

The following transcript is provided for your convenience, but does not represent the official record of this meeting. The transcript is provided by the firm that provides closed captioning services to the City. Because this service is created in real-time as the meeting progresses, it may contain errors and gaps, but is nevertheless very helpful in determining the gist of what occurred during this meeting.

>> Councilmember Liccardo: I'm guessing it's about 1:30 so we'll call this meeting to order. And I'll just call roll here. Councilmember Rocha, here. Councilmember Herrera, here. Councilmember Campos, here. And Councilmember Liccardo, we're all here. So we have a quorum. Fabulous. So we'll move on to item, which I've misplaced. Pardon me, thank you very much. Move on to review of work plan which there's nothing to alter at this point.

>> Ed Shikada: That's correct chair.

>> Councilmember Herrera: Motion to approve.

>> Councilmember Liccardo: We probably don't need a motion. How about the motion on consent? Betsy is here.

>> Councilmember Herrera: I'd like to make a comment on the MTC, Jim Beall's legislation, proposed legislation. That is going to come before council, I'd like to say how supportive I am and we definitely need that additional seat on MTC. Would that give us an additional seat on MTC, is that correct?

>> Hans Larsen: That would provide us an additional seat on Santa Clara County, with an additional one for San José.

>> Councilmember Herrera: The three permanent seats, one wasn't necessarily designated for San José, is that right?

>> Hans Larsen: That's correct. We have a representative of ABAG as a person from Santa Clara County.

>> Councilmember Herrera: Okay, and how many seats does San Francisco have right now?

>> Hans Larsen: San Francisco has two direct seats and they often fill one of the, usually the BCDC seat is typically a San Francisco representative.

>> Councilmember Herrera: So we'll be on par with San Francisco in representation was my point.

>> Hans Larsen: That's correct, we would have representative structure that is closer to where we are today than when MTC was formed back in 1970. So really we see it as a modernization of their representation structure to better reflect the population and job balance within the Bay Area.

>> Councilmember Herrera: And as you so many times said Hans it's very important for us in that better representation at this level will help us drive some of the projects that we need to have completed.

>> Hans Larsen: Absolutely.

>> Councilmember Liccardo: On that point, when you see Jim Beall, please thank him, it's wonderful he's carrying the load on that effort and he's beginning to get support from partners in Contra Costa County and elsewhere, so with that we'll entertain a motion.

>> Councilmember Herrera: Motion to approve.

>> Second.

>> Councilmember Liccardo: All in favor? The consent agenda passes unanimously. Move on to electric vehicle infrastructure and Randy, welcome.

>> Hans Larsen: Good afternoon. Mr. Chair, members of the committee, Hans Larsen, director of transportation and we're pleased to provide with you a status report on the City's efforts to develop an electric vehicle infrastructure. Joining me for this presentation is Randy turner from Public Works. And I just wanted to

acknowledge the team effort that goes into this includes the office of economic development, Planning, Building, and Code Enforcement, environmental services department and City Manager's office. What we're working on is a number of efforts that align with the City's Green Vision goals. One to convert the city's fleet to all alternative fuel vehicles. We're also doing efforts to lead by example to encourage residents and businesses within San José to purchase and use electric vehicles. And a lot of what this is about is really driving innovation and clean tech industry and jobs within the San José area, and I think we're very proud that within the Bay Area that we're clearly leading the country in terms of being the center for electric vehicle industry in the United States. And you may have seen the Mercury News articles in the last couple of days that really highlight the significant attention on the new electric vehicles that are coming out. So going to go over as just a highlight of the items in the staff report, some of the key initiatives that we're pursuing. The first one relates to expanding our city fleet with electric vehicles. We have quite a large fleet of electric vehicles, 174 already. Many of those vehicles though are more service vehicles that assist with park maintenance and operate within the city facilities. But we're participating with 11 other agencies within the Bay Area, to expand our electric vehicle fleets and we're participating in a program that would add three more to San José. We're also working very aggressively to get more electric vehicle charging stations, within the San José area, that makes it more convenient for the public to use electric vehicles, and recharge them in public or semi public spaces. So in total, there are about 70 new chargers that we would be bringing online. This is a significant addition to the nine that we currently have. These new chargers, the first generation chargers I might note took about 22 hours to charge up your vehicle. The new generation chargers which is mostly what we'll be receiving take eight hours to charge and as we highlight on the next slide, this is a charging project that would allow you to swap the battery in your electric vehicle and in one minute time replace the battery with a fully charged one. This is a project we're participating with the City of San Francisco on in locating four of these electric vehicle swap stations, two in the San José area, two in the San Francisco area and the idea is to have the taxi industry use these as part of electric vehicles, as part of their taxi fleet. The next area in which we're work is make it easy for people who buy electric vehicles to install chargers at their homes. And in October, of last year, the Planning, Building, and Code Enforcement department streamlined their process for residents, and businesses to install charger locations, you can see the notes here that there's -- you can get a permit online, or just come into the office and do it over the counter. No plans required. The inspection would just ensure that you're complying with the manufacturer's instructions for the installation. And we have thus far had 19

permits issued for at-home charging stations. The other thing I wanted to add is, the D.O.T.'s parking policy that encourages parking in city garages. You get free parking if you have an alternative-fuel vehicle. We previously had the program that included hybrids but hybrids are pretty much -- very popular these days and there's no longer, as of July 2011 there won't be the hybrid incentives for use of carpool lanes so we're adjusting our policy to align with that. And so we would modify the policy that we'll be taking forward to council in the next few months to continue the incentive for electric vehicles. Just in coasting, some of the key next steps that we're working on as mentioned is, implementing the electric vehicle fleet purchases, which we're targeting for fall of this year. Continuing work on the implementing the grants for the electric vehicle chargers. And then moving forward with the permitting process, and really kind of the finalizing the site identification for the better place battery swap project. That concludes our brief overview. Happy to take any questions that you may have.

>> Councilmember Liccardo: Thank you Hans, questions, comments. Councilmember Herrera.

>> Councilmember Herrera: Thanks for the report Hans. I remember sitting in a transportation committee at the league of cities and we had an interesting presentation about electric vehicles and I think somebody from PG&E came and a few other folks and I was ready to raise my hand and brag about the electric, our charging stations and our cars we're going to get and somebody from San Diego announced how many they were getting and it was like hundreds. And so I'm wondering, how -- what's the allocation like? Where did the money originally come down to MTC for this, and did Southern California, how did they end up with a lot more than we did? I was sort of shocked with the numbers for those guys and I'm assuming you sort of know about maybe what happens in San Diego? Maybe not.

>> We haven't actually tracked what's been happening in San Diego but with regard to what we're getting here in San José the funds for installation are coming from the CEC. For the actual acquisition of the device, it's a blend of CEC funds and ARRA funds that are helping us get those dollars in place. So at this point those funds are a little slow in coming. When again as we mentioned we'll be close to 70 additional devices along with the nine individuals that we have in place already.

>> Councilmember Herrera: I think I'm recollecting that San Diego's was ARRA funding. I'm not sure why they got a bigger church.

>> We're trying to be smart how we do our deployment. Not to say San Diego isn't. We're focusing on the downtown, initial deployments and radiate out from the downtown core to see what makes sense around the city perimeter.

>> Councilmember Herrera: I'm really glad we're getting them. I wanted to brag, but San Diego's got hundreds of cars. They talked about the load if people were going to adopt these cars, early adopters, significant folks purchasing electric cars and plugging them in, in their neighborhoods that one of the biggest concerns was PG&E had concern for the grid, the impact on it and that there needed to be notification when these cars are purchased so that PG&E can know when there's a neighborhood, they sort of did a diagram on there and showed us, the impact of a neighborhood, the increase on the grid as more cars would end up on a particular cul-de-sac. So it's like a very exciting technology but they showed us how directly that's going to impact in terms of impact on PG&E and the grid.

>> And I think the key there is the slow deployment of the vehicles and how they're going to be spread throughout the city. We're not seeing tremendous numbers of. I think the industry is producing upwards of 100,000 collect vehicles a year at least that's the commitment at this point. So I think that gives us time to be smart on how we place chargers and what sort of impacts are going to be on the grid. The other thing to remember is a majority of the charging is going to happen at night when the peak loads are way down, the technology is smart enough to be able to pull your vehicle into your garage and plug it in and program it to start charging at 11:00 or -- at night or midnight. In fact the technology is so bright, if you choose or forget to start the charging process, it will simply send you a text message on your iPhone and say, hey, come back out and plug me in or get me started. So I think there's enough of the technology there to help us minimize the impacts on the grid and the slow rollout will help us be able to keep pace with the capacity.

>> Councilmember Herrera: I remember talking about there was differently generations of technology. So is there some older technology where it doesn't have the smart capability and some of the newer technology that does preferentially having it working in the downtown in the evening, you know, overnight?

>> Right now what's coming out for residential purposes is actually the smartest technology available.

>> Councilmember Herrera: Wonderful.

>> What we have in a few of our garages is some legacy equipment, but we plan to replace that. However, we're really not going to see folks pulling into our parking structures and looking to charming for eight hours or so. They're looking for a quick one-hour charge or two-hour charge to get them back on the road.

>> Councilmember Herrera: Great, I think it's a good way to go. They pointed out the savings in the carbon footprint with vehicles is much greater than solar panels and the savings that we're going to get on that that really converting over to a different kind of vehicle is really important for the future especially as we try to work with climate change. Thank you.

>> Councilmember Liccardo: Thank you. Councilmember Rocha.

>> Councilmember Rocha: Thank you for the report. I had really three questions, I guess. And looking at some of the discussion about our fleet, and it appears that we're in a mode of I guess replacement and approaching it as purchasing new vehicles as opposed to some other jurisdictions that look at leasing. Can you explain to me a little bit of why we would be doing that? I know that's a little bit off track but you know this is an investment and a commitment to continue along this path.

>> Well, okay. So there's two responses there. In this case this is a demonstration project for the region. So we've partnered as Hans mentioned with 11 other jurisdictions. We're really trying to evaluate what the impact of electric vehicles would have on a regional transportation system. So part of that demonstration project was including the

acquisition of those vehicles. Notwithstanding the fact of availability is pretty tough and I'm not sure we're going to see anything in the leasing market for electric vehicles. So that's the answer to the demonstration question. In terms of overall ownership of vehicle assets, that's an area that we're beginning to study right now in terms of looking at total cost of asset ownership from a full life cycle maintenance cost to balancing that which we get when we go to auction. And measuring that against what our current vehicle asset ownership cost looks like and see what makes sense for the city.

>> Councilmember Rocha: So electric vehicles is not in the market yet but the hybrid vehicles are as far as leasing?

>> There are.

>> Councilmember Rocha: To the best of your knowledge.

>> There are hybrid vehicles that are available but electric vehicles are really slow in coming. The Nissan leaf in particular, I don't think that you can drive up to a lot and find one that would be available. We're not able to do any advance ordering at this point, and based on the current time line for acquisition, we're pretty much done with the 2011 model year. We're going to be looking at in fall trying to order 2012 models. And that has everything to do with their ability to produce them quick enough and the manufacturer's commitment on total numbers.

>> Councilmember Rocha: Okay, then I'll guess I'll use this opportunity to make my plug for pushing us to really look at leasing. My experience at the school district, we were approached about leasing and such an easier analysis to do when you have seven or eight cars as opposed to what we have here. So we looked at it, and it was there but I think for a small district that type of risk is little more conservative on that side. So I think we should maybe really strongly look at that. My other question and with all due respect to chair Liccardo, I notice a lot of these stations we're looking at downtown. Employment centers such as North San José, Edenvale, and even with North San José potentially becoming a pretty dense residential area, can you explain to me a little bit of the philosophy behind that?

>> The philosophy is really based on where the concentration of traffic is in the downtown core. Now these are the city stations. The great point about charge point America program that Coulomb is putting forth is there's a residential or private aspect of that as well that would be able to address those high density work areas of North San José and Edenvale as well. You'll note in the report we talk about an allocation of 55 chargers for San José. Now, that's for the government portion of our organization. We've sited 25 at this point. We're holding 30 back at this point until we can really judge where the need is in the rest of our facility inventory. Whether it's at a community center or a library. Right now since a great deal of our concentration of traffic coming into the town is concentrated in the core we're looking at trying to get those units installed in parking garages and surface lots.

>> Councilmember Rocha: Okay. Just -- I'm sorry were you going to --

>> Hans Larsen: Just to add some of the things that we're looking ahead to is you know, integrating electric vehicle infrastructure within private developments. And so as new developments come online there's some cities that have model ordinances that having chargers built within their parking facilities and new developments and that's something we're looking at and I imagine our next report to the committee will have some more work in that area.

