

Public Comments

Agenda Item 5 – Building Code Update

Written Comments Received By 12pm on 11/28/2022



November 28, 2022

City Council Meeting

From: Nancy Tierney [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, November 27, 2022 4:59 PM
To: Public Comment
Subject: 11/22/22 City Council Meeting Agenda item #5

[CAUTION: External Email]

Mayor and City Council Members

I write on agenda item 5 in support of the proposed action to adopt the Ordinance on the 2022 Edition of the California Building Standards Code and Fire Code with Local Amendments, including amendments to require building electrification (Reach Codes), underground utility installation, and expanded geotechnical hazard evaluation. My message in support of this ordinance at the first reading on November 14 focused on two primary reasons: to join other Bay Area cities like San Mateo in approving building electrification measures for existing buildings and remodels as a necessary step to reduce indoor pollution; and to demonstrate the power of small cities to lead on environmental measures. These reasons still hold. I'd like to challenge Council to think more broadly about what we can do to ensure a healthier planet for all species, including humans. In addition to adopting more aggressive Reach codes in our city, we can oppose the proposal by the California Public Utility Commission (CPUC), known as Net Energy Metering 3.0. This extreme proposal would slash the value of solar energy by 75% while boosting utility profits at the expense of the public, starting next year. These changes would make it more expensive for households, churches, businesses, schools currently without rooftop solar to invest in solar technology. Adopting NEM 3.0 is a backwards move for CA. Instead we should be making rooftop solar more affordable for everyone. The takeaways from my statement are twofold: vote to adopt the 2022 Edition of the CA Building Code, as proposed; express public opposition to the CPUC proposal that would make rooftop solar unaffordable for the majority of Californians.

Thank you.
Nancy Tierney

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

Public Comments

Agenda Item 6 – Manor Drive Overcrossing

Written Comments Received By 12pm on 11/28/2022



November 28, 2022

City Council Meeting

From: Christine Boles [REDACTED]
Sent: Saturday, November 26, 2022 5:28 PM
To: _City Council; Public Comment; Woodhouse, Kevin; Petersen, Lisa; Carter, Yulia
Subject: Questions/Comments for City Council meeting on Monday November 28

[CAUTION: External Email]

Hello everyone,
I hope you all had a lovely Thanksgiving!
I have a few questions/comments related to Monday's agenda.

- 1) I have recopied at the end of this email my questions about the **Manor Overcrossing** project from two weeks ago, which I don't see in this packet. Could someone please answer my questions on Monday?
- 2) I am trying to find the record of the Council's approval of using \$1,000,000 from the Disaster Accounting Fund for the BBIRP project. The staff report says it was approved in June 2022, but I do not see a discussion of this in those meeting agendas. Can someone please point me to this information?
- 3) Related to the item above, I saw mention of the 2022-2023 CIP Budget Allocation in relation to the Disaster Fund and I was trying to find the 2022-23 document. The city's meeting portal website has a search function, but it appears to have been disabled. I hope this is just temporary as it is a very useful tool.
- 4) Again related to the item above, I found the 2021-2026 CIP on the Public Works website, and saw the funding for the BBIRP, but it still says Grant TBD for this year. Is there a more current 2022-23 CIP that includes this information?

The screenshot shows a web browser window displaying a spreadsheet titled "63783336027400000". The spreadsheet contains financial data for the City of Pacifica's 2021-2026 Capital Improvement Program. It includes a summary table for Fund 22 and detailed project information for the Beach Boulevard Infrastructure Resiliency Project and Station 72 Deck Replacement.

Phase	To Date	21 - 22	22 - 23	23 - 24	24 - 25	25 - 26	Total
Planning & Design	\$						\$
Grant - State	\$	800	350	350			\$ 1,500
Grant - THD	\$	-	1,000	1,000			\$ 2,000
Construction & Management	\$	-					\$
Unfunded	\$	-			50,000	50,000	\$ 100,000
	\$	-					\$
	\$	-					\$
	\$	-					\$
Total	\$	800	1,350	1,350	50,000	50,000	\$ 103,500

Fund - 22 General Capital Improvement 22 - 6

CITY OF PACIFICA
2021-2026 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

Station 72 Deck Replacement
This project would design and construct the replacement of the deck located at Fire Station 72. The new deck would be ADA compliant. The existing deck is a safety hazard.

