

From: [Samantha Hobart](#)
To: [Richard Simonitch](#)
Subject: Winship Bridge
Date: Monday, February 3, 2020 4:51:06 PM

I live at 78 Sir Francis Drake and would like to share my concerns with the work that is occurring upstream. I am completely uneducated on this type of work and I recognize that there are many considerations that am not aware of; i.e. I am aware that I am unaware. I don't even know how to ask smart questions because I don't receive complete and accurate information.

It is my full intention to help move this project along and make smart decisions together, but no one is helping us do that and the continued discrepancies in the information that is provided makes the situation worse. I bought my home October 2018 and the first meeting I was invited to was on 12/9/2019 by the good will of a neighbor. The town, county, or any other organization had not invited me which builds confusion and distrust. We need the necessary information to make sound decisions.

I want the greater good for the community as I have lived in Marin for 16+ years however I hope you can appreciate my great concern the actions the county is taking which will increase the risk of my property flooding.

Some of my current concerns are:

- 1) There are continued discrepancies between the information provided by the Town, County, etc.
- 2) It was my understanding that me and my neighbors would be receiving a flood elevation report with the work that was done by Oberkamper. This did not happen. All I received was a one page piece of paper that stated the 25 year and 100 year flood levels at a few different points on my property, however no one is showing me the elevation of the ground. How can I make an informed decision if I can't compare the flood levels to the ground level?
- 3) The work upstream seems to be moving forward before mitigating the risks downstream to me and my neighbors which makes no sense. Why would the county increase the risk to a specific neighborhood without mitigating that risk first? What happens when our homes flood? We should be planning proactively instead of reactively after the damage/risk has occurred.
- 4) No one as advised me on how increased risk is being addressed. For example, if water levels are increasing 1 inch, even though that may be below my first finished floor, how does that increase therisk for flooding?
- 5) The county is advising all the flood levels in comparison to the first finished floor of my home, however water underneath my home in the crawl space is still detrimental to the integrity of my home. Therefore, there should be mitigation measures taken to also not allow water underneath my home.
- 6) I am unclear on the scope of the proposed work and how it will affect my home. For example, if there is damage to drywall, who is responsible for that? My home is older as well, so what happens when I need new electrical because of the proposed work from the town, but the amperage from the street is not sufficient and a new subpanel is required. There are multiple examples, but the point is one project snowballs to another. Who is

responsible for that?

- 7) I have great concerns on how the work upstream will decrease the value of my home. With the increased risk of flooding, there will be damage to my home with lost equity. What is the town and county doing to help protect the values of our homes?

There were funds raised and taxes that we all pay to remedy the flood risk to ALL neighbors, not just a select group and me and my neighbors also need to be considered and the flood risks removed from our homes as well. The homes that are receiving reduced flood risks will also have the benefit of potential reduced or eliminated flood insurance costs. ALL neighbors should be receiving the same considerations.

I would like to continue the conversation and come to an agreement that takes all risks in to consideration.

Thank you,
Samantha

From: [John Crane](#)
To: [Richard Simonitch](#); [Joe Chinn - Town Manager](#); [Linda Lopez](#)
Subject: Hearing Date & Time Wrong
Date: Monday, February 3, 2020 4:59:06 PM
Attachments: [TOWN OF ROSS JOHN CRANE 2.3.20.pdf](#)
[TOWN OF ROSS JOHN CRANE 2.3.20.pdf](#)

February 3, 2020

Richard Simonitch
Public Works Director/Engineer
Town of Ross Public Works Department
P.O. Box 320^[1]_[SEP]
Ross, CA 94957

RE: WINSHIP AVENUE BRIDGE OVER SAN ANSELMO CREEK REPLACEMENT
PROJECT (BRIDGE NO. 27C0074) INITIAL STUDY/MITIGATED NEGATIVE
DECLARATION COMMENT

Dear Mr. Simonitch:

For the public record, it has just been called to my attention that the:

NOTICE OF TOWN COUNCIL HEARING AND
NOTICE OF INTENT TO ADOPT A NEGATIVE DECLARATION
FOR THE NEW CONSTRUCTION OF THE WINSHIP BRIDGE
6:00 P.M. THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 13, 2018

I received a notice today and it matches the earlier one I received on January 5, 2020, postmarked 02 JAN 2020. I have attached it below.

The Winship Bridge Notice of Hearing email you sent on January 13, 2020. Here is the link: <https://files.constantcontact.com/b2138801501/1c667a8f-bd22-44dc-a37e-ee15a4793190.pdf>

This is causing confusion because you have the wrong year – 2018: and you have omitted the words “Mitigated” which is not correct. A Negative Declaration is not the same as a Mitigated Negative Declaration.

Also, you also say NOTICE OF INTENT TO ADOPT, which is deferent that NOTICE TO CONSIDER. This header is a discrepancy and expresses different intent than intended.

This is causing confusion for people. Clearly this is improper notice. And it could have reduced comments by giving an old date that residents thought had passed.

Since I am writing this at 4:50 p.m. on February, please add them to the public record

for comments. I would like to know how the Town of Ross will remedy this so that people are not confused.

Thank you.

John Crane
Attachments



TOWN OF ROSS

**NOTICE OF TOWN COUNCIL HEARING AND
NOTICE OF INTENT TO ADOPT A NEGATIVE DECLARATION
FOR THE NEW CONSTRUCTION OF THE WINSHIP BRIDGE
6:00 P.M. THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 13, 2018**

Owner: Town of Ross
Contact: Rich Simonitch, Public Works Director
Location: Winship Bridge
Zoning: R-1:B-10 (Single Family Residence, 10,000 Square Feet Min. Lot Size)
General Plan: ML (Medium Low Density 3-6 Units/Acre)

Public hearing for the Town Council to consider Design Review to allow for the new construction of the Winship Bridge. Design Review is required to allow the new construction of the bridge to be located within 25-feet of a creek, waterway, or drainageway. The Town Council will also consider the adoption of a Negative Declaration that has been prepared pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act.

The public hearing will be held at Ross Town Hall, 31 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard, at the corner of Sir Francis Drake Boulevard and Lagunitas Road. Copies of the Negative Declaration and the Plans are available for review during regular office hours in the Planning Department or can be accessed on the Town's website at the Frequently Requested Documents and Forms page link at www.townofross.org. The Town Council invites interested parties to submit written comments in advance of the hearing. Written comments will be received from January 3, 2020 through February 3, 2020 by 5:00PM and will be included in the Council agenda packet. Other written comments should be submitted at least 48 hours prior to the Council meeting so the Council has ample time to review the comments. A staff report will also be available at the Town web site at townofross.org on February 7, 2020. For further information, please contact Rich Simonitch, Public Works Director, at (415) 453-1453, extension 115, or rsimonitch@townofross.org.

DATE PUBLISHED: January 3, 2020

:

John Crane Films

415.847.5054

website: www.johncranefilms.com

email: johncranefilms@gmail.com



From: [Doug Ryan](#)
To: [Joe Chinn - Town Manager](#); [Richard Simonitch](#); [Rice, Katie](#); [Elizabeth Brekhus](#); [Julie McMillan](#); [Beach Kuhl](#); [Elizabeth Robbins](#); [Rupert Russell](#)
Subject: Winship Bridge CEQA
Date: Friday, January 31, 2020 9:51:09 PM

I am voicing my concerns over the decision to avoid an environment impact report (EIR) for the Winship Bridge replacement project. I reside at 74 Sir Francis Drake Blvd in Ross and am thus an affected and aggrieved party by your acceptance of a negative declaration.

"determine whether proposed project implementation would result in potentially significant or significant impacts on the physical environment; and (2) incorporate mitigation measures into the proposed project design, as necessary, to eliminate the proposed project's potentially significant or significant project impacts or reduce them to a less-than-significant level" from the introduction of the document.