>> Councilmember Rocha: Okay and the maintenance of these stations, I know some these are grant-funded, some of these are privately installed. Can you just speak generally to the maintenance component? Because I notice you said the bulk, I think the term was the bulk of the installation cost would be covered. But that still leaves us with some obligations and I'm wondering what that is.

>> There's two areas. The ongoing cost is really about how we manage the cost of energy. How do we dispense the energy and do we recover that cost? So we're looking at a cost structure that will do just that. The network management of a charge point program can be done quite easily with the technology. Depending whether it's a level one or level two charger we would set a rate structure to cover the cost of a session, a one hour session. On top of that would be a maintenance fee that would go towards managing the upkeep of the stakes which at this

point seems to be very low. Our concerns are if they get damaged somehow, someone decides to leave the parking spot without unplugging their vehicle and takes the cord with them or if it gets vandalized in one shape or another, we want to have a means and a method to be able to address that maintenance. But in terms of working parts and pieces there isn't a whole lot of maintenance there. It's more about just the upkeep and making sure it's operational.

>> Councilmember Rocha: Great, thank you.

>> Councilmember Liccardo: Thank you. I had another question about location. I know of the ABAG grant, five of the 15 were going to be located at the Las Plumas facility. I certainly understand the symbiosis of the environmental innovation center and what we're trying to do there. But I'd imagine that, and in case you're not familiar, it's in the eastern part of my district and not far from Xavier's over by 101 and Mayberry. I guess the concern I had was the visibility of those locations, particularly hoping, I think many of us hope that having visibility of these stations identity in various parts of the city will actually encourage the adoption of this technology, and so I wonder, it makes sense to be more dispersed about it, at least you know, in the same if you wanted to serve for instance that same area, I know there's a couple of gas stations on, trying to remember exactly what street those were -- yeah, there are a couple of highest demand gas stations in the city because they charge the cheapest gas, that's the key, I think, right between Xavier's and my district. It would be great to have a charging station right across the street there. But the question does it serve us to have five in a location that's fairly remote because it's in an industrial area, you know although admittedly close to the 101 but kind of an industrial area?

>> I think the number the reason why we drove to five was the educational aspect that we hope to really gain out of the environmental innovation center. I think that will also drive the use. We hope to be able to do an electric vehicle demonstration project there as well that would show the emerging technologies of those vehicles, so having the charge points there I think is a natural tie. We can certainly take a look at the number and see if it's an appropriate number as well as try to make some connections with some of the private businesses. And I will note that there are three, 450 volt chargers, fast-chargers that are coming from 350 green that were also covered on one of the CEC grants that will be placed not on city property, that could be conceivably at a fueling station,

probably more like what you might see at a mall or something like that where you have a high concentration of parkers, but that type of technology is something that you could drive up to and get a fairly quick charge within less than an hour, something on the order of about 20 minutes to get a complete, complete full battery charge which really might lend itself to a fueling station application but certainly we'll take that under advisement and see what makes the best sense.

>> Councilmember Liccardo: Thanks, because I'm sure there are many slots throughout the area where people can point to and say, this is a really high visibility place, can we find a way to get it there.

>> I think, again, that's why we're reserving the 30 additional level 2 chargers from Coulomb. If it turns out the best place is not within a city parcel but within a high use area within council district 10, if that makes sense to place it there. we'll try to make those -- we'll try to make that happen.

>> Councilmember Liccardo: Great. Thank you. I'm, sorry Don. You have something further on that issue?

>> Councilmember Rocha: You are suggesting pilot project at councilmember sites, right?

>> Councilmember Liccardo: A house or --

>> Councilmember Rocha: Audit, are you going to be able to track the use of these stations? I'm sure there's probably technology that will show how --

>> Yeah, that's one of the positive aspects of the overall network. Think of a network operation center that's looking at each one of these charge points, whatever manufacturer it is. And it's on a map and we're able to determine how much it's been used, how much electricity has been dispensed, who the user has been. You really get some good metrics in terms of utilization, and that will help drive whether that's the right place, maybe we're not marketing correctly or do we need to move it over two blocks let's say. The short answer is yes, we'll get

good utilization information and that is in fact one of the reporting requirements of the grant to determine how -- to report out how well they're being used.

>> Councilmember Liccardo: Thanks, Randy. Question about the Taylor Street site for the changing station, what better place. I know Ed and I have talked about this. Has there been some coordination with GSA about whether or not they be informed sufficiently about the idea?

>> Regarding the overall acquisition by the federal government?

>> Councilmember Liccardo: Yes.

>> We're going to put that conversation in place and see if there's the high potential for collaboration on the parcel, that's the last thing that we want to do, is put the sale of that property at risk. We're working on a backup property as we speak.

>> Councilmember Liccardo: Okay.

>> While we think that is the ideal location for this, that is not the be all, we can move to a different place.

>> Councilmember Liccardo: While the federal government is not always collaborative, I suggest they won't be in this case. Okay great. And then finally, the use of the 120 volt technology. You may have already answered this question Randy when you suggested a lot of folks are just going to be pulling in for an hour. I'm just wondering where you can put that technology, it takes 22 hours to fully charge a leaf. I imagine maybe some residential garages will make sense but are there many places really where we can deploy that or should we be holding off until the next --

>> Well we talked about the Leaf. But there are some other electric vehicles that are on their way, there are some electric motorcycles that would benefit from a lower-level charger but the great thing is the technology is coming

with dual purpose. There are level one level two chargers so depending on what sort of receptacle you have on your vehicle not all vehicles are going to have the capability of being able to use a level one or a level two charger so we have to make both available. But I think in the end we probably, when this is fully rolled out we're going to see a vast majority of utilization on the level 2 side of those chargers.

>> Councilmember Liccardo: Thank you very much. I don't have any cards from members of the public. Are there any comments or questions?

>> Motion to approve.

>> Councilmember Herrera: Second.

>> Councilmember Liccardo: All in favor, opposed, that passes unanimously. We'll move on then to item 2. I'm sorry, item D-2, the bike plan 2020 annual report. Welcome John.

>> Hans Larsen: Okay, Mr. Chair, members of the committee our next report is an annual update on bike plan 2020. And joining me for this report is John Brazil from the Department of Transportation. He's our pedestrian-bicycle coordinator. We had, by way of background, the city council in November 2009, adopted a ten year bicycle master plan for the city that set forth some very ambitious goals to move San José towards being one of the best bicycling cities in the country. Among the goals that are outlined on the next slide are to develop a 500 mile bike way network. And this is a complement to the 100-mile trail network which was just part of our bike plan, so the 100 mile trail network would be supplemented with a founder mile on street bike way network. We wanted to move our mode share for bicycle use to 5%. It's a little under 1% now. We want to improve bike safety, we want to add more bike parking, and we want to be nationally recognized as a great bicycling city. And the league of American bicyclists ranks cities in terms of their bicycle friendliness. We currently have a bronze level ranking which is -- puts us on the radar screen as a friendly city. But our ambition is to move up within ten years to be a gold-ranked city which there are relatively few of right now today. As I mentioned, this aligns with our Green Vision goals to be a leading city as far as sustainability. One of the key elements of the bike plan was identifying

the 500 mile network into two different systems. One is a primary bike way network which includes our trails as well as an enhanced level of on street bike ways, the intention is to create a system around the city that makes bicycling very convenient, safe and friendly. Then we supplement that network with more of a detailed on street network that includes more traditional kinds of bike facilities like bike lanes. So this enhanced network includes trails, it includes the new types of facilities, bicycle boulevards, which we'll talk about a little bit more, and it looks towards developing separated systems that separate bicycle traffic with some kind of buffering from the vehicle traffic and you can see a picture of that on the bottom right corner. The map that you see here, what we are striving to do is to have the system on this map all be the dark green color. So that represents that we have completed these parts of the network with an enhanced design standard, much of what's on there now are trail systems, like green indicates we've got facilities there, perhaps they're bike lanes but they're not built to the enhanced standard that we'd like. Yellow indicates projects that we're actively pursuing and have funding for. And then red represents gaps in the system, where we currently don't have funding for projects and facilities are missing. So the goal is, within ten years is to have this map appear dark green. And so we'll continue to provide you with progress reports each year to show the progress that we're making in that regard. One of the things that we wanted to highlight with this report was identification of a three-year work plan where we'd focus our efforts in developing our bike way network, largely we are reliant on grant funding that we can get for developing this system. And so our focus is selecting projects where we can be competitive for grants that are feasible, cost-effective. Generally the grants require a focus around major activity centers where you tend to have more bicycle activity. The areas in which generally we're most successful in getting grants are those that are focused around our employment centers, downtown, North San José and the Edenvale area. We're also focusing on making connections where we have gaps in the system, making the trail on-street interface work very well. So those are some of the key things that are driving the selection of projects that are in the three-year work plan. This slide here indicates where much of the investments are proposed. We continue to have a very bold program in terms of developing our trail network. That's managed by Yves Zsutty he's here in the audience if you have any questions on that. Then we're focusing on key facilities that are part of an enhanced onstreet network where we want to demonstrate and deploy new ways of providing bicycle friendly streets. And so we are actually seeking to demonstrate the concepts of a buffered bike lane so that there's actually separation either by paint or by physical devices that provide an added buffer between bicycle traffic and car traffic. We're experiencing with colored bike

lanes, on the San Fernando corridor and then we want to introduce a couple of bicycle boulevards and actually part of San Fernando, the San Antonio corridor and the West Cambrian corridor, which ties in with the Los Gatos creek trail. And then we're trying to develop a cycle track project which there's a strong physical separation between car traffic and the bicycle way. And we've identified the Branham corridor as being well suited for that because primarily it doesn't have a lot of driveways along that corridor. Usually the cycle track concepts work well in cities that don't have a lot of driveway access that requires opening up the cycle track area. So going back to the map, that we want to develop as dark green, we've got sort of our five innovation projects and river oaks, San Fernando with colored bike lanes, Branham lane cycle track, the Cambrian bike boulevard and the San Fernando San Antonio, we have another one, on the San Antonio Street corridor. Next slide, there it is, okay. So another visual of what these again look like, with buffered bike lanes, with some painted or stock separation, colored bike lanes which we want to pursue in King and San Fernando, and then the cycle track concept on Branham. These are examples of other cities that are doing these things. One of the interesting things with the demonstration projects is in California these are not adopted types of treatments to put on your roadways. And so we actually have to go through a fairly lengthy process of applying, to do innovative treatments. And part of that requires doing before and after studies to show the effectiveness of these. San Francisco recently went through process where they got approval to experiment with some of these things. And we're working to get approval from CalTrans and federal highway administration to do these in San José. Wanted to talk a little bit about the bike boulevard concept, and this is essentially where you take for the most part a residential neighborhood street and you convert it into a fast, convenient facility for bicycle traffic. But at the same time while you're doing that you don't want to make it fast and convenient for car traffic. So it's a combination of special markings and traffic calming techniques that make it easy for biking but then it doesn't on the other hand encourage it to be a speedway for car traffic. So you can see some of the things that you would typically have on a bike boulevard, special markings, speed humps, and some turn restrictions within the corridor that accommodate the bicycle traffic as a priority. Some of the challenges that we have in implementing these, and so we have, again, three corridors that we are looking at developing projects over the next couple of years, West Cambrian, San Fernando and San Antonio. Traffic features which for the most part neighborhoods like but for some times they can be controversial, you need to work effectively with the community to develop the appropriate kinds of solution that works best for the neighborhood. Want to touch a little bit on this what we call the secondary bike way

network. The comments I had just provided to you were focused on the enhanced primary network. We also want to continue developing the secondary network which is about 54% complete. We do get regular grant moneys through the TDA 3 program in which we can stripe bike lanes on about ten locations a year. The list here indicates where we have the projects for 2010, 2011. And we would expect to come to council with the new allocation of fundings for the following year, as part of our TDA grant approval in maize. The action council would just be an allocation of money for this purpose. We continue to do work in terms of identifying the best streets in which to apply these funds so it will be more specific later. Oftentimes what we try to do is align the bike way striping with pavement maintenance projects. When we're out there resealing a street it's a great opportunity to put in new striping particularly bike lanes where they're appropriate. Want to highlight some of the other programs that we have that are really designed to encourage more bicycle use. As we've announced to council, we're the recipient of MTC's walk and roll San José grant in which we're going to, over the next three years, we'll be able to work with 30 elementary schools in San José and development encouragement programs to facilitate more school kids to walk and bike to school. This is a very encouraging program we have. We've also received a grant to develop bicycle signal detection. We are continuing to work and have received a grant from the VTA to update our design standards for kind of the latest bicycle friendly treatments. We're working on some signage projects that look at connecting the trail system with on-street. We're looking at with Yves and his team on some projects in the downtown, North San José and in the Willow Glen area to connect the trail system with destinations in some of our employment or special activity areas. We continue to have -- get grants for bicycle parking. You can see the photo here. Of kind of a unique artistic on street bike rack. Where you can put a -- looks like a car but it's actually a rack for I don't know, eight or ten bicycles. And we're planning to put a couple of these in, in the downtown area near San José State University where there's a need for more bicycle parking and as we've discussed with this committee we're working with the VTA on developing a public bike share program. Also, in the area of encouragement, San José continues to be an active area with lots of bicycle events. Later this week we're working with the Silicon Valley bicycle coalition on having our first bicycle summit in which we get together bicycle advocacy organizations and talk about how we can improve bicycling in San José and Silicon Valley. We'll again host the Amgen tour of California, next month. There's the king of the mountain bike ride, and then we have our annual bike-to-workday which is maize 12th. So that's coming up, encourage all of you to ride your bike to work on that day. That concludes our presentation. Happy to take any questions you have.

