

---

**Steering Committee meeting minutes**  
**May 10, 2006**

Introductions. Agenda was reviewed and approved. Minutes of the April 12, 2006, meeting were approved with the following corrections:

- The comment about whether the creek is seen as an amenity or a crime corridor came from a Steering Committee member.
- The comment about the City of Santa Clara volunteering to be a pilot for using the *Streamside and Facilities Protection Manual* as a "counter tool" came from Trish Mulvey.
- Marge DeStaebler's name was added to the attendance list.

The next meeting will be June 14. The presentation will be about woody debris and habitat conditions and will be given by two fisheries biologists from SCVWD, Melissa Moore and David Salsbery.

**Announcements**

- Philippe Cohen, Jasper Ridge Biological Preserve: Another bathymetry of Searsville Lake will be done this year.
- Pam Sturner, SFWC: Stacks of our new outreach materials are available today for Steering Committee members to take back to their organizations.
- Marty Laporte, Stanford Utilities: Balance Hydrologics will present results of the past year's water quality monitoring in the creek at the September 13 Steering Committee meeting.

**Presentation: Review of local agency policies, regulations, and procedures in the San Francisquito watershed – steelhead habitat protection** (Richard Harris and Susie Kocher, U.C. Berkeley Center for Forestry)

Pam introduced the topic of today's presentation: the outcomes of a project commissioned by SFWC in 2002 to see how well local agencies' policies were protecting the San Francisquito watershed. She welcomed the authors – Richard Harris and Susie Kocher from the U.C. Berkeley Center for Forestry and Jill Bicknell of EOA – and gave the floor to Katie Pilat, the manager of the project, for additional background.

Katie introduced the project, saying there would be presentations on the results of two reviews of local agency policies, regulations, and procedures in the San Francisquito watershed. The goal was to evaluate the effectiveness of local jurisdictions in protecting creek and watershed resources. One review was focused on steelhead habitat protection, and the other on stormwater management, site design, and several other policies affecting watershed protection. The project was undertaken to build on previous studies done in parts, but not all, of watershed, and to fill in the gaps. It was funded by the Costa-Machado Water Act of 2000 with a grant administered through the State Water Resources Control Board.

Of all the watershed jurisdictions (East Palo Alto, Menlo Park, Palo Alto, Portola Valley, Woodside, San Mateo County, Santa Clara County, and the Santa Clara Valley Water District), only San Mateo County had participated in a previous review with a salmonid habitat focus

(known as “FishNet 4C”), whereas Santa Clara County, Palo Alto, and the Santa Clara Valley Water District (SCVWD) had all participated in the Development Policies Comparison Project for Santa Clara County jurisdictions through Santa Clara Valley Urban Runoff Pollution Prevention Program (SCVURPPP).

For the current study, East Palo Alto, Menlo Park, Portola Valley, Palo Alto, and the Santa Clara Valley Water District participated in the steelhead habitat-focused review; East Palo Alto and Menlo Park participated in the review that focused on stormwater management and other development policies. (See tables in “Pilat” presentation, downloadable from <http://www.sanfranciscuito.org/projects/forums/archive.>)

The first set of reviews, which focused on how policies, regulations, and procedures protect steelhead habitat, was conducted by Richard Harris and Susie Kocher of the U.C. Berkeley Center for Forestry. It was a three-part study that included document review primarily of general plans, ordinances, and a smaller number of supplemental documents; a field practices evaluation that evaluated how the policies were carried out in on-the-ground projects; and a set of case studies, which assessed the development review process from start to finish for five projects at locations distributed throughout the watershed.

The second set of reviews, which examined stormwater management, site design, and other policies that affect watershed protection, was conducted by EOA Incorporated and will be presented by Jill Bicknell of EOA. There was no field component to this study. In addition to reviewing general plans and ordinances, this study also included a review of codes and other regulations, guidelines, standard drawings, and constructions details. This study fulfilled part of the participating jurisdictions’ C.3.J stormwater permit requirements (the Site Design Standards self-evaluation worksheet). EOA also reviewed erosion and sediment control, natural resource protection, alternative transportation, and watershed-based planning.

