



**CITY OF PACIFICA
CITY COUNCIL MINUTES**

**Council Chambers
2212 Beach Blvd
Pacifica, CA 94044**

Mayor Mike O'Neill
Mayor Pro Tem John Keener
Councilmember Sue Digre
Councilmember Sue Vaterlaus
Councilmember Deirdre Martin

**June 12, 2017 (MONDAY)
www.cityofpacifica.org**

Mayor Mike O'Neill called the meeting to order on June 12, 2017 at 7:00 PM

CLOSED SESSION - NONE.

7:00 PM OPEN SESSION

Call to Order

Mayor O'Neill asked Council if they were okay with leaving the Warrior's game on the monitors.

Councilmember Digre asked if there were any legal questions.

Asst. City Attorney Doherty stated that it was not a problem.

Mayor O'Neill stated that the presentation from Seton Medical Center will be postponed due to an automobile accident preventing their presence at the meeting. He stated that Item 16, Growth Management Ordinance will be moved up to a public hearing and will follow Item 11. He stated that he hoped to move Item 13 to the last item of the meeting as their report was over an hour.

Councilmember Digre questioned putting them at the end with the possibility of being cancelled because they are running late.

Mayor O'Neill asked if Council wanted to cancel or postpone that item.

Councilmember Digre stated that she wasn't asking to cancel or postpone it, unless they were agreeable to postponing it.

Mayor O'Neill restated that the Seton Report would be postponed, Item 16 will be moved to Item 12 under public hearing and Item 13 will be moved to the last agenda item, Item 17.

Mayor pro Tem Keener asked if they needed a motion.

Mayor O'Neill asked the Asst. City Attorney if they needed a motion now or later in the meeting.

Asst. City Attorney stated that they can make a motion to amend the agenda now.

Mayor O'Neill asked for a volunteer to make the motion.

Mayor pro Tem Keener moved to amend the agenda as the Mayor described; seconded by Councilmember Vaterlaus.

5-0

Attendee Name	Title	Status	Arrived
Mike O'Neill	Mayor	Present	
John Keener	Mayor Pro Tem	Present	
Sue Digre	Councilmember	Present	
Sue Vaterlaus	Councilmember	Present	
Deirdre Martin	Councilmember	Present	

Staff Present: Keith Breskin, Interim City Manager; Nira Doherty, Asst. City Attorney; Van Ocampo, Public Works Director; Tina Wehrmeister, Planning Director; Dan Steidle, Police Chief; Mike Perez, PB&R Director; PW Sr. Civil Engr. Raymond Donguines; Bonny O'Connor, Asst. Planner; Robert Smith, Asst. Planner; Ed Vandehey, MIS Mgr.; Kathy O'Connell, City Clerk.

Salute to the Flag led by Councilmember Digre

Closed Session Report

None.

SPECIAL PRESENTATIONS

John Ferrelli, CEO Seton Medical Center

Kellyx Nelson - San Mateo County Conservation District

Kellyx Nelson, of the San Mateo County Conservation District, made a presentation, briefly explaining that the organization provides technical assistance, facilitates projects, planning and outreach, done through partnerships with other groups. She mentioned their four areas, water, climate, wildlife and agriculture. She first focused on water monitoring of bacteria, etc., next on climate to address reducing greenhouse gases, fires, etc., next wildlife by dealing with habitats of endangered species, etc., and concluded by mentioning the various areas where they partner with groups and individuals to accomplish goals.

Councilmember Digre thanked her for the presentation and asked if she could tell them if there is an erosion problem in San Pedro Creek.

Ms. Nelson responded that there was in areas where the banks were cut away but it presented a win-win situation, mentioning that the problem has been accelerated by human land use.

Mayor pro Tem Keener thanked her for the presentation and asked if their group was involved in the notice sent to residents regarding pet waste.

Ms. Nelson responded that they were not, adding that almost all their outreach has been digital.

Associate Engineer Donguines stated that, as part of the TMDL, the water board required Public Works to do the mailer to Pacificans.

Ms. Nelson stated that as part of the TMDL, they were working for funding to deal with pet waste and they will be hearing more about it.

Councilmember Vaterlaus thanked her for the presentation, stating it was most informative.

Mayor O'Neill commented that they are a special district, and he asked how they are funded.

Ms. Nelson stated that a modest budget comes from a property tax base but the larger portion of their budget is almost entirely grant funded.

Mayor O'Neill asked if they have been in touch with the 4H farms in the county.

Ms. Nelson stated that they provide technical assistance to them.

Mayor O'Neill mentioned that the 4H in Pacifica brings their waste to the community garden for recycling. He thanked her, adding that he had never heard of her organization before.

Ms. Nelson stated that some know about them and others think they are the best kept secret.

Proclamation - Amateur Radio Week

Mayor O'Neill then read a proclamation honoring Amateur Radio Week.

Councilmember Digre stated that they are very valuable, mentioning that, during earthquakes, they are one of the few ways to reach relatives.

Mayor O'Neill mentioned attending the event on Sweeney Ridge when he was first on Council. He stated that it was a wet foggy night and they were communicating with people from many countries.

CONSENT CALENDAR

Mayor O'Neill stated that he had a card to pull off Item #10. He referred to Item #5, asking, after they pull out the \$72,000, if they will know the balance.

Interim City Manager Breskin stated that the balance will be over \$900,000.

Mayor O'Neill stated that he noticed that it was because there was a drop in enrollment and he asked if this was because of that decline in enrollment.

Interim City Manager Breskin stated that he would have to defer to PB&R Dir. Perez.

PB&R Dir. Perez asked the mayor to repeat the question.

Mayor O'Neill thought this was the first time they pulled the money out of there, and he asked if it was across all grade levels because he thought there was declining enrollment in the district as a whole. He thought it would be affecting the number of children needing daycare.

PB&R Dir. Perez stated that the pre-school was a bigger impact. He stated that next year eligibility income for the subsidized families was going to be raised and they are expecting an increase in enrollment. He stated that, since 2008, they have made more than they spent and this was the first time that they haven't. He stated that the money goes back to the city so it was part of the subsidy.

Mayor O'Neill stated that Pacifica was eligible for funding and he asked if that funding was in danger because of all the talk in Washington.

PB&R Dir. Perez stated that they don't see that now, but prior to this year, when there was Washington talk, there was a lot of state talk. He stated that the state will get worked up and everything will be okay. He stated that this year, the opposite is true because of the eligibility requirements. He stated that they were looking to do well next year with no issues. He stated that, if something comes up, they will let them know.

Mayor O'Neill stated that the federal funding was for the big lift and the rest of the county will be totally eliminated by the federal government.

Mayor O'Neill pulled Item #10.

Councilmember Vaterlaus moved to approve the consent calendar with elimination of Item #10; seconded by Mayor pro Tem Keener.

RESULT:	ADOPTED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER:	Sue Vaterlaus, Councilmember
SECONDER:	John Keener, Mayor Pro Tem
AYES:	O'Neill, Keener, Digre, Vaterlaus, Martin

1. Approval of Disbursements for 04/12/17 through 4/26/17 & 05/05/17 through 05/15/17.
PROPOSED ACTION: Move to approve attached list of disbursements for 04/12/17 through 4/26/17 & 05/05/17 through 05/15/17.
2. Approval of Minutes
PROPOSED ACTION: Move to approve the minutes of the regular meeting held on May 8, 2017 and May 22, 2017 and a special meeting held on May 16, 2017.
3. Proclamation Confirming Existence of Local Emergency of the Pacifica Coastline from Westline Drive to the End of Beach Boulevard.
PROPOSED ACTION: Accept current photos as of June 6, 2017 (Attachment 2) and move to continue proclamation confirming the existence of local emergency.
4. Revisions to Job Description for Code Enforcement Officer
PROPOSED ACTION: Approve revisions to the Code Enforcement Officer job description.
5. Request to Transfer Revenues from the Child Care Reserve Account to the General Fund in the Amount of \$72,457 for the 2015-2016 Fiscal Year.
PROPOSED ACTION: Approve to transfer revenues from the Child Care reserve account to the General Fund in the amount of \$72,457 for the 2015-2016 fiscal year.

6. Authorize the Senior Services Programs to Submit Applications to San Mateo County Area Agency on Aging for OAA Grant Funding for Fiscal Year 2017-2018.
PROPOSED ACTION: Authorize staff to prepare documents and the City Manager to sign contractual agreements and any amendments with the County of San Mateo Area Agency on Aging for Congregate Nutrition, Transportation, Home Delivered Meals and Supplemental Home Delivered Meals programs for the fiscal year 2017-2018. Authorize staff to pursue future one-time only funds, State funds or County support if they become available during fiscal year 2017-2018.

7. Notice of Completion for the Hazardous Materials Abatement and Demolition of 310 Esplanade Avenue.
PROPOSED ACTION: Adopt the resolution next in order a Resolution of the City Council of the City of Pacifica accepting completion and directing the City Manager to file Notice of Completion for the Hazardous Materials Abatement and Demolition of 310 Esplanade Avenue.

8. Approval of Construction Services Agreement Between the City of Pacifica and R.E. Staite Engineering, Inc. for the Pacifica Pier Wall Caps Replacement Project
PROPOSED ACTION: Move to approve the Construction Services Agreement between the City of Pacifica and R.E. Staite Engineering, Inc. (Attachment 1) in the amount of \$83,750 for the Pacifica Pier Wall Caps Replacement Project, and authorize the City Manager to execute the agreement.