By your own words, you are increasing the throughput through the new bridge compared to the old bridge. By simple physics, one or both of the following **MUST** occur: water velocity immediately downstream of the bridge will increase; and/or water levels immediately downstream of the bridge will occur. Therefore, my property **WILL** be adversely impacted. Either increased erosion will occur over time and/or my property will be more prone to flooding than it is today due to your decision to replace the existing bridge with one that will have a higher throughput. Additionally, there is no discussion of the impacts on the bridge at Sir Francis Drake Blvd immediately adjacent to my house. Another of my concerns is whether that bridge can handle the increased throughput you propose to put through the Winship Bridge.

Per your CEQA:

- a) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:
 - i) result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site;
 - ii) substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite;
 - iii) create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or
 - iv) impede or redirect flood flows?

You state in the beginning you will increase the throughput capacity of the bridge. **THEREFORE**, in the event of a flood, a)iv) **YOU WILL IMPEDE OR REDIRECT FLOOD FLOWS**. There can be no waffling, misunderstanding, or not being clear here. You have decided to increase throughput capacity which will put **MORE** water on my property in the event of a flood. Therefore you are responsible for any negative consequences to my property, including in its entirety any loss in market value or decrease in marketability of my property. Furthermore, you state here that this project is a component of the Ross Valley Flood Reduction program. Please be advised the Board of Supervisors unanimously acknowledged in their adoption of the flood control project that my property (among others) will be negatively impacted. You are hereby noticed that is part of the public record.

Under the near-term foreseeable future projects condition, modeling results show increased water surface elevations by up to 4 inches in the floodplain area between the

Winship Avenue and the downstream crossing of the Sir Francis Drake Avenue due to more floodwater in the channel. These potential cumulative effects are more fully described in **Section 3.23 “Mandatory Findings of Significance”**.

FOUR MORE INCHES of water on my property certainly has a disastrous and calamitous effect on my property. Again there can be no misunderstanding. Any damage to my property as the result of this shall be the responsibility of the Town of Ross.

For all the reasons cited above, I implore you to do the right thing and prepare a full EIR that documents the impacts to those properties affected (including mine) so that prudent and necessary mitigation measures can be identified and taken prior to the foreseeable calamity of pretending everything is fine.

Please feel free to contact me directly to further discuss.

Doug Ryan

415.297.8402

John C. Crane

86 Sir Francis Drake Blvd., San Anselmo, CA 94960
(415) 847.5054 | john@johncranefilms.com | www.johncranefilms.com

January 31, 2020

Richard Simonitch
Public Works Director/Engineer
Town of Ross Public Works Department
P.O. Box 320
Ross, CA 94957

RE: WINSHIP AVENUE BRIDGE OVER SAN ANSELMO CREEK
REPLACEMENT PROJECT (BRIDGE NO. 27C0074) INITIAL
STUDY/MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION COMMENT

Dear Mr. Simonitch:

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comment on the Winship Avenue Bridge over San Anselmo Creek Replacement Project (Bridge No. 27C0074) Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration Comment (the "IS/MND").

Given that the County's overall Ross Valley Flood Programs are in a state of disarray, the timing for replacement of Winship Bridge should be of huge concern to all. Replacing the bridge, before County plans are finalized, will open the floodgates to a host of unknown problems. This is not a risk worth taking.

I urge the town to reconsider the decision to replace Winship Bridge and allow the County time to solve the problems as promised when they enacted flood fees in 2007.

Removing and replacing Winship Bridge in conjunction with the San Anselmo Flood Risk Reduction Project (SAFRR) exposes downstream homeowners and property owners to new inundation. This increased potential applies not only to the Winship neighborhood but also includes all creek-side neighbors extending to Lagunitas Bridge and beyond. Building the bridge without all the construction and flood mitigation measures fully considered has the potential to cause considerable damage to nearby homes and my property.

Repairing the bridge would eliminate virtually all the environmental problems and many design issues, and it solves many construction issues that have not been properly addressed in the IS/MND. I understand the Town of Ross sees a need

John C. Crane

86 Sir Francis Drake Blvd., San Anselmo, CA 94960
(415) 847.5054 | john@johncranefilms.com | www.johncranefilms.com

to replace Winship Bridge. However, since the costs for the repairing the bridge has never been fully explored, the Town of Ross should reexamine that option.

As a longtime resident, I have very significant concerns that the level of information and analysis provided by the IS/MND (as prepared by GEI Consultants) is deficient and does not adequately provide sufficient information to evaluate many of the project impacts that would occur within the Town of Ross.

The IS/MND improperly identifies and incorporates by reference other projects and/or mitigation measures to the Winship Bridge project as part of the project description. This potentially taints the baseline for evaluating reasonably foreseeable impacts as a result of this project. I note that there is not a single sentence that identifies an impact that remains as “potentially significant.”

I believe you have not met the required standards for a mitigated negative declaration and that there are many factual errors, out-of-date information, and discrepancies in the many studies cited in the IS/MND. I have noted my concerns in bullet points below, followed by a more in-depth discussion.

At 150 pages of detailed and technical information, the length of the IS/MND is a deterrent to public participation and an informed decision-making process. Despite the volume of information, as presented, the IS/MND is insufficient.

The following bullet points itemize some of my concerns about the IS/MND:

- **Page 3-75 Table 3-7:** Simulated water surface elevations are within inches of downstream properties' first finished floor elevations. Table 3-7 clearly shows that my home at 86 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard is at risk. It is not reasonable to expose my home to flooding when it has not previously flooded including the 2005 flood event. One scenario shows that there is **difference of just .18 feet or 2.25 inches. My home will flood if that is the plan.**
- **Page 3-73, section c) 1v) Impede or redirect flood flows:** The Town has relied on other projects to confirm the HEC-RAS 1D/2D unsteady-flow modeling is accurate. The IS/MND references other studies that are unavailable for review and the inability to review those studies potentially taints the baseline for evaluating reasonably foreseeable environmental impacts. What was the timing of the peer review by the United States Army Corp of Engineers (USACE) and SAFRR and which models did they review? Since modeling is not exact, the U.S. Geological Survey recommends measured verification, but that information is not provided.

Since models are not 100%, the margin of error should also be disclosed.

- **Pages 3-85 and 3-87, section 3.15.2 Discussion:** Incorrect information is given for the actual distance of my home from the bridge. Misstating the proximity of the “nearest sensitive land uses” (Construction Issues, page 3-87) creates a false sense of security for excessive ground-borne vibration damage. This error occurs twice in the IS/MND. It states on page 3-85 that “the nearest single-family residences are located within approximately 25 to 30 feet of where construction would occur.” **This is not true. My home is immediately adjacent to the bridge. It is just 11 feet away from the Winship Bridge and a mere 9 to 10 feet away from the abutment. That is 4 to 5 feet less than the length of a Toyota Camry (15.91 feet).** For the IS/MND to have this wrong is a serious mistake, which needs to be addressed with specific mitigation measures for construction and noise. It is imperative that the correct measurements are used and that the IS/MND does not minimize the potential for damage.
- **Page 3-87, section b) Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise:** To be clear, my specific concerns include statements such as “temporary sources of ground-borne vibration and noise during construction activities [including CISS pile driving into bedrock and heavy equipment that exceeds vibration levels] would result in adverse human reactions or building damage.” The very next sentence says “the nearest sensitive land uses are approximately 25-30 feet away.” As noted above, this statement is not true. On page 3-87, more details are needed to disclose how the Town of Ross and the construction contractor will “minimize construction-related vibration impacts to sensitive receptors and buildings,” including 86 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard. It is not clear what will happen when “temporary” vibrations cause temporary or permanent damage to my home. This needs to be properly considered and disclosed.
- **Page 3-104, section b) Would the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable?:** Please give the exact locations of where the barriers would be placed between Barber Avenue and Sir Francis Drake Bridge to keep “up to 4 inches” of the increased flow remains in the creek as discussed on page 3-104. Please address why there are no barriers for Winship Bridge to Sir Francis Drake Boulevard when it is the impacted area. Such barriers would alleviate potential damage. Why are the downstream homes that will be impacted not protected with the same measures given to upstream homes that won't be impacted? How many homes have been flooded in extreme event

John C. Crane

86 Sir Francis Drake Blvd., San Anselmo, CA 94960
(415) 847.5054 | john@johncranefilms.com | www.johncranefilms.com

(such as 2005) both upstream and downstream of Winship Bridge between Barber Avenue and the crossing at Sir Francis Drake Boulevard (Sir Francis Drake Bridge)?

