



COUNTY OF SAN MATEO INTERDEPARTMENTAL CORRESPONDENCE

To: Honorable Board of Supervisors
From: Steve Monowitz, Director of Planning & Building
Subject: Complaints regarding Cypress Point construction
Memo Date: April 2, 2026

Executive Summary

This memo addresses three formal complaints to the San Mateo County Board of Supervisors dated March 10 and March 13 (Attachments 1-3) and one email complaint to Supervisor Mueller and other recipients dated March 28 (Attachment 4), regarding the Cypress Point Affordable Family Community development at 1800 Carlos Street in Moss Beach.

The Planning and Building Department issued planning and building permits for the Cypress Point project, and the project is currently under development. The developer is MidPen Housing and general contractor is Devcon Construction. Although the County has permitting authority for this project and has contributed funds to the project, this is not a County project; this is a MidPen Housing project.

A primary concern expressed in the complaints is that surrounding neighbors were not notified about the recent discovery during construction of asbestos-containing material (ACM), and concerns that the presence and removal of ACM could present health risks due to airborne exposure. The Planning and Building Department has confirmed that upon discovery of the asbestos-containing material, the general contractor followed all the protocols required by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD), including testing, removal, and abatement by licensed and qualified contractors. Due to the location of the materials below ground, and the subsequent abatement in accordance with BAAQMD protocols, the asbestos-containing material did not pose risks of airborne transmission to the surrounding community, and public noticing was not required. However, MidPen has committed to providing timely and detailed notifications to the public should any additional hazardous material be discovered in the future.

Other concerns raised by the complaints include emergency access, CEQA compliance, and construction impacts such as noise, dust, and vibrations. All discretionary approvals for the project were granted during the planning phase. Staff are ensuring the project complies with its conditions of approval during the construction phase, which is an administrative process that does not require public review and input.

The complaints are addressed in detail by topic area below. Should you have questions or wish to discuss further, I am available to meet on this matter.

1. Public Safety and Emergency Access

Complaint #1 mentions concerns about emergency vehicle access previously raised by the local fire department. On October 20, 2025, prior to the beginning of construction, the Coastside Fire Protection District formally submitted a letter of support to the Board of Supervisors to establish a no-parking zone on Carlos Street in order to maintain adequate emergency access for the neighborhood. That no-parking zone was installed in early December 2025, and is actively being enforced by the Sheriff's Office. The project site is in full compliance with applicable fire safety codes and received all necessary approvals, including from the Coastside Fire Protection District, before construction commenced in late December 2025.

2. CEQA Compliance

The Cypress Point project underwent an extensive environmental review process over the course of its seven-year approvals process (2017-2024) with the California Coastal Commission and the County of San Mateo. During this period, MidPen commissioned more than a dozen environmental reports, all of which are publicly available on the County's website. The project also completed a CEQA-equivalent environmental review with the California Coastal Commission.

In 2023, the County retained an independent consultant to oversee CEQA compliance specifically for the Cypress Point project. Those reports, along with the draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR), are available for public review on the [County's project webpage](#). An environmental group named Midcoast ECO filed a lawsuit against the California Coastal Commission and the County, challenging the adequacy of the environmental review of the Local Coastal Plan amendment when it was before the Commission. The Commission and the County prevailed in the trial court and the decision was upheld by the Court of Appeal in September 2024. Moreover, State law was amended in 2024 in such a way as to cause the project to be exempt from CEQA. Therefore, the Cypress Point project has not violated CEQA. Despite this exemption from CEQA, MidPen voluntarily adopted the mitigation measures identified in the draft EIR as conditions of project approval.

3. Asbestos Discovery, Abatement, and Regulatory Compliance

Complaints #1, #2, and #3 refer to hazardous materials and asbestos. During the first phase of the project (the Local Coastal Program amendment), MidPen had the site surveyed to assess potential hazardous materials, and submitted two Environmental Site Assessment documents: one assessing the overall site and potential hazards, and the second looking at subsurface hazardous materials. These documents are available for review on the [County's Cypress Point project webpage](#).

On February 10, 2026, previously unidentified underground piping suspected of containing asbestos was discovered below ground during soil excavation activities at the project site. Construction work was promptly stopped, and Devcon Construction immediately followed regulatory testing and compliance protocol and notified the Bay Area Air Quality Management District, including the project location, anticipated scope of removal, and anticipated schedule. BAAQMD acknowledged receipt of the notification and fees. Several days later, additional suspected asbestos-containing insulation that was previously unidentified was observed in the soil, and field sampling and laboratory analysis were again conducted.

ProTech Consulting & Engineering, a professional environmental consulting firm, was retained to evaluate and sample the materials. Laboratory analysis confirmed asbestos-containing material (ACM)—with concentrations greater than 1%—in both the pipe insulation and the asphalt-impregnated insulation jacket along approximately 450 linear feet corresponding to the historical alignment of former Buena Vista Street. A second area of previously unidentified ACM was also confirmed near a former mechanical structure in the northeast portion of the site. Since the materials were encountered below ground in a contained work zone during excavation—not as part of a planned demolition of an aboveground structure—and subsequent removal was performed in accordance with BAAQMD compliance protocols, there was no uncontrolled airborne exposure risk to the surrounding neighborhood.

