

# Midcoast Community Council

*representing Montara, Moss Beach, El Granada, Princeton, and Miramar*  
P.O. Box 248, Moss Beach, CA 94038-0248 - [www.MidcoastCommunityCouncil.org](http://www.MidcoastCommunityCouncil.org)

**Claire Toutant** **Gregg Dieguez** **Michelle Weil** **Len Erickson** **Jill Grant** **Dan Haggerty** **Dave Olson**  
Chair Vice-Chair Treasurer Secretary Asst Secretary

Date: October 12, 2022  
To: Mike Schaller, Senior Planner  
Cc: Serene Ip, MidPen Housing Project Manager; Eric Martinez CCC, San Mateo County Planning Commission  
Subject: Comments on PLN2018-00264 CDP, Cypress Point Family Community

As elected representatives of the people of the community surrounding the site of the proposed development at Cypress Point, we are aware that the project has been a focus of intense community interest and concern since its inception. While most people do recognize the urgent need for more affordable housing, many question whether this location is an appropriate site for development. The community's concerns include the project's impact on traffic and safety, its impact on the coastside's already strained infrastructure, and its impact on the local environment.

One broad area of concern is the Cypress Point project's impact on traffic and safety. For example, the intersection of Carlos St. and Highway 1 is listed as the principal highway access for the project, but the project application itself describes the intersection as "unsafe", with the mitigation measures TM-3 and TM-5 as insufficient, and further describes additional possible mitigation measures as difficult and expensive. While this may be true, the intersection of Carlos St. and Highway 1 occurs at a blind curve in the highway, so if this is to be the primary highway access point, then some means must be found to increase safety for vehicles, bicycles, and pedestrians accessing and crossing the highway. It is unacceptable that this project be allowed to proceed without addressing a safety issue of this magnitude.

Furthermore, we request that the County, Caltrans, and MidPen improve the safety of this corridor, consistent with maintaining traffic flow by reducing the speed limit on northbound SR1 between Etheldore and Carlos Ave to 45 or even 40 mph, rather than 50mph, because of the curve and hill approaching Carlos Ave.

ICE studies for both SR1/Carlos and SR1/Etheldore should be completed as soon as possible, and MidPen should be required to partially fund these studies.

An additional safety issue associated with this project is the issue of evacuation in an emergency. Given its importance, emergency evacuation routes must be planned for and discussed explicitly. There should be a clearly marked secondary emergency evacuation route, with access to the highway in the event of a major emergency such as an earthquake or wildfire. The issue of adequate evacuation routes is a significant and longstanding concern for the Midcoast community.

In Chapter 6 of the detailed plans, emergency vehicle access is shown from the northeast part of the property, from Lincoln St. This needs to be made explicit and consistent in the plans. Currently some plan pages show a driveway extension paved with asphalt connecting to Lincoln at the Northeast portion of the property; others show that access as

covered with large rock, and/or as a stabilized Construction Entrance. This needs to be described consistently, with detailed notes, as it will exist at project completion.

Beyond safety, the Cypress Point project impacts everyday vehicular and pedestrian traffic in a number of ways that concern our community. ICE studies are proposed at SR1 and Etheldore/Vallemar and California. We do not think that signalization will be needed, but in any case measures such as left-turn lanes and roundabouts are preferred to signals.

Sidewalks are proposed on several streets, but many residents are opposed to them, so the community should be included in decisions on the adjacent streets. The section of Carlos south of the Cypress Point entrance requires improvements to allow pedestrians and vehicles to safely use the street, with the increased traffic from this project. We support crosswalks, but note that crossings of SR1 are not specifically mentioned, and must be addressed, because residents will need to cross the highway.

The MCC requests a mitigation requirement that MidPen provide 100% of funding to design a trail to provide a safe bicycle and pedestrian route from the project to Montara, and that County development of a trail parallel to SR1 between Moss Beach and El Granada be accelerated.