Department(s): Engineering
Project Manager(s): Henriquez
Project Number: THD
Fund: 22 - General Capital Improvement

5) I had noted in a public comment letter I sent in on 6/9/21 that GHD had not completed all their Phase I tasks per their contract. Will these be completed in this next phase? Excerpt from my letter is included below.

- 3) GHD's contract requirements have not been met.
GHD's Master Agreement Contract, dated 5/26/20, Task 1.4.1 Flood Assessment Risk and Adaptation Plan says,
"The Team will also identify other potential flood protection alternatives, such as secondary walls landward of primary seawall, landscaping,

raising Beach Boulevard and installing drainage, close Beach Boulevard to non-resident traffic or all vehicles, relocate utilities landward, and other potential improvements."

Thank you!

Christine Boles, Architect

Beausoleil Architects

[REDACTED]

Pacifica, CA 94044

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

"Do your little bit of good where you are; it's those little bits of good put together that overwhelm the world." - Desmond Tutu

Dear Council and staff,

I am excited to see the Manor Overcrossing project starting up again and that there will be multiple public meetings in the future! I have a few questions and comments.

1) The staff report refers to technical reports and studies, preliminary traffic assessments, assessment of needed bridge work, etc. Could those documents please be shared? I did not see them online on the Public Works CIP page. Sam Bautista also mentioned that CalTrans recently did an inspection of the bridge due to the spalling concrete and I would like to see that as well. Let me know if you need me to file a PRA request.

2) I am happy to see the bus stop and parking spaces taken off the bridge. I am concerned about the loss of parking in this very busy area, and the change from angled parking to parallel parking at Walgreens and Mazzettis. Parallel parking is especially concerning in front of Walgreens on Palmetto as it takes a lot longer for a car to pull in and out of a parallel spot, which would slow traffic right at that busy intersection even more.

3) I have heard from several residents that live in the area that Walgreens' delivery trucks have not been using their loop driveway as was intended for deliveries. The trucks apparently pull up and unload on Manor, or on Palmetto in front of the homes at 532 and 538 Palmetto. If their trucks cannot use the approved double driveway for deliveries, then could we look at moving some of their required parking onto their site instead, and adding a loading zone for certain hours/days on Manor?

4) I am happy to see that the bike lanes on the bridge seem to be more protected from car traffic, especially as they would be used by young students going to Ocean Shore. Perhaps it is part of the bike/pedestrian master plan, but we need to make sure the new bike lanes extend the extra block to the school.

4) The Milagra onramp needs a lot more discussion as it is a very divided issue in our community. Some are for it, more seem to be adamantly opposed. I can see how it could improve congestion at Manor and Oceana, but many residents in the Milagra area are concerned about potential additional traffic and crime in their quiet residential area. It would be helpful to really understand the traffic and safety data and provide some visualizations so we can talk openly about the options. This onramp is in conflict with a number of spaces for our Safe Parking Program as I'm sure you know. There seems to be room to consider widening Oceana here, and adding the parking back in. This could be important for future redevelopment of the Public Works site as well.

5) Is it too late to consider other options? For example, if the Manor bridge can be improved without tearing it down, that could really help reduce the congestion and loss of business access during construction. Could we consider a separate over crossing for pedestrians and bikes, so that cars and buses can take the full width of the current bridge and we would have an even safer crossing for pedestrians and bikes perhaps connecting Ocean Shore School and Manor Plaza more directly?

6) Could we look at this project in conjunction with some ideas for redeveloping Manor Plaza and the parking lot there? I am hoping that we can consider this area for some of our RHNA housing numbers and also look at redevelopment towards more vibrant shopping areas with rooftop restaurants, community gardens, etc. There is a lot of interest in District 2 for revitalizing this area and I have started conversations with some of the merchants. If we're going to increase density here as was identified in the General Plan, then we should look at larger projected traffic counts now as part of this project.

Thank you!

