



COUNTY OF SAN MATEO

555 COUNTY CENTER, 5TH FLOOR • REDWOOD CITY • CALIFORNIA 94063-1665 • PHONE (650) 363-4100 • FAX (650) 361-8220

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
MARK CHURCH
RICHARD S. GORDON
JERRY HILL
ROSE JACOBS GIBSON
ADRIENNE TISSIER

NEIL R. CULLEN
DIRECTOR

November 9, 2005

Ms. Karen Wilson
Chair, MidCoast Community Council
P.O. Box 64
Moss Beach, CA 94038

Dear Ms. Wilson:

Re: Resurfacing Roads in the MidCoast

The following is in response to the questions regarding the proposal to consider resurfacing as an alternative to the road standards currently listed in the MidCoast Community Plan. I have responded to your questions in a Question (Q) and Response (R) format and have annotated your questions as I understand them. I will also discuss the issues at the MidCoast Community Council (MCC) meeting of November 9, 2005, and will attempt to answer any other questions that you, other Council members or the public may have regarding this issue.

I also believe, as a starting point, that we need to have a common understanding that the proposal to resurface existing County maintained paved roads that have not been built to any discernible standard is a means of preserving the surface of these roads in a reasonable condition; and that resurfacing of the roads is not a solution to drainage issues in the MidCoast. However, that does not preclude the Department from working with the MCC to address ways to fund and construct drainage improvements as may be desired and supported by the community and MCC.

I believe that the MCC has two separate issues to consider:

- 1) Should the resurfacing of County maintained roads that do not meet the standards in the MidCoast Community Plan be pursued by the County, and if so, will the MCC support the County:
 - a) expanding the language in the Community Plan to include resurfacing of the streets as an option; or
 - b) removing road standards from the Community Plan and have the standards adopted by the Board of Supervisors by resolution; or

Ms. Karen Wilson
Chair, MidCoast Community Council
Re: Resurfacing Roads in the MidCoast
November 9, 2005

Page 2

- c) having the resurfacing considered an allowed exception as provided in paragraph 3d, General Policies, of the Community Plan, on the premise that resurfacing the road will preserve the existing "neighborhood quality" of an area.
- 2) Should the County consider drainage improvements that can reduce flooding in areas of the MidCoast as separate projects that are not required to be built in connection with road improvements?

Questions and Responses

- Q1. An initial concern is the planning aspect of this process and these proposals. The consideration of adding more paved streets without addressing the equally important issue of proper drainage would seem to be almost counter-productive in the long-run, as paving streets without addressing drainage, is a waste of County funds, as the streets can not withstand the amount of diverted water and will be a continuous expense if not dealt with now.
- R1. I agree that drainage is an issue in some areas of the MidCoast and also believe, as stated in previous correspondence, that the MCC and the County could be criticized as providing exceptions- either for resurfacing or drainage projects - can be perceived as an attempt to avoid the public process that is provided for in the Community Plan. However, the proposal is not to "add more paved streets," but to preserve the roadway surface of what is currently the maintained road system. The MCC may determine that the standards as provided in the Community Plan are appropriate, or decide that exceptions should be sought, or determine that the standard should only be changed after the hearings and surveys as provided by the Community Plan are held/conducted.
- Q1a. Are the Mitigation Fees that are being paid by our local builders for the maintenance of the street system spent locally or are they distributed County-wide to all the unincorporated areas?
- R1a. The fees are collected within sub-areas of the County and must be spent within the subarea for which they are collected. The MidCoast is a subarea. The proposal in my previous letter was to use the Mitigation Fees to help finance drainage improvements that would be built in conjunction with road improvements in the MidCoast; that is still an option.

Ms. Karen Wilson
Chair, MidCoast Community Council
Re: Resurfacing Roads in the MidCoast
November 9, 2005

Page 3

- Q1b. Streets that have frequent flooding have much higher damage. Not addressing drainage and storm water control results in higher maintenance costs for the streets that are surfaced – the sections of Cedar and Harte in Montara, Etheldore/Cypress in Moss Beach, Santa Maria/The Alameda in El Granada, 2nd street in Montara.
- R1b. I agree. However, we were not successful in getting everyone to contribute their equivalent amount of Mitigation Fees on Cypress as a “test case” to move forward with a project that would improve drainage and reduce flooding.
- Q1c. Plans for resurfacing or new surfacing projects do not take into consideration potential impacts and damage to “downstream” areas from increased and faster runoff – specifically the proposed surfacing of Alta Vista and Jordan/Irving in Montara. (that should not even be considered without drainage mitigation included).
- R1c. The proposal would be to resurface existing County maintained paved roads to their current width. No new impervious surface would be created. Alta Vista and Jordan/Irving were not a consideration in our proposal as they are not County maintained roads. However, other agencies such as the fire agencies, are requiring widening or turnouts and turnarounds on non-maintained roads in conjunction with development.
- Q1d. This approach is also creating a long term impact on the vacant lots that are left, creating a burden for local builders and property owners who are left to pick up the additional expense of all up-hill development.
- R1d. I disagree that the resurfacing of existing paved roads creates or exacerbates down stream drainage issues.

