

**Surfliner Inn Project  
Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR)**

**Environmental Review Committee Minutes  
February 18, 2026  
5:30 p.m. In-Person Meeting**

The meeting was called to order at approximately 5:30 p.m. by Nick Bobroff, Chair.

**ROLL CALL**

**Members present:** Nick Bobroff, Chair  
John Ilasin  
Delyani Millar  
Vince Semonsen

**Members absent:** Jenny Slaughter

**OTHERS PRESENT:** Mindy Fogg, Principal Planner, Community Development Department  
Brian Allee, Environmental Science Associates (ESA)  
Cody Sargeant, City Attorney's Office

Approximately 20 members of the public were in attendance.

**PUBLIC COMMENT ON ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA**

None

**PROJECT PRESENTATION**

Mindy Fogg introduced the item and described where the Draft EIR and resources could be found online. Brian Allee gave an overview, described the Draft EIR, gave the Project Description, explained the analysis and potentially significant impacts, described the mitigation measures, summarized the alternatives, and summarized the EIR appendices. The presentation concluded with the overall schedule and next steps.

**ERC MEMBER QUESTIONS**

Vince Semonsen

- Asked about the wildlife corridor analysis and read from the section of the Draft EIR. Noted that there may be an internal conflict where it says the railroad is a potential corridor but that there would not be corridor impacts associated with Lot #4. Noted that connection from State Park to Salt Marsh may be important.
- Also raised concerns regarding the potential cumulative impacts.

Nick Bobroff

- Asked staff to explain why parking and traffic congestion are not analyzed in the Transportation Section
  - Staff explained that sufficient parking and level of service (related to congestion) is a planning issue rather than an environmental impact.
  - Staff explained that Senate Bill (SB) 743 replaced the issue of traffic congestion with vehicle miles traveled (VMT) analysis.
- In a few sections (e.g., geology and water quality), the Draft EIR concludes that impacts would be less than significant because other regulatory requirements would apply. Can staff explain why those would not be included as mitigation measures?

- Staff explained that CEQA impacts are analyzed after all regulatory compliance requirements are applied and then determines if residual significant environmental impacts remain.
- Asked staff to explain how the project alternatives were identified/selected??
  - Staff explained that alternatives must be able to feasibly meet most project objectives while potentially reducing environmental impacts. In addition, during the Notice of Preparation and Scoping Meeting, most public comments raised concerns regarding the Parking Lot #4 design, as well as comments about rooftop activity noise. So alternatives were identified that would look at tradeoffs related to the parking lot and rooftops uses.
- Regarding noise from the rooftop, the scenarios that were modeled assumed a certain number of people and event sizes. How were those determined?
  - Staff explained that reasonable examples were chosen. So while larger events could still be less than significant, staff intended to condition the project to stay within those examples used.

Vince Semonsen

- Asked about the alternatives comparison and where there are incrementally greater impacts.
  - Staff explained that when evaluating the alternatives, some turned out to have similar impacts or have incrementally greater impacts based on the extent of physical construction.

**PUBLIC COMMENT**

1. Kristin Larson – Raised concerns about proposed Parking Lot #4, wildlife impacts, stormwater runoff, out-of-date studies, and California Fish and Wildlife Department letter.
2. Giti White – Raised concerns about private development in public space, needing an alternative that considers an alternative project site, interference with railway/platform access, expanded train schedule, aesthetic impacts/view corridors, sea level rise, and habitat values.
3. Susie Anderson – Raised concerns regarding Alternative 3 potential impacts to the Community Garden such as shadows, noise, soils, weeds, carbon sequestration, and benefits to residents.
4. Emelyn Juenger – Raised concerns regarding impacts to raptors, nests and oak trees.
5. Victor Garza – Raised concerns about adequate public participation, out-of-date information/studies, California Fish and Wildlife Department letter, that parking is not a CEQA impact but three alternatives have to do with parking, California Public Utilities Commission letter, safety at Lot #4 for pedestrians and vehicular queuing, and stormwater runoff.
6. Teda Pilcher – Raised concerns about the Community Garden (Alternative 3) and the unwanted changes that would come from moving it such as access, disruption, and blocked sunlight.
7. Leslie Gascoigne – Raised concerns about transportation impacts, loss of parking / conjunctive use, California Coastal Commission letter, safety of ingress and egress, out-of-date studies, other commercial/residential projects and cumulative impacts, hazards at the railway, and emergency ingress and egress.
8. Shawn C. White – Raised concerns regarding safety at Lot #4 (left-hand egress turn), visual impacts and public views, architectural character, wildlife impacts, and noise.
9. Nathan Pratt – Raised concerns regarding traffic and parking, that parking is an environmental issue that needs more study, and that the EIR is written as though the project is approved with objectives that are approved.

