



SAN FRANCISQUITO CREEK
JOINT POWERS AUTHORITY
SFCJPA.ORG

**Notice of Regular Meeting of the
BOARD OF DIRECTORS
City of Menlo Park Council Chambers
701 Laurel Street, Menlo Park, California
July 23, 2015 at 4:00 p.m.**

AGENDA

- 1) ROLL CALL
- 2) APPROVAL OF AGENDA
- 3) APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES – June 25, 2015 Board meeting
- 4) PUBLIC COMMENT – *Individuals may speak on any topic for up to three minutes; during any other Agenda item, individuals may speak for up to three minutes on the subject of that item.*
- 5) REGULAR BUSINESS – EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT
 - a) S.F. Bay-Highway 101 project construction planning
 - b) Potential actions prior to December 2015 to provide temporary flood protection along the Creek
 - c) Board consideration of the SFCJPA response to the San Mateo County Civil Grand Jury Report "Flooding Ahead: Planning for Sea Level Rise" released on June 4, 2015
- 6) BOARD MEMBER MATTERS - *Non-agendized comments, requests, or announcements by Board members; no action may be taken.*
- 7) ADJOURNMENT

PLEASE NOTE: This Board meeting Agenda can be viewed online by 4:00 p.m. on July 20, 2015 at sfcjpa.org -- click on the "Meetings" tab near the top. Supporting documents related to the Agenda items listed above will be available at the same online location by 10:00 a.m. on July 22, 2015.

NEXT MEETINGS: Regular Board meeting, September 24, 2015 at 4:00 p.m., Palo Alto City Council Chambers. Meetings of the Board's Finance Committee, Emergency Preparedness Committee, and Personnel Committee are expected prior to September 24, and each will be announced on sfcjpa.org as the meeting date is determined.

San Francisquito Creek Joint Powers Authority
July 23, 2015 Regular Board Meeting
Agenda Item 3
June 25, 2015 Regular Board Meeting Minutes

Director Pine called the meeting to order at 4:05 p.m. at the City of Palo Alto City Council Chambers, Palo Alto, CA.

DRAFT

1) ROLL CALL

Members Present: Director Keith, City of Menlo Park (not present)
Director Abrica, City of East Palo Alto
Director Burt, City of Palo Alto
Director Kremen, Santa Clara Valley Water District
Director Pine, San Mateo County Flood Control District

JPA Staff Present: Len Materman, Executive Director
Kevin Murray, Staff
Miyko Harris-Parker, Staff

Legal Present: Greg Stepanicich

Others Present: Trish Mulvey, Palo Alto resident; Dennis Parker, East Palo Alto resident; Jerry Hearn, Portola Valley resident; Tom Zigterman, Stanford; Jean McCown, Stanford; Joe Teresi, City of Palo Alto; Kamal Fallaha, City of East Palo Alto; Saied Hosseini, Santa Clara Valley Water District (SCVWD); Ann Stillman, San Mateo County Flood Control District (SMCFCD); Eileen McLaughlin, Citizens Committee to Complete the Refuge (CCCR)

2) APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Director Burt made a motion to approve the agenda. Director Kremen seconded. Agenda approved 4-0. Director Keith not present.

3) APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES – May 28, 2015

Director Abrica made a motion to approve the May 28, 2015 meeting minutes. Director Burt seconded. May 28, 2015 meeting minutes approved 4-0. Director Keith not present.

4) PUBLIC COMMENT

Trish Mulvey, Palo Alto resident, spoke about her involvement with the City of Palo Alto regarding public art, and the potential to work with the SFCJPA and its member agencies on its projects. Additionally, Mrs. Mulvey requested staff help dealing with the issue of newly restricted public access to the creek due to the fact that the existing easement allows access for agency maintenance work but is not transferrable volunteers.

5) REGULAR BUSINESS

Presentation by Stanford University regarding the Searsville Alternatives Study on the future of Searsville Dam and Reservoir

Mr. Materman introduced Tom Zigterman and Jean McCown of Stanford who together described the results of the Searsville Alternatives Study on the future of Searsville Dam and Reservoir, including the preferred project and an alternative project undergoing further exploration.

Mr. Materman asked for clarification regarding new information in the presentation that listed the amount of creek flow (in cubic feet per second or cfs) that would be detained by the two alternative projects. Referring to an analysis by the SCVWD, Materman described how Searsville currently provides a flood protection or attenuation benefit.

San Francisquito Creek Joint Powers Authority
July 23, 2015 Regular Board Meeting
Agenda Item 3
June 25, 2015 Regular Board Meeting Minutes

Ms. McCown requested a copy of the report and Mr. Zigterman commented on the importance of working together to ensure the success of the projects. Director Abrica asked when the SCVWD analysis would be available. Mr. Murray commented that the report is expected to be ready in several weeks.

Director Kremen asked how Stanford intends to pay for the proposed project. Mr. Zigterman responded saying that Stanford is currently looking into grant funds and that Stanford is looking at how to collaborate with agencies to see what agencies may take on different aspects of the project.

Jerry Hearn, Portola Valley resident, thanked everyone who participated in this process and commented that he is pleased that the alternative that Stanford recommended provides an opportunity to assess its success before proceeding with something that cannot be undone.

Director Burt noted that there are still open questions as to whether the new numbers presented by Stanford reflect added attenuation and how the newer SCVWD modeling may have influence the SFCJPA's 100-year project.

Director Kremen asked for verification that the Division of Dam Safety would be reviewing the Searsville project. Mr. Zigterman responded saying that the Department of Water Resources Division of Safety of Dams inspects the dam regularly and that they would review the project.

S.F. Bay-Highway 101 project construction planning

Mr. Materman and Mr. Murray provided updates on the S.F. Bay-Highway 101 project.

Regarding the removal of abandoned PG&E gas pipelines under the creek, Director Burt asked if we know whether or not the two pipes had been placed at the same elevation, and if they had the same likeliness to affect streamflow. Mr. Murray responded saying that the two lines are at the same elevation.

Director Burt mentioned that when he read the recent letter from the Regional Water Quality Control Board, he was hopeful, as it seems that they are only requiring removal of the line that had been previously abandoned, not both lines. Mr. Materman explained that we have spelled out in all of our correspondence that there are two pipelines, seeking clarification on if we are expected to remove just the line that we are causing to be abandoned as the Certification states, or both the line to be abandoned and the line that was abandoned back in 1959. Greg Stepanicich, SFCJPA general counsel, stated that we have made many efforts to restate our question to gain clarity on what exactly the Certification and the RWQCB requires regarding the two pipelines, but even within the most recent letter from RWQCB there is some ambiguity. Director Kremen suggested sending a letter to RWQCB saying thank you for confirming that the Project shall remove one gas pipeline, the one to be abandoned by the project as stated in the Certification.

Resolution 15.6.25 of the Board Directors adopting the 2013 Bay Area Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) Plan to enable the SFCJPA to obtain an IRWM grant from the California Department of Water Resources

Mr. Materman asked the Board to approve Resolution 15.6.25 of the Board Directors adopting the 2013 Bay Area Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) Plan to enable the SFCJPA to obtain an IRWM grant from the California Department of Water Resources.

Director Kremen motioned to approve Resolution 15.6.25 of the Board Directors adopting the 2013 Bay Area Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) Plan to enable the SFCJPA to obtain an IRWM grant from the California Department of Water Resources.

San Francisquito Creek Joint Powers Authority
July 23, 2015 Regular Board Meeting
Agenda Item 3
June 25, 2015 Regular Board Meeting Minutes

Director Burt seconded. Motion to approve Resolution 15.6.25 of the Board Directors adopting the 2013 Bay Area Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) Plan to enable the SFCJPA to obtain an IRWM grant from the California Department of Water Resources approved unanimously 4-0. Director Keith not present.

Caltrans' San Francisquito Creek Highway 101 Bridge Replacement Project update

Mr. Materman provided a summary and update on the Caltrans' San Francisquito Creek Highway 101 Bridge Replacement project.

Director Burt left at 5:50 pm.

Kamal Fallaha, City Engineer of the City of East Palo Alto, shared with the Board the concerns held by the City of East Palo Alto regarding the traffic congestion and access restriction into and out of East Palo Alto. Mr. Fallaha told the Board that he contacted Caltrans regarding this issue and as a result a meeting is being held on Friday, June 26, to discuss changes to the project staging.

Director Abrica noted that the City of East Palo Alto Council is very concerned about the traffic effects of this project and he thanked Mr. Fallaha and his fellow staff members for their work on this issue.

Director Pine asked for clarification on the duration of project. Mr. Teresi explained that the project will be ongoing and impact traffic to varying degrees for three years.

Mrs. Mulvey thanked all of the staff members who have been working on this project. Mrs. Muvley requested that staff look into having the Caltrans alert sign on East Bayshore Road moved closer to the post office.

6) BOARD MEMBER MATTERS

Director Kremen noted that the SCVWD Board approved its FY2015-16 annual budget, including the SCVWD annual member agency contribution to the SFCJPA. The other directors present then mentioned that their agencies had also recently approved their annual contribution.

7) ADJOURNMENT

Director Pine adjourned the meeting at 6:02 pm.

Minutes Prepared by Clerk of the Board: Miyko Harris-Parker.

San Francisquito Creek Joint Powers Authority
July 23, 2015 Board Meeting
Agenda Item 5
Executive Director's Report

With the help of Kevin Murray and Miyko Harris-Parker, I am pleased to submit the following:

a. S.F. Bay-Highway 101 project construction planning

At SFCJPA Board meetings for the past two years, we have discussed our efforts to prepare for construction, including the relocation of utilities, in order to improve public safety and increase marsh habitat in the Creek between S.F. Bay and Highway 101. Below is a summary of construction planning activities since the last Board meeting.

Permitting

Over the past year our efforts to secure regulatory permits for the Project have been disproportionately dominated by the Regional Water Quality Control Board's permit, known as the Water Quality Certification. At the June 25, 2015 SFCJPA Board meeting, I provided an update on our efforts to revise items in the April 7, 2014 Certification for the project. With the exception of seeking clarity regarding which PG&E pipeline under the creek – the one impacted by our project or the one abandoned by PG&E 56 years ago – the Certification requires us to remove, in recent weeks we have focused on the Army Corps of Engineers permit known as a 404 permit after that section of the Clean Water Act. Because of the presence of endangered species, Biological Opinions from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) are required for the Corps to issue its permit.

For the Corps permit, we provided requested materials to the USFWS and NMFS in late May of this year. One of the requested items required the SCVWD to engage a consultant to design additional project features which will serve as requested mitigation for impacts of project construction in the Faber Marsh adjacent to the creek, work that is now underway. SFCJPA and SCVWD staff met and spoke by phone with USFWS and NMFS to discuss the materials and to seek re-initiation of the 135-day period allotted to these federal agencies to provide to the Corps their respective Biological Opinions for the project.

Recently, the NMFS and USFWS requested new materials or responses to questions, and last week SFCJPA staff initiated by-weekly calls with the Corps, NMFS, USFWS, and SCVWD to ensure that this process moves forward in a timely way. Over the next month, the top priorities of SFCJPA staff will be to review materials that advance the writing of the Biological Opinions and to encourage Corps staff to advance specific Corps tasks while the Biological Opinions are being prepared by the USFWS and NMFS.

