

Re: Draft letter to the State Lands Commission for presentation 5/19 BBCAG

Tuesday, May 19, 2009 1:21 AM

From:

"Brogdon Maturo" <brogmat@yahoo.com>

To:

"clara johnson" clara-a-johnson@sbcglobal.net

For me, this letter covers our interest, simple and direct. I have no recommendations for change.

As I am doing my election worker thing on 5/19, I will not be able to attend the regular meeting. For the record, I support this letter and, sight unseen, the letter Mary was to draft to DTS.

I'll see you on the 4TH of June.

Terry Maturo

(415) 508-1913 Home

(415) 706-1692 Cell

Draft letter to the State Lands Commission for presentation 5/19 BBCAG

Tuesday, May 19, 2009 5:19 PM

From:

"Dana Dillworth" <earthhelp@earthlink.net>

To:

"Clara Johnson" <clara-a-johnson@sbcglobal.net>

Message contains attachments

[Letter to State Lands Com. 0509.doc \(579KB\)](#)

Dear Clara and BBCAG members,

Michael Warburton echoed my concerns (in blue.) I thought I was going to be able to come to tonight's meeting, but am stuck with an obligation that is awkward to get around.

Tom, my usual cover, is a poll-official this evening. He has to work through to the drop-off the election machines, so I am not able to come, to even half the meeting.

What I would say is: there are two paragraphs that use the language of human and environmental health or human health and environmental health. It's awkward, should be one or the other.

The issue of the wetlands should be spelled out a little clearer, or are you hoping this just initiates the discussion? If that's the case, please ask them for studies and/or funding to grant us to come up with the best plan. I'm not certain who said it, Ray Miller(?) but the fact that the Kinder Morgan supply line is in the right of way along the lagoon may

impact any wetlands restoration no matter how noble. But I think the language that future pressure would be to wall-off this land and our desire for sustained wetlands should be made.

We need studies that WE, the CITIZENS direct, NOT the city. You may also note that natural resources and watershed studies to date are insufficient. This letter could/should be cc'ed to Fish and Game for their support as well.

The second issue is the generic term wetlands. It would seem the State-owned lands are best for saltwater wetlands/marsh and a "natural" shoreline. There are freshwater wetlands, too, that are part of Kinder Morgan's remediation plan which are not in their (Kinder Morgan's OR State Lands Commission) ownership. The wetlands west of Tunnel Road have been dammed and altered in recent years (after a water main break?) and are not functioning in the way they should (or have for the last 40 years.) (Kinder Morgan's Bogus Remediation Plan.)

This letter should have a sense of urgency with a statement that no more wetland loss (even interim) should be allowed in addition to active restoration being necessary. (We need to get earmarked in their budget.) In addition, I would also suggest that the State Lands Commission take a stronger role to limit the amount of toxins that pass through their land.

My question that a map should be included, is to make the connection from the Levinson Marsh to their lands, a watershed resource view. Sorry I won't be at tonight's meeting, as this might be one meeting that I could make a difference.

Also, Mary called me urging me to become more involved in BBCAG's remediation subcommittee. I thought that I hadn't received notice about 5/4, but on closer inspection, I did. I am at a loss because we need independent thought similar to when Oregon State University worked with us through the Federal Technical Assistance to Brownfields Program. I know a group that will work with us, but cannot stand to have it marred by City-interruptus.

We have been so moved by Lenny Siegel's and Audubon's presentations to know that we can get better representation, better plan, but this City-dominated CAG may not be the right venue. I'm sorry things are this way. Dana

Dana,

- this looks great- maybe some note about pressures to privatize and that some of this last remaining trust land would be most valuable to the public as natural wetland, one of the legally protected trust uses. Also, perhaps note the importance of the buffer in this time of rising sea level and avoidance of construction in areas that will likely be inundated in the not too distant future. For that matter, isn't a wetland a better intermediate use when further clean-up may be required? Your own intuitions are probably the best guide here...

Hope all's well, mw

