

<p>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, Secretary Dave Olson, Treasurer Gregg Dieguez Jill Grant Dan Haggerty</p>
---	--

Minutes for Meeting of March 10, 2021

Call to Order (7:03pm)

All Council Members present. 84 others present. This meeting was conducted virtually in compliance of State and County COVID-related orders.

1. Board of Supervisors' Report

Lena reported on the American Rescue Act and the funds it will provide to San Mateo County, primarily for infrastructure. Yesterday the Board approved the documents for the easements provided by CUSD for the parallel trail connections to El Granada School. More RCD chipping dates are planned in Moss Beach, El Granada, and Montara. 28% of eligible residents have received COVID-19 vaccinations to date. The Board approved \$10,000 grants to ALAS and \$20,000 to Coastside Hope for Covid-19 assistance programs.

Dan asked about progress on the fire station lighting. Lena had no updates.

Carlyle Ann Young spoke about an RV sewage leak, and asked if the County could work on a pump out program.

Harvey Rarback said that HMB has approved and staff has worked through the details of a new recycling center behind CVS. The Council also approved \$100,000 for grants to restaurants impacted by Covid-19. The American Rescue Act will also provide funds directly to HMB. The annual priority setting Council meeting will be on March 24th.

Carlyle Ann Young noted that the LUP did not include anything about evacuation routes, and asked the city to consider them as a priority item.

Kathryn Slater-Carter, MWSD said their next meeting will be on the 18th, with a SAM meeting on the 15th. MWSD passed their audit with no issues. She mentioned that the recent tours of the MWSD plant were recorded and can be viewed from their website.

2. (7:30) Public Comment & Announcement

No public comment

3. Regular Agenda

(7:30) 3a. Quarry Park Crown/Wildfire Risks

Keith Mangold gave a presentation on Quarry Park fire risks and related issues, including prevention, insurance and evacuation.

(7:55) Gregg then gave a presentation covering issues during past wildfires, primarily the CZU and Oakland fires, what worked, what didn't work, and what actions the community and the MCC might take to decrease the risks and impact of future fires.

(8:00) Council questions

Jill mentioned that in Tuolumne County they routinely clear brush, etc. and then burn it during burn days to dispose of it. She asked Keith's opinion of doing something similar in San Mateo County. Keith doesn't think it's a good idea, largely due to air quality issues. Gregg has contacted Calfire about grants for controlled burns in our area. Michelle mentioned that Calfire and SFPUC have been working on a controlled burn in SFPUC lands.

Claire asked Keith about his background. Keith said he was a systems consultant, but also did some work in disaster recovery. He's an interested amateur in the area of wildfires.

Len asked Keith if he understood correctly that he was asking for an elimination of the eucalyptus in Quarry Park; Len was concerned about the cost, and how to leverage other efforts. Gregg said something similar was done in San Diego County.

(8:10) Public questions

Carlyle Ann Young said that she had heard that substantial state money had been allocated to Quarry Park and other county parks. She thinks evacuation is a high priority. Keith said in reply that no mature trees are to be removed under those grants.

Graham Wood a resident on EG Blvd. Thought Keith's presentation is excellent, and concerned about the single route for evacuation. Has been waiting for progress for many years. Wants firebreaks protecting his neighborhood from Quarry Park fires. He raised the issue of the locked gate at the top of EG Blvd, and wanted to know if Calfire had a key for emergency access.

Kathryn Slater-Carter We need to decide if it's all eucalyptus, all large eucalyptus, or other types of trees also. She pointed out the need for regular maintenance after trimming eucalyptus due to resprouting. Mentioned that MWSD doesn't have adequate water to fight large wildfires, nor does CCWD. Mentioned MMWD website logs of rainfall over many years. Said that we are going back into lower rainfall

Dolores Silva mentioned the Hazard Mitigation plan and that she hadn't been aware of it until recently, and wondered if it was considering wildfire in our area. Concerned about fire risk and evacuation in other parts of the Midcoast, especially with new home projects.

