

Attachment 1

San Mateo County Midcoast Update LCP Amendments Coastal Commission Staff's Suggested Modifications Page 1 of 71

California Coastal Commission (CCC) staff recommends the following suggested modifications to the Midcoast Local Coastal Program (LCP) Amendments submitted by San Mateo County. The County's proposed amendments are shown in underline for language to be added, and ~~strike through~~ for language proposed to be deleted. The language shown in double underline represent language that the CCC staff suggests be added, and the language shown in ~~double strike through~~ represents language that the CCC staff suggests be deleted. Suggested modifications that do not involve direct text changes are shown in ***bold italics***.

1.1. Suggested Modifications to LUP Chapter 1: Locating and Planning New Development

1.1.1. Suggested Modifications to County Exhibit A: Buildout

Suggested Modification No. 1 – Buildout Table:

Replace the 1980 original buildout estimate Table 1 with the correct Commission certified Table 1, as shown in exhibit 4 and insert the tables and accompanying text into LUP Chapter 1 before Table 1.2.

Updated Buildout Estimate (2006)

<u>R-1 Zoning District</u>	<u>4,804</u> <u>units</u>
<u>R-3 Zoning District</u>	<u>443</u> <u>units</u>
<u>R-3-A Zoning District</u>	<u>513</u> <u>units</u>
<u>RM-CZ and PAD Zoning Districts</u>	<u>160</u> <u>units</u>
<u>C-1 and CCR Zoning Districts</u>	<u>99-495</u> <u>units</u>
<u>Second Units</u>	<u>466</u> <u>units</u>
<u>Caretaker's Quarters</u>	<u>45</u> <u>units</u>
<u>El Granada Mobile Home Park</u>	<u>227</u> <u>units</u>
<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>6,757-7,153</u> <u>units</u>

The following table represents an updated estimate of residential buildout for the Midcoast LCP Update Project Area, as shown on Map 1.3. Buildout is the planned endpoint in a community's growth ~~when that would occur if all land that has been designated for development has been developed to its maximum density, i.e. the sum of all units potentially allowed under existing certified LCP policy density limitations. The buildout estimate assumes that public service constraints can be resolved, and that there are no resource constraints or other LCP requirements that would limit buildout density on individual sites. The methodology involved counting individual parcels and determining development potential according to the Land Use Plan.~~ The buildout estimate and the LCP policies on which it is based are not entitlements and do not

Attachment 1

San Mateo County Midcoast Update LCP Amendments Coastal Commission Staff's Suggested Modifications Page 2 of 71

guarantee that any proposed development will be approved. The buildout methodology also assumes that all contiguously owned substandard lots will be merged according to County merger policies (i.e., contiguously owned substandard lots are combined into one conforming parcel for purposes of counting units, and only one unit per "merged" lot is included in the buildout figure). Solitary, non-contiguous substandard lots are counted as one unit each in the buildout figure. The actual buildout number could be closer to 9,553 units if lots are not merged as assumed by this methodology.

1.1.2. Suggested Modifications to County Exhibit F: Annual Growth Rate

Suggested Modification No. 2 – Timing of New Housing Development:

1.22 Timing of New Housing Development in the Midcoast

- a. In order to ensure that roads, utilities, schools and other public works facilities and community infrastructure public works are not overburdened by rapid residential growth, require that the following limitations on building permits granted in the Midcoast for the construction of residences, other than affordable housing, be applied beginning in the first calendar year after LCP certification: limit the maximum number of new dwelling units built in the urban Midcoast to 75 that which would result in a growth of one percent (1%) in Midcoast population units each per calendar year until:
 - i. A comprehensive transportation management plan, as described in Policy 2.59, is incorporated into the LCP; and
 - ii. Facilities to adequately contain stormwater infiltration and inflow that exceed the existing IPS system capacity during storm events and peak flows have been constructed and sufficient evidence has been presented that IPS capacity is adequate to avoid sewage overflows and water quality violations; and
 - iii. The growth rate is changed by an LCP Amendment.
- b. New dwelling units include each new single-family residential unit, each new unit in a multiple-family residential development, each new unit in a mixed-use development, and each new caretaker quarter, and each new second dwelling unit.
- c. New dwelling units do not include affordable housing units as defined by Section 6102.48.6 of the certified zoning regulations, i.e. subject to income and cost/rent restrictions., and second dwelling units.

Attachment 1

San Mateo County Midcoast Update LCP Amendments Coastal Commission Staff's Suggested Modifications Page 3 of 71

- d. The number of new dwelling units built each year means that number of units for which building permits have been issued authorizing construction to commence. The date of building permit issuance does not relate to the date of building permit application.
- e. This annual limit on residential units is not an entitlement, i.e. it does not guarantee that any proposed development will be approved. A coastal development permit for residential development may only be approved if the proposed development can be found consistent with all applicable policies of the certified LCP.
- f. In determining the number of permissible dwelling units per calendar year, the County shall use the most recent U.S. Census figures for the Midcoast to calculate the average number of persons per household.
- a. ~~125 per year until Phase I sewer and significant new water facilities have both been provided, unless the County Board of Supervisors makes the finding that water or other public works have insufficient capacity, consistent with the protection of sensitive habitats, to accommodate additional growth (see Policy 7.20).~~
- b. ~~125 in the years following the provision of Phase I sewer and significant new water facilities, unless the County Board of Supervisors makes the finding that water, schools and other public works have sufficient capacity to accommodate additional growth. In any year that the Board makes this finding, up to 200 building permits may be granted. The exact number of building permits shall be determined by the Board at the time the finding is made.~~

1.1.3. Suggested Modifications to County Exhibit M Stormwater Pollution Prevention Best Management Practices

Suggested Modification No. 3 – Deletion of Proposed Policy 1.35:

- ~~1.35 All new land use development and activities shall comply with the requirements of the existing Countywide Stormwater Pollution Prevention Program (STOPPP), including best management practices and performance standards. The minimum STOPPP requirements are shown in the Appendix that is a part of this component.~~

APPENDIX

Attachment 1

San Mateo County Midcoast Update LCP Amendments Coastal Commission Staff's Suggested Modifications Page 4 of 71

MINIMUM STORMWATER POLLUTION PREVENTION PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS

1. All New Development

All new development, including remodeling of existing buildings, shall comply with the following minimum requirements:

- a. Avoid or minimize and mitigate the potential adverse impacts to water quality from new development by using pre-construction, during construction, and post-construction best management practices.
- b. Prevent the flow of liquid building materials and wastes onto impervious surfaces and into storm drains and waterways.
- c. Prevent construction equipment, building materials and piles of soil from contact with rain using plastic sheeting or other temporary cover, and contact with stormwater using berms, ditches, and other methods.
- d. Contain vehicle and equipment cleaning, storage, maintenance, and refuse and recycling areas to prevent runoff from discharging into the storm drain system.
- e. Clean up leaks and spills immediately to prevent soil and groundwater contamination, contact with paved surfaces, and discharge into the storm drain system.
- f. Use silt ponds, berms and other techniques to trap sediment, spilled liquids and other pollutants.
- g. Employ site planning and construction methods to reduce the need for pesticides and contaminants, and prevent contact with stormwater.

2. New Development that Alters the Land

In addition to the requirements listed in 1. above, new development, construction or other activities that disturb or otherwise alter the land shall comply with the following minimum requirements:

- a. Where the potential for significant erosion from construction activities exists, prepare and implement an erosion and sediment control plan that includes effective erosion and sediment control measures.
- b. Protect sensitive areas, minimize changes to the natural topography, and avoid removing existing vegetation unless absolutely necessary.

Attachment 1

San Mateo County Midcoast Update LCP Amendments

Coastal Commission Staff's Suggested Modifications

Page 5 of 71

- ~~e. Protect undisturbed areas from construction impacts using vegetative buffer strips, sediment barriers, filters, dikes, mulching and other measures as appropriate.~~
 - ~~d. Reduce the amount of impervious surface areas, and use permeable pavement where feasible.~~
 - ~~e. Reduce the amount of runoff crossing construction sites by constructing berms, swales and dikes and diverting drainage ditches. Use berms or temporary check dams to reduce the velocity of stormwater runoff.~~
 - ~~f. Use landscaping to collect, detain and filter surface runoff, and design landscaping to minimize the use of irrigation, fertilizers and pesticides.~~
 - ~~g. Prevent erosion and trap sedimentation onsite using sediment basins or traps, earthen dikes or berms, silt fences, check dams, soil blankets or mats, and storm drain inlet protection.~~
 - ~~h. Control erosion on slopes by seeding and planting vegetation, and using hay bales, temporary drainage swales, silt fences and berms.~~
 - ~~i. Restrict land clearing, earth moving, and excavation and grading activities to during dry weather, i.e., between April 15th and October 15th of each year.~~
 - ~~j. Separate construction sites from storm drains with berms and filters, stabilize denuded areas, and maintain erosion and sedimentation controls during wet weather, i.e., between October 15th and April 15th of each year.~~
 - ~~k. Provide for ongoing operation and maintenance of installed stormwater treatment measures.~~
 - ~~l. As applicable based on project size, secure a Construction Activity Stormwater General Permit from the San Francisco Bay Area Regional Water Quality Control Board.~~
- ~~3. Specific New Development, Uses or Activities~~

~~In addition to the requirements listed in 1. and 2. above, new development, uses or activities in the following categories shall comply with specific STOPPP stormwater pollution prevention requirements.~~

- ~~a. Heavy Equipment Operation~~
- ~~b. Earth Moving Activities~~
- ~~c. Roadwork and Paving~~
- ~~d. Applying Concrete/Mortar~~
- ~~e. Applying Paint, Solvents and Adhesives~~

Attachment 1

San Mateo County Midcoast Update LCP Amendments Coastal Commission Staff's Suggested Modifications Page 6 of 71

- ~~f. Swimming Pools, Spa and Fountains~~
- ~~g. Landscaping/Gardens~~
- ~~h. Parking Garages~~
- ~~i. Outdoor Equipment/Materials Storage~~
- ~~j. Refuse Areas~~
- ~~k. Vehicle/Equipment Cleaning, Repair and Maintenance~~
- ~~l. Fuel Dispensing Areas~~
- ~~m. Loading Docks~~
- ~~n. Food Service Equipment Cleaning~~
- ~~o. Pesticide/Fertilizer Application~~

Suggested Modification No. 4 – Suggested Water Quality Policies:

1.35 Estimating and Mitigating Pollutant Loads and Flows

Estimate increases in pollutant loads and flows resulting from proposed development. Incorporate structural and non-structural treatment measures to mitigate the projected increases in pollutant loads and flows to the maximum extent feasible.

1.36 Development Standards to Preserve Water Quality

Require new development to:

- a. Minimize the amount of impervious surfaces and directly connected impervious surfaces in areas of new development and redevelopment and where feasible maximize on-site infiltration of runoff.
- b. Implement pollution prevention methods supplemented by pollutant source controls and treatment. Use small collection strategies located at, or as close as possible to, the source (i.e., the point where water initially meets the ground) to minimize the transport of urban runoff and pollutants offsite or into a municipal separate storm sewer system.
- c. Preserve, and where possible, create or restore areas that provide important water quality benefits, such as riparian corridors, wetlands, and buffer zones. Land acquisition and/or conservation easement acquisition of such areas is encouraged.
- d. Limit disturbances of natural water bodies and natural drainage systems caused by development including roads, highways, and bridges.
- e. Avoid development of areas that are particularly susceptible to erosion and sediment loss;
- f. Reduce pollutants associated with vehicles and increased traffic resulting from development.

Attachment 1

San Mateo County Midcoast Update LCP Amendments Coastal Commission Staff's Suggested Modifications Page 7 of 71

- g. Control stormwater quality impacts by using appropriate best management practices (BMPs). All projects, regardless of size, will be required to implement appropriate pre-construction, construction, and post-construction best management practices.
- h. Implement Hydromodification Management controls such as on-site and regional controls and in-stream measures as required by the Regional Board, to control stormwater discharges from applicable new development and redevelopment projects, in which the combined amounts of impervious surface created and replaced totals one acre or more, so that these discharges do not increase the erosion potential of the receiving creek over the pre-project (existing) condition. A project that does not increase the impervious area over the pre-project condition is excluded from this requirement.
- i. Reduce the need for pesticides and contaminants and prevent contact of these pollutants with stormwater by employing site planning, source control, and construction methods.

1.37 Best Management Practices (BMPs)

Implement Best Management Practices (BMPs) before and during construction and grading operations in order to minimize erosion, sedimentation, and water pollution:

- a. All development, including remodeling of existing buildings, shall comply with the following minimum requirements:
 - (1) Prevent the flow of liquid building materials and wastes onto impervious surfaces and into storm drains and waterways.
 - (2) Prevent construction equipment, building materials and piles of soil from contact with rain using plastic sheeting or other temporary cover, and contact with stormwater using berms, ditches, and other methods.
 - (3) Contain vehicle and equipment cleaning, storage, maintenance, and refuse and recycling areas to prevent runoff from discharging into the storm drain system.
 - (4) Clean up leaks and spills immediately to prevent soil and groundwater contamination, contact with paved surfaces, and discharge into the storm drain system.
 - (5) Use silt ponds, berms and other techniques to trap sediment, spilled liquids and other pollutants.
- b. Development and Other Activities that Alter the Land

In addition to the requirements listed in 1.37a. above, development, construction or other activities that disturb or otherwise alter the land shall comply with the following minimum requirements:

Attachment 1

San Mateo County Midcoast Update LCP Amendments

Coastal Commission Staff's Suggested Modifications

Page 8 of 71

(1) Where the potential for significant erosion from construction activities exists, prepare and implement an erosion and sediment control plan that includes effective erosion and sediment control measures.

(2) Protect sensitive areas, minimize changes to the natural topography, and avoid removing existing vegetation unless absolutely necessary.

(3) Protect undisturbed areas from construction impacts using vegetative buffer strips, sediment barriers, filters, dikes, mulching and other measures as appropriate.

(4) Reduce the amount of runoff crossing construction sites by constructing berms, swales and dikes and diverting drainage ditches. Use berms or temporary check dams to reduce the velocity of stormwater runoff.

(5) Use landscaping to collect, detain and filter surface runoff, and design landscaping to minimize the use of irrigation, fertilizers and pesticides.

(6) Prevent erosion and trap sedimentation onsite using sediment basins or traps, earthen dikes or berms, silt fences, check dams, soil blankets or mats, and storm drain inlet protection.

(7) Control erosion on slopes by seeding and planting vegetation, and using hay bales, temporary drainage swales, silt fences and berms.

(8) Development related land disturbance, e.g., site preparation, shall not occur between October 15 and April 15 unless the applicant demonstrates to the satisfaction of the Community Development Director and Building Official that the development site will be effectively contained to prevent erosion and sedimentation, and that such site containment has been established and is ongoing. Site containment shall include, but not be limited to, covering stored equipment and materials, stabilizing site entrances and exposed slopes, containing or reducing runoff, and protecting drain inlets.

(9) Separate construction sites from storm drains with berms and filters, stabilize denuded areas, and maintain erosion and sedimentation controls during wet weather, i.e., between October 15th and April 15th of each year.

(10) Provide for ongoing operation and maintenance of installed stormwater treatment measures.

(11) As applicable based on project size, secure a Construction Activity Stormwater General Permit from the San Francisco Bay Area Regional Water Quality Control Board.

Attachment 1

San Mateo County Midcoast Update LCP Amendments

Coastal Commission Staff's Suggested Modifications

Page 9 of 71

c. Site Design Measures

(1) Require for all projects, regardless of size, adequate site design measures such as minimizing land disturbance and impervious surfaces (especially parking lots); clustering of structures and pavement; disconnecting roof downspouts; use of micro-detention, including distributed landscape detention; preservation of high quality open space; maintenance and /or restoration of riparian areas and wetlands as project amenities

(2) Reduce the amount of impervious surface areas. Use permeable materials where appropriate (i.e., light vehicle loading and lightly trafficked areas, such as automobile parking areas).

d. Source Control Measures

(1) Require for all projects, regardless of size, adequate source control measures to limit pollutant generation, discharge and runoff, to the maximum extent practicable. Examples of source control measures include indoor mat/equipment/hood filter wash racks or covered outdoor wash racks plumbed to the sanitary sewer for restaurants; covered trash and food compactor enclosures with a sanitary sewer connection for dumpster drips; sanitary sewer drains for swimming pools; sanitary drained outdoor covered wash areas for vehicles, equipment, and accessories; sanitary sewer drain connections to take fire sprinkler test water; storm drain system stenciling; landscaping that minimizes irrigation and runoff, promotes surface infiltration where possible, and minimizes the use of pesticides and fertilizers; and appropriate covers, drains, and storage precautions for outdoor material storage areas, loading docks, repair/maintenance bays, and fueling areas.

1.38 Developments of Special Concern

Require developments with land use activities that have a high potential for generating pollutants to incorporate BMPs to address the particular pollutants of concern. This shall include, but not be limited to:

a. Require parking lots to incorporate BMPs to minimize runoff of oil, grease, car battery acid, coolant, gasoline, sediments, trash, and other pollutants to receiving waters.

b. Require commercial developments to incorporate BMPs to minimize polluted runoff from structures, landscaping, parking areas, repair and maintenance areas, loading /unloading areas, and vehicle/equipment wash areas.

c. Require automotive service stations, gasoline outlets, car washes, and vehicle repair facilities to incorporate BMPs to minimize runoff of oil, grease, solvents, car battery acid, coolant, gasoline, and other pollutants to the stormwater conveyance system from areas

Attachment 1

San Mateo County Midcoast Update LCP Amendments Coastal Commission Staff's Suggested Modifications Page 10 of 71

including fueling areas, repair and maintenance areas, loading/unloading areas, and vehicle/equipment wash areas.

d. Require restaurants to incorporate BMPs to minimize runoff of oil, grease, solvents, phosphates, suspended solids, and other pollutants.

e. Require outdoor material storage areas to be designed (e.g., with a roof or awning cover) to minimize runoff of toxic compounds, oil and grease, heavy metals, nutrients, suspended solids, and other pollutants.

f. Require roof or awning covers over trash storage areas to minimize off-site transport of trash and other pollutants.

g. Require beachfront and waterfront development to incorporate BMPs to minimize polluted runoff to beach and coastal waters.

h. Require confined animal facilities, stables and similar animal keeping operations to be sited and designed to manage, contain, and dispose of animal waste using BMPs to insure that waste is not introduced to surface runoff or ground water. In no case shall an animal keeping operation be managed or maintained so as to produce sedimentation or polluted runoff on any public road, adjoining property, or in any creek or drainage channel.

i. Require onsite sewage treatment systems (septic systems) to be sited, designed, installed, operated, and maintained to avoid contributing nutrients and pathogens to groundwater and/or surface waters.

j. Require onsite sewage treatment systems (septic systems) to be sited away from areas that have poorly or excessively drained soils, shallow water tables or high seasonal water tables that are within floodplains or where effluent cannot be adequately treated before it reaches streams or the ocean.

Require new development to include protective setbacks from surface waters, wetlands and floodplains for conventional or alternative onsite sewage treatment systems, as well as separation distances between onsite sewage treatment system components, building components, property lines, and groundwater. Under no conditions shall the bottom of the effluent dispersal system be within five feet of groundwater.

1.39 Stormwater Treatment

a. When the combination of site design and source control BMPs are not sufficient to protect water quality as required by the LCP, or when required by Regional Board per municipal permit provisions, structural treatment BMPs will be implemented along with site design and source control measures. Use multi-benefit, natural-feature, stormwater

Attachment 1

San Mateo County Midcoast Update LCP Amendments Coastal Commission Staff's Suggested Modifications Page 11 of 71

treatment systems, such as landscape-based bioretention systems, bioswales and green roofs, in place of proprietary systems where feasible.

b. Design and install stormwater treatment systems that will reduce the discharge of pollutants in the stormwater runoff to the maximum extent practicable, for at least the following projects, and as required by the San Francisco Bay Area Regional Water Quality Control Board:

(1.) New development or redevelopment projects that create and/or replace 10,000 square feet or more of impervious surface including commercial, industrial, residential housing subdivisions (i.e., detached single-family home subdivisions, multi-family attached subdivisions (town homes), condominiums, and apartments), mixed-use, and public projects. Interior remodels, routine maintenance or repair (such as roof or exterior wall surface replacement and pavement resurfacing within the existing footprint), and single-family homes that are not part of a larger plan of development, are excluded from this category.

If a redevelopment project increases or replaces more than 50 percent of the impervious surface of a previously existing development, the entire project must be included in the treatment system design (e.g., stormwater treatment systems must be designed and sized to treat stormwater runoff from the entire redevelopment project). For redevelopment projects that increase or replace less than 50 percent of the impervious surface, stormwater treatment systems must be designed and sized to treat stormwater runoff from the new and/or replaced impervious surface of the project.

(2) Any newly constructed street, road, or highway; contiguous paved surfaces installed as part of a street, road or highway project (including contiguous sidewalks and bicycle lanes); or impervious trails that are greater than 10 feet wide or are creekside (within 50 feet of the top of bank), that create 10,000 square feet or more of contiguous impervious surface.

(3) Replaced arterial streets or roads that are rehabilitated down to the gravel base (i.e., roads or pavement that are demolished and re-built from the gravel base up) and that create and/or replace 10,000 square feet or more of contiguous impervious surface. Replacement of local and connector non-arterial roads and paved trails, routine surface repaving, pothole repair of all other streets, roads, highways are excluded.

c.. Design and install post-construction structural BMPs (or suites of BMPs) to treat, infiltrate or filter the amount of stormwater runoff produced by all storms up to and including the 85th percentile, 24-hour storm event for volume-based BMPs and/or the 85th percentile, 1-hour storm event (with an appropriate safety factor, i.e. 2 or greater) for

Attachment 1

San Mateo County Midcoast Update LCP Amendments Coastal Commission Staff's Suggested Modifications Page 12 of 71

flow-based BMPs or the flow of runoff from a rain event equal to at least 0.2 inches per hour intensity to the maximum extent feasible.

1.40 Drainage

Require post-development peak flow (runoff) and velocity to be less than or equal to pre-development peak flow and velocity in areas where there are no existing down stream storm drain systems. No additional runoff, caused by development, shall cross property lines. In areas where there are existing storm drain systems, those systems shall be of adequate size to accept the increased runoff, or mitigation procedures shall be taken. Mitigation procedures may include on-site storm drain detention or off-site storm drain detention.

