



CITY OF PACIFICA
OPEN SPACE & PARKLAND ADVISORY COMMITTEE
January 17, 2024, 6:00 – 7:30 P.M.
Auditorium, Pacifica Community Center, 540 Crespi Drive, Pacifica

In attendance were Chair Patton, Vice Chair Arnos, Goodmiller, Natesan, and Tan. Planning Director Murdock (dial-in), Staff Liaison Lin, Senior Planner Cervantes, and Councilmember Bigstycck were also present. Cardona, Lancelle, and McDermod were absent.

CALL TO ORDER: *Chair Patton* called the meeting to order at 6:04 PM.

ADMINISTRATIVE BUSINESS: *(5 minutes)*

Roll Call A quorum was confirmed.

Approval of Order of Agenda – *Unanimously approved.*

Approval of Minutes of November 15, 2023 (distributed to OSPAC with Agenda) – *Unanimously approved.*

PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS:

Public Comment – *This portion of the agenda is available to the public to address the Committee on any issue within the subject matter jurisdiction of the Committee that is not on the agenda (3 minutes per speaker).*

Committee Communications – INFORMATIONAL ITEMS: *(5 minutes)*

- 1. Update by GGNRA/GGNPC** – *Brown (GGNRA)* informed the committee that their internal review of the preliminary alternative was done and met with City staff recently. The City will proceed to review these materials over the next month, and an update or presentation will likely be given in the March OSPAC meeting regarding these trailhead and parking alternatives at Mori Point.

Patton thanked *Brown* for his update and commented that the wayfinding signs were installed at the wrong location.

Brown clarified that there were two signs, one at the approach at Bradford Way and another at Westport Drive that points to the left. A request had also been made to lower the installed sign, but a crew has not yet been out to do so.

Arnos asked if the request to lower the sign was the one previously reported and discussed in the prior meetings.

Brown (GGNRA) confirmed that it was.

Bigstycck offered to open communication channels with the City Council regarding the ongoing Mori Point concerns.

Brown (GGNRA) appreciated the offer and commented that the goal is to make sure the City is also aligned and on board with these alternatives.

Arnos suggested that canvassing and posting flyers may be helpful to get the residents involved who may not have been as involved with the process.

2. Update by City Council –

Councilmember Bigstycck updated the committee regarding communications with San Mateo County District Supervisor Mueller on Measure K funds and was told that Mueller may be able to just coordinate with County Parks and process it in-house. He provided additional high-level updates on the Housing Element and the Local Coastal Land Use Plan were the items at the latest Council meeting. He announced that it looks like March 2nd would be the next LCLUP meeting, with the Housing Element Meeting on Monday, January 22nd.

Planning Director Murdock confirmed the meeting dates.

STAFF COMMUNICATIONS: (5 minutes)

3. Development project updates

Staff Liaison Lin announced new updates for Pacifica Highlands (OSTF Lot 20) and for 570 Crespi (OSTF Lot 32)

Natesan asked for clarification on how many units originally proposed for the Pacifica Highland project.

Staff Liaison Lin responded that 54 units.

Patton asked *Senior Planner Cervantes* if the new project would still have approximately 60 acres of open space.

Senior Planner Cervantes confirmed that the development footprint is around the same. However, it is still under preliminary application review, with slightly more disturbed development area closer to Coast Highway now.

Tan asked for clarification about the proposed Project and development on any ridgelines and asked if there are any updates to Hillside Meadow project.

Senior Planner Cervantes responded that she would have to verify the plans for the question regarding the ridgelines.

Staff Liaison Lin provided updates on the Hillside Meadow project (OSTF Lot 50) and confirmed that there were no updates since the November 2023 OSPAC meeting.

Patton announced that if any committee member or members of the public would like to follow along these project statuses, the City's website has a map and spreadsheet that provides these updates.

Arnos asked for updates on OSTF Lot 2, specifically on the proposed scope of work.

Staff Liaison Lin will follow up with staff for the next meeting.

Tan commented that it was difficult to track exactly where these proposed OSTF project sites were in relation to the location in the City, and requests for a map to be included in the future meetings.

Patton asked if *Tan* has a copy of the Open Space Task Force Report.

Tan confirmed that he does and wanted to suggest a visual for the agenda.

Staff Liaison Lin responded that he would work with staff to find a way to incorporate the request.

DISCUSSION ITEMS:

4. Review of the City Council-OSPAC Joint Study Session on 8/28/2023, pertaining to consideration of revisions to OSPAC's authorizing resolution. (60 minutes)

- **Recommended Action:** Discuss Joint Study Session on OSPAC authorizing resolution update and consider requesting City Council adoption of an amended authorizing resolution.

Natesan asked if there was a track-changes version for the prepared resolution by the City Council versus the one by the subcommittee.

Planning Director Murdock responded that one was not unavailable and provided a brief presentation on the timeline following the joint study session and the prepared resolutions.

Patton thanked *Planning Director Murdock* for the presentation and announced that she had done the comparison beforehand and noted the differences between the resolutions.

Patton identified a requested change to include trails in the resolution prepared by the City Council.

Goodmiller agreed with *Patton* to include trails as part of the revisions.

Arnos requested for both resolutions to be numbered by paragraph numbers so that the comparison may be easier to understand.

Planning Director Murdock asked for clarification on if the referenced resolution to compare to the one prepared by the City Council was the one passed in 2015, and not the proposed resolution prepared by OSPAC in August of 2023.

Patton confirmed it was the one proposed by OSPAC in August of 2023.