Land/Easement Acquisition

On the Palo Alto side of the creek, the SCVWD is working to secure necessary land and easements, and their staff can provide an update at the SFCJPA Board meeting. On the East Palo Alto side of the creek, the SFCJPA has led the effort to secure the necessary easements to construct the project. Last month, I informed the Board that the American Self Storage property along the creek on East Bayshore Road in East Palo Alto was sold to Public Storage. Since then, SFCJPA and Public Storage staff have met to discuss our proposal regarding the required easement on that property. Public Storage has expressed its willingness to agree to the terms previously arranged with American Self Storage. This will save us the time and effort of re-negotiating an easement arrangement with the new owner, but still requires us to update the draft easement agreement to reflect the new ownership and other incidental changes. San Mateo County Real Property staff is working on those changes. At this Board meeting, we will provide an update regarding this or other properties requiring easements for the project.

b. Potential actions prior to December 2015 to provide temporary flood protection along the Creek

Given that regulatory agency permits for the S.F. Bay-Highway 101 project have delayed the implementation of that project and our ability to complete the design and EIR of flood protection projects further upstream, coupled with the fact that scientists are now predicting a strong El Nino event this winter, much of my time over the past month and the next three months will focus on:

San Francisquito Creek Joint Powers Authority
July 23, 2015 Board Meeting
Agenda Item 5
Executive Director's Report

- completing the Flood Early Warning System website for the public and emergency responders, and
- actions we can take now to provide temporary flood protection in advance of major storms this winter.

Regarding the Flood Early Warning System website, we have been working with a consultant to identify the necessary scope to complete the project. This week, the City of Palo Alto hired this consultant, whose work will be reviewed by the SFCJPA Board Emergency Preparedness Committee, emergency response professionals from the cities, fire district, and SCVWD, and it will be shown to the SFCJPA Board at its next meeting on September 24 in Palo Alto.

We are also working to quickly understand the benefits and impacts of potential actions between now and Thanksgiving that could provide temporary flood protection to residents and businesses in East Palo Alto, Palo Alto, and Menlo Park. I define temporary as lasting at a minimum this winter season and a maximum until we construct the major capital projects between the Bay and the Pope-Chaucer Bridge. During this Board meeting, we'll discuss these potential actions we and staff from our member agencies are examining.

c. Board consideration of the SFCJPA response to the San Mateo County Civil Grand Jury Report "Flooding Ahead: Planning for Sea Level Rise" released on June 4, 2015

Following over eight months of work, on June 4, 2015 the San Mateo County Civil Grand Jury issued a report (enclosed) entitled "Flooding Ahead: Planning for Sea Level Rise" to answer the question: what actions can San Mateo County, and the 20 cities and two relevant local special agencies within the county, take now to plan for sea level rise? This report discusses vulnerability within the County, existing flood protection agencies, and specific findings and recommendations regarding how best to move forward to address these vulnerabilities. One of the two "relevant local special agencies" mentioned in the report is the SFCJPA, and we are asked to formally respond to the findings and recommendations within the report. Generally speaking, the recommendations that we are asked to respond to seek increased public education about Sea Level Rise (SLR), the identification of a single organization to undertake SLR planning, and that local governments champion SLR issues before regional, State, and federal governments. At this Board meeting, I will summarize the key findings and recommendations and ask the Board to vote to authorize me to send the enclosed draft response to the Superior Court.

Proposed Board Action: Authorize the Executive Director to send the enclosed draft SFCJPA response to the San Mateo County Civil Grand Jury Report "Flooding Ahead: Planning for Sea Level Rise" released on June 4, 2015.

Submitted by:



Len Materman
Executive Director



Superior Court of California, County of San Mateo

Hall of Justice and Records
400 County Center
Redwood City, CA 94063-1655

JOHN C. FITTON
COURT EXECUTIVE OFFICER
CLERK & JURY COMMISSIONER

(650) 261-5066
FAX (650) 261-5147
www.sanmateocourt.org

June 4, 2015

Board of Directors
San Francisquito Creek Joint Powers Authority
615 B Menlo Avenue
Menlo Park, CA 94025

Re: Grand Jury Report: "Flooding Ahead: Planning for Sea Level Rise"

Dear Board Members:

The 2014-2015 Grand Jury filed a report on June 4, 2015 which contains findings and recommendations pertaining to your agency. Your agency must submit comments, within 90 days, to the Hon. Susan I. Etezadi. Your agency's response is due no later than September 3, 2015. **Please note that the response should indicate that it was approved by your governing body at a public meeting.**

For all findings, your responding agency shall indicate one of the following:

1. The respondent agrees with the finding.
2. The respondent disagrees wholly or partially with the finding, in which case the response shall specify the portion of the finding that is disputed and shall include an explanation of the reasons therefore.

Additionally, as to each Grand Jury recommendation, your responding agency shall report one of the following actions:

1. The recommendation has been implemented, with a summary regarding the implemented action.
2. The recommendation has not yet been implemented, but will be implemented in the future, with a time frame for implementation.
3. The recommendation requires further analysis, with an explanation and the scope and parameters of an analysis or study, and a time frame for the matter to be prepared for discussion by the officer or director of the agency or department being investigated or reviewed, including the governing body of the public agency when applicable. This time frame shall not exceed six months from the date of publication of the Grand Jury report.
4. The recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted or reasonable, with an explanation therefore.

Please submit your responses in all of the following ways:

1. Responses to be placed on file with the Clerk of the Court by the Court Executive Office.
 - Prepare original on your agency's letterhead, indicate the date of the public meeting that your governing body approved the response address and mail to Judge Etezadi.

Hon. Susan I. Etezadi
Judge of the Superior Court
c/o Charlene Kresevich
Hall of Justice
400 County Center; 2nd Floor
Redwood City, CA 94063-1655.

2. Responses to be placed at the Grand Jury website.
 - Copy response and send by e-mail to: grandjury@sanmateocourt.org. (Insert agency name if it is not indicated at the top of your response.)
3. Responses to be placed with the clerk of your agency.
 - File a copy of the response directly with the clerk of your agency. Do not send this copy to the Court.

For up to 45 days after the end of the term, the foreperson and the foreperson's designees are available to clarify the recommendations of the report. To reach the foreperson, please call the Grand Jury Clerk at (650) 261-5066.

If you have any questions regarding these procedures, please do not hesitate to contact Paul Okada, Chief Deputy County Counsel, at (650) 363-4761.

Very truly yours,



John C. Fitton
Court Executive Officer

JCF:ck
Enclosure

cc: Hon. Susan I. Etezadi
Paul Okada

✓ Information Copy: Executive Director



FLOODING AHEAD: PLANNING FOR SEA LEVEL RISE

[Issue](#) | [Summary](#) | [Glossary](#) | [Background](#) | [Methodology](#) | [Discussion](#) | [Findings](#)
[Recommendations](#) | [Requests for Responses](#) | [Bibliography](#) | [Appendix](#) | [Responses](#) | [Correction](#)

ISSUE

What actions can the County of San Mateo, and the 20 cities and two relevant local special agencies within the county, take now to plan for sea level rise?

SUMMARY

San Mateo County is at severe risk for sea level rise (SLR) over the period 2015-2100. The County, and the 20 cities and two relevant local special agencies within the county,¹ do not have a coordinated approach to address *existing* problems related to flooding and are not prepared for the added challenge of SLR. This investigation documents the countywide risk that SLR poses to people, property, and critical infrastructure. For example, wastewater treatment plants are highly vulnerable to SLR and this vulnerability presents significant problems for all cities, not just those along the coast and bay.

This Grand Jury report discusses ways to get organized to plan for SLR, as well as alternative sources of funding for SLR-related projects. Based on this investigation, the Grand Jury recommends that a single organization undertake SLR planning on a countywide basis. This report also examines ways to address SLR as part of local land use planning and recommends including SLR-related policies in local General Plans. It also recommends implementation of a coordinated program to raise public awareness of SLR, particularly as to how it may impact this county. Finally, the report highlights the need for effective and coordinated advocacy at the regional, State, and federal levels.

The Grand Jury strongly urges action *now* to undertake countywide planning for SLR. By acting now, SMC may be able to reduce future costs by integrating SLR-related projects with other programmed levee projects, such as those that may be triggered by new FEMA flood hazard maps. By acting now, San Mateo County jurisdictions may apply land use planning measures to mitigate future exposure to SLR. Finally, by acting now to address SLR, San Mateo County can also address the lack of coordination among jurisdictions that is evident in existing flood prevention efforts. Notably, this lack of coordination places the county at a severe disadvantage when applying for federal or State monies for flood protection.

GLOSSARY

County of San Mateo or **County**: County government under the Board of Supervisors

San Mateo County or **SMC**, or **county**: the geographic entity. Local governments and residents collectively.

¹ The two relevant special agencies with responsibilities for flood prevention are the County Flood Control District and the San Francisquito Creek Joint Powers Authority.

Levees: includes levees, horizontal levees, walls, dikes, and similar structures designed to prevent flooding along the coast, bay shoreline, and along creeks subject to tidal flows

Local officials: elected and appointed officials and staff of the County, cities, and special agencies within the county, interviewed by the jury

CEQA: California Environmental Quality Act. A law governing the environmental review process, including the preparation of environmental impact reports, to be used by local governments when considering proposed new developments.

JPA: Joint Powers Authority. A separate government agency created by its member agencies (such as cities and counties), typically with officials from the member agencies on its governing board. JPAs are formed for specific purposes and to exercise powers commonly held by the member agencies. For example, two or more cities may form a JPA to manage a common government function, such as fire protection for their jurisdictions, where it is more cost-effective to act together than separately.

Specific Agencies

BCDC: San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission. A State agency with permit authority over new development along the San Francisco Bay shoreline. BCDC requires an SLR risk assessment for any new development within its jurisdiction. It published the report *Living with a Rising Bay: Vulnerability and Adaptation in San Francisco Bay and on Its Shoreline* (2011).

C/CAG: City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County. A JPA formed by the County of San Mateo and all 20 cities within the county for various purposes including, for example, oversight of a regional transportation Congestion Management Program.

CCC: California Coastal Commission. A State agency with permit authority over new development along the coast. CCC requires an SLR risk assessment for new development within its jurisdiction.

CEC: California Energy Commission. A State agency responsible for energy policy and planning, including research. It published the reports *The Impacts of Sea Level Rise on the San Francisco Bay* (2012) and *Climate Change Scenarios and Sea Level Rise Estimates for California* (2009).

CO-CAT: Coastal and Ocean Working Group of the California Climate Action Team. A working group of senior staff from 17 State agencies with ocean and coastal resource management responsibilities. It issued the *State of California Sea-Level Rise Guidance Document* (2013) for use by State agencies as part of their assessments and decisions.

FEMA: Federal Emergency Management Administration. A federal agency whose responsibilities include preparing Flood Insurance Rate Maps that depict areas subject to

inundation by a “100-year storm.”² At present, FEMA does not map flood hazards based on anticipated future sea levels.

NRC: National Research Council. An operating arm of the National Academy of Sciences and the National Academy of Engineering, a private nonprofit institution. It published the report *Sea Level Rise for the Coasts of California, Oregon and Washington: Past, Present and Future* (2012).

