

# **Public Comments on Items Not on Posted Agenda**

Written Comments Received By 12pm on 05/28/2024



*May 28, 2024*  
*City Council Meeting*

---

**From:** Beckmeyer, Sue  
**Sent:** Monday, May 20, 2024 11:25 PM  
**To:** Michelle Kenyon [BWS Law]; Woodhouse, Kevin; Public Comment  
**Subject:** Fwd: Ramaytush Ohlone Comments  
**Attachments:** Rockaway Quarry Comments 17 May 2024.pdf

---

**From:** Jonathan Cordero <jonathan@ramaytush.org>  
**Sent:** Monday, May 20, 2024 8:40 AM  
**To:** Murdock, Christian <cmurdock@pacificaca.gov>; \_City Council <citycouncil@ci.pacificaca.us>; Hauser, Samantha <hausers@ci.pacificaca.us>; a Ferguson <aferguson@ci.pacificaca.us>; Berman, Lauren <bermanl@ci.pacificaca.us>; Redfield, Chris <CRedfield@ci.pacificaca.us>; Wright, Greg <gwright@ci.pacificaca.us>; Vaterlaus, Sue <svaterlaus@pacificaca.gov>  
**Subject:** Ramaytush Ohlone Comments

**[CAUTION: External Email]**

Dear Mayor, Council Members, Chair, Commissioners, and Christian Murdock,

Thank you (Christian) for setting aside time to meet with the official leadership of the Ramaytush Ohlone a few weeks ago. I have attached a letter that states in general our concerns regarding the Rockaway Quarry Reclamation Project.

I am unable to attend tonight's meeting, and I hope you will consider our comments as you deliberate on the future of the project.

Sincerely,

Jonathan Cordero  
Chair, Ramaytush Ohlone  
Executive Director, Association of Ramaytush Ohlone

**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.**

SHUTE MIHALY  
& WEINBERGER LLP

396 HAYES STREET, SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102  
T: (415) 552-7272 F: (415) 552-5816  
www.smwlaw.com

SARA A. CLARK  
Attorney  
Clark@smwlaw.com

May 17, 2024

**Via Electronic Mail Only**

Planning Department, City of Pacifica  
Attn: Christian Murdock  
540 Crespi Drive  
Pacifica, CA 94044  
Email: [cmurdock@pacificagov](mailto:cmurdock@pacificagov)

Re: Comments of the Ramaytush Ohlone Tribe on the Environmental  
Impact Report for the Rockaway Quarry Reclamation Plan

Dear Mr. Murdock:

On behalf of our client, the Ramaytush Ohlone Tribe (“Tribe”), we submit the following comments on the Environmental Impact Report (“EIR”) for the Rockaway Quarry Reclamation Plan (“Project”). As the Tribe has informed the City of Pacifica (“City”), the Project is located on the site of the Tribes’ ancestral village of origin at the time of European contact. Ancestors of Tribal members moved up and down the Calera

Creek watershed and across the hill to Sharp Park. Tribal cultural resources have been discovered underneath the surface along nearly the entire Calera Creek watershed, and many more are likely still intact. For this reason, we urge the City to pause further consideration of the Project until the Tribe can work with the City and the Applicant to ensure adequate consideration of the Project's potential impacts and potential alternatives and mitigation measures.

We also submit these comments to inform the City that the ("EIR"), is inadequate under the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA"), Public Resources Code § 21000 et seq., and the CEQA Guidelines, California Code of Regulations, title 14, § 15000 et seq. ("CEQA Guidelines"). Without significant revisions, the City cannot certify this fundamentally flawed EIR or approve the Project.

## **I. The DEIR Is Inadequate Under CEQA.**

The EIR is "the heart of CEQA." *Laurel Heights Improvement Ass'n v. Regents of University of California* (1988) 47 Cal.3d 376, 392 (citation omitted). It is "an environmental 'alarm bell' whose purpose it is to alert the public and its responsible officials to environmental changes before they have reached ecological points of no return. The EIR is also intended "to demonstrate to an apprehensive citizenry that the agency has, in fact, analyzed and considered the ecological impacts of its action. Because the EIR must be certified or rejected by public officials, it is a document of accountability." *Id.* (citations omitted). The EIR must disclose and analyze all reasonably foreseeable direct and indirect environmental effects of a project. *See* CEQA Guidelines § 15064(d); *see also id.* §§ 15065(a)(4), 15358(a); Pub. Res. Code § 21065.3 (emphasis added).

