

Midcoast Community Council

An Elected Municipal Advisory Council to the San Mateo County Board of Supervisors

P.O. Box 248, Moss Beach, CA 94038 www.MidcoastCommunityCouncil.org

Lisa Ketcham . Dave Olson . Chris Johnson . Laura Stein . Erin Deinzer . Dan Haggerty . Joel Janoe

Approved Minutes: Meeting on Wednesday, September 10, 2014, at Granada Sanitary District Offices, El Granada, CA

Call to Order — 7:01 p.m.

Present: Councilmembers Ketcham, Olson, Johnson, Stein, Deinzer, and Haggerty.

Absent: Janoe.

- Supervisor Don Horsley
- Sarah Rosendahl, Supervisor's Aide
- Summer Burlison, Project Planner
- Martha Miller, Plan Princeton consultant
- Neil Merrilees, chair, San Mateo County Parks Commission
- 14 members of the public

1. Board of Supervisors' (BoS) Report — Supervisor Horsley

—Highway 1/Surfer's Beach

-The County has been working with Caltrans on this project to save Highway 1 near Surfer's Beach for the last year. Project objectives include not only protecting Highway 1 but also improving coastal recreation and coastal access, including repair of a 400-foot segment of the Coastal Trail.

-The County is ready to sign a contract with consultant WRECO to conduct engineering, permitting, and planning; WRECO has experience working in the area and working with Caltrans. County will oversee this phase of the project and has a \$400,000 budget for environmental engineering, permitting, and planning. Caltrans will complete the physical construction. The City of Half Moon Bay has pledged \$100,000 to this project. Coastal Commission has committed \$50,000 to this project for the trail.

—Parallel Trail

-The Parallel Trail project comprises two elements: the southern segment and the northern segment. For the southern segment, the County has received TA funding of \$500,000 for planning, permitting, and design.

-Next week the County will release an RFP for a consultant to design the first segment of the trail from Alto/Mirada to Coronado.

-For the northern segment, the County did not receive the grant funding it sought (active transportation grant) and will have to look elsewhere for the necessary funds.

—Coastside Parking Assessment

-The County is working with State Parks and the Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) to conduct data collection to determine recreational parking opportunities on the Coastside. Will bring alternatives before the MCC for community feedback.

—Ed Larenas, Moss Beach—Mentioned that he is chair of Surfrider San Mateo County chapter but speaking as a Moss Beach resident. Asked about the status of the Army Corps of Engineers (ACE) Project to address issues of erosion and beach depletion caused by construction of the outer breakwater for Pillar Point Harbor in 1959.

A: Supervisor Horsley—There is nothing definitive to report yet. They are still in the "study" phase, which might last two to three years. The ACE is reluctant to commit to any position until they finish their long-term solution study. The ACE has shown no willingness to consider any short-term solutions.

—Neil Merrilees, Moss Beach—Neil and fellow San Mateo County Parks commissioner Meda Okelo are forming an ad-hoc committee of five to six people to discuss and develop a policy for County parks in unincorporated areas of the County. Neil envisions six to eight meetings with the goal of developing a letter or advisory note

to delineate a policy. Invited the MCC to select a representative and an alternate representative for the committee.

- Lisa Ketcham, MCC chair—Announced that the MCC is sponsoring two upcoming candidate forums. The Harbor Commission candidate forum will take place on Thursday, September 11, 2014, at 7:00 p.m. at Cypress Meadows in Moss Beach. The Coastside Fire Protection District (CFPD) candidate forum is scheduled for October 7, 2014, at 7:00 p.m. at the offices of the Granada Sanitary District (GSD).
- Dave Olson, MCC vice chair—Mentioned that there will be a public meeting on the update of the San Mateo County Housing Element on Wednesday, September 17, 2014, from 6:30 to 8:30 p.m. at the GSD offices in El Granada.

