



**Community Advisory Group Meeting**  
**San Jose/Santa Clara Water Pollution Control Plant**  
**March 30, 2011**  
**6:00 – 8:00 p.m.**

**About the Community Advisory Group**

The Community Advisory Group (CAG) was formed in fall 2008 to provide ongoing feedback and a community perspective throughout the three-year Plant Master Plan process. CAG members were appointed by the Plant’s Technical Advisory Committee and are representative of all Plant service area cities – San José, Santa Clara, Milpitas, Cupertino, Campbell, Los Gatos, Monte Sereno, and Saratoga. Members were selected to reflect a range of backgrounds in education, environment, business, recreation, and community activism.

**Minutes - DRAFT**

**Attendees**

<b>Member</b>	<b>Representation</b>	<b>Present</b>	<b>Absent</b>
David Zwack	CAG Member, City of Campbell	X	
Bob Power	CAG Member, City of Cupertino	X	
Richard Yanda	CAG Member, Town of Los Gatos		X
Dolores Hovey	CAG Member, City of Milpitas	X	
Patrick Wong	CAG Member, City of Milpitas	X	
Dave Baxter	CAG Member, City of Monte Sereno		X
Carrie Jensen	CAG Member, City of San José	X	
Diana Foss	CAG Member, City of San José	X	
Robert Levy	CAG Member, City of San José	X	
Tony Santos	CAG Member, City of San José	X	
Gina Marin	CAG Member, City of Santa Clara	X	
Jim Alves	CAG Member, City of Santa Clara	X	
<i>Vacant</i>	CAG Member, City of Saratoga	X	
Carl Cilker	CAG Member, At-large	X	
Donald Peoples	CAG Member, At-large		X
Eileen McLaughlin	CAG Member, At-large	X	
Joseph McCarthy, Jr.	CAG Member, At-large	X	
Michael Gross	CAG Member, At-large		X

<b>Other Attendees</b>	<b>Representation</b>
Dan Canfield	California Department of Parks and Recreation
Jennifer Kincaid	CirclePoint, Facilitator
Leslie Stobbe	City of Milpitas
Kristen Yasukawa	City of San José, CAG Liaison
Jennifer Garnett	City of San José, Communications Manager
John Stufflebean	City of San José, Environmental Services Director
Rosa Santiago	City of San José, Office of Councilmember Chu
Kirsten Struve	City of San José, Project Manager
Matt Krupp	City of San José, Project Planner
Jill Hamilton	Environmental Science Associates
Betty Brown	Member of the public
Dean Stanford	Member of the public
Janet Alexander	Member of the public
Jim Sweet	Member of the public
Kristal Caidoy	Member of the public
Melanie Carrido	Member of the public
Mike O'Halloran	Member of the public
Nicholas Dewar	Public Policy Collaboration, Facilitator
Mike Rodriguez	Santa Clara Valley Water District

The purpose of this meeting was to present, discuss and understand the Preferred Alternative, the upcoming project schedule, future CAG involvement opportunities, and the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) process.

### **Introductions**

Facilitator Nicholas Dewar and CAG members present were introduced. Nicholas led a brief discussion of the meeting outline and format.

#### *Outcomes*

- The group agreed to the ground rules as necessary.

### **Agenda Review**

The group reviewed the March 30, 2011 meeting agenda.

#### *Outcomes*

- The March 30, 2011 meeting agenda was approved without changes.

## **Approval of November 18 CAG Meeting Summary**

The November 18, 2010 meeting summary was distributed to CAG prior to the meeting for individual review. At the meeting, CAG members were asked to accept it as a document that accurately reflects the November 18, 2010 meeting.

### *Outcomes*

- The November 18, 2010 meeting summary was approved without changes and can be viewed at [rebuildtheplant.org](http://rebuildtheplant.org) under Get Involved-Community Advisory Group.

## **Schedule**

City of San José Communications Manager Jennifer Garnett explained the upcoming project schedule and outlined future CAG involvement opportunities. She reviewed actions since the November CAG meeting, which included collecting public comments on the Draft Recommended Alternative from community workshops in January 2011 and from stakeholder and regulatory group meetings. The input was used to refine the Draft Recommended Alternative into the Preferred Alternative, which will be presented to the San José and Santa Clara city councils in April. Upon council approvals, the Preferred Alternative will enter the environmental review process (CEQA).

