

MEMO

Date: January 8, 2021

From: Nans Voron / SCAPE

Re: Draft Responses to Comments / Hayward Shoreline Adaptation Master Plan Draft
 #3

Carin High / Citizens Committee to Complete the Refuge

Comment #1

- Outreach: Appendix A of the Master Plan provides summaries of stakeholder meetings and comments made during these meetings, but it would have been useful to have access to agency comment letters. A review of Appendix A stakeholder outreach indicates that the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) was contacted and that comments from the USFWS would be submitted by May 26, 2020. Were those comments received – are they the comments that appear in Appendix A submitted by Steven Schoenberg? Did California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) provide any additional comments? The letters from these agencies could provide insight into the preferences of one design element over another and whether issues of concern were identified by the agencies. It doesn't appear from the information provided in Appendix A that outreach to the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) has occurred. Feedback from the RWQCB would be extremely useful and could inform HASPA in advance, of any permitting challenges that might be posed by the preferred alternative. Last, it is unfortunate that environmental groups that advocate for the protection of species such as Audubon, the Citizens Committee to Complete the Refuge, the Sierra Club, etc., were not included as stakeholders or at least included in a focus group discussion prior to final public comment period for the Master Plan.

Response #1

- Appendix A includes all meeting minutes and any formal letters received in relation to the Plan.
- Appendix A also includes comments received by Steven Schoenberg on behalf of USFWS, on May 28, 2020.

- The San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board was approached multiple times during the engagement process and provided no comments nor participated in any meeting or workshops.
- Both Audubon and the Sierra club were invited to participate into workshops, meetings and online surveys prior to the final public comment period.
- Citizens Committee to Complete the Refuge submitted a letter that can be found in Appendix A.

Comment #2

- As we stated in our opening remarks, the authors of the Master Plan are to be commended for their visual and written presentation of the range of adaptation strategies that might be applied within the plan area. The information provided within the document is a primer for decisionmakers planning resilience projects along the edges of San Francisco Bay and is remarkable in the breadth of topics covered ranging from descriptions of the afore-mentioned adaptation strategies, to permitting agencies and their potential concerns, to potential funding mechanisms for various elements of the Master Plan. That being said, it would be extremely useful to provide access to the technical information that may have been relied upon to determine which elements of the preferred alternative were the most feasible. The Hayward Shoreline Adaptation Master Plan website should continue to be maintained and a “Library” or “Resources” section added, similar to the South Bay Salt Pond Restoration Project website - <https://www.southbayrestoration.org/> The website could then provide technical reports/studies as a resource that is continually updated for those members of the public who wish to continue to be engaged with the process of Master Plan implementation and could also serve as an educational outreach platform for the public at large.

Response #2

- All of the technical information produced during the Master Plan process can be found in the final Master Plan document, or previous submissions. These are all accessible on the project website- www.haywardshorelinemasterplan.com.
- The Design Team also provided GIS information related to sea level rise and ground water emergence to the City of Hayward. This information has been made available on the City’s GIS portal.

- As projects are implemented over time, additional technical information could be made accessible to the public.
- The Design Team recommends to HASPA to maintain the Master Plan website past the lifetime of the study in order to share technical information and additional studies as they become available while the Master Plan is being implemented.

Comment #3

- Sea Level Rise Estimates Used: Page 119 of the Master Plan states: “The plan is looking at reducing risk to critical assets from daily tidal inundation and future 100-year storm surge in a up to 4’ of sea level rise scenario. For planning purposes, the Project Team has been considering a target elevation of 14.3’ (NAVD 88) to evaluate the various Design Alternatives and to assess the feasibility of the Preferred Alternative. The plan is based on adapting the project area over a mid-range time frame. Based on State guidance, this time frame is estimated to be between 50 and 60 years long.” According to the Master Plan the estimates utilized were based upon 2018 California Coastal Commission recommendations. In February of this year the California Ocean Protection Council (OPC) approved its “Strategic Plan to Protect California’s Coast and Ocean for 2020-2025.”¹ This document includes as a target, “1.1.1: Ensure California’s coast is resilient to at least 3.5 feet of sea-level rise by 2050 or higher, as consistent with the State’s Sea-Level Rise Guidance Document as appropriate for a given location or project. This target will be modified periodically based on the best available science and updates to the State’s Sea-Level Rise Guidance Document.”
- Will HASPA alter its Master Plan Assumptions to incorporate this latest guidance? Will the OPC guidance have any impact on the elevations of interim levees at Oro Loma and the Salt Marsh Harvest Mouse Preserve which have elevations that aim to “reduce risk up to the existing 100-year storm plus 2’ of sea level rise (SLR)?” Does the increase in the rates of predicted SLR inundation impact the time frame within which various components of the Master Plan need to be implemented to provide SLR resilience for existing infrastructure and development? For example, should the California Environmental Quality Act

(CEQA) processes for Line of Protection projects be initiated sooner than 2030 and 2045?

