

## **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)

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

### ***Minutes for Meeting of JULY 8, 2020***

**Call to Order** (7pm) Meeting conducted virtually via Zoom due to shelter-in-place orders. This meeting is in lieu of the regularly scheduled meeting of June 10.

Michelle Weil absent; all other Councilmembers present. Also present: 21 other people, including other government officials.

#### **1. Board of Supervisors' Report**

Carrie Dallman of Supervisor Horsley's office noted that there are vacancies for community representatives on the Coastside Design Review Committee and encouraged applications. She also invited public comment on the Tunitas Creek Beach Improvement Project. Details are on the MCC website.

Harvey Rarback on HMB City Council said that beach closures over the July 4 weekend were successful.

#### **2. Public Comment & Announcements**

Gregg Dieguez asked that the MCC serve as a gatekeeper for the community to understand how to have standing in addressing issues before decision-making bodies. Dave suggested that he review the rules each body has for its own standards. Gregg encouraged MCC to hold its own meetings on this and offered some of Lisa Ketcham's writings as a model for these considerations. He also asked for a new study to replace the 2010 analysis of water resources.

#### **3. Consent Agenda**

- a. Approve Minutes for June 8 and 24. Approve General Election resolution for electing MCC members.

Approved 5-0

#### **4. Regular Agenda – The Council may take action on the following items:**

##### **a. Connect the Coastside**

Joe LaClair, Planning Services Manager, made a presentation (attached to agenda) regarding hitherto unexamined aspects of CTC, including land use and Highway 92.

Dan advocated for below-grade crossings

Dave thought that lots indicated for potential retirement may already belong to land-preserving organizations,

Len asked if there was a model for how changes in Delay Index can be calculated in planning new developments. Joe said that this would come later and would likely use CECAG-TVA model and there was a nexus model to set developer fees.

Dan felt that using Delay Index to plan changes was complicated.

Claire thought that some information on Highway One traffic studies should be re-examined and that review of operations of Highway 92 businesses might change some of the planning.,

Dan said that there were too frequent pedestrian crossings at Frenchman’s Creek, and Joe responded that the intersection was under the control of Caltrans and HMB.

Gregg was glad to see more detail on land use but was uncertain how to access some of it and wondered how much of it was up-to-date. He noted that 2015 studies indicated LOS failures. Joe responded that 2017 studies generally corroborated 2014 data. The County would try to look at more current information but that updating to show post-COVID reality would be impossible and that it was important to complete the plan.

JQ Oeswein raised points related to comparison of various studies and measurement methods and extrapolation to build-out figures.

Harald Hermann questioned possible inconsistencies in various reports over the years and Joe responded that planning makes general assumptions about future needs but that individual project could change those needs.

Marcia Yates feared that conditions placed on development might not be enforced, citing Big Wave. She felt unlistened to and believes that Caltrans is reluctant to spend money in this locality.

Dolores Silva thought that developers’ traffic mitigation fees are too low and worried about emergency/evacuation adequacy. She feels that an unfortunate effect of the delay in finishing CTC is the loss of past leaders who were involved in and knowledgeable about the process.

Joe said that Moss Beach proposals related to Cypress Point would be “inserted” in the overall plan following community input. He promised that developers would pay “their fair share.” He thought that CalFire’s evolving evacuation format was useful.

Len asked how “fair share” was determined and was told that currently that was a production of ad hoc negotiation.

Dan asked if past errors in calculation were identified as such in subsequent reports. Joe said that could be done if asked for.

Marcia asked whose projections are used in reviewing proposed developments and Joe said that the project submits its studies to peer review.

#### **b. CTC—Public Comment on Virtual Meetings**

Dolores wished she could have seen remarks in the chat box at the final meeting.

JQ thought there was not enough time for people to speak and felt isolated from community process.

Marcia thought the process was fragmenting rather than unifying and was distracted by technical issues.

Michelle Dragony compared the meetings unfavorably to MWSD Prop 218 meeting and asked MCC to hold its own meeting.

Kimberly Williams reported technical problems hearing all participants and noted that report-out omitted some points.

Dolores asked for clarification on number of community participants—probably around 100 unique individuals.

Claire said that some specific suggestions were lost because group leaders were unfamiliar with the area

Dan cited multiple difficulties, including transcripts not being available.

Dave was happy that MCC would hold a meeting. He noted that we had offered earlier to be part of the process but that didn't happen.

**c. CTC—Additional Meetings in July and beyond**

Len hopes that a special meeting on July 15 will provide for more community discussion and coordination with Half Moon Bay. It will focus on technical aspects. A subsequent special meeting on 7/29 or 8/5 will focus on specific projects. Joe will provide information on build-out. All information can be accessed on the MCC website.

**5. Council Activity**

Claire continues to attend elected-officials COVID updates. She also attended the Attorney General's hearing on the sale of Seton and Seton Coastside. There was unanimous support at the hearing for a proposed sale that would continue much of the present operations, including Coastside emergency services.

**6. Future Agendas**

In addition to meetings cited above, the annual financial report will be considered at the next MCC meeting.

**Adjournment (9:25)**