

<p style="text-align: center;">Midcoast Community Council <i>An elected Advisory Council to the San Mateo County Board of Supervisors representing Montara, Moss Beach, El Granada, Princeton, and Miramar</i> PO Box 248, Moss Beach, CA 94038 http://www.MidcoastCommunityCouncil.org</p>	<p>Michelle Weil, Chair Claire Toutant, Vice Chair Len Erickson, Treasurer Dave Olson, Secretary Gregg Dieguez Jill Grant Dan Haggerty</p>
--	--

Minutes for Meeting of November 10, 2021

Call to Order (7:03pm)

All Council Members present. This meeting was conducted virtually in compliance of State and County COVID-related orders.

1. Resolution to Continue Remote Meetings

Cid said that she hoped we'd keep having zoom meetings even if we go back to in-person meetings.

Michelle said that the MCC does plan to do that.

Gregg moved to adopt Resolution 2021-02, 2nd Jill, passes 7-0

(7:07) 2. Board of Supervisors' Report

Lena Silberman said that she had been told that the SMCAAlert system hasn't been activated in some cases where it should have been, and she is following up on that to see how the fire, Sheriff, and CHP coordinate. The County received the \$175,000 grant for administrative costs on wildfire fuel reduction. She suggested people download the Choose Local San Mateo County app to help local businesses get hooked up with the County for grants, etc. The Supervisors received a report on redistricting, and created a subcommittee of Supv. Canepa and Horseley to review the two recommended maps and 4 others that weren't voted on by the redistricting committee because they came in late, as well as the minimal change map. The Supervisors voted to authorize the off-leash dog recreation pilot program. There has been a lot of participation in the 5-11 year Covid vaccination program. The County is back in the yellow CDC tier.

Cid said that she attended the Supervisor meeting, and that the Committee for Green Foothills and also the Sierra Club spoke out in opposition and if approved, that they would appeal it to the Coastal Commission. She asked what the final day would be for comments on redistricting. Lena said she wasn't sure, but the state requires that the map be adopted by December 15th, so probably the first meeting in December.

Lisa Ketcham said that the off-leash dog pilot project will not go into effect because it requires a CDP and that will be at a Planning Commission meeting. It is appealable to the Coastal Commission.

Ann asked about a closed session item on approving \$1.195M dollars for the Cypress Ave (later corrected to near Cypress Point). Lena answered that the item was actually in the consent category and was voted on the same as the MCC, unless that someone pulls it from consent. Lisa said that it was in support of a grant application to the Transportation Authority, not directly from county funds, and that the MCC had written a letter in support of this grant. It's to do a study of that section of the highway.

Dan said that he had talked to Summer about the El Granada fire station and said that there had not been an expert measurement of the light leaving the property. He has had mail back and forth with Summer, and is still waiting for more information. Lena

asked Dan to send her those emails, and cc her on any new email, and she'll talk to Summer and bring it to priority.

(7:22) Harvey Rarback (HMB Council) gave updates on last night's city council meeting. More than one hundred people attended to talk about housing, it's lack and importance, and that real affordable housing is very difficult. The council made it clear that it is a very high priority to build affordable housing, and discussed several parcels that the city owns. Money and community support remain an issue. He reported that the electrification issue will be at the November 16th meeting and that there has been a lot of misinformation published. He said it is important for decarbonization and the health of the planet. The city council is considering requiring that anybody working for the city directly or as a contractor be vaccinated. The deadline for redistricting maps was extended and the committee will meet again in early December.

Gregg asked if there was a study on the overall benefits to the climate crisis of the electrification program, and hadn't seen an answer yet. Harvey answered that he had sent an article on the benefits of electrification which must have been the wrong article because it was not on point, and would try to send something more. He clarified that it wasn't energy saving, but rather greenhouse gas reduction that was the goal of the ordinance.

