Public Comments on Items Not on Posted Agenda

Written Comments Received After 12pm on 06/10/2024



June 10, 2024 City Council Meeting

From: Sent: To: Subject: Jeff Guillet Tuesday, June 11, 2024 10:45 AM Coffey, Sarah; Public Comment FW: Objection to approval of LCLUP proposed changes

[CAUTION: External Email]

For inclusion in the public record.

Jeff Guillet

From: Jeff Guillet
Sent: Friday, May 31, 2024 6:07 PM
To: Pacifica City Council <citycouncil@ci.pacifica.ca.us>; Vaterlaus, Sue <svaterlaus@pacifica.gov>; Beckmeyer, Sue
<sbeckmeyer@pacifica.gov>; Mary Bier <mbier@pacifica.gov>; Tygarjas Bigstyck (tbigstyck@pacifica.gov)
<tbigstyck@pacifica.gov>; Christine Boles (cboles@pacifica.gov) <cboles@pacifica.gov>
Subject: Objection to approval of LCLUP proposed changes

Dear Mayor Vaterlaus and council members:

I am interrupting our vacation and writing to you from Alaska to protest the highly irregular June 4 meeting to consider the approval of the 2024 Draft LCLUP.

It is clear that city council, staff, and the public have little understanding of the damage this LCLUP will have on Pacifica for many years to come. Property rights provided by the California Coastal Act will be overridden by a non-elected commission who clearly has no concern for our city or residents. It is your job as council members to protect the city and your constituents. It is unconscionable for you to do anything less.

THERE IS NO RUSH TO APPROVE THIS LEGALLY FLAWED PLAN. The idea that Special Resiliency Areas do not include the West Fairway Park neighborhood and the Sharp Park Golf course is capricious and arbitrary. The LCLUP claims to use the best available science, but new sea level rise guidance will be approved the same day as the June 4 meeting. Lawsuits will follow due to takings which will bankrupt the city. Is this the legacy you want to leave? DO NOT LET THE CITY MANAGER STRONG ARM YOU INTO MAKING AN UNINFORMED DECISION.

The LCLUP process began with a six+ year public engagement process. The city submitted that well written draft LCLUP to the California Coastal Commission who completely rewrote it with their unfunded and illegal mandates. Their overreach is staggering. City planning director Murdock has given half answers or no answers at all to city council and the public.

I beg you to vote no to approve moving forward on this highly flawed and illegal LCLUP. No one but the city manager wants this approved. We do not need to be the first city to accept Coastal Commission's aggressive demands that will shape the California coast forever. Other cities and history are watching.

Jeff Guillet

Get Outlook for iOS

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.

Glioley ce my mariya Potos.



Scenic Pacifica Incorporated Nov. 22, 1957

> May 17, 2024 Marilyn Pacifica, CA 94044

Subj: Maintenance of Aleli Walk and Calara Creek Park

Dear Marilyn:

The purpose of this letter is to remind residents who live in the vicinity of Calara Creek Park of their maintenance obligations. Some community members have contacted the City with concerns about the maintenance of Aleli Walk and Calara Creek Park and have requested that the Department of Public Works perform service. The City does not own this land and therefore does not maintain it. According to state law, property owners abutting Aleli Walk and Calara Creek Park are responsible for the maintenance of these areas. (California Streets and Highways Code § 5610 et seq.) Moving forward, the City will not respond to requests for maintenance of these areas.

CITY OF PACIFICA Planning, Building, and Code Enforcement

540 Crespi Drive • Pacifica, California 94044-3422

(650) 738-7341 • www.cityofpacifica.org

If you have any questions or concerns, please contact me by phone at (650) 738-3767 or by e-mail at ryip@pacifica.gov.

Sincerely,

Roland Yip Deputy Director of Public Works MAYOR Sue Vaterlaus

MAYOR PRO TEM Sue Beckmeyer

COUNCIL Mary Bier Christine Boles Tygarjas Bigstyck I recently called Public Works to report a large limb that had fallen in the creek.

I received a written response from the Deputy Director of Public Works stating that according to state law, owners abutting Calera Creek are responsible for the maintenance of these areas. What exactly does that mean?

