



**US Army Corps  
of Engineers**®  
San Francisco District

SAN FRANCISCO DISTRICT

Regulatory Division  
1455 Market Street, 16<sup>th</sup> Floor  
San Francisco, CA 94103-1398

# PUBLIC NOTICE

PROJECT: The San Francisquito Creek Flood Reduction, Ecosystem Restoration, and Recreation Project

PUBLIC NOTICE NUMBER: 2013-00030S  
PUBLIC NOTICE DATE: December 18, 2014  
COMMENTS DUE DATE: January 16, 2015

PERMIT MANAGER: Lisa Mangione

TELEPHONE: 415-503-6763

E-MAIL: Lisa.Mangione@usace.army.mil

1. **INTRODUCTION:** The San Francisquito Creek Joint Powers Authority (SFCJPA) (POC: Len Materman, 650-324-1972), 615 B Menlo Avenue, Menlo Park, CA 94025, has applied to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), San Francisco District, for a Department of the Army Permit to discharge fill material into jurisdictional waters of the United States associated with the construction of a 1.5-mile flood control project along San Francisquito Creek from San Francisco Bay to East Bayshore Road. San Francisquito Creek represents the boundary between San Mateo and Santa Clara counties in the project area. This Department of the Army permit application is being processed pursuant to the provisions of Section 404 of the Clean Water Act of 1972, as amended (33 U.S.C. § 1344 *et seq.*), and Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899, as amended (33 U.S.C. § 403 *et seq.*).

2. **PROPOSED PROJECT:**

**Project Site Location:** The San Francisquito Creek Flood Reduction, Ecosystem Restoration, and Recreation Project (Project) is located within the Santa Clara watershed basin, within the larger South San Francisco Bay Hydrologic Unit (HUC 18050004). The Project site is located within the San Francisquito Creek channel and is bordered to the west by the Cordilleras Creek watershed and to the east by the South San Francisco Bay.

The project is located along a 1.5-mile stretch of San Francisquito Creek from San Francisco Bay (37°27'15"N, -122°06'57"W, USGS Mountain View quadrangle) to East Bayshore Road (a frontage road to U.S. Highway 101 [U.S. 101]) (37°27'11"N, -122°07'39"W, USGS Palo Alto quadrangle). For description purposes, the Project is divided into three reaches. The lower reach extends from San Francisco Bay to Friendship

Bridge, the middle reach from Friendship Bridge to Daphne Way, and the upper reach from Daphne Way to East Bayshore Road. Additionally, the right bank is located in San Mateo County (East Palo Alto), and the left bank is located in the Santa Clara County (Palo Alto). Figure 2.0 shows the Project reaches and identifies the left and right banks.

**Project Site Description:** The 210.0-acre project site is situated in an alluvial plain, alluvial fan, and tidal marsh area. The Palo Alto Municipal Golf Course (Golf Course) and Palo Alto Airport are adjacent to the eastern and southern boundaries of the project site. San Francisco Bay is to the east, and residential areas and tidal marshes are to the north and west. The western edge is formed by East Bayshore Road. San Francisquito Creek enters the action area immediately east of U.S. Highway 101. Much of the San Francisquito Creek's length within the project site has been straightened and channelized, although it remains unlined within constructed levees.

**Project Description:** As shown in the attached drawings, the applicant proposes to construct flood facility improvements that would increase the capacity of San Francisquito Creek to convey and retain floodwaters from runoff and extreme San Francisco Bay tides in order to protect residents and property from flood events along the lower section of San Francisquito Creek, from San Francisco Bay to East Bayshore Road.

Figures 2.1 – 2.5 show the project site plan and all project components.

Work within the project boundary includes the following activities.

- Excavating sediment deposits within the channel to maximize conveyance.

- Rebuilding levees, degrading levees, and relocating a portion of the southern levee to widen the channel for increased channel capacity and protection from extreme tides.
- Constructing floodwalls in the upper reach to increase capacity and maintain consistency with Caltrans' enlargement of the U.S. Highway 101/ East Bayshore Road Bridge over San Francisquito Creek (Caltrans facility).

Major Project elements include:

- Levee setback and improvements to widen the channel and increase levee height and stability between East Palo Alto and the Palo Alto Golf Course.
- Floodwalls in the upper reach downstream of East Bayshore Road.
- Extension of Friendship Bridge via a boardwalk across new marshland within the widened channel.

