

**10ALAMEDA COUNTY
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS'
TRANSPORTATION/ PLANNING COMMITTEE**

**Monday, June 5, 2017
9:30 a.m.**

**Supervisor Scott Haggerty, Chair
Supervisor Nate Miley**

Location *Board of Supervisors Chamber – 5th Floor*
County Administration Building
1221 Oak Street, Oakland, CA 94612

Summary/Action Minutes

I. Mountain House Community Traffic Mitigations and Potential Impacts on Gateway Policies and Alameda County Roads

[Attachment 1](#)

[Attachment 2](#)

[Attachment 3](#)

Albert Lopez, Director, Planning Department, presented a memorandum on the Mountain House Community Traffic Mitigations and Potential Impacts on Gateway Policies and Alameda County Roads.

The Mountain House Community Services District staff contacted Alameda County regarding proposed traffic mitigation projects and the potential impacts on Alameda County roads. Planned roadway improvements within the Mountain House development were identified in the Mountain House 1994 Environmental Impact Report and Specific Plan CEQA documents.

Policies in the Alameda County East County Area Plan (ECAP) strongly discourage increasing roadway capacity into or out of Eastern Alameda County, other than to improve road safety.

Senior staff from the Community Development Agency and the Public Works Agency met with District 1 staff and the San Joaquin County and Mountain House representatives to begin discussions on how to address these potential conflicts as the planned improvements move forward.

Staff seeks direction from the Transportation and Planning Committee regarding the conflict between the ECAP policy and the Mountain House transportation improvements.

Purpose:

Report progress

Advocacy or Education

Request Transportation and Planning Committee recommendation

Other:

Speaker

Anthony Docto, Mountain House Community Services District representative, the three counties talked about the growth on the regional roadways, “our community master planned community” size of the town of Danville, getting our town hall and downtown approved; function as a city; still unincorporated (4) Master plan development, schools, good sized city; approached San Joaquin County and try to think ahead of development curve; asking for safety improvements to roads.

Recommendation from Transportation and Planning Committee: The Community Development Agency to set up discussions with Supervisor Haggerty’s Office, the Supervisors that represents Mountain

House and the Mountain House Community Services District regarding the potential impacts to Gateway Policies.

II. Alameda County Resource Conservation District's Annual Report

Katherine Boxer, Executive Director, Resource Conservation District, presented a PowerPoint presentation on the District's Annual Report.

The Alameda County Resource Conservation District is one of the top conservation agencies in Alameda County. The ACRCDD provides technical and educational services for natural resource conservation and enhancement. RCD seeks opportunities to demonstrate progressive conservation techniques and facilitate the use of locally-approved and voluntary solutions to resource and agricultural challenges throughout the County.

2016 Highlights

The ARCD began the groundwork to manage the Sunol AgPark, and 18 acre parcel on San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFP)UC watershed property.

New partnership with Point Blue Conservation Science for a Partner Biologist, to work with landowners to inventory resources and concerns, identify suitable conservation practices, evaluate them from a wildlife perspective and identify funding programs to incentivize enhancement activities.

Purpose:

- Report progress**
- Advocacy or Education
- Request Transportation and Planning Committee recommendation
- Other:

Recommendation from Transportation and Planning Committee: The Alameda County Resource Conservation District (ACRCDD) will begin conversations with the Sheriff's Office to possibly establish a partnership with Dig Deep Farms.

The ACRCDD will contact their Board of Directors regarding possibly becoming a dependent district.

III. Report on SB-1, Transportation Funding for Unincorporated Alameda County

[Attachment](#)

Daniel Woldesenbet, Director, Public Works Agency, presented a PowerPoint presentation on SB 1, Transportation Funding for Unincorporated Alameda County.

