



TRANSPORTATION and INFRASTRUCTURE COMMISSION  
**REGULAR MEETING**  
**MINUTES**

Thursday, March 27<sup>th</sup>, 2025, 6:15 pm

North Berkeley Senior Center  
1901 Hearst Avenue  
Berkeley, CA, 94709

**A. PRELIMINARY BUSINESS**

**1. Call to order**

**6:15 pm:** Commission Secretary Amiri called the meeting to order.

**2. Roll call**

**6:16 pm:**

Commissioners Present: Ben Gerhardstein (alternate for Karen Parolek), Ellie Greene (alternate for Ren Zaro), Marc Hedlund (alternate for Adrian Leung), Arsh Singh Hothi, Julia Moss, Holly Scheider, Kim Walton (arrived at 6:23 pm)

Excused: Liza Lutzker

Staff Present: Terrance Davis, Wahid Amiri, Noah Budnick, Elaine Hargraves

6:16 pm: Four members of the public present.

**3. Meeting chair selection – Action requested**

**6:17 pm Action:** It was Moved / Seconded (Hedlund / Gerhardstein) for Commissioner Moss to chair this meeting.

**6:17 pm: Vote:**

Ayes: Gerhardstein, Greene, Hedlund, Hothi, Moss, Scheider, Walton

Noes: None

Abstain: None

Absent: None

Excused: Lutzker

Recused: None

**6:17 pm Motion passed 7-0-0-0-1-0**

**4. Public comment on items not on the agenda**

**6:17 pm:** Three public comments.

6:20 pm: Three members of the public present.

**5. Approval of minutes from the February 20<sup>th</sup>, 2025 meeting**

**6:24 pm Action:** It was Moved / Seconded (Scheider / Walton) to review and approve the February minutes at the April Transportation and Infrastructure Commission meeting.

**6:24 pm: Vote:**

Ayes: Gerhardstein, Greene, Hedlund, Hothi, Moss, Scheider, Walton

Noes: None

Abstain: None

Absent: None

Excused: Lutzker

Recused: None

**6:24 pm Motion passed 7-0-0-0-1-0**

**6. Approval and Order of Agenda**

**6:25 pm Action:** It was Moved / Seconded (Greene / Gerhardstein) to approve the meeting agenda.

**6:25 pm: Vote:**

Ayes: Gerhardstein, Greene, Hedlund, Hothi, Moss, Scheider, Walton

Noes: None

Abstain: None

Absent: None

Excused: Lutzker

Recused: None

**6:25 pm Motion passed 7-0-0-0-1-0**

**7. Update on administration and staff**

**6:26 pm:** Deputy Director Wahid Amiri provided updates and answered Commissioner questions about the Transportation Division hiring an Associate Planner for transit, a Senior Planner to manage Vision Zero and two new Traffic Calming Program staff; restarting the Traffic Calming Program; preparing to onboard a new Parking Services Manager; recruiting a new Transportation Manager.

6:27 pm: Four members of the public present.

Deputy Director Amiri provided updates and answered Commissioner questions about the Engineering Division recruiting to hire a Supervising Civil Engineer for streets, sidewalks and stormwater, an Associate Civil Engineer for development and permitting, two Engineering Inspectors – one for sewers and one for development and permitting – one Junior Public Works Engineer for sewers and one Chief of Party for surveying; recently awarded contracts for sewer work on Adeline, Shattuck, and Oxford, restroom renovation and elevator improvements at the Telegraph-Channing Parking Garage, improvements at Fire Station #2, phase one of Strawberry Creek Culvert maintenance, FY23 streetlight maintenance, FY25 curb ramp improvements, pedestrian safety on Sacramento Street, the Woolsey-Fulton Bike Boulevard and Shattuck MLK Bus Stops project and the FY25 street maintenance and rehabilitation project.

Commissioners asked follow up questions and commented on the following topics: when the Engineering and Transportation divisions were last fully-staffed; if the divisions conduct exit interviews; how the City of Berkeley can better retain staff; the status of hiring for the Associate Planner for Vision Zero; staff churn; underfilling positions with engineers in training.

**8. Announcements**

**6:42 pm:** No announcements.

**B. DISCUSSION / ACTION ITEMS**

**1. Ad hoc subcommittee nominations**

Commissioners nominated new commission members to serve on ad hoc subcommittees.

**6:43 pm Action:** It was Moved / Seconded (Hedlund / Walton) to nominate Commissioner Scheider to the Bike Plan Update Ad Hoc Subcommittee.