Floodwalls would be constructed on both banks from U.S. Highway 101/East Bayshore Road to just downstream of Daphne Way on the north bank (East Palo Alto side) and past Geng Road on the south bank (Palo Alto side). Downstream of the floodwalls, the existing levee on the north side of the channel would be rebuilt to a greater height and strength to the location of the O'Connor Pump Station near Friendship Bridge. A new stronger and taller south levee would be located inland of the existing levee (on land currently occupied by the Golf Course), creating space for a floodplain terrace. Except for a short section around the eastern footings of Friendship Bridge, the existing levee along this stretch would be removed. Trails that would also act as maintenance roads would be constructed on top of the levees and behind the floodwalls.

The existing Friendship Bridge would be retained and extended via a boardwalk from the retained southeastern footing across the new floodplain terrace to the relocated south bank levee. High-marsh and transitional vegetation would be planted from the edge of the San Francisquito Creek channel to the toe of the levees throughout the Project area, including the new floodplain created from extending the south levee back and excavation of sediment deposits within the channel.

The applicant has revised the proposed project in three substantive ways based on input from the United States Fish and Wildlife Service and the California Regional Water Quality Control Board:

- 1) Faber Tract levee stability improvement: The Faber Tract is a tidal marsh on the north side of the channel adjacent to San Francisco Bay. Fill would be added to the levee separating the Creek from Faber Tract to reduce concerns regarding levee erosion and the potential for mass levee failure. Raising the lowest levee crest elevation downstream of Friendship Bridge from a minimum elevation of 11 feet to 13 feet, and incorporating a 6H:1V (height to vertical ratio) levee side slope into the Faber Tract marsh. This levee side slope will help protect the levee toe from erosion due to flow overtopping over a 400 foot distance as it transitions to a higher elevation closer to Friendship Bridge.
- 2) Bay levee degrade: Removal of approximately 600 feet of the existing levee downstream of the Faber Tract, in a tidal marsh area adjacent to San Francisco Bay. This will further connect the marsh to the creek and decrease the water surface elevation during large flood events, allowing the channel to expand out over the marsh area at a point further upstream than under existing conditions.
- 3) Rock slope protection (RSP) reduction: Proposed RSP has been reduced by 1.61 acres (70,171 square feet) from the original project design, resulting in a new RSP area total of 5.86 acres. The 1.61 acres will be replaced with vegetative levee protection and turf reinforcement mat that will provide soil stabilization and habitat improvements.

Project activities would require relocation of electrical transmission towers and poles; abandonment of existing and construction of new gas transmission lines; and realignment or relocation of sewer lines and storm drains.

Construction of Project elements would likely occur over two years. Construction would begin in 2015, possibly starting with utility modifications and building the new levee of the south bank outside the existing levee. Work would progress upstream and be completed by the end of 2016. Construction activities could take place between 8 a.m. and 6 p.m. on weekdays, and 9 a.m. and 5 p.m. on Saturdays, in accordance with City of Palo Alto and City of East Palo Alto municipal codes.

**Basic Project Purpose:** The basic project purpose comprises the fundamental, essential, or irreducible

purpose of the project, and is used by USACE to determine whether the project is water dependent. The basic project purpose is flood control.

**Overall Project Purpose:** The overall project purpose serves as the basis for the Section 404(b)(1) alternatives analysis, and is determined by further defining the basic project purpose in a manner that more specifically describes the applicant's goals for the project, while allowing a reasonable range of alternatives to be analyzed. The overall project purpose is to improve flood protection, restore and enhance habitat functions, and improve recreational opportunities within the Project reaches with the following specific objectives:

- Protect properties and infrastructure between East Bayshore Road and the San Francisco Bay from San Francisquito Creek flows resulting from 100-year fluvial flood flows occurring at the same time as a 10-year tide that includes projected Sea Level Rise through 2067 and FEMA freeboard requirements.
- Accommodate future flood protection measures that might be constructed upstream of the Project.
- Enhance habitat along the Project reach, particularly habitat for threatened and endangered species.
- Enhance recreational uses.
- Minimize operational and maintenance requirements.

