LONG-TERM MANAGEMENT STRATEGY (LTMS) FOR THE PLACEMENT OF DREDGED MATERIAL IN THE SAN FRANCISCO BAY REGION

FINAL

Policy Environmental Impact Statement/
Programmatic Environmental Impact Report

Volume I

Also includes Appendices A, H, J, K, and M

October 1998

Prepared by

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (COE)
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)
San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC)
San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board (SFBRWQCB)
State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB)

Errata

The following Appendices can be found in Volume II of the Draft EIS/EIR: B, C, D, E, F, G, I, L, N, O, P, and Q. These appendices were not reprinted with the Final EIS/EIR because they have not changed since the Draft EIS/EIR. Updated Appendices A, H, J, K, and M are included with Volume I of the Final EIS/EIR. Also, new Appendix R (Comments and Responses on the Draft EIS/EIR) is included in the new Volume III (the Table of Contents in Volume I of the Final EIS/EIR incorrectly lists this new volume as "Volume II"). Anyone needing a copy of the unchanged appendices from Volume II of the original Draft EIS/EIR should contact the following person:

Karen Mason
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Planning Branch, 7th Floor
333 Market Street
San Francisco, CA 94105-2197
415-977-8677

Alternative 3 (Balance Upland/Wetland Reuse and Ocean Disposal), which is discussed throughout the EIS/EIR, is both the "Preferred Alternative," pursuant to 40 C.F.R. § 1502.14(e), and the "Environmentally Preferable Alternative," pursuant to 40 C.F.R. § 1505.2.

Volume I, page 5-21, right column, 1st full paragraph. The text should be revised as follows:

> Since violations of the O_3 standard occurred in 1995 and 1996, the EPA ~~is in the process of redesignating~~ has redesignated the SFBAAB from attainment/ maintenance to nonattainment of the O_3 standard. This redesignation ~~is expected in July 1998~~ became effective on August 10, 1998, and it will require….

Volume I, page 5-21, bottom right paragraph to page 5-22, top left paragraph. The last partial sentence on page 5-21 should be revised as follows:

> Since the EPA ~~will redesignate~~ redesignated the SFBAAB to nonattainment of the O_3 standard ~~by as early as July 1998~~, effective as of August 10, 1998, the…

Volume I, page 6-78, bottom right paragraph. The 1st sentence under the section titled "Site Monitoring Disposal Fees" should be revised as follows:

> Disposal fees, determined to be legally applicable, would require state legislative action to implement.

LONG-TERM MANAGEMENT STRATEGY (LTMS) FOR THE PLACEMENT OF DREDGED MATERIAL IN THE SAN FRANCISCO BAY REGION

FINAL

Policy Environmental Impact Statement/
Programmatic Environmental Impact Report

Volume I

Also includes Appendices A, H, J, K, and M

Prepared for

LTMS Management Committee

Prepared by

The LTMS Agencies

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (COE)
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)
San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC)
San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board (SFBRWQCB)
State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB)