**6:43 pm: Vote:**

Ayes: Gerhardstein, Greene, Hedlund, Hothi, Moss, Scheider, Walton

Noes: None

Abstain: None

Absent: None

Excused: Lutzker

Recused: None

**6:44 pm Motion passed 7-0-0-0-1-0**

**6:44 pm Action:** It was Moved / Seconded (Walton / Scheider) to nominate Commissioner Walton to be the BART liaison.

**6:45 pm: Vote:**

Ayes: Gerhardstein, Greene, Hedlund, Hothi, Moss, Scheider, Walton

Noes: None

Abstain: None

Absent: None

Excused: Lutzker

Recused: None

**6:45 pm Motion passed 7-0-0-0-1-0**

6:45 pm: Six members of the public present.

**2. Ad hoc subcommittee elections**

Commissioners acted on the nominations.

**6:47 pm Action:** It was Moved / Seconded (Moss / Greene) to elect Commissioner Scheider to the Bike Plan Update Ad Hoc Subcommittee.

**6:47 pm: Vote:**

Ayes: Gerhardstein, Greene, Hedlund, Hothi, Moss, Scheider, Walton

Noes: None

Abstain: None

Absent: None

Excused: Lutzker

Recused: None

**6:47 pm Motion passed 7-0-0-0-1-0**

**6:47 pm Action:** It was Moved / Seconded (Walton / Scheider) to elect Commissioner Walton to be the BART liaison.

**6:47 pm: Vote:**

Ayes: Gerhardstein, Greene, Hedlund, Hothi, Moss, Scheider, Walton

Noes: None

Abstain: None

Absent: None

Excused: Lutzker

Recused: None

**6:47 pm Motion passed 7-0-0-0-1-0**

**3. Measure FF presentation**

**6:48 pm:** Public Works Director Davis briefed the Commission on progress towards implementing Measure FF, which was passed by Berkeley voters in 2024. He reviewed the goals of Measure FF, discussed implementation challenges, provided a revenue forecast, described the SAFE STREETS Citizen Oversight Committee (SSOCC) and reviewed a timeline of key milestones.

6:51 pm: Five members of the public present.

**7:10 pm:** Commissioners asked clarifying questions on the following topics: if the integrated planning framework is comprehensive; if federal funding is a concern; if the Southside Complete Streets and Alameda County Transportation Commission's San Pablo Avenue projects received federal funding; if there's a pathway for faster public engagement and public comments to speed up implementation; what percent of implementation work is done by City staff versus contractors; if integrated planning is just happening for Measure FF or if it's happening for transportation planning as a whole; are there opportunities to standardize work processes and public comment processes?

**7:31 pm:** Members of the public commented on the factors that might contribute to cost escalation; the consideration of quick build versus more permanent projects; prioritizing

the disabled community with Measure FF funding; whether or not Public Works halted work on the Bike Plan to evaluate disability impacts.

**7:30 pm:** Commissioners commented on the following topics: using Measure FF money for quick builds; East Bay MUD and PG&E paving curb to curb in Oakland; if Measure FF planning will happen in-house or with a consultant; concern about the lack of community outreach; the need for consultants to prove their expertise in working with specific communities; the need to spend time in communities; why the new Measure FF funding isn't moving plans faster.

**4. Measure FF SAFE STREETS Citizen Oversight Committee (SSOCC) member nominations**

As stated in Measure FF (2024), Commissioners nominated two members to the Measure FF SAFE STREETS Citizen Oversight Committee (SSOCC) to oversee Measure FF expenditures and progress reports, ensure compliance, evaluate tax impact and meet periodically.

**8:04 pm Action:** It was Moved / Seconded (Moss / Gerhardstein) to nominate Commissioner Lutzker to the Measure FF SAFE STREETS Citizen Oversight Committee (SSOCC).

**8:05 pm: Vote:**

Ayes: Gerhardstein, Greene, Hedlund, Hothi, Moss, Scheider, Walton

Noes: None

Abstain: None

Absent: None

Excused: Lutzker

Recused: None

**8:05 pm Motion passed 7-0-0-0-1-0**

**8:05 pm Action:** It was Moved / Seconded (Hothi / Hedlund) to nominate Commissioner Hothi to the Measure FF SAFE STREETS Citizen Oversight Committee (SSOCC).