Christine Boles, Architect

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

From: Julie Starobin [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, November 28, 2022 12:22 PM
To: Public Comment; Engineering Division
Subject: Milagra Onramp

[CAUTION: External Email]

I am writing to encourage the Department of Public Works and the Council to find another alternative to a NB freeway onramp at Milagra. If another onramp is determined to be necessary and I don't think it is, other locations should be considered. For instance, the existing NB onramp on Oceana near Paloma could be refigured to allow cars to enter from the north and the south. There is a similar configuration currently being used without problems on Lundy Way just south of Sharp Park Blvd.

The Manor overcrossing needs to be fixed but that project should not be linked to the onramp at Milagra. They are two totally different projects and should be considered separately.

At the few public meetings that considered this issue, an overwhelming number of Pacific Manor residents opposed the construction of an onramp on Milagra. You need to pay attention to the people who are affected by your decisions.

Thanks in advance, Julie Starobin Pacific Manor

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

From: Coffey, Sarah
Sent: Monday, November 28, 2022 12:40 PM
To: Public Comment
Cc: La, Emily
Subject: FW: Manor Overcrossing agenda item #6

From: D Gold [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, November 28, 2022 12:35 PM
To: _City Council <citycouncil@ci.pacifica.ca.us>; Coffey, Sarah <scoffey@pacifica.gov>
Subject: Fwd: Manor Overcrossing agenda item #6

[CAUTION: External Email]

----- Forwarded message -----

From: D Gold [REDACTED]
Date: Mon, Nov 28, 2022 at 12:31 PM
Subject: Manor Overcrossing agenda item #6
To: <mbier@pacifica.gov>, <tibstyck@pacifica.gov>, <svaterlaus@pacifica.gov>, <moneill@pacifica.gov>, <sbeckmeyer@pacifica.gov>
Cc: Christine Boles [REDACTED]

Dear City Council members,

I am writing regarding the Manor Street overcrossing project and the associated proposal to create a new onramp from Milagra.

The two projects continue to be linked, despite community feedback that it is important to separate the two projects. Although it may be true that the Manor overcrossing should be replaced for safety reasons, this in no way creates a demand for a new onramp at Milagra, which would create new safety concerns in the impacted neighborhood, and also violates existing highway safety policies because of the proximity to existing onramps.

Already CalTrans has ruled out certain items the planning department proposed for the Manor overcrossing. It is important that the city staff focus on safer design for the two intersections involved.

Although certain staff members are single mindedly continuing to advocate for a Milagra onramp, it remains a bad choice for the City. The brief, off-hand dismissal in the staff report of the suggestion to create bidirectional access to the existing on-ramp near Paloma is an indication of how little consideration is being given to alternate, and safer, proposals. It is simply not true that improving access to the existing onramp would not improve any perceived traffic problems.

I once again urge you to separate the two projects, and dismiss the Milagra on-ramp. It is important that close consideration be given to all proposals for restructuring the Manor intersections so that additional pedestrian, bicycle, and traffic hazards are not exacerbated.

Thank you for your consideration.

D. Gold
Pacific Manor.

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

Public Comments

Agenda Item 7 – GHD

Written Comments Received By 12pm on 11/28/2022



November 28, 2022

City Council Meeting

From: Christine Boles [REDACTED]
Sent: Saturday, November 26, 2022 5:28 PM
To: _City Council; Public Comment; Woodhouse, Kevin; Petersen, Lisa; Carter, Yulia
Subject: Questions/Comments for City Council meeting on Monday November 28

[CAUTION: External Email]

Hello everyone,
I hope you all had a lovely Thanksgiving!
I have a few questions/comments related to Monday's agenda.

- 1) I have recopied at the end of this email my questions about the **Manor Overcrossing** project from two weeks ago, which I don't see in this packet. Could someone please answer my questions on Monday?
- 2) I am trying to find the record of the Council's approval of using \$1,000,000 from the Disaster Accounting Fund for the BBIRP project. The staff report says it was approved in June 2022, but I do not see a discussion of this in those meeting agendas. Can someone please point me to this information?
- 3) Related to the item above, I saw mention of the 2022-2023 CIP Budget Allocation in relation to the Disaster Fund and I was trying to find the 2022-23 document. The city's meeting portal website has a search function, but it appears to have been disabled. I hope this is just temporary as it is a very useful tool.
- 4) Again related to the item above, I found the 2021-2026 CIP on the Public Works website, and saw the funding for the BBIRP, but it still says Grant TBD for this year. Is there a more current 2022-23 CIP that includes this information?