San Francisquito Creek has a history of flooding. The most recent flood into homes occurred as a result of an estimated 15-20 year event in December 2012, when the creek overtopped its banks in several areas. The maximum instantaneous peak flow recorded at USGS Gage 11164500 during the December 2012 event was 5,400 cubic feet per second (cfs). The 'flood of record' occurred in February 1998, which had a maximum instantaneous peak flow recorded at 7,200 cfs. The USACE estimates that the 1998 flood was a 45-year flood event.

**Project Impacts:** The proposed project would result in the discharge of approximately 38,124 cubic yards of fill material comprised of 35,000 cubic yards of engineered fill (soil), 2,923 cubic yards of rock, 24.9 cubic

yards of gravel, and 175.6 cubic yards of asphalt pavement.

The proposed project would permanently impact 8.3 acres and temporarily impact 3.1 acres of waters subject to Section 404 of the Clean Water Act of 1972. Permanent impacts include the discharge of fill into 6.38 acres of wetlands and into 1.93 acres of other waters. 1.52 acres of wetland impacts and 1.61 acres of other waters would be temporarily impacted during project construction. The proposed project would also impact open waters (0.80 acres of permanent impacts and 1.61 acres temporarily impacts) subject to Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899. These areas do not support eelgrass beds.

**Proposed Mitigation:** The applicant has coordinated the current project design with federal and state regulatory and resource agency input to ensure maximum avoidance of aquatic and other sensitive resources. To further minimize impacts to aquatic and other sensitive resources, the applicant has incorporated an extensive list of minimization measures for general construction site housekeeping, water quality protection, focused measures to protect fish and wildlife resources, sensitive plant species, wetland and riparian vegetation, and trees. To offset unavoidable impacts to jurisdictional waters, the applicant proposes to provide compensatory mitigation at a minimum 1:1 ratio for temporary and permanent impacts.

The applicant has provided a conceptual compensatory mitigation plan that includes onsite mitigation in the form of creation of approximately 13.59 acres of tidal marsh on both sides of San Francisquito Creek, effectively restoring tidal influence in the project site. The proposed compensatory mitigation would span the entire project site extent on both banks, from East Bayshore Road to San Francisco Bay on the right bank and from East Bayshore Road to the end of the existing left levee on the left bank. Both sides of the channel would be planted from the toe of the levee or base of the floodwall to the edge of the San Francisquito Creek channel. After levee construction is complete, the tidal marsh area would be terraced and revegetated with high-marsh plants. The high-marsh planting area would total 5.93 acres and the high-marsh transition planting area would total 7.66 acres. Native marsh plants would be used to revegetate the terraced land. Plants appropriate to the high marsh would be planted near the stream channel. Plants native to marsh transition areas would be planted in areas more distant from the San Francisquito Creek channel. The applicant maintains that the completed mitigation will provide

habitat of higher quality that is more appropriate for the Bay shoreline than is being impacted, such that that the impacted 11.44 acres of jurisdictional habitat is fully compensated at a 1:1 ratio.

The applicant contends that successful implementation of the mitigation proposal would fully offset the permanent and temporary impacts to diked marsh, tidal salt marsh, freshwater pond and marsh, tidal channel and bay waters, and riparian habitat associated with the proposed project, and would enhance the habitat surrounding the lower reach of San Francisquito Creek.

The applicant will be required to submit a detailed compensatory mitigation and monitoring plan to USACE for review and approval prior to issuance of a USACE permit for the project. The plan must be prepared in accordance with the requirements set forth in the 2008 Mitigation Rule (33 CFR Parts 325 and 332) and the most current version of the USACE San Francisco District's Mitigation and Monitoring Proposal Guidelines, and shall include, at a minimum, the items described at 33 CFR 332.4(c)2-14: objectives, site selection, site protection instrument, baseline information, determination of ratios, mitigation work plan, maintenance plan, performance standards, monitoring requirements, long-term management plan, adaptive management plan, financial assurances, and other information as deemed necessary by USACE.