with Document Production Assistance by

Science Applications International Corporation
Environmental Programs Division

October 1998

TABLE OF CONTENTS

VOLUME I

1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY 1-1

1.1 PURPOSE AND STRUCTURE OF THIS DOCUMENT 1-1

1.2 NEED FOR A LONG-TERM MANAGEMENT STRATEGY 1-2

1.3 OVERVIEW OF THE LTMS EFFORT 1-3

1.3.1 Relation of the LTMS to National Dredging Policy 1-3

1.4 EIS/EIR SCOPING PROCESS 1-5

1.5 STUDY LIMITATIONS 1-5

1.6 DEVELOPMENT OF ALTERNATIVE MANAGEMENT APPROACHES 1-6

1.6.1 Screening of Preliminary Alternatives 1-6

1.6.2 Policy-Level Mitigation Measures 1-6

1.6.3 Alternatives Retained for Detailed Analysis 1-9

1.7 COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES 1-11

1.7.1 Evaluation Criteria for the EIS/EIR Alternatives 1-11

1.7.2 No-Action (Current Conditions) 1-12

1.7.3 Alternative 1 (Emphasize Aquatic Disposal) 1-13

1.7.4 Alternative 2 (Balance Upland/Wetland Reuse and In-Bay Disposal) 1-14

1.7.5 Alternative 3 (Balance Upland/Wetland Reuse and Ocean Disposal) 1-15

1.7.6 Air Quality Effects 1-16

1.8 THE PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE 1-16

1.9 IMPLEMENTATION 1-16

1.9.1 Finalizing the Policy EIS/EIR 1-16

1.9.2 Development of the Comprehensive LTMS Management Plan 1-17

1.9.3 Agency-Specific Regulatory and Policy Changes 1-17

2.0 INTRODUCTION 2-1

2.1 THE SAN FRANCISCO LONG-TERM MANAGEMENT STRATEGY 2-3

2.1.1 LTMS Organizational Structure 2-4

2.1.2 Overall Goals and Objectives of the LTMS 2-4

2.1.3 Phases of the LTMS 2-4

2.1.3.1 Phase I: Evaluate Existing Management Options 2-6

2.1.3.2 Phase II: Formulate Alternatives 2-6

2.1.3.3 Phase III: Detailed Analysis of Alternatives 2-6

2.1.3.4 Phase IV: LTMS Implementation 2-6

2.1.3.5 Phase V: Periodic Review and Update 2-6

2.1.4 LTMS Work Groups 2-7

2.1.4.1 Ocean Studies 2-7

2.1.4.2 In-Bay Studies 2-7

2.1.4.3 Upland/Wetland Reuse Studies 2-7

2.1.4.4 Work Group Collaboration — Planning Studies 2-7

2.2 HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE LEADING TO THE LTMS 2-8

2.2.1 Historical Dredged Material Management in the San Francisco Bay Region 2-8

2.2.2 "Mudlock" 2-10

2.2.3 Relationship of the San Francisco Estuary Project to the LTMS 2-12

2.2.4 National Dredging Policy 2-13

2.2.5 Relationship of the LTMS to the CALFED Bay/Delta Program 2-13

2.3 EIS/EIR SCOPING PROCESS 2-13
2.4 PROPOSED ACTION 2-14
2.4.1 Purpose for Action 2-15
2.4.2 Need for Action 2-15
2.4.2.1 Need to Ensure Adequate Disposal Capacity for Projected Volumes of Dredged Material 2-16
2.4.2.2 Need to Ensure Appropriate Environmental Protection 2-16
2.4.2.3 Need to Improve Coordination and Integration of Agency Policies 2-17
2.4.2.4 Need to Develop a Regional Framework to Facilitate Reuse of Dredged Material for Beneficial Purposes 2-18
2.4.2.5 Need to Identify Appropriate Funding Policies to Support the Above Issues and Facilitate the Goals of the LTMS 2-18
2.5 EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR THE EIS/EIR ALTERNATIVES 2-19
2.6 OTHER ISSUES OF PUBLIC CONCERN 2-19
2.6.1 Issues Addressed in Policy-Level Mitigation Measures Common to All Alternatives 2-19
2.6.2 Study Limitations: Issues Raised during Scoping that are Outside the Scope of this EIS/EIR 2-21
2.7 SELECTING A PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE LONG-TERM APPROACH 2-23
2.8 FUTURE ACTIONS 2-23
2.8.1 Finalizing the Policy EIS/EIR 2-24
2.8.2 Development of the LTMS Comprehensive Management Plan 2-24
2.8.3 Other Agency Regulatory and Policy Changes 2-24
2.9 NON-STANDARD STRUCTURE OF THE EVALUATION IN THIS EIS/EIR 2-25

3.0 DREDGING AND DREDGED MATERIAL CHARACTERISTICS — AN OVERVIEW 3-1
3.1 DREDGING IN THE SAN FRANCISCO BAY REGION 3-1
3.1.1 Dredging and Disposal Methods 3-1
3.1.1.1 General 3-1
3.1.1.2 Dredging Process, Equipment, and Techniques 3-2
3.1.1.3 The General Impacts of Dredging 3-4
3.1.1.4 Transportation of Dredged Material 3-6
3.1.1.5 Material Placement or Disposal Operations 3-7
3.1.1.6 Feasible Reuse Options in the San Francisco Bay Area 3-11
3.1.2 Dredging Volumes — LTMS Planning Estimates 3-13
3.1.2.1 Method for Re-Evaluating Dredging Volumes 3-13
3.1.2.2 Revised Dredging Volume Estimate for the 50-Year LTMS Planning Period 3-14
3.2 BAY AREA SEDIMENT AND DREDGED MATERIAL CHARACTERISTICS 3-15
3.2.1 Physical Characteristics 3-16
3.2.2 Movement and Fate of Sediments in the Estuary System 3-20
3.2.3 Contaminants in Dredged Material 3-51
3.2.3.1 Anthropogenic vs. Non-Anthropogenic Chemicals — What is "Contamination"? 3-55
3.2.3.2 Major Sources of Sediment Contamination 3-55
3.2.3.3 Contamination Levels in San Francisco Bay/Delta Estuary Sediments 3-56
3.2.3.4 Efforts to Reduce Sediment Contamination 3-63
3.2.3.5 Determining When "Contamination" is a Problem in San Francisco Bay/Delta Estuary Sediments 3-63

3.2.4 Contaminant Exposure Pathways and Potential Risks in Different Placement Environments 3-64
3.2.4.1 Exposure Pathways in Aquatic Placement Environments 3-66
3.2.4.2 Exposure Pathways in Upland Placement Environments 3-69
3.2.4.3 Exposure Pathways in Nearshore Placement Environments 3-71
3.2.4.4 Ability to Take Corrective Site Management Measures in Different Placement Environments 3-71
3.2.4.5 Summary of Potential Management Actions and Control Measures for Contaminant Pathways of Concern 3-73
3.2.5 Role of Sediment Evaluations (Testing) 3-75
3.2.5.1 Testing for Aquatic Disposal 3-75
3.2.5.2 Testing for Upland Disposal 3-81
3.2.5.3 Testing for Nearshore Disposal 3-82
3.2.5.4 Opportunities to "Streamline" Testing Needs 3-83
3.2.6 Management of Contaminated Dredged Material 3-84
3.2.6.1 Confined Aquatic Disposal 3-84
3.2.6.2 Confined Upland Disposal 3-86
3.2.6.3 Treatment 3-87
3.3 STATUS OF DREDGED MATERIAL DISPOSAL TODAY 3-88
3.4 SUMMARY 3-89

4.0 AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT 4-1
4.1 LTMS PLANNING AREA 4-1
4.2 REGIONAL SETTING 4-3
4.2.1 Climate of the LTMS Planning Area 4-3
4.2.2 Geologic History of the LTMS Planning Area 4-4
4.2.3 Pre-Settlement Conditions 4-5
4.2.4 Historical Changes 4-6
4.2.4.1 Increased Sediment Deposition 4-6
4.2.4.2 Land Reclamation and Agriculture 4-7
4.2.4.3 Dams and Water Diversions 4-7
4.2.4.4 Flood Control 4-9
4.2.4.5 Pollution 4-9
4.2.4.6 Introduced Species 4-10
4.2.4.7 Commercial and Recreational Fisheries 4-10
4.2.5 Navigation in the Estuary Today 4-10
4.2.5.1 Shipping Lanes and Vessel Traffic 4-10
4.3 AQUATIC ENVIRONMENTS OF THE SAN FRANCISCO BAY/DELTA ESTUARY 4-19
4.3.1 Estuary-Wide Conditions 4-19
4.3.1.1 Hydrology 4-19
4.3.1.2 Water Quality 4-25
4.3.1.3 Sediment Quality 4-30
4.3.1.4 Aquatic Habitats of the San Francisco Estuary 4-34
4.3.1.5 Biological Resources of the San Francisco Bay Estuary 4-37
4.3.1.6 Marine Mammals 4-45
4.3.2 Embayments 4-46
4.3.2.1 Central Bay 4-46
4.3.2.2 San Pablo Bay 4-62
4.3.2.3 Carquinez Strait 4-70
4.3.2.4 Suisun Bay 4-78