9. Approval of Consultant Services Agreement Between the City of Pacifica and Alta Planning & Design for Professional Design Services for the 400 Block Esplanade Coastal Trail
PROPOSED ACTION: Approve the Consultant Services Agreement between the City of Pacifica and Alta Planning & Design to provide professional design services (Attachment 1) for the 400 Block Esplanade Coastal Trail for an amount not-to-exceed \$75,000 and authorize the City Manager to execute the agreement

10. Letter of Opposition to Governor Brown Related to Proposition 64 Trailer Bill
PROPOSED ACTION: Authorize the Mayor to send the letter of opposition to Governor Brown related to the Proposition 64 trailer bill.

Mayor O'Neill opened public comments.

David Whitney, Pacifica, stated that at the March 6 meeting, Council discussed the trailer proposals on taxation of medical and recreational marijuana, but they seemed not decided on the legality of it. He stated that he belonged to the Howard Jarvis Association and he wrote to the legal department. They responded regarding his question on excise taxes for recreation and medical marijuana and whether either of them can be banned. Their answer was that cities may tax recreational marijuana but not medical marijuana, and they may be able to tax cultivation and harvesting of medical marijuana but not sales. They also stated that the city should be able to ban recreational marijuana dispensaries and medical dispensaries. They also stated that, if the city does ban them, they should inform the state. He referred to his comment that there would be repercussions, and he said that, with this trailer, there will be repercussions and they will have a central control to decide everything, including taking the illegal operations'

rights away for legal pursuits. He felt the city will lose money if everyone goes to the medical and recreational will be zapped. He stated that a license will only be able to do medical or recreational, but not both. He stated that Pacifica should be like South San Francisco and San Bruno who don't want to deal with the legal problems. He stated that the city was out of control, mentioning that the Planning Commission meeting wanted to push everywhere.

Bridget Duffy, Pacifica, stated that she wasn't familiar enough with the issue to speak, but she wanted to raise the point that, when there is a transitional period, such as the country went from legal slaves to freeing slaves, there was a necessity for a higher authority because of fears and prejudices at that time. She stated that we have been under falsehoods of cannabis for many decades and know the reasons why, having to do with money. She mentioned Hearst not liking the competition of hemp, which are renowned worldwide for their durability. She stated that she was a fan and she suggested that everyone relax. She stated that it was important that they are going through a transition and not everyone feels the same way, but the law is the law and it has medical value and is now legal to use it recreationally. She stated that education would be better than trying to fight it or get local control and educate the public. She stated that the fears that exist are like the fears that people have about people of other races, even though slavery has been gone for many years.

Mayor O'Neill stated that he didn't have any more cards and closed comments but the Police Chief wanted to talk and it will be, in essence, a staff report.

Police Chief Steidle stated that he was prepared to speak on it, but he was ready to entertain any questions about the staff report.

Mayor pro Tem Keener referred to staff report regarding repeal of the state medical marijuana ID program, stating that repealing the program will result in locals taking a hit in sales tax revenue. He stated that he didn't follow that and asked if he could explain it.

Police Chief Steidle stated that staff was approached by the League of California States as well as the California Police Chief's Association on the bullet point items. He stated that the medical cannabis regulation safety act was enacted in Sacramento in 2015, part of the act was people wanting to get medical cannabis free of state sales tax would have to get a state medical marijuana card. He stated that there were only a few thousand of those in existence in California. Most of them are getting recommendations from doctors in different ways. He stated that, in 2015, they said you have to have the card if you want that break. He stated that, to get the card, you have to jump through a few hoops for a legitimate medical need. He stated that in 2016 when they passed Prop. 64, with recreational marijuana being legal, there was no exemption you had to pay sales tax and any excise taxes. He stated that, if they repeal the medical marijuana program, things will stay as they are today and anyone who can telephone a doctor and get a written recommendation, can skip the state process and get the marijuana tax free. He stated that there won't be any incentive to vet those who need it for medical purposes and those using it for recreational purposes. He stated that the analysis done by the League of Cities stated what was likely going to happen was those who don't have a legitimate medical need and really belong in the recreational program and paying taxes and not getting the tax break are going to continue with letters of recommendation and getting it tax free and where the cities will take the hit in the sales tax. He concluded that those who should be paying sales tax will skirt the system and will not pay sales tax.

Mayor pro Tem Keener asked confirmation that the trailer bill advocates repealing the state medical marijuana ID card program which is the program many people have signed on for.

Police Chief Steidle stated that he was correct.

Mayor pro Tem Keener thought that was more stringent than the other form of medical marijuana approvals which are a signed note from your doctor.

Police Chief Steidle stated that was also correct.

Mayor pro Tem Keener concluded that this would affect the marijuana card ID program, and he asked if the trailer bill would affect getting the signed notes from your doctor and using that to get medical marijuana.

Police Chief Steidle understood that you would still be able to get marijuana in that fashion.

Mayor pro Tem Keener concluded that this would just take out the state ID program and leave the doctor's notes for medical marijuana.

Police Chief Steidle explained that it would take out the state ID as a requirement and he thought it allow counties to do it voluntarily.

Mayor pro Tem Keener asked if medical marijuana was subject to excise tax as recreational marijuana is, if the jurisdiction passes an excise tax.

Police Chief Steidle stated that was correct.

Mayor pro Tem Keener referred to repeal of over concentration language, and he thought it would hurt fragile neighborhoods and weaken efforts to prevent an over concentration of marijuana in retail sites, and asked what over concentration language would be repealed.

Asst. City Attorney Doherty stated that there was language in the AUMA, Prop. 64, that limits over concentration, and clarified that concentration levels of various cannabinoids are supposed to be articulated in the state regulations. She stated that the trailer bill would eliminate that over concentration language and negating the need for the various state agencies who are charged with the responsibilities to promulgate the regulations for implementation of the AUMA from establishing those over concentration limits.

Mayor pro Tem Keener stated that he was glad he asked, as he took a different meaning to over concentration.

Mayor O'Neill asked if that meant that, for the proposal from the Planning Commission that limits the city to six retail sites, they could not regulate the number of dispensaries in Pacifica.

Asst. City Attorney Doherty stated that it does not change that.

Mayor O'Neill concluded that the city could still regulate it to six.

Asst. City Attorney Doherty responded affirmatively.

Mayor pro Tem Keener stated that was his point. He thought that also, and the over concentration to which the language was referring was the actual concentration of THC or cannabinoids in the product. He wondered what concentration was permitted now.

Asst. City Attorney Doherty stated that she did not know off the top of her head, as it was different concentrations for different types of cannabinoids.

Mayor O'Neill stated that it doesn't make sense with what it says in the staff report, reading that the staff report states that repeat of the language will hurt fragile neighborhoods and weaken efforts to prevent an over concentration of marijuana retail sites. He stated that the Planning Commission passed it and she stated they could still regulate six, but she was saying that over concentration of the product, not the sales.

Asst. City Attorney Doherty stated that was her understanding of the trailer bill, but she could look up Section 26051 now.

Mayor O'Neill suggested she look it up.

Mayor pro Tem Keener stated that she can look it up while he asks his final question, referring to page 2, third bullet, which mentioned the need to clarify government ability to apply for grants. He stated that it addressed a question many cities have asked, whether they could have clear rules on what can and cannot be banned and still allow a city to retain eligibility for grant monies. He asked what kind of grants they were talking about.

Police Chief Steidle stated that it was his understanding they were going to talking about grants for enforcement, similar to alcohol establishments with A, B, C, if they have grants to give the city. He stated that the California Police Chiefs Association was telling them that some of the excise tax money that the state collects, 15% on marijuana sales, may be eligible to receive by law enforcement agencies.

Mayor pro Tem Keener thought there was some uncertainty of what can and cannot be banned to allow them to remain eligible for the grant funds.

Police Chief Steidle stated that it was vague and uncertain and the organizations are asking for more clarity.

Asst. City Attorney Doherty stated that she looked up Section 26051 of Prop. 64, and she stated that Mayor O'Neill was correct that it relates to a concentration of marijuana retail establishments, but the trailer bill would not restrict the city from limiting the number of establishments to six. She explained that the trailer bill repeals language related to unreasonable restraints on competition, perpetuate an illegal market and encourage underage use or adult abuse by the licensing authority of the state issuing the various licenses for non-medical marijuana. She stated that it would remove some of the provisions that the state agencies are currently required to consider in issuing a state license but does not impact a local agency's right to make those considerations.

Mayor O'Neill concluded that the state could license 50 establishments for Pacifica but the city could limit it to six.

Asst. City Attorney Doherty responded affirmatively. She stated that there are changes to cannabinoid concentration levels also, but that was not what was intended by the bullet point.

Mayor O'Neill clarified that the proposal from the Planning Commission limits the number of establishments in Pacifica to six.

Councilmember Vaterlaus referred to mention of tax, and asked confirmation that there are cities that charge the excise tax currently on medicinal marijuana.

Asst. City Attorney Doherty stated that there are cities that have approved medicinal and non-medicinal excise tax. She did not know if there were cities currently assessing the tax on non-medical marijuana establishments.

