

Public Comments on Items Not on Posted Agenda

Written Comments Received By 12pm on 03/25/2024



March 25, 2024

City Council Meeting

From: Cindy Abbott [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, March 19, 2024 12:37 PM
To: Vaterlaus, Sue; Beckmeyer, Sue; Mary Bier; Bigstych, Tygarjas; Boles, Christine
Cc: Woodhouse, Kevin; Public Comment
Subject: Concern and public comment regarding: Planning Commission Staff Report, for 3/18/24, Agenda Item #1, Tribal Consultation

[CAUTION: External Email]

Dear Mayor Vaterlaus and members of the Pacifica City Council,
Below is the language of the land acknowledgement that you read at the beginning of each City Council meeting. Following several recent city meetings and staff reports, I am wondering if this is something that the City of Pacifica, through its staff, truly believes in and wants to elevate, or if it is nothing more than reading the words.

"The city of Pacifica acknowledges that we occupy the unceded ancestral homeland of the Ramaytush Ohlone peoples, who are the original inhabitants of the San Francisco Peninsula. We honor the Ramaytush Ohlone peoples for their enduring commitment to Mother Earth. As the indigenous protectors of this land and in accordance with their traditions, the Ramaytush Ohlone have never ceded, lost nor forgotten their responsibilities as caretakers of this place, as well as for all peoples who reside in their traditional territory. We affirm their sovereign rights as First Peoples and wish to pay our respects to the ancestors, elders and relatives of the Ramaytush Ohlone peoples."

The staff report for last evenings Planning Commission meeting (re quarry reclamation), both in writing and verbally, has been both curt and dismissive regarding outreach to Ramaytush Ohlone tribal representatives. A similar approach has also been taken during the recent (March 2) LCLUP meeting.

From the staff report prepared for the Quarry Reclamation Continued Public Hearing, Agenda Item #1, March 18, 2024:

Tribal Consultation 16. Confirm whether the City must undertake tribal consultation as requested at the public hearing on June 5, 2023.

Staff Response: During public comment, a member of the public named Catalina Gomes identified herself as the executive director and founder of Muchia Te' Indigenous Land Trust and requested the City to undertake tribal consultation in relation to the proposed project. State law requires tribal consultation in advance of a General Plan amendment (known as Senate Bill 18 or "SB 18" consultation) and prior to commencement of environmental review under the California Environmental Quality Act, or "CEQA" (known as Assembly Bill 52, or "AB 52" consultation). The proposed project does not include a General Plan amendment, and SB 18 consultation is not applicable. The project does include California Environmental Quality Act review, and AB 52 consultation could apply to the project.

Staff has reviewed applicable law and also consulted with the Native American Heritage Commission in relation to the subject tribal consultation request, and concluded that tribal consultation is *not required* or available at this time. A tribe requesting AB 52 consultation must request a jurisdiction to

place them on a list of tribes for this purpose, and must request consultation within 30 days of receiving notification from a jurisdiction. In this case, the City has no tribes that have requested to be placed on a list for future AB 52 consultation, and accordingly, did not issue any notices indicating a tribal consultation opportunity was available. Moreover, the City has already prepared the CEQA document and any qualifying tribal consultation request would be untimely at this stage. Lastly, the commenter is not the designated contact of, or a tribal representative of, a traditionally and culturally affiliated California Native American tribe as recognized by the Native American Heritage Commission. Therefore, the commenter is not eligible to request AB 52 consultation in any case. However, the commenter may participate in the public hearing process and comment as may any other member of the public. PC Staff Report Rockaway Quarry Reclamation Plan March 18, 2024 Page 10 Based on the foregoing, the City has complied with applicable law governing tribal consultation and is not required to provide tribal consultation in response to the subject request.

At last evenings Planning Commission Public Hearing both Cata Gomes and Jonathon Cordero, representatives of the Ramaytush Ohlone people who resided in past centuries in the space known today as Pacifica, spoke out with concerns regarding the findings presented in documentation regarding this project. Both made public comment to request such.

Due to historical injustices, most indigenous people in the State of California are not (horrible wording) "recognized" and/or are "not eligible". If the City of Pacifica is sincere in its stated intention of: "*honoring their commitment to Mother Earth*" and affirming "*their sovereign rights as First Peoples and wish to pay our respects to the ancestors, elders and relatives of the Ramaytush Ohlone peoples*", why are they not being treated with respect, and in the interest of equity, being provided with a platform to elevate their voices after centuries of oppression? While it may not be "legally required" isn't it just and right to do so?

If it is outside of the scope of what you see as city's staff's role of actively seeking to honor and respect the ancestors, elders and relatives of the Ramaytush Ohlone people, then I believe you should reconsider the intent and implementation of the spirit of the land acknowledgement.

Thank you for considering your role and staff's in acknowledging the devastating past of how the people of this area have been treated and are still being treated without due respect.

Cindy Abbott

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: Thursday, March 21, 2024 8:43 AM
To: Public Comment
Subject: FW: "Reclamation" of the Quarry - NO

From: Beckmeyer, Sue <sbeckmeyer@pacificafica.gov>
Sent: Thursday, March 21, 2024 6:45 AM
To: Coffey, Sarah <scoffey@pacificafica.gov>; La, Emily <ELa@pacificafica.gov>
Cc: Murdock, Christian <cmurdock@pacificafica.gov>
Subject: Fwd: "Reclamation" of the Quarry - NO

Please add Jennifer's comments to the permanent record for the Quarry Reclamation project.
Thank you,
— Sue B.

From: Jennifer Chaloehtiarana [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, March 20, 2024 9:24:36 AM
To: Vaterlaus, Sue <svaterlaus@pacificafica.gov>; Beckmeyer, Sue <sbeckmeyer@pacificafica.gov>; Bier, Mary <mbier@pacificafica.gov>; Bigstyk, Tygarjas <tbigstyk@pacificafica.gov>; Boles, Christine <CBoles@pacificafica.gov>; _City Council <citycouncil@ci.pacificafica.ca.us>
Subject: "Reclamation" of the Quarry - NO

[CAUTION: External Email]

As a longtime Pacifica resident, I am totally opposed to the proposed "reclamation" of the Quarry. It is clearly a sham, set up to put money in the pockets of private interests (outside of Pacifica) and leave us with an environmental mess.

The owners of the company are known criminals and have lost their license to do business in other locations.

The dirt they will bring in WILL contain contaminants, and so close to our ocean!

The traffic and damage to the roads will be irreparable, and at significant cost to Pacifica.

How can you even consider this? Is this so we will all say "Oh wait, let's build a Hotel there instead because that sounds better than this"??

You will be held responsible for decades to come from the impacts of this. Do not let this be your legacy.

--
Jennifer Chaloehtiarana