- **Page 3-104:** The detailed descriptions of limited “minor downstream impacts” to be mitigated by the SAFRR project on page 3-104 are now known and need updating for public review. It should be noted that the mitigation measures are limited and minimal.
- **Page 2-1, section 2.2.1 Bridge Replacement Component:** Please detail the specific dates of when “flood flows have overtopped the bridge deck in the past” on page 2-2. My neighbors and I have not seen evidence of this. This underscores why relying on County models without verification potentially provides misinformation and makes it confusing for the public to accurately assess. If the Town has actual dates, they should be provided.
- **Pages 3-103 and 3-104 b) Would the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? :** Ross Valley Program elements are not finalized. Since the Ross Valley Program elements have not been finalized, how can the Town conclude that the “proposed project would not result in any cumulatively considerable incremental contribution to significant cumulative impacts”?
- **Pages 2-1, section 2.2.1 Bridge Replacement Component:** The costs for repairing or rehabilitating Winship Bridge versus replacing the bridge, according to section 2.2.1 Bridge Replacement Component, have not been explored. Repair would likely be less damaging to the environment, nearby homes, and residents of Ross. Not looking at the option because “design plans for the original bridge structure were (and continue to be) unavailable for review” is not an acceptable excuse as the bridge is not that complicated. How do you reconcile the cost to recreate such plans with the proposed impacts and resulting construction—and the potential damage to homes—that will take place in an around Winship Avenue and Sir Francis Drake Boulevard? The repair option would alleviate virtually all of those concerns.
- **Page 3-107, section c) Would the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly? :** To say there is “no impact on human beings either directly or indirectly” is not factually correct. There has been considerable harm done already to some residents who have had to deal

John C. Crane

86 Sir Francis Drake Blvd., San Anselmo, CA 94960
(415) 847.5054 | john@johncranefilms.com | www.johncranefilms.com

with the worry, stress, and uncertainty of their homes being inundated or damaged for a number of years. This has even caused some Ross homeowners to sell their homes at a discounted price (such as 20 Winship Avenue.) The IS/MND should be revised accordingly to accurately reflect the adverse effects on human beings during construction, on properties values, and on the potential for erosion after altering the flow of the creek.

- **Page 3-102, section Would the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable?:** This section states, “creek improvements in the lower end of the watershed [will] increase capacity and stability in the lower reaches to handle flood flows as they move through the watershed.” It is improper and inappropriate to use this as a benefit when the Town of Ross knows that the County Corte Madera Creek Project has no plan and that it has gone decades without a feasible one. What assurances can the Town offer residents that the County will deliver such a plan? As the above statement makes clear we need a plan to “increase capacity and stability” to handle flood flows.
- **Page 3-103, section 3.23.1 Discussion:** clearly states that “Each phase would incorporate various Ross Valley Program elements to provide a designated level of protection, which are 10- to 25 flood event protection (Phase 1) and 25- to 100-year flood event protection (Phase 2). Specific details regarding the exact size, design, location, sequencing, and phasing of Ross Valley Program elements have not been finalized yet.” Using 100-year flood protection benefits that will not happen until at least 2028-2050 creates a false impression of flood protection, and it is misleading to use this information as a project justification.

The above highlight some of my concerns, and I make additional comments below.

Simulated Water Surface Elevations Versus Home Elevations

Removing the bridge creates significant hydrological problems for 86 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard and other downstream properties. The Town of Ross is aware that the County’s plan is to add more water to the creek via SAFRR and that downstream measures for the Corte Madera Creek Project are not in place.

The simulated water surface elevations at the upstream face of Winship Bridge shown in the IS/MND are dangerously close to my home’s first finished floor as recently surveyed by Stetson Engineers, Inc. and documented in their Site Inspection Summary Memo dated December 3, 2019.

John C. Crane

86 Sir Francis Drake Blvd., San Anselmo, CA 94960
(415) 847.5054 | john@johncranefilms.com | www.johncranefilms.com

Looking at Table 3-7 Simulated Water Surface Elevations on page 3-75, and the Site Inspection Summary Memo prepared by Stetson Engineers, Inc. using licensed surveyors from Oberkamper & Associates shows my first finished floor to be 39.21 feet. Table 3-7 shows 39.03 feet at the upstream face of Winship Bridge in a 100-year flood flow event. **That is a difference of just .18 feet or 2.25 inches. My home will flood if that is the plan.**

Given that I am just a couple inches above the creek, I am very concerned about the small fluctuations that can occur in extreme floods.

There are natural fluctuations in raging floodwaters, and such things as waves, surges, and debris—which the creek is extremely vulnerable to due to the high number of trees inside the creek and on the banks—can quickly increase the water levels and create an unsafe situation and cause flooding.

For the record, my home did not flood in 2005, and it has never flooded in the 25 years I have lived in it. In 2005, 1 to 2 more inches in the creek would have entered my back bedroom door. Deliberately adding up to 4 more inches – as now planned - would flood my home in an event similar to 2005. And that is what is being planned.

On page 3-104 (in the section titled “Would the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable?”), the IS/MND states “modeling results also show increased water surface elevations by up to 4 inches in the floodplain area between the Winship Avenue and the downstream crossing of the Sir Francis Drake Avenue . . . due to more floodwater in the channel.” It is only logical to be highly concerned about flooding. This concern is exacerbated by the inherent uncertainty of modeling.

Removing the bridge *before* additional downstream measures are in place *heightens* this risk. It is claimed that the creek can handle more water just after Sir Francis Drake Bridge; however, this has been contested in numerous studies.

It should be pointed out that the section below Sir Francis Drake Bridge includes homes in repetitive loss areas. And is there any doubt that by the time more water reaches Lagunitas Bridge and the concrete channel beyond, it has the potential to cause more flooding?

Please detail what the Town of Ross will do to minimize damage to the environment, reduce risk, and ensure the safety of its residents. The Town needs to recognize that removing the bridge could cause my home and others' homes to flood and the Town should provide appropriate mitigation measures to prevent that occurrence.

John C. Crane

86 Sir Francis Drake Blvd., San Anselmo, CA 94960
(415) 847.5054 | john@johncranefilms.com | www.johncranefilms.com

Which Models Were Peer Reviewed?

Although the IS/MND makes it clear on page 3-74 that the models have been peer reviewed by “EIR SAFRR, the San Anselmo bridge replacement projects, the USACE’s Corte Madera Creek Flood Risk Reduction Project, and the Marin County’s Lower Corte Madera Creek Levee Evaluation Project,” it does not specify the timing of the peer review or offer sufficient detail as to which models were peer reviewed.

This is a concern because the SAFRR FEIR was certified on September 18, 2018, and it was announced that the County was going to terminate the USACE last fall before making it official in December 2019. Did they actually peer review the current model?

Since Stetson Engineers recently *reran the numbers* used in the Site Inspection Summary memo dated December 3, 2019, it calls into question when the peer review took place. Therefore, when the IS/MND says, “peer reviewed,” are they referring to the original numbers used for SAFRR FEIR or the more recent ones prepared by Stetson Engineers?