I gave some thought to how much time PW actually spends doing maintenance in Vallemar. I have observed the following.

- 1. When requested, they come in once a year to cut weeds prior to July 4.
- 2. They pickup creek debris when volunteers have worked cleaning the creek. The largest cleanup is usually Earth Day. Sometimes residents will clean an area and ask to have a pickup.
- 3. Tree maintenance has been a financial problem from day one; Do you expect residents to take on that responsibility? Public Works is no longer cutting and disposing large limbs that fall.
- 4. Maintenance of the pipes that drain water into Calera Creek. This obviously is not done very often. The pipe behind my house was completely rotted and caused a sizable amount of erosion that could have affected the road.
- 5. They pickup furniture that's been dumped in the creek. (very rare)
- 6. Then there's the preparation of the area before winter which doesn't always occur before the rains come.
- 7. Lastly, although not creek related, we can't seem to get the pot holes filled.

In a 12-month period, it doesn't appear that Vallemar is putting a strain on city services.

Questions.

- 1. Is this a directive from council?
- 2. Why was there no input from the residents who would be impacted?

It seems to me, this letter inplies, residents are responsible for all the items I've listed related to Calera Creek Park. with the exception of filling pot holes From: Sent: To: Subject: Brittaney Shade Wednesday, June 12, 2024 8:21 PM Public Comment Short Term Rentals (Public Comment)

[CAUTION: External Email]

Dear Pacifica City Council,

I am writing to express my hope that the city passes a limit on STRs in Pacifica. I am a resident of the city, active in the community and would love to be able to afford a home here. Due to the limited housing supply, each house that is listed for sale vs. short term rental can make an impact to the trajectory of our town. I live in Manor and have a STR down the street, there is frequently loud music and people in and out. There is also always a TON of garbage on the street. If there were full-time residents living there, there would be more ownership of the community vs. transient renters.

Pacifica is a target for AirBnB's due to it's beauty and proximity to the city. Some STR owners look at this as purely a cash grab with no connection to the community. Meanwhile, residents like myself are struggling to find housing. Additionally, many studies find that commercialized short-term rentals artificially inflate rentals costs.

I know STR bring in an income to the city via taxes. I feel strongly that the community created through long term residents is far more valuable than the income. We need Neighbors not AirBBs. How many STR owners volunteer at local events? Support our local business on the regular? Help neighbors out in need?

I appreciate your consideration and am happy to chat more.

Very best,

Brittaney Shade

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.

June 10, 2024 **City Council Meeting**

Public Comments Item 14 - 310-330 Esplanade Avenue FEIR

Written Comments Received After 12pm on 06/10/2024



June 10, 2024 City Council Meeting

From: Sent: To: Subject: Coffey, Sarah Monday, June 10, 2024 2:47 PM Public Comment FW: 6/10 meeting item 14 Esplanade cliff top park and cliff revetment

From: Boles, Christine <CBoles@pacifica.gov>
Sent: Monday, June 10, 2024 2:47 PM
To: Coffey, Sarah <scoffey@pacifica.gov>
Subject: Fw: 6/10 meeting item 14 Esplanade cliff top park and cliff revetment

public comment sent to council this morning about agenda item 14

Christine Boles

Councilmember, City of Pacifica

From: Remi Tan
Sent: Monday, June 10, 2024 11:58 AM
To: _City Council <<u>citycouncil@ci.pacifica.ca.us</u>>
Subject: 6/10 meeting item 14 Esplanade cliff top park and cliff revetment

[CAUTION: External Email]

Dear City Council, I am commenting on Item 14,

This is an expensive project that primarily benefits the owners of the adjacent 340 and 350 Esplanade and the Bluffs apartments, therefore it should be paid by special assessment on those properties. It is unfair that all citizens should pay for this. Those apartment owners are benefiting from higher rents due to the building's oceanfront location and should use the higher rents to deal with their own erosion issues.

The park and revetment should be paid by the previous owners of the torn down apartments as they neglected to maintain coastal erosion defenses.

