



David H. Selvy

November 16, 2008

Cynthia Fowler or Fari Tabatabai
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
San Francisco District
1455 Market Street
San Francisco, CA 94103

Re: Corps Dredge Spoils Project
Hamilton Wetlands Restoration Project

Dear Cynthia Fowler or Fari Tabatabai:

The proposal to place an "aquatic transfer station" in San Pablo Bay has been brought to my attention.

This has a special significance to me; because when our club needed to dredge our harbor in 2003, we were told that we could not release the spoils into the river...the spoils from the harbor we were dredging were mud and copious amounts of water. Understanding that, we were also told that we had to impound the spoils on the property to allow it to percolate into the ground. This necessitated us digging a containment basin capable of holding 12-18,000 cubic yards of mud. This caused our one year dredging project to last over 2-1/2 years and at far greater expense to a non-profit organization.

When we asked if we could discharge the clarified top water into the estuary, we were summararily told no.

What has changed?

Why has apparent "special consideration" been given to this Corps Dredge Project to allow the convenience of dumping the spoils in the bay, but not given to our small club, needing to dredge our harbor so it could be used?

Certainly their mud is no cleaner than ours...certainly it is no less turbid than ours and certainly the impact of the abhorrent costs of meaningless rules and regulations vis-à-vis bureaucratic mindlessness, has hit home to those who write the rules?

What is different with your mud, that is not with our mud...? Is it because it is your mud and not ours?

I get it..."Don't do as I do; do as I say". Or shall we say some more... "chickens have come home to roost?"

ACOE's review of the EIS/EIR of October 2008 has left some unanswered questions.

1. The report does not cover how many loads of dredge spoils will be placed in the aquatic transfer facility per day, per week or per year. Will this be a 24/7/365 operation? Sediment dispersal charts only show the travel rate of what appears to be one load. If vessels are unloaded continually that would mean San Pablo Bay would have a never ending cloud of sediment.

The pumping of sediment from the facility is also expected to stir sediment, what are the hours of operation? Ours was only on the flood tide.

2. The report does not cover how this murky water would affect the health of adult salmon trying to reach their spawning grounds, nor does it cover whether or not it could prevent them from reaching their natal waters.



David H. Selvy

Re: Corps Dredge Spoils Project

Hamilton Wetlands Restoration Project

Page 2 –

3. The report does not recognize the collapse of the Central Valley Salmon runs and the complete closure of commercial and recreational salmon fishing for the first time in California's history. It IS germane.
4. The aquatic transfer facility could further endanger already depressed stocks of salmon and steelhead. Not covered, are health and mortality issues for outgoing **salmon smolts** trying to reach the Pacific Ocean. I have not mentioned the resurgence of Halibut and how this plume and turbidity would affect it.
5. So...I ask; How will turbidity from these operations affect all the other aquatic life forms in San Pablo Bay? Recognizing they are there is one thing, but not addressing how operations could alter their survival other than entrainment appears irresponsible.
6. The report does not take into consideration decreased freshwater outflow from the Delta. The State is campaigning for a water bond to build "**alternate conveyance facilities**" (read that the hated "Peripheral Canal"). Will decreased outflow plus the transfer facility operation stress the already Bay/Delta ecosystem? My unwashed, voter's supposition is; ...yes. Regardless of that other issue, it remains that the methods outlined in Alt. 2 are flawed and should not be implemented.
7. What effects will global warming and seawater rise have on this proposed operation and the ecosystem? (More "chickens"?)
8. The report does not recognize the Pelagic Organism Decline in the Bay/Delta estuary. The entire food chain has collapsed. In many instances charts reveal additional losses as "less than significant with mitigation".
9. The report shows some fishery losses as "significant and unavoidable". **WRONG!!** They can be avoided by not going forward with Alt. 2. Use Alt. 1 which has already been approved; better yet, just barge it to islands within the bay area and place it on those lands for percolation as we were made to do.
10. Any loss of green sturgeon, a threatened species, and white sturgeon a species of concern (as reacted to by Department of Fish & Game's change in "take" regulations) is unacceptable, considering their slow growth rate and reproductive cycle.

The Hamilton Wetlands Restoration Project is a noble undertaking but it should not be completed at the expense of the Bay/Delta ecosystem.

I am a citizen and a voter. Do not make a cynic of me.

Respectfully submitted,

David H. Selvy
Tax payer, Voter, Boater, Sport Fisherman and Hunter
Sportsmen Yacht Club - P/C 2004, I.O.B.G.

C.C. RBOC, Bay & Delta Yachtsman, P.I.C.Y.A., All Delta Yacht Clubs
Betsy Wilson or Tom Gandesbery
California State Coastal Conservancy
1330 Broadway, 13th Floor
Oakland, CA 94612

330 Eastridge Drive, San Ramon, California 94582-4911
Phone: (925) 968-1687 email: davidselvy@comcast.net