The evening's meeting was the last scheduled CAG meeting and Jennifer thanked CAG members for their work and contributions to the three-year PMP process. Jennifer emphasized that the project team would stay in touch with the members, notify them of opportunities to be involved in the CEQA process, and contact them if another community group formation was necessary.

She also presented the upcoming project meeting schedule, which CAG members were strongly encouraged to attend:

- *Transportation and Environment (T&E) Committee*  
April 4, 2011 at 1:30 p.m. at San José City Hall, Wing 118 and 119
- *Treatment Plant Advisory Committee (TPAC) meeting*  
April 7, 2011 from 3:00 p.m. – 5:00 p.m. at San José City Hall, Tower 1734
- *San José City Council meeting*  
April 19 at 1:30 p.m. at San José City Hall Council Chambers
- *Santa Clara City Council meeting*  
April 19 at 7:00 p.m. at Santa Clara City Hall Council Chambers

Jennifer encouraged CAG members to attend the San José City Council meeting on April 19 to receive a council commendation for their contributions to the PMP as well as speak at the project update.

*Note: The council commendation was rescheduled to a later date.*

To answer questions regarding the meetings, Jennifer explained that the Preferred Alternative was not finalized and the plan could still undergo changes after the city council meetings.

#### *Outcomes*

- For more information, contact CAG Liaison Kristen Yasukawa at [Kristen.yasukawa@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:Kristen.yasukawa@sanjoseca.gov) or 408-975-2606.

#### **Preferred Alternative – Public Input and Refinements**

Plant Master Plan Project Manager Kirsten Struve and Project Planner Matt Krupp presented how public input helped refine the Draft Recommended Alternative into the Preferred Alternative for the CEQA process. The same presentation will be used at the San José City Council meeting. During the presentation, CAG members asked questions and made comments regarding both the presentation and the Preferred Alternative.

Matt explained that staff responded to all questions submitted directly to them or via the website, and captures every comment and letter submitted by the public for consideration.

When reviewing the project timeline and the rate increase projections, CAG members asked if anything could be done to speed up the Plant rebuild. Matt responded that a faster rebuild could result in a higher risk of project failure or the project not being optimized properly that may result in unexpected rate increase. Even with an optimized switch to mechanical dewatering, the process change will result in an increase in operational costs that could rise anywhere between 7 and 10 percent.

In response to a question, Matt explained that the critical infrastructure repair projects that would have occurred even without the Plant Master Plan will not be part of the larger Plant Master Plan EIR (a discussion of program and project EIRs appears in the next section of these notes). However, these projects will be evaluated under their own separate CEQA process and evaluated collectively in the Plant Master Plan EIR as part of the cumulative impacts section. When asked why the program-level CEQA process would be conducted now if there is a chance that it could be changed later due to the project-level CEQA processes, Matt said that it is necessary to know the environmental impacts of the overall plan so that as the plan moves forward, it would be possible to look at alternatives that will reduce those impacts. Projects in the Plant Master Plan EIR addressed at a programmatic level, which include projects in the later years of the Plan, will require additional environmental analysis once the project is better defined.

Members asked whether the restored Artesian Slough was included in the Preferred Alternative, since it was missing from a map in the presentation. Matt assured the group that the Slough was still in the plan and simply did not appear on the high-level map that was presented.

CAG members expressed concern that a connection from Dixon Landing Road and I-880 to Zanker Road would encourage traffic through Alviso, creating safety concerns on North First Street near the elementary school. Kirsten assured members that the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) would evaluate all traffic impacts and address those concerns. Members acknowledged that the proposed road connection would help bring people/employees to the area, and suggested including a traffic circle or other traffic calming tactic so the connection does not become a bypass.

Other members thought that the roads would be invasive to the wildlife preservation areas that are proposed near the salt ponds, and that a roadway would be very expensive to construct if it were to avoid affecting wildlife. A member asked if a private road option for truck access to the Zanker Road facility would prevent public access to recreational areas by the shore. Matt responded that different road options would be explored after the traffic studies were completed by the environmental review team. CAG members reiterated that access to the area is the main concern of Alviso residents. Matt replied that further studies are needed to understand what will or will not work regarding traffic.

CAG members suggested changing the presentation's photo of retail development to reflect the group's previous discussions of not including big-box stores in the retail development. The project team explained that a variety of retail types were being considered, including non-big-box retail.

