

**San Francisquito Watershed Council
Steering Committee minutes
March 22, 2006**

Introductions. Agenda was reviewed and approved. Minutes of the December 14, 2005 meeting approved, with the correction that in the notes about the Corte Madera Creek Guide, Reach 1 should be furthest downstream and Reach 3 should be furthest upstream. Next meeting April 12.

Announcements:

- Philippe Cohen, (Jasper Ridge Biological Preserve): For the past several years Philippe and Leonie Batkin (Stanford Management Company) have been working with Stanford leaseholders to reroute equestrian trails away from the creek and its banks. This effort is now completed, and Philippe will soon send a letter to Woodside's equestrian trail group explaining the changes and showing a map of the new trails. SFWC and Leslie Lambert of the Town of Portola Valley requested copies, which Philippe will email to them.

Presentation: Reflections on Sand Hill Road Project (Jim Inglis and Annette Walton, Stanford University):

Pam introduced the presentation by recapping the Steering Committee's request in November to hear more about the innovative methods used by the project team to care for the stream, move trees, and manage traffic during construction.

Jim Inglis: Jim oriented the group by showing aerial photos of the site, which ran along San Francisquito Creek from the Sand Hill Road crossing to the Junipero Serra Road crossing, and pointing out the main features of the project. Part of it involved removing a low-water golf cart crossing and creating habitat from redwood root wads and rocks. Two new pedestrian bridges were added as well. Retrofitting the existing ones would have been more expensive because they were below the high water level. The new structures, which are made of weathered steel, are completely out of the creek and minimized the removal of trees.

Some of the environmental mitigation measures for the project were:

- to preserve vegetation
- to protect the creek
- to protect archaeological resources
- to reduce traffic and parking problems
- to provide bike to pedestrian access.

Another factor was the many agencies involved, among them NOAA's National Marine Fisheries Service, the California Department of Fish and Game, and the Regional Water Quality Control Board. The project also crossed county and city lines. Menlo Park was the lead agency.

Considerations taken into account in the planning included steelhead migration (including removal of the low-water crossing) and flow and erosion control.

Work started June 1, 2004, which meant a pretty aggressive project schedule. Stanford petitioned the agencies to get approval for this start date, which was two weeks earlier than the usual date of June 15. As it turned out, these extra two weeks were critical to finishing the project on time. To begin construction, the project had to have equipment in the creek and so had to temporarily divert the creek. To prepare, Stanford hired a biological consultant, Jeff Olberding, and a fisheries biologist from NOAA's National Marine Fisheries Service to relocate steelhead from that section. There were about 40 juveniles; the largest was about 4 inches long. The project team built a coffer dam upstream of the project area and set up two 48 inches pipes to divert the creek. A specialist was hired to use electroshocking to stun the steelhead and move them downstream of the project site. A complication developed when the consultant found a 6-foot pool in the project area. This posed a problem, because electroshocking only works to depths of 3 feet.

In some sections the diversion pipes were half pipes. They were used to provide daylight to help guide steelhead through them. The second pipe was installed as emergency backup for large flows.

Throughout the process monitoring was done upstream and downstream to ensure that water quality requirements were being met during construction. A key element was tight coordination between the monitoring consultant, the cities, and the onsite team to deal with situations as they arose.

Another unexpected development during construction was the amount of debris found buried in the creek bed and banks. This meant that the team had to over-excavate for the bridge foundations.

In addition, a significant number of archaeological resources were found.

The care of trees on the site was another important feature. The plan had to be constantly changed to accommodate design revisions made to minimize tree removal and relocation. In the end, the project team moved the road 10 feet from its location in the original designs to minimize removal. The schedule also had to be set around raptor nesting season from February 15 to June 1. In the end, the project team moved a total of about 50 trees, including ten from the golf course to the roadside. One large one died, but most of the smaller ones did well. During the project the trees to be relocated were stored on the golf course. Arborwell was the contractor.

The traffic management plan flowed from the team's decision to split the project into two years and shut Santa Cruz Avenue during the entire second construction season (although they provided an emergency lane during this time). In order to make this plan succeed, they had to complete the widening of the Sand Hill Road bridge during the first year.

Annette Walton from Stanford Management Company (SMC) gave the presentation about care of the creek during construction.