2. Public Comment

- Bill Kehoe, Moss Beach—Met with residents from the North Zone of the Coastside disaster-preparedness region (Montara, Moss Beach, Princeton, El Granada); Captain Nick Gattuso, district coordinator of the San Mateo County Sheriff's Office of Emergency Services; and Jim Holley of Volunteer Disaster Services at the American Red Cross, Bay Area Chapter. Bill is working with this group to spearhead a way to break up the larger Coastside plan for emergency action into smaller, neighborhood plans. The County has a draft document, which is still being developed. This group is looking for other people who are interested in getting involved and is seeking community input. If interested, contact Bill at mccbillkehoe@gmail.com.
- Len Erickson, El Granada— At the August 27, 2014, MCC meeting, Len made two sets of comments on transportation projects. He presented updates to those comments.
 - Regarding Highway 1 Traffic and Safety Improvements: Pedestrian Crossings, Left Turn Lanes, Highway Medians,
 - Discussion should leave the public clear that when marked crossings are placed on the Highway there is a legal requirement for cars to stop in both directions when a pedestrian enters the crossing.
 - Per expanding project scope, Len feels that his own comments about giving attention to connecting crossing with important adjacent trails and the comments of others regarding additional highway features beyond basic left turns raise good points but take the project beyond its scope. Feels it is better to hold the project to a tight scope and expect best progress.
 - Regarding “Connect the Coastside”, and the broad range of public input on transportation needs that are being collected and the final process statement, for the development of a finance plan, he asks what can we afford? Feels there is a very different shading than the project scope statement taken from the LCP mandate, which states: “3.1.a Develop and analyze a range of alternative strategies for addressing existing transportation-related problems, and for minimizing and mitigating the impacts of future development. Identify land use strategies for minimizing the impacts of future development on traffic and circulation”
- Leonard Woren, El Granada—The date, time, and place for the Granada Community Services District (GCSD) kickoff meeting is still to be determined. Look for information on the GSD website (<http://granada.ca.gov/>) and at the next GSD board meeting on September 18, 2014. Suggests County planners for Connect the Coastside review safe crossings on the Stanford University campus in Palo Alto, which include center medians without flashing lights and signs. Questions the validity of consultants' statements about the requirements for center medians.
- Dan Haggerty, MCC—Noted that the “Post Office” lot in El Granada is now up for

sale to the general public. Remembers that in the 1990s, the community rejected development on this lot. Feels that Harbor District General Manager Peter Grinnell knows how important this lot is to the community. Disappointed that the Harbor District has never sought input from the community about the current status and future plans for the lot. Feels strongly that this is public land and that the community of El Granada should be first in line to acquire it. Invites CFPD Assistant Fire Chief Paul Cole to come to the MCC and provided an update to the community on CFPD plans for its new fire station in El Granada.

- Sabrina Brennan, Moss Beach—Noted that in November, there is an election for three seats on the San Mateo County Harbor Commission: two four-year seats and one two-year seat. Last night, the San Mateo County Democratic Party endorsed Nicole David (4-yr), Tom Mattusch (2-yr), and Robert Bernardo (4-yr) for Harbor Commission. David also endorsed by San Mateo County Supervisor Dave Pine. Mattusch also endorsed by California State Senator Jerry Hill.
- Laura Stein, MCC treasurer—Noted that the Calendar page of the MCC website (<http://www.midcoastcommunitycouncil.org/calendar/>) provides a comprehensive calendar of all Coastside governmental meetings. Asked Supervisor Horsley to remind his staff of this valuable resource when they are scheduling meetings.
- Lisa Ketcham, MCC chair—Announced that the Harbor District general manager will hold a public meeting on October 4, 2014, at 11:00 a.m. at the Comfort Inn in Half Moon Bay to discuss the West Shoreline Trail (out to Mavericks) Improvement Project.

3. Consent Agenda *Approved 6-0*

- a. Approved Minutes for August 27, 2014.

