

Midcoast Community Council

October 28, 2020

Agenda Item 4c - Mirada Road Coastal Trail Bridge Replacement

Correspondence received

October 13, 2020

To: Midcoast Community Council

From: Lennie Roberts, Legislative Advocate, Green Foothills

Re: Item 4b on the October 14, 2020 MCC Agenda: Replacement bridge over Arroyo de en Medio Creek

Green Foothills supports relocation of the failed bridge over Arroyo de en Medio Creek rather than replacement, based on the following:

The project plans submitted by County Public Works to the Coastal Commission (CDP Application for Soil Nail Wall and Pedestrian Bridge Replacement Project on Mirada Road, Application Number 2-17-0289) include constructing soil nail walls at three locations north and south of the existing bridge, demolishing the abandoned concrete arch bridge, and installing rock slope protection at the base of the soil nail walls. As proposed, the project is inconsistent with the Hazards policies of the California Coastal Act and the San Mateo County Local Coastal Program.

The July 11, 2019 decision of the California Coastal Commission regarding a proposed seawall at 2 Mirada Road, Half Moon Bay, (CDP Application 2-16-0784) just south of Arroyo de en Medio Creek, included Findings that the California Coastal Trail could be relocated inland rather than extending armoring the bluffs to protect it, and that such relocation as well as limitation on the extent of the proposed seawall is the less environmentally damaging feasible alternative.

Based on this recent decision and in light of sea level rise projections, the prudent action now is to relocate the bridge inland a sufficient distance so the California Coastal Trail and other infrastructure will not be subject to accelerated bluff erosion and structural failure in the future.

Date: Oct. 14, 2020
From: Lisa Ketcham
To: Midcoast Community Council
Subject: Key Points for Comment on Mirada Rd Coastal Trail Bridge Replacement

Be pro-active. Don't spend millions buying time with another temporary bridge. Stop the relentless extension of coastal armor southward. We know it accelerates erosion and loss of beach. The County should take the lead, follow the science, move the public infrastructure out of harm's way, and build for the future. CCC 2019 decision on a proposed seawall just to the south at Casa Mira found that the Coastal Trail does not qualify for coastal armoring because the trail can be relocated. State Parks' land is available to re-route that trail segment to line up with a trail bridge across Medio Creek at Alameda Ave.

Public process. The community should be included in determining the preferred location for the replacement bridge. The 7/22/2015 MCC letter on alignment priorities for the Parallel Trail segment thru Miramar provides an example of an inclusive planning process and substantive comment from the community. An earlier example is 10/9/2001 MCC comment letter on plans for the construction of the current steel overlay bridge, which noted no disturbance of creek or beach and asked for re-routed sewer line.

2016 Mirada Rd Sea Level Rise Adaptation Design Charrette. County, HMB & MCC reps acknowledged that Alameda Ave was the logical retreat for Mirada Rd. Supervisor Horsley discussed this issue at MCC 7/13/16, captured by detailed minutes. It's time to pave Alameda Ave to connect with Magellan in anticipation of the loss of vehicle access on Mirada Rd. It's time to re-route utilities off Mirada Rd, before an emergency, as was done for Ocean Blvd in Seal Cove.

Hwy 1 Safety & Mobility Improvement Studies, 2010 & 2012. A bike/pedestrian route on Alameda Ave including a bridge across Arroyo de en Medio at that location was proposed in these community-based design studies.

Install the replacement Coastal Trail bridge over Medio Creek at Alameda Av.

Land Access to Medio Creek. The land required for a public Coastal Trail bridge at Alameda Ave. is in the Arroyo de en Medio riparian corridor and not available for development by the private owners, whereas trails on public land are a permitted use in riparian corridors (LCP Policy 7.9). Explore land access for the bridge by easement or fee title. Investigate the potential for a southern access trail easement on the vacant former railroad parcel just west of Alameda, which more closely lines up with Alameda north of the creek (for a shorter bridge), and with the Coastal Trail re-route on State Parks land to the south.

From: Michelle Hogg

Date: Wednesday, October 14, 2020

To: Len Erickson, Dave Olson

Subject: Coastal Trail Bridge alternative

Dear Midcoast Community Council members,

Our home is at the north end of Alameda Ave. where the proposed coastal trail bridge alternative would go through. To say that we and our home would be greatly impacted by such a project is an understatement, yet I have not been contacted by anyone involved with this project or the proposal.