Please clarify when the peer reviews were done and which models and numbers were reviewed.

U.S. Geological Says Models Not 100% And Need Measured Verifications

What is the margin of error for the models? A slight miscalculation or a change in parameters could make a huge difference for homes just inches above simulated water levels.

According to the IS/MND on page 3-103, the simulated water surface elevations were determined by using a HEC-RAS 1D/2D unsteady-flow. According to the U.S. Geological Survey, there is a degree of model uncertainty for hydraulic conditions at bridge sites:

Although there is awareness of the utility of two-dimensional models to predict the complex hydraulic conditions at bridge structures, little guidance is available to indicate whether a one- or two-dimensional model will accurately estimate the hydraulic conditions at a bridge site.

-Simulation of Water-Surface Elevations and Velocity Distributions at the U.S. 13 Bridge, Tar River at Greenville, NC

John C. Crane

86 Sir Francis Drake Blvd., San Anselmo, CA 94960
(415) 847.5054 | john@johncranefilms.com | www.johncranefilms.com

The USGS also recommends that these models use a comparison with measured stage at stream gaging stations along with simulated water-surface elevations extrapolated upstream and downstream at the gage locations to help improve reliability.

There is no indication that this has been done in the IS/MND. I think the Town needs to clarify what was done exactly. Were the models verified with stream gauges? If so, which ones? Was the USGS Ross Gauge used to verify the models? San Anselmo?

Please comment on the methodology used and the verification methods the Town has relied on to confirm the modeling is accurate. Please provide what is the margin of error so we can assess the safety for avoiding the flooding of downstream homes.

Incorrect Information Regarding Distance of My Home

On page 3-85 under the section 3.15.2 Discussion in the fourth paragraph, it says “the nearest single-family residences are located within approximately 25 to 30 feet of where onsite construction would occur.”

This is incorrect. My home is just 11 feet away from the Winship Bridge and a mere 10 feet from the abutment. Not 25 to 30 feet. That is 4 to 5 feet less than the length of a Toyota Camry (15.91 feet).

The 3.15.2 Discussion addresses noise in a general way by limiting the hours, adding “noise barriers” for homes within 100 feet, and so forth, but it needs to clarify and provide details as to what specific measures will be done for my home which is much closer than acknowledged in the IS/MND.

This error is repeated again on page 3-87 under the section Construction Issues with slightly altered wording. Just below Table 3-11, it states that “the nearest sensitive land uses are approximately 25 to 30 feet from the project site.” ***Again, my home is just 11 feet away from the Winship Bridge and a mere 10 feet from the abutment.***

It is unclear to me why the IS/MND does not acknowledge this fact. Please describe why this indisputable fact was not disclosed and what additional mitigation measures will be enacted as a result.

Significant Construction Impacts Need to Be Mitigated

There is significant potential for physical damage to my home caused by

John C. Crane

86 Sir Francis Drake Blvd., San Anselmo, CA 94960
(415) 847.5054 | john@johncranefilms.com | www.johncranefilms.com

construction of Winship Bridge. It is a fact that my home is much closer than the IS/MND recognizes. My concerns also include, but are not limited to, using my property for construction as well as the age of my home.

In addition, I am concerned that construction could damage to the root system of the huge Redwood tree on my property (perhaps the largest in the area), and several trees that touch the abutment of the bridge and bridge. Please specify whether or not trees will be removed on my property, and whether or not an arborist should study and inspect the root system of my redwood. Are mitigation measures needed to protect my trees?

Please describe a specific plan that realistically addresses the potential problems caused by the construction of a new bridge just a few feet from my home. Such a plan should contain details that demonstrate what steps the Town of Ross and the construction contractor will take to avoid damage to my home, which is much closer than acknowledged. Although it is clear that the Town of Ross and the construction contractor take responsibility for any damage, what does that mean in practical terms if there is damage to my property? This should be clarified in the IS/MND.

On page 3-83 under Construction Vibration, it says the following:

- “Construction activities can cause vibration that varies in intensity depending on several factors. The use of pile driving and vibratory compaction equipment typically generates the highest construction related ground-borne vibration levels.”
- “The two primary concerns with construction-induced vibration, the potential to damage a structure and the potential to interfere with the enjoyment of life, are evaluated against different vibration limits.”
- “...the construction activity (e.g., impact pile driving) occurs immediately adjacent to the structure.”

My home is clearly “immediately adjacent” to bridge and, therefore, is at significant risk for being damaged. How do you propose to offset that adverse impact?

In addition, a further complication is that Quincy Engineering has clearly stated that the method of CISS piles to be used in construction is not the most desirable option.

Driving CISS piles deep into the bedrock layer, given the project is in a

John C. Crane

86 Sir Francis Drake Blvd., San Anselmo, CA 94960
(415) 847.5054 | john@johncranefilms.com | www.johncranefilms.com

residential neighborhood is **not** the most desirable option, as it would require considerable energy and result in high noise levels for extended periods of time.

- Preliminary Bridge Foundation Report dated November 13, 2017, prepared by Quincy Engineering

Using heavy equipment, as shown on Table 2-3 on page 2-12 under the heading Proposed Equipment and Purposes, such as a pile driver, a vibratory hammer, and a bulldozer will be used just a few feet from my home not 25 to 30 feet.

On page 3-88 in the section under Mitigation Measure N-2: Construction Vibration Reducing Best Management Practices, the IS/MND bullet point two states that:

- Should pile driving activities result in exceedances of the vibration threshold, the construction contractor will implement the following construction practices:
 - o Avoid impact pile-driving where possible in vibration-sensitive areas. Drilled piles or the use of a sonic or vibratory pile driver causes lower vibration levels where the geological conditions permit their use.
 - o Select demolition methods not involving impact, where possible. For example, sawing bridge decks into sections that can be loaded onto trucks results in lower vibration levels than impact demolition by pavement breakers, and milling generates lower vibration levels than excavation using clam shell or chisel drops.

Please explain how under Mitigation Measure N-2, the Town of Ross and the construction contractor will “minimize construction-related vibration impacts to sensitive receptors and buildings” including my home at 86 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard immediately adjacent to the bridge.

In summary, please state what mitigation measures will be taken to avoid damage to my property and what compensation the Town of Ross will provide if my home is damaged during construction of Winship Bridge. Please address both temporary loss and permanent damage to my property should either occur. Also please provide what has been budgeted for contingencies; cost overruns; mitigating damage to the environment, homes, and private property; and the like. Please provide a specific breakdown.

Significant Reduction in County’s Mitigation Measures

John C. Crane

86 Sir Francis Drake Blvd., San Anselmo, CA 94960
(415) 847.5054 | john@johncranefilms.com | www.johncranefilms.com

Stetson Engineers, Inc. has documented in their Site Inspection Summary Memo dated December 3, 2019 that only three homes—56 Lincoln Park, 20 Winship, and 78 SFD—will receive any kind of mitigation. (See Residential Survey and Site Inspection Results and Preliminary Mitigation Measures.)

For the record, the IS/MND was released on January 3, 2020, however the Site Inspection Summary is dated December 3, 2019.

The Site Inspection Summary Memo makes it abundantly clear that there will be very limited mitigation for homeowners. And none at all between Barber Avenue and Winship Bridge and only two mitigation measures between Winship Bridge and Sir Francis Drake Bridge. The IS/MND does not mention the results of Site Inspection Summary Memo noted above.

The findings in the IS/MND should be made clear so that residents have an understanding of what the county is actually going to do.

On page 3-104, the following points below need to be updated:

- Mitigation Measure 4.9-4: Provide Flood Protection to Substantially Affected Areas from the SAFRR Project Final EIR would reduce this cumulative impact to a *less-than-significant* level.
- To date, the County has conducted additional survey work at potentially inundated properties to determine where existing habitable structures would experience new inundation.
- As a result of this survey work, specific flood proofing recommendations (i.e., floodgates, structural raising, and flood proofing materials) are being implemented at these potentially inundated properties.