Natesan identified that the proposed resolution by the City Council left out important language originally mentioned in the one prepared by OSPAC in August 2023, and request that "trail connectivity, biodiversity, and habitat protection," to be included in the paragraph beginning. "BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, the OSPAC shall advise. The City Council..." identified as paragraph 8 on the resolution.

Patton announced that paragraph 11 through 15 are all new language not previously identified in the resolution prepared by OSPAC, while paragraphs 9, 10 and 16 were the same.

Arnos commented that it may be helpful if there was a document comparing the changes made between the two parties that can allow for the committee to identify and discuss the differences.

Natesan asked under paragraph 15, could the advisement to the applicant be in writing and made public, and for clarification on if the proposed language is only referring to a verbal response to be made by OSPAC.

Planning Director Murdock responded that he was curious as to functionally how that would work if the advisement was to be made in writing to the applicant following their presentation to OSPAC. He identified that this process would then establish a follow up process should OSPAC want to provide a written response to the presentation. In addition, it would effectively make OSPAC more of a formalized part of the development review process, and that is not something he would perceive having support from the City Council and the potential addition of staff resources and time for reports and analyses. This was not fully discussed at the joint study session and would be a new request to the City Council.

Councilmember Bigstyk asked if there are prepared minutes following every meeting.

Planning Director Murdock confirmed that was correct.

Councilmember Bigstyk asked if it was possible then to append the pertinent parts of the meeting minutes to the application as a subtle reminder to the applicant.

Natesan stated that the prepared minutes is more of a summary as opposed to a formalized minute, and oftentimes varies to the extent of what could be transcribed by the Planning staff.

Planning Director Murdock responded that he is interpreting *Natesan's* comment as that these minutes are not transcripts from the meeting, to which he confirms, and that staff does try to have a balanced approach to the minutes for OSPAC as compared to the extensive details in Planning Commission and City Council minutes. He further clarified that the draft resolution is structured for OSPAC to advise applicants, and not the Planning Commission or City Council, which would be a formal role in the development review process, to which he perceives as not being supported by the City Council at the Joint Study Session.

Natesan thanked *Planning Director Murdock* for the clarification.

Arnos requested for further details breaking down the differences so that the committee may better digest the changes for a more productive discussion.

Patton suggested that paragraph 15 be revisited for further discussion. She proceeded to refer to Attachment B (August 2023 proposed resolution by OSPAC) and stated that paragraph 1 and 3 was included, while paragraph 2, 4, and 5 were not.

Natesan commented that paragraph 4 should be included to address the previous comment regarding inclusion of biodiversity and habitat protection.

Patton continued to state that paragraph 6, 7, 8, and 9 were included, while paragraph 10 was not.

Planning Director Murdock asked if paragraph 10 started at line 61.

Patton responded that it was line 48.

Tan asked for clarification on line 20 to 27 and 48 to 59 can't be taken verbatim and substituted for paragraph 9 in the proposed City Council resolution?

Patton responded that paragraph 9 is from the 2015 resolution, and in addition if the committee felt that paragraph 10 in the proposed resolution is significantly different and important enough to substitute for the City Council prepared paragraph 9.

Natesan requested that in paragraph 9, to add, or “other suitable long-term owners” to “Transfer of Cattle Hill...”

Arnos commented that there aren’t enough time left in today’s meeting to make a decision, and asked that the previously requested comparison document be accompanied in the next meeting.

Patton confirmed that the discussion will be continued in next month’s meeting. She proceeded to identify that paragraph 11 and 13 were included, while paragraph 8 and 12 would require additional assessment by the committee to compare the differences.

Natesan proposed for paragraph 15 of the proposed City Council resolution for further assessment.

Goodmiller asked about staff’s time given the significant changes between the proposed OSPAC resolution versus the City Council resolution, and that track changes may not be as helpful versus comparison between the paragraphs.

Natesan agreed and instead to have track changes within the comparison of the paragraphs between the proposed OSPAC resolution and the one by the City Council.

Tan stated that he would like to have a detailed track changes version as previously proposed by *Arnos* and wanted to know if there are any comments from staff as to why the proposed resolution differed significantly from the one prepared by OSPAC.

Councilmember Bigstyk responded that City staff made changes based on what was heard during the joint study session.

Planning Director Murdock agreed with *Councilmember Bigstyk* and continued that to hold true to much of the prior OSPAC resolution as possible while filtering out things that didn’t appear to have City Council support and new ideas raised during the joint study session process. He agreed with *Goodmiller* that a track changes version won’t be helpful and don’t know if staff can exercise judgement which paragraphs to track changes or not. He suggested that in the next study session for staff to prepare a comparison table between the two resolutions and identify paragraphs that most closely relate to one another, as well as for the subcommittee to meet again prior to the next meeting for further discussion.

Patton agrees with the idea of a chart and personally assumes that they are at about 70-85% in agreement so far.

Tan addressed additional issues regarding the City not being supportive of the idea of requiring the project sponsor to go upon the committee because it would potentially delay the project and in violation of HCD’s process.

Patton responded that they are out of time, and for the discussion to continue in next month’s meeting.

Patton asked for a motion for staff to come back with a chart for next month’s meeting.

Natesan motioned, *Goodmiller* second.

5. Propose and Confirm February Ahni Trail Workday (10 minutes)

Patton asked for a motion for the February workday to occur on February 10.

Arnos motioned, *Natesan* second.

ADJOURNMENT *Patton* adjourned at 7:32 PM.