Karen Allen lives on EG Blvd and has been working with County and Calfire about fire risks in her area, as well as PG&E. She supports the comments about the urgency. Would like the eucalyptus removed, at least the crowns. She is a member of CERT. Would like the neighborhood to be able to unlock the EG gate to open up an evacuation route.

Marion Adeney asked about land use designations (ownership) and what bodies are involved, and what funding is available. She mentioned statewide resources for decision making and funding, including blueforest.org and forestobservatory.com. She is an ecologist who did graduate work in fire ecology.

Grayson Berbano is a long time EG resident, and lives on EG Blvd near the top. He is concerned about roads in his area that he doesn't see the county maintaining, and in particular the paper road. Dave said that paper streets are the joint responsibility of the residents of the legal subdivision containing them, and therefore are not maintained by the county, because they are not part of the county road system.

(8:35) Public comment closed

Dave pointed out that it's not just the coast that has high risk areas, and that other areas are also urgently requesting action on preventing fires. He also mentioned that there was significant concern when POST cut eucalyptus in Quarry Park before they transferred it to the county. Also pointed out that County legal liability increases significantly once they start taking preventative actions, if they don't prove adequate.

Claire thought the presentation and public comments were very useful. She sees the County Parks attitude toward this issue as quite different from what has been presented and discussed tonight.

Len showed pictures saying that he believes the Quarry Park risks are much higher than other Midcoast areas.

Jill thinks we should write a letter on this issue, and would like public members included. She thinks the letter should include eucalyptus biology, manpower and funding resources, and would like a map of all eucalyptus areas and land owners. Wants the tree ordinance completed, and to encourage eucalyptus removal, making it easier to cut them.

Dan mentioned the CZU fire and the lightning that caused it. He reached out to Director Calderon and Supervisor Horsley in August, but no real action since then. He wants a removal plan from County Parks as soon as possible, including revegetation and keeping paths open afterwards. Would like a brainstorming meeting on solving the problems.

Gregg sees 4 things to be done at the same time. The chipper program, completing the tree ordinance, Quarry Park as a priority (including an MCC letter), and a broader issues list being established. Broader issues should include responsible agencies.

Michelle summed up, and said we will decide who works on the letter under future agendas.

(8:50) 3b. Connect the Coastside

Len summarized where the draft stands, timeline to completion, and that comments are still open. Since they focused on projects in the next 5 years, that is something the MCC needs to focus on. He also mentioned areas that he thinks should have had more effort.

Dave summarized the parallel trail, and that we would like to see a better plan for the overall trail. Would also like to see more efforts on getting people out of cars, and to encourage carpooling.

Len summarized what he thinks should go into the MCC letter on Connect the Coastside for our next meeting

(9:05) Public comment

Kathryn Slater-Carter wanted to be sure that the impact to local sewer and water infrastructure is considered when designing and implementing projects. Would like the MCC letter to ask the County to put in writing that they will meet those asks.

Michelle Dragony requested that the MCC ask why all the projects are funded only by grants, not by county funds.

Dolores Silva wants to know the process for the projects to get permits, and how the projects are evaluated in terms of their impact on traffic.

Carlisle Ann Young is concerned about the length of time to get projects approved and completed. Does not want to see any stop lights.

(9:12) Council comments

Dan does not think the current Connect the Coasts draft meets its goals. Wants undergrade crossings in the plan

Gregg is inclined to favor the letter that Len and Dave proposed. He thinks that future growth costs should be covered by the projects causing growth, but thinks that is likely a different letter.

Jill agrees with Kathryn's request. Agrees with Michelle Dragony's request.

Claire said that Connect the Coasts has been an eye-opener. She is unenthusiastic about the lack of input from the coast on what will actually happen.

Dave responded to Kathryn's request that it wasn't really an issue, because that kind of thing will be considered for each and every project if and when they are designed and implemented. He said that it isn't just water and sewer, it's power lines, gas pipes, etc. He further said that none of these projects are really part of the Connect the Coasts goals, they are just a laundry list of possibilities and that's why they don't have funding sources. He doesn't think that should be a major focus of our letter or concerns.

Len pointed out that only once in this 6 or 7 year project has any of it gone to the Coastal Commission, except one issue, which didn't really go anywhere. So it's after the final draft that the Coastal Commission staff will see this and make their comments.