Response #3

- The final master plan target elevation exceeds the most recent guidance from the California Ocean Protection Council, as well as guidance from other state and federal entities. The interim levees are intended to provide near-term flood protection but are recommended to include foundations that can be adapted to a higher elevation in the future as needed. The master plan provides a flexible framework and as projects are further refined, and as additional climate science and guidance is developed, specific elevations of future projects and the timing of projects can be refined.

Comment #4

- General Support of the Preferred Master Plan Alternative: In general, without access to supporting information that demonstrates the various elements of the Preferred Alternative are feasible to implement (e.g. geotechnical and hydrological studies, etc.), we support the Preferred Alternative, including the use of gravel beaches to reduce erosion, expansion of tidal marsh habitat, the use of horizontal levees as part of wastewater treatment facilities and the eventual relocation of the Hayward Shoreline Interpretive Center. As stated earlier, we commend HASPA for incorporating nature-based solutions as adaptation and resilience strategies and for recognizing the ecological value of the Hayward Shoreline to the San Francisco Bay.

Response #4

- As the projects identified in the Plan are being implemented, further analysis and engineering studies will be required. The Master Plan analyzed alternatives for high-level feasibility with feedback from a variety of stakeholders and experts. Additional feedback and stakeholder engagement will be required for individual projects as they are being further designed.

Comment #5

- Salt Marsh Harvest Mouse Preserve: We do wonder how long the interim levees will be effective against sea level rise and have concerns about the sustainability of the salt marsh harvest mouse (SMHM) preserve. Have any

preliminary plans been developed for the SMHM preserve that involve increasing ground elevations within the preserve itself and not just on the ecotone levee? In the short term, the ecotone levee (#2f on page 182) will provide the capability for SMHM habitat to migrate upslope and provide escape habitat for SMHM during periods of inundation, but as sea level rises and tidal marsh habitat is compressed between rising seas and the Bay Trail, there will be less suitable habitat for the SMHM. The Master Plan includes a provision for realignment of the Bay Trail (page 171), “The current alignment of the Bay Trail will be maintained as long as possible (until it is inundated with sea level rise) and connected to the realignment.”

- We urge HASPA and the Bay Trail to consider relocation of the Bay Trail before the trail itself is threatened by inundation to provide some higher elevation habitat for the SMHM that is not subjected to human disturbance. As sea level rises, the SMHM population within the plan area will have few places that it can escape to, while recreational uses can be relocated to avoid conflicts with an endangered species.

Response #5

- The interim levee at the SMHM preserve is only intended to provide protection up to the medium-term time horizon. This elevation will have to be decided as this project is further being developed. Additionally, further studies will be required to identify the feasibility of increasing the elevation of the preserve, without impacting the existing protected habitat.
- The Bay Trail comment is noted and the phasing of the bay trail relocation will be further studied and analyzed in the future.

Comment #6

- California Least Tern Breeding Colony: The preferred alternative provides two options for the California Least Tern (LETE) breeding colony – the first is to relocate the breeding pond to the east of its current location, behind the SMHM Preserve interim levee. The second is to leave Pond 3A in place and raise the levee around the pond. The existing condition for the LETE breeding pond is that access to the levees adjacent to the breeding pond is limited to maintenance vehicles, monitoring of the LETE breeding colony, and very occasional access along the levee by classes from the Hayward Shoreline

Interpretive Center on their way out to the Bay. The two proposed LETE breeding pond alternatives feature the location of the Bay Trail on two or three sides of the breeding colony pond. The Northern California LETE breeding colonies - the larger Alameda NAS colony and the Pond 3A breeding colony - have had some of the highest rates of recruitment in California. According to the 2016 Season California Least Tern Breeding Survey², "...the San Francisco Bay and central coast areas had the highest minimum fledgling-to-maximum pair ratio," with the Pond 3A colony have producing 1.80 fledglings per pair. This was one of the highest ratios in the state. Clearly the Hayward LETE breeding colony is of importance in the recovery this species. In recent years LETE have established a breeding colony on Pond E14 within the Eden Landing Ecological Reserve.