The Site Inspection Summary notes 13 properties, including my home at 86 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard, on its “Preliminary Identified Properties in the Vicinity of Winship Bridge Subject to New Inundation by the SAFRR Project” list, but that list is now down to three – and I am no longer on it. Limited mitigation measures increase the odds that homes and the environment could be damaged, and this information needs to be updated and included. No one wants to have his or her family home deliberately flooded by the County or Town.

Provide Location of Barriers to Keep Up To 4 Inches of Flow in the Creek

On page 3-104 (in the section titled “Would the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable?”), the IS/MND says that the “water surface levels will be increased up to 4 inches in the floodplain area

John C. Crane

86 Sir Francis Drake Blvd., San Anselmo, CA 94960
(415) 847.5054 | john@johncranefilms.com | www.johncranefilms.com

between Winship Avenue and the crossing of the Sir Francis Drake Avenue” and that “the increased flooding near the project site (i.e., between Barber Avenue and the Sir Francis Drake Bridge) under the 25- and 100-year flood events would be avoided by placing flood barriers along the creek channel on affected properties, which would cause those flows to stay in the creek channel.”

On page 3-104 it states, “Figures 3-9 and 3-10 show the changes in the HEC-RAS model-simulated floodplain extent and depth between the proposed project plus the Foreseeable Projects (cumulative condition) and existing conditions for the 100-year flood.” It does not say that barriers would be placed on affected properties between Winship Avenue and the crossing of the Sir Francis Drake Avenue, which are going to have up to 4 inches more water. This seems illogical. Please explain why there won’t be barriers in this area if it is the most impacted?

Please describe and provide the specific locations of where the barriers would be placed between Barber Avenue and Sir Francis Drake Bridge and how many inches of the “up to 4 inches” of the increased flow will remain in the creek. How many homes have been flooded in extreme event (such as 2005) both upstream and downstream of Winship Bridge between Barber Avenue and the crossing at Sir Francis Drake Boulevard (Sir Francis Drake Bridge)?

Cumulative Impacts Downstream Caused by Increased Water Levels

Page 104 states “this induced flooding may result in a *potentially significant* cumulative impact.”

In a *Marin Independent Journal* article published on January 18, 2020, Town of Ross’ Public Works Director/Engineer, Richard Simonitch, as follows:

With the SAFRR project completed, the new Winship Bridge would alleviate some increased water levels upstream of the bridge, but downstream water levels would be increased by a very minor, insignificant amount.

As stated earlier new inundations of up to 4 inches is a problem for some homes, so it is not insignificant. The Marin I.J. article continues:

Even those minor downstream impacts would be mitigated by the SAFRR project,” he said. “The important take away here is that Ross’ Winship bridge replacement project, taken by itself, has little if any impact on water levels in the creek, and alleviates increased water levels upstream of the bridge caused by the SAFRR.

John C. Crane

86 Sir Francis Drake Blvd., San Anselmo, CA 94960
(415) 847.5054 | john@johncranefilms.com | www.johncranefilms.com

We now know that there will be limited mitigation measures. This needs to be clearly communicated to decision makers.

Please provide a detailed description of how the impacts on water levels will not flood homeowners and properties downstream of Winship Bridge while providing benefits to upstream homes. Please explain how very limited mitigation measures will work downstream to protect homes.

I'm not convinced that my home should have been removed from the County's mitigation list when the simulated water levels on the upstream face of Winship Bridge are so dangerously close to my first finished floor. There is no margin for error, and in the USGS words: *"little guidance is available to indicate whether a one- or two-dimensional model will accurately estimate the hydraulic conditions at a bridge site."*

Ross Valley Program Elements Not Finalized So Cumulative Impacts Are Impossible to Know

How can the Town know the outcome of the County's efforts when the "Ross Valley Program elements have not been finalized?"

Drawing conclusions about cumulative impacts, when the plans are not finalized defies logic. These two statements from the IS/MND clearly illustrate this:

- Page 3-103: "Specific details regarding the exact size, design, location, sequencing, and phasing of Ross Valley Program elements have not been finalized yet."
- Page 3-104: "Consequently, the proposed project would not result in any cumulatively considerable incremental contribution to significant cumulative impacts resulting from the projects listed above or any other past, present, or probable future projects in the area."

These two statements are logically incompatible.

Since the "Ross Valley Program elements have not been finalized," how can the Town conclude the "proposed project would not result in any cumulatively considerable incremental contribution to significant cumulative impacts"?

Please describe how the Town can assure homeowners that future plans will not have significant cumulative impacts when the County plans are unknown.

Provide Dates for The Flood Flows That Overtop Winship Bridge

John C. Crane

86 Sir Francis Drake Blvd., San Anselmo, CA 94960
(415) 847.5054 | john@johncranefilms.com | www.johncranefilms.com

On page 2-2 in section 2.2.1 Bridge Replacement Component, it says:
“Additionally, the existing bridge’s small hydraulic opening is a contributor to flooding concerns in the Town as flood flows have overtopped the bridge deck in the past.”

However the neighbors who live near the Winship Bridge have never seen evidence of flood flows overtopping the bridge. If the Town has evidence, it should be disclosed. This statement in the IS/MND needs proof that it actually happened:

Page 2-2: “Accordingly, the current Marin County Flood Control Zone 9 hydraulic studies show the bridge being overtopped by the design 100-year event...”

As members of the Town Council may recall, Peter Brekhus, former Mayor for the Town of Ross, told the Council that this is wrong and that he has never seen flood flows overtop Winship Bridge in more than 40 years. I can confirm that I have never seen this happen either, and I have lived right next to Winship Bridge for 25 years.

The IS/MND should present evidence that Winship Bridge has actually been “overtopped” and provide the specific dates of when “flood flows have overtopped the bridge deck in the past” or remove the hypothetical models if measurable models cannot verify them.

A Substantial Impact on Water Levels, Velocity, and Flow

By design, the replacement of Winship Bridge includes a bigger opening and redirects the flow while the County almost *simultaneously increases the amount of water* in the creek.

On page 2-3, in Section 2.3 Project Objectives include:

- Providing a larger hydraulic opening for passage of water in San Anselmo Creek at Winship Avenue to improve drainage in the Town
- Shifting the bridge opening eastward to better align with the channel's historic alignment

This combination will have a substantial impact on water levels, velocity, and flow. By widening the bridge’s opening, increasing the water level up to 4 inches and changing the existing flow of the creek, it will introduce new patterns of erosion and introduce new problems to downstream properties, which could

John C. Crane

86 Sir Francis Drake Blvd., San Anselmo, CA 94960
(415) 847.5054 | john@johncranefilms.com | www.johncranefilms.com

include flooding and destruction. This needs to be acknowledged and studied to address the problems that come with these combined actions.

At 20 Winship where several trees including coast redwoods will be removed and mitigation measures are in place. 20 Winship Ave. is immediately downstream of Winship Bridge and directly opposite my home, you can see that many trees on the edge of the creek are at risk of falling. I have a major concern that additional erosion could make them topple, and they may fall across the creek and fall on my property. Increasing the flow by widening the opening on Winship Bridge will only make the situation worse. Those types of serious impacts need to be addressed and added to the IS/MND. I put the Town on notice that the trees at 20 Winship are one of my many concerns that will be exacerbated by replacing the old bridge with a new one. Even now one of the towering trees at 20 Winship Ave. are at risk of falling on my property.

Overstating Ross Valley Program

The IS/MND is using program elements that no longer exist and should be revised accordingly. It should clarify what the result will be when various elements cannot be delivered by the Ross Valley Program.

