

From: John Ebnetter <jebnetter@cityofsanmateo.org>

Sent: Monday, August 16, 2021 11:15 AM

To: Rick Bonilla <RBonilla@cityofsanmateo.org>; Joe Goethals <jgoethals@cityofsanmateo.org>; Diane Papan <dpapan@cityofsanmateo.org>; Amourence Lee <alee@cityofsanmateo.org>; Eric Rodriguez <erodriguez@cityofsanmateo.org>; Drew Corbett <dcorbett@cityofsanmateo.org>; Patrice Olds <polds@cityofsanmateo.org>; Christina Horrisberger <chorrisberger@cityofsanmateo.org>

Subject: GPU on tonight's city council meeting

Council Members and Staff:

The General Plan Update needs to be comprehensive with all the required elements coordinated to attain a truly cohesive working document. As this pertains to the Land Use Alternatives, Public Health is directly tied to impacts on utilities and public services. The feasibility of land use will be greatly influenced by the city's adaptation to sea level rise and just as importantly, subterranean saltwater intrusion brought on by rising seas. Urban Fire Management, coupled with evacuation plans, is also an important aspect impacting land use and circulation within the city that will require cooperation with neighboring jurisdictions.

Storm surges, coupled with salt water subterranean intrusion, can inundate the sewage treatment plant, rendering it incapable of keeping us safe. Saltwater intrusion is projected to extend up to half a mile from the shoreline, which will continuously penetrate the thousands of broken sewer lateral lines sending salt water to the plant that does not have the technologies to operate once salt water is introduced.

This intrusion will render some currently inhabited locations and possible non improved areas uninhabitable. Working with PG&E to incorporate their efforts to protect their bay front substation from failure, due to storm surges and intrusion, will give the city a better understanding of what is feasible for sustained land use designations.

The states guidelines on GPU requires jurisdictions to extend the boundaries of their GPU past their borders if it is determined it bears relation to its planning. Sea level rise is noted as one example of the necessity to cooperate with adjoining locals. We need to engage Burlingame and Foster City to work on the sea level rise issues while cooperating with Belmont and Hillsborough on Urban Fire exposure.

The plan should also use San Mateo Counties Health data that identify high density locations of poverty and residential overcrowding. This data should be used in conjunction with the upcoming release of the 2020 census to determine the necessity of using the Environmental Justice Element to further understand the types and locations of housing needs for those most in need.

The requirements for Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing start with outreach, assessment of fair housing and then site inventory is supposed to be done. We have taken the approach of doing the site inventory first, have not identified pertinent environmental threats to the sites, nor have we had discussions of public health and safety due to infrastructure failures.

We seem to be leaving ourselves open for failure. Once the CEQA document is assembled, if we have not completed comprehensive studies to alleviate or mitigate threats to public health tied to infrastructure failures, have not addressed poverty in certain neighborhoods nor fully complied with AB

686 on Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing the CEQA will be suspect to challenge. We need to take a step back, follow the proper steps for compliance of AB 686, address our very important vulnerability of impending natural disasters and put public health concerns at the forefront of our land use alternatives.

To assemble a general plan without it being completely comprehensive will only leave us open ultimately to disasters that are currently unfolding throughout the world, due in many instances to ignoring the vulnerability of communities to the ravages of climate disruptions.

Thanks

John Ebnetter

Personal Opinion