Beyond merely disclosing potential environmental impacts, CEQA requires the EIR identify ways to avoid or minimize them. Pub. Res. Code § 21002.1. An EIR may not defer evaluation of mitigation to a later date. CEQA Guidelines § 15126.4(a)(1)(B). Where, as here, the environmental review document fails to fully and accurately inform decision makers and the public of the environmental consequences of proposed actions, or identify ways to mitigate or avoid these impacts, it does not satisfy the basic goals of CEQA. *See* Pub. Res. Code § 21061 ("The purpose of an environmental impact report is to provide public agencies and the public in general with detailed information about the effect that a proposed project is likely to have on the environment; to list ways in which the significant effects of such a project might be minimized; and to indicate alternatives to such a



project.”) As a result of the EIR’s numerous and serious inadequacies, there can be no meaningful review of the Project by the Tribe, the public, or the City’s decision makers.

**A. The EIR Fails to Adequately Identify Tribal Cultural Resources that May Be Impacted by the Project.**

CEQA requires public agencies to analyze the impact of a project on tribal cultural resources. Pub. Res. Code § 21084.2. Tribal cultural resources are defined as “[s]ites, features, places, cultural landscapes, sacred places, and objects with cultural value to a California Native American tribe” determined eligible for inclusion in the California Register of Historical Resources or a local register of historical resources. Pub. Res. Code § 21074(a)(1)(A)-(B). An agency also has discretion to identify tribal cultural resources as significant based on their the criteria under Section 5024.1(c). This could include (1) association with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California’s history and cultural heritage; (2) association with the lives of persons important in the past; and (3) embodiment of the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or (4) ability to yield information important to prehistory. Any discretionary determinations “shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.” Pub. Res. Code § 21074(a)(2).

Here, the EIR’s analysis of tribal cultural resources suffers from significant and numerous flaws. Most fundamentally, the EIR fails to adequately identify tribal cultural resources that may be impacted by the Project. This inadequacy stems from a few key issues:

- To identify tribal cultural resources, the EIR relies entirely on a 22-year old assessment from Holman and Associates Archaeological Consultants (“Holman Assessment”). As the EIR explains, however, the Holman Assessment was primarily a desktop review (i.e., “a review of available historic documents and a record search”). DEIR at 4.4-3. The only on-the-ground survey focused on “locating an examining undisturbed native soil within the site” (*id.*); it did not focus on identifying tribal cultural resources that are likely still present beneath the surface. The Holman Assessment incorporated no Tribal input or Traditional Ecological Knowledge.<sup>1</sup> And

---

<sup>1</sup> The EIR states that “consultation pursuant to AB 52 is not required for the proposed project.” DEIR at 4.4-4. Even if the City has correctly reached this conclusion, the lack of

due to its age, it includes no additional information that may have been gathered or made known in the interim period. The EIR's sole reliance on this outdated and incomplete assessment leads to a significant underreporting of tribal cultural resources that may be impacted by the project.

- These errors are likely in part because the EIR's Historical and Cultural Resource Assessment was prepared by Zentner and Zentner, who appear to lack adequate archaeological or cultural resource credentials (John Zentner is an ecologist with a planning background; Sean Micallef is also an ecologist). The assessment should be redone by individuals with appropriate expertise and credentials.
- The Tribe is aware that there is a known village site adjacent to the Project area and at least three midden sites located within the Project area, confirmed in part by the 1986 survey referenced on DEIR at 4.4-4. In addition, given the Project site's location within the Tribes' ancestral village, the likelihood of encountering buried tribal cultural resources during ground disturbing activities is extremely high. The Project may impact these tribal cultural resources, this potential impact must be understood and analyzed in the consideration of this Project. While the EIR includes some conclusory statements that the project could uncover undocumented archaeological resources (DEIR at 4.4-10), such conclusions without analysis are insufficient under CEQA. *Sierra Club v. County of Fresno* (2018) 6 Cal.5th 502, 526 ("*Friant Ranch*")
- The EIR erroneously concludes that because the project site "had been subject to extensive disturbance" (DEIR at 4.4-3, see also DEIR at 4.4-9), the cultural and tribal cultural resource value is likely to be low and impacts will therefore be less than significant. This assumes a western perspective on archaeological resources, wherein resources are only valuable for what they can tell us about the past. Under this framework, resources are less valuable if they have been previously disturbed. For the Tribe, however, tribal cultural resources do not lose all value due to previous disturbance; rather, the fact of previous disturbance creates a heightened need to protect

