

## Midcoast Community Council

*An elected Advisory Council to the San Mateo County Board of Supervisors  
representing Montara, Moss Beach, El Granada, Princeton, and Miramar*

PO Box 248, Moss Beach, CA 94038

<http://www.MidcoastCommunityCouncil.org>

Len Erickson, Chair  
Michelle Weil, Vice Chair  
Claire Toutant, Secretary  
Barbra Mathewson, Treasurer  
Dan Haggerty  
Dave Olson

## Minutes: Meeting on December 9, 2020 - Virtual via Zoom

### Call to Order (7:07pm)

Council members present: Len Erickson, Michelle Weil, Claire Toutant, Barbra Mathewson, Dan Haggerty, Dave Olson

Government: Supervisor Don Horsley, Aide Lena Silberman, DPW Director Jim Porter, HMB Council Member Harvey Rahrback

### 1. Board of Supervisors' Report and reports from other Government Officials

Supervisor's Aide Lena Silberman:

**COVID**—The County has opted out of Bay Area voluntarily-adopted increased restrictions. Testing capacity has increased. The state has a vaccine task force.

**Homelessness**--County is purchasing Coastside Inn as shelter.

**Notes from Meeting with Supervisor Horsley and County Manager Mike Callagy**  
(meeting held prior to MCC session)

- **Review Coastside issues**, particularly fire-related ones, preceded this meeting.
- **CARES Allocations** to small business in targeted zip codes, child care and non-profits
- **Emergency planning**--Supervisors Horsley and Pine formed task force on vegetation management.
  - Claire Toutant--questions which zip codes get business aid? How is ICU capacity calculated?
  - Ric Lohman- Will SMC impose restrictions now that the County has become a magnet for homeless people from other areas
  - Dan Haggerty requests more information given to community of purchase of Coastside Inn

**Supervisor Don Horsley swears in newly elected council members** Jill Grant and Gregg Dieguez and re-elected council member Dan Haggerty take the Oath of Office

**Harvey Rahrback, HMB City Council updates**

- County hopes to re-purpose Coastside Inn after cleaning and renovation
- HMB public safety committee will issue report 12/10
  - Cid Young--Will increased police be available for new shelter?--To be determined, but clientele are already present in the community

**Jim Harvey of MWSD** - Met on Montara Mountain with SFPUC, who agree to reverse their plans for major environmental changes to accommodate rain-measuring equipment

- Ric Lohman: they will remove fencing?
- Gregg Dieguez: this agreement will have to be monitored

### 2. Public Comment & Announcements

- **Ric Lohman** - Opposed to recent MCC letter concerning Caltrans variable signage. Cites instances when Coastside residents have insisted on more positive solutions.

**3. Consent Agenda approved 6-0 – (moved by Dave Olson, seconded by Michelle Weil)**

Approve Minutes for November 18, 2020 special meeting

**4. Regular Agenda**

**a. (7:40) – Replacement of the Medio Creek Bridge on the Coastal Trail (Erickson)**

**County Presentation**

Introduction by Don Horsley

DPW: Jim Porter, Colin, Ann Stillman, Planning: Joe LaClair

Mirada Road is eroded, (King Tides, Rising Sea Level – continuing problem). Feels that replacing the bridge in place is the best option. Meeting with residents feels that replacement in place is the best option.

Presentation by Jim Porter – Introduces Robert Stevens, consultant, Gil head of engineering, Yang,

[Link to Jim's Slides](#)

History and Closure of Bridge – structural failure

Usage heavy especially on weekends

Bridge serves the Coastal Trail and property access

Carries utilities, electrical, sewer

Sand level changes by season (5)

Alternative trail alignments – most expedient method is current alignment

Preferred alignment – shotcrete, rebar nails into bluff, sand level varies by 8-9 feet

In permitting process (NegDec) – target is construction in summer, 2021, if permitting is complete

Don Horsley – comment on Alignment 5 – replace in place

This option protects Mirada Road as well. Discussed previous efforts (sheet pile wall), continue RSP, Concern that if protection efforts stop, the road will quickly fail. Even with continuing protection efforts, the road may fail in 50 years. Don feels protection now which is quicker and is important for the coastside. Other options take years of planning and litigation plus construction.