San Francisquito Creek crosses several jurisdictions and required permits from 5 regulatory agencies. Because of this unique position, there were an incredible number of eyes watching the whole project. It took an immense amount of coordinating, communicating and hiring the best

professional engineers, hydrologist, biologists, and other professionals to protect the creek during the project. To a large degree, the permits we had to obtain had built in protective measures that we had to abide by.

From the very beginning, each company's roles were defined and our job at SMC was to make sure that it was carried out, particularly when it came to protecting the creek. Stormwater Pollution Prevention (SWPP) and Best Management Practice (BMP) plans were created, communicated, implemented, and inspected. The key items that we felt were effective during this project were:

- 1) Communication: Open communication about the project with the cities and agencies in a constructive fashion and addressing any concerns.
 - We hired Olberding Environmental Consultants to be our key contact with the Army Corp, Fish and Game, NOAA, and the Water Board. He prepared all the documentation for the agencies, did the permitting, updated the agencies on the progress of the project, and requested extensions as needed.
 - SMC held meetings with the local jurisdictions to discuss the protections in place, providing the timing when certain BMPs were to be implemented. At the very start of the construction there were a lot of open areas (golf course) due to grading and we got feedback from both Menlo Park and the City of Palo Alto on how we were planning to address this issue. SMC had originally planned to hydroseed but elected to sod the course instead due to start of the rainy season and hydroseed other areas. We sodded an acre a day and had it completed before the first major rainfall (October 19, 2004).
- 2) Design, Preparation, Installation and Monitoring of SWPPs and BMP's for the project. SMC prepared and got the NOI from the State Board for the project but each contractor had to prepare a site specific SWPPs based on their scope of work; they had to implement it. Stanford during the project met with the Santa Clara County and the cities of Menlo Park and Palo Alto at the site to inspect the BMP's. Mostly Stanford and the City of Menlo Park inspected or monitored the BMP's by providing full time inspectors on-site to monitor the BMPs. All discrepancies that were noted were corrected immediately.
- 3) SMC asked Balanced Hydrologics to monitor water quality parameters, such as stream flow, erosion, turbidity, and pH on the creek through out the project. They also assisted in BMP monitoring. Four sampling locations were established (Piers Lane, USGS gauging station, between the low-water crossing and the bridge construction, and at Oak Creek Apartments). The monitoring program started October 1, 2003 and ended September 20, 2005. The major construction on the widening of the bridge over the creek began in May 2004 and was completed in October 2004. The baseline turbidity for the project was not to exceed 50 NTU over the background level, and the acceptable range of pH was 6.5 to 8.5.

At critical segments of the project Balance was on site to observe the dewatering of a large pool beneath the bridge over the creek prior to widening the bridge abutment. This process

involved isolating the work area by installing nets upstream and downstream, constructing coffer dams, removing fish from the pool, and installing drain pipes to bypass flows around the work site. When this work was occurring, Balance monitored the turbidity hourly. The downstream turbidity exceeded the NTU background twice: once June 4 when the project team was removing and replacing sandbags while modifying the coffer dam, and again August 16 due to the excavation of a sump pool while pumping was in process. Balance staff immediately notified the contractor of the exceedances and corrective actions were taken. The turbidity rapidly decreased to normal levels.

Another critical point in the project that involved Balance's oversight took place when the concrete on the bridge deck was poured. The contractors had sealed the joints of the plywood forms, preventing leakage of almost all of the excess water into the creek. Balance measured the specific conductance and pH during and after the concrete pour. The pH measurements were consistent upstream and downstream at 7.9.

Other protective measures incorporated including using Volcomp-20, which seals/cures the concrete along the bridge abutment and concrete sacks; otherwise it would have taken 28 days for the concrete to cure. This was required by the regulatory agency.

A number of steps were taken to care for habitat during construction as well.

