



SAN FRANCISQUITO CREEK
JOINT POWERS AUTHORITY
SFCJPA.ORG

**Notice of Regular Meeting of the
BOARD OF DIRECTORS
City of Palo Alto Council Chambers
250 Hamilton Avenue, Palo Alto, California
March 23, 2017 at 4:00 p.m.**

AGENDA

1. ROLL CALL
2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA
3. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES – January 26, 2017 Regular Board meeting
4. PUBLIC COMMENT – *Individuals may speak on any topic for up to three minutes; during any other Agenda item, individuals may speak for up to three minutes on the subject of that item.*
5. REGULAR BUSINESS – Executive Director’s Report
 - a. S.F. Bay-Highway 101 project: discuss construction activities and planning
 - b. Upstream of Highway 101 project: discuss the Environmental Impact Report scoping process
 - c. Consider changing the meeting day or time of Regular Board meetings
 - d. Review the Fiscal Year 2016-17 Operating Budget mid-year
6. BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS – *Non-agendized requests or announcements; no action may be taken.*
7. ADJOURNMENT

PLEASE NOTE: This Board meeting Agenda and supporting documents related to items on the Agenda can be viewed online by 4:00 p.m. on March 20, 2017 at sfcjpa.org -- click on the “Meetings” tab near the top.

NEXT MEETING: Regular Board meeting, April 27, 2017 at 4:00 PM, City of Menlo Park Council Chambers

San Francisquito Creek Joint Powers Authority
March 23, 2017 Regular Meeting of the Board
Agenda Item 3
January 26, 2017 Board Meeting Minutes

Director Pine called the meeting to order at 4:04 p.m. at the City of Menlo Park Council Chambers, Menlo Park, California.

DRAFT

1) ROLL CALL

Members Present: Director Pine, San Mateo County Flood Control District
Director Kremen, Santa Clara Valley Water District (SCVWD)
Director Scharff, City of Palo Alto
Director Abrica, City of East Palo Alto; not present at roll call

Members Absent: Director Keith, City of Menlo Park

JPA Staff Present: Len Materman, Executive Director
Kevin Murray, Staff
Tess Byler, Staff

Legal Representative: Greg Stepanicich

Others Present: Trish Mulvey, Palo Alto resident; Jerry Hearn, Portola Valley resident;
Jim Wiley, Menlo Park resident; Kamal Fallaha, City of East Palo Alto;
Dale Jacques, SCVWD; Brad Eggleston, City of Palo Alto

2) APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Agenda approved.

3) APPROVE BOARD MEETING MINUTES: DECEMBER 15, 2016 REGULAR BOARD MEETING AND DECEMBER 20, 2016 SPECIAL BOARD MEETING

Mr. Materman noted the incorrect use of the term “readjourned” in agenda items 5 and 7 in the December 15, 2016 Regular Board Meeting Minutes. Director Kremen made a motion to approve the December 15, 2016 Regular Board Meeting Minutes, with noted edits, and the December 20, 2017 Special Board Meeting Minutes. Director Scharff seconded. December 15, 2016 Regular Board Meeting Minutes, with noted edits, and the December 20, 2016 Special Board Meeting Minutes approved 3-0. Director Abrica not present at time of approval. Director Keith not present.

4) PUBLIC COMMENT

None.

Director Abrica arrived at 4:06 PM.

5) REGULAR BUSINESS

S.F. Bay-Highway 101 project: discuss construction activities and planning

Mr. Materman provided the Board with an update on the Bay-101 project activities that have occurred since the December 15, 2016 meeting of the Board.

Chairperson Pine asked for clarification on the timing of floodwall installation near the International School. Mr. Materman stated that we are told that the SCVWD contractor anticipates beginning the installation floodwalls on the Palo Alto side in February.

San Francisquito Creek Joint Powers Authority
March 23, 2017 Regular Meeting of the Board
Agenda Item 3
January 26, 2017 Board Meeting Minutes

Analysis of January storms and response to it by local agencies

Mr. Materman provided the Board with an analysis of the January storms and the associated response activities.

Director Kremen commented that he found the Flood Early Warning System confusing and that the information provided on the Palo Alto website was much clearer. Mr. Materman stated we are always looking to improve the site and would welcome any specific suggestions.

Kamal Fallaha, City of East Palo Alto, gave a summary of the debris clean up, the public notifications, and the process of ensuring Caltrans engagement with the city during and after the storms.

Dale Jacques, Santa Clara Valley Water District, provided a summary of the effects of the storm in Santa Clara County. Mr. Jacques noted the improvement of communication between the multiple agencies across the county borders. Mr. Jacques relayed a message of thanks for the diligence of the Palo Alto Public Works team.