I realize at this stage it is only a proposal, but I would like a voice in this matter. Can you please advise me on who I might contact to learn more about this? My husband and I plan to attend the council meeting this evening. Thank you in advance for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Michelle Hogg

462 Alameda Ave, Half Moon Bay, CA 94019

From: Dave Krasowski
Date: Monday, October 12, 2020
To: Midcoast Community Council
Subject: Mirada Road Coastal Trail Bridge Replacement

We are writing to comment on the plans to replace the Mirada Road Coastal Trail Bridge. We were very disappointed to awaken one day to the closure of the present bridge. It had clearly been deteriorating for some time and severely lacking in maintenance. Although it is clear that the current state of the bridge may be beyond repair and represents a hazard, we strenuously object to any plan which would relocate the Coastal Trail to Alameda Avenue. We are homeowners on Alameda Avenue and this relocation would result in a severe degradation in the quality of life on our street. This section of Alameda Avenue is a dead end with only 4 homes on the street. The introduction of traffic from the Coastal Trail would disrupt our lives by bringing hundreds of pedestrians, bikers and vehicles to our street. It also removes a section of the trail not previously subject to vehicle traffic and exposes pedestrians and bikers to a much lengthier and more hazardous route.

We understand that replacement of the bridge is a complicated project and that the Coastal Commission may favor a retreat response rather than rebuilding in the present location but we do not think the Alameda Avenue re-route is a viable solution.

Due to COVID impacts, we will not be attending MCC meetings but expect that the Council will keep us informed of the status of this matter.

Sincerely,

David Krasowski
Jennifer Roberts
468 Alameda Ave.
Half Moon Bay, Ca. 94019

From: Pat Tierney

Date: Sunday, October 25, 2020

Subject: Concerns about Medio Creek Coastal Trail Bridge

We are homeowners that have been impacted by the closure of the recent Mirada Road Coastal Trail Bridge in Miramar and would be greatly affected by not replacing the failed bridge and, as the MidCoast Community Council seems to be suggesting on your website, repositioning the trail directly across the street from our house.

There are literally hundreds of people using the coastal trail on a weekend day and with the bridge closure, all of that traffic has now been shifted onto Mirada Rd. past our house. This has had noise, safety and quality of life impacts to our formerly quiet neighborhood. Traffic on Mirada Rd has significantly increased. There are no sidewalks on Mirada and the street is narrow and line-of-sight distances are very short in many places. An ambulance was called to care for a bike rider who crashed while avoiding pedestrians recently and we have witnessed several other hazardous situations with bicyclists zooming down the street, disregarding other bicyclists, people and cars. Groups of pedestrians are walking up the middle of the road, one recent group with a 3-4 year old on a tricycle in the middle of the street near a blind corner on Mirada. All my neighbors have seen cars speeding up the street through the Alameda-Mirada intersection. This situation is very different from prior to the bridge closure when bicyclists and pedestrians on the Coastal Trail were separated from cars. The number of accidents from this crazy dangerous combination of new trail users and cars on Mirada Road south of Medio Creek is likely to increase in the future, if left the way it is now.

More people are already partying in and using our yards and vacant fields as toilets. There is a small parking area, but no restrooms in the area, since CA State Parks removed a nearby portable toilet on State Park land at the intersection of San Andreas and the Coastal Trail. We have seen more visitors peeing in the parking area across from our home in the last five weeks than we ever want to again. The neighbors pick up piles of trash every weekend - neither the City of HMB nor State Parks ever cleans this parking area and there are no trash cans.

This part of Mirada Road has always been a quiet residential area, not a commercial strip, like north of Medio Creek. We are not opposed to use of the Coastal Trail. We welcome visitors to the coast. But the current detour up Mirada was told to our neighborhood as a temporary situation until the bridge is replaced, not a permanent trail route. We want a bridge replacement at the current site to take back this additional traffic, as promised, not keep it on our residential street.

By not supporting the bridge replacement in the same location the Council is shoving all this use down our throats without consulting the neighbors directly. No one from the County, MCC or City has contacted us and yet we have been and will be greatly

impacted by the proposed non-replacement at the current location. This is not right. There are no other sections of the Coastal Trail in HMB which go through neighborhoods. Do not make a hasty wrong decision. Keep tourism development, like the Coastal Trail, out of our residential neighborhoods.

The entire 3.5 mile coastal trail was built to be a significant distance from residential homes to ensure the safety of all homeowners and protect the property values, EXCEPT for the portion of the trail that runs through COUNTY and STATE PROPERTY. Moving the coastal trail inward away from the coast would change the dynamics of the coastal trail from a coastal route of land owned by the government to a trail that runs through personal residential property owned by individual families. Moving the coastal trail inward to run between residential properties would have a direct impact on the safety of said property owners as hundreds of individuals would give access to back yards and the front yards of these properties on a daily basis. Moving the coastal trail through the residential back yards will not only potentially jeopardize the safety of the residents, but as one real estate professional told us, will definitely hurt the current property values of this neighborhood.