MCC Statement. As another point of clarification for all our members, residents, property owners and developers, as we understand it Public Works is looking for a way to allow resurfacing of streets within the County-maintained system that are not up to full standard, a practice not allowed under the current standards. These streets are currently maintained to their current level of development with minimal patching, filling, and whatever else is needed. The proposals are a way to allow entire resurfacing of these streets, even though this may result in finished surface roadways that do not meet the specified road standards.

Q2. Is this understanding of the proposal correct as stated above?

Ms. Karen Wilson
Chair, MidCoast Community Council
Re: Resurfacing Roads in the MidCoast
November 9, 2005

Page 4

- R2. Generally yes. The streets are currently maintained as paved streets. The Board has, in other parts of the County (i.e. Emerald Lake Hills, Devonshire Canyon and Fair Oaks) adopted road standards by resolution that included resurfacing the existing travel ways of the County maintained roads. We believe over the long term, that resurfacing a road is a more cost effective solution than continual patching.
- Q3. Will changing the language in the Community Plan be done administratively after local MCC hearings, or will it require much more extensive review? Please clarify.
- R3. It is a more extensive process as the Community Plan is a subset of the County General Plan. Language changes as were done in 1994 would require hearings before the County Planning Commission, approval by the Board of Supervisors, and, I believe, review and approval by the Coastal Commission. In addition, I believe that surveys of the property owners in the areas affected by proposed language changes would need to be conducted as provided in the current Community Plan.
- Q4a. We are curious as to the origin for this proposal. Was this initiated from within DPW?
- R4a. Yes, this proposal was made after we surveyed property owners on various blocks as discussed with the MCC, to determine if property owners wanted the improvements as described by the Community Plan installed on their street. The general sense of the responses was that property owners were concerned that full improvements would generate more traffic and some property owners were not interested in paying for property related construction (driveway and walkway conforms, mail box relocations, etc.) that could be necessary as part of an improvement project.
- Q4b. Were there requests from local property owners, and if so, which ones?
- R4b. There had been requests in terms of petitions for street improvements being constructed using assessment district proceedings prior to the passage of Proposition 218. The last project we did using an assessment district was the Navarra/Escalona/San Juan Project that was reviewed by the MidCoast Council. This project was completed in 2002.
- Q4c. Has there been analysis of the costs and benefits of these policies in regards to overall community benefit versus increased benefits for a limited number of property owners?
- R4c. No. I believe the community as a whole benefits by the maintenance of the road system.
- Q4d. Would this proposal increase the value and development potential of marginal undeveloped properties by placing them on an "improved" street, a value that is currently

Ms. Karen Wilson
Chair, MidCoast Community Council
Re: Resurfacing Roads in the MidCoast
November 9, 2005

Page 5

earned from the expense of having the streets raised to the required standard? These issues relate to those regarding criteria in #5 below.

R4d. I do not believe there is an increase in potential based on our experience in Devonshire Canyon and Emerald Lake Hills. The streets proposed to be resurfaced would be County maintained roads.

Q4e. These reflections underscored the need for a process as in Option 1, with public hearings as necessary, to determine the community benefits and subsequent impacts.

R4e. I believe that the MCC needs to determine what process they wish to support. As I stated in my previous letter, each option as described has both positive and negative aspects.

Q5a. The MCC would like to get a better idea on the benefits of reconstruction versus resurfacing. There is the concern that resurfacing could result in a number of roads with nice surfaces, that would seem fine to drive on, but present traffic and pedestrian hazards including access for emergency vehicles from substandard widths, exacerbate parking, worsen drainage problems and result in more expensive (and not obvious) roadbed failures in the not-so-distant future.

R5a. The determination as to the benefits, I believe, needs to be made at the local level. We have implemented standards in the Fair Oaks area adjacent to Redwood City, as an example, that provides the property owners with five options from maintain "as is" to a standard similar to the Montara standard- 22feet of pavement with 3 foot valley gutters. Traffic and the potential impact of traffic on a street are issues that may occur whether the street is maintained as is, resurfaced, or reconstructed.

