

MINUTES

**CITY OF PACIFICA
PLANNING COMMISSION
COUNCIL CHAMBERS
2212 BEACH BOULEVARD**

June 20, 2022
7:00 p.m.

Chair Berman called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

Chair Berman explained the conditions for having Planning Commission meetings pursuant to the provisions of the Governor’s Government Code Section 54953 (as amended by AB-361), which suspends certain requirements of the Brown Act and pursuant to the orders of the Health Officer of San Mateo County, dated June 17, 2020, to conduct necessary business as an essential governmental function with no public attendance allowed. She also gave information on how to present public comments participating by Zoom or phone.

Acting Planning Director Murdock took a verbal roll call.

ROLL CALL: Present: Commissioners Domurat, Ferguson, Godwin, Hauser, Leal, Wright and Chair Berman
Absent: None

SALUTE TO FLAG: Led by Commissioner Godwin

STAFF PRESENT: Acting Planning Director Murdock
Asst. Planner O’Connor

Chair Berman opened public comment on Administrative Business.

Acting Planning Director Murdock stated that there are no hands raised.

Chair Berman closed public comments.

APPROVAL OF ORDER OF AGENDA Commissioner Ferguson moved to rearrange the agenda to put Commission and Staff Communications between Agenda items 1 and 2 in the Order of Agenda; Commissioner Godwin seconded the motion.

The motion carried **7-0**.

Ayes: Commissioners Domurat, Ferguson, Godwin, Hauser, Leal, Wright and Chair Berman
Noes: None

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: Commissioner Godwin moved approval of the minutes of May 2, 2022 and May 16, 2022; Commissioner Domurat seconded the motion.
MAY 2, 2022
May 16, 2022

Acting Planning Director Murdock took a verbal roll call.

The motion carried **7-0**.

Ayes: Commissioners Domurat, Ferguson, Godwin, Hauser,
Leal, Wright and Chair Berman
Noes: None

DESIGNATION OF LIAISON TO CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF JUNE 25, 2022, JUNE 27, 2022 AND JULY 11, 2022:

Chair Berman asked Acting Planning Director Murdock if he could give them background on each item.

Acting Planning Director Murdock stated that the June 25, 2022 special meeting is on Saturday to consider Planning Commission's recommendation to approve the General Plan Update and certify the Environmental Impact Report (EIR), and the Commission would need to represent the Commission's action to recommend the General Plan Update and EIR certification. He stated that the June 27, 2022 meeting is a public hearing to consider an appeal of the Planning Commission's approval of the 570 Crespi project and associated recommendations for the legislative actions, like the General Plan Amendment, rezoning and development agreement and the liaison from the Commission would be represented the Commission's action on that project approval. The July 11, 2022 meeting would be a commission liaison to City Council on the Commission's recommendation on the Sharp Park Specific Plan. He stated that is different in that the Commission hasn't yet taken action, but given the timing of that meeting relative to the potential cancellation of the July 5, 2022 Planning Commission meeting, he identified that opportunity to at least have a placeholder liaison and they can take that up after the Commission reaches a recommendation.

Chair Berman stated that, before accepting the volunteers, regarding the July 11 liaison, she appreciated the place folder. She stated that she thought it would be good to hold off on designating that liaison until after they review the Sharp Park Specific Plan, but if anyone wants to preemptively volunteer as a placeholder, they could talk about that, but she would like to bring this up after they actually review the Sharp Park Specific Plan as a Commission. She asked for any thoughts or would someone like to volunteer for the June 25 or June 27. She stated that, for June 25, the hearing on the General Plan and EIR, Vice Chair Hauser volunteered.

Vice Chair Hauser stated that it works for her if no one else wants to do it, and she would like to do it.

Chair Berman appreciated her for volunteering for that. She asked for a volunteer for the June 27 meeting for the 570 Crespi appeal and asked Acting Planning Director Murdock if he was able to give insight on the appeal or remind them of the project.

Acting Planning Director Murdock stated that, on the latter request, it is a mixed use project proposed on the site next to the Pacifica Community Center and involves purchase a portion of the city's parcel and combining it with the existing private property to create a mixed use project with 19 residential units and commercial area on the ground floor at the front of the project site and including a development agreement with certain public and developer benefits such as offsite improvements of the Community Center and also involves heritage tree removal.

Chair Berman mentioned that this is an item where Vice Chair Hauser recused herself so she would not be the best choice as a liaison.

Commissioner Leal stated he volunteered to be a liaison the last time this was up and it was moved to this date but unfortunately he isn't available to attend on that Monday.

Chair Berman asked if there were any potential volunteers and anyone available on that day.

Commissioner Godwin stated that he was available.

Chair Berman asked if he is willing to be the liaison.

Commissioner Godwin stated that, if no one else wants it, he will do his best.

Chair Berman stated the Commission would appreciate his volunteering, so she stated that they will put him down as the liaison.

Commissioner Godwin stated that sounds good.

Acting Planning Director Murdock stated that, regarding the July 11 meeting, he asked her to clarify her comment about taking this up after the Commission makes a recommendation, i.e., did she mean potentially later in this meeting or if the Commission reaches a recommendation at some subsequent meeting of the Commission.

Chair Berman stated likely at some subsequent meeting as realistically seeing that they may not complete their deliberation on the Sharp Park Specific Plan at this meeting. She thought, similar to most other designation of liaison items, they typically do it after the Commission has made a recommendation to City Council, understanding that not every commissioner is going to vote the same way. She asked if it was acceptable after they close out item 2.

Acting Planning Director Murdock stated that it was, adding that he just needed that clarification.

Commissioner Wright stated that he has a potential conflict with future meetings unless it is the July 5 meeting that they are talking about. He stated that, if they want a quorum of non-recused people, they may want to reconsider whether they are going to get that vote in this evening, just being transparent.

Chair Berman asked him if he would prefer that they designate the liaison directly after public comment and what was his desire for the designation of liaison for the Sharp Park Specific Plan.

Commissioner Wright stated that it was less about the designation of the liaison as he would be inclined to want to vote sooner rather than later, but he understands they want to hear from everyone that they can but he is willing to go as late as it takes.

Chair Berman asked if he was not opposed to saving the designation of liaison until after their determination on the Sharp Park Specific Plan.

Commissioner Wright responded affirmatively.

Chair Berman stated that clears up the designation of liaisons and they will move on to consideration of cancellation of meeting July 5. She asked if Acting Planning Director Murdock needed them to vote on agreement of the cancellation of the meeting.

Acting Planning Director Murdock deferred to Asst. City Attorney Sharma as far as the mechanism. He thought they would ask first to see if there is interest among the Commission for such a cancellation. He stated that it is a meeting that is typically canceled given the challenge of scheduling and having a quorum of Commissioners so close to the Independence Day holiday. He wanted to bring it up for consideration at this meeting.

Commissioner Wright asked if they can table that decision until they see how far they make it through the current agenda items prior to deciding whether they may or may not need that meeting.

Chair Berman thought that would be a question for Asst. City Attorney Sharma.

Asst. City Attorney Sharma stated that it is the Chair's discretion to move the item if the Planning Commission agrees with tabling that for later.

Chair Berman would like to hear from the rest of the Commission, as that is a good strategy.

Commissioner Ferguson stated that he has to recuse himself from the Sharp Park consideration anyway, but he won't be available for that meeting date.

Commissioner Leal added that he won't be available on that date as well.

Chair Berman asked Commissioner Wright if he was saying he would not be available on July 5 regardless.

Commissioner Wright stated that he is available on the 5th.

Commissioner Domurat stated he would be available on the 5th, but as he mentioned to others that he has a short time fuse today, ending earlier than about 10 PM. He wasn't sure how that would affect any vote for the plan for later on this evening and continuation of that discussion for Sharp Park in the future.

Chair Berman thought they should look at trying to form a quorum if they would have a quorum. She asked Vice Chair Hauser if she was available or what are her thoughts on cancelling the July 5 meeting.

Vice Chair Hauser stated that she didn't feel strongly about it either way as she is available if needed.

Chair Berman stated that she can be available as well.

Commissioner Ferguson stated that he won't be there, but he stated that it is a recognized holiday and a lot of people might miss out on some community engagement for that meeting.

Chair Berman stated that the 5th is a Tuesday.

Commissioner Ferguson stated that he has it in his head that everyone is going to be on vacation.

Chair Berman understood, but she will be driving home that day from vacation but she can be available. She stated that it sounds like they could have a quorum. She liked Commissioner Wright's suggestion of trying to get a sense after at least starting Agenda Item #2 to determine if they could utilize the July 5 date. She understands how hard staff and the Commission has been working this past month for the General Plan, EIR and Sharp Park Specific Plan and she was sure many people would appreciate having that day off in recognition of the holiday, even though that day may not be a holiday. She asked if they can revisit this consideration item at the end of this meeting. She is guessing staff needs to have an understanding of whether or not they have that meeting before they finish this meeting.

Acting Planning Director Murdock stated that he was trying to provide some certainty to the community into the Commissioners as well as staff. If they find out following this evening there is not a quorum available on July 5, they will cancel the meeting and they will not be able to conduct. If they knew that commissioners preferred not to have the meeting at this point or would not be available, then trying to address that eventuality so they can let people know in advance and plan business accordingly with applicants and other business.

Chair Berman gets the sense that maybe the preference is to not have a meeting on that day but they can be flexible if it would be beneficial to City Council's schedule.

Commissioner Domurat stated that there was discussion to potentially continue tonight's meeting, if it is not completed, to later on this week, and he asked if that was still being considered.

Acting Planning Director Murdock stated that it looks like a quorum of the Commission would be available on June 23, starting at 7 PM and that is another alternative date prior to July 5 that the Commission might be able to use to complete its recommendation. He stated that currently Chair Berman Commissioner Domurat, Commissioner Godwin and Vice Chair Hauser have indicated their availability and Commissioner Wright indicated he will be out of town and unavailable. He stated that those would be the four available commissioners and all are available to participate on Thursday evening.

Chair Berman stated that she would prefer to revisit this consideration item at the end of potentially that Thursday adjourned meeting. She asked if everyone else agrees. She asked if they need to take a vote on this. She stated that they are going to reconsider it.

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS:

Sr. Planner O'Connor stated that they have hands raised and she introduced the speakers.

Dan Stegink, Pacifica, stated that he wanted to address a couple of procedures they have engaged in that are antithetical to a good planning process. He stated that, anytime they add an item to an agenda, it requires public comment. He pointed out his concerns that they didn't follow the rule of law at their special meeting on June 11 and at this meeting, giving his specific thoughts on what he considered incorrect process.

Clif Lawrence, Pacifica, stated that he has come before them many times as an advocate of public engagement, and while he congratulated them on doing a good job and being open to public comments, he wanted to clarify the terminology they used in their Commission annual report to Council to accurately convey their desire to listen to and consider the concerns and suggestions made by the community.

Christine Boles, Pacifica, appreciated the questions the Commission asked at the previous meeting on the General Plan, but she then expressed her concerns on specific issues that they did not explore further to verify they had the most accurate information in the documents before approving the General Plan.

Samuel Casillas, Pacifica, referred to the June 6 meeting and expressed his concerns about mischaracterizations of statements from Pedro Point residents and their work with the Coastal Commission, and shared his thoughts on what was actually expressed by residents.

Richard Harris, San Francisco Public Golf Alliance, referred to the June 6 meeting and the 10-day appeal time following the June 6 meeting, as he has not seen any minutes from that meeting to see if any of the changes were added to the final version being presented to Council and he had a procedural question with his concerns on the appeal time so that they can know what will be presented to Council.

Remi Tan, Pacifica, stated that he is concerned that there are no meeting minutes published from the June 6 Commission meeting, and specifically mentioned his concerns on the General Plan not complying to state law and will possibly lose state funding if not corrected.

Judy Hanson, Pacifica, appreciated the work the Commission has done, but she then expressed her concerns on specific items that they are not addressing in response to the concerns expressed by the residents of Pacifica.

Chair Berman closed oral communications. She asked Asst. City Attorney Sharma to advise them regarding some questions brought up in oral communications and the Commission would want to ask staff questions and she asked when it would be the appropriate time to do that.

Asst. City Attorney Sharma stated that the appeal period ran from ten days from the date of the Planning Commission's decision on June 11 regarding the General Plan Update and the EIR.

Chair Berman stated that there were quite a few questions that came up and they may want to talk about, and she asked if now was the appropriate time to talk about some of the oral communications.

Asst. Cit Attorney Sharma stated that, if she would like to discuss that now, this would be the correct time to do it.

Asst. Planning Director Murdock asked if he is correct that the Commission can get brief clarifying responses from staff but not engage in a dialogue, given that these items are not on the agenda.