Brad Eggleston, City of Palo Alto, noted that these storm systems were the first significant events to hit the channel since the implementation of the SFCJPA Flood Early Warning System and he found the system extremely useful.

Director Kremen asked how the decision to use reverse 911 is made. Mr. Materman noted that reverse 911 is a function of cities or counties, and invited any comments from their staff in attendance.

Director Abrica asked who is responsible for the flash flood warning that come across the phones and radio. Mr. Jacques explained that those flash flood warnings are sent out by the National Weather Service.

Director Abrica also asked about the existing communication protocols with Caltrans. Director Abrica commended Mr. Fallaha for his diligent proactiveness in contacting Caltrans. Mr. Jacques noted that when Caltrans put the trash rack in place two seasons ago, his recollection was that anytime there was a forecast of significant rain, Caltrans would have the excavator brought onsite and someone on call.

Jerry Hearn, Portola Valley resident, commented on the unusual amount of debris within the channel on account of large areas of the upper watershed being undeveloped and the fact that this winter follows several dry seasons.

Jim Wiley, Menlo Park resident, noted that he has watched the channel for over thirty years,, and that with another thousand cubic feet of flows, the amount of debris in the channel will increase to ten times the amount we have seen during these current storms. Mr. Wiley noted the vagueness of the agreement the cities signed with Caltrans regarding their monitoring of winter storms during construction.

Chairperson Pine asked about the level of debris to be expected once the Bay-101 project and the upstream project are both complete. Mr. Murray concurred with Mr. Wiley's comments adding that the buildup of debris is largely due to the trash rack and that once the Caltrans project is complete, much less debris will be built up in that area.

Trish Mulvey, Palo Alto resident, noted that a good amount of the debris that flows through the channel comes from other smaller systems upstream. Mrs. Mulvey suggested that the Board Emergency Preparedness Committee could meet to discuss this.

San Francisquito Creek Joint Powers Authority
March 23, 2017 Regular Meeting of the Board
Agenda Item 3
January 26, 2017 Board Meeting Minutes

Authorize the Executive Director to execute Amendment Number 1 to the January 8, 2013 consultant agreement with ICF Jones & Stokes for the Environmental Impact Report of the project upstream of Highway 101

Mr. Materman asked the Board for authorization to execute Amendment Number 1 to the January 8, 2013 consultant agreement with ICF Jones & Stokes for the Environmental Impact Report of the Project upstream of Highway 101.

Mrs. Mulvey expressed her support for the amendment urging the Board to approve the contract. Mrs. Mulvey noted that when she submits her comments on the EIR she will be asking that an objective be reducing the properties at flood risk so, that they do not have to have flood insurance. Mrs. Mulvey asked when there will be a more detailed timeline from the project consultant.

Mr. Murray noted that an updated schedule will probably be developed within the first few weeks of work following approval of this contract amendment.

Mr. Wiley expressed his desire to see that some of the alternatives be combined. Mr. Murray noted that there is nothing that prevents us from combining alternatives; in fact, a stated objective of the EIR is that the selected project not preclude future actions. Mr. Murray further explained that we are looking for an achievable action we can take now to maximize the benefit of that action. Then, in the future, we could combine that action with another alternative to achieve greater protection.

Director Kremen asked if it is accurate to state, even if there is not 100-year protection, any protection incremental to reducing the dollar amount of the potential flooding. Mr. Materman confirmed that is accurate, noting that the objectives within the EIR would basically provide protection up to an approximate sixty-year storm flow, which is similar to the 1998 flood of record.

Chairperson Pine made a motion to authorize the Executive Director to execute Amendment Number 1 to the January 8, 2013 consultant agreement with ICF Jones & Stokes for the Environmental Impact Report of the project upstream of Highway 101. Director Kremen seconded. Motion to authorize the Executive Director to execute Amendment Number 1 to the January 8, 2013 consultant agreement with ICF Jones & Stokes for the Environmental Impact Report of the project upstream of Highway 101 approved 4-0. Director Keith not present.

Director Scharff left at 4:40 pm.

Resolution 17.1.26 of the SFCJPA Board of Directors, approving the Second Amendment to the Employment Agreement with the Executive Director and amending the SFCJPA Salary Schedule

Mr. Stepanicich outlined the changes proposed by the Board to the Employment Agreement with the Executive Director and the SFCJPA salary schedule. Chairperson Pine noted that the amendment is retroactive to July 1, 2016.

Director Abrica made a motion to approve Resolution 17.1.26 of the SFCJPA Board of Directors, approving the Second Amendment to the Employment Agreement with the Executive Director and amending the SFCJPA Salary Schedule. Director Kremen seconded. Motion to approve Resolution 17.1.26 of the SFCJPA Board of Directors, approving the Second Amendment to the Employment Agreement with the Executive Director and amending the SFCJPA Salary Schedule. Motion approved 3-0. Director Scharff and Director Keith not present.