Q5b. We need to understand what is the current situation with streets that meet the requirements to be in the county maintained system and why are they being denied.

R5b. The Board adopted an ordinance for the MidCoast that provides for the most part, that streets on the urban side of the urban rural boundary will be taken into the maintained road system if they meet the following criteria:

- * Contiguous to a county maintained road or state highway
- * At least one block long
- * Adjacent property is at least 50% developed commensurate with the zoning
- * Majority of property owners petition to having the road brought into the maintained system and agree to pay for future road improvements if additional improvements are desired.

Ms. Karen Wilson
Chair, MidCoast Community Council
Re: Resurfacing Roads in the MidCoast
November 9, 2005

Page 6

- * Meet minimum standard of 16 foot all weather surface with drainage swales and appropriate drainage

The most recent inquiry that I am aware of was on Fir and Irving. The streets did not meet the requirement as stated above and therefore I informed the property owner that I would not recommend that they be brought into the County maintained system.

Q6a. How is the priority list of roads to be resurfaced created?

R6a. We developed a list of roads in cooperation with the homeowners association in the Emerald Hills area and suggested a list in the Devonshire Canyon area that was reviewed and approved by the Board of Supervisors at a noticed public hearing. However, I believe that criteria would have to be established for the MidCoast since there are seven discreet areas as defined in the Community Plan.

Q6b. What is the process of finalizing the priority list?

R6b. I believe for an area as large as the MidCoast that public hearings would need to be held before your Council, and then the list considered by the Board of Supervisors.

Q6c. Normally, what are the criteria for prioritizing?

R6c. Criteria can include the amount of traffic, the location of the road with respect to other roads such as Highway 1, existing drainage, and the condition of the road.

Q6d. Who and what is the process for defining the criteria?

R6d. Currently we use a Pavement Condition Index (PCI) for determining when roads with standard "structural sections" get paved and what pavement resurfacing is to be used - i.e. asphalt concrete, chip seal, cape seal, slurry seal, etc. The PCI of the pavement is determined by standard criteria developed by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission. Also see R6c.

Q6e. What is the minimum road condition in which resurfacing is considered an option?

R6e. I believe you are asking how good does the pavement have to be in order for the road to be resurfaced, or the converse, how poor is the pavement such that resurfacing is not an option. There is no specific minimum as the goal is to maintain the road in a reasonable condition balanced with the revenues that we have. We do use a number of different

Ms. Karen Wilson
Chair, MidCoast Community Council
Re: Resurfacing Roads in the MidCoast
November 9, 2005

Page 7

surface treatments to maintain the roadways as explained above, and part of the process can be patching, as may be necessary, to be done before the road is surfaced.

- Q6f. A lot of the problems could be dealt with by simply defining resurfacing as "maintenance," not as an "improvement." We see nothing in the material that was forwarded that restricts maintenance!
- R6f. I agree. I also believe that we need consensus relative to the intent of the Community Plan as the State Controller, in defining the expenditure of gas tax revenues that is the primary source of revenues to finance road construction and maintenance, defines maintenance as the application of no more than 1 inch of material over an existing surfaced street. Resurfacing with asphalt concrete usually consists of using between 0.1' to 0.15' (1-1/4 inches to 1-3/4 inches) of material. However, maintenance could be defined differently relative to the Community Plan.
- Q6g. However, we do not want the lowering of the road standards to discourage the County from being involved in solutions for local drainage problems.
- R6g. See my comments at the beginning of this letter. I believe that road maintenance and drainage can be addressed as two distinct issues that could be coordinated. I also believe the current Community Plan standards link road drainage improvements with road improvements, and road improvements with a specific standard for each area of the MidCoast. There needs to be community and MCC support to either change the Community Plan to allow a separation of the road maintenance from drainage improvements, or the same support for an exemption process to allow individual road maintenance projects or drainage projects to move forward under the current Community Plan.
- Q6h. If the standards were to include resurfacing, how would the community or MCC partake in the process of criteria definition and development of the priority list of roads to be resurfaced?
- R6h. See R6a and R6b.
- Q6i. What is the cost efficiency in expanding the language in the Community Plan to include resurfacing to the road standards definition when drainage has been a documented problem since the Mid 70's? If there are legitimate concerns about the effect of this work, what are the impacts on the more serious systemic and cumulative drainage problems and road failures due to the neglect of dealing with drainage issues?

