

Airport Land Use Committee (ALUC)
Meeting Minutes
July 31, 2014

1. Call to Order

Chair Newman called the Airport Land Use Committee (ALUC) Meeting to order at 4:03 pm.

Members Present:

Terry O'Connell, Carol Klatt, John Muller, Robert Gottschalk, Ken Ibarra, Cameron Johnson, Richard Garbarino, George Auld

Staff/Guests Attending:

Sandy Wong, Tom Madalena, Adrian Jones, John Bergener, Kim Gainza, Emmy Gainza, Jon Yoshimine, Jeff Peck, Devin Yoshimine, Michelle Marconi, Scott Holmes, Jim Larimer, Chris Hunter, David Burrito, Carol Ford

2. Public Comment On Items Not On The Agenda

None.

3. Minutes of the May 23, 2013 Meeting

Motion: Member O'Connell moved/member Garbarino seconded approval of the May 23, 2014 minutes. Motion carried unanimously without member Gottschalk voting as he arrived after the vote occurred.

4. Meeting notes of the April 24, 2014 Meeting

There was no discussion as this was an information item.

5. Election of ALUC Officers for calendar year 2014

Member Klatt nominated Chair Newman and the nomination was closed. Member O'Connell motioned to elect Chair Newman as Chair and member Garbarino seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously. Member O'Connell motion to nominate and elect member Keighran as Vice-Chair and member Ibarra seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

6. Presentation on the Big Wave Project

Camille Leung, San Mateo County Planning staff, presented an update on the current Big Wave project on the San Mateo County coast.

7. Public hearing on the Draft Final Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP) for the Environs of Half Moon Bay Airport and review and approval of a recommendation to the C/CAG Board (Airport Land Use Commission) for adoption of the ALUCP for the Environs of Half Moon Bay Airport

Sandy Wong, C/CAG Executive Director, opened this item and introduced Dave Fitz, project consultant. Dave Fitz presented the process for the development of the ALUCP as well as the comments received and provided a summary of the comments along with the staff proposal on how to address the comments received. The public hearing was opened to receive comments on the ALUCP.

Mr. David Byers

Comment 1. We are satisfied that this section 4.1.5.2 is being kept in the ALUCP.

Comment 2. CALTRANS wrote a 5 ½ page letter wanting section 4.1.4.2 dropped and we disagree with that request.

Comment 3. San Mateo County provided comments to the ALUCP asking that section 4.1.5.2 be kept in the document.

Comment 4. The California Coastal Commission stated that section 4.1.5.2 is consistent with the Local Coastal Plan and should be retained in the ALUCP.

Comment 5. The negative declaration is not the appropriate document for this project and an EIR should be done.

Mr. Jon Yoshimine

Comment 6. This is a very confusing plan that states it is not expanding the airport but is expanding the airport.

Comment 7. We ask that the Big Wave project not have to conform to the new plan's restrictions.

Mr. Jeff Peck

Comment 8. I don't understand this report. The report says it is not expanding the airport, but then it says there is going to be 60,000 annual operations. Then the report says it has an effective runway length of 3,500 feet but expands the runway length to 5,000 feet. We are not going to expand the airport- but we are going to expand the noise contours.

Comment 9. I know the zones are being extended.

Comment 10. I think a project that appears to be expanding the airport should do an environmental impact report.

Comment 11. There needs to be some clarification from outside consultants and an EIR should be done.

Comment 12. Definitely keep the grandfathering clause in.

Comment 13. Please do a formal EIR so that people like me can understand the impacts of this project.

Mr. Mathew Hrain

Comment 14. I understand the need to expand the airport, but an assessment of the impacts should be done. I feel that the negative declaration is a dishonorable short cut.

Mr. Devin Yoshimine

Comment 15. Do an EIR to assess the impacts.

Ms. Michelle Marconi

Comment 16. I am confused about the airport plan. I would like a better explanation of the impacts of the airport plan on the Big Wave project.

Ms. Emmy Gainza

Comment 17. I have been waiting my whole life for the Big Wave project to happen- if you could please help us, that would make me happy.