---

required consultation does not obviate the requirement that the EIR contain accurate and complete information about tribal cultural resources and the Project's potential impacts.

such resources moving forward. Under CEQA's requirements to protect tribal cultural resources, these issues must be given adequate consideration.

This failure to analyze the Project's impacts to these tribal cultural resources violates CEQA's mandate to analyze *all* of the Project's impacts. *See* CEQA Guidelines § 15064(d); *see also id.* §§ 15065(a)(4), 15358(a); Pub. Res. Code § 21065.3 (emphasis added); *Protect the Historic Amador Waterways v. Amador Water Agency* (2004) 116 Cal.App.4th 1099, 1109.

**B. The DEIR Fails to Adequately Mitigate for the Project's Significant Tribal Cultural Resource Impacts.**

CEQA is not just a disclosure statute. When an agency identifies significant impacts, it must take affirmative steps to try and resolve those impacts. Pub. Res. Code §§ 21002, 21002.1(b); *Friant Ranch*, 6 Cal.5th at 526; *King and Gardiner Farms v. County of Kern* (2020) 45 Cal.App.5th 814, 852 (agencies generally must adopt feasible mitigation to reduce significant effects to a level of insignificance). Here, the EIR fails to support its conclusion that its generic mitigation measures will actually reduce impacts to a less-than-significant level, in violation of CEQA.

Specifically, the EIR concludes that implementation of mitigation measures 4.4-2(a) and 4.4-2(b) would reduce significant impacts to a less-than-significant level. (DEIR at 4.4-10 to -12). These two mitigation measures require (a) "treatment" of human remains that may be encountered, and (b) "appropriate mitigation" for newly discovered historical or unique archaeological resources. In almost all instances, application of these types of mitigation measures results in removal of tribal cultural resources from a site for "protection" at some off-site location. This is contrary to CEQA, which requires lead agencies to use preservation in place for archaeological resources if feasible, unless other mitigation would be more protective. CEQA Guidelines § 15126.4(b); *Madera Oversight Coal. v. County of Madera* (2011) 199 Cal.App.4th 48, 82-87. Moreover, this removal does not reduce the impact of the Project; instead, it exacerbates it. The lack of clear Tribal involvement in the implementation of these mitigation measures will result in further cultural resource harm.

**II. Conclusion**

This Project cannot be approved in its present form. The EIR is legally inadequate and cannot serve as the basis for Project approval, especially when it fails to incorporate adequate information regarding tribal cultural resources at the Project site. For these

Pacifica Planning Department  
May 17, 2024  
Page 6

reasons, the City must make the requisite changes to the EIR, in conjunction with Tribal input, so that it is consistent with CEQA and all applicable requirements, and recirculate it for public review.

Thank you for your consideration.

Very truly yours,

SHUTE, MIHALY & WEINBERGER LLP



Sara A. Clark

cc: Jonathan Cordero, Ramaytush Ohlone Tribe

---

**From:** Coffey, Sarah  
**Sent:** Tuesday, May 21, 2024 8:49 AM  
**To:** Public Comment  
**Subject:** FW: Please read and do not Adopt or build at Oceana High school  
**Attachments:** Father and Son playing at Oceana.jpg

---

**From:** Al R [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Monday, May 20, 2024 5:51 PM  
**To:** Housing <Housing@pacifica.gov>; Harkousha, Brianne <BHarkousha@pacifica.gov>; Brooks, Elizabeth <ebrooks@pacifica.gov>; Murdock, Christian <cmurdock@pacifica.gov>; Christine Boles <christineforpacifica@gmail.com>; \_City Council <citycouncil@ci.pacifica.ca.us>; Coffey, Sarah <scoffey@pacifica.gov>; Woodhouse, Kevin <kwoodhouse@pacifica.gov>  
**Subject:** Please read and do not Adopt or build at Oceana High school