All known asbestos-containing materials were subsequently removed by R.B. Construction (CSLB #614028), a DOSH-registered asbestos abatement contractor, using industry-standard wet suppression methods to prevent the possibility of uncontrolled airborne asbestos fibers during removal. On March 3, 2026, BAAQMD performed an on-site inspection and reviewed all removal procedures. All work was completed by March 9, 2026. ProTech conducted post-removal visual and tactile inspections of all affected excavation areas and concluded that those areas were cleaned to a reasonable and appropriate standard consistent with the nature of the materials encountered.

The BAAQMD protocols do not require notification of nearby residents under these circumstances in which there is no airborne exposure risk to the surrounding neighborhood. However, understanding that the presence of and remediation of asbestos and other hazardous

materials is concerning to nearby residents, MidPen has committed to providing timely and detailed notification should any additional hazardous material be discovered (see item 8 below).

4. Noise, Fumes, and Exhaust

Complaint #3 mentions excessive noise, fumes, and exhaust. The project's [Conditions of Approval](#), approved by the Board of Supervisors on March 26, 2024, are available on the County website. Condition of approval 14 is to implement BAAQMD best management practices (BMPs) to control dust and exhaust, including minimizing idling times by shutting equipment off when not in use or by reducing the maximum idling time to 5 minutes, and verifying all equipment for proper use by a certified emissions evaluator. Condition of approval 15 is to use low-diesel particulate matter exhaust construction equipment. These BMPs, as well as all other conditions of approval for the project, are included in the construction contract with general contractor Devcon, as required, and MidPen has confirmed that Devcon is following them.

Condition of approval 22 is to implement construction noise BMPs. The condition does not establish a particular noise threshold, but limits construction to the hours of 7:00 am to 6:00 pm on weekdays and 9:00 am to 5:00 pm on weekends. The contractor has complied with the hours of operation since the beginning of construction. While some amount of noise is unavoidable in the course of construction, the project is currently in the mass grading phase, which involves the most amount of equipment, and creates a lot of noise. Mass grading is expected to be complete within the next two months. Subsequent construction phases will have limited heavy equipment-creating noise.

Complaint #4 mentions construction crews working on Saturday, March 28. Saturday construction is allowed under condition of approval 22, and was done on that particular Saturday due to forecast rain the following week that would pause construction. Going forward, notifications of planned Saturday construction will be posted on MidPen's project website to inform the public ahead of time (see item 8 below).

Complaint #3 also referenced backup beeping sounds from bulldozers being noisy and disruptive. Backup beeping is required by OSHA for workplace safety, and is unavoidable.

Complaint #3 cites that construction vehicles and portable toilets are currently staged along the property line of the only home that is adjacent to the site. Equipment staging is located at this edge of the site because it is the part of the site that will not be developed with future buildings, and the equipment needs to be stored near the Carlos Street entrance to the site. The project site plan was designed to maximize distance between new buildings and existing residences; this edge near an existing home will not be developed with new buildings. The rest of the site is currently being graded, and other edges of the site will have building pads on them.

Additionally, the project conditions of approval require heavy equipment to enter the site through the Carlos Street entrance to avoid disruption to the neighborhood via the Lincoln Avenue entrance, and the equipment must be stored near that entrance. Once mass grading is complete and utilities and construction pads are installed (expected within the next two to three months), staging will be relocated to a different part of the site further from the subject property.

5. Vibrations

Complaint #3 states that no warning was provided of demolition of concrete using cranes, which produced vibrations. Some vibration is unavoidable in the course of demolition. The contractor will continue to follow conditions of approval by limiting work to the hours of 7:00a.m. to 6:00p.m. during weekdays as required, to minimize impacts to nearby residents. In the future, the developer/contractor will also notify nearby residents beforehand of construction activities causing significant noise or vibration (see item 8 below).

6. Grading

Complaint #4 states that onsite grading violates building height restrictions and Coastal Act regarding visual impacts, and is not consistent with the County Design Review standards that require finished grade not deviate significantly from the natural grade.

The grading plans for Cypress Point, which include 28,894 cubic yards of grading total (9,506 cubic yards of cut and 19,388 cubic yards of imported fill) were presented to the Planning Commission on March 13, 2024 and to the Board of Supervisors on March 26, 2024 during the Coastal Development Permit phase. The grading permit was approved by the Board along with the Coastal Development Permit and General Plan Land Use Amendment on March 26, 2024.

The contractor's grading activity and volumes comply with the approved plans and the findings and conditions of approval (see Attachment 8).

Further, the design review regulations cited are specifically for single family residential development, not a multifamily planned urban development (PUD) such as this. Although the project was not required to present to the Coastside Design Review Committee (CDRC), the applicant chose to do so in 2023 in order to gather input from the CDRC. The same grading plans that were presented to the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors were also presented to the CDRC.

As approved, the project complies with the General Plan Visual Resources policies by locating development to avoid obstructing existing views of the Pacific Ocean and with the PUD-140 zoning regulations by limiting building height to 28 feet from *finished* grade. Once built, the development will not obstruct views from Carlos Street or Stetson Street, and will be partially visible from Lincoln Street and Buena Vista Street (the two streets closest to the east side of the

project site). Westerly scenic vistas from these two roads are currently dominated by the numerous trees surrounding the periphery of the site, which will remain. The buildings nearest Lincoln Street and Buena Vista Street will be set back approximately 230 feet from the nearest neighboring residences on those streets and will have building pads ranging from 183 feet above mean sea level (MSL) up to 186 feet MSL, while the existing houses on Lincoln Street sit at approximately 205 feet MSL. All other building pad elevations on the project site will be lower than 183 feet MSL. Because of the differences in topography and the preservation of existing trees on the project site, the roofs of project buildings will be only partially visible from Lincoln Street and from the base of Buena Vista Street. They will appear similar in height and mass to the existing water storage tanks, and lower in height than the background vegetation. All other proposed buildings will be located at lower elevations and more distant from Lincoln Street and Buena Vista Street.