4.3.2.5 South Bay 4-83
4.3.2.6 Delta 4-86

4.4 UPLAND/WETLAND REUSE ENVIRONMENT 4-87
4.4.1 The Upland/Wetland Reuse Environment Setting 4-88
4.4.1.1 Upland/Wetland Reuse Environment Parameters 4-88
4.4.2 Upland Habitats and Resources 4-98
4.4.2.1 Diked Historic Baylands 4-98
4.4.2.2 Managed Wetlands 4-105
4.4.2.3 Riparian Habitat 4-106
4.4.2.4 Delta Levees 4-108
4.4.2.5 Urbanized Areas 4-110
4.4.3 LTMS Ranking of UWR Sites 4-113
4.4.4 Capacity Estimates for UWR 4-113
4.4.4.1 SUAD vs. NUAD Material 4-116
4.4.4.2 Habitat Restoration 4-116
4.4.4.3 Rehandling Facility 4-116
4.4.4.4 Levee Maintenance and Stabilization 4-118
4.4.4.5 UWR Reuse Scenario Estimates 4-118
4.4.5 Types of Upland and Wetland Reuse — Resources of Concern 4-120
4.4.5.1 Habitat Restoration 4-120
4.4.5.2 Levee Maintenance and Stabilization 4-125
4.4.5.3 Rehandling Facilities 4-132
4.4.6 Additional Potential UWR Impacts of Concern 4-136
4.4.6.1 Odor and Dust Impacts 4-136
4.4.6.2 Archaeological and Cultural Resources Impacts 4-137
4.4.7 Conclusions Regarding Upland and Wetland Reuse 4-137

4.5 THE PACIFIC OCEAN ENVIRONMENT 4-138
4.5.1 Setting 4-138
4.5.2 Physical Environment 4-138
4.5.2.1 Physical Oceanography 4-143
4.5.2.2 Water Quality 4-144
4.5.2.3 Offshore Geology 4-147
4.5.2.4 Physical Environment Summary 4-148
4.5.3 Biological Resources 4-148
4.5.3.1 Pelagic Community 4-148
4.5.3.2 Terrestrial-Based Marine Community 4-149
4.5.3.3 Benthic Community 4-150
4.5.3.4 Commercially and Recreationally Important Species 4-151
4.5.3.5 Special Status Species 4-151
4.5.3.6 Biological Resources Summary 4-153
4.5.4 Pollutants and Historic Impacts 4-153
4.5.4.1 Dredged Material Disposal 4-154
4.5.4.2 Chemical and Conventional Munitions Waste 4-154
4.5.4.3 Radioactive Waste 4-154
4.5.4.4 Pollutants and Historic Impacts Summary 4-155

4.6 REGIONAL SOCIOECONOMIC SETTING 4-155
4.6.1 Existing Regional Economic Activity 4-156
4.6.2 Dredging-Dependent Industries and the Regional Economy 4-157
4.6.2.1 Structure of the Dredging Economy 4-157
4.6.2.2 Contribution of Dredging-Dependent Industries to the Regional Economy 4-158

4.6.3 Types of Costs faced by the Dredging Community 4-162
4.6.3.1 Testing Costs 4-162
4.6.3.2 Dredging and Placement Costs 4-163
4.6.3.3 Rehandling Costs 4-163
4.6.3.4 Site Development and Management Costs 4-163
4.6.4 Existing Financing Structures for Dredging and Disposal 4-164
4.6.4.1 Major Dredgers Financing 4-165
4.6.4.2 Small Dredgers Financing 4-165

4.7 AIR QUALITY 4-166
4.7.1 Climate and Meteorology 4-166
4.7.2 Applicable Air Quality Regulations 4-169
4.7.2.1 Federal Regulations 4-169
4.7.2.2 State Regulations 4-171
4.7.2.3 Local Regulations 4-171
4.7.3 Baseline Air Quality 4-173
4.7.4 San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin Emissions 4-180

4.8 REGULATORY ENVIRONMENT 4-182
4.8.1 Existing Laws and Policies Governing Dredged Material 4-182
4.8.1.1 International Treaties 4-182
4.8.1.2 Federal Laws 4-182
4.8.1.3 State Laws and Policies 4-185
4.8.2 Description of the Permitting Framework and Process 4-186
4.8.2.1 Current Application Process 4-187
4.8.2.2 COE Projects 4-189
4.8.3 Process for Material that is Unacceptable for Aquatic Disposal 4-189

5.0 POLICY-LEVEL MITIGATION MEASURES AND ALTERNATIVES DEVELOPMENT 5-1

5.1 POLICY/PROGRAM-LEVEL MITIGATION MEASURES 5-1
5.1.1 Mitigation Measures that Generally Apply to Dredged Material Disposal and Reuse 5-1
5.1.1.1 Material Suitability and Sediment Quality Testing 5-1
5.1.1.2 Site Management and Monitoring 5-2
5.1.1.3 Reviewing the Need for Dredging 5-2
5.1.1.4 Coordinated Dredged Material Management 5-3
5.1.1.5 Small Dredger Set-Aside 5-3
5.1.2 Mitigation Measures that Apply in Specific Environments 5-3
5.1.2.1 Upland Habitat Conversion Associated with Restoration Projects 5-4
5.1.2.2 Habitat Protection 5-5
5.1.2.3 Ocean Site Monitoring 5-11
5.1.3 Mitigation Measures Applicable to Specific Types of Projects or Facilities 5-11
5.1.3.1 Rehandling Facilities and Dedicated Confined Disposal Facilities 5-14
5.1.3.2 Wetland Restoration 5-14
5.1.3.3 Confined Aquatic Disposal (CAD) 5-16
5.1.3.4 Levee Reuse 5-17

5.2 CLEAN AIR ACT CONFORMITY ANALYSIS 5-17
5.2.1 Introduction 5-17
5.2.2 Regulatory Background 5-20
5.2.3 Applicability Analysis 5-21
5.2.4 Conformity Determination 5-22

5.3 ALTERNATIVES DEVELOPMENT 5-22
5.3.1 Options Eliminated from Consideration Based on Scoping 5-23
5.3.2 Development of Material Distribution Scenarios 5-23

5.3.3 Preliminary Alternatives Carried Forward for Consideration 5-24
5.3.3.1 Preliminary Alternative A: No-Action (Current Conditions) 5-25
5.3.3.2 Preliminary Alternative B: Emphasize Aquatic Disposal (Minimal Upland/Wetland Reuse) 5-26
5.3.3.3 Preliminary Alternative C: Emphasize Ocean Disposal 5-27
5.3.3.4 Preliminary Alternative D: Balance UWR and In-Bay Disposal (Minimal Ocean Disposal) 5-27
5.3.3.5 Preliminary Alternative E: Balance UWR and Ocean Disposal (Minimal In-Bay Disposal) 5-27
5.3.3.6 Preliminary Alternative F: Emphasize Upland/Wetland Reuse 5-28