**[CAUTION: External Email]**

Hello planning departments and City Council. I am a resident of the Oceana High School neighborhood. Oceana high School is our de facto community courtyard if you all didn't know, and I am not sure if any of you all live in this neighborhood. Regardless, If you did live in this small neighborhood, you all would know that people from all over Pacifica come and enjoy the "Open Space" on the field 7 days a week. It is quite a peaceful environment and I encourage you to come play some ball sport activity, frisbee, enjoy the scenic view of the Ocean, spend some time with your family and or go for a peaceful walk. Maybe you'll see one of the many Herons that frequent the place or catch a glimpse at a redtail hawk getting some prey on the open space/field. A potential development of 178 units here would ruin everything here I mentioned and double the population in this specific neighborhood. In a nutshell, you all know what development would mean to this neighborhood, while taking away the only open space for individual recreation that is available from Manor Dr. to Vallemar that people and animals enjoy everyday. I highly oppose ANY development of housing in Oceana High School. Besides all this, this would have a substantial adverse effect on our scenic vistas/views of the Ocean, that which would be disrupted as well. ([www.Planbayarea.org](http://www.Planbayarea.org) Aesthetics and Visual Resources Section 3.2.3, AES-1,2,3. and Coastal Act Section 30251)

:The attachment picture is of a Father and Son playing catch, which is quintessential to what typically happens here on a daily basis.

Thank you for reading this.

Albert Romero; second generation immigrant and resident of the Oceana High School neighborhood.

**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:** Jong, Nancy <njong@buchalter.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, May 22, 2024 3:16 PM  
**To:** Murdock, Christian  
**Cc:** KMurphy@bwsllaw.com; Michelle Kenyon [BWS Law]; asweeney@tollbrothers.com; Coffey, Sarah; nkosla@tollbrothers.com; Guerra, Alicia C.; Mansouri, Braeden  
**Subject:** Pacifica Housing Element Update - Sea Bowl Property [IMAN-BN.FID3603943]  
**Attachments:** 5\_22\_2024 Letter to C. Murdock re Housing Element Update(82741937.1).pdf

**[CAUTION: External Email]**

Mr. Murdock:

Please see attached letter.

Sent on behalf of Alicia Guerra.

Thank you,

Nancy Jong  
Assistant to Alicia Guerra

Buchalter

---

**Nancy Jong**  
Legal Assistant to Jay Paxton, Thomas Sherwood and Bukola Mabadeje.  
**T** (415) 296-1659  
**F** (415) 227-0770  
[njong@buchalter.com](mailto:njong@buchalter.com)

---

425 Market Street, Suite 2900  
San Francisco, CA 94105  
[www.buchalter.com](http://www.buchalter.com)

Notice To Recipient: This e-mail is meant for only the intended recipient of the transmission, and may be a communication privileged by law. If you received this e-mail in error, any review, use, dissemination, distribution, or copying of this e-mail is strictly prohibited. Please notify us immediately of the error by return e-mail and please delete this message and any and all duplicates of this message from your system. Thank you in advance for your cooperation. For additional policies governing this e-mail, please see <http://www.buchalter.com/about/firm-policies/>.

**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.**



425 Market Street  
Suite 2900  
San Francisco, CA 94105  
415.227.0900 Phone  
415.227.0770 Fax

May 22, 2024

415.227.3508 Direct  
aguerra@buchalter.com

**VIA E-MAIL**

Christian Murdock, Planning Director  
City of Pacifica  
540 Crespi Drive  
Pacifica, CA 94044

Re: Pacifica Housing Element Update - Sea Bowl Property

Dear Christian:

Buchalter, a Professional Corporation (“Buchalter”), represents Toll Brothers with its proposal to develop a residential townhome project on the property located at 4625 Coast Highway in the City (APN: 022-150-440) (the “Property”). Toll Brothers is proposing to demolish the existing Sea Bowl bowling alley and subdivide one parcel into 25 parcels for the development of 15 - three story multifamily townhome buildings (81 townhome style units with 22 ADUs) and 5 - three story duet style buildings (10 duet style units) (the “Sea Cove Project”). The Sea Cove Project would result in the development of 113-unit residential units, 178 resident parking spaces, and 22 guest parking spaces. Toll Brothers originally filed with the City of Pacifica (“City”) an SB 330 Preliminary Application for the Project on September 11, 2023, and a formal application on April 1, 2024.