SCC: State Coastal Conservancy. A State agency that purchases, protects, restores, and enhances coastal resources. Currently supports preparation of local coastal plans and vulnerability assessments in San Mateo County that address SLR.

BACKGROUND

San Mateo County (SMC) residents are at severe risk for flooding due to projected sea level rise (SLR) over the period 2015-2100. In fact, SLR is already occurring. Measurements at the San Francisco Tide Station at the Golden Gate show eight inches of SLR between 1897 and 2006, consistent with figures from around the world.³

The precise amount and rate of SLR are unknown, but State agencies have consistently advised that seas are rising at “accelerating rates,” and project SLR ranging up to 65 inches (167 centimeters) by the year 2100.⁴ One scientist advised SMC officials of the possibility of even greater SLR, nearly 15 feet, during this century.⁵

² A “100-year-storm” is used to define a rainfall event that statistically has a one percent chance of occurring in any given year. However, it is not the storm that will occur once every 100 years. Rather, it is the rainfall totals that have a one percent chance of being equaled or exceeded each year.

³ Matthew Heberger et al. (Pacific Institute) 2012, *The Impacts of Sea Level Rise on the San Francisco Bay*, California Energy Commission (CEC) Publication No. CEC-500-2012-014, pp. 2-3; and San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC), *Living with a Rising Bay: Vulnerability and Adaptation in San Francisco Bay and on Its Shoreline*, Staff Report, October 6, 2011, p. 18.

⁴ In 2008, Governor Schwarzenegger issued an executive order requiring State agencies to prepare SLR scenarios for the years 2050 and 2100 to “assess project vulnerability, reduce expected risks, and increase resilience to sea level rise.” In response, the Coastal and Ocean Working Group of the California Climate Action Team (CO-CAT), representing 17 State agencies, proposed interim SLR projections for the year 2100 ranging from 31 to 69 inches, grouped into “low,” “medium,” and “high” models (based on a 2009 CEC study). For some planning purposes, agencies such as BCDC focused on 55 inches of SLR, the average projection in the “high” model. However, CO-CAT urged agencies to “select SLR values based on agency and context-specific considerations of risk tolerance and adaptive capacity.” (See BCDC, *Living with a Rising Bay*, pp. 9, 20-22.) In 2012, the National Research Council (NRC) issued a report *Sea Level Rise for the Coasts of California, Oregon and Washington: Past, Present and Future*. The report projects SLR ranging from about 16 inches to 65 inches (42 to 167 centimeters) by the year 2100. The NRC report was commissioned by California, Oregon, and Washington State agencies, by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, and the U.S. Geological Survey. CO-CAT now considers the NRC report to be the “best available science” on SLR for this state, but allows State agencies to use the projections “in a flexible manner” in their assessments or decisions. (See CO-CAT, *Sea-Level Rise Guidance Document*, March 2013, p. 1, and California Coastal Commission (CCC), *Draft Sea Level Rise Policy Guidance*, October 14, 2013, p. 4.)

⁵ John Englander, Conference Speech at Jackie Speier, Rich Gordon, and Dave Pine, “Meeting the Challenge of Sea Level Rise in San Mateo County,” December 9, 2013, College of San Mateo Theatre, San Mateo, CA.

Scientists have identified the major sources of SLR: an increase in water temperature causing expansion of the oceans, plus the addition of water from melting glaciers.⁶ Based on scientific studies, State agencies warn that additional SLR is now *inevitable*.⁷

Most discussions of SLR focus on the cause (climate change) and means of prevention (such as reducing carbon emissions). This Grand Jury report is not about preventing SLR, but rather about *adaptation* to SLR. Adaptation includes measures such as constructing or modifying levees, elevating structures, restoring wetlands, or abandoning low-lying areas.

This report addresses SLR that is projected to gradually increase through the year 2100. Although this may seem to stretch far into the future, it is within the lifespan of younger residents and the useful life of many existing buildings and infrastructure. Substantial areas of the county are *already* within existing FEMA flood insurance rate maps. Unless better protected, these areas could feel the first impact of SLR at any time.

Over the last 20 years, there have been incidents of severe flooding in SMC. In December 2014, low-lying basins and levee over-topping were contributing factors when a moderate “five-year”⁸ storm left hundreds of residents homeless.⁹ If the County, cities, and two relevant local special agencies are struggling to address *existing* flood conditions, how will they handle worse conditions in the future?¹⁰

METHODOLOGY

Documents

See Bibliography for a detailed list:

- Federal, State, and regional agency reports
- Consultant studies prepared for government agencies

⁶ The risk is not just SLR alone, that is, a slow rise in sea level until one day the levees are topped. For one thing, SLR can undermine the integrity of existing levees. Even more, the risk lies in the *combination* of SLR, plus the yearly high tides (“king” tides), plus a 100-year storm that causes a storm surge and wave action in the Bay, plus heavy rainwater runoff in creeks. Other factors that influence the risk of flooding due to SLR include changes in land elevation due to earthquakes, and the subsidence, or sinking, of land such as that caused by excess pumping of groundwater. See BCDC, *Living with a Rising Bay*, p. 4; and see Schaaf & Wheeler, Consulting Civil Engineers, *Climate Change Impacts for San Mateo, California*, February 2, 2009, pp. 4-10 (report commissioned by the City of San Mateo).

⁷ “Perhaps the most notable finding from the IPCC is that the effect of GHG emissions will continue long after emissions are reduced. The IPCC projects that global temperature will continue rising for a few centuries before stabilizing. Sea level rise from thermal expansion will continue for centuries to millennia. Sea level rise from ice-sheet melting will continue for several millennia.” BCDC, *Living with a Rising Bay*, p. 9.

⁸ A five-year storm statistically is a storm whose magnitude has a 20% chance of occurrence each year.

⁹ Angela Swartz, “Cleanup Begins: Some Still Can’t Return to Homes Damaged from Storm, CSM Shelter Available,” *San Mateo Daily Journal*, December 16, 2014; a 45-year flood in 1998 that damaged about 1,700 properties was a factor that led to the creation of the San Francisquito Creek JPA. See <http://sfcjpa.org/web/about/agency-overview/>.

¹⁰ The two relevant local special agencies with responsibilities for flood prevention are the San Mateo County Flood Control District and the San Francisquito Creek Joint Powers Authority.

- Information from government websites
- City and county planning documents
- Newspaper articles
- Videos of two conferences on SLR held in San Mateo County

Site Tours

Silicon Valley Clean Water wastewater treatment plant (Redwood Shores)

Interviews

In conducting this investigation, the jury interviewed 14 individuals including two elected officials; four city managers or assistant city managers; four executive directors, general managers, or assistant general managers of three joint powers authorities; and four County of San Mateo appointed officials.

DISCUSSION

San Mateo County's Exposure to Sea Level Rise

As noted earlier, State agencies project SLR within a range of up to 65 inches by 2100. A 2012 report, prepared by the Pacific Institute for the California Energy Commission (CEC), documents the potential impacts on areas around San Francisco Bay of sea level rise of 16 inches by 2050 and 55 inches by 2100.¹¹

The results of the CEC study are startling. Of all the counties in California, SMC is by far the most exposed to SLR, in terms of both the residents and economic value at risk. Assuming 55 inches of SLR, the replacement value of buildings and contents at risk of flooding along the bay is estimated to exceed \$23 billion, while that along the coast is valued at \$910 million (land value is not included in these figures).¹² This is about one-quarter of the statewide total and nearly 40% of the Bay Area total. The dollar figure only hints at the threat to the people and structures within SMC due to SLR:

- 120,000 residents at risk of losing their homes to flooding (also nearly one-quarter of the statewide and 40 percent of the Bay Area totals)¹³
- 110,000 employees at job locations at risk

¹¹ Heberger et al., *The Impacts of Sea Level Rise*, pp. 6-21. As noted in the discussion in footnote 4 of this Grand Jury report, 55 inches is the average of "high" model projections. Thus, it represents a close-to-worst-case scenario (excluding catastrophic SLR discussed elsewhere in this report).

¹² SCC, "San Mateo County Shoreline Vulnerability Assessment," Staff Recommendation, January 29, 2015, p. 2. Valuation of coastal property at risk was not included in the Heberger et al. report but was provided by the Pacific Institute.

¹³ Pacific Institute, "Thematic Maps." <http://www.pacinst.org/publications/sea-level-rise-thematic-maps/>. Based upon 2010 U.S. Census data, the website updates the 110,000 population figure for SMC that was included in Heberger et al.

- 6 wastewater treatment plants at risk
- 1 power plant at risk
- 72 miles of highways at risk
- 420 miles of roads at risk
- 10 miles of railroads at risk
- 78 EPA-regulated hazardous material sites at risk
- 75% of existing wetlands at risk of being “unviable”

The Grand Jury reviewed SLR flood maps prepared by the Pacific Institute, which show the impact of 55 inches of SLR.¹⁴ These maps are included in the Appendix. All of Foster City and substantial areas of Redwood City and San Mateo could be inundated. Serious flooding could also occur in East Palo Alto, Menlo Park, San Carlos, Belmont, Burlingame, Millbrae, San Bruno, and South San Francisco.

The 55-inch SLR flood zone covers important commercial centers including part of South San Francisco’s biotech industrial area, the hotels along Burlingame’s shoreline, numerous shopping areas, business parks, and recreational spaces. Within this floodplain are the headquarters of Visa International in Foster City, Franklin Templeton Investments in San Mateo, Oracle in Redwood Shores, and Facebook in Menlo Park.

Fifty-five inches of SLR waters would flood San Francisco International Airport and the County’s Half Moon Bay and San Carlos Airports. Other County facilities at risk include the new jail under construction and the Government Center, both in Redwood City. The Caltrain line in San Mateo, Burlingame, and Millbrae is threatened. The Port of Redwood City and marinas operated by the County Harbor District at Pillar Point on the coast and at Oyster Point in South San Francisco could be flooded.

The new Kaiser Foundation hospital in Redwood City, the Kaiser Foundation medical office building in San Mateo, the new Palo Alto Medical Foundation medical office building in San Carlos, and the Stanford Health Care medical office buildings in Redwood City are all within the 55-inch SLR flood zone.

On the coast, parts of Half Moon Bay and Pescadero could be flooded. In Pacifica, the potential for SLR has “very serious implications . . . areas of the Sharp Park Golf Course, the Rockaway Beach district, and the West Linda Mar and West Sharp Park neighborhoods could be inundated.”¹⁵ Further, “coastal erosion processes that have caused damage along the high bluffs of Pacifica’s northern neighborhoods would very likely increase in magnitude . . . while there

¹⁴ Pacific Institute, “Impacts of Sea Level Rise on the California Coast.”
http://www2.pacinst.org/reports/sea_level_rise/gmap.html.

¹⁵ Dyett & Bhatia (consultants), *City of Pacifica Draft General Plan*, March 2014, pp. 7-8.

could be new risks of erosion along the length of Pacifica’s coastline in areas that are not currently exposed to wave action erosion. . . .”¹⁶

Countywide Impact—Tax Revenue

Although no exact figure has been calculated, it is evident that the impacts identified above would also have a severe effect on tax revenues from a variety of sources. In particular, a reduction in property tax revenue from SLR flood zones would affect all taxing entities in the county. This might affect the provision of County and city services throughout the county.