On page 3-102, section "b, the IS/MND asks whether the project would "have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable."

It states that "the primary goal of the Ross Valley Program is to substantially reduce the flood hazard in Ross Valley . . ."

But the IS/MND contains elements that are no longer relevant. This list includes the following:

1. Flood diversion storage (FDS) basins, located in the upper reaches of the watershed to detain peak flows outside of the creek network during flood events
2. Bridge replacements in Fairfax, San Anselmo, and Ross to remove impediments to flows in the creek and reduce localized flooding
3. Creek improvements in the lower end of the watershed to increase capacity and stability in the lower reaches to handle flood flows as they move through the watershed
4. Low impact development policies

5. Flood preparedness and educational programs

Figure 3-7 on page 3-105 shows nine detentions basins. However, current plans call for only one detention basin to be built. The IS/MND should reflect the current plans that can be realized and not plans that were envisioned and discarded long ago. The IS/MND should be amended to accurately reflect plans that will actually be implemented. And the Corte Madera Creek Project has no plan at all.

Timing Is Wrong Due to Corte Madera Creek Project Delays

“Creek improvements in the lower end of the watershed to increase capacity and stability in the lower reaches to handle flood flows as they move through the watershed”

The quote above from page 3-102 speaks to the need for the “Creek improvements in the lower end of the watershed to increase capacity and stability in the lower reaches to handle flood flows.”

However, the Town is well aware of the following problem – there is no current plan for the Corte Madera Creek Project or “lower reaches”:

- The Town of Ross is well aware there is still no flood plan for the Corte Madera Creek Project and that only recently has a RFP gone out for a consultant to prepare yet another EIR. (Per *The Morning After*, January 2020)
- We all know that getting the EIR approved, securing funding and then implementing viable flood control projects for the Corte Madera Creek Project is a long way off.
- It is well known and documented that a feasible plan for the Corte Madera Creek Project has eluded the Marin County Flood Control District and the United States Army Corp of Engineers (USACE) for decades. And that now USACE has been terminated.
- Moving forward without flood control projects in place from the Lagunitas Bridge to the College of Marin is too risky. There are too many inherent liabilities and consequences—all which can be avoided.

The Town of Ross has enough information to evaluate the situation before acting. Is the Town of Ross prepared to be a party to the County’s overall flood plans knowing that they are incomplete and potentially fatally flawed?

John C. Crane

86 Sir Francis Drake Blvd., San Anselmo, CA 94960
(415) 847.5054 | john@johncranefilms.com | www.johncranefilms.com

The IS/MND should clarify what the Town of Ross will do when and if the County fails to deliver the Corte Madera Creek Project in a timely fashion. What measures will the Town take to prevent flooding in Ross and the towns downstream?

Is Winship Bridge Eligible for Rehabilitation Funding?

On page 2-1 under 2.2.1 Bridge Replacement Component, the IS/MND acknowledges that the term “functionally obsolete” is a federal designation that means a bridge isn't up to current building standards. This is very different than “structurally deficient” which is a safety issue. It is functionally obsolete due to its “substandard deck geometry” according to the Town of Ross Winship Bridge Replacement Project website. There is no urgency for replacing the bridge because of safety issues. I know there are funding issues, but acting prematurely when the County’s plans are in state of flux is a mistake.

Winship Bridge has a “sufficiency rating” of 54.6 as noted in the IS/MND on page 2-1.

The costs to repair rather than replace the bridge has not been explored, as the Town voted (with one dissenting vote) not to even get an estimate for repair. It has been commonly believed by many that there is no funding available for repair. However, under the Federal Highway Bridge Program (HBP), bridges that have a sufficiency rating of less than 80 but greater than 50 are eligible for rehabilitation funding.

On page 2-2, the IS/MND says, “the purpose of the HBP is to replace or rehabilitate publicly owned bridges that the State and Federal Highway Administration have deemed significantly important but unsafe, due to structural deficiencies, physical deterioration, or functional obsolescence.”

At the October 24, 2016, Special Meeting for Ross Town Council, it was suggested that:

“...why is it an impossible task to provide the Council with a scope or quote on retrofitting the bridge and in order to do so they would have to remove the bridge. She wanted to know the cost of retrofitting this bridge so that it is seismically safe.”

“...staff visit the Flood Control District to see if funds are available to analyze repair efforts.”

John C. Crane

86 Sir Francis Drake Blvd., San Anselmo, CA 94960
(415) 847.5054 | john@johncranefilms.com | www.johncranefilms.com

I do not believe that the Council has ever explored if funds were available. A lot has changed since the 2016 meeting, which makes seeking funds for repair now worthy of reconsideration.

Repairing the bridge would provide an opportunity for the County to provide meaningful downstream measures.

Repair would eliminate virtually all the environmental problems and design issues and solve many construction issues, as well as preserving a bridge nominated for the National Historic List of Bridges.

Looking at the costs for the repair option, beginning with recreating “design plans for the original bridge structure [that] were (and continue to be) unavailable for review,” when all things are considered, may very well be a more affordable option.

Residents Are Impacted Despite The IS/MND Claims

On page 3-107, it states, “there is no impact to human beings.”

- “...the proposed project would not cause substantial adverse effects on human beings either directly or indirectly.”
- “Thus, construction and operation of the proposed project would not cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly, and would improve the quality of life for humans...”

I would argue that there has been considerable harm done already to some residents, who have had to deal with the worry, stress, and uncertainty as to whether their homes will be impacted or flooded for a number of years. It has even caused some Ross homeowners to sell their homes.

Only two homes, downstream of Winship Bridge, will be the recipients of County mitigation measures via SAFRR. This is ironic because both homes were recently sold, and the new owners are receiving County protection while other homes such as my own have been removed from the mitigation list. This is disturbing to say the least. Liz Lewis, Planning Manager at Marin County Public Works, told the former owner of 20 Winship Avenue that she would not receive any mitigation measures from the County, prompting her to sell for less than full value. She and her daughter suffered great emotional distress over the County’s unwillingness to provide mitigation to her home - now being provided to the new owner. The County is going to provide the exact same mitigation measures to protect her garage that she sought and were denied. She sold her home at a

John C. Crane

86 Sir Francis Drake Blvd., San Anselmo, CA 94960
(415) 847.5054 | john@johncranefilms.com | www.johncranefilms.com

large discount because of the bridge project.

During the October 24, 2016, Special Meeting for Ross Town Council, a council member expressed “concern for the consequences of (council member) to the Town if the bridge hydrology changes and there are impacts to downstream properties, the Town will have lawsuits.”

I have already expressed my concern that construction of Winship Bridge so close to my home could have a significant impact on my home and my family. And that my home could be flooded the County and Towns’ combined action.

So to say there is “*no impact on human beings either directly or indirectly*” is not factually correct. The IS/MND should be revised accordingly to accurately reflect the adverse effects on human beings during construction, on properties values, and on the significant potential for erosion after altering the flow of the creek.

Flooding Other Towns and Homes Is Not Reasonable or Rational

The Town of Ross knows that, for now, the County has abandoned all hope of providing the 100-year level of flood protection that our flood fees, starting in 2007, were to provide. The 100-year level of flood protection will not be realized —if ever—until 2028 to 2050 in phase 2 (according to the Draft). That is a long way off, and there is no guarantee it will ever happen.

Quoting from page 3-103 under 3.23.1 Discussion:

To focus implementation efforts, the Flood Control District proposes to develop the Ross Valley Program elements in two phases: 2017-2027 (Phase 1) and 2028-2050 (Phase 2). Each phase would incorporate various Ross Valley Program elements to provide a designated level of flood protection, which are 10- to 25-year flood event protection (Phase 1) and 25- to 100-year flood event protection (Phase 2). Specific details regarding the exact size, design, location, sequencing, and phasing of Ross Valley Program elements have not been finalized yet.