### 3. STATE AND LOCAL APPROVALS:

**Water Quality Certification:** State water quality certification or a waiver is a prerequisite for the issuance of a Department of the Army Permit to conduct any activity which may result in a fill or pollutant discharge into waters of the United States, pursuant to Section 401 of the Clean Water Act of 1972, as amended (33 U.S.C. § 1341 *et seq.*). The applicant has submitted an application to the California Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) to obtain water quality certification for the project. No Department of the Army Permit will be issued until the applicant obtains the required certification or a waiver of certification. A waiver can be explicit, or it may be presumed, if the RWQCB fails or refuses to act on a complete application for water quality certification within 60 days of receipt, unless the District Engineer determines a shorter or longer period is a reasonable time for the RWQCB to act.

Water quality issues should be directed to the Executive Officer, California Regional Water Quality Control Board,

San Francisco Bay Region, 1515 Clay Street, Suite 1400, Oakland, California 94612 by the close of the comment period.

**Coastal Zone Management:** Section 307(c) of the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972, as amended (16 U.S.C. § 1456(c) *et seq.*), requires a non-Federal applicant seeking a federal license or permit to conduct any activity occurring in or affecting the coastal zone to obtain a Consistency Certification that indicates the activity conforms with the State's coastal zone management program. Generally, no federal license or permit will be granted until the appropriate State agency has issued a Consistency Certification or has waived its right to do so.

Since the project occurs in the coastal zone or may affect coastal zone resources, the applicant is hereby advised to apply for a Consistency Determination from the San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission to comply with this requirement.

Coastal zone management issues should be directed to the Executive Director, San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission, 50 California Street, Suite 2600, San Francisco, California 94111, by the close of the comment period.

**Other Local Approvals:** The applicant will be applying for the following additional governmental authorizations for the project: Lake and Streambed Alteration Agreement to be issued by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife.

### 4. COMPLIANCE WITH VARIOUS FEDERAL LAWS:

**National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA):** Upon review of the Department of the Army permit application and other supporting documentation, USACE has made a *preliminary* determination that the project neither qualifies for a Categorical Exclusion nor requires the preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement for the purposes of NEPA. At the conclusion of the public comment period, USACE will assess the environmental impacts of the project in accordance with the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. §§ 4321-4347), the Council on Environmental Quality's Regulations at 40 C.F.R. Parts 1500-1508, and USACE Regulations at 33 C.F.R. Part 325. The final NEPA analysis will normally address the direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts that result from regulated activities within the jurisdiction of USACE and other non-regulated

activities USACE determines to be within its purview of Federal control and responsibility to justify an expanded scope of analysis for NEPA purposes. The final NEPA analysis will be incorporated in the decision documentation that provides the rationale for issuing or denying a Department of the Army Permit for the project. The final NEPA analysis and supporting documentation will be on file with the San Francisco District, Regulatory Division.

**Endangered Species Act (ESA):** Section 7(a)(2) of the ESA of 1973, as amended (16 U.S.C. § 1531 *et seq.*), requires Federal agencies to consult with either the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) or the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) to ensure actions authorized, funded, or undertaken by the agency are not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of any Federally-listed species or result in the adverse modification of designated critical habitat. As the Federal lead agency for this project, USACE has conducted a review of the California Natural Diversity Data Base, digital maps prepared by USFWS and NMFS depicting critical habitat, the *Biological and Essential Fish Habitat Assessment for the San Francisquito Creek Flood Reduction, Ecosystem Restoration, and Recreation Project San Francisco Bay to Highway 101* (BA), dated November 2012, and the BA amendment dated August 27, 2014, provided by the applicant, to determine the presence or absence of such species and critical habitat in the project area. Based on this review, USACE has made a preliminary determination that the following Federally-listed species and designated critical habitat are present at the project location or in its vicinity, and may be affected by project implementation:

- California red-legged frog (*Rana aurora draytonii*) - threatened; project site is not within designated critical habitat;
- San Francisco garter snake (*Thamnophis sirtalis tetrataenia*) – endangered; no critical habitat designation;
- Western snowy plover (*Charadrius alexandrinus nivosus*) – threatened; project site is not within designated critical habitat;
- Ridgway’s rail (formerly known as the California clapper rail) (*Rallus obsoletus obsoletus*) – endangered; no critical habitat designation;
- California least tern (*Sterna antillarum browni*) – endangered; no critical habitat designation;
- Salt marsh harvest mouse (*Reithrodontomys raviventris*) – endangered; no critical habitat

designation;

- California seablite (*Suaeda californica*) – endangered; no critical habitat designation;
- Central California Coast steelhead (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*) – threatened; project site is within designated critical habitat; and,
- Southern Distinct Population Segment of North American green sturgeon (*Acipenser medirostris*) – threatened; project site is within designated critical habitat.