- 1) Pre-construction raptor and swallow surveys were completed prior to each phase of the construction project by Olberding Environmental in February, April and July 2004, and February 2005. The biologist used stationary viewing locations covering a 350-foot area in each direction as well as walking surveys in the riparian habitat. There was no evidence of nesting by raptors in the trees surveyed, and no raptors were observed during the survey.
- 2) HT Harvey conducted a study in May 2003 to look for the presence or absence of certain protected species such as the California red-legged frog, tiger salamander, western pond turtles, and steelhead. Only the steelhead trout was found.
- 3) Biological monitors were present to make sure that no fish were in the areas where project construction took place. There were temporary impacts to steelhead associated with the coffer dam installation, pool dewatering and redirection of the creek, and removal of overhanging vegetation. Mitigation measures for the steelhead had to be established because of the removal of a low-water golf cart crossing and bank stabilization. Mitigation included installing infill vegetation, a series of boulder clusters and redwood tree root structures, and other features to create instream habitat.
- 4) Fish capture and relocation efforts were successful. A total of 36 steelhead were relocated from the bridge area and 35 from the low-water crossing.
- 5) Stanford will be responsible for replanting vegetation and monitoring the creek for the next 5 to 20 years to document plant survival rates, geomorphic stability, and other indicators of success. The university will have to provide annual reports to the Water Board.

Questions and comments:

- How did the budget turn out? *Response:* OK!
- The traffic stayed pretty acceptable throughout the project. It was not as bad as I expected. There were some problems with Campus Drive, but they were worked out.
- The cantilevered section was nowhere near the creek channel. This avoided all creek impacts.
- With the early October storm we had that year, the project team got out of there just in time.
- Where does runoff from the road and bridge go? *Response:* Into swales along Sand Hill Road, where it percolates into the ground. The swales have been holding together well all winter.
- Where were redwoods planted? *Response:* There were no redwoods planted. Redwood root wads were used to create habitat structure in the location where the low water crossing was removed.

Update from the San Francisquito Joint Powers Authority (Cynthia D'Agosta, Executive Director):

Cynthia's update focused primarily on two topics: the status and next steps on the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (COE) / San Francisquito Creek JPA Flood Damage Reduction and Ecosystem Restoration Project Feasibility Study, and the status and next steps on levee vulnerabilities in East Palo Alto.

The first public meeting about the COE/JPA project will take place on April 27 from 7:00 to 8:30 p.m. at the International School. The public notice is scheduled for release next week. This meeting will provide an introduction to the COE feasibility study process, the six planning steps, the kinds of things to be studied, the budget process, and the reasons why COE studies take time to complete. Afterward, there will be stations set up around the room focused on various components of the study, including environment, flood solutions, budget, planning, and economic analysis. Attendees will be able to meet with representatives from the COE and the JPA.

Another reason for the meeting is to record the community's ideas and concerns. Cynthia is preparing the COE team to be ready to talk extensively with the community. It would be helpful for those interested to give their thoughts and questions ahead of time so that the COE will be prepared to address them.

The hydraulics and hydrology studies for the project have begun. Representatives from the COE, the Santa Clara Valley Water District (SCVWD), Menlo Park, and Palo Alto met in February to discuss the studies. The three local agencies are supplying models to the COE, which will identify information gaps and set criteria for the models. The COE will also set standards to gauge the models against, a common practice in projects of this kind. For example, the SCVWD and COE might model various situations differently. In the case of over-banking, a question to consider is whether the model should allow flow to return to the creek. These are the kinds of decisions about how best to make the model reflect the reality of the creek channel that the

parties will have to agree on. The COE must approve these decisions in order to be able to certify the project at the end. FEMA also weighs in on the criteria for the hydraulics and hydrology studies but usually goes with the COE's recommendations; FEMA and the COE calculate flows and flood elevations differently. The information from the hydrology and hydraulics studies will come to the Steering Committee for review; the goal is to have the information ready this summer.

Question: What model will be used for the tides?

Response: It's not known yet; the engineers will make a recommendation. The existing levees were not built for flood protection, so FEMA ignores them, and the COE may or may not consider them.

The local sponsor does CEQA and the COE does NEPA for the project. The JPA will certify the environmental document from the feasibility study and be the lead, but SCVWD and the San Mateo County Flood Control District will do the groundwork. For the public meeting on the 27th, the JPA will do a 30-day federal and state notice as part of the CEQA process.

Another upcoming event related to the project is a tour of the upper watershed with the COE project team. They'll stop at Searsville, the Felt Lake diversion, and some of the upper watershed tributaries.

In addition, there are now quarterly meetings between members of the JPA Executive Team (a subset of the Management Team) and upper-level COE personnel to report progress.

Question: What is the status of the federal funding for the project?