The Town also knows that in 2012, the 100-year goal was lowered to a 25-year-level of flood valley-wide protection, but now the County cannot even achieve that. And now the County is now looking at a 6-year level of flood protection—perhaps a 10-year at best.

The original plan was to send floodwaters all the way to the bay. But now the solution is to send floodwaters from San Anselmo to the Town of Ross, Kentfield

John C. Crane

86 Sir Francis Drake Blvd., San Anselmo, CA 94960
(415) 847.5054 | john@johncranefilms.com | www.johncranefilms.com

and Larkspur, however, without a plan in place, which eliminates or *even limits* downstream flooding.

The problem with the IS/MND is that it references benefits and data from the 100-year level of flood protection as current facts; however, we are now looking at a greatly reduced level of flood protection for the near future. This is misleading and needs to be corrected in the IS/MND.

Conclusion

The IS/MND is inadequate and fails to provide decision-makers necessary information to make an informed decision on the merits of this project. The absence of many mitigation measures—with potentially flawed assumptions on impacts to the environment, private properties, and humans—renders the IS/MND deficient. Therefore, the record as a whole does not meet the California Environmental Quality Act's (CQEA) standards for a Mitigated Negative Declaration, and an EIR should be prepared.

In conclusion, I hope that the Town of Ross will reevaluate the replacement of Winship Bridge and consider repairing it as a more reasonable measure.

The Town must take the time to get it right, otherwise we will only have disastrous consequences.

Sincerely,

John Crane

John C. Crane

86 Sir Francis Drake Blvd., San Anselmo, CA 94960
(415) 847-5054 | john@johncranefilms.com | www.johncranefilms.com

February 1, 2020

Mayor Elizabeth Brekhus and Town Council
Town of Ross
P.O. Box 320
Ross, CA 94957

Dear Mayor Elizabeth Brekhus and Town Council:

I have lived in the Town of Ross for more than 25 years. I love it here, as do my children and grandchildren. As my daughter said over Christmas, "Your home is so cozy, Dad." My children went to Ross School, and my father and aunt spent their childhood summers in the Town of Ross and Kentfield. We have been part of this community for decades.

I am writing to explain my concerns about the Winship Bridge replacement project. I have read the Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND) cover-to-cover, attended as many flood meetings as possible, and read everything I could about flooding in Marin County. I can see how hard it is to find a comprehensive solution for flooding in the Ross Valley, but that is the challenge before us.

I want to briefly address two of the biggest impacts that replacing the Winship Bridge, as planned in the IS/MND, will have on me. Firstly, my home and property will suffer water damage and be flooded. And secondly, my home and property will suffer structural damage to the foundation, dwellings and more caused by construction, and that I will lose or suffer damage to portions of my fence, deck, trees, tree roots, overhead branches and more. None of which is addressed in the IS/MND as it should be. There needs to be clear mitigation measures, remedies for repair, replacements and contingencies for other unforeseen consequences. These need to be addressed in advance of the project.

In my research, I discovered that the IS/MND contains several inaccuracies and discrepancies in its data and conclusions, which I have identified and submitted in my comments to the Public Works Director and Town Clerk. I would like to add this letter's summation of my concerns to the record as well.

In regard to my first concern about flooding, my back door is just 11 feet from the bridge, not 25 to 30 feet as the IS/MND erroneously states. My bedroom door is virtually the same height as the new simulated water levels at the bridge. While my home did not flood in the 2005 flood event, removing the bridge in conjunction with the County's San Anselmo Flood Risk Reduction Project will raise the creek by 4 more inches and, thereby, flood my home.

To my second concern, construction will create ground-borne vibrations – which can shake the ground like an earthquake - and other heavy equipment related damages that

John C. Crane

86 Sir Francis Drake Blvd., San Anselmo, CA 94960
(415) 847-5054 | john@johncranefilms.com | www.johncranefilms.com

will cause temporary or permanent damage to my home. This includes, but is not limited to, foundation settling or cracking, interior cracking of walls, floors and windows or other structural damage as well as utility failure which can cause electrical, gas, water or plumbing related damage.

And although the IS/MND says there will be “no impact from excessive noise to people residing or working in the project area,” I know by experience (building of Imagination Park in San Anselmo, China Basin in San Francisco, and renovation of 4 Grant Ave in San Francisco) that the noise from heavy construction equipment and pile driving will make it impossible to live here and run my business during construction (which involves sound and video editing, writing, and telecommunications). This, too, need to be addressed in advance and considered.

All in all, IS/MND is inadequate and fails to provide decision-makers necessary information to make an informed decision on the merits of this project. The absence of many mitigation measures—with potentially flawed assumptions on impacts to the environment, private properties, and humans—renders the IS/MND deficient. Therefore, the record as a whole does not meet the California Environmental Quality Act’s (CQEA) standards for a Mitigated Negative Declaration, and an EIR should be prepared.

I cannot state this strongly enough. If the Winship Bridge project goes ahead as planned in the IS/MND, my home will flood or be otherwise destroyed by construction, my property value will drop, and/or my flood insurance premium will be increased. Additionally, my business will not be able to function at capacity. I cannot afford such property and financial impacts.

For every cause, there is an effect, and since replacing the bridge at this time will open the floodgates (in a very literal sense) to a host of problems, I urge the Town of Ross to reconsider repairing or rehabilitating the bridge as a more rational and prudent course of action.

The IS/MND acknowledges that the term “functionally obsolete” is a federal designation that means a bridge isn't up to current building standards. This is very different than “structurally deficient” which is a safety issue. The IS/MND makes it clear there is funding for either replacement or rehabilitation, under the Federal Highway Bridge Program (HBP), for bridges that have a sufficiency rating of less than 80 but greater than 50. Winship Bridge has a sufficiency rating of 54.6 as noted in the IS/MND.

As you consider options for the bridge, I offer an open invitation to the Mayor and Town Council members to visit my home—preferably before the February 13, 2020, Town Council meeting—to see firsthand how close my home actually is to the bridge. I’m confident that you’ll understand the complexity of the proposed project in a new light and see that my concerns are valid. I can make my schedule work for any time and day that best suits you as a group or as individuals.

John C. Crane

86 Sir Francis Drake Blvd., San Anselmo, CA 94960
(415) 847-5054 | john@johncranefilms.com | www.johncranefilms.com

Thank you for taking the time to consider my concerns. I look forward to hearing from you in the near future.

Sincerely,

John Crane

cc: Joe Chinn, Town Manager

Linda Lopez, Town Clerk

Richard Simonitch, Public Works Director/Town Engineer

**James Bradley O'Connell
Leslie A. O'Connell
P.O. Box 653
15 Sir Francis Drake Blvd.
Ross, CA 94957
415.459.9939**

3 February 2020

Richard Simonitch
Public Works Director/Engineer
Town of Ross Public Works Department
P.O. Box 320
Ross, CA 94957

Re: Winship Avenue Bridge over San Anselmo Creek Replacement Project (Bridge No. 27C0074) Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration Comment

We are concerned about possible harm that the Winship Bridge Project may cause to homes downstream from the bridge. The County's Corte Madera Creek Project plans are currently unknown, and the impact of changing the creek hydrology at San Anselmo is unclear. Our property is located downstream from the Laganitas Bridge, on the strip of Sir Francis Drake Blvd adjacent to the Corte Madera Creek. This matter is of concern to us because our property was subject to flooding in the December 2005 event, and we have also experienced near flooding on several occasions during the sixteen years we have lived here.

Please explain why one of the key objectives (per 2.3 Project Objectives) which is to provide: "a larger hydraulic opening for passage of water in San Anselmo Creek at Winship Avenue to improve drainage in the Town" in tandem with the San Anselmo Flood Risk Reduction Project (SAFRR) will not induce more flooding downstream. How is it possible to put 4" more water in the creek upstream and not have it travel downstream?