**8:05 pm: Vote:**

Ayes: Gerhardstein, Greene, Hedlund, Hothi, Moss, Scheider, Walton

Noes: None

Abstain: None

Absent: None

Excused: Lutzker

Recused: None

**8:05 pm Motion passed 7-0-0-0-1-0**

**5. Measure FF SAFE STREETS Citizen Oversight Committee (SSCOC) member elections**

Commissioners acted on the nominations to the Measure FF SAFE STREETS Citizen Oversight Committee (SSOCC).

**8:05 pm Action:** It was Moved / Seconded (Walton / Gerhardstein) to elect Commissioner Lutzker to the Measure FF SAFE STREETS Citizen Oversight Committee (SSOCC).

**8:06 pm: Vote:**

Ayes: Gerhardstein, Greene, Hedlund, Hothi, Moss, Scheider, Walton

Noes: None

Abstain: None

Absent: None

Excused: Lutzker

Recused: None

**8:06 pm Motion passed 7-0-0-0-1-0**

**8:06 pm Action:** It was Moved / Seconded (Hedlund / Greene) to elect Commissioner Hothi to the Measure FF SAFE STREETS Citizen Oversight Committee (SSOCC).

**8:06 pm: Vote:**

Ayes: Gerhardstein, Greene, Hedlund, Hothi, Moss, Scheider, Walton

Noes: None

Abstain: None

Absent: None

Excused: Lutzker

Recused: None

**8:06 pm Motion passed 7-0-0-0-1-0**

**C. INFORMATION ITEMS AND SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS**

**8:07 pm:** Commissioner Moss reported that the Bike Plan Update Ad Hoc Subcommittee met with staff to discuss commission input.

**D. COMMUNICATIONS**

**8:09 pm:** Commissioner Hothi communicated that Shattuck Avenue needs audible pedestrian signals. Commissioner Hedlund expressed thanks for the new signal at Hillegass and Ashby. Commissioner Greene communicated that the pedestrian signals at Shattuck and Virginia are broken.

**E. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS**

**8:12 pm:** Commissioner Gerhardstein asked for an update on the City's traffic calming designs.

**F. ADJOURNMENT**

**8:13 pm:** Commissioner Moss adjourned the meeting.

Transportation and Infrastructure Commission  
Thursday, March 27<sup>th</sup>, 2025

*The next meeting of the Transportation and Infrastructure Commission is scheduled for Thursday, April 17<sup>th</sup>, 2025 at 6:15 pm, at the North Berkeley Senior Center, 1901 Hearst Ave, Berkeley, CA 94709.*

Administrative Procedures

From the City of Berkeley Commissioners' Manual, 2019 Edition, page 70 regarding minutes:

Although the Brown Act does not require minutes, except for closed sessions, the Commissioners' Manual does require minutes of commission meetings but not for subcommittee meetings. When required, minutes are limited to action minutes only. Minutes are unofficial until approved by the commission. The minutes are converted to PDF and posted on the City's website.

The secretary shall keep an accurate record of the commission's proceedings and transactions. The secretary shall provide action minutes similar to those provided to the Council by the City Clerk. Action minutes list the date, time, and place of the meetings; the staff in attendance; the commissioners present and absent; and a clear and concise description of final actions taken. Approved motions are indicated by "moved, seconded, and carried" and include a breakdown of the vote. The vote breakdown includes the commissioners voting yes, no, abstain, absent, recused, and reason for recusal. Reasons for making a motion, debate, content of public comments, and audience reaction are not to be included.

Commission Secretary: Wahid Amiri, Deputy Director  
Engineering and Transportation Divisions, Public Works  
1947 Center St., 4th Floor, Berkeley, CA, 94704  
Telephone (510) 981-7061 / Fax: (510) 981-7060 / TDD: (510) 981-6903  
Email: [wamiri@berkeleyca.gov](mailto:wamiri@berkeleyca.gov)

To: Members of the Berkeley Transportation in Infrastructure Commission

From: Susan Schwartz, Friends of Five Creeks

Please forgive this hasty and unusual request.

The City of Berkeley has been promised, in draft form, a \$500,000 grant from the Department of Water Resources to repair a very serious erosion problem at 9<sup>th</sup> Street on Codornices Creek, our area's only trout stream. The 15 day comment period that closes at **5 PM April 5**.

I hope that some of you will send supportive comments to the RSP Program Manager at [RSP@water.ca.gov](mailto:RSP@water.ca.gov).

Skeletal info is here:

<https://water.ca.gov/News/Public-Notices/2025/Mar-25/Web-Announcement-Spring-2025-Draft-Grant-Awards>

This is important because the Regional Water Quality Control Board is seeking permit requirements that would go beyond the scope of what Department of Water Resources requires, I believe far exceed the funds available. As the attached letter explains, I believe these are emblematic of the permit gridlock for which California is notorious.