The rapid erosion of the Medio Creek bridge foundation occurred because the existing rip rap near the bridge has not been maintained by the County and City of HMB. The bridge was closed because the current bridge was poorly designed and built of steel that rusted badly. That is not the Mirada homeowners' fault. The County and State have recently replaced the same type of manufactured bridges in their original locations over Pilarcitos Creek and Frenchman's Creek, both in the floodplain. Why is it that another bridge in the same general area is not proposed to be replaced in its current location when there are funding and plans to do so, and potential adverse impacts on private property are so much greater?

Another major concern with your position of not replacing the Medio bridge its current location is you are basically recommending to abandon businesses and houses along Mirada Road north and south of Medio Creek, especially the three homes along the edge at the mouth of the creek. How would you like your house to be allowed to fall into the ocean, at a total loss to you, when it could easily be avoided just by maintaining what is there? We are not asking anything more than to fix the problem the City of HMB and County created by not maintaining the rip rap on each side of the Medio Creek bridge, and by installing an inferior and inappropriately manufactured bridge. The Mirada Road homeowners should not suffer due to these mistakes.

Rerouting a new Coastal Trail onto Alameda Avenue is fraught with problems and is opposed by 100% of the residents in this immediate area. It would completely change the character of the neighborhood, from eminent domain used to take private land, cutting people's property by 10-25%, sidewalks, noise all day, trash, increased theft - these are not figments of our imagination, as we see them already with the temporary bridge closure. How would you like the coastal trail reducing your front yard

by 25% and going right near the windows in your house? I invite MCC members to come to this area on a sunny summer Saturday at 10:30 am and let neighbors show you what is it really like. Spend more than 10 minutes observing: bring beach chairs during a sunny summer Saturday. Do not make a hasty inaccurate decision to send a letter to the Coastal Commission opposing bridge replacement, as was suggested in your last MCC meeting.

Replacing the Medio Creek Coastal Trail bridge in its current location could save money. No new engineering studies for a new alignment would be needed. No purchase of private land on Alameda through eminent domain would be needed. No rerouting and construction of the sewer line would be needed. The cost of a new Alameda bridge might be more than replacing at the existing site. And it would give us time to plan and coordinate actions for the entire beach front area along Mirada, without having to redo earlier mis-starts. A long-term plan will spread out the cost from being born primarily by the three homeowners along north Mirada and the homeowners on Alameda and Mirada, to a broader group in the County.

Any planned changes in the Medio Creek bridge and rerouting of the Coastal Trail must be done in tandem with planning for ALL of Mirada Road, north and south of the creek. What are we going to do about the section of Mirada north of the creek, including the Bach and Miramar Beach Restaurant? You can't just let homes and one business on one part of Mirada Road fall into the ocean, while de facto supporting the continued protection of some homes and commercial businesses elsewhere on the same street. This is a justice and fairness issue.

What happens on the Medio Creek bridge affects all of Mirada Road and the County and City cannot try to piece-meal the issues. The County, City, State Parks, and the Harbor District need a plan, including safe beach access points, roads, parking, restrooms, etc., for all of Mirada Road and the coastal trail that traverses it.

There are better and less costly alternatives to an Alameda trail route. First and best is to support the County's Bluff Stabilization Plan and replace the failed bridge with a durable bridge. The plans are drawn, and funds are available, and it is slated to start construction in 8 months with Coastal Commission approval. Again, bluff stabilization would be maintaining what is already there. This would not condemn the loss of houses and businesses along Mirada Road, north and south of Medio Creek, and would keep the Coastal Trail traffic and impacts where they have been and are better able to be accommodated, and away from the residential areas. The bridge replacement now would give the stakeholders at least the 10+ years needed to get an approved comprehensive plan for Mirada Road and required public input. This includes MCC, the County, City and the Harbor District supporting the transfer of sand from dredging of the harbor and placing it on the Surfers Beach - Miramar Beach area to replenish sand and slow erosion of the bluffs.

I strongly urge the Mid Coast Community Council to change your draft no-replacement at the existing site and, in fact, to support replacement of Medio Creek Coastal Trail Bridge in its current location, as soon as possible. Replacement of the bridge at its current location should not be delayed. This will minimize impacts to residential neighborhoods and businesses, increase trail user safety and give stakeholders time to plan for the future of this area. I also urge the Council to support the development of a comprehensive plan for the Mirada Road corridor, north and south of the bridge, which includes a thorough public discussion of impacts to residences and businesses and alternative alignments, after the Medio Creek bridge crisis has been solved for at least 10-20 years by stabilizing the bluffs and replacing the bridge in its current location.