- Neither of the options seems ideal from a perspective of exposure of the breeding colony to potential human disturbance. If the Bay Trail wasn't along three sides of the LETE breeding pond, it might make the most sense to leave the pond in its current location and build up the surrounding levees because this would avoid the need to relocate the colony and would provide a greater footprint for the SMHM preserve. However, we know nothing about how this might impact adjacent wetlands, whether the soils could withstand additional fill material for raising the levee, how water levels within the pond would be maintained, etc.

Response #6

- The habitat considerations for the LETE are noted. As these projects are implemented, further analysis and alternatives will be developed to ensure LETE habitat is preserved in the future with sea level rise.
- The feasibility of building a levee around the entire existing colony, and maintaining that levee as a shoreline that will get inundated with sea level rise, was considered but other alternatives were selected to balance risk reduction, habitat adaptation, and cost implications.

Comment #7

- Human Disturbance: The potential conflict between recreational use and protection of wildlife and the habitats that support them was raised during the stakeholder meetings and public comment period. We do not oppose public

access; we believe carefully and thoughtfully located public access is a necessity for Bay Area residents. However, we strongly believe that along the edges of the Bay, consideration must be given to the needs of tidal marsh species particularly since we have lost approximately 90% of our historic tidal marshes, and the ability of our remaining tidal marsh habitat to survive sea level rise has been severely compromised by the placement of development right up to the edges of the Bay.

- This Master Plan is commendable for the incorporation of tidal marsh restoration as an important goal of the adaptation and resilience plan, and in the short term, some “breathing space” does exist to allow tidal marsh species to distance themselves from human disturbance. Elements of the Master Plan where potential conflicts between recreational use and wildlife may occur are along the proposed gravel beaches – it appears the only location where public access does not extend to the gravel beaches may be on the western side of the Oliver Salt Ponds. These areas may be used by nesting waterbirds and by roosting LETE and may be in close proximity to areas where LETE may forage at high tide. The Bay Trail may completely surround the SMHM Preserve which could be problematic during periods of inundation due to King tides or 100-year flood conditions when SHMH might be forced to the sides of the levees unless sturdy and taller vegetation is provided as escape habitat within the marsh). Western Snowy Plover may also utilize these areas as well as nesting islands within the LETE breeding colony pond. The San Francisco Bay Bird Observatory (SFBBO) report mentioned earlier states, “Snowy Plover nests are legally protected by a 600 ft radius nest buffer because Snowy Plovers in the San Francisco Bay have been shown to flush off their nests when a perceived predator is at a distance of up to 500ft.” The Master Plan may provide adequate structural habitat for rare and listed species such as the Western Snowy Plover, the California Least Tern or the salt marsh harvest mouse, but without adequate separation from human disturbance, the habitat may go unutilized.

Response #7

- Thank you providing such detailed information. Comment noted. Any project that is implemented will require further analysis and feasibility studies on the proposed configuration of new habitat, how it will be able to adapt with sea

level rise and how public access will be provided or prevented to protect endangered species habitat.

Comment #8

- Conclusion: CCCR would like to thank you for the opportunity to provide comments. The Master Plan is a significant undertaking and we commend HASPA for its efforts and for setting enhancement of the Hayward shoreline's ecological value and providing refuge to help endangered tidal marsh species as goals of the Master Plan.
- We hope there will be future opportunities for public engagement in this planning process and that groups such as CCCR and the Audubon Society can participate as stakeholders . We request that CCCR is added to the notification list for the Master Plan.

Response #8

- CCCR is included on all updates in the Master Plan process and did submit a formal letter. The Audubon Society was included in stakeholder invites, but did not participate.
- The Design Team recommends to HASPA that both CCCR and Audubon receive updates on the Master Plan as the process unfolds.

