

Public Comments
Agenda Item 7 – Economic
Opportunities Study

Written Comments Received After 12pm on 03/27/2023



March 27, 2023
City Council Meeting

From: Samuel Casillas [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, March 27, 2023 7:26 PM
To: Public Comment
Subject: City Council Meeting 3/27/23 Item 7. Accept Final Report, List of Opportunities & Timing of the Pacifica Economic Opportunities Study.

[CAUTION: External Email]

Dear City Council Members and Staff,

The Economic Opportunities Study is comprehensive and attempts to look at the whole city but captures eight individual opportunities instead of an actual overall city strategy. Overall, the focus and goal of this study should be as stated *“Economic Development Strategies for a long-term and financially sustainable vision for Pacifica, as well as the City Council’s Strategic Plan goal of Fiscal Sustainability”*. The big question is how are to get to fiscal sustainability?

- First, the city needs to further consider and maximize locations that are already developed and can handle additional development
 - All the strip malls in Pacifica are relics of the 50's and some are poorly utilized, like the Park Pacifica Mall. The strip mall owners need to be incentivized to rebuild these properties to add housing above that would, by default, be affordable
 - These locations are already built on so the environmental reviews would be minimal or non-existent
 - We also need to calculate overall how much of the new housing would be affordable and focus on those housing needs
- We need to maximize our unique and differentiated qualities that other places don’t have: our beaches, hiking, the coastal trail and places like the SeaBowl where out of town visitors come for a unique experience and then we need to market to them to know what else is available in Pacifica; but we also need a proactive economic development director to search for the right kind of businesses that will be a draw and complement our unique offerings; think of what we could have demanded where the Panda Express is now (a Shake Shack or a Sam’s Chowder House?) and also look at bike rentals or kayak rental business on the beach fronts
- The report does not addresses economic opportunities around small business conferences and sports tournaments (softball, our big pool, golf course), especially to fill up hotels and businesses in the off season.
 - Again, we need a proactive economic development director to search for opportunities around small business conferences and sports tournaments (softball, our big pool, golf course), especially to fill up hotels and businesses in the off season as well as maximize the festivals and events so that people who come know where they can go for a drink, hike, bike ride or restaurant after they attend an event.

- We need to attract unique businesses. San Francisco has an ordinance that blocks chain restaurants from going into certain neighborhoods; this needs to be done here; How did we end up with a McDonalds, a Taco Bell and an Panda Express adjacent to the best beach north of Santa Cruz?
- There is no basis to state *“Housing is Not a Loss Leader, it’s a Growth Driver: New housing can generate significant new tax revenues and support local jobs. Housing is not necessarily a net negative fiscal impact, especially at current property values”*
 - The document keeps repeating *“the 50-60 units/+\$30M value/\$1 million in new resident spending. This could yield +\$150,000 in annual tax revenue to City”*; this is not backed by any analysis and is just a made up number. In order to generate \$1M in spending there has to be a REASON for people to spend that here---we don’t!
 - This study itself states *“ Wastewater treatment plant expansion may be needed to support significant new project development”* so with sewage expansion and of cost of services like infrastructure, police/fire housing is a net loser; we already have an over extended sewer system that we are now being taxed for \$200M just for one pump station so what will it all cost. It’s a net loser and any COS study will tell you that rezoning commercial to residential will lose a city more revenue not add.
 - The way a city increases its revenue is to bring in visitors from outside of the city who are not a user of the city’s services while spending money while they visit Pacifica
 - Also, The city only receives 16% of property taxes (look at the back of your bill when it comes in).
- The *“Recommendation that the City work with City and County of San Francisco to expand activities and promotion of the historic and beautiful Sharp Park Golf Course”* is misguided. The city of San Francisco receives those revenues, Pacifica does not. What the city should be doing is figuring out how to get the people who play 66,000 rounds of golf (with 76% of them being from out of town to) at Sharp Park to extend their stay in Pacifica by offering complementary business services and marketing them to the golfers before, during and after they play golf; consider a spa treatment for them and maybe their spouses with dinner at a nice restaurant or a sports bar nearby on Palmetto Ave
- Let’s get non-tourist facing businesses upstairs or out of Rockaway Beach area (that is our one true tourist hub and it’s full of karate studios, insurance and realtors) retail space along the coast needs to be maximized for visitor serving businesses; an ordinance needs to be put in place for this in tourist zones; the city leads have a responsibility to maximize our tax revenues

Additionally, for all the new potential development there is no real analysis for traffic mitigation; adding this 1900 housing units along with any new commercial development will surely be challenged when traffic analysis is needed. Our roads and highways cannot realistically handle the addition of hundreds of units in the mid to southern parts of Pacifica without expansion of the highway which has already been rejected.