6.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES 6-1
6.1 "GENERIC ANALYSIS" OF THE THREE PLACEMENT ENVIRONMENTS 6-1
6.1.1 Water Quality Comparisons 6-2
6.1.1.1 Ocean Disposal 6-2
6.1.1.2 In-Bay Disposal 6-3
6.1.1.3 Disposal at Upland/Wetland Reuse Sites 6-7
6.1.2 Fish and Wildlife Habitat Comparisons 6-9
6.1.2.1 Ocean Disposal 6-10
6.1.2.2 In-Bay Disposal 6-11
6.1.2.3 Disposal at Upland/Wetland Reuse Sites 6-12
6.1.3 Special Status Species Comparisons 6-15
6.1.3.1 Ocean Disposal 6-15
6.1.3.2 In-Bay Disposal 6-16
6.1.3.3 Disposal at Upland/Wetland Reuse Sites 6-17
6.1.4 Transportation System Comparisons 6-18
6.1.4.1 Ocean Disposal 6-19
6.1.4.2 In-Bay Disposal 6-20
6.1.4.3 Disposal at Upland/Wetland/Reuse Sites 6-20
6.1.5 Air Quality Comparisons 6-21
6.1.5.1 Impact Significance Criteria 6-22
6.1.5.2 Ocean Disposal 6-23
6.1.5.3 In-Bay Disposal 6-25
6.1.5.4 Upland/Wetland Disposal 6-25
6.1.6 Archaeological and Cultural Resource Comparisons 6-29
6.1.7 Summary of Benefits and Impacts by Placement Environment 6-29
6.1.8 Final Alternatives Carried Forward for Consideration 6-29
6.1.9 Summary Matrix: Benefits and Impacts/ Risks of the Final Alternatives Compared to the Environmental Criteria in the Preceding Generic Analysis 6-32
6.2 EVALUATION OF THE FINAL ALTERNATIVES AGAINST THE FINAL EVALUATION CRITERIA 6-42
6.2.1 Benefits and Risks to Ecological Systems 6-42
6.2.1.1 No-Action (Current Conditions) 6-42
6.2.1.2 Alternative 1 — Emphasize Aquatic Disposal (Minimal UWR) 6-43
6.2.1.3 Alternative 2 — Balance Upland/Wetland Reuse and In-Bay Disposal (Minimal Ocean Disposal) 6-44
6.2.1.4 Alternative 3 — Balance Upland/Wetland Reuse and Ocean Disposal (Minimal In-Bay Disposal) 6-44
6.2.2 Regulatory Certainty 6-45
6.2.2.1 No-Action (Current Conditions) 6-46
6.2.2.2 Alternative 1 — Emphasize Aquatic Disposal (Minimal UWR) 6-47

6.2.2.3 Alternative 2 — Balance Upland/Wetland Reuse and In-Bay Disposal (Minimal Ocean Disposal) 6-47
6.2.2.4 Alternative 3 — Balance Upland/Wetland Reuse and Ocean Disposal (Minimal In-Bay Disposal) 6-48
6.2.3 Dredging-Related Economic Sectors 6-48
6.2.3.1 Background on Cost Estimates 6-49
6.2.3.2 Evaluation of Socioeconomic Effects 6-52
6.2.4 Air Quality Assessment 6-61
6.2.4.1 No-Action Alternative 6-61
6.2.4.2 Alternative 1 6-64
6.2.4.3 Alternative 2 6-65
6.2.4.4 Alternative 3 6-66
6.2.4.5 Comparison of Project Alternatives 6-67
6.3 ADDITIONAL POLICIES IDENTIFIED AS NEEDED BASED ON EVALUATION OF POTENTIAL IMPACTS 6-68
6.3.1 Special Consideration for "Small Dredger" Projects 6-68
6.3.2 Establishment of Additional Capacity for Rehandling and for Upland/Wetland Reuse or Disposal 6-68
6.4 SUMMARY OF THE PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE 6-69
6.4.1 Achieving the Preferred Alternative 6-69
6.5 INITIAL IMPLEMENTATION OF ALTERNATIVE 3 — TRANSITION PERIOD 6-69
6.5.1 Overview 6-69
6.5.2 Disposal Goals 6-70
6.5.3 Assumptions Regarding Capacity 6-71
6.5.4 Transition Period Initial Disposal Limit 6-71
6.5.5 Decreasing the in-Bay Disposal Limit 6-76
6.5.6 UWR and Ocean Disposal During the Transition Period 6-76
6.5.7 Potential Strategies for Implementing Alternative 3 6-76
6.5.7.1 Strategy 1 — 3-Year Allotments with "Banking" and "Trading" Allowed 6-79
6.5.7.2 Strategy 2 — 3-Year Allotments with "Banking" and "Trading" Allowed and a Fixed Overall Yearly Disposal Cap 6-80
6.5.7.3 Strategy 3 — 1-Year Allotments with Trading Allowed 6-80
6.5.7.4 Strategy 4 — First-Come, First-Served 6-80
6.5.7.5 Strategy 5 — Reduced In-Bay Disposal of COE Maintenance Material Only 6-80

7.0 IMPLEMENTATION OF THE SELECTED ALTERNATIVE 7-1
7.1 ACTIONS TO BE TAKEN BY PARTICIPATING AGENCIES BASED ON THIS EIS/EIR 7-1
7.1.1 Improved Sediment Evaluation and Testing Procedures 7-2
7.1.2 Improved Site Management and Monitoring Procedures 7-2
7.1.3 Improved Regulatory Coordination 7-3
7.1.4 Responding to a Changing Environment 7-3
7.2 OPTIONS FOR ACHIEVING THE LONG-TERM DESIRED DREDGED MATERIAL DISTRIBUTION: LIMITING AND ALLOCATING AQUATIC DISPOSAL 7-4