Benjamin Pearl / San Francisco Bay Bird Observatory

Comment #9

- I am contacting you to comment on the Hayward Regional Shoreline Adaptation Master Plan. Specifically, I wanted to address the plan's inadequate consideration for breeding habitat for the Pacific Coast Distinct Population Segment (DPS) of Federally Threatened Western Snowy Plovers (plovers). Hayward Regional Shoreline (the shoreline) is one of the most significant plover breeding sites within the San Francisco Bay Estuary (Recovery Unit 3, RU3), and in 2020 supported 14% of all plover breeding documented in RU3 (Pearl et al. In Progress). Outside of the South Bay Salt Pond Restoration Project footprint, which supports the majority of plovers in RU3, three sites at the shoreline provide the most important plover breeding habitat in RU3.

Response #9

- Comment noted. Additional feasibility studies and analysis related to endangered species habitat will be required as part of the Master Plan implementation and while the current plan provides a high level road map, it is recommended that additional considerations are given to breeding habitat.

Comment #10

- Oliver Brothers North Salt Ponds are a critical Snowy Plover breeding site.
- In the USFWS Snowy Plover Recovery Plan, the Oliver Brothers North Salt Ponds (OBN Ponds) were noted as one of only seven plover population centers in RU3, and identified as an important area to provide breeding habitat to minimize the potential for population decline (USFWS, 2007). Although this area is not surveyed by either HARD or EBRPD, the San Francisco Bay Bird Observatory (SFBBO) has documented breeding activity in the OBN Ponds for almost twenty years. Since 2003, SFBBO staff and volunteers, most of which were Hayward Shoreline Interpretive Center staff, have conducted at least monthly surveys in these ponds during the breeding season (March-September). In 2003, when SFBBO staff conducted surveys once every two weeks, a total of seven nests were located in these ponds (Strong & Dakin, 2004). After 2003, SFBBO did not have the resources to monitor the area, and surveys were conducted in these ponds by volunteers on a monthly basis. During this time, volunteers located nests and/or observed broods in 2007 (Robinson-Nilson et al. 2007), 2009-10 ((Robinson-Nilson et al. 2009; (Robinson-Nilson et al. 2010), 2014 (Tokatlian et al. 2014), and 2019 (Pearl et al. 2019). Data reported on ebird by citizen scientists indicate undetected breeding activity in the OBN Ponds in 2015 and 2018. In 2020, when SFBBO staff conducted surveys on a weekly basis from May 22-October 2, 11 nests were monitored and an additional two nests were detected as broods (Pearl et al, In Progress). Five of the monitored nests hatched, while four were depredated and the fate of one nest was unknown. Anecdotally, broods experienced moderate to poor survival.
- Although high water levels may have limited plover breeding in the OBN ponds during some years, repair of the outboard levee in 2012 by HARD reduced high tide flooding and likely resulted in more suitable breeding habitat being available to plovers each year. The large amount of breeding activity documented in 2003 and 2020, the only years in which SFBBO staff conducted

regular surveys, indicates that a large amount of breeding activity was likely missed in the years in between. Loss of this breeding habitat without providing enough suitable replacement habitat would have significant affects upon plover recovery in RU3 and for the DPS as a whole.

Response #10

- Comments noted. Oliver Salt Ponds are one of the most vulnerable diked ponds along the Hayward Shoreline. The repairs to the outboard levee would not address flooding from the low-lying levees along the inland channels. The possibility of protecting Oliver Salt Ponds over time with sea level rise was evaluated, but due to severe cost implications, it was recommended to restore the ponds to tidal marsh and relocate the breeding habitat further inland where it is less vulnerable to sea level rise.

Comment #11

- Frank's Dump West undersurveyed, provides high quality Snowy Plover breeding habitat
- In addition to the OBN Ponds, Franks Dump West (FDW) has been identified as suitable breeding habitat since at least 2003. As with the OBN Ponds, after 2003 SFBBO did not have the resources to survey FDW. While HARD employees conducted volunteer surveys for SFBBO between 2004-2019, it appears that FDW was not surveyed by volunteers after 2006. Despite this, with the exception of 2009, plovers have been reported at FDW by citizen scientists on ebird from 2008-2020 during the months of April-July, when plovers present are likely breeders. Breeding was confirmed in six years, when broods were reported on ebird in 2014 and 2016-2020. In 2020, when SFBBO conducted weekly surveys from May 22-October 22, 18 nests were monitored, with 17 determined to have hatched. Among the 6 ponds monitored by SFBBO in 2020 with at least ten nests, FDW had the highest hatching success observed (Pearl et al. In Progress). In addition, five plover chicks were banded from two separate broods, with 3 chicks from one brood all determined to have fledged. Although only 13% of hatched nests were banded, anecdotally, unbanded plover broods at FDW experienced the highest fledging success in RU3, with the majority of broods from hatched nests present each week until fledging.

