John Davidson
City of San Jose Planning Dept.
200 E. Santa Clara St
San Jose, CA 95113
via email: John.Davidson@SanJoseCA.gov
sent Nov. 4, 2014

re: Scoping Questions for the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the Three Creeks Bridge Project (PP13-085)

Dear Mr. Davidson,

I'd like to submit the follow items to be included in the scope of the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the Three Creeks Trail Bridge Project (PP13-085).

I appreciated that the City held a public meeting Tuesday, Oct. 21st, at the Willow Glen Community Center. I'm pleased that you were able to attend, as were Yves Zsutty, Sara Fleming, Rodney Rapson, and others from the City of San Jose. Additionally, David Von Ruedon from CH2M-Hill and team-members Matt Franck (biologist) and Steve Mikesell (historian) were present to answer questions. It was a well-attended and informative meeting.

At that meeting, I submitted some comments for the DEIR Scoping that I cryptically scribbled on slips of paper. This email repeats many of those comments and expands on some of them (and, at the very least, makes them easier to read!) I have also added some additional comments for inclusion in the scoping of the DEIR. (Sorry there are so many! – this is a complex project with a lot of aspects, and a thorough analysis is needed to enable an informed decision.)

*Note:* some nomenclature (from the 2012 City-commissioned Engineering Report by CH2M-Hill): the existing trestle consists of a "superstructure" and a "substructure".

- The superstructure is the deck and the railing. The deck is top surface, used by the trestle-user: ties and rails in the case of the railroad, or concrete slabs (or other surface) for the trail.
- The trestle's substructure consists of piles (the main vertical timbers), braces (diagonal beams bolted to the piles), sashes (horizontal beams bolted to the piles), caps (the large beams across the top of the piles), and stringers (the two 32" × 20" beams that run the entire 210' length of the trestle). A "bent" is a set of piles in a row, the cap on top of them, and possibly braces and sashes tying them together. The Willow Glen (WG) Trestle has 13 bents, plus an abutment at either end.

**Scope**

- In addition to issues that Staff already plans to address, the DEIR should also address the various issues raised by the public, both in this current phase and also those that were raised during last year's Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND) process. For your convenience, I attach a copy of the letter I submitted on the IS/MND dated 12/19/13. (Some of the comments from last year may have been repeated here…)

**Alternatives**

An EIR needs to evaluate several alternative scenarios, including:

- "Project" – the 210' free-span prefabricated steel truss bridge that is currently being proposed
- "No Project" – the "do-nothing" alternative: the trestle is left as-is and there is no trail connection.

There need to be additional alternatives for comparison. I recommend the following:

- "Restored Trestle, 2012 plans" – the trestle is repaired and adapted as per the plans in the City-commissioned 2012 Engineering Report by CH2M-Hill. This involves stripping the ties, catwalk, and guywire railings from the trestle, stabilizing and repairing the substructure, and placing decking (e.g., concrete slabs) on top of the stringers, with fencing/hand-rails on top.
- "Restored Trestle, 2004 plans" – the trestle is repaired and adapted as per the 2004 CEQA documents. This keeps more of the trestle more intact: the catwalk and guywire railings are stripped but the ties are kept/repaired/replaced, and the trail decking and railing are placed on top of the ties.
- "Paralleled" – the trestle is stabilized but not adapted for trail use, and a trail bridge (e.g., the 210' free-span prefabricated steel truss bridge) is installed parallel to the trestle to provide trail continuity.

I am interested in the relative construction costs, maintenance costs, hazards, and historic integrity between the Restored-2012 and Restored-2004 alternatives. The 2004 design would keep some more of the trestle (i.e., the ties), but have those ties been replaced over the years and could they also increase the fire hazard? On the other hand, the support offered by the ties might allow for a thinner and less-costly decking options.

- What are the best decking options? The Engineering Report discussed precast concrete slabs and Ipe (a South American hardwood): which is best? Are there other alternatives to consider, such as recycled-plastic planks, plate metal, or the dense-mesh grating sometimes used on drawbridges? What are the relative merits of each (e.g., cost, environmental impacts, maintenance, aesthetics, …)

I have heard various members of the public ask about the Paralleled alternative, so I include it in this list.

- Is there enough city-owned land available to include the parallel bridge within the right-of-way?
- Can additional land be bought or easement obtained if needed?
- Can the trestle be preserved as a historic artifact and remain safely fenced off? With a parallel new bridge providing trail connectivity, would the trestle still tempt people to climb on it and thus become "an attractive nuisance"?

