta Plan.
Action 26	11/13/2015	Sue Tippets Santa Clara Valley Water District	Both the Action 26 description and background information need to provide a more balanced presentation of the science regarding the importance of Bay-Delta freshwater inflow/outflow to beneficial uses. Statements like, “critical importance of freshwater outflow” and “the lack of adequate freshwater flows, timing, and duration is currently insufficient to support a healthy estuary...” need to be tempered to acknowledge the significant scientific debate that surrounds this issue. The District applauds the SFEP for identifying tasks of providing “scientifically sound data” and “sound science” to these issues; however, sound science must acknowledge the multiple scientific hypotheses regarding the functions provided by flows in this highly altered estuary. For example, historically, large storm flows would overtop river banks, inundate floodplains, and subsequently deliver large pulses of nutrients produced on those floodplains to “feed” the estuary. This conceptual model supports more outflow being important to support a healthy estuary. However, in today’s highly altered estuary, simply increasing Delta

			<p>outflows does not necessarily provide this benefit when those flows are carried in hardened surfaced channels. The sound science that needs to be brought to this issue must go beyond the simple correlations between flow and abundance that form the basis of many of the statements cited in the Draft CCMP. The science must look at the mechanisms behind those correlations and the ecological processes and functions that we hope to restore in this highly altered system.</p> <p>Task 1 under Action 26 is to work with partners on a report highlighting the role of freshwater flows in the lower portion of the estuary. We ask that the District be included as a partner in the preparation of that report.</p>
Action 26	11/11/2015	Barbara Salzman Marin Audubon Society	Action 26 - This is good on flows. I suggest adding language about Friends work.
Action 27	11/10/2015	Nicole Dobroski State Lands Commission	Page 35, section "ACTION 27" – If some of the agricultural water usage in this region can be traced to livestock, would it be possible to incentivize the reduction of livestock production and conversion of land to farming of other crops that do not require large volumes of water to thrive?
Action 28	11/13/2015	Sue Tippetts Santa Clara Valley Water District	Action 28, to identify and work to eliminate illegal water diversions in the San Francisco Bay region describes a 2011 probe of Delta water rights by the Delta Watermaster. While the Delta Watermaster's report may have concluded that most of the diversions in the Delta are legal riparian or pre-1914 water rights, his probe was very cursory and his conclusions are still debated. Reference to the Delta probe should either be deleted or modified to describe the limitations of the probe and its findings.
Action 29	11/13/2015	Sue Tippetts Santa Clara Valley Water District	Action 29 to address emerging contaminants calls for drafting a model ordinance based on Alameda's safe drug disposal ordinance and encouraging adoption by other counties. Given that nearly 40% of California's land area drains to San Francisco Bay, this task, and others within this action, should be expanded to develop statewide drug disposal programs.
Action 31	10/09/2015	Becky Tuden City of Oakland Public Works – Watershed Division	Listing the specific name of a tool is too specify and given length of planning time frame planning tool – Green PLAN –it...could be many other methods and this could be outdated. I also wouldn't put all my eggs into only one methodology.
Action 31	10/09/2015	Becky Tuden City of Oakland Public Works – Watershed Division	Goals should include looking for large, REGIONAL projects...not just small piecemeal retrofits. Could milestone be identifying large sites in watershed for potential retrofit (i.e. Pump stations) . Placing bioretention at edge of bay could also help with sea level rise adaptation.
Action 33	11/14/2015	elizabeth wilkie Resident	Connect this action to Action 3, regarding transition zones that includes the fresh/salt water interface of the estuary.
Action 34	10/09/2015	Becky Tuden City of Oakland Public Works – Watershed Division	Trash actions should also include investigation options for more source reduction or product bans....no polystyrene, no plastic bottles sold, what individual packaging can be sold as bulk? Cigarettes???? I also wouldn't place so much emphasis in the "trash tracker". I know SFEP funded it but I don't know many municipalities actively using it.
Action 34	11/10/2015	Nicole Dobroski	Page 42, section "BACKGROUND" – What was the outcome of the state requirement that cities and counties reduce the amount of trash going into the estuary by 40% by 2014? It

		State Lands Commission	would be useful to understand what (if any) strategies were employed to address this issue, whether they were successful, and why/why not.
Action 34	11/13/2015	Janet Cox	Action 34, Trash: You've got two "Task 2"s. More important, I'm not sure who is going to do this work. SFEP? BASMAA under the Prop 84 grant? Who is going to "help to create a regional trash monitoring program" and "publish a review of the Trash Tracker"? (Whatever it is, and whoever does it, it won't be a public document, as "publish" implies.) Are you describing MRP compliance? Maybe this wording came from Chris Sommers, who needs to tell me more about what I'm supposed to be doing for the project, but it's news to me and different from how I've heard the work described. (It hasn't started yet.)
Action 35	11/13/2015	Katherine Smith UC Davis	In my experience it is hard for many people to grasp the importance of whole ecosystem health. They do not understand the value of researching/protecting an endangered mouse. It is important for people to understand how interconnected everything is and if we lose part of it, even icky mice, its going to have large effects on the ecosystem as a whole. Since the mice are charismatic but most adults don't like them it might be most effective to push this education at an elementary school level.
Action 35	11/10/2015	Nicole Dobroski State Lands Commission	Page 43, section "ACTION 35" - What about promoting public shoreline cleanup efforts (e.g. "Coastal Cleanup Day") as a way to remove trash from the watersheds that drain into the Estuary?
Action 36	11/16/2015	Erik Vink Delta Protection Commission	The Great California Delta Trail will be a continuous regional recreational corridor that will extend around the delta, including, but not limited to, the delta's shorelines in Contra Costa, Solano, San Joaquin, Sacramento, and Yolo Counties and will link the San Francisco Bay Trail system to the planned Sacramento River trails in Yolo and Sacramento Counties. Additionally, the Delta Trail will link to park and recreational facilities and land and water trail systems throughout the Delta. A blueprint report for the Delta Trail in Contra Costa and Solano Counties has been completed. A similar report is currently underway for the trail in Sacramento, San Joaquin, and Yolo Counties. Approximately 20 miles of trail have been designated for the Delta Trail.
Action 36	11/13/2015	Sue Tippets Santa Clara Valley Water District	Action 36 to provide public access and recreational opportunities. Task 1- consider minimizing the length of paved trails and incorporating the use of other permeable or stabilized soil treatments for trails. Task 2 should include focused analysis on impacts of human intrusion into or avoidance of specific sensitive wildlife areas.
Action 39	11/14/2015	elizabeth wilkie Resident	If we do not explicitly link the key feature of the estuarine ecosystem (the salt/fresh water interface) to the work of marsh restoration and resiliency, i fear this document will keep the work segregated in action as in word, though we work to integrate sustainable living with this ecosystem.