1.41 Hydromodification Management (HM) Standard

Stormwater discharges from applicable new development and redevelopment projects, in which the combined amounts of impervious surface created and replaced totals one acre or more, shall not cause an increase in the erosion potential of the receiving stream over the pre-project (existing) condition. Increase in runoff flow and volume shall be managed so that post-project runoff shall not exceed estimated pre-project rates and durations, where such increased flow and/or volume is likely to cause increased potential for erosion of creek beds and banks, silt pollutant generated, or other adverse impacts to beneficial uses due to increased erosive force. Projects shall implement the hydromodification requirements by use of on-site control measures, regional control measures, or in-stream measures, as required by the Regional Board.

1.1.4. Suggested Modifications to County Exhibit Q Resolving Policy Conflicts:

Suggested Modification No. 5:

~~1.3~~ Resolving Policy Conflicts

~~Where conflicts occur between one or more LCP policies, resolve them in a manner which on balance is the most protective of significant coastal resources. This provision does not affect nor limit the Coastal Commission's authority under Public Resources Code Section 30007.5.~~

1.1.5. Suggested Modifications to County Exhibit R Correcting and Clarifying LCP Provisions

Suggested Modification No. 6 – Rural Areas

***1.7 Designation of Rural Areas**

Designate as rural those lands shown outside the urban/rural boundary on the

Attachment 1

San Mateo County Midcoast Update LCP Amendments Coastal Commission Staff's Suggested Modifications Page 13 of 71

~~Local Coastal Program LCP Land Use Plan Maps 1.3 s, in effect on March 25, 1986, that were~~
~~are designated Agriculture, General Open Space, Timber Preserve, or Public Recreation on that~~
~~date.~~

1.1.6. Additional Suggested Modifications to LUP Chapter 1

Suggested Modification No. 6 – New adequacy of public services policy:

1.18.1 Ensure Adequate Public Services and Infrastructure for New Development in Urban Areas.

a. No permit for development in the urban area shall be approved unless it can be demonstrated prior to project approval, that the development will be served upon completion with adequate public services, including but not limited to public water, wastewater collection, treatment and disposal; storm drainage; fire and emergency medical response; police protection; transportation; schools; and solid waste collection and disposal; as applicable to the proposed development.

b. Demonstration of adequate water and sewer facilities shall include evidence that adequate capacity (including transmission collection, treatment and disposal) exists within the system to serve the development and all other existing and foreseeable development the system is committed to serving, and evidence that the entity providing the service will provide such service for the development.

c. Limit new dwelling units within the Coastsides County Water District service area to the number of available non-priority connections in the Midcoast permitted by the El Granada Pipeline Project (Coastal Commission CDP A-2-SMC-99-063; A-1-HMB-99-020).

d. Allow new water connections in the Montara Water and Sanitary District water service area only if consistent with the MWSD Public Works Plan (Coastal Commission PWP No. 2-06-006), Chapter 2 of the LCP, and all other applicable policies of the LCP.

e. Private wells shall be prohibited within the urban services line of the Midcoast unless authorized pursuant to a groundwater management plan incorporated into the LCP.

f. Private septic systems shall be prohibited within the urban services line of the Midcoast unless authorized pursuant to a groundwater management plan incorporated into the LCP.

g. Demonstration of adequate transportation services shall include compliance with Policies 2.58 and 2.59.

h. Lack of adequate services to serve the proposed development shall be grounds for denial of the project.

Attachment 1

San Mateo County Midcoast Update LCP Amendments Coastal Commission Staff's Suggested Modifications Page 14 of 71

1.2. Suggested Modifications to LUP Chapter 2 (Public Works)

1.2.1. Suggested Modifications to County Exhibit R

Suggested Modification No. 7 – Service area boundaries:

2.22 Establishing Service Area Boundaries

a. Require, as a condition of granting a permit for expansion of sewage treatment facilities, that sanitary sewer connections be limited to the urban areas and rural residential areas as shown on the ~~LCP Land Use Map~~ Land Use Plan Map 1.3 and the zoning map. Exclude property located outside the urban boundary and rural residential areas from assessment for sewage treatment facilities by SAM or its member agencies.

b. Allow SAM to supply reclaimed wastewater to areas outside service areas consistent with LUP Policy 2.18(c).

c. ~~Begin transferring responsibility for septic tank monitoring in the rural areas of the Montara and Granada Sanitary Districts to the County Environmental Health Division or some other public agency within a year of LCP certification. When another agency agrees to assume this responsibility, r~~ Redraw the boundaries of the sewer districts to correspond to the urban boundary and the boundary of rural residential areas.

d. ~~If it is impossible for the County Environmental Health Division or another agency to assume responsibility for monitoring septic tanks, maintain existing sewer district boundaries and divide districts into rural and urban zones. Accordingly,~~

~~(1) Make the boundaries of the urban zone, where sanitary sewer connections are provided, correspond to the urban areas and rural residential areas, as shown on the LCP Land Use Plan Map.~~

~~(2) Restrict the activities in the rural zone to monitoring and inspecting septic tanks. Prohibit sanitary sewer connections in this rural zone.~~

~~(3) Adjust the sewer district fees in the rural zone to reflect the lower level of service and minimize growth inducement.~~

Suggested Modification No. 7 – Montara Treatment Plant:

2.23 ~~Locating Sites for Sewage Treatment Plants~~ Montara Treatment Plant

a. ~~Designate the existing site of the Montara Treatment Plant as Institutional on the LCP Land Use Plan Map. Allow a sewage treatment plant or pumping station to be constructed there. If SAM or its member utility, the Montara Sanitary District, does not use this site for expanded or additional sewage treatment facilities, change the site's designation to general open space on the LCP Land Use Plan Map.~~ a. Allow Montara Water and Sanitary District to use the old Montara Treatment Plant for wet weather storage and a pump station

b. Reserve public pedestrian access on the seaward side of this Montara site and connect it to proposed trails at both ends consistent with the policies of the Shoreline Access Component.

c. ~~Designate a site, approximately 2 to 3 acres in size, north of California Avenue near Yale Avenue on the property of the Half Moon Bay Airport, as Institutional on the LCP Land Use Plan Map. Allow a sewage treatment plant or pumping station to be constructed~~

Attachment 1

San Mateo County Midcoast Update LCP Amendments Coastal Commission Staff's Suggested Modifications Page 15 of 71

~~there subject to FAA approval. If Granada Sanitary District does not use this site for expanded or additional sewage treatment, change the site's designation to Transportation on the LCP Land Use Plan Map.~~

Suggested Modification No. 8 – Phasing public works development:

2.7 Phased Development of Public Works Facilities

Require the phased development of public works facilities in order to insure that permitted public works capacities are limited to serving needs generated by development which is consistent with the Local Coastal Program policies. Allow expansion of public works facilities, including but not limited to water supply and transmission, sewage treatment and transmission, and the San Mateo County Midcoast and City of Half Moon Bay regional transportation system only after considering the availability of other public works facilities, and establishing whether capacity increases would overburden the existing and probable future capacity of other public works facilities. Consideration of highway capacity shall include review of the adequacy of the level of service (LOS) on Highways 1 and 92. Adequate level of service for Highways 1 and 92 shall be defined, at minimum, as Level of Service (LOS) C except during the peak commuter period when LOS D is acceptable and the recreation peak periods when LOS E is acceptable.

Suggested Modification No. 9 – Priority uses:

2.8 Reservation of Capacity for Priority Land Uses

a. Reserve public works capacity for land uses given priority by the Local Coastal Program as shown on Table 2.7 and Table 2.17. Public works shall include water supply and transmission, sewage treatment and transmission, and the San Mateo County Midcoast and City of Half Moon Bay regional transportation system, including the level of service (LOS) on Highways 1 and 92. All priority land uses shall exclusively rely on public sewer and water services.

b. For each public works development ~~phase~~, reserve capacity adequate to allow priority land uses to develop to the buildout allowed by ~~that phase~~ the LCP.

c. ~~Under the following circumstances,~~ Allow public agencies and utilities to reallocate capacity to non-priority land uses only through an LCP Amendment. ~~÷ (1) when landowners refuse to pay the assessment fees for public services to serve priority land uses because they desire to keep their land vacant or develop a non-priority land use allowed on the site by the Local Coastal Program, and (2) when a landowner, in response to a written inquiry by a public agency or utility, indicates in writing that he/she does not plan to develop his/her land as a priority land use and will not be using any reserved capacity during a certain phase. The public agency or utility shall calculate the capacity needed to serve the remaining priority land uses. Reserved capacity that~~

Attachment 1

San Mateo County Midcoast Update LCP Amendments Coastal Commission Staff's Suggested Modifications Page 16 of 71

~~is not required for the remaining priority land uses may be reallocated to non-priority land uses after the public agency has gained the approval of the Planning Commission.~~ Applications for a LCP Amendment to reallocate priority capacity must be accompanied by substantial evidence and studies documenting excess capacity. Before approving the reallocation and before submitting the reallocation to the Coastal Commission for an LCP Amendment, the Planning Commission shall substantiate ~~make the finding,~~ in writing, that the remaining reserved capacity will be adequate to serve the remaining priority land uses.

~~The reservation of capacity for priority land uses shall be increased during the next phase to compensate priority land uses for this reallocation. At least 50% of the priority land uses planned in each phase must be provided capacity for; that capacity may not be allocated to the next phase.~~

d. Allow Coastsides County Water District and Montara Water and Sanitary District to allocate priority capacity in accordance with Table 2.17 equivalent to ten standard size (5/8 inch diameter) service connections (approximately 2,710 gallons per day total) ~~in order to~~ provide municipal water service to residential dwellings which are connected to the public sanitary sewer system, when such a connection is necessary to avert a substantial hardship caused by the failure of a private well serving the dwelling in production quantity or quality as certified by the Director of the Environmental Health Division. For purposes of this policy, "substantial hardship" shall not include any failure which can be remedied by repair or replacement of well equipment or facilities, or relocation of a well on a parcel. Whether substantial hardship exists shall be determined by the Community Development Director Planning Director, following consultation with the Director of Environmental Health and the General Manager of the ~~Coastsides County Water District~~ serving water district.

In order to minimize the reduction in water reserved for Coastal Act priority and uses, applications for reallocated water shall include a Water Fixture Retrofit Plan to replace existing water fixtures of the residence applying for the connection with water conserving fixtures. This plan must be reviewed and approved by the ~~Coastsides Community Water District~~ General Manager of the serving water district prior to the establishment of the connection, and contain the following:

- (1) A list of all existing fixtures to be retrofitted and their present associated water flow (e.g., gallons/second);
- (2) A list of all proposed fixtures to be installed and their associated water flow;
- (3) The estimated annual water savings resulting from the proposed retrofit, showing all calculations and assumptions; and
- (4) A leak detection test; all leaks shall be repaired, but such repairs shall not be calculated in the estimates of savings. The inspection personnel of the serving water district shall inspect the water fixtures prior to and following the retrofit to confirm compliance with the approved plan and proper installation.

Attachment 1

San Mateo County Midcoast Update LCP Amendments Coastal Commission Staff's Suggested Modifications Page 17 of 71

The Coastside Community Water District inspection personnel of the serving water district shall inspect the water fixtures prior to and following the retrofit to confirm compliance with the approved plan and proper installation.

The serving water district shall provide notices to the County Planning Department and the Coastal Commission of all failed wells applications.

Suggested Modification No. 10 – Deletion of outdated public works policies:

~~2.9 Phase I Capacity Limits~~

~~Based the first phase capacity of public works facilities on documentable and short term need (approximately 20 years or less) consistent with the Local Coastal Program. Monitor the needs of existing land uses and use these results and the existing and probable future capacity of related public works and services to document the need.~~

~~2.10 Growth Management~~

~~After Phase I sewer and substantial water supply facilities have both been provided, limit building permits for the construction of non-priority residential land uses in the Mid-Coast in accordance with the policies of the Locating and Planning New Development Component.~~

~~2.11 Monitoring of Phase I~~

~~a. Require that public agencies, utilities or special districts monitor the needs of land uses for public works capacity during Phase I.~~

~~b. Notify affected public agencies, utilities and special districts of the requirements for monitoring included in this plan.~~

Suggested Modification No. 11 – Public works expansion policies:

~~2.12 Timing and Capacity of Later Phases for Expansion of Public Works Facilities~~

~~a. Use the results of Phase I monitoring to determine the timing and capacity of later phase(s).~~

~~b. Guide timing by allowing later phase(s) to begin when Phase I capacity has been or will be consumed within the time period required to construct additional capacity.~~

e. Amount of expansion capacity shall be determined. Establish the capacity by: (1) estimating the capacity needed to serve the land use plan at buildout, (2) considering the availability of related public works to establish whether capacity increases would overburden the existing and probable future capacity of other public works, (3) after a thorough traffic study, determining the existing and future level of service (LOS) on Highway 92 and Highway 1 as a result of the facility expansion. No expansion of other public works facilities shall be permitted unless existing or probable future capacity of other related infrastructure, including but not limited to water supply and transmission, sewage treatment and transmission, and the San Mateo County Midcoast and City of Half Moon Bay regional transportation system, including the level of service (LOS) on Highways 1 and 92, is sufficient to adequately serve the level of development

Attachment 1

San Mateo County Midcoast Update LCP Amendments Coastal Commission Staff's Suggested Modifications Page 18 of 71

that would be supported by the proposed public works facility expansion. Adequate level of service for Highways 1 and 92 shall be defined, at a minimum, as Level of Service (LOS) C except during the peak commuter period when LOS D is acceptable and the recreation peak periods when LOS E is acceptable; and (34) considering the availability of funds.
d. Require every ~~phase~~ expansion of capacity to go through the coastal development review process.

2.13 Coordination with the City of Half Moon Bay

Coordinate with the City of Half Moon Bay's certified Local Coastal Program to take into consideration the policies of the City's LCP when determining: ~~(1) Phase I sewer capacity and (2) when and how much to increase the capacity of all public works facilities after Phase I.~~

Suggested Modification No. 12 – Expansion of special district policy:

2.15.1

Allow the formation or expansion of special districts only when existing or probable future capacity of other related infrastructure, including but not limited to water supply and transmission, sewage treatment and transmission, and the San Mateo County Midcoast and City of Half Moon Bay regional transportation system, including the level of service (LOS) on Highways 1 and 92, is sufficient to adequately serve the level of development that would be supported by the proposed special district formation or expansion. Adequate level of service for Highways 1 and 92 shall be defined, at minimum, as Level of Service (LOS) C except during the peak commuter period when LOS D is acceptable and the recreation peak periods when LOS E is acceptable.

Suggested Modification No. 13 – Deletion of outdated sewer policies:

~~2.16 Phase I Capacity Limits~~

~~For Phase I, limit the aerator, clarifier and outfall capacity of Sewer Authority Mid-Coast (SAM) joint treatment plant facilities and pump stations to average dry weather flows (adwf) of 2.0 million gallons per day (mgd).~~

~~2.17 Monitoring of Phase I~~

~~Require that the Sewer Authority Mid-Coastside (SAM or its member agencies) monitor: (1) the actual amount of sewage generation by land use, particularly non-residential, and (2) the rate of growth of new development. Require them to submit an annual data report to the County summarizing the results of this monitoring.~~

Suggested Modification No. 14 – Expanding sewer capacity:

2.18 Timing and Capacity of ~~Later Phases~~ Sewage Treatment and Distribution Capacity Expansion

~~a. Use the results of Phase I monitoring to determine the timing and capacity of later phase(s).~~

Attachment 1

San Mateo County Midcoast Update LCP Amendments Coastal Commission Staff's Suggested Modifications Page 19 of 71

~~a. Allow expansion of sewage treatment and distribution capacity only under the following circumstances: (1) only when existing capacity~~ Guide timing by allowing later phase(s) to begin when Phase I capacity has been consumed or will be consumed within the time period required to construct additional sewage treatment capacity; (2) only after considering the availability of other public works facilities, and establishing whether capacity increases would overburden the existing and probable future capacity of other public works facilities; and (3) only when the level of service (LOS) on Highways 1 and 92 is found to be at a minimum of LOS C except during the peak two-hour commuting period when LOS D is acceptable, and except during peak recreational hour when LOS E is acceptable, and only when substantial evidence and traffic studies substantiate that the LOS would be maintained at that level or better.

b. Projects to increase sewage collection, transmission, and storage capacity to prevent wet weather overflows only, are permitted notwithstanding traffic conditions on Highways 1 and 92 provided that the projects do not induce growth or increase the treatment capacity of the SAM plant or the total number of sewer connections made available by the SAM treatment plant expansion permitted by Coastal Commission CDP No. 1-94-111 as of the time of certification

c. Projects to upgrade the SAM treatment plant from secondary to tertiary treatment to provide recycled water to the existing Ocean Colony Golf Course (that currently utilizes wells), agricultural uses, and other Coastal Act priority uses are permitted notwithstanding traffic conditions on Highways 1 and 92 provided that the recycled water project does not induce growth, nor provide additional water connections to other commercial, residential, or industrial water users; or increase the treatment capacity of the SAM plant or the total number of sewer connections made available by the SAM treatment plant expansion permitted by Coastal Commission CDP No. 1-94-111 as of the time of certification.

~~ec. Establish the capacity by: (1) estimating the sewage treatment capacity needed to serve the land use plan at buildout, (2) considering the availability of related public works and whether expansion of the sewage treatment capacity would overburden the existing and probable future capacity of other public works, and (3) considering the availability of funds.~~ Sewage treatment, collection, storage, and transmission projects shall be consistent with the following standards:

1. Maximum Capacity. The maximum service capacity of the project shall not induce growth inconsistent with the protection of coastal resources and public access and recreation opportunities and will assure that untreated wastewater will not be discharged into any coastal waters including streams, wetlands, and the marine environment.

2. Priority Uses. The project shall demonstrate that sewage treatment capacity is available and allocations are reserved for Coastal Act priority uses.

3. Other Public Service Capacities. The maximum level of development supported by the project shall not exceed that supported by other existing and probable future public services, including water supply and road capacity. The project shall not induce growth

Attachment 1

San Mateo County Midcoast Update LCP Amendments Coastal Commission Staff's Suggested Modifications Page 20 of 71

beyond that level necessary to maintain acceptable road Levels of Service and circulation to protect coastal access and recreation opportunities, and provide for public safety (e.g., fire evacuation).

4. **Siting.** The project shall be sited and designed to minimize impacts to visual resources, prevent degradation of sensitive habitats, and shall be consistent with all applicable policies of the LCP.

Suggested Modification No. 15:

~~2.19 Phase I Capacity Allocations~~

- ~~a. Require, as a condition of permit approval, that the Phase I capacity be allocated as follows:~~
- ~~(1) .6 mgd adwf to the Granada Sanitary District and~~
 - ~~(2) .4 mgd adwf to the Montara Sanitary District until the City of Half Moon Bay's Local Coastal Program is certified.~~
- ~~b. After certification of the City of Half Moon Bay's Local Coastal Program, and receipt from the City the information requested in 2.19(f), the allocations in 2.19(a) shall be amended so that capacity is allocated among the member agencies in proportion to the member agencies' respective service needs as identified in both the County and City certified Local Coastal Programs.~~
- ~~c. Service need shall be defined as the ultimate need for sewage treatment capacity required to implement the buildout of the entire Land Use Plan portion of the City and County Local Coastal Programs.~~
- ~~d. Need for the Granada and Montara Sanitary Districts shall be as shown on Tables 2.3 and 2.4 as amended to reflect changes in the Land Use Plan since they were prepared.~~
- ~~e. Amend Tables 2.3 and 2.4 whenever all amendments to the certified Land Use Plan which affect these tables are approved by the Coastal Commission.~~
- ~~f. Request the City of Half Moon Bay to submit information to the County on the: (1) population, dwelling units and acreages of non-residential land uses permitted at buildout of their land use plan and (2) sewage generation factors used to estimate need for sewage treatment capacity at buildout.~~
- ~~g. Allow consideration of amendments to the sewage treatment allocations whenever an amendment to the certified City or County Local Coastal Programs is approved by the Coastal Commission.~~

Suggested Modification No. 16 – Reserving sewer capacity for priority use:

2.21 Reservation of Capacity for Priority Land Uses

- a. Reserve sewage treatment capacity for each land use given priority by the Coastal Act or the Local Coastal Program. These priority uses are shown on Table 2.7. Amend this table to reflect all changes in the Land Use Plan which affect these priority land uses.
- b. Where existing or planned sewage treatment facilities can accommodate only a limited amount of new development, services to Coastal Act priority uses listed on Table 2.7 shall have priority over Local Coastal Program priority uses listed on Table 2.7.

Attachment 1

San Mateo County Midcoast Update LCP Amendments Coastal Commission Staff's Suggested Modifications Page 21 of 71

~~b. For each phase of sewage treatment facility development reserve capacity adequate to allow each priority land use to develop to the percent of buildout allowed by the phase.~~

c. Allow capacity to be reallocated to non-priority land uses in accordance with Policy 2.8.

Suggested Modification No. 17 – Private septic systems:

2.24.1 Private septic systems shall be prohibited within the urban services line of the Midcoast unless authorized pursuant to a groundwater management plan incorporated into the LCP.

Suggested Modification No. 18 – Delete outdated water supply policy:

~~2.25 Phase I Capacity Limits~~

~~Require that Phase I capacity not exceed the water supply which: (1) serves the development which can be sewered by the Phase I 2.0 mgd adwf sewer capacity allocated for Mid-Coast areas within the urban boundary and (2) meets the documented needs of floriculturalists within the existing Coastside County Water District Service Area. Use recent data on the amount of water consumed by land use to determine the actual water supply capacity allowed.~~

Suggested Modification No. 19 – Monitoring water consumption:

~~2.26 Monitoring of Phase I~~Require that the water service providers, presently Coastside County Water

District (CCWD) and the ~~Citizens Utilities Company (CUC)~~ Montara Water and Sanitary District (MWSD), monitor: (1) the actual amount of water consumption by land use, and (2) the rate of growth of new development. Require them to submit an annual data report to the County summarizing the results of this monitoring.

Suggested Modification No. 20 – Expansion of water supply:

~~2.27 Timing and Capacity of Later Phases~~ Expansion of Water Supply and Distribution Capacity

~~a. Use the results of Phase I monitoring to determine the timing and capacity of later phase(s).~~

~~b. Guide timing by allowing later phase(s) to begin when Phase I capacity~~

a. Allow expansion of water supply, service connections, and water treatment and distribution capacity to serve new development only under the following circumstances: (1) when existing capacity has been consumed or will be consumed within the time required to construct additional water supply capacity; (2) after considering the availability of other public works facilities, and establishing whether capacity increases would overburden the existing and probable future capacity of other public works facilities; and (3) only when the level of service (LOS) on Highways 1 and 92 is found to be at a minimum of LOS C except during the peak two-hour commuting period when LOS D is acceptable, and except during peak recreational hours when LOS E is acceptable, and only when substantial evidence and traffic studies substantiate that the LOS would be maintained at that level or better.