- Despite the lack of surveying in FDW over the years, it is clear that this pond has supported plover breeding since at least 2014, and likely much longer. If the Sulphur Creek levee and outboard levee along FDW were repaired and raised to meet expected SLR scenarios, and a water control structure was installed on Sulphur Creek to better control water levels in FDW, this pond could continue to contribute significantly to meeting USFWS recovery goals for RU3 and the DPS as a whole. If this pond is opened to tidal action, which was the only alternative ever presented for this Master Plan, and similarly high quality habitat is not provided elsewhere, plover recovery in RU3 will be significantly negatively impacted.

Response #11

- Comments noted. The feasibility of maintaining levees along the Bay over time with sea level rise is of concern as well. Any project identified in the Master Plan will require additional feasibility studies and analysis to determine the appropriate adaptation of habitat over time with sea level rise.

Comment #12

- Least Tern Island provides important plover habitat, but depends on Least Terns
- Least Tern Island in Pond 3A, which was created by the EBRPD to support a breeding colony of California Least Terns, has incidentally supported some plover breeding as well. From 2008, when plovers first nested on the island, through 2020, an average of 4.1 ± 3.0 nests were monitored by EBRPD Biologists (SFBBO Annual Reports 2008-2020). Least Terns are a colonial species that forms a dense breeding colony and aggressively defends eggs and chicks from predators, while plovers are a semi-colonial species that does not actively defend its nest from predators, but instead rely upon crypsis to reduce predator detection. When predators are as far away as 600ft, plovers may flush to conceal the location of the nest. Therefore, plovers may benefit by nesting among Least Terns (Powell 2001, Pearl et al. 2017), who aggressively defend the colony from predators. They also benefit from the intensive habitat management and predator control conducted at the colony by EBRPD.
- It must be noted, however, that in monitoring islands, levees, and berms created as part of the South Bay Salt Pond restoration project, SFBBO has found that plovers do not preferentially select to nest on these habitat types,

and more importantly, these habitats provide low quality habitat compared to salt ponds (Pearl et al. 2019). Due to the small area and narrow parameters of these habitats, the effectiveness of plover's crypsis is greatly reduced, as predators are more likely to randomly find a nest compared to within expansive salt ponds, where they would need to be specifically hunting for nests. As such, any habitat created to support plovers outside of the Least Tern colony should provide a large amount of dry and sparsely vegetated salt panne habitat, ideally enhanced with oyster shells, gravel, or other materials to increase plover crypsis.

Response #12

- The LETE habitat design considerations are noted.

Comment #13

- Major reduction in plover breeding habitat unaccounted for in Master Plan
- In both the Background Report and Master Plan, a map of Hayward Regional Shoreline illustrates where various listed species, including plovers, have been reported on ebird. The map shows that plovers have been reported all over the shoreline, with the OBN Ponds and FDW showing a large amount of sightings. The same map uses symbols to identify where the listed species breed on-site, with plovers erroneously only being listed in Hayward Marsh despite the clear history of breeding in these areas laid out above.
- Currently, the shoreline provides up to approximately 290 acres of habitat suitable for plover breeding in OBN Ponds, FDW, Franks Dump East (FDE), Pond 3A, and surrounding areas, depending upon water conditions. The highest quality habitat among these is found at FDW (49 acres), OBN Ponds (114 acres), and Pond 3A (29 acres). Under the Preferred Alternative with Southern Alternate, total potential breeding habitat would be reduced to approximately 126 acres. If the Southern Alternate is not implemented, available breeding habitat would be reduced to approximately 119 acres, and none of the currently highest quality sites would remain. Instead, plover breeding habitat would be found at three locations, the Diked Baylands/Saltponds (51.5 acres; Diked Pond) north of Hayward Marsh, FDE (41.4 acres), and the small pond east of the West Winton Landfill (4.2 acres; West Winton Pond). As previously mentioned, plovers are a semi-colonial species that requires ample space

throughout their life history to breed successfully, and the major reduction in habitat size could have significant impacts upon the number of plovers that the shoreline can successfully support.