>> Councilmember Liccardo: Thank you, Hans. Questions, Councilmember Campos.

>> Councilmember Campos: Thank you. Just a couple of -- first of all, great report. I think, you know, this is the right direction for us to go in. You know just with our growing population and just limited space to grow. Our streets and put more cars on the streets which we do not have to do, we have to look at alternative means of transportation. So couple of questions just regarding you know looking at where critical mass is in terms of bike riders that not only are using the lanes and the trails for recreational use but those that really rely on bikes to do -- to get to work, to and from work or to school or to do their commerce. And so one of the things that I noticed in the report and it would be attachment 1, the three-year work plan, the report shows that one of the -- the San Antonio bike boulevard would go from Coyote Creek to King Road. Is that just a description, or are you looking for it to go east of King Road and connect to Capitol Expressway which again opens it up to even more lanes.

>> Hans Larsen: Yes, ultimately as part of the primary network it goes further East than King Road, that is the intent to have this as an enhanced corridor. From King Road to the East has had a more traditional bike lanes there today as it goes towards capitol expressway area. So the limits of this project is what we are identifying kind of closing the gap of the system but certainly we would envision future phases that would continue enhanced improvements that would take it literally over to like the Lake Cunningham area and further into East San José.

>> Councilmember Campos: Okay so basically this is just describing the bike boulevard ending at King Road where it will then turn into a traditional bike lane, because I know there are bike lanes right now on San Antonio.

>> Hans Larsen: Right, this is intended to close the gap that's there right now, experiment with a different kind of treatment, and certainly we're hopeful that this is successful and we can look in other areas on whether we want to continue with colored bike lanes or soft separation or -- we've got a whole -- hoping to develop a whole tool box of different kinds of treatments and roll this out as we work over the next ten years to really fill out a good system.

>> Councilmember Campos: So this report doesn't include I'm sure more miles of traditional bike lanes that are on streets like Ocala avenue that has a traditional bike lane that I didn't see listed on your map or on here. The reason why I'm going there is that a number of our bike lanes are new high schools and I think it's important not just to incorporate the elementary schools, but you know there's a lot of high school students that are reliant on bikes. And it's our responsibility to keep them safe and if we can provide them safe access to and from you know home and school then we certainly need to head in that direction. Are we -- are we taking that into consideration?

>> Hans Larsen: Yeah, I would -- I would there -- we'd be happy to take input from all the council offices in terms of as we continue to expand and seek grants for developing the system if there are priorities that any of your offices have or even any council offices, we're happy to receive this input as we continue to develop this. I think as we've identified here is what we have grant-funding for and that includes some limits as far as how far we can go. But there are a lot more grants available for bicycle transportation and we hope to be competitive for those and to the degree we can continue to develop a priority list for future projects we're happy to receive the input from your offices and the community.

>> Councilmember Campos: Okay, just to keep in mind and we'll certainly communicate with you regarding the schools in district 5, but if you just cover east side union and San José unified you are covering most councils that are probably in all ten council districts that we really need to make that a priority, especially, unfortunately people are much more distracted on the road when they're driving their cars. And if we can create another barrier to show drivers you know you need to stay in your lane and you know provide space for bicyclists, especially our kids who are trying to get to and from home to school, that we need to take this into consideration. This is the time to do it since we're establishing these policies. The other question or suggestion regarding the bikes and transit -- on the bikes and transit section page 3 of 4 with the bike share program, just a consideration, as we're doing this, and focusing for those that are going to San José State or to and from work, that we consider and include recreational uses for the bike share program so if there's people that you know just want to you know ride one of our trails for exercise, that that option be out there, as well.

>> Hans Larsen: Okay, good suggestion.

>> Councilmember Liccardo: Thank you. Councilmember Herrera.

>> Councilmember Herrera: Thank you. Yeah, I appreciate the report. And I just think it's very important that you know that we recognized that biking is good for the environment, is also good for the economy, good for everything in terms of San José's future. I had a couple of questions. In terms of the walk and roll program, and you talk about on page 3, selected elementary schools. How are those elementary schools going to be selected? What's the criteria?

>> Hans Larsen: We -- yes, we're going to begin rolling this program out next fall. And we're happy to receive input in terms of which schools that we work with. Generally, we're going to be working with schools that are interested in the program. So generally, there -- it's going to take close cooperation between school administration, having engaged parents that want to participate. So we're not looking to come out and say you have to do this but we're doing outreach with the school administrators through the school-city collaborative effort that we have this program and so essentially we're looking for volunteers that want to participate. And we've got a couple of schools that have done this already, with great success, and the numbers are mind boggling for less than 20 kids walk and bike before the program they have over 200 kids doing it after. So the success of the program will be dependent on the support that we get from the schools and parents. So we'd again take any feedback that you have, in terms of schools that you think are ready to do this, and happy to contact them and see where it goes.

>> Councilmember Herrera: How many schools do you think will be in the program?

>> Hans Larsen: The grant, it's a three year grant allowing us to work with 30 elementary schools so roughly we'll do about ten a year.

>> Councilmember Herrera: Okay.

>> Hans Larsen: So one per each council district if it works out that way.

>> Councilmember Herrera: I think that's great and I think to your point obviously, folks need to be receptive, you can't force it on people but I think it's really a great idea. I mean I'm -- it's just a real concern of mine that I seem to see in a lot of schools, not as many kids walking to school as there should be. And I remember those of us who grew up here and remember the days when we used to walk to school. You wouldn't think of getting a ride unless you were lucky and on a bus route you had to walk to school. And a lot of our kids some kids not walking because of parents driving them, some kids afraid to walk to school. There's a lot of fear out there and a lot of that could be lessened if we create that safe environment, and just education, because I think there is more fear out there that's justified in a lot of cases. There are areas where kids are afraid because they physically feel they're going to be harmed. And that's another area where we need to look at that, too. There are kids in -- I sit on the mayor's gang prevention task force. San José Unified superintendent talked about a story that really just broke my heart of a very young child, I think eight, nine years old carrying a weapon to class and not trying to do anything to harm anybody else but simply stating that they felt if they carried it they would be safe to walk home and so I think it's -- there's a lot of different ways, different reasons why, and different areas that have different needs in terminates of these programs so I do hope that it will be expanded to all different districts and different schools with different needs. So that we can -- so kids can have the opportunity to know the joy of being able to ride a bike and being able to walk to and from school. I think it's really, really important. And even though it's 30 schools and we have a lot more schools that need it maybe we have a way to share the results of that either we capture it on video or information so that we broadcast that to other schools who are not included in it so that we stimulate the interest because we're not going to be able to solve it all with this program but hopefully we will get PTAs and parent groups and other groups promote the idea of biking and riding. I wanted to highlight this program I think it's very important. In terms of the TDA funding in your attachment 1 I get the grants are going to work in places with high employment centers. I see 8 and 5 are only a couple times on there. Really excited about the capitol expressway project though I want to say that. That's phase one of light rail. This is part of it and you know we've had pedestrian deaths, people walking in front across capitol expressway, very unsafe area, looks more like a expressway. I hope these changes with pedestrian improvements and bike lanes that people will notice that there are pedestrians here and that this is a neighborhood around it and it will become less of a freeway like so I think

that's very important. But we have other folks, we have a lot of folks in our neighborhoods that want to be able to ride a bike but for recreation, some probably for commuting, a lot probably because gas is getting more and more expensive and people are starting to pull out the bike and take short trips instead of getting in their car. So what other sources of funding do you see other kinds of grants that we could avail ourselves of for areas that aren't right next to the traditional employment areas that would get more bike capability? I know when I bike to work, it's -- I'm taking my life in my hands, coming from Evergreen to downtown. I couldn't get a lot of takers when I asked some of the staff to join me on that little adventure riding from my house down to City Hall. So just wanted your answer on that.

>> Hans Larsen: Well, I think what we're hopeful is that there's going to continue to be more moneys available for grant programs for bike transportation. And I think one of the things that many of us are waiting for is a new federal transportation bill. Because both the policies from the VTA and MTC are that they're willing to allocate more of discretionary federal dollars that come to the Bay Area and to Santa Clara County and the VTA that more of those dollars would be allocated for bicycle transportation. But we need that new source of money to then trickle down for this purpose. So the new federal transportation bill's been overdue what, a couple of years now. And there's, you know, some new drafts out there but we'll keep our fingers crossed on seeing that come forward. So it's probably one of the sort of best opportunities is sort of refilling the federal funding process that gives us moneys to put together grants.

>> Councilmember Herrera: Well I hope with all the changing political winds and new committee person up there that there's still a willingness to have funding for bicycle projects. And that's what I understood, that there was going to be that type of funding in the reauthorization bill, that they were considering not just highway funding, but also funding for bicycle projects. My last question is about Tully road. We're all happy to see the capitol-101 project finally underway. We're not so happy when we drive home in it but -- and go to work in it but I think all of us are looking forward to its completion and traffic getting a whole lot better going up and down 101. What -- and I probably saw this already but can you refresh my memory, what kind of pedestrian and bicycle improvements will there be on Tully which is going to be much wider and I hope there's going to be a much safer way to cross over on Tully for bicycles and pedestrians?

>> Hans Larsen: Yes, it will be greatly improved for both pedestrians and bicyclists with wider sidewalk area and lanes for bicyclists in that corridor. With the reconfiguration of the 101-Tully interchange where the offramp movements coming off of the freeway actually stop at a signal make a much more controlled environment for pedestrians and bikes to get through as opposed to where the cars just continually loop onto Tully like it's an extension of the freeway. So that's been an important goal for both the city and the VTA is to convert that interchange to something that is more bike-ped friendly.

>> Councilmember Herrera: You reminded me what it's like to cross there, you're sort of taking your life in your hands as you're trying to dodge the cars as you're going across that crosswalk there across the freeway. Thank you.

>> Mayor Reed: Councilmember Rocha.

>> Councilmember Rocha: Thank you. Follow a little bit on Councilmember Herrera's point about the walk and roll program. And use this as my opportunity to again advocate for the crossing guards because it's a mixed message if we're looking at eliminating that program and then we're asking the kids to walk to school and get on their bikes and cross intersections. I'm very glad the mayor's support on that in the Mayor's Budget Message. The bike and ped update, forgive my ignorance, where are we on that, thinking we might see that in a progress report or maybe that was last year's.

>> Hans Larsen: Yes, the ten year bike master plan was approved by council in '09. So this -- we're in --

>> Councilmember Rocha: These are all components of that?

>> Hans Larsen: These are -- yeah. We've got a ten year vision of where we want to go and we're providing this committee with annual progress reports as we move towards building out that plan.

>> Councilmember Rocha: So each one of these was specifically listed in that? So I can go back and see that?

>> Hans Larsen: We have a 500 mile network that was defined with about 130 miles as enhanced bike ways and the balance of it as what we call secondary bike ways. Be happy to get you a copy of the report if you don't have that in your office.

>> Councilmember Rocha: I only saw it as a draft so final would be helpful. Thank you.

>> Hans Larsen: Sure.

>> Councilmember Liccardo: Thank you very much for the report. I had a quick question. Could we go back to that slide that had some description of the bike boulevard and the various features, I know, there they are, I think that's it, there they are, beautiful. So I couldn't help but notice the speed humps or tables being included, which I'm thrilled to see, feature of some bike boulevards though not all. The question I had as we are using this \$150,000 grant from VTA to revise our design standards, will we see more of humps or God forbid speed bumps in those design standards, or are we still not going that direction in terms of trying to push speed bumps into the streets?

>> Hans Larsen: We have speed humps, lumps --

>> Councilmember Liccardo: Yes I know there's a whole -- yes.