Councilmember Digre asked if the governor gave a reason why he wanted all these things.

Police Chief Steidle understood that, when medical cannabis regulation safety act and then Prop. 64 came out, the governor was trying to reconcile some differences between the two and bring it together as one. He stated that, unfortunately, that was dropping some things in the medical cannabis regulation safety act that they didn't agree with.

Councilmember Digre thought it was local control.

Police Chief Steidle responded affirmatively.

Mayor O'Neill concluded he was dropping the possibility of local revenue but keeping the 15% state revenue.

Police Chief Steidle asked if he was referring to the state sales tax.

Mayor O'Neill responded affirmatively, mentioning that when they met earlier, he had stated that there was a separate bill that would eliminate the local revenue for marijuana sales but the state would keep their revenue.

Police Chief Steidle thought they may have miscommunicated. He explained that what he was referring to was dropping the state ID program would likely result in the reduction of state sales tax revenue.

Mayor pro Tem Keener moved to authorize the Mayor to send a letter of opposition to Governor Brown related to the proposition 64 trailer bill; seconded by Councilmember Martin.

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

Suzanne Moore, Pacifica, stated she was a homeowner and a member of Fair Rents for Pacifica. She stated that a temporary moratorium on rent stabilization and just cause eviction, drafted and written by the City Attorney and placed for a ballot measure by City Council was successfully challenged by paid petitioners funded by the California Apartment Association. She stated that the petition drive, marked by witness misinformation, bullying threats and documented assaults reversed 14 months of community effort within ten days. She stated that members of the community in favor of the temporary moratorium were not notified when the petition drive started or ended which impacted their ability to respond. She stated that the outcome was close, She stated that they had 60 signed forms of voters requesting name removal from the petition but were not submit able since the petitioners had handed in their signatures earlier that morning. She stated whether a state law which allows a reversal of public will as fair was moot at this point but the result is real and critical. She stated that hundreds of Pacifica tenants were at risk for sizeable rent increases and no fault evictions between now and the November election. She felt it was a crisis and she recommended that all tenants who received rent increases since February 13 contact San Mateo County Legal Aid

and Pacifica Resource Center as they can provide advice and possible assistance during this difficult experience. She stated that some tenants may be too embarrassed to seek this aid but she asked that they think of it as payback for what they have given their community in the past. She stressed that well being of the community depended on the well being of members and families, as safe affordable housing was necessary for well being. She recommended that everyone study the ordinance and vote in its favor in the coming election.

Jamie Monozon, Pacifica, stated that she was the new CEO of the Chamber of Commerce and she invited everyone to buy tickets to their Taste of Pacifica on June 24. She stated that Victor Spano was with her. She stated that there will be 25 different restaurants.

Bridget Duffy, Pacifica, stated that the last time she attended the meeting, the Mayor did not vote to protect the renters experiencing retaliatory rent increases. She stated that it was well documented that the only opposition to rent stabilization in Pacifica was coming from the real estate industry and she asked how working for the real estate industry wasn't a conflict of interest when voting on the subject. She was horrified at what he was put through and she wondered about the legal staff of the city. She thought it appeared that they were also working for the real estate industry. She talked to a woman who got a \$600 retaliatory rent increase after the City Council let it go to the vote and her landlord said, if she wants to stay in Pacifica, past October it will go up another \$600. She stated that it sounded as though he was trying to get rid of all the renters before the vote. She felt it was horrifying. She stated that everyone already feels bad about what was happening in our country, but she questioned that some staff appear to be working for the real estate industry. She stated that a quick look at tax returns will clarify who they are working for, and she suggests that someone start looking into it or let people vote on this.

David Whitney, Pacifica, stated that he was in favor of rent control, but after reading the ballot proposal, it sounded like communism to him. He mentioned a scenario where the landlord would have to pay a former renter. He then referred to the cost of a rent control board, stating that it was a waste of money as they will accomplish nothing. He stated that, to own rental property in Pacifica will be a pain and people will sell and eventually the people getting the high rent increases will be gone. He thought the proposition will fail because of the idea that it was like communism taking over personal property.

Therese Dyer, Pacifica, thanked Mayor pro Tem Keener for asking questions at the last City Council meeting which reconfirmed her idea regarding the certificates of participation. She stated that she has been requesting a lot of information and she found out that there were a lot of falsehoods. She asked for the number they have had since the inception in 1996 and there were a total of six which was not true. She stated that she was looking at the agendas in May, and when she questions things, they put down City Council Agenda and Pacifica Finance Authority, which means a joint regular and special meeting, but it has nothing to do with the certificates of participation, mentioning the dates. She stated that they better question Asst. City Manager Hines what he was doing as this calls for a state audit. She stated that Mr. Hines' report mentions the board of directors but not by name, but she says they were the Council. She stated that it sounded like they were regular meetings aside from the regular Council meetings, and she felt it was not being transparent.

Ron Maykel, Pacifica, stated that he wanted to bring something to the Council's attention. He referred to the parking lot at Rockaway near the Calera Creek, stating that there was a sign warning people that the water was contaminated which happens periodically. He wasn't aware if it was from the pumping station or from the recycle plant. However, he stated that as the

creek attracts kids, he thought they should do a better job of posting the signs in several places and in more visible spots.

Tod Schlesinger, Pacifica, stated that he had to come regarding rent control. He stated that he is an expert and no one consulted him. He stated that if anyone thought this had anything to do with SAMCAR, realtors or homeowners , they were out of their mind. He stated that the people who put this up before them was members of the Council as they listened to the special interest groups. He stated that this wasn't going to pass in November because they didn't do their homework and they have egg on their face. He stated that all the huge rent raises should be blamed on the Council. He then stated that while Councilmember Digre was off the hook with the DA, she wasn't off the hook with him. He didn't know how the letter sent to the City Attorney got straight to the DA. He then referred to the City Council rules and stated that she was not out from the civil investigation. He asked why the City Attorney didn't look at the lease and he stated, if she didn't produce it, he would subpoena it.

Mayor O'Neill stated that he was only to address the Council as a whole, not an individual.

Mr. Schlesinger stated that he has free speech. He then stated that at least three issues violated were in the 1974 political format and he will be pursuing it. He referred to the Asst. DA of San Mateo which only said there was no criminal violation but it doesn't mean there was no civil violation. He stated that the City Attorney needs to pay attention to him or she can go too.

Dave O'Connor, Pacifica, stated that he was present to talk about the maintenance of Beach Boulevard area, specifically the picnic area. He commended Public Works for doing a great job, but it ended at the picnic area. He stated that it was shameful, questioning who made the decision of abandoning this area. He asked staff and Council to look at cleaning up the area.

Margaret Goodale, Pacifica, stated she had a thank you for DPW and the staffer who put together the pet waste flyer that arrived in mailboxes. She felt it was clear and to the point. She appreciated having it done. She then invited everyone to the Little Brown Church on the upcoming Friday where there will be two scientists showing images of the sea floor off the Pacifica Coast and author, Gary Greggs, and Jasniq Sharma from County Office of Sustainability speaking about their recently completed vulnerability study and Asst. Planner Bonny O'Connor will help them understand about where they were with local coastal planning.

Julie Lancelle, Pacifica, stated that she watches the meetings, but she had to come because on hearing what people say to the Council, especially during oral communications, was so hurtful and she knows they have to develop some kind of armor to deal with some of the unfair things that are said. She knows they spend many hours and don't get paid very much to do it. They do it because they are committed to the well being and betterment of our community and its residents. She didn't think people realize how much time it takes to do the job, and she wanted to thank them for all the time they put in to make improvements.

COUNCIL COMMUNICATIONS

Councilmember Martin thanked Julie Lancelle for her comments. She planned to remind everyone about the sea level rise meeting on Friday at the Little Brown Church at 6:45. She attended the Half Moon Bay sea level presentation a couple of weekends ago with a booth set up at the beach showing sea levels and erosion levels in years to come which she found shocking. She talked to the county about putting on some presentation in Pacifica on what it would look like at our beaches. She stated that the Beach Coalition had a great beach cleanup

the past weekend. She stated that they also had three business teams come to Linda Mar, Rockaway and Sharp Park who removed 8,000 pounds of weeds from Linda Mar and Rockaway switchbacks. She stated that there are four teams from Genentech coming this week to clean the beaches and Community Center and remove more weeds. The Beach Coalition thanked Public Works for delivering truckloads of wood chips. She referred to a report from Robert's Road, stating that it has gotten progressively worse with litter. She was going to push movement in that regard. She suggested that you say something to educate people about the litter landing in the ocean. She thought there was a link to the Pacifica Resource Center on the city website, but she didn't think there was a link to the Pacifica Beach Coalition and she would like to discuss that as they have a relationship with both those organizations. She stated that the Library Advisory Committee the upcoming Wednesday at the Sanchez Library. She stated that the Pacifica Resource Center board meeting is scheduled on July 12 because of July 4. She stated that Emergency Preparedness will meet on June 21 at the Pacifica Police Department. She gave a "shout out" to Public Works for the new play structure at Edgemar Park, with the neighbors saying it is awesome. She stated that the Bike and Pedestrian Advisory Committee meets June 22, mentioning a call for projects that she is working on with PR Dir. Ocampo.

