

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

Dave Olson . Claire Toutant . Lisa Ketcham . Dan Haggerty . Chris Johnson . Brandon Kwan . Barbra Mathewson
Chair Vice Chair Secretary Treasurer

Unapproved Minutes: Meeting on August 22, 2018, at GCSD

Call to Order. 7:00 PM

Attendance: all 7 councilmembers present

2 government representatives; 42 members of the public

1. Board of Supervisors' Report & Reports from other Government Officials

Ellie Dallman, Supervisor Horsley's Aide:

- Free home composting workshop Aug 25 in Pacifica – see SMC Office of Sustainability.
- Volunteers needed for annual bike/pedestrian count Sept 11-16 – see Active Transportation, SMC Office of Sustainability, or call 650-599-1420

Harvey Rarback, HMB City Council:

- New library opened Aug 18. Community room available for rental.
- Minor intersection improvements are planned for Hwy1/92 and 92/Main to improve peak eastbound traffic flow.

2. Public Comment and Announcements

Lindley Ferchel, Montara, suggested that highway at Gray Whale Cove be re-routed east of parking lot instead of installing crosswalk for beach-goers.

Cid Young, Moss Beach, suggested installing highway sign at Gray Whale Cove indicating beach is clothing optional in hopes that would decrease number of visitors.

Carl May, Moss Beach, addressed the issue of unsustainable growth. Damaging development done slowly makes the final result just as bad. When a place is built out beyond sustainability, cutting back additional proposed development to lesser amount is still unacceptable. One place cannot legitimately be developed at the cost of damaging another.

3. Consent Agenda

- a. Approve Minutes for August 8, 2018 – approved 7-0.

4. Regular Agenda

a. (7:15) MidPen Housing submittal to County for LCP amendment for Cypress Point Affordable Housing Community, PLN2018-00264 (Ketcham).

Applicant requests Land Use and Zoning amendments to reduce 11-acre parcel density from medium-high to medium, and reduce number of allowed units from 148 (mix of market rate & affordable) to 71 (all affordable).

Desired outcome: Submit comments to the project planner on the application referral.

Lisa made a presentation on the draft letter. These are initial (not comprehensive) comments on the information we have now. Goal this evening is to focus on whether we got the draft letter right.

<http://www.midcoastcommunitycouncil.org/storage/mtgs-com2018/2018-08-22-MCCpresentation-MidPen.pdf>

Barbra: Moss Beach Market is glorified liquor store. Seton is not a medical center.

Public comment

Letter from Patricia Lynn, Montara: Traffic analysis is insufficient and alternatives analysis should have considered other locations.

Cid Young, Moss Beach: Project density is too high. Location is too remote for low-income working families with children. Prefers housing go to deserving seniors who would have less impact on traffic. Suggests County acquire the land and build a community center.

Karen deMoor, Moss Beach: Resist Density recognizes the need for affordable housing, but this proposal is too many units in the wrong location, resulting in significant environmental impacts – specifically traffic, sewage infrastructure, and hazardous materials. MCC should oppose it.

Gregg Diéguez, Montara, opposes the project. Climate crisis puts all infrastructure at risk: roads, sewer, water, fire protection. Water capacity assessments are wrong in MWSD report. Sewer system is over-burdened. There is no benefit to existing residents – only risk and harm. Asks MCC to do whatever possible to delay and disapprove this project, even if that means recommending against LCP amendment to make project more obviously un-appealing. He is available to assist in supplemental analyses, and to work with MWSD and SAM managers.

Dolores Silva, Moss Beach: PUD zoning approved in 1986 seems inappropriate even for that time, but the proposed change is presented as a huge concession. Where does this number ever get justified? Studies are inadequate. An EIR has not been done to determine if the site is even suitable for housing, given former military use.

J.Q. Oeswein, Moss Beach: Environmental assessments did not fully account for all potential contaminants. Not listed as known hazardous materials site because it has never been tested, nor has its military history been evaluated by a government agency. MWSD has record of asbestos abatement around their water tank, but there is no record for any other portions of the site. This oversight makes the entire environmental review suspect, for adequacy and completeness. Possible that other toxins are present and not adequately tested: steam plant, underground fuel tank, motor pool, vehicle maintenance area, possible buried refuse as was common military practice at that time. Soil samples should be obtained from adequate depth around the entire site in all areas where soil will be disturbed by digging, grading, or where runoff could affect undisturbed areas. Application should not be considered without full and complete EIR.