To address project related impacts to these species and designated critical habitat, USACE initiated consultation with NMFS on April 25, 2013, and with USFWS on April 29, 2013, pursuant to Section 7(a) of the ESA. On November 3, 2014, and December 2, 2014, NMFS and USFWS, respectively, responded with letters to USACE requesting additional information pursuant to 50 CFR 402.14 in order for consultation to be initiated. USACE has forwarded the NMFS and USFWS letters to the applicant and will be coordinating submittal of the additional information to NMFS and USFWS.

Any required consultations must be concluded prior to the issuance of a Department of the Army Permit for the project.

**Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (MSFCMA):** Section 305(b)(2) of the MSFCMA of 1966, as amended (16 U.S.C. § 1801 *et seq.*), requires Federal agencies to consult with the NMFS on all proposed actions authorized, funded, or undertaken by the agency that may adversely affect essential fish habitat (EFH). EFH is defined as those waters and substrate necessary to fish for spawning, breeding, feeding, or growth to maturity. EFH is designated only for those species managed under a Federal Fisheries Management Plan (FMP), such as the *Pacific Groundfish FMP*, the *Coastal Pelagics FMP*, and the *Pacific Coast Salmon FMP*. As the Federal lead agency for this project, USACE has conducted a review of digital maps prepared by NMFS depicting EFH, and has reviewed the *Biological and Essential Fish Habitat Assessment for the San Francisquito Creek Flood Reduction, Ecosystem Restoration, and Recreation Project San Francisco Bay to Highway 101* (BA), dated November 2012, and the BA amendment dated August 27, 2014 to determine the presence or absence of EFH in the project area. Based on this review, USACE has made a preliminary determination that EFH is present at the project location or in its vicinity, but that the Project would not have

substantial adverse effects on the critical elements of EFH. To address project related impacts to EFH, USACE initiated consultation with NMFS on April 25, 2013, pursuant to Section 305(5)(b)(2) of the MSFCMA. The NMFS has indicated they will provide EFH conservation recommendations, if necessary, as part of the ESA Section 7 consultation. Any required MSFCMA consultation must be concluded prior to the issuance of a Department of the Army Permit for the project.

**Marine Protection, Research, and Sanctuaries Act (MPRSA):** Section 302 of the MPRS of 1972, as amended (16 U.S.C. § 1432 *et seq.*), authorizes the Secretary of Commerce, in part, to designate areas of ocean waters, such as the Cordell Bank, Gulf of the Farallones, and Monterey Bay, as National Marine Sanctuaries for the purpose of preserving or restoring such areas for their conservation, recreational, ecological, or aesthetic values. After such designation, activities in sanctuary waters authorized under other authorities are valid only if the Secretary of Commerce certifies that the activities are consistent with Title III of the Act. No Department of the Army Permit will be issued until the applicant obtains the required certification or permit. The project does not occur in sanctuary waters, and a *preliminary* review by USACE indicates the project would not likely affect sanctuary resources. This presumption of effect, however, remains subject to a final determination by the Secretary of Commerce, or his designee.

**National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA):** Section 106 of the NHPA of 1966, as amended (16 U.S.C. § 470 *et seq.*), requires Federal agencies to consult with the appropriate State Historic Preservation Officer to take into account the effects of their undertakings on historic properties listed in or eligible for listing in the *National Register of Historic Places*. Section 106 of the Act further requires Federal agencies to consult with the appropriate Tribal Historic Preservation Officer or any Indian tribe to take into account the effects of their undertakings on historic properties, including traditional cultural properties, trust resources, and sacred sites, to which Indian tribes attach historic, religious, and cultural significance. The applicant has conducted a review of latest published version of the *National Register of Historic Places*, survey information on file with various city and county municipalities, and the “Initial Cultural Resources Investigation San Francisquito Creek Flood Damage Reduction and Ecosystem Restoration Project, Santa Clara and San Mateo Counties, California” (Cultural Resources Report) dated March 2011 and prepared by Far Western Anthropological Research Group, Inc., to