The study couldn’t have been completed without the participation of staff from the City of East Palo Alto, the City of Menlo Park, the Town of Portola Valley, the City of Palo Alto, and the Santa Clara Valley Water District – many thanks to all who participated! SFWC also thanks to the reviewers, Richard Harris, Susie Kocher, and Jill Bicknell.

Richard Harris began his presentation with a brief description of a similar set of studies he conducted or five coastal counties of northern California at the time when several California salmonids were put on the Endangered Species List. The next set of studies, known as FishNet 4C, covered the Central Coast from the Russian River to Monterey. Between these two studies, Richard has seen the gamut of practices. The San Francisco study was an interesting opportunity because it was the first adaptation of these studies to an urban environment and also the first on the Bay side of the coast. The San Mateo County study had focused on the coast side. (Slides from Richard’s presentation are available at <http://www.sanfranciscuito.org/projects/forums/archive.>)

The study objectives were to evaluate the effectiveness of policies and practices being used in the watershed to manage impacts on fish habitat, including the stream, the streamside zone, and the contributing impacts from the watershed. The second objective was to provide

recommendations for improvement.

The study area was the entire San Francisquito watershed, which covers about 45 square miles and includes the alluvial fan in the lower watershed and the foothills of the Santa Cruz Mountains in the upper watershed. The watershed encompasses all or parts of Palo Alto, East Palo Alto, Menlo Park, Portola Valley, and Woodside.

Some important background issues are that this watershed still sustains a steelhead run (with spawning in Los Trancos Creek, Bear Creek, and West Union Creek); it is listed on the 303-d list as impaired for sediment; fish passage is impaired throughout the watershed; and Stanford University is the most significant potential sponsor of new development in the watershed.

The study methodology was essentially to engage local jurisdictions in a self-assessment of their policies and practices. Modeled on previous work done for the Five County Group and FishNet 4-C, the review covered all policies and ordinances pertinent to fish habitat. The reviewers met with staff from each jurisdiction to select typical development sites at which to conduct field reviews as well as recent development projects to use for case studies.

The results of the study were that environmental review procedures are meticulous, regardless of the scale of the project. They also showed a number of innovative practices being used, perhaps largely driven by stormwater permit requirements. There are some legacy issues from existing development, including inconsistent riparian treatment throughout the watershed, an absence of policies on migration barriers, and erosion in the upper watershed, all of which require watershed-scale solutions. Tomlinson (see report for reference) proposes that the San Francisquito Creek JPA be the coordinating entity. Some of the other existing collaborative organizations within the watershed may be able to help address these issues.

Some of the positive things the reviewers saw in the field included the SCVWD's use of instream structures (rock weirs) to reduce bank erosion by treating the flow regime rather than armoring the banks. The SCVWD is also using bio-engineering as an alternative to conventional bank treatment. One such use of bio-engineering can be seen on Stevens Creek by Highway 85. Richard noted that the reviewers had to go outside the San Francisquito watershed to see on-the-ground projects for the SCVWD tour, as the SCVWD had no on-the-ground projects in the watershed at the time of the tour in the summer of 2005.

The Glen Oaks Equestrian Center's use of a rock-lined retention basin for site runoff was an example of the minimization of hydrologic impacts and nonpoint source pollution, pursuant to NPDES permits. The widening of the Sand Hill Road bridge showed that major projects are conditioned to avoid impacts on the main stem. The levee-raising project on the mainstem downstream of Highway 101 particularly struck Richard as an example of a flood control project that avoided direct impacts on the channel and riparian vegetation. On the Palo Alto side, the levee was raised in a wire basket structure without changing the footprint of the levee. The collection of runoff in roadside swales along the widened Sand Hill Road showed that urban storm water management practices reflect state-of-the-art thinking.

In general, there is little new development occurring in the San Francisquito watershed, and

when it does, it is subject to penetrating environmental scrutiny. All the jurisdictions have ordinances for controlling nonpoint source pollution, and development is not permitted to increase the rate of runoff or peak flows in receiving streams. Erosion control measures are applied to drainage outfalls.

Lingering issues include the existence of barriers to steelhead migration, the occurrence of bank stabilization on private lots that is sometimes unregulated, inconsistent riparian protection (especially with so much creek bank in private ownership), and inconsistent regulation of redevelopment in the riparian zone.