Ms. Karen Wilson
Chair, MidCoast Community Council
Re: Resurfacing Roads in the MidCoast
November 9, 2005

Page 8

- R6i. We have found in other areas that resurfacing has not materially changed drainage patterns. However, resurfacing also has not rectified drainage problems that are not associated with the surface of the road.
- Q6j. The lack of response in the Cypress Ave. situation should not be taken as a reason to not address the problem. The mitigation fees should be used to correct the problem rather than as a burden to existing residents due to a lack of county planning.
- R6j. We have recommended that mitigation fees be used to make drainage improvements. However, we also recommended that those benefiting from the improvements who have not paid mitigation fees due to the age of the structure, pay the equivalent amount as we do not believe that there is sufficient funds to finance drainage improvements for the entire area. The cost of maintaining drainage facilities is also an issue.
- Q7. It appears that the exception criteria in the Community Plan allows for creative planning and work beyond concrete gutters accelerating ground water run-off speed, rate and flow.
- R7. As stated in previous correspondence, exemptions could be considered by the Board but would need the support of the community and the MCC.
- Q8. Additional pavement for parking areas reduces the area for water absorption and contributes to runoff speed, volume and rate, and can only get worse if these types of "parking areas" continue to be allowed. We would like to think the policy is open to interpretation. We request the DPW work with the MCC to set a series of policies and conditions for these types of developments, including considerations of neighborhood drainage impacts. To our mind, this does not need to be part of any Road Standard revision.
- R8. We can discuss establishing standards and policies. However, it will require public review and input since the Community Plan provides for parking areas.
- Q9a. How are the requirements for Stormwater Management under the County NPDES permit going to be, or are they handled in regards to existing drainage conditions and those that might occur under the resurfacing proposals. And, who is supervising the NPDES permit at this time?
- R9a. My understanding is that existing drainage conditions do not require any action under the current NPDES permit conditions, and we apply for Coastal Development Permit (CDP) Exemptions for our current resurfacing projects on streets that have standard structural sections. Drainage projects as may be approved to move forward will also be subject to

Ms. Karen Wilson
Chair, MidCoast Community Council
Re: Resurfacing Roads in the MidCoast
November 9, 2005

Page 9

CDP review and most likely permits from the Regional Water Quality Control Board and the California Department of Fish and Game if the project is located within a stream or tributary.

The California Coastal Commission in conjunction with the Regional Water Quality Control Board will be evaluating the watersheds that drain into the Fitzgerald Marine Reserve as the Reserve is considered a Critical Coastal Area (CCA) by the State. This may have implications on future development as well as existing development in these watersheds.

Staff of the Environmental Services Agency, Environmental Health, County Counsel, and Public Works are also meeting with Supervisors Gordon and Hill regarding NPDES as the State is proposing additional NPDES requirements.

Q9b. We appreciate your referral to Planning in regards to building sites. Please let us know who that was referred to and if there is any response.

R9b. Lisa Grote, the Community Development Director. Lisa is one of the staff persons meeting with Supervisors Gordon and Hill.

Q9c. What is being done to address the down stream impacts due to runoff from new development?

R9c. See R9a. In addition, mitigation fees are being collected from new development that can be used to finance drainage improvements once they are agreed to.

In conclusion and as stated at the beginning of my responses, I believe there are two issues for the MCC to consider:

- a) should the resurfacing of County maintained roads that do not meet the standards in the MidCoast Community Plan be pursued by the County; and
- b) should the County consider drainage improvements that can reduce flooding in areas of the MidCoast as separate projects that are not required to be built in connection with road improvements.


My intent is not to eliminate the standards as approved in the Community Plan, but to allow the Department more flexibility in maintaining the County maintained road system. We could still consider minimum standard improvements where desired by the property owners. The construction of drainage improvements would either have to comply with the standards in the

Ms. Karen Wilson
Chair, MidCoast Community Council
Re: Resurfacing Roads in the MidCoast
November 9, 2005

Page 10

Community Plan or an exemption that meets the criteria in the Community Plan would have to be approved by the Board of Supervisors, if the Community Plan is not amended. Drainage improvements may also be more complicated as while plans to provide for the conveyance of the stormwater are relatively straight forward, the long term quality of the storm water may be an issue that has to be addressed before the regulatory agencies will allow construction to go forward.