Response #13

- Comment noted. Additional mapping and analysis will be required as the plan is being implemented over time. Plover breeding habitat locations will be further documented.
- Additional environmental analysis and considerations will have to be given to Plover breeding habitat as projects are being identified. The Master Plan tries to achieve a balance between risk reduction, public access and ecological restoration as stated in its goals.

Comment #14

- Appropriate enhancement of remaining plover habitat is critical
- While any alternative that results in a significant reduction in suitable plover breeding habitat, as all alternatives presented did, is not preferred to support plover recovery, enhancement of remaining habitat under the preferred alternative would be critical to partially address the loss of habitat. In the Diked Pond, which would represent the largest remaining plover habitat at the shoreline, providing a large expanse of dry, sparsely vegetated salt panne habitat with no predator perches and consistently available foraging habitat would be essential. Spreading oyster shells, gravel, or other materials to increase plover crypsis would also be important. With these enhancements, the Diked Pond could provide good quality plover breeding habitat.
- FDE may also provide decent quality breeding habitat, but has several problems that limit its habitat value. Most importantly, the presence of three large electrical power towers in the pond provide perches for raptors to hunt from, and in the case of Common Ravens, Peregrine Falcons, and Red-tailed Hawks, are also used to nest on. As part of a predator management plan to support threatened and endangered species, the Don Edwards San Francisco Bay National Wildlife Refuge monitors power towers in sensitive habitat on both Refuge lands and Eden Landing Ecological Reserve for nesting predators and works with PG&E to remove them (Pearl et al. 2019). Operating a similar program in FDE, as well as installing anti-perching equipment where possible,

could significantly improve plover breeding success. FDE is also partially overgrown with dense pickleweed and other vegetation, which plovers can't nest in, reduce plovers ability to detect approaching predators, and provides hiding places for Northern Harriers, Short-eared Owls, and mammals. Removal and/or thinning of this vegetation would be critical to providing the maximum amount of breeding habitat. Lastly, due to the triangular shape of the pond, the wide north side of FDE provides the best potential habitat, while the narrow south side, which is close to the landfill, building, and road, has limited habitat quality.

- The West Winton Pond, at a very small 4.2 acres, and experiencing high disturbance located directly next to the Bay Trail, provides limited habitat value to breeding plovers. If breeding did occur at this pond, it could only support 1-2 nests total each year. However, the value of this pond could be significantly improved by merging its area with a portion of the wet weather equalization ponds proposed to be converted into a freshwater treatment marsh. By adding an additional 25 acres of land along an existing raised area in the wet weather equalization ponds, the West Winton Pond would then provide 29.2 acres of breeding and foraging habitat. Similar enhancements as those proposed for FDE and the Diked Pond could provide moderate to good quality breeding habitat.

Response #14

- Comments noted. Any project identified in the Master Plan will require additional feasibility studies and analysis to determine the appropriate adaptation of habitat over time with sea level rise.

Comment #15

- Additional changes to Master Plan must be considered
- Although the preferred alternative in the Master Plan is an improvement upon the three alternatives presented prior, given an abundance of data that indicates the importance of the shoreline to plover recovery in both RU3 and for the DPS as a whole, it is nevertheless inadequate to support the number of plovers that have been recently shown to breed on site. Based upon the data presented, I strongly suggest that HASPA consider changes to the plan, whether those suggested here or otherwise, to provide a greater amount of breeding habitat for plovers.

- Thank you very much for your responses and consideration.

Response #15

- Comments noted. Any project identified in the Master Plan will require additional feasibility studies and analysis to determine the appropriate adaptation of habitat over time with sea level rise.

Margaret Mary Bauer

Comment #16

- Thank you for the in depth analysis and recommendations made. I am heartened to see that our city staff and council are on the ball with dealing with this issue.

Response #16

- Comment noted.

Sally A Holt

Comment #17

- The western wall should be extended to at least the end of Hayward (ie Costco).

Response #17

- The study area for this project does not extend south of SR 92. The proposed line of protection extends inland at the southern end of the project area in order to tie into higher ground.