Richard recommended the following actions for increasing habitat protection for steelhead: 1) pursuing more consistent riparian management; 2) undertaking cooperative efforts to remove barriers; 3) pursuing more consistent regulation of re-development; and 4) taking a watershed-wide approach to bank stabilization. All of these things are best achieved through existing collaborative organizations in the watershed. Richard offered an additional note on riparian zone management: watershed managers in the San Luis Rey watershed in San Diego County got funding to examine the whole riparian zone of the watershed and organize it into units for which protection, enhancement, or restoration is recommended.

Questions:

*Question:* You mentioned that there are inconsistencies from jurisdiction to jurisdiction here. Do you have examples of zoning or other mechanisms from other watersheds?

*Response:* The issue here is that the lot lines go to the center of the stream. There are different mechanisms used in different places to protect the riparian corridor: riparian corridor ordinances, flood protection ordinances, zoning overlays, etc. Richard will forward references for different ordinances and zoning mechanisms.

*Question:* Did you see any consistent approaches that you considered either problematic or useful as a BMP?

*Response:* The main thing we saw were the effects of the NPDES requirements, which have been in place in this area for 16 years. These requirements have not yet been implemented in rural areas. They are effective at preventing stormwater pollution and also protect steelhead habitat. Combining riparian vegetation (tree) management that protects riparian functions and takes preventative action for erosion control with stormwater pollution prevention is the key to habitat protection. Most riparian ordinances have lots of exemptions. The same standards that apply to new development do not apply to existing development.

*Question:* You mentioned that watershed protection is very advanced in the Lake Tahoe area. What sort of practices are they using?

*Response:* One example is that because they are a high sediment priority watershed, they have strict BMP requirements in which BMP compliance is attached to the title of a property. They are also doing some monitoring to determine whether BMPs are actually effective at protecting the stream or if they are just being done because they are required.

*Question:* When will the report come out and how will it be distributed?

*Response from Katie Pilat (SFWC):* Hopefully by the end of May. We will post it on the Watershed Council website and distribute it to the local jurisdictions and libraries.

*Question:* Do the weirs shown in one of the slides of a SCVWD erosion reduction project actually slow the flow?

*Response:* No, but they redirect it to the middle of the channel and away from the banks. They are designed for bank protection and to promote deposition in lower flows. During high flow the weirs are submerged and some deposited sediment may be washed out.

*Comment:* It sounds like Richard did not review the Santa Clara Valley Water Resource Protection Collaborative's materials. It would be nice to have him review those materials. Bill Springer will forward Richard the website with links to these materials, including the erosion guidelines.

*Question:* What is your overall impression of the health of the creek?

*Response:* For where it is, it is in amazingly good shape. It is in a high population density area and the riparian corridor is relatively intact. There is more risk to the creek in an area like the Russian River, because there is more development going on there. Here, the development is largely done, so the question is: how can we bring the stream back and correct nagging issues? We can focus on that question here. We still have the fish and there is a very alert, interested community. The next step is to elevate steelhead habitat protection issues to implementation. You need to take the next step organizationally to take on watershed-wide issues.

*Comment from Cynthia D'Agosta (SFC-JPA):* The Army Corps project may be a good opportunity to address issues like passage barriers and find solutions.

**Presentation: Review of local agency policies, regulations, and procedures in the San Francisquito watershed – watershed protection including site design and stormwater management** (Jill Bicknell, EOA, Inc.)

Jill Bicknell began with an introduction of EOA, Inc., the contractor that manages the Santa Clara Valley Urban Runoff Pollution Prevention Program (SCVURPPP). The study that EOA conducted for the San Francisquito watershed was not a SCVURPPP project but is linked to previous studies conducted through SCVURPPP. Jill acknowledged the EOA staff who conducted the review work including Wendy Edde, Carina Chen, and Jennifer Block. She also acknowledged the work of city staff who participated in this study including Pat Stone, Virginia Parks, and others from the City of Menlo Park; and Debra O'Leary, Fernando Bravo, and others from the City of East Palo Alto. Jill noted that the bulk of this review was completed over 10 months ago, so some of the information may have changed.

