

[Draft] Minutes of the 13 November 2002 Midcoast Community Council meeting

The meeting was called to order by Chuck Kozak at 7:40 p.m.

Members present: Chuck Kozak, Sandy Emerson, Ric Lohman, Paul Perkovic, April Vargas, and Karen Wilson.

Member absent: Kathryn Slater-Carter.

Public Comment

Leonard Woren (El Granada) noted the article in today's *San Francisco Chronicle* about the break in the Hetch Hetchy delivery pipeline, which lost about 70,000,000 gallons of water. He stated that this was a good argument for living within what your local ecosystem can support.

Rob Carman (San Mateo Sheriff's Department) noted that the Ninth Annual Youth Summit will be held at the IDES Hall at 1:15 p.m. on Friday, November 22. Questions can be referred to Joe Sheridan at 573-2081.

Leonard Woren reminded the audience that there will be a general public workshop on the proposed Half Moon Bay Library on Friday, November 15 from 5 p.m. to 8 p.m. at the library – with pizza! They will have presentations by the architect as well as plenty of opportunities for discussion.

Board of Supervisors Report

Deborah Hirst (Legislative Aide to Supervisor Rich Gordon) reported that at the last Board of Supervisors meeting they decided not to impose a rent control ordinance for the El Granada Manufactured Home Park. However, they did decide to require a new Use Permit. They are also investigating the possibility of purchasing the land. Long Range Planning was also asked to look at a new ordinance for Manufactured Home Parks. Rich Gordon was also appointed to head up a new task force on Parks and Recreation in the Mid-Coast area.

Committee Reports

Treasurer's Report – As Kathryn Slater-Carter was absent, there was no report.

Parks and Recreation Committee – Sandy Emerson reported that the last meeting discussed the proposed ordinance for a development fee to fund the goals of the Needs Assessment, which is on our agenda tonight. Part of the discussion included crossings of

Highway 1 and possible bike paths through the communities. The existing road standards do not allow bicycle lanes east of Highway 1, so there may be some need to revise the road standards as part of the LCP update process. The next meeting will be next Monday, December 9, at 7:30 p.m., at Three Zero Cafe at Half Moon Bay Airport.

Planning and Zoning Committee – Karen Wilson reported that development of the design review standards is continuing; they meet every Tuesday afternoon at the Sheriff's Substation in Moss Beach. The regularly scheduled Design Review is tomorrow, November 14, at 1:30 p.m. The next Committee meeting will be Wednesday, November 20, at 7:30 p.m., at Three Zero Cafe at Half Moon Bay Airport.

Public Works Committee – April Vargas reported that their last meeting on November 6 was well attended and heard a presentation by Neil Cullen, Director of Public Works. There was interest in limiting speeds in residential neighborhoods. Drainage was another major concern. The next committee meeting will be Wednesday, December 4, at 7:30 p.m. at Three Zero at Half Moon Bay Airport.

Consent Agenda

Minutes from July 17, July 24, August 14, August 28, September 25, October 9, and October 23 - deferred to next meeting.

Regular Agenda

1. Proposal for Development Fees for MidCoast Parks

Sandy Emerson introduced this item. The Environmental Services Agency has proposed a draft Development Fee Proposal to implement the Parks and Recreational Needs Assessment. The draft was presented to the Board of Supervisors. Mary Burns, Director of Parks and Recreation, will give us further details.

Mary Burns (San Mateo County Director of Parks and Recreation) was asked by Marcia Raines (Environmental Services Agency Director) to examine whether a development fee approach might assist in funding community parks in the MidCoast area. The County contracted with Callander Associates for the study, together with a telephone survey that helped identify broader community needs. The Needs Assessment identified the need for a variety of facilities and provided some initial cost estimates. Two major questions that are still unanswered are "What entity would control and operate this parks and recreation system?" and "How would it be financed?" State legislation (Development Mitigation Fee Act) circumscribes the types of development mitigation fees that can be exacted and used to help fund such programs.

Highway 1 and possible bike paths through the communities. The existing road standards do not allow bicycle lanes east of Highway 1, so there may be some need to revise the road standards as part of the LCP update process. The next meeting will be next Monday, December 9, at 7:30 p.m., at Three Zero Cafe at Half Moon Bay Airport.

Planning and Zoning Committee – Karen Wilson reported that development of the design review standards is continuing; they meet every Tuesday afternoon at the Sheriff's Substation in Moss Beach. The regularly scheduled Design Review is tomorrow, November 14, at 1:30 p.m. The next Committee meeting will be Wednesday, November 20, at 7:30 p.m., at Three Zero Cafe at Half Moon Bay Airport.

Public Works Committee – April Vargas reported that their last meeting on November 6 was well attended and heard a presentation by Neil Cullen, Director of Public Works. There was interest in limiting speeds in residential neighborhoods. Drainage was another major concern. The next committee meeting will be Wednesday, December 4, at 7:30 p.m. at Three Zero at Half Moon Bay Airport.