Estimate (from Jim P – several years, community process, design, construction, fastest estimate 5 year, as long as 10, cost of design/build would be more expensive) Would like to avoid it. DPW response to CCC to be out next week ([link to Dec. 15 DPW reply](#)) and further analysis, out in January.

**Questions from the MCC Councilmembers:**

Dave Olson

GCSD – Sewer effort will be straightforward,

Long term process is needed in any event and thinks it best to start the process now.

Not opposed to building in place if it can be done cheaply. Has concern about the armoring which has accelerated the erosion, more armoring, more erosion study is needed. Long-range planning and erosion studies should start at the same time as any current planning (?? How much time, months? Ask consultant)

Claire Toutant

Would not like to lose this section of the coastal trail, but it exists away from the bluff elsewhere, nice, but not necessary. Moving to the highway is similar to what will happen at Wave Crest. Any detour is similar to Trail is similar to proposals for between Seymour and the Ritz

Gregg Dieguez

Sewer line is not active, electrical not needed, Sees county is willing to pay twice, ?? How long will the bridge last, ?? Affect of bridge on erosion. ?? Why does moving back mean abandoning the neighborhood ?? What can the MCC do to be helpful in moving the preferred option forward.

Barbra Matthewson

Agree with Dave's comment. Prefers the Alameda idea. Erosion has increased noticeable in the last 6 months. Doesn't expect the bridge to last 30 years, Highway 1 detour not an option, Don't spend money on something that will wash away

Jill Grant

Is the bridge pre-fabbed offsite  
>> Answer from R. Stevens – pre-fabbed and brought in sections  
Can Bridge be built first and then armoring later  
>> Ann Stillman of SMC--County is in process of responding to set of questions from CCC, for at least the next month

Dan Haggerty

Agree with Supervisor Horsley. Concern – how to deal with the erosion. Has observed what has been do in in Pacifica (?? Is that Shotcrete). In Pacifica Lands End – stairs in shotcrete – observed water coming out from wall. ?? What can be done to address drainage from behind the wall and buffer at the base (replenished sand)

Michelle Weil

MCC should have been involved sooner, given that County planning has been going on for 3 years. ?? for Don - Why wasn't MCC / community involved sooner.  
>> Don – didn't feel that a study was needed. It was just a simple replacement. Shutting the bridge down surprised Don. Offers in-person site tour for Gregg and others interested. A time was set. Dan was interested in a tour at another time.

Len Erickson –Ask Jim Porter to speak to the concerns about erosion of creek bed?

>> Jim Porter: There is a sand movement study (?? Get access to the study, is the study the CCC is waiting for) Call on rober Stevens consultant  
(1:23:00) >> Robert Stevens consultant, Alameda resident, not involved in study. Sand is a dynamic process ref. to slides) There is a seasonal cycle to wave / shoreline interaction. Most of the interaction is with the RSP. Do not expect problems upstream or along the coast. ?? How to confirm this comment ?? sand movement study

Joe LaClair : [Link to Joe's Slides](#)

(1:24:00) >> What has been learned over past. 30 years. RSP at Mirada has slowed erosion relative to Mirada Surf West to the North. Sea level rise (1/8" per year) From experience in sea level rise planning: building at current location is cost-effective and avoids changes to neighborhood. Local community is not prepared for major changes in trail and related impacts. 10-15-20 years in current location are a cost effective step.. For Planning's Role – be prepared for re-location decisions, but we aren't at that point yet. Commit to longer term processes impact on other structures. Represents the county on Marine Sanctuary study also has oversight of project and sand replenishment project is

underway. Surfers Beach is one focus area which has impact on the Mirada area. Normal coastal process. (Len ?? What about Harbor Jetty Impact) Will be addressed in Connect the Coastside.

Dan Haggerty

Asks Joe about erosion impact on shotcrete. Various approaches to armoring may be especially helpful with creek erosion. Raising concern about erosion behind shotcrete wall:

(1:31:00) >> Robert Stevens response to Dan's question: There is a structure behind the shotcrete to alleviate erosion impact. Design is in process: proposed engineered fabric is proposed. (?? Need more detail)

### **(1:33:00) Comments from the public**

Pat Tierney, Miramar resident

Cites 57 signatures on petition to replace at present location."Alameda is our home, it is not the coastal trail." One Shore, a county erosion-control group, will work with residents. MCC should retract its recent letter on bridge replacement.