They also recommend dense plantings of trees in the sole open meadow edging the creek in the long stretch of public creek west of San Pablo. Friends of Creeks has defended this meadow in multiple ways for 25 years.

I hope that you will support this grant, which your Public Works Department went to significant effort to seek, despite severe staff shortages.

I do not believe they can solicit this at this meeting. They can briefly report on it, and /or you can ask questions. You also can request copies of the proposal, and I believe ask to be sent copies of the relevant links. Or you can email [f5creeks@gmail.com](mailto:f5creeks@gmail.com) now or soon, and I will send the links.

Thank you for your attention and consideration.

Susan Schwartz, President

Friends of Five Creeks



# Friends of Five Creeks

*Volunteers preserving and restoring watersheds of  
North Berkeley, Albany, Kensington, south El Cerrito and Richmond since 1996  
1236 Oxford St., Berkeley, CA 94709  
510 848 9358 f5creeks@gmail.com www.fivecreeks.org*

Mar. 27. 2025

Keith Lichten, Division Manager  
Watershed Management Division  
San Francisco Bay Water Board  
1515 Clay St., Suite 1400  
Oakland, CA 94612  
By email

Re: Water Board email re Department of Water Resources Spring 2025 \$500,000 grant to City of Berkeley (Friends of Five Creeks, Co-Sponsor) for Codornices Creek Restoration at 9<sup>th</sup> Street Bend

Dear Keith:

We have not seen each other for some years, but you may remember me from when you were a young staff member and Friends of Five Creeks discovered the steelhead in Codornices Creek. At the time, Board rules set schedules for review of classifying creeks as having anadromous fish. We waited until the correct year, but the staff refused to address our and others' proof. The board's ombudsman said it had "other priorities." We are still seeking to protect those fish.

"Perturbed" understates my reaction to the attached Water Board email concerning the erosion that has festered for more than 25 years at the north end of Berkeley's 9<sup>th</sup> Street. Here, the meander's natural northward veer and blocked draining from the street joined forces to wash out what was once the creek's best trout pool and dangerously undercut the street.

Let's start by agreeing that the City of Berkeley negligently ignored reports and pleas for a generation. Segments of 18-inch culverts were left dangling in air to eventually fall and wash downstream. Berkeley is only now facing the situation, as the eroded, scarp-like bank is undercutting the street and there is a fair chance that a heavy truck using the adjacent loading dock will tumble in, following a dumpster that had to be hauled out with a crane.

Leadership of Berkeley's Public Works Department, however, is entirely new. On March 11, Berkeley was awarded the only grant in the spring round of the Department of Water Resources (DWR) Riverine Stewardship Grant program -- \$500,000 to repair the bank and restore the bank at 9<sup>th</sup> Street. The DWR excluded fixing the street flooding and blocked drainage, as beyond the scope of its program. A different grant proposal to fix that problem is pending.

Berkeley may have gotten this money by the skin of its teeth. The spigot of state and federal grants is at minimum slowing. Near-term economic prospects look hazy. The state has a long history of slowing and clawing back grant money when things get tough. Here is a current example: CalTrans just awarded Berkeley \$4.1 million to address the even longer-festering problems at Aquatic Park, where aged pipes and poor circulation are filling in and polluting the lagoons, killing fish, and threatening to collapse the freeway. However, this sole Bay Area grant came as CalTrans prematurely ended the program, canceling a scheduled third round. Most of the money behind it was federal.

Seeking your correct job title, I found your recent Power Point: [Restoration Permitting: Collaboration is Key](#). The Board's email confirms what a respected regional planner recently told me: In the Bay Area, the permit process remains as captious and Byzantine as ever.

*Friends of Five Creeks is a partner project of 501(c)3 Berkeley Partners for Parks*

The Water Board should focus on working with stakeholders to find the best workable solution to benefit the environment.

Here are specific comments on the email.