Asst/ City Attorney Sharma agreed that he is correct. They can get brief clarifications but the items are not before the Commission.

Chair Berman understood. She then stated that she has a few clarification questions and thought some Commissioners may also. She referred to the Asst. City Attorney referring to the ten-day appeal time regarding their last meeting where they provided a recommendation for the General Plan and EIR, and she asked how they can advise on how Council will be reviewing the Commission's deliberation on the General Plan and EIR, with or without meeting minutes. She stated that there were a couple of questions regarding not having the meeting minutes before the Council's meeting.

Asst. City Attorney Sharma stated that meeting minutes are not a requirement for Council to consider items that come before them. She stated that it is a public meeting and there are records at the meeting and no legal requirement for the minutes.

Acting Planning Director Murdock stated that the Commission and the public will see them when they publish the staff report with the agenda packet for the June 25 Council special meeting and they have included links to videos of the meeting and the public has an opportunity as part of review of that package of information to listen to the actual verbatims proceedings which, in many senses, will be more helpful and more informative than the more abbreviated depiction of that meeting through the minutes. He stated that the information in those videos are available on Pacific Coast TV's YouTube channel and they will also include direct leads to those two meetings in the staff report for the June 25 meeting.

Chair Berman appreciated that, and she thought both Council and the public would appreciate it. She then referred to the question for requirements for public comment as some of the item they discussed at the end of the adjourned meeting when they were deliberating on the General Plan, they were working closely with the Asst. City Attorney. She asked if she would advise on what requires public comment after their deliberation. She asked if their deliberation of the General Plan and their comments on it require a public comment period.

Asst. City Attorney Sharma stated that the public comment period was taken and that satisfies the requirement under the Brown Act, Section 954.3, and public comments can be taken at any time before or during Commission deliberations, and that requirement was met.

Acting Planning Director Murdock thought there was a suggestion that there was a new map introduced following public comment, and he did not know that it was factually correct. They clarified that there was an unintentional omission of a map from the January 2022 public review and comment version but that was introduced as an attachment to the June 6 Planning Commission staff report and it was already in the record and the public had an opportunity to comment on that information.

Chair Berman referred to one of the public comments, stating that they did talk about that item at the June 11 meeting and she asked if staff can summarize the requirement for the RHNA allocation and how it relates to the housing element and how the General Plan will be updated to reflect the housing element in compliance with the RHNA allocation.

Acting Planning Director Murdock thought there was a misconception that the General Plan update must include planning for the entire original housing new allocation which is 1,892

housing units across a variety of income levels over the next eight-year planning period when, in fact, state housing element law provides for what they call a rezoning process following adoption of the housing element. He stated that, while it is fine and if it is possible, a local agency can plan for the entire housing element in advance of adopting the housing element and it is not a legal requirement. The law is set up so that cities that don't have sufficient capacity in their General Plan can make those changes to accommodate the regional housing needs allocation subsequent to the housing element adoption. He stated that, given where we are at this late stage in the General Plan Update, it is more sensible to conclude the General Plan Update process without planning for the RHNA in the land use element because of all the other beneficial aspects of the General Plan Update, which he has articulated previously, including new hazard information, new policies, protecting open space such as hillsides, etc., and having updated information based on a 2022 General Plan to accommodate more than 1,000 more housing is probably the better place to be than relying on a 1980 General Plan and that is why staff was recommending adopting the General Plan Update and then undertake a very focused housing element update process.

Chair Berman asked if any Commissioners had clarification questions regarding the oral communication.

Vice Chair Hauser asked for clarification from Asst. City Attorney Sharma if there was something done tonight where public comment wasn't being at the correct time and, if so, do they need to reopen public comment.

Asst. City Attorney Sharma stated that, as she explained before, public comment just needs to be taken at some point before action is taken, and that was done for the item that was referenced.

Vice Chair Hauser appreciated that clarification.

Chair Berman stated that, with no further questions, she would move on to new public hearings.

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

- 1. CDP-440-22** **File No. 2022-015 – Coastal Development Permit CDP-440-22,**
To install a wireless detection system module onto an existing structure within the State Route (SR) 1 right-of-way (ROW) at the northeastern corner of the SR 1 intersection with Reina Del Mar Avenue and erection of one variable message sign and associated improvements within SR 1 ROW immediately west of an undeveloped property (APN 018-140-700) in Pacifica as part of Caltrans SR 1 Traffic Operations Systems Improvement Project. Recommended CEQA Action: Consider the State Route 1 Traffic Operational Systems Improvements Project (Post Miles 04 SM-1-26.43 to 47.20) Initial Study with Negative Declaration (SCH No. 2020080229) prepared by Caltrans, District 4.

Sr. Planner O'Connor presented the staff report.

Chair Berman asked Sr. Planner O'Connor if someone from Caltrans District 4 will be the applicant and do they have a presentation.

Sr. Planner O'Connor stated that they do have staff from Caltrans District 4 and they will be available to provide an applicant presentation.

Acting Planning Director Murdock stated that he will promote the applicant representatives once the Commission shifts to the public hearing portion of the item.

Chair Berman stated they will start with questions for staff.

Commissioner Domurat asked, for clarification, if they were only looking at only for 9-1 and 9-2, but not any of the others within the area of Pacifica.

Sr. Planner O'Connor agreed that he was correct, adding that Caltrans will be required to get any necessary permits for the other locations within the coastal zone outside the jurisdiction of Pacifica's local coastal program.

Commissioner Domurat also concluded that the location was pretty much set by Caltrans, and he asked if he was correct.

Sr. Planner O'Connor stated that the city does not have jurisdiction over that.

Vice Chair Hauser referred to the comment letter Sr. Planner O'Connor read into the record, and asked if she was correct that the Commission has not seen any application or anything on the project that is referenced.

Sr. Planner O'Connor stated that she was correct that the application referenced in her presentation has not been presented to the Planning Commission at this time. She stated that application has been deemed complete and they are at the beginning stages of the environmental review process.

Commissioner Godwin referred to the General Plan review, and Mr. Tan indicating that roundabouts were preferable to other changes to intersections, and asked if there was a reason why the round-about wasn't considered as opposed to using some sort of traffic management system and a sign.

Sr. Planner O'Connor thought she could allow the applicant to give him a full response to that. She stated that the project, as she understands it, is just technology improvements along the state right-of-way and not infrastructure improvements to meet requirements.

Acting Planning Director Murdock added that, as mentioned in staff's presentation, it was intended for non-recurring traffic congestion whereas he thought the round-about solution would be a roadway improvement to address recurring congestion and the goals of the projects would be quite different.

Commissioner Godwin stated that roundabouts are inherently safer as is shown where they have been implemented and there are a number of reasons why they are a technologically superior solution. He would need to know why we are going with the less desirable solution. He thought there might be some reasons such as lack of land or something that would make this solution better in this circumstance but in general, he thought Mr. Tan's point was good that roundabouts are a modern way of dealing with intersections as opposed to the 19th century stop lights.

Commissioner Wright stated he was looking for staff clarification as to whether there was any consideration given to the highest and best use of ingress and egress for that lot where they are talking about doing that construction, and would oncoming traffic be obstructed by this sign. He stated when he looked at the mockup, it was relatively low. He asked, in the event they do apply for a permit for ingress and egress, whether they will be required to bear the burden of any expense of removing the guard rail for the portion they are discussing and relocating of this or has there been any kind of working together with them to meet both needs before they do this.

Sr. Planner O'Connor stated she can partially answer the question but she would encourage him to ask the applicant that question as they have the authority for Caltrans right-of-way, but from staff's preliminary review, using standard sight triangles for the designed speed of the highway, they believe there could be a conflict between the variable message sign and/or the guard rail with the proposed ingress/egress location, but they have not done that full analysis and that analysis would be done as part of the Pacifica Highlands project. She stated that the first phase would be in the environmental review stage to see if there are any traffic design hazards with the proposed ingress and egress locations. She concluded that she will let the applicant speak to any other considerations they made. She added that she had one further point for the record, i.e., Caltrans has made it clear to the city that they don't have a current encroachment permit application on file for ingress or egress for that project.

Commissioner Leal asked what the date was when the comment letter was sent from Pacifica's Planning Director to Caltrans in response to the negative declaration documentation for initial study.

Sr. Planner O'Connor asked if that was the date they commented on the initial study negative declaration as she stated she didn't have date at hand and she can try to find it in the records, and the applicant may be able to respond to that question.

Chair Berman stated that most of her questions are for the applicant, but she has one question for staff. She asked whether, before applicants apply for a building permit, and while applicant's are in the entitlement phase, Pacifica typically allows the applicant to apply for an encroachment permit with Caltrans or does the city typically require the applicant to wait until Planning approval so entitlement is in parallel with the building permit phase when they can do their Caltrans encroachment permit.

Sr. Planner O'Connor stated that city staff has had early consultation with Caltrans and encouraged them to create progress on their encroachment permit into the State Route 1 right-of-way because they would want to make sure the design for the ingress and egress is in line with the design for the portion of the project that is under the city's jurisdiction.

Commissioner Domurat asked, to piggyback on that, whether there was any knowledge of the proposed ingress and egress and are there options to where that would be post development and construction of the signs, i.e., are there other options where those can be moved in order to accommodate those signs and do we have a concept of other places where they can locate ingress and egress or are they completely locked in to where the sign will be.

Sr. Planner O'Connor thought that would probably be best answered by the applicant.

Commissioner Wright asked if there was even a possibility of a different location for the ingress and egress that wouldn't be obstructed.

Sr. Planner O'Connor stated that, as it is similar to Commissioner Domurat's question, she encouraged him to ask the applicant about that feasibility.

Acting Planning Director Murdock stated that he would like to answer Commissioner Leal's question about the transmittal of the city's comment letter.

Chair Berman encouraged him to do so.

Acting Planning Director Murdock stated that the city sent the comment letter on October 7, 2020.

Chair Berman asked if there were any other questions for staff, and seeing none, she invited the applicant to speak.

Acting Planning Director Murdock stated that there are several team participants from the applicant and it will take a moment to have them all come out.

Mandanish Shugar, applicant, stated she is the project manager from Caltrans and is present with the project team from various areas of Caltrans, and they are present to answer questions from the Commissioner. They weren't planning to make a complete presentation as Sr. Planner O'Connor has done a great job. She has listened to the questions from the Commissioners, and they can use the ten minutes to address some of them if that was okay.

Chair Berman thought it was acceptable that they don't have a presentation and they can bring it back to the Commission to ask her team questions.

Acting Planning Director Murdock asked Chair Berman to pause for a moment as he hasn't been able to promote all the Caltrans project team. He stated that Ms. Shugar's team members will need to accept his promotion and Chris Paddock and Nina Hofmarcher should see a popup asking if they want to join as a panelist and he asked that they accept that.

Ms. Shugar stated that she can go through the names of the team members and he can send it to all of them. She stated they have Nina Hofmarcher and Zachary Gifford from Environmental Planning, Abdul Godani from Design, David Mann from Traffic Operation Systems, Lester Lee, and Chris Paddock from Landscape Architecture.

Acting Planning Director Murdock stated that, of all those individuals, the only one he has not seen as a participant is Abdul Godani and everyone else has been invited to be promoted and it looks like they have all accepted.

Ms. Shugar stated that they have some PowerPoint slides that they can visuals when Commissioners ask questions. They will try to answer as best as they can.

Chair Berman brought it back to the Commission to ask questions of her team. She began with one of her questions. She stated that multiple things are happening at the same time, although they have not received an application for the new development that supposed to go in the location where the 9-2 sign will go. She wondered if it was possible to use a variable message sign that is on a trailer that allows it to be a little less permanent and could be located in this location for the time necessary but the ingress/egress with the new development gets permitted and is underway and they are going to apply for an encroachment permit, and if it was possible that the stopping site distance can be coordinated with a final location for the variable message sign as a trailer sign.

Ms. Shugar stated that it would defeat the purpose of the project, as the purpose is to provide a messaging system along the route that is currently lacking and, as a result, the project proposes five variable message signs along the 20-mile stretch, all the way from Half Moon Bay in the south to Daly City in the north. These are strategically located. She asked David Mann to add to this as he is in a strategic position. She stated that the reason they are trying to install these signs is because Highway 1 is a two-lane highway and there have been several incidents that require a messaging system to be able to alleviate congestion when it does happen and having the signs installed at this time is optimal because, when there is a traffic congestion, getting our maintenance to get out there and install portable message signs is not an option. She stated that the entire purpose of the project is to have these coordinated messaging systems that connects with their traffic management center in Oakland and they are able to monitor traffic and incidents in the tunnel, as well as along the 20-mile stretch and messages can be sent to the TMC and relate back to the screens and the traveling public is notified of all these emergency incidents that could likely occur along the route. She asked Mr. Mann if he would like to add something to this.

