

Meeting Minutes



RWQCP – Mountain View – Moffett Field Area Water Reuse Project

Subject: Public Meeting
Date/Time: November 19, 2003 from 6:30 pm to 7:30 pm
Location: Palo Alto – Mitchell Community Center
Prepared for: Daisy Stark, RWQCP
Prepared by: Emily Silverman (ESA) and Kate Streams (RMC)

Attendees	Organization	E-mail Address
Bobel, Phil	Palo Alto Regional Water Quality Control Plant	phil_bobel@city.palo-alto.ca.us
Blomenkamp, Viv	LWVPA	Vivian@blomenkamp.com
Kiner, Rochelle	City of Mountain View	Rochelle.kiner@ci.mtnview.ca.us
Kubler, Helene	Raines, Melton and Carella, Inc. (RMC)	hkubler@rmcengr.com
Moss, Bob	NASA / Moffett Field	
Moulton, Leslie	Environmental Science Associates (ESA)	lmoulton@esassoc.com
Serge, Dave	City of Mountain View	dave.serge@ci.mtnview.ca.us
Showalter, Pat	Mountain View Resident	
Silverman, Emily	ESA	esilverman@esassoc.com
Stark, Daisy	Palo Alto Regional Water Quality Control Plant	daisy_stark@city.palo-alto.ca.us
Streams, Kate	RMC	kstreams@rmcengr.com
Young, Beth	City of Palo Alto	Beth.young@city.palo-alto.ca.us

Agenda

I. The agenda of the workshop was as follows:

Topic	Facilitator	Timing
Welcome / Introduction <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meeting Overview • Meeting Agenda 	Daisy Stark (PARWQCP)	5 minutes
Proposed Project	Helene Kubler (RMC)	10 minutes
Environmental Process	Leslie Moulton (ESA)	5 minutes
Public Comment	Phil Bobel (PARWQCP)	25 minutes
Wrap-up / Review	Phil Bobel (PARWQCP)	5 minutes

II. The following document was discussed during the meeting: Initial Study and Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration (DMND), October 2003. The document may be reviewed at the City of Palo Alto.

Copies of the PowerPoint presentation are available upon request. Please contact Daisy Stark at 650-329-2287.

Discussion

I. Introduction

- a. Daisy welcomed everyone and indicated that the main purpose of the meeting is to solicit public input on the proposed project and the published DMND.
- b. Daisy introduced the project team (Palo Alto Regional Water Quality Control Plant (PARWQCP), State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB), City of Palo Alto, RMC (engineering consultant for the city), and ESA (environmental consultant for the city) and described the role of each in the project.

II. Proposed Project

- a. Helene Kubler presented a brief overview of the proposed project, including the alignment, facilities and service areas.
- b. Helene described the two proposed alignments (i.e. levee and Embarcadero Road options) near the Regional Plant.
- c. The schedule, including planning, environmental documentation, design and construction, was outlined.

III. Environmental Review

- a. Leslie Moulton gave a brief overview of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) process and discussed how the CEQA Initial Study is based on the 1995 Program Environmental Impact Report (EIR).
- b. The review process and schedule for this project was outlined.
- c. The key environmental findings were identified as mostly construction related. Biological resources disruption, traffic disruption, identification of cultural resources and water quality impacts were further detailed.

- d. Leslie outlined the review schedule of the CEQA document. Review by necessary agencies and by the public will be conducted through December 2, 2003. All comments will then be reviewed, and if necessary, will be addressed in the final Mitigated Negative Declaration. Palo Alto will then consider adopting the CEQA documents and project in January or February 2004.

IV. Public Comment

- a. Phil Bobel opened up the remaining portion of the meeting to the public for both technical questions and comments regarding the project. Comments/questions were recorded and will be addressed in the final Mitigated Negative Declaration. Some of the questions were addressed during the meeting. The questions/comments were more specifically as follows:
 - i. Comment: Bob Moss requested clarification on distribution of recycled water into Moffett Field. Specifically why does the pipeline end at the boundary of Moffett Field, why does it not go to Moffett Golf Course?

A: The pipeline gives a point of connection for Moffett Field into the recycled water pipeline. Moffett Golf Course is currently connected to the existing Sunnyvale recycled water pipeline.
 - ii. Q: How does the City of Mountain View's approval process fit in with the City of Palo Alto's approval process?

A. Rochelle Kiner answered that the project will be on the City of Mountain View City Council agenda in January or February 2004. The city has already conducted a planning study session.
 - iii. Comment: Bob Moss commented that although there are less biological impacts with the Embarcadero Road alternative than with the levee alternative, there are more traffic concerns and vice-versa.

A. Leslie Moulton commented that the DMND has looked at the biological and traffic impacts for both alternatives. There are mitigation measures to reduce impacts to the biological resources including timing restrictions.
 - iv. Q: Are there agreements in place with recycled water users (including the business parks)?

A. Rochelle Kiner answered that the City of Mountain View will be the primary user of recycled water for use in irrigation of parks and medians. City of Mountain View meters will be installed and recycled water will be offered cheaper than potable water to promote recycled water use.
 - v. Comment: Bob Moss indicated that there have been problems in other settings with some of the businesses refusing to use recycled water in any way. A survey should be conducted to determine exact alignment of the pipeline.

A. Rochelle responded that users will be able to refuse recycled water. As potable water prices increase and during periods of drought businesses will be able to switch to recycled water. Especially during a drought, recycled water will be a very reliable supply. Helene noted that the current alignment of the pipe and laterals is based on a number of factors including the location of the 90 to 100 existing irrigation meters in the Shoreline Area.
 - vi. Comment: Pat Showalter indicated that the levee alternative (as opposed to the Embarcadero Road alternative) might be easier to access for maintenance.

A: Bill Miks indicated that although that may seem to be the case, there still might be access restrictions due to impacting the sensitive biological resources.

vii. Comment: Bob Moss requested clarification of the Steven’s Creek crossings.

A: Helene indicated that three potential crossings were considered; but only two crossings will be retained (the first at La Avenida and the second at Charleston). The crossing on Crittenden Bridge was shown as a possibility because of the bridge (lower construction costs) but the bridge is located too far from Moffett Field proposed uses.

viii. Comment: Pat Showalter submitted a letter of support for the project to Daisy Stark.