Councilmember Vaterlaus stated that she went to lots of meeting. Library Workshop at IBL where people came to voice their opinions. She was at the Resource Center's annual awards luncheon. She learned about housing at a home for all, working to develop a plan for affordable housing to make sure that community members know the necessity for affordable housing to get rid of the NIMBYism that happens when they try to put in any affordable housing. She stated that people say they want it but NIMBY. She attended an event by Jackie Speier to discuss the state of the nation and how it relates to San Mateo County with a lot of good insight. She stated that ABAG was merging with MTC with a day long meeting to discuss the merger. She attended the 40th grand opening for Flory's Book Store. She stated that the Pacific Coast TV awards celebrating being here for another 40 years. She attended the City and County ABAG legislative committee to discuss the bills affecting the county and there was a report on the highway users tax that estimated Pacifica will receive \$787,000 in road funds. She stated that she attended the county fair and had a great time.

Councilmember Digre stated that she attended many of the meetings mentioned. On the PCT awards, she stated that it brings the two communities, Pacifica and Half Moon Bay, together. She reminded them they can learn what they are doing and it was valuable if you want to get into media. She attended the AAUW meeting which does a lot to help young ladies to get grants for further education. She mentioned the Economic Development Committee's meeting at the Police Department and Open Space will be giving a report on the third Wednesday. She mentioned that we have a little bit of the Colma Creek which covers several cities. She stated that the SF Airport Roundtable has pulled up the legislative subcommittee and worked on the work plan for the roundtable. She stated that the legislative committee was dedicated to helping across the nation to engage the grassroots as the power to get any change regarding noise in the air industry was going to be grassroots in affecting congressional areas across the United States. She stated that they need the public. She suggested that people go to Flory's to buy their books. She stated that it may cost a bit more, but it was a wonderful part of our community and worth supporting.

Mayor O'Neill stated that he and Councilmember Digre attended the Chapel by the Sea Memorial event. He attended Lafco and the Fire Works Task Force. He attended the Fog Fest committee and there are issues they are working on that need to be negotiated. He stated that the Library JPA has new exhibit was cool but they have to check another building because they

can't fit it in Pacifica's buildings. He stated it was an inflatable dome and go through two airlocks to get in it and they shoot asteroids, etc. He attended the CCAG board and will be discussing a couple of the items with the City Manager. He was at the PCT telethon and they did ask for a mayoral proclamation celebrating 40 years. He took the initiative and did it.

STAFF COMMUNICATIONS

Interim City Manager Breskin stated that the previous month staff had a luncheon recognizing employees who had reached thresholds of service and he then mentioned the employees by name and the number of years. He stated that they have all been serving the city honorably for a long time and he felt it was good to recognize that. He then mentioned the discussion of bonds for the equalization project at a previous meeting, and the mayor asked the City Manager about oversight of the bonds. He stated that the Asst. City Manager spoke on that, mentioning the use of the phrase "trust me" and a number of people scoffed at that. He thought it was unfortunate because staff works to be as honest as they can with City Council and they serve with dedication and honorably every day and many are neighbors of the people in the community. He stated that they can't lose sight of that. He stated that he has worked in many cities and, while he has been here less than three months, he can honestly say that this is the strongest staff he has ever been associated with and was proud to be associated with them.

Councilmember Digre thanked him and staff.

Mayor O'Neill thanked him for congratulating the staff that has lasted that long.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

11. Resolution of the City Council of the City of Pacifica Adopting the City of Pacifica 2017-2022 Capital Improvement Program
PROPOSED ACTION: Adopt the resolution next in order Resolution of the City Council of the City of Pacifica Adopting the City of Pacifica 2017-2022 Capital Improvement Program

PW Sr. Civil Engr. Donguines presented the staff report.

Mayor pro Tem Keener referred to the San Pedro Creek bridge replacement, stating that for 2017-18, they had \$400,000 left for spending of Measure A funds.

PW Sr. Civil Engr. Donguines stated he was correct.

Mayor pro Tem Keener asked what it was for and would it complete their spending on that bridge project.

PW Dir. Ocampo stated that the project was complete, and the \$400,000 was to monitor and maintain the mitigation of the plants. If we spend that money, it will be reimbursed by the Transportation Authority.

Mayor pro Tem Keener asked him to repeat what it was to monitor.

PW Dir. Ocampo stated that it was for planting, such as erosion control.

Mayor pro Tem Keener referred to the packet page 215 regarding San Pedro Creek and Pacifica state beach, etc., and mentioned having funding up to 2020-21 except for 2019-20 and he asked if the gap was on purpose or mistake.

PW Sr. Civil Engr. Donguines stated that it was on purpose, as the monitoring was to start two years ago, and they were late so the two were consecutive and then there is the gap and they continue monitoring the following year.

Mayor pro Tem Keener referred to the Montecito Avenue storm drain improvements where it states the existing storm drain drains into the Chamber property. They had hopes of selling the property to a developer for a hotel, and he thought storm drain improvements directed away from the property would be welcome. He asked if the expenditures scheduled for 2017-18 would take care of that or will it require more.

PW Dir. Ocampo stated that it was primarily for a study. He stated that, during movement of the treatment plant to its new location, the storm drain that goes from Palmetto to Beach Boulevard was cut off and a study was the best way to do that. He stated that he did an investigation on Montecito to see if there was room, due to the number of utilities in the area, including the sewer main that goes back into the pump station. He stated that the present option was utilizing the existing right of way on Pacific Avenue to reconnect the existing storm drain line as there is an existing right of way going through the Chamber property. He reiterated that it was an investigation for the best solution.

Mayor pro Tem Keener asked if the goal would be to get the existing right of way off the property such as Pacific Avenue.

PW Dir. Ocampo stated that, within the existing right of way through the property, there is also a sewer main and they will look at all the options and see if part of the development will consider including that in their design. If so, they will go with that but, if not, they will have to relocate.

Councilmember Martin, referred to packet page 228 and asked what financial HR software they are going to be using.

MIS Mgr. Vandehey stated that the financial software was the GEMS product they have had for several years which had been approved by Council for a set amount and they were trying to spend the last bit on maintenance or possible expansion but it was put off several times.

Councilmember Martin asked if it was financial and HR software.

MIS Mgr. Vandehey responded affirmatively.

Councilmember Digre referred to the Ray Davis Trust Fund was helpful to the city and she asked if it was starting to go up at all.

PW Dir. Ocampo stated that PB&R Dir. Perez was the one managing the fund, but he recalled that the interest they get from it was negligible.

Councilmember Digre agreed that it was negligible now, adding that at one time it was better.

Mayor O'Neill referred to packet page 200 regarding the Manor Drive over crossing. He stated that he has been on that bridge, and he sees the rebar in the street because the cement is worn

out. He thought it was scheduled to be fixed next year or not at all. He referred to the grant period which was part of Measure A money for Highway 1 improvement.

PW Dir. Ocampo stated that they were referring to the Call for projects from the San Mateo County Transportation Authority as pertaining to the highway program. He stated that they are supposed to have a project in 2017, but he learned from the TA program director that they are in the mode of collecting where the funds are to know how much money is available when they get a call for a project. He stated that the purpose of the project was to widen the over crossings so they can provide traffic signals at the intersection of Manor and Oceana and Manor and Palmetto to allow traffic to flow smoothly. He stated that, if he is referring to the spalling that is currently happening on the deck, they were introducing a project that will address that. He stated that they have done that before. He stated that it was the way the over crossing was constructed in the mid-60s and the concrete cover on the rebar was not as much as it should be. They were discovering that now and the heavy truck loads make the rigidity of the concrete pop.

Mayor O'Neill mentioned that this was coupled with the Measure A Highway 1 improvement funds for Milagra on ramp. He asked if the call for projects would be later this year.

PW Dir. Ocampo stated that the latest word he got from the program director of the TA was that it was later this year.

Mayor O'Neill asked if they have had any word from Caltrans regarding okaying the ingress and egress concern for the phony bus stop.

PW Dir. Ocampo assumed he was talking about the Milagra on ramp. He stated that they were using that because Council adopted a resolution stating the Milagra on ramp project was a component of that and that was what they were using as matching funds. They will move with the project and say that it is the city's match. They were waiting for the call for projects and they will say this is the match they have.

Mayor O'Neill thought they had \$900,000 at one point, and he asked if that was still available.

PW Dir. Ocampo stated that it was, specifically for this project.

Mayor O'Neill asked him to give Council notice when they put that application in as they will have to do some lobbying with anyone they know to save the funds for Pacifica.

PW Dir. Ocampo stated that they will definitely do that.

Mayor O'Neill stated that any letters people would like to write would be appreciated.

PW Dir. Ocampo stated they would do that.

Mayor pro Tem Keener asked if the over crossing bridge and potential on ramp were Caltran's responsibilities.

PW Dir. Ocampo stated that they could say that for the widening of the highway which is owned and operated by the state, but the impact was on our local roads and with the introduction of the on ramp, they were trying to alleviate the traffic on local roads, as well as the over crossing and that was why they were saying it was the city's.

Mayor O'Neill stated that the on ramp and off ramp are Caltrans and they need their approval.

PW Dir. Ocampo responded affirmatively.

Mayor pro Tem Keener agreed that the city needs their approval, but they were saying it was ours task to find the funding for it.