- Develop a long term coastal trail plan,
- Replace the trail in place
- Armor at creek mouth + Plants and Soil replenishment
- One Shore – County Group on Coastal Erosion

Neil Day, Miramar resident

home owner on Alameda -Replace bridge at current location ASAP, provides best connection north to the Harbor, With reference to 1972 photo

- North end abutment – little evidence of erosion
- Entire Miramar community supports replace in place
- Taking property – last resort – not appropriate here
- No dispute about engineering studies

Ethan Miller, Miramar resident

Look at north end- asserts there is no difference in erosion from 1972 to now  
If creek erosion is manageable, there is no need to change bridge location-  
Photos attached,  
refers to Nov.19, 2020 letter

Cid Young

-Can bridge be physically relocated if needed later?—  
>> Jim Porter - Yes, in theory, but unlikely in practice, different span length  
Fears Miramar will have problems similar to Seal Cove  
Ocean Blvd was abandoned and considered to retreat

Jennifer Savage, CA policy manager for Surf Rider

This should be seen as a Sea Level Rise adaptation project.

(Len E comment) Note that this is Half Moon Bay Harbor Jetty Issue

Contrast with Ethan Miller's comments

Armoring is against CCC policy. Destroys beaches and creates erosion  
Coastal Trail does not need to be at shoreline and CCC opposes armoring of Trail.  
Encourages long-term perspective

Kimberly Williams, local Surf Rider member – 14 year resident

Seeks expert opinions from Coastal erosion person

Says Pacifica erosion projects are not successful – what type of armoring is there (Shotcrete / plain concrete)  
Concern about armoring in the creek mouth  
Financial concerns – cost estimates by Supervisor Horsley are overblown

Jim Harvey—Coastside resident

Cites areas in Carmel that are well-managed with armoring  
Carmel by Sea along pebble beach – see Shotcrete there  
Examine erosion  
North side of Carmel Beach

**(1:56:00) Return Discussion to the MCC**

Question to Jim Porter – Can we direct further questions to DPW staff

>> Jim Porter – send all questions to Jim and he will direct them to staff  
Don confirms meeting time with Gregg Dieguez  
Gregg made connection – status of Dan’s efforts

Michelle

Willing to support re-consideration  
Concern about time required for relocation  
Need for more expert opinion

Dan-

Want more expert information especially erosion and drainage

Jill

Can a replacement be done on a temporary basis while other planning is done?—  
>> Jim Porter - No, any deviation from plan needs new permits and studies  
What about emergency repairs?  
Cites particular project –  
>> Jim – emergency repairs that are life threatening get fast track

Gregg

CCC will likely not approve plans, leading to County spending money and time on 2 sets of plans  
Notes surf rider concerns

Claire

Should consider having a study session  
Wants that information before making further decisions

Dave—

Current status is emergency CDP and further emergency cannot be considered.  
Proposed armoring is extensive.  
Moving abutments inland might be possible without increasing armoring. It would be very extensive to construct new abutments  
Consider 175 feet of armoring extensive  
Note previous letter about having a longer bridge reduce the armoring requirement  
>> Jim Porter – translates Dave’s request to moving te abutments back  
>> Consultant– current approach relies on using the current abutments, this is especially difficult on the North side. Reliance on current abutments is critical feature of DPW approach

**b. (8:30) – Election of Officers (Erickson)**

For Chair--Michelle. Moved Claire, second Dave. Approved 7-0

For Vice-Chair--Claire Moved Dave, second Michelle. Approved 7-0

For Secretary--Len Moved Dave, second Claire Approved 7-0

For Treasurer--Dave. Moved Len, second Michelle Approved 7-0

**5. Council Activity**

Dan concerned about bright lighting at new El Granada fire station

**6. Future Agendas**

December 16 - Special Meeting) – Brown Act Brown Act and Rosenberg's Rules of Order

December 23 = Regular meeting canceled

**Adjourn** (10:00pm)

