

# C/CAG

## CITY/COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS OF SAN MATEO COUNTY

*Atherton • Belmont • Brisbane • Burlingame • Colma • Daly City • East Palo Alto • Foster City • Half Moon Bay • Hillsborough • Menlo Park • Millbrae • Pacifica • Portola Valley • Redwood City • San Bruno • San Carlos • San Mateo • San Mateo County • South San Francisco • Woodside*

### **MEETING AGENDA** **San Mateo Countywide Water Coordination** **Committee (SMCWCC)**

**Date:** Friday, October 19, 2018  
7:30 a.m. to 9:00 a.m.  
**Place:** San Mateo City Hall  
Conference Room C (across from Council Chamber)  
330 West 20<sup>th</sup> Avenue  
San Mateo, CA

PLEASE CALL Reid Bogert (599-1433) IF YOU ARE UNABLE TO ATTEND

- |    |  |                                     |             |
|----|--|-------------------------------------|-------------|
| 1. | Public comment on items not on the agenda.   | Presentations are limited to 3 mins |             |
| 2. | Approval of minutes from the September 21, 2018 meeting.   | Action (Pine)                       | Pages 1 - 3 |
| 3. | Receive update on the progress of Staff Advisory Team (SAT) and provide input on draft agency "Supposal."                                | Action (Staff)                      | Pages 4 - 8 |
| 4. | Review and approve alternate date for the Water Coordination Committee meeting scheduled for November 16, 2018, due to holiday schedule. | Action (Pine)                       | Page 9      |
| 5. | Member comments and announcements.   | Information                         |             |
| 6. | Adjournment.<br>(Next meeting – TBD)   | Action (Pine)                       |             |

**NOTE:** All items appearing on the agenda are subject to action by the Committee. Actions recommended by staff are subject to change by the Committee.

**NOTE:** Persons with disabilities who require auxiliary aids or services in attending and participating in this meeting should contact Mima Guilles at 650 599-1406, five working days prior to the meeting date.

# Countywide Water Coordination Committee

## **DRAFT** MINUTES MEETING OF SEPTEMBER 21, 2018

Chair Pine called the meeting to order at 7:35 am at the San Mateo City Hall.

Attendance sheet is attached.

### **1. Public Comments on items not on the agenda.**

None.

### **2. Approval of minutes from the Aug 17, 2018 meeting.**

*Motion: Member Vaterlaus moved to approve the Aug 17, 2018 minutes as presented; Seconded by Member Aguirre; Motion carried unanimously.*

### **3. Receive update on the progress of Staff Advisory Team (SAT) and provide input on draft agency proposal framework and governance policy questions.**

Ellen Cross with Environmental Science Associates (ESA), which is supporting the SAT effort, gave summarized recent actions and deliverables from the SAT, including updates to the Road Map for developing a proposal for a new water management entity; the completion of six meetings with 20 cities grouped by geography to conduct initial outreach and request feedback; and refinement of the Proposal Framework (including draft mission/vision statements, goals and priority objectives, and core values for the new entity, along with initial stakeholder outreach and engagement approaches).

The Committee received high-level input from the city/town group meetings with key highlights and outlier feedback. Many of the city/town representatives communicated a need for a shared voice and coordinated countywide entity to manage regional shoreline protection and sea level rise issues, especially with respect to facilitating the permitting process, seeking state and federal funds and providing technical guidance. Other feedback from the meetings included consensus that the new entity should maintain projects once built, that the entity should also help with planning projects and that at least initially, there needs to be a balance between developing meaningful projects without overwhelming existing programs. It was recommended that the County's flood resilience projects constitute pilot projects to demonstrate feasibility and the proper role and function of the new entity, and initially that the projects proposed and managed by the entity should represent "lifeline" type projects intended to serve countywide climate change related water issues.

