

APPENDIX E
SUMMARY OF COMMENTS FROM
STAKEHOLDER MEETINGS HELD IN 2012

No.	Request	Status/Comments
1	Incentivize projects that beneficially reuse material (e.g., issue mitigation credits, etc.). This recommendation included numerous variations on incentives. Please see highlight from meetings for more details.	Some of the recommendations are currently outside the LTMS agencies' current authorities. A stakeholder workgroup could further investigate ways to provide incentives for beneficial reuse.
2	Charge for in-Bay disposal to make it cost competitive with beneficial reuse, and use profit to construct beneficial reuse sites.	Stakeholders could pursue new state or federal legislation if they so desire, but this recommendation is currently outside the LTMS agencies' authorities.
3	Require projects that need to dredge outside of the work windows to take their material to a beneficial reuse site.	This can and has been done on a case-by-case basis, when practicable.
4	Develop a funding strategy for LTMS/selling points of the program/discuss shared values of habitat creation and beneficial reuse.	A new funding strategy for the LTMS program is needed. A stakeholder and agency workgroup could pursue new state or federal legislation as part of such a strategy. This has been identified as a priority topic.
5	Develop a bond measure to fund beneficial reuse projects.	Additional funding for beneficial reuse sites is needed and desired. Some specific options for developing additional funding sources specific to beneficial reuse were raised in the review process, and there may be other opportunities that a stakeholder workgroup could pursue as well. This has been identified as a priority topic.
6	Develop an interagency program where mitigation credits could be banked for taking material to beneficial reuse sites.	The LTMS agencies cannot develop or manage mitigation banks; however, ideas such as allowing a "credit" in exchange for beneficial reuse, are under consideration.
7	Work with the San Francisco Bay Joint Venture (SFBJV) for increased beneficial reuse and restoration opportunities.	Ongoing; this is identified as priority topic.
8	Have the SFBJV add the certainty of dredging projects (i.e., timing and volume) to their list.	Ongoing.
9	Develop a clearinghouse to allow for pre-dredging planning to match dredging and beneficial reuse projects.	A pilot meeting is planned; this is identified as priority topic.
10	Provide information on beneficial reuse sites becoming available through SFBJV.	Complete; see Appendix B.
11	Develop a graphic showing the distribution of beneficial reuse sites used over the past 12 years.	Complete; see discussion in Appendix B and Section 3.3.3.
12	Develop a table/map identifying beneficial reuse site capacities, costs, and constraints/limitations.	Ongoing; this is identified as priority topic.

No.	Request	Status/Comments
13	Provide a definition of beneficial reuse, and better define in-Bay reuse types, such as beach and mudflat nourishment and/or levee repairs.	The definition of beneficial reuse is intentionally broad; see Appendix B.
14	Expand focus on habitat creation to include aquatic habitat.	Ongoing; this is identified as priority topic.
15	Identify and show the percentage of beneficial reuse that has come from new work projects.	Complete; see Appendix B.
16	Address grain size issues for beneficially reused material.	Complete; see Appendix B.
17	Assess whether sea level rise may require certain sites to receive material sooner than others to remain viable.	The Baylands Ecosystem Habitat Goals Technical Update is addressing this issue.
18	Develop an expedited permitting process for dredging projects that use beneficial reuse sites.	The LTMS agencies will continue to look for opportunities to accomplish this wherever possible.
19	Analyze carbon sequestration benefits of beneficial reusing material compared to hauling it to the San Francisco Deep Ocean Disposal Site (SF-DODS).	The LTMS program already considers beneficial reuse – where it is practicable – to be preferable to ocean disposal.
20	Group small dredging projects together or with a larger dredging project to have the material taken to a beneficial reuse site.	This is currently possible for dredging project sponsors to initiate, but requiring it is outside the LTMS agencies' current authorities.
21	Encourage coordination between federal and non-federal dredgers to reduce mobilization costs similar to efforts undertaken by U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) Portland District.	Recommendations from the Value Engineering study are under consideration.
22	USACE contracting should encourage bundling projects.	Under consideration.
23	USACE should make beneficial reuse their highest priority rather than lowest priority; use the Section 204 process (a USACE funding program for beneficial reuse projects).	Ongoing; this is identified as priority topic.
24	Breakdown the cost components of the Hamilton Wetlands Restoration Project (HWRP).	Complete; see Appendix C.
25	Compare the habitat enhancement value of the Middle Harbor Enhancement Area, HWRP, and other habitat restoration projects.	Under consideration.
26	Summarize the USACE Dredged Material Management Plan (DMMP) work effort.	USACE's DMMP effort is on hold and available information will be used where appropriate.

