

Public Comments

Agenda Item 7

Written Comments Received After 12pm on 2/28/2022



February 28, 2022

City Council Meeting

From: Christine Boles <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, February 28, 2022 4:39 PM
To: Berman, Lauren; Domurat, George; Ferguson, Alex; Godwin, James; Hauser, Samantha; Leal, David; Murdock, Christian; Nibbelin, John; Public Comment; Wehrmeister, Tina; Woodhouse, Kevin; _City Council Group
Subject: Consent agenda item 7, SB9

[CAUTION: External Email]

Dear Mayor Bier, Mayor Pro-Tem Bigstych, Council Members, Planning Commissioners and staff,

I respectfully ask you to pull this item from the Consent Calendar tonight. While I agree that Planning staff needs to work on our policies for addressing SB9, the interim policies and guidelines included in this item need a good deal of further discussion and refinement.

A few things you should be aware of:

- 1) this bill is very controversial and quite a few California cities are already suing the state in regards to this law. Has the City Attorney reviewed and opined on these matters?
- 2) the law contains poorly written restrictions for controlling density increases in high fire risk areas. I spoke with an official at Cal Fire a week and a half ago and they are working quickly to write these standards at the request of many municipalities in the state.
- 3) There is no mention in the city's draft guidelines in this staff report about restrictions in high fire, or other high hazard areas, such as in areas with coastal erosion. And we know our current fire, landslide, and coastal erosion maps need major work. I have a 20 page letter almost ready to send you regarding the DEIR fire issues after my discussions with Cal Fire. I'm on vacation now and will get it to you before the 8th.
- 4) the law as written allows setbacks of only 4' on sides and 4' at the rear (currently 20') for most residential zoning. This can dramatically affect reductions in landscaping, cutting down trees, reducing privacy screening, and reducing the ability of a site to manage storm water.

We need more comprehensive guidelines in place to guide staff in their review as they are the only ones who will be able to review these applications, not the Planning Commission or City Council, as only administrative review is allowed by SB9.

Please pull this item and put it on the regular agenda for a later meeting, ideally a joint study session with the planning commission.

Sincerely,
Christine Boles

--
Christine

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

Written Comments Received After 12pm on 2/28/2022



February 28, 2022

City Council Meeting

From: wxyz wxyz [REDACTED] >
Sent: Monday, February 28, 2022 5:03 PM
To: k f
Cc: Public Comment
Subject: Contract Award NOT No Bid PRC-

[CAUTION: External Email]

contract award to PRC is artificially rushed and ill advised. Need contract to go out to bid, as HMB has done. lifemoves.org is a seasoned and sophisticated service provider. has financials on their website. A serious board, complete staff bios, an advisory committee. Multi-million dollar program. PRC has no metrics on the website that show any level of housing success. What PRC does engage in is self congratulatory back-patting and unverified claims of placements. Finally, the contract and ultimate city vendor to run this 13-space program must honor ca public records law

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.

From: kathryn fontwit [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, February 28, 2022 5:05 PM
To: Public Comment
Cc: Public Comment
Subject: Re: Contract Award NOT No Bid PRC-

[CAUTION: External Email]

Also I Insist Council Bigstycck recuse himself. His previous history as a PRC Board Member limits his ability to remain impartial, especially when it comes to our tax dollars

From: wxyz wxyz [REDACTED] >
Sent: Monday, February 28, 2022 5:03 PM
To: k f
Cc: publiccomment@pacificca.gov
Subject: Contract Award NOT No Bid PRC-

contract award to PRC is artificially rushed and ill advised. Need contract to go out to bid, as HMB has done.
lifemoves.org is a seasoned and sophisticated service provider. has financials on their website. A serious board, complete staff bios, an advisory committee. Multi-million dollar program. PRC has no metrics on the website that show any level of housing success. What PRC does engage in is self congratulatory back-patting and unverified claims of placements. Finally, the contract and ultimate city vendor to run this 13-space program must honor ca public records law
Get [Outlook for iOS](#)

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.

