

# 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 [www.MidcoastCommunityCouncil.org](http://www.MidcoastCommunityCouncil.org)*

Date: October 28, 2020  
To: Jim Porter, DPW Director  
Cc: Erik Martinez, Coastal Program Analyst, California Coastal Commission  
Cc: Supervisor Don Horsley  
Subject: Coastal Development Permit (CDP) Application Number 2-20-0319 (Mirada Road Soil Nail Wall and Pedestrian Bridge Replacement dated 6/3/2020)

The Midcoast Community Council has strong concerns about the large area of the proposed soil nail walls and rock slope protection (RSP) associated with this project as detailed in the plans dated January 16, 2020.

In addition to the problematic tie-in with the existing unpermitted RSP at the 2 Mirada Road parking lot, the proposed armoring will significantly narrow the creek channel. We are concerned that the proposed armoring will focus wave energy against the creek banks upstream of the bridge, and will likely cause increased creek bank erosion.

The significant armoring proposed will also likely result in beach erosion near this project, and would also remove the informal trail access to the beach that exists on the south bank, east of the existing pedestrian bridge. That access is the only beach access for several hundred yards north and south of the creek.

Recent Coastal Commission decisions regarding a new home at Arbor Lane in Moss Beach have treated creek bank armoring similar to armoring of the ocean bluffs, and have not allowed armoring to protect the Coastal Trail just south of the Casa Mira condominiums near this project, instead suggesting that the Coastal Trail be moved inland.

The MCC requests that the bridge be built further inland, rather than rebuild a bridge at the same location, since sea-level rise and increased storm energy will likely make this a short duration project. The closest location would be at Alameda Ave. Small easements or purchase of property would be needed on the north bank to connect the two sides, due to the offset. Alternatively, an easement could be obtained across the eastern side of parcel 048-052-260, In either case, the Coastal Trail could then be re-aligned on State Parks property to join Mirada Rd in the vicinity of Ramona Way right of way.

A less desirable, but possibly easier alternative would be to make the proposed replacement pedestrian bridge 20-25 feet longer, thereby moving the new abutments 10-12 feet further back from the creek bank, greatly reducing or removing the need for armoring to protect the abutments. This alternative would not solve the issues related to sea-level rise, so this is only a near term solution.

**MIDCOAST COMMUNITY COUNCIL**  
**s/Len Erickson Chair**

Attachment: Letter from Lennie Roberts, Green Foothills

October 13, 2020

To: Midcoast Community Council

From: Lennie Roberts, Legislative Advocate, Green Foothills

Re: Item 4b on the October 14, 2020 MCC Agenda: Replacement bridge over Arroyo de en Medio Creek

Green Foothills supports relocation of the failed bridge over Arroyo de en Medio Creek rather than replacement, based on the following:

The project plans submitted by County Public Works to the Coastal Commission (CDP Application for Soil Nail Wall and Pedestrian Bridge Replacement Project on Mirada Road, Application Number 2-17-0289) include constructing soil nail walls at three locations north and south of the existing bridge, demolishing the abandoned concrete arch bridge, and installing rock slope protection at the base of the soil nail walls. As proposed, the project is inconsistent with the Hazards policies of the California Coastal Act and the San Mateo County Local Coastal Program.

The July 11, 2019 decision of the California Coastal Commission regarding a proposed seawall at 2 Mirada Road, Half Moon Bay, (CDP Application 2-16-0784) just south of Arroyo de en Medio Creek, included Findings that the California Coastal Trail could be relocated inland rather than extending armoring the bluffs to protect it, and that such relocation as well as limitation on the extent of the proposed seawall is the less environmentally damaging feasible alternative.

Based on this recent decision and in light of sea level rise projections, the prudent action now is to relocate the bridge inland a sufficient distance so the California Coastal Trail and other infrastructure will not be subject to accelerated bluff erosion and structural failure in the future.