Mr. Scott Holmes

Comment 18. There is a little confusion, the 1995 CLUP specifically states that the operational runway length is 3,874 feet and from that you generate zones for a short general aviation runway. I have three ALUCP reports that state the runway is now 5,000 feet. The 1995 report said the paved surface was 5,000 feet but not usable for approaches. When you use 5,000 feet as the runway length, you use the chart for the medium general aviation runway which requires larger zones. I am the one who locates the zones on the property and under the short general aviation runway zone 2 is only 125 feet, the medium general aviation zone 2 is 275 feet.

Comment 19. The preliminary draft in 2013 said the runway protection zone did not impact anything and that was sort of changed in the latest draft but it is still unclear.

Comment 20. I appreciate the grandfather clause- but I do not know how you do not call that expansion. You have expanded the size of the airport and the protection zones significantly. All of Princeton is within zone 2 and it creates problems for us as well.

Ms. Summer Burlison

Comment 21. Wanted to add to one of our comments that we submitted via letter concerning a 12-acre parcel in the Moss Beach area. In addition to the comment we submitted, we have identified that this parcel has been allocated for affordable housing pursuant to our housing element. The San Mateo County 2007-2014 Housing Element designates the subject 12-acre parcel as an affordable housing site allocated toward the County's fair share of total regional housing needs. Past County Housing Elements have also identified this site as an affordable housing site. It is projected that this parcel has a maximum capacity for 105 affordable units with a "realistic" capacity of 50 units under current zoning (R-3-A/S-5/DR/CD - Affordable Housing District) and general plan land use designation (Medium High Density Residential, 8.8 - 17.4 dwelling units per net acre). Proposed ALUCP Safety Zone 3 will bisect this parcel such that approximately half of the parcel will be subject to a much lower density of 1 dwelling unit per 2 acres, under the Draft Final ALUCP safety zone density criteria. Since the County does not support split zonings or land use designations as good planning practice, we would be required to

amend the General Plan land use designation of this parcel to a lower density which would not only adversely impact our total fair share of affordable housing for San Mateo County, but would also impact our specific income allocation needs and would adversely impact our already limited amount of affordable housing sites within the midcoast area. Furthermore, environmental conditions on the upper portion of this parcel (which would be outside of Safety Zone 3) present development challenges from a sensitive habitats and Local Coastal Program standpoint.

Comment 22. We request that this parcel be excluded from Safety Zone 3. Alternatively, we believe that the initial study should provide adequate analysis of the impacts of the Draft Final ALUCP on the subject parcel, and should consider impacts on the San Mateo County Housing Element on whole.

Member Garbarino motioned to close the public hearing and member Muller seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

The ALUC chose to postpone this item and to have it brought back to the ALUC at the next meeting in September.

8. Public hearing on the Initial Study and Proposed Negative Declaration for the Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP) for the Environs of the Half Moon Bay Airport and review and approval of a recommendation to the C/CAG Board (Airport Land Use Commission) for adoption of the Initial Study and Negative Declaration for the ALUCP

Sandy Wong, C/CAG Executive Director opened this item and Dave Fitz, project consultant, offered to answer questions on the Initial Study and Proposed Negative Declaration since the ALUC had received a prior presentation on the Initial Study and Proposed Negative Declaration. The public hearing was opened to receive comments on the Initial Study and Proposed Negative Declaration.

Mr. Jim Larimer

Comment 23. I am a supportive of Big Wave. It seems that a negative declaration is not appropriate.

Ms. Carol Ford

Comment 24. An EIR should be done.

Member Garbarino motioned to close the public hearing and member O'Connell seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

The ALUC chose to postpone this item and to have it brought back to the ALUC at the next meeting in September.

9. Receive a status update on the Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP) for the Environs of San Carlos Airport

Adrian Jones, project consultant, presented an update on the ALUCP for the Environs of San Carlos Airport.

10. Review and approval of the ALUC regular meeting schedule for 2014

The committee reviewed the ALUC meeting schedule for 2014.

11. Member Communications

None

12. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 6:08 pm.