Public Comments
Agenda Item 9

Written Comments Received After 12pm on 8/8/2022

August 8, 2022

City Council Meeting

From: Vicki Sundstrom [redacted]
Sent: Monday, August 8, 2022 12:16 PM
To: Public Comment
Subject: City Council Meeting - 8/8 - Agenda item 9

[CAUTION: External Email]

For the public record - here is the link to the Coastal Commission Agenda and related hearing -

https://www.coastal.ca.gov/meetings/agenda/#/2022/8

It's quite detailed in stating that they are finding against the City of Pacifica and that the City was told of the compliance issues before implementing the program.

If City Staff and City Council knowingly take on risks that cost us legal fees and fines, they should pay for them and not pass the costs onto the tax payers.

Screenshot from Bradford way appeal to CCC

> In this case, these five factors, considered together, support a conclusion that the appeal of the City's approval of a CDP for this project does raise a substantial issue of conformance with public access policies of the Coastal Act and certified LCP. Thus, and for all the reasons stated herein, the Commission finds that Appeal Number A-2-PAC-22-0029 raises a substantial issue of conformance with the certified City of Pacifica LCP and the public access policies of the Coastal Act.

Screenshot for Pedro Point appeal to CCC

> In this case, these five factors, considered together, support a conclusion that the appeal of the City's approval of a CDP for this project does raise a substantial issue of conformance with public access policies of the Coastal Act and certified LCP. Thus, and for all the reasons stated herein, the Commission finds that Appeal Number A-2-PAC-22-0031 raises a substantial issue of conformance with the certified City of Pacifica LCP and the public access policies of the Coastal Act.

Screenshot from appeal of the OVO in Pedro Point - City staff guided Planning commissioners -

Nonetheless, during the May 16 hearing, City/Applicant repeatedly told the Planning Commissioners that anything other than a "yes" vote on the three CDPs at issue (including any attempt to continue that hearing to try to obtain additional information on important environmental issues, such as potential black-water spills and discharges that could flow into the nearby Pedro Point Field waterway/culvert, a documented home to the California red-legged frog) would "imperil" the city's legal position and threaten the *Geary* settlement. *E.g.*, Audio at 159:50-200:40, 2:21:30- 2:22:06, 2:26:05- 2:27:03.[2] This is inaccurate. Again, the *Geary* settlement and the related Court-ordered injunction merely require City/Applicant to allocate 13 spaces within city limits to OSV residents. Specifically, the locations "may be subject to change by the City as long as thirteen spaces with an average length of thirty (30) feet are maintained by the City as part of the [Safe Parking Program]." *See* Settlement Agreement at p. 4, ¶6(a)(6)(attached). The Settlement Agreement also provides that, if the Coastal Commission denies a permit application, City/Applicant can simply relocate the affected spaces. *Id.* The injunction says essentially the same thing. *See* order granting stipulated injunction, also attached. Nonetheless, the Commissioners took City/Applicant's admonitions to heart, repeatedly expressing their belief that their votes were merely *pro forma,* and that they had no choice but to approve the three permits, including CDP-438-22, despite their misgivings. *E.g.*, Audio at 2:28:52 – 2:32:19; 3:08:01-3:08-45; and, most notably, Commissioner Ferguson's comments at 3:44:26-3:46:08 re the *pro forma* nature of the vote and the detrimental effect of CDP-438-22 on coastal access. Therefore, to the extent that valid Planning Commission approval is a prerequisite to the final approval of this CDP, I respectfully submit that it ***does not*** exist here.[3]

Thank you.

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

Public Comments
Agenda Item 14

Written Comments Received After 12pm on 8/8/2022

August 8, 2022

City Council Meeting

From: Coffey, Sarah
Sent: Monday, August 8, 2022 11:43 PM
To: Public Comment
Subject: FW: Safe Parking Program

From: William Bradford [redacted]
Sent: Monday, August 8, 2022 11:42 PM
To: _City Council <citycouncil@ci.pacifica.ca.us>; Coffey, Sarah <scoffey@pacifica.gov>
Subject: Safe Parking Program

[CAUTION: External Email]

You are all talking about debating with the Water District about PSPP at their location. Why are you not talking about involving the discussion with your constituents about the same subject? You are completely ignoring your constituents.

Open the issue to the public and obtain an EI

William Bradford

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

From: Coffey, Sarah
Sent: Monday, August 8, 2022 11:51 PM
To: Public Comment
Subject: FW: PSPP

From: William Bradford [redacted]
Sent: Monday, August 8, 2022 11:49 PM
To: _City Council <citycouncil@ci.pacifica.ca.us>; Coffey, Sarah <scoffey@pacifica.gov>
Subject: PSPP

[CAUTION: External Email]

You are discussing debating/negotiating with the Water District regarding the OSV living space and you are not debating/involving your constituents in this program. Why is that???

William Bradford

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