The project team also clarified that there would be no solar panels in the salt marsh. Instead, the plan recommends placing solar panels on building roof-tops and along the eastern Plant boundary, although this location was not finalized.

When discussing wildlife habitat, members suggested using the Santa Clara Valley Habitat Plan's regional approach to the burrowing owl habitat as a model and include more emphasis on the burrowing owl strategy between different local agencies in the PMP.

CAG members expressed concern regarding the management resources for the wetlands area and suggested working with the neighboring Don Edwards National Wildlife Refuge. Members were also concerned about whether levees at Pond A-18 will be removed and how they may be altered to allow for sea-level rise. Kirsten said that as the plan continues to move forward, the PMP team will engage with the agencies involved in levee planning. She explained that the plan allows for the Santa Clara Valley Water District to change or relocate levees in the future, provides space for the levee, and the Shoreline Study will determine the final alignment of the levee.

When asked whether additional levees will be built at Pond A-18 to address global warming, Matt said that proposed levee being considered in the Preferred Alternative for protection and the existing one will be the "final stop." He explained that the proposed levee will be able to last longer because the salt marsh proposed on its bay-ward side will serve as a buffer against the wind, waves, and sea-level rise. An example of this is the lack of marsh buffering

the levees around New Orleans that contributed to the massive flooding during Hurricane Katrina. He stated that the Army Corps of Engineers will take a regional approach to planning levees, not just focus on the Plant.

CAG members asked why a highway is being proposed for an area that is being preserved for wildlife. The project team answered that the EIR will evaluate the environmental impacts of the road and the city councils will make the final decision.

Matt reiterated that the Plant is in an urban area, and that it will not be possible to move people out of the area. He also stressed that roads can be implemented with a minimal environmental impact. CAG members felt that even though the plan is in an urban area, there is still the need to preserve the environment. They recognized that a dead-end road in the north-east of the area might protect wildlife but would not help create an economically viable area and suggested using a causeway similar to the Yolo Causeway, which is built at a height that allows for wildlife to exist underneath it.

There was a question regarding storm water drainage from the development area proposed for the north side of SR-237. CAG members asked whether runoff from there would flow into the Artesian Slough because they were concerned about negative impacts to the Bay from unfiltered stormwater. Matt assured members that the stormwater permits restrict direct runoff into the Bay, and drainage policies described in the plan followed low-impact design criteria and the City of San José's green policies for water runoff, which are already stringent. He assured members that any runoff would not impact the Alviso area.

#### *Outcomes*

- For more information, contact Project Manager Kirsten Struve at [kirsten.struve@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:kirsten.struve@sanjoseca.gov) or 408-945-5180.

#### **CEQA Process Presentation**

Environmental consultant Jill Hamilton presented on the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) process and how it applies to the PMP. She presented the CEQA schedule which included scoping meetings held on June 7 and June 9, 2011, and accepting draft EIR comments in October 2012. In answer to a question, she said that the City of San José can opt to extend the comment period longer than the standard 30 days. She also clarified the difference between a program-level and project-level EIR, since the PMP EIR will be a combination of the two:

- Program-level EIR – Program-level analysis is appropriate for the long-term, conceptual improvements in the PMP. These improvements will be defined in greater detail at a later date, at which point the city will determine the additional analysis needed under CEQA.
- Project-level EIR – Some of the technical improvements that will be implemented in the near term will be defined in sufficient detail to allow project-level evaluation in the EIR. No additional CEQA will be required for these improvements.

She also explained that additional project-level CEQA will be necessary in the future because the program-level analysis EIR will not be able to evaluate environmental impacts of specific projects that are developed later within the PMP. The City of San José will determine whether the plan's EIR adequately evaluates the impacts of individual projects within the Plan. If it does not, then supplemental CEQA documentation will be prepared. She said that the final EIR is scheduled for certification in March 2013.

City of San José Environmental Services Director John Stufflebean asked what type of activities may affect the timing of the EIR process. Jill answered that the EIR project description is being determined, and that changes in how to evaluate certain aspects of the plan and changes in project characteristics would slow down the process. She noted that the process could also be slowed if the EIR is challenged after it is approved.

#### *Outcomes*

- For more information, contact Project Planner Matt Krupp at [matt.krupp@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:matt.krupp@sanjoseca.gov) or 408-945-5182.