- Without expertise, I agree with the email that moving the (nonfunctional) outfalls lower would help both water quality and threatened steelhead. I don't know what this would entail, or its cost.
- The public right of way on 9<sup>th</sup> Street is too small to create an adequate bioretention system – a depression filled with engineered soil and vegetation, filtering water and slowing runoff. Hemmed in by access to one building's parking and another's loading dock for heavy trucks, it floods with every sizable storm. The Board should find a way to permit and allow reasonable credit for structural solutions, such as flow-through planters, designed for areas with poor drainage and site constraints. (I represented creek groups in the process to integrating hydrograph modification, several permit cycles ago. It was used in appropriate sites then.)
- It is neither legitimate nor realistic to insist that the project is not restoration because it would also stabilize the bank. The project also would improve water quality and restore the 9<sup>th</sup> Street pool. This pool was so good that a Board-approved project dumped more than 100 trout into in on a hot day in order to dewater a block downstream for "restoration." No "restored" reach ever regained numbers like that.

Given the restricted street corridor and more than a century's channel incision due to urban development, a pre-European stream form will be restored here only if someone exercises eminent domain on businesses including the Berkeley Repertory Theater. Even building back the pre-meander bank of a generation ago would have unpredictable effects on the north bank and downstream, and the meander would seem likely to eat it back again.

- By the same argument, the required hardscape is self-mitigating. It will be needed in order to make stable improvements. , as it is required to Making things better here will require hardscape – rock or concrete. It is not appropriate to require mitigation.
- It seems like a bad joke that this email demands mitigation for removing a third generation of young root-sprout elms doomed to die of the incurable *Ophiostoma*-caused Dutch elm disease. In the DWR-approved plan, they would be replaced with viable and varied native vegetation. Across the creek, when the giant elms (stumps still visible) died, their brushy root sprouts at first took over the whole meadow. Our volunteers still do hard labor with these sprouts as we struggle to re-establish varied native vegetation. We have long preserved some snags for habitat, but this seems unwise close to buildings on the cliff-like south bank. There also are plenty of varied native trees now – Coast live oak, buckeyes, box elder, alder, walnut, willow, even a rogue redwood.
- The Board's letter calls for planting dense alders to discourage illegal camping on the north bank, opposite the project. This would not work any better than the dense willows that the Board required in restorations downstream, which did nothing to lessen our long struggle with camps, needles, fires, rats, and human waste.

Real creeks have clearings, from fire or flood or deadfall. They let sunshine reach water and provide primary productivity. They support a suite of colorful, vibrant water-loving flowers, bright dragon flies, insect hatches, frogs, turtles, healthy algae for cover and food, and other aspects of creek life. The Board's one-size-fits-all approach on Codornices ignores all this. It also ignores the early maps that show the creek petering out in grassland a short way downstream, well shy pf the year-round slough that meandered north-northwest to the Bay.

The 9<sup>th</sup> Street meadow is the sole place below San Pablo where the public – especially youth and families using the busy adjacent sports fields – could see these aspects of natural creek life. Friends of Five Creeks has fought for 25 years to make these joyous experiences possible, since we built the first rough trail from street to street. We have overcome infestations of elm brush, bindweed, and head-high flammable weeds that public agencies' failure to mow. We have cleared a solid cover to homeless-camp detritus that wiped out the native understory we had spread. to provide the joyous experiences possible here through 25 years . This has included the death of the elms, dense infestations of elm brush and bindweed, head-high weeds left to go to seed, and a solid paving of homeless-camp detritus that wiped out native understory. We have persuaded or insisted that the agencies responsible resume maintenance and build the creekside trail.

If the Board demands its outdated, narrow, and failed approach here, wiping out this lone meadow, we will withdraw our sponsorship as community partner and oppose the project. (We equally oppose a “boulder field,” whatever that means.)

Friends of Five Creeks makes mistakes. So do the other community stewards now finding creative solutions downstream. The Board should recognize and learn from its own missteps. Basing actions on a narrow set of partial truths has not served Codornices Creek well.

Designing to a mathematically correct meander has worked outstandingly to prevent floods below Fifth Street. Between Sixth and Eighth Streets, however, the designed channel quickly incised down to hardpan, making access difficult and providing virtually no habitat. The dense willows required by the Board formed root mats that covered the shallow creek bottom, preventing formation of pools and undercuts that trout need. (See the independent reviews of the downstream projects at <https://fivecreeks.org/background/>).

The Board also should recall that its insisting on closely spaced willows extending far back from all banks drove off the Codornices Creek Watershed Council, the volunteer stewardship group it founded and financed with paid staff. With their ideas disregarded and hard work destroyed, the group dissolved. Without volunteer stewardship, the responsible agencies – Albany, Berkeley, and UC Berkeley – forgot their promises of care, along with the escrowed money to pay for it. The project became a disgrace, characterized by litter, dumping, camps, and dense vegetation that children were warned not to enter as they hurried between the sports fields. This changed because Friends of Five Creeks volunteers returned and insisted that the maintenance money be used and the agencies do their jobs.