Attachment 1

San Mateo County Midcoast Update LCP Amendments Coastal Commission Staff's Suggested Modifications Page 22 of 71

b. Supplemental water supply projects to serve urban development served by private wells that exist as of the date of this amendment certification shall be permitted notwithstanding traffic conditions on Highways 1 and 92, but only when existing capacity has been consumed.

c. Supplemental water supply projects shall be consistent with the following standards:

(1) The maximum service capacity of the project will not induce growth inconsistent with the protection of coastal resources and public access and recreation opportunities.

(2) The project shall assure that water withdrawals from surface streams and groundwater will be sufficiently limited to protect: (i) adequate instream flows necessary to support sensitive species and other riparian/wetland habitats; (ii) underlying groundwater aquifers; and (iii) agricultural resources.

(3) The project shall demonstrate that water capacity is available and allocations are reserved for Coastal Act priority uses.

(4) The project shall demonstrate that water storage and delivery systems will be adequate to meet the fire safety and other public health and safety needs of new development supported by the project, consistent with the protection of other coastal resources.

(5) The maximum level of development supported by the project shall not exceed that supported by the existing and probable future capacity of other public services, including wastewater treatment capacity and road capacity. The project shall not induce growth beyond that level necessary to maintain acceptable road Levels of Service and circulation to protect coastal access and recreation opportunities, and provide for public safety (e.g., fire evacuation).

(6) The project shall demonstrate that it is an element (where economically and environmentally appropriate) of a balanced water supply portfolio that also includes other supply alternatives, including conservation and water recycling to the maximum extent practicable.

(7) The project shall minimize the use of energy.

(8) The project shall be sited and designed to minimize impacts to visual resources and shall be consistent with all applicable policies of the LCP.

~~e. Establish the capacity by: (1) estimating the water supply capacity needed to serve the land use plan at buildout, (2) considering the availability of related public works and whether expansion of the water supply would overburden the existing and probable future capacity of other public works and (3) considering the availability of funds.~~

Suggested Modification No. 21 – Desalination:

2.28 Desalination

Attachment 1

San Mateo County Midcoast Update LCP Amendments

Coastal Commission Staff's Suggested Modifications

Page 23 of 71

Any proposed desalination plants shall require a coastal development permit and an amendment to this LCP.

Desalination facilities must:

a. Provide public services;

b. Avoid or fully mitigate any adverse environmental impacts to coastal resources;

c. Be consistent with all LCP and Coastal Act policies, including those for concentrating development, supporting priority coastal uses, and protecting significant scenic and habitat resources;

d. Be designed and sized based upon adopted community planning documents, which may include General Plans, Urban Water Management Plans, Regional Water Supply Plans, Local Coastal Programs, and other approved plans that integrate local or regional planning, growth, and water supply/demand projections;

e. Use technologies that are energy-efficient. Estimates of the projected annual energy use and the environmental impacts that will result from this energy production, and evidence of compliance with air pollution control laws for emissions from the electricity generation, shall be submitted with permit applications;

f. Use, where feasible, sub-surface feedwater intakes (e.g., beach wells) instead of open pipelines from the ocean, where they will not cause significant adverse impacts to either beach topography or potable groundwater supplies;

g. Use technologies and processes that eliminate or minimize the discharges of hazardous constituents into the ocean and ensure that the least environmentally damaging options for feedwater treatment and cleaning of plant components are selected. Opportunities for combining brine discharges with other discharges (e.g., from a sewage treatment facility or power plant) should be considered and the least environmentally damaging alternative pursued. Applicants should provide information necessary to determine the potential impacts to marine resources from the proposed intake and discharge. Obtaining this information may require new or updated engineering, modeling and biological studies, or in some cases may be obtained from pre-operational monitoring, monitoring results from other desalination facilities, and pilot studies conducted before building a full-scale facility;

h. Be designed and limited to assure that any water supplies made available as a direct or indirect result of the project will accommodate needs generated by development or uses consistent with the kinds, location and densities specified in the LCP and Coastal Act, including priority uses as required by Coastal Act Section 30254, and;

i. Be an element (where economically and environmentally appropriate) of a balanced water supply portfolio that also includes conservation and water recycling to the maximum extent practicable.

Suggested Modification No. 22 – Delete outdated:

~~2.28 Phase I Capacity Allocations~~

~~Require, as a condition of permit approval, that the Phase I capacity to a particular area does not exceed the proportion of buildout that Phase I sewage treatment allocations permit.~~

Suggested Modification No. 23 – Reserving priority water capacity:

Attachment 1

San Mateo County Midcoast Update LCP Amendments Coastal Commission Staff's Suggested Modifications Page 24 of 71

2.29 Reservation of Capacity for Priority Land Uses

a. Reserve water supplies for each land use given priority by the Coastal Act or the Local Coastal Program. These priority uses are shown on Table

2.17. Amend this table to reflect all changes in the Land Use Plan which affect these land uses.

b. For ~~each phase of each~~ water supply and distribution expansion that is permitted, ~~development, adequate capacity adequate to allow each~~ for priority land uses shall be reserved consistent with LCP Table 2.17 to develop to the percent of buildout allowed by the phase, before offering additional capacity to non-priority land uses in accordance with Policy 2.8.

~~c. Allow capacity to be reallocated to non-priority land uses in accordance with Policy 2.8.~~

c. Where existing or planned public water facilities can accommodate only a limited amount of new development, services to the Coastal Act priority uses identified in Table 2.17 shall have priority over the Local Coastal Program priority uses identified in Table 2.17.

Suggested Modification No. 24 – water conservation:

2.31 Conservation

~~Encourage~~ Require water service providers to establish water conservation programs to reduce existing and future water consumption.

Suggested Modification No. 25 – Standards for groundwater production:

2.32 Groundwater Proposal

Require, if new or increased well production is proposed to increase supply consistent with LCP Policy 2.27, that:

a. Water quality be adequate, using blending if required, to meet the water standards of Policy 2.30.

b. Wells are installed under inspection according to the requirements of the State and County Department of Public Health.

c. The amount pumped be limited ~~to a safe yield factor which such that it does~~ will not impact water dependent sensitive species and habitats including streams, riparian habitats and wetlands marshes.

d. ~~Base the safe yield and~~ pumping restriction on studies conducted by a person agreed upon by the County and the applicant which shall: (1) prior to the granting of the permit, examine the geologic and hydrologic conditions of the site to determine ~~a preliminary safe yield the amount that may be pumped without which will not~~ adversely affecting a water dependent sensitive habitat or result in depletion of the aquifer; and (2) during the first [three] years, monitor the impact of the well on groundwater and surface water levels and water quality and plant species and animals of water dependent sensitive habitats to determine if the preliminary pumping restriction ~~safe yield~~ adequately protects the sensitive habitats and what measures should be taken if and when adverse effects occur.

e. If monitoring shows impacts to water-dependent sensitive habitats, the pumping rate shall be reduced until it is clear that such impacts will not occur.

Attachment 1

San Mateo County Midcoast Update LCP Amendments Coastal Commission Staff's Suggested Modifications Page 25 of 71

Suggested Modification No. 26 – Private wells:

2.33 Private wells shall be prohibited within the urban services line of the Midcoast until authorized pursuant to a groundwater management plan incorporated into the LCP.

Suggested Modification No. 27 – Delete outdated:

~~2.35 Pipeline Project Proposal~~

- ~~a. Require, if a pipeline to Crystal Springs or San Andreas Lake is proposed to increase water supplies, assurance from CCWD and the San Francisco Water Department of the long range availability of the water supply.~~
- ~~b. Require the phased development of pump stations and treatment facilities in accordance with Policy 2.25.~~
- ~~c. Require that the pipeline size not exceed the closest nominal size to what is required to carry peak daily demand at buildout.~~
- ~~d. Require that storage facilities be located consistent with LCP policies, particularly the Agricultural, Sensitive Habitats and Hazards Components.~~

Suggested Modification No. 28 – Required findings for water supply development:

2.36 Findings

Require, as a condition of permit approval for any facilities to increase water supply, that the following findings are made: (1) the addition of this water supply facility is consistent with ~~the Capacity Limits and Allocations of this Component~~ LUP Policies 2.27, 2.28, and 2.29, (2) storage is adequate to insure that sufficient emergency supply is available and any additional development allowed because of this increase in water supply will be served during dry summer months, (3) the development of this facility minimizes energy consumption and (4) the siting of this facility is consistent with LCP policies.

Suggested Modification No. 29 – Roadway capacity expansion:

2.48 Capacity Limits

- a. Limit expansion of roadways to capacity which does not exceed that needed to accommodate commuter peak period traffic when buildout of the Land Use Plan occurs and which does not exceed existing and probable future capacity of water and sewage treatment and transmission capacity or other wise conflict with other policies of the LCP.
- b. Use the requirements of commuter peak period traffic as the basis for determining appropriate increases in capacity.
- c. Ensure that any additional development that would be served/facilitated by the road expansion project does not exceed the development levels that the existing water supply and sewage treatment capability can serve.

Attachment 1

San Mateo County Midcoast Update LCP Amendments Coastal Commission Staff's Suggested Modifications Page 26 of 71

d. Maintain Highway 1 as scenic two-lane road outside the Urban Midcoast area depicted on LUP Map 1.3.

Suggested Modification No. 30 – Level of service:

2.49 Desired Level of Service

In assessing the need for road expansion and when assessing the traffic impacts of proposed developments, consider Service Level D acceptable during commuter peak periods and Service Level E acceptable during recreation peak periods.

1.2.2. Suggested Modification to County Proposed Exhibit I: Future of Devil's Slide Bypass Property

Suggested Modification No. 31 – Route 1 and 92 capacity/devil's slide bypass:

2.50 Route 1 and Route 92 ~~Phase I~~ Capacity Limits

- a. On Route 92, limit ~~Phase I~~ improvements to: (1) slow vehicle lanes on uphill grades, and (2) the following operational and safety improvements within the existing alignment or lands immediately adjacent: elimination of sharp curves, lane widening, turn pockets, wider shoulders to improve ~~allow~~ passage for bicycles and emergency vehicles and signals at major intersections.
- b. On Route 1, limit ~~Phase I~~ improvements to: (1) slow vehicle lanes on uphill grades and the following operational and safety improvements within the existing alignment or lands immediately adjacent: elimination of sharp curves, lane widening, lane reconfiguration, acceleration/deceleration lanes, wider shoulders to allow passage for bicycles emergency vehicles and signals at major intersections; (2) Additional traffic lanes in the Midcoast project area as depicted on Map 1.3, provided the additional lanes are found to be in compliance with all other applicable policies of the LCP, including, but not limited to, sensitive habitat and wetland protection policies; and (23) construction of a tunnel for motorized vehicles only behind Devil's Slide through San Pedro Mountain.

The tunnel design shall be consistent with (a) Coastal Act limits restricting Route 1 to a two-lane scenic highway, and (b) minimum State and federal tunnel standards. A separate trail for pedestrians and bicycles shall be provided outside the tunnel as specified in Policy 2.56a and 2.56b.

- e. ~~When CalTrans determines that the original Devil's Slide Bypass Alignment, also know as the "Adopted Alignment," between Sunshine Valley Road and McNee Ranch State Park, is no longer needed for highway purposes, i.e. as a right-of-way, the County will:~~

- ~~(1) Designate the former right-of-way as a Linear Park and Trail.~~
- ~~(2) Revise the zoning of the former right-of-way to implement the Linear Park and Trail designation.~~
- ~~(3) Permit existing roads which cross the former right-of-way to remain.~~

Attachment 1

San Mateo County Midcoast Update LCP Amendments Coastal Commission Staff's Suggested Modifications Page 27 of 71

- ~~(4) Permit water supply source and distribution facilities within the former right of way.~~

Suggested Modification No. 32 – Traffic monitoring:

2.52 ~~Phase I~~ Monitoring

- a. Require ~~during Phase I~~ that CalTrans monitor peak commuter period traffic and submit data reports to the County on the results of this monitoring, as a basis for documenting the need for increased roadway capacity, when a permit application is submitted.
- b. The County shall monitor the number and rate of new residential construction particularly in the rural Mid-Coast and its relation to levels of peak commuter period and recreation peak period traffic levels.
- c. Submit annual traffic monitoring reports to the Coastal Commission

Suggested Modification No. 33 – Capacity of roadway expansion:

2.53 ~~Timing and~~ Road Expansion Capacity of Later Phases

- ~~a. Use the results of Phase I monitoring to determine the timing and capacity of later phase(s).~~
- ~~b. Guide timing by allowing later phase(s) to begin when Phase I road capacity has been consumed or when actual traffic development shows that road capacities should be expanded.~~
- ~~c. Establish the capacity by of future road expansion projects by:~~ (1) estimating the road capacity needed to serve the land use plan at buildout, (2) considering the availability of related public works and whether expansion of the road capability would overburden the existing and probable future capacity of other public works, The additional development that would be served/facilitated by the road expansion project may not exceed the development levels that the existing and probable future water supply and sewage treatment capability can serve, (3) considering the availability of funds and (4) demonstrating that basic levels of public transit service have been met and the proposed improvement will not result in reduced public transit patronage; (5) ensuring that State Highway One in rural areas north of the Midcoast project boundary and south of the City of Half Moon Bay, shall remain a scenic two lane road.

Suggested Modification No. 34 – Roadway alignments:

2.54 Roadway Alignments

- a. For Routes 92 and 84, use the existing alignment when increasing roadway capacity, unless it can be proven physically and economically infeasible, or if use of the existing alignment would be environmentally more damaging than an alternative route.
- b. ~~For Route 1, allow construction of a tunnel behind Devil's Slide through San Pedro Mountain. The tunnel should be given high priority for federal and State highway funds. Until a tunnel is completed, the State should maintain and repair the road on the existing alignment. No part of Route 1 used by motor vehicles shall be built on any alignment that bisects Montara State Beach, including the "McNee Ranch Acquisition" except along the current Route 1 alignment. Any alternative to the tunnel, except the repair and reconstruction of the existing road, shall require approval by a majority of the voters of San Mateo.~~

Attachment 1

San Mateo County Midcoast Update LCP Amendments Coastal Commission Staff's Suggested Modifications Page 28 of 71

c. Require that the roadway improvements be consistent with all applicable policies of the Local Coastal Program, ~~particularly including, by not limited to,~~ the Sensitive Habitats and Agriculture Components.

Suggested Modification No. 35 – Preferential treatment for buses/shuttles:

2.55 Preferential Treatment for Buses

Require that CalTrans provide preferential treatment for buses and shuttles at congested locations, such as the intersection of Routes 1 and 92, in accordance with the Transit Policies of this Component.

1.2.3. Suggested Modification to County Proposed Exhibit K: Highway 1 Pedestrian Access

Suggested Modification No. 36 – Bicycle and Pedestrian Trails:

2.56 Improvements for Bicycle and Pedestrian Trails

a. Require, if funds are available, that CalTrans provide adjacent or separate facilities for bicycle and pedestrian trails in accordance with the policies of the Recreation and Visitor-Serving Facilities and Shoreline Access Components and the San Mateo County Comprehensive Bike-Routeways Plan (CCAG). ~~If a tunnel is constructed behind Devil's Slide, require as part of the project that CalTrans construct a bicycle and pedestrian trail outside the tunnel.~~ When the tunnel is completed behind Devil's Slide, assure that CalTrans provides for a multi-use bicycle and pedestrian trail and connections as part of the California Coastal Trail (CCT), consistent with the coastal development permit for the tunnel project.

b. ~~Require, as a minimum, that CalTrans provide adequate right of way on new or expanded roadways to allow the future development of bicycle and pedestrian trails in accordance with the policies of the Recreation and Visitor-Servicing Facilities Component and the County Bikeways Plan.~~ Upon the completion of all access improvements associated with the tunnel behind Devil's Slide, if there is no plan for an alternative transition of responsibility for managing the relinquished portion of Highway 1 that is slated to become part of the CCT, the County will accept Caltrans' relinquishment of the abandoned portion as a non-motorized trail and shall open and operate the trail and facilities 365 days a year. This CCT facility shall be incorporated into the San Mateo County Parks System and remain within that system until such time as responsibility for operation and maintenance of the access is transferred to an alternative permanent custodian.

c. ~~Through coordination with CalTrans, promote the development of a continuous Midcoast pedestrian/bicycle/multi-purpose path parallel to Highway 1 within the right of way.~~ The County will work with Caltrans, the State Coastal Conservancy, the Coastal

Attachment 1

San Mateo County Midcoast Update LCP Amendments

Coastal Commission Staff's Suggested Modifications

Page 29 of 71

Commission, State Parks, Golden Gate National Recreation Area, and other public agencies to ensure that a CCT trail alignment is developed and will continue from the southern terminus of the Devil's Slide Highway 1 relinquishment and link to other trail systems.

~~d. Through coordination with Caltrans, promote the development of above and below ground pedestrian crossings at the Midcoast locations along Highway 1 shown as "Proposed Safe Crossing" in the Midcoast Recreational Needs Assessment – Map 3.~~

Require, at a minimum, that CalTrans provide adequate right-of-way on new or improved roadways to allow the future development of bicycle and pedestrian trails in accordance with the policies of the Recreation and Visitor-Servicing Facilities and Shoreline Access Components and the San Mateo County Comprehensive Bike Route Plan (CCAG).

~~e. When warranted by the size of Highway 1 projects in the Midcoast, require that CalTrans:~~

~~(1) Develop a pedestrian/bicycle/multi-purpose path parallel to the portion of Highway 1 where the project is located, and/or~~

~~(1) At locations shown as proposed Safe Crossing" in the Midcoast Recreational Needs Assessment, develop an above or below ground pedestrian crossing. Through coordination with CalTrans, promote the development of a continuous Midcoast pedestrian/bicycle/multi-purpose path (or a system of single mode paths) parallel to Highway 1 consistent with the California Coastal Trail (CCT) Plan (Policy 10.37.A) and within the right-of-way when no other preferable CCT alignment is available.~~

f. Through coordination with CalTrans, promote the most appropriate, safe, feasible crossings, either at-grade, above- or below-ground pedestrian crossings at Midcoast locations along Highway 1, including those shown as "Proposed Safe Crossing" in the Midcoast Recreational Needs Assessment – Map 3.

g. Unless a suitable off-highway alternative already exists or is being provided, require that CalTrans incorporate the following as part of any new or improved roadway project:

(1) A continuous Midcoast pedestrian/bicycle/multi-purpose path (or a system of single mode paths) parallel to Highway 1 consistent with the California Coastal Trail (CCT) Plan (Policy 10.37.A) and within the right-of-way when no other preferable CCT alignment is available., and/or

(2) The most appropriate, safe, feasible crossings, either at-grade, above- or below-ground pedestrian crossings at Midcoast locations along Highway 1, including those shown as "Proposed Safe Crossing" in the Midcoast Recreational Needs Assessment – Map 3.

Suggested Modification No. 37 – Protecting roads for visitors:

Attachment 1

San Mateo County Midcoast Update LCP Amendments Coastal Commission Staff's Suggested Modifications Page 30 of 71

2.57 Protecting Road Capacity for Visitors through Transportation System Management Techniques

- a. Use the following transportation system management techniques to maximize the efficiency and effectiveness of existing roadways during recreation peak periods and protect road capacity for visitors: (1) recommend that the State Highway Patrol enforce illegal parking regulations along Route 1 and in emergency pullouts on peak weekends and holidays; (2) recommend that CalTrans install left turn storage lanes at all parking lots (25 spaces or greater) along the shoreline; (3) ~~minimize the number of prohibit~~ new road or driveway connections to Routes 1 and 92 in the Midcoast area as shown on Map 1.3 which do not serve recreation facilities unless there is no other feasible alternative; ~~and~~ (4) ~~minimize the number of new road or driveway connections to Route 1, 92, and 84 in rural areas which do not serve recreation facilities; and~~ (54) orient local commercial and community facilities away from Highways 1 and 92.
- b. Recommend to the City of Half Moon Bay that it prohibit the location of local commercial or community facilities on Route 92 and on Route 1, within a half mile of Route 92.
- c. Monitor the peak recreation period traffic to determine whether the above techniques are successful and whether new residential development is consuming road capacity needed for visitors.