Mr. Mann stated he is the statewide traffic operations director. He stated that the question of whether they could use a portable variable message signs in the short term, and he thought that, while anything is feasible, it doesn't make sense from a security standpoint, reliability standpoint and functionality standpoint for the installation of these signs. He stated that, because of this type facility information that they would like to present that the changeable message signs or portable changeable message signs there would likely not be the appropriate measure. He stated that their other concern about portable signs is that they tend to be vandalized and stolen which is

something the permanent signs tend to be more resilient to that. He stated that another thing mentioned is as this new development is currently in the environmental phase, for them it is not even a project as they are still working through the process. As they work through the design, that is something they can work with Caltrans to potentially make some small adjustments at that site to make the site distance a little bit more feasible. He stated that, given the current proposed location, they don't believe it is a significant issue as there is likely some right-of-way there that they can make adjustments to either move it closer to the roadway or further from the roadway, depending on certain safety parameters. He thought that is something that is very low cost and can be done at the time of the project. For the sake of the public and reliability that they are looking for or the functionality, that is something they would not recommend to use portables at this point.

Chair Berman had a follow up clarification question. She asked, when he mentioned that they could shift the permanent location a couple of feet, if he was suggesting that they work with the applicant of the separate project before the initial installation or suggesting that they install it where they want now and in the future the applicant can apply for Caltrans to relocate it a couple of feet.

Mr. Mann agreed that it was a two-phase approach. He stated that, initially, they obviously want to partner with the local community and local developer in the city to find the ideal situation at the tail end of the design phase which is where they are now, but during construction, as part of the site evaluation in engineering, they can make further adjustments. He thought that was something that they would definitely like to work with the city or county on so they can minimize the relocations in the future. He added that, if the project does the housing development and it comes to fruition in the future, that is something they would ask the housing development to participate in the cost of relocation. He stated that his initial sense is that the relocation would be cost limited because the type is fine in the way they are installing it and is not a significant rework if they do need to move it. He thought the first approach would be to try to mitigate the visual impacts initially and work with the team, which would their recommended approach at this time.

Chair Berman asked if they work with city staff to try to locate the facilities to be minimally impacted.

Mr. Mann responded affirmatively, adding that they try to find the appropriate offset for both site distance and also to make sure they still have the disability for the traveling public and provide that they have the proper right-of-way and they do not have the times to take any right-of-way and any other environmental factors that are their environmental team can provide to them.

Vice Chair Hauser appreciated the application and work that has been done. She wondered if the applicant has an exhibit showing the location of the sign that better helps them understand Caltrans right-of-way versus the property lines of the adjacent property owner as she thought that would be helpful to see. She stated that her second questions is that, with the negative declaration completed in early 2021, she wanted to get a sense whether they knew when the application would be deemed complete and was deemed complete. She would like to understand the chronology of both things.

Sr. Planner O'Connor stated that she can help clear both of those items. She hoped this was what Vice Chair Hauser was asking for as the exhibit shows a comparison of the two projects, the one

on the right being the Caltrans proposal, the royal blue lines are property lines, and that separates Caltrans roadway from real property and then the project as shown and described in the staff report is detailed here and on the left is the most recent plans for the Pacifica Highlands project, and they are showing ingress and egress locations. She stated that they can note the drainage landmarks which she highlighted with green arrows on both sites and it gives an idea of the reference points and the walkway that is detailed on both pictures, kind of coming in together and this gives them an idea of the relationship between the two projects.

Vice Chair Hauser thought they were helpful graphics. She stated that she was also looking for the true north and true south most property lines to understand the frontage of the adjacent properties. She had one more question, i.e., the road that was shown in that graphic on the left where the project is proposed and recognized that it is not a project that this Commission has even considered or heard of. She stated that it was a new road being proposed and is not an existing road or existing curb cut off Highway 1, and she asked if her understanding was correct.

Sr. Planner O'Connor stated that it was correct.

Acting Planning Director Murdock asked Chair Berman, while they wait for Sr. Planner O'Connor to bring up the graphic, if she would allow him to clarify a statement he made earlier. He stated that there were two comment letters sent by the city, and he thought Commissioner Leal may have been inquiring about the later of the two. He stated that the initial comment letter was sent on the date he indicated, but the one that is included in the negative declaration prepared by Caltrans was actually conveyed in April 2021.

Sr. Planner O'Connor showed an overview and hoped the details are seen on Vice Chair's side of the screen. She stated that the pink line showed the property lines, right-of-way and, for a reference point, the double drainage points.

Vice Chair Hauser asked if the grade contours were similar. She stated that the list shown in the graphic she showed was to the right of her cursor. She asked if she is correct.

Sr. Planner O'Connor asked if she would repeat the question.

Vice Chair Hauser, referred to the image shown that was side by side comparison where the new curb cut would be, and asked where the new access was in comparison with her cursor.

Sr. Planner O'Connor stated that the proposed ingress and egress for the Pacific Highway project would start about approximately 70 feet or closer to 67 feet north of the double drainage point.

Vice Chair Hauser appreciated that information. She then referred to the certification on the date that the application was deemed completed, and asked if it was before or after the date of the published negative declaration which, if she wasn't mistaken, had a state clearing house number associated with it and she believes this was made available to the public. She asked if the negative declaration made available publicly and the date the application from the project applicant was deemed complete.

Sr. Planner O'Connor stated that ISMMD was adopted in May 2021. The application for the Pacifica Highways project was deemed complete by Pacifica on May 9, 2022.

Commissioner Wright asked if he is correct in assuming that the guard rail being put up is going to interfere with the proposed ingress and egress.

Sr. Planner O'Connor stated that they have not done that whole analysis yet. As mentioned earlier, she stated Engineering Department has provided them with standard sight distance triangles for the design speed of Highway 1 and, based on its preliminary review, we do think there is some potential that there would be a conflict between the proposed ingress/egress design and the location of all the facilities being considered at this time, but they have not done a formal analysis on that.

Commissioner Wright asked Mr. Mann if the height of that sign is sufficient or the setback of the sign sufficient, if someone was to be leaving the property where the proposed development is going to be, would they still be able to see oncoming traffic before trying to merge onto the highway.

Mr. Mann thought it was not necessarily the height of the sign, but also the distance from the edge of the roadway as potentially that could impact their visibility of oncoming traffic. He stated that Caltrans can work with their team members to look at the height of the sign if necessary. He stated that, typically, the sign itself would be at least seven feet off the ground for distance for drivers to observe it, but also to minimize the likelihood of minor vandalism.

Commissioner Wright asked if they would be willing to commit to try to at least reach out to the abutter and see if they can make appealed adjustments that would accomplish both of them working together to have both get what they need.

Mr. Mann stated, given where they are today, that he thought the appropriate things they could commit to work with the city or county, depending on the jurisdiction, to try to find the appropriate distance from the travel way to minimize the potential impacts if the potential access to the state highway is built. He stated that they were quite away from that point and it would be early for them to commit exactly what they would look to do, but he thinks they can commit to work with local staff.

Commissioner Leal stated that a lot of the questions were about 9-2 and they also have a 9-1 project on the agenda, and he stated that his understanding is that they are two independent technology improvements along Highway 1, and he asked Caltrans staff if there was any dependency or communication between the two in terms of location and he would want the location.

Mr. Mann stated that the two elements they are proposing within the city limits, as of today, are not directly tied to each other. One element that talks specifically on the existing traffic signal structure is a performance measuring system for their transportation management center to have a better understanding of the number of vehicles that use the facility on a day to day basis but also to improve their long term traffic engineering and planning studies as well. He stated that system could provide information to the message sign but, given where they are in today's technology and the way they get information from various third party providers, they are likely not going to connect the two elements together as of today. He stated that both of that information is fed to their data centers in Oakland.

Commissioner Leal understands that it does in terms of the proximity of them and they need to be at a certain distance from one another to communicate and it sounds like that technology is not there yet and that is not a consideration at this time. He then asked if there were any other locations for 9-2 reviewed, and particular locations he is thinking of are closer to Post Mile 42.8 or Post Mile 43 a little further north on the same side. He stated that may serve as the same attempt to the public in terms of redirecting traffic should there be a traffic issue on Highway 1 or Sharp Park Road. He asked if there were any other locations reviewed for the sign at the current location, other than the one modified already in a similar proximity.

Mr. Mann thought that he didn't recall and he didn't want to misspeak about the number of locations within the city that they have specifically looked at, but, if Zachary Gifford from Environmental Planning was on the line, maybe he can provide an answer of how many locations they took a look at within the city limits.

Mr. Gifford stated that he mentioned the size of the other one he said, closer to the church, and he asked if that was his question.

Commissioner Leal stated that besides the other one that was earlier revised.

Mr. Gifford stated that, in the early development of the project, they did briefly looked at a sign north of Reina Del Mar but due to environmental factors, site distances and other complications, it was found to move back further south along Highway 1 to be a better location for the data collection for the sign as well for the emergency and incident related messaging.

Commissioner Godwin stated, following up on Commissioner Leal's point, he asked if the sign has to be the size as initially proposed or can it be smaller or larger, moved further up the hill, further south. He stated that it seems like the traffic sensor at Reina Del Mar has got to go at the intersection but he thought they have some flexibility with the sign, and he asked if they can talk a little bit about why not relocate it somewhere else, away from this proposed development access or egress point.

Mr. Mann stated that the one thing about the size they are proposing is appropriate for the context that they have on this type of highway system, based on the speeds they are traveling. He stated that, ideally, the sign would be a little bit larger but due to concerns about visual impacts, the ability to install the sign, they tried to find a sign that they could fit the most urgent messages that they can display so that is why they came up with this sign. He stated that it can't get much smaller as it would be very challenging to read at 55-60 mph, and they were pushing the boundaries there. They are also trying to be consistent across the coast in the coastal area about the size of signs as well and they want to find something that is reasonable but allows them to provide the necessary information. He stated that the second thing about location, which Mr. Gifford already covered, was a number of constraints that they faced in terms of environmental factors, which he thought Mr. Gifford could add to, and the one area where they can make some slight adjustments in the field when they start doing the actual construction is that they can potentially move the sign, and they will have to do a site verify further away from the roadway to make it easier for drivers to come out of that potential future driveway. In terms of significant relocation, he thought that was too late in the process, given all the constraints they have now.

Commissioner Godwin asked if Mr. Gifford wanted to add anything.

Mr. Gifford stated that, as far as the other location, there were constraints with a large amount of vegetation that possibly needed to be removed in that area and biological constraints that were significant enough for them to review moving it to different locations that were less impactful to the environment.

Commissioner Godwin understood that position. He then stated that his navigation system already give him a lot of alerts of that traffic, and he asked if the whole concept of the sign somewhat obsolescent or even approaching obsolete as is there any real need to even do the sign as all that is going to impact a large number of drivers.

Mr. Mann stated that he gets that question all the time in his current role as the statewide traffic operations manager. They agree that they are definitely evolving to use these in vehicle tools and your phone apps, and the Department of Transportation is definitely looking at ways to display that information in their vehicles, however there were two factors he wanted to bring up. One is the use of cell phones while driving remains illegal in California and that is something their partners at CHP and local PD take very seriously as distracted driving is something that they do not want to encourage. Two is, from an equity perspective, it will take quite a bit of time for their fleet to turn over as there are a lot of drivers from varying age groups, different ethnicities, and many coming from other areas that don't have access to these apps safely in their vehicle. He agrees that they are becoming more common place, but their goal is to reach all traveling public members and where this sign will provide that service. He agrees that, potentially upwards of a decade or two decades when they have that fleet conversion and driver conversion, he definitely thinks that projects like this and what they are doing will be less in the future.

Commissioner Godwin referred to stop lights and trying to manage them is a 19th century technology and roundabouts have been shown to be a lot safer as people don't try to beat roundabouts the way they do stop lights and end up killing themselves or killing somebody else. He asked if they thought seriously about redesigning the intersection to something that is safer than what they have used since 1950s.