Part of the reviews completed for the cities of Menlo Park and East Palo Alto were done to satisfy stormwater permit requirements, specifically for Provision C.3.J. Impacts from new and existing development are covered by Provision C.3 and section J covers how to use site design to reduce impacts. The requirement that this study fulfilled was a self-evaluation through which co-permittees were required to conduct a review of local site design standards and identify opportunities for revisions that would result in reduced impacts to water quality.

EOA developed the policies comparison worksheet based on a model used by the Center for Watershed Protection (CWP) in Maryland. They had already put together lots of guidelines for watershed protection. To conduct the earlier reviews through SCVURPPP (completed for Palo Alto, Santa Clara County, and the Santa Clara Valley Water District in 2003) and for this current study, EOA modified CWP's worksheets to fit local needs and followed that format.

The concepts or basic goals for model policies are:

- To preserve open space, natural drainage channels, native vegetation, and riparian zones;
- To prevent/control erosion and the transport of sediment into waterways;
- To reduce increases in stormwater runoff peaks and volumes by reducing the amount of impervious surface and directing runoff to pervious areas; and
- To control sources of pollutants in stormwater and receiving waters.

EOA's methodology was to compare each jurisdiction's documents to the model policies. Some examples are standards for cul-de-sacs and street width. In the appendices of the report, the questions posed to the cities are listed, along with the cities' answers and the citation of the relevant policy or regulation. After the initial review, EOA staff met with city staff to verify the answers and ask for additional resources and clarification. EOA then made conclusions and recommendations.

The model policies were broken down into the following planning principle categories:

- Erosion and Sediment Control During Construction
- Reduction of Impervious Surface and Implementation of Post-construction Controls
- Drainage Design Requirements
- Reducing Pollutants of Concern
- Natural Resource Protection/Restoration
- Alternative Transportation
- Policies to Promote Regional/Watershed-based Planning and Zoning

Jill provided a summary of highlights and recommended improvements for each city for each planning principle category. Her presentation slides can be downloaded at <http://www.sanfranciscuito.org/projects/forums/archive>.

Both cities are meeting stormwater permit requirements for stormwater treatment BMPs at new and redevelopment projects resulting in 1 acre or more of impervious surface. This August the minimum area will drop to 10,000 square feet. Also, the stormwater permits require the development of a plan, called a Hydro-Modification Plan, or HMP, to control stormwater peak flows against increases in flow and duration. An HMP is now in effect for Santa Clara County, and San Mateo County is waiting for the Regional Board to approve its HMP. Both cities that participated in the review have the authority to establish controls on the volume and rate of stormwater runoff from new and redevelopment projects through their municipal codes.

Regarding pollutants of concern, there has been a lot of outreach from both cities on mercury and pesticide control. Menlo Park's municipal code requires demolition projects to recycle a certain percentage of waste materials. Tree removal and natural resources protections are well covered

in the two cities' policies and regulations. Setback requirements along creeks keep coming up in locations all around the area. A more consistent approach throughout the watershed to setbacks would be helpful.

In summary, there are lots of regulations and lots of good protections. These regulations have created awareness among both city staff and residents. Funding exists to support putting the necessary policies in place to protect the creek.

Questions:

*Question:* Will these presentations be available?

*Response:* Yes, on the Watershed Council's website  
(<http://www.sanfranciscuito.org/projects/forums/archive>)

*Question:* Are there opportunities in the watershed for liner parks along the creeks?

*Response from Cynthia D'Agosta (SFC-JPA):* Yes, along the mainstem.

*Response from Jill Bicknell:* The codes and policies in place currently would allow this to happen.

*Question:* Are the SCVURPPP reports on the SCVURPPP website?

*Response:* Yes. The website is SCVURPPP.org and the reports can be found under the C3 button under "products" from around 2003.

*Question:* Are there any updates on any of the SCVURPPP jurisdictions (Palo Alto, Santa Clara County, or SCVWD)?

*Response:* These jurisdictions report progress and efforts completed to comply with requirements in annual reports. Unfortunately, the information may be buried or scattered on the SCVURPPP website.

Katie Pilat finished the presentation with a summary from both reviews. The take-home messages from the two reviews are that there are generally strong environmental review and enforcement procedures to protect creek resources, and that the final reports will provide recommendations for individual jurisdictions to strengthen watershed and fisheries protection and identification of issues best addressed through collaboration across jurisdictional boundaries.