7. Stormwater Drainage

Complaint #4 also mentions concerns about storm drainage once the project is built. As approved, the project is required to generate no net increase in stormwater runoff compared to pre-development. Drainage plans were reviewed and approved by the Planning and Building Department and by Department of Public Works prior to building permit issuance. Stormwater runoff on the project site will be collected in onsite stormwater retention basins, and drain inlets will be located at low points throughout the hardscape and landscape areas to collect and convey large storm event overflow runoff. The project will install a new connection to the existing storm drain main on Carlos Street, which ultimately outfalls to Montara Creek.

8. Community Communication and Transparency

MidPen currently sends monthly construction update letters to property owners in the neighborhood via mail. Each letter includes contact information for Devcon Construction and MidPen Housing's project team:

John Medina, Devcon Construction, jmedina@devcon-const.com | (408) 466-9834

Serena Ip, MidPen Housing, sip@midpen-housing.org | (650) 339-0581

A sign is also posted at the site entrance with contact information for the site superintendent.

Based on requests made by the County, interested members of the public can now view monthly updates and other timely information between monthly mailings, such as the asbestos abatement described above, on MidPen's project website at <https://www.cypresspointfamilycommunity.com/>, as well as subscribe to an email list to receive updates by email.

Member's Memorandum
April 2, 2026
Page 7

Attachments:

1. Complaint #1 dated March 10, 2026
2. Complaint #2 dated March 13, 2026
3. Complaint #3 dated March 13, 2026
4. Complaint #4 dated March 28, 2026
5. Response letter from MidPen Housing, dated March 17, 2026
6. BAAQMD Notification Acknowledgement, dated February 10, 2026
7. ProTech Asbestos Discovery and Abatement Summary, dated March 16, 2026

cc: Brenna J. McNab
Delores Silva and Richard Gates
Linda Yee
Serena Ip and Kushal Modi, MidPen Housing
Kimberly Williams, Midcoast Community Council
Nicholas Calderon, Deputy County Executive

Attachment 1



County of San Mateo Complaint Form

PLEASE NOTE:

This form is to submit written concerns about a County department, division or service. If you wish to file a claim for damages, you must submit a ***Claim against the County*** form to the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors.

Please print legibly or type

Name	Brenna J. Gano McNab		
Address	574 Sierra Street		
City, State, ZIP	Moss Beach	CA	94038
Phone Number	(415) 225-6173	Xcell	<input type="checkbox"/> other
Email Address	brennajmcnab@gmail.com		

Describe basis of complaint (continue on reverse side if needed):

Please see the attached letter

Signature of person making complaint: *Brenna J. McNab* Date: 3/10/2026

Please return form to:

COMPLAINTS, Board of Supervisors
500 County Center, 5th Floor
Redwood City, CA 94063

Your complaint will be distributed to the appropriate officials for response and/or action.

For Internal Use Only		
To	Date	Reply
CM		
CC		
Dept.-		
Other		

Brenna J. Gano McNab
574 Sierra Street
Moss Beach, CA 94038
415.225.6173 | brennajmcnab@gmail.com

March 10, 2026

Mike Callagy
County Executive Officer
County Government Center
500 County Center, 5th Floor
Redwood City, CA 94063

Subject: Formal Complaint and Request for Investigation – MidPen Housing Development, Public Safety, CEQA Compliance, and Asbestos Exposure Concerns

Dear Mike Callagy and San Mateo County Board of Supervisors,

I am submitting this formal complaint regarding the MidPen Housing development currently under construction in our neighborhood. Residents have serious concerns that this project has proceeded while circumventing meaningful public process, disregarding fire safety concerns, and failing to provide legally required transparency regarding the discovery and removal of asbestos at the site.

This development proposes approximately 71 housing units in a constrained residential area with limited access and inadequate parking infrastructure. The local fire department previously raised concerns regarding emergency access and safety risks, including the potential inability for fire and emergency vehicles to adequately reach the site. Despite these warnings, the project appears to have moved forward without clear mitigation measures or transparent explanation to the community regarding how these safety risks were addressed.

Emergency access is not a minor procedural issue—it is a life safety matter. A development of this density in a constrained area without adequate access raises serious concerns regarding compliance with local fire codes, emergency response standards, and basic public safety obligations.

These concerns are even more serious given that the Coastside currently does not have a hospital serving the community. Residents already face long transport times for emergency medical care off the coast. Any development that increases congestion or impedes emergency vehicle access further strains already limited emergency infrastructure and poses a heightened risk to both current residents and future occupants of the development.

Even more alarming is the recent discovery and removal of asbestos at the construction site. Residents were not proactively informed that asbestos was present, nor were we notified of the

removal timeline, remediation procedures, or safety protocols implemented to prevent airborne contamination during the removal process.

Asbestos exposure is a serious environmental health hazard, and failure to properly notify nearby residents raises concerns about compliance with state and federal asbestos handling regulations, including requirements related to environmental safety, air monitoring, and public disclosure.