San Francisquito Creek Joint Powers Authority
March 23, 2017 Regular Meeting of the Board
Agenda Item 3
January 26, 2017 Board Meeting Minutes

Chairperson Pine, on behalf of the Board, thanked Mr. Materman for his hard work over the last year which has been important and historical.

Board Organization: select membership on committees

Chairperson Pine provided a brief outline of the Board organization and appointments.

Director Abrica made a motion to appoint Director Scharff to the Personnel Committee, replacing former Director Pat Burt, and leaving all other appointments and committees as is. Director Kremen seconded. Motion to appoint Director Scharff to the Personnel Committee, replacing former Director Pat Burt, and leaving all other appointments and committees as is. The motion was approved 3-0. Director Scharff and Director Keith not present at time of vote.

Chairperson Pine asked staff to agendize a discussion at the next meeting of the Board regarding adjusting the start time or day of future Board meetings.

6) ADJOURNMENT

Chairperson Pine adjourned the meeting at 5:22 pm.

Minutes Prepared by Clerk of the Board: Miyko Harris-Parker.

San Francisquito Creek Joint Powers Authority
March 23, 2017 Board Meeting
Agenda Item 5
Executive Director's Report

With the help of Kevin Murray, Miyko Harris-Parker, and Tess Byler, I am pleased to submit the following:

a. S.F. Bay-Highway 101 project: discuss construction activities and planning

Over the past nine months, at each Board meeting we have discussed the construction activities of a project to improve public safety and recreation, and increase marsh habitat, from the Bay to Highway 101. The following summarizes these activities since the last Board meeting eight weeks ago.

On-site weekly meetings are held among staff from the SFCJPA, Santa Clara Valley Water District (SCVWD), cities of Palo Alto and East Palo Alto, and the levee and floodwall contractor to coordinate construction activities and sequencing, and permit compliance. Additionally, the SFCJPA continues to coordinate utility relocation with those entities, the City of Palo Alto's Golf Course project, PG&E, and the East Palo Alto Sanitary District (EPASD).

Beginning in early May, floodwalls will be delivered to the project site and installed in areas outside of the current channel. Between mid-June to mid-October, installation will occur along both sides within the current channel from East Bayshore Road to Geng Road. During that same time, downstream of the floodwall contractor's work, we plan for East Palo Alto Sanitary District to install their new sewer line and siphon, and PG&E to install the cross-creek section of the new gas line.

Surveys for Ridgway's Rail were completed this month, and no activity centers (which could indicate nesting sites) were detected in the Creek upstream of Friendship Bridge. This means the restricted work zone will be substantially smaller than in 2016. As expected, numerous Rail centers were detected in the Faber Tract marsh, and SFCJPA, U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service (USFWS) and CA Department of Fish & Wildlife staffs are working to enable as much work as possible in 2017.

On March 2, we released a Request for Proposals for a consultant to provide construction support, maintenance, monitoring and reporting for restoration elements in the Faber Tract marsh. Proposals are due March 21, and I will provide a brief update on the proposals received at this Board meeting. Installation of the marsh restoration features will take place under a separate construction contract, for which we plan to advertise for bids in August so that construction can begin late this year.

Since December, I have executed four agreements necessary for construction or mitigation on the Bay-Highway101 project and one agreement to maintain our Flood Early Warning System. These include:

1. A contract with HT Harvey & Associates for an amount not to exceed \$9,340 to advance marsh restoration design from 30% to 60% completeness so it can be included in bid documents released in August. The 30% design was completed under a contract between HT Harvey and SCVWD.
2. A contract with The Watershed Nursery in an amount not to exceed \$23,981 for propagation of plants so that they are mature enough to transplant in December as marsh restoration plantings.
3. A contract with the utilities engineering firm of Freyer and Lauretta, Inc in an amount not to exceed \$23,800 to design a new fire hydrant and associated lines to replace an existing fire hydrant adjacent to the incoming floodwall in East Palo Alto. The new hydrant will be installed along East Bayshore Road at a location recommended by the Menlo Park Fire Protection District.
4. A contract with the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Wildlife Services Division, to which the SFCJPA will provide \$8,000 this year to support predator management in and around the Faber and Laumeister marshes. Entering into this agreement, and continuing it with similar amounts for five more years, was a condition of the project's federal permit based on a recommendation in the USFWS Biological Opinion.
5. An extension to the contract with Balance Hydrologics, the consultant firm that created the background data website for the SFCJPA's Flood Early Warning System, for an amount not to exceed \$28,492 for ongoing inspection and maintenance of the equipment, transmission systems and background data website for the system. The extension covers services through June 2018.