For well over a year, Toll Brothers representatives have submitted comments on the City’s Draft Housing Element Update, and requested that the Property be identified in the Site Inventory to no avail. We have received the latest letter from Department of Housing & Community Development (“HCD”) dated March 29, 2024 (the “March 29 Letter”) advising you that the City remains out of compliance with State Housing Element Laws. As you know, HCD noted that the necessary rezones are not complete (Programs 1-1 General Plan and Zoning Amendments to Achieve regional housing needs allocation (RHNA)), and the housing element is out of compliance and will remain out of compliance until the rezoning have been completed.

As noted in our prior letters to you and to the City Council, State law requires that a housing element provide an “inventory of land suitable and available for residential

buchalter.com

Los Angeles  
Denver  
Napa Valley  
Orange County  
Portland  
Sacramento  
Salt Lake City  
San Diego  
San Francisco  
Scottsdale  
Seattle

Christian Murdock, Planning Director

May 22, 2024

Page 2

development” that have “*realistic and demonstrated potential* for redevelopment during the planning period to meet the locality’s housing need.” (Gov. Code, § 65883(a)(3) (emphasis added).) The City even acknowledges this requirement in the Draft Housing Element.<sup>1</sup> (Draft Housing Element, p. F-2.) HCD has acknowledged this and other issues with the Housing Element in finding it out of compliance.

Once again, we reiterate our request to add the Sea Bowl Property to the Housing Element. Toll Brothers’ Sea Cove Project for the redevelopment of the Sea Bowl Property represents a realistic and demonstrated potential for redevelopment of the Property with housing. In that regard, Toll Brothers intends to continue processing its formal development project application submitted under the Builder’s Remedy.

The Sea Cove Project presents a realistic opportunity to redevelop the Property with residential units and offset a portion of the shortage of RHNA units identified in the City’s Housing Element. As HCD identified in its March 29 Letter, the City’s Housing Element “should consider public comments received regarding the inclusion of sites from property owners” with a written interest in residential development. (March 29, Letter, append., p. 2.) The “[housing] element must analyze the likelihood that the identified units will be developed as noted in the inventory in zones that allow 100 percent nonresidential uses,” considering “development trends supporting residential development.” (March 29, Letter, append., p. 1.) As explained above, Toll Brothers and its representatives have submitted numerous comments to the City, requesting that the City include the Property in the Housing Element Sites Inventory. Thus, the Sea Cove Project is the exact type of residential project that is likely to be developed. Here, HCD is expressly recommending the City undertake Toll Brothers’ request, and we believe supports the City’s decision to include the Property within the Housing Element’s Sites Inventory.

HCD acknowledges the Housing Element’s discussion of the City’s planned infrastructure improvements to its sewer and water capacity. (March 29, Letter, append., p. 2.) Specifically, the Housing Element must include a program providing for the City’s commitments to these improvements in order to accommodate its RHNA requirement. As we noted in prior letters, Toll Brothers is willing to consider sharing in the cost of some of these improvements with the City and other benefitting developments.

The March 29 Letter additionally requested the City include in the Housing Element a timeline for implementing actions that encourage the development of ADUs. As you know, the Sea Cove Project proposes 22 ADUs. As the Draft Housing Element explains, ADUs can provide naturally affordable housing options for middle- and lower-income individuals and households which will contribute to the housing that will assist with satisfying the City’s RHNA

---

<sup>1</sup> The Draft Housing Element explains that state law “requires an inventory of land suitable for residential development *that can be feasibly developed* during the 2023-2031 period and is sufficient to provide for the regional housing need for all income levels” (emphasis added).

Christian Murdock, Planning Director

May 22, 2024

Page 3

requirement. (*See* Draft Housing Element, pp. F-6, F-12.) Accordingly, including the Sea Cove Project in the Housing Element Sites Inventory is consistent with both Draft Housing Element policies and HCD's request.

Toll Brothers echoes HCD's comment with respect to Program HE – 1-1. HCD explains that the City must commit to the necessary General Plan amendment and rezoning requirements that will accommodate all of the required affordable housing without discretionary action. (March 29, Letter, append., p. 4.) Toll Brothers has consistently requested that the City adopt measures like this in order to accommodate the Sea Cove Project, which will greatly contribute to the housing required under the City's RHNA allocation.