Very truly yours,



Neil R. Cullen
Director of Public Works

NRC:sdd

FAUSERS\ADMIN\ESDMIDCOAST\2005\response to karen wilson nov letter on resurfacing standards nov 8 NRC.doc

Enclosures: Karen Wilson's Letter of November 6, 2005
Neil R. Cullen's Letter of August

cc: Supervisor Rich Gordon
Marcia Raines, Director, Environmental Services Agency
Lisa Grote, Community Development Director, Pony No. PLN122

MidCoast Community Council

An elected Municipal Advisory Council to the San Mateo County Board of Supervisors
Serving Over 11,000 Coastal Residents
Post Office Box 64, Moss Beach, CA 94038-0064

November 6, 2005

FAX/Email

Neil Cullen, Director

San Mateo County Public Works Division
555 County Center 5th Floor
Redwood City CA 94063
(650) 599-1421 FAX: (650) 361-8220
ncullen@co.sanmateo.ca.us

RE: Proposal on resurfacing of MidCoast Streets.

Dear Neil;

Thank you for your response to our initial questions regarding the resurfacing proposals. I apologize for the delay in getting back to you sooner, however many residents and developers are extremely concerned on this issue, and I wanted to be sure to reflect comments from all concerned. Review of that information has, of course, prompted further questions and comments which I hope you will be able to address either in advance of or at our regular meeting of November 9, 2005. These comments came from members of the Council and the public "all" that had reviewed the materials available.

1. An initial concern is the planning aspect of this process and these proposals. The consideration of adding more paved streets without addressing the equally important issue of proper drainage would seem to be almost counter-productive in the long-run, as paving streets without addressing drainage, is a waist of County funds, as the streets can not withstand the amount of diverted water and will be a continuous expense if not dealt with **now**. We believe this is an important consideration for a number of reasons:
 - Mitigation fees are being paid by our local builders for the maintenance of the street system – are all the fees collected locally spent locally, or are they distributed County-wide to all the unincorporated areas? Are there priority areas where these fees are being utilized? As some residents and vacant lots take the brunt of all development, while others feel no effects.
 - Not addressing drainage and storm water control results in higher maintenance costs for the streets that are surfaced – the sections of Cedar and Harte in Montara, Etheldore/Cypress in Moss Beach, Santa Maria/The Alameda in El Granada, 2nd street in Montara and other areas in the MidCoast that have frequent flooding have much higher damage to the streets and adjacent properties.
 - Plans for resurfacing or new surfacing projects does not take into consideration potential impacts and damage to "downstream" areas from

increased and faster runoff – specifically the proposed surfacing of Alta Vista and Jordan/Irving in Montara. (that should not even be considered without drainage mitigation included).

- This approach is also creating a long term impact on the vacant lots that are left, creating a burden for local builders and property owners who are left to pick up the additional expense of all up-hill development.
2. As another point of clarification for all our members, residents, property owners and developers, as we understand it Public Works is looking for a way to allow resurfacing of streets within the County-maintained system that are not up to full standard, a practice not allowed under the current standards. These streets are currently maintained to their current level of development with minimal patching, filling, and whatever else is needed. The proposals are a way to allow entire resurfacing of these streets, even though this may result in finished surface roadways that do not meet the specified road standards.

Is this understanding of the proposal correct as stated above?

3. We would like some clarification regarding what is really involved in changing the language within the **Community Plan**. Can it be changed administratively after local MCC hearings, or will it require much more extensive review?

In our consideration of the three possible options presented in your letter of ways to do that, we wondered if changing the actual wording in the road standards might require more than a minimum of local hearings before the MCC; that the argument could be made that, as the Community Plan is incorporated by reference into the LCP, it should require review by the Planning Commission, Board of Supervisors, and Coastal Commission. This has always been our basic understanding of the status of the Community Plan. Please clarify.

4. We are curious as to the origin for this proposal. You mention in your letter the convenience of resurfacing all parallel streets so no one is burdened with extra traffic, which makes good sense in a Public Works kind of way. Was this initiated from within DPW? Were there requests from local property owners, and if so, which ones? And has there been analysis of the costs and benefits of these policies in regards to overall community benefit versus increased benefits for a limited number of property owners? Would this proposal increase the value and development potential of marginal undeveloped properties by placing them on an "improved" street, a value that is currently earned from the expense of having the streets raised to the required standard? These issues relate to those regarding criteria in #5 below.

These reflections underscored the need for a process as in Option 1, with public hearings as necessary, to determine the community benefits and subsequent impacts.

5. The question arose on reconstruction vs resurfacing. We understand that resurfacing is certainly less expensive, and if that turns out to be an equitably beneficial approach, it would make sense. The Council would like to get a better idea on the benefits of reconstruction and when this would be a better approach – there is the concern that this could result in a number of roads with nice surfaces, that would seem fine to drive on, but present traffic and pedestrian hazards including access for emergency vehicles from substandard widths, exacerbate parking, worsen drainage problems and result in more expensive (and not obvious) roadbed failures in the not-so-distant future.