Christopher Davis, Moss Beach: Project is completely inappropriate for this location. He is environmental chemist working almost exclusively on military base investigations. It's almost unheard of in this day and age to transfer military base to public use without thorough sampling and analysis. Traffic study is inadequate and flawed. Proposal to close north end of Carlos St is probably highest community impact that could possibly be devised and must be changed.

Harald Herrmann, Moss Beach, discussed cumulative traffic impacts of 8 to 10 large projects pending or approved on the Coastsides, which will impact our safety and mobility -- already overburdened by traffic.

David Lynn, Montara, is opposed to project in any form. Proposed density is out of character with surrounding community. There are very few Coastsides jobs. Coastal infrastructure is old and inadequate. Hwy 1 is increasingly congested. Full EIR is required.

Ann Rothman, Moss Beach: 1980's zoning was for a mix of low, moderate and market rate housing – never intended for 100% affordable. Seton Coastsides is for sale. If it closes, the medical facility would be lost as well as jobs. Several units will be dedicated for people with mental health problems but there are no local services available to them. Congested local streets will impact emergency response time from firehouse on Stetson. This area is high fire risk zone and evacuation will be difficult. Supports the idea of a roundabout.

Sunny Hibbits, Montara, is opposed to project. She doesn't want to live in urban area.

Traffic is a problem -- will affect back streets. No more buses on Sunshine Valley Rd.

Len Erickson, El Granada: Regarding Hwy 1 and roundabouts, he quotes posted email from Steve Monowitz, "From our analysis to date the project will necessitate the installation of a signal and approved crossing at California Ave." That fact should be worked into MCC letter, expressing concern that Connect the Coastside has not yet come to the community.

Michael Prieto, Moss Beach: Gave specifics on width and condition of portions of local streets that are privately maintained – Sierra, Buena Vista, Lincoln.

Audrey Patchett, Moss Beach: Reports gloss over issues and lack facts, such as, bus times, grocery, medical center, school impacts, police response capacity. Concerned about width of local streets for this much increased traffic. MCC letter overall is passive – needs to take a stand that this isn't right for the coast.

John Qaquandah, Montara: Appreciates MCC comments in the letter, but agrees they seem passive, just asking for clarification. Need to address how traffic would be impacted all the way to HMB. If LCP amendment is approved, is CDP approval a foregone conclusion?

[A: CDP is same process all coastal development goes through, so not a foregone conclusion. Projects do change but almost all are eventually approved in some form.]

Carl May, Moss Beach: LCP amendments are always in favor of developers – their collective voice outweighs the entire community. Changes in LCP must be consistent with Coastal Act (see Chapter 1). This project has nothing coastal in character about it, but it's supposed to. LCP amendment is not appropriate at this time without specifics necessary to judge consistency with Coastal Act. Project specifics and cumulative effects must be considered for LCP amendment.

Louis Lam, Moss Beach: People run stop signs at Stetson/California every day. In 2 years he has seen 3 T-bone collisions at Etheldore/California. With even more cars, there will be more crashes. With increase in cars on Etheldore, with no sidewalk, he won't be able to walk his son to the park.

Bonnie Ring, Moss Beach: This area is not appropriate for dense affordable housing. MCC should have advisory committee with community members who are experts.

Buffy Bunting, Moss Beach: Why would we justify any of this if we don't have to? EIR is essential; supports MCC.

Emily Berk, Moss Beach: Consistency checklist items should be contested. Seton is not a medical center. Market is not a grocery. We don't have mass transit or school buses. There will likely be extensive on-street over-flow parking.

Theresa McLaughlin, El Granada: Cost of widening pavement on local streets for 2-way traffic is unknown. There are more suitable Coastside locations for affordable housing, with better access to services.

Tony Magnuson, Moss Beach, states he is master planner and engineer. Traffic analysis used older trip generation model -- newer model gives higher trip generation. Hwy capacity manual for delay time has been superseded, but he hasn't seen whether that makes a difference. County requires LOS C (or D at their discretion). Comment could be we don't accept LOS D. What number of units would allow LOS C?

Marcia Yeates, Moss Beach, stressed water capacity, and fire hazard. Appreciates MCC work, but community members have responsibility to write the Planning Commission and Supervisors.