Accomplishments: The studies did raise awareness about steelhead habitat and stormwater pollution prevention issues. It is also the first time comparable information has been gathered for (almost) all watershed jurisdictions. The study can be regarded as a tool to identify strategies for improvement and examples of successful practices used by nearby jurisdictions.

Next steps: Each jurisdiction will likely use results in different ways, depending on priorities and resources. Stakeholders may want to address multi-jurisdictional topics in an appropriate collaborative forum.

*Question:* Should the Steering Committee look at the watershed-wide issues and see which dovetail with Watershed Council priorities at a later meeting?

*Response:* Yes – this is a great idea. Let’s agendize it for a future Steering Committee meeting.

*Comment from Sam Herzberg, San Mateo County Parks:* I worked with Richard Harris on the FishNet 4C project. After the study was completed, San Mateo County Supervisors Gordon and Hill took the lead in establishing a watershed protection and restoration council that included members of various departments. The group meets to talk about watershed issues and the goal is to merge the Clean Water Act and the Endangered Species Act at the county level. It needs to be interdepartmental because public works issues apply to or impact parks or planning and vice versa. It has led to a healthy discussion about steelhead protection with council members involved. The County is considering developing a watershed protection ordinance. It has also submitted a Proposition 50 proposal to develop stream care (“Creekwise”) outreach materials aimed at streamside property owners and to develop a countywide GIS system focused on watersheds, streams, vegetation, and flooding. Lastly, the Regional Water Quality Control Board recently announced that it would develop streamside setback regulations that would be part of future NPDES permits.

*Comment from Trish Mulvey:* The Regional Board is currently working on amendments to the San Francisco Bay Basin Plan, so the discussion of streamside setback regulations is at the policy level right now. There are no current plans for actual implementation into the NPDES permits yet. Also, we should ask San Mateo County to come in and give a presentation on progress made in protecting salmonid habitat since the completion of the FishNet 4C study.

### **Update: Public participation and timeline for U.S. Army Corps / San Francisquito Creek JPA project study**

Pam Sturner introduced the topic, saying it had been agendized to follow up on questions about the Army Corps / JPA project asked at the April Steering Committee meeting. In addition, since the April 27<sup>th</sup> Army Corps / JPA project study kickoff meeting, the Watershed Council has received a number of calls about the public process for the project. Cynthia D’Agosta from the JPA is here to give that update, and an update about the project as a whole.

Cynthia said she would give an update, but that this was a topic that we should agendize for another meeting to discuss more fully. The April 27<sup>th</sup> meeting was the Corps’ public kick-off meeting to scope what should be studied in the feasibility phase. This meeting was also the first meeting required by the NEPA and CEQA processes that began a 30-day comment period during which the Corps will accept comments on issues to include in the study. Comments can be submitted to the JPA or to the Corps to Sarah Gaines ([Sara.M.Gaines@spd02.usace.army.mil](mailto:Sara.M.Gaines@spd02.usace.army.mil)). The Project Management Plan for the feasibility phase has been developed and is available on the JPA’s website (<http://www.cityofpaloalto.org/public-works/jpa-index.html>).

The Corps’s public input process is somewhat limited, so the JPA as the local project sponsor hopes to develop a more comprehensive outreach process. The Corps’s process is to collect all the comments and use them to help define and evaluate the alternatives. The Federal Register notice is online on the JPA’s website and describes the alternatives that are already on the table. The next public meeting will be in the summer of 2007 at which the Corps will present their evaluation of alternatives. The goal of this meeting will be to reach a consensus about the

“without project” conditions and to decide which alternatives will go forward for more detailed analysis and which will be discarded. Between now and the next meeting (summer 2007) we have the opportunity to make comments and provide input to the JPA Board. There will be another public review period at the completion of the Draft EIR/EIS. The process will consider the potential for future development by looking at the general plans of the jurisdictions within the study area. Information about the process will also be available through the Corps’s San Francisquito Creek project website and newsletter.

The Corps will also give the compiled comments to the JPA. It is the JPA’s desire to conduct a more involved public process in order to, for example, bring the Corps’s hydrology and hydraulics analysis to the public. The JPA is working on the scope for a public outreach plan. Because current funding doesn’t include a budget for this outreach, the JPA is requesting that the two county agencies release funds to support it. A letter of support from the Watershed Council would help show the board the importance of a more extensive outreach program.