63783336027400000

Fund	21-22	22-23	23-24	24-25	25-26	Total
01-General Fund	\$ 25					\$ 25
	\$ -					\$ -
	\$ -					\$ -
	\$ -					\$ -
	\$ -					\$ -
Total	\$ 25	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 25

Beach Boulevard Infrastructure Resiliency Project (formerly Seawall Reconstruction Project)

Moved from Fund 38. This project will start a multi-year collaborative process to completely replace the northern Beach Boulevard Seawall and Promenade. The first phase will result in a feasibility study, conceptual design alternatives. The second phase will result in engineered plans and specifications. The third and final phase will be construction.

Department(s): Engineering
Project Manager(s): Marquez Buitista
Project Number: TBD
Fund: 22 - General Capital Improvement
Category: Coastal Protection
Start Date: 2018
Duration: 5 years
Project Status: Active
Funding Status: Partially Funded

Phase	To Date	21-22	22-23	23-24	24-25	25-26	Total
Planning & Design							
Grant - State	\$ 800	\$ 350	\$ 350				\$ 1,500
Grant - TBD	\$ -	\$ 1,000	\$ 1,000				\$ 2,000
Construction & Management							
Unfunded	\$ -			\$ 50,000	\$ 50,000		\$ 100,000
	\$ -						\$ -
	\$ -						\$ -
Total	\$ 800	\$ 1,350	\$ 1,350	\$ 50,000	\$ 50,000	\$ -	\$ 103,500

Fund - 22 General Capital Improvement 22 - 6

**CITY OF PACIFICA
2021-2026 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM**

Station 72 Deck Replacement

This project would design and construct the replacement of the deck located at Fire Station 72. The new deck would be ADA compliant. The existing deck is a safety hazard.

Department(s): Engineering
Project Manager(s): Henrique Pomiepie
Project Number: TBD
Fund: 22 - General Capital Improvement

5) I had noted in a public comment letter I sent in on 6/9/21 that GHD had not completed all their Phase I tasks per their contract. Will these be completed in this next phase? Excerpt from my letter is included below.

- 3) GHD's contract requirements have not been met.
GHD's Master Agreement Contract, dated 5/26/20, Task 1.4.1 Flood Assessment Risk and Adaptation Plan says,
"The Team will also identify other potential flood protection alternatives, such as secondary walls landward of primary seawall, landscaping,

raising Beach Boulevard and installing drainage, close Beach Boulevard to non-resident traffic or all vehicles, relocate utilities landward, and other potential improvements."

Thank you!

Christine Boles, Architect

Beausoleil Architects

[REDACTED]

Pacifica, CA 94044

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

"Do your little bit of good where you are; it's those little bits of good put together that overwhelm the world." - Desmond Tutu

Dear Council and staff,

I am excited to see the Manor Overcrossing project starting up again and that there will be multiple public meetings in the future! I have a few questions and comments.

1) The staff report refers to technical reports and studies, preliminary traffic assessments, assessment of needed bridge work, etc. Could those documents please be shared? I did not see them online on the Public Works CIP page. Sam Bautista also mentioned that CalTrans recently did an inspection of the bridge due to the spalling concrete and I would like to see that as well. Let me know if you need me to file a PRA request.

2) I am happy to see the bus stop and parking spaces taken off the bridge. I am concerned about the loss of parking in this very busy area, and the change from angled parking to parallel parking at Walgreens and Mazzettis. Parallel parking is especially concerning in front of Walgreens on Palmetto as it takes a lot longer for a car to pull in and out of a parallel spot, which would slow traffic right at that busy intersection even more.

3) I have heard from several residents that live in the area that Walgreens' delivery trucks have not been using their loop driveway as was intended for deliveries. The trucks apparently pull up and unload on Manor, or on Palmetto in front of the homes at 532 and 538 Palmetto. If their trucks cannot use the approved double driveway for deliveries, then could we look at moving some of their required parking onto their site instead, and adding a loading zone for certain hours/days on Manor?

