Public Comments
Agenda Item 2

October 11, 2021

City Council Meeting

From: Public Comment
Subject: FW: Manor Overcrossing and onramp to Highway 1 North on Milagra

From: Beckmeyer, Sue <beckmeyers@ci.pacifica.ca.us>
Sent: Friday, October 8, 2021 1:06 PM

Begin forwarded message:

From: D Gold <[redacted]>
Date: October 8, 2021 at 12:44:30 PM PDT
To: "Beckmeyer, Sue" <beckmeyers@ci.pacifica.ca.us>, "Bier, Mary" <bierm@ci.pacifica.ca.us>, "Vaterlaus, Sue" <vaterlauss@ci.pacifica.ca.us>, "O'Neill, Mike" <o'neillm@ci.pacifica.ca.us>, "Bigstyck, Tygarjas" <bigstyckt@ci.pacifica.ca.us>
Subject: Manor Overcrossing and onramp to Highway 1 North on Milagra

[CAUTION: External Email]

Dear Mayor Beckmeryer and City Councilmembers,

I am writing to urge you to pull item 8, the Manor Drive Overcrossing, from the consent calendar and schedule the item for another meeting so that the community can have input on this project.

In 2019, I attended two community meetings at which I and many others in the Pacific Manor community expressed our strong opposition to this proposal. We signed up on mailing lists to get further information, and we have gotten no information, until learning of this item on the consent calendar.

There are many reasons to oppose this project. For one, the proposed Milagra on-ramp will create more traffic on neighborhood streets, and it is likely not conforming to highway design standards in terms of distance from other onramps. There are many alternatives that were discussed by community members at the meetings in 2019, and it appears that NONE of them were considered.

Apparently this project has proceeded outside of public view, with the excuse of pandemic restrictions. However, the many community members who have spent hours dealing with this project have not been kept informed. This is very poor process for our little city.

Please remove this item from the consent calendar, and schedule a robust discussion.

Thank you.

D. Gold
Pacific Manor

Public Comments
Agenda Item 10

October 11, 2021

City Council Meeting

From: Coffey, Sarah
Sent: Monday, October 11, 2021 8:47 AM
To: Public Comment
Subject: FW: Agenda-Land Acknowledgement

From: Ish and Vern Villalobos <[redacted]>
Sent: Sunday, October 10, 2021 12:01 PM
To: Beckmeyer, Sue <beckmeyers@ci.pacifica.ca.us>; O'Neill, Mike <o'neillm@ci.pacifica.ca.us>; Bigstyck, Tygarjas <bigstyckt@ci.pacifica.ca.us>; Bier, Mary <bierm@ci.pacifica.ca.us>; Vaterlaus, Sue <vaterlauss@ci.pacifica.ca.us>; Bliss, Sydney <sbliss@pacifica.gov>; Brooks, Elizabeth <ebrooks@pacifica.gov>; City Manager <cmoffice@pacifica.gov>; Coffey, Sarah <scoffey@pacifica.gov>
Cc: #1 ish [redacted]
Subject: Agenda-Land Acknowledgement

[CAUTION: External Email]

Mayor Beckmeyer and City Council,

Thank you for creating the Ramaytush Land Acknowledgement. As an enrolled member of the Omaha Tribe of Nebraska it brings a sense of welcoming and a positive step towards repatriation. There are so many days when I'm grateful that my family lives in this beautiful town. This is the Ramaytush peoples ancestral homeland. They lived here before it was Pacifica, before it was the United States. They are the original stewards of the land, they raised their children here, lived and died here. Today, the Ramaytush are still here even though there's only one family lineage left after colonization, genocide and ethnocide. Today, some Land Acknowledgements have resulted in better relationships with communities and American Indian tribes. By the Pacifica City Council Acknowledging this is an act of respect while supporting the original history of Pacifica.

I've been made aware of some residents who may not approve of your efforts. I believe education is the best way of understanding information. The link to California Law, ***AB-1968 Tribal Land Acknowledgment Act of 2020*** is https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billTextClient.xhtml?bill_id=201920200AB1968.