>> Hans Larsen: Traffic calming tool box that we have. Some people like them some people don't like them. We generally don't like to put speed device in a community that aren't really fully embraced. Another factor is emergency response services so we have to work very closely with the fire department on what their response routes are and whether you know there's an ability to put in speed humps on certain corridors. But again I think we're looking at primarily more residential oriented streets so these aren't your main access routes but that's another factor that determines what kind of treatment we would put where.

>> Councilmember Liccardo: Right so I appreciate I've been in the middle of many of the battles in the past, and traditionally it's always lined up as I see it neighborhoods desperately wanting speed bumps where there's a lot of speeding traffic and usually the city coming forward, saying, we'd like to but the fire department doesn't want them because of emergency access. And I'm wondering is there an opportunity to revisit that debate within these design standards to actually see whether or not the city is willing to take a different approach towards having speed bumps in residential neighborhoods? Because the truth of the matter is, we don't see them, I can think of two locations in the city where we have them but otherwise they just don't exist. Speed bumps. I know speed humps are being considered in a couple of locations, is there an openness to actually consider that as we reconsider design standards?

>> Hans Larsen: I would say yes. Ultimately it's a policy decision in terms of how we treat these things. So with the grant that we received from the VTA looking at kind of expanding our tool box of design standards, particularly focused on pedestrian bicycle safety, traffic calming, so as we develop that I think there's certainly an opportunity to revisit some of those issues, and get policy input in terms of the direction that it takes.

>> Councilmember Liccardo: That would be fantastic, Hans, just to be able to have that public discussion. I know we're at a disadvantage because this has been a historic position of the fire department, and I know Chief McDonald, you know, if I haven't had the benefit of actually having spoke to him about the issue, coming now to into the department new, I think it would be helpful to have that conversation around some of our larger goals, particularly around mode shift. Because you know, certainly in my opportunity to talk to transportation directors in other cities, you know even as recently as last year when Manuel and I had the opportunity to speak with transportation directors, of two Dutch cities where they really had extraordinary mode share you know for 30% of the commuters were using bicycles and so forth, they really emphasized the use of speed control devices like speed bumps. We talked at great length about the objections of their own emergency access departments and it always came down to the director saying look every day we've got children on the street being threatened by speeding traffic. Once every year, two years, there might be a fire truck that comes through the street and that might slow them down by half a second. We're much more concerned about the daily impact of speed on children

and cyclists. In California given our auto centric approach, this is something we're very shy about. This goes all the way up to CalTrans. I know you guys are hamstrung by this in many ways. I really hope we can have a public discussion around aggressive use of speed control devices like speed humps. I know there are some who don't like them in the neighborhoods. But overwhelmingly, during my conversations people want them badly because they're so frustrated with speeding traffic and they know there's no police, you know we just don't have the police resources to go out there and catch all the folks. So I hope we can have that public discussion. And then secondly, you know I agree with Councilmember Campos about the importance of that San Antonio corridor, I think that's very important to create a key east-west connection. I know there's oops wanted to include additional data but I wonder if in future presentation it would be possible however it is you lay it out, to identify key origination and destinations that we are trying to create through whatever bike way project we've got. We may not be familiar with other council districts and what exactly we're trying to accomplish with a particular project and being able to identify okay this is a community college, this is a key origin or destination for cyclists and this is an employment center, those kinds of things would certainly help us be able to clearly check in about, okay, the priorities are aligned with really moving people where we know they're going to be using bikes. I know that it doesn't -- it's hard to find the room in that chart but if there's some way to do that, I think that would be really helpful.

>> Hans Larsen: I think that's a good suggestion, I'd be happy to follow on with that.

>> Councilmember Liccardo: Thanks Hans. And then the last thing, the walk and roll grants, I've talked to folks, and I know you guys are talking to the same folks that specialize on bikes and they have all kinds of grant programs for encouraging cycling at schools and so forth, and they always require a local match and you know we're typically out of local match. An I'm wondering can we use the walk and roll grants as the local match for any of these other sort of programs to sort of leverage money?

>> Hans Larsen: I think that's a good idea. We have done that where you get one grant and use that as a match for something else. I think that as we roll out the walk and roll program and to Councilmember Herrera's point you know, we intend to create some videos and materials and sort of a how-to guide on doing this so that if there's

other schools beyond the initial 30, that we've got the information that this can expand. But certainly, I think you know our hope is that this is successful, as we launch it, and we may be able to then attract interest from other organizations that want to donate money and continue the effort. So we certainly are always on the lookout for those opportunities.

>> Councilmember Liccardo: Okay great thank you Hans. Councilmember Herrera.

>> Councilmember Herrera: The speed bump point. Palo Alto has bicycle boulevards they don't seem to have the trouble putting up the speed bumps. What's the difference?

>> Hans Larsen: John, do you have perspective on that?

>> Probably several factors, the corridors for the bicycle boulevards are often along a rail line. Which -- hard to describe this, but park avenue for example in Palo Alto runs for a couple of miles right along the railroad lines where there are no cross streets.

>> Councilmember Herrera: I'm thinking midtown, where there's cross streets and is not along a rail line.

>> So along Fletcher and Bryant Street, bike lane, so what they did in those locations was chose to -- no easy decision and there was a lot of fallout from the community, but chose to at a few block intersections divert automobile traffic. And they had a few years where there were some very unhappy neighbors because the neighbors couldn't turn left into their house, they had to turn right and drive around another block. It was not an easy decision for them they did have some fallout but after a few years they decided to keep it. There is seasonal decision on Palo Alto bike boulevards and it's a balance.

>> Councilmember Herrera: I agree with what Sam said about finding ways to do this. It's a great idea if we've included in the design so that maybe this can get included in new areas that we're developing too in streets. Thinking about where bikes would need to circulate and include that, and I don't know if that can be -- if

there can be fees associated with that that could be paid by new development but I think being able to ride a bike safely down the street is definitely a quality of life issue and I agree that the community asked for these things and we're in a quandary when we have to assess the safety for emergency vehicles.

>> Councilmember Liccardo: Okay, if there are other questions or comments?

>> Councilmember Herrera: Motion to approve.

>> Second.

>> Councilmember Liccardo: All in favor, that passes unanimously. Thank you very much, gentlemen. We'll move on to D-3, the plant master plan. Hi, John. This is the little project we call the plant master plan.

>> John Stufflebean: Thank you very much. John Stufflebean director of environmental services. Short presentation on the plant master plan and we're pretty excited about this. This is a milestone in our process. We're about three years into the process and we're actually preparing to forward our recommendation to begin the CEQA process. So the plant master plan, the main action that we're requesting from council will be the selection of the preferred alternative for the CEQA analysis. We're also recommending a contract -- amending and extending a contract with our CEQA consultant. What I'm going to talk about today is a little background then the fact that, talk about the critical infrastructure rehabilitation that's needed at the plant. The preferred technical alternative, preferred land use alternative and as I mentioned the CEQA contract amendment. Several of you have seen this before. This is the tributary area to the plant. We call it the sewer shed and the eight cities of the South Bay. Of course San José is about two-thirds of the flow and the other cities contribute the other third. It's an area of about 300 square miles and serves about 1.4 million people and so this is one of the largest plants in the United States. More of a closeup of the plant. Some of you have seen this before. The plant is in the yellow area right at the corner of 880 and 237. And it's a large area, it's about two miles across and two miles the other way, so it's about four square miles, a lot of area that's available. This is a closeup of the plant itself. Some of you have seen this before. Operational area is in the center, 180 acres. Biosolids area up to the Northeast about 770

acres, pond 18 one of the salt ponds we purchased a few years ago and everything else we call the buffer lands. Why are we doing this? Main reason is that first of all, aging infrastructure. The plant was built 34 years ago, and it was built with a life of 30 to 40 years, so it needs to be replaced. Beyond that, there's the future regulations which we want to make sure we anticipate, that we put in whatever processes are necessary and make room for those as future regulations that come along. Population growth, we expect population growth of four to 500,000 people over the 30 year planning horizon, and then originally when the plant was built it was simply a waste facility. Now we look at it as a research and recovery facilities. We're recovering water, we're recovering the organic material and the biosolids and even recovering energy from the biosolids. Also one of our drivers is to be a good neighbor, to as we rebuild the plant, to decrease odor, to decrease the visual impact and to even decrease the noise. And then, the picture on the right shows where sea level might be in about turn of the century, next century. As you can see most of the plant is in the blue sea level rise would be under water and the plants don't work when they're under water. This is our schedule. As I mentioned we're three years into it. We started, kind of focusing down we started with all the conceptual alternatives that you could imagine. Had some community workshops on that, like a brainstorming evidence. We then focused in on viable alternatives. We came up with three viable alternatives for the land use and the several for the plant had some additional community workshops and now we're coming forward we had a recommended plan which we had a third set of community workshops in January, which I'll talk about in a second and now we're at the CEQA scoping points so you can see we are well into the process and then we're estimate CEQA will take year and a half to two years and we'll be able to implement the final plan. This is a picture of the January workshops. As I said we had five workshops all around the tributary area and they were very well attended and we got a lot of good comments from people. We asked them what they liked about the plan what they'd change about the plan and comments we received about the workshops and also on line are attached to your memo. This is again a drawing that you've seen before. This is our objectives. And you see at the top, the plant has to operate but beyond that we're talking about the triple bottom line, economic goals, basically this is a -- our goals are balanced. We want to try to achieve all of these four goals. With respect to economic goals it's mainly about producing jobs, land for jobs which as you all know San José needs. Beyond that environmental goals which we focus on this site of generating habitats on site and then the finally the social goals and what really focused in on here again is reducing odor and also having recreational opportunities, both active and passive recreational opportunities and also, protecting the character of

Alviso, since Alviso is our neighbor. There's two tracks of this plan. The left side you can see there's actually the operational plan which is the fundamental reason that we're doing this. The plant has to operate so we've identified the future plant footprint. What do we need to protect for the land over the next 30 years. Meanwhile we looked at what potential land uses could occur in this area and then married that up with the land that was left over, and looked at the land use opportunities. This is the outcome of the -- for the technical aspect was a 30 year capital program so we now have the road map for rebuilding the plant. It's not inexpensive. It's about \$2.2 billion of improvements that are needed. It includes improvements to all process areas of the plant. It adds odor control for anyplace where it's needed and that's quite a number of processes. It also relocates and reduces the sludge lagoons and drying beds, into a much smaller footprint. It enables those lands and additional lands to be put into new land use. This 3.2 billion does not include any additional operating and maintenance cost and does not include proposed uses for the buffer land. If someone wants to put in retail or develop a park, those funds are going to have to come in from different sources, we can't use sewer funds for that, of course. We've divided the needs into two different categories. One category is critical infrastructure needs for rehabilitating and rebuilding the plant. And these are things we need anyway whether we do a plant master plan or not and so these are the things we already identified that have to be done. So we're doing, we're not putting these projects into the big CEQA process. We know -- we don't think we need to do that but these are things you may recall that we rebuilt -- we built a second head works or part of that. We need to complete that job, rebuild the rest of the new head works. There is a lot of rehabilitation that needs to be done in the primary and secondary parts of the plant and also developing the digesters. These projects we're proceeding with not part of the CEQA. This is the recommended alternative. As you can see the plant in the middle is in the big black box. That's the area that we're protecting for the future footprint and everything around the plant we're recommending land uses for that and I'll get in the details of that in a second. Again this is a treatment this big box our analysis is concludes this is all we need for the next 30 years. We want to protect enough area for the plant to operate well into the future. Beyond that how can we assist with regional develop, how can we provide habitat and regional parks and trails. These are the things in the CEQA. There are two categories of things in the CEQA. On the left is odor control and biosolids dewatering, and so with respect to odor control and biosolids dewatering, we're putting these in the CEQA as recommending them as project level, which means that we can proceed with those more quickly. So we think this is the quickest way that we can implement these projects. So we will actually design the projects that need to be