4. Regular Agenda

- a. **Plan Princeton Draft Alternatives.** Summer Burlison, San Mateo County project planner for Plan Princeton, and Martha Miller, project consultant, Dyett & Bhatia, provided an overview presentation and answered questions about the Draft Conceptual Alternatives workbook for Plan Princeton. The purpose of this presentation was to receive feedback on any key items missed in the draft report and to determine if the alternatives developed are responsive to community input and technical analysis. Project planners will use this feedback for consideration and advisement in order to refine the alternatives workbook for official release.
 - Plan Princeton documents are available at www.planprinceton.com.
 - Dave Olson, MCC vice chair—Concerned about the definition of “underutilized” parcels in the draft workbook. Doesn’t think it is a very useful definition. Suggests a new definition that does not rely on assessed valuation of the property.
 - A: Martha Miller, D&B—Acknowledged.
 - Dave Olson, MCC vice chair—Is a harbor safe aquatic zone addressed or defined in this report?
 - A: Martha Miller, D&B—Will check on that.
 - Dave Olson, MCC vice chair—Would like the report to provide some explanations for some of the suggestions, for example, the one-way couplet of Princeton/Harvard.
 - A: Martha Miller, D&B—Noted.
 - Lisa Ketcham, MCC chair—Feels that a community center is very much needed but noted the Alternatives reference a “visitor center? Wants clarification on details of use, function, and purpose of a visitor center.
 - A: Martha Miller, D&B—It will be a place to provide information to visitors. It will public oriented. Could also serve as a community center.
 - Lisa Ketcham, MCC chair—Pointed out that the steep cliff face on Pillar Point Bluff is suggested for public recreation but should be open space. Also the private parcel seaward of Pillar Ridge community should be open space instead of

agriculture since it is not prime ag land but partly steep and landslide prone or vegetated with native coastal scrub habitat. Also, the owner has no feasible access to the property. Big Wave parcels on Airport St, which are prime ag land and actively farmed, should be designated Agriculture on the land use map as required by LCP Policy 5.2. Big Wave south parcel, which is not proposed to be developed, should also be considered for Open Space and wetlands restoration.

A: Martha Miller, D&B—Noted comments about bluff areas. Mentioned that designating privately owned land as open space is a difficult legal proposition and County must be very careful with a decision on this. It is a sensitive issue.

—Lisa Ketcham, MCC chair—Concerned about traffic circulation through Princeton vis-a-vis the two “choke” points especially with regard to the proposed zoning changes along Airport Road. Would like to see another way to access Airport Road..

A: Martha Miller, D&B—More access points present a challenge because of limitations of airport and Highway 1. Designated routes and wayfinding could help with this issue.

—Erin Deinzer, MCC—Has emergency preparation and evacuation been considered as part of this plan?

A: Martha Miller, D&B—To some extent, but early warning and wayfinding are more important than zoning for emergency preparation and evacuation.

A: Supervisor Horsley—Most changes proposed in this draft are infrastructure changes; massive redevelopment will not happen.

—Laura Stein, MCC treasurer—Made several comments.

-Worried about circulation issues. Notes that the traffic survey used for this report was done in 2007; must use the 2014 Big Wave traffic survey. Draft alternatives don't address two traffic choke points at Cypress Avenue/Highway in Moss Beach and Capistrano/Prospect in Princeton nor do they address a more direct route for through traffic to Airport Street. CCAG has in their packet distributed today, their review of the Big Wave North Parcel Alternative EIR, the need for a trip reduction plan—based on the anticipated roadway congestion. A plan such as this is an impossibility due to the issue of the two limiting choke points, Cypress and Prospect, as pointed out in the MCC letter. The circulation improvement proposals in the draft report need to address this issue as well.

-Big Wave North parcel is correctly noted as in agricultural use in Figure 2-1, but all proposed alternatives are industrial. Feels that the County should comply with the LCP, and designate the parcel as Agriculture on the Land Use Map.

-Doesn't feel that Business Park designation is appropriate or consistent with surrounding zoning and semi-rural nature of the area.