**History**

From what I've learned, the WG Trestle was built in 1921 for the Western Pacific Railroad Company, and it has a unique design in that it has a "substandard" configuration that precluded its

use for heavy freight and for higher speed passenger trains. This raises a number of topics that should be researched as part of the DEIR:

- What was the impact of the 1906 Earthquake? I've heard that the Santa Cruz Mountains were heavily lumbered to provide wood for the rebuilding of San Francisco and surrounding areas.
  - Was the lumber industry well-established there prior to the 1906 Earthquake?
  - Did the timbers in the WG Trestle come from the Santa Cruz Mountains?
  - Are the WG Trestle timbers of standard dimensions, or are they smaller-diameter and "substandard" because all the larger lumber had already been harvested a decade earlier for the rebuilding of SF and environs?
- The construction of the WG Trestle was delayed by World War I.
  - Was the delay due to the Government temporarily taking over the railroads for the war?
  - Was the delay due to financial impacts of recovering from the war?
  - Was the design impacted by a shortage or the high cost of steel for the bolts?
- Was the trestle deliberately designed in a manner so that it could not be shared with Southern Pacific, either for competition or company rivalry?
- Or was the trestle "substandard" simply because Western Pacific was "cheap", and the trestle design was "good enough" for the purpose at-hand?

From what I've read, Southern Pacific had served San Jose for decades with tracks running right through the center of town (down 4th St.). Around the turn of the last century, the 75-year-old "franchise" allowing that alignment had expired, and City officials were pressuring Southern Pacific either to provide grade-separated crossings downtown, or else to construct an alignment around town that did not impact downtown traffic. I've heard that the California Railroad Commission or Board(?) recommended that Southern Pacific share the route around town with Western Pacific.

- What was the relationship between Western Pacific and its larger rival, Southern Pacific?
- Did Western Pacific deliberately design the trestle in a manner that would preclude it from having to share with Southern Pacific?
- Given that Southern Pacific couldn't share the alignment and therefore had to construct its own tracks and creek crossing (still in use near San Carlos St.), did that added cost noticeably effect the relative fortunes of the two companies?
- Did the time-delay in Southern Pacific's construction of the around-town alignment affect the profitability of Western Pacific, which was able to service the local canneries in the interim?

Regarding finances:

- How did the WG Trestle and the Willow Glen Spur track impact Western Pacific financially?
- Was the route profitable?
- Did it help Western Pacific relative to its rival?
- Did it impact Western Pacific's survival and future viability?
- Was there an impact on the development of Northern California by having competition between rail service providers?

The Willow Glen Spur line served a number of canneries, including Del Monte.

- Which canneries were served by the WG Trestle?
- What fraction of their produce arrived by rail?
- What fraction of their product distribution was by means of the trestle?
- What tonnage of product was transported over the trestle?
- I recall hearing that, at least for some period of time, all of Del Monte's canned fruit cocktail was produced at the Auzerais plant. Is that correct? For what time period? What market share did Del Monte have in canned fruit cocktail? At the peak, what fraction of the country's fruit cocktail was transported over the WG Trestle?

The trestle is comprised of dozens of piles (vertical timbers).

- Please find and produce the "as-built" plans for the trestle
- How deep are the piles driven into the ground?
- Are some of the original piles old-growth redwood or old-growth fir?
- What number of piles have been replaced?
- What number of piles have been added to the original configuration? Is the current design significantly different or basically the same as the original configuration?
- What would be the cost to get a comparable quantity of old-growth redwood today? Would it even be possible?
- How many of the braces and sashes are original? What type of wood are they? Are they locally harvested and milled old-growth wood?
- How many of the cap beams are original? What type of wood are they? Are they locally harvested and milled old-growth wood?
- How much of the stringers are original? What type of wood are they? Are they locally harvested and milled old-growth wood?
- Are the ties original or have they been replaced over the years?
- Is there a significant difference, historically, between options "Restore 2012" and "Restore 2004"? Do the ties add significantly to the historic authenticity of the trestle substructure?
- Would the historic character of the trestle be better preserved if it were stabilized and preserved, but not adapted for trail use (the "Paralleled" alternative)?

The trestle crosses the Los Gatos at one of its widest points, where it is roughly three times wider than it is nearby upstream and downstream.