The Committee also received an update on the Draft Governance Criteria Matrix and were presented a series of questions about the potential responsibilities of the entity pertaining to

governance issues. The Committee provided the general following input on governance questions:

1. Should Agency Design, Construct, Own and Maintain Projects?  
**Yes, as well as support permitting and funding.**
2. Should Agency identify SLR guidelines and recommendations? Should it have authority to enforce guidelines?  
**The agency should not have land use authority, but should provide guidelines for smart growth and technical resources without enforcement powers. Providing technical resources will help agencies keep up with the changing science on sea level rise and climate change.**
3. Should Agency be able to tax or generate revenue?  
**Yes. The agency should have the ability to tax or otherwise generate revenue.**
4. Should Cities have a decision-making role in New Agency? Board of Elected Officials? All Cities, or Representative Cities?  
**The entity should have a Board of Elected Officials from a selection of agencies that provides geographic representation to overcome decision-making and other constraints of having a very large Board.**  
If so, what is the right construct?
5. What should the range of land use guidance be?  
**It's best to provide recommendations for land use guidance only. Some agencies will need support, however, because not all have land use along the shoreline of their jurisdictions.**

The Committee reviewed next steps for the SAT, including incorporating feedback from the Committee and city/town meetings into the Proposal Framework for discussion at the October 4 SAT. The SAT and consultant team will also be developing a staff report to the cities to support the outreach process in early 2019.

**4. Member comments and announcements (information item).**

None.

**7. Adjournment.**

Meeting was adjourned at 8:52 AM. Next meeting is scheduled for October 19, 2018.

Countywide Water Coordination Committee Attendance								
Committee Member	Agency	1/17/2018	2/21/2018	4/18/2018	6/15/2018	7/20/2018	8/17/2018	9/21/2018
Dave Pine (Chair)	County of San Mateo	X	X	X	X	X		X
Lisa Yarbrough-Gauthier (Vice Chair)	East Palo Alto	X	X		X	X		
Sue Vaterlaus	Pacifica	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Diane Papan	San Mateo		X		X		X	X
Mark Addiego	South San Francisco	X		X		X	X	X
Maryann Derwin	Chair of C/CAG	NA	NA	NA	X	X	X	X
Marie Chuang	Vice Chair of C/CAG	NA	NA	NA	X	X		X
Alicia Aguirre	Former Chair of C/CAG	NA	NA	NA	X	X	X	X
<b>Others in attendance (Sept 21, 2018):</b>								
Sandy Wong	C/CAG							
Matt Fabry	C/CAG							
Reid Bogert	C/CAG							
Brian Perkins	District Director, Congresswoman Jackie Speier's Office							
Erika Powell	SM County Flood Resilience							
Jim Eggemeyer	County Office of Sustainability							
Jim Porter	SM County Public Works							
Hilary Papendick	SM County Office of Sustainability							
Larry Patterson	City of San Mateo, City Manager							
Michael Barber	Supervisor Pine's office							
Ellen Cross	ESA Associates							

## C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

Date: October 19, 2018

To: San Mateo Countywide Water Coordination Committee

From: Sandy Wong, Executive Director of C/CAG

Subject: Receive update on the progress of Staff Advisory Team (SAT) and provide input on draft agency “Supposal.”

---

### **Recommendation:**

That the Countywide Water Coordination Committee (Committee) receive an update on the progress of Staff Advisory Team (SAT) and provide input on draft agency “Supposal.”

### **Fiscal Impact:**

Consultant support to the SAT is funded by the San Mateo County Department of Public Works.

### **Background:**

As directed by this committee, a Staff Advisory Team (SAT) was convened to develop a draft proposal by the end of the year for a new entity or agency that can compete for Federal, State, and other funding sources and to better manage flooding, regional stormwater management, and sea level rise at a countywide level. The SAT is supported by Environmental Science Associates (ESA) under contract to the County Department of Public Works.

Since the September Committee meeting, after obtaining input via outreach to all 20 cities through five informational meetings, and based on the framework and tools developed by SAT with ESA assistance, a draft “Supposal” (see Attachment 1) has been prepared. A “Supposal” is a straw proposal serving as a starting point for discussions around potential new agency.

While this “Supposal” is at its early draft stage, is intended to be a catalyst for expediting the conversation around potential governance structures, given the complexity of the topic and the short time to develop a new agency proposal. It is neither the only nor the preferred option, but one feasible option for discussions.