1.2.4. Suggested Modification to County Proposed Exhibit H: Midcoast Traffic Mitigation Measures

Suggested Modification No. 38 – Traffic Mitigation

~~2.51~~ Traffic Mitigation

~~In the Midcoast LCP Update Project Area, as shown on Map 1.3, require Transportation Demand Management (TDM) measures for new development which generates a net increase of more than 50 peak hour trips per hour at any time during the a.m. or p.m. peak period. TDM measures can include establishing a shuttle service, subsidizing transit for employees, charging for parking, establishing a carpool or vanpooling program, having a compressed work week, providing bicycle storage facilities and showers, or establishing a day care program.~~

2.57.1 Traffic Mitigation for all Development

In the urban Midcoast, require new development as defined in Section 30106 of the Coastal Act, that generates any net increase in vehicle trips on Highways 1 and 92, except single family residential development and visitor serving uses to develop and implement a traffic impact analysis and mitigation plan (TIMP). Prior to the approval of any coastal development permit application involving the above, information necessary for the analysis and implementation of all

Attachment 1

San Mateo County Midcoast Update LCP Amendments Coastal Commission Staff's Suggested Modifications Page 31 of 71

components of the TIMP shall be submitted in support of any CDP application. Calculation of new vehicle trips generated shall assume maximum occupancy/use of any approved development. The TIMP shall include:

- a. Traffic mitigation measures, including but not limited to transportation demand management (TDM) measures set forth by the City/County Association of Governments (CCAG), lot retirement or merger of lots of record (as described in subsection (c) below), establishing a shuttle service for employees of the subject development, subsidizing transit for employees of the specific development, charging for non-public access parking, establishing a carpool or vanpooling program for employees of the subject development, having a compressed work week for employees of the subject development, providing bicycle storage facilities and showers for employees of the subject development, and establishing a day care program for employees of the subject development. Prior to approval of the Coastal Development Permit the County shall find that the proposed mitigation measures reduce all new vehicle trips generated by the project to the maximum extent feasible.
- b. Specific provisions to assess, and mitigate for, the project's significant adverse cumulative impacts on public access to, and recreational use of, the beaches of the Mid-coast region of San Mateo County. This shall include an assessment of project impacts combined with other projects causing related impacts, including all reasonably foreseeable future projects as defined in 14 CCR § 15130(b). Public access and recreation mitigation measures to consider include: providing public access parking that is not time restricted, public access signage indicating that public access parking is available, providing a public recreation shuttle bus to all the beaches during key recreational use times that commences at the junction of Highway 92 and 280, dedication of construction of various public access improvements such as bikeways, and vertical and lateral public paths to and along the beaches and/or bluffs.
- c. **Land Divisions.** Mitigation measures for all land divisions shall include lot retirement or merger, as described in Subsections (1) and (2) below:
 - (1) **Lot Retirement:**
 - i. Prior to issuance of the coastal development permit, the applicant shall submit evidence, for the review and approval of Community Development Director, that the development rights have been permanently extinguished on the number of existing legal lots equal to the number of lots to be developed such that the development of property authorized shall not result in a net increase of residential development within the Midcoast project area as depicted on Map 1.3. The development rights on the lots shall be extinguished only in the Midcoast Region of San Mateo County, an area that is generally depicted on Map 1.3 and that is primarily served by the segment of Highway 1 between its intersection with Highway 92 and Devil's Slide and/or by the segment of Highway 92 west of Highway 280. Each mitigation lot shall be an existing legal lot or combination of

Attachment 1

San Mateo County Midcoast Update LCP Amendments Coastal Commission Staff's Suggested Modifications Page 32 of 71

contiguous lots in common ownership and shall be zoned to allow development of a detached single-family residence. The legality of each mitigation lot shall be demonstrated by the issuance of a Certificate of Compliance by the City or County consistent with the applicable standards of the certified LCP and other applicable law.

ii. For each development right extinguished in satisfaction of c(1) of this policy, the applicant shall, prior to issuance of the coastal development permit execute and record a document, in a form and content acceptable to the Community Development Director, irrevocably offering to dedicate to a public agency or private association approved by the Executive Director an open space or scenic easement to preserve the open space and scenic values present on the property that is the source of the development right being extinguished and to prevent the significant adverse cumulative impact to vehicular traffic levels and public access to the coast that would result as a consequence of development of the property for residential use. Such easement shall include a legal description of the entire property that is the source of the development right being extinguished. The recorded document shall also reflect that development in the easement area is restricted as set forth in this permit condition. Each offer shall be recorded free of prior liens and encumbrances that the Executive Director determines may affect the interest being conveyed. The offer shall run with the land in favor of the People of the State of California, binding all successors and assigns, and shall be irrevocable for a period of 21 years, such period running from the date of recording.

iii. For each development right extinguished in satisfaction of c(1)(ii) of this policy, the applicant shall, prior to issuance of the coastal development permit, also execute and record a deed restriction, in a form and content acceptable to the Community Development Director, requiring the applicant to combine the property that is the source of the development right being extinguished with an adjacent already developed lot or with an adjacent lot that could demonstrably be developed consistent with the applicable certified local coastal program. The deed restriction shall include legal descriptions of all combined and individual lots affected by the deed restriction. The deed restriction shall run with the land, binding all successors and assigns, and shall be recorded free of prior liens and encumbrances that the Community Development Director determines may affect the enforceability of the restriction. This deed restriction shall not be removed or changed without an amendment to the coastal development permit.

iv. As an alternative to the method described in subsection c(1)(ii) and (iii) above, the applicant may instead, prior to issuance of the coastal development permit, purchase existing legal lots that satisfy the criteria in

Attachment 1

San Mateo County Midcoast Update LCP Amendments Coastal Commission Staff's Suggested Modifications Page 33 of 71

subsection c(1)(i) above and, subject to the review and approval of the Community Development Director, dedicate such lots in fee to a public or private land management agency approved by the Community Development Director for permanent public recreational or natural resource conservation purposes.

2. Lot Merger

i. Prior to issuance of the coastal development permit, the applicant shall submit evidence, for the review and approval of Community Development Director, that contiguously owned lots, equal to the number of lots to be developed, are merged such that the development of property authorized shall not result in a net increase of residential development within the Midcoast project area as depicted on Map 1.3. The lots shall be merged only in the Midcoast project area. Each merged lot shall be an existing legal lot or combination of contiguous lots in common ownership and shall be zoned to allow development of a detached single-family residence. The legality of each merged lot shall be demonstrated by the issuance of a Certificate of Compliance by the City or County consistent with the applicable standards of the certified LCP and other applicable law. For each lot merger, the applicant shall, prior to issuance of the coastal development permit, also execute and record a deed restriction, in a form and content acceptable to the Community Development Director, requiring the applicant to combine the lot(s) to be merged with an adjacent already developed lot or with an adjacent lot that could demonstrably be developed consistent with the applicable certified local coastal program. The deed restriction shall include legal descriptions of all combined and individual lots affected by the deed restriction. The deed restriction shall run with the land, binding all successors and assigns, and shall be recorded free of prior liens and encumbrances that the Community Development Director determines may affect the enforceability of the restriction. This deed restriction shall not be removed or changed without an amendment to the coastal development permit.

Suggested Modification No. 39- Transportation Management Plan:

2.57.2 Transportation Management Plan

Develop a comprehensive transportation management plan to address the cumulative traffic impacts of residential development on roads and highways in the entire Midcoast, including the City of Half Moon Bay. The Plan shall be based on the results of a County-commissioned study that identifies the total cumulative traffic impact of projected new development at LCP buildout and shall propose specific LCP policies designed to offset the demand for all new vehicle trips generated by the project on Highway One, Highway 92, and relevant local streets, during commuter peak periods and peak recreation periods and mitigate for, residential development's

Attachment 1

San Mateo County Midcoast Update LCP Amendments Coastal Commission Staff's Suggested Modifications Page 34 of 71

significant adverse cumulative impacts on public access to, and recreational use of, the beaches of the Mid-coast region of San Mateo County.

The Plan shall thoroughly evaluate the feasibility of developing an in-lieu fee traffic mitigation program, the expansion of public transit, including buses and shuttles, development of a lot retirement program, and development of a mandatory lot merger program.

1.2.5. Suggested Modifications to County Proposed Exhibit C: Updated Estimated of Sewage Treatment Demand

Suggested Modification No. 40 – Sewage treatment demand table:

TABLE 2.3

~~Original Sewage Generation Estimate (1980)~~

TABLE 2.3 ESTIMATE OF SEWAGE GENERATION FROM BUILDOUT OF LOCAL COASTAL PROGRAM LAND USE PLAN MONTARA SANITARY DISTRICT				
Land Use	Number of Acres	Number of People	Sewage Generation Factor¹	Sewage Generation (GPD)
<u>MONTARA MOSS BEACH</u>				
<u>RESIDENTIAL²</u>				
Developed ³	-	3,607		252,400-360,700
Single Family	-	(3,523)	70-100 g/d/e	
Multi Family ²	-	(84)	70-100 g/d/e	
Undeveloped	-	3,825		267,750-382,500
Single Family	-	(3,540)	70-100 g/d/e	
Multi Family	-	(276)	70-100 g/d/e	
<u>COMMERCIAL⁴</u>				
Developed	1.05	-		1,580
Retail	(0.40)	-	2,000 gal/acre	(800)
Recreation	(0.65)	-	1,200 gal/acre	(780)

Attachment 1

San Mateo County Midcoast Update LCP Amendments Coastal Commission Staff's Suggested Modifications Page 35 of 71

Undeveloped	11.14	-		21,870
Retail	(10.32)	-	2,000 gal/acre	(20,640)
Recreation	(0.82)	-	1,500 gal/acre	(1,230)
INDUSTRIAL⁴				
Developed	-	-		-
Marine-Related	-	-		-
General	-	-		-
Undeveloped	42.60	-		-
Marine-Related	(0.00)	-		-
General	(42.60)	-	1,250 gal/acre	53,250
PUBLIC RECREATION				
Parks and Beaches	-	405 ⁶		4,080 ⁶
TOTAL				601,020-823,980

NOTES:

1. ~~Unless otherwise indicated, sewage generation factors are based on Resources Engineering and Management's Draft Phase II Report - Granada Sanitary District Master Plan Study, March, 1979.~~
2. ~~The Midcoast Buildout in the Locating and Planning New Development Component is the source for the number of dwelling units and household size which is: Single Family 2.6 and Multiple Family 2.1 persons per household.~~
3. ~~Based on assumption that 99% of the existing 180,000 gpd Montara Sanitary District flows are generated by developed residences. A 4% increase was added to the existing flows for increasing sewage generation at buildout.~~
4. ~~Commercial and industrial acreages based on planimeter measurements of the LCP Land Use Plan.~~
5. ~~Based on the number of projected annual visitors to Montara State Beach divided by 365 to estimate an average day.~~
6. ~~Based on estimates of sewage generation for beach and tourist restrooms developed by Williams, Kuebelbeck and Associates, Inc., for the Environmental Impact Statement on the Pillar Point Project.~~

Attachment 1

San Mateo County Midcoast Update LCP Amendments Coastal Commission Staff's Suggested Modifications Page 36 of 71

- ~~7. This table reflects the second units that are permitted in R-1 Coastal Zoning Districts. It is estimated that 299 persons would be housed in second units located in this area based on a household size estimate of 1.410 persons per second unit as derived using standards for a one-bedroom duplex from the U.S. Department of Commerce and Housing and Urban Development, Annual Housing Survey, 1977.~~

b. Updated Sewage Generation Estimate (2006)

The following is an estimate of Midcoast sewage generation at buildout, which includes the Montara Water and Sanitary District component. The wastewater treatment provider for the unincorporated Midcoast is Sewer Authority Mid-Coastside (SAM), serving the Montara Water and Sanitary District and Granada Sanitary District. Residential sewage treatment demand in the Sewer Authority Mid-Coastside service area is for 2001 was approximately 66.8 85 gallons per day per person. The sewage treatment demand for Midcoast non-residential uses is estimated as follows:

<u>Neighborhood Commercial (C-1)</u>	<u>2,000 gallons per acre per day</u>
<u>Commercial Recreation (CCR)</u>	<u>1,500 gallons per acre per day</u>
<u>Waterfront (W)</u>	<u>2,000 gallons per acre per day</u>
<u>Light Industrial (M-1)</u>	<u>2,000 gallons per acre per day</u>
<u>Institutional</u>	<u>500 gallons per acre per day</u>

Residential Use

The estimated Midcoast residential buildout to be served by sewers is as follows:

<u>R-1 zoned areas</u>	<u>4,804 units</u>
<u>R-3 zoned areas</u>	<u>443 units</u>
<u>R-3-A zoned areas</u>	<u>513 units</u>
<u>C-1 and CCR Zoning Districts</u>	<u>99-495 units</u>
<u>Second Units</u>	<u>466 units</u>
<u>Caretaker's Quarters</u>	<u>45 units</u>
<u>Mobile Home Park</u>	<u>227 units</u>
<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>6,597-6,993 units</u> *
* <u>Excludes 160 units on RM-CZ and PAD zoned Midcoast parcels; most of which are assumed will not connect to a sewage treatment facility.</u>	

Attachment 1

San Mateo County Midcoast Update LCP Amendments Coastal Commission Staff's Suggested Modifications Page 37 of 71

For the purposes of this study, the estimated residential buildout is 6,993 units (this number could increase to a maximum buildout of 9,553 units if contiguously owned substandard lots are not merged or retired).

Census 2000 showed average Midcoast household size as 2.78 persons per household. Based on the residential sewage treatment demand figure above (66.8 85 gdp), the estimated sewer treatment capacity needed to serve Midcoast residential buildout is 1.65 million gallons per day.

Non-Residential Uses

The area designated for non-residential sewage treatment demanding uses in the Midcoast is as follows:

<u>Land Use/Zoning</u>	<u>Acres</u>
Neighborhood Commercial (C-1)	<u>24</u>
Commercial Recreation (CCR)	<u>45</u>
Waterfront (W)	<u>39</u>
Light Industrial (M-1)	<u>47</u>
Institutional	<u>49</u>

~~Based on the non-residential sewage treatment demand figures above.~~ The sewage treatment capacity needed to serve non-residential uses at buildout is as follows:

<u>Land Use/Zoning</u>	<u>Gallons per Day</u>
Neighborhood Commercial (C-1)	<u>48,000</u>
Commercial Recreation (CCR)	<u>67,500</u>
Waterfront (W)	<u>78,000</u>
Light Industrial (M-1)	<u>94,000</u>
Institutional	<u>24,500</u>
<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>311,000</u>

The sewage treatment capacity needed to serve non-residential buildout is 0.31 million gallons per day.

Combined Residential and Non-Residential Uses at Buildout

The total sewage treatment capacity needed to serve combined residential and non-residential Midcoast buildout is 1.9664 million gallons per day.

Attachment 1

San Mateo County Midcoast Update LCP Amendments Coastal Commission Staff's Suggested Modifications Page 38 of 71

...

1.2.6. Suggested Modifications to County Proposed Exhibit D: Updated Estimate of Midcoast Water Consumption

Suggested Modification No. 41 – Water consumption table:

TABLE 2.9

~~Original Water Consumption Estimate (1980)~~

TABLE 2.9 ESTIMATE OF WATER CONSUMPTION DEMAND FROM BUILDOUT OF LAND USE PLAN CITIZENS UTILITY COMPANY				
Land Use	Number of Acres ¹	Number of People	Water Generation Factor	Water Generation (GPD)
MONTARA MOSS BEACH				
RESIDENTIAL				
Developed	--	3,607	93-134 g/d/c	335,550-483,300
Single-Family	--	(3,523)		--
Multi-Family	--	(84)		--
Undeveloped	--	3,825	93-134 g/d/c	355,700-512,600
Single-Family⁶	--	(3,549)		--
Multi-Family	--	(276)		--
COMMERCIAL²				
Developed	4.05	--		2,000
Retail	(0.40)	--	2,000 gal/acre	(1,000)
Recreation	(0.65)	--	1,500 gal/acre	(1,000)
Undeveloped	11.14	--		27,400
Retail	(10.32)	--	2,500 gal/acre	(25,800)
Recreation	(0.82)	--	1,900 gal/acre	(1,600)
INDUSTRIAL²				
Undeveloped	42.60	--		85,200

Attachment 1

San Mateo County Midcoast Update LCP Amendments

Coastal Commission Staff's Suggested Modifications

Page 39 of 71

Marine-Related General	(0.00) (42.60)	- -	2,000 gal/acre	- (85,200)
<u>PUBLIC RECREATION²</u>				
Parks and Beaches	-	408 ³	11.5 gal/day/capita	4,700
FLORICULTURE	-	-		40,000 ⁴
Developed	-	-		(20,000)
Expansion	-	-	100% increase	(20,000)
<u>INSTITUTIONS⁵</u>				
Developed	-	-		13,600
TOTAL				864,100- 1,168,000

NOTES:

- ~~Commercial and industrial acreages based on planimeter measurements of the LCP Land Use Plan.~~
- ~~Water generation factors for commercial, industrial and public recreation uses derived from estimates of sewage generation in the sewer section of this component and the estimates of the relation between sewage generation and water consumption by Williams, Kuebelbeck and Associates, Inc., in the Pillar Point Harbor Project Environmental Impact Report. A 15% system loss is included.~~
- ~~Based on an estimate of average daily visitors to Montara State Beach at buildout.~~
- ~~Estimate of CUC existing floricultural usage, projected to expand 100% at buildout.~~
- ~~Institutions include schools and convalescent homes. School equals about 1,200 gpd (Farallone). The rest is a convalescent home. Expansion at buildout assumes a 35% increase for schools, assuming a probable year round system with the potential to accommodate about 35% more children than the system now serves.~~
- ~~This table reflects the second units that are permitted in R-1 Coastal Zoning Districts. It is estimated that 299 persons would be housed in second units located in this area based on a household size estimate of 1,410 persons per second unit as derived using standards for a one bedroom duplex from the U.S. Department of Commerce and Housing and Urban Development, Annual Housing Survey, 1977.~~

Attachment 1

San Mateo County Midcoast Update LCP Amendments Coastal Commission Staff's Suggested Modifications Page 40 of 71

Updated Water Consumption Estimate (2006)

Montara Water and Sanitary District

The following is an estimate of water consumption at buildout for Midcoast properties served by the Montara Water and Sanitary District (MWSD). Based on 2001 and 2002 Midcoast water consumption data, annual average residential water consumption is assumed to be 87 gallons per day per person. Peak day consumption is generally 1.8 x annual average water consumption.

Non-residential water consumption is estimated as follows:

<u>Neighborhood Commercial (C-1)</u>	<u>2,000 gallons per acre per day</u>
<u>Commercial Recreation (CCR)</u>	<u>1,500 gallons per acre per day</u>
<u>Waterfront (W)</u>	<u>2,000 gallons per acre per day</u>
<u>Light Industrial (M-1)</u>	<u>2,000 gallons per acre per day</u>
<u>Institutional</u>	<u>500 gallons per acre per day</u>

Residential Use

The portion of Midcoast residential buildout expected to be served by a water supply utility is 6,993 units (this number could increase to a maximum buildout of 9,553 units if contiguously owned substandard lots are not merged or retired). Census 2000 showed average Midcoast household size as 2.78 persons per household. Based on the residential water consumption figure above (87 gdp), the estimated water supply capacity needed to serve Midcoast residential buildout is 1.69 million gallons per day (annual average consumption).

Utility service area maps show that MWSD serves approximately 47.4% of the Midcoast water supply area. The water supply capacity needed for the Montara Water and Sanitary District to serve residential buildout is at least 0.80 million gallons per day (annual average) and 1.44 million gallons per day (peak day).

Non-Residential Uses

The acreage of non-residential water consuming uses served is as follows:

<u>Land Use/Zoning</u>	<u>Acres</u>
<u>Neighborhood Commercial (C-1)</u>	<u>9</u>
<u>Commercial Recreation (CCR)</u>	<u>4</u>
<u>Waterfront (W)</u>	<u>8</u>

Attachment 1**San Mateo County Midcoast Update LCP Amendments
Coastal Commission Staff's Suggested Modifications
Page 41 of 71**

<u>Light Industrial (M-1)</u>	<u>47</u>
<u>Institutional</u>	<u>31</u>

Based on the non-residential water consumption figures above, the water supply capacity needed for MWSD to serve each non-residential use at buildout is as follows:

<u>Land Use/Zoning</u>	<u>Gallons Per Day</u>
<u>Neighborhood Commercial (C-1)</u>	<u>18,000</u>
<u>Commercial Recreation (CCR)</u>	<u>6,000</u>
<u>Waterfront (W)</u>	<u>20,000</u>
<u>Light Industrial (M-1)</u>	<u>94,000</u>
<u>Institutional</u>	<u>15,500</u>
<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>153,500</u>

Combined Residential and Non-Residential Demand at Buildout

Taking into account 14% percent of system losses and the potential development of substandard lots if they are not merged or retired as anticipated, the total annual average water supply capacity needed for the Montara Water and Sanitary District to serve combined residential and non-residential buildout is at least ~~0.95~~ 1.08 million gallons per day.

The total peak day water supply capacity needed for the Montara Water and Sanitary District to serve combined residential and non-residential buildout is ~~1.72~~ 1.96 million gallons per day.

Attachment 1

San Mateo County Midcoast Update LCP Amendments

Coastal Commission Staff's Suggested Modifications

Page 42 of 71

TABLE 2.10

Original Water Consumption Estimate (1980)

TABLE 2.10 ESTIMATE OF WATER CONSUMPTION DEMAND FROM BUILDOUT OF LAND USE PLAN COASTSIDE COUNTY WATER DISTRICT WITHIN COUNTY JURISDICTION				
Land Use	Number of Acres	Number of People	Water Generation Factor	Water Generation (GPD)
<u>EL GRANADA PRINCETON</u>				
<u>RESIDENTIAL</u>				
Developed	-	3,400	93-134 g/d/e	316,200-455,600
Single-Family	-	-		-
Multi-Family	-	-		-
Undeveloped	-	5,193	93-134 g/d/e	482,900-695,900
Single-Family ⁶	-	(4,042)		
Multi-Family	-	(1,151)		
<u>COMMERCIAL^{1,2}</u>				
Developed	6.00	-		14,600
Retail	(4.25)	-	2,500 gal/acre	(10,600)
Recreation	(2.65)	-	1,500 gal/acre	(4,000)
Undeveloped	57.20	-		148,580
Retail	(14.70)	-	4,700 gal/acre	(68,100)
Recreation	(42.50)	-	1,900 gal/acre	(80,750)
<u>INDUSTRIAL^{1,2}</u>				
Developed	11.00	-		27,500
Marine-Related	(11.00)	-	2,500 gal/acre	(27,500)
General	(0.00)	-		-
Undeveloped	29.29	-		73,225
Marine-Related	(29.29)	-	2,500 gal/acre	(73,225)
General	(0.00)	-		-

Attachment 1

San Mateo County Midcoast Update LCP Amendments

Coastal Commission Staff's Suggested Modifications

Page 43 of 71

<u>ESSENTIAL PUBLIC SERVICES</u>				
Developed ⁵	--	--		<u>1,700</u>
Undeveloped	--	--		<u>6,425</u>
<u>PUBLIC RECREATION²</u>				
Parks and Beaches	--	<u>318³</u>	11.5 gal/day/capita	<u>3,700</u>
<u>FLORICULTURE⁴</u>				
Developed	--	--		<u>230,000</u>
Expansion	--	--		<u>(60,000)</u>
	--	--		<u>(170,000)</u>
TOTAL				<u>1,306,100-</u> <u>1,658,500</u>

NOTES:

- ~~1. Commercial and industrial acreages based on planimeter measurements of the LCP Land Use Plan. These figures, as revised in 1991, do not include roads.~~
- ~~2. Water generation factors for commercial, industrial and public recreation uses derived from estimates of sewage generation in the sewer section of this component and the estimates of the relation between sewage generation and water consumption by Williams, Kuebelbeck and Associates, Inc., in the Pillar Point Harbor Project Environmental Impact Report. A 15% system loss is included.~~
- ~~3. Based on an estimate of average daily visitors to Fitzgerald Marine Reserve at buildout.~~
- ~~4. Floricultural water usage is estimated as follows:~~

<u>Developed</u>	(-2 mgd) 60,000 gpd 140,000 gpd	CCWD actual 1978 floricultural usage. CCWD County areas (30% of actual). Half Moon Bay (70% of actual).
<u>Expansion</u>	50,000 gpd 120,000 gpd	Water usage by existing Pillaritos Valley floriculturalists now relying on creek and well water. 100% expansion of existing floricultural use at buildout.
- ~~5. El Granada School projected to expand its existing consumption (1,300 gpd at the time of LCP adoption) by 35% at buildout because of a probable year-round system with the potential to accommodate about 35% more children.~~

Attachment 1

San Mateo County Midcoast Update LCP Amendments

Coastal Commission Staff's Suggested Modifications

Page 44 of 71

- ~~6. This table reflects the second units that are permitted in R-1 Coastal Zoning Districts. It is estimated that 350 persons would be housed in second units located in this area based on a household size estimate of 1.410 persons per second unit as derived using standards for a one-bedroom duplex from the U.S. Department of Commerce and Housing and Urban Development, Annual Housing Survey, 1977.~~
- ~~7. Essential public services include the following uses: Emergency Facilities, Correctional Facilities, Transportation Facilities (public), Utility Facilities, Hospitals, Skilled Nursing Facilities, Intermediate Care Facilities, Libraries, Community Centers, Elementary and Secondary Schools, Institutional Day Care Facilities for Children (Day Care Centers as defined by State law), Adults and the Elderly, Institutional Full Time Care Facilities for Children and Adults, and Institutional Shared Housing Facilities for the Elderly. These services must be provided by a public agency or private non-profit or government-funded (partially or fully) purveyor to be considered an essential public service. The reserve capacity allocated to these priority uses may not be shared by any associated, non-priority use and must be forfeited when the priority use is discontinued.~~

b. Updated Water Consumption Estimate (2006)

Coastside County Water District

The following is an estimate of water consumption at buildout for Midcoast properties served by the Coastside County Water District (CCWD). Based on 2001 and 2002 Midcoast water consumption data, annual average residential water consumption is assumed to be 87 gallons per day per person. Peak day consumption is generally 1.8 x annual average water consumption.