Public Comments

Agenda Item 12

Written Comments Received After 12pm on 2/28/2022



February 28, 2022
City Council Meeting

From: Christine Boles [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, March 1, 2022 11:21 AM
To: Berman, Lauren; Domurat, George; Ferguson, Alex; Godwin, James; Hauser, Samantha; Leal, David; Murdock, Christian; Nibbelin, John; Petersen, Lisa; Public Comment; Marquez, Ryan; Wehrmeister, Tina; Woodhouse, Kevin; _City Council Group
Subject: Follow up to last night's Council meeting on SB9 and Manor armoring

[CAUTION: External Email]

Good day Council Members, Planning Commissioners and staff,
I'm currently on vacation in Hawaii celebrating my 30th wedding anniversary and was a bit scattered last night without my computer. The time limits on comments was frustrating too, especially for the Manor armoring issues as I had to cut sections out at the last minute. I wanted to follow up on a few things.

1) SB9 - I appreciate hearing that the City is against this law and wants to tighten restrictions to better weed out inappropriate or dangerous projects. There's a lot of good in what Planning Staff wrote in the guidelines to use the strictest interpretations allowed. What's missing though, and what would be the biggest help, is clear policy about limiting building in hazardous areas.

Here's part of the text of SB9. It gives a lot of discretion to the building official about issues of public safety.

(d) Notwithstanding subdivision (a), a local agency may deny a proposed housing development project if the building official makes a written finding, based upon a preponderance of the evidence, that the proposed housing development project

would have a specific, adverse impact, as defined and determined in paragraph (2) of subdivision (d) of Section 65589.5, upon public health and safety or the physical environment and for which there is no feasible method to satisfactorily mitigate or avoid the specific, adverse impact.

Right now, with our old General Plan, and our poor draft Safety Element and incomplete hazard maps in the DEIR, planning and building staff do not have the necessary tools to evaluate a site for safety issues like fire and landslides. I urge you to make updating these sections of the GP a top priority. We can revise and approve these sections while we're still working on updating the others. These sections are foundational for the others, like the Sharp Park Specific Plan, anyway.

Language could have been added to the guidelines presented last night as well, and perhaps you can still direct staff to add such language as an amendment to what was approved last night. This is an example of where public input earlier on could have helped you craft better guidelines to help meet your goals. The public can be a great resource for you, but you have to allow us into the process earlier on. I have seen time and again where you seem to value our input, but then vote to approve what is before you anyway because of time constraints and the sense of urgency. How can we improve processes and communication so that the public can better serve as your partners in improving the city?

2) As I'm sure you could tell in my voice last night, I am livid about the way the Manor bluff armoring was handled last night. The fact that you all (except Mayor Bier, thank you) decided to move ahead with more rock revêtement without any public outreach or engagement is infuriating. The consultant basically assumed that hardly anyone uses this beach. They said on packet page 328 that the "area is not accessible on a daily basis due to tides". Did anyone do counts or survey residents to see how they used the beach? I walk there often and am always amazed at how many people and dogs use this beach given how hard it is to access it. I used to walk there myself, but can't access now since the storms of October and December 2021 caused more major bluff erosion AFTER the temporary boulders were put in place.

Rock revetment isn't working because it does nothing to alleviate the erosion of the tops of the cliffs caused by rainfall. The consultant didn't even answer my technical question about this issue last night. Are we just spending more money and valuable staff time pursuing solutions that don't actually buy us any long term resiliency? I can't answer that question with the information presented last night, can you?

So now with your vote, it seems we are we stuck only looking at revetment as an option. Boulders placed on the beach limit beach width and the ability to walk on this already very narrow beach. Would one of the other options of using shotcrete have better protected the beach width? We'll never know because we never even got to ask the question.

And doesn't the Coastal Commission require beach access and robust public engagement? Has the decision made in haste last night after midnight when everyone was too tired to think critically about such a complex issue actually compromised our ability to obtain permits for any project in this location?

I have so many more questions and the 2 minutes allotted was really insulting given all the work I have put in to trying to understand these issues that are so critical to District 2. Perhaps more reflection on your council goals of an engaged community can be discussed during goal setting.

Sincerely,
Christine Boles

--

Christine

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.