We need to understand what is the current situation with streets that meet the requirements to be in the county maintained system and why are they being denied by the county - we have several residents that have requested this, and are told they are not going to be accepted.

6. How is the priority list of roads to be resurfaced created? What is the process of finalizing the priority list? What are the criteria for prioritizing? Who and what is the process for defining the criteria? What is the minimum road condition in which resurfacing is considered an option?

A lot of the problems could be dealt with by simply defining resurfacing as "maintenance," not as an "improvement." We see nothing in the material that was forwarded that restricts maintenance! However, resurfacing substandard streets (an insignificant range of road and drainage condition) without a case-by-case consideration of the neighborhood drainage will exacerbate and expand our current serious problem. "Lowering" the standards to include resurfacing, which effectively redefines resurfacing as maintenance, might relieve and discourage the County from having to address this issue, something we do not want if the County is ultimately going to be part of the solution.

If the standards were to include resurfacing, how would the community or MCC partake in the process of criteria definition and development of the priority list of roads to be resurfaced?

What is the cost efficiency in expanding the language in the Community Plan to include resurfacing to the road standards definition when drainage has been a documented problem since the Mid 70's? If there are legitimate concerns about the effect of this work, what are the impacts on the more serious systemic and cumulative drainage problems and road failures due to the neglect of dealing with drainage issues?

The lack of response in the Cypress Ave. situation should not be taken as a reason to not address the problem, when the general perception of the problem is that the flooding was created by the lack of planning of drainage effects to down stream residents. The mitigation fees should be used to correct the problem rather than as a burden to existing residents due to a lack of county planning.

7. In your response to our question about the inclusion of drainage, you stated:

"I reviewed the circa 1977 plan and did not find a specific reference to drainage. However the 1994 amendment speaks to drainage as a part of the road standards. My recollection was that the 1994 revision was after we had completed projects which included drainage. However, the completion of these plans also led to the community surveys and the revisions to the Community Plan."

Drainage as defined in the Midcoast Road Standards (sections 1.b, 2.b, and 3.b) consists of " ... standard gray concrete (curbs and) gutters to channel runoff ..."

In addition, Section 5 of the standards, regarding exceptions, goes as far as saying: "... in no case shall exceptions result in paved roads with less than ... drainage facilities to control surface storm water."

This clearly opens it up for creative planning and work beyond concrete gutters accelerating ground water run-off speed, rate and flow.

8. In your response to the question about parking bays, you responded in part that

" ... That section goes on to say" (g) permit unpaved shoulders (or paved shoulders with an encroachments permit) "which allows for parking areas in front of properties."*

The section quoted is supplemented by Section 1.c, which says that:

"Paved parking shoulders and driveway extensions may be allowed ... upon issuance of an encroachment permit by the Department of Public Works. In such cases, an acceptable parking surface material shall be determined ... based on slope, drainage, and engineering conditions."

The problem is the addition of areas of pavement far in excess of what would normally be expected from a single-family residence, especially when the area in front of two or three houses becomes a continuous sheet of asphalt in the ROW and within the front setback area of the parcels. The loss of water absorption and the contribution to runoff speed, volume and rate is significant, and can only get worse if these types of "parking areas" continue to be allowed. If homes are being build on the MidCoast Larger than the amount of parking needed, there is clearly a problem that must be immediately addressed. Part of the issue here may be that the definition of drainage as a determining factor is not neighborhood drainage, but just the basic engineering of running rainwater of any new pavement within the encroachment area. We would like to think the policy is open to interpretation. We request the DPW work with the MCC to set a series of policies and conditions for these types of developments, including considerations of neighborhood drainage impacts. To our mind, this does not need to part of any Road Standard revision.

9. Our original question on Storm Water Management enforcement may have been poorly worded, as it was meant to address not only new construction sites but the effects of that construction on the ROW areas in front of the parcels, as well as road development and maintenance procedures.

To a significant degree, this relates to the proposals for resurfacing, as in most instances we see where this procedure is resulting in worsening conditions of runoff speed, volume and rate during heavy rains, exceeding carrying capacities of existing storm drain culverts and increased erosion and siltation into our creeks (filling creeks with debris, the only form of storm water management we currently have) which is being ignored.

How are the requirements for Stormwater Management under the County NPDES permit going to be, or are they handled in regards to existing drainage conditions and those that might occur under the resurfacing proposals. And, who is supervising the NPDES permit at this time?

We appreciate your referral to Planning in regards to building sites. Please let us know who that was referred to and if there is any response.