San Francisquito Creek Joint Powers Authority
March 23, 2017 Board Meeting
Agenda Item 5
Executive Director's Report

Expenses for items 1 – 4 above were included in the Construction Funding Agreement between the SFCJPA and member agencies, and funding from the CA Department of Water Resources grants to the SFCJPA will be used to pay for these contracts. Costs for item 5 above will be covered by the SFCJPA's Operational Budget within the Project Consultants account.

b. Upstream of Highway 101 project: discuss the Environmental Impact Report scoping process

As discussed at the July, September, and October Board meetings last year, the SFCJPA is moving forward with project planning and environmental documentation for a capital project upstream of Highway 101. On December 21, 2016 in both San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties, the SFCJPA published a Notice of Preparation (NOP) that stated we intend to develop an Environmental Impact Report (EIR).

The SFCJPA is partnering with the Army Corps of Engineers to prepare parallel environmental documents. On December 23, 2016, the Corps published in the *Federal Register* a Notice of Intent (NOI) to prepare an integrated Feasibility Study/Environmental Impact Statement (FS/EIR) for the San Francisquito Creek Flood Risk Management Study. Completion of our EIR separate from, but coordinated with a Corps FS/EIR of the similar alternatives will preserve the SFCJPA's opportunity to implement improvements on our own or on our own schedule, should there be delays to the federal process.

The SFCJPA has initiated a robust stakeholder process for this project. This began on December 6, 2016 at a meeting and site tour with resource agency staff to discuss project objectives, opportunities and constraints, and to solicit input on planning steps that can be taken now to help expedite construction permitting in the future. In addition, the SFCJPA hosted the following four public meetings:

- January 18, 2017 in Menlo Park- *Joint public scoping meeting with the Corps of Engineers*
- January 26, 2017 in East Palo Alto
- January 31, 2017 in Palo Alto
- February 1, 2017 in Menlo Park

A summary of verbal comments at the public meetings and written public and agency comments are enclosed with this Report. These comments will be used to inform the project objectives, alternatives and environmental effects to be analyzed in the EIR, as well as the Corps FS/EIS documents.

Although the formal comment period ended March 10, 2017, the SFCJPA continues to solicit input from stakeholders, including during a presentation to the Menlo Park Environmental Quality Commission on March 15, 2017. We anticipate that the stakeholder process will continue throughout the development of the Draft EIR. We continue close coordination with the Corps, and other project partners, including SCVWD and Stanford University. The SFCJPA intends to move forward with a project that is achievable, and meaningful to stakeholders, without delay. Our anticipated EIR schedule is as follows:

Date	Activity
December 21, 2016	Notice of Preparation published, comment period starts
January & February 2017	Scoping meetings in MP, EPA, and PA
March 10, 2017	NOP comment period closes
September 2017	Draft EIR released to public, comment period begins
November 2017	Draft EIR 60-day public comment period closes
February 2018	Final EIR published
March 2018	Final EIR certified, permit applications submitted

San Francisquito Creek Joint Powers Authority
March 23, 2017 Board Meeting
Agenda Item 5
Executive Director's Report

c. Consider changing the meeting day or time of Regular Board meetings

At its December 15, 2016 Regular meeting, the Board approved a 2017 schedule of SFCJPA Regular Board meetings, which is enclosed with this Report. This schedule continued the practice of rotating meetings between the city council chambers of Menlo Park, East Palo Alto and Palo Alto and holding the meetings 4:00 p.m. on the fourth Thursday of every month except November and December. At the January 26, 2017 Board meeting, Chair Dave Pine requested that the Board discuss potentially changing the day and/or time of its Regular Board meetings, and thus it is on the agenda now.

Potential Board Action: Change the day and/or start time of Regular Board meetings in 2017.

d. Review the Fiscal Year 2016-17 Operating Budget mid-year

This agenda item is an informational item only, and is intended to give Board members an overview of the SFCJPA's budget picture three quarters of the way through the current 2016-17 Fiscal Year. At the next Board meeting on April 27, 2017, I plan to request Board approval of the Operating Budget for the next (2017-18) Fiscal Year.

In April 2016, the Board approved the FY 2016-17 Operating Budget, which anticipated \$892,900 in income and \$892,500 in expenses. The enclosed document titled "Approved, Actual as of March 15, 2017, and Estimated Year-End" shows the approved annual operating expenses in the first (left hand) column. The middle column of expenses lists the actual amount spent during the first nine and one-half months of this fiscal year, and the third column lists the estimated operating expenses at year-end on June 30, 2017.