It was created based on the following:

- The Supposal takes a bottoms-up approach to formation of a new agency. It would build upon existing and potential future “Building Block Projects,” where project partners enter into Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs) to fund new projects as they are proposed, rather than trying to form a single new 21-member agency from the start. There are three

Building Block Projects now underway subject to existing MOUs that are being coordinated by the County: Bayfront Canal (Redwood City, Atherton, Menlo Park, Unincorporated County); Belmont Creek (Belmont, San Carlos, Unincorporated County); and Navigable Slough (South San Francisco, San Bruno, Unincorporated County)

- It acknowledges that the current County funding and effort to initiate the Building Block Projects is due to expire and a new champion for these efforts is essential.
- It uses the MOUs of the Building Block Projects to retain the control of the projects by those with a vested interest in the projects and their benefits.
- It addresses concerns raised by cities regarding why they should be expected to pay for an agency that does not provide them with equivalent value.
- It takes advantage of an existing agency (the County Flood Control District) to get things organized and initiated quickly.
- It transfers governance of the District from the Board of Supervisors to the local agencies both at the new agency Board level but more importantly retains local control of the Building Block Projects at the MOU level.
- It attempts to make expansion of the core services agency in terms of participation or functions relatively easy.
- It limits the size of the new core services agency so that the “subscription” costs for cities would remain moderate.

This Supposal anticipates the County would fund half of the administrative costs during the first three years of the agency’s existence. The Supposal recognizes the need for state legislation to amend the Flood Control District Act to revise its governance structure and powers (including the ability to impose fees, etc.).

The SAT also reviewed the updated Road Map for presenting an agency proposal by the end of the calendar year and the revised Proposal Framework. Additionally, the SAT reviewed the Functions Matrix, which evaluates the existing related programs in the County to help identify potential overlap and needs of a new entity, a Collaboration Opportunities graphic showing potential synergies with external flood, restoration, regulator and infrastructure agencies, and the Governance Criteria Matrix, which has been updated with SAT input since the last Committee meeting.

Staff and ESA representatives will provide a presentation to the Committee summarizing the above work products, focusing discussion on Committee feedback on the Supposal as a starting point for further developing an agency proposal. Committee members are encouraged to provide critical feedback to the SAT on the Supposal, and recommendations for additional organization types for consideration.