- Why is the channel wide there – is it natural, or was this once a quarry?
- What is the explanation for the train crossing there: did the tracks parallel some existing roadway that once forded the creek there?

## ***Trestle "Issues":***

The idea of replacing the trestle with the new steel bridge has been advocated by some in part because of perceived issues with the existing structure: fire, flood, pestilence, and poison. For a fair evaluation of alternatives, these issues should be examined, both for the existing wood trestle and also for the proposed steel bridge, so that the tradeoffs can be fairly evaluated.

### **Fire**

Fire safety has been a big topic of discussion. Some basic information would prove most helpful.

The trestle is comprised of large timbers: like a yule log or a telephone pole, they are not extremely flammable and cannot simply be ignited with a single match. They are made of wood, however, and can eventually be ignited by sustained heat, such as from a brush or bonfire.

- What is the "char rate" of redwood pilings? Large wood beams will burn on the outer surface, but the wood is insulating and so the inner portion of the beam is not immediately burned: there is a rate (inches per hour under some standard fire condition, such as when surrounded by a large brush fire) at which the wood is burned inward from the outside surface.
- Given the "margin of safety" in the trestle design, how long could the pilings burn before they become too thin to safely support the load? (For example, if the timbers are 12" in diameter, and need to be at least 8" to carry the load, then two inches could be lost from the outer surface without compromise. If the wood burned at 1"/hr., then it could burn for 2 hours without serious damage. Please provide the actual numbers for these calculations.)
- Does the creosote treatment make the timbers easier or harder to ignite? What is the ignition temperature for wood? For creosote? Would the fire-retardant treatment that is proposed in the City-commissioned Engineering Report have an impact on these ignition temperatures?
- Would the fire suppression sprinkler system proposed for the restored wood trestle be adequate to suppress brush fires and to reduce the probability that the structure would become involved in the fire?
- Given the redundancy in the trestle design, would it remain structurally sound even if one or two pilings were totally compromised by fire?
- Is the "Restore 2004" alternative more susceptible to fire than "Restore 2012", given the retention of the wood ties at the top?
- Is any added risk from the "Restore 2004" alternative adequately mitigated by the planned sprinkler system?

Steel structures can "buckle" when excessively heated: the metal does not melt, but it does lose its strength, resulting in structures "yielding". The metal conducts the heat, and so the thickness of the metal doesn't provide protection against failure.

- What type of steel is used in the prefabricated bridge?
- What is the "specific yield strength vs. temperature" profile for the bridge's structural steel?
- What is the truss' design margin?
- At what temperature does the steel's reduced strength offset the design margin?
- What is the temperature of a large brush fire (e.g., of a clump of dried arundo – "bamboo")?
- How long would it take before a metal structure in or above such a fire would fail?
- If there were a localized fire (e.g., from a brush fire), would the entire single-span truss collapse, or would the damage be localized to specific truss members?
- If there were a brush fire beneath the steel bridge, how long would it take to inspect and repair the heat damage to the bridge, certify the structural integrity, and restore the bridge to service?
- Is a fire suppression sprinkler system proposed for the prefabricated steel bridge?

- If "yes", would it be adequate to prevent the structure from becoming compromised in a brush fire? Is the cost of the fire suppression system included in the cost estimates?
- If "no", then what other measures (e.g., routine channel maintenance) are being proposed to mitigate the fire hazard for the steel bridge? Are those costs included in the budget?

Concerning the available fire protection:

- What are the response times of the nearest three fire stations?
- Do the fire engines routinely carry the materials and equipment needed to suppress an oil-based fire (e.g., the creosote-treated timbers)?
- Do the fire respondents have adequate access to the entire length of the structure? Can the trestle be reached from the top-of-bank, and/or do the fire-suppression personnel and equipment have adequate access to enter the channel?

**Hydrology**

The Project Bridge is clear-span: it crosses the 210' distance without any in-channel obstructions. In comparison, the existing wood trestle has a number of bents (sets of vertical piles, braces, and sashes) within the channel.

The trestle crosses the Los Gatos Creek at about its widest point: it is roughly three times wider at the trestle than it is immediately upstream (at the Lincoln Ave. bridge) or downstream (at the Southern Pacific bridge near San Carlos St.). At the same time, the channel has roughly the same depth throughout, with the same top-of-bank elevation and water level.

- What is the volume flow-rate of the 100-year flood, in cubic feet per second?
- What is the speed of the 100-year flood in the normal channel (e.g., at Lincoln Ave. or the SP bridge), in feet per second?
- What is the speed of the 100-year flood at the trestle, in feet per second?