Thank you and Best Regards,

Remi Tan, AIA LEED AP BD+C

Architecture, Green Building Real estate investment and brokerage

Sent from my iPhone

From: Sent: To: Cc: Subject: Attachments: Irene Monday, June 10, 2024 4:57 PM Public Comment Yip, Roland; Cervantes, Stefanie; Christine Boles Item 14: 310-330 Esplanade seawall and park creation Concrete breakwater-Japan.png; breakwater jacks in Okinawa, Japan.png; concrete tetrapods breakwater, Japan.png; map of Esplanade apartments n bluff.png; gabion retaining walls.png; map-Mussel Rock to Mori Pt.png; retaining walls and path.png; retaining walls on steep slope.png; retaining walls on slope.png; Old radio station house on Esplanade.png; rice terraces in Manila.png; SlopeGrid Retaining Wall - HDG Building Materials.pdf

[CAUTION: External Email]

Hi Roland and Stefanie,

I just want to provide some inputs into item 14:Esplanade seawall and park creation. I realized my comment is kind of late since I just figured out where to look.

I would like to suggest that you guys look into a combination of solutions to hold back the bluff along this and other areas. Attached are some photos I took from the Internet as suggestions.

I don't think a vertical concrete wall is going to hold the bluff due to the extreme wave actions below that would undermine the bluff. If you look at any natural topo of mountains or hillsides, you will notice that they are mostly gradual sloping, unless there are rocks which fit into each other.

My suggestion is to use a combination of breakwater concrete jacks and rock ripraps at the base of the bluff, but allow some distance away from the bluff. Then use concrete or gabion retaining walls closer to the bluff. Will need to have a lot of weep holes at the concrete walls for natural drainage to reduce hydraulic pressure. Before doing anything to the bluff, will need to do some gentle sloping of the bluff to provide for gradual retaining walls with steel or concrete retaining walls that are similar to rice terraces and plant native vegetation on each terrace. This will mean less surface area on top of the bluff since it will be shaved to reduce the steepness.

My other suggestion is that we need to do this from Mussel Rock to Mori Point in stages. Maybe it can be a public/private venture since the apartments/homes along the bluff will benefit from this combination fix.

Thanks for letting me provide this suggestion.

Irene Lee

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.



CELL-TEK, PROJECTS **SlopeGrid Retaining Wall**

Products Our Work CeResourceslopeGCompanying WGontact

4 years ago Erik Nelson

Blog

4 Channel Hollow Core - The Vancouver Clinic

Rooftop Decks Post Pa

Cell-Tek SlopeGrid® as a Retaining Wall Alternative

Protecting Property on Steep Slopes

Soil won't stand at attention. You cannot command it to stay in place. Steep slopes of 40% grade or more will inevitably slough, shift, or slide. Heavy rainfall will speed soil displacement and frequent precipitation events will not give the soil the opportunity to fully recover.

Nature always wins. If you need a reminder visit the Grand Canyon or other place where water beats rock, given enough time. It's best to find a soil containment solution that keeps soil in place and works in harmony with nature.

Retaining Walls Are One Solution

Conventional landscape solutions for steep slopes include the construction of retaining walls. Retaining walls can provide beauty to a landscape and the surrounding structures while offering functional value and protection by keeping soil in place.

additional expenses the owner will eventually pay for. That's like paying for the project twice.



only solution to protecting steep slopes. Let's look at another solution.

Products

Resources

Our Work

Company

Blog

Contact

Slope Protection Using SlopeGrid

SlopeGrid is a geosynthetic soil reinforcement material. It is a plastic polymer stretched to form a lightweight, high-tensile-strength grid across a slope. The grid acts similarly to reinforcing mesh in concrete, adding strength to the shear strength of the soil. But unlike concrete, there is no water runoff or buildup behind a wall. Soil drainage is an inherent benefit to the design of slopes that use SlopeGrid.

SlopeGrid Retaining Wall Benefits

SlopeGrid consists of a series of interconnected cells and when fastene it will prevent erosion and keep soil in place. SlopeGrid is an economic effective alternative solution to a traditional retaining wall. Benefits of SlopeGrid instead of a traditional retaining wall include:

ı.

I.