A few relevant sections from the Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (the "IS/MND"):

- On page 3-75 it states: "Under the near-term foreseeable future projects condition, modeling results show increased water surface elevations by up to 4

inches in the floodplain area between the Winship Avenue and the downstream crossing of the Sir Francis Drake Avenue due to more floodwater in the channel.”

- On page 3-104 it states: “The results show that the proposed project under the cumulative condition would reduce the 100-year water surface elevation by up to 18 inches in the Upper San Anselmo area and by up to 7 inches in the Lower San Anselmo area (including the project site). Replacement of the bridges under the cumulative condition would increase the capacity of the creek to convey floodwaters (allow more water in the channel) and reduce floodwater overflow into the floodplain and, thus, result in less flooding in downtown San Anselmo, a largely beneficial impact for the Ross Valley. However, modeling results also show increased water surface elevations by up to 4 inches in the floodplain area between the Winship Avenue and the downstream crossing of the Sir Francis Drake Avenue (the area with red numbers shown in **Figure 3-10**) due to more floodwater in the channel. This induced flooding may result in a *potentially significant* cumulative impact.”
- On page 3-104 it states: “As more fully described in the SAFRR Project EIR, the increased flooding near the project site (i.e., between Barber Avenue and the Sir Francis Drake Bridge) under the 25- and 100-year flood events would be avoided by placing flood barriers along the creek channel on affected properties, which would cause those flows to stay in the creek channel. Downstream of the Sir Francis Drake Bridge, the creek channel has the extra capacity to contain the increased peak discharge; therefore, in the near-term cumulative scenario, implementation of the SAFRR Project (including Mitigation Measure 4.9-4: Provide Flood Protection to Substantially Affected Areas from the SAFRR Project Final EIR) would reduce this cumulative impact to a *less-than-significant* level.

How do you reconcile that downstream of Sir Francis Drake Bridge that “the creek channel has the extra capacity to contain the increased peak discharge” with the fact that the channel narrows again at Lagunitas Bridge and flows into a concrete channel that will not have any flood controls in for the foreseeable future. It is convenient for SAFRR to state that it will “reduce this cumulative impact to a *less-than-significant* level” when it is outside the scope of their project. What is unacceptable is to not have a plan that will work downstream of the SAFRR scope. Without the County’s Corte Madera Creek Project there are no protection measures for the downstream portion of the creek.

As the IS/MND states: “a larger hydraulic opening for passage of water in San Anselmo Creek at Winship Avenue to improve drainage in the Town,” but doesn’t even say which Town are they referring to. This is a lot of information that is not clearly presented that the public can readily understand.

The IS/MND does not adequately address the consequences downstream with sufficient information to evaluate the impacts to our home in the Town of Ross.

Sincerely,

Leslie O'Connell

From: [Jennifer Mota](#)
To: [Joe Chinn - Town Manager](#); [Richard Simonitch](#)
Subject: Winship Bridge Project Concerns
Date: Monday, February 3, 2020 9:09:18 AM

February 3, 2020

Richard Simonitch
Public Works Director/Engineer
Town of Ross Public Works Department
P.O. Box 320
Ross, CA 94957

Dear Mr. Simonitch,

My name is Jennifer Mota at 82 Sir Francis Drake Blvd. I am writing about concerns over the proposed construction of Winship Bridge. The increased risk of flooding due to the bridge project and excessive noise from nearby construction has me very concerned.

Your CEQA clearly states you will increase the throughput capacity of the bridge which will have a negative effect on my property. There needs to be an EIR completed to specifically identify the exact effects this will have on my parcel at 82 Sir Francis Drake Blvd. and my neighbors, who will be impacted by this project. What impact will that have on my flood insurance? What about my property value? Not to mention an increased risk of flooding and/or erosion. It would be irresponsible to go ahead with this project without completing an EIR and answering these extremely important questions. If the project is completed, it will have a negative impact on my home in an event of a flood. If this occurs without proper mitigation, I will consider you to be responsible for any loss of my home or my properties value.

As a mother of an infant and toddler I am also extremely concerned about the wellbeing of my children and how this project will be detrimental to their healthy living environment.

The Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration states that it "is unlawful for any person or Construction Company within the Town limits to perform any construction operation before 8:00 a.m. or after 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday of each week and not at any time on Saturday, Sunday, or the other

holidays listed in Section 9.20.060.”

As you know, young children need frequent naps during the day. How will this be possible tearing down a bridge and building a new one? In Table 3.15 Noise, it asks the question “would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels.” The box checked is “No Impact.” How is it possible that construction noises won’t keep my babies awake? Or that my house won’t shake from “ground borne construction vibrations?”. How will my children take naps between the hours of 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. with such nearby construction? What about all the dust and dirt caused by construction? Will they be able to play in our yard? I think not....

I am also concerned for my neighbor next door, Neil Mason at 84 Sir Francis Drake Blvd. who is elderly and stays home most of the time. What about the impacts on him?

I don’t believe the Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration is correct when it says there is no impact because of noise. It is not possible, and the document should be corrected.

I don’t think the Town of Ross has fully considered the impact to people living near Winship Bridge. Towards the end of the document (on page number 107) it says, “Thus, construction and operation of the proposed project would not cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly and would improve the quality of life for humans...”

This absolutely as wrong as it can be. I hope the Town of Ross does not truly believe this. And taking steps to correct this before it is too late.

Sincerely,

Jenny Mota



John Crane <johncranefilms@gmail.com>

Re: letter

1 message

John Crane <johncranefilms@gmail.com>

Mon, Feb 3, 2020 at 1:24 PM

To: Richard Simonitch <rsimonitch@townofross.org>

Richard - I would like you to use whatever internal mechanism is normal for getting letters to the Mayor and Town Council as emails are sometimes overlooked.

And yes I would like it logged into the official record.

Thank you for your follow up and help. It is very appreciated.

Sincerely,

John

Sent from my iPhone

On Feb 3, 2020, at 10:26 AM, Richard Simonitch <rsimonitch@townofross.org> wrote:

John,

We have received your letter to the Mayor and Town Council. Just to be clear, this letter has already been delivered to the intended recipients and staff is receiving it only for the record and there is no need to forward it. Please let me know if otherwise.

Thank you,

Richard Simonitch

Public Works Director/Town Engineer

Town of Ross

P.O. Box 320

Ross, CA 94957

(415) 453-1453 ext. 115

This email and attachments may contain information that is confidential, privileged and protected from disclosure. Review, dissemination or copying is prohibited. If this email is not intended for you, please notify the sender and immediately delete the entire transmittal.

From: John Crane <johncranefilms@gmail.com>

Sent: Monday, February 3, 2020 9:40 AM

To: Richard Simonitch <rsimonitch@townofross.org>; Joe Chinn - Town Manager <jchinn@townofross.org>; Linda Lopez <llopez@townofross.org>

Subject:

Dear Richard, Joe and Linda:

I would like to add my letter to Mayor Elizabeth Brekhus and Town Council addressing my concerns for the Initial Study /Mitigated Negative Declaration Comment (the “IS/MND”) to the record.

Please confirm that you have received it.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

John Crane Films

415.847.5054

website: www.johncranefilms.com

email: johncranefilms@gmail.com



John C. Crane

86 Sir Francis Drake Blvd., San Anselmo, CA 94960
415.847.5054 | john@johncranefilms.com | www.johncranefilms.com

February, 3 2020

Richard Simonitch
Public Works Director/Engineer
Town of Ross Public Works Department
P.O. Box 320
Ross, CA 94957

Dear Richard:

I would like to add this letter to Mayor Elizabeth Brekhus and Town Council addressing my concerns for the Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration Comment (the "IS/MND") to the record.

Sincerely,

John Crane