Non-residential water consumption is estimated as follows:

<u>Neighborhood Commercial (C-1)</u>	<u>2,000 gallons per acre per day</u>
<u>Commercial Recreation (CCR)</u>	<u>1,500 gallons per acre per day</u>
<u>Waterfront (W)</u>	<u>2,000 gallons per acre per day</u>
<u>Light Industrial (M-1)</u>	<u>2,000 gallons per acre per day</u>
<u>Institutional</u>	<u>500 gallons per acre per day</u>

Residential Use

Attachment 1

San Mateo County Midcoast Update LCP Amendments

Coastal Commission Staff's Suggested Modifications

Page 45 of 71

The portion of Midcoast residential buildout expected to be served by a water supply utility is 6,993 units (this number could increase to a maximum buildout of 9,553 units if contiguously owned substandard lots are not merged or retired). Census 2000 showed average Midcoast household size as 2.78 persons/household. Based on the residential water consumption figure above (87 gdp), the estimated water supply capacity needed to serve Midcoast residential buildout is 1.69 million gallons per day (annual average consumption).

Utility service area maps show that CCWD serves approximately 52.6% of the Midcoast water supply area. Therefore, the water supply capacity needed for the Coastsides County Water District to serve residential buildout is 0.89 million gallons per day (annual average) and 1.60 million gallons per day (peak day).

Non-Residential Uses

The acreage of non-residential water consuming uses is as follows:

<u>Land Use/Zoning</u>	<u>Acres</u>
<u>Neighborhood Commercial (C-1)</u>	<u>15</u>
<u>Commercial Recreation (CCR)</u>	<u>41</u>
<u>Waterfront (W)</u>	<u>31</u>
<u>Institutional</u>	<u>18</u>
<u>Agriculture (Floriculture) (PAD)</u>	<u>(see below)</u>

Based on the non-residential water consumption figures above, the water supply capacity needed for CCWD to serve each non-residential use at buildout is as follows:

<u>Land Use/Zoning</u>	<u>Acres</u>
<u>Neighborhood Commercial (C-1)</u>	<u>30,000</u>
<u>Commercial Recreation (CCR)</u>	<u>61,500</u>
<u>Waterfront (W)</u>	<u>77,500</u>
<u>Institutional</u>	<u>9,000</u>
<u>Agriculture (Floriculture) (PAD)</u>	<u>170,000</u>
<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>348,000</u>

Combined Residential and Non-Residential Demand at Buildout

Attachment 1

San Mateo County Midcoast Update LCP Amendments Coastal Commission Staff's Suggested Modifications Page 46 of 71

Taking into account 9.5% percent of system losses and the potential development of substandard lots if they are not merged or retired as anticipated, The total annual average water supply capacity needed for the Coastside County Water District to serve combined residential and non-residential buildout is at least ~~1.24~~ 1.36 million gallons per day.

The total peak day water supply capacity needed for the Coastside County Water District to serve combined residential and non-residential buildout is ~~2.23~~ 2.44 million gallons per day.

Suggested Modifications to Exhibit E: Reallocated Priority Use Reserved Water Capacity

Suggested Modification No. 42 – Reservation of public works for priority uses:

2.8 Reservation of Capacity for Priority Land Uses

- a. Reserve public works capacity for land uses given priority by the Local Coastal Program as shown on Table 2.7 and Table 2.17. Public works shall include water supply and transmission, sewage treatment and transmission, and the San Mateo County Midcoast and City of Half Moon Bay regional transportation system, including the level of service (LOS) on Highways 1 and 92. All priority land uses shall exclusively rely on public sewer and water services.
- b. For each public works development ~~phase~~, reserve capacity adequate to allow priority land uses to develop to the buildout allowed by ~~that phase~~ the LCP.
- c. ~~Under the following circumstances, Allow public agencies and utilities to reallocate capacity to non-priority land uses only through an LCP Amendment. : (1) when landowners refuse to pay the assessment fees for public services to serve priority land uses because they desire to keep their land vacant or develop a non-priority land use allowed on the site by the Local Coastal Program, and (2) when a landowner, in response to a written inquiry by a public agency or utility, indicates in writing that he/she does not plan to develop his/her land as a priority land use and will not be using any reserved capacity during a certain phase. The public agency or utility shall calculate the capacity needed to serve the remaining priority land uses. Reserved capacity that is not required for the remaining priority land uses may be reallocated to non-priority land uses after the public agency has gained the approval of the Planning Commission. Applications for a LCP Amendment to reallocate priority capacity must be accompanied by substantial evidence and studies documenting excess capacity. Before approving the reallocation and before submitting the reallocation to the Coastal Commission for an LCP Amendment, the Planning Commission shall make the finding substantiate, in writing, that the remaining reserved capacity will be adequate to serve the remaining priority land~~

Attachment 1

San Mateo County Midcoast Update LCP Amendments

Coastal Commission Staff's Suggested Modifications

Page 47 of 71

~~uses. The reservation of capacity for priority land uses shall be increased during the next phase to compensate priority land uses for this reallocation. At least 50% of the priority land uses planned in each phase must be provided capacity for; that capacity may not be allocated to the next phase.~~

- d. Allow Coastside County Water District and Montara Water and Sanitary District to allocate priority capacity in accordance with Table 2.17 equivalent to ten standard size (5/8 inch diameter) service connections (approximately 2,710 gallons per day total) in order to provide municipal water service to residential dwellings which are connected to the public sanitary sewer system, when such a connection is necessary to avert a substantial hardship caused by the failure of a private well serving the dwelling in production quantity or quality as certified by the Director of the Environmental Health Division. For purposes of this policy, "substantial hardship" shall not include any failure which can be remedied by repair or replacement of well equipment or facilities, or relocation of a well on a parcel. Whether substantial hardship exists shall be determined by the Community Development Director Planning Director, following consultation with the Director of Environmental Health and the General Manager of the Coastside County Water District serving water district.

In order to minimize the reduction in water reserved for Coastal Act priority and uses, applications for reallocated water shall include a Water Fixture Retrofit Plan to replace existing water fixtures of the residence applying for the connection with water conserving fixtures. This plan must be reviewed and approved by the Coastside Community Water District General Manager of the serving water district prior to the establishment of the connection, and contain the following:

- (1) A list of all existing fixtures to be retrofitted and their present associated water flow (e.g., gallons/second);
- (2) A list of all proposed fixtures to be installed and their associated water flow;
- (3) The estimated annual water savings resulting from the proposed retrofit, showing all calculations and assumptions; and
- (4) A leak detection test; all leaks shall be repaired, but such repairs shall not be calculated in the estimates of savings. The inspection personnel of the serving water district shall inspect the water fixtures prior to and following the retrofit to confirm compliance with the approved plan and proper installation.

The Coastside Community Water District inspection personnel of the serving water district shall inspect the water fixtures prior to and following the retrofit to confirm compliance with the approved plan and proper installation.

The serving water district shall provide notices to the County Planning Department and the Coastal Commission of all failed wells applications.

Suggested Modification No. 43: Priority allocation table:

TABLE 2.17

AMOUNT OF WATER CAPACITY TO BE RESERVED FOR PRIORITY LAND USES¹
MONTARA WATER AND SEWER DISTRICT CITIZENS UTILITY DISTRICT (MONTARA/MOSS BEACH)

ALLOCATION OF RESERVED CAPACITY TO PRIORITY LAND USES	PHASE I <u>March 2009</u>		BUILDOUT	
	Units	Gallons/Day	Units	Gallons/Day
<u>Coastal Act Priorities</u>				
Marine Related Industrial	--	--	--	--
Commercial Recreation	.57 acres	1,100	.82 acres	1,230
Public Recreation	282 persons	3,200	408 persons	4,080
Floriculture		13,800		20,000 <u>15,000</u>
<u>Essential Public Services²</u>				<u>5,000</u>
<u>Local Coastal Program Priorities</u>				
Specific Developments on Designated Sites Containing Affordable Housing (1) North Moss Beach Site (11 acres)	148	64,380	148	35,816 to 51,504
<u>Other Affordable Housing</u>			20	5,000
Total Water Capacity for Priority Land Uses		82,480		61,126 to 76,814
Percent of Total Water Capacity for Priority Land Uses		10.6%		5.4 to 9.2%
Percent of Buildout Allowed by Phase		50 to 69%		100%
Total Water Capacity		778,800		836,300 to 1,128,700

TABLE 2.17 (continued)					
AMOUNT OF WATER CAPACITY TO BE RESERVED FOR PRIORITY LAND USES ¹ COASTSIDE COUNTY WATER DISTRICT (COUNTY JURISDICTION)					
ALLOCATION OF RESERVED CAPACITY TO PRIORITY LAND USES	PHASE I March 2009		BUILDOUT		
	Units	Gallons/Day	Units	Gallons/Day	
<u>Coastal Act Priorities</u>					
Marine Related Industrial	22.85 acres	55,770	29.29 acres	71,870	
Commercial Recreation	33.15 acres	61,630	42.50 acres	79,395	
Public Recreation	248 persons	2,900	318 persons	3,700	
Floriculture		179,400		230,000 295,000	
Essential Public Services ²		7,700		9,135 14,135	
<u>Local Coastal Program Priorities</u>					
Specific Developments on Designated Sites Containing Affordable Housing (1) North El Granada Site (6 acres) (2) South Moss Beach Site (12.5 acres)	104	39,936	322	77,924 to 112,056	
<u>Other Affordable Housing</u>			20	5,000	
Consolidated Lots in Miramar	55	20,900	70	16,900 to 24,400	
Historic Structures ³ (1) Johnston House	1	1,480	1	1,480	

TABLE 2.17 (continued)				
AMOUNT OF WATER CAPACITY TO BE RESERVED FOR PRIORITY LAND USES ¹ COASTSIDE COUNTY WATER DISTRICT (COUNTY JURISDICTION)				
ALLOCATION OF RESERVED CAPACITY TO PRIORITY LAND USES	PHASE I March 2002		BUILDOUT	
	Units	Gallons/Day	Units	Gallons/Day
Total Water Capacity for Priority Land Uses		369,716		490,404 to 532,036
Percent of Total Water Capacity for Priority Land Uses		29.4%		30.4 to 41.8%
Percent of Buildout Allowed by Phase		59 to 78%		100%
Total Water Capacity		1,257,000		1,273,600 to 1,611,600

NOTES:

1. Capacity reserved for additional priority land use development. Does not include existing, developed priority land uses at time of LCP adoption.
2. Essential public services include the following uses: Emergency Facilities, Correctional Facilities, Transportation Facilities (public), Utility Facilities, Hospitals, Skilled Nursing Facilities, Intermediate Care Facilities, Libraries, Community Centers, Elementary and Secondary Schools, Institutional Day Care Facilities for Children (Day Care Centers as defined by State law), Adults and the Elderly, Institutional Full-Time Care Facilities for Children and Adults, Institutional Shared Housing Facilities for the Elderly and One-Family Dwellings with Failed Domestic Wells. These services must be provided by a public agency or private non-profit or government-funded (partially or fully) purveyor to be considered an essential public service. The reserve capacity allocated to these priority uses may not be shared by any associated, non-priority use and must be forfeited when the priority use is discontinued.

12,710 gallons/day are reserved for One-Family Dwellings with Failed Domestic Wells. ~~This reservation was calculated by reserving capacity for ten (40) One Family Dwellings, each consuming 271 gallons/day of water.~~ This reservation is allocated as follows:

Coastside County Water District – 7,710 gallons/day (30 units)
Montara Water and Sanitary District – 5,000 gallons/day (20 units)
3. In order to qualify for priority, historic structures must meet the criteria contained under LCP Policy 2.37.c(b).

Attachment 1

San Mateo County Midcoast Update LCP Amendments Coastal Commission Staff's Suggested Modifications Page 51 of 71

1.3. Suggested Modifications to LUP Chapter 3 (Housing)

1.3.1. Suggested Modification to County Exhibit L: Incentives for Midcoast Affordable Housing

Suggested Modification No. 43 – Affordable housing incentives:

3.17. Incentives for Midcoast Affordable Housing

Provide the following incentives for voluntary development of affordable housing units on Midcoast parcels other than the designated housing sites:

~~a. Any property that is (1) developed with an affordable (very low, low or moderate income) housing unit, i.e., subject to income and cost/rent restriction contracts with San Mateo County, and (2) located in an urban Midcoast zoning district where residential units are permitted, may receive reserved water supply capacity to the extent authorized by LCP Tables 2.7 and 2.17, respectively.~~

~~b.a. In addition, a~~ Any substandard lot smaller than 4,500 sq. ft. in area and not in common ownership with contiguous lots that is (1) developed with an affordable (very low, low or moderate income) housing unit, i.e., subject to income and cost/rent restriction contracts with San Mateo County, and (2) located in a Midcoast residential zoning district, shall be entitled to:

- (1) Up to 200 sq. ft. of covered parking floor area that is not counted toward the applicable building floor area limit; and
- (2) One required parking space may be provided uncovered.

1.4. Suggested Modifications to LUP Chapter 10 (Shoreline Access)

1.4.1. Suggested Modifications to County Exhibit P (Role of Trail Providing Agencies)

Suggested Modification No. 44 – California Coastal Trail:

10.37.1 California Coastal Trail (CCT)

Segments of the California Coastal Trail shall be developed consistent with the parameters of this policy.

Attachment 1

San Mateo County Midcoast Update LCP Amendments Coastal Commission Staff's Suggested Modifications Page 52 of 71

Within two years of this LCP, as amended, being certified, the County will seek a planning grant, and/or comparable funding, for planning and implementation of the California Coastal Trail (CCT). This request for funding will provide for a CCT Alignment Study including the following parameters:

1. The County shall take the lead responsibility and will consult with the National Park Service, the State Department of Parks & Recreation, the State Coastal Conservancy, the California Coastal Commission, the Counties of San Francisco and Santa Cruz, the Cities of Daly City, Pacifica and Half Moon Bay, Caltrans and other appropriate public and private entities and interested parties in designing, locating, funding, acquiring and implementing the CCT.
2. The CCT shall be identified and defined as a continuous trail system along the state's coastline and designed and sited as a continuous lateral trail network traversing the length of the County's Coastal Zone and connecting with contiguous trail links in adjacent Coastal jurisdictions, the counties of San Francisco and Santa Cruz as well as with the Cities of Pacifica and Half Moon Bay.
2. Existing segments of the CCT within County jurisdiction include at least the following:
 - a) Former Highway One at Devil's Slide, once formally relinquished by Caltrans and opened as a public trail
 - b) Old San Pedro Road
 - c) Surfer's Beach trail
 - d) Mirada Surf west
 - e) Various segments within State Park properties that have been signed with the CCT official state logo.
3. The CCT shall be designed and implemented to achieve the following objectives:
 - a) Provide a continuous walking and hiking trail as close to the ocean as possible;
 - b) Provide maximum access for a variety of non-motorized uses by utilizing alternative trail segments where feasible;
 - c) Maximize connections to existing and proposed local trail systems;
 - d) Ensure that all segments of the trail have vertical access connections at reasonable intervals;
 - e) Maximize ocean views and scenic coastal vistas;
 - f) Provide an educational experience where feasible through interpretive facilities.
4. CCT Siting and Design Standards:
 - a) The trail should be sited and designed to be located along or as close to the shoreline where physically and aesthetically feasible. Where it is not feasible to locate the trail along the shoreline due to natural landforms or legally authorized development that prevents passage at all times, inland bypass trail segments located as close to the shoreline as possible should be utilized. Shoreline trail segments that may not be passable at all times should provide inland alternative routes. Special attention should be given to identifying any segments that necessarily must be placed within Caltrans right-of way.

Attachment 1

San Mateo County Midcoast Update LCP Amendments

Coastal Commission Staff's Suggested Modifications

Page 53 of 71

b) Where gaps are identified in the trail, interim segments should be identified to ensure a continuous coastal trail. Interim segments should be noted as such, with provisions that as opportunities arise, the trail shall be realigned for ideal siting. Interim trail segments should meet as many of the CCT objectives and standards as possible.

c) The CCT should be designed and located to minimize impacts to environmentally sensitive habitat areas and prime agriculture lands to the maximum extent feasible. Where appropriate, trail access should be limited to pass and repass. Where necessary to prevent disturbance to sensitive species, sections of the trail may be closed on a seasonal basis. Alternative trail segments shall be provided where feasible. For situations where impact avoidance is not feasible, appropriate mitigation measures should be identified, including but not limited to use of boardwalks, reducing width of trails, converting edges of agricultural land to public trail use when the minimal amount of conversion is used, etc.

d) The CCT should be located to incorporate existing oceanfront trails and paths and support facilities of public shoreline parks and beaches to the maximum extent feasible.

e) The CCT should be designed to avoid being located on roads with motorized vehicle traffic where feasible. In locations where it is not possible to avoid siting the trail along a roadway, the trail should be located off of the pavement and within the public right-of-way, and separated from traffic by a safe distance or by physical barriers that do not obstruct, or detract from, the visual scenic character of their surroundings. In locations where the trail must cross a roadway, safe under- or over-crossings or other alternative at-grade crossings should be considered in connection with appropriate directional and traffic warning signage.

5. CCT Acquisition and Management:

a) Trail easements should be obtained by encouraging private donation of land, by public purchase, or by dedication of trail easements required pursuant to a development permit.

b) The CCT Alignment Study should identify the appropriate management agency(s) to take responsibility for trail operation and maintenance.

6. CCT Signage Standards:

a) The trail should provide adequate signage at all access points, trailheads, parking lots, road crossings, and linkages or intersections with other trails or roads and shall incorporate the State adopted CCT logo.

Attachment 1

San Mateo County Midcoast Update LCP Amendments Coastal Commission Staff's Suggested Modifications Page 54 of 71

b) The trail should provide adequate safety signage, including but not limited to, road crossing signs and yield/warning signs on multi-use trail segments. Where appropriate signs should be developed in coordination with Caltrans, Cities of Daly City, Pacifica and of Half Moon Bay, County Public Works Department and/or any other applicable public agencies or nonprofit organizations.

7. CCT Support Facilities:

a) To maximize access to the CCT, adequate parking and trailhead facilities should be provided.

8. CCT Mapping:

a) The final CCT map shall identify all finally planned or secured segments, including existing segments, all access linkages and planned staging areas, public and private lands, existing Easements, Deed Restricted sections and sections subject to an Offer-to-dedicate (OTD). Where property ownerships or other constrictions make final alignment selection unfeasible, a preferred corridor for the alignment shall be identified. The map shall be updated on a regular basis.

b) The CCT preferred alignment corridor shall be identified on all applicable County Trail Maps contained in the LCP.

9. Inclusion of CCT in LCP:

a) Within one year of the completion of the CCT Alignment Study, the LCP shall be amended to incorporate all plans and designs for locating and implementing the CCT within the County, including the final maps of the trails and corridor alignments.

Suggested Modification No. 45 – Policies on shoreline access agencies and providers:

10.41 Lead Agency Major Shoreline Access Provider

Encourage the State Department of Parks and Recreation to continue assuming ~~e the~~ a major role responsibility for ~~in~~ the acquisition, development, and maintenance of public shoreline access along the coast.

10.44 Major Shoreline Access Facilitator

Encourage the State Coastal Conservancy to continue assuming a major role in funding and facilitating the acquisition, development, and maintenance of public shoreline access to and along the coast.

10.49 San Mateo County Harbor District

Attachment 1

San Mateo County Midcoast Update LCP Amendments Coastal Commission Staff's Suggested Modifications Page 55 of 71

Encourage the San Mateo County Harbor District to continue its efforts developing and maintaining public shoreline access on the District's coastal properties.

10.50 National Park Service

Encourage the National Park Service to acquire, develop, open and maintain public shoreline access on coastal land in the Golden Gate National Recreation Area.