A concern has been expressed that the trestle bents will catch debris (e.g., fallen trees from up-stream) and cause a flood:

- What would the water speed be at the trestle if debris were to block half the entire channel (width and depth), relative to the water speed for the clear-channel case?
- Where does the debris come from?
- What would the water level be in a 100-year flood at the trestle without debris caught on the trestle?
- What would the water level be in a 100-year flood at the trestle with debris blocking half the entire channel (width and depth)?
- What would the water level be in a 100-year flood with the Project clear-span truss bridge?
- Where would the debris in the stream go if not caught on the trestle?
- What would happen if the debris were to catch on an obstruction downstream, such as the SP train bridge by San Carlos Street or the culverts under Park Avenue and Montgomery Street?
- What would the 100-year flood level be at the SP bridge if a comparable amount of debris were to catch on that structure?

- As the channel is roughly three times smaller at the SP Bridge, would the channel be entirely blocked by the debris that would half-way block the channel by the trestle?
- Historically, how much debris has flowed down the channel and been caught by the trestle?
- Who is responsible for maintaining the channel by the trestle: the City or the SCVWD?
- How often is the channel maintained?
- If there are no in-stream structures and the creek channel is unmaintained, would debris still collect, for example, on clumps of arundo ("bamboo")?

**Pests**

At least one Councilmember has raised the issue of termites, but the City-commissioned engineering report apparently makes no mention of any insect damage.

- What is the current state of the wood in the trestle?
- Is it infested with termites?

**Contamination**

The trestle timbers are treated with creosote.

- What is the State-defined allowable level of contamination (e.g., in part-per-million PPM) from creosote in a stream?
- What is the leach-rate of 90+ year-old timbers in the stream: how much contamination do they contribute under normal flow? How much under high flow?
- How much contamination is there in the creek water from other in-stream structures upstream of the trestle?
- Are there additional creosote-treated structures in the Los Gatos or the Guadalupe downstream of the trestle?
- How much contamination is there in the creek water from other sources, such as rain runoff from telephone poles, wood sheds, fence posts, etc.?
- What fraction of the total contamination load is due to the trestle?
- What are the plans for mitigating the contamination from other sources? What is the schedule for these mitigations? What is the cost and the source of funding?

There are over 30,000 creosote-treated timbers in the waters of San Francisco Bay. There are studies on how to deal with them (for example, see http://www.sfei.org/sites/default/files/ReportNo605_Creosote_Dec2010_finalJan13.pdf):

- What is the consensus on what to do with timbers that are free-floating and shedding toxics as they are moved by the tides and bump into things: are they to be removed?
- What about timbers in structures presently in use, such as piers and bridges: are they being removed or replaced? What is the schedule for replacing the various piers in SF Bay? What is the cost and the source of funding?
- What about timbers in structures that are no longer in use and have no value: are they being removed? What is the schedule for their removal? What is the cost and the source of funding?
- What about timbers in structures that are no longer in use but do have historic value (e.g., the pier of former ferry terminals, or the loading docks where armaments were packed for shipping off to war): are they being preserved or removed?

Old wooden railroad trestles are adapted for trail use across the country by many public agencies and private organizations. (For example, see the trestle in Anacortes, Washington, or the Canon River Trail in Minnesota.)

- How do these groups and agencies deal with the issue of creosote contamination?
- What maintenance efforts are needed to keep the structures safe and intact?

Can the creosote contamination be mitigated?

- Can the creosote be "encapsulated", much like lead paint or asbestos, with an overcoat of an appropriate paint or other coating?
- Can the leach-rate be reduced by protecting the timbers from the water flow by means of cladding (e.g., wrapping the timbers in the water with aluminum flashing or plastic wrap)?

In case of the Project Bridge:

- How much contamination will get into the creek during the removal of the trestle?
- How are the contamination impacts mitigated?
- How much contamination will result from the disturbance of the soils around the trestle?
- How much contamination will result from the scrapping and chipping of the surface of the timbers as they are disassembled and removed?
- How much does it cost to take the required measures to reduce the contamination during the trestle removal? Are these costs included in the overall budget?
- Does the steel bridge contaminate? What is in the rain runoff from the structure?
- Does the steel bridge contaminate the water with iron compounds?
- Does the steel bridge contaminate the water with other compounds, such as welding fluxes, surface treatments, galvanized coatings, etc.?