Sometimes;

- Advocating for people is difficult, might cause discomfort and sometimes you'll be alone in the process.
- American Indians are no more than 2% of the US population, due to genocide and diseases brought by colonizers.
- Doing what is right isn't always easy.
- American Indian history is United States history.
- Ramaytush history is Pacifica history.

I support your efforts and I am hopeful that this resolution will pass with an unanimous vote.
I do have a comment about the words ***"uninvited guests"*** -it puts a negative tone on the Land Acknowledgement and unless approved by The Association of Ramaytush Ohlone, perhaps another word would be more welcoming and positive?

I'm out of town and celebrating my 30th anniversary through tomorrow but I will try to attend the City Council if it's ZOOM.

Thank you for your service,

Laverne Villalobos
Member of the Omaha Tribe of Nebraska
Homeowner and resident of Pacifica
[redacted]

Public Comments
Agenda Item 12

October 11, 2021

City Council Meeting

From: Christine Boles <[redacted]
Sent: Monday, October 11, 2021 10:07 AM
To: Murdock, Christian
Cc: Wehrmeister, Tina; Woodhouse, Kevin; _City Council Group; Public Comment
Subject: Re: LCP updates?

[CAUTION: External Email]

Good morning Christian and Tina,
In preparation for tonight's Council meeting, agenda item 12, is it possible to get an update on where we stand with the Coastal Commission for the LCLUP update? Has there been further communication to/from the CCC since the January 12, 2021 letter that is attached below? These documents used to be on the Plan.Pacifica website, but I am longer able to find them.

I am particularly concerned about Item 5 (copied below) in this letter from the Coastal Commission as there have been several recent projects approved by the Planning Commission and City Council in the Coastal Zone that have been subsequently denied by the Coastal Commission. The project on Danmann is being heard on appeal this Friday and the staff report recommends the Commission take over responsibility for the project due to a "substantial issue with regards to coastal hazards" that were not properly addressed by the City.

"5. Suggested Modifications. While we have made progress in prior discussions on the draft LCLUP update, we note that the City did not incorporate a number of edits and feedback provided by Commission staff throughout the City's review and approval process for this draft update. Specifically, it seems that Commission and City staff continue to disagree on the natural hazards and coastal resilience policies and definitions. Without progress on these major differences, Commission staff expects to suggest a significant number of modifications to the draft update. Therefore, it is likely that we will identify, and where necessary propose, suggested modifications to address such issue areas as part of our ongoing review of the proposed LCLUP update transmitted to date."

I am hoping that by now we are close to having an LCLUP draft that the Coastal Commission can sign off on so we can move forward with other major projects and redevelopment in the coastal zone with the certainty that we are properly addressing erosion and sea level rise.

Thank you.

Christine Boles, Architect

Beausoleil Architects

[redacted]

Pacifica, CA 94044

[redacted]

www.beausoleil-architects.com

"Do your little bit of good where you are; it's those little bits of good put together that overwhelm the world." - Desmond Tutu

On Mon, Jan 25, 2021 at 9:06 AM Murdock, Christian <murdockc@ci.pacifica.ca.us> wrote:

Hi Christine,

Please find the last CCC staff filing letter and referenced attachment included with this email. The comments pertain to descriptive requirements of the City's filing with the CCC and do not include substantive comments on the contents of the Certification Draft LCP, except to the extent Item 5 notes ongoing differences between the City and CCC in relation to natural hazards and coastal resilience policies and definitions. The CCC's positions on these issues have already been made a part of the public record during the LCP update process.

Regards,

Christian

CHRISTIAN MURDOCK, AICP

DEPUTY DIRECTOR OF PLANNING

CITY OF PACIFICA | PLANNING DEPARTMENT

1800 Francisco Boulevard, Pacifica, CA 94044

Phone: (650) 738 – 7444 | murdockc@ci.pacifica.ca.us

From: Christine Boles [mailto [redacted]
Sent: Thursday, January 21, 2021 1:58 PM
To: Murdock, Christian <murdockc@ci.pacifica.ca.us>
Cc: Wehrmeister, Tina <twehrmeister@pacifica.gov>
Subject: Re: LCP updates?