Currently, the county standard for new development only addresses the amount of additional speed, rate and flow of run-off from new construction as to the capacity of the gutter/culvert/ditch in front of the property being developed with absolutely NO consideration for the additional impacts to down stream/creek/drainage and slope of existing property and the effects not only to existing residents, but vacant lots which are primarily owned by developers. Please let us know what will be done to address this situation immediately, as the cost of litigation would be costly not only to the county but to the tax payers.

Again, thank you for your help. We look forward to receiving more information on this proposal and seeing you at our next meeting on November 9.

Sincerely

Karen Wilson
Chair, MidCoast Community Council

Cc: Supervisor Rich Gordon
Marcia Raines
Lisa Grote
Concerned Residents & Developers
MidCoast Community Council Members (current and elected)
Steve Smith
Stephen Lowens

1. The first part of the document discusses the importance of maintaining accurate records of all transactions and activities. It emphasizes the need for transparency and accountability in financial reporting.

2. The second part of the document outlines the various methods and techniques used to collect and analyze data. It includes a detailed description of the experimental procedures and the statistical tools employed.

3. The third part of the document presents the results of the study, including a comparison of the different methods and a discussion of the implications of the findings.

4. The fourth part of the document provides a conclusion and a summary of the key points discussed throughout the report.

5. The fifth part of the document contains a list of references and a bibliography, providing a comprehensive overview of the sources used in the research.

6. The sixth part of the document includes a list of appendices and supplementary materials, which provide additional information and data related to the study.

7. The seventh part of the document contains a list of figures and tables, which illustrate the results and findings of the study.

8. The eighth part of the document includes a list of footnotes and a glossary, providing definitions and explanations for key terms and concepts.

9. The ninth part of the document contains a list of acknowledgments and a list of authors, recognizing the contributions of all individuals involved in the research.

10. The tenth part of the document includes a list of appendices and supplementary materials, which provide additional information and data related to the study.

11. The eleventh part of the document contains a list of figures and tables, which illustrate the results and findings of the study.

12. The twelfth part of the document includes a list of footnotes and a glossary, providing definitions and explanations for key terms and concepts.

13. The thirteenth part of the document contains a list of acknowledgments and a list of authors, recognizing the contributions of all individuals involved in the research.

August 24, 2005

Ms. Karen Wilson
Chair, MidCoast Community Council
P.O. Box 64
Moss Beach, CA 94038

Dear Ms. Wilson:

Subject: Proposed Expansion of the MidCoast Road Standards to Include the Resurfacing of Substandard Streets

I would appreciate meeting with you and the Public Works subcommittee of the MidCoast Council to discuss including resurfacing as an alternate to the standards that are contained in the MidCoast Community Plan. Our meeting could then be followed by a discussion with the full Council at a regularly scheduled Council meeting, if there is a general consensus that including resurfacing as a standard should be pursued. The reason for requesting a meeting is as follows:

Current MidCoast Standards

The current standards were included in the Community Plan (Plan) for the area which was adopted in 1994. The Plan provides that "all owner and County initiated road improvement projects... shall comply..." with the standards as defined for each area of the MidCoast. We completed only three improvement projects in the MidCoast since 1994, as the financing of improvements was complicated by the passage of a Constitutional amendment (Proposition 218) that essentially eliminated a governmental agency's ability to levy assessments for property related improvements. Property related improvements are usually constructed together with road improvements.

Other Financial Options Evaluated

We subsequently discussed alternatives with your Council whereby no property related improvements would be constructed with a project. This eliminated the need for property assessments as the adjacent property owners would have to determine what they wanted or needed in terms of driveway, walkway or parking improvements, and then coordinate and pay for this work separately. Your Council approved this concept and we surveyed property owners on 12 streets to see if minimum street improvements were desired. We only received surveys back from a majority of property owners on portions of Etheldore Street in Montara and on

Ms. Karen Wilson, Chair, MidCoast Community Council

Subject: Proposed Expansion of the MidCoast Road Standards to Include the Resurfacing of Substandard Streets

August 24, 2005

Page 2

Cornell and California Avenues in the Princeton area. We did not receive a majority of surveys back on the remaining nine (9) streets, as property owners either were not willing to commit to being responsible for work associated with their property, or were concerned that improvements would lead to more traffic traveling at a higher rate of speed.