7.3 FINANCING OPTIONS TO PROMOTE BENEFICIAL REUSE 7-5
7.3.1 Federal Financing 7-5
7.3.1.1 Develop More Dredging-Related Wetlands Restoration Projects 7-6
7.3.1.2 Develop Projects that Use Funds Designed to Restore or Enhance Habitat Associated with Already-Constructed Navigational Projects 7-6
7.3.1.3 Use Exceptions Presently Allowed to the NED Plan Process to Approve More Projects with Upland Disposal and Beneficial Reuse Features 7-6
7.3.1.4 Expand Use of the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund 7-6
7.3.1.5 Identify Beneficial Reuse Projects Appropriate for Supplemental Environmental Projects Undertaken through Enforcement Actions 7-7
7.3.1.6 Wetland Mitigation Banking 7-7
7.3.2 State Financing Options 7-7
7.3.2.1 Mitigation Funds 7-7
7.3.2.2 State Regional Dredging Trust 7-8
7.3.2.3 Allow Privately-Owned, Multi-User Disposal Sites to Receive Limited Financial Incentives 7-8
7.3.2.4 Fund Staff Position to Identify Markets and Uses for Dredged Material During Project Planning Phase 7-8
7.3.2.5 New State or Regional Tax 7-8
7.3.3 State and Federal Financing Options 7-8
7.3.3.1 CALFED 7-8
7.4 FACILITATING AN EFFICIENT REGIONAL DREDGING MANAGEMENT SYSTEM 7-8
7.4.1 Institutional Barriers Limiting the Flexibility of Regional Disposal Planning 7-9
7.4.1.1 Developing Cost-Sharing Arrangements to Include All Local Beneficiaries Can Be Difficult 7-9
7.4.1.2 Federal Cost-Sharing Policies for Dredging Activities Favor Aquatic (in-Bay and Ocean) Disposal Methods 7-9
7.4.1.3 Absence of Programs for Federal and State Government Participation in the Acquisition and Development of Disposal Sites for "Unsuitable" Materials 7-9
7.4.1.4 Prerequisites to Qualify for Federal Financing of New Project Dredging Can Be Costly 7-10
7.4.1.5 Revenues Available to Disposal Sites are Limited 7-10
7.4.1.6 Absence of Governmental Funds for Site Monitoring of Beneficial Uses 7-10
7.4.1.7 Federal Guidelines for Carrying Out Section 404(b)(1) of the Clean Water Act Can Be a Barrier to Wetland Restoration Projects in Sensitive Jurisdictional Wetland Areas 7-10
7.4.2 Options for Facilitating Effective and Efficient Disposal Planning 7-10
7.4.2.1 Change Federal Cost-Sharing Formulas 7-10
7.4.2.2 Authorize an Agency to Acquire and Oversee Upland Disposal Sites 7-11
7.4.2.3 Replace the Existing State Lands Dredging Fee, the BCDC Dredging Fee, and the SFBRWQCB Permit Fee with a Single Regional Dredging Fee 7-11
7.4.2.4 Authorize the Creation of a State Regional Dredging Trust 7-11
7.4.2.5 Change Policies on the Use of the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund 7-11
7.4.2.6 Streamline Federal Requirements under 404(b)(1) Guidelines for Restoration Projects 7-11

8.0 CUMULATIVE BENEFITS AND IMPACTS 8-1
8.1 POTENTIAL CUMULATIVE EFFECTS OF ACTION ALTERNATIVES ON THE IN-BAY ENVIRONMENT 8-1
8.1.1 Water Quality 8-1
8.1.2 Changes to the Bay System 8-1
8.1.3 Air Quality 8-2
8.2 POTENTIAL CUMULATIVE EFFECTS OF ACTION ALTERNATIVES ON THE OCEAN ENVIRONMENT 8-2
8.2.1 Water Quality 8-2
8.2.2 Increased Maritime Traffic 8-2
8.2.3 Air Quality 8-2
8.3 POTENTIAL CUMULATIVE BENEFITS AND IMPACTS OF ACTION ALTERNATIVES ON THE UPLAND/ WETLAND REUSE ENVIRONMENT 8-3
8.3.1 Habitat Conversion 8-3
8.3.2 Water Quality 8-4
8.3.3 Air Quality 8-4
8.3.4 Truck Traffic 8-4

9.0 SHORT-TERM USES VS. LONG-TERM PRODUCTIVITY 9-1

10.0 IRREVERSIBLE OR IRRETRIEVABLE COMMITMENTS OF RESOURCES 10-1

11.0 GROWTH-INDUCING IMPACTS 11-1

12.0 REFERENCES 12-1

13.0 GLOSSARY 13-1

14.0 ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS 14-1

15.0 PREPARERS OF THE LTMS POLICY EIS/PROGRAMMATIC EIR 15-1

16.0 LIST OF MEASUREMENTS 16-1

APPENDICES

Note: Below is a complete list of all the appendices that are part of the EIS/EIR. Appendix R (Comments and Responses on the Draft EIS/EIR) has been added as a new appendix since the public draft document; it is contained in Volume II of the Final EIS/EIR. Of the other appendices listed below, only appendices A, H, J, K, and M have changed since the Draft EIS/EIR. These five appendices are bound with Volume I of the EIS/EIR. Since the other appendices have not changed since the Draft EIS/EIR, they have not been reproduced for the Final EIS/EIR.

A LTMS Participants Past and Present

B California Environmental Quality Act Environmental Assessment Checklist for the Long-Term Management Strategy for San Francisco Bay Area Dredged Material

C Dredging-Related Recommendations from the San Francisco Estuary Project's *Comprehensive Conservation and Management Plan*

D Excerpts Related to National Dredging Policy from *The Dredging Process in the United States: An Action Plan for Improvement*

E San Francisco Regional Dredging Quantity Estimate, Dredging Project Profiles, and Placement Site Profiles

F Proposed Overall LTMS Sediment Classification Framework

G Confined Aquatic Disposal (CAD) in San Francisco Bay — General Discussion of Environmental Impacts and Issues

H Federal and State Water Quality Criteria and Objectives

- H.1 Federal Water Quality Criteria for Freshwater, Saltwater, and Human Health (40 CFR Part 131)
- H.2 San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board Narrative Objectives for Surface Water and Groundwater and Numerical Objectives for Fresh Surface Water, Fresh Groundwater, and Saltwater
- H.3 Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board Water Quality Objectives
- H.4 Water Quality Control Plan for the San Francisco Bay/Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Estuary: Chapter II (Beneficial Uses) and Chapter III (Water Quality Objectives)

I Wildlife Species of the San Francisco Estuary

J Biological Species of Concern

K Information on the Jersey Island Levee Maintenance Demonstration Project and the Sonoma Baylands Wetland Demonstration Project