Mr. Mann stated that he did hear a comment about roundabouts in the past and as a department, anytime they have an opportunity to upgrade an intersection or add an intersection roundabout is a considered alternative. It is a mandatory evaluation they must complete as part of the project development process and, in many cases now, the department is installing roundabouts in many different areas. Here in the Bay Area, while it doesn't seem that they are doing a lot, they are quite a bit of planned roundabouts and some in construction. He stated that the challenges with roundabouts are, one, they potentially require more land to support such a large facility such as what they are looking at on Highway 1. In a lot of areas, they may not be viable for a roundabout, given the approach detail that they have. Secondly, he stated that this project was construed as mainly information project, travel information to the public emergency management and any modifications to the intersection capacity modifications at the intersection were completely out of scope and not considered as part of the process and the funding was dedicated to electronic and trying to better communicate to the drivers and address some of the major concerns we have been facing along the Highway 1 corridor. He thought his question was something that speaks to what the department is moving forward with, i.e., looking at a safer systems approach and integrating more modern intersection design to promote safety and efficiency. He stated that he shouldn't be surprised if, in future projects, they may modify an intersection. He stated that this is something Pacifica hypothetically propose a new traffic signal

on State Route 1 and they will be required to do a round-about analysis and consider whether it is feasible or not. He stated that the process will play itself out at that time.

Commissioner Godwin thought it might be worthwhile to change the perspective on the project on the fairly narrow one now to a broader one.

Chair Berman asked staff that, understanding that the Pacifica Highlands project has been deemed complete, whether this new installation by Caltrans impact the completeness of that project and understating that it may impact the stopping site distance for the ingress/egress of that project.

Sr. Planner O'Connor stated that it wouldn't change the completeness status of the project. It will be something staff will definitely continue to reach out and get information from the applicant to address as they are still in the early phase of that project and would be able to address it as they move forward.

Chair Berman stated that Mr. Mann did clarify earlier that there is no interconnect from this variable message sign to the traffic signal at Reina Del Mar and there isn't a requirement based on distance between that intersection and this variable message sign, and understanding that there is great limitation for the driveway of a property at this stretch of road because the queue link at Reina Del Mar is actually quite long. She was sure the level of service of this intersection can prove that too, and the gaps here are going to be pretty short with this future development. She asked if there was a possibility to move this variable message sign further north. She understood, in reviewing the report of all the development for these signs that are going to go up and down the coast in the District 4 area, a couple of hundred feet, and can't imagine it would impact the effectiveness of this variable message sign. She asked if it was possible to locate the sign further north.

Mr. Mann stated he will start and he can bring the team in to help answer that as it is a good point that these types of signs specific to the verbal message signs, there is a small flexibility to move them, but they have a number of factors that they consider, from the amount of time the drivers are able to read and comprehend the messages that they are displaying at the speed that they are traveling, and there is also the potential additional light into other areas that they don't want them to be going from the signs. While the signs adjust for the ambient conditions, they try to be as dim as possible and they are also taking that into consideration. In terms of where they are today, I feels that it would be very challenging potentially to move it a couple of hundred feet hypothetically. They have looked at current process they have and the clearances from an environmental standpoint that they would not have the impacts at this location. He thought that was something they could take back to the team and see what adjustments they can make, but it would be very difficult for them to commit to. He didn't know if anyone else on his team wants to speak in terms of the impacts to their environmental clearances and other factors out there, but he thought it would be a challenging act. He thought, given where they are at today and the distance from the driveway and how much right-of-way, he thinks it would be a little bit less of an issue and he thought they can definitely work with the city in terms of getting the offset correct to minimize the impacts to that future driveway potentially if it is constructed. He asked if Nina Hofmarcher or Zachary Gifford had their hands raised.

Mr. Gifford stated he didn't, but he can chime in, then asked if he had cut anyone off.

Ms. Shugar wanted to clarify that it was their understanding that the housing development still doesn't have environmental clearance and she asked if that was correct.

Sr. Planner O'Connor stated that she is correct as the application has not gone through the California Environmental Quality Act process yet.

Ms. Shugar agreed with Mr. Mann that they are willing to work with the staff from the city and county, adding that their project has gone through various alliterations and they have moved the sign many times. Every time they move it, they have to approve it environmentally and they can move it a few feet to the left, right, north or south, but moving it 200-300 feet as mentioned by Mr. Gifford, there are environmental constraints and encounter archeological resources and they have spent a lot of staff time and resources trying to position the sign where it is, and while they can investigate trying to move it again, that would be a setback to Caltrans' project to be able to come up with a new location for the VMS sign. She added that the developer for the housing development could potentially investigate mitigation measures for the site distance issue that they have cited. She thinks they need to investigate that, get the project cleared environmentally, stating that they are 3-4 years away, and they also need an encroachment permit from Caltrans. She thought all those issues need to be resolved before requesting Caltrans to adjust the location of the sign at this point. Again, she stated that they can look into it, but as mentioned by Mr. Mann, it would be very difficult to commit to that.

Chair Berman recognizes that the Planning Commission has not received the housing development as an item to review and approve, but what they have recently done is they spent about 30 minutes talking about this particular property and making it suitable for housing with our General Plan. She stated that, regardless of where the driveway is for this location and given that the whole stretch of road is allocated for a mixed use neighborhood and a good amount of residential, for the people living here to have this sign further north so when they turn right on Highway 1, they can benefit from the sign as well. She is trying to consider good planning.

Ms. Shugar thought she made a great point, but as previously mentioned, the signs are located strategically to allow the traveling public to make decisions in a timely manner. She would defer to Mr. Mann to talk about how this sign was located or Mr. Gifford or Mr. Lee, as this was based on that idea that it would allow motorists to make a timely decision to get off of the highway or onto the highway.

Mr. Gifford stated that he would let either Mr. Mann or Mr. Lee to capture that as they are more professional about the placement of signs.

Mr. Mann stated that what they wanted to capture for the entire community was to provide enough warning in advance of decision points to allow drivers to take some alternatives, given the potential issues they may face ahead, and was one of the major factors in determining that. He stated that they are trying to balance the capturing as much as the traffic as they can and at the same time providing enough advanced warning for them to comprehend the information and think about the alternatives they can take as they head north on Highway 1. He stated that, in an ideal world, they would like to install additional signs which is something the department would definitely consider in the future as part of their larger buildout plan, but with Caltrans, this was very dedicated funded for a handful of signs at the time and they tried to best strategically place them along the entire Highway 1 corridor to provide maximum audiences and help with some of the most pressing needs they saw at the time. He stated that is their main intent and driver in

terms of sign selection locations, and he has been hearing a lot of conversation regarding moving the sign here and there, and he stated that moving it five feet doesn't really impact things significantly, but moving it a little bit more is actually more constraining on where they are at this time. He pointed out that, the way funding cycles work for transportation, this project has been delayed multiple times to try to address all the questions and concerns from the community throughout the entire coast. He stated that, if they don't move forward with this, they will lose the opportunity to provide that emergency management, it will be very disappointing to their department as well as to the elected officials who have been asking Caltrans to do something about incident emergency management for the Highway 1 corridor.

Chair Berman referred to his mentioning that the sign needs to be located strategically before a driver needs to make a decision, and based on his analysis, she asked what decision is the first decision that a driver would have to make based off of this sign and where is that location.

Mr. Mann responded that the main decision point is up towards Highways 1 and 35 but there are a number of crossing roads that come between 35 and 1, such as Sharp Park, and they want to be able to capture some of that. He stated that the other thing they were considering as well was that they didn't want people to get too close up towards Highways 1 and 35, and there were a number of places for people to go and turn around and go the other way. He stated that those were a couple of factors they were looking at.

Commissioner Leal stated that, regarding the content on the sign and community benefit, they see other signs in the Bay Area with notices of closures, particularly for the Tom Lantos Tunnel and accidents around Sharp Park Road, and being able to communicate in this jurisdiction of the sign and the content is not just limited to Caltrans roads, but any vehicular traffic on any public road that may impact traffic severely.

Mr. Mann agreed that was correct in general, and he thought their signs were focused for the highway system, but there are potential events within the local jurisdiction that may raise the level of displaying those signs, and they can work with the San Mateo County Emergency Operations Center, County Sheriff and others to find the appropriate timing and display of those types of closure messages. He thought the main point is that the signs are on an as needed basis, mainly for incidents, special events and potentially emergency evacuations. He also thought there were opportunities to use the signs appropriately when we do have major potential traffic impacts on local streets and they have done it in the past, such as in San Francisco and other major cities around the Bay Area. He stated that they want minimize the use of these signs to be cognizant of the dark skies approach on the coast and they will try to work with the community and first responders to come up with a subset of messages or message scenarios that they can use for that case.

Commissioner Leal also referred to location, and agreed with Chair Berman that the current location of the sign is not necessarily the best location to serve most of the travelers in Pacifica with development aside, and he stated that Reina Del Mar is a very busy intersection and traffic actually goes into the Vallemar neighborhood and comes back out and heads north, and if you head south, it makes a left into Reina Del Mar and comes back and that entire group of travelers will be missed. He knows there is Caltrans right-of-way at post mile marker 42.8 which is roughly in front of the police station and 43 is a significant piece of right-of-way that extends into the east Fairway neighborhood, and those seem like the most appropriate locations but as Mr. Gifford mentioned earlier, it sounds like those may have been evaluated and there were either site

line challenges or other environmental issues that would need to be restudied and he appreciated that. He then referred to heading south, and stated that it is not in the project, but Pacifica still doesn't have a sign like this headed south at its city limits and he thought closest was Clarinada and he thought Clarinada is in Daly City, and they have one at the tunnel which he believes is outside of the city's limits. He thought most of our traffic challenges are headed south on the weekends and being able for travelers in that direction to adjust their travel when they hit traffic around the Manor to Sharp Park area and take Sharp Park Road east to get on 280 or adjust their beach plans would be advantageous to the public for the next grant funding cycle for traffic signs in Pacifica.

Vice Chair Hauser stated, if no one objected, she would love to do public comment at some point soon as she feels they are starting to get into things that are less questioning.

Chair Berman asked Commissioner Wright if he had a clarification question for the applicant before they go to public comment.

Commissioner Wright stated that he does have a couple of questions, but he is also happy to hear public comment first and circle back to that.

Chair Berman stated that he had his hand raised for a while and she feels it would be great to hear his questions.

Commissioner Wright understands they want the sign a certain distance from the light as they don't want people reading and smashing into stopped traffic at that light and he appreciates part of the reason for wanting to put it there, and he didn't think they did a sufficient job considering their abutter in his potential for ingressing and egressing, and he was a bit concerned about that. He stated that it sounds as though they committed to maximize what field adjustments they can do. He stated that the guard rail is more concerning to him, and he asked if they could give him a ballpark idea of how much expense the abutter would need to go to remove a piece of that guard rail in order to make his plan for he egress and ingress feasible in the event it comes to pass three years from now.

Mr. Mann asked Abdul Godani if he had the latest cost for a guard rail per foot that they are using.

Ms. Shugar didn't think he was able to join in.

Acting Planning Director Murdock stated that Abdul Godani is in the participant area but he did not accept the invitation to promote to panel and he will try once more.

Ms. Shugar thought he may not be familiar with this and he can try again. She stated that she will text him.

Mr. Mann stated that they will find that. It was a very site specific question, but he doesn't believe the cost would be significant in terms of having to adjust the guard rail. He thought that was something they would need to do that site specific walk through going forward.

Commissioner Wright asked if they have considered what they call coming out of the quarry across from Vallemar making a right turn only to cut down that light sequence 25% so they get more cars through there and get rid of their light sequence.

Mr. Mann asked if he could repeat that question regarding which intersection he was referring to.

Commissioner Wright stated the Reina Del Mar at Vallemar, just north of where they are talking about the sign. At that light, there is a light sequence coming out of what they call the quarry, oceanside to the west, and he asked if they have considered making that a right turn only to not have it have to have a light sequence so they could do a merge lane and go on and they could get 25% more of the cars through that light by eliminating an entire light sequence.

Mr. Mann stated that is not the scope of the discussion, this specific intersection improvement and is something that he can have their traffic signal operations manager work with Sam from the city to take a look at that. He would make a comment on one thing, i.e., all their traffic lights are supposed to be actuated and when there are no vehicles coming out of that particular movement, they do not serve that traffic movement and it is relatively very efficient and, at the high level, he didn't think making that right turn only would necessarily yield much potential benefit in terms of the overall delay that drivers are experiencing today, but it is something they can bring back to their traffic signal operations team and bring it back to the city Public Works team.

Chair Berman opened the Public Hearing.

Acting Planning Director Murdock stated that there are hands raised and he will get the timer set up and they will get underway. He then introduced the speakers.

Dale Leta, project manager with BKF Engineers, stated he is calling as a representative of the Pacifica Highlands Development. He thanked city and Caltrans staff for all their hard work on this great improvement for the city to enhance traffic and safety along Highway 1 corridor. He clarified where they were in the encroachment permit process, and expressed positive thoughts on all working together to reach the best possible decisions for everyone.

Laurie C. Pacifica, stated that she has an invested interest and is concerned about putting several signs on Highway 1 in our scenic city. She stated that in calling this a service to the public, this is a natural environment area, with a highway going through it, and she pointed out that there is a station on the radio that reports problems so she is very aware of any issues and she would propose the money be reallocated to things like picking up trash on the highway as they are well behind on that and she is not about disappointing Caltrans or politicians but in keeping the beauty of the city.