#### **CAG Process Review**

Because the meeting was running approximately 10 minutes behind schedule, Nicholas proposed saving time by skipping the CAG meeting review (since there is no next meeting upon which to improve) and allotting fewer minutes to the public comment section of the meeting. All of the CAG members were agreeable to this.

Nicholas then asked for feedback from the CAG members about all aspects of the CAG process – from recruitment to meetings to correspondence – to identify and understand CAG successes and improvement opportunities to help inform future community groups, meetings, and workshops for the City of San José and the Plant.

CAG members acknowledged that staff members came to all meetings from the beginning and did a great job. They understood that not everyone would be completely satisfied by the Preferred Alternative, but felt that the staff did a great job of developing alternatives that aimed to satisfy everyone, and that, in particular, addressed the concerns of the Alviso community. A CAG member stated that they were impressed by the amount of time everyone dedicated to the project and appreciated the commitment to an authentic public outreach effort.

Staff – including the facilitator, Nicholas Dewar – was acknowledged for keeping CAG meetings on track and for accomplishing a great deal during the meetings. Members appreciated staff keeping the group well-informed throughout the whole process, even for members who did not own a computer, and felt that the process was extremely well-organized from the start. Members felt that each meeting time was used wisely so that meetings ended on-time, members stayed on subject, and the whole process was fun, informative, and educational. Members felt that the quality and efficiency of the meetings made them more productive and encouraged participation.

Members enjoyed working with the staff, and appreciated not spending time “wordsmithing” documents associated with the process. The chance to interact one-on-one with staff was also a positive experience for members, and they felt that the staff did a great job educating CAG members with effective presentations in addition to their excellent outreach to the community.

Although some members felt that the meetings got off track at times and focused too much on technical aspects including odor control, other members fully appreciated the technical focus because they felt that their concerns about odor control were important and were thoroughly addressed by the CAG.

CAG members felt that they learned from everyone’s different perspectives – whether they were the perspectives of staff members or their fellow CAG members – so that even if they didn’t agree with the other perspectives, they obtained a better understanding of them and were more respectful of others’ points of view. They felt that the staff did a good job acknowledging everyone’s different perspectives and did a good job balancing them in the alternatives.

Some CAG members felt that the scope of the three draft alternatives was too narrowly focused and that the *Back to Bay* alternative should have represented absolutely no development whatsoever. As a result, this narrowed scope may have skewed the design of the Preferred Alternative so that it includes more developed areas.

Some CAG members also said that they would have appreciated receiving materials further in advance of meetings, as they received some of the materials that required extensive review the day before the meeting. Another member commented on recruitment for certain service areas because some CAG positions were vacant.

One member expressed that it would have been helpful to bring the General Plan 2040 Task Group and the Neighborhood Commission into the PMP process. Another member felt it would be helpful to have understood the end of the process, specifically the city councils’ involvement, throughout the entire process.

#### *Outcomes*

- For more information, contact CAG Liaison Kristen Yasukawa at [kristen.yasukawa@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:kristen.yasukawa@sanjoseca.gov) or 408-975-2606.

#### **Public Comment**

The public participated in the meeting by submitting comments and questions to project staff. One member submitted a handout on a zero-emission electrical vehicle off-road park for the recreational area on the Plant lands. Dan Canfield, Associate Park and Recreation Specialist in the Off-Highway Motor Vehicle Recreation Division of the California Department of Parks and Recreation endorsed that proposal.

A representative of the Santa Clara Valley Water District explained that the District is attentively following the progress of the PMP, and, as a resident of Santa Clara, voiced concern that the EIR should consider traffic impacts to the Plant area resulting from a potential new football stadium that may be built in Santa Clara.

Another member of the public expressed appreciation for the Milpitas CAG members and appreciated the collaborative perspective that resulted from the group's work.

In response to a question posed by a member of the public, Matt explained that the plan's recreational areas have only been planned on a generalized basis, so there are no specific park types in the current plan.

#### *Outcomes*

- Several members of the public provided feedback.

#### **Adjournment**

The CAG meeting adjourned at 8:00 p.m.

---

*The City of San José is committed to open and honest government and strives to consistently meet the community's expectations by providing excellent service, in a positive and timely manner, and in the full view of the public.*  
[www.sanjoseca.gov/clerk/cp\\_manual/CPM\\_0\\_15.pdf](http://www.sanjoseca.gov/clerk/cp_manual/CPM_0_15.pdf)