No.	Request	Status/Comments
27	Do not dispose of good quality sediment in the ocean; keep it in the Bay for flood control and habitat.	The main goals of LTMS are to minimize in-Bay disposal as a waste, and to maximize beneficial reuse. Ocean disposal is included as a "safety valve" for when reuse is not practicable, and to date 17% of dredged material has been disposed at SF-DODS. The LTMS agencies will continue to require reuse where possible, but limited ocean disposal will continue to be part of the overall program.
28	Define the terms "practicable" and "feasible".	See 40 CFR 230 and San Francisco Bay Plan Dredging Policies.
29	Establish a LTMS goal to reduce upland beneficial reuse site costs.	Ongoing; identifying affordable reuse opportunities has always been an LTMS focus.
30	Incorporate air quality and sea level rise into the LTMS program.	Air quality is addressed at a project level under the California Environmental Quality Act and National Environmental Policy Act. Incorporation of sea level rise in the LTMS program is under consideration and discussed in Section 3.4.
31	Look at light loading of ships/channels not maintained at sufficient depths.	Complete; see Section 3.3.4.
32	Contact bar pilots for information on how often channels have restrictions.	Complete; it was found that bar pilots do not keep running records of restrictions.
33	Develop chart showing when projects actually start construction during the work window.	Complete; see Appendix A.
34	Develop narrative explaining how long it takes for permits and episodes to be approved.	This was addressed in Dredging 201 (see LTMS website) and will also be addressed in Dredger's Handbook (under development).
35	Review Skid Hall permit coordination report.	Complete.
36	Coordinate permit conditions for eelgrass mitigation.	Programmatic Essential Fish Habitat (EFH) Consultation is complete; coordination of permit conditions is ongoing.
37	Develop a chart that presents the percentage of projects not issued permits due to testing data or other reasons.	No permits have been denied based on testing data; however, not all sediment is suitable for all placement sites and sometimes permittees choose not to dredge areas that are unsuitable for their preferred placement site.
38	Revise the Dredged Material Management Office's (DMMO's) work windows chart to show that consultation is required year round for green sturgeon and longfin smelt.	The LTMS agencies will update the work windows chart when the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's National Marine Fisheries Service (NOAA Fisheries) completes the Programmatic Endangered Species Act (ESA) consultation (anticipated to occur in 2013).
39	Allow Integrated Alternative Analyses (IAAs) to cover longer periods of time.	Under consideration.

No.	Request	Status/Comments
40	Remove or reduce environmental work windows.	Some windows may change as a result of ongoing Programmatic ESA consultation; however, this is a function of the resource agencies.
41	Develop longfin smelt guidance for mechanical dredging projects.	The LTMS agencies have proposed guidance to the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) to consider.
42	Work with NOAA Fisheries and CDFW to remove Coho from the work windows chart.	The LTMS agencies will update the work windows chart when NOAA Fisheries completes the ESA consultation, which is anticipated to occur in 2013.
43	Develop a chart showing the volumes and locations of material not suitable for unconfined aquatic disposal.	Information is available in early DMMO annual reports; the DMMO will start tracking this information again.
44	Separate mobilization/demobilization costs from the dredging costs in the Background Information Document; add footnotes to charts if appropriate.	Complete; see Appendix C.
45	Develop hopper-only cost chart and a new work versus maintenance chart.	Complete; see Appendix C.
46	Develop national dredging costs and show regional differences.	Complete; see Appendix C.
47	Summarize anecdotal information on regional dredging costs.	Complete; see Appendix C.
48	Separate dredging volumes for deepening versus maintenance projects in all charts.	Complete; see Appendices B and C.
49	Develop a chart showing the material brought to SF-DODS per year.	See Section 3.2; additional information is available in DMMO annual reports.
50	Modify the Project Coordination Work Group's dredging projects chart to look further into the future to enhance certainty.	The projects are included in the dredging chart as far into the future as provided by the dredging project sponsor. Annual projects will be specifically noted.
51	Review completed LTMS science studies to obtain a comprehensive understanding of what is currently known and unknown.	Underway.
52	Re-energize the Confounding Factors Work Group.	The LTMS agencies are supportive of the stakeholders reconvening the Confounding Factors Work Group.
53	Make funding available for a formal independent review of the LTMS program.	Period program reviews with outside stakeholder input are a built-in aspect of the LTMS Management Plan.
54	Use the Delta LTMS as a measure of success.	Under consideration.
55	Rework or terminate the stepdown process to avoid allocations.	Under consideration.
56	Reference data set(s) for the in-Bay disposal sites SF-10, SF-16, and SF-9.	This is proposed for 2014 with assistance from the Regional Monitoring Program and San Francisco Estuary Institute.
57	Require relevant environmental documents to undergo regular updates.	Ongoing.