10. Annie Sly - Raised concerns regarding aesthetics, scenic natural resources, community character, compatibility with small beach town character, size/scale/form of development, protection of views and visual resources, and that key viewpoints in EIR are misleading and conclusions are incorrect.
11. Alan Koch – Raised concerns that parking and traffic impacts are not addressed, studies are out of date, consultants are paid by applicant, and the design of the parking lots should be done by the City.
12. Ariana Katovich – Raised concerns regarding new FEMA flood maps and potential flooding impacts, sea level rise, parking, wildlife movement and the need for nighttime analysis, and stormwater/drainage.
13. Lorraine McIntire – Raised concerns that comments provided by others are not substantiated, that the City should move forward with project to benefit the community, and that alternatives should be considered also.
14. Gary Campopiano – Raised concerns regarding aesthetic impacts (provided photographs) to scenic vistas/scenic views/ridgelines, that the photographs and renderings in the EIR are not accurate, and that three-dimensional analysis should be done.

#### **CITY STAFF COMMENTS**

##### Mindy Fogg

- Confirmed that technical issues raised by the public would be addressed in the Final EIR.
- Clarified the timing of the Draft EIR baseline relative to the Notice of Preparation, but that updated information can be added to the Final EIR.
- Clarified that alternatives are not analyzed in detail but are compared to the Proposed Project.
- Clarified that the Project Objectives were written after the Notice of Preparation for the purposes of preparing the Draft EIR.

#### **COMMITTEE MEMBER COMMENTS**

##### Vince Semonsen

- Include additional study of Lot #4 open space area using cameras during daytime/nighttime to determine what wildlife is using the area.

##### Delayni Millar

- Agree with Committee member Semonsen regarding wildlife.
- Also include a wider study area to show the difference between the residential areas and the open space.
- Add updated information regarding traffic safety.

##### John Ilasin

- Concurred that the updated FEMA floodplain and insurance rate maps have been approved.
- Minor correction in Section 3.14-1: Class II Bike Path should say Class II Bike Lane.

##### Nick Bobroff

- Review Mitigation Measure MM-BIO-1 regarding breeding season for birds/raptors to ensure no potential nesting impacts.
- For Mitigation Measure MM-BIO-2 regarding tree protection and replacement, consider adding monitoring to ensure protected trees survive well after construction or are otherwise replaced.

- For Mitigation Measure MM-CUL-1 recommend cross referencing MM-TRC-1 to understand that there will be an archaeologist and a tribal monitor.
- For noise impact 3.11-1, note that the City typically imposes more restrictive construction hours such as Monday-Friday 7:00 am to 5:00 pm.
- Agree that more information about wildlife needed.
- Add more information about the pre/post impervious surfaces related to stormwater and drainage.
- Agree that additional information about traffic safety needed for turning movements in and out of proposed Lot #4 with consideration given to pedestrians and bicyclists also.

**ACTION:**

Motion by Committee member Ilasin, seconded by Committee member Millar, to recommend approval of the Draft EIR to the Planning Commission with the comments from the public and ERC incorporated into the Final EIR.

**VOTE:** 4-0

**MEETING ADJOURNED:** 7:29 p.m.

YouTube recording of Meeting: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=K69eCvxVs04&t=5040s>