Project Benefits

· Economical especially compared to block walls





Blog



Blog



Coastal defence, Okinawa. Coastal defence on Zamami Island protecting the road from the sea with the port in the background.



Concrete breakwater against a blue sky





Breakwater made from concrete tetrapods, Oshima Brige, Sakai, Fukui, Japan





Steenunnerhit IStva

Seacliff

Monterey Rd

Pacifica Nursing & Rehab

-84

Sull van Dr John

Pacifica Esplanade Beach

Millas Cleaning Services

Data CRUMB BFML CAOPC The Bluffs at Pacifica Apartments

I FRAN

A MILLINE









Concrete retaining walls on a high, steep hill slope, old structures in city of Porto, Portugal Captions are provided by our contributors.





Flooded rice paddies stairstep down a mountain slope in Banaue, north of Manila. PHOTOGRAPH BY JOHN JAVELLANA, REUTERS

From:	Samuel Casillas
Sent:	Monday, June 10, 2024 5:29 PM
То:	Public Comment
Subject:	Certification of Final Environmental Impact Report and other associated approvals for
	310-330 Esplanade Avenue Infrastructure Preservation Project
Attachments:	esplanade seawall city council comments 6 10 24.docx

[CAUTION: External Email]

Hello,

Please see my comments for the council meeting tonight for item #14: Certification of Final Environmental Impact Report and other associated approvals for 310-330 Esplanade Avenue Infrastructure Preservation Project.

Thanks,

Sam

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. Pacifica City Council 1800 Francisco Boulevard Pacifica, CA 94044 <u>publiccomment@pacifica.gov</u> CC: California Coastal Commission Staff

Date: June 10, 2024

Subject: Certification of Final Environmental Impact Report and other associated approvals for 310-330 Esplanade Avenue Infrastructure Preservation Project

Dear City Council:

The FEIR for Pacifica's Esplanade Ave project and related CEQA review is fatally flawed and requires a full re-draft due to the current draft's CEQA and Coastal Act violations. These errors need to consider the impact of building a seawall at this location to the erosion it will cause to the adjacent non-hardened bluffs beyond 310-330 Esplanade as well as the effect this seawall will have on beaches north and south of the seawall and any environmental degradation this seawall will cause. The piecemeal placement of this seawall to join two other piecemeal seawalls north and south of this project will cause significant damage to the adjacent beaches and bluff areas do not have hard armoring. The degradation of coastal environmental and recreational assets along the coast is a violation of both CEQA and Coastal Act and these violations need to fully reviewed and rectified before this seawall plan can continue.

These proposed approvals are in violation of the 1980 Pacifica general plan:

- This plan is actually in violation of CEQA Section 21081. Where by its implementation the monitoring program is moot because the project itself cannot avoid significant effects on the environment.
- Coastal Act (CA) Section 30240(a): ESHA must be protected against any significant disruption of valuable habitat, and only uses dependent on such resources shall be allowed. The FEIR has not fully mapped ESHA in this area of the CZ. The city is also required to standardize ESHA buffer zones along the beach/bluff interface which has not occurred in the FEIR.

The city is also ignoring groundwater data at this site that could show soil degradation in 310-330 Esplanade and adjacent area from the latest hydrology data from USGS shows the groundwater hazard through its coSmoS database that would create an erosion hazard and become a public nuisance

The violations to the Coastal Act, CEQA and California Code of Regulations renders the whole of the FEIR invalid and would require a new EIR and considerable revisions to the 310-330 Esplanade infrastructure seawall plan.

By ignoring the potential hazard and environmental restraints data for this site including ground water hazards, erosion, soil stability, SLR and potential protected species habitat the city is in violation of multiple CEQA and state laws, including the Coastal Act.

Also, the city's risk assessment is only for 30 years, but for infrastructure a time horizon of 75-100 year time horizon should be used as dictated by design life policies. The city should be obligated to study the relocation of infrastructure as a viable option for this area.

Regards,

Samuel Casillas Board member, PPCA Past Vice-Chair, Pacifica Economic Development Committee Past Member, Pacifica Sea Level Rise Adaptation Planning Committee Past Co-Chair GGNRA Board Liaison Committee Past Member, Pacifica GPU Community Outreach Committee