At this time, we estimate that year-end expenses will be about \$7,000 below the approved budget, which will allow us to defer to the next fiscal year some of the grant overhead we planned to utilize this fiscal year. At this Board meeting, I intend to highlight any noteworthy items in the revenue and expenses we anticipate between now and the end of this fiscal year. This discussion will help to set the stage for a discussion and potential approval of the 2017-18 Operating Budget at next month's Board meeting.

Submitted by:



Len Materman
Executive Director

Agenda Item 5.b.

Summary of
Public and Public Agency Comments
on the Notice of Preparation for the
Upstream of Highway 101 Project EIR



SAN FRANCISQUITO CREEK
JOINT POWERS AUTHORITY
SFCJPA.ORG

**San Francisquito Creek Flood Protection, Ecosystem Restoration and Recreation Project
Upstream of Highway 101
Notice of Preparation**

Summary of Written and Verbal Comments

The San Francisquito Creek Joint Powers Authority (SFCJPA) filed a revised Notice of Preparation (NOP) to develop an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for a capital project on the upstream portion of San Francisquito Creek in San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties on December 21, 2016. On December 23, 2016, the Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) published a Federal Register Notice of Intent to prepare an integrated Feasibility Study/ Environmental Impact Statement (FS/EIS) that is being coordinated with the SFCJPA (FR Vol. 81, No. 247 Notices, Page 94351).

The SFCJPA will prepare environmental documents required under California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the Corps will prepare documents under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA).

The SFCJPA held four scoping meetings during the review period, as listed below:

1. January 18, 2017 at 6:30 p.m. at the Laurel School Upper Campus, 275 Elliott Drive in Menlo Park, CA. This was a joint Scoping Meeting with the Corps of Engineers.
2. January 26, 2017 at 7:00 p.m. at the East Palo Alto City Hall Community Room, 2415 University Avenue in East Palo Alto, CA.
3. January 31, 2017 at 7:00 p.m. at the Palo Alto Art Center Auditorium, 1313 Newell Road, Palo Alto, CA.
4. February 1, 2017 at 7:00 p.m. at the Menlo Park City Council Chambers 701 Laurel St, Menlo Park, CA

The SFCJPA purpose of these public meetings was to describe the project scope and to solicit public input on the following for the EIR:

- Project objectives
- Potential alternatives to be studied
- Potential environmental effects that will be analyzed

The Corps purpose of the meeting was to solicit input regarding the environmental issues of concern and the alternatives that should be discussed in the integrated FS/EIS.

Verbal comments made by those attending the four scoping meetings were recorded. Additionally, the SFCJPA and Corps received written comments. A summary of public comments is provided below, followed by a summary of comments submitted by public agencies.

All comments will be considered in developing the draft EIR and FS/EIS.

Summary of Public Comments

In addition to verbal comments recorded during the scoping meetings, forty-one written comments were received. The following is a summary of all of these comments categorized by whether the comment was related to the project's objectives, alternatives or environmental effects as described in the Notice of Preparation.

SFCJPA Objectives

The project will use an integrated watershed approach, with the following specific objectives:

- *protect property and infrastructure from floodwaters exiting the creek, while minimizing impacts to adjacent communities and the environment;*
- *enhance habitat within the Project area, particularly interconnected habitat for threatened and endangered species;*
- *create new recreational opportunities and connect to existing bike and pedestrian corridors;*
- *minimize operational and maintenance requirements; and*
- *identify alternatives that would not preclude future actions to bring cumulative flood protection up to a 100-year flow event.*

Corps Objectives

The Corps objective is limited to evaluating opportunities to reduce fluvial flooding to reduce risks to public safety due to flooding, consistent with protecting the Nation's environment, in accordance with national environmental statutes, applicable executive orders, and other Federal planning requirements. The Corps will identify a Tentatively Selected Plan that will be the least cost alternative.

Summary of Comments Related to Objectives

1. Keep the natural look of the creek. (many commenters)
2. Objectives are vague. Not clear what size the Pope-Chaucer Bridge is going to be designed for. (several commenters)
3. Project objectives are focused on private property and endangered species. Are we not concerned about jeopardy to humans and protection of humans and pets?
4. Clarify the level of flood protection provided by the project.
5. Objective for design should prevent the 1998 flood, with benchmarks to this objective.
6. The objectives seem ambiguous. Under CEQA and Clean Water Act, it is already established that we want minimal impacts, but the objective seems to be to minimize impacts. This might not be a constructive objective since it's already covered.
7. Add an objective to remove properties from the FEMA flood map and requirements to purchase flood insurance.
8. Consider an objective to complete the project in less than 35 months. A stakeholder coordination team may help meet this timeline.
9. The Project should only be designed to accommodate the 1998 flood event and not oversized to accommodate a 1% flood event.
10. A 98% (7,000 CFS) solution completed in the next couple years is preferable to a 99% (8,800 CFS) solution at an unknowable time in the future.