PW Dir. Ocampo agreed, explaining that it alleviates the traffic on local roads and over crossings. He stated that the project at the Manor Drive crossing was two-fold, for safety and traffic reduction.

Councilmember Vaterlaus stated that there were various projects for the Police Department and she asked if they can be combined or are they separate requests for money. She then clarified that it was the Fire Department.

PW Dir. Ocampo stated that they can be combined, but it was about availability of funds so that they can put 2 or 3 together which would be optimum. But if they have to address just one, they do that.

Mayor O'Neill opened the public hearing and, seeing no one, closed the public hearing.

Councilmember Vaterlaus moved to adopt the resolution next in order, Resolution of the City Council of the City of Pacifica adopting the City of Pacifica 2017-2022 Capital Improvement Program; seconded by Mayor pro Tem Keener.

RESULT:	ADOPTED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER:	Sue Vaterlaus, Councilmember
SECONDER:	John Keener, Mayor Pro Tem
AYES:	O'Neill, Keener, Digre, Vaterlaus, Martin

CONSIDERATION

12. Consideration of Eliminating the Location of 2212 Beach Boulevard as a Potential Site of a Future Newly Constructed Public Library.
PROPOSED ACTION: Take action as deemed appropriate by the members of the City Council.

Councilmember Vaterlaus recused herself from this item because she managed a property down the street from this location, which she no longer manages, but has to wait until she is at a specific dollar limit before she can speak on any library issues.

Interim City Manager Breskin presented the staff report.

Mayor O'Neill asked Mayor pro Tem Keener to explain why he asked that this item be put on the agenda.

Mayor pro Tem Keener referred to the bond measure on the fall that came 12% short of passing with no organized opposition. He stated that, before the election, he mentioned three groups who were against it for several reasons. He stated that based on the percentage for it gives them hope that there was substantial support, but not enough. He thought, if they want to see a bond measure pass to fund the library, they have to change things and he suggested coming up with a different site and save Sanchez Library. He stated that another aspect was developing

the Beach Boulevard site and he thought a decision on this would be better sooner rather than later so the developer knows what he/she is working with.

Councilmember Digre stated that she thought she experienced definite organized opposition. She referred to his hope for substantial support and she felt it was there. She acknowledged that there was no guarantee because there was no money for the library or that site, and she thought the Library supporters realize there is no money and no guarantee. She stated that she would support that they continue as they are and have Council take leadership in working out the kinks in the library situation. She was concerned that, with the library having lots of time between open forums, they might not be getting the attention needed to wrestle with wanting a library but having issues with the Sanchez situation. She thought there were other possibilities, but she didn't have any information.

Mayor O'Neill reminded her that she was getting into deliberations and they have cards.

Councilmember Digre stated that she did not have a question.

Mayor O'Neill opened public comments.

Caroline Barba, Pacifica, stated that she was co-president of the Pacifica Friends of the Library and their representative on the Library Advisory Committee. She stated that she was present to register a protest about the possibility of using that site. She felt that the city created the Library Advisory Committee to oversee the process to work through and try to come up with a plan to get a new library. She would like to see the process worked through, but they barely started. She stated that we do need a new library because the present libraries are small and cramped. She didn't know the answer, but there were a lot of possibilities, and she would like them to have the opportunity to see what they are and she asked that they leave it the way it is.

Margaret Goodale, Pacifica, stated that, at the Council meeting July 21, 2016, Dilip Travedi from Moffatt and Nichols spoke and presented the sea level rise study, which was that Beach Boulevard was a critical enough asset for the city that sand would be placed in front of the reach of the sea wall and the sea wall would be maintained and she stated those two assumptions could cost Pacificans as much as \$100 million within this century. She stated that sand placement was not a one time fix and, without it, the waves can run up and over the sea wall. She stated that an upgraded sea wall was extremely expensive and moving the library site was preferable to committing future Pacificans to continue to pay for sea walls and endless sand for the next 85 years. She stated that the report also stated sea level will rise no more than 5 1/2 feet. She asked if Council could guarantee that in the current political climate.

Linda Jonas, Pacifica, stated she was also at that meeting and she understood from that report that we wouldn't need to fear for at least 100 years of it being taken over by the ocean, otherwise she asked why the city would consider building a huge hotel on this location. She stated that they had almost 55% approval of the new library and bond and there was opposition, stating that she could not get on NextDoor without one person taking over every conversation. She stated that, even with opposition, they came out with general approval. She felt we should let the democratic process take place. She stated that Council appointed the committee to search through locations and figure out the best option. She thought this interjection sounds like a personal agenda and not letting the process take place. She stated that Council appointed them, and they sent information to the community advertising three meetings. She asked that they let them have the three meetings, do research from the public and let the community decide, not just a few people.

Tygarjas Bigstyck, Pacifica, stated he personally thought it was a good site. He voted for it with 55%. He stated that, during the election, there were two arguments that kept coming up, one being Sanchez, and he stated before that it was possible that a shuttle service might be viable from that end of town to address younger and older people who would not be able to get to a centralized location. He thought, if SamTrans was willing to do a shuttle service for Devil's Slide, he thought they might do a shuttle service for a library that would probably have more ridership than the Devil's Slide shuttle. He also heard people question giving money to a library when we can't even fix our roads. It was his understanding that people making that argument were conflating two issues, such that looking at how things are funded didn't have anything to do with each other. He thought, if roads were addressed, their minds might be set at ease and it would be easier for them to vote for a library. He suggested that if Council can find a more clever approach to the road situation, it would not be an impediment to explain to those individuals that these were two different revenue streams. He thought, if they come up with creative ways of dealing with the voters' primary concerns, it might still be a viable site. He hoped Council decides to take the creative approach that will bring this to fruition for the 55% who voted for it.

Celeste Chernicky, Pacifica, stated that as a resident of Park Pacifica for 43 years, she urged Council to vote no for this proposal. She stated she had two points, first, some are under the misconception that the proposed site was a major problem with the selection. She stated that 55% wanted the site and she saw no evidence to support that the location was a major problem. She stated that she was a precinct caller for four weeks before the election, and she had one or two individuals bring up the proposed site as a concern, and a handful about the assessment. She stated that the major concern for those with any concerns was the closing of Sanchez Library. She felt, if they look at the election results by precinct, they seem to support that as the major concern, not the proposed site. Secondly, she referred to the Library Advisory Committee that was created and given the job of evaluating the election and what they have learned and ask for input from the community on what they wanted, and come up with their conclusions and proposals. She was confused on why they were talking about this now instead of letting the Advisory Committee do the analysis, get input. She knew it was important to let the people speak, and the people need to be informed as well as Council does. She stated that the Committee can do the work for them and she strongly urged Council to vote no on the proposal.

Kathy Long, Pacifica, stated she was a Pedro Point resident and member of the Library Advisory Committee. She stated she was surprised to see this on the agenda to remove the Beach Boulevard site. She stated that, as a member of the Committee, she found it disappointing and demoralizing to have Council consider such an action when the Advisory hasn't even been able to review the feedback and recommendations from the most recent community outreach efforts. She stated that they hope to expand the number library sites, but this was one that should still be under consideration. They were considering what they can do to keep something open at Sanchez. She urged the Council to vote on this issue and leave the site as a possible consideration.

Jerry Crow, Pacifica, stated that he lives in Linda Mar. His concern in eliminating the site was its key nature in the overall plan for West Sharp Park. It is the consequence of thousands of hours of study and analysis, and their experience is that the Little Brown Church has seen thousands of visitors and was a taste of what they might expect from the revitalization of that district. He stated that the most accurate information on sea level rise was from the satellites posted on the NOAA, and they have a narrative statement over the last 22 years that the

average rate as been consistent at less than 1/8 inch per year, and any others are just estimates and less accurate.

Therese Dyer, Pacifica, stated that she was opposed to any new library until they are more transparent with the city's finances and it was not centrally located and to save money they could have negotiated with the development of the quarry. She stated that they can't have it both ways, going against the developer who wants to come in and bring revenue and put a \$32 million bond measure on the taxpayers. She stated that we are paying a higher sewer tax and water tax and she was against it. She stated that one alternative would be the Sanchez Library which is not kept up. She felt they have plenty of room to build on and up, but it was not centrally located, but she thought was the best bet.

Bridget Duffy, Pacifica, stated she was glad it was on the agenda because she felt it was a no-brainer. She stated that we have an unfolding epic on planet earth with the melting of the ice caps, factual information and well documented. She stated that it will add a lot of water to the sea and the sea will rise. She stated that it was not just sea level rising but an erosion factor that they are seeing in other parts of the world where whole islands are disappearing quickly, not just because of the high level of the water but it has an effect under the water of eroding the coastline. She asked if you want to put \$100,000 in the sea wall. She stated, if the sand erodes, we don't know what is going to happen with the ocean and she didn't understand why they were still talking about a library. She uses the library and she did studies with people who use the library and they don't have any complaints about the libraries. She stated that they are a last century technology and mentioned a man who has plans for an oceanic center which she thought would be amazing. She stated that the library has been voted down twice. She acknowledged that over 50% voted yes, but over 50% voted yes for the quarry and she asked if we should develop the quarry. She stated that she loved the Chamber building and should be renovated and repurposed as a live/work space for artists. She stated that they can get revenue from it and, if or when the ocean comes in, it is not a loss. She questioned why anyone would put substantial money into this area. She considered it insanity and denial of the truth about the climate. She hoped they kick the site off and she felt it should not be developed.