4) I am happy to see that the bike lanes on the bridge seem to be more protected from car traffic, especially as they would be used by young students going to Ocean Shore. Perhaps it is part of the bike/pedestrian master plan, but we need to make sure the new bike lanes extend the extra block to the school.

4) The Milagra onramp needs a lot more discussion as it is a very divided issue in our community. Some are for it, more seem to be adamantly opposed. I can see how it could improve congestion at Manor and Oceana, but many residents in the Milagra area are concerned about potential additional traffic and crime in their quiet residential area. It would be helpful to really understand the traffic and safety data and provide some visualizations so we can talk openly about the options. This onramp is in conflict with a number of spaces for our Safe Parking Program as I'm sure you know. There seems to be room to consider widening Oceana here, and adding the parking back in. This could be important for future redevelopment of the Public Works site as well.

5) Is it too late to consider other options? For example, if the Manor bridge can be improved without tearing it down, that could really help reduce the congestion and loss of business access during construction. Could we consider a separate over crossing for pedestrians and bikes, so that cars and buses can take the full width of the current bridge and we would have an even safer crossing for pedestrians and bikes perhaps connecting Ocean Shore School and Manor Plaza more directly?

6) Could we look at this project in conjunction with some ideas for redeveloping Manor Plaza and the parking lot there? I am hoping that we can consider this area for some of our RHNA housing numbers and also look at redevelopment towards more vibrant shopping areas with rooftop restaurants, community gardens, etc. There is a lot of interest in District 2 for revitalizing this area and I have started conversations with some of the merchants. If we're going to increase density here as was identified in the General Plan, then we should look at larger projected traffic counts now as part of this project.

Thank you!

Christine Boles, Architect

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

Public Comments

Oral Communications

Written Comments Received By 12pm on 11/28/2022



November 28, 2022

City Council Meeting

Pacifica City Council
2212 beach boulevard
Pacifica, CA 94044
Public Health and Safety Commission

VVO Victims of Violence
Organization
[REDACTED]
San Francisco, 94121

On the city of Pacifica descend unscrupulous Russian speaking criminals. Activities of this gang explained on enclosed brochure named: "You May Fall Victim To This Horrible Crime." Pacifica city resident Marvin Artobern and his Friend Nancy are suffering from these crimes as many other Americans are victims too. Taking into account all of mentioned above information and in brochure we at VVO decided to enact for the City of Pacifica Emergency Ordinance to stop crimes associated with this gang.

City of Pacifica Emergency Health and Safety Ordinance enacting project called: "Protection city of Pacifica residents from transmitting illegal forced and unwanted microwave, radio, audio, ultrasound, infrared or any other form of energy."

Absolutely no person or any other entity have a right to implant in victims bodies any kind of energy receiving and transmitting devices with consequent energy transmitting and receiving or transmit directed or non directed energy at a victims w/o implants residing in the city of Pacifica, animal or human in the form of radio frequencies, audio, ultrasound, infrared or any other form of energy even without purpose to harm or with the purpose of willfully and maliciously to cause any kind of damage to health and meaningful life of a victims. Law enforcement must consider these transmissions as a violent crime and prioritize investigation and prosecution above mentioned criminal actions when complains from victims are received in writing or orally. To perform investigation radio scanners and other energy detectors must be supplied by appropriate government agencies to city of Pacifica law enforcement personnel. City of Pacifica health and security commission under immediate obligation to help victims to remove implants, including doctor's compensation. Average person don't have any means to stop transmissions and/or remove implants. Exclusion: Illegal public gatherings-protests, demonstrations, riots, coups when law enforcement personnel may use legal tools: microwave crowd dispensers, acoustic devices, radio jammers and more means beyond scope of this ordinance.

This ordinance is in compliance with the State of California laws: 646.9, 422, 647i, 632, 631.

This ordinance is in compliance with the Sate of United States laws: Title III Of 1968, 18USC Charter 119, 18USC Chapter 1801, 18USC Paragraph 871, 18USC Paragraph 2261. We at VVO need help of City Attorney to make this ordinance more closely compliant to state and federal laws.

Thank you,



Marvin Artobern

Founder of VVO Nov. 28, 2022