done to control odor, which largely includes covering tanks, controlling the odor, treating the air which is expensive. And it also includes moving from our existing biosolids process to a new biosolids process and we'll define that project and move ahead as quickly as possible on that. The second category is new technologies. These are technologies that are out in the future and the technology is evolving, they may change from what we're proposing now. These will be at a program level in the CEQA. So these will be described, but actually before they're built they'll have to do additional project bill to CEQA when the projects are better defined. And again one of the main things we're doing is phasing out of the biosolids. The biosolids are shown in the brown, lagoons and drying beds, we will be phasing those out and moving them into what's called the future biosolids area on this diagram. It's a smaller area, it will be mechanical dewatering most likely. Again it's a more expensive operation, significantly more expensive because we're using the sun now to dry biosolids, this requires mechanical dewatering which requires lots more energy. Clearly requires CEQA because we're changing major land use and going to be using a lot more energy. Both of these things drive to us obviously require CEQA. This is a big part of the CEQA analysis. This is scheduled, again I've shown you this before, showing you that we believe we could get transitioned to mechanical dewatering by 2025. And there's a lot involved with this. Including finishing the CEQA, mitigating the legacy biosolids which is where we're proposing to move the operation, and then really ideally you rehabilitate everything upstream of that because that would change the characteristics of the biosolids. So the design for the dewatering will depend on the characteristics of the new biosolids so ideally you would want to do pilot testing with the new material that's produced after the upstream processes are completed and then you'd actually design and construct them. As you know the moment that we switch from our existing operation to mechanical dewatering we'll need a 7 to 10% rarity increase. That's just because of additional cost of operating the additional cost of energy but we obviously need to do this at some point. We received as you know a lot of comments, why can't do you that quicker. And so well, how could we possibly do that any faster, and we've identified a way to shave about four years off of this by initiating the design prior to doing the pilot testing. There's some risk that we would have to kind of redesign it once we really learned the specific characteristics of the material after we rehabilitated the upstream processes, but we think that's probably a risk that we could take. So that could move it up four years. I also want to mention that we're looking at how we could speed it up even faster than that. We'll come back to you in May with our recommendations on some other ideas that we've heard about that we're looking at with respect to other ways we can deliver these projects more

quickly. We'll be coming back in May to see if it's possible to even go faster. This is the kind of the planning colors for what the master plan will look like. Official San José planning colors. Currently the entire site is this kind of light blue which is quasi-public land, and as you can see in this diagram, the plant itself and some of the buffer lands stay this color. Other the buffer lands become the green open space, red is retail, purple is kind of combined industrial and retail and other parts of the land become industrial and the research park. So this is consistent with the Alviso plan that's another issue that we've heard a lot about is this is in Alviso and we want to be sure we're consistent with our neighbors. I'll talk about that in a second. Beyond that we have transportation has been one of the bigger issues that's come up in our public meetings. Currently the only access to this area really is the existing Zanker road access. That would certainly continue beyond that we're proposing to consider access from the West along North tech drive, extending north tech drive from first street, possibly from the East, extending from McCarthy boulevard and possibly even from the north from Dixon landing. Our objective in making these additions would be to providing access to the area because there's going to be more people going there but also to make sure the traffic doesn't impact Alviso and the other areas that it actually is handled in this area and not kind of spilling over into adjacent lands. With respect to traffic, we're proposing that we have what we're calling complete streets. We could -- this is a good segue from the past item that it would not just be streets for cars but it would also be streets for bicycles and pedestrians and that's one of the important elements, and beyond that, one of the comments that have come up is, what about the impacts of 237, it's already very crowded, well, obviously the environmental impact analysis will have to evaluate the impacts on traffic and mitigation measures will have to be considered. Now just go through again if of the three areas of our development. One is economic development, this is the parts of the plan that deal with economic development. It includes retail in the red area right at 237 and Zanker road and it also includes clean tech institute, and the clean tech institute we see this as a partnership between academic business and civic and we've had some discussions already with some universities, San José State, they're very interested in this concept of having this kind of a campus environment which can connect to industries. We're excited about that actually. Beyond that we're looking at R&D industrial and the concept here is to protect lands for clean tech industrial uses and clean tech industrial reserve. We have a piece of land right around 237 that can be developed very quickly and another piece of land where the drying beds are, that will have to wait of course until the drying beds are moved, that will kind of have to be phased in. And then beyond that we've also got the renewable energy fields, we've identified a fair amount of property for

solar fields, of course, on the roofs out there and on the plant and any development that's going on out there. This just shows what the Alviso master plan is and you can kind of tell the plan is again shown all in blue here. We believe this is wide consistent with this. We've worked very hard with being consistent. What we've done is separate any of the plant development from Alviso by putting the owl habitat in between. Kind of a nice open space between the Alviso and any development that would occur. We're also looking at diverting traffic away and flood waters away from Alviso. One of our objectives finance is to generate some revenue on the plant land and our analysis shows us we can't really generate that much. We were hoping maybe we could generate so much revenue that we could really help rebuild the plant. First of all, there is a timing issue that the plant needs to be rebuilt long before this development occurs, but even after development occurs we're looking at a million dollars or so a year from -- project from San José for additional taxes, a little more for the county, little more for the school district, so the school districts certainly benefit. And the big one is the ground lease and the ground lease we're looking at maybe 10, \$11 million a year we could generate. But again that's in full development, the plant development is \$100 million a year. It's still a fairly small percentage of the plant operations but it certainly would help. But the big reason for doing this is jobs. That we can generate 800 jobs during construction and once it's fully developed, a place for 17,000 jobs. And as you all know San José needs jobs. This is we've worked very closely with the envision 2040 task force to make sure this land consistently is developed consistently with the principles and the plan of the general plan, so this shows the environmental uses on the land. And on several different categories as I mentioned there is the burrowing owl sort of the southwest corner there we call it upland grasslands. Protects from any development in Alviso but also provides a valuable place for the burrowing owls. Beyond that we are identifying environmental uses where pond 18 is, and we're looking at that as a terraced wetland, that kind of terraces from open bay up to mud flat and then up to tidal marsh. And this provides much better protection than just a levee, because it's actually land that's terraced up and provides a nice buffer from any rising sea level or from any tidal influences and then provides a great salt habitat for our strictly for our endangered species, clapper rail and the salt marsh harvest mouse. And then finally, we're also providing some fresh water wetlands. We're discharging water into instead of just right now we discharge all our water into one location, into Alviso slough. We're proposing to move to discharge into several locations which has kind of a double benefit. One is, it's not putting so much fresh water in one place, which has a negative impact on the saltwater marsh in that area. Plus we're providing fresh water in other places and we can generate additional

fresh water marshes. So we think there's some great benefit to that. These are particularly valuable, and again we may reduce our discharge impacts. I would want to mention that we have received a letter included in your packet from a number of environmental community groups that are suggesting that we should have an all environmental impact, all environmental option calling it the water ecology and water alternative. We did consider that but we felt that it does not meet our goals. Our goal as I said, that council adopted, was a balanced plan that includes economic development and environmental aspects and social. So an all environmental option we didn't bring forward because we don't feel it meets the goals. And then finally in terms of social uses, mostly focused on recreational uses, developing quite a nice trail system, 16 miles of trails around the plant. It connects the city to the bay, these trails would do that. They also would connect the Guadalupe to the Coyote creek so you provide a nice connection across the north part of the city and also 40 acres of recreation which could be ball fields and soccer fields. So here now is the existing plant picture and we see this transitioning over 30 years to something a lot greener and includes development that benefits the city and the surrounding regions. And of course this development, the timing of this depends not on us. It depends on us working with other partners. So there's a lot of partners we'll have to work with in terms of developing recreational uses, developing the retail, developing the industrial parks. But what we're doing is providing a place for this to happen which is really important. Finally today we are recommending that we extend the contract William CEQA contractor, ESA and J and F, to increase the compensation, basically the work that's needed to do to complete the environmental work. We are going to the San José council if this is approved in April 19th, we'll also be going to the Santa Clara council, as you may recall Santa Clara is part owner of the plant so they have to approve this plant as well. The environmental impact analysis will then take about a year and a half or so and then implementation will begin in 2013. So that concludes our presentation. Here is a reiteration of the recommendations, to proceed with the preparation of the environmental impact report and development of the final documents for the alternative, preferred alternative, to exercise the option to extend the contract for the EIR work and also to direct staff to come back next month with our additional details on odors and timing and how we can decrease odors, mitigate odors more quickly and also move the biosolids process more quickly if that's possible. That concludes our presentation.

>> Councilmember Liccardo: Thank you, John. Could we have -- we have members of the public who would like to speak, maybe we can hear from the public first before we begin our discussion. Great. Go forward then with David Wall followed by Joey McCarthy and I'm sorry, Shawnee Clayhouse.

>> David Wall: Good afternoon, it's always a pleasure to be in the presence of Your Honors, particularly my councilmember in District 3. First of all, the comment that in 30 years the plant will be more greener than it is today is a misrepresentation. Any development at all out there goes against where it is already as green as it can be. Especially, sludge drying. But I would like the director to explain his memo dated to you all on March 28th of this year. Subject: South Bay, San Francisco emergency port access port study, in reference to policy alignment, feasible study is in alignment with the plant master plan process to improve the shoreline of San José and potentially provide additional public access. Now your response Mr. Director if you choose to respond should be tailored to the restrictions placed on all plant operating funds and all funds in particular that ESD has, that ESD is responsible for the economic development of the port of Alviso. The bogus assertions, not made by ESD at all, but by the Silicon Valley San José chamber of commerce in their feasibility study, and how much time and effort did all ESD employees spend in producing this feasibility report. Lastly, it is my opinion that all of Your Honors should force every item on the treatment plant advisory committee to come to you prior to going to council. Because there's a lot of money tied up in this feasibility study. And I think that it deserves a lot more scrutiny, not only by Your Honors but by the public. And Mr. Director, feel free to respond to this. It's something I particularly don't understand how the water pollution control plan or ESD could be involved in developing the economic outlay of the port of Alviso. Thank you.

>> Councilmember Liccardo: Thank you, David. Mr. McCarthy followed by Mr. Klinehouse, forgive me if I mispronounced your name.

>> Good afternoon, I'm Joey McCarthy, representing McCarthy ranch. First of all I'd like to thank John and his staff for taking time to meet with McCarthy Ranch and discuss our concerns that the plant master plan is -- we are impacted pretty severely by the odors from the plant. We support the plan, like I said I think staff has done a great job. Our main concern has to do with the timing of the dewatering and the 11 to 14 year time frame that staff has

stated for removal of that operation. You know McCarthy ranch as well as the Milpitas community and the City of San José are severely impacted by this current processing and we've done some brief analysis of our own through an expert and we think it should take about two years to implement the dewatering. I know staff is looking into it, we encourage that and we hope in the plan there will be a solution that removes those drying beds as soon as possible. Thank you.

>> Councilmember Liccardo: Thank you, Joey. Mr. Klinehouse followed by Bob power and Stephanie Millar.

>> Good afternoon, chair Liccardo and councilmembers. I'm Shawnee Klinehouse with Santa Clara County valley Audubon society. In June of 2010,.

>> Councilmember Liccardo: Ma'am, I'm sorry, can you speak in front of the microphone? So that way it can be recorded.

>> In June of 2010 and again in January 2011, environmental organizations that represent thousands and thousands of this community submitted letters of the master plan and this included Santa Clara Valley Audubon society, the committee for green foothills, citizen committee to complete the refuge, Sierra Club, the Loma Prieta chapter, Green Belt Alliance, California Native Plant Society, Santa Clara County Creek Coalition, Save the Bay, and San Francisco Bay keeper. In these letters, and we handed those to you today, as well as copies of these comments, we asked for an ecological alternative that we presented to the public, and input from the public meetings also consistently supported an argument for an alternative that proposes no development other than that that is needed for the functioning of the sewerage control plant and water pollution control plant. We did ask again and again for an option to be presented that would not -- that would dedicate the remainder of the land to ecological land uses. We still think that this is needed. We also asked for the grasslands along highway 237 to be maintained as open space and to provide critical wildlife corridor and refuge for plants and wildlife especially in the face of global climate change. Staff has been very, very generous with their time and attention to our issue and we appreciate all the time and their listening to us and incorporating our concern in the proposal they put in front of you. However, we are here to ask that an ecological alternative be -- still be provided to the public and that

the EIR if we -- you choose to continue with that will present a comprehensive analysis for an alternative that includes the upgrades that are necessary to the plant and ecological land use, and no other development that is not related to the needs of the plant. We further ask that since we've heard today and before that there are many projects that are going to take place before the master plan is approved and that there is development on the -- in the area, we're asking that additional -- for an additional projects project, we're asking that you consider an interim burrowing owl preservation plan. There is an allocation of land for burrowing owls but time is short. We're trying to save this animal in this area. We want this bird to persist and there are many plans that will help with that but we're short of time. So for now we're asking.

>> Councilmember Liccardo: Sorry to interrupt. But you've expended the time. We've received the letter though.

>> Thank you.

>> Councilmember Liccardo: Thank you very much. Bob power followed by Stephanie Marr.