-Feels that development of caretaker units in Princeton is a major issue. Asks how new applications for caretaker units will be handled. Feels this is a major problem given the formula for determining number of caretaker units allowed, especially when it is not known how many caretaker units currently exist in Princeton.

-Concerned about water and sewer capacities.

-Mentioned that the report states there is an abundance of vacant lots in Princeton. Wonders if this could be because the “marine-related” designation is too restrictive. Is more clarification of the term needed?

-Per Alternative B, asks what the impact of more visitor-serving designations and the resulting higher land values might have on fishermen who use the lots and land in Princeton for storage.

—Dan Haggerty, MCC—Questions how the alternatives have been packaged and presented in the draft workbook. Asked if the alternatives are modular or must be selected as presented.

A: Martha Miller, D&B—The individual elements of each proposed alternative plan are components that can be mixed and matched as desired. The three alternative plans are not block choices.

—Dan Haggerty, MCC—Referenced inlaid brick walkway along Capistrano Road in Princeton. Would like to see this type of design aesthetic employed for visual benefit and consistency. Also expressed shock at the alternative proposal to develop a street extension from Capistrano east to Capistrano west through the Harbor Village Mall parking lot. Feels the current intersection on east Capistrano is already too dangerous and more traffic at this intersection should not be encouraged. Alternatives should be considered that get more cars off the road.

—Dave Olson, MCC vice chair—Noted that all three alternative proposals mention a revetment or seawall for the Princeton shoreline. Would like to see an alternative proposal that does not include a revetment or seawall. Expressed concern that extending the Coastside Commercial Recreation (CCR) designation along Princeton Road could force out existing coastal use residents and tenants.

—Chris Johnson, MCC secretary—Asked for clarification of the term “market demand” on page 22 in the Draft Alternatives Workbook. What does this refer to, what is the methodology for determining “market demand,” and how will “market demand” be applied to Plan Princeton? Asked for clarification on the mechanism and timeline for updating design standards as mentioned on page 22 in the Draft Alternatives Workbook. Feels that the Big Wave NPA project is not being integrated into the master plan as evidenced by the lack of “Gateway Improvement” designation for the Cypress Avenue/Highway 1 intersection on the Alternatives maps and the fact that all three Alternative plans designate the proposed Big Wave NPA site as either Business Park/Light Industrial or General Industrial even though Big Wave NPA includes a residential component.

A: Supervisor Horsley—The Cypress Avenue/Highway 1 intersection is being looked at as part of the Congestion Management plan.

—Laura Stein, MCC treasurer—What design standards will be used?

—Sabrina Brennan, Moss Beach—Appreciates the work of the planners and finds the alternatives workbook very helpful. Had a number of comments.

- Appreciates bike options in Alternative plans; disappointed that Coastside Bicycle Coalition (CBC) was not included in the stakeholders group; wants planners to engage with CBC.

- Doesn't think the Parallel Trail should cross Highway 1 at Capistrano.

- Feels the bike lane on Airport Road needs to be safer than it is now.

- Feels that the traffic bottleneck at Prospect/Capistrano is really a problem.

- Feels business park zoning should be located near the transit corridor on the peninsula. There is not enough public transit on the Coastside to support locating business on the Coastside. Feels that siting business parks in places with limited housing and transportation doesn't fit with regional planning. Planners should think about making the Coastside an attractive place to work from home.

- Wants tsunami evacuation plans incorporated into Plan Princeton plans.

- Concerned about the switch from agricultural land to other zoning classifications; feels that prime ag land on the Coastside needs to be preserved.

- Wants to see more details in the plans about beachfront access and development. Feels that access should be paired with public safety issues such as water pollution.

- Thinks a community-focused facility is important. Proposed an open performance venue such as an amphitheater and playground. Requests more outdoor gathering places.

—Mary Larenas, Moss Beach—Wants to make sure that there is safe access to beach for the elderly and disabled in the Alternative Plans. Wants Perched Beach reduced back to gentle slope to water so the elderly can access the water.