Countywide Impact—Wastewater Treatment Plants

The impact of SLR is not limited to jurisdictions touching the ocean or bay. Inundation of wastewater treatment plants would pose severe countywide environmental and health threats. Since sewer systems rely on gravity, treatment plants are often located at sea level, with outflow of treated wastewater into the bay or ocean. The CEC report identified the following plants in SMC as vulnerable with 55 inches of SLR:¹⁷

- Mid-Coast Sewer Authority (includes the city of Half Moon Bay)
- City of Millbrae
- San Francisco International Airport
- City of San Mateo (includes the city of Foster City and part of the town of Hillsborough)
- South Bayside System Authority (now Silicon Valley Clean Water) (includes the cities and towns of Atherton, Belmont, East Palo Alto, Menlo Park, Portola Valley, Redwood City, San Carlos, and Woodside)
- South San Francisco/San Bruno (includes the town of Colma)

In addition to the threat of flooding, it is likely that these plants, and others that pump their treated water into the bay or ocean, will also need to install stronger pumps in order to deal with the increased water pressure at depths that will have increased due to SLR.¹⁸

The State CO-CAT advises that shoreline wastewater treatment plants with no space to relocate inland have “low adaptive capacity and high potential impacts from flooding.” For such facilities, preparing for a higher projected SLR would be prudent.¹⁹

The Grand Jury toured the largest treatment plant, located in Redwood Shores, operated by Silicon Valley Clean Water. It serves 200,000 south county residents. At the plant, key

¹⁶ Ibid.

¹⁷ Heberger et al., *The Impacts of Sea Level Rise*, p. 16. Note also that the City of Brisbane is served by the Southeast Water Quality Control treatment facility in San Francisco, which also appears to be vulnerable to SLR.

¹⁸ Source: Interview.

¹⁹ CO-CAT, *Sea-Level Rise Guidance*, pp. 3-4.

components have been elevated to protect against possible levee failure. However, this does not take into account SLR. Also, staff noted that the treatment plant receives wastewater from four pumping stations, all of which are in the SLR flood plain.²⁰

Catastrophic Sea Level Rise

A 2013 *National Geographic Magazine* article described potential SLR of 212 feet, over many centuries.²¹ In a presentation to SMC officials, oceanographer John Englander said that a 10-foot rise over just 10-15 years is possible this century if two west Antarctic glaciers break loose into the ocean.²² This would be *in addition to* the SLR already projected by State agencies. This Grand Jury report looks at the local planning required for up to about 55 inches of SLR. At this level, SLR impacts SMC to a much greater extent than other Bay Area counties, and it makes sense to look at this county separately. However, SLR on the order of 15 feet or more would severely impact the entire Bay Area and planning may need to be addressed primarily at the regional level.

SLR Is a Countywide Issue

A key question is whether SLR should be viewed as a *countywide* threat or only as a risk to areas threatened with *actual inundation*. The answer to this question has important implications for how the problem is addressed—and who pays for it.

Currently, flood control, whether along creeks or shorelines, is the responsibility of each city, as cities have responsibility for public safety and for land use. In fact, exposure to SLR is partly the result of land use decisions by cities to develop tidal wetlands and other low-lying areas.

However, as detailed above, the impact of SLR will fall on *all* county residents. In particular, the exposure of wastewater treatment plants and the loss of countywide tax revenue are serious countywide threats.

Public Awareness of the Threat

Developing a plan to adapt to SLR will require broad support among elected officials and other government policymakers and, most importantly, the general public. This, in turn, requires greater public awareness of the issue.

Two forums on SLR sponsored by Congresswoman Jackie Speier, Assemblyman Rich Gordon, and Supervisor Dave Pine have served to educate many local elected officials and government

²⁰ Source: Interview.

²¹ Tim Folger and George Steinmetz, “Rising Seas: How They Are Changing Our Coastlines,” *National Geographic*, September 2013.

²² John Englander, Conference Speech at Speier, Gordon, and Pine, “Meeting the Challenge of Sea Level Rise”; see also Will Travis (former Executive Director of BCDC), Conference Speech at Speier, Gordon, and Pine, “Meeting the Challenge of Sea Level Rise.” Travis noted that at some point higher levees may not be viable and suggested that we may need to look at the Dutch model of “living with water”; see also Larry Goldzband (Executive Director of BCDC), Conference Speech at Speier, Gordon, and Pine, “Meeting the Challenge of Sea Level Rise.” He noted the possibility of addressing SLR at the Golden Gate, rather than along the entire length of the bay shoreline.

staff.²³ However, as one city manager noted, continuing education is necessary as elected officials rotate off their councils.

Moreover, despite some press coverage of the two forums, it appears that the public at large is not well informed on the issue. At present, the Grand Jury is not aware of any on-going educational efforts by local governments to inform county residents about SLR, particularly as it may impact SMC.

Preparing for SLR

Existing Flood Protection in San Mateo County

Cities and two special local agencies are responsible for construction and maintenance of levees within their jurisdictions.²⁴ Often, they pay the entire cost of levee projects. They work closely with various regional, State, and federal permitting agencies to meet design standards, both for the structures themselves and the adjacent shoreline environment.²⁵

Presently, there is a chain of levees along the bay. Each link in the chain is the responsibility of a different city or special agency. However, flood risk is based on topography, not political boundaries. Thus, the safety of properties in any given city often depends on levee projects undertaken by its neighboring cities. The public is protected only so long as the “weakest link” in the chain of levees is able to meet the threat. Officials interviewed by the Grand Jury identified a number of existing “weak links.”

Currently, no countywide agency has oversight of the levees as a whole. No agency provides countywide planning, coordinates cities’ construction and maintenance efforts, or assists with grant applications related to *existing* flood problems, much less preparing for SLR. Cities do not contribute money to pay for projects outside their jurisdiction, even though their own residents may benefit.

The San Mateo County Flood Control District is “countywide” on paper but its tax base is limited by the California Water Code to certain “subzones,” which were specified prior to the voters’ adoption in 1978 of Proposition 13. The District’s revenue stream is small and limited to funding flood control along the Colma, San Bruno, and San Francisquito Creeks. The District has no staff of its own, contracting with the County’s Public Works Department on an as-needed basis for necessary staffing.

²³Jackie Speier, Rich Gordon, and Dave Pine, “Meeting the Challenge of Sea Level Rise in San Mateo County,” College of San Mateo, December 9, 2013, and “Planning for Sea Level Rise in San Mateo County,” Foster City City Hall, June 27, 2014.

²⁴ The cities of East Palo Alto and Menlo Park, the San Mateo County Flood Control District, the city of Palo Alto and the Santa Clara Valley Water District have formed the San Francisquito Creek Joint Powers Authority to address flooding, enhanced ecosystems and recreation along that creek in both San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties. The San Mateo County Flood Control District also has responsibility for flood control along Colma and San Bruno Creeks.

²⁵ Other agencies may be involved in particular situations. For instance, Caltrans is responsible for protecting State highways and airport owners may be responsible for protecting certain airports. (Source: Interviews.)

Current Efforts in San Mateo County to Plan for SLR²⁶

The County has taken the lead in trying to jump-start the process of planning for SLR. Along with working groups of elected officials, city staff, and special district personnel, the County has commenced (a) conducting a vulnerability assessment, (b) exploring options for a countywide governance organization to address flood control and SLR, and (c) identifying sources of funding. In January 2015, the County's Office of Sustainability received a grant from the State Coastal Conservancy (SCC) to jointly manage an SLR vulnerability assessment for SMC. The study will cover the entire bayside and the coast from Half Moon Bay north.²⁷ While there is currently no guarantee, staff is confident that the Office of Sustainability will continue working on SLR beyond the period of the grant.

Characteristics of a Possible Organization to Address SLR Planning

Almost every local official interviewed by the Grand Jury acknowledged the need for greater coordination among jurisdictions to address SLR. Each person was asked about options for "getting organized" to address SLR. Some of the characteristics identified by many of those interviewed include:

- The organization should be countywide, including upland and coastal communities.
- The cities should participate in decision-making by the organization.
- The organization should have a *focus* on SLR and have a staff with expertise in the subject.
- The organization must be sustainably funded.

Interviewees also identified a number of existing needs related to planning for SLR that should be met:

- Identify consistent SLR-related projections and flood control project standards for all jurisdictions
- Help coordinate jurisdictions regarding SLR-related flood control projects and seek a commitment by jurisdictions to implement projects in a timely fashion

²⁶ Other important SLR-related efforts in SMC include the "SFO/San Bruno Creek/Colma Creek Resilience Study," a joint effort of the airport, affected cities, and the County to assess SLR impacts in the vicinity of San Francisco International Airport (Brendan P. Bartholomew, "Peninsula Sea-Level Study to Focus on Flood Threats Surrounding SFO," *San Francisco Examiner*, February 13, 2014). The San Francisquito Creek JPA is undertaking two SLR-related projects: the SAFER Bay project will protect property within the cities of East Palo Alto and Menlo Park from Bay 100-year tides with up to three feet of SLR and enhance and create Bay marshes; and the San Francisco Bay to Highway 101 project along San Francisquito Creek that will protect the tidally influenced areas of East Palo Alto and Palo Alto from a 100-year creek flow coincident with an extreme tide and 26 inches of SLR (<http://sfcjpa.org/projects>). In addition, the SCC is funding Local Coastal Plan updates for Half Moon Bay and Pacifica that will address adaptation to SLR (SCC, "San Mateo County Shoreline Vulnerability Assessment" RFP, February 18, 2015).

²⁷ SCC, "San Mateo County Shoreline Vulnerability Assessment," Staff Recommendation, January 29, 2015.

- Assist with grant applications (State and federal agencies prefer to provide grants to projects that demonstrate a multi-jurisdictional approach)
- Seek to broaden the revenue sources for SLR projects

However, several city managers and others questioned whether the cities are ready for a new organization to assume direct control of levees, since such an organization might impinge on city authority regarding public safety, land use, and use of eminent domain.

Organizational Options

The Grand Jury discussed the following organizational options for SLR planning with the interviewees:

- Expanding the role of the County Flood Control District (SMCFCD) and/or the County Office of Sustainability
- Creating a new independent special district with an elected board (such as the Santa Clara Valley Water District)
- Expanding the role of the City/County Association of Governments (C/CAG)
- Creating a new joint powers authority (JPA) with an appointed board of elected officials from the cities and County (and possibly relevant special agencies)

The County option (first bullet point) offers advantages. As an existing agency, the Flood Control District would not need to be created anew (although legislative action would be required to expand its role). Its existing jurisdiction extends countywide, at least on paper. County staff already has expertise in matters relating to flood control. Although separate, the SMC Office of Sustainability is also developing staff with knowledge about SLR. The relevant functions of the Office of Sustainability and County's Public Works Department (which staffs the County Flood Control District) could easily be coordinated or merged. Both the Flood Control District and the Office of Sustainability are responsible to the County Board of Supervisors. Therefore, a way would need to be found to ensure that cities may participate in decision-making. Given its other responsibilities, some interviewees were also concerned that the County Board of Supervisors might not be able to give SLR the focus it requires.

