

# **Public Comments**

## **Agenda Item 10**

Written Comments Received After 12pm on 4/11/2022



*April 11, 2022*  
*City Council Meeting*

---

**From:** Christine Boles <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** Monday, April 11, 2022 4:39 PM  
**To:** \_City Council Group; Woodhouse, Kevin; Public Comment; Petersen, Lisa; Bautista, Sam  
**Subject:** Consent Agenda Item 10 Manor Overcrossing

**[CAUTION: External Email]**

Good afternoon Mayor Bier, and City Council,

I am excited to see that the Manor overcrossing project has received grant funding and will be proceeding into the next stages of design. I reviewed the contract and scope of work this afternoon and have a few questions. I am hoping that you would consider pulling this item from the consent agenda for discussion this evening.

Questions:

- 1) Packet page 131 talks about a Community Impacts Assessment but says a "full" report is not warranted. Can staff explain why it's not warranted? What might we be missing in a full report that would help us evaluate the alternatives?
- 2) Page 124 says that only one design layout alternative will be looked at, with options for widening or rebuilding, and options for pedestrian and bicycle paths. The design chosen would be the most cost effective solution. Cost effective I assume means construction cost for the project, but not necessarily most cost effective for the community. Might there be another creative option we could look at that would have fewer impacts on our businesses or on the area access and parking during construction? It would be nice to leave open the possibility of another out of the box solution we might come up with in a community meeting.
- 3) It does say two options for a new on-ramp at Milagra will be considered, which again many community members and businesses do not want. I understand you need to do one study as part of this funding exercise, but maybe the other costs associated with a second on ramp design could be better used to consider a possible new design option described in item 2?
- 4) page 127 talks about preparing traffic forecasts for the Design and Opening year, but I'm not sure what they mean by design year, can you ask staff to clarify? Are we considering additional traffic for new housing and commercial in the area per our General Plan update and RHNA numbers? I am assuming a fair number of additional RHNA housing units will be put in the north end of town where we do not have the high traffic/low fire service availability as are serious issues from Vallear south? We really should be working on our Housing Element now so this work and these decisions can be coordinated
- 5) page 131 section 3.3.8 says a conceptual stage construction plan will be created for the refined options, but I would argue that this should be done for all options considered as traffic and staging for the duration of construction might factor into the choice of the preferred option for the community.
- 6) Can staff confirm if all of the remedial work called out to be performed in the 4/13/2004 CalTrans Bridge Inspection Report has been done? Does some of this need to be done in the years before the final project is built to ensure ongoing safety for pedestrians and vehicles?

Thank you!

Christine Boles, Architect

**Beausoleil Architects**

[REDACTED]

Pacifica, CA 94044

[REDACTED]

[www.beausoleil-architects.com](http://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.