At minimum, residents should have been informed of:

- When asbestos-containing materials were discovered
- Whether a formal hazardous materials survey was conducted prior to demolition
- The scope and location of the asbestos contamination
- The licensed contractor responsible for abatement
- The safety and containment procedures used during removal
- Air monitoring and environmental safety measures implemented during remediation
- Whether any potential exposure risks existed for neighboring residents

The lack of transparency and communication from the developer is unacceptable and raises legitimate concerns about whether required environmental and public safety protocols were properly followed.

Additionally, these issues raise potential California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) compliance concerns. If hazardous materials such as asbestos were present at the site, the project should have included appropriate environmental review, mitigation measures, and public disclosure regarding the risks associated with demolition and construction activities. Failure to properly disclose or mitigate environmental hazards may constitute a violation of CEQA's requirements for environmental review and public transparency.

Further, the failure to adequately notify nearby residents of hazardous materials removal raises concerns regarding public nuisance and failure-to-warn liability, particularly where construction activities may involve substances known to present significant health risks when disturbed.

Given the seriousness of these issues, I respectfully request that the County immediately:

1. Initiate a formal investigation into the asbestos discovery and removal at the project site, including compliance with all applicable environmental health regulations and reporting requirements.
2. Confirm whether proper notification procedures were followed with the Bay Area Air Quality Management District and other regulatory authorities responsible for asbestos abatement oversight.
3. Provide the public with documentation regarding hazardous materials surveys, abatement permits, air monitoring reports, and clearance testing related to asbestos removal at the site.
4. Reevaluate the public safety implications of this development, particularly in light of the fire department's previously raised concerns and the limited emergency medical infrastructure available on the Coastside.

5. Ensure the developer complies with all CEQA obligations, including disclosure and mitigation of environmental hazards associated with the project.
6. Require the developer to provide immediate transparency to surrounding residents regarding environmental safety and construction impacts.

Residents should not be placed at risk because a developer failed to adequately address environmental hazards or public safety concerns. The absence of proactive disclosure regarding asbestos removal is deeply troubling and warrants immediate scrutiny by the appropriate regulatory authorities.

I respectfully request that this complaint be formally logged, investigated, and responded to in writing, and that the neighborhood be informed of any findings or corrective actions.

Public safety, environmental health, and due process must take precedence over development expediency.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Brenna J. McNab". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Brenna J. Gano McNab

Attachment 2



County of San Mateo Complaint Form

PLEASE NOTE:

This form is to submit written concerns about a County department, division or service. If you wish to file a claim for damages, you must submit a ***Claim against the County*** form to the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors.

Please print legibly or type

Name	Linda Yee		
Address	450 Nevada		
City, State, ZIP	City Moss	State CA	ZIP Code 94038
Phone Number	(408) 410-8815		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> cell <input type="checkbox"/> other
Email Address	yeester.linda789@gmail.co		

Describe basis of complaint (continue on reverse side if needed):

Devcon Construction Inc is removing asbestos from the Cypress Point Project and did not
disclose this information in their Feb 24th monthly courtesy notice. This information has been
verified with a call to the onsite project supervisor. Because this company was not upfront
with this information, they have put the neighborhood at risk of being exposed to asbestos.
are wearing hazmat suits to remove the asbestos, but "Neglected" to inform the community, so
we could mask up! This should never have happened, asbestos when airborne goes
This company should be held accountable for this

Signature of person making complaint: Linda D Yee **Date:** 3/13/26

Please return form to:

COMPLAINTS, Board of Supervisors
 500 County Center, 5th Floor
 Redwood City, CA 94063

Your complaint will be distributed to the appropriate officials for response and/or action.

For Internal Use Only		
To	Date	Reply
CM		
CC		
Dept.-		
Other		

Attachment 3

Dolores Silva & Richard Gates

1993 Carlos St., PO Box 915
Moss Beach, CA 94038
650-278-0588
dsilvagates@gmail.com

March 13, 2026

Mr. Mike Callagy
County Executive Officer
County Government Center
500 County Centers, 5th Floor
Redwood City, CA 94063

RE: Violation of County's Conditions of Approval for Cypress Pt Housing Construction

Dear Mr. Callagy and Honorable Members of the San Mateo County Board of Supervisors,

This is a formal complaint regarding MidPen Housing work to date in the clearing and demolition of an 11-acre forested site in Moss Beach. This site is a former WWII Naval training base that was likely built with hazardous materials such as asbestos, lead, PCB's and other commonly used materials. The County and MidPen relied on limited studies for the approval of this project and instead delayed in-depth analysis to the construction/demolition process per the County's Conditions of Approval. As the only adjoining residence to the construction site, we have the following observations to demonstrate how the conditions are either being violated or are inadequate regarding potentially harmful impacts to the immediate neighborhood.

HANDLING OF HAZARDOUS MATERIALS:

1. Demolition occurred with no hazardous materials specialist observed - In mid-January, after the forest was cleared using huge tractor cranes, the same cranes were used to demolish the remaining foundations of the multiple military buildings. Large concrete remnants were hoisted up and dropped on others to break them up into more manageable pieces that were then loaded



on to large trucks and hauled away. No hosing down and no inspection for contamination were observed. Was screening and sampling for concerning contaminants performed as required? At least two dozen fully loaded trucks then exited through the neighborhood, leaving a dusty trail, perhaps for deposit elsewhere without caution? Carlos Street is too fragile for these heavy loads and too populated for these materials to go without alarming the neighborhood.