Cid asked if as part of redistricting the city would still have four council members and mayor, whether the mayor would be the tiebreaker vote or would they get an equal vote on their you know on the issues. Harvey replied that state law says we need five so the mayor is just one of five. The difference is whether the mayor is elected as mayor, and at large, or there are 5 districts, and the mayor continues to rotate through the council. In 2018 we went to four districts, but haven't yet elected an at large mayor.

Ann asked if the hotel that the city had purchased for the homeless could be converted into affordable housing, rather than building new housing. She said that in New Jersey, they allowed splitting single-family homes in two to provide less expensive additional housing. Harvey answered that the city did not buy what is now called the coast house used to be the coast side inn the county bought it. The city has entered into a memorandum of understanding with the county about how it's to be run, initially as a homeless shelter, and then in the future potentially affordable housing, although that would require kitchens to be added. Harvey said that splitting houses is related to SB9 that allows the division of houses into two different homes, each of which could have an ADU (with some limitations).

(7:22) Harvey Ryback half moon bay councilmember

(7:38) 3. Public Comment & Announcement

Cid said that she has not seen SMC Alert messages in several events that impact traffic. She was told that in at least one of them, it was in the SF CHP jurisdiction (north of Montara), and that the officer she talked to said that they don't coordinate with the SMC Alert system. She also spoke about the County redistricting plans, and the importance of people expressing their opinions to the Supervisors, particularly in keeping the coastside in a single district, but also that she thinks we need 7 supervisors, rather than the current 5.

Ric Lohman spoke about the redistricting, and disagreed with Cid, in that he is in favor of the Rudy Espinoza map, because it keeps more of the unincorporated residents in a single district, whereas the Unity map is more focused on the cities. He would rather not have Pacifica in the same district as the rest of the coast, because it has so many people with different opinions and needs, compared to the rest of the coast.

Graham Wood asked if the Council would be doing any additional followup on the Mangold wildfire petition with 600 signatures. He also asked how the community can engage with the consultants. Michelle answered that she is the primary contact for the committee for the Midcoast, and that so far not much has yet happened, because the contract was being finalized by the RCD. She will bring updates to the MCC meetings, and that public comment will be an important part of the process.

(7:43) 4. Consent Agenda

a. Approve minutes for October 27, 2021 Regular Meeting

Dan moved to approve, 2nd Len.

Graham Wood spoke about a concern he had about the minutes, so the minutes were pulled from consent at his request, and moved to the first item on the regular agenda.

5. Regular Agenda

(7:45) October 27 Minutes

Graham said that he felt his comments were misrepresented, and would like them corrected.

Cid spoke that she had an issue with the Sept 27th minutes, as well. She was told that those had already been approved, and Dave said that the minutes are never complete and verbatim.

Dave said that he didn't have a clear understanding of Graham's concern.

Graham said that his issue was that he had said that despite the counties spending \$2M dollars on wildfire work in El Granada no money had been spent on the high fire risk El Granada Blvd evacuation route, and that what appeared in the minutes was that Graham asked for more money to be spent. He did not regard that as accurate.

Len moved, Dan 2nd that the minutes be moved to the next meeting, so that Dave and Graham could work on new wording.

Passes 5-2, Dave and Claire against.

(7:51) 5a. Plastic Free Future

Presentation by Alejandra and Matt Warren, of Plastic Free Future on how plastic pollution is affecting humans and the environment. Matt went through the presentation, covering the growth of plastics in the environment, particularly the ocean, and it's impact on the environment and human health. There is an impact from the production and side products, as well as plastic waste.

Very little plastic waste is recycled or recyclable, and even plastic that is recycled is typically reused only once, not multiple times. The result is that microplastic particles have entered the food chain and then to animals and humans. He said that the local Ox Mountain waste facility was nearing its capacity, partly due to plastics.