In the case of an independent special district with its own elected board (second bullet point), neither the cities nor the County Board of Supervisors would have decision-making authority. It is not a near-term option, since it would require voter approval, hiring of staff and acquisition of office space, among other things. The Grand Jury's investigation also suggests that the creation of a new district would be an expensive choice, particularly if the district's responsibilities are limited to SLR planning. An independent special district might be a more appropriate option if responsibilities included actual levee construction and maintenance.

The Grand Jury inquired as to whether C/CAG, which already has committees on several environmental subjects, could expand its role to include planning for SLR. However, local officials felt that C/CAG is strongly focused on congestion management and does not have

expertise in SLR/flood control. C/CAG staff has not proposed to the agency's Board of Directors that the agency take on SLR.²⁸

Creating a new JPA (fourth bullet point) would allow the cities (and County) to have a voice. A JPA for SLR could hire staff with expertise in the field and, as a single-purpose agency, could stay focused on SLR. One negative factor is the need to create a brand new governmental structure and the added expense to do so. However, it is possible that the JPA could contract for administrative services and staffing with another agency, such as the County. A second concern expressed by local officials is the need to structure the JPA so that a membership that includes the County, 20 cities, and possibly other relevant local agencies does not become unwieldy.

Based on this analysis, the Grand Jury concludes that, under current circumstances, there is no perfect choice for an organization to undertake countywide SLR planning. However, it appears that either enlarging the role of the County Flood Control District or creating a new JPA would be viable options. What is critical is that a coordinated countywide approach be agreed upon soon.

Funding of an Organization to Plan for SLR

The costs of an organization that only focuses on *planning-type* functions such as coordinating local jurisdictions, conducting studies, developing standards and timelines, and preparing grant applications would be much less than the cost of actual construction of levees. It could be funded by member contributions, grants, and contributions from industry and wastewater treatment agencies. This would be similar to the general fund revenues that C/CAG currently collects from member contributions and grants.

Funding of Projects to Protect against SLR

At the Grand Jury's first interview, a local official posed the following question regarding SLR: "how are we going to pay for it?" Levee construction is extremely expensive. Projects recently completed or proposed in the county, just to address existing needs, have run into the tens of millions of dollars.²⁹

Current Funding for Levee Protection in San Mateo County

Currently, funding for levee projects comes mainly from local general funds or capital improvement funds, plus, in some cases, an assessment on property owners who directly benefit from such projects. Where relatively few properties are involved, the assessment per parcel can be prohibitive.

²⁸ Source: Interview.

²⁹ For example, in 2012 the City of San Mateo completed \$22.7 million in levee improvements to protect 8,000 properties and faces raising another \$22.35 million for levee improvements to protect 1,500 properties that remain in FEMA flood insurance rate maps (Larry Patterson, Conference Speech at Speier, Gordon, and Pine, "Meeting the Challenge of Sea Level Rise"). The San Francisquito Creek JPA has secured State and local funding for its \$37.5 million project for the portion of that creek between the Bay and Highway 101 (Gennady Sheyner, "San Francisquito Creek Project Sees Breakthrough after Permit Stall," *Palo Alto Online*, November 3, 2014, and interview).

The cost of flood insurance to property owners is also expensive. As a result, cities focus on projects that remove residents from FEMA flood zones (which determine the need for insurance). Savings on insurance helps offset the cost of a property assessment.

Potential Countywide Sources of Funding for SLR Projects

City general funds and assessments on properties that directly benefit may also be used for SLR-related projects. However, since SLR has countywide impacts, spreading part of the cost countywide appears justified. Some potential sources of countywide revenue include:³⁰

- Wastewater agencies may impose fees on customers within their service area to help pay for levee projects that protect wastewater treatment plants and pumping stations threatened by SLR.
- Officials interviewed doubt that, at present, SLR levee projects could secure the 66.7% voter approval required under Proposition 218 for a special tax (i.e., a tax imposed to raise revenue for a specific purpose). However, this could be a source of funds in the future, when the threat of SLR becomes more evident.
- The County and cities may raise funds through general taxes, such as County Measure A (2012), which require approval of a simple majority of voters, and distribute a *portion* of such revenues to protect against SLR, so long as the measure does not include a specific commitment to fund SLR projects.
- C/CAG used the simple majority voter threshold to win approval for County Measure M (2010), a vehicle registration fee used for a variety of transportation projects and for mitigation of transportation-related stormwater pollution.³¹ Any organization, such as the County Flood Control District or a new JPA, that addresses SLR and other related issues such as groundwater management and water pollution, might be able to use a similar approach.
- State law (SB 628, 2014) allows for the formation of Enhanced Infrastructure Financing Districts within cities and counties with the authority to issue bonds, with 55% voter approval, for purposes such as “flood control levees and dams, retention basins, and drainage channels.”³² In certain circumstances, such districts may be formed within SMC jurisdictions to serve as a source of funding for SLR projects.
- Contributions may be solicited from business parks or agencies responsible for facilities such as airports or highways that are within SLR flood plains. For example, the Facebook headquarters campus in Menlo Park will benefit from the San Francisquito Creek JPA’s SAFER project, and the company has contributed \$275,000 toward its design and EIR.³³
- Mitigation fees may be imposed on new developments in areas subject to SLR.

³⁰ Source: Interview.

³¹ C/CAG, Funding-Local/Measure M. <http://ccag.ca.gov/funding/measure-m/>.

³² California Legislative Information, SB-678 Enhanced Infrastructure Financing Districts.

³³ Renee Batti, “Stemming the Tide,” *Almanac: The Hometown Newspaper for Menlo Park, Atherton, Portola Valley and Woodside*, March 10, 2014, and interview source.

Potential Regional, State, and Federal Sources of Funding for SLR Projects

To date, local cities have received little federal or State funding for levee projects.³⁴ Several officials advised that granting agencies typically prefer projects that show multi-jurisdictional cooperation, placing the local government entities in San Mateo County at a significant competitive disadvantage in securing such funds. However, even for a multi-jurisdictional project, grants are highly competitive. SLR-related projects face a further difficulty if the granting agency does not yet recognize the risk of SLR. Finally, since SMC is by far the county most vulnerable to SLR, it may be difficult to find other counties with similar needs with which to collaborate on a regional basis. However, there is one new source of funding:

- The State of California’s Climate Resilience Account, created in 2014, is a source of grant funding directed specifically at SLR. Although only \$2.5 million has been allocated statewide in the first year, it may be enlarged in the future.

Reducing Costs by Integrating SLR-Related Projects with Other Levee Projects

Given that the amount and rate of SLR are uncertain, local officials may be reluctant to spend large amounts of money for projects that may never be needed. Possible cost-saving options that cities and relevant special agencies may examine on a case-by-case basis include:³⁵

- Integrating SLR-related protection with existing planned or proposed levee projects³⁶
- Developing SLR-related projects in stages, with specific “triggers” required before undertaking each stage of construction

In order to take advantage of these cost-saving options, however, SLR planning should begin now. For instance, a FEMA representative has advised county officials that new FEMA flood hazard maps will be forthcoming in the near future. These maps will reflect a new higher calculation of bay wave action during storms. This new calculation, which is independent of any SLR effect, may trigger the need for new levee projects to keep properties in SMC from being subject to flood insurance requirements. Incorporating consideration of future SLR in these new projects may result in cost-savings later.³⁷

SLR Is a Land Use Issue

Levee projects are a common solution to SLR. However, they may not be feasible everywhere, due to financial, environmental, or technical reasons. If the risk of flooding due to SLR cannot be completely eliminated, the County and cities will need to examine land use measures to help mitigate the threat of SLR.³⁸ Possible land use measures include the following:

³⁴ Notably, San Francisquito Creek JPA has received an \$8 million State Water Resources Board grant for a multi-jurisdictional project. (Source: Interview.)

³⁵ Craig Conner, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Conference Speech at Speier, Gordon, and Pine, “Meeting the Challenge of Sea Level Rise.” These suggestions were supported by local officials interviewed by the Grand Jury.

³⁶ The San Francisquito Creek JPA’s San Francisco Bay to Highway 101 flood protection project will address, in combination, a 100-year creek flow coincident with an extreme tide and 26 inches of SLR. (Source: Interview.)

³⁷ Kathleen Schaefer, FEMA, Conference Speech at Speier, Gordon, and Pine, “Meeting the Challenge of Sea Level Rise.”

³⁸ Flood control levees themselves are local land uses, sometimes offering public trails, and vista points, and other recreational options.

- Jurisdictions can include adaptation to SLR in the Safety Element of their General Plans. While not required by State Guidelines,³⁹ several cities in the county do mention SLR in their Safety Elements and/or Climate Action Plans.⁴⁰
- Jurisdictions may restrict new development or types of land use in areas subject to SLR.
- Jurisdictions may use building codes to mitigate SLR flood risk. For instance, they could require habitable areas and key building equipment be placed above flood level.
- Jurisdictions may identify areas suitable for environmental resource protection and habitat enhancement, in light of the threat of SLR.
- Jurisdictions may need to identify certain areas to be abandoned to SLR.
- Jurisdictions may impose SLR mitigation fees as a condition of approval on major residential or commercial projects in undeveloped areas subject to future SLR.
- Jurisdictions may use the CEQA environmental review process to ensure that exposure to SLR is considered, and mitigation measures identified, when major residential or commercial projects are proposed within a SLR flood plain.

Actions Needed at the Regional, State, and Federal Levels

While focused on SMC, this investigation points to the need for action on SLR at other levels of government. The County, cities, and relevant local special districts, through their representation at regional agencies, memberships in state associations, lobbyists, and elected State and federal legislators, could advocate on our behalf. Some examples include:

- Federal agencies, such as the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, do not currently recognize SLR in their flood control mapping and/or funding.⁴¹
- Federal and State funding is extremely limited for all stages of adaptation to SLR: studies, planning, and actual levee projects.

³⁹ California Governor’s Office of Planning and Research, *State of California General Plan Guidelines*, 2003.

⁴⁰ The City of Pacifica’s draft Safety Element has a particularly comprehensive discussion related to SLR. However, the City will wait for “an adequate model with sufficient local detail” to project specific impacts of SLR (see Dyett & Bhatia, *City of Pacifica Draft General Plan*, March 2014, pp. 8-11 – 8-16). The City of San Carlos approved a *Climate Action Plan* (CAP) as a component of the City’s General Plan update. The CAP includes a BCDC map of the city showing SLR of 16 and 55 inches. The City’s approach to SLR is to cooperate with regional agencies, such as BCDC. (See City of San Carlos, *Climate Action Plan*, October 12, 2009, pp. 2, 87-91.) The City of San Mateo commissioned a report that includes a description of the potential effects of SLR on that city and has appended the report to the City’s General Plan. However, the General Plan states that “considering that there is no definitive estimate and that sea level rise will occur slowly over time, the City will continue to address FEMA’s current certification standards” (see *City of San Mateo 2030 General Plan*, 2010, pp. VII-6 and Appendix V, Schaaf & Wheeler, *Climate Change Impacts for San Mateo, California*).