1.5. Suggested Modifications to LUP Chapter 11 (Recreation and Visitor Serving Facilities)

1.5.1. Suggested Modifications to County Exhibit J (Updated LCP Trails Policy)

Suggested Modification No. 46 – Trails:

11.13 Trails

- a. The 2001 County Trails Plan establishes a trails program for the Coastal Zone with the objective of: (1) connecting major shoreline areas and trails to inland park and recreation facilities and trails, and (2) linking existing and proposed recreation facilities along the coast. Policies 3.0 -3.2 (County Trail Policies) and Policies 4.0 – 4.3 (County Trails Design and Management Guidelines) of the 2001 County Trails Plan are hereby incorporated into the LCP.
- b. Designate the following as Local Coastal Program (LCP) trails:
 - (1) County-wide
 - a) ~~Coastal Trail as delineated by the State Coastal Conservancy. California Coastal Trail, connecting Thorton beach to Ano Nuevo State Reserve. Ocean Corridor Trail of the State Department of Parks and Recreation.~~
 - (2) Regional ~~Other~~ trails (portions located within the Coastal Zone)proposals:

Attachment 1

San Mateo County Midcoast Update LCP Amendments Coastal Commission Staff's Suggested Modifications Page 56 of 71

- (a) Montara Mountain Guleh Trail connecting ~~Point Montara Lighthouse to the Gregorio Trail between~~ Montara State Beach and San Pedro Park near the McNee Ranch, with connections to Gray Whale Cove State Beach.

- (b) Pilarcitos, Scarper View, Midcoast Foothill, and Old San Pedro Road Trails, as shown in the County Trails Plan.

When the County Trails Plan is amended, the Scarper View Trail could be more precisely described as located on Mirada Surf West, Mirada Surf East, Quarry Park, and other publicly owned properties.

(b)

- (c) Half Moon Bay to Huddart Park Trail connecting Half Moon Bay State Beach near via Higgins Road to ~~the Gregorio Trail from~~ Huddart County Park.

(e)

- (d) Purisima Creek to Huddart County Park Trail connecting from Route 1 near via Purisima Creek Road to ~~the Gregorio Trail from~~ Huddart County Park.

(d)

- (e) Martin's Beach to Huddart County Park Trail connecting from Martin's Beach via the Lobitos Creek cut-off and Tunitas Creek Road to Huddart County Park.

(e)

- (f) San Gregorio State Beach to Town of Pescadero Trail connecting San Gregorio State Beach to the communities of San Gregorio and Pescadero via La Honda Road and Stage Road.

(f)

- (g) Gazos Creek Coastal Access to Butano State Park Trail connecting Gazos Creek Coastal Access to Butano State Park via Gazos Creek Access Road.

(h) Midcoast Foothills Trail connecting the south boundary of McNee Ranch State Park with Highway 92 in Half Moon Bay.

- (3) Trails, located within the coastal zone, offered by property owners for public use.

Attachment 1

San Mateo County Midcoast Update LCP Amendments

Coastal Commission Staff's Suggested Modifications

Page 57 of 71

- (4) All future trails located in the coastal zone shall be considered a Local Coastal Program trail.

Suggested Modification No. 47 – Improvement of public recreation:

11.27 Improvement, Expansion and Maintenance of Public Recreation

- a. Continue to provide for the improvement, expansion and maintenance of the Fitzgerald Marine Reserve, ~~and San Pedro Valley Park and the CCT.~~
- b. Support efforts to add the Devil's Slide bypass roadway alignment to adjoining park units, including, but not limited to, the Golden Gate National Recreation Area.
- ~~b.~~
- c. Explore developing a contractual agreement with the State Department of Parks and Recreation which would allow the County to maintain and operate State-owned recreation areas with reimbursement for these expenses by the State Department of Parks and Recreation.
- ~~c.~~
- d. Undertake the development and maintenance of ~~Gregorio/Murphy and~~ LCP proposed trails, ~~including the Coastal Trail~~, with reimbursement for these activities by the State of California to the greatest extent possible.
- ~~d.~~
- e. Collect in-lieu fees and contribute these and other minor funds to the appropriate County fund including, but not limited to, the Midcoast Parks Development Fund administered by the Parks and Recreation Division. ~~County's general funds and use~~ Use these funds to: (1) develop County public recreation facilities, including trails, and (2) provide matching funds for State and federal recreation programs in accordance with the priorities in Policy 11.23.
- ~~e.~~
- f. Sign ~~major~~ public recreation areas and commercial recreation areas consistent with Policy 11.16.

1.5.2. Suggested Modifications to County Exhibit K "Pedestrian Improvements for Highway 1"

Attachment 1

San Mateo County Midcoast Update LCP Amendments Coastal Commission Staff's Suggested Modifications Page 58 of 71

Suggested Modification No. 48 – Trails and recreational development:

11.26 Requirements for Trails and Recreational Development

- a. Require the dedication by public agencies of trail easements along the routes of ~~the Gregorio/Murphy and LCP Trails Program, including the Pacific Ocean Corridor Trail after submission by the State Department of Parks and Recreation of an acceptable alignment.~~ the LCP Trails (as defined in Section 11.13b).
- b. Require some provision for public recreation for each development permit for a land division within the Coastal Zone. Require either: (1) the dedication of trail easements when the division affects land along the routes of ~~Gregorio/Murphy and LCP Trails Program trails, including the CCT -Pacific Ocean Corridor Trail,~~ after submission by the State Department of Parks and Recreation of an acceptable alignment, or (2) the payment of in-lieu fees in areas outside a trail corridor. Base the amount of the land to be dedicated or the fees to be paid on a graduated scale related to the size, type, and adverse impact on the development of open space recreational opportunities or coastal access.
- c. ~~Require CalTrans, as a condition of granting development permits for expansion of State roads for improvements for bicycles in the Coastal Zone, to provide adequate right-of-way and construct bikeways in conformance with the standards and types of bikeway construction contained in the County's Bikeways Plan.~~ Require each agency, board, department, or commission of the state with property interests or regulatory authority in coastal areas, to the extent feasible and consistent with their mandates, to cooperate in the planning and making of lands available for the California Coastal Trail (CCT), including the construction of trail links, placement of signs and management of the trail consistent with AB 1396.
- ~~c.~~
~~Through coordination with CalTrans, promote the development of a continuous Midcoast pedestrian/bicycle/multi-purpose path parallel to Highway 1 within the right-of-way.~~
- d. Through coordination with CalTrans, promote the development of a continuous Midcoast pedestrian/bicycle/multi-purpose path parallel to Highway 1 within the right-of-way consistent with the California Coastal Trail (CCT) Plan (Policy 10.37.A) and within the right-of-way when no other preferable CCT alignment is available.

Attachment 1

San Mateo County Midcoast Update LCP Amendments Coastal Commission Staff's Suggested Modifications Page 59 of 71

- e Through coordination with CalTrans, promote the development of the most appropriate, safe, feasible crossings, either at-grade, above and - or below-ground pedestrian crossings at the Midcoast locations along Highway 1, including those shown as "Proposed Safe Crossing" in the Midcoast Recreational Needs Assessment – Map 3.
- fg ~~When warranted by the size of Highway 1 projects in the Midcoast, require that CalTrans:~~ Unless a suitable off-highway alternative already exists or is being provided, require that CalTrans, except for general maintenance activities, incorporate the following as part of any roadway project:
- (1) ~~Develop a pedestrian/bicycle/multi-purpose path parallel to the portion of Highway 1 where the project is located, and/or a continuous Midcoast pedestrian/bicycle/multi-purpose path (or a system of single mode paths) parallel to Highway 1 consistent with the California Coastal Trail (CCT) Plan (Policy 10.37.A) and within the right-of-way when no other preferable CCT alignment is available, and/or~~
 - (2) ~~At locations shown as "Proposed Safe Crossing" in the Midcoast Recreational Needs Assessment, develop an above or below ground pedestrian crossing.~~ The most appropriate, safe, feasible crossings, either at-grade, above- or below-ground pedestrian crossings at Midcoast locations along Highway 1, including those shown as "Proposed Safe Crossing" in the Midcoast Recreational Needs Assessment – Map 3.
- g, h- Ensure that transportation agencies, including Caltrans, San Mateo County Transportation Authority, San Mateo County Public Works, etc., coordinate their actions to provide for the California Coastal Trail (CCT) along the San Mateo County coastline. In particular, no highway, County road or street right-of-way will be transferred out of public ownership unless it has first been evaluated for its utility as part of the CCT or other public access, and is found to have no reasonable potential for such use. Transfer of public roads or rights-of-way out of public ownership that may provide such public access shall require a coastal development permit appealable to the Coastal Commission. The sale or transfer of state lands between the first public road and the sea with an existing or potential public accessway to or from the sea, or that the Commission or County has formally designated as part of the California Coastal Trail, shall comply with Coastal Act section 30609.5.
- h.i. The County shall work with the San Mateo County Transportation Authority and the Metropolitan Transportation Commission to ensure that provisions for the CCT are included within the Regional Transportation Plan each time that it is updated, consistent with AB 1396.

Attachment 1

San Mateo County Midcoast Update LCP Amendments Coastal Commission Staff's Suggested Modifications Page 60 of 71

1.5.3. Suggested Modifications to County Exhibit P "Role of Trail Providing Agencies"

Suggested Modification No. 49 – Public expenditure for recreation:

11.24 Priorities for the Expenditure of Public Funds

- a. Establish the following priorities for the expenditure of public funds on public recreation and visitor-serving facilities, based on the level of existing development and need:
 - (1) Improve and maintain existing public recreation areas in the Midcoast.
 - (2) Develop and maintain necessary visitor-serving facilities, such as rest areas, public restrooms, drinking water, campgrounds, within existing public recreation areas.
 - (3) Expand recreational opportunities through the provision of trails, including the CCT, and youth hostels.
 - (4) Acquire and develop for recreational use lands which are adjacent to and would expand the size of existing publicly owned recreation areas.
 - (5) Acquire and develop for recreational use lands which would introduce a public recreation area into a section of the Coastal Zone where no public recreation areas now exist.
 - (6) Acquire and develop lands designated as community parks.
- b. Use the following priorities when expending County funds for trails:
 - (1) Implement the California Coastal Trail Plan identified in LCP Policy 10.37.A and as included in Regional Transportation Plans as identified in Policy 11.32. Gregorio Trails Program as adopted by the County Board of Supervisors.
 - (2) Implement the ~~other~~ Regional Local Coastal Program trails proposals identified in LCP Policy 11.13.
- c. Regularly reassess these priorities as new public recreation and visitor-serving facilities development takes place in the Coastal Zone.

Attachment 1

San Mateo County Midcoast Update LCP Amendments

Coastal Commission Staff's Suggested Modifications

Page 61 of 71

- d. Encourage low cost facilities in privately developed visitor-serving facilities, particularly hotels and motels.

Suggested Modification No. 50 – State Parks:

11.25 Requirement that State Parks Development Conform to the Local Coastal Program

- a. Require that the State Department of Parks and Recreation, as part of any application for a Coastal Development Permit, and in addition to any other submittals required, submit a long-range plan for any park unit proposed for improvement which includes: (1) the development plan, including the location of all proposed structures, parking areas, trails, recreation facilities and any proposed alterations of the natural environment, (2) a map of sensitive habitats and lands which are needed for the protection and vital functioning of sensitive habitats and (3) evidence of how agriculture has been considered in the planning of each park unit by (a) demonstrating how the Department will continue or renew the maximum amount of prime agricultural land and other lands suitable for agriculture in agricultural production within each park unit and (b) providing site specific justifications, which are consistent with the criteria for conversion in the Agriculture Component, for converting prime agricultural land or other lands suitable for agriculture to non-agricultural use, and (4) any capital outlay projects proposed for the subsequent one-year period.
- b. Require, prior to granting a development permit to the State Department of Parks and Recreation, that the development and the long-range park unit plan be found consistent with the certified Local Coastal Program, or with a public works plan approved by the California Coastal Commission.
- e. ~~Encourage the State Department of Parks and Recreation to specify an alignment for the Pacific Ocean Corridor Trail, including design and locational requirements. This alignment should include trails along Route 1 proposed in the Shoreline Access Component and shall be shown in each applicable park unit long-range plan.~~

11.28 Role of the State Department of Parks and Recreation

- a. Designate the State Department of Parks and Recreation as the primary agency for the acquisition, development and maintenance of public recreation and visitor-serving facilities in the Coastal Zone.

Attachment 1

San Mateo County Midcoast Update LCP Amendments

Coastal Commission Staff's Suggested Modifications

Page 62 of 71

- b. Encourage the Department to contribute the major portion of funds for the development, expansion and maintenance of public recreation and visitor-serving facilities in accordance with the priorities and policies of this component.
- c. Encourage ~~Designate~~ the State Department of Parks and Recreation as ~~the agency~~ to develop and maintain segments of the California Coastal Trail on State-owned property ~~the Pacific Ocean Corridor Trail~~, in conjunction with the shoreline access trails.
- d. Consider the possibility of having the County undertake the maintenance of the facilities with reimbursed funds.

Suggested Modification No. 51 – Coastal Conservancy:

11.29 Role of the State Coastal Conservancy

- a. Request the State Coastal Conservancy to contribute funds to acquire land or interests in land in the areas surrounding public beaches, parks and nature preserves when private development would clearly damage the resource values of the public land.
- b. Support and facilitate the efforts of the State Coastal Conservancy to ~~coordinate the development of the California Coastal Trail, including delineation of the Coastal Trail alignment. &&~~

Suggested Modification No. 52 – Harbor District:

11.30 Encourage San Mateo County Harbor District

Encourage the San Mateo County Harbor District to continue its efforts providing public recreation and visitor-serving facilities on the District's coastal properties, including provision of shoreline access and trails.

Suggested Modification No. 53 – National Park Service:

11.31 Encourage National Park Service

Encourage the National Park Service to provide public recreation and visitor-serving facilities on coastal land in the Golden Gate National Recreation Area, including provision of shoreline access and trails.

Suggested Modification No. 54 – San Mateo County Transportation Authority

11.32 Encourage the San Mateo County Transportation Authority and the Metropolitan Transportation Commission to ensure that provisions for the CCT are included within the Regional Transportation Plan each time that it is updated, consistent with AB 1396.

Attachment 1

San Mateo County Midcoast Update LCP Amendments Coastal Commission Staff's Suggested Modifications Page 63 of 71

1.5.4. Additional Suggested Modifications to Chapter 11

Suggested Modification No. 55 – Re-designation of Caltrans Devil's Slide Bypass Alignment:

11.31 Use of Caltrans' Devil's Slide Bypass Alignment within Montara

a. In anticipation that Caltrans will transfer to the County ownership of some or all of the original Devil's Slide Bypass Alignment, also known as the Martini Creek "Adopted Alignment," between the McNee Ranch acquisition of Montara Beach State Park and Highway 1 [including the Peninsula Open Space Trust (POST) ownership south and east of Sunshine Valley Road], the County has :

(1) Designated the former right-of-way as a Linear Park and Trail. Land uses within the Devil's Slide Bypass Alignment Linear Park and Trail shall be limited to: low-intensity, non-motorized park and trail recreation uses (pedestrian, bicycle, and equestrian (as appropriate)), open space, sensitive resource protection and restoration, agriculture, and repair and maintenance of existing structures.

(2) Revised the zoning of the former right-of-way to Community Open Space) in order to implement the Linear Park and Trail designation as described in section (b) below.

(3) Provided for existing roads which cross the former right-of-way to remain or be relocated, particularly for resource protection purposes, following completion of the Land Management Plan (LMP) described below in part (b).

(b) Within two years of certification of San Mateo County LCP Amendment 1-07, the County will seek a planning grant, or comparable funding, in partnership with Caltrans and other affected agencies, for completion of a Linear Park and Trail Plan (LTP) for the Devil's Slide Bypass Alignment (Adopted Alignment ROW area (also called out as the Midcoast Foothills Trail in the 2001 County Parks Plan)). This request for funding will provide for:

1. identification of appropriate, continuous trail alignments for hiking trail and bicycle routes, and equestrian trails as appropriate, along with projected road and stream crossing locations, consistent with the Linear Park and Trail guidelines of LUP Appendix 11.A;
2. reservation of suitable trailhead parking and scenic viewing areas; identification of connections to other trail systems, public transit, and community facilities;

Attachment 1

San Mateo County Midcoast Update LCP Amendments Coastal Commission Staff's Suggested Modifications Page 64 of 71

3. identification of connections to other trail systems (including the California Coastal Trail network), public transit, and community facilities;
4. identification of existing roads that will be retained, realigned, consolidated or retired (generally, all plated but unnecessary, roads will be retired) and of actions that the County will undertake to implement the desired road configurations and crossings;
5. identification of sensitive resource features and appropriate impact avoidance measures for each. Appropriate mitigation measures should be identified for situations where impact avoidance is not feasible for the useable location of hiking and biking trails in the Adopted Alignment Linear Park. Such sensitive resource features include, but are not limited to, the following:
 - (i) wetlands, streams, designated critical habitats, and other environmentally sensitive habitat areas;
 - (ii) archaeological, paleontological and historical features;
 - (iii) productive agricultural lands;
 - (iv) highly scenic landscapes; and
 - (v) watersheds identified as critical for potable water or anadromous fish habitat.
6. identification of sites with potential prescriptive access rights and of sites with value for development as scenic vista points, interpretive centers, or other public uses consistent with the Linear Park and Trail uses allowed within this land use designation;
7. evaluation and reservation of sites suitable for future Caltrans' potential mitigation needs, particularly for public access, agriculture, wetlands, and other environmentally sensitive habitats as well as reservation of necessary access to those selected sites;
8. identification of lots that were bisected by the highway ROW acquisition process and are suitable for recombination and lot line adjustment, as necessary, to accommodate the most reasonable land use pattern within the community, provided for any particular site, the optimum alignment of the linear trails and supporting facilities will not be compromised;
9. provisions to ensure that adequate ROW space along and across the existing County roads traversing the Adopted Alignment ROW is

Attachment 1

San Mateo County Midcoast Update LCP Amendments Coastal Commission Staff's Suggested Modifications Page 65 of 71

reserved for safe crossing of the future hiking and biking trails within the Linear Park; and.

10. an implementation plan for the Linear Park and Trail, including identification of potential funding sources for trail construction; management mechanisms; and any identified parking areas, scenic vistas, or other implementing measures and public support facilities.

1.6. Suggested Modifications to the Land Use Plan and Implementation Plan Maps

Suggested Modification Nos. 56-62 – LUP and zoning map modifications:

56. The County shall create and submit an updated land use plan (LUP) map and an Implementation Plan (zoning) map for the urban Midcoast area, based on the maps titled "Midcoast LCP Update Project." These maps shall depict the certified land use and zoning designations for the Midcoast.

57. The LUP map shall clarify that the existing land use designation for the "burnham strip," is "Open Space" with a "Park" overlay as identified by the certified Montara, Moss Beach, El Granada Community Plan.

58. The LUP maps shall change the Residential Land Use designations for the Devil's Slide Martini Creek Bypass Alignment property to General Open Space.

59. The IP zoning map shall change the zoning for the portion of the Devil's Slide Bypass Alignment property from RM-CZ and R-1/S-17 to COSC, and place a "Linear Park and Trail" overlay designation on the Devil's Slide Bypass Alignment property between the McNee Ranch acquisition of Montara Beach State Park and Highway 1.

60. All land use designations on the LUP map shall be referred to as LCP land use designations, and not as General Plan land use designations.

61. Both maps shall be stamped as "certified by the California Coastal Commission on [insert final certification date]."

62. The LUP map shall be inserted into the certified LUP as Map 1.4, and the zoning map shall be inserted into the certified zoning regulations in Chapter 20B Coastal Development District.

2. IMPLEMENTATION PLAN SUGGESTED MODIFICATIONS

Attachment 1

San Mateo County Midcoast Update LCP Amendments Coastal Commission Staff's Suggested Modifications Page 66 of 71

Staff recommends the following suggested modifications to the proposed LUP amendment be adopted. The language shown in double underline represent language that the Commission suggests be added and the language shown in ~~double strike through~~ represents language that the Commission suggests be deleted from the language as originally submitted. Suggested modifications that do not involve direct text changes, but are directives to the City are shown in *italics*.

2.1. Suggested Modifications to County Proposed El Granada Gateway District (Burnham Strip):

Suggested modification No. 63:

SECTION 6229.0. REGULATIONS FOR "EG" DISTRICT. The following regulations shall apply in the El Granada Gateway (EG) District.

SECTION 6229.1. PURPOSE. The purpose of the "EG" District is to provide for low intensity development at the "Burnham Strip" in El Granada, which preserves, to the greatest degree possible, the visual and open space characteristics of this property.

SECTION 6229.2. DEFINITIONS.

1. Community Centers

Facilities used by local citizens for civic activities, performances, presentations or other purposes.

2. Interpretive Centers

Facilities used for the education of the public with respect to natural, historical and cultural environments and legacies.

3. Libraries

Facilities used for storage, exhibition and lending of various media including, but not limited to, books, periodicals, documents, audio and videotapes and visual art.

4. Linear Parks and Trails

Linear strips of land established for the purposes of walking, hiking, bicycling, horseback riding and boating, and comprising a natural or manmade linear resource such as stream drainage, bluff line, ridge, utility right-of-way, or service

Attachment 1

San Mateo County Midcoast Update LCP Amendments

Coastal Commission Staff's Suggested Modifications

Page 67 of 71

road.

5. Open Field Cultivation of Plants and Flowers for Ornamental Purposes

The cultivation, sale and distribution of seeds, flowers, plants, and/or trees of ornamental value that are grown in or on an open field, i.e., uncovered by any structure, such as a greenhouse.

6. Temporary Outdoor Art Centers

Outdoor facilities used temporarily for the exhibition, study or creation of works of artistic value.

7. Outdoor Athletic Facilities

Outdoor facilities, associated grounds and accessory structures used for active recreation, including swimming pools, tennis courts, playing fields or similar uses.

8. Outdoor Recreation Areas

Outdoor areas used for a variety of outdoor recreational purposes, including areas that will provide for public use of natural and manmade water features, as well as for special recreation activities.

9. Parks

Areas of scenic and natural character where outdoor recreation opportunities and facilities may be provided for public convenience and enjoyment, and within which interpretive exhibits can be established.

10. Temporary Outdoor Performing Arts Centers

Outdoor areas used temporarily for the presentation of live musical, dance, dramatic or other artistic performances, involving portable facilities and equipment, e.g., movable stage sets, and seating.

11. Temporary Outdoor Sales

Outdoor areas used temporarily by multiple small commercial establishments which serve the general public, typically from portable stalls, in the outdoor sales of food, arts and crafts, or used manufactured goods, e.g., farmers markets, flea markets, art shows, and food and wine tastings.

Attachment 1

San Mateo County Midcoast Update LCP Amendments Coastal Commission Staff's Suggested Modifications Page 68 of 71

12. Temporary Outdoor Showgrounds and Exhibition Facilities

Outdoor areas used temporarily for a variety of showground and exhibition activities, including rodeos, fairs, carnivals, and traveling shows, involving portable facilities and equipment.