Alejandra then said that the impact is unequal, with greater impact on black and brown communities. He mentioned that San Mateo County and Half Moon Bay have passed ordinances reducing single use plastics in the food industry, as well as other governments in the state. Everybody can help by not buying products in plastic containers, and using reusable cloth bags, reusable containers, etc. She said that many products sold as compostable are not really compostable except under special humidity and temperature conditions, so that was not a good solution. Reuse also lowers costs for business and consumers in the long run.

(8:15) Council questions

Jill said that she knows many in our community think and care about this issue, and asked about paper bags vs plastic, and the fact that some stores have switched to plastic bags that they label as "reusable". Matt said that considering the full lifecycle from production to waste, paper bags are better than plastic, because they degrade

in short times, and are often made partly from recycled materials, but plastic does not. Alejandra said it's best to use reusable cloth bags, and that labeling plastic bags as reusable is greenwashing, not a good solution, because they are almost never reused multiple times.

Gregg said that he's heard from other sailors that there are whirlpools in every ocean forming a plastic gyre. He asked if some kind of catalytic reactors on ships could help digest that plastic. He thinks we need a carbon tax or rebate to cover the real cost of plastic and other carbon products, and that China and other countries are now refusing to take most recycling, and hopes a deposit on products at purchase might also help. Alejandra said that yes, recycling is becoming an issue of both social and environmental justice, so we need to reduce use of plastic. Matt said that we need to hold the companies producing plastic responsible.

Len asked if there is any action the MCC can take with the Supervisors to build on this work, Alejandra said perhaps as part of a climate action plan, on the production side primarily, and anything related to SB1383 for food reusability.

Dan asked about a documentary called Seaspiracy, and whether the fishing industry is part of the problem. Alejandra said that globally, the fishing industry is a major contributor to plastic pollution from nets, etc.

Cid asked about beverage CRV and asked whether there was a difference between glass bottles and cans. Alejandra answered that clear glass and aluminum are best, because they can be recycled indefinitely.

Dave said that we do have a fishing industry locally that uses plastic in nets and crab traps, so that is something the council could work on locally, through the harbor commission. Alejandra said the issue has always been enforcement.

In wrapping up, Matt suggested people look at the County <https://www.smcsustainability.org/food-ware> website.

(8:35) 5b. Connect the Coastside Final Draft

Presentation by Chanda Singh and Katie Faulkner about the final draft of Connect the Coastside. They summarized the changes between the January 2021 version and the final draft, as well as giving the background of the effort, and next steps, including the timeline. The final draft incorporates feedback to the previous version, primarily on programs and policies, infrastructure, implementation, questions about the data, and coordination with other agencies, The final draft includes a table summarizing the changes.

Maps were added and updated to reflect newer analyses of parcels subject to lot merger and retirement. There is concern that many lot mergers could facilitate accelerated development. Additionally, lot retirement could pose legal problems for the county, and there have been only 3 subdivisions from 2010-2020.

In the transportation section, there were requests for better coordination of traffic control for weekend traffic. A section was added for collaboration with HMB and other agencies, and for microtransit for shuttles, including from the bay side, and was expanded to all coastside communities. There were additions to pedestrian paths and crossings, and clarification of design recommendations (detailed design outside the scope of CTC).

In response to requests for new data collection on traffic, language was added to say that this would be done as part of specific projects as they are designed, not in scope for CTC. Similarly for simulations of traffic flow for new projects. Level of Service data was added for HMB.

The implementation changes include more coordination with other agencies, that the cost estimates are conceptual only, and moving more projects into the near term priorities list, and yearly progress updates to the MCC.

The CTC has been determined to not be a project under CEQA, and is therefore not subject to CEQA review. Individual recommendations may be considered projects under CEQA, and that determination will be made before implementation. A memorandum was added to provide more detail.

The plan is to present CTC to the Planning Commission in early 2022, and then the Board of Supervisors.

(8:50) Council questions

Gregg asked why HMB was not included in the CTC, and said that he felt that the feedback meetings were not well run, and that it's important that future discussion be done as a single group. Chandra said that recommendations for HMB were not included, by request of HMB City staff.