Thank you,

Sam Casillas

From: Anna [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, March 28, 2023 10:32 AM
To: Public Comment
Subject: Comments / Questions on the Final Economic Opportunities Report and mid year budget review

[CAUTION: External Email]

Hello,

I hope all is well. I was reviewing the Economic Opportunities Report and the mid year budget and had some questions / thoughts on Items 7 and 10 for the Council's consideration:

Economic Opportunities Study - Item 7

- page 164
 - Kosmont > is this the only group that performed the EOS or were there other EOS to compare against?
 - second bullet notes that new development is to only increase General Fund revenues?
- page 168
 - what key projects have been postponed due to budget deficits?
 - how have those projects been re-prioritized for the current year? we taking a risk based approach this reprioritization?
 - what are we doing about the 7% TOT that is lower than statewide and oceanfront community averages? who's working on getting those increased?
 - business license taxes appear to be quiet low, is that b/c of the lack of ability to attract new businesses to the area?
- page 177
 - what is the issue with the permitting process? Who is the "contract staff"? What efficiencies can be gained here?
- page 191
 - when I saw the imagery on blended use, lets not forget the importance of children's parks/play structures, as well as dog parks. Having an area with a pizza joint, ice cream parlor, cafe nearby a park area will help stimulate foot traffic and more outings
- page 204
 - Pacifica Pier > are there plans to repair the damaged part of the pier?
- page 246
 - What about the small area where Domino's Pizza on Palmetto? Seems like one side is vacant and for lease. Have considerations for this area been made, too?

Midyear Budget Review - Item 10

- page 353
 - 13% increase in Contract Services > have these been substantiated?
- page 355

- is \$60k increase in grant writing services reasonable? I'm not sure how this amount compares to prior grant writing expenditures.
- Legal services > is the settlement agreement in the city's favor or will there be add'l legal expense related to the settlement, and have those costs been factored in?
- page 357
 - Fund 22 > I had to read this a few times, does this mean we are moving forward with the repair work that would be eligible for possible FEMA reimbursement funding, or not? If there's the chance that we can recoup that, shouldn't that work be prioritized?
 - Restricted Reserves > who as reviewed/audited the restricted reserves to ensure they're not understated and therefore potentially overstating the GF unassigned balance?
- page 358
 - What does the non-spendable amount pertain to?
 - Why was there such a significant decrease in the "Facility Maintenance & Replacement" in the 2022-23 budget? One time costs in 2021-22?
 - Compensated absences > surprised this is a flat number from year to year (is this amount not adjusted for inflation?)
 - child care reserve > same comment as above
 - legal reserve > same comment as above
- page 363
 - 1.979M for vehicle replacement - have these costs been verified? Were they offset by any disposal values?
- Page 365
 - Fund 72 Motor Pool Replacement > The Revised budget is double the 2021-2022 spend, substantiated?
 - Fund 40 Debt service > this accounts for principal and interest?

Please let me know if you have questions on the above, thanks!

Anna Lee

District 2 Homeowner/Resident



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 10 – Midyear Budget

Written Comments Received After 12pm on 03/27/2023



March 27, 2023

City Council Meeting

From: Anna [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, March 28, 2023 10:32 AM
To: Public Comment
Subject: Comments / Questions on the Final Economic Opportunities Report and mid year budget review

[CAUTION: External Email]

Hello,

I hope all is well. I was reviewing the Economic Opportunities Report and the mid year budget and had some questions / thoughts on Items 7 and 10 for the Council's consideration:

Economic Opportunities Study - Item 7

- page 164
 - Kosmont > is this the only group that performed the EOS or were there other EOS to compare against?
 - second bullet notes that new development is to only increase General Fund revenues?
- page 168
 - what key projects have been postponed due to budget deficits?
 - how have those projects been re-prioritized for the current year? we taking a risk based approach this reprioritization?
 - what are we doing about the 7% TOT that is lower than statewide and oceanfront community averages? who's working on getting those increased?
 - business license taxes appear to be quiet low, is that b/c of the lack of ability to attract new businesses to the area?
- page 177
 - what is the issue with the permitting process? Who is the "contract staff"? What efficiencies can be gained here?
- page 191
 - when I saw the imagery on blended use, lets not forget the importance of children's parks/play structures, as well as dog parks. Having an area with a pizza joint, ice cream parlor, cafe nearby a park area will help stimulate foot traffic and more outings
- page 204
 - Pacifica Pier > are there plans to repair the damaged part of the pier?
- page 246
 - What about the small area where Domino's Pizza on Palmetto? Seems like one side is vacant and for lease. Have considerations for this area been made, too?