Remi Tan, Pacifica, stated that the Reina Del Mar intersection has been problematic, mentioning some specific problems during weekdays, and beach traffic has gotten progressively worse. He also questions the location of the sign as it is almost where the highway turns into a freeway and there is usually no problems going up past Manor to Daly City as the traffic is usually going southbound. He agreed with the previous speaker to save that money, as well as funds from the cancelled highway widening project and put it towards more fruitful things, such as converting the lights at Linda Mar, as well as Fassler, Crespi, to traffic circles to make it safer.

Cindy Abbott, Pacifica, appreciated the conversation so far, and she agreed with Commissioner Godwin that technology is approaching obsolescence, and mentioned other options available to most people. She reported on similar conversations down the coast at Half Moon Bay, etc. She expressed her personal thoughts that the signs weren't providing enough value and reducing congestion was a false argument so suggested not approving this and continue the conversation with other coastside cities for a different alternative.

Clifford Lawrence, Pacifica, expressed his thought on the southbound traffic problem, the Pacifica Highlands application status, and being involved in modifications in an area where an application has not been heard.

Christine Boles, Pacifica, thanked Caltrans staff for being here and explaining where they are coming from on these issues. She expressed her concerns on the problem regarding the traffic problem in Pacifica and pointed out similar issues addressed in the General Plan and EIR in connection with additional housing projects in the city, and she would welcome the opportunity to start conversations with Caltrans on all traffic measures to help solve the issues.

Chair Berman closed the Public Hearing.

Vice Chair Hauser stated she had one more question for Caltrans. She asked if this was a sign that was specifically traffic related, as she was under the impression from the staff report that there was other information that would be provided on the sign, and asked if they could speak on it.

Mr. Mann stated that the primary purpose of the sign is for traffic incidents, however, when there is a need, it can also be used for emergencies to assist with evacuations. He stated that, from a national standpoint, there is very limited types of information that they can put on the sign as managed by the federal government, and there are clear guidelines in manuals on that, and all the information is going to be travel alert, traffic and emergency focus, but no public service announcements unrelated to transportation are allowed, but there are potentially some public safety campaigns but they would not necessarily propose as they want to be consistent with their dark skies approach on the coast and keep it focused to as needed events that do not normally happen, and causes about 55% of the congestion on a national average and that is what they are trying to focus on. He referred to the conversations about recurrent congestions that Highway 1 corridor faces during certain times of day but the main benefit of the signs is to handle non-recurrent situations that contribute up to 55% of the delay that travelers face.

Vice Chair Hauser stated that traffic is the primary goal. She does not think it is appropriate to be considering the sign in the context of a project that hasn't even come before the Commission but what she does think is appropriate is what Chair Berman mentioned, i.e., a land use designation. When she was asking questions earlier about the frontage of the property they are adjacent to, she wanted to understand the property as a whole, whatever it turns out to be. She asked if they were looking at something at this time that could make it difficult for a property owner to use their property and she is concerned with that, but her bigger concern comes from the things that the public brought up. She was not sure if the aesthetics that really fits into this area. She stated that a public comment mentioned that, you get to this point, there was really not much to do when you see it. She stated that, if it is not about the safety component, such as an tsunami, etc., she didn't know if she can get there personally but she would love to hear what everybody else has to say.

Commissioner Domurat wasn't concerned until the last five minutes. He is very concerned that enough of the real time information won't be displayed and he concur with what everyone says that, by the time you get there, if there is congestion, you don't need to know if you can see it. He was very concerned that there isn't emergency information like amber alerts, tsunami warnings, local emergencies on the sign. He stated that is the real information needed, not about the aesthetics because the importance of tsunami and amber alerts would outweigh that. If that is not going to be provided, he didn't see much need for the signs. He sees a lot of need for Caltrans to work with the community and do some additional transportation studies to see how they can modify that area with the light. He knows that is not part of the discussion or what they are all about. His concern is that the information isn't going to be that useful to very many people at this point. He thought the state needs to mandate that auto manufacturers mandate heads up displays where the information is displayed on their windshield as they are driving and come into an area. He thought a lot can be done with technology that is there already and maybe we will get there someday.

Commissioner Leal stated that he was happy to allow for other Caltrans staff to clarify any points that were just mentioned and they may have some clarifying points of the content on the sign. Then he will make his comment.

Chair Berman was in agreement.

Mr. Mann thinks there is a misunderstanding of what is and is not allowed on the sign. He was trying to let everyone know that they would like to take a very cautious approach in displaying the messages they have out there due to the number of concerns they can receive from those who live on the coastside. What is on the table for the sign to be used is very clear, such as traffic incidents that happen and not just to let people know there is congestion but to use the sign to let them know to slow down to avoid secondary accidents, which is one of the pillars they have in their department to warn them at the end of queue. He stated that is something they would definitely use it for. And they will also use the sign to alert them to potential closures and incidents on Highway 1, 35, 280 because that's where a lot of the travelers are going and they want to alert them of those situations as well. In addition, they know the coastal weather is drastically changing and those are potential options on the table such as with significant rain events and fog, and there are many examples of these signs being used all over California for the specific situations. He stated that emergency evacuations, tsunami and amber alerts are all transportation traveler information allowed and are on the table. He explained that he stated earlier that they want to work with the emergency responders and the cities to find the right balance so they don't have the signs on continuously and would have them on when appropriate for the situation at hand. He stated that, to make sure the signs would be used for all those types of scenarios, and they want to be judicious in their use to make sure they don't have them on continuously to minimize the potential impacts to others that are concerned about it. He stated that there are other opportunities such as special events and he knows this sign is going in the north bound direction and there are other signs potentially going into Pacifica and other areas and they could use the signs to let them know about those particular activities and he just wanted to caution everyone that they have to be very careful in terms of the verbiage they put on there as there are national guidelines that restrict them from certain uses. He stated that, if the community is open to it and emergency responders are wanting the sign to be used more frequently, that is something Caltrans will work with individually. He understands that there are others who don't want the sign on as much and they have to be cognizant of it. He stated that there are other uses

of the sign that they talk about from a safety perspective, in terms of getting motorists to slow down which is a big challenge for them. They have used signs in the past to alert people to reduce their speeds to help with the local police departments and they want to promote that. He thought all those are opportunities on the table but they do need to work with all the stakeholders involved to make sure that they are used judiciously as the signs are installed. He hoped that clarifies his initial point in terms of usage and possibility out there for everyone.

Commissioner Leal thanked him as it does clarify the uses. He thought, considering all the factors, he was in favor of this sign as well as the other project before them, N-1 with the wireless at Reina Del Mar intersection. He stated that the usefulness of the sign has come up a couple of times regarding when they would use it, when would it be valuable and a couple incidents stick out to him as to when it could potentially be used. He stated that those living all over town know that, during the winter time, there will be a couple of accidents heading north on Highway 1 towards 280 and 35 when it starts getting slick, especially in early winter months of December and January. He stated that the use of the sign could potentially redirect traffic through Sharp Park Road onto 35 down to Westborough around 280 and would also avoid congesting small arteries in town such as the Clarendon accident or Oceana Blvd., with people trying to get around the Manor neighborhood. He stated that was one case being beneficial. He stated that, back in March, there was a significant accident on 280 driving northbound to San Francisco. He stated that he remembers because he was almost involved in a secondary collision and luckily he avoided it. He thought in that situation Caltrans can direct traffic over Sharp Park Road or around 280 through to 101 so people could make it to San Francisco around that incident. He sees a general benefit to the community given that they don't have these signs other than the temporary ones that Caltrans puts in or city owned. He didn't like the location for several factors, such as the reach of the motorists in town and because it is directly adjacent to a private parcel that has been discussed and turned into a development where there were other locations along Highway 1 that could be adjacent to either the developed plain or more expensive Caltrans property. He stated that this is one of their CMS signs which is more heavy duty, one in the tunnels, more permanent structure and this permit does underground wiring but it is still made out of wood posts and does seem like it could be relocated in the event that a project comes before them and the developer looks to Caltrans on the appropriate plan, as well as the city, to mitigate any negative ramifications of the location if approved. He is generally in favor of both 9-1 and 9-2 in front of them.

Commissioner Godwin stated that anything they can do to improve the true point of that intersection is worthwhile and if Caltrans can put up some sensors as they look like and they think they can increase the through put and the safety of the Reina Del Mar one intersection, he was in favor of that. He was not sure what the benefit of the sign is, whether the usability outweighs the visual blight. His inclination is sensors yes, sign no and that is where he stands now.

Commissioner Wright wondered, in light of everything staff heard in terms of their discussion and interaction with Caltrans, if they had any change in their position whatsoever in terms of the way they're viewing this project.

Sr. Planner O'Connor stated that she will take this opportunity to recenter where staff is. She stated that Caltrans has come to Pacifica as they are the authorized jurisdiction to review applications for coastal development permits on behalf of the Coastal Commission, since the project is occurring in the coastal zone, to receive a coastal development permit, and there has

been a lot of discussion about the use of the sign and the exact location of it. She reminded the Commission that those types of discussions should be focused on how that affects the Commission's ability to make the findings for the coastal development permit which Caltrans is seeking. She stated that Pacifica does not have jurisdiction to approve projects in the Caltrans right-of-way and have the authority to review and evaluate its potential to meet the coastal development permit findings.

Acting Planning Director Murdock stated that, as Sr. Planner O'Connor mentioned, what the city's role is in this instance is not to decide whether the sign is appropriate or not. Caltrans has domain over Highway 1 right-of-way, but to ensure that what Caltrans does in the Highway 1 right-of-way in Pacifica is consistent with the city's local coastal program and that is where the connection exists between the plan we have for our community and the findings for approval of a coastal development permit. He stated that, in this case, for the two improvements that Caltrans is making, in packet page 93, that is where the beginning of the specific analysis of making the findings for approval of the project was prepared by staff. They identified a relationship to Coastal Act Policy No. 1 related to maximum access and recreational opportunities consistent with public safety. He stated that there is a relationship between safe traffic flow and safe public access and there is a narrative on page C106 of the Local Coastal Land Use Plan about the importance of public roadways, facilities within coastal neighborhoods, designed to be compatible to the scale, intensity and character of the neighborhood, as well as discussion in the LCLUP, page C112, because Highway 1 is Pacifica's lifeline, its appearance and safety are critical to the city in its future and there are some bullet points about safety and operational improvements protecting coastal views and improving the visual edge of the highway. There is a relationship between the sign design, placement and those characteristics, and there are other examples in the staff report on packet pages 93 and 94, and that is what Sr. Planner O'Connor is referring to and trying to recenter the Commission on its actual task which is to consider whether they can make the findings for approval of the permit or not.

Commissioner Wright asked if there is an appeal process if the abutter isn't happy with what the Commission's decision is at this meeting. He asked for an explanation of what that process might be for him.

Sr. Planner O'Connor stated that there is a local appeal process and a person can appeal the Commission's actions on this permit within ten days of the Commission taking action on it. She stated that, because they are in the Coastal Commission appeals jurisdiction, there is also an opportunity for a member of the public to appeal to the Coastal Commission.

Commissioner Ferguson stated that he has been listening and looked over the LCLUP and tried to figure out from his perspective if this fits. He referred to discussion about the usefulness of the sign, and he was someone who has the display on his company vehicle that gives him all this information before he starts the car and it doesn't service a large portion of Pacificans, but its stated goal is to improve traffic and public safety and he can kind of get behind that. He is lost with the need to protect coastal views and improve the visual edge of the highway and he can't see any way around this blight on this otherwise very attractive green space along Highway 1. He stated that he didn't see enough reason for public benefits to outweigh the blight to that coastal view and he would be inclined to not support the sign and he has no problems with their sensors.

Acting Planning Director Murdock asked him to help the Commission and staff understand more about what specific aspects of the project contribute to the blight in his perspective.

Commissioner Ferguson stated that they are putting up what is a visually unappealing sign, only used in the case of an emergency or public safety, and it is blocking what is one of the last green belts between the neighborhoods of Pacifica and he thought that was a big attraction factor that people driving along the coast and coming down the coast to spent dollars in Pacifica and coming to use our national resources. He stated that we have a very limited amount of green open spaces left along Highway 1. They are there and it attracts people, but for him it is a slippery slope as he doesn't see enough of a reason for this to justify putting something that he believes is an eyesore between Rockaway Beach and the businesses there, Gorilla BBQ and where the urban area starts again. He believes it is on one place where there isn't already any development and they are placing something visually unappealing on the visual edge of a right-of-way that is used by people just to come by for the scenic beauty.