Len asked about 3 near term projects, the Caltrans SHOPP Hwy 1 improvement project, and how that relates to CTC recommendations, 2nd what's next with Cypress Point once CTC is completed, and 3rd Caltrans plans for the crosswalk at Virginia in Moss Beach. Chandra said that CTC has been shared with Caltrans, and that she doesn't see too much interaction with this SHOPP project, as primarily a pavement project. She said that Cypress Point next steps will be up to MidPen Housing, but they are aware of the CTC timeline. She said that there have been conversations between Planning and Caltrans on the Virginia crosswalk, but she doesn't have details.

Dan said he thinks that CTC is shaping ideas and that he thinks more details are needed now, not when the projects start, and mentioned underpasses being left out, and that there is nothing about improving existing traffic signals. Chanda said feasibility was not in scope for individual projects in the CTC, that would come later. On undercrossings, the major issue was land requirements and ADA by her understanding.

Len asked about whether items like the Delay Index would require going to the Coastal Commission for LCP amendments, and there would be time for additional discussion at that time, and whether simulations would be done at that time. Chanda said yes on the LCP amendment, but not sure if simulations would be appropriate.

Claire said she understood that the Delay Index adjustments for bicycle lanes mentioned by Len were not for actual changes in vehicle traffic time, but as more of a mitigation, and Chanda said that was essentially correct. Claire then asked if the plan was more of a framework than details; Chanda said that it was a long term conceptual plan, and strategic, not details.

(9:14) Public Comment

Cid asked about Cypress intersection and why it was so much more expensive, and whether that was because of a roundabout. Chanda said not more expensive because of a roundabout, just a conceptual estimate of the cost of that intersection, possibly with the preferred roundabout. Cid asked if there is a hard timeline for any projects, or whether they could all be delayed for a long time. Chanda said only projects that moved ahead independent of CTC have definite timelines (like the SHOPP project). Cid said she didn't think there had been any detailed cost estimates of underpasses, and felt that safety projects should be higher priority.

JQ Oeswein followed up on Delay Index, and said that he felt it would be more appropriate to measure actual impact of bike lanes on vehicle traffic flow. He asked why 16th St is the only major intersection project that has no near or medium term project. Chanda said 16th St is the complex because of the likely Carlos St realignment, and that's why it was further out. She said the Delay Index is due to the limited options on Hwy 1, and now the state requires Vehicle Miles Traveled analysis

(with emphasis on reduction, rather than time based, and that they would try to clarify the discussion around Delay Index.

Dolores Silva asked how the plan will be used with respect to new development, especially given the likely timelines for plan projects, including those already in process. They will be built before the CTC projects happen. Chanda said that large development projects have their own analysis and new development will refer to the CTC policies, etc. It won't affect development already underway. Dolores asked if the County will allow developers to use CTC conceptual projects to get them off the hook for mitigation. Katie said no, because the development impacts are mitigated for each project, not other possible projects such as those in the CTC.

Ann asked if the new geological hazard map that is out will be taken into account for the CTC. Katie said that during the LHMP all new data was considered. A safety element update of the general plan is also underway, and new hazard data would also be considered for that.

Rob said that wants to get safely from HMB to Montara, and he would like to understand what in the CTC is making that possible. He doesn't see that specifically in the summary and projects. Chanda said that the Multimodal trail will eventually go along the east side of Hwy 1 the whole way, but the Coastal Trail does cross the highway at 16th. Rob asked if that would be years out, and Chanda said yes, likely, and that the Coastal Trail alignment is only a recommendation. Rob said he'd like to see a preliminary investigation of an underground tunnel at the highway in Moss Beach.

(9:34) Council Discussion

Claire made the analogy between treating the chart vs treating the patient in a hospital and the CTC, and she feels the CTC is treating the chart, and not the patient. Katie said that they are trying to consider the patient, for example, not just recommending widening Hwy 1.