Stan Zeavin, Pacifica, stated that the city used the Moffatt and Nichols report to support the idea that the library should be placed where it was on the ballot. He stated that most people have not looked closely at the Moffatt and Nichols, stating that the executive summary says three times that, for this particular spot to survive to the end of the century, they need to fix the wall, continually add sand in front of it so it doesn't topple over and if any of those three things aren't happening, that location is in big trouble. He also understood that nourishing the beach will happen between 6 and 15 years depending on the tide, shape of the land and currents. He stated that every time they do that it will cost extravagantly and estimates are that, if it happens several times, it could cost \$50 to \$100 million above the cost of the library. He feels that the location is very important and he voted against the library because of the location. He stated that they have a rising ocean and it isn't going to change. He congratulated Councilmember Digre for rising above the crap continually thrown at her by a few mean spirited citizens.

Chaya Gordon, Pacifica, thought it was a good idea to look at why the ballot measure failed. She could give her opinions but she thought a study of that would be helpful. She stated that, in terms of the taxes, she would vote for that as a supporter of community facilities and libraries are important. In terms of the site, she felt because of sea level rise, it was not an appropriate site. She felt others had covered various facts, but she added that sea level rise will definitely affect that site. She recalled the Moffatt and Nichols speaker saying that, since the library would be on the second floor, sea level rise would be okay anyway and at that point, she lost any

belief in what that person said as she thought that was ludicrous. She stated that they need to do more research on that. She also thought it was important to keep Sanchez. She thought it was easy for those with their own transportation to dismiss what it is like to be older and not have transportation. She thought the shuttle was a great idea, but Pacifica was struggling with improving public transportation which she thought was great, but she didn't think the problem should fall on several of the groups of users of Sanchez, non-drivers or no transportation. She concluded that they need to keep Sanchez and find a site that will not be subject to sea level rise and she was in favor of taking this site off the table.

David Whitney, Pacifica, stated that, as the ballot did not pass, the site should be freed from being tied up in a library site that was not going to pass anyway. He mentioned that Mayor pro Tem Keener said that the record of people voting for a library tax increase was not too good. He appreciated him bringing this up. He stated that he looks at that site and he sees waste. He referred to all the utility increases, etc., and felt that people will not vote for this. He prefers to keep Sanchez and, as mentioned by Bridget Duffy, spiff up the libraries. He stated that the South San Francisco library was restored for \$3 million and he thought Pacifica could do better than \$26 million. He appreciated him doing this and he thought they could make money on the present site.

Dan Stegink, Pacifica, stated that 54% of the people didn't vote for the library, and 53.6% of the people voted for the library. He concluded that the library bond didn't pass by 12.06%. He stated that the pro-library group spent \$114,000 to pass the bond and \$17 was spent against it. He stated that it was not the city's job to insure private companies against risk which is why they can build a hotel that can raise 12% TOT tax. He referred to the footprint of the library, using the same numbers used to justify the quarry, and concluded that the square footage could contribute \$514,000 a year to the city's revenue by having that be hotel rooms instead of a library. He stated that the purpose of the library committee was to choose an architect, but the architect had already been chosen as well as the lot. He stated that at the recent study session, less than 7 members of the public participated. He stated that, if 2 library committee members had brought a person, they would have had the same amount that showed up. He was confused why he had anyone recuse himself. He asked, if Councilmember Vaterlaus has to recuse herself from voting on the issue, how she is a member of the library committee. He felt she should recuse herself from that committee also. He referred to the states littoral cell expert said they could build a library at this location, but they will have to put it on stilts. He stated that there were three other locations better than this one, U.S Bank building at Eureka Square, lot behind the police station, parking lot between the Little Brown Church and the Tai restaurant on Francisco. He stated that the people have spoken and they didn't speak for this library.

Sue Beckmeyer, Pacifica, questioned how many times she has been present in support of this library project and how many more times will she support it. She stated that they were trying to short circuit the process. She stated that they have a Library Advisory Committee who voted 5-0 to give them a charge and part was to find a site, look at site alternatives, including a two-library option. She stated that they haven't had a chance to do their work. They have had one meeting with two more public meetings scheduled, September 28 and November 2. She stated that there were also several outreach times set and that work needs to happen she stated that they can have a discussion about sites once the data are in, but she felt to take a site off the table is, to her, a reflection of some folks thought this library did not pass but more a reflection of the fact that it just might. She acknowledged that it was not quite 55%, but mentioned it requires 55% to pass a school bond. She stated that more people voted for this bond in this site than have voted for any sitting Council person in the last ten years. She concluded that there was definitely support for the library in Pacifica and it was a matter of working together to come

up with a solution that meets common needs. She admitted that she entered this process focused on one library, because she studied the issue and felt it was economically more viable to put their resources under one roof. She stated it would enable them to be open for seven days a week, but she gave consideration to the fact that it did not reach the threshold for funding. She thought about the south end of town and those who use Sanchez which was an important part of their days when open. She concluded that, if Pacifica chooses a geographically acceptable solution, that was the choice, but she felt they needed to let Pacificans make the choice and let the process play out. She stated that the intent of looking for a new library on Palmetto has always been revitalization of the neighborhood and part and parcel of the intent behind this project.

Robine Runneals, Pacifica, stated that she has lived in this area for 42 years and has always tried to work for the betterment of her city, mentioning that she has worked on many committees, etc. dealing with improvement of the neighborhood. She stated that, from decommissioning of the sewer plant and moving it to the quarry, the next plan was what to do with the site. She stated that her heart was with the neighborhoods in the committees on which she served for the betterment of Pacifica. She felt they need to let the committee continue to do their work. She feels that the process they have outlined was all encompassing and they will come together with a fair recommendation for the future of the library. She was disheartened by the maker of this motion and why they were there. She stated that his continual efforts are to make sure that nothing ever succeeds in this neighborhood. She stated it was not about the projects or streetscape, but for her it was the people who live near the beach, homeowners, etc., and how little they have seen the present Council come forward and support them in the light of sea level rise. She asked, if people in Holland can live for hundreds of years in dealing with the ocean successfully to protect homes, etc., why it cannot be looked at in Pacifica. She felt they were abandoning them. By putting this on the agenda, they were telling them that they don't care about them. She asked what will happen when they abandon the homes and what will happen to the homeowners and how the city will be bankrupt because they were abandoning them at the beach. She asked them to support the library committee and let them do their work.

Ellen Ron, Pacifica, stated she wanted to restate what they have already heard. She stated that over 10,000 voted yes on the library project, which included the present site. She stated that they haven't heard any hard evidence that the site was a deciding factor for the majority who voted against it. She stated most of what she has heard was projected past the specific proposal and it shows there is passion. She asked that they let the Library Advisory Committee complete its task and open up the process as that was what people wanted because there were a lot of things done behind closed doors, and now they are being opened. She felt it was taking the process away from the people by removing these before people have had a chance to look at them. She stated that the Library Advisory Committee had a community meeting previously and are meeting the following Wednesday. She asked what the urgency was. She asked that they let the committee do its work, let the people hear and speak to all the options. If this is not the best site, it should come out in the process.

Mary Ann Nihart, Pacifica, stated that she was a member of Westpac and a former councilmember. She wanted to talk about the Tribune article she did on this subject and what its intention was and what it meant. She stated that she heard the city manager talk about trust and honesty. She felt that trust was more than just honesty. She stated that no one is questioning honesty, but with a history and a process, communities build expectations based on those processes. She outlined in the My Turn that goes back 20 years in Pacifica's history, with multiple reports. She stated that the issue of what they have put into the neighborhood has

been significant. Three things were promised. The first, undergrounding the utilities with removal of the poles, hasn't been completed yet. Next is a streetscape with amenities that promote a walkable business serving district, for which they have put up with the noise, etc., and businesses have suffered on Palmetto waiting for this to move forward. They have had a "dummy downed" version of improving Palmetto. Lastly, they had a charrette process on the site with many meetings, looking at the economics of what they were putting there. She stated that the Council and city went with a mixed use set of involvements. If they are talking about turning this site entirely to a hotel, she asked them to think about that, mentioning that they have already turned down one large hotel. She stated that they could have had TOT for years, but they turned it down based on this. She then referred to the sea level rise, stating that no one is doubting that. She acknowledged that it was going to happen, but if they don't figure out how to protect the assets in the neighborhood like the pump station that takes all of the wastewater from the north end and town and moves it to the wastewater treatment plant and the millions that it would take to move that, as well as all the properties, then it will cost the city more. She felt they need to be looking at how they are going to respond to sea level rise. She stated that she needs less fear and many more answers.

Julie Lancelle, Pacifica, appreciated the Councilmembers, but she felt they don't want to take things off the table prematurely. She wasn't sure she understands why they would want to take out an option with regard to this property at this time. She didn't want to get into where they will put the new library, because it sounds like a process is going on and they are considering it. She acknowledged that it was a difficult decision based on all the issues raised. She was troubled by the proposal to take it off. She admired Mayor pro Tem Keener and she hasn't spoken with him to get the details of why he proposes to do this and it was her opinion that it was premature.