~~13. Urban Roadside Stands~~

~~Structures in urban areas of either portable or permanent construction used for the sale of produce and other goods and merchandise.~~

14. Vegetative Stormwater Treatment Systems and Underground Storage Facilities

The installation of:

- a. Ground level vegetation devices to filter, reduce the velocity of, and/or absorb stormwater flow from off-site sources including, but not limited to the use of bio-filters, vegetated buffer strips and engineered wetlands, and/or
- b. Underground storage or detention facilities for stormwater from off-site sources.

SECTION 6229.3. USES PERMITTED. The following uses are permitted in the "EG" District subject to the issuance of a use permit, as provided in Chapter 24 of this part.

1. Community Centers

2. Interpretive Centers

3. Libraries

4. Linear Parks and Trails

5. Open Field Cultivation of Plants and Flowers for Ornamental Purposes

6. Temporary Outdoor Art Centers

7. Outdoor Athletic Facilities

8. Outdoor Recreation Areas

Attachment 1

San Mateo County Midcoast Update LCP Amendments Coastal Commission Staff's Suggested Modifications Page 69 of 71

9. Parks
10. Temporary Outdoor Performing Arts Centers
11. Temporary Outdoor Sales
12. Temporary Outdoor Showgrounds and Exhibition Facilities
- ~~13. Urban Roadside Stands~~
143. Vegetative Stormwater Treatment Systems and Underground Storage Facilities
14. Public Parking for Surfer's Beach
15. Public Restrooms and Showers
16. Public Pedestrian Trails and Bicycle Trails
17. Realignment of Highway 1

SECTION 6229.4. DEVELOPMENT CRITERIA AND STANDARDS. All new development must meet the following minimum standards:

1. Minimum Parcel Area: 3.5 acres.
2. Maximum Building Height: 16 feet.
3. Minimum Building Setbacks

<u>Front Setback</u>	<u>Side Setback</u>	<u>Rear Setback</u>
<u>50 feet</u>	<u>20 feet</u>	<u>20 feet</u>

4. Maximum Parcel Coverage: Ten percent (10%) parcel size.

Maximum parcel coverage shall include all structures that are 18 inches or more above the ground.

5. Impervious Surface Area

The amount of parcel area covered by impervious structures less than eighteen inches (18") in height is limited to ten percent (10%) parcel size. The runoff equivalent of 10% (parcel size) could be achieved by directing runoff to on-site porous areas or through the use of detention basins. Impervious structures

Attachment 1

San Mateo County Midcoast Update LCP Amendments Coastal Commission Staff's Suggested Modifications Page 70 of 71

include, but are not limited to, non-porous driveways, decks, patios, walkways and swimming pools.

An exception to the limit may be granted by the Community Development Director upon finding that off-site project drainage, i.e., runoff, will not exceed that amount equivalent to 10% (parcel size). The applicant shall submit a professionally prepared site plan showing topography, drainage and calculations which demonstrates this finding can be made.

6. Landscaping

All building and structures shall be screened with sufficient landscaping to obscure and soften their appearance when viewed from Highway 1.

7. Signs

a. Prohibited Signs:

- (1) Signs having animated, moving, rotating, inflatable, or flashing parts.
- (2) Signs emitting intense and highly focused light, including beacons.
- (3) Off-premises signs, including billboards.

b. Number of Signs: One per use or establishment.

c. Maximum Sign Display Area: 20 sq. ft. on each sign face.

8. Winter Grading

Development related grading, e.g., site preparation, shall not occur between October 15 and April 15 in any given year unless the applicant demonstrates to the satisfaction of the Community Development Director and Building Official that the development site will be effectively contained to prevent erosion and sedimentation, and that such site containment has been established and is ongoing. Site containment shall include, but not be limited to, covering stored equipment and materials, stabilizing site entrances and exposed slopes, containing or reducing runoff, and protecting drain inlets.

Attachment 1

San Mateo County Midcoast Update LCP Amendments

Coastal Commission Staff's Suggested Modifications

Page 71 of 71

9. Traffic Control

In addition to all other applicable policies of the LCP, all development that generates traffic demand, including temporary uses, shall comply with LCP Policies 2.58 and 2.59.

Suggested Modification No. 63: Hydromodification definition

Hydromodification. Hydromodification is broadly defined as altering the hydrologic characteristics of water bodies to cause degradation of water resources. However, for the purpose of administering LCP policy, hydromodification shall mean any condition which, as a consequence of new impervious surface development and the construction of storm drainage systems, rainwater can no longer infiltrate into the soil and flows offsite in greater volume and erosive velocity than occurred under pre-project conditions to cause natural creeks or earthen channels to erode excessively, enlarge or otherwise change their configuration. The effects of this additional erosion, i.e. hydromodification can include degradation of stream habitat, loss of water quality and property damage.

Analysis of CCC Staff's Suggested Modifications to the Midcoast LCP Update

June 22, 2009

Mod. #	Policy	Part of Amend?	Modification Description	Analysis	Recommended Response
2	1.22	Yes	Replaces the County proposed 75 unit annual limit with a maximum population growth rate of 1% and applies this limit to secondary dwellings (i.e. "granny units"). Adds language requiring a comprehensive transportation management plan and resolution of sewage overflow problems before the growth rate can be changed (via future LCP amendment).	<p>A 1% population growth rate currently equals approximately 39 units based on the 2000 Census average household size of 2.78 persons per residential unit.</p> <p>Basing development limits on population rather than number of units will be more difficult to administer because the conversion of population to units would have to be recalculated as growth occurs and new population information is developed.</p> <p>Reducing the growth rate will impede the ability of new development to help fund and provide infrastructure projects.</p> <p>Applying growth limits to second units discourages infill development that provides affordable housing opportunities and helps offset high home prices.</p> <p>It is unnecessary to state that growth limits will be in place until the LCP is amended, at which time the Commission will consider wastewater, traffic, and other relevant issues.</p>	<p>Delete the modification. Otherwise, revise it to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> maintain the County proposed unit of measurement; exclude secondary dwelling units; and, eliminate language that hinges changes in the growth rate on a traffic management plan and resolution of wastewater transmission issues.
3 & 4	1.35	Yes	Deletes new policy that requires compliance with the San Mateo Countywide Water Pollution Prevention Program and references minimum requirements attached as an appendix to the LCP. Adds seven new expansive policies that require very detailed and specific measures.	<p>The technical standards proposed by CCC staff are inconsistent with other LCP policies in level of detail, and apply different standards for the coast than are being applied countywide. They also limit the County's ability to efficiently implement new approaches to water quality protection that continue to be perfected and refined, because by removing the reference to SMCWPPP, the County will have to amend its LCP anytime it wants to adjust the very specific methods being prescribed by CCC staff.</p>	<p>Maintain the reference to SMCWPPP and the use of appendix. If necessary, supplement the appendix by incorporating the standards detailed by the modification where appropriate. These standards should be clarified and consolidated prior to inserting them into the appendix.</p>

Analysis of CCC Staff's Suggested Modifications to the Midcoast LCP Update

June 22, 2009

Mod. #	Policy	Part of Amend?	Modification Description	Analysis	Recommended Response
5	1.3	Yes	Deletes policy that allows County to resolve conflicts between LCP policies in a manner that is, on balance, the most protective of significant Coastal Resources.	CCC staff's interpretation of Coastal Act Section 30007.5 is that it can be used only to resolve conflicts between Chapter 3 of the Coastal Act, and not to conflicts between policies of a certified LCP. This conflicts with the Coastal Act's delegation of coastal development permit decisions to local governments, and Coastal Act Section 30200(b), which recognizes that conflicts may arise when local governments are implementing the provisions of the Coastal Act through LCP's.	Delete the modification and certify Policy 1.3 as submitted by the County.
6	1.18.1	No	Adds new policy that prohibits approval of new development unless it can be served by adequate public services. With respect to water and sewer facilities, there must be adequate capacity to serve the development and all other development the system is committed to serving. Also prohibits private wells and septic systems within the urban services line unless authorized pursuant to a groundwater management plan incorporated into the LCP.	CCC staff's proposed policy is not clear about the information required to demonstrate the adequacy of public services, and establishes a moratorium on new development until existing service levels on Highways One 1 and 92 are resolved and a solution to existing wet weather overflow problems is implemented. While a cautious approach towards new wells and septic systems is needed, an exception to the recommended prohibition would be appropriate where new development can demonstrate that wells or septic systems will not have detrimental impacts. Because single-family residential development is largely excluded from CDP requirements, CCC staff's policy will create a more intensive review process for commercial, mixed-use, and multi-residential infill projects. Prohibiting new development until infrastructure and service capacities are increased does not consider the role that new development plays in implementing such improvements.	Delete sections a, b, g, and h of proposed policy 1.18.1 and revise the language prohibiting wells and septic systems to identify the circumstances under which wells and/or septic systems will be allowed.

Analysis of CCC Staff's Suggested Modifications to the Midcoast LCP Update

June 22, 2009

Mod. #	Policy	Part of Amend?	Modification Description	Analysis	Recommended Response
8, 11, 20, 25, 28, 29, and 33	2.7, 2.12, 2.27, 2.32, 2.36, 2.48, and 2.53	No	Adds new policy language limiting the capacity of public works expansions to that can be accommodated by other existing and probable future capacity of other public works facilities.	CCC staff's proposed modifications create a situation under which the status of public services, rather than the protection of coastal resources, determines the future level of development allowed by the LCP. They necessitate that public works project occur at the same time, which will present significant obstacles to the efficient and cost effective implementation of major infrastructure projects.	Delete the modifications or revise them to state that public works capacities are limited to that which can serve the buildout allowed by the LCP.
9 and 42	2.8a - d	In part (section d only)	Expands the policy requiring the reservation of public service capacities for priority land uses to include roadway capacity.	These modifications seem to require that the County determine the transportation needs of existing and future priority land uses; analyze the relationship of this demand to roadway levels of service; identify how future roadway projects and transit improvements will be used; and document that roadway projects are adequate to serve both priority and non-priority land uses allowed by the LCP. This type of analysis is not only prone to error and debate, but is really only a paper exercise. When it comes down to actual use of the roadway and transit network, there is no effective means of allocating these facilities to priority land uses.	Delete sections of the modifications that require the reservation of roadway capacity for priority uses.
12	New Policy 2.15.1	No	Allows the formation or expansion of special districts only when public service capacity issues such as water, sewer, and transportation are resolved.	The modification could preclude the formation of a special districts that may be needed to meet the existing needs of the coastsides, and prevent the consolidation of existing service districts to provide more efficient and/or cost effective public service	Delete the modification.

Mod. #	Policy	Part of Amend?	Modification Description	Analysis	Recommended Response
14	2.18	No	Revises existing language regarding the timing and sizing of projects that expand sewage collection and treatment capacities, and restricts the possible future reuse of treated wastewater by prohibiting connections to commercial, residential, or industrial water users.	The modifications to Policy 2.18 raises the same concerns described above regarding suggested modifications 8, 11, 20, 25, 28, 29, and 33. It also restricts the possible reuse of treated wastewater, which can provide an alternative source of irrigation for landscaping and agricultural purposes and thereby reduce demands on limited groundwater supplies. The proposed restriction is unnecessary and runs counter to objective of protecting the groundwater basin.	Revise the modification in accordance with the County's response to modifications 8, 11, 20, 25, 28, 29, and 33 (above), and delete the proposed restriction on the reuse of treated wastewater.
16, 23, and 43	2.21, 2.23, and 3.17	In part (Policy 3.17 only)	Deletes the County's proposal to reserve additional water for 40 more affordable housing units and revises the existing priorities for water service by giving Coastal Act land use priorities higher standing than affordable housing.	Coastal Act Section 30604(f) and (g) directs the CCC to encourage the provision of affordable housing in the coastal zone. One of the ways to do this is to make affordable housing eligible to receive water that has been, or will be, set aside for priority land uses. Although water may not be currently available, such a policy will require future water projects to be designed and implemented with this in mind. CCC staff's proposal to revise existing policies in a manner that gives Coastal Act land use priorities higher standing than affordable housing is inconsistent with Sections 30604(f) and (g).	Delete Suggested Modification 43, as well as the portions of Suggested Modifications 16 and 23 that make affordable housing a secondary priority.
20	2.27	No	Allows new water supply projects that that enable wells be replaced with connections to municipal water systems only after existing capacities are consumed.	It does not appear that this modification will have an effect within the Montara Water and Sanitary District's boundaries, where existing water service capacities have been consumed. It will, however, create an obstacle to replacing wells within the Coastside County Water District, where allocated water is not being fully consumed.	Revise the modification to allow new water supply projects that replace wells with service connections to move forward as soon as possible.

Analysis of CCC Staff's Suggested Modifications to the Midcoast LCP Update

June 22, 2009

Mod. #	Policy	Part of Amend?	Modification Description	Analysis	Recommended Response
21	New Policy 2.28	No	Requires an LCP amendment for any proposed desalination plant, and establishes standards for the development of desalination projects.	The requirement for an LCP amendment should only apply to instances where a proposed desalination plant is not allowed by the existing LCP. The proposed standards for desalination, which will be applied Countywide, has not been adequately noticed or reviewed at the local level. It is unclear when a reverse osmosis or other desalting system would be considered a "desalination plant" subject to this policy.	Delete the modification, or revise it to eliminate the need for an LCP amendment and clarify what constitutes a "desalination plant".
32	2.52	No	Requires the County to monitor the relationship of residential construction to traffic levels during peak commuter and recreation traffic periods.	There is no data available, and no monitoring program in place, to document roadway levels of service during peak recreation periods. Regional use of Hwys 1 and 92 make it impossible to draw reliable conclusions about the relation of residential development to levels of service.	Delete the proposed revisions to Policy 2.52b.
36	2.56	In part (sections c and d only)	Requires the County to: accept portions of Hwy 1 upon completion of the Devil's Slide tunnel; operate the trail and facilities 365 days a year; and, incorporate these facilities into the County park system. Also applies the requirement that CalTrans install pedestrian crossings and a recreation path parallel to Highway One to "any new or improved roadway project".	The revisions essentially mimic the conditions of approval for the Devil's Slide Tunnel project except that the policy being recommended by CCC staff requires the County to open and operate the trail and access facilities 365 days a year; the conditions of the permit allow the terms of public access to be developed in coordination with the Devil's Slide Coastal Access Task Force, and include provisions for temporary closures. CalTrans staff has expressed concern regarding the policy requiring pedestrian crossings and a trail parallel to Hwy 1 because it could be applied to repair and maintenance activities or other small-scale projects. Clarification regarding the type of roadway projects that would trigger these requirements would be beneficial.	Revise the modification to clarify the terms under which the trail may be closed, and that the terms of public use shall be determined in coordination with the Devil's Slide Coastal Access Task Force. Work with County and CalTrans staff to better define when Highway 1 roadway projects trigger the need to install pedestrian crossings and/or a parallel path.

Analysis of CCC Staff's Suggested Modifications to the Midcoast LCP Update

June 22, 2009

Mod. #	Policy	Part of Amend?	Modification Description	Analysis	Recommended Response
38	2.51	No	Requires Traffic Impact Analysis and Mitigation Plans for all new development that generates a net increase in vehicle trips on Highway 1 or 92, except single-family residential and visitor-serving development. Also requires all land divisions to retire or merge a number of existing legal lots equivalent to the number of lots created by the division.	The proposed lot retirement requirement involves a complex program under which applicants proposing a land division would have to locate and purchase other land with equivalent development potential, and record legal documents prohibiting their future development. It also places the responsibility for long-term management of retired lots on public agencies, private associations, or adjacent landowners. In light of the recent Witt and Abernathy court decisions, this requirement will have a much broader application than originally anticipated by CCC staff, and will pose significant challenges for infill development.	Revise the modification to apply lot retirement requirements only to land divisions that create 5 or more new parcels. Exempt land divisions associated with the development of affordable housing projects from this requirement.
39	New Policy 2.57.2	No	Requires the County to develop a comprehensive transportation management plan, based on the results of a County commissioned study that identifies the total cumulative traffic impact of LCP buildout. Among other things, the Plan must propose policies "designed to offset the demand for all new vehicle trips generated by the project", and "mitigate for cumulative impacts on public access to and recreation use of Midcoast Beaches".	The County is actively engaged in transportation management planning, among other ways by participating in the update of the Countywide Transportation Plan. This update, and other transportation planning efforts that are currently underway, will provide an opportunity to address many of the transportation issues that CCC staff wants addressed in a comprehensive plan. However, several of the plan components required by the modification, such as the buildout study and the formulation of new LCP policies, will require supplemental planning efforts. Some of these requirements are outside the scope of a typical traffic management plan, such as the development of policies that mitigate impacts of residential development on recreational use of beaches. It is unlikely that the County will have the financial and staffing resources to undertake these supplemental efforts in the near future.	Revise the modification to delete requirements that the transportation plan be based on a new buildout study and include policies that mitigate impacts of residential development on recreational use of beaches.

Analysis of CCC Staff's Suggested Modifications to the Midcoast LCP Update

June 22, 2009

Mod. #	Policy	Part of Amend?	Modification Description	Analysis	Recommended Response
44	New Policy 10.37.1	No	Requires the County to pursue a grant or other funding to conduct a Coastal Trail alignment study, with a specified scope of work, within two years of amendment certification.	The County is an active participant in a wide range of trail planning and improvement projects, including interagency efforts to plan for and develop a continuous coastal trail system. The programming of County Park's projects is done in close coordination with the Board of Supervisors, based on a careful evaluation of Countywide needs and available resources. The County is supportive of the effort to establish and improve a coastal trail network, and will continue to be an active participant in this regard. However, it is inappropriate for CCC staff to dictate how the County Parks Department's time and resources should be spent.	Revise the modification to delete the requirement that the County seek funding and complete a California Coastal Trail Alignment Study.
55, 58, and 59	New Policy 11.31 and LCP Maps	No	As submitted by the County, the Update supports efforts to add the Devil's Slide bypass roadway alignment to adjoining park units, such as the GGNRA. CCC staff's suggested modifications require the County to designate bypass lands as a Linear Park and Trail, rezone this area to Community Open Space, and pursue a grant or other funding to complete the park and trail within two years of amendment certification.	While the County supports the concept of including the bypass lands within adjoining park units, there are many issues that need to be resolved prior to rezoning the entirety of this area, including issues related to ownership. According to CalTrans staff, there are legal agreements with former landowners regarding the future dispensation of these lands in the event the bypass is not constructed. CalTrans staff has also indicated a need to understand the form of compensation it would receive for transferring this land to a public agency, and stated the importance of preserving rights of access to lots that are within and east of the bypass alignment. Until these issues are resolved, it would be inappropriate to zone the entire area for open space. As noted in the analysis of Suggested Modification 44 (above), it also is inappropriate for CCC staff to dictate how the County Parks Department's time and resources should be spent.	Delete the modifications.

Mod. #	Policy	Part of Amend?	Modification Description	Analysis	Recommended Response
57	LCP maps	No	Requires the County to designate a Park Overlay District on the Burnham strip.	Maps contained in the County's Montara, Moss Beach, and El Granada Community Plan designate the Burnham strip as "Parks, Beaches, & Recreation Corridors". While this designation points out areas that should be considered for park and recreation improvements, it does not provide any standards for, or restrictions on development. Including a "park overlay" on the LCP Land Use Plan Map is therefore unnecessary.	Delete the modification.
63	§6229-6229.4 of the Zoning Regs	Yes	Revises allowable uses on the Burnham strip, among other ways by prohibiting the installation of roadside stands used for the sale of produce or other goods and merchandise, and by limiting "outdoor art centers" used for the exhibition, study or creation of art to a temporary use only.	These restrictions are unnecessary and preclude uses that could benefit residents and visitors.	Revise the modification to retain roadside stands and outdoor art centers as permitted uses.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA -- BUSINESS, TRANSPORTATION AND HOUSING AGENCY

ARNOLD SCHWARZENEGGER, Governor

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

111 GRAND AVENUE
P. O. BOX 23660
OAKLAND, CA 94623-0660
PHONE (510) 286-5900
FAX (510) 286-5903
TTY 711



*Flex your power!
Be energy efficient!*

June 15, 2009

Supervisor Rich Gordon
San Mateo County Board of Supervisors
Hall of Justice
400 County Center
Redwood City, CA 94063

Dear Supervisor Gordon:

The California Department of Transportation (Department) plans to attend the Tuesday, June 16, 2009, Board of Supervisor's meeting, to observe and listen to comments made by the County's representatives and by the public regarding the California Coastal Commission (CCC) staff's recommendation on amendments to the Midcoast Update Local Coastal Program (LCP), as it relates to issues affecting the Department and its activities. This topic is identified as Agenda Item 10 and scheduled to begin at 5:00 p.m. As indicated, the Department will not ask for an opportunity to provide either its comments or its responses to any comments made during tomorrow's working session.

Although not intended to be a comprehensive summary, we thought it appropriate to reiterate some of the Department's issues regarding certain of the proposed amendments to the LCP. The County will note that all of the following relate to the Department's responsibility to protect the public's investment in the State highway system and the fact that some of the proposed amendments to the LCP impede upon the Department's duty to fulfill its legislatively mandated obligations and responsibilities and/or pre-existing contractual obligations.

The Department has previously expressed its concerns regarding proposed LCP amendments that would alter the allowable use of the Department's right of way. One of these concerns relates to the potential effect of such amendments on certain of the Department's commitments as to access or other matters related to owners.

Another Departmental concern relates to the proposed downzoning or designation of its right of way to a linear park or open space. Such downzoning fails to acknowledge compensation for the loss in value resulting from such action. Additionally, to the extent there is a perception that the proposed LCP amendments do not require the Department to "sell" any interests in its right of way, the Department is nevertheless entitled to the fair market value of its right of way, regardless of the process by which the right of way is reduced.

"Caltrans improves mobility across California"

Supervisor Rich Gordon
June 15, 2009
Page 2

The Department also has concerns that the proposed LCP amendments may not allow sufficient time for the Department to identify and evaluate parcels within its right of way to ensure fulfillment and compliance with legislatively-mandated obligations. For example, the Department must have adequate time to identify lots previously bisected by the highway right of way acquisition process that are suitable for recombination and lot line adjustment, as necessary, to accommodate the most reasonable land use pattern with that of the community. Similarly, the Department would appreciate sufficient time to evaluate, identify and reserve potential sites suitable for the Department's future mitigation needs, particularly for public access, agriculture, wetlands, and other environmentally sensitive habitat needs, and reserve necessary access to those selected sites.