Response: Cynthia noted that just this week she received an email from a watershed coordinator in Los Angeles County asking for letters of support to restore continuation funding for COE projects to the President's budget. There are many such projects in the same boat. Congresswoman Anna Eshoo will carry all the support letters received for the San Francisquito project to the committee meetings that start this week. She has asked for a \$425,000 add-on to the federal budget this year to keep the project moving; it is hoped that the project will receive \$250,000. Local money is in place to keep it moving for this calendar year. JPA Director Greg Zlotnick can ask the Santa Clara Valley Water District Board to forward more match if the federal money slows.

Question: How has working with the COE been?

Response: Working with the COE has been fine. Also, as part of the internal coordination effort, the JPA is now working on a six-party agreement among its members regarding match contributions.

Another activity underway at the SFCJPA is working with Eagle Scout Troop 222 in Menlo Park to conduct an inventory of vulnerable trees along the creek, especially near bridges. The hope is to link with street-tree mapping efforts in the cities of Menlo Park and Palo Alto. The systems are different, but the Eagle Scout leading the project thinks that the technical issues can be overcome. The survey area will be from the San Mateo bike bridge on Sand Hill Road to Friendship Bridge, and 20 teams of 10 volunteers will be involved. Kevin Murray will conduct a

training tonight, and the survey will take place on Sunday, March 26. Notice will be sent to creekside residents in the survey area to explain the project.

Cynthia also gave an update on the condition of levees along the creek in East Palo Alto. At some point after the completion of the levee project in 2002, some slumping had been noted in the levees along East Bayshore across the creek from the auto body shop in front of a storage facility. The New Year's Eve storms caused the slump to deepen and broaden; the path on top has now fallen and been sectioned off. An additional factor is that there are homes just downstream of the storage facility. After their initial inspection, East Palo Alto staff examined the levees more closely and found other problems. Ponds have formed downstream of the end of Daphne Street, and creek water is seeping into them via holes tunneled through the levees by rodents. East Palo Alto has sandbagged the holes as a temporary fix. A third potential problem with the levees was also identified. The top of the levee has a 37-yard crack along it a few inches wide between the ends of Daphne and O'Connor Streets, and other, smaller cracks are visible just below the surface. At the end of February, East Palo Alto asked for assistance from the COE. The COE recommended that the city seek assistance through the San Mateo County Office of Environmental Services (County OES). The County OES surveyed the levees and declared a local emergency. The State Office of Emergency Services and the Menlo Fire District will seek a declaration of emergency at the state level. This will allow work to be done and possibly reimbursed. Congresswoman Anna Eshoo wrote a letter to the governor on March 10 asking that the project be added to the state disaster declaration. There is no plan yet, and in order to get the COE and the state Office of Emergency Services to make recommendations, a state declaration is needed first.

The SFC JPA held an emergency meeting on March 8 to brief its members about the situation.

Question: When the Palo Alto levees were worked on, were the ones on the East Palo Alto side worked on, too?

Response: The SCVWD and the Palo Alto worked on the Palo Alto side, which was a continuous, structured raising of the whole length of the levee. For the East Palo Alto side, the San Mateo County Flood Control District did the environmental document for a project to do repairs and fill low spots; East Palo Alto conducted the work. When East Palo Alto incorporated, there was no resolution on the maintenance of some of its infrastructure, including these levees. These kinds of issues will also be important for the COE / JPA project. There's a difference in funding between the San Mateo County members and the Santa Clara County members: the San Mateo County Flood Control District has 2-3 employees, and the SCVWD has a much larger staff and takes a watershed approach. This will need to be resolved for the COE project.

Question: For the fire districts, there's mutual emergency response between counties. Is that not the case for the agencies responsible for flood control?

Response: No. The water agencies usually work on long-term planning issues, not emergency response. The county offices of emergency services can't go across county lines, which has a lot to do with where funding comes from. The Menlo Fire District is interested in working with the JPA on cross-county response. The San Mateo County Office of Emergency Services is looking into providing an automated call system to all its cities in flood zones. Homeland Security funds

can be used to address flood issues (such as coordination and more rainfall monitoring in the upper watershed).