>> Chairman Liccardo, councilmembers I'm bob power, executive director for Santa Clara Valley Audubon. Appreciate this opportunity to talk about the plant master plan. I was a member of the citizens advisory group for the master plan since its inception. I can tell you from an insider's viewpoint that staff has taken a very, very complex set of issues and crafted a really well thought out comprehensive plan for your review and city council's review. At the same time, I represent an environmental organization so when there are issues that put at play land use, open space, versus -- and species concerns vs. development we're going to be on opposite sides of that argument. What Shawnee was trying to point -- the point she was trying to finish with, was that while we're developing the economic plan that shows how burrowing owls will offset 17,000 permanent jobs, and as soon as we develop that plan we'll bring it to you, while we're developing that, you're waiting for this land to be developed in the ways that director Stufflebean has explained. And that might be in a couple years. It might be five years, it might be ten years. It might be 20 years before you get the partnerships, and so that land's available for the owls. And so we're looking for an interim management plan to complement the other plans that are on the table. To take care of the owls while we're waiting for that land to be developed. And that may be just the last

piece that those owls need to survive in Santa Clara County. And so we ask that the committee direct staff, and make a recommendation to city council, that there be a parallel management plan, while we're waiting for the land to be developed. I appreciate your time in hearing us today.

>> Councilmember Liccardo: Thank you, Mr. Power. And Stephanie Millar. Hope I haven't mispronounced your name. Miller, I'm sorry, I misread it.

>> Hi, my name is Stephanie Miller. I represent the Irvine company, we are a landlord owner of McCarthy Center, located in Milpitas, a million square foot campus office property. The odors emitted from the plant are really one of our biggest complaints that we do receive from our customers and our tenants at McCarthy center. At times our customers and their visitors can't even enjoy our outdoor seating areas and recreation areas we've developed at the center. Having myself personally worked in the area since 2009 I can tell you that at sometimes the odor impact of that smell is really severe and not very pleasant. The issue has not only impacted our existing tenant retention program, it is also evident in some of our prospective leasing that we are trying to do new deals at the property. Just recently we suffered the loss of a 150,000 square foot tenant, and this was their primary complaint and concern was about the odors that they keep hearing in the area. Several tenants in our -- that we're currently discussing preliminary leasing renewals discussions have expressed concerns about the impact of the odors to us as well and you know at this point they're really uncertain about what their future intentions are, they are going to look elsewhere and again it kind of stems back to the odors that they do say impacts and affects as well as other employees who work at the center. We have also experienced odor complaints from residents at our 2600 units, north park apartment community which is located off first street in San José. So from these two examples it's pretty apparent that it's also impacting different areas in the region, not just one area in Milpitas. The Irvine company as a whole we're really committed to expanding and retaining our presence in the Silicon Valley area and we just need your help and support at our existing locations to ensure that we're able to achieve occupancy and gain and you know gain tenants and definitely increase our value of the property as well too. So currently our apartment communities division is developing a 1700 large complex at the old Sony site and in the future at some point we do have Santa Clara Gateway, which is a million square foot office complex that's slated for development to be determined. So basically, at this point we really just urge you to ensure us that you do address the odor

impact to the surrounding neighborhood and that it is thoroughly reviewed so proper corrective measures can be implemented. In addition completing the plant upgrade sooner than the 2025 should also be strongly considered. I just want to thank you for your time and your consideration and appreciate the efforts that have been made thus far. Thank you.

>> Councilmember Liccardo: Ms. Miller, before we leave the microphone I think we have a question.

>> Councilmember Rocha: Ma'am, not to put you on the spot but vacancy rates at those two sites, do you know those?

>> 55%.

>> Councilmember Rocha: Do you know the residential?

>> I'm not in the residential division I'm in the commercial but we obviously work for the same company.

>> Councilmember Liccardo: Can I follow up? I certainly appreciate in need for dewatering and odor removal and I understand we're obviously going to be coming back in May and staff is going to be looking at how we can accelerate that or if it's possible. The question I have when was the commercial when the office was built, was that in the '90s?

>> Early 2000. Early.

>> Councilmember Liccardo: Has something changed between then and now in terms of the odor situation?

>> I cabinet speak on that on my behalf but I do know that we have had customers that have been in there since that time period and they have said they have always smelled the odors.

>> Councilmember Liccardo: I'm just wondering, at the time of construction, they knew the odor was there, maybe the construction workers were worried about it. I'm trying to understand, the decision is was made to build there, certainly was made with the recognition that there was odors.

>> Well, you know, thinking that, that we did purchase the property from the McCarthys, they've been there since before the plant was actually developed and built. So it is a long-term location and site that has had many different parties involved in the development of that site. So you know I can't speak back on behalf -- back in those days.

>> Councilmember Liccardo: Fair enough, I'm not trying to put you on the spot but I'm trying to understand if something has changed? At this point probably not.

>> I don't believe so.

>> Councilmember Liccardo: Thank you very much. Why don't we take questions and comments at this time? Is there a motion?

>> Councilmember Rocha: Thank you. So the environmental documentation that you're going through, the funding comes from the fees that were generated, through the plant? And the --

>> John Stufflebean: Yes, that's correct.

>> Councilmember Rocha: Can you explain give me a sense of what annually we're receiving on those? Do you call them fees, revenue?

>> John Stufflebean: Yes, sewer service and use fees and it's on a order of \$100 million a year.

>> Councilmember Rocha: \$100 million a year. What's the reserves look like?

>> John Stufflebean: Reserves are healthy. We keep in reserve, we have a number of reserves, essentially two month operating reserve, I don't know the exact number, order of 15 to 20 million reserve. In the case of emergency, that we need to quickly do some kind of a construction project or take some action.

>> Councilmember Rocha: How much annually is it I'm sorry.

>> John Stufflebean: Two month reserve at all times.

>> Councilmember Rocha: First number, annual.

>> John Stufflebean: Give an example, 100 million for the entire fund.

>> Councilmember Rocha: So we have about 40 or 50 million in reserves?

>> John Stufflebean: No about 20. I can get those exact numbers to you.

>> Councilmember Rocha: Yeah I didn't put you on the spot as I was sitting here I was thinking in terms of what we're looking at. Now the current capital plan that we have outside this new master plan what does that look like annually?

>> John Stufflebean: Right, so our current capital plan is running about \$40 million a year, 40 to \$50 million a year. We're gearing it up to 70 to \$80 million a year this is what we need to complete the capital plan over the 30-year period.

>> Councilmember Rocha: And that increase is due to the master plan improvements and --

>> John Stufflebean: Right we have to continue to operate the plant so that doesn't change. On top of that we have to have obviously the fees necessary, there's no other source of funds we have to have the fees necessary to rebuild it at the same time.

>> Councilmember Rocha: 40 million a year currently in our capital plan is seems like a lot of money. Is that maintenance or --

>> John Stufflebean: That's just the capital. In the past couple of years we rebuilt the head works, an alternative disinfection program, and about 80 million dollars of electrical work that's being done over a three or four year period, and we're now initiating some other major projects, I mentioned some of them. The digesters need to be rebuilt, \$5 million a digester, and there's 15 digesters. So there's a lot of capital projects that -- basically the master plan lays out all the different capital projects that have to be done over the next 20 to 25 years, the total of which is about \$2.2 billion and so you just divide that by how many years there are, you need about \$80 million a year to do that.

>> Councilmember Rocha: What's the capital program look like for you when you budget it out? A five year, three year?

>> John Stufflebean: Five year. We do official city budget is a five year plan, we do a ten year plan. A little over our head right? -more progressive. It's different.

>> John Stufflebean: Because the plant is so big and we're looking a little further out.

>> Councilmember Rocha: Why was the -- and again I wasn't here for a lot of the prework you did. I did participate with the outreach you did when I was at the agency. Why a 30 year plan? I know council approved that directly, can I get a sense of why you recommended and why council went that direction?

>> John Stufflebean: One of the reasons was to match it up with the 2040 General Fund, general plan. So we kinds of match it up with that. We also looked at that's a pretty typical time frame for these kinds of master plans. Sacramento's in the process of doing theirs, San Francisco doing there is. So 30 years is about what it takes to look ahead to all the exam needs are. Beyond that you get kind of difficult to predict, that's a pretty typical range, 20 to 30 is a typical range, we just use that. Part of that is to match up with the general plan.

>> Councilmember Rocha: Can you explain how that is going, you have someone who is on that. Are the changes in the designations addressed in the update?

>> John Stufflebean: We envisioned this as main the first general plan revision after the general plan is adopted would be to make the revisions on the plant. Joe do you want to add to that?

>> Joe Horwedel: The envision 2040 plan has a place holder for jobs on the plant lands and we have deferred to the plant master planning process to deal specifically with the if those jobs were to occur there where they would be configured on the property and we would go through and reflect that ultimately in the general plan after the plant master plan is done.

>> Councilmember Rocha: Does that take an update or --

>> Joe Horwedel: It would happen through the general plan update process. Once the plan was adopted, we would come back in and as John noted the schedules for the plant master plan is in the 2013 time frame. Our goal is to be done this year with the general plan update. So we would cycle in about the time -- Sam is holding me to that, that the -- it would be about the time frame of our first update to the general plan. Doing the annual review.

>> Councilmember Rocha: And would they pay for those general plan?

>> Joe Horwedel: I'm very good at making sure that happens.

>> Councilmember Rocha: I've noticed the odor comment a number of times here and then I also noted your referential to it and acknowledge to it. In terms ever exposure or conformance issues, are there state local or federal laws that we need to be in compliance with or are in compliance with that I'm not aware?

>> John Stufflebean: So the way that this works is there's an air regulatory board, and the neighbors take odor complaints, they investigate them. If they determine the source and they get a number of complaints there are actions they can take. I can mention that there have been a number of odor complaints that have been generated in the Milpitas and North San José area. Over the past five years, they often don't determine exactly what the source is but over the past five years there's only been one complaint that's been confirmed to come from the plant. Others certainly may have. But there are other sources of odor in the area. There are for example the Milpitas collection system, sewer collection system generates some odors. Our collection system generates odors. There's a landfill nearby that generates odor. They have an open-air composting operation that generates odor. One of the odors we looked at last time, they were applying manure to a ball field. So there are sources of odor, other than the plant and the area. It is certainly a source of odor. The plant was built in 1956 because the odor was so bad you could smell the outfall in Campbell. So the plant you know is -- was designed to reduce odor. And so you know it takes some material that is very odorous that comes in, what goes out doesn't have any odor. The plant was designed with open tanks in the '50s, 60s, 70s. It was fairly undeveloped in that area. Wherever there is tanks that generate odor our intention is to cover them but it's a big big job to do that. Tens of millions of dollars to do that. So we are not in violation of any odor laws. And when we are on the rapid kind of response list so that when odors come in when the investigators come out if there's anything at the plant we jump right on it. We've also taken a lot of measures over the past two years, I would say if you look at what's different five years ago or ten years ago from the plant is we've significantly reduced odor. We've added some chemicals to reduce odor, we changed the solids operation to -- in terms of when we -- generally we generate odors when we turn the biosolids, and we're very careful, we don't do that, except very few times -- we time it when the weather's right. We do it the right time of year. So we've taken a lot of measures to reduce odor. I think we have significantly reduced odor, if you looked in the kind of history of complaints, I think that's the

case. You know, but it is the nature of the beast, I mean there is some odor from these plants. Our objective is as we rebuild it to really reduce them even more as much as we possibly can.

>> Councilmember Rocha: What's the jurisdiction that does the investigation?

>> John Stufflebean: Air quality control board.

>> Councilmember Rocha: Okay they do it. So as we do this EIR, and we'll eventually circulate it for public review and comment you would expect that that would probably be popping up in some of the comments that we are to receive?

>> John Stufflebean: Sure and of course everything we're doing it's an interesting conflict that you get because many of the measures we're going to take to reduce odor will require more energy. There will be a positive impact from odor reduction and in terms of the environment, there's a negative impact because you're using more energy. So that's kind of the balancing things you have to go through when you do the environmental review.

>> Councilmember Rocha: That's where the solar fields come into play.

>> John Stufflebean: Exactly why we're doing more renewables out there. We have to manage through that but that will be one of the major things we look at. We have to look at all the environmental impacts of the actions we take and the environmental impact of routeing odor in many cases will be the reduced energy use.

>> Councilmember Rocha: Let's look at this aspect, let's do the EIR, circulate it for public review and comment. Outside of any comments, is there any legal issue we may get challenged on the it's not addressed, if you assume at a that might be the case if there's any potential threats out there then we could have this EIR held up or the master plan held up for some time, little bit, again that's all speculation but I'm assuming that's everything you have considered.

>> John Stufflebean: Sure as we design the process we're trying to mitigate potential for that by making sure we cover all the issues that might come up thoroughly and accurately, it could always be challenged absolutely.