—Neil Merrilees, Moss Beach—Thanked the planners for offering a preview of the Alternatives workbook. Also thanked the Board of Supervisors for funding the Plan Princeton project and driving the project. Feels that some problems were not addressed in the draft workbook:

- For this plan to be effective, current zoning issues must be identified and delineated accurately. How the existing conditions are presented will affect the options developed. Feels that existing land use in Princeton, which does not reflect the marine-related priority use designation, is the result of improper existing zoning and lack of oversight and enforcement.

- Thinks some of the proposals are great but existing problems must be delineated correctly.

—Leonard Woren, El Granada—The current live/work situation in Princeton with regard to residential units is “a sham.” Plan Princeton needs to make sure that live/work permitting must be only for live/work situations. Supports Dave Olson’s comments about “no armoring” of the Princeton shoreline. Wants a no-armoring alternative in the Alternatives workbook. Notes that when the Coastal Act was passed, the CCC wanted no residential units in Princeton. Caretaker units were allowed as a compromise. Concerned that if unrestricted housing is allowed, Princeton will become a residential subdivision.

—Gael Erickson, El Granada—Concerned that the Coastside Bicycle Coalition was not included in the stakeholders group. Feels it is important that cyclists be included in the discussion.

—Randy Kinghorn, Half Moon Bay—Made the following comments:

- Noted that a 2007 Harbor Commission study determined that a boat haul out was not economically feasible in Princeton because there weren’t enough boats in the area.

- Feels that the Marine Industrial zoning designation is too restrictive and has limited business opportunities historically.

- Has reached out to marine research organizations about establishing operations in Princeton but claims none have been interested.

- Points out that a use permit is needed for marine-related business. Feels that this is cost prohibitive for small businesses.

—Bill Kehoe, Moss Beach—Feels that land use has been historically bad in Princeton. Feels that harbors are rare and County should do everything possible to keep Princeton focused specifically on water-facing, marine-related uses. Wants fishing/marine-related businesses and properties by the water. Points to Harbor Village mall as an example of poor land use. Feels that there are some good ideas in the Alternatives workbook, but feels that the community wants a plan that harkens back to Princeton’s history as a fishing village.

—Dave Olson, MCC vice chair—Suggests that any kind of seawall/revetment along the Princeton shoreline will need to be 30 feet out from the current edge of the beach unless eminent domain is exercised.

A: Supervisor Horsley: Suggested that he and Dave Olson walk the current shoreline together to inspect and discuss it. Supervisor Horsley feels that a seawall along the harbor shore in Princeton is a good idea. County won’t pay for it; property owners will. Would allow for public access. Please consider it as a possibility.

—Supervisor Horsley—Appreciates all the comments. Feels that the planners and MCC are working hard to develop a better plan that has broader community support.

—Martha Miller, D&B—We want to hear about the good ideas and the bad ideas. Feels that through Plan Princeton, specific land uses can be defined. Noted that process for obtaining use permit requirements will be considered.

—Summer Burlison, SMC project planner—Announced that the Alternative Plans will be revised for the final report on September 25, 2014. The revised Alternatives

Workbook will be available for community review beginning on September 25, 2014, in advance of the community meeting at the Oceano Resort on October 2, 2014.

—Lisa Ketcham, MCC chair—Will there be other ways to provide comments other than at the community meeting?

A: Summer Burlison, SMC project planner—There will be some way to provide online comments. This feature is not currently available. Check planprinceton.org.

—Lisa Ketcham, MCC chair—How long will you be accepting comments?

A: Martha Miller, D&B—Not sure yet. A good estimate is a couple of weeks.

—Lisa Ketcham, MCC chair—Can the MCC comment as a council?

A: Martha Miller, D&B—Yes.

—Dan Haggerty, MCC—Will the community meeting on October 2, 2014, be videotaped?

A: Summer Burlison, SMC project planner—No. Logistics of the room and multiple speakers at multiple tables make it difficult.

Adjournment — 9:20 p.m.