Ted Kaye, Moss Beach: People want the project stopped. Whatever techniques the MCC has to stop this project, that is what we would like you to do.

Council discussion

Barbra: At MCC Feb 2016 meeting, MidPen Housing rep said they would not build 148 units, so they shouldn't act like they're doing us a favor reducing to 71. They said they would work with the community, but they don't listen to us. Don't amend the LCP. There's no assurance that this housing will go to households with Coastside jobs. MCC is the only body on the referral distribution that can speak to that. We need the housing but that is not the spot for it.

Brandon: Not good location and no guarantee that people who need it will be able to afford it. Even local restaurant workers would have to drive to work from this location. Second units might alleviate housing shortage, but 4 units/building and 1-bedroom units are too urban and out of character in area of single-family homes. We shouldn't build dense subsidized housing so people can live in a nicer town. People should work their way to living in the Midcoast in a proper single-family home. Resident eligibility should include background check for criminal background, legal resident status, and drug use. Traffic mitigations of better bus service and safe crossings will increase congestion by having more obstacles in the road. MCC should advocate for the residents and keeping the rural nature of our community intact.

Claire: Lots of thoughtful comments and talented people here tonight -- would like to tap into some of the expertise. Issue of abandoned military site does seem to have been glossed over. We should not lose track of annual limits on new residential units, and how this project would affect them. The issue of local preference and income limits we have addressed as well as we can with incomplete information.

Chris: If MCC simply states total opposition to the project, we lose our voice in the process and the opportunity to exert whatever influence we can on the outcome. In his 5 years on MCC this is one of the most strongly worded letters MCC has authored. Potential contamination may be key issue in making the point that this is wrong location. Three additions to letter he would consider are asbestos contamination, cumulative traffic effect, and vehement community opposition.

Dan: Letter should include necessity for EIR and needs to have a bite in it. Local roads were never designed for amount of traffic they are holding today. This project is simply bad planning. Supports Resist Density. Agrees with Chris on vehement opposition.

Dave: No EIR is required for LCP amendment, so no point in asking for it now. CCC staff did ask for a lot of data for their review. It would be good to add a note in the letter that asbestos should be looked at. They did 32 core sites across the parcel at varying depths, a reasonably thorough sampling. We could quibble with whether they analyzed all the data. If there are experts on hazardous materials in the community, please look at that and tell us what's wrong with it. We can always send another letter. Re fire danger, we rely on the experts at Coastside Fire Protection District. Re traffic, in the key comparison of cumulative vs cumulative-with-project, the project itself does not change any of the LOS levels. Opposition to the project is not unanimous. At workshops he was not the only person in favor of the project. Anybody with technical expertise, please get in touch with project planner and MCC.

Lisa: A lot of comments on this project are about an overall situation that has been accumulating, of unsustainable Midcoast growth and planned buildout numbers, which is supposed to be addressed in the long-delayed Connect the Coastside Comprehensive Transportation Management Plan. Stopping this project will not fix that over-arching situation, or even the future of this parcel which will still be in private ownership with the existing zoning density. MCC has consistently advocated for the need to significantly reduce Midcoast residential buildout. This is going in the right direction for that parcel. Would that we could get this kind of buildout number reduction throughout the Midcoast. Will any property owners volunteer to down-zone their land or give up development rights? All needed information is not yet available to comment on, and we have an extension to end Sept for further comments on the referral.

Motion by Dave/Chris: Amend draft letter to include initial statement substantially like the one added to our comment on the RV Park “Wide public opposition to this project continues unabated...” Motion carried 7-0.

Motion by Dave: Amend letter to add request for assessment for asbestos on the site.

Claire: That would be whole new paragraph because it doesn't fit under anything else.

Lisa: We could do that in our follow-up letter so we have time to include other environmental issues in the same paragraph.

Dave withdrew his amendment.

Motion by Chris/Claire: Approve letter as amended. Motion carried 7-0.

<http://www.midcoastcommunitycouncil.org/storage/mtgs-com2018/2018-08-22-CypressPt-referral-MCC.pdf>

5. (10:02) Council Activity – Correspondence & meetings attended

Barbra attended Aug 15 library opening preview event.

6. Future Agendas

Chris: Considering idea of MCC working with County and State Parks to put up plaque on Surfers' Beach stairs in memory of Malcolm Feix.

Adjourn: 10:05 PM