Consent Agenda

Minutes from July 17, July 24, August 14, August 28, September 25, October 9, and October 23 - deferred to next meeting.

Regular Agenda

1. Proposal for Development Fees for MidCoast Parks

Sandy Emerson introduced this item. The Environmental Services Agency has proposed a draft Development Fee Proposal to implement the Parks and Recreational Needs Assessment. The draft was presented to the Board of Supervisors. Mary Burns, Director of Parks and Recreation, will give us further details.

Mary Burns (San Mateo County Director of Parks and Recreation) was asked by Marcia Raines (Environmental Services Agency Director) to examine whether a development fee approach might assist in funding community parks in the MidCoast area. The County contracted with Callander Associates for the study, together with a telephone survey that helped identify broader community needs. The Needs Assessment identified the need for a variety of facilities and provided some initial cost estimates. Two major questions that are still unanswered are "What entity would control and operate this parks and recreation system?" and "How would it be financed?" State legislation (Development Mitigation Fee Act) circumscribes the types of development mitigation fees that can be exacted and used to help fund such programs.

The draft explains the constraints on development fees, anticipated costs, possible funding sources for existing population, etc. The current level of development is approximately 55% of the buildout population, so new development can only be expected to provide about 45% of the total cost. The goal is to have about 3 acres of park and recreational space for every 1,000 residents. They decided to drop the trails costs out of the plan, because they anticipate that trails would be used by more than just local residents. The Callander study considered 6 acres per 1,000 residents, but a comparison with other Peninsula cities shows that this is a very high standard. The report concludes with three options, from a limited funding approach to one that would provide a full 6 acres per 1,000 residents.

The Board would need to make certain required findings before adopting development fees, which would be drafted by County Counsel. Fees could go into effect immediately, but cannot be spent until matching funds (for existing residents) are identified from some source or sources. The Board formed a Task Force (with Rich Gordon as Chair) to help work on this process and determine what entity or entities might administer the projects.

Ric Lohman asked about funding for the 55% from current residents. What options are there? Mary Burns said grants are an option that is here right now (from Proposition 12 or Proposition 40 funds, for instance), but that a parcel tax might be necessary, too.

Paul Perkovic asked whether funds that were not spent within 5 years had to be refunded to developers (or the property owners at the time). Mary Burns said that a review must be done by the policy setting agency to determine whether the plans are being achieved adequately to continue the fee, or whether refunds might be necessary. Paul also asked if the comparison chart showing fees of \$13,500 for South San Francisco and \$15,000 for Belmont were correct. Mary Burns said that she had spoken to those cities herself, and that those figures were accurate.

Ric Lohman asked if there were any specific discussions of individual parcels, such as the former CalTrans right-of-way for the discarded Devil's Slide Bypass. Mary Burns noted that the Callander study examined existing County-owned parcels to minimize the acquisition costs to fulfill the plan.

Sandy Emerson noted that the CalTrans right-of-way usage will be discussed at the Local Coastal Program Update Workshop on Monday, November 18 at El Granada School at 7:30 p.m. She also said that the Lantos legislation for funding of the Devil's Slide tunnel requires the old right-of-way to be turned over to the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. The annual maintenance costs under the Callander study are about \$2,000,000 per year, which is not feasible to achieve with a parcel tax in her opinion. Therefore, we must pick and choose our acquisitions and projects carefully to match likely funds.

This proposal will also be discussed by the County Parks and Recreation Commission at their regular meeting on Thursday, December 5 at 2:30 p.m.

April Vargas asked if the 3 acres per 1,000 residents was selected, which results in a \$1.38 per square foot mitigation fee, could this fee be adjusted later? Mary Burns said that yes, it could be adjusted either up or down, as appropriate.

Karen Wilson asked about Assembly Bill 1600, which Mary had said only applied to new development. Mary Burns said that the Planning and Building Department would collect the mitigation fees for parks just as they do for roads; there would be no new net County costs.

Paul Perkovic asked whether County contributions for such park acquisitions as Quarry Park or Mirada Surf can be counted as part of the existing resident's contribution. Mary Burns said that she had already asked County Counsel about that, and the answer is no.

Chuck Kozak asked whether the costs for additional acreage (such as in Quarry Park) that are not counted as useful for mini parks, neighborhood parks, or community parks, are a hidden cost to the community. For instance, Mary had said that only about 4 acres out of the 40 acre Quarry Park parcel are suitable for neighborhood park usage. He also asked about the Task Force – is there any general idea of the makeup, size, expertise, segments of the community that might be considered, etc.

Sandy Emerson commented that at last week's Board meeting, the Board designated Rich Gordon as a committee of one, with authority to select other task force members. Mary Burns said she thinks it is very important to have close coordination with Half Moon Bay.