2. Asbestos found and no notice to neighborhood. - On February 27, a large green trailer with a "DANGER - ASBESTOS" label was dropped off very close to our home. A neighborhood walking trail runs between our stucco fence and the project's chain link fence. Men in head-to-toe white protective gear began depositing large parcels into the truck. We called the project superintendent to inquire regarding the scope of asbestos contamination and the



appropriateness of having the trailer at the nearest point to our home and the walking trail. We called twice more before a response. Early on March 5, a second green trailer was dropped off even closer to our home. That afternoon, we got a return call but no explanation other than brief answers to say a buried pipe was found to be encased in asbestos. No warning and no health advisory. We were forced to leave home through these days as a precautionary measure.

VIOLATIONS OF NOISE MANAGEMENT - Contrary to specific best management practices

1. Some of the tractor-type bulldozers are very squeaky and unnecessarily noisy (see Conditions 22.b.). The backup beeping of multiple bulldozers is intolerable most days with several going off at once permeating the entire neighborhood. We are displaced regularly by excessive noise.
2. Fumes and exhaust are a continual problem. Even on Friday, one of these bulldozers was billowing exhaust. These unhealthful conditions have been ongoing throughout the grading process for the last several weeks. This photo shows the proximity to our terrace off our kitchen.



3. Staging areas since December are located immediately next to our home — the only home adjacent to the site — and wrap around our garden. Completely contrary to Condition 22.b. (5) “Establish Construction staging areas at locations that will create the greatest distance between construction-related noise sources and noise-sensitive receptors nearest the project site”... This is on an 11-acre site! Even the portable toilettes are right next to our garden as we realized when they were being cleaned after normal work hours and the odors ran us out of our garden. **We are continually assaulted by the sights of heavy equipment, noise, contaminated air, foul smells, and concerns regarding toxins.**



VIOLATIONS OF CONSTRUCTION VIBRATION BEST MANAGEMENT PRACTICES

The demolition of the building remnants was as noted above, using huge cranes to drop large pieces of concrete onto other concrete. The noise and resulting vibrations were like that of explosives. This went on for days until all the concrete lay in bits. No warning of the noise/vibrations and no consideration to the surrounding neighbors.

In summary, the County’s Conditions for approval are being violated in various instances. In some situations, these conditions are inadequate to protect the nearby neighborhood from harmful impacts to health and well being. The courtesy notices provided by the builder are very superficial and unhelpful for the purpose of managing the potential harmful impact of the work being performed. In our particular case, we are being regularly displaced from our home as we attempt to protect our health and sanity. This is causing anxiety and is costly in various ways. We have had a few phone exchanges with the project superintendent and recently sent a written memo similar to this specifying some of our objections to the process and lack of information ahead of potential issues. We are now filing this complaint to make you aware of the situation and, at a minimum, to ask for enforcement of the conditions the County required.

Sincerely yours,

Dolores Silva & Richard Gates

Attachment 4

From: Dolores Silva <dsilvagates@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, March 29, 2026 3:07 PM
To: Nicholas Calderon
Subject: Fwd: Cypress Point Housing - Project Concerns

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of San Mateo County. Unless you recognize the sender's email address and know the content is safe, do not click links, open attachments or reply.

Hello — My first attempt had an incorrect address for you — hope this one works...

Begin forwarded message:

From: Dolores Silva <dsilvagates@gmail.com>
Subject: Cypress Point Housing - Project Concerns
Date: March 28, 2026 at 1:47:38 PM PDT
To: SMC_SupMueller@smcgov.org, "n.calderone@smc.gov.org" <n.calderone@smc.gov.org>, MCC <midcoastcommunitycouncil@gmail.com>, scott@mwsd.net, Kathryn@mwsd.net, Bill@mwsd.net, cyoung@mwsd.net, lleah@mwsd.net, Camille Leung <cleung@smcgov.org>
Cc: "emma@coastsidenewsgroup.com" <emma@coastsidenewsgroup.com>, Michelle Dragony <mdragony@coastsidebuzz.com>

Hello Everyone,

I am writing to bring several community concerns to your attention regarding the on-going preparation for Cypress Point housing. The list is growing but for now, I would like to bring attention to three areas of significant concern.

1. Violations of Conditions of Approval and lack of useful communication - The nearby residents have raised various concerns to the project superintendent; however, nothing has improved. Several of us filed complaints with the County regarding violations of the County's Conditions for Approval, inadequate information in the 'courtesy notices' for the nearby residents to consider potential impacts to their health and well-being, impacts to roads and traffic, etc. In particular, when they indeed found asbestos contamination, no one was informed except through neighbors who directly saw the men in full protective gear carrying material to two large trailers labelled with Asbestos warnings located right next to a walking trail. The County so far has not responded to our formal complaints filed the week of March 9. Regarding asbestos, there was simply a curt notice after alarm was raised by residents— providing bare minimum information other than to say they followed 'best practices'.



At a minimum, we are asking that the County's Conditions for Approval be enforced, and we are seeking better information through their 'courtesy notices' reflecting real consideration of the impact their work is having. Another annoying example of the lack of consideration is that today is Saturday and, with no notice, for the first time on a Saturday, they are working with full-scale tractor noise, constant beeping, dust, etc. — no time for us to plan an escape and no relief for nearby residents. Prior to this, there have been 2 incidents when PG&E worked through the night with no notice.