Use of Mitigation Fees

We recently proposed the use of mitigation fees as a means of constructing drainage improvements in the MidCoast together with street improvements for areas that have drainage problems. Under this plan, property owners whose homes were built prior to the imposition of mitigation fees, were asked if they would voluntarily contribute an amount equal to the mitigation fee that they would be required to pay if constructing their homes today, or to enter into an agreement to pay the fees at such time as their property was sold. This option was initiated on Cypress Avenue in Moss Beach where localized flooding occurs on an almost yearly basis. We sent sixteen (16) property owners the surveys. However, we only received responses from four (4) property owners indicating that they were interested. We are now in the process of sending the property owners letters notifying them that we are dropping this proposal due to the lack of property owner interest.

Resurfacing of County Maintained Roads

Road resurfacing is generally considered a maintenance type project by the State Controller; the Planning Division of the Environmental Services Agency considers resurfacing as a maintenance type project and has, in the past, issued Coastal Development Permit Exemptions for this type of work; we continue to resurface (slurry seals, cape seals or asphalt overlays) streets in the MidCoast that were previously improved to a minimum standard; and the Board of Supervisors has, for other areas of the County, adopted the resurfacing of roads as the minimum standard. This has occurred in both the Emerald Hills and the Devonshire Canyon areas and is also one of the options for the Fair Oaks area adjacent to Redwood City.

We have not resurfaced roads that have not been built to a standard in the MidCoast due to the limiting language in the MidCoast Community Plan as previously discussed.

Proposed Resurfacing of Roads in the MidCoast

My intention is not to eliminate the standards as approved in the Community Plan, but to allow the Department more flexibility in maintaining the travel ways of the County maintained road system in a reasonable condition commensurate with the area. Past surveys, as stated previously, indicate that property owners are hesitant to agree to street improvements as they believe that improving only their street will attract traffic, as the other streets will remain unimproved.

Ms. Karen Wilson, Chair, MidCoast Community Council

Subject: Proposed Expansion of the MidCoast Road Standards to Include the Resurfacing of Substandard Streets

August 24, 2005

Page 3

Approving resurfacing as an alternative could allow us to do parallel streets and thereby reduce the potential for shifting traffic and allay the property owners' concerns.

I believe that your Council can consider three options if you agree that resurfacing should be considered as an alternate for the MidCoast:

- 1) expand the language in the Community Plan to include resurfacing of the streets as an option;
- 2) remove the road standards from the Community Plan and have the standards adopted by the Board of Supervisors by resolution;
- 3) consider resurfacing of a maintained road as an allowed exception as provided in paragraph 3d, General Policies, of the Community Plan, on the premise that resurfacing the road will preserve the existing "neighborhood quality" of an area.

Each option has both positive and negative aspects. Option 1 and 2 would take more time to implement as public hearings would have to be held and a survey of the property owners in a subarea(s) would need to be conducted. Option 3 can be implemented in a shorter period of time but could subject your Council and the Department to criticism of attempting to "avoid" the process as required by the Community Plan:

The cost of resurfacing a road is considerably less expensive than reconstructing a road, and therefore, more resurfacing could be done with a like amount of funds. However, we believe that a priority list of roads to be resurfaced would have to be established as has been done in other parts of the County, as there are roads in the seven (7) subareas of the MidCoast that we believe need to be resurfaced.

Attached is an excerpt from the Community Plan that contains the current street standards and the exception criteria. I can have staff develop maps that indicate the roads that have been improved in the MidCoast to a standard, roads that remain to be reconstructed or resurfaced, and a "first cut" of roads that could be resurfaced pending the creation of a "complete" priority list.

As stated previously, my intent is not to eliminate the standards as approved in the Community Plan, but to allow the Department more flexibility in maintaining the County maintained road system. We could still consider minimum standard improvements where desired by the property owners. However, I believe the construction of drainage improvements would either have to comply with the standards in the Community Plan or an exemption that meets the criteria in paragraph 5 of the Community Plan would have to be approved by the Board of Supervisors, if the Community Plan is not amended.

Ms. Karen Wilson, Chair, MidCoast Community Council

**Subject: Proposed Expansion of the MidCoast Road Standards to Include the
Resurfacing of Substandard Streets**

August 24, 2005

Page 4

Please contact me at 650-599-1421 or by email at ncullen@co.sanmateo.ca.us to set up a mutually convenient time to meet, or if you have any questions that I need to answer prior to our meeting.

Very truly yours,

Neil R. Cullen
Director of Public Works

NRC:sdd

F:\USERS\ADMINESD\MIDCOAST2005\MidCoast Council - letter to add resurfacing as a standard aug 16.doc

F-36 (129)

Enclosure: Excerpt - MidCoast Community Plan

cc with enclosure: Supervisor Richard Gordon