Acting Planning Director Murdock stated that, in addition to the sign, is there any concern about the placement or extent of the Midwest Guardrail System or MGS, and does that contribute.

Commissioner Ferguson stated that there will be a power drop off that pole and the infrastructure there. He stated that the guard rails is a thing they can expect along the highway as our signs but we have existed without them up until this point. He stated that they are all constituents in Pacifica and saying that this something they drastically needed for all these years and he thought they were adding visual blight on the edge of the highway.

Chair Berman asked Acting Planning Director Murdock if he had anything more to say.

Acting Planning Director Murdock thought he captured most of that.

Chair Berman asked Mr. Mann and his team if she is recalling correctly that she remembers reading through the staff report with mention that the infrastructure installed in both locations would provide Caltrans insight to the current traffic situation. She asked if she is correct that Caltrans will be using both of these locations of the sign and the facility that will go on the traffic signal pole as a way to measure the current traffic situation in this area.

Mr. Mann clarified that on the variable message sign, as of today, they do not have a traffic sensor on it but that is something they have considered, but to minimize the impacts, they have left that feature off. he stated that the traffic sensor at the intersection will provide them information in real time to give them a better understanding of how many vehicles are using it and potentially also help them optimize the traffic signal operations as well. He stated that, to answer her question regarding there is no traffic sensing equipment, that is something the newer technology allows them to install and does not require the height they need, and they would strongly consider in the near future.

Chair Berman stated she is supportive of that and clear from public comment and some of the Commissioners' comments that Highway 1 could use some improvement to the traffic and she appreciates that part of it comes from Caltrans taking the time to study and collect volume data on the area to help improvement it in the future. She agreed with a lot of the commentors and some Commissioners regarding the usefulness of the sign. She sees it both ways, the usefulness when it comes to decision making with the split between Highway 1 up to 280 and Sharp Park and occasionally potentially once a year, there is a huge accident on Highway 1 if someone accidentally drives the wrong direction and that has happened within the past year. She agreed

with a commentor who mentioned that once there is traffic, they know there is traffic and you don't necessarily need a sign to tell you unless you are one of the first few people who are going to queue up behind an accident. She wants to personally stay on track with the staff report, and she understands they were redirected to the findings and, given their purview on this item, she didn't disagree with any of staff's recommendation in the findings because she understands that they can't change Caltrans' analysis in this area and how Caltrans deems appropriate to serve the highway. She then referred to the land use in the area where the variable message sign will go, with the current General Plan that they are reviewing again, and is not the one they reviewed on June 6 and 11, she didn't see any inconsistencies or red flags with that 42-year-old General Plan. She stated that it is unfortunate with the timing as she does think there is a better location for this variable message sign with respect to the General Plan they just recommended approval to City Council. She thinks a parcel the size for Pacifica Highland project, not having reviewed the project but parcels that size, knowing the density that it can have, there will probably be operation issues if that driveway needs to be too close to Reina Del Mar which already has a long queue link in peak hours. She thinks, with the future General Plan, this sign location is going to be a burden to that property owner as relocating their driveway would potentially be tough from an operation standpoint or it will be a burden to relocate with another encroachment permit to relocate the variable message sign. She wants to appreciate Commissioner Ferguson's points on the aesthetics, given the current location. She agrees that it isn't going to be the prettiest site but, for her, it is not necessarily a deal breaker with regard to the findings.

Vice Chair Hauser stated, in regard to the findings, she has no problems with the one at Linda Mar. She stated that, in regard to the findings, there is something not keeping with the neighborhood character. She read the requirements and thought it was consistent with environmental protection goals, but she wasn't sure that it was consistent with the character of the neighborhood. On that one, she is kind of leaning towards Commissioner Ferguson's thoughts, but on the one at Linda Mar, she has no problem approving that.

Commissioner Domurat stated that, before signing off, he feels a little better if they have some good needed safety information on it, and it has been indicated that it could be a decision that there is the availability to do those kinds of things and he feels good about that. He asked if he missed it in the report, or Caltrans has a PowerPoint slide that would have shown a graphic of the highway with a photoshop image of what that sign would look like in terms of sizes. He thought it must be a big sign. He stated that he is signing off and wished them all good luck.

Chair Berman thanked him. She then asked if they wouldn't mind pulling it up if anyone from the Caltrans team has that image.

Acting Planning Director Murdock stated that he thought what was referenced was on packet page 92 and he could zoom in on either of them or if there is a different graphic that someone has, he can stop sharing.

Chair Berman asked if any Commissioner wants a closer look or anything.

Vice Chair Hauser wouldn't mind a zoom on the bottom one.

Acting Planning Director Murdock asked Vice Chair Hauser if that was any better.

Chair Berman asked if everyone had a chance to digest the aesthetics.

Commissioner Leal stated that he had one more comment and a procedural question as he thought they may want to take the items separately. He stated that it was his understanding that there was currently a sign there already and perhaps a less useful sign that tells them how many miles it takes to get to Daly City and San Francisco. He stated that there was also a random sign that goes up on the private parcel of non-profit signs and signs that go up at the Christmas Tree lot, also slightly north of that location. He thought some arguments made at this time can be made and he wanted all of them to be considered. He then stated that, as he read the motion, he couldn't figure out a way to vote on the 9-1 location and the 9-2 location separately. He asked staff, based on the comments they have heard at this time, they may want to vote on them separately and, if they do, what would a motion like that look like.

Asst. City Attorney Sharma suggested that they take the action they would like to do to segment out the decisions and have that be all in one motion. She stated that it could be where they approve one of them and continue discussion on the second part. She stated that the direction would be given all in one motion.

Chair Berman asked Commissioner Leal if he had anything else.

Commissioner Leal stated that he wasn't going to add.

Chair Berman wanted to give Ms. Shugar a chance to speak in case it is a response to someone's question but before they get to that, she is trying to gauge the Commission's appeal to combining the motion or separating. She thought there were a lot of concerns they have but they don't necessarily pertain to their purview of this item. She stated that Commissioner Ferguson mentioned not agreeing with one of the findings, which she agreed with him, and she wondered if anyone else on the Commission has a similar thought on that. She knows Vice Chair Hauser mentioned that she did. She was trying to get to whether there is a condition of approval that may make people feel more comfortable with this item. She stated that she would pass this over to Ms. Shugar and asked if she had a response to someone's question.

Ms. Shugar wanted to speak to the efforts they put in to visually mitigate the appearance of the signs and the control of oximes they are planning to install. She stated that it was true that they can't reduce the size of the panel as they need that to accommodate all the messaging that they would like to display and that was the size they need for motorists to be able to read the information. They have made an attempt to use wooden posts for supporting the panels or they could investigate painting the control of oximes to two or more to a different shade like brown or green and try to blend it in using earth tones. She stated that they also tried to place it where there is existing open infrastructure, power lines, etc., and from that perspective, they have done their best to mitigate visual impacts and they could add some vegetation if it doesn't require maintenance and soften the look further. She stated that they made considerable effort to try and mitigate the appearance of the equipment and it was true that it will not blend in fully with the existing vegetation. She pointed out that the sign currently located on the east side of the pedestrian pathway, not necessarily blocking coastal views on the west side. She asked if Mr. Gifford would like to add anything.

Mr. Gifford stated that she did quite well, reiterating that they have done a lot to minimize their visual impact as much as possible to convey the messages for emergency and incident related messaging and they tried to use sign materials that will suit the coastal highway and, as Ms.

Shugar said, they could use some additional elements to soften their visual impacts, such as choosing the colors that will be more appropriate to the Commission, and the staff report mentions something like that for possible replanting there or a planting plan to reduce the visual impacts of the controller cabinets specifically. He stated that they have tried to do whatever they can to minimize the impacts of the VMS signs.

Sr. Planner O'Connor wanted to follow up on Mr. Gifford's comments. She stated that staff has included a condition of approval to include a landscaping plan to soften the appearance of the control structure and that is included in the draft resolution.

Commissioner Godwin stated that there is one other option they haven't discussed at this time that is just becoming available which is the holographic road sign and they don't need anything physical there, just projected in the air over the roadway using laser technology. He stated that the systems exist and he was sure Caltrans can get one if they want which would eliminate all the infrastructure. He asked if someone from Caltrans can comment on why they aren't getting holographic ones since there seems to be so much resistance down the whole coastside and they have to go with this somewhat old-fashioned electromechanical signs.

Chair Berman asked if someone from Caltrans was able to help answer.

Ms. Shugar stated that she can try to do that, but she was hoping Mr. Mann would help her out. She stated that they have limited funding at this time for this project and something like what the Commissioner Godwin mentioned about using holograms is likely to require newer technology, more costly and she wanted to mention that typically when projects are programed, they are programed in what is called the state highway operations protection program and typically on a four-year cycle and updated every two years. If they have to investigate something like this at this point, it would take a considerable amount of time and at this point in time this is the best technology we have to be able to address the needs of this highway especially the emergency incidents that have occurred and could occur in the near future. She stated that it is an interesting concept and they would certainly investigate it for the future if possible. She stated that, at this point, they have this project before the Commission and they would appreciate it if the Commission would consider supporting it.

Mr. Mann stated that it was brief. He thought it was a novel and innovative idea and something that, from a statewide perspective in his upcoming assignment, they can look into, but that technology has been improved nationally and locally in California for use. He thought, at this point, they have gone with the latest and thinnest low profile design that is currently on the market and is something they feel very comfortable that it will take them in the near future.

Commissioner Wright stated that she asked if there was an intentional condition and he was torn about this and he doesn't see it as necessarily being in keeping but he can't get past the fact that staff is in favor of it. He is concerned about the neighboring property. He stated that, if Caltrans was willing to truly work with the neighbor to make it so that they could have their cake and eat it too, he could be persuaded to support it with that condition. He stated that it is a really tough call.

Vice Chair Hauser wanted to echo what Commissioner Wright just said, as she agrees it is a really tough call. She thinks that, for her, what makes it hard is not the bulk of the sign as she understands that it is the color and is lit and is meant to be perceptible and they want it to be

bright. She understands that hiding it is counterintuitive. She thinks the hard part is that she recognize how hard Caltrans has worked on this and she doesn't want them to lose their funding for the sign, but she also thinks it is not in the right location and she thinks something Chair Berman said at the beginning during the question period was that it may make more sense to move 200 yards or so northward. She understands that it takes additional study and the reason she feels like that is that, as you look what is northward, as Commissioner Ferguson said, it is not a green belt with a lot of existing trees and it is a beautiful part of the coastal drive that people take when they go to Highway 1 as it is asphalt parking lots and there are still joint poles up and down the structure of Highway 1 and that is not a change. She stated that Caltrans right-of-way over adjacent properties has room for the sign, and there is another green and white sign that says Reina Del Mar and they already have a sign up there, and she thought that general vicinity is a more appropriate location. She stated that one of the Commissioners said there was currently a sign there, but that sign currently there is green and white and not lit. She stated that it blends in while still being perceptible. She stated that, if they were willing to continue this to explore a location that would be slightly further north, she would feel comfortable doing that. She stated that approving the one at Linda Mar, she was not sure if anything that she has heard in the last 20 minutes has gotten her closer towards a black and yellow lit sign in front of a bunch of trees.

Chair Berman personally agrees with what sounds like they are coming to a conclusion and potentially a continuance for condition of approval.

Commissioner Leal thought many of the same points being raised now and they are probably ready for someone to make a motion. He thought his motion won't be approved so he won't make one at this time, but he was happy to make one that says no to the motion.

Chair Berman asked if anyone is ready to make a motion, and stated it sounds like some of the things they are toying with is that they all agree that it is not necessarily the right location, especially due to the aesthetics of the existing condition that is there and that is one of the clearest things to point to, and a location further north would place it a little more in a commercial setting with a parking lot and more infrastructure. She asked staff if that was something they can condition in approval or is it something they may want to have a continuance on. She asked if any Commissioners want to help clarify or disagree, she asked them to feel free to do so.

Vice Chair Hauser stated that, if the rest of the Commission felt strongly that a condition would cover it, she might be onboard for the right condition, but her feeling is that they are talking in very broad terms about somewhere further north for this and she would like to see where that is and she referred to a reference made to the fact that the funding has an expiration date on it and she didn't want to approve something with a condition where additional stud will be taken and Caltrans loses the funding. She thinks, to some extent, they should leave a little bit of this in their hands knowing that they will probably not have the momentum from the Commission on this current location for this particular of the two signs.

Commissioner Wright asked if it would be possible for them to leave this sign out of it for now so they can move forward with part of it and maybe continue the part they seem to be having such a hard time with.