2. URGENT — Grading and signs of violating Building Height restrictions and Coastal Act regarding visual impacts:

During all of March, the building contractor has pursued the preparation of the forest-cleared land which has resulted in significant changes to the natural grade. They have been leveling it out by lowering the height to the east towards Lincoln St and raising the height to the west towards Carlos St. I would estimate that the area towards Carlos St is now something like 10 to 12 feet higher — Photo below shows chain link fence on natural grade vs the raised grade near the Carlos St entrance.



I spoke to John Medina, Project Superintendent, along with a project engineer on March 26 and they confirmed this was per the plan. — I recall the Design Review included a major push by Lisa Ketcham pointing out the height limitations, and Midpen actually agreed to lower the height of at least one building that did not conform. However, I do not recall any discussion of the grade being changed as it has now been done. The County Design Review standards require that a Finished Grade Limit shall not significantly deviate from the natural grade. However, this is a very significant deviation making the already oversized buildings even more imposing, contrary to the Coastal Act. I asked 'AI' how these height standards were applied to Cypress Point and got a summary (at bottom, after #3) which does not match what I am seeing — YIKES! — Why is this?

3. Storm Drainage concerns - During my conversation with John Medina and Engineer, I raised the concern about storm drainage. They pointed to the drainage plans and bio-retention ponds and such. However, what I asked was where would storm water drain. The response was that it would drain like it does now on Highway 1, along the side of the road, and more specifically drain along Carlos St in an open channel to the north. How can this be acceptable? Storm drainage is already a serious problem on the coast that adding impervious ground will exacerbate. More drainage to the north endangers the sensitive habitat of the creek that flows to the Marine Fitzgerald Reserve, adding pollution to a protected reserve.

The urgency in item 2 prompted this communication. I'm asking for your assistance in getting these concerns the proper attention and, if you have any feedback to provide the community, we would very much appreciate hearing from you.