Dan said that the CTC recommendations are not in agreement with what many in the community wanted.

Gregg said that he isn't yet ready to bring all his comments (and those from the community) to the meeting tonight, and asked how we can get those comments to the county later. Michelle said either we can delay the letter to January, or individual comments can be sent to the CTC team.

Dave spoke to Gregg's question, saying that he didn't understand why there was a rush, that the document was complex, and the changes large, and that he felt more time was needed. Chanda said that they had hoped to take the CTC to the January Planning Commission meeting. Dave said that he felt that was unreasonable. Expecting us to be able to do this by next meeting, particularly during the holidays, when we need to be able to discuss this live in meetings due to the Brown Act, just wasn't possible, and that because of the time and year, and time required, he hadn't yet started, and didn't plan to start until next year. He said we should ask that CTC not go to the Planning Commission until February, or more likely, March. Len said that he thinks that if CTC goes to the PC at the end of January, that should give us 2 months, and that should be enough time, possibly including special MCC meetings. Dave said he didn't agree.

Michelle asked how the council would like the process to work. Gregg said that he wanted to gather community feedback for the letter but that his priority was to get the wildfire items completed first. Dave said he was thinking of a study session, with the community and council determining where we had consensus, and where we didn't. He believes that there will be a number of cases where we don't have consensus, and that we need to include those differences of opinion in our letter, and that the only way to do that is in public meetings. Michelle said that we have had a number of

meetings on CTC, and asked if people think there are enough changes to need lots more discussion. Dave said that he doesn't think that we are going to be questioning fundamental data or content of the plan, but rather comment on where the council or the community disagree with something in the plan. Len asked if Dave wanted it all done at regular meetings, or if special meetings were OK. Dave said he's fine with extra meetings, but wasn't sure about other councilmembers. He said that he had enough commitments between now and Christmas that he couldn't devote time to it before then, and that since this was a nearly 12 year long project, he didn't see the urgency for comment.

Dan used the Frenchmans Creek intersection as an example of poor planning and implementation. He'd like to see discussion about timings on crosswalks. Michelle asked if Dan agreed that we couldn't write a letter for the next meeting, and if he could be available. Jill answered that she agreed we need a study session, and she's available. Claire agreed, but thinks we can do it in one study session.

(10:08) 5c. MCC Website

Len said that Lisa did a good job on the website, but he would like us to look at functional changes in the website in 2022, such as tracking issues and projects. For example, using the plastics topic tonight, what could we do with the website to give people information. On wildfires, tracking the progress of the scoping, and ways for the community to provide feedback. Also whether there might be different ways to provide access and searching to our historical documents.

(10:13) 6. Council Activity

Gregg said that Dan and he took hikes through Quarry Park, and he understands why the El Granada Blvd neighbors are concerned. He's been looking into electrification of housing, and he's not convinced of the benefits. SAM has delayed implementation of a Non-Domestic Waste Water Policy, and he thinks that may become a regulatory problem.

Dave attended part of the 30x30 (30% of land and ocean protected by 2030) conference run by UC Irvine on zoom, and felt it was well worthwhile watching portions of it, and looking at the presentations. He attended the Board of Supervisors meeting on the Dog Off-Leash Policy and redistricting, and said Lena had covered those issues.

Michelle and Claire met with County Health on the vaccination rates for the Midcoast. It turns out that almost 1000 vaccinated people weren't being counted, because they didn't match up with the Census Place maps that were being used. The proposed fix is to stop reporting individual areas, and simply report the full Midcoast as a unit.

(10:20) 7. Future Agendas

November 24th – Meeting canceled due to holiday

December 8th – Officer Elections

TBD - Connect the Coastside Letter

TBD - HMB Airport Noise

TBD - MCC Annual Retreat

(10:30) Adjournment

Moved Len, 2nd Dave, passes 7-0