**Maintenance:**

The issue of maintenance seems to be exceptionally important to the City. We hear comments that the trestle is many times more expensive than the replacement bridge to maintain, yet elsewhere we see that no maintenance is budgeted for the replacement bridge, and thus even a single dollar for trestle maintenance technically would be well over twice the new bridge's nothing.

- Are the cost estimates for maintenance, given in the City-commissioned Engineering Report by CH2M-Hill, reasonable? (Table 16 on page 3.5 gives an estimate of $20k every 5 years, or an average of $4,000/year.)
- How many years' worth of maintenance can be paid for with the roughly $700,000 savings in "design and construction" costs of a restored trestle relative to the Project Bridge?
- What is the estimated useful lifetime of a properly restored and maintained trestle for use as a bike/pedestrian bridge?
- The Community has expressed a willingness to help. Has the community been contacted about setting up a "Friends" account at some non-profit (e.g., with the San Jose Parks Foundation) so that donations and fund-raisers could help defray the maintenance cost?

## *Truss "Issues":*

There are a number of issues concerning the prefabricated single-span steel truss bridge as well:

**Structural**

During the public design meetings last year, members of the public asked if it would be feasible to have a mid-stream viewing area – a wider area where trail users could stop and admire the view without being in the through traffic path. We were told that that would not be feasible with the steel truss design since it required structural integrity in the truss-work and unbroken stress paths to remain standing. Recall that, a few years ago, a modern freeway bridge in Minneapolis (I-35W) collapsed due to a single-point-failure: a gusset rusted out due to bird-droppings collecting on a single critical joint.

- Is the prefabricated steel bridge "single-point-failure" tolerant? Rephrased: would the truss collapse if an individual structural member or joint were to fail?
- If the structure doesn't fail completely, what is the margin-of-safety for when any individual structural member were to be compromised, such as by overheating or by rust?
- What are the inspection and maintenance plans to assure that there is not a build-up of debris at junctions that could promote rust or corrosion?
- What are the plans for maintenance and repair should a joint become compromised?
- Are the costs of these inspections, maintenance and repairs included in the budget?
- What is the anticipated useful lifetime of the steel truss bridge if it is not routinely maintained?
- What is the anticipated useful lifetime of the steel truss bridge if it is given optimal routine maintenance? Is that maintenance scheduled and included in the budget?

The Project steel bridge is proposed to have a "natural rust" patina. I understand that the bridge keeps its appearance by having the rust wash off in the rains, and, as a result, the structural members become thinner over time. I have heard reports of a steel bike/ped bridge in San Mateo County (or was it Santa Cruz?) that failed after only a couple decades, far short of its advertised lifetime. This was due to rust caused by the moisture in the air. While the climate in San Jose is drier, it may still be humid in the microclimate within the creek channel.

- What is the design margin on the structural elements?
- Will the bridge be inspected periodically to assure that structural elements have not become too thin due to rust and corrosion?
- Can the truss be repaired if individual structural members become compromised? How much would it cost? Are these repair costs budgeted? How long would the bridge be out-of-service and closed to the public?

**Carbon Footprint**

The State of California is committed to minimizing the impact on global warming. Doesn't AB-32 discuss methods of reducing the Carbon footprint and set conditions and processes in evaluating projects and proposals? All of the alternatives for the Three Creeks Trail crossing, other than "No Project", are "beneficial" in that they provide for non-motorized transportation. Nonetheless, there are differences between the alternatives:

- What is the carbon impact of patching the damaged piles (vertical timbers) of the existing trestle, repairing or replacing damaged sashes and braces, and repairing/replacing damaged ties? ("Restored 2004")
- What is the carbon impact of removing all the ties and disposing of them in an appropriate manner (e.g., transporting to a landfill qualified to receive contaminated materials)? (upgrade to "Restored 2012")

- What is the carbon impact of removing the entire trestle and transporting the material to a qualified landfill?
- What is the carbon impact of mining the iron ore, smelting the steel, fabricating the structural members, transporting the materials from mine to smelter to fabricator to assembler to site?
- What is the carbon impact of the concrete-slab decking? Is the quantity of concrete (and thus the carbon impact) the same or different for the various Alternatives?

**Impacts on Landfill**

- Where is the landfill that is designated to receive the contaminated trestle materials (ties, damaged braces and sashes, and perhaps the entire structure)?
- What is the capacity of that landfill?
- Would the different Alternatives have different impacts on the remaining lifetime of the landfill?

