

William & Beihua Kehoe  
891 Kelmore St.  
Moss Beach, CA 94038

March 11, 2012

Ken Kirkey, Director of Planning, ([kennethk@abag.ca.gov](mailto:kennethk@abag.ca.gov)),  
Ezra Rapport, Secretary-Treasurer, ([ezrar@abag.ca.gov](mailto:ezrar@abag.ca.gov)),  
Jackie Reinhart ([JackieR@ABAG.ca.gov](mailto:JackieR@ABAG.ca.gov)) and  
Dayle Farina ([DayleF@ABAG.ca.gov](mailto:DayleF@ABAG.ca.gov)).

Association of Bay Area Governments  
101 Eighth St.  
Oakland CA 94607

Subject: San Mateo County (SMC) Application for Priority Development Area (PDA) status for the Midcoast urban area

Dear Ken Kirkey et al:

I respectfully request that you deny San Mateo County's request to designate the SR 1 (Hwy 1) corridor on the San Mateo coast as a Rural Corridor place type so that SMC can apply for Priority Development Area funding.

It is my understanding that the objective of PDAs is to reduce congestion and environmental pollution by developing housing and services near job centers and transportation corridors. Neither of these objectives will be reached in the development of the Midcoast.

The Midcoast area consists of the five unincorporated communities of Montara, Moss Beach, El Granada, Princeton, and Miramar, which are located entirely within the County's Coastal Zone. The primary industry is visitor serving businesses (hotels, restaurants, shops ...), fishing and agriculture. However, the majority of coastsiders commute "over the hill" to either San Francisco or Silicon Valley for their livelihood. We are served by only two SAMTRANS buses (#17 & #294). Route 17 (Montara to HMB) 90-min interval 8-6 (9-5 Sun); 60-min interval 6- 8 AM weekdays and Route 294 (Pacifica to San Mateo) 90-min interval 8-6 weekdays only, do not meet any real definition of a transportation corridor. It is notable that even this minimal SAMTRANS service has been difficult to maintain over the past several years due to revenues from ridership not justifying the costs.

Another issue to consider is the Midcoast area has significant constraints to new development, both geological (faults, erosion, slides) and topographical (coastal range, coastal plain, limited transportation corridors) which limit future expansion. There are potential conflicts with the certified County LCP in which housing has the lowest priority land use under the Coastal Act. Also, there is inadequate infrastructure, including water, sewer, and highway capacity, to accommodate the current planned build out of in this area. Likewise, because of the limited access to the Midcoast, the lack of critical mass of supportive industries and the limit of a large

diversified labor pool, it is highly unlikely that there will be any significant job increases which would allow for a good balance of jobs/homes to justify this request.

Finally, although I am writing this letter as an individual, I serve as Chair on the Midcoast Community Council (MCC), a Municipal Advisory Council (MAC) to the San Mateo County Board of Supervisors (BoS), and contrary to the County's claim that this application was discussed at one of the MCC's public meetings in 2011, I can affirm that this was not presented in any coherent form. The MCC sent a letter (attached) to the BoS on January 23, 2012 asking for a delay in their application so the implications could be studied and the public informed but the Board decided to proceed anyway. This lack of public process should not be ignored and I ask you to remove the Midcoast from consideration for PDA designation.

Sincerely,

Bill & Beihua Kehoe  
Moss Beach, CA