[CAUTION: External Email]

Thank you, Christian, can you please share that communication and add it to the website for the public? The last correspondence I found posted is from October 2018. https://www.cityofpacifica.org/depts/planning/sea_level_rise.asp

This is really important to the upcoming discussion about the sea wall.

Christine Boles, Architect

Beausoleil Architects

[redacted]

Pacifica, CA 94044

[redacted]

www.beausoleil-architects.com

"Do your little bit of good where you are; it's those little bits of good put together that overwhelm the world." - Desmond Tutu

On Thu, Jan 21, 2021 at 1:49 PM Murdock, Christian <murdockc@ci.pacifica.ca.us> wrote:

> Hi Christine,
>
> The City is still working with the Coastal Commission through the certification process. We received additional comments in January on our second submission from December.
>
> Regards,
>
> Christian
>
> On Jan 21, 2021, at 12:14, Christine Boles [redacted] wrote:

[CAUTION: External Email]

Hi Christian,

Can you tell me where the city stands on this update with the Coastal Commission? I'm trying to educate myself before the next sea wall meeting.

Thank you,

Christine Boles, Architect

Beausoleil Architects

[redacted]

Pacifica, CA 94044

[redacted]

www.beausoleil-architects.com

"Do your little bit of good where you are; it's those little bits of good put together that overwhelm the world." - Desmond Tutu

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.

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: Monday, October 11, 2021 12:55 PM
To: Public Comment
Subject: FW: Please accept the attached for tonight's City Council Meeting - Agenda Item #12
Attachments: Comments for Agenda Item #12 11 October 2021.docx

---

From: Clif Lawrence [redacted]>
Sent: Monday, October 11, 2021 12:36 PM
To: Coffey, Sarah <scoffey@pacifica.gov>
Cc: _City Council Group <CityCouncil@ci.pacifica.ca.us>
Subject: Please accept the attached for tonight's City Council Meeting - Agenda Item #12

Sarah,
Please accept the attached as comments for tonight's City Council Agenda Item #12.

Thank you,

Clif Lawrence

Re City Council 11 October 2021 Agenda Item #12

I applauded the sentiments.... “The respondent agrees with the finding(s)” Then I had to go back and re-read the opening paragraph...

I’m paraphrasing here... The City responses “SEEM” to relate to DRAFT documents...

Is that kosher?

Since the topic is “Sea Level Rise”, a topic of discussion post-dating our 1980 General Plan... our responses to a County Grand Jury hang on a referenced DRAFT document... that as far as I know has not yet been made public.
I don’t know if it’s even been shared with City Council.

Then again, how much weight can a draft document have, when a draft is a considered to be a document still in the process of change?

We’re going to tell the Grand Jury, the draft is “scheduled” for adoption hearing in the Spring of 2022. Will we also mention this date has been sliding. Or that there was at least one earlier failed attempt in 2014. I recall that earlier this year in a goal setting workshop, it was suggested we did not need to include a new General Plan in our goals for this year, because there was no question of its completion in this calendar year.

How can we attest to a Grand Jury that we “agree”, seemingly based on a DRAFT document that has been a draft document for years.
...and still not public? That is, I am assuming the reference is to a Post-2019 Draft Document. Or are we referencing a 2014 Draft Document; which in INS terms would be described as “Out Of Status”.

I hope someone, more articulate than I will share these or other concerns with the Grand Jury.

Sincerely, with grave concerns,
Clifford Lawrence

11 October 2021

We've been talking about the Draft General Plan for so long... it's seems to have taken on some reality...like it's a real document. Who has seen it?

Did the contractors who were working on it finish their two-year gig and split town?

Their Plan Pacifica website looks like it has not been updated in a year.