**Attachment:**

1. Modified County Flood Control District “Supposal”

## **Flood and Shoreline Protection Agency**

*(Working name of agency; requires further discussion)*

### **Draft “Supposal”**

**October 2, 2018**

<b>Supposal Element</b>	<b>Suggestion for Discussion</b>
Mission and role of Agency	Develop a flood control and resiliency plan for the Bayshore and the Coastsides to address 2100 sea level rise. This plan would be implemented by designing and constructing existing and future “Building Block Projects” in conjunction with participating cities under a MOU for each project. The agency would secure grant funding for these projects and provide “core services” as requested by the participating cities under each MOU. Core service would consist of planning, engineering and design support. Based on input from cities, it is likely that the mission of the agency will expand to include maintenance of facilities once constructed as part of the Building Block Projects.
Existing Block Projects	There are three Building Block Projects now underway subject to existing MOUs: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bayfront Canal (Redwood City, Atherton, Menlo Park, Unincorporated SMC)</li> <li>• Belmont Creek (Belmont, San Carlos, Unincorporated SMC)</li> <li>• Navigable Slough (SSF, San Bruno, Unincorporated SMC)</li> </ul> MOUs for each of these Building Block Projects spell out the role and contribution of the participating cities and the County. Currently a total of seven cities and the County participate in these MOUs. Additional MOUs would be developed for other “stretches” of the Bayshore and the Coastsides as further described below.
Organization Type	The County Flood Control District would be modified through State legislation and moved out of the County to serve as the new agency. Legislation would also define the powers of the agency including the ability to tax, issue bonds or take other actions deemed necessary for the agency to implement its mission.
Governance	The County Flood Control District, revised through legislation, would shift governance from the Board of Supervisors to an independent Board with a minimum of 5 and maximum of 7 members consisting of one member of the Board of Supervisors and city council members from geographic districts (North, Central, South, Coastal). Oversight of the Building Block Projects would be the responsibility of the participating cities as defined by their MOU.
Minimum Participation	The County and all cities party to one or more existing or future Building Block Project MOU would be required to join the new agency.
Potential Expansion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• One or more Building Block Projects could be initiated under new MOU(s) to address 2100 sea level rise along the Bay shore. For example, Millbrae, Burlingame, San Mateo and Foster City could initiate a Building Block Project.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• One or more Building Block Projects could be initiated under new MOU(s) to address coastal erosion along the coastal region (Daly City, Pacifica, Half Moon Bay and Unincorporated County).</li> <li>• Other sea level rise or flood protection needs could be addressed through new MOUs.</li> <li>• Cities could also join the new agency voluntarily.</li> </ul>
Functions Not Included	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This “supposal” does not anticipate any change to the scope, purpose or structure of the Office of Sustainability. Its work with sea level rise vulnerability and adaptation would be essential to (but not part of) the new agency.</li> <li>• Storm water quality and regulatory permit compliance efforts, including regional storm water projects, have not been included within the agency’s functions but could be added at any time deemed appropriate by C/CAG.</li> </ul>
Initial Agency Funding	<p>The initial concept is for the County to fund half of the costs of the core services provided by the agency and the participating cities to fund the remaining half. City contributions would be based on population (or other formula). The estimated total costs of the core services range from \$750,000 to \$1.5 million depending on the number of MOUs that are executed. Spread over a larger number of cities, this should maintain city costs at a modest level (&lt;\$100k for larger cities assuming the County is willing to fund 50% of the costs). It is anticipated that the above described funding approach would remain in place for the first three years following the agency’s formation. Thereafter an ongoing/secure funding source would be established (e.g. local tax, Enhanced Financing Infrastructure District, etc.).</p> <p>The Flood Control District currently collects approximately \$3.1 million annually in pre-Prop 13 property tax revenue from three flood zones. Revenue generated from property taxes collected in a flood zone can only be used within that zone. It is intended that the agency would continue to receive this revenue and that it would continue to be restricted for use within the flood zone where it was generated.</p>
Building Block Project Funding	<p>Funding of all work on the Building Block Projects, other than the core services provided by the agency, would be determined in each MOU. This funding would be secured only from those cities benefiting from the improvements. As projects progress it will be essential for a significant portion of the funding to come from State or Federal grants.</p>
Initial Staffing	<p>Staff support of the existing Building Block Projects will be needed within the new organization. Also, establishing leadership for the new organization will be important. The leader will need to have operational experience, including maintenance, given the range of responsibilities that the agency is expected to assume.</p>





## C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

Date: October 19, 2018

To: San Mateo Countywide Water Coordination Committee

From: Sandy Wong, Executive Director of C/CAG

Subject: Review and approve alternate date for the Water Coordination Committee meeting scheduled for November 16, 2018, due to holiday schedule.

**Recommendation:**

That the Countywide Water Coordination Committee (Committee) review and approve alternate date for the Water Coordination Committee meeting scheduled for November 16, 2018, due to holiday schedule

**Fiscal Impact:**

None.

**Background:**

At the June 15, 2018 Water Coordination Committee meeting, the Committee approved a schedule for the remaining calendar year, to accommodate additional members of the committee and to align with the formation of the Staff Advisory Team. Due to the Thanksgiving Holiday in November, Chair Pine and C/CAG staff recommend an alternate November meeting date, for November 30, 2018 instead of November 16, 2018, as shown in the revised calendar below.

C/CAG Water Coordination Committee  
 City of San Mateo, City Hall, Conference Room C located at 330 W 20<sup>th</sup> Ave, San Mateo, CA  
 Friday at 7:30 AM – 9:00 AM

July 20
August 17
September 21
October 19
November 30
December 21

**Attachments:**

None.