Midyear Budget Review - Item 10

- page 353
 - 13% increase in Contract Services > have these been substantiated?
- page 355

- is \$60k increase in grant writing services reasonable? I'm not sure how this amount compares to prior grant writing expenditures.
- Legal services > is the settlement agreement in the city's favor or will there be add'l legal expense related to the settlement, and have those costs been factored in?
- page 357
 - Fund 22 > I had to read this a few times, does this mean we are moving forward with the repair work that would be eligible for possible FEMA reimbursement funding, or not? If there's the chance that we can recoup that, shouldn't that work be prioritized?
 - Restricted Reserves > who as reviewed/audited the restricted reserves to ensure they're not understated and therefore potentially overstating the GF unassigned balance?
- page 358
 - What does the non-spendable amount pertain to?
 - Why was there such a significant decrease in the "Facility Maintenance & Replacement" in the 2022-23 budget? One time costs in 2021-22?
 - Compensated absences > surprised this is a flat number from year to year (is this amount not adjusted for inflation?)
 - child care reserve > same comment as above
 - legal reserve > same comment as above
- page 363
 - 1.979M for vehicle replacement - have these costs been verified? Were they offset by any disposal values?
- Page 365
 - Fund 72 Motor Pool Replacement > The Revised budget is double the 2021-2022 spend, substantiated?
 - Fund 40 Debt service > this accounts for principal and interest?

Please let me know if you have questions on the above, thanks!

Anna Lee

District 2 Homeowner/Resident



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 on Items Not on Posted Agenda

Written Comments Received After 12pm on 03/27/2023



March 27, 2023

City Council Meeting

From: Molly Dahlman [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, March 27, 2023 3:09 PM
To: Public Comment
Subject: Public Comment on Item Not on Agenda

[CAUTION: External Email]

To Pacifica City Council and Planning Commissioners:

My intent was to call into the City Council meeting tonight but am unable to attend. I was not at the study session on Tuesday but heard about the Housing Element though the fact that Sea Bowl is closing. I have since reviewed The City of Pacifica Housing Element document. There are a lot of potential sites on the list that probably need more analysis and I would be a big proponent of having more meetings and more community engagement before we send the housing element to HCD.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,
Molly Dahlman

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: Wednesday, March 29, 2023 9:58 AM
To: Public Comment
Subject: FW: Solar APP+ Information

From: Carter, Yulia <ycarter@pacificagov.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, March 29, 2023 9:55 AM
To: Coffey, Sarah <scoffey@pacificagov.gov>
Cc: La, Emily <ELa@pacificagov.gov>
Subject: FW: Solar APP+ Information

For your record.

From: Beckmeyer, Sue <sbeckmeyer@pacificagov.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, March 28, 2023 9:23 PM
To: Margo Meiman [REDACTED]
Cc: Brooks, Elizabeth <ebrooks@pacificagov.gov>; Barranti, Alyssa <abarranti@pacificagov.gov>; Woodhouse, Kevin <kwoodhouse@pacificagov.gov>; Murdock, Christian <cmurdock@pacificagov.gov>; Carter, Yulia <ycarter@pacificagov.gov>
Subject: Re: Solar APP+ Information

Thanks so much, Margo!
— Sue B.

From: Margo Meiman [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, March 28, 2023 9:14:59 PM
To: _City Council <citycouncil@ci.pacificaca.us>
Cc: Brooks, Elizabeth <ebrooks@pacificagov.gov>; Barranti, Alyssa <abarranti@pacificagov.gov>; Woodhouse, Kevin <kwoodhouse@pacificagov.gov>; Murdock, Christian <cmurdock@pacificagov.gov>
Subject: Solar APP+ Information

[CAUTION: External Email]

Dear City Council and City Staff,

I am following up on my comments during last night's City Council meeting regarding the Solar APP+ program, which provides cities with a platform for online, automated solar permitting.

[This website](#) includes information on how to apply for grant funding from the California Energy Commission to establish online, automated solar permitting.

[Text of SB-379](#) "Residential solar energy systems: permitting" Act.

I have also attached a fact sheet about the Solar APP+ program.

Please take advantage of this funding opportunity so that Pacifica can more easily be in compliance with SB-379 and so that building owners can more easily install solar.

Thank you,
Margo Meiman

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.