Regards,

Patrick and Robin Tierney
241 Mirada Road
Half Moon Bay, CA 94019



October 28, 2020

To: San Mateo County Department of Public Works, Midcoast Community Council
CC: California Coastal Commission, San Mateo County Board of Supervisors, Caltrans
From: San Mateo County Chapter, Surfrider Foundation

Re: Proposed Mirada Road Coastal Trail Bridge Replacement

The San Mateo County Chapter of Surfrider Foundation is opposed to the current proposal by San Mateo County Department of Public Works (DPW) to replace the Mirada Road coastal trail bridge at the same location over Arroyo de en Medio Creek along with increased coastal armoring. It has become clear based on the August 12, 2020 presentation that DPW hasn't researched thoroughly or considered other options to relocate the failing bridge inland. Given the directives of the California Coastal Commission regarding armoring along this stretch of coast, as well as the short life span of a replacement in this location, this proposal isn't cost-effective nor is it in keeping with best practices and policy guidance to address sea level rise.

DPW reported that the life expectancy of the current proposal is at best 30 to 40 years, and most likely less, due to sea level rise and continuing erosion. Moving the trail inland is a better long-term solution in terms of cost and in terms of benefit to our beaches and coastline. Coastal armoring has consistently been shown to increase bluff erosion and loss of our beaches, and is inconsistent with California Coastal Act policies as are the project plans submitted by DPW to the California Coastal Commission (CDP Application 2-17-0289). In the application, DPW proposes constructing soil nail walls at three locations north and south of the existing bridge, as well as installing riprap at the base of the soil nail walls. This is not only inconsistent with the Hazards policies of the California Coastal Act but also contradicts the San Mateo County Local Coastal Program.

The landscape and the stakeholders are only going to become more complicated over time, so proceeding to move the bridge and coastal trail inland sooner rather than later also avoids greater complications in terms of more substantial disruption and possibly more property stakeholders in future years.

It is also inconsistent with the July 11, 2019 decision of the CA Coastal Commission regarding a proposed seawall at 2 Mirada Road to protect apartment buildings and a portion of the Coastal Trail ([CDP Application 2-16-0784](#)) south of Arroyo de en Medio Creek. Our Chapter argued that the Coastal Trail is not a coastal-dependent use, but can be relocated and is therefore not

entitled to shoreline armoring, and that using the Coastal Trail as justification would set a terrible precedent for the rest of the state. Commissioners agreed and approved the seawall only for protection of the apartment building at 2 Mirada, not for the Coastal Trail.

Additionally, our Chapter encourages San Mateo County to explore the option suggested by others of the potential for a southern access trail easement on the vacant former railroad parcel west of Alameda, which more closely lines up with Alameda north of the creek and with the Coastal Trail re-route on State Parks land to the south.

Based on all of the above, the local San Mateo County Chapter of Surfrider Foundation strongly supports relocation of the bridge and coastal trail inland as the most environmentally sound, sustainable, and most financially responsible solution.

From: Kevon Cottrell

Subject: Agenda item 4c Mirada Road Coastal Trail Replacement

Date: October 28, 2020

My message to Dave Olson via Nextdoor. I would like this in the record of tonight's meeting. Thanks

Yeah there's cross talk in this thread. To clarify:

- 1) Alameda Ave crossing would face litigation and would take a decade.
- 2) I would like to explore the idea of a temporary repair (maybe an 89' railroad car with extensions) at the present Mirada road location.
- 3) The present detour to highway one is a death trap.
- 4) A long term solution is to widen the highway one crossing over the Medio creek to undo the bottleneck that has caused at least one death (just in the last three years). As a constituent I ask your consideration of the above ideas.

I would like to expand on these points:

- 1) just reiterate
- 2) I'm not attached to a rr car solution but a temporary fix is essential.
- 3) Dave did not think I'm serious about the danger. The present ped/bike detour creates a bottleneck at the north end (Medio) that has northbound bikers veering across Medio to avoid southbound ped/bikes. It's only a matter of time...
- 4) Dave said no effort has been put forward to widen the hwy 1 Arroyo de la Medio overcrossing. Sadly a neighbor was killed on his bike there. There is a narrowing and tree caused shade area that makes the area dangerous. The present detour just compounds this.

Thank you,

Kevon Cottrell El Granada

From: PATRICK and ROBIN TIERNEY

Subject: Comment about Medio Creek Coastal Trail Bridge

Date: October 28, 2020

Hello,

I would appreciate an opportunity to comment on the agenda item on the Medio Creek bridge. My comment is shown below.

Patrick Tierney

I strongly urge the MCC to continue to delay sending a letter to the Coastal Commission, and instead support the County's plans to replace the Medio Creek Coastal Trail Bridge in its current location, as soon as possible . Bluff stabilization and replacement of the bridge at its current location should not be delayed. This will minimize negative impacts to residential neighborhoods and businesses, increase trail user safety and give stakeholders time to plan for the future of this area. I also urge MCC to convene a stakeholder group to develop a comprehensive plan for the Mirada Road corridor, north and south of the bridge, which includes a thorough public discussion of impacts to residences and businesses and alternative alignments, after the Medio Creek bridge crisis has been solved for at least the next 10-20 years by stabilizing the bluffs and replacing the bridge at its current location