⁴¹ This may change. “In accord with the Biggert-Water Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2012, FEMA is to establish a Technical Mapping Advisory Council that will provide recommendations to FEMA on flood hazard mapping guidelines— including . . . the impacts of sea level rise. . . . FEMA will be required to incorporate future risk assessment in accordance with the recommendations of the Council.” (See FEMA, <http://www.fema.gov/coastal-frequently-asked-questions#CoastalFloodHazardMappingQuestions>, pp. 10-11.)

- With just \$2.5 million in this year’s budget for statewide use, funding of the California Climate Resilience Account, dedicated to SLR, is inadequate.
- California General Plan Guidelines (2003), prepared by the Governor’s Office of Planning and Research, do not require that SLR be addressed in the Safety Element or elsewhere in local general plans.
- Regional agencies, such as BCDC, could provide a forum for discussing SLR, including alternatives for addressing catastrophic SLR greater than 10 feet.

While these and other actions at the regional, State, and federal levels are important, it must be emphasized that San Mateo County cannot afford to wait for planning and resources to appear from outside the county. They may never come.

FINDINGS

- F1. SMC is at severe risk for flooding due to the gradual rise in sea level, projected at up to 65 inches (167 centimeters) by the year 2100. Catastrophic SLR of nearly 15 feet is a possibility this century.
- F2. SLR is a threat *countywide*, including the upland areas. All residents depend on public infrastructure, especially wastewater treatment plants. Also, a significant portion of the countywide property tax base is within the area threatened by SLR.
- F3. Although many local officials are now familiar with and concerned about the threat of SLR, there is inadequate public awareness of SLR’s potential impacts on this county.
- F4. Levees, including their financing, are currently the responsibility of each individual city or special agency with jurisdiction along streams, bay, and coast (the County is responsible for unincorporated areas).
- F5. Flood risk is based on topography, not political boundaries. The safety of properties in one jurisdiction often depends on levee projects undertaken by another jurisdiction.
- F6. Currently, no countywide agency exists to provide planning, facilitate coordination among jurisdictions, or to assist with securing funding for *existing* flood control projects. The same is true for future SLR-related projects.
- F7. To the Grand Jury’s knowledge, no local jurisdiction has adopted SLR projections or maps for specific local land use planning purposes.⁴² No consistent SLR projection has been adopted countywide by the County and cities.
- F8. There is a recognized need for a countywide approach to SLR planning and coordination among jurisdictions.
- F9. Several city managers and others interviewed did not support having a new countywide organization assume direct control of levee projects at this time.
- F10. The County and cities can address SLR in their General Plans and Climate Action Plans, can map the threat, and can adopt relevant policies.

⁴² See discussion of SLR planning in several San Mateo County cities in footnote 39.

- F11. Many actions to address SLR are within the authority of regional, State, and federal agencies.
- F12. By acting *now*, SMC may be able to reduce future costs by integrating SLR-related projects with other programmed levee projects, and by using land use planning measures to mitigate future exposure to SLR.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The Grand Jury recommends increased public education about SLR:

- R1. The County, each city in the county and relevant local special agencies⁴³ should conduct a public education effort to increase awareness of SLR and its potential effects on this county.

The Grand Jury recommends identifying a single organization to undertake SLR planning:

- R2. The County, each city in the county and relevant local special agencies⁴⁴ should identify a single organization, such as a new joint powers authority or an expanded SMC Flood Control District, to undertake countywide SLR planning. It should be structured to ensure that:

- The organization is countywide in scope
- The organization is able to *focus* on SLR
- Both the County and cities (and possibly relevant local agencies) are able to participate in the organization's decision-making⁴⁵
- The organization is sustainably funded

- R3. The organization's responsibilities should include:

- Adopt consistent SLR projections for use in levee planning countywide
- Conduct and/or evaluate vulnerability assessments⁴⁶
- Provide a forum for inter-jurisdictional coordination and exchange of information related to SLR
- Undertake grant applications for SLR-related planning and projects
- Facilitate raising funds on a countywide basis for SLR-related projects, to be passed through to agencies with direct responsibility for project construction

⁴³ San Mateo County Flood Control District and San Francisquito Creek Joint Powers Authority.

⁴⁴ Ibid.

⁴⁵ The organization could also create a technical advisory committee with representatives of departments responsible for levee construction and management, as well as representatives of public facilities at risk, such as airports and wastewater treatment plants.

⁴⁶ A vulnerability assessment could (a) inventory areas at risk for SLR (commercial, residential, public facilities, and infrastructure), (b) determine the adequacy of existing levee protection, and (c) identify and prioritize the projects that will be needed to adapt to SLR.

- Monitor actual SLR over time and any changes in SLR projections, based upon the latest federal, State, or regional government reports and scientific studies
- Through the CEQA environmental review process, comment on major new developments proposed in the SLR floodplain
- Advocate on behalf of the member jurisdictions with federal, State, and regional agencies regarding SLR issues
- Assist the County and cities in public awareness efforts, as described in R1

R4. The County, cities and two relevant local special agencies⁴⁷ should consider expanding the role of the organization beyond SLR to include planning and coordination of efforts to address *existing* flooding problems along the Bay, coast, and creeks that are subject to tidal action. It may be cost-effective to integrate SLR protection with other levee-improvement programs.

The County and cities may also consider expanding the role of the new organization to include potentially compatible functions such as the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES), currently managed by C/CAG, and the new (2014) State requirements for local sustainable groundwater planning.

R5. The organization—its administration, staffing, and program expenses—should be funded on a sustainable basis by:

- Member contributions
- Contributions solicited from parties threatened by SLR, including corporations and agencies that operate public facilities such as wastewater treatment plants
- Grants solicited from available potential sources such as the California Climate Resilience Account
- Reducing administrative costs by contracting for services with the County or another agency

The Grand Jury recommends that SLR be addressed in local land use planning:

R6. The County and each city should amend its General Plan, as needed, to address the risk for SLR. The Safety Element⁴⁸ should include a map of any areas vulnerable to SLR, as determined by measurements in the countywide Vulnerability Assessment [R3]. Further, it should identify policies that apply to areas threatened by SLR.

⁴⁷ San Mateo County Flood Control District and San Francisquito Creek Joint Powers Authority.

⁴⁸ As an alternative, the City of San Carlos has addressed SLR in its Climate Action Plan (CAP). The City states that the CAP was developed as a “component of the 2009 General Plan update . . . a legally defensible approach to ensuring that the Climate Action Plan is implemented” (see City of San Carlos, *Climate Action Plan*, 2009, p. 2).

The Grand Jury recommends that local governments champion SLR issues before regional, State, and federal governments and agencies:

R7. The County, cities, and relevant local special agencies, through their representatives on regional agencies, membership in state associations, lobbyists, and elected State and federal legislators, should pursue SLR-related issues with government bodies outside SMC.

REQUEST FOR RESPONSES

Pursuant to Penal code section 933.05, the Grand Jury requests responses as follows:

From the following governing bodies:

Responses to recommendations R1, R2, R3, R4, R5, R6, and R7 are requested from:

- The County of San Mateo Board of Supervisors
- The City and Town Councils of Atherton, Belmont, Brisbane, Burlingame, Colma, Daly City, East Palo Alto, Foster City, Half Moon Bay, Hillsborough, Menlo Park, Millbrae, Pacifica, Portola Valley, Redwood City, San Bruno, San Carlos, San Mateo, South San Francisco, and Woodside

Responses to recommendations R1, R2, R3, R4, R5, and R7 are requested from:

- The Board of Directors of the San Francisquito Creek Joint Powers Authority

Response to recommendation R4 is requested from:

- The Board of Directors of the City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County

The governing bodies indicated above should be aware that the comment or response of the governing body must be conducted subject to the notice, agenda, and open meeting requirements of the Brown Act.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Reports issued by the Civil Grand Jury do not identify individuals interviewed. Penal Code Section 929 requires that reports of the Grand Jury not contain the name of any person or facts leading to the identity of any person who provides information to the Civil Grand Jury.

Bartholomew, Brendan P. “Peninsula Sea-Level Study to Focus on Flood Threats Surrounding SFO.” *San Francisco Examiner*, February 13, 2014. <http://www.sfexaminer.com/sanfrancisco/peninsula-sea-level-study-to-focus-on-flood-threats-surrounding-sfo/Content?oid=2703933>.

Batti, Renee. “Stemming the Tide: Creek JPA Steps up to Tackle Threat of Rising Bayside Water.” *Almanac: The Hometown Newspaper for Menlo Park, Atherton, Portola Valley and Woodside*, March 10, 2014. <http://www.almanacnews.com/print/story/2014/03/05/stemming-the-tide>.

California Coastal Commission (CCC). *Draft Sea Level Rise Policy Guidance*, October 14, 2013. http://www.coastal.ca.gov/climate/slr/guidance/CCC_Draft_SLR_Guidance_PR_10142013.pdf.

California Coastal and Ocean Working Group of the Climate Action Team (CO-CAT). *State of California Sea-Level Rise Guidance Document*. March 2013. http://www.opc.ca.gov/webmaster/ftp/pdf/docs/2013_SLR_Guidance_Update_FINAL1.pdf.

California Governor’s Office of Planning and Research. *State of California General Plan Guidelines*. 2003. http://opr.ca.gov/docs/General_Plan_Guidelines_2003.pdf.

California Legislative Information. SB-678 Enhanced Infrastructure Financing Districts. https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billTextClient.xhtml;jsessionid=651694fa45e5c3efb597efd185ad?bill_id=201320140SB628.

California State Assembly Select Committee on Sea Level Rise and the California Economy. *Sea-Level Rise: A Slow-Moving Emergency*. August 2014. [http://sealevelrise.assembly.ca.gov/sites/sealevelrise.assembly.ca.gov/files/Select Committee Sea-Level Rise Report.pdf](http://sealevelrise.assembly.ca.gov/sites/sealevelrise.assembly.ca.gov/files/Select%20Committee%20Sea-Level%20Rise%20Report.pdf).

California State Coastal Conservancy (SCC). “Inner Bair Island Wetland Restoration.” Staff Recommendation. May 29, 2014. http://scc.ca.gov/webmaster/ftp/pdf/sccb/2014/1405/20140529Board03G_Inner_Bair_Island.pdf.

California State Coastal Conservancy (SCC). “San Mateo County Shoreline Vulnerability Assessment.” Request for Proposals. February 18, 2015. http://scc.ca.gov/files/2015/02/20150218_RFP_San-Mateo-County-Shoreline-Vulnerability-Assessment.pdf.

California State Coastal Conservancy (SCC). “San Mateo County Shoreline Vulnerability Assessment.” Staff Recommendation. January 29, 2015.
http://scc.ca.gov/webmaster/ftp/pdf/scbb/2015/1501/20150129Board13_San_Mateo_County_Shoreline_Vulnerability_Assessment.pdf.

Cayan, D., M. Tyree, M. Dettinger, H. Hidalgo, T. Das, E. Maurer, P. Bromirski, N. Graham, and R. Flick. “Climate Change Scenarios and Sea Level Rise Estimates for the California 2008 Climate Change Scenarios Assessment.” California Climate Change Center. California Energy Commission, Public Interest Energy Research Program, CEC-500-2009-014-D. August 2009.
<http://www.energy.ca.gov/2009publications/CEC-500-2009-014/CEC-500-2009-014-D.PDF>.