SB-1, Transportation Funding Bill will provide \$5.2 billion a year for funding transportation projects statewide. It includes a .12 cents per gallon gas excise tax increase, .20 cents per gallon diesel excise tax increase, a \$25-\$175 annual "Transportation Improvement Fee" based on vehicle value. \$100 annual fee for zero emission vehicles, reset price based excise tax at .17 cents per gallon. The new fuel taxes are set to begin in November 2017, with the value-based transportation improvement fee beginning in the Spring of 2018. The price-based excise tax will be rest on July 1, 2019 and the new zero emissions vehicles fee will begin in 2020.

Eligible projects for SB-1 funding include road maintenance and rehabilitation, safety projects, railroad grade separations, complete streets and traffic control devices.

The SB 1 Funding Approval Process

The County will provide a list of projects proposed to be funded each year to the California Transportation Commission, pursuant to an adopted budget approved at a public meeting.

In addition the County will provide descriptions and the location of each proposed project, schedule for completion and estimated useful life of improvement. Upon expenditure of RMRA funds required documentation will be submitted to the California Transportation Commission.

The Public Works Agency has identified approximately \$23 million per year in SB -1 revenues phased in over four years. Estimated needs include pavement work, rural roads, major corridor projects, sidewalk needs, bridge work and traffic signal work.

Purpose:

- Report progress**
- Advocacy or Education
- Request Transportation and Planning Committee recommendation
- Other:

This item was informational only and required no Committee action.

IV. Update on Medical Cannabis Dispensary and Cultivation Ordinances and Consider Proposal to Allow the Commencement of Medical Cannabis Cultivation Prior to Adoption of the Proposed Medical Cannabis Cultivation Ordinance and Amendments to the Zoning Ordinance

On April 25, 2017, the Board of Supervisors considered the proposed Medical Cannabis Dispensary and Cultivation Ordinances at their Planning meeting. The Supervisors referred the ordinances back to the Transportation & Planning Committee for consideration of comments received recommending changes to the ordinances. Draft ordinances reflect the changes made per the Supervisors' direction.

Updates

- Staff has clarified how the County Building and Fire Codes would apply to medical cannabis cultivation operations.
- Provided additional information about hoop houses to consider whether medical cannabis cultivation should be allowed in hoop houses in addition to greenhouses.
- Changed the prohibition on participation in cannabis operations from 10 years to 3 years in accordance with the state Medical Cannabis Regulation and Safety Act (MCRSA).

Fee study

Staff is working with a consultant to prepare a fee study consistent with the provisions of Proposition 26 to determine the appropriate level of fees for application review and approval for medical cannabis dispensaries and cultivation sites in addition to cannabis delivery.

Next Steps

Staff will incorporate any additional edits provided by the Transportation and Planning Committee into the proposed ordinances; staff will present the revised ordinances at the following public meetings to receive public input and obtain recommendations, if any and bring the ordinances back to the full Board of Supervisors for consideration on August 1, 2017.

Proposed meeting schedule

- Sunol Citizens Advisory Committee – June 21, 2017
- Castro Valley Municipal Advisory Council- June 26, 2017
- Agricultural Advisory Committee- June 27, 2017
- Unincorporated Services Committee – June 28, 2017
- Transportation and Planning Committee – July, 2017
- Planning Commission – July 10, 2017
- Board of Supervisors – First Reading – August 1, 2017
- Board of Supervisors – Second Reading – September 12, 2017

Speakers

Vicki Stadelman expressed that she is against adding additional dispensaries to the unincorporated area and additionally agricultural lands are not appropriate for growing medical cannabis. Keep drug propagation out of the unincorporated community.

Drew Miller, Anthony Law Offices, supports passing a resolution to begin to apply for permits.

James Anthony made several comments regarding the ordinance and requested to move the resolution forward.

Sharif El-Sissi supports moving the resolution forward.

Chris Allen spoke in support of the medical cannabis and cultivation ordinances.

[Attachment 1](#)

[Attachment 2](#)

Purpose:

- Report progress
- Advocacy or Education
- Request Transportation and Planning Committee recommendation
- Other:

Recommendation from Transportation & Planning: Support. Move to the full Board of Supervisors.

V. PUBLIC COMMENT

None.

Board of Supervisors' Committees agendas are available via Internet at: www.acgov.org