Consistent with our request that the Sea Cove Project be included in the Targeted General Plan Amendments, Rezoning and Objective Development Standards Program for the Housing Element Update, we also request that the City consider the Sea Cove Project in its Environmental Impact Report (EIR) under preparation for the Pacifica Housing Element Targeted General Plan Amendments, Rezoning, and Objective Development Standards Program (6th Cycle). As you know, we previously requested on December 18, 2023 that the Sea Cove Project be covered by the City's Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration for the 6<sup>th</sup> Cycle Housing Element Update. We supplemented that request with yet another request that the Sea Cove Project be included in the City's EIR for the General Plan Amendments and Rezoning project as a comment on the Notice of Preparation for the EIR currently under preparation. Those requests are incorporated by reference into this comment letter in furtherance of Toll Brothers' interest in accommodating the City's need to provide more housing in accordance with State law.

Again, Toll Brothers respectfully requests that the City make these necessary changes in the next draft of the Housing Element. Doing so will ensure the necessary planning for badly-needed residential capacity in the City.

# Buchalter

Christian Murdock, Planning Director

May 22, 2024

Page 4

Thank you for your attention to these comments and please do not hesitate to reach out if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

BUCHALTER  
A Professional Corporation

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to be 'Alicia Guerra', with a long horizontal line extending to the right.

By

Alicia Guerra

AG:nj

cc: Sarah Coffey  
Michelle Kenyon  
Karen Murphy  
Nick Kosla  
Alli Sweeney  
Braeden Mansouri

---

**From:** Clif Lawrence [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Friday, May 24, 2024 12:11 PM  
**To:** Public Comment; Murdock, Christian  
**Cc:** Woodhouse, Kevin; \_City Council; Clif Lawrence  
**Subject:** re: May 22,2024 - Virtual Scoping EIR for Draft Housing Element

**[CAUTION: External Email]**

Christian,

My apologies for missing the first 12 minutes of the session.

This note is to convey that I feel an opportunity for education was lost.

What I believe you heard, was a few individuals attempting their best to provide the types of input that was being solicited.

What I believe were heard after our comments, was that they were not relevant.

OPPORTUNITY LOST: What we did not hear from you, what would have been relevant in your view.

Regards,

Clif Lawrence

**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**

### **Item 6 – Peace Resolution**

Written Comments Received By 12pm on 05/28/2024



*May 28, 2024*

*City Council Meeting*





---

**From:** Clif Lawrence [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Friday, May 24, 2024 1:18 PM  
**To:** \_City Council; Public Comment; Woodhouse, Kevin; Coffey, Sarah  
**Cc:** Peter Loeb; Clif Lawrence  
**Subject:** CORRECTION to earlier : Agenda Item 6 - City Council - May 28, 2024 (PLEASE remove word "(bully)" Thank you

**[CAUTION: External Email]**

agendaItem 6 - City Council - May 28, 2024

**6. Peace Resolution**

**PROPOSED ACTION:** Consider whether or not to adopt the attached "Pacifica Resolution for Peace and Reconciliation."

To those who chose to lobby the City Council into presenting this resolution.

Has it occurred to you:

1. The City Council members have no direct power in this area.
2. if you have not been calling or writing your TWO U.S. Senators and ONE Congress Representative EVERY DAY, you have NOT done ALL that you could.

One who also grieves the brutality and loss of life everywhere.

Clif Lawrence



**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:** Denise Leonardi [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, May 28, 2024 8:30 AM  
**To:** Public Comment  
**Subject:** Subject Line #6

**[CAUTION: External Email]**

Dear Council,

As a member of the Pacifica community I support the Peace Resolution! Please make this official and vote yes tonight on Subject #6.

Thank you,

Denise Leonardi  
[REDACTED]

**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:** Suzanne Moore [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, May 28, 2024 8:48 AM  
**To:** Public Comment  
**Subject:** Item #6 5/28/24 - Pacifica Peace Resolution

**[CAUTION: External Email]**

Honorable Council Members and City Staff,

I stand with PPP in support of the peace resolution.