CBS San Francisco and Bay Cities News Service. “San Mateo County Planners Grapple with Expected 3-Foot Sea Level Rise.” June 27, 2014.
<http://sanfrancisco.cbslocal.com/2014/6/27/san-mateo-county-planners-grapple-with-expected-3-foot-sea-level-rise/>.

City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County (C/CAG).
<http://www.ccag.ca.gov>.

City and County of San Francisco Civil Grand Jury 2013-2014. *Rising Sea Levels at Our Doorstep*. June 2014.
http://civilgrandjury.sfgov.org/2013_2014/2014_CGJ_Report_Rising_Sea_Levels_w_correction.pdf.

City of Redwood City. “Latest Update: Redwood Shores Levee Project: Construction Complete.” January 2011. <http://www.redwoodcity.org/bit/infrastructure/levee1008.html>.

City of Redwood City. Public Safety Element. *Redwood City General Plan*. October 11, 2010.
http://www.redwoodcity.org/phed/planning/generalplan/FinalGP/04_PublicSafety_FINAL.pdf.

City of San Carlos. Climate Action Plan. *San Carlos General Plan: Envision 2030*. October 12, 2009. <http://www.cityofsancarlos.org/civicax/filebank/blobdload.aspx?blobid=5883>.

City of San Mateo. Safety Element. *City of San Mateo 2030 General Plan*. 2010.
<http://www.cityofsanmateo.org/DocumentCenter/Home/View/7168>.

City of South San Francisco. Safety Element. *South San Francisco General Plan*. October 1999.
<http://www.ssf.net/360/Read-the-Plan>.

Cote, John. “Unprepared? Who, Us? San Francisco Lacks Plan for Rising Sea Level,” SFGate (blog). June 25, 2014. <http://blog.sfgate.com/cityinsider/2014/06/25/unprepared-who-us-san-francisco-lacks-plan-for-rising-sea-level/>.

County of San Mateo Public Works. “Flood Control Districts.”
<http://publicworks.smcgov.org/flood-control-districts>.

Dyett & Bhatia (consultants). Safety Element. *City of Pacifica Draft General Plan*. March 2014. <http://www.cityofpacifica.org/civica/filebank/blobload.asp?BlobID=6557>.

Federal Emergency Management Administration (FEMA). “Coastal Flood Hazard Mapping Questions.” <http://www.fema.gov/coastal-frequently-asked-questions#CoastalFloodHazardMappingQuestions>.

Folger, Tim, and George Steinmetz. “Rising Seas: How They Are Changing Our Coastlines.” *National Geographic*, September 2013. <http://ngm.nationalgeographic.com/2013/09/rising-seas/folger-text>.

Heberger, Matthew, Heather Cooley, Eli Moore, Pablo Herrera (Pacific Institute). *The Impacts of Sea Level Rise on the San Francisco Bay*. California Energy Commission (CEC) Publication No. CEC-500-2012-014. July 2012. <http://www.energy.ca.gov/2012publications/CEC-500-2012-014/CEC-500-2012-014.pdf>.

Kzakoff, Lois. “Rising Seas—Civil Grand Jury Finds San Francisco Needs to Do Much to Prepare.” SFGate (blog). June 27, 2014. <http://blog.sfgate.com/opinionshop/2014/06/27/rising-seas-civil-grand-jury-finds-san-francisco-needs-to-do-much-to-prepare/>.

Louisiana Resiliency Assistance Program. “San Mateo, CA—Levee Construction Success Story.” October 2012. <http://resiliency.lsu.edu/planning/san-mateo-california-levee-construction-success-story/>.

National Research Council (NRC). *Sea Level Rise for the Coasts of California, Oregon and Washington: Past, Present and Future*. 2012. Summary. <http://dels.nas.edu/resources/static-assets/materials-based-on-reports/reports-in-brief/sea-level-rise-brief-final.pdf>.

Pacific Institute. “Impacts of Sea Level Rise on the California Coast.” http://www2.pacinst.org/reports/sea_level_rise/gmap.html.

Pacific Institute. “The Impacts of Sea-Level Rise on the California Coast: Thematic Maps.” <http://pacinst.org/publications/sea-level-rise-thematic-maps/>.

San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC). *Living with a Rising Bay: Vulnerability and Adaptation in San Francisco Bay and on Its Shoreline*. Staff Report. October 6, 2011. <http://www.bcdc.ca.gov/BPA/LivingWithRisingBay.pdf>.

San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC). “New Sea Level Rise Policies Fact Sheet.” October 2011. http://www.bcdc.ca.gov/planning/climate_change/SLRfactSheet.shtml.

San Francisquito Creek Joint Powers Authority. <http://sfcjpa.org/web/about/agency-overview/>.

San Francisquito Creek Joint Powers Authority. Projects Overview. <http://sfcjpa.org/web/projects/projects-overview/>.

Schaaf & Wheeler, Consulting Civil Engineers. *Climate Change Impacts for San Mateo, California*. February 2, 2009.

<http://www.cityofsanmateo.org/DocumentCenter/Home/View/7183>.

Sheyner, Gennady. "San Francisquito Creek Project Sees Breakthrough after Permit Stall." *Palo Alto Online*, November 3, 2014. <http://paloaltoonline.com/news/2014/11/01/san-francisquito-creek-project-sees-breakthrough-after-permit-stall>.

Speier, Jackie, Rich Gordon, and Dave Pine. "Meeting the Challenge of Sea Level Rise in San Mateo County." College of San Mateo, December 9, 2013 (conference). Video:

pentv.tv/videos/specials/sea-level-rise.

Speier, Jackie, Rich Gordon, and Dave Pine. "Planning for Sea Level Rise in San Mateo County." Foster City City Hall. June 27, 2014. Video: pentv.tv/videos/specials/sea-level-rise.

Swartz, Angela. "Cleanup Begins: Some Still Can't Return to Homes Damaged from Storm, CSM shelter available." *San Mateo Daily Journal*, December 16, 2014.

<http://www.smdailyjournal.com/articles/news/2014-12-16/cleanup-begins-some-still-cant-return-to-homes-damaged-from-storm-csm-shelter-available/1776425135053.html>.

Weeks, Jennifer, and the Daily Climate. "How Should San Francisco Plan for Sea-Level Rise?" *Scientific American*, September 21, 2010. <http://www.scientificamerican.com/article/how-should-san-fran-plan/>.

Weigel, Samantha. "After Report, Planning Begins for Sea Level Rise: County Officials Hopeful about Policy Recommendations in Assembly Document about 'Slow-moving Emergency.'" *San Mateo Daily Journal*, August 11, 2014. <http://www.smdailyjournal.com/articles/news/2014-08-11/after-report-planning-begins-for-sea-level-rise-county-officials-hopeful-about-policy-recommendations-in-assembly-document-about-slow-moving-emergency/1776425128189.html>.

Weigel, Samantha. "City Seeking Voter Input on Financing: San Mateo Will Survey Public on How to Fund \$48.5M in Street, Flood Control Improvements." *San Mateo Daily Journal*, October 8, 2014. <http://www.smdailyjournal.com/articles/news/2014-10-08/city-seeking-voter-input-on-financing-san-mateo-will-survey-public-on-how-to-fund-485m-in-street-flood-control-improvements/1776425131307.html>.

Weigel, Samantha. "FEMA Targets Lagoon Residents: San Mateo Neighborhood Hit with New Insurance Regulations." *San Mateo Daily Journal*, July 30, 2014.

<http://www.smdailyjournal.com/articles/news/2014-07-30/fema-targets-lagoon-residents-san-mateo-neighborhood-hit-with-new-insurance-regulations/1776425127489.html>.

Weigel, Samantha. "Sea Level Rise Focus of Conference: Federal, State, Local Officials to Highlight Potential Impact on San Mateo County." *San Mateo Daily Journal*, December 7, 2013. http://speier.house.gov/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=1305:sea-level-rise-focus-of-conference-federal-state-local-officials-to-highlight-potential-impact-on-san-mateo-county&catid=2&Itemid=15.


Weigel, Samantha. "Surfer's Beach Erosion Prompts Joint Effort: Half Moon Bay, County, State Discuss Improvements to Seawall." *San Mateo Daily Journal*, October 22, 2014. <http://www.smdailyjournal.com/articles/news/2014-10-22/surfers-beach-erosion-prompts-joint-effort-half-moon-bay-county-state-discuss-improvements-to-seawall/1776425132038.html>.

Worth, Katie. "Redwood City Knee-Deep in Levee Quagmire." *San Francisco Examiner*, May 6, 2008. <http://www.sfexaminer.com/sanfrancisco/redwood-city-knee-deep-in-levee-quagmire/Content?oid=2153354>.

APPENDIX



Sea level rise inundation maps for selected areas of San Mateo County are presented below. The turquoise-colored zones represent the “current area at risk” to flooding during a 100-year storm, without consideration of existing flood protection levees. The magenta-colored zones represent the area at risk during a 100-year storm with 1.4 meters of SLR (140 centimeters or about 55 inches). The green-colored zones represent areas at risk of erosion from 1.4 meters of SLR, but are not clearly distinguishable at the scale used in this Appendix. These maps were prepared by the Pacific Institute, with specific infrastructure and major government and commercial facilities identified by the Grand Jury with an * symbol.

SAN FRANCISCO INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT AND VICINITY




Maps from Pacific Institute at "http://www2.pacinst.org/reports/sea_level_rise/gmap.html"
Modified by the Grand Jury to show facilities at risk


Area at risk from a 100-year coastal flood event

-  Current area at risk
-  Area at risk with a 1.4 meter sea-level rise

Erosion



-  Area at risk from erosion in 2100 with a 1.4 meter sea-level rise

SAN MATEO AND VICINITY




Maps from Pacific Institute at "http://www2.pacinst.org/reports/sea_level_rise/gmap.html"
Modified by the Grand Jury to show facilities at risk


Area at risk from a 100-year coastal flood event

-  Current area at risk
-  Area at risk with a 1.4 meter sea-level rise

Erosion



-  Area at risk from erosion in 2100 with a 1.4 meter sea-level rise

REDWOOD CITY AND VICINITY




Maps from Pacific Institute at "http://www2.pacinst.org/reports/sea_level_rise/gmap.html"
Modified by the Grand Jury to show facilities at risk


Area at risk from a 100-year coastal flood event

-  Current area at risk
-  Area at risk with a 1.4 meter sea-level rise

Erosion

-  Area at risk from erosion in 2100 with a 1.4 meter sea-level rise

PACIFICA



Maps from Pacific Institute at "http://www2.pacinst.org/reports/sea_level_rise/gmap.html"


Area at risk from a 100-year coastal flood event

- Current area at risk
- Area at risk with a 1.4 meter sea-level rise

Erosion

- Area at risk from erosion in 2100 with a 1.4 meter sea-level rise

HALF MOON BAY



Maps from Pacific Institute at "http://www2.pacinst.org/reports/sea_level_rise/gmap.html"
Modified by the Grand Jury to show facility at risk

Area at risk from a 100-year coastal flood event

- Current area at risk
- Area at risk with a 1.4 meter sea-level rise

Erosion

- Area at risk from erosion in 2100 with a 1.4 meter sea-level rise

Issued: June 4, 2015

June 4, 2015

A typographical error was discovered following the distribution of advance copies of the report entitled "Flooding Ahead: Planning for Sea Level Rise."