- K.1 Lessons Learned from the Jersey Island Levee Maintenance Demonstration Project
- K.2 The Sonoma Baylands Wetland Demonstration Project
  - Project Description
  - Annual Monitoring Report 1997 — Executive Summary
  - *An Adaptive Response Program for Insuring the Evolution of a Vegetated Marsh at Sonoma Baylands*, prepared by Philip Williams & Associates for the Coastal Conservancy, 5/20/98

L Benefit Assessment of Alternative Long-Term Management Strategies for the Disposal of Dredged Materials from San Francisco Bay

M Information on the Dredged Material Management Office (DMMO)

- LTMS General Operating Principles for a Pilot DMMO
- DMMO 6-Month Pilot Phase Review Report (March 28, 1997)
- DMMO Second 6-Month Pilot Phase Review Report (January 1998)

APPENDICES (cont'd)

N Capacity Estimates for Upland/Wetland Reuse Sites

O Air Quality

P Derivation of Dredging and Disposal Costs

Q Financial Analysis of Implementation Approaches for the Long-Term Management Strategy, Task 3 Report: Alternative Financing Methods and Institutional Issues

VOLUME II

R Comments and Responses on the Draft EIS/EIR

FIGURES

1.3-1 LTMS EIS/EIR Planning Area 1-4
1.6-1 Relative Sediment Volumes Destined for Each Type of Placement Environment under the Various LTMS Alternatives 1-10
2.1-1 LTMS Organizational Structure 2-5
2.2-1 Location of the Carquinez Strait, San Pablo Bay, Suisun Bay, and Alcatraz Disposal Sites in San Francisco Bay 2-9
2.2-2 Alcatraz Disposal Site: Material Dumped and Peak Mound Elevations, 1986-1997 2-11
2.9-1 Schematic Reflecting Organization Structure of the EIS/EIR 2-26
3.1-1 Types of Dredges 3-3
3.1-2 Plume Shapes by Dredge Types 3-8
3.1-3 Types of Confined Disposal Facilities 3-10
3.2-1 Stratigraphy of Sediment Deposits in San Francisco Bay 3-17
3.2-2 General Distribution of Surface Sediment Types in the San Francisco Bay/Delta Estuary 3-19
3.2-3 Conceptual Illustration of Sediment Movement in the San Francisco Bay System 3-21
3.2-4 Index Map for Figures 3.2-5 through 3.2-18 3-22
3.2-5 Net Bathymetric Changes in San Francisco Bay from 1955 to 1990 — South Bay, Sections A1 & A2 (Plate 1) 3-23
3.2-6 Net Bathymetric Changes in San Francisco Bay from 1955 to 1990 — South Bay, Section B (Plate 2) 3-25
3.2-7 Net Bathymetric Changes in San Francisco Bay from 1955 to 1990 — South Bay, Section C (Plate 3) 3-27
3.2-8 Net Bathymetric Changes in San Francisco Bay from 1955 to 1990 — South Bay, Sections D & F (Plate 4) 3-29
3.2-9 Net Bathymetric Changes in San Francisco Bay from 1955 to 1990 — South Bay, Section E (Plate 5) 3-31
3.2-10 Net Bathymetric Changes in San Francisco Bay from 1955 to 1990 — North Bay, Section A (Plate 6) 3-33
3.2-11 Net Bathymetric Changes in San Francisco Bay from 1955 to 1990 — North Bay, Section B (Plate 7) 3-35
3.2-12 Net Bathymetric Changes in San Francisco Bay from 1955 to 1990 — North Bay, Section C (Plate 8) 3-37
3.2-13 Net Bathymetric Changes in San Francisco Bay from 1955 to 1990 — North Bay, Section D (Plate 9) 3-39
3.2-14 Net Bathymetric Changes in San Francisco Bay from 1955 to 1990 — San Pablo Bay, Section A (Plate 10) 3-41
3.2-15 Net Bathymetric Changes in San Francisco Bay from 1955 to 1990 — San Pablo Bay, Section B (Plate 11) 3-43
3.2-16 Net Bathymetric Changes in San Francisco Bay from 1955 to 1990 — San Pablo Bay, Section C (Plate 12) 3-45
3.2-17 Net Bathymetric Changes in San Francisco Bay from 1955 to 1990 — Suisun Bay, Section A (Plate 13) 3-47
3.2-18 Net Bathymetric Changes in San Francisco Bay from 1955 to 1990 — Suisun Bay, Sections B & C (Plate 14) 3-49

Figure *Page*

3.2-19 Modeled Initial Sediment Deposition Patterns from Disposal at the Alcatraz Island Site 3-52
3.2-20 Modeled Initial Sediment Deposition Patterns from Disposal at the San Pablo Bay Site 3-53
3.2-21 Modeled Initial Sediment Deposition Patterns from Disposal at the Carquinez Site 3-54
3.2-22 Location of Publicly-Owned Treatment Works (POTWs) in the Bay Area 3-57
3.2-23 Location of Industrial Discharge Sites in the Bay Area 3-59
3.2-24 Combined Pollutant Loadings to the Bay/Delta by Source Type 3-60
3.2-25 Contaminant Pathways for Open Water Disposal 3-67
3.2-26 Contaminant Pathways for Upland Confined Disposal Facilities 3-70
3.2-27 Contaminant Pathways for Nearshore Confined Disposal Facilities 3-72
4.1-1 LTMS EIS/EIR Planning Area 4-2
4.2-1 U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Major Navigation Projects in the Bay/Delta Estuary 4-11
4.2-2 Traffic Lanes Outside the Golden Gate Bridge 4-13
4.2-3 Typical Vessel Traffic Routes in the San Francisco Bay 4-14
4.2-4 Vessel Traffic Zone Map 4-18
4.3-1 San Francisco Embayments 4-20
4.3-2 Bathymetry of San Francisco Bay 4-23
4.3-3 Horizontal and Vertical Distribution of Turbidity Under Typical Summer and Winter Conditions 4-27
4.3-4 General Distribution of Surface Sediment Types in the San Francisco Bay/Delta Estuary 4-31
4.3-5 Alcatraz Open Water Disposal Site SF-11 4-47
4.3-6 Alcatraz Disposal Site: Areas of Clamshell vs. Hopper Disposal 4-48
4.3-7 Annual Disposal Volumes at Alcatraz (1975-1994) 4-49
4.3-8 Monthly Disposal Volumes at Alcatraz (September 1993 — September 1994) 4-50
4.3-9 Alcatraz Disposal Site and Golden Gate National Recreation Area Locations 4-51
4.3-10 Eelgrass Beds in San Francisco Bay 4-56
4.3-11 Location of Sensitive Biological Resources on Alcatraz Island 4-59
4.3-12 The Western Gull Study Area on Alcatraz Island 4-60
4.3-13 San Pablo Bay Open Water Disposal Site SF-10 4-63
4.3-14 Annual Disposal Volumes at San Pablo Bay (1975-1994) 4-64
4.3-15 Monthly Disposal Volumes at San Pablo Bay (September 1993 — September 1994) 4-65
4.3-16 Carquinez Strait Open Water Disposal Site SF-9 4-71
4.3-17 Annual Disposal Volumes at Carquinez (1975-1994) 4-72
4.3-18 Monthly Disposal Volumes at Carquinez (September 1993 — September 1994) 4-73
4.3-19 Suisun Bay Open Water Disposal Site SF-8 4-79
4.3-20 Monthly Disposal Volumes at Suisun Bay (September 1993 — September 1994) 4-80
4.4-1 San Francisco Bay Habitats 4-89
4.4-2 Combined Pollutant Loadings to the Bay/Delta by Source Type 4-91
4.4-3 Historic Changes in Tidal Marshes of the San Francisco Bay and Delta 4-99
4.4-4 Sonoma Baylands Tidal Marsh Restoration Site — Typical Levee Section 4-121
4.4-5 Federal Flood Control Project Levees 4-127