**Trail Safety**

The trail needs to be safe to use.

- Will the decking material be smooth enough for the various anticipated trail users, including bicyclists, skateboarders, roller-skates, baby carriages, etc.?
- Will the decking be free of grooves, dips, patterns, or other surface features that might cause the wheel of a bicycle to be guided in an undesired manner?
- Will the bridge be ADA accessible? Free of steps, obstructions, mazes or posts?
- Will the railing be adequate to keep trail users from falling from the bridge?
- Will the railing be designed in a manner that is safe for bicyclists? For example, smooth horizontal railing along the inner side is fine, whereas verticals along the inner side could snag a handlebar.
- Will the trail be wide enough to allow safe passage of users?

Members of the public have expressed a desire to be able to pause midstream and admire the view of the riparian habitat: can they do so without blocking the trail or risk being struck by fast-moving trail users?

- Will the trail be wide enough to allow viewing of the creek channel?
- Can the Project Alternative accommodate a mid-span viewing area? (I seem to recall that the truss configuration required continuous structural members and thus was not accommodating: are there reasonably priced viable alternative configurations for a steel bridge?)
- Would the Restore-2012 or the Restore-2004 Alternative be better for a mid-span viewing area? Concepts have been presented by others that would utilize the full width of the piling caps to allow out-of-path viewing areas.

**Aesthetics of the structure:**

- Will the steel bridge be “pretty”?
- Will the City be able to procure a bridge with “character” and a pleasant design, or are we getting the “Basic” design?
- Will the design be evocative of the region and representative of historic Willow Glen?

- Would visitors to San Jose be tempted to go out of their way to see the Project Bridge?
- Would visitors be tempted to go out of their way to see a restored trestle?

**Additional questions:**

I doubt that the following are officially part of a CEQA review, but they still are of practical interest:

- Has the steel bridge already been purchased?
- Are there alternative sites where it could be used?
- The City is trying to use a Prop. 40 Roberti-Z'Berg grant, which will expire in mid-2015. Can the City use that grant for other purposes, such as for acquiring land near Tamien Station that could serve as a trailhead for the Three Creeks Trail?
- Are there other funding sources available (e.g., from the State's "Cap & Trade" program) that might be used for the Three Creeks Trail crossing beside the Prop. 40 grant?
- If the City is not interested in preserving, adapting, and maintaining the trestle, would it be willing to transfer the ownership and responsibility to some other agency, such as possibly Santa Clara County Parks, the Open Space Authority, or the State of California?
- Is the City interested in involving the Community in funding and/or design aspects of the project?

I apologize once again for asking so many questions: it is not my intent to inundate you with needless questions, but rather to prod the process so that we all have enough information gathered for the decision-makers so that they can make a well-informed decision.

Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions. I'd be pleased to help however I can.

~Larry Ames
Larry@WGTrestle.org

cc: San José: Planning Director Harry Freitas, Public Works Rodney Rapson
the Community: District 6 Neighborhood Leaders Group (D6NLG)
Creek & Trail Advocates: Save Our Trails; Friends of the Willow Glen Trestle; Friends of the Los Gatos Creek; Citizens for a Livable San José (CalSJ); Happy Hollow Foundation; Guadalupe River Conservancy
SCVWD: Boardmember Barbara Keegan; staff Sarah Young, Sue Tippets
San José Parks, Recreation & Neighborhood Services (PRNS): Director Julie Edmonds-Mares; Deputy Director Matt Cano; trails Yves Zsutty, Sara Fleming
San José Transportation Dept.: Director Hans Larsen, bikes John Brazil
Engineers: CH2M-Hill: Program Manager David Von Rueden; SJ State: Jim Ammon
Fire: Deputy SJ Fire Chief (retired) Jim Carter
Environmental: Shani Kleinhaus (Audubon Society); Richard McMurtry; Terri Balandra; Alice Kaufman & Jeff Segall (Committee for Green Foothills); Trish Mulvey
Historians: Jean Dresden (Willow Glen), Brian Grayson (PAC*SJ), Steve Cohen (SJ), Susan Blake (Campbell), April Halberstadt (County), Wayne Donaldson (State)
Railroads: California Trolley and Railroad Corporation
Legal: Susan Brandt-Hawley, CEQA
Media: Barbara Marshman, Carol Rosen, Anne Gelhaus, Leeta-Rose Ballester