Michelle Lin

Comment #18

- From my understanding as an environmentalist is that levees cause more erosion in the long-term – thus creating a solution today at the expense of tomorrow. Since the levees are already present and still provide protection to our facilities, I suggest that we make the effort to expand the marsh beyond the levees through implementing more ecological solutions - planting more vegetation. Marshes act like a sponge, buffering torrents from storms while the vegetations add another benefit of filtering pollutants. Expanding the habitat is also a long-term solution to the continual threat of sea-level rise. Thus, doing

so would mitigate future storms without the expensive and short term solution of raising the height of levees.

Response #18

- The Preferred Alternative aims to provide as much tidal restoration outboard of existing and new levees as possible, while balancing the need to reduce risk to built assets along the Shoreline.
- The Preferred Alternative also expands tidal marsh habitat and identifies strategies to preserve this habitat over time with sea level rise. The marshes will require active management with sea level rise, or else they will transition eventually to mudflats and open water.

Carl

Comment #19

- I have a question about the center - it states you are thinking of moving it as a possibility. Where would it be moved to? I don't think I saw that in the report.

Response #19

- The Preferred Alternative does not identify a specific location to move the Hayward Shoreline Interpretive Center. The SMHM Interim Levee will protect the structure in place up to a certain level of sea level rise. At that point, it can either be retrofitted to be elevated above sea level, or be relocated to another location. One option for relocation is on top of the West Winston Landfill, however this will require additional feasibility and engineering studies.

Comment #20

- Another question that might be more for the City of Hayward, but getting to the center is a two lane road in and out. Has there been talk by the city about making a bike lane to the shoreline and also the overhead bridge to get to Eden Landing, has there been any talk about that? Again a lane to the bridge would be nice, that again might be city of Hayward. I am not sure if that would take up part of the park on that side of the road

Response #20

- There is currently a pedestrian bridge above SR-92 that connects the Bay Trail from Eden Landing to the Hayward Regional Shoreline.

- The bike lane suggestion is noted.

Comment #21

- Also has there been any thought to making the trail from the center to San Leandro paved? I know this is an odd question but I have been asked this by people I have seen on the trail. I have said that I don't think it will ever happen given the resource that it is.

Response #21

- The suggestions is noted. The exact material of the Bay Trail will require additional feasibility studies and analysis, however we do know that a paved trail is preferred to leverage transportation funding as it could be considered as a commuter trail.

Comment #22

- Overall the plan looks fine.

Response #22

- Comment noted.

Debbie Pollart / City of San Leandro Public Works Director**Comment #23**

- Graphic after page 57 shows a 'bridge' located in the San Leandro Marshlands (located adjacent to/north of San Lorenzo Creek). This area is not within the COH's jurisdiction and I'm wondering what exactly the bridge is intended to be/function as (i.e., for peds/bikes?).

Response #23

- This graphic depicts infrastructure (transmission towers and power lines) that will be impacted by sea level rise, as indicated on the legend.

Comment #24

- Graphic after page 67 - All of the Heron Bay subdivision should be indicated as 'yellow' (residential). This graphic shows two bridges, so same comment as #1 above.

Response #24

- Comment noted- the graphic representation of Heron Bay subdivision will be updated.
- This graphic depicts infrastructure (transmission towers and power lines) that will be impacted by sea level rise, as indicated on the legend.

Comment #25

- Pages 69 and 79, LAVWMA is an acronym and should be all caps.

Response #25

- Comment noted- this will be updated.

Comment #26

- Page 71 - Why is there no mention of the San Leandro Marshlands? They are outside of the Project Area, but shown in the graphic, just like the South Bay Salt Ponds Restoration Project. Ditto for graphic after page 75.

Response #26

- Comment noted- label will be added.

Comment #27

- Graphic after page 77, Heron Bay subdivision should be all yellow (no different colored lots).

Response #27

- Comment noted- this will be updated.

Comment #28

- Referring to the graphic before page 141, I will be very interested to see the discussion of potential impacts to City of San Leandro residents/infrastructure and our 315 acres of restored marshlands in the coming CEQA review process from the proposed flood protection levee (the northernmost portion). Similar to ACFCD's comment noted in the Draft Plan, I have a concern about this feature simply pushing water elsewhere and potentially impacting San Leandro residents and biologically sensitive marshlands (we also have Ridgeway Rails and Salt Marsh Harvest Mouse).