Figure *Page*

4.4-6 Local Flood Control Non-Project Levees 4-128
4.4-7 Illustrated Levee Stabilization Berm 4-130
4.5-1 Location of the San Francisco Deep Ocean Disposal Site (SF-DODS) 4-140
4.5-2 Transport Processes during Open-Water Disposal 4-146
4.6-1 Total Revenue Tonnage of Cargo Handled at Estuary Ports and Number of Arrivals 4-160
4.7-1 LTMS Area of Air Quality Impact 4-167
6.1-1 Relative Sediment Volumes Destined for each Type of Placement Environment under the Various LTMS Alternatives 6-33
6.5-1 Proposed In-Bay Disposal Volume Limits Over Time — Alternative 3 6-77

TABLES

2-1 1988 Baseline Imported Cargo Forecast 2-1
2-2 Vessel Calls per Year 2-3
3.1-1 Revised Dredging Volume Estimate for San Francisco Bay (1995-2045) 3-15
3.2-1 Concentrations of Heavy Metals and Organic Compounds in Old Bay Mud and Merritt Sand Deposits 3-16
3.2-2 Industries Associated with Sediment Contamination 3-58
3.2-3 Mean Concentrations of Selected Toxicants in Surficial Sediments from Three Basins and Four Peripheral Area of San Francisco Bay 3-61
3.2-4 Ambient Concentrations of Selected Contaminants in San Francisco Bay Sediments from Recent Monitoring Programs 3-61
3.2-5 Potential Management Actions and Control Measures, by Contaminant Pathway 3-74
3.2-6 Routine Sediment Physical and Chemical Analysis 3-81
4.2-1 Vessel Transits for the San Francisco Bay Area (1987) 4-16
4.2-2 Projected 1995 Vessel Transits for the San Francisco Bay Area 4-17
4.3-1 Bathymetric Data for San Francisco Bay 4-22
4.3-2 Ranges of Near Total Concentrations of Trace Metals in Water Samples (SFEI 1994) 4-29
4.3-3 Ranges of Dissolved Concentrations of Trace Metals in Water Samples (SFEI 1994) 4-29
4.3-4 Water Quality Parameters near the Alcatraz Disposal Site 4-52
4.3-5 Physical and Chemical Parameters Measured in Alcatraz Disposal Site Sediments 4-53
4.3-6 Levels of Pollutants Measured in Alcatraz Environs Sediments 4-55
4.3-7 Summary of Resources of Concern for the Alcatraz Dredged Material Disposal Site and Central Bay 4-62
4.3-8 Dissolved Water Quality Parameters near the San Pablo Bay Disposal Site 4-66
4.3-9 Summary of Bulk Chemistry in Sediments at the San Pablo Disposal Site 4-67
4.3-10 Summary of Bulk Chemistry in Sediments from Monitoring Stations in San Pablo Bay (1993-1994) 4-68
4.3-11 Summary of Resources of Concern at San Pablo Bay Dredged Material Disposal Site and San Pablo Bay 4-70
4.3-12 Dissolved Water Quality Parameters near the Carquinez Disposal Site 4-74
4.3-13 Physical and Chemical Parameters Measured in Sediments from the Carquinez Disposal Site 4-75
4.3-14 Sediment Quality in Carquinez Strait 4-76
4.3-15 Summary of Resources of Concern at Carquinez Strait Dredged Material Disposal Site and Carquinez Strait 4-78
4.3-16 Sediment Quality in Suisun Bay 4-82
4.3-17 Summary of Resources of Concern for Suisun Bay Dredged Material Disposal Site and Suisun Bay 4-83
4.3-18 Sediment Quality in the South Bay 4-85
4.3-19 Summary of Resources of Concern for the South Bay 4-86
4.4-1 Special Status Species within the Upland Environment of the EIS/EIR Planning Area 4-102
4.4-2 Common Noise Levels and Human Response 4-111
4.4-3 California Office of Noise Control Land Use Compatibility Guidelines 4-112