Best Regards,
Dolores Silva
1993 Carlos St, PO Box 915
Moss Beach, CA 94038

~~~~~

***FROM AI Search for item #2:***

The **Cypress Point** project in Moss Beach (71 units of affordable housing by MidPen Housing) is a high-profile example of how these height and grading rules are applied to large-scale developments.

As of early **2026**, construction has officially begun, and the project serves as a case study for the "natural grade" protections you asked about.

## **1. The 28-Foot Limit at Cypress Point**

Despite being a 100% affordable housing project—which often allows developers to bypass local limits via the **California Density Bonus Law**—MidPen Housing explicitly designed this project to fit within the local **28-foot height limit**.

- **Buildings:** All 16 residential buildings are capped at **two stories**.
- **Design Intent:** The project was "down-zoned" during the planning phase to ensure it remained "consistent with the surrounding neighborhood" and did not tower over existing single-family homes.

## 2. Can they move earth to "raise" the height?

For this specific project, the answer remains **no**. The development is governed by a **Planned Unit Development (PUD)** and a **Coastal Development Permit (CDP)**, which include strict grading requirements:

- **Natural Grade Measurement:** The 28-foot limit for Cypress Point is measured from the **existing natural grade**. Because the site (a former military training ground) has a significant slope—ranging from 77 feet to 189 feet above sea level—the buildings must "step" with the terrain.
- **Grading Limits:** The project involves moving approximately **28,900 cubic yards** of earth. However, this grading is primarily for creating stable building pads and internal roads, not for "jacking up" the elevation of the buildings.
- **The "Looming" Factor:** The **Coastside Design Review Committee (CDRC)** and the **Coastal Commission** reviewed the "massing" of these buildings. If a developer tried to use fill to raise a building's base, it would be flagged as an "impact on visual resources" under the Local Coastal Program (LCP), which protects coastal views and neighborhood character.

## 3. Why they didn't go higher

Under state law (like **AB 1763**), MidPen *could* have theoretically requested a height increase of up to 33 feet (or three stories) as an "incentive" for affordable housing. However, they chose to stick to 28 feet and two stories to:

1. **Gain community and County support** (reducing the "visual impact" was a key compromise).
2. **Comply with LCP Policy 3.13**, which specifically encourages affordable housing to be limited to two stories to maintain Midcoast character.

March 17, 2026

Dear Mr. Callagy and the San Mateo County Board of Supervisors,

We are aware of the formal complaint submitted regarding our Cypress Point Affordable Family Community development at 1800 Carlos Street in Moss Beach and offer the following information to help clarify regulatory compliance and address public concerns.

## **1. Public Safety**

The complaint references emergency access concerns from the local fire department. On October 20, 2025, prior to construction starting, Coastside Fire Protection District formally submitted a letter of support to the Board of Supervisors to establish a no parking zone on Carlos Street to maintain adequate emergency access for the neighborhood. The no parking zone was installed in early December 2025. The project site is also in compliance with fire safety codes and received the necessary approvals prior to starting construction in late December 2025.

## **2. CEQA Compliance**

As part of the approvals process with the California Coastal Commission and the County of San Mateo that spanned over seven years from 2017-2024, MidPen commissioned over a dozen environmental reports which were made available to the community on the County's website. The project also complied with a CEQA-equivalent environmental review process with the California Coastal Commission.

In 2023, the County hired a consultant to oversee CEQA compliance for the Cypress Point project. Those reports and the draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) are available on the County's website. State law deemed the project exempt from CEQA in 2024, but the project has voluntarily adopted the mitigations from the draft EIR as conditions of approvals.

## **3. Developer transparency regarding environmental safety and construction impacts**

MidPen sends property owners in the neighborhood monthly letters with construction updates. Each letter includes contact information for Devcon Construction, the general contractor on-site, and Serena Ip, with MidPen Housing. Additionally, there is a large sign posted at the entry of the site with contact information for the site superintendent. In our next monthly mailed update, we will advise interested parties who are interested to sign up for an e-mail list serve. We will use the e-mail list serve to send out additional information between the monthly mailed updates.

## **4. Asbestos Exposure**

Asbestos was commonly used in building materials in the past; thus, the discovery of asbestos is considered a routine part of modern construction. Regulatory compliance protocols and standard removal procedures have been established by State and Federal agencies to limit exposure. At Cypress Point, industry-standard wet suppression methods

were used to limit the possibility of asbestos fibers during the removal. Hazmat suits and protective gear are required for prolonged or frequent occupational exposures for workers and should not be mistaken for uncontrolled proper abatement or as an indication of significant airborne asbestos presence.

On February 10, 2026, an underground pipe suspected of containing asbestos was discovered during soil excavation activities at the Cypress Point project site (1800 Carlos Street, Moss Beach). Devcon Construction followed regulatory compliance protocol to notify the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD). BAAQMD acknowledged receipt of the notification and fees. The notification included the project location, anticipated scope of removal, and anticipated schedule. Several days later, additional suspected asbestos-containing insulation was observed in soil. Field sampling and laboratory analysis were again conducted.

On March 3, 2026, BAAQMD performed a site inspection for the asbestos removal and reviewed all removal procedures that took place. All known asbestos-containing materials were removed safely by R.B. Construction CSLB #614028 in accordance with federal, state, and BAAQMD regulations, and all work was completed by March 9, 2026.

Please feel free to contact the project team if there are further or future questions:

- John Medina, Devcon Construction, [jmedina@devcon-const.com](mailto:jmedina@devcon-const.com) or (408) 466-9834
- Serena Ip, MidPen Housing, [sip@midpen-housing.org](mailto:sip@midpen-housing.org) or (650) 339-0581

Thank you,  
Serena Ip  
Associate Director of Housing Development

# Attachment 6



BAY AREA AIR QUALITY  
MANAGEMENT DISTRICT

ASBESTOS JOB  
NOTIFICATION

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF NOTIFICATION & PAYMENT OF FEES



APPROVAL DATE

February 10, 2026

### R.B. Construction, Inc.

893 Boggs Terrace  
Fremont, CA 94539

J# (JOB NUMBER)

ASB146494



Regulation 11  
Rule 2

### Invoice No.:

T201247

The Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) acknowledges receipt of your payment and your Asbestos Removal or Demolition Plan described as: **Moss Beach (Renovation)**

### Location Information:

Moss Beach  
1800 CARLOS ST  
Moss Beach, CA 94038-9703

### Removal Method:

Wet Methods

### Removal Amount:

150 linear ft

**Job Start Date:** February 27, 2026

**Job Completion Date:** March 6, 2026



## ASBESTOS JOB NOTIFICATION REVISIONS

If there are any changes to any aspect of the submitted Job Notification, including the starting or completion dates, changes in Contractor or waste disposal site, you must inform the District per Section 401.5 of Regulation 11-2.



## REVISIONS TO ONLINE JOB NOTIFICATIONS

For online submitted Job Notifications, revisions to Job information must be made online using the following steps:

1. Log into your BAAQMD account at [myaironline.baaqmd.gov/account/login](http://myaironline.baaqmd.gov/account/login)
2. Go to the My Job Notification list.
3. Click on the specific Job Notification to view the summary.
4. Click on the "Change Job Details" button

If you have trouble accessing your account online, or have questions regarding changes on Job Details, contact **415-749-4762**.