SFCJPA and Corps Alternatives

The five alternatives proposed to be analyzed are:

- Alternative 1: No Action
- Alternative 2: Modify Pope-Chaucer Bridge and widen creek channel bottlenecks
- Alternative 3: Construct one or more upstream detention basins
- Alternative 4: Construct an underground bypass culvert
- Alternative 5: Construct floodwalls along the channel

Summary of Comments Related to Alternatives

1. Support upstream detention (Alternative 3) and removing Pope Chaucer Bridge and bottlenecks (Alternative 2). (many commenters)
2. Support an underground bypass (Alternative 4) (several commenters).
3. Consider overland floodways using local roadways, like Salt Lake City and Martinez, CA.
4. Remove Woodland bypass from the scope, it's impossible to implement and won't stop flooding at Pope-Chaucer.
5. Consider an alternative that includes a large channel under the Pope-Chaucer Bridge that could also solve traffic problems.
6. Concern was raised regarding the feasibility of upstream detention basins.
7. Consider combinations of alternative to optimize a better solution, such as one that combines Alternative 2 and Alternative 3, or Alternative 2 followed by Alternative 3 (many commenters).
8. Add an alternative to deepen or widen the channel in affected areas; develop a program for sediment management.
9. Evaluate benefits of a series of small scale water detention facilities compared to proposed large scale detention. Could include retention on individual properties. (several commenters)
10. Add bank stabilization as an alternative.
11. Consider construction of a channel bypassing Pope-Chaucer Bridge.
12. Consider removing non-native species and debris (including dead vegetation) to increase channel capacity as an alternative or in addition to the current alternatives.
13. Add alternatives to remove Pope-Chaucer Bridge and restore the habitat or replace Pope-Chaucer Bridge with a single span pedestrian/bicycle bridge and restore habitat.
14. Consider evaluating a combination of currently listed alternatives, which could reduce environmental effects. Some options do not make sense without combining them. (many commenters)
15. Consider removing the Pope Chaucer Bridge, with no replacement.
16. No action is not a good option. The creek is precarious during heavy rainstorms.
17. Constructing an underground bypass would be too intrusive and expensive.
18. For detention to work there would need to be multiple detention areas.
19. Look for habitat restoration options beyond what is required for mitigation. For example, setting back existing floodwalls along Woodland Avenue in E. Palo Alto.
20. Floodwalls downstream of Pope Chaucer Bridge can't be an alternative because it will not stop flooding at Pope-Chaucer.
21. Floodwalls could be acceptable if the visual effect is subtle (not resembling a culvert).
22. Consider incentives or requirements for low impact design / impermeable surfaces to reduce flood risk.
23. The triangle piece of land near Pope-Chaucer was used to slow traffic. Do not allow traffic in future to cut this corner.
24. Do not cut the trees, add concrete or build new floodwalls (many commenters). Concerns raised about habitat impacts, changes to community character and decreases in property values associated with tree removal and new flood walls.
25. Do not install a bridge at Pope-Chaucer that would increase traffic.
26. Alternative 3 has to provide enough capacity to hold the total stream flow from a storm that is in excess of what the creek can handle, not just the peak flow rate.
27. Alternative 4 would either have to provide bypass around or along the creek from above the Middlefield Bridge to Highway 101 to achieve 100 year (8,800 cfs) protection unless the Middlefield, Pope/Chaucer, University Avenue and Newell bridges are all replaced, as none of them have a capacity over 7,100 cfs.
28. Goal for stage 1 of the flood control work on the creek between Middlefield Bridge and Highway 101 is to increase the capacity to at least 7,000 cfs. This will require the replacement of the Newell and Pope/Chaucer bridges. The question is what should be the capacity of the replacement bridges, 7,000 cfs or 8,800 cfs?

Building the 2 bridges for 8,800 cfs would avoid having to rebuild them later if a future decision was made to increase the creek capacity to 8,800 cfs. If those two bridges were built for 8,800 cfs, the Middlefield Bridge capacity of 7,000 cfs would limit the downstream flow to that value which is within the capacity of the University Avenue Bridge. Going to a creek capacity of 8,800 cfs at some time in the future would then only require replacing the Middlefield Road and University Avenue bridges along with additional widening of the creek channel itself.