Finally, the Department has previously identified and provided its concerns regarding the proposed amendments to the LCP related to the California Coastal Trail. However, we want to reiterate our concern that the proposed paragraphs 2.56d and 2.56g, improperly attempt to impose significant, overly broad obligations on the Department. Of equal concern is the absence of any feasibility or funding limitations on these proposed obligations. The Department has also expressed its concern that the most recent proposed amendments have added new language imposing additional, unilateral obligations on the Department relative to the California Coastal Trail that did not exist in the earlier version.

Despite reiterating some of the above issues, we remain optimistic that our respective concerns will be addressed, over the upcoming weeks, as the County and the Department continue our commitment to keep the dialogue open. Given our past cooperative efforts, the Department is confident that all interested parties will continue to maximize opportunities to identify mutually satisfactory resolutions to address our respective concerns. If you have further questions or concerns, please contact me at (510) 286-5900.

Sincerely,



BIJAN SARTI
District Director

"Caltrans improves mobility across California"



COMMITTEE FOR
GREEN FOOTHILLS

June 16, 2009

President Mark Church and Members,
San Mateo County Board of Supervisors
400 County Center
Redwood City, CA 94063

Re: Midcoast LCP Update

Dear President Church and Members of the Board,

Committee for Green Foothills (CGF) has several major concerns regarding the County Planning and Building Staff's proposed response to the Coastal Commission's suggested modifications to the Midcoast LCP Update.

As you are aware, in the urban Midcoast area, the cumulative impacts of new development in the City of Half Moon Bay, as well as the unincorporated communities of El Granada, Princeton, Miramar, Moss Beach, and Montara have raised significant issues as to the adequacy of the infrastructure to serve buildout without adversely impacting coastal resources and/or public access to and along the shore.

The Coastal Act requires that in order to certify a Land Use Plan (LUP) amendment, the Coastal Commission must find that it **"meets the requirements of, and is in conformity with, the policies of Chapter 3 of the Coastal Act"**.

The key Coastal Act policies regarding new development and public services are:

Section 30250 (a): "New residential, commercial, or industrial development...shall be located within, contiguous with, or in close proximity to, existing developed areas able to accommodate it or, where such areas are not able to accommodate it, in other areas with adequate public services and where it will not have significant adverse effects, either individually or cumulatively, on coastal resources..."

Section 30254: "New or expanded public works facilities shall be designed and limited to accommodate needs generated by development or uses permitted consistent with the provisions of this division; provided, however, that it is the intent of the Legislature that State Highway Route 1 in rural areas of the coastal zone remain a scenic two-lane road. Special districts shall not be formed or expanded except where assessment for, and provision of, the service would not induce new development inconsistent with this division. Where existing or planned public works facilities can accommodate only a limited amount of new development, services to coastal dependent land use, essential public services and basic industries vital to the economic health of the region, state, or nation, public recreation, commercial recreation, and visitor-serving land uses shall not be precluded by other development."

COMMITTEE FOR
GREEN FOOTHILLS

3921 E. Bayshore Road
Palo Alto, CA 94303

650.968.7243 PHONE
650.968.8431 FAX

info@GreenFoothills.org
www.GreenFoothills.org

ATTACHMENT 3

Page 3-18

These two policies work together and are the foundation of coastal planning for urban areas such as the Midcoast. Buildout (the maximum allowable amount of development determined by the amount of all available land developed to the maximum density levels allowed) must not exceed the available infrastructure (now and in the future) to serve it. The key question that still is unresolved between Coastal and County Planning staffs is how the LCP amendment can accommodate the planned buildout in the Midcoast when current infrastructure — specifically water supply, wastewater disposal, roadway capacity, and stormwater drainage facilities — is inadequate.

Recent Court Decisions on Parcel Legality affect Substandard Lots: CGF has been concerned for many years over the thorny unresolved issue in the Midcoast of permitting development on substandard lots. Most of the Midcoast was subdivided in the early 1900s by filing of subdivision maps, which were grids of lots and streets overlaid on the land without consideration of topography, infrastructure or other design considerations. Many of these antiquated subdivision lots are located within environmentally sensitive areas, such as wetlands and riparian areas in the Montecito Riparian Corridor and Miramar, or in hazardous areas, such as the cliffs of Seal Cove. The County's proposed two-phase substandard lot merger does not adequately address the problem of cumulative development on these substandard lots. Owners who wish to avoid merger have been able to transfer adjacent properties into separate ownership to defeat the intent of the existing and proposed merger policies.

Recently, the landscape dramatically changed regarding substandard lots. On May 7, 2009, in a memo to the Board of Supervisors regarding two recent Court of Appeal decisions (*Witt Homes, Inc. v. County of Sonoma*, and *Abernathy Valley, Inc. v. County of Solano*) County Counsel advised that the Abernathy decision "clearly establishes that the mere reference to a subdivision map" filed in compliance with the 1908 subdivision map law "does not conclusively establish its legal separation from adjacent lands in common ownership."

Accordingly, the LCP buildout numbers must be adjusted to recognize and reflect the fact that parcels in common ownership are only one "legal" parcel, notwithstanding the number of "paper lots" that comprise the parcels. The County needs to develop a procedure to address the actual legal status of both developed and undeveloped parcels where there is more than one contiguous "paper lot" in common ownership. The County should require a land division approval where required and where parcels have been illegally created, apply LCP Policy 1.29d. If a Conditional Certificate of Compliance is to be approved under LCP Policy 1.29d, it should be conditioned to comply with current LCP zoning and other LCP policies to ensure protection of coastal resources, avoid hazards, and all other relevant LCP policies. The County also needs to address the situation where owners have segregated parcels into separate ownerships in an attempt to avoid the current County policy that requires merger of substandard lots at the time of a building permit application.

Regarding the Preliminary Staff Recommendations in the June 1, 2009 memo to the Board of Supervisors, CGF has the following specific comments:

Recommendation #1: Revisions to Annual Growth Rate: CGF does not support the Staff Recommendation to delete Suggested Modification 2, which would reduce the allowable annual growth rate from 2% to 1% until the County develops a comprehensive transportation management

plan and adequate facilities to contain stormwater infiltration and inflow have been constructed. CGF notes that your County Planning Commission also recommended a 1% growth rate limit, which is consistent with Half Moon Bay's annual growth limit. CGF believes the 1% annual limit is sound public policy in light of the inadequacies of road, sewer, and water capacities. CGF does not support exceptions to the growth limit for Princeton caretaker units, or for second units, as they also contribute to the infrastructure demand. CGF would support basing the annual growth rate upon the number of units rather than a percentage of the population, for simplicity.

Recommendation #2: Water Quality Protection: CGF appreciates the issues raised by Planning Staff regarding consistency with the current San Mateo Countywide Water Pollution Prevention Program (SMCWPPP). However, when the Regional Water Quality Control Board adopts new standards for Municipal Regional Permit standards, the LCP standards will be out of date and inconsistent with those standards. CGF suggests that the LCP amendment should specify that the SMCWPP or its current replacement shall apply.

Recommendation #3: Demonstration of Public Service Capacities: CGF supports coastal staff's suggested modifications that require demonstration of adequate public services in order to approve new development, in order for the LCP amendment to comply with Coastal Act Sections 30250 and 30254. County staff has pointed out some practical problems with applying the infrastructure capacity to all public services, including schools, fire, emergency, police protection, and solid waste collection, in addition to transportation, water, sewer, and stormwater facilities. CGF suggests that County Planning and Coastal staff work to clarify (1) that demonstration of public service capacities must address all new development, including within the urban exclusion area, and (2) how the adequacy of public services beyond water, sewer, transportation and stormwater facilities can be addressed in this LCP update.


Recommendation #4: Prohibition of Wells and Septic Systems: CGF strongly supports the prohibition of new drinking water wells and septic systems in the urban area. Continuing to allow private individual drinking water wells and septic systems undermines the economic viability of the public sewer and water providers, places an undue burden on the customers of the public systems, and threatens to adversely impact public health and sensitive coastal resources. Already some wells have failed; in drought cycles we can expect many more. CGF does not support planning staff's proposed exceptions to the prohibition of new wells and septic systems.

Recommendation #5: New Policies Regulating the Size of Public Works: CGF agrees with the county planning staff that the suggested modifications should be revised to limit the capacity of public works to a level which will serve, but not exceed, the buildout allowed by the LCP.

Finally, CGF recommends that your Board refer the public comments at your hearing on June 16 to the staff for analysis, rather than giving direction at this meeting. The Midcoast LCP Update has been under review by your Board and the Coastal Commission since January, 2005. Despite this very long time frame, which has included extensive public workshops and hearings, it is very important that your Board have a full staff analysis of public comments. We note for example that the proponents of the Big Wave project are now proposing numerous LCP amendments (Attachment 3 of the Staff Report) that would facilitate their proposed project. The Big Wave

project has not undergone any public hearings. If Big Wave (or other projects) require project specific LCP amendments, such amendments should be considered at the time of the county's review and approval of the project. Initiating new LCP amendments at this late stage of review is NOT appropriate, and will further delay the long-overdue adoption of the Midcoast LCP amendments.

Thank you for consideration of our views,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Lennie Roberts".

Lennie Roberts, Legislative Advocate
Committee for Green Foothills
339 La Cuesta
Portola Valley, CA 94028

From: <jhstuff@comcast.net>
To: <atissier@co.sanmateo.ca.us>, <rgordon@co.sanmateo.ca.us>, <mchurch@co.s...
CC: <kathryn@montara.com>
Date: 6/16/2009 8:52 AM
Subject: Midcoast Local Coastal Program Update Project

John Duff

464 Third Ave

Half Moon Bay, CA 94019

June 16, 2009

San Mateo County Board of Supervisors

400 County Center

Redwood City , CA 94063

Subject: Midcoast Local Coastal Program Update Project

I am writing this electronic letter to request that San Mateo County adopt all Coastal Commission staff recommendations to the LCP Update.

I recommend that San Mateo County reduce the building growth rate to 1% as recommended by the CCC until it can show that water and other public service systems meet the need of the current population, much less that of the area as the population grows. All too often County-mitigated requirements associated with development address only the immediate project in a cookie-cutter fashion but fail to address the cumulative impacts of all the projects on the community as a whole. As a result, our coastal population has grown without a concomitant improvement or understanding in community and environmental infrastructure including traffic congestion, water demand, under-staffed and over-crowded schools, medical access, groundwater quality and supply, and increased urbanization and funneling of water runoff, which short circuits natural hydrologic pathways and increases water pollution.

To comply with the well-thought-out Coastal Act, I ask that San Mateo County adopt the policy recommendations of the CCC.

Thank you,

John Duff

From: "Evy Smith" <evy@boffoproductions.com>
To: "Adrienne Tissier" <atissier@co.sanmateo.ca.us>, "Richard Gordon" <r...
Date: 6/16/2009 5:35 AM
Subject: California Coastal Commission Staff Recommendations and Midcoast LCP

All,

The purpose of this email is to express my support of the California Coastal Commission staff's recommendation for the Midcoast Local Coastal Program amendments. San Mateo County is urged to adopt the CCC staff recommendations.

It is imperative that we catch up with the growth that has already occurred here on the coast, and then implement smart growth going forward. Our traffic congestion, our groundwater supplies, our hill building, all need to be addressed prior to additional growth.

These are the policies that I support, as recommended from the CCC staff:

New policies that require demonstration of adequate public service capacities and restrict the allowable capacity of public works projects.

- * A recommended prohibition against individual private wells and septic systems within the Midcoast urban area.
- * Replacement of the County proposed 75-unit annual limit with a population growth rate of 1%, and application of this limit to secondary dwellings units.
- * New policies that replace Countywide storm water pollution control requirements with detailed construction, erosion control, drainage, and treatment standards.
- * Deletion of a policy that would enable the County to resolve conflicts between LCP policies in a manner that is on balance the most protective of coastal resources.
- * A prohibition against the formation or expansion of special districts until public service capacity issues are resolved.
- * New traffic mitigation, monitoring, and reporting requirements.
- * New requirements for the provision of coastal access trails and related studies.
- * Deletion of a proposed incentive to provide affordable housing units.
- * Requirements to designate the Devil's Slide bypass alignment as a Linear Park and Trail and rezone this area to Community Open Space.
- * Changes to land use designations and allowable uses on the Burnham Strip.

Once we have addressed and solved for these policies, then the County can

adopt more open and smart growth.

Thank you for your support to the CCC staff's recommendations.

I appreciate that the Board has scheduled the hearing for tomorrow night and look forward to participating.

Sincerely,

Evy M. Smith

216 Magellan Ave.

Half Moon Bay, CA 94019

From: "Jack McCarthy" <jackmc333@yahoo.com>
To: "Adrienne Tissier" <atissier@co.sanmateo.ca.us>, "Richard Gordon" <rgord...>
Date: 6/15/2009 11:55 PM
Subject: Midcoast Local Coastal Program (LCP) Update Project: California Coastal Commission Staff Recommendations

June 15, 2009 via email
Members of the San Mateo County Board of Supervisors
Hall of Justice and Records 400 County Center
Redwood City, California 94063

Subject: Midcoast Local Coastal Program (LCP) Update Project: California Coastal Commission Staff Recommendations

Dear Honorable Supervisors:

This is a short note of comment on the California Coastal Commission (CCC) staff recommendations. I endorse the CCC staff recommendations and hope they will be adopted. As one who attended many of the public hearings on the Midcoast Local Coastal Program Update, I understand that the California Coastal Commission staff's recommendations closely reflect the consensus that was reached in those hearings and adopted by the San Mateo County Planning Commission, but were later discarded. Further comments are as follows:

Please adopt the CCC staff's recommended annual residential growth rate of 1 percent

Public hearings resulted in a recommendation of a 1 percent growth rate limit by the County Planning Commission.. This growth rate limit is consistent with Half Moon Bay's Measure D, which was recently approved by the Coastal Commission. The County's proposed 75-unit annual limit would increase new residential development in the Midcoast at a level that could not be sustained by roads, water and sewer infrastructure.

Please adopt the CCC staff's recommendation for demonstration of adequate public service capacities prior to approval of new development

The County's envisioned doubling of residential units at build-out could turn out to be even larger, given the strong likelihood that the number of vacant non-conforming parcels on the Midcoast has been undercounted. The County's proposed LCP amendment would allow approval of development that could bring about severe traffic congestion on Highways 1 and 92, thus denying coastal access to the visiting public in violation of the Coastal Act and also preventing the neighboring City of Half Moon Bay from complying with its own LCP. Another limiting aspect of the area's infrastructure is the capacity of the Cabrillo Unified School District which already suffers from overcrowding, antiquated facilities, limited methods of increasing funding, and problems meeting federal academic performance standards. To comply with the Coastal Act, the County should adopt the policy recommendation of the CCC staff regarding demonstration of adequate public service capacities prior to approval

of new development.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,
Jack McCarthy
400 California Ave.
Moss Beach, CA 94038

From: <nutrimel@comcast.net>
To: "Adrienne Tissier" <atissier@co.sanmateo.ca.us>, "Richard Gordon" <rgord...
CC: <kathryn@montara.com>
Date: 6/15/2009 9:20 PM
Subject: Midcoast Local Coastal Program (LCP) Update Project: California Coastal Commission Staff Recommendations

June 15, 2009 via email

Members of the San Mateo County Board of Supervisors

Hall of Justice and Records

400 County Center

Redwood City, California 94063

Subject: Midcoast Local Coastal Program (LCP) Update Project: California Coastal Commission Staff Recommendations

Dear Honorable Supervisors:

I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the California Coastal Commission (CCC) staff recommendations to be discussed at the June 16 public hearing. My comments are as follows:

Retain the CCC staff's recommended annual residential growth rate of 1 percent based on population, along the lines of Half Moon Bay's Measure D.

I agree that the Coastal Commission's recommendations should be upheld. There will always be the WANT to develop and expand and it has to be halted at some point or every speck of land will be built upon for profit reasons. All we are asking for now is slow growth.

Retain the CCC staff's recommended policy for demonstration of adequate public service capacities prior to approval of new development
It seems irresponsible to keep building out areas without really understanding the adequacy of the public service capacities to those newly developed areas.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Melinda MacNaughton

El Granada, CA Resident

Members of the San Mateo County Board of Supervisors

Hall of Justice and Records

400 County Center

Redwood City, California 94063

Subject: Midcoast Local Coastal Program (LCP) Update Project: California Coastal Commission Staff
Recommendations

Dear Honorable Supervisors:

I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the California Coastal Commission (CCC) staff recommendations to be discussed at the June 16 public hearing. My comments are as follows:

Retain the CCC staff's recommended annual residential growth rate of 1 percent based on population, along the lines of Half Moon Bay's Measure D.

I agree that the Coastal Commission's recommendations should be upheld. There will always be the WANT to develop and expand and it has to be halted at some point or every speck of land will be built upon for profit reasons. All we are asking for now is slow growth.

Retain the CCC staff's recommended policy for demonstration of adequate public service capacities prior to approval of new development

It seems irresponsible to keep building out areas without really understanding the adequacy of the public service capacities to those newly developed areas.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Melinda MacNaughton

El Granada, CA Resident

From: "Lynette Curthoys" <lcuthoys@comcast.net>
To: "Adrienne Tissier" <atissier@co.sanmateo.ca.us>, "Richard Gordon" <r...
Date: 6/15/2009 9:19 PM
Subject: LCP Update

I appreciate the Board of Supervisors scheduling another hearing to obtain public input into the LCP process. I am not able to attend the meeting tomorrow night, but I strongly support the staff's recommendations, especially those that would:

Reduce the allowable annual growth rate from 2% to 1%, consistent with the City of Half Moon Bay's growth limit

Prohibit private drinking water wells and private septic systems in the urban area until the County develops a comprehensive groundwater management plan as an LCP amendment

Allow an increase in the allocation of priority water connections for failed drinking water wells from 10 houses to 50

Require a coastal development permit and an amendment to the LCP for any proposed desalination plants, in order to fully protect sensitive coastal resources

Improve traffic mitigation for new development

Add public parking, trails, and restrooms as permitted uses subject to a Use Permit, and deleting outdoor athletic facilities and urban roadside stands in the new "EG" District, which comprises the "Burnham Strip" in El Granada

Revise proposed LCP Policies regarding the Devil's Slide "Adopted Alignment" to more effectively implement the transfer of Caltrans surplus land to the County and plan for a proposed Linear Park and Trail

Thank you,

Lynette Curthoys

P.O. Box 2746

El Granada, CA 94018

June 15, 2009 via email

Members of the San Mateo County Board of Supervisors
Hall of Justice and Records
400 County Center
Redwood City, California 94063

Subject: Midcoast Local Coastal Program (LCP) Update Project: California Coastal Commission Staff Recommendations

Dear Honorable Supervisors:

I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the California Coastal Commission (CCC) staff recommendations to be discussed at the June 16 public hearing. My comments are as follows:

Retain the CCC staff's recommended annual residential growth rate of 1 percent based on population, along the lines of Half Moon Bay's Measure D.

A 1 percent growth rate limit was recommended by the County Planning Commission following numerous local public hearings. Moreover, this growth rate limit is consistent with Half Moon Bay's Measure D, which was recently approved by the Coastal Commission. The County's proposed 75-unit annual limit would have the effect of concentrating new residential development in the Midcoast relative to that taking place to the North in Pacifica and the South in Half Moon Bay. Excess new development in the Midcoast absorbs the capacity of limited infrastructure elements (roads, schools, water, and sewer) that have been commonly-financed with other neighboring communities. Moreover, the County's proposed 75-unit annual would exempt several categories of new housing units from the growth limit (e.g., second units) which means that the true growth rate could be higher than 75 units. The exempt units would place just as much stress on the area's infrastructure as any other type of residential unit. It's also worth noting that these proposed growth limits apply only to residential units; they do not in any way restrain the rate of commercial development that will also impose demands on the infrastructure. The 2006 closure of Devil's Slide for four months demonstrated that Coastside roadways cannot handle a large increase in traffic coming south from the Midcoast through Half Moon Bay. Adopting the CCC staff's 1 percent growth limit will allow time for roadway capacity and other infrastructure elements (such as schools) to be improved prior to reaching full build-out.

Retain the CCC staff's recommended policy for demonstration of adequate public service capacities prior to approval of new development

The County's envisioned doubling of residential units at build-out could turn out to be even larger, given the strong likelihood that the number of vacant non-conforming parcels on the Midcoast has been undercounted. The County's proposed LCP amendment would allow approval of development that could bring about severe traffic congestion on Highways 1 and 92, thus denying coastal access to the visiting public in violation of the Coastal Act and also preventing the neighboring City of Half Moon Bay from complying with its own LCP. Another limiting aspect of the area's infrastructure is the capacity of the Cabrillo Unified School District which already suffers from overcrowding, antiquated facilities, limited methods of increasing funding, and problems meeting federal academic performance standards. To comply with the Coastal Act, the County should adopt the policy recommendation of the CCC staff regarding demonstration of adequate public service capacities prior to approval of new development.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Kevin J. Lansing
359 Filbert Street
Half Moon Bay CA 94019

From: "Steven Groubert" <sgroubert@hotmail.com>
To: <smonowitz@co.sanmateo.ca.us>
Date: 6/16/2009 6:33 AM
Subject: Coastal Commission staff recommendations to the LCP Update

Dear Supervisor Monowitz,

My wife and I thank you and the Board for having tonight's meeting here on the Coast. Unfortunately we will be leaving the area early today and will be unable to attend.

We want to let you know that we strongly support the Coastal Commission staff recommendations to the LCP Update.

Sincerely,

Steven and Nella Groubert
215 9th St
Montara
(650) 728-7001

From: <Edacook@aol.com>
To: <smonowitz@co.sanmateo.ca.us>
CC: <kathryn@montara.com>
Date: 6/16/2009 12:52 PM
Subject: California Coastal Commission Staff Report on the MidCoast LCP

Dear Supervisor Monowitz:

I am writing in support of the California Coastal Commission staff report on the MidCoast Local Coastal Program Update Amendments, and also in support of the CCC staff itself. I agree with all the recommendations of the CCC, and commend them for a fine and thoughtful report.

Sincerely,
Eda Cook
171 Turnberry Road
Half Moon Bay, CA 94019

*****An Excellent Credit Score is 750. See Yours in Just 2 Easy

Steps!

(<http://pr.atwola.com/promoclk/100126575x1221823265x1201398681/aol?redir=http://www.freecreditreport.com/pm/default.aspx?sc=668072&hmpgID=62&bcd=JuneExcfooterNO62>)