The Board should recognize that rules based on a narrow set of partial truths do not serve for the complexities of either nature or human behavior – especially in our fast-changing world.

I look forward to the Board’s withdrawing this email and collaborating with all concerned to find ways to carry out this important project, and protecting and restoring our only trout stream.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Susan Schwartz", with a large, stylized flourish extending to the right.

Susan Schwartz, President, Friends of Five Creeks

**Attachment: Email from Brian Wines, San Francisco Bay Water Board, to Drew Goetting, Founder & CEO | Restoration Design Group Inc.**

| 510.644.2798 | 800 Hearst Avenue, Berkeley, CA 94710 | [RestorationDesignGroup.com](http://RestorationDesignGroup.com)

### **General Comment**

I have reviewed this project with other Water Board staff and we consider the project to be a bank stabilization project, rather than a restoration project. Bank stabilization is necessary to protect a parking lot and to rebuild two damaged outfalls. The proposed design relies on hardscape (rock riprap) to stabilize the bank failure and mitigation is required for the placement of rock on the bank of Codornices Creek (Creek), as well as any impacted riparian vegetation.

We encourage the project team to relocate the outfalls from the middle of the Creek bank to the toe of bank. Relocating the outfalls to the toe of bank will minimize erosion between the outfall and the toe of bank and will also help to flush sediments out of the pool on the outer bank of the meander bend.

### **Specific Comments**

#### **Application for 401 Water Quality Certification**

##### **Box 14. Project Purpose**

Please revise the project purpose to bank stabilization

##### **Box 15. Description of Activity and Environmental Impacts**

The text in this section states that the 18-inch diameter outfall will be repaired by others. The design and construction of the outfall must be incorporated in the bank stabilization design and permitted as a component of this project.

##### **Box 18. Dredge & Fill Information**

For projects in creeks, both the surface area and linear feet of fill must be included in the final column of Box 18.

Box 18 must also be revised to include the temporary impacts associated with dewatering the Creek channel during construction. Temporary impacts include the dimensions of the coffer dams (square feet and linear feet in the direction of flow) and the dimensions of the dewatered reach of the Creek between the coffer dams (square feet and linear feet in the direction of flow).

##### **Box 19. Mitigation**

Please revise the entry in this box to provide mitigation for the placement of hardscape on the Creek bank, as well as mitigation for any riparian vegetation that will be removed by Project construction.

##### **Box 20. CEQA**

The entry in this box states that a Notice of Exemption (NOE) has been prepared for the project. Please provide the Class of Categorical Exemption that the NOE was based on. A Class 33 Exemption for habitat restoration is not appropriate for this project.

### **Additional Information**

#### **Box 15**

Text in this section states that the City is pursuing a vault-based stormwater treatment system and inlet filters to treat flows entering the creek at the 18-inch diameter outfall. We encourage the City to replace the proposed vault-based treatment with a bioretention system. Bioretention systems include biological processes for breaking down and/or sequestering pollutants in runoff and require less rigorous maintenance than vault-based systems. Bioretention systems also provide some mitigation of the impacts of hydrograph modification.

#### **Design Sheets**

Sheet L-1 refers to the removal of an unspecified number of elm trees. Please quantify the amount of trees to be removed and provide mitigation for all removed trees.

Sheet L-1 shows the location of a rebuilt outfall for an 18-inch diameter stormdrain line. The Additional Information for Box 15 refers to a second stormwater outfall. Please clarify the number of outfalls that will be impacted by the project.

Sheet L-5 shows an outfall daylighting through rock riprap in the mid-bank of the Creek. Please relocate the outfall to the toe of bank to improve flushing of sediment from the pool in the meander bend.

Sheet 1 proposes to place a boulder field on the floodplain on the inside meander bend as a means of discouraging encampments. Please consider a dense planting of alders as a means of discouraging encampments.

**Biological Habitat Evaluation Report** (Vollmar, May 20, 2024).

**Section 6.1 Wetlands or Waters of the U.S. and State of California.**

Text in this section appears to state that waters of the State extend to the ordinary high water mark. This is incorrect. Waters of the State extend at least to the top of bank.

Text in this section erroneously describes the project as self-mitigating. The project will remove riparian vegetation and place new hardscape on the Creek bank. Mitigation must be provided for all new hardscape placed on the Creek and for all impacted riparian vegetation.

Brian Wines

Water Resource Control Engineer

San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board