Table *Page*

4.4-4 Confined Disposal Site Ranking 4-114
4.4-5 Rehandling Facility Site Ranking 4-114
4.4-6 Habitat Development Site Ranking 4-114
4.4-7 Levee Rehabilitation Site Ranking 4-114
4.4-8 High Feasibility Sites 4-115
4.4-9 Moderately Feasible Sites 4-115
4.4-10 Low Feasibility Sites 4-115
4.4-11 Potentially Feasible Rehandling Facility Sites 4-117
4.4-12 Dredged Material Capacity Estimates for Upland and Wetland Reuse Low Scenario 4-118
4.4-13 Dredged Material Capacity Estimates for Upland and Wetland Reuse Medium Scenario 4-119
4.4-14 Dredged Material Capacity Estimates for Upland and Wetland Reuse High Scenario 4-119
4.4-15 Habitat Restoration — Resources of Concern Summary Matrix 4-126
4.4-16 Levee Reuse — Resources of Concern Summary Matrix 4-133
4.4-17 Rehandling Facilities — Resources of Concern Summary Matrix 4-136
4.4-18 Resources of Concern — UWR Summary Matrix 4-137
4.5-1 Ocean-Related Resources of Concern 4-156
4.6-1 Existing and Projected Jobs of the San Francisco Bay Region 4-156
4.6-2 Summary of Maritime Industry Economic Activity 4-159
4.7-1 National and California Ambient Air Quality Standards 4-168
4.7-2 Federal Attainment Schedule 4-170
4.7-3 State Nonattainment Classifications 4-171
4.7-4 Maximum Pollutant Concentrations Monitored in the Regions Affected by LTMS Activity (1991-1993) 4-174
4.7-5 1990 Emission Inventory for the San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin (tons/day) 4-181
5.1-1 Summary by Area: Timing Restrictions on Dredging Activity in the San Francisco Bay/Delta Estuary 5-8
5.1-2 Summary by Area: Timing Restrictions on Disposal Activity in the San Francisco Bay/Delta Estuary 5-12
5.1-3 Overall Guidance for Rehandling Facilities and Dedicated Confined Disposal Facilities 5-15
5.1-4 Overall Guidance for Wetland Restoration 5-16
5.1-5 Overall Guidance for Open-Water Confined Aquatic Disposal (CAD) Sites 5-18
5.1-6 Overall Guidance for Levee Reuse 5-20
5.3-1 Scenarios for Distribution of Dredged Material in In-Bay, Ocean, and Upland/Wetland Reuse Environments 5-25
5.3-2 Preliminary Alternative A: No-Action — Current Conditions (Very High In-Bay, Very Low Ocean, Very Low UWR) 5-25
5.3-3 Preliminary Alternative B: Emphasize Aquatic Disposal (Medium In-Bay, Medium Ocean, Low UWR) 5-26
5.3-4 Preliminary Alternative C: Emphasize Ocean Disposal (Low In-Bay, High Ocean, Low UWR) 5-27
5.3-5 Preliminary Alternative D: Balance UWR and In-Bay Disposal (Medium In-Bay, Low Ocean, Medium UWR) 5-28

Table *Page*

5.3-6 Preliminary Alternative E: Balance UWR and Ocean Disposal (Low In-Bay, Medium Ocean, Medium UWR) 5-28
5.3-7 Preliminary Alternative F: Emphasize UWR (Low In-Bay, Low Ocean, High UWR) 5-29
6.1-1 Potential Benefits and Impacts to Water Quality, by Placement Environment and Disposal Volume 6-2
6.1-2 Potential Impacts and Benefits to Fish and Wildlife Habitat, by Placement Environment and Disposal Volumes 6-10
6.1-3 Potential Impacts and Benefits to Special Status Species, by Placement Environment and Disposal Volume 6-16
6.1-4 Potential Benefits and Impacts Associated with Transportation Systems, by Placement Environment and Disposal Volume 6-19
6.1-5 Daily Emissions for Low/Medium/High Volume Disposal Scenarios at Proposed Placement Environments 6-23
6.1-6 Total Emissions and Emission Factors per Unit Volume for Low/Medium/High Volume Disposal Scenarios at Proposed Placement Environments 6-24
6.1-7 Summary of Potential Benefits and Impacts by Placement Environment and Disposal Volume 6-30
6.1-8 Summary of Policy-Level Mitigation Measures Specific to Placement Environments and Resources, by Alternative 6-34
6.2-1 Comparison of Alternatives with Respect to Benefits and Risks to Ecological Systems 6-43
6.2-2 Comparison of Alternatives with Respect to Regulatory Certainty 6-45
6.2-3 Comparison of Alternatives with Respect to Dredging-Related Economic Sectors 6-49
6.2-4 Estimated Unit Costs for Testing, Dredging, and Disposal 6-51
6.2-5 Estimated Unit Costs for Site Preparation and Management 6-52
6.2-6 Estimates of Total Costs, by Alternative and Work Category 6-53
6.2-7 Estimates of Federal versus Non-Federal Costs, by Alternative 6-54
6.2-8 Major Assumptions Underlying Cost Estimates and Economic Analysis 6-55
6.2-9 Daily Emissions Associated with Each LTMS Alternative 6-62
6.2-10 Total Emissions Associated with Each LTMS Alternative 6-63
6.5-1 Total and Average Annual Maintenance Dredging Volumes (1991-1997) 6-72

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The Writing Team gratefully acknowledges the following people and groups for their assistance in the development, management, and production of this document:

Andree Breaux, Ph.D.
San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board

Geoff Chatfield
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, San Francisco District

Tom Gandesbery
San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board

Andrea Gaut
San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board

Ron Gervason
San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board

Steve Goldbeck
San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission

John Hillenbrand
San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board, on detail to U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 9

Bertina Hu
Student Intern, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 9

Bill McCoy
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, South Pacific Division

Jeff Losel
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 9

Karen Mason
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, San Francisco District

Allan Ota
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 9

Richard Stradford
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, San Francisco District

Patricia Strong
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 9

Rebecca Tuden
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 9

Janet Whitlock
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 9

Carolyn Yale
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 9

THE LTMS MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

Loretta Barsamian
San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board

George Domurat
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, South Pacific Division

LTC Peter Grass
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, San Francisco District

Walter Pettit
California State Water Resources Control Board

Alexis Strauss
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 9

William Travis
San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission

In addition, a preliminary Administrative Draft of the EIS/R was prepared for the LTMS in early 1995 by ENTRIX, Inc. and Gahagan and Bryant Associates, Inc. Although this submittal was ultimately rewritten by the LTMS agencies themselves, the effort of these companies is acknowledged.

FORWARD

Please note the following with regard to this Final EIS/EIR.

1. Appendices. Only the appendices that have changed since the Draft EIS/EIR are included with this final document. This includes appendices A, H, J, K, and M, plus new Appendix R (Comments and Responses on the Draft EIS/EIR). Appendices A, H, J, K, and M appear at the end of Volume I; Appendix R is bound separately as Volume II.

2. Changes since the Draft EIS/EIR. The main changes since the Draft EIS/EIR are noted by vertical lines in the left margin of the document. The vertical lines reflect only information that has been *added* to the document; deletions from the public draft document are not indicated with vertical lines. The vertical lines note only the major changes (a new paragraph, new section, new figure or table) since the public draft document; the more minor changes (a changed word, a new sentence or two) are not indicated by vertical lines.