Chair Berman stated that Commissioner Leal mentioned splitting it up. She stated that they have two locations and two facilities that they are reviewing at this time, the sensor on the traffic signal

at Reina Del Mar and the sign that has been heavily talked about at this time. She asked staff if she is correct that they are looking at those two locations for facilities.

Sr. Planner O'Connor stated that she was correct.

Chair Berman asked if they have the ability to split their motion and take those two locations separately.

Acting Planning Director Murdock stated that it was staff's opinion that they can take different actions on the two components of the project, but given the structure of the agenda and the permit in question, they would ask that it be in a single motion.

Chair Berman asked if it is a single motion but they have different determinations for each of them. She thought they were looking at moving to approve the sensor on the traffic signal pole at Reina Del Mar and then also continuing the item for the variable messaging sign with the comments they presented thus far, and for clarification, they would like Caltrans to review locating the signs further north. She wants to acknowledge something Commissioner Leal said, that it would be beneficial to locate the sign north of the Vallemar neighborhood as that is a large portion of the community that could benefit from the sign and potentially reconsidering the feasibility of that location north of Reina Del Mar but effectively taking comments they have talked about thus far.

Vice Chair Hauser stated that, as she was talking, she would like the police station. She didn't want to belabor the point, but if it pleases her, she would like to hear from Mr. Mann to understand with the funding constraints they have if there is a time clock they have with a date certain that they will need. She stated that, if the Chair is open to it, she would love for Mr. Mann to give them more.

Mr. Mann stated that Ms. Shugar is handling the project management and he asked if she can let them know what their funding deadlines are as he understands they don't have any more time extensions with the California Transportation Commission and any more significant delays, in general, would cause the funds to lapse and they would have no recourse to make these improvements or add these funds to any other project along the coast. He asked for the exact dates that they are looking at now.

Ms. Shugar stated that he is correct. They have a one time extension that would allow them to get their fund by January 2023, and begin construction by spring. Beyond that, their funding would expire as they were only allowed a one time extension. She stated that, if they were to work with the city and consider moving the signs 200-300 feet away, that would trigger use studies, environmental studies and the parcel right next to this VMS sign is extremely sensitive and Mr. Gifford can back her up on this, as they have had issues with archeological resources being disturbed and this is, at this point, the optimal location for them to install the VMS signs. She stated that everything else that the city could condition or recommend, they would have to investigate and she can't say at this point what the impacts might be. They have limited time to use up the funds that are currently programmed. She reiterated that it has taken them about eight years from the time that the project was programmed to get to this point, and if they were to lose the funding, then they will be starting from scratch again. She asked if that answers Mr. Mann's question.

Mr. Mann stated that it helps from a timeline perspective but, at this point, they are interested in hearing any specific feedback that they can take back and have to go through the process. He stated that carrying feedback from the Commission is better than not hearing anything as they would definitely like to do anything they can to put the messaging out there on the corridor, given the number of feedback they will hear from the general community as a whole and the travelers that have been using that Highway 1 and that is something they would like to hear. If they do deal with something in the short term, he thought they would be open, but the constraints in terms of funding and the other environmental things is that they take very seriously at this point.

Commissioner Godwin stated that he was open to having the signs by the police station as Vice Chair Hauser said, and he thought it was an appropriate place for a warning sign and people wouldn't be shocked by it and it wouldn't take away from the rest of the community. If they have to use this technology, he thinks that is the one place he was comfortable having.

Vice Chair Hauser stated that, if that is the feedback, having it north of Reina Del Mar and thinking that the police station is an approximately appropriate place, she didn't think exactly in front of it where there is a lot of greenery and trees is the right place for it, but there is a stretch that looks like it has a wide shoulder that she believes would be Caltrans right-of-way, north of the auto body shop or right next to the northern property line of the auto body shop where she didn't think that type of sign would be obtrusive but would be in keeping with the particular character of that intersection and that use and that is a detailed clarification of what she meant when she said the police station.

Chair Berman appreciated that part of the locating of the sign has to do with decision making time before reaching Sharp Park, although she agrees that the police station would be a nice location for it and they will probably need to leave it to Caltrans to identify the proper location but a compromise that she personally thinks is in their jurisdiction is that the Reina Del Mar intersection has a lot of volume, even from people within Vallemar and she thought it would be beneficial for the sign to be north of Reina Del Mar just to be equitable for that neighborhood and considering the aesthetics that have been mentioned thus far. She stated that there is currently commercial space that provides opportunity there and given that there is no left turn out of the driveway and the sign would be north of the driveway and it shouldn't be a stopping site distance issue. She thinks they gave a good amount of feedback and she was wondering if Commissioners would be amenable to approving the first location, 9-1, and continuing the location, 9-2.

Commissioner Leal stated that he knows it is on the table now, and he would agree with the location they recommended in the feedback to Caltrans. He asked if there is anything stopping Caltrans coming back to the Commission prior to the expiration of their deadlines with a new location near where they are suggesting based on their feedback and the community's feedback and amending the project for further review and approval by the Commission.

Acting Planning Director Murdock stated he will start and ask Sr. Planner O'Connor to add on to his remarks. He stated that there are likely a number of steps that Caltrans will need to take with their internal process and their obligations as the lead agency under CEQA such as perform environmental analysis on the alternative project location preceding some response to the city and it will take some period of time, and Sr. Planner O'Connor can outline what the timeline has been since application to public hearing and the amount of coordination and analysis that the city will also need to undertake evaluation of the potential alternative location. He stated that they will

then try to gel all of that with the timelines that Ms. Shugar had outlined for them regarding the extension to January and need to start construction in the spring of 2023. He didn't know how feasible it would be to have all that occur in this timeline. He asked for input from Sr. Planner O'Connor.

Sr. Planner O'Connor stated that the application officially came in on April 26, 2022 for the CDP from Pacifica and they worked swiftly to bring it to a public hearing due to their timeline, but that doesn't account for what Acting Planning Director Murdock mentioned regarding the CEQA work and the lead agency work they have to do prior to applying with the city. She stated that the city could do it in approximately two months this time, but it doesn't account for the full scope of work they will have to go through.

Commissioner Leal stated that the point of his question is, in terms of offering feedback in terms of a new location, there are steps that have to happen to get a new location. He stated that, if they approve the current location at this meeting, they may or may not get a new location, but they may get a new traffic improvement on Highway 1. If they continue, those same steps have to happen but they are against a time crunch. He wanted to clarify that, if they approve and with all the steps happening, that new location could become before them for the sign in discussion at this time prior to the end of the year if "all the ducks line up in a row" and they could see the new location, hypothetically, whether continued or approved at this time.

Chair Berman asked if he is seeking confirmation from staff.

Commissioner Leal stated he was thinking of getting or not getting confirmation from staff. He stated that Caltrans could bring location 9-2 back before the Planning Commission from a project standpoint.

Acting Planning Director Murdock thought, from a process standpoint, they could file an amendment to an approved application or file a second application. He thought part of that would depend on whether any appeals have been filed and that process is still playing out for the site if it were to be approved in its currently proposed location, so there are options for Caltrans procedurally to get before the Planning Commission again with some other project location.

Chair Berman asked if Ms. Shugar had a response.

Ms. Shugar wanted to inform the Commissioners that they are considering the police department location and that was something Caltrans had looked into initially and they had proposed that area as a location for a VMS sign and the environmental document was approved in 2021. She didn't recall the reasons but there were environmental concerns with that location and was one of the reasons they had to move it. She stated that they could work with the city and investigate that location again, but it is very likely that it wouldn't work due to environmental, biological or archeological resources.

Commissioner Wright stated that he would be in favor of approving it in Vice Chair Hauser's location and have Caltrans have the ability to come back to the Commission before the loss of funding to say they have to put it at the already approved location in the event they weren't able to effectuate that in time. He asked staff if that was possible.

Sr. Planner O'Connor stated that there are definitely some CEQA concerns with that proposal, as they would be approving a project design that is not covered under the environmental review of the document they have considered at this time. She thought that would remove its feasibility.

Vice Chair Hauser appreciated the clarification and she would want to make sure that there weren't any disturbances. She wanted to be clear that the location she is talking about and Commissioner Wright mentioned was previously disturbed and obviously there needs to be CEQA or whatever Caltrans needs to go through, they would want to see those having been done sufficiently. She appreciated that, where areas previously disturbed, that should take some of the concerns off the table such as biological concerns.

Chair Berman stated that the time is 10:30 and they are toying with a motion and she didn't know if anyone was brave enough to make the leap but she wants to guide them somewhere.

Commissioner Leal stated he was about to make a motion, and he thought Vice Chair Hauser was going to make one.

Commissioner Leal moved that the Planning Commission FINDS the State Route 1 Traffic Operational Systems Improvements Project (Post Miles 04 SM-1-26.43 to 47.20) Initial Study with Negative Declaration (May 2021, SCH No. 2020080229) prepared by California Department of Transportation, District 4, adequate for purpose of complying with the California Environmental Quality Act and APPROVES Coastal Development Permit CDP-440-22 by adopting the resolution included as Attachment A to the staff report, including conditions of approval in Exhibit A to the resolution; and incorporates all maps and testimony into the record by reference

Chair Berman asked if his motion was per the staff report.

Commissioner Leal responded affirmatively.

Chair Berman stated that they have a motion per the staff report and approval of both locations. She is looking to see if they have a second to support that approval. She stated that she feels like they are between a rock and a hard place as they are having a tough time trying to provide input where they feel more comfortable of the location of 9-2 but it sounds like, regardless of what happens, effectively it could be more heartache to continue the item but they are going to end up with the same result, put in layman's terms. She asked if staff could help provide some guidance.

Acting Planning Director Murdock stated that, with all the deliberation he has heard from the Commission, it sounds like there are concerns and there is not a clear consensus on the Commission to support the project as proposed. He stated that there is a good amount of support for a different location for the sign north of Reina Del Mar Avenue, but for reasons articulated by the applicant, they previously considered that and believe that it is not feasible from a CEQA standpoint or at least within the type of document they prepared or interested in preparing with that being a negative declaration. He thought there was also some inquiry as to relocating the sign somewhat northward from its current location but still within that same roadway segment and they heard information from the applicant that there are potential archeological resource concerns that would preclude that relocation. He states that there seems to be a fair amount of information from the applicant suggesting that a location other than the proposed location may

not be something they are able to undertake, as far as their project, and it sounds to him like the Commission is essentially in the position of considering whether they can make the findings for the project location as it is. He stated that it may warrant further deliberation on that point, more specific information about the findings that may be of concern to the Commission. He stated that they heard from Commissioner Ferguson about aesthetic concerns and that the project as proposed is out of character and not consistent with the LCP and it may be possible with some further clarification and guidance. If the Commission continued this for a month from now to another public hearing, that might give Caltrans some time and an incentive to investigate other options for improving the sign's appearance. If they come back and they cannot do anything, the Commission can rule on whether it is able to make the findings to approve the project. He thought that would be a potential course of action for the Commission to take.

Chair Berman understands Commissioner Leal has a motion on the table, but she asks the Commission's thoughts on continuing.

Vice Chair Hauser stated, if acceptable to staff and the City Attorney, she would make a motion to recommend approval for 9-1 and continue 9-2 to a date certain per Acting Planning Director Murdock's current recommendation, and she would consider doing that for the second meeting of January or the first meeting of August.

Chair Berman thought she meant July.

Vice Chair Hauser apologized.

Commissioner Ferguson stated that he was going to say exactly what Vice Chair Hauser said.

Acting Planning Director Murdock asked if they could give the applicant an opportunity to offer a perspective as they are assuming that a month is sufficient time, but he doesn't know if it would work for Caltrans for their internal processing and to hear if they would be in favor of getting approval for one component and not both or would they rather come back with both and get a decision at the continued hearing.

Chair Berman agreed and asked Mr. Mann or Ms. Shugar to comment.

Mr. Mann thinks getting positive feedback from one component would be helpful. They would like both elements of the project but they want to work the community to find something that is palatable as anything relocating from where it is today would be something risky but worth considering. He didn't know if they can get it done within a month, so they have to consider that as part of the decision making process. He thinks allowing this item for the VMS to continue if they don't have the support for the current location is something they are open to. He asked Ms. Shugar if she wanted to remind everyone about the timelines they are looking at.

Ms. Shugar agreed with him, but added that her fear is that, having investigated many locations, they might end up being in the same position as they are today, which is what one of the Commissioners mentioned. She stated that it is likely to take more than a month for them to come up with a new location investigated for environmental issues and they would be cutting it close as it would delay their request for funds. She stated that it was possible that they will be able to accommodate this, if not in July, perhaps August is a possibility. She would ask Mr. Gifford to weigh in on the timeline for investigating environmental impacts for a potential new

location for a VMS sign. She believed they could get both today but, as that is not likely to happen, she thinks they can work with the city and community to come up with a new location if feasible.