>> Councilmember Rocha: I notice on page 4 when you spoke to this issue or at least in the report, to the extent practical. That's to the point you just talked about, this is not an exact science, you treating sewage so you expect there's always going to be some impact.

>> John Stufflebean: Yes.

>> Councilmember Rocha: 2.2 billion identified in the master plan for capital cost, all those improvements are going to be laid out in that document specifically laid out costs associated with each one?

>> John Stufflebean: Probably not quite to that level. What the document will include will be a schedule for a listing of all the projects that need to be done and kind of a general schedule but that will change as you work through in other words the kind of the official plan is the five year, that's the one we really look at, that's the one that's adopted by the city. But every year we update five years, so every year we learn what we've learned in the last year, there may be some modifications made so the five year kind of becomes the official CIP for the plants. We kind of do a ten year plan for ourselves just to kind of keep track of it but the plan will identify kind of all the projects we envision over the 30 year period and generally speaking when we anticipate they will happen. But again that will be revised each year as we go through it.

>> Councilmember Rocha: That five year mentioned on page 5 what's the cost of those improvements?

>> John Stufflebean: The current five year plan. Our CIP person is right here, she can give us the exact numbers.

>> Rachel Bavani, our code division manager for the program. Our current adopted five year CIP is about 250. We'll be proposing another one next year that will raise it to 291. So we're slowly ramping up to that 80 million a year that John's talking about.

>> Councilmember Rocha: 250 million for that five-year, okay. On page 6 you've mentioned the financing option over the next years. Can you expand on that and explain what you're doing.

>> John Stufflebean: Sure. Generally speaking we have historically been a pay as you go operation which means we simply use did revenues we collected in one year to pay for whatever the costs were in that year. The major revenue bonding that we've done has been for the recycled water system which is also funded by these same moneys. As we move forward one option is to continue a pay as you go system but as we see a year coming up ahead or a couple years where there's going to be a spike in the needs for projects, we can certainly look at revenue bonding and so that really I think that's kind of the major option we'd be looking at is when and if - if and when we might want to do revenue bonding. Right now it looks like somewhere around four or five years from now we might be considering revenue bonding because it's kind of like how the projects lay out, that's what we're working through on the financing plan. We're also always of course looking for additional sources, outside sources of revenue. Right now there aren't many. The plant was built almost entirely with federal funds, 85% was federal money. Now there's essentially nothing but we're certainly always looking for that so we'll see if we can incorporate additional funds out there as well.

>> Councilmember Rocha: The topic of revenue bonding, you're going to bring that back.

>> Councilmember Pyle: The next time out?

>> John Stufflebean: Financing options yes.

>> Councilmember Rocha: The report is in April that part was in May. Why wouldn't we do that at the same time? Would you be comfortable moving that April report to May to coincide with the two? There may be some issues that we'd want to hear together or make some decisions based on the two findings.

>> John Stufflebean: I would propose that we keep the April plan in place. I mean I don't think the financing is really going to have much impact on the plant itself, it's just kind of how you implement the plan. Our recommendation would be to go ahead and leave the plan on the agenda for April and then in May it's more like what are some options for how we could maybe move the odor issues up sooner, how to move the biosolids sooner, when do we look at revenue, volume, that sort of thing. I think it's fine, I would propose trying to leave the plan as it is, because that's something that's certainly not going to change over that time.

>> Councilmember Rocha: I'm not so sure I entirely agree with you on that one. Let me pose the question, then what would be the cost issue, what's the issue that the two or three week delay would do for you?

>> John Stufflebean: Well, I mean obviously it delays the whole process. It -- we do have a number of folks lined up for the April 19th meeting we're kind of planning to come on that date so that would be some scheduling. It wouldn't be the end of the world if you delayed it, we're ready to come we'd like to stay on schedule.

>> Councilmember Rocha: Few more questions for my fellow colleagues to consider, someone to consider that if we move for approval to maybe coincide the two issues. The more information I have the better I feel on any sort of decisions we make on that date. The 230 million that you mentioned about the biosolids improvement you also talk about piloting methods and that's based on new technologies. Are there specific ones or just generally speaking there's always improvements?

>> John Stufflebean: I mean, the technology advances every year. Right now if we would choose the issues of technology, we'd probably choose centrifuges for the dewatering operation, mechanical dewatering. The specific design of those centrifuges depends on the quality of the biosolids that you're dealing with. So if we don't know the final product, we could overdesign or underdesign some of the piping, some of the valving, some of the siding.

So there's that risk that you would miss the mark if you try to design it before you know exactly what the final product looks like. It might not be optimal. As far as our professional recommendation as far as the most responsible thing to do is it would be to progress through, upstream, get the results first and do the piloting. You could move that ahead as I said and start the design now but you might have to make some revisions and might not be optimal which you would kind of have to pay forever.

>> Councilmember Rocha: You mentioned 70 million for improvement for odor control. That's the short term additional improvements you're going to make on odor control?

>> John Stufflebean: That's right, covering some of the tanks -- you finished?

>> Councilmember Rocha: No go ahead.

>> John Stufflebean: Covering the tanks as the sewage moves through it gets treated more and more. In the earlier processes, it smells pretty much. The head works, they're open air we've covered that. The first process we'd be looking at covering part or all of those tanks. That's the major part of odor control. The solids you separate out, the first process of solids go into is a thickening process to thicken the solids before they go into the digesters, the digesters are completely closed but the thick centers are open air. We'd certainly be looking at covering those up. So that \$70 million is mostly for headworks, primaries and thickeners to covering them, so then it's not just covering them. Again you have to cover them, then you have to -- the air that's in there you have to treat it before you discharge it so there's a process that has to be designed, there's physical processes, biological processes, you have to choose which ones are appropriate. To treat that air to be able to meet the standard and so part of it is also how what is the odor how bad is it, how business do these odor control systems have to be, that all has to be designed. So that's what the \$70 million is for.

>> Councilmember Rocha: So I guess in my mind I was wondering if that \$70 million investment is just going to go away when we do the big improvements?

>> John Stufflebean: Oh no no.

>> Councilmember Rocha: Given what you just said those are going to be permanent improvements?

>> John Stufflebean: Yes, sir.

>> Councilmember Rocha: Now, the potential land use alternatives, I know you went through some extensive community outreach on these and talking about potential uses. And I had some thoughts of course way back then in terms of talking about office uses et cetera when in north San José there's a significant amount of vacancy already, and why the use of land would be more viable, or I can't think of the right word but in your mind why -- what -- how did you come to the conclusion that you think folks might want to invest in these properties when there's a lot of potential vacant space or potential redevelopment opportunities?

>> John Stufflebean: Sure. It wasn't my conclusion, because I am not the expert in this.

>> Councilmember Rocha: Do you take credit for it?

>> John Stufflebean: I support it. But it was -- we basically brought in experts to help us with this, our economic development folks, our planning folks. There were two main reasons for that. One is, it is a 30 year plan. Over the next 30 years I think there is certainly the notion that space could well be taken up and there would be additional space needed. Beyond that there are some of these demands that would -- that where they need a big piece of land, that's for their particular type of facility. And what we're hearing is those don't really exist in San José so this provides a special opportunity for some unique types of economic development.

>> Councilmember Rocha: Nancy was kind of walking up. The reason -- to explain why I was getting to that point was also a suggestion in the comments that folks asked for additional natural or environmental review, and I was thinking, those to me might be options that if we have different plans for that, please share.

>> Thank you very much. Nancy Kline economic development. Part of the reason that the land is so important is jobs, also the type of jobs. North San José you are looking at a higher footprint going from .35 F.A.R. to .2 F.A.R. over that time span. This type of opportunity would allow more true R&D type opportunity so it would be very different and in some ways allow us to make up what we've lost in light and heavy industrial especially in the light industrial side. At this moment again it is a freeze frame where ESD is leading and we'll work with ESD on some additional consultant work to look at exactly what the opportunity could likely be over the next five to ten to 15 to 20 years so we're capturing a range of jobs and also middle income jobs that will help with clean tech economy in particular but also related jobs.

>> Councilmember Rocha: Thank you. A lot of the items we discussed would to me lend us to be a little more aggressive in terms of capital investment whether it's jobs the economy potential jobs and revenue the ten to 11 million potential to the city. Would that go to your fund or the General Fund?

>> John Stufflebean: It's up to the council. And everybody gets their share. We would get two-thirds of it and the other cities would get their third.

>> Councilmember Rocha: Thank you for taking the time and thank you to my colleagues for bearing with me. This is my first crack at this item and to me it's an extremely important project and you've put a heck much a lot of work into it. Thank you for your time. I'm looking forward to it. I won't be here for a good amount of improvements you're doing. I'll be here as a resident. For San José this is fantastic. With that I'd like to accept this report with the recommendation listed in here with the modification to have that report coincide with the May date if possible. Thank you.

>> Councilmember Campos: Second.

>> Councilmember Liccardo: There's been a motion. I'm going to beg my colleagues indulgence for a moment. I'm going to have to leech shortly. I wanted to ask one quick question and one long question. Is there

any of this 2.2 billion that's going to be used to address the impacts of sea level rise on the plant facilities? That is levees, walls, anything or is that all --

>> John Stufflebean: Not directly. We don't build levees but the levees need to be rebuilt. Our role will be to work with the corps of engineers and the Water District to make sure the levees are put in place at the right levels. Most likely we won't be directly building the levees but we will have a strong influence on where they're put.

>> Councilmember Liccardo: I understand they'll be looking for a contribution? No?

>> John Stufflebean: My understanding they are responsible for providing the levees and our role will be to help decide where to put them.

>> Councilmember Liccardo: Hope they build them. I'm looking at the diagram you have in the executive summary, page 5 I think if I'm not mistaken. Pretty ominous looking map of the impact of 55 inch sea level rise. I've seen similar maps from ABAG and they're very scary so I hope we do something about that. Anyway I know we're working on it. The second question is this: The concerns raised by members of the Audubon society and other environmental groups, I've been thinking about a bit in the context of what I know we would agree is probably something of a disappointing annual revenue projection report. And I know there's projected economic benefit of \$16.5 billion, and I know those assumptions that underlie that number are always something that are subject to debate but I'm thinking about the fact that there's probably not enormous amount of revenue for city though significant amount. The fact that as I look at the retail site there I know it's -- we're picking a corner there at Zanker and 237 that will probably be visible but not an enormous amount of foot traffic or any kind of other significant traffic other than for folks who might be working the industrial sites there. I'm thinking about the cost of whatever public costs there may be around protecting this land as the sea level does rise because I think we're pretty certain it will. Thinking about the ongoing odor complaints now in the future not from this plant but all the other sources. I'm starting to wonder whether or not the environmental groups have a pretty good point here which is should we be reevaluating our goals in some way? I know Nancy is going to beat me about the head for

asking this question and she's going to beat me severely after the meeting but I think it's a question worth asking ourselves because we set these goals at a time when we had a certain set of assumptions and maybe we should be revisiting those assumptions. I'm not saying we have to throw the plant out but I'm raising these questions to take another look. John would you like to comment on that?

>> John Stufflebean: Sure. Some things I will respond to, the levees have to be rebuilt to protect the plant. That has to happen. So when that's done, it does then provide protection for these lands, it's just the way the levees will be configured. So you are then providing some land that will be protected that could be developed. So that's kind of a piggyback benefit of the plant being there.

>> Councilmember Liccardo: Sure.

>> John Stufflebean: I will also add that we are doing a lot in this plant that has big benefits for the environment. We're developing new habitats. Instead of just a pond, it's just going to be just a terraced levee that's going to be much more valuable from the environmental perspective. Instead of drying beds, there's going to be some fresh water habitat. So there's a lot of things we're doing I think will be very beneficial. Also as we develop it I think there's a potential to develop it in a very environmentally safe way. So you can have this integrated well and have potential there, where there could be a green development possibility so we certainly would like to see that as well. But really, it does come down to San José's job poor, here's a piece of land that's available and I probably should let Nancy continue from there if you'd like to.

>> I would like the opportunity, thank you. It's critically important for the job base. If we want any -- if you could have tons of parents stand up that they want their kids to be able to live in the area. If we don't have the job base we won't be able to do that. And in terms of the ongoing financial difficulties, we think the report is appropriately very conservative about the amount of money that will come back to the city and when you're talking about balance overall for opportunities for great recreational and environmental impacts that are positive that will be there and to have that much land and not let an appropriate amount which is really when you look the it much smaller the economic development portion originally was closer to 600 acres that in that sense of balance to not

take advantage of doing something which can be landmark, positive in terms of how development as John was referencing but to limited what is our probably best economic development site because it is closer to the peninsula, closer to where people will continue to located first in Santa Clara or Sunnyvale and make those connections first before they come further down into San José, it's very difficult for us to not capitalize to some extent in a very positive, responsible way but that leads to jobs and revenue as well.