determine the presence or absence of historic and archaeological resources within the permit area. Based on this review, USACE has made a *preliminary* determination that historic or archaeological resources are likely to be present in the permit area, and that such resources may be adversely affected by the project. The Cultural Resources Report shows the project site as having a moderate to very high potential to contain buried prehistoric sites. To address project related impacts to historic or archaeological resources, USACE may determine that initiation of consultation with the State Historic Preservation Officer or the Tribal Historic Preservation Officer, pursuant to Section 106 of the Act, is warranted. Any required consultation must be concluded prior to the issuance of a Department of the Army Permit for the project. If unrecorded archaeological resources are discovered during project implementation, those operations affecting such resources will be temporarily suspended until USACE concludes Section 106 consultation with the State Historic Preservation Officer or the Tribal Historic Preservation Officer to take into account any project related impacts to those resources. USACE will render a final determination on the need for consultation at the close of the comment period, taking into account any comments provided by the State Historic Preservation Officer, the Tribal Historic Preservation Officer, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, and Native American Nations or other tribal governments.

**5. COMPLIANCE WITH THE SECTION 404(b)(1) GUIDELINES:** Projects resulting in discharges of dredged or fill material into waters of the United States must comply with the Guidelines promulgated by the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency under Section 404(b) of the Clean Water Act (33 U.S.C. § 1344(b)). An evaluation pursuant to the Guidelines indicates the project is not dependent on location in or proximity to waters of the United States to achieve the basic project purpose. This conclusion raises the (rebuttable) presumption of the availability of a practicable alternative to the project that would result in less adverse impact to the aquatic ecosystem, while not causing other major adverse environmental consequences. This conclusion raises the (rebuttable) presumption of the availability of a less environmentally damaging practicable alternative to the project that does not require the discharge of dredged or fill material into special aquatic sites. The applicant will be required to submit an analysis of project alternatives, which will be reviewed by USACE.

**6. PUBLIC INTEREST EVALUATION:** The decision on whether to issue a Department of the Army Permit will be based on an evaluation of the probable impacts, including cumulative impacts, of the project and its intended use on the public interest. Evaluation of the probable impacts requires a careful weighing of the public interest factors relevant in each particular case. The benefits that may accrue from the project must be balanced against any reasonably foreseeable detriments of project implementation. The decision on permit issuance will, therefore, reflect the national concern for both protection and utilization of important resources. Public interest factors which may be relevant to the decision process include conservation, economics, aesthetics, general environmental concerns, wetlands, cultural values, fish and wildlife values, flood hazards, floodplain values, land use, navigation, shore erosion and accretion, recreation, water supply and conservation, water quality, energy needs, safety, food and fiber production, mineral needs, considerations of property ownership, and, in general, the needs and welfare of the people.

subsequent project modifications of a minor nature may be obtained from the applicant and/or agent, or by contacting the Regulatory Permit Manager by telephone or e-mail cited in the public notice letterhead. An electronic version of this public notice may be viewed under the *Public Notices* tab on the USACE website: <http://www.spn.usace.army.mil/Missions/Regulatory>.

**7. CONSIDERATION OF COMMENTS:** USACE is soliciting comments from the public; Federal, State and local agencies and officials; Native American Nations or other tribal governments; and other interested parties in order to consider and evaluate the impacts of the project. All comments received by USACE will be considered in the decision on whether to issue, modify, condition, or deny a Department of the Army Permit for the project. To make this decision, comments are used to assess impacts on endangered species, historic properties, water quality, and other environmental or public interest factors addressed in a final environmental assessment or environmental impact statement. Comments are also used to determine the need for a public hearing and to determine the overall public interest of the project.

**8. SUBMITTING COMMENTS:** During the specified comment period, interested parties may submit written comments to Lisa Mangione, San Francisco District, Regulatory Division, 1455 Market Street, 16<sup>th</sup> Floor, San Francisco, California 94103-1398; comment letters should cite the project name, applicant name, and public notice number to facilitate review by the Regulatory Permit Manager. Comments may include a request for a public hearing on the project prior to a determination on the Department of the Army permit application; such requests shall state, with particularity, the reasons for holding a public hearing. All substantive comments will be forwarded to the applicant for resolution or rebuttal. Additional project information or details on any