*Question:* To what degree could JPA Board meetings be used for public process for this project?

*Response:* They could be to allow public comment, but not really for discussion. Also, public process really requires good facilitation in order to avoid a lot of repetition and re-steps.

*Comment:* There’s not a lot of time for this public outreach process, especially without having funding secured yet.

*Response:* This is true. The July 2007 target for the next Corps meeting could be flexible.

*Question:* How much money is needed to do good public outreach for the whole four-year feasibility phase?

*Response:* About \$100-150K. For the first year, we’d need about \$24-30K for four meetings.

*Question:* The Federal Register notice mentions looking at reservoirs in the watershed as part of the project. The Corps cannot include private property in its study without property owner permission, and this may be a limitation for reservoirs on private property. Are there other red flags we should know about regarding potential project alternatives?

*Response:* The Corps is at least doing an initial review of all proposed ideas for alternatives right now. They will eventually throw out impossibilities such as alternatives that are too expensive, present private property obstacles, are aesthetically unacceptable to the community (e.g., very high floodwalls), have ecological impacts that would be too great, and are not economically viable.

*Question:* Does that process go on behind closed doors?

*Response:* The Corps will review all the documents it receives, such as studies and general plans for the cities and the Baylands. There will be back and forth between the Corps and the JPA management team throughout the process.

*Question:* How much should a lay person try to get involved in learning about the hydrology and hydraulics studies?

*Response:* The JPA management team will try to distill the information and provide it to the public. Hydrology is concerned with the rainfall throughout the watershed and how much makes

it into the creek. Hydraulics is concerned with the mechanics of the flow and how much water the creek can hold.

*Question:* Will the SFWC Vision Document be provided to the Corps?

*Response:* Yes. Cynthia will request documents and background materials from all JPA member agencies to provide to the Corps.

Richard McMurtry commented that the Corps project represents a very unique pot of money in that it can be used not only for flood damage reduction but also for ecosystem restoration. It is one of only five new Corps projects in the country. Because it has an ecosystem restoration component, it can study things that flood control projects could not study. He then passed out a set of handouts to all attendees (available on SFWC website at <http://www.sanfranciscuito.org/projects/forums/archive>) containing two emails from Matt Stoecker and a draft resolution that he wrote as an example of something that could be used by the Watershed Council. The text reads:

“Resolved that the San Francisquito Watershed Council recommends:

- That a watershed approach be taken to the Ecological Restoration component of the San Francisquito Creek Feasibility study
- That this approach consider the major areas of potential ecological restoration previously identified in earlier studies including (1) Alternatives for Searsville Dam (no action, periodic dredging, dam removal/lowering to ladder), (2) Improved spawning habitat in Bear Creek and tributaries, (3) Improved fish passage throughout system, (4) Improved fish passage on Los Trancos Creek, (5) Reintroduction of native plants, and (6) Restoration/preservation of a continuous vegetative corridor.
- That this approach consider the concerns and issues of all stakeholders in the analysis of alternatives
- That the Watershed Council intends to develop for consideration by the JPA a list of issues associated with the alternatives identified above.”

Richard stated that the key issue of the third bullet was to recommend that all issues brought to the Corps be given consideration in the analysis of alternatives and that some issues not be rejected.

*Question:* What if we love the draft resolution minus the last bullet? Will it be given more or less weight if it comes from the Watershed Council vs. from an individual?

*Response:* Not at this time. One letter will put the contents into consideration.

The project description in the Federal Register notice is a shortened version. The fuller version is in the Project Management Plan.

*Question:* Has the CRMP Flood Reconnaissance report been incorporated into the alternatives described in the Federal Register?

*Response:* Yes.

*Question:* What are Stanford’s ideas about what to do with the dam?

*Response from Cynthia D'Agosta:* The Searsville Dam Task Force, which included representatives from Stanford, recommended that a study of sediment impacts be completed for Searsville Dam. That study has been completed and is available at <http://facilities.stanford.edu/searsville/>.

*Comment:* As a private property owner, Stanford can say no to the dam being included in the Corps study.