>> Councilmember Liccardo: Okay. Thank you. I know Councilmember Campos has stated he needed to go in the next -- I understand that but I'm worried about losing -- Councilmember Campos please I'm sorry.

>> Councilmember Campos: Go ahead.

>> Councilmember Herrera: I appreciate, the point Nancy just made about economic development. I think it's -- I think we can't let an opportunity go by like this. And I really appreciate the fact that this report is very balanced. You know, it's really tough, we're dealing with environmental issues, we're dealing with the need for recreation. We are taking a portion of it and looking at economic development. But I'm really impressed with what we're doing in here to extend -- expand owl habitat, looking at the expanded salt marsh for the harvest mouse and all the things we're doing in terms of the environment that I think are really positive. I had a question, if you could put the slide up for economic development up there that you had. Probably more than one slide but a bunch of projects. So these are all the projects that would be on the 300 or 400 acres, I'm hearing different numbers here.

>> John Stufflebean: That's correct.

>> Councilmember Herrera: And this is where the 17,000 plus jobs would come from?

>> John Stufflebean: 300-plus roads -- 300 acres, plus the roads.

>> Councilmember Herrera: Plus the roads. And we're estimating about 17,000 jobs would come from this?

>> John Stufflebean: That's correct.

>> Councilmember Herrera: That's an incredible number of jobs. It seems the number a million, we're looking at a million a year from economic activity from this, besides the ten to 11 million in a ground lease, that seems really conservative in terms of the potential revenue.

>> John Stufflebean: That's just the portion of course that goes to San José itself. I guess the next slide talks about that. There, so yeah, I see about a million to San José, more to the county, quite a bit more to the school districts and then of course there's lease revenue as well. Yeah, as Nancy said, we totally agree this is conservative. There could be more, I guess we felt it was better to be conservative than --

>> Councilmember Herrera: I can understand that.

>> Quick note on that. There's no infrastructure, that's the challenge, you would see a lot more plus would strife at other cities arounds us have achieved in retaining the land not selling the land for the long term benefit so that the amount of money then as a long term ground lease that's why we're being so conservative.

>> Councilmember Herrera: There could be capital equipment put in, there could be taxes potentially from that we don't know what's going to develop what exactly would happen there. But I guess I'm concerned of when these jobs are going to happen. If we're.

>> Supervisor Shirakawa: Going to -- it's going to take 15, 20 years to reach a point where we think that that's really developable, is that when we're going to see the jobs then? We're going to wait 15 years?

>> Just a quick note it's very much looking at the economy. When this first was done we were in the heart of 2009 and the very, very dour economy. As we begin to pick up a little bit, there's a reason to expect that it could be a little brighter, but staff would want to be conservative and not oversell what could be produced and not oversell the time line.

>> Councilmember Herrera: Right but I guess if we have a potential of getting thousands of jobs here, I'd like to see that happen sooner rather than later. But if it's one thing we need in this city is jobs. I can tell you that, there is a lot of people out of work, I know out of work in any district and other places that are looking for work not only in jobs but jobs in new industries like clean tech. How to make a transition into other kinds of jobs and that's happening all over the country. I think it's very important that the economic development portion that we -- if there's a way to move this along more quickly that we do that, that I appreciate the fact that you had coming back in May a look at how we can achieve this sooner, I guess the dewatering portion I guess is what you're looking at.

>> John Stuffelbean: Yes.

>> Councilmember Herrera: In terms of alleviating the odors. One thing that does bother me about this though even once we achieve that, it seems like there's a lot of sources of odor that we don't control. That does concern me that, you know, I don't know if Milpitas and the other places that have the odors emanating from them are going to step up and do something, that might become the issue. We can't control the entire, we can control what we can control and I'd like to see us move forward on this. It is my understanding that there's -- we heard I think from the McCarthy folks that there's potential moving more quickly on this and there could be some opportunities to move more quickly. I think staff's in agreement that that's ultimately the end game here is get a dewatering process in place so that we can have solids and de-liquefy the process, right, that's where the odor's coming from, is that right?

>> John Stuffelbean: Right, you know, currently it's basically solar drying. You put the solids out and it is solar drying. So obviously it goes up into the air. The new process would be -- that would entirely be done, the drying would be done inside a centrifuge, inside some kind of a building, so then you wouldn't have a release to the atmosphere. In other words, that would reduce the odor.

>> Councilmember Herrera: And then are those solids, can they be used to go from waste to energy? Is that a possibility with that, too, so we would create some --

>> John Stufflebean: Yes, separate items are coming to council, there's some gasification proposals that we're looking at. Also there's a possibility of taking some of the biosolids -- we currently get waste energy the digesters generate, because you know, a third of the energy we produce at the plant is from the solids. But there's still some more solids that actually come out of the digesters. It is our processes to help us recover those and we would certainly be looking at those as well.

>> Councilmember Herrera: so that could be another process of those numbers?

>> John Stufflebean: Right, but it takes a fair amount of energy to get the water out mechanically, so you're kind of at a tradeoff.

>> Councilmember Herrera: I guess I'm just concerned that the dewatering part is at the tail end of the plan and I would like to have -- I know there's been a motion made here and wondering if when you come back we could consider moving one of the considerations we move this more to the front of the plant if there is a way we can move this more quickly. I know that there's -- you talked about trying to understand what the upstream portion is, in order to adequately plan for whichever technology should be put into place for the dewatering. But I'm also concerned about losing opportunity with the acreage and the businesses that are wanting to move forward. I'm very concerned about that especially if we can get jobs there and move this thing along more quickly. So is that something that is automatically going to be considered when you're looking at moving this more quickly, that you could potentially change the time frame of this to move it more forward in the plan, or would I need to get that added to the motion?

>> John Stufflebean: No we want to look at kind of the regional benefits of moving it more quickly. So we will include some, as best we can, if we were to move that more quickly, what would there be some benefit that would accrue to the region by doing that. Again, as I mentioned these numbers are there's a lot of assumptions that go into those kind of analysis.

>> Councilmember Herrera: Right.

>> John Stufflebean: But we can certainly look at that and see what rough idea could be had.

>> Councilmember Herrera: I think you need to do a cost analysis of yes what would be the benefits of moving this forward if we could move this forward more quickly could we get the economic development done more quickly and obviously your point is well taken that the technology is going to change and we need to understand what is coming in in terms of what we put to handle what's going to go out. So I would just like it to be very carefully considered and if possible if there are those benefits to move this process more to the front of the plan in the first two years.

>> John Stufflebean: So the sooner we can start the EIR process the better.

>> Councilmember Herrera: Okay. Thank you.

>> John Stufflebean: I also would like to mention in terms of timing that we're also scheduled for the Santa Clara city council meeting on the 19th so if we do move it out we would also have to work with them to move it out which we are willing to do, they're scheduled on the 12th.

>> Councilmember Liccardo: John is that feasible? I'm not clear on the motion in terms of timing of all the things you have to do.

>> John Stufflebean: If we delay it, there's a couple of implications on this. One is a lot of folks are ready for the 19th. That can be handled of course. It does affect the implementation, exactly why we want to start up. Three or four weeks later that we can start are the environmental review process. Our consultants are ready to go, there are seasonal aspects of odor. The sooner we can start that, the sooner we can get a full season in. There are other implication.

>> Councilmember Liccardo: After hearing that suggestion you want to modify your motion?

>> Councilmember Rocha: Maybe move it two weeks I'm comfortable continuing.

>> John Stufflebean: It's actually -- we can still go to TPAC this week, we have to bring this to TPAC don't we. This has to go through the TPAC advisory committee. They currently scheduled to meet the second week of May. We would have to wait until TPAC met and it would be a little longer delay than that.

>> Councilmember Rocha: You would still come to council in May, then?

>> John Stufflebean: It would have to be after the TPAC meeting. So it would be late May.

>> Councilmember Rocha: Okay.

>> Councilmember Liccardo: Okay, so the motion is? Don, if you could just repeat it, it was some time ago.

>> Councilmember Rocha: When staff returns to the council in May, to include the report as well.

>> Councilmember Liccardo: Okay, great, wonderful. And John, with regard to the suggestion about an interim land management plan, I think that was suggested by one of the speakers from the Audubon society, is that something that staff is likely to incorporate anyway, in terms of -- obviously this plan isn't going to develop economically anyway, it's going to be there for --

>> John Stufflebean: We do have concerns for interim uses that they tend to be impermanent so we do need to be cognizant of that.

>> Councilmember Liccardo: Okay, even if you call it an interim management plan.

>> John Stufflebean: Yes.

>> Councilmember Liccardo: Be happy to discuss it more offline, Councilmember Herrera.

>> Councilmember Herrera: I'm just a little bit confused. So the motion is to accept staff's recommendation and the time line is different than what you're asking for?

>> John Stufflebean: Yeah I mean we're currently going to TPAC this Thursday, they will hear this part this Thursday, the odor part they are not scheduled to hear yet. That speeding up the process will go to TPAC in the May meeting. If we delay everything until May, we would have to wait until after that -- we wouldn't be able to do the EIR part until the odor part is heard by TPAC which is somewhere in mid to late May. Which we can do that. We can schedule the council meeting in late May. We can do that, it's just a month delay on everything. Just wanted you to know the things you're trying to speed up this is adding a month to the schedule.

>> Councilmember Herrera: Can you tell me of what was your understanding ever staff's preference in these meets, in the timing of this as opposed to this motion?

>> John Stufflebean: Our preference is to stay with the schedule that we've put forward which would be coming back on April 19th.

>> Councilmember Herrera: Coming back on April 19th. And I'd prefer that too.

>> Councilmember Liccardo: Let me suggest, maker of the motion open to modification, friendly amendment to stick with the current schedule?

>> Councilmember Rocha: Let me repeat the purpose of accepting the report and having council accept this report with the direction and the time line without having the information on the elimination of odors, the evaluate the timing the cost the delivery options all the financing mechanisms, I would rather have all that, when we accept

that report of council. Because I'm assuming that we accept this report, we're not going to see it again for how long? I mean when would you return to the council on any of this? Outside of the financing.

>> John Stufflebean: It could be many months ahead. I guess I would just add that what you're doing in May will not really have any impact on what you're acting on in April. It's just how to implement it more quickly, how to finance it. I can't imagine there being anything you'd want to change based on what you know in May, on the plan you're looking at in April.

>> Councilmember Rocha: Except if council wanted to decide we wanted to move quicker --

>> John Stufflebean: The plan doesn't talk about how quickly we move, just what we do. The schedule is still totally open. You can make the decision on scheduling in May to move it quickly. That could still be consistent when away you need to do in April.

>> Councilmember Rocha: The scope of the EIR we can still add that in, in May and that won't affect --

>> John Stufflebean: The EIR will not talk about scheduling, just what we do and change.

>> Councilmember Rocha: But it will talk about what you want to do in the five year.

>> John Stufflebean: No it just talks about what gets done in the plan.

>> Councilmember Rocha: Okay then I'm comfortable with what staff suggested.

>> Councilmember Liccardo: Seconder agreeable with that? All in favor, opposed, that passes unanimously. Thank you. We now have time I believe for public comment. David Wall.

>> David Wall: This was interesting meeting today. At TPAC on Thursday item D will basically have to be deferred until May, which is everything you've talked about today. Which is an indicator, ladies and gentlemen, of why it is so important that you have the treatment plan advisory committee agenda and everything contained therein produced to you every month so you have an idea. Water pollution control is not kid stuff. It is advanced public service. You can't learn it overnight by making a decision on whether to build some idiotic retail facility out there. What you should concern yourselves, with great alarming, is there's nothing in here about an earthquake that happens at the plant. And all that development that's been allowed to go on out there, and what will happen when there is a standing wave of raw sewage that is taller than me. The hover craft project in itself is a joke. But that is not to be discussed further. What is to be discussed is, emergency planning, number 1, point number 2, from lawyer point of view, the water pollution control plant's permit for mercury discharge is one item. You start playing around with dredging, that project alone will kick up all sorts of other contaminants. Now, will the water pollution control plant because of its discharge permits be constricted from further discharge of those identified pollutants with reference to what the dredging operation will cost? You see, there's a lot of sticky business with what's going on out there. And it's evident to me because of my advance knowledge of that operation, it's serious questioning has to be done and it's should be done like I saw today and I was very much pleased, with the types of questioning, but the necessity for everybody from this treatment planned advisory committee come before the transportation and environment committee prior to going to council instead of just -- this TPAC just going right to council because it's too complex for anybody. Thank you.

>> Councilmember Liccardo: Thank you. Okay. This meeting's adjourned.