Gregg said that he has talked to Joe LaClaire and that Joe said that this document will provide a roadmap that can be used for future funding.

Jill said she had the same comments from Joe, and reiterated her request for mention of utility issues.

Len, Dave and Michelle will work on the letter for the next meeting.

(9:25) 3c. Meeting Minutes

Michelle summarized why this is an agenda item, because of the proposed change in minutes format, rather than on Consent.

Len wants to try and use the information from the live captioning in the minutes, and also links to points in the video. He wasn't able to get very far in that due to other MCC efforts that he is working on.

Michelle wanted to be sure that there was a consensus from the council before more minutes were done in the new format.

Claire said that as the previous secretary she sympathized with the effort involved. She wondered if Len's time might be better used in other ways. Len said he hopes Jill will be able to help with that.

Dave said that as a past secretary that he knew the effort. He is not a fan of minutes from many other bodies that are too brief to understand what happened at the meeting. These new minutes however are just too long at 13 pages, and each time he goes through it he finds new errors. He thinks that if somebody wants to annotate videos with references, that's great, but the minutes need to be a summary, not a full transcript. He's not a fan of separating actions and discussion, it is too hard to follow.

Gregg doesn't have any concerns with the separation of actions and discussion. He is concerned about our lack of staff. He wants an efficient way to do minutes, not necessarily a particular form.

Dan has been a long time advocate of having just the motions and actions, not the discussion in the minutes. He thinks we may be the only council that has the discussion in the minutes. He thinks it should be shortened, so it can be read easily.

Len said that most other bodies have significant budgets, and that's why they need concise and accurate minutes. As an advisory body, the MCC has discussion as an important element.

Claire agrees that discussion is an important part of the MCC. She mentioned that when Lisa first helped her as Secretary that it's important to have a mention of those who spoke, and so that people can actually read it, and understand what happened. She thinks that Len's format doesn't meet the readability.

Jill likes what Len did with the Jan 27th minutes, where the first 2 pages gave a quick summary, and then you could see the full transcript. She is concerned that summarizing leads to the possibility of misstating comments. She doesn't want a lot of time being spent creating minutes.

Carlisle Ann Young mentioned that Robert's Rules of Order specified how minutes should be done, but with videos, she doesn't think that's as important now.

Michelle responded to Carlisle Ann, and that Rosenberg's rules (used by the MCC) doesn't specify minute content. She thinks that full transcripts are too long for anybody to review for accuracy, and that the automatic transcripts have many inaccuracies. She advocates for keeping the minutes short, so that all councilmembers can review for accuracy.

Len states that when writing minutes, he would like councilmembers to say why they are voting the way they are just prior to the vote. He thinks the more or less complete transcript of Supervisor Horsley's comments at the January retreat were quite useful.

Claire doesn't think that writing everything that is said is sometimes less accurate.

Dave made a request that for the next meeting, Len do only one set of minutes, not all 3, to avoid wasting time.

Dan asked if the video could be moved from youtube to something else that had easier to use controls. Len replied that would be difficult because we get them from PCTV. Dave said that youtube does give you a variety of tools, although finding the right spot can be hard. He said that the videos for HMB and the County used different video tools, but neither were much better than youtube.

(9:55) 4. Council Activity

Gregg attended the SAM meeting and said that SAM was not part of the Local Hazard Mitigation Plan. He talked to the county and all local agencies, and as a result all local agencies are now going to be part of the process.

Len said he had talked to the HMB staff and that the Coastside Recovery Initiative wasn't yet in process, but that it should be starting up soon.

Michelle reported on the status of the MCC newsletter. It's running about a week behind our planned timeline. It will go to translation tomorrow.

(10:00) 5. Future Agendas

March 24 - Connect the Coastside Letter, RCD First Flush, Fuel Reduction

TBD - Quarry Park Fuel Reduction Project (SMC Parks and RCD), possible MCC letter (Dan, Jill, Gregg) for subsequent meeting

Adjournment (10:05)

Moved Gregg, 2nd Michelle passed 7-0