**Subject:** Concerns with Commenting on the Cypress Point Project

Date: Tuesday, February 25, 2020 at 9:38:59 PM Pacific Standard Time

From: Len Erickson

To: Steve Monowitz

CC: Joe LaClair, Mike Schaller, Stephanie Rexing, Erik Martinez

Attachments: 2019\_2018\_MCC\_CypressPt\_Referrals.pdf

To: Steve Monowitz, SMC Community Development Director

cc:

SMC Planning Staff Joe LaClair Mike Schaller

## California Coastal Commission

Stephanie Rexing Erik Martinez

From: Len Erickson, MCC Chair

This letter expresses process concerns about the status of review comments from the MCC to San Mateo County regarding the Cypress Point project.

I am raising these points as MCC Chair in an effort to get responses from San Mateo County that will enable the MCC to make further comments on this project.

With the proposed next Planning Commission session on the Cypress Point project scheduled in late March, I would like to highlight points that make it difficult for the MCC to provide relevant and appropriate feedback on this project:

## Lack of Response to the MCC's Comment Letters

Prior to the January 22 PC session, the MCC had provided comments in three separate letters. On January 7 I provided the three letters in a single document

o 2019-05-22-CypressPt-referral-MCC

o 2018-09-26-CypressPt-referral-MCC

o 2018-08-22-CypressPt-referral-MCC-rev2

sent to Mike Schaller in an email (attached). Mike Schaller acknowledged receipt and that this document was helpful. While the staff report for the Jan. 22 meeting contained specific reference and responses to the first two letters, it omitted the third referral, 8-22-2018 which was the most detailed submission. Without specific response to this letter, it has been difficult for the MCC to gage the Planning Departments perspective on the issues we raised.

Neither the voluminous staff report (600+ pages) nor the 25 itemized responses on the County's project page: <a href="https://planning.smcgov.org/cypress-point-affordable-housing-community-project">https://planning.smcgov.org/cypress-point-affordable-housing-community-project</a> are helpful in this matter.

Consider Transportation in the following three documents, one issued prior and two issued after to the 8-22-2018 MCC Referral.

- 2. Responses to Workshop Comments.pdf (July 2018)
- 7. PrelimEnvEval UPDATE 4-19.pdf
- 23. Transportation Impact Analysis UPDATE 4-19.pdf

The staff report makes reference to the role of Connect the Coastside (CTC) in a discussion on (pp. 14-15) - Policy 2.52 (Traffic Mitigation for all Development in the Urban Midcoast) and introduces the new term TIMP, which is presumably a renaming of the term in use for several years (Comprehensive Transportation Management Plan – CTMP). How all the transportation related documents fit together is unclear and will not come to the public until April, after the proposed final Planning Commission hearing on the Zoning amendment.

As an example of the difficulty in understanding the situation:

- Project document (2. Responses to Workshop Comments.pdf July 2018) calls for the closure of the intersection of Carlos Street north with SR1.
- The MCC letter 2018-08-22 critiqued this closure for several reasons including its role in completing the California Coastal Trail in the Midcoast.
- No further reference is made to this recommendation until the Connect the Coastside document made a reference utilizing Carlos in as shown in a concept diagram.

Stepping back and reviewing the overall picture, the complicated discussion above I would like to make the following point:

- A year ago, the MCC convened a discussion of MCC members with. County Staff and Caltrans Staff to
  discuss the Moss Beach Corridor, an SR1 road segment extending extending from the south Etheldore
  South / SR1 to Etheldore North / SR1. The impact of the Cypress Point Project is to extend the Corridor
  definition from Etheldore South / SR1 to Montara's 16<sup>th</sup> Street / SR1.
- In moving forward, the full extent of the uses, opportunities and requirements for the expanded SR1
  Moss Beach Corridor should be considered and not be primarily driven by the potential impacts of the
  Cypress Point Project.