Response #28

- As noted on page 236, more detailed technical analysis will be needed to evaluate the proposed tie-ins to high ground, access needs across the line of protection (for transportation connectivity, wildlife, safety, etc.) as well as evaluate the potential for increasing flood levels in surrounding communities.

Comment #29

- Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Draft Master Plan Report. Please include me in future notifications when the Draft EIR is available for public comment.

Response #29

- Comment noted. The design team recommends to HASPA to update the project's distribution list.

Wade Winblad**Comment #30**

- Please visit the San Leandro marina or Sausalito. We could have a beautiful and FUNCTIONAL shoreline. Now we have stinking mud flats and a stupid useless museum. I haven't been there in about 10 years because it's a wasteland.
- I want to visit a restaurant or Marina. Development will be generate revenue instead of a TAX DRAIN. Why do you government types want mud?

Response #30

- Comment noted.

Comment #31

- Would prioritize Restaurants, Views, Entertainment

Response #31

- Comment noted.

Jackie Zipkin / EBDA**Comment #32**

- I'm not planning to submit formal comments because overall, I think this has been a fantastic process and all of EBDA's big picture ideas have been incorporated. I am writing just to offer a handful of minor suggestions to

improve the final report. None of these are critical, but they are things that occurred to me in reviewing it again. Please let me know if you have any questions. I look forward to continuing to work with the team on implementation.

Response #32

- Comment noted.

Comment #33

- On page 98 in the graphic that describes the Ecotone Levee, where it says “Reclaimed Water”, I suggest changing the text to read, “Effluent could potentially be discharged through the densely vegetated slope” or “under the densely vegetated slope.” Per the design of the Oro Loma system, the water is discharged subsurface. This is important because there have been community concerns about having wastewater added to local marshes. This distinction makes clear that the wastewater is under the soil and poses no risk to the public (not that it would anyway, but it seems like an important clarification).

Response #33

- Comment noted- this will be updated in the final document.

Comment #34

- On page 101:
 - I don’t really see the relevance of the Novato example. Perhaps instead use a Hayward example?
 - Suggest standardizing on Treatment Facility or Plant in the graphic.
 - For the eastern part of the graphic, change to Livermore-Amador Valley or add Livermore Plant/Facility and Dublin-San Ramon Plant/Facility.
 - In the description, change “decommissioning” to “repurposing”

Response #34

- Comment noted- this will be updated in the final document.

Comment #35

- Page 127, see edits in red. Also, should Oro Loma Sanitary District be added to this table?

Response #35

- Comment noted- this will be updated in the final document.

Comment #36

- Page 141 and page 150 – Why is the area next to the Hayward ponds in the Closer to the Bay alternative is shown as ecotone levee rather than horizontal levee with wastewater inputs as in the other alternatives?

Response #36

- This configuration was provided as an option for discussion. The final Preferred Alternative incorporates a horizontal levee, however the Design Alternatives were formulated to solicit feedback over multiple configurations to inform the selection of the final proposal.

Comment #37

- Page 145 – delete the sentence “This alternative assumes that EBDA is decommissioned.” It’s not accurate and doesn’t seem necessary.

Response #37

- Comment noted- this will be updated in the final document.

Comment #38

- Pages 183 and 185 – it seems to me it makes sense to phase the Hayward treatment wetland and the Hayward horizontal levee together so that you can integrate their designs.

Response #38

- Comment noted.

Comment #39

- 7. Page 191 – typo: Dams and Reservoirs - Reservoirs such has the Don Castro Reservoir

Response #39

- Comment noted- this will be updated in the final document.

Comment #40

- Page 209 – typo under stakeholders for Oro Loma Phase 1 : East Bay Dischargers Authority

Response #40

- Comment noted- this will be updated in the final document.

Comment #41

- Page 222 – Under #1 (Oro Loma), suggest the following: Coordination Opportunity: Monitoring and evaluation of the Oro Loma Horizontal Levee pilot is an opportunity to inform the design and implementation of the proposed Hayward and First Mile/Oro Loma Horizontal Levees. Also, under #2 (First Mile), fix typo: East Bay Dischargers Authority

Response #41

- Comment noted- this will be updated in the final document.

Comment #42

- Page 236 – Under Wastewater Treatment: This includes assessing space needed for the treatment wetland, as well as how the design may be impacted by the potential decommissioning repurposing of the EBDA pipeline.

Response #42

- Comment noted- this will be updated in the final document.