The retail and human-need resources of “downtown Moss Beach” are not as robust as the application indicates. SamTrans and MidPen should collaborate to provide imaginative alternatives to existing transit options, as mentioned at the end of the Ch 13 Traffic Impact Analysis. The project should provide on-site mailboxes with USPS delivery, to minimize need for trips to the post office. In light of new state policies, EV charging facilities should be increased beyond the minimum required.

A second broad area of concern is the impact on the Midcoast’s already strained infrastructure, including sewer and water supplies for both fire-fighting and daily use. There is documented reason to be concerned about the adequacy of existing water supply, sewage capacity and hydrant pressures. Mitigating the risks from any deficiencies should be a priority. We urge in-depth studies to ensure an adequate supply.

Another area of concern is the impact of the project on the local environment. To start, the biological resources document (Ch 3) is blank, despite multiple requests to the planner. We look forward to assisting with the planned EIR. Clearly the CDP can’t be completed until this document is published, and reviewed.

The Ch 11 Hydromodification Management document (and Ch 6 plans) do not clearly indicate how much storm water will flow into Montara Creek and ocean (nor where it will flow into the creek, and how that will affect the creek between the outflow and the ocean) during a major storm (such as those during October and December 2021). Because this project is in the ASBS biologically sensitive area for Fitzgerald, it’s important that an updated analysis be performed that takes into account the likelihood of heavier rainfall in short periods, e.g. the storms in October and December 2021. These types of storms are more likely as a result of climate change.

We would like more information about the location and use of fill, as well as mitigation of the impact of multiple truckloads of material through small neighborhood streets. In the Environmental Information Disclosure Form (Ch 2), there is a statement that 7,000 cubic yards of fill will be used, however page C3.0 of the Ch 6 plans shows a cut of 9,507 cy, a fill of 19,388, for a net 9,881 fill. This substantial discrepancy must be corrected. The MCC asks that the 50-100 truck trips required to deliver this fill be routed and timed to minimize impact on the neighborhood, and not be delivered early morning, or during peak school

traffic hours. Second, it is not clear which portion of the site will be graded, nor how deep the maximum fill will be. It appears that net fill is located primarily in the central portion of the site, but it would be very helpful for the community if the areas of substantial cut and fill were indicated with shading or coloring.

There is past evidence of asbestos found at the site, and the geotechnical studies showed anomalous levels of lead at one test site. Stronger than normal mitigation measures should be required during construction to ensure that these materials are not dispersed as dust during construction. Additionally, the areas of the site post-grading, and prior to construction, particularly where fill is placed, should be tested for heavy metals, and organic chemicals that may remain on site from fuels, and past fire-fighting training.

Details on the plans for the undeveloped (openspace) portion of the property are lacking, and should be required prior to approval. A mitigation measure allowing public access to the trails in the openspace portion should be required. MidPen mentioned this during public meetings, however box "4t" in Ch 1 CDP Application Companion Page has the "No" box checked (public trail easement). Additionally we request that the onsite community building be made available for public meetings and other use when not otherwise in use by the residents (this is mentioned in the Ch 13 traffic analysis, but not elsewhere).

If the project does proceed, there is substantial community support for prioritizing the apartments for people who currently work or live on the Coastsides. This must be part of the project approval requirements, that 85% of the units will be allowed to factor in this preference. There was considerable discussion of this earlier, but it's missing from the CDP documents.

The Council requests that as partial mitigation of the several potential concerns raised that the number of units in the project be reduced.

We ask that funds be placed in escrow for a period of time after completion of the project to deal with any unforeseen problems. An audit, remediation, and repair process must be in place to repair any incremental damage caused by construction of the proposed project. Streets damaged by construction traffic must be repaved after construction, with all repairs to be paid by the applicant. We request that this mitigation measure be an explicit requirement of the CDP.

s/ Claire Toutant, Chair