The first bullet point at the top of Page 6 should reference 6 wastewater treatment plants, not 5. Those six wastewater treatment plants are listed with greater detail on Page 7.

Draft SFCJPA response to the
San Mateo County Civil Grand Jury Report
“Flooding Ahead: Planning for Sea Level Rise”
released on June 4, 2015



SAN FRANCISQUITO CREEK
JOINT POWERS AUTHORITY

SFCJPA.ORG

DRAFT

July 24, 2015

The Honorable Susan Etezadi
Judge of the Superior Court
c/o Charlene Kresevich
Hall of Justice
400 County Center, 2nd Floor
Redwood City, CA 94063-1655

Dear Judge Etezadi:

The Board of Directors of the San Francisquito Creek Joint Powers Authority (SFCJPA) voted at its public meeting on July 23, 2015 to authorize me to send to you the following response to the San Mateo County Civil Grand Jury Report "Flooding Ahead: Planning for Sea Level Rise" released on June 4, 2015. The SFCJPA is listed as a "relevant local special agency" within the Report. As requested by the Grand Jury, this response indicates whether the SFCJPA agrees with or disagrees with (in whole or in part, with explanation) each of the twelve Findings within the June 4 Report. Furthermore, as requested in the June 4 Report, the letter responds to the Report's Recommendations R1, R2, R3, R4, R5, and R7.

SFCJPA Responses to each Finding

- F1. SMC is at severe risk for flooding due to the gradual rise in sea level, projected at up to 65 inches (167 centimeters) by the year 2100. Catastrophic SLR of nearly 15 feet is a possibility this century.
- SFCJPA: The SFCJPA agrees that properties within San Mateo County are at severe risk due to the continued rise in sea level, though we recognize that estimates of Sea Level Rise (SLR) over the next century vary greatly. Agencies ranging from the State of California to the federal government to United Nations have produced estimates of Sea Level Rise in the coming decades. The projects planned and designed by the SFCJPA incorporate Sea Level Rise that is anticipated to occur during the 50-year life of the project concurrent with an extreme (100-year) tide and with additional freeboard required by FEMA to remove properties from the National Flood Insurance Program. For example, for our SAFER Bay project protecting East Palo Alto and Menlo Park, our design objective is the new FEMA 100-year tide (11 feet NAVD 88) plus 24 inches of freeboard plus 36 inches of Sea Level Rise. This protection would be about 8.5 feet above the current average of the highest of the daily high tides.
- F2. SLR is a threat *countywide*, including the upland areas. All residents depend on public infrastructure, especially wastewater treatment plants. Also, a significant portion of the countywide property tax base is within the area threatened by SLR.
- SFCJPA: While the work of the SFCJPA is focused on the cities of East Palo Alto and Menlo Park, we agree that, if nothing is done, SLR will adversely impact upland areas.
- F3. Although many local officials are now familiar with and concerned about the threat of SLR, there is inadequate public awareness of SLR's potential impacts on this county.
- SFCJPA: We agree with this statement, and frequently discuss SLR and its impacts on the communities of East Palo Alto and Menlo Park during our public meetings.
- F4. Levees, including their financing, are currently the responsibility of each individual city or special agency with jurisdiction along streams, bay, and coast (the County is responsible for unincorporated areas).

- SFCJPA: The SFCJPA is only familiar with the responsibilities associated with levees in Menlo Park and East Palo Alto. We agree with F4 in the context of these two cities.
- F5. Flood risk is based on topography, not political boundaries. The safety of properties in one jurisdiction often depends on levee projects undertaken by another jurisdiction.
- SFCJPA: We agree with this statement, which summarizes why multi-jurisdictional flood protection projects – and the regional government agencies that plan and implement them – are important to addressing regional challenges. This does not mean that a regional project should be forced upon a jurisdiction that does not see its value – in this case the neighboring jurisdictions that desire the project should find a way to proceed with protecting their citizens.
- F6. Currently, no countywide agency exists to provide planning, facilitate coordination among jurisdictions, or to assist with securing funding for *existing* flood control projects. The same is true for future SLR-related projects.
- SFCJPA: We agree with this statement, as the San Mateo County Flood Control District (a founding member agency of the SFCJPA) is funded to work only in a few specific zones within the county.
- F7. To the Grand Jury's knowledge, no local jurisdiction has adopted SLR projections or maps for specific local land use planning purposes. No consistent SLR projection has been adopted countywide by the County and cities.
- SFCJPA: The SFCJPA is not aware that the County or cities within it have adopted a consistent SLR projection to plan their projects. As mentioned in the response above to Finding 1 or F1, the SFCJPA has adopted 36 inches of SLR concurrent with a 100-year tide and FEMA freeboard for its SAFER Bay project.
- F8. There is a recognized need for a countywide approach to SLR planning and coordination among jurisdictions.
- SFCJPA: The SFCJPA agrees that a regional approach to SLR, which may be countywide, is needed.
- F9. Several city managers and others interviewed did not support having a new countywide organization assume direct control of levee projects at this time.
- SFCJPA: The SFCJPA has seen the value of collaboration and shared responsibility among neighboring communities desiring to protect life and property and reduce requirements for flood insurance. While we believe that coordination among neighboring jurisdictions and the implementation of a life-safety project does not have to be interpreted as a challenge to any jurisdiction's sovereignty, we take no position on decisions made by cities outside our area of concern.
- F10. The County and cities can address SLR in their General Plans and Climate Action Plans, can map the threat, and can adopt relevant policies.
- SFCJPA: The SFCJPA agrees that these actions would be helpful to begin to address the issue.
- F11. Many actions to address SLR are within the authority of regional, State, and federal agencies.
- SFCJPA: We partially agree with this statement, as regional, State and federal agencies can influence actions that require regulatory permits or land easements, but we are not aware of any additional authority over such actions.
- F12. By acting *now*, SMC may be able to reduce future costs by integrating SLR-related projects with other programmed levee projects, and by using land use planning measures to mitigate future exposure to SLR.
- SFCJPA: The SFCJPA agrees with this statement.

SFCJPA Responses to Recommendations R1, R2, R3, R4, R5, and R7

R1. The County, each city in the county and relevant local special agencies should conduct a public education effort to increase awareness of SLR and its potential effects on this county.

SFCJPA: The SFCJPA is specifically listed as one of the two “local special agencies” in a footnote to this recommendation (the other is the San Mateo County Flood Control District). The SFCJPA has implemented and will continue to implement this recommendation over the next few years of our creek and SAFER Bay projects by discussing historical and predicted SLR, and its impacts on East Palo Alto and Menlo Park, during our public meetings.

R2. The County, each city in the county and relevant local special agencies should identify a single organization, such as a new joint powers authority or an expanded SMC Flood Control District, to undertake countywide SLR planning. It should be structured to ensure that:

- The organization is countywide in scope
- The organization is able to *focus* on SLR
- Both the County and cities (and possibly relevant local agencies) are able to participate in the organization’s decision-making
- The organization is sustainably funded

SFCJPA: This recommendation cannot be formally implemented by the SFCJPA because it is beyond our present legal authority to create a countywide agency. We can share our experience that a JPA or the SMC Flood Control District can provide the necessary coordination to flood protection, however it takes years for a JPA to develop the relationships and agreements among its member agencies necessary to plan, design, and implement major capital projects. If an expanded SMC Flood Control District is the preferred option to address SLR and other flooding concerns, it is important that jurisdictions that “opt in” to receive the benefits of its projects have a role in – and invest in – joint project planning. The four objectives for such an organization listed in R2 are important, though it need not *solely* focus on SLR to succeed at addressing that issue.

R3. The organization’s responsibilities should include:

- Adopt consistent SLR projections for use in levee planning countywide
- Conduct and/or evaluate vulnerability assessments
- Provide a forum for inter-jurisdictional coordination and exchange of information related to SLR
- Undertake grant applications for SLR-related planning and projects
- Facilitate raising funds on a countywide basis for SLR-related projects, to be passed through to agencies with direct responsibility for project construction
- Monitor actual SLR over time and any changes in SLR projections, based upon the latest federal, State, or regional government reports and scientific studies
- Through the CEQA environmental review process, comment on major new developments proposed in the SLR floodplain
- Advocate on behalf of the member jurisdictions with federal, State, and regional agencies regarding SLR issues
- Assist the County and cities in public awareness efforts, as described in R1

SFCJPA: This recommendation cannot be formally implemented by the SFCJPA because it is beyond our present legal authority to create a countywide agency. The SFCJPA believes these responsibilities are warranted and reasonable, and we recommend adding a responsibility to represent the County with regional entities related to flooding and SLR and that the words “and elected officials” be added to the second-to-last bullet after the word “agencies.”

R4. The County, cities and two relevant local special agencies should consider expanding the role of the organization beyond SLR to include planning and coordination of efforts to address *existing* flooding problems along the Bay, coast, and creeks that are subject to tidal action. It may be cost-effective to integrate SLR protection with other levee-improvement programs. The County and cities may also consider expanding the role of the new organization to include potentially compatible functions such as the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES), currently managed by C/CAG, and the new (2014) State requirements for local sustainable groundwater planning.

SFCJPA: This recommendation cannot be formally implemented by the SFCJPA because it is beyond our present legal authority to create a countywide agency. The SFCJPA believes this recommendation is warranted and reasonable because flooding from fluvial (freshwater) sources is closely linked to tides and SLR for creeks and storm drains near the shoreline of S.F. Bay or the Pacific Ocean, and because tides *currently* contribute to flooding problems in these areas. While the SFCJPA believes it is logical and cost-effective for one agency to address the inter-related challenges and opportunities involving flooding, storm water and groundwater as is done successfully in other counties, we would not want other issues to delay the creation or expansion of an entity focused on flood protection.

R5. The organization—its administration, staffing, and program expenses—should be funded on a sustainable basis by:

- Member contributions
- Contributions solicited from parties threatened by SLR, including corporations and agencies that operate public facilities such as wastewater treatment plants
- Grants solicited from available potential sources such as the California Climate Resilience Account
- Reducing administrative costs by contracting for services with the County or another agency

SFCJPA: This recommendation cannot be formally implemented by the SFCJPA because it is beyond our present legal authority to create a countywide agency. All of the sources listed above, as well as new revenue sources related to ballot measures and reductions in flood insurance premiums, are potential funding sources for this effort and the SFCJPA and its member agencies have benefitted from each. It is important to reiterate that all communities benefit from wastewater treatment plants.

R7. The County, cities, and relevant local special agencies, through their representatives on regional agencies, membership in state associations, lobbyists, and elected State and federal legislators, should pursue SLR-related issues with government bodies outside SMC.

SFCJPA: The SFCJPA has implemented and will continue to implement this recommendation through our work on regional organizations and our work with State and federal agencies and elected officials.

On behalf of the SFCJPA Board, thank you for taking on the complex and urgent long-term task of addressing Sea Level Rise and other flood risks in San Mateo County. Please let me know if we can be of further assistance.

Sincerely,

Len Materman
Executive Director