29. Consider a 1,000 cfs bypass as shown in ACOE 2003 report. This option might be better than bridge replacement with less environmental effects.
30. There is an existing study regarding Buckeye Creek that might be informative for creating a detention basin there. Arastradero Preserve (Felt Lake) is another possible site for detention.
31. Create recreational opportunities of all kinds at every possible site related to the project.
32. Why are you not planning to modify Middlefield Road Bridge?
33. Consider solutions that replenish the local aquifer to reduce dependence on water imports.
34. Consider “inverse condemnation” and build bridge as a public works project. This is for the City of Palo Alto—fixing bridge will remove this issue.
35. Early in the DEIR process, provide information comparing each alternative’s footprint, cost and environmental impacts. A decision tree would be helpful.
36. Form a Citizen’s Advisory Group for the design of the bridge (two commenters).
37. Need to be consistent with local general plans, particularly as related to open space and natural resource protection.
38. The project has taken too long and want action now (many commenters).
39. Need to cumulatively analyze Newell Bridge and SFCJPA projects to avoid piecemealing (several commenters).
40. Consider replacement of the Pope-Chaucer Bridge with a single arch bridge of small diameter that can convey an additional 700 cfs of water or construct a diversion channel around the bridge and under Palo Alto Ave or Woodland Ave that would convey 700 cfs of water. This would minimize impacts to heritage trees.
41. Appoint a Citizen Advisory Committee for design of a new Pope-Chaucer Bridge. Recommendations regarding the bridge design were also made.

Notice of Preparation List of Potential Environmental Effects to be analyzed

- Aesthetics
- Air Quality
- Biological Resources and Riparian Habitat
- Climate Change
- Geology and Soils Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Hydrology and Water Quality
- Land Use and Private Property
- Construction Noise and Vibration
- Paleontological, Archaeological & Architectural Resources
- Recreation and trails
- Traffic and Transportation
- Utilities and Public Services

Summary of Comments Related to Potential Environmental Effects to be analyzed and Environmental Analysis

1. How will climate change impacts be evaluated – what metrics?
2. What planning horizon will be evaluated?
3. Need to consider wildlife impacts related to trails and connectivity more broadly than just for threatened and endangered species. Trails are increasingly becoming commute corridors (ten feet wide with two foot shoulders), not just quiet footpaths.
4. Need to discuss maintenance impacts.

5. Consider how sea level rise will raise groundwater levels and increase flood risk.
6. Make sure there is even handed evaluation of impacts on both sides of the creek.
7. Make sure you understand the connection of the creek and groundwater wells.
8. Analyze increased erosion due to increased water velocity after the project, with consideration of potential increased sediment releases from Stanford.
9. Alternative 2 needs to be closely examined to determine plant and tree impacts.
10. Need to synchronize the EIR with Palo Alto's Newell Road Bridge replacement project and CalTrans to avoid concerns about CEQA piecemealing – especially relevant to design consideration for bottlenecks (several commenters).

Summary of Comments from Public Agencies

Written comments were received from the California Department of Fish and Wildlife, US Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA), US Department of the Interior: Juan Bautista de Anza National Historic Trail, and the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board. The USEPA's comments were addressed to the Corps, and some comments are only relevant to the FS/EIS document being prepared by the Corps.

Special Status Species. Comments described special status animal and plant species that should be considered in the EIR. Recommendations for species surveys were made.

Impact Analysis. Recommendations were provided regarding direct and indirect impact types that should be considered in the EIR.

Cumulative Impacts. Recommendations were provided regarding the EIR's cumulative impact analysis.

Regulatory Approvals. Comments described the state and federal regulatory approvals that will be required prior to project implementation.

Stakeholder engagement. Stakeholder engagement was encouraged, including with community members, the Corps, Stanford University and agency staff. A neutral facilitator was suggested for stakeholder meetings.

Restoration. Recommendations were made to enhance steelhead habitat.

Recreation. Recommendations were made to protect and enhance recreational opportunities.

Objectives. Concern was raised that project objectives are not clear.

Alternatives. A recommendation was made that the EIR should analyze alternatives that protect against 20, 60 and 100-year flood events, in a phased approach. Another recommendation was made to analyze a combination of the proposed alternatives.

Least environmentally damaging, practicable alternative (LEDPA) is required by the Water Board, for all waters of the State, including the creek channel from top of terrace to top of terrace and the riparian corridor. Note the federal requirement for a LEDPA analysis, under CWA section 404, is only applicable to waters of the U.S. (i.e., the channel waters up to the ordinary high water mark).

CEQA/NEPA Approach. A recommendation was made to prepare a joint EIR/EIS with the Corps rather than separate EIR and EIS documents.

Mitigation. A recommendation was made to develop alternatives that are self-mitigating to achieve no net loss of wetlands.

Bridge design. A recommendation was made that any bridges should fully span channels.

Increase Detention Options. A recommendation was made to consider use of ball fields and low-use parking lots as temporary detention basins and to route flows to golf courses and other landscaped areas during flood periods.

Sediment Transport Model. Development of a sediment transport model was requested to inform a design that will efficiently transport sediment, particularly in light of proposed increases in sediment released from Searsville Dam.