**NOTE:** This form is not intended as verification of either the completeness of your original notification or of its compliance with BAAQMD Regulation 11-2. If you have any questions regarding this matter please contact an Air Quality Technician (415-749-4762, [asbestosjobs@baaqmd.gov](mailto:asbestosjobs@baaqmd.gov)). Please include your Asbestos Application Number and Invoice Number for any correspondence with the District.

# Attachment 7



1208 MAIN STREET  
REDWOOD CITY, CA 94063

P: (650) 569-4020

E: INFO@PROTECH-CAL.COM

---

## Summary of Findings

### Discovery and Abatement of Asbestos Containing Materials

---

March 16, 2026

Job No.: 052-AA26.R1

#### Client

CJ Matthews  
**Campanella Corporation Building Demolition**  
PO Box 489  
Byron, CA 94514

#### Project

**Cypress Point Affordable Housing Community**  
1800 San Carlos St.  
Moss Beach, California

### PROJECT BACKGROUND

During the ongoing soil excavation and engineering site development phase of the Cypress Point Affordable Housing Community Project, insulated piping was discovered below grade in an area corresponding with a prior alignment of Buena Vista Street that historically crossed the southern portion of the development parcel.

ProTech was requested to visit the site for the limited purpose of evaluating suspect pipe insulation materials encountered during excavation activities. During that visit, ProTech collected representative samples of the white pipe insulation and the black asphalt-impregnated insulation jacket at three locations where access had been created through controlled potholing.

Laboratory analysis confirmed the presence of asbestos content greater than 1% in both the white pipe insulation and the black insulation jacket, thereby constituting Asbestos-Containing Material (ACM) as defined by applicable regulatory standards.

It is ProTech's understanding that the amount of insulated piping was initially estimated by others to be approximately 150 linear feet (LF). As excavation and discovery activities progressed, additional insulated piping was reportedly encountered, and the total amount ultimately identified below grade was later understood to be approximately 450 linear feet along the general west-to-east alignment of the former roadway corridor.

### CONSULTANT ROLE

ProTech's involvement on this project was limited to site visits requested for specific tasks, including the collection of representative bulk samples of suspect materials and later performing post-removal visual inspections of designated excavation areas following contractor removal activities.

ProTech did not prepare abatement specifications, manage or supervise the abatement contractor, determine the scope of removal, direct excavation activities, or quantify the total amount of asbestos-containing material present at the site. All excavation, material discovery, and removal activities were performed under the direction of the project contractor.

## ADDITIONAL DISCOVERY

Several days later, ProTech was again requested to return to the project site after excavation personnel reported encountering additional suspect insulation debris within soil near a concrete slab located in the northeast portion of the property, believed to be associated with a former mechanical structure that likely housed boiler equipment.

The slab area is located below the main parcel grade and consisted of a flat excavated soil area adjacent to the slab and an excavated soil ramp extending southeast from this area up to the main parcel grade.

During this visit, which occurred prior to the initiation of removal activities, ProTech conducted field sampling in multiple locations including soil containing suspect insulation debris adjacent to the concrete slab, along the excavated bare soil ramp extending southeast from the slab area, and at the top of the excavated ramp where visible debris was present in the soil.

Laboratory analysis confirmed asbestos concentrations greater than 1%, thereby confirming the material to be Asbestos-Containing Material (ACM).

Following confirmation of asbestos-containing materials through laboratory analysis, an asbestos abatement contractor was subsequently retained to perform removal of the identified asbestos-containing materials.

## ABATEMENT ACTIVITIES

Following confirmation of asbestos-containing materials, RB Construction of Fremont, California, a DOSH-registered asbestos abatement contractor, performed removal of the identified asbestos-containing materials.

Removal activities occurred in two primary areas of the project site.

- **Former Pipe Alignment Area**

Asbestos-containing pipe insulation and asphalt-impregnated insulation jacket associated with buried piping discovered along the approximate alignment of the former Buena Vista Street corridor were removed. Work included removal of exposed pipe insulation materials and associated fragments present within excavation soils encountered along the pipe alignment.

- **Former Mechanical Structure Area**

Asbestos-containing thermal insulation debris was removed from excavated soil areas associated with the former mechanical structure located in the northeast portion of the site. These areas included the flat excavated soil area adjacent to the concrete slab and the excavated soil ramp extending southeast from this area up to the main parcel grade where insulation debris had been observed within the exposed soils.

Removal activities included the removal of visible asbestos-containing insulation materials and associated debris encountered within the excavation areas. Materials were containerized by the abatement contractor for off-site disposal.

## POST-ABATEMENT INSPECTION AND FINAL CLEANING

Upon notification that removal activities had been completed in designated areas, ProTech returned to the site to perform post-removal visual inspections on two separate dates.

The first inspection addressed the former pipe alignment trench area, where loose soils were visually examined for remaining insulation debris following contractor removal activities.

A second inspection was conducted in the area associated with the former mechanical structure, including the flat excavated soil area adjacent to the slab and the excavated ramp where insulation debris had previously been observed.

These inspections involved visual and tactile examination of loose soils across the affected excavation areas in order to identify and remove remaining visually accessible asbestos-containing debris, progressing downward through loose

materials to the exposed excavated base to verify that no readily identifiable asbestos-containing debris remained within the exposed excavation limits.

During this final inspection and detail cleaning effort, an estimated three to four cubic yards of additional asbestos-containing debris and impacted soil were recovered, properly bagged, labeled, and prepared for disposal.

## CONCLUSION

Based on the completion of the removal activities and the subsequent visual inspection and cleaning effort, ProTech determined that the affected excavation areas were cleaned to a reasonable and appropriate standard consistent with the project conditions and the nature of the materials encountered.

Given the historical nature of the site and the condition of the materials encountered—specifically damaged and fragmented insulation within soil—removal efforts focused on the identification and recovery of visible and accessible asbestos-containing debris through careful inspection and soil sorting procedures.

At the conclusion of these activities, the work areas were found to be adequately cleaned of observable asbestos-containing debris, and no additional readily identifiable ACM remained within the exposed work zones at the time of final inspection.

These areas are scheduled to be reburied as part of the ongoing site development activities, and the condition observed at the completion of the removal and inspection process was considered acceptable for the intended site development work.

Because the materials encountered during this project consisted of fragmented insulation debris within soil associated with historical underground utilities and structures, additional asbestos-containing fragments could potentially remain. ProTech's observations and conclusions are therefore limited to conditions that were visible and accessible within the excavation areas at the time of the site visits.

Prepared By:

*Glen Koutz*

---

### **Glen Koutz**

Certified Asbestos Consultant – DOSH #92-0019 / 23-7418

CDPH Lead Inspector/Assessor & Supervisor – LRC-10125 / 10126

Principal Consultant - ProTech Consulting & Engineering