Peacemaking is not easy. It demands we be inconvenienced, we make a commitment greater than ourselves, and we have the courage to accept risk - all to offer a voice that promotes peace and to speak out for those desperately inconvenienced through no fault of their own and at terrible risk.

We learn from our peaceful actions: to express compassion in the face of hate, to interrupt bullying with a peaceful voice of reason, to accept risk when offered an opportunity to effect positive change, and to build a community of peace.

This war IS a Pacifica issue - not just because Pacifica families are directly impacted, but because this teaching moment helps us to learn

- that peace is local and peacemaking is worthy,
- that we have a choice and there's something we can do,
- that the recurring history of war and hate can be impacted by the voice of peace.

Please pass this resolution. Thank you.

--

**Suzanne Moore**

[REDACTED]

**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:** Tuesday, May 28, 2024 9:05 AM  
**To:** Public Comment  
**Subject:** FW: Peace Resolution about the Middle East (meeting May 28)

-----Original Message-----

From: Miriam Salzer [REDACTED]  
Sent: Monday, May 27, 2024 6:41 PM  
To: \_City Council <citycouncil@ci.pacifica.ca.us>; Coffey, Sarah <scoffey@pacifica.gov>; Woodhouse, Kevin <kwoodhouse@pacifica.gov>  
Subject: Peace Resolution about the Middle East (meeting May 28)

[CAUTION: External Email]

Hi City Council members,

I have been a citizen of Pacifica for 20 years. My rabbi mentioned the agenda item for Pacifica to make an official statement regarding the war in the Middle East. The City of Pacifica going on record with opinions about foreign policy is neither a good use of time nor a good precedent to set. However, if people insist on having a resolution, this particular one is very well worded.

Miriam Salzer

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:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, May 28, 2024 10:47 AM  
**To:** Public Comment  
**Subject:** Pacifica City Council 5.28.24 Agenda Item #6

**[CAUTION: External Email]**

5.28.2024

Reference Agenda Item #6

Honorable Pacifica City Council members,

My name is Joanne Rokosky. As a Coastsides resident, I urge your support for the Pacifica Resolution for Peace and Reconciliation that will come before you tonight. Specifically, the Resolution asks for an immediate and sustained ceasefire, safe return of hostages and detainees, immediate provision of life-sustaining humanitarian aid, and initiation of reconciliation and a viable peace process for Israelis and Palestinians.

To some it may seem like such a statement by a small California community is meaningless for a war many thousands of miles away. But I look at it differently. Violent rhetoric and violent actions begin locally before metastasizing to distant areas. And around us, on the Coastsides, I increasingly see hateful rhetoric and dismissal of the needs of those who are viewed as "the other." I believe that it is imperative at this time for all of us, including elected leaders, to publicly state that we view all members of our community as deserving of respect and of having their needs met and that we do not tolerate hateful rhetoric or violent action. A statement such as this from the Pacifica City Council demonstrates a commitment to our shared humanity and global interconnectedness. I urge adoption of the Resolution.

Sincerely,

Joanne Rokosky

**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:** Blue Murov [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, May 28, 2024 11:29 AM  
**To:** Public Comment  
**Subject:** Cease fire

**[CAUTION: External Email]**

Hello,  
I support a ceasefire resolution. Please vote yes.

Blue Murov  
Pacifica

**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:** Diana Reddy [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, May 28, 2024 11:41 AM  
**To:** Public Comment  
**Subject:** Peace Resolution

**[CAUTION: External Email]**

Honorable Mayor Vaterlaus and Councilmembers:

You are to be commended for having the courage to agendize the controversial, yet powerful, Peace Resolution for tonight's meeting. You are also to be applauded for focusing the resolution on Peace, very appropriate for a city named Pacifica.

Some leaders believe such a resolution addressing international situations is outside their jurisdiction. On one hand, no reasonable person condones the acts committed by Hamas. On the other, Palestinian friends and neighbors have been seeking our support for decades. During those decades the United Nations has condemned the unlawful taking of land belonging to Palestinian families for hundreds of years, and we have remained silent. It is time for all of us to stand up and let our Palestinian and Jewish neighbors know that we stand up for peace.

I urge you to support tonight's Peace Resolution. Thank you for all you do on behalf of your community.

Diana Reddy  
former Vice Mayor  
City of Redwood City

**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.**