Flow Velocity. Assessment of water velocities was requested to ensure designs are conducive to fish passage and will not result in unanticipated erosion and scour.

Upper Watershed. An assessment of flood control opportunities upstream of the study area was requested.

Agenda Item 5.c.

2017 Schedule of Regular Board meetings



SAN FRANCISQUITO CREEK
JOINT POWERS AUTHORITY
SFCJPA.ORG

2017 Schedule

Regular Board of Directors Meetings

All meetings are on Thursday, beginning at 4:00 p.m.

January 26

City of Menlo Park Council Chambers
701 Laurel Street
Menlo Park

February 23

City of East Palo Alto Council Chambers
2415 University Avenue
East Palo Alto

March 23

City of Palo Alto Council Chambers
250 Hamilton Avenue
Palo Alto

April 27

City of Menlo Park Council Chambers
701 Laurel Street
Menlo Park

May 25

City of East Palo Alto Council Chambers
2415 University Avenue
East Palo Alto

June 22

City of Palo Alto Council Chambers
250 Hamilton Avenue
Palo Alto

July 27

City of Menlo Park Council Chambers
701 Laurel Street
Menlo Park

August 24

City of East Palo Alto Council Chambers
2415 University Avenue
East Palo Alto

September 28

City of Palo Alto Council Chambers
250 Hamilton Avenue
Palo Alto

October 26

City of Menlo Park Council Chambers
701 Laurel Street
Menlo Park

November 16

City of East Palo Alto Council Chambers
2415 University Avenue
East Palo Alto

December 14

City of Palo Alto Council Chambers
250 Hamilton Avenue
Palo Alto

Agenda Item 5.d.

Fiscal Year 2016-17 Operating Budget

Approved, Actual as of 3/15/17,

And Estimated Year-End

San Francisquito Creek Joint Powers Authority Fiscal Year 2016-17 Operating Budget

Approved, Actual as of March 15, 2017, and Estimated Year-End

REVENUES (Year-End)

Member contributions (\$152,000 x 5)	\$	760,000
Grant funding: S.F. Bay-Hwy. 101 project	\$	35,000
Grant funding: SAFER Bay project	\$	46,000
Flood Control 2.0 regional project	\$	44,997
Interest	\$	100
Other Revenue *	\$	648
Total Revenues	\$	886,745

EXPENSES	Approved FY16-17 Budget	7/1/16-3/15/17 Actual	FY16-17 Estimated Year-End
Acct. Description	Amount	Amount	Amount
Personnel			
1 Executive Director Salary	160,000	126,817	175,117
2 E.D. Transportation Allowance	5,000	3,542	5,000
3 Finance & Administration Manager Salary	90,763	69,507	95,979
4 Senior Project Manager Salary	105,070	80,463	111,108
5 Project Manager Salary	90,000	63,750	90,000
6 Salaries Adjustments	0	0	0
7 COLA	0	0	0
8 Employee Benefits	200,000	125,101	195,000
9 Membership Dues	4,900	0	4,000
10 Payroll Administration/Fees	2,900	2,224	2,900
11 Employer Taxes	40,000	43,024	53,000
Subtotal Personnel	698,633	514,428	732,105
Contract Services			
12 Legal Counsel	44,000	23,755	37,500
13 Auditor	15,000	0	15,000
14 Grant Finance Administrator: Bay-Hwy. 101 project	0	0	0
15 Grant Finance Administrator: SAFER Bay project	0	0	0
16 Project Consultants	40,000	20,115	35,000
Subtotal Contract Services	99,000	43,870	87,500
Administrative			
17 Computers/Software	3,000	1,640	3,000
18 Meeting Supplies	1,000	1,008	1,200
19 Travel/Training	3,200	3,541	8,000
20 Office Supplies	1,200	963	1,200
21 Telecommunication	2,300	1,671	2,300
22 Postage	200	23	200
23 Printing/Design	350	1,120	1,500
24 Website	2,300	0	2,300
25 Liability Insurance	5,800	6,210	6,210
26 Office Lease	33,000	22,950	33,000
27 Utilities	6,500	2,765	6,500
28 Office furniture/maintenance	1,000	1,147	1,420
Subtotal Administrative	59,850	43,037	66,830
General Contingency			
29 General Contingency	35,000	0	0
Total Expenses	\$ 892,483	\$ 601,335	\$ 886,435

Notes: Fiscal Year runs July 1-June 30

* "Other Revenue" includes \$200 wellness grant from ACWA/JPIA, \$448 refund from the overcharge of permit fee

Account fields 1, 3 & 4 in Actual and Estimated Year-End columns include a total of \$20,812 for one time cash-out of accrued vacation

Account field 1 in Actual and Estimated Year-End columns includes a salary increase approved by the Board on January 26, 2017