Leonard Woren (El Granada) commented on several items. He is not at all happy with the target to be 3 acres per 1,000. If you look down the list of comparison jurisdictions, the target is often not met. So set your goal higher! He suggests setting the target at 6 acres per 1,000. The fee needs to be put in place right away. We have already lost the opportunity to count the several million dollars for Mirada Surf east. He volunteered himself for the task force.

Bern Smith (El Granada) said that one of the very strong recommendations that came out of Callander's analysis was that getting to 6 acres per 1,000 was probably unobtainable. We have options near to hand that many other places do not have, such as many low-impact recreational spaces. He also expressed some concern that the fees be applied uniformly to all projects, and recounted some experiences with Planning where there was disagreement over which fees might be applicable.

Sandy Emerson proposed recommending support of the intermediate staff proposal – e.g., \$1.38 per square foot as the mitigation fee. This is based on the 3 acre per 1,000 standard.

Chuck Kozak asked whether the Rural Residential Area was included – and recommended that it should be.

Paul Perkovic suggested that remodels and additions where there is an increase in square footage should also be subject to the fees. He also suggested that if affordable housing is subjected to lower fees, that will mean a higher fee for other development. Also, it is easier to reduce a fee than to raise it later. He would prefer to aim for the 6 acres per 1,000 residents goal.

Leonard Woren suggested that if a reduced or zero rate is recommended for affordable housing, that it should apply only to the affordable units, not the entire development; or, preferably, only apply if the entire development is affordable.

Ric Lohman also supported the idea of going for the higher fee, based on the 6 acres per 1,000 goal.

Sandy Emerson moved that the Council recommend that the Board accept the report, adopt a standard of 6 acres of useable parkland per 1,000 residents (rather than 3), adopt a development fee as soon as possible adequate to achieve that standard of no less than \$2.76 per square foot (gross square footage, including garage space) for residential development in the Midcoast area, and create the Board committee and Task Force as soon as possible. The Task Force should have members from the MidCoast Community Council, Midcoast Park Lands, Cabrillo Unified School District, and other stakeholders. Paul Perkovic seconded, with the understanding that the area within which the fee would be imposed includes the Rural Residential Area, would also apply to additions and remodels that increase floor area, and would include a reduction for affordable units.

April Vargas is uncomfortable with the amount proposed. She noted that as the parkland target is raised, the cost to the current community members – or the need for additional grant or state funds – is also raised.

After discussion, the motion was adopted by a vote of 4 in favor (Sandy, Ric, Paul, Karen) to 2 opposed (Chuck, April).

2. Council Participation in Coastside Opportunity Center's Adopt-A-Family Program

Chuck Kozak introduced this item. In past years we have agreed to donate approximately one person's amount of money each.

Karen Wilson moved that Council members contribute \$40 to \$50 each. Sandy Emerson seconded. Approved by unanimous consent.

3. Midcoast Local Coastal Program Review Update

April Vargas presented this item, reporting on the November 4 workshop on caretaker units in the Princeton area, in the Waterfront zoning district. George Bergman had developed several additional staff alternatives based on public comment from the prior meetings on this subject. Those ranged from prohibiting any (new) residential uses in the W district to eliminating all restrictions and allowing residential everywhere.

There was some confusion as to which developments count for the existing 20% ratio. For instance, are Airport Overlay parcels counted?

Ric Lohman is absolutely against any of the proposals that eliminate the ratios. He also thinks the County has zero enforcement (in general), so it is insane to grant privileges with the expectation that the County will somehow enforce rules. He also is concerned that we will lose the industrial / marine related uses as this area is converted to waterfront residential.

Paul Perkovic supported his proposal for a transfer of a residential development credit from an isolated substandard parcel in a residential zone (retired for development) to a Waterfront parcel to allow a residential use on that W-zoned parcel. He also reiterated his belief that any residential use should result in requirements to adhere to the residential zoning constraints for R-1/S-17 districts for the entire project (e.g., setbacks would apply to the commercial as well as residential portions of the project, total Floor Area Ratio would apply to the total floor space, not just the residential floor space).

Sandy Emerson does not think that the area has met the objective of the zoning district.

Bern Smith (El Granada) noted that if you expand the live-work concept, you eliminate one commuter. However, he agrees that the actual on-the-ground use out there does not fit the zoning district expectation.

The next Workshop will be on November 18 at 7:30 p.m. at El Granada School, covering future use of the Devil's Slide right-of-way, opportunities to add coastal trail segments, and Highway 1 undercrossings. Sandy Emerson noted that the review documents are available on the Midcoast Community Council's web site.

Leonard Woren suggested that the Council take the position that the County should implement the Montara / Moss Beach / El Granada Community Plan.

Update on Continuing Council Projects

Future Agenda

November 27, 2002

Decision to omit by unanimous consent (day before Thanksgiving).

December 11, 2002

1. Design Review Standards

December 25, 2002

Decision to omit by unanimous consent (Christmas Day).

The meeting was adjourned at 10:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Paul Perkovic, Secretary.