

Challenges, Concerns and IMC General Recommendations

Challenges and concerns regarding Permitting, Capital Funding Partnerships and Climatic Extremes will likely continue throughout the life of the SCW program. This year there is the additional complexity from the uncertainty of support from the Federal government.

Permitting – (Prior year comments/recommendations)

The majority of capital projects in the Annual Report require permits from other agencies and obtaining these permits in a timely manner can be a challenge. Permit delays can increase construction costs and erode the public's trust.

- The IMC recommends the District continue to look for new ways to reduce or eliminate permitting delays and provide the public with clear information about the timeline for each project including specific information about how long the District has been waiting for permits from other agencies and steps taken to address the delays.
- The IMC recommends staff develop an action plan to make sure all options to address permit delays have been explored and include that information in the next Annual Report.

2015-2016 Recommendations:

- *Include a table that lists each capital project and shows the different agencies providing approval for each project with a simple H, M, or L (high, medium, low) to indicate level of confidence that approval for the project will be received.*
- *Regarding the length of time the District has been waiting for permits from other agencies:*
 - *Include the date the application was accepted as completed and the number of days the agency has to respond, if applicable.*
 - *If there is a delay beyond the respond by date, provide information about next steps taken by the District to address the delay.*

Capital Funding Partnerships – (Prior year comments/recommendations)

Large capital projects cannot be funded solely by the District and can rely heavily on funds from outside agencies. There are two areas which can prove challenging to the successful completion of these types of projects.

- **Funding** – Funding from outside agencies is not always guaranteed nor is it always delivered at the projected time.
- **Local Priorities** – *(vs priorities associated with Federal project funding)*
 - The IMC recommends the District continue to develop projects that reflect our local priority of enhancing and improving the condition of our rivers and creeks while providing the necessary flood protection.

2015-2016 Recommendation: The IMC recommends the 2016-2017 SCW report include a table listing each project with multiple funding sources with a simple H, M, or L (high, medium, low) for each funding source to indicate level of confidence that funding will be received.

Climatic Extremes - (Prior year comments/recommendations)

Drought

The effect of the drought on stream flow, water quality and vegetation restoration has created challenges for meeting specific KPIs in several projects. For the District as a whole, the immediate need for staff to address the impacts of the drought on available water has diverted staff time from the program to the pressing need to conserve and find other sources of water.

- The IMC recommends the District re-evaluate the timing and costs of projects significantly affected by the drought.
- The IMC recommends the District provide information about how the need to address our critical water shortage has affected staff time for the Safe, Clean Water and Natural Flood Protection Program.

2015-2016 Recommendation: None

IMC Recommendations - Annual Report Format

Status Box/Status Section

If the status of a project changes from On-Target, provide a brief explanation (a few words) under the status box. In addition, create a Status History section that shows the year and status. Maintain that information in all subsequent SCW Annual Reports.

Maps

Review all maps in the report to ensure they have appropriate legends.

Confidence Levels - Jurisdictional Complexity

Projects including information regarding Confidence Levels should complete the Jurisdictional Complexity section and list the other organizations with jurisdictional authority.

Priority B – Reduce Toxins, Hazards and Contaminants in Our Waterways

The IMC recommends the 2016-2017 report include a table showing the cost of the creek and river clean-up projects with the tonnage of trash removed for each affected watershed for projects B1, B2, B3, B4, B6, and B7.

Appendix A – Cumulative Financial Summary FY 2013-2016, page A-2

Revenue – Other (\$79.7 million)

Identify the source of these funds and the amount per source as an additional table to Appendix A.

Appendix C – Grantee and Partners Information

- Include the date the project was completed and the measureable results from that project.
- For creek clean ups include tonnage of trash removed and the locations where the trash was removed.
- Clarify the title of Appendix C to differentiate community partnerships from capital project partners not included in this table.

Additional IMC Support

The IMC requests that the District:

- Continue to provide opportunities for IMC members to visit projects to obtain a better understanding of SCW Projects.
- Provide presentations on the following:
 - Santa Clara Valley Open Space Authority and the opportunities resulting from the passage of Measure Q
 - SCW Independent Audit Results, staff response and Board direction
 - U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) project updates provided to the Board on April 11, 2017

This page is intentionally left blank.