Continuing business (Trish Mulvey):

Santa Clara Valley Urban Runoff Pollution Prevention Program (SCVURPPP) trash prevention effort: SCVURPPP and the Regional Board are concerned about the amount of both trash in creeks and trash reaching the Bay from local creeks. The SCVURPPP Copermittees have identified a list of “trash hotspots” to monitor, and at Jim Johnson’s recommendation, Palo Alto included the reach of San Francisquito from University Avenue to Bayshore. The SCVURPPP trash working group has completed an assessment of where trash comes from and is now determining next steps. One idea is to develop a set of best management practices for capturing and collecting trash, at either catch basins or outfalls. We might want to think about being a pilot site. Phil Bobel is involved in this effort, and we should be in touch with him and his new staff member, Chris Fujimoto, about this. We could also invite the trash working group’s co-chair Brett Calhoun from the SCVWD to talk to us about a role for a community group to engage in this process.

Question: Are fines higher for littering in the creek than elsewhere?

Response: No.

Comment: If the fines were high enough, that might go a long way toward deterring dumping in the creek.

Comment: Enforcement is often the issue.

Santa Clara Valley Water Resources Protection Collaborative (SCVWRPC): The Collaborative convened in 2002 as the Santa Clara Valley Water District began updating its creekside ordinance. The Collaborative is now doing presentations to homeowners about what they need to know in order to undertake projects and stewardship efforts. Trash and debris removal is part of the outreach; the SCVURPPP BMPs should be coordinated with this effort. The Collaborative outreach team has identified eight topics for new materials. Three concern permits. They are: 1) a FAQ sheet for permitting counter staff; 2) information for property owners about what they need to know in order to get a permit from their local jurisdiction, and 3) information for property owners about what they need to know in order to get permits from other agencies with jurisdiction over creeks, including the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and the California Department of Fish and Game. Five are educational pieces about the following topics: 1) what it means to be a good creek steward, with a list of day-to-day activities; 2) invasive and native riparian vegetation; 3) bank erosion and repair; 4) trash; and 5) outfalls. One idea that is being considered is creating a “kit” with these kinds of materials for streamside property owners.

The Collaborative is meeting March 23rd (tomorrow). It will receive an update on the community meetings and outreach and give input on proposed revisions to the ordinance.

Question: What is the status of the ordinance at this point?

Response: Palo Alto is considering taking on permitting (as opposed to continuing to have permits issued by both the City and by the SCVWD). Santa Clara County may have the SCVWD continue filling this role.

Question: Is the outreach team planning any cross-county efforts?

Response: The Collaborative works within the SCVWD's Santa Clara County jurisdiction. Three sides of the county are creeks: Scott Creek between Milpitas and Fremont (Alameda County), the Pajaro River border with San Benito County, and San Francisco; so there are cross-border issues other places too.

Comment: Rich Gordon has asked for a report about the effectiveness of the Collaborative and its outreach efforts.

Comment: Sam Herzberg's model San Mateo County information sheet about permits from the other regulatory and resources agencies may be used for one of the eight outreach pieces.

Santa Clara Basin Watershed Management Initiative: The WMI's Watershed Assessment and Monitoring Subgroup is working with the Stevens and Permanente Creeks Watershed Council to help determine what they need for their assessment and monitoring plan of their watershed.

Announcements: As part of its watershed stewardship planning effort, the SCVWD funded a thorough historical ecology study of Coyote Creek downstream of Anderson Dam. At the next WMI Core Group meeting on April 6th, Robin Grossinger of the San Francisco Estuary Institute will give a presentation about this project at a brown bag lunch from 12:00 to 1:00 at the SCVWD headquarters.

In addition, the WMI's Land Use Subgroup is planning its next series of "How Creeks Affect Development and How Development Affects Creeks" workshops on May 3 at the former Martin Luther King Library in San Jose. Robin Grossinger will be one of the presenters.

Regional Water Quality Control Board: Regions 1 and 2 got a grant to propose an amendment adding three beneficial uses to the North Coast and SF Bay Basin Plans. An announcement of the May 9th South Bay CEQA scoping meetings is in the circulating file. The uses being considered for addition to the plans include: Wetland Habitat (WET); Flood Peak Attenuation and Flood Water Storage (FLD); and Water Quality Enhancement (WQE). These have been approved by the State Water Resources Control Board and the State's Office of Administrative Law and are in place elsewhere in California but would be new here. It is expected that these uses will be applied Bay Area-wide.

Staff reports:

Katie Pilat, Restoration Projects Manager: On March 4 the Watershed Council held a volunteer workday, which was a broom pull in conjunction with the town of Portola Valley. The next workday is April 1 and will be a broom pull at Cow Hill.

In its fish passage work, SFWC has just held the 75% design review with several San Mateo County departments and other stakeholders. Construction is optimistically scheduled for this fall.