*Comment from Philippe Cohen, Jasper Ridge Biological Preserve:* Stanford will walk away from any proposal that the dam be modified to operate as a flood control dam.

Cynthia recommended that Richard McMurtry read through the Project Management Plan and then submit a letter with his comments, either asking specifically that the removal or modification of Searsville Dam be considered for the project or providing the broader set of comments similar to those in his draft resolution.

*Question from Matt Sagues, MROSD:* Of the three reaches designated for the project, it seems that there is an emphasis on Reaches 1 and 2. Is this true?

*Response:* No, but that's where the flooding has been, so this is the focus for the flood management component. All reaches could have a potential ecosystem restoration component. Reach 3 has the potential for sediment reduction as part of ecosystem restoration. All reaches will have a hydrologic study done on the movement of water over land into the creeks. Only Reach 1 will have a more detailed hydraulic study done.

*Question from Matt Sagues, MROSD:* MROSD is beginning to do planning for trails within the watershed. Is it too late to get on the stakeholder list?

*Response from Cynthia D'Agosta:* Not at all.

*Question from Richard McMurtry to Philippe Cohen:* You've described what would make Stanford walk away. What would make Stanford walk in the door?

*Response from Philippe Cohen:* I can't speak for all of Stanford, but I imagine that most of the bullets listed in the resolution.

*Question from Trish Mulvey to Cynthia D'Agosta:* Matt Stoecker and Richard McMurtry have proposed that the Watershed Council facilitate a Searsville Dam Task Force. What is the right forum to bring this idea up to the JPA, and who facilitated the last round of such a task force?

*Response from Cynthia D'Agosta:* I will agendaize this question (what is the right forum for reconvening a Searsville Task Force?) for the JPA management team. The management team's input will help inform the Watershed Council discussion on this topic. This is why we need an engaging public process where we can break out into conversations on various topics including budget and technical issues such as moving water and sediment through the system.

*Comment from Kevin Murray, SFC-JPA:* I would like to make a recommendation on the process for submitting comments to the Corps. Keep comments succinct, but include enough specific information to make your point. If possible, phrase them in the format, "I would like to see \_\_\_\_\_ included in the EIR/EIS process." It is also acceptable to say something like, "I don't think it is worth studying \_\_\_\_\_."

*Question from Richard McMurtry:* In order to sell the project, to what extent would broadening

the geographical and ecological extents of the project help it pass?

*Response:* There was general agreement that this would help.

**Staff reports:** No staff reports were presented at this meeting.

**Continuing business:**

- Trish Mulvey: The Santa Clara Valley Water District will not be considering the updated Water Resources Protection Ordinance until after July 4<sup>th</sup>.

Meeting adjourned.

In attendance:

Fred Nichols – USGS, retired  
Kent Steffens – City of Menlo Park  
Libby Lucas – California Native Plant Society  
Leslie Lambert – Town of Portola Valley  
Lennie Roberts – Committee for Green Foothills  
Linda Elkind – Portola Valley Planning Commission  
Dianne Dryer – City of Menlo Park  
Claire Elliot – Stevens and Permanente Creeks Watershed Council  
Viv Blomenkamp – League of Women Voters Palo Alto  
Bill Springer – Santa Clara Valley Water District  
Walter Nelson – Families for Fair Government Institute  
Jill Bicknell – EOA Incorporated  
Paul Heiple – Portola Valley Conservation Committee  
Marge DeStaebler – Portola Valley Conservation Committee  
Robert Shun – Department of Conservation  
Kevin Murray – San Francisquito Creek Joint Powers Authority  
Marty Laporte – Stanford Utilities  
Ginger Holt – Stanford Weekend Acres  
Philippe S. Cohen – Jasper Ridge Biological Preserve  
Trish Mulvey – Santa Clara Basin Watershed management Initiative  
Art Kraemer – Crescent Park Neighborhood Association  
Julie Skelton – Stanford Management Company  
Matt Sagues – Mid Peninsula Regional Open Space District  
Joe Teresi – City of Palo Alto  
Ken Torke – City of Palo Alto  
Jonathan Owens – Balance Hydrologics  
Sam Herzberg – San Mateo County Parks  
Richard McMurtry

Minutes respectfully submitted by Katie Pilat.