Mr. Mann added that it is very difficult for them to look at the project history they have done over the last few years and before responding officially, knowing the issues of the various alternative sites, they want to find out all the locations that have been looked at in the past before responding any further, and at that point, if it is a location that they haven't previously considered, or considered with other constraints, that is additional time needed. He is suggesting that they can work with city planning to find an appropriate time that they come back for this item if this is something that they don't have support for at its current location.

Ms. Shugar thought they could do that. She stated that this is the third or fourth location that they have looked into and every time they moved the location, they end up having to _____ environmental document and that is likely to happen again. She stated that it all takes time but they can work with the city to investigate and come up with a location that might be more palatable to staff and Commissioners.

Mr. Mann agrees that it is a risk and his point of view is that any relocation will put the project at risk. He stated that Caltrans does not have any projects planned for this area in the near future, especially for these types of technology improvements at this point, and they are looking at a long horizon in terms of a follow up effort for new installations at this point. He thought they definitely want to make sure they have all the information at hand before they make the recommendation of when they can potentially come back to the Commission with a new revised proposed alternative.

Commissioner Godwin wants to make sure the applicant knows that they can continue an item a second time and this doesn't commit them to one date if they are having issues and ask for a second continuance that they wouldn't grant that if additional time is needed. He stated that they can start saying a month is probably going to be tight and suggest continuing for two months. He asked for feedback from Caltrans staff on what timeline would be most comfortable for them.

Acting Planning Director Murdock thought, from staff's perspective, it would be good to have a target date that they can all work cooperatively towards, and recognizing that a month really isn't a month when they factor in time to write the report and publish the agenda packet. He stated that they might want to look no earlier than August 15, the second meeting in August, and they can consider a date further out for Caltrans, but as Commissioner Godwin said, if they have a target and they need more time, they can have the Commission continue it again and they can at least include some information on the status and progress made to the date of August 15 or the ultimate date.

Vice Chair Hauser stated she would like to take a motion that somewhat follows that.

Chair Berman stated that sounds good.

Asst. City Attorney Sharma wanted to point out that there was a motion on the floor and Chair Berman asked for comments before it was considered, and she thought if Chair Berman could put a call out for a second and consider the motion officially if that is the case before _____.

Chair Berman saw Commissioner Leal's hand up and she would like to hear from him before killing his motion effectively.

Commissioner Leal stated he was going to withdraw his motion from the floor.

Chair Berman thanked him, and stated that the first motion made was withdrawn and she asked Vice Chair Hauser if she would like to take a stab at a new motion.

Vice Chair Hauser asked Asst. City Attorney Sharma to correct her if she doesn't do it correctly. Vice Chair Hauser stated, in regard to location 9-1, she moves that the Planning Commission finds that State Route 1 Traffic Operational Systems Improvements Project (Post Miles 04 SM-1-26.43 to 47.20) Initial Study with Negative Declaration (May 2021, SCH No. 2020080229) prepared by California Department of Transportation, District 4 adequate for purposes of complying with the California Environmental Quality Act; and approves Coastal Development Permit CDP-440-22 by adopting the resolution as regards solely location, 9-1, included as Attachment A to the staff report, including conditions of approval in Exhibit A to the resolution and incorporates all maps and testimony into the record by reference; and in regard to location 9-2, moves that the Planning Commission continue this item to date certain of August 15; Commissioner Wright seconded the motion.

Acting Planning Director Murdock took a verbal roll call.

The motion carried **5-1**.

Ayes: Commissioners Ferguson, Godwin, Hauser,
Wright and Chair Berman
Noes: Commissioner Leal

COMMISSION COMMUNICATIONS:

Vice Chair Hauser stated that, outside of the Planning Commission, she worked with the Science Department at Oceana High School to set up two fog collectors in their community garden, sustainable water collection technology and if anyone wants a picture she will be happy to send it. She thought it was cool and she wanted to give everyone an update.

Chair Berman stated that she would love for her to send her a picture, or she could send it to staff and staff could send it to all of them.

STAFF COMMUNICATIONS:

Acting Planning Director Murdock stated, as mentioned earlier, the City Council will be conducting a special meeting on Saturday, June 25, at 9 am to consider the Planning Commission's recommendation to adopt the comprehensive General Plan Update and certify the Environmental Impact Report. He stated that they published the agenda this evening for that meeting and it is available for the public in the city's meeting portal. He stated that, if anyone has questions about the meeting, they can reach out to the Planning Department.

Chair Berman stated that, before moving on, she recognized that it is 10:48 and, although it is a continued public hearing, they are going to listen to public comments and she wondered if the Commission can target for how long they may be able to stay up for the evening. She then mentioned that she saw a 4, stating that she didn't know if she could do that.

Vice Chair Hauser was a little concerned that they have been watching the amount of attendees whittle down a little and the goal is to hear public comment, and after saying that July and January are the same month, she recognized that she would probably be able to give a fuller attention on a different day when this is the only item on the agenda, and she would be in favor of giving the public a more timely opportunity to provide comment.

Chair Berman agreed with that as they started probably at 30 and now they are at 15. She thought staff has taken a poll of eligible commissioners for Agenda Item #2 and their availability.

Acting Planning Director Murdock agreed, adding that the options available before this Saturday's meeting of City Council, it looks a quorum of the Commission is only available on Thursday, June 23, with a meeting start time of 7 pm.

Commissioner Wright stated that since a number of the public have waited to make a comment, he thought it would behoove them to give them the courtesy of allowing them to speak as they have waited a good amount of time and he didn't think it was right for them to push them off and have them wait in line again.

Chair Berman thought it was a fair point. She stated Acting Planning Director Murdock was in the middle of saying something.

Acting Planning Director Murdock wanted to call their attention to the fact that they are currently in between agenda items and talking about matters related to one of the agenda items. He thought they could call the item and, as part of the preliminary discussion of the item continue it.

Chair Berman stated she intended for the start of that item to be a question of how long are they going to go at this time. She stated that, before she opens the next agenda item, she wondered if any commissioners need to recuse themselves.

Commissioner Leal stated that he will need to recuse himself from the next item due to ownership of real property in the Sharp Park Specific Plan area and as it is the last item on this agenda, he will be leaving the meeting.

Commissioner Ferguson stated that, for the same reason as Commissioner Leal, he has ownership of real property in the West Sharp Park area and will also recuse himself.

CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARINGS:

2. 2020-007 Consideration of Sharp Park Specific Plan and Recommendation To City Council.

Recommended CEQA Action: Find adoption of the Sharp Park Specific Plan substantially consistent with the General Plan Update and Sharp Park Specific Plan Final Environmental Impact Report, State Clearinghouse No. 2012022046.

Chair Berman asked Asst. City Attorney Sharma if they have to look into the staff report before they discuss how they will continue this item.

Asst. City Attorney Sharma stated that they may have discussion among themselves on preliminary items such as what she suggested before they hear the staff report.

Chair Berman stated that they are talking about continuing but she thought it was a fair point that there are at least 12 people on Zoom and potentially others calling that have comments they have waited a long time to state and she asked Asst. City Attorney Sharma if they are able to open public comment now and listen to those waiting hours to speak and keep it open for their adjourned meeting and start the adjourned meeting with public comments for those who have not spoken yet.

Asst. City Attorney Sharma stated that it might be administratively difficult to keep track of who has spoken and generally yes, but it might be difficult to accomplish that.

Commissioner Wright asked if staff was willing to rise to the challenge to keep track of who has spoken.

Acting Planning Director Murdock stated that they will make every effort to record the name the speaker used to identify themselves if they provide a name. On looking at the attendee list, assuming people whose names are shown are the actual speakers, many of them are familiar and known to them and they will hopefully have an opportunity to readily identify the speakers and keep proper track of who has spoken already.

Chair Berman appreciated the effort.

Vice Chair Hauser wondered if the community members who wished to speak would benefit from the presentation of the staff report, noting that they have already heard a staff report on this and they are prepared to answer questions, in which case he has no issue of what Commissioner Wright is proposing. She thinks, if they have the benefit of hearing the staff report before they make their comments and ask questions, she thought the public should have that benefit as well. She thought it was hard, and she see the idea of people sitting around for four hours and not being able to comment, but she also wants it to be fair and to be enthusiastically listening so it was hard.

Chair Berman stated that it was unfortunate that they had a major item on the agenda that they wanted to do their due diligence. She asked Asst. City Attorney Sharma what her guidance was on when they are able to listen to public comment and is it required to hear the staff report. She thought the answer was no, but she asked her to answer the question.

Asst. City Attorney Sharma stated she was correct and they may reorder items as long as they take public comments and that is sufficient to satisfy their obligation.

Acting Planner Director Murdock asked if he could make a suggestion for her to consider. He thought hearing the staff report might be helpful, given that the flow of the meeting might be a little more contiguous if they then open the public hearing and then adjourn and resume with the public hearing still open. He thought it might be a bit disjointed to do that without having a staff report occur first. He stated that they might consider just polling those participants of the meeting that are still on the call to see if they raise their hands if they would prefer to speak tonight as some of them may prefer to speak when they are pressured.

Chair Berman asked if they are allowed to take a poll.

Acting Planning Director Murdock didn't know if there was a reason why they can't ask them to raise their hands, not that they would be calling upon them.

Chair Berman thought they were providing their public comments with yes or no questions.

Asst. City Attorney Sharma stated that it wouldn't be considered a poll but just a preview of individuals who would be open to providing public comment.

Acting Planning Director Murdock stated that, if they were in Council Chambers, they might ask the audience to raise their hands to indicate if they want to speak now or speak at the next meeting.

Chair Berman asked those listening in to raise their hand if they would like to speak tonight, understanding that they will be continuing this item to a date certain with an opportunity for public comment at that time.

Asst. City Attorney Sharma wanted to clarify that she heard about an adjourned meeting, not a continuance.

Chair Berman stated that she meant an adjourned meeting which they know the date, Thursday, at 7 pm. She stated that she sees two hands and she appreciated Acting Planning Director Murdock's guidance on the continuity of the meeting to have the staff report first and then listen to public comment. She thanked him for accepting the challenge to keep track of who comments so they can be in order when they start on Thursday. She asked if they can have a short break before the staff report. She then called the break, and reconvened the meeting.

Acting Planning Director Murdock introduced the consultants from Dyett & Bhatia, Rajeev Bhatia and Allison Moore. He opened the staff report.

Allison Moore then completed the staff report.

Chair Berman opened the Public Hearing, and confirmed that they were taking comments on the Sharp Park Specific Plan and not on past agenda items such as General Plan or EIR.

Acting Planning Director Murdock introduced the speakers.

Richard Harris, San Francisco, stated he is president of the San Francisco Public Golf Alliance. He stated that attention has been on the Sharp Park Golf Course for several years and have appeared before the Council for many years. He referred to his letter dealing with factual errors in a paragraph in Chapter 1 dealing with the golf course and described his corrections.

Cliff Lawrence, Pacifica, referred to the consideration of the SPSP as a moot exercise and asked about the current working relationship between the city and the CCC, expressing his specific thoughts and questions on why this is not a moot exercise.

Remi Tan, Pacifica, stated Dyett & Bhatia did a great job on the SPSP and he expressed his thoughts and concerns regarding the plan possibly needing to be reupdated.

Chair Berman asked if there were any call ins.

Acting Planning Director Murdock stated that all participants would be in the same panel with the Zoom format and everyone on the apt were allowed and would be shown.

Chair Berman left the Public Hearing open and stated that they will adjourn this meeting to Thursday, June 23, at 7:00 p.m. They will start the meeting with public comments.

Asst. City Attorney Sharma stated, for clarification, she stated that the action is to adjourn this regular meeting of the Planning Commission to Thursday, June 23, at 7 p.m.

Acting Planning Director Murdock added on Zoom. He stated that the notice of adjournment will indicate the Zoom link for participants to join that meeting as well.

Chair Berman asked if they take a motion for this.

Chair Berman moved to adjourn the Planning Commission meeting as previously stated to Thursday; Vice Chair Hauser seconded the motion.

Acting Planning Director Murdock took a verbal roll call.

The motion carried **4-0**.

Ayes:	Commissioners Godwin, Hauser, Wright and Chair Berman
Noes:	None
Abstain:	Commissioners Ferguson and Leal

Chair Berman declared that anyone aggrieved by the action of the Planning Commission has ten (10) calendar days to appeal the decision in writing to the City Council.

Respectfully submitted,

Barbara Medina
Public Meeting Stenographer

Planning Commission Minutes

June 20, 2022

Page 44 of 44

APPROVED:

Acting Planning Director Murdock