In the stormwater demonstration projects, construction on the second half of the Menlo Park parking lot remains on hold because of the rain.

Pam Sturner, Coordinator: Pam spent 10 days this month at the CALFED Watershed Partnerships Seminar. It had essentially three elements: lectures during the day on various topics in watershed science and policy, exercises in leadership, and a team assignment to produce a watershed plan for the Amador Dry Creek Watershed Council, a newly formed group. The watershed that was the subject of the plan is in the foothills of the Sierra just below Kirkwood Ski Resort and mostly in Amador County. One of the most interesting aspects of the seminar was meeting the 36 other participants, who came from all over California and work in watershed management in various capacities, and hearing their perspectives on issues of concern. This was particularly true of the Central Valley members, who are dealing with a host of complex issues, including invasives, threatened species, pollution from defunct mines, and the conversion of agricultural land to other uses, including suburban development. The Central Valley contingent was deeply concerned about water supply, and particularly the possibility that the Bay Area, with its larger population, will vote their water away. Amador County has put a three-year moratorium on new development while it updates its general plan in order to address constraints on water supply and wastewater management capacity. Among the lectures, one of the most interesting was one on watershed function by Jeff Mount, a geology professor at UC Davis. He did a wonderful job of explaining the watershed science in terms that a (mostly) general audience could easily understand. Another lecture of interest to SFWC was one by Lev Kavvas, a hydrologist at UC Davis who is developing a hydrology model that he hopes can eventually be used by nonspecialists.

This month SFWC also submitted its CALFED Watershed Program grant seeking funds to replicate the Urban Creeks Council's "house call" project in a small pilot area of the upper watershed and hire a professional planning consultant to help us with a strategic outreach plan.

Pam noted that the next meeting will be held on April 12 and will feature the second part of the SCVWD's presentation on the Water Resources Protection Ordinance; this one will be about the guidance to homeowners contained in the *Streamside Facility Protection Manual* (formerly the *Guidelines and Standards for Land Use near Streams*). She then asked attendees for their news from the watershed.

Comment: Jeff Mount wrote *California Rivers and Streams*. It's a great book.

Comment: There are starting to be discussions about the golf courses in Menlo Park and Palo Alto, where a remodel is being considered.

Comment: The San Mateo County Parks Department is having a public meeting tonight on the Huddart Park Master plan. It was in the Almanac today, and information is in the circulating file.

Comment: The person in charge of field maintenance for Portola Valley reports using 22-4-4 fertilizer on the playing fields in Portola Valley. That amounts to 900 pounds of nitrogen a year for all the fields (the one near Rosotti's gets most of it). In addition, clippings from mowing are left on the field, rather than being bagged up and removed. This is an issue that has grown in our community; there's more and more pressure to create perfect, dry playing fields. The Ford, Rosotti's, and Corte Madera fields use sand channels under the turf, which sends runoff right to the creek, and that design is being considered for Woodside School, too.

Comment: Residents in Los Trancos Woods reported the dumping of chipped wood along the creek bank on Los Trancos Road. The town is going to post "no dumping" signs and do follow-up.

Pam called for any additional comments. Hearing none, she adjourned the meeting at 5:00.

In attendance:

Paul Garcia, County of Santa Clara Supervisor Liz Kniss's office
Paul Heiple, Portola Valley Conservation Committee and California Native Plant Society
Marge DeStaebler, Portola Valley Conservation Committee
Leslie Lambert, Town of Portola Valley
Tracy Ingebrigtsen, Stanford University Utilities
Ginger Holt, Stanford Weekend Acres
Ken Torke, City of Palo Alto
Bill Springer, Santa Clara Valley Water District
Gene Spurlock, SFWC volunteer
Philippe S. Cohen, Jasper Ridge Biological Preserve
Jim Inglis, Stanford Management Company
Annette Walton, Stanford Management Company
Libby Lucas, California Native Plant Society
Art Kraemer, Crescent Park Neighborhood Association
Viv Blomenkamp, League of Women Voters of Palo Alto
Cynthia D'Agosta, San Francisquito Creek JPA
Jerry Hearn, Acterra
Dianne Dryer, City of Menlo Park
Julie Skelton, Stanford Management Company
Trish Mulvey (via phone)
Katie Pilat, SFWC

Minutes respectfully submitted by Katie Pilat.