Ron Maykel, Pacifica, stated that options were important and they were fortunate that they have lots of choices in many areas. He stated that this site is one of the options, but if they have multiple options, it would be nice if those voting had the ability to vote on the option. He asked if they can write a ballot to show the different options. He thought they may need to reduce the big library but set up the ballot so some funding could be used to expand or remodel the Sanchez Library and the larger sum used for the new library in this site. He felt they need to revisit the design of the ballot measure as he felt there were other ways to go. He stated that this site is one of the options and he didn't know whether it is the best option, but he felt the parking lot next to the Tai restaurant would be great with underground parking and two stories above it and they could have something like a civic center with the museum, library, city hall, etc. He felt options were important and he asked them to consider the right vote on this issue.

Mayor O'Neill closed public comments.

Councilmember Martin stated that she didn't have any questions as to why it was put on the agenda but she didn't think it was an easy decision for anyone to make the suggestion to put it on the agenda because of the discussion. She stated that one point of discussion was how many sites are they going to consider. She thought there were 11 on the table and taking this site off, it would make it 10. She stated that, if they give the community three choices, that was hard. She appreciated everyone who came to speak for both sides. She was against the library on this site, mentioning the eye opening facts of sea level rise. She was bummed when she attended the community event with five people who stayed. They were polling children and seniors, but children don't vote. She was concerned with the direction of the group running the forums. She felt they need to be more focused with a wonderful group of people. She was surprised to be around so many people at the Library Advisory Committee with open minds after

the vote. She stated that when voting in November, you were voting for or against Sanchez, for or against the tax and for or against this site. She stated that there was no doubt people want a new library but there are all the reasons why and they haven't gotten to the bottom of that yet. She mentioned that people say they disbanded the Rent Advisory Committee but they were not spending any money as a city on it, but with this Group 4, they were spending several thousand dollars to have them do their work. She was for letting this site stay as an option as there was a process happening with a lot of money being spent to have this process. She felt they need to get people out and be active participants in the process. She didn't think this site as a potential hotel has anything to do with this. She stated that they have nothing on the table now. If someone comes and makes them an offer, the library site was off the table because it is, but until that happens, she felt there was a process in place and personally she didn't think it was a good idea but she felt group four needs to get focused. She recommends that the Library Advisory Committee gets focused also, as it was their job to help get an agreeable space, not close Sanchez which is a community space for families, etc.

Mayor pro Tem Keener stated that he wasn't arguing either way about sea level rise or the other issues, but he was trying to point out that they were 12 points short of passing a library bond and something has to change. He thought it was the site and the Sanchez Library. He stated that they heard from many speakers saying it was not the site, but they were on the library committee and advocating for a library for years. He would like to see a library constructed in their lifetime, but they weren't getting any closer. He put this on the agenda to try and get closer.

Councilmember Digre stated that, while they are in the process of any controversial issues, the community stick to their usual good character and not characterize intent that is malicious. She hasn't had any chats with Mayor pro Tem Keener but she didn't think he has any malcontent issues or an agenda and just wants to see things move quickly. She stated that, when talking about going to the ballot, she felt the community had gotten beyond Sanchez and she was in favor of Sanchez. She was wrong, and the issue of Sanchez was too big and she missed it. She feels that needs to be address is the Sanchez. She stated that, as mentioned by Councilmember Martin, it was the character of that part of our community and the character of our entire community. She stated that considering taking this site off as a potential site didn't speed anything up in her opinion. She was not in favor of it but should stay the course. As leadership, Council should step forward on sea level rise. They need to be honing in on what was happening or going to happen in this community rather than the county, etc. She would like to focus on that and, if within that focus, they say with regard to the library or hotel, to get out of it, she hoped the committee would see it and, if she was hearing mayor pro Tem Keener correctly, their leadership was wanting to move the library issue forward. She didn't think taking it off this site helps them do that. She concurs with the question of what they can do to focus in and she suggested that they get the Sanchez element going. She questioned whether they can afford to deal with both of them, and she suggested that they not focus on taking the library off this site but look at Council to speed up on other issues, but that is not the vote at this time. This item is whether it is beneficial, wise, etc., to take it off this site, and she was against that.

Mayor O'Neill stated that he didn't want to remove it as a possibility for many reasons. He stated that they got 54% of the vote saying yes to a new library at this site. He referred to the mention of having to haul sand, and it will cost, but he thought they will have to do that anyhow because they have to protect the pump station. He has heard estimates between \$9 and \$15 million to move the pump station and they should be floating a bond and do the design work and engineering to move the pump station and go to the voters for a bond for that and it would be 67% also. He stated that the same sand that would protect the pump station would also protect

the library if built at this site. He referred to the second story parking, and stated that engineers stated the parking lots can be designed so that would not be an issue. He stated that it was also part of a neighborhood plan. He recalls sitting in someone's living room in Palmetto years ago and they were talking about this plan. He stated that, if the library is located at this site, which needs to be determined by the committee, it would drive daytime traffic down to Palmetto which would make any shops, restaurants and businesses on Palmetto successful and at night, you have the nighttime crowd, and use those businesses. He felt it was part of an integrated economic plan for the neighborhood that needs to be addressed and looked at. He agreed that it was more Sanchez than this site. He hoped the Library Advisory Committee will be able to tweak and design some plan, whether a tax measure to support more hours at Sanchez, whether a smaller library up here and whether they remodel both, but it was up to the committee. He mentioned that Rent Advisory was disbanded and now they were taking options away from the Library Advisory, and there was a trend forming that they were not being transparent and asking them to do things but not giving them the opportunity to do what they asked. He does not support removing this as an option.

Councilmember Digre didn't know if they go with an alternative action.

Councilmember Digre moved that the consideration of eliminating the location as a potential site of a future newly constructed public library not be chosen.

Asst. City Attorney Doherty stated that it was an acceptable motion.

Councilmember Digre stated that they do not vote for the elimination.

Asst. City Attorney Doherty stated that they are going to vote on her motion.

Councilmember Digre stated that they not vote to eliminate.

Mayor O'Neill moved that they keep the Palmetto Avenue site in the mix for the library location.

Councilmember Digre asked if that was acceptable.

Asst. City Attorney Doherty stated that it was acceptable.

Councilmember Martin seconded the motion.

Councilmember Vaterlaus returned to the dais.

RESULT:	ADOPTED AS AMENDED [3 TO 1]
MOVER:	Mike O'Neill, Mayor
SECONDER:	Deirdre Martin, Councilmember
AYES:	O'Neill, Digre, Martin
NAYS:	Keener
RECUSED:	Vaterlaus

- 13. Open Space and Parkland Advisory Committee Preservation Award and Annual Report**
PROPOSED ACTION: Motion to receive and file.

This was first item under Consideration.

Jim Sullivan, Chair of OSPAC, presented the Open Space and Parkland Advisory Committee Preservation Award to Noel Blinco, mentioning all he has done over the years in Pacifica.

Noel Blinco, Pacifica, thanked them for the award. He stated that he has worked with a lot of people, mentioning that he spent time promoting open space in the hills, working to protect the snowy plovers and is now asking for better enforcement of dog leash laws. He is happy to live in Poacifica and enjoy the open space, open hills and beaches.

Councilmember Digre stated that many of them have worked with Noel and he knows the hills and shores very well. She stated that he is dedicated and is out there every day doing something for Pacifica. She stated that he was also a Shakespearean expert. Councilmember Vaterlaus thanked him for all the work he has done for Pacifica.

Mayor pro Tem Keener thanked him.

Councilmember Martin agreed with the other comments, adding that he is amazing.

Mayor O'Neill thanked him, stating that he has known him for many years.

Mr. Blinco hopes he has a few more years.

Asst. Planner O'Connor stated that she had the privilege of assisting Planning Director Wehrmeister and acting staff liaison for the Open Space and Parkland Advisory Committee. She was appreciated the honor of introducing the current chair of the committee, Jim Sullivan who will be presenting the annual report.

Mr. Sullivan presented the annual report, touching on issues connected with GGNRA jurisdiction, San Mateo County Parks in Pacifica, and other items under the Open Space Advisory Committee jurisdiction on which they work to improve parks, trails, etc. He thanked the Council for their support.

Councilmember Digre stated that she has served with this committee and she stated that they are very energetic. She appreciated everything this group is doing, as well as the Pacifica Historical Society. She thanked them for their hard work.

Mayor pro Tem Keener thanked all of them. He has attended a few of their meetings and he felt they fill a valuable role.

Councilmember Vaterlaus stated that she has never been to an Open Space Committee meeting with all the committees she has been on and she plans to attend one of their meetings. She thanked them for all they do.

Committee Member Joanne Arnos thanked her and she invited the public to attend their meetings as well.

Councilmember Martin thanked them for bringing attention to all Pacifica's open space and paying attention to it.

Mayor O'Neill stated that he almost made it to one of their meetings but he was supposed to go to the one next door.

Council then took a photo with Noel Blinco.

RESULT: NO VOTE REQUIRED

14. City Council Study Session on Short Term Rental Regulations

PROPOSED ACTION: Accept the Short Term Rental Study Session Staff report. Provide feedback to Staff on the type of regulation and priorities for managing the operation of the Short Term Rental Industry.

Asst. Planner Smith presented the staff report.

Councilmember Martin asked if he will be going through everything that was in the agenda packet, with all the maps.

Asst. Planner Smith stated that it will be the condensed version, around 10 minutes.

Councilmember Martin stated that she was asking because she went through the agenda packet and she has a lot of questions. She stated that there was a lot of feedback that they want from Council, and she was hesitant to start asking her questions at this time, as she feels she has too many questions and they will need a lot more time, and she would suggest that they have a study session on this. She was interested and would like more of the public involved in this, especially when looking at neighborhood maps. She stated that she has talked to people in those neighborhoods who would love to hear some of this and she would not want to repeat it twice. She recommended that they not have this presentation and have a study session in which he gives the presentation at a separate meeting.

Mayor O'Neill stated that he has no problem with that as he felt it was a meaty subject that needs to be talked about. He would question if each of them have special concerns that they can mention to staff and they can research them when they come to the study session.

Councilmember Martin reiterated that she had a lot.

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated that it would be easier to send them to the City Manager who can forward them on. She stated that it was acceptable and she thought they could work through the city clerk to figure out a meeting in the near future.

Councilmember Martin stated that she could look at her calendar.

Mayor O'Neill stated that Mayor pro Tem Keener never brings his.

Councilmember Digre stated that she did not have hers.

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated that they will work with City Clerk O'Connell in the next week to poll for dates.

Councilmember Martin stated that she didn't meant to blow this out of the water but she was not available the first or third week of July.

Mayor O'Neill stated that if there were any special concerns that a councilmember has, they should send an email to the City Manager to forward and they will work on a date to have that.

Councilmember Digre asked if the Planning Commission has dealt with this.

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated that they have not.

Councilmember Digre thought they should be involved.

Mayor pro Tem Keener stated that, if they were bringing it to the Council looking for an ordinance or modification of an ordinance, he thought Council should deal with it.

Mayor O'Neill stated that they could have a joint session, but he agreed that getting 12 people together was difficult.

Mayor pro Tem Keener stated that Council asked for this about two years ago.

Mayor O'Neill suggested that they have the City Clerk send out a poll to see when they are available.

Councilmember Digre thought it was a good idea for them to send their concerns so they have some information.

Mayor O'Neill thought a lot will be the same.

Mayor pro Tem Keener stated that the staff report was pretty thorough, and well written.

Councilmember Digre referred to the visuals on page 342, and asked if they could have something more visible. She can't see the words.

Asst. City Attorney Doherty stated that they need a motion to continue if they are not going to take public comment.

Mayor O'Neill asked if they can take one comment now.

Asst. City Attorney Doherty stated that they can then continue it, but they will need a motion.

Mayor O'Neill opened public comments.

Tygarjas Bigstyk, Pacifica, stated that he was going to speak in favor of taxes. He hoped he would be able to attend the study session.

Mayor O'Neill stated that they will continue public comments at the study session.

Councilmember Martin moved to continue the City Council study session on short term rental regulations to a time to be determined; seconded by Councilmember Digre,

RESULT:	ADOPTED AS AMENDED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER:	Deirdre Martin, Councilmember
SECONDER:	Sue Digre, Councilmember
AYES:	O'Neill, Keener, Digre, Vaterlaus, Martin

15. Approval of Letter to Caltrans for Abandonment of the Proposed Widening of Highway 1 and for San Mateo County Transportation Authority to Repurpose the Funds, Previously

Designated for the Design Phase of the Calera Parkway (Widening of Highway 1), Towards the Study of Other Alternatives, or the Combination Thereof, to Solve the Peak Hour Congestion Along Highway 1.

PROPOSED ACTION: Move to authorize transmitting the attached letter addressed to Caltrans stating the City's desire for Caltrans to abandon the proposed widening of Highway 1 and for San Mateo County Transportation Authority to repurpose the funds, previously designated for the design phase of the Calera Parkway (Widening of Highway 1), towards the study of other alternatives, or the combination thereof, to solve the peak hour congestion along the Highway 1.

PW Dr. Ocampo presented the staff report.

Mayor O'Neill: Okay. Do you want to have public hearing first or Council comments?

Councilmember Martin: I just wanted to clarify what was changed in the letter. Is that okay? So, since we last met, there were a couple of changes in the letter and, after we received the letter from the TA asking where do we stand, decided that some of the wording in the first draft referred to items that were not the same bucket of money, right? So, in other words, if we wanted pedestrian crosswalks, it would be a different bucket of money. So, decided that it would make a little more sense to just kind of focus on the word alternatives and that was a good coverall for most things. So, that was one thing that we changed. The second paragraph down, Council strongly feels that widening Highway 1 is not the solution to the peak hour traffic congestion, etc. There was a word, is not the only solution. I wanted to take out that word only. And then, the third paragraph, Council feels that through a combination of alternatives, a solution to the congestion can be achieved. So, that was kind of the change. In other words, we took out the specifics of it and referred to alternatives because that was what we've kind of been referring to all along. We also added the last paragraph, saying that we are focused on developing more environmentally sustainable solutions to our congestion problems. So, that refers back to meeting our greenhouse gas emissions goals and to help us eliminate congestion. So, those were the changes, and I just wanted to make sure I pointed that out to you, in case you didn't pick up on it. That's it. Do you want to open it up now?

Councilmember Digre: My numbers are out of order. Where is the letter.

Councilmember Martin: Packet page 378 is the new version. Packet page 380 is the letter from the TA.

Councilmember Digre: So, 378 goes to 380, right, for the continuation of the letter.

Councilmember Martin: Page 378.

PW Dir. Ocampo: Goes to 279.

Councilmember Martin: Goes to 379, I have a copy here if you want.

Councilmember Digre: The second page, I don't have. I was just thinking I had notes on that page, however. We said alternatives. I think I would encourage that we be a little bit more 21st centuryish and actually say that, that we do 21st century alternatives. Part of the reason I'm saying that is because, if you recall, when I had that conversation with Malcom Dougherty, he indicated that there was going to be money for alternative, intelligent traffic strategies and that ...

Mayor O'Neill: Who is he?

Councilmember Digre: He is the Director of Transportation, the second person in charge.

Mayor O'Neill: What department?

Councilmember Digre: State Department of Transportation. So, he indicated that, at the time, and that was a couple of years ago, that there was going to be - this was a coming thing, and there was going to be money available but there is not going to be enough money, and that you need to get your foot in the door so that's why I've been really crazy about getting traffic - the ITS traffic signals so we do have money for those two traffic signals so we do have our foot in the door, so I just think, in our letter, if we're more clear about that.

Councilmember Martin: Can I respond?

Councilmember Digre: Sure.

Councilmember Martin: I would have no problem adding the word in the third paragraph, we therefore would like Caltrans to investigate other 21st century alternatives, however, the last paragraph, I think by saying the words develop more environmentally sustainable solutions to our congestion problems, that basically covers it and puts us in the 21st century modern era.

Councilmember Digre: I missed - I didn't catch that word, modern. Okay.

Councilmember Martin: Yeah, you know, it's up to you.

Councilmember Digre: My personal preference is would we really go for asking for using some of that money for two more so we have all four in our city, but oh well, don't want to push too hard, I guess.

Mayor O'Neill: Do we want to go public comment next?

Councilmember Martin: Sure.

City Clerk O'Connell: Excuse me mayor, it's 10:45. Do you want to make a motion to go beyond 11 p.m.?

Mayor O'Neill: I guess. Do we want to continue past - we have one other item after this, and that's the Fireworks Task Force, which should be short.

Councilmember Martin: How many cards do we have?

Mayor O'Neill: Maybe ten.

Mayor pro Tem Keener: I say 12.

Mayor O'Neill: There are eight cards.

Councilmember Digre: I would go to 12.

Councilmember Digre: I would second that.

Mayor O'Neill: So, 12 midnight? Okay. So, a motion.

Mayor pro Tem Keener: She made it and she seconded it.

Mayor O'Neill: Oh, I'm sorry. I didn't hear the second. Vote.

5-0

Councilmember Digre: I don't know if we did either.

Mayor O'Neill: Okay. So, the motion to continue the meeting til 12 midnight has passed, 5-0, so that means to the public, we will go until 12 midnight. If we have not finished an item or we have not addressed an item, we will just stop the meeting at midnight, okay? So, now back to public comments now. I will open the public hearing for Item #15. Okay?

Chaya Gordon, Pacifica, stated she supported sending the letter in question, and she was also speaking as co-chair of Pacificans for Highway 1 alternatives. She stated that, in case it escaped anyone, PH1A chose that name because, from the very beginning they recognized that alternatives were going to be the way to deal with the traffic congestion on Highway 1, which has been their focus since the beginning. They felt it was the best and only way, focusing on alternatives to get improvement. She stated that the intelligent traffic signals in progress were an excellent start, adding that countless studies throughout the state have shown that adding lanes does not improve traffic congestion but the opposite. She stated, if you build it, they will drive on it. She stated countless studies also showed, to decrease greenhouse gas emissions, we need to do things like better public transit, car pooling, etc., acknowledging Council mentioning them when looking at alternatives. She felt telling Caltrans and TA that Pacifica wants to explore alternatives and combinations of alternatives and not pursue widening is the right thing to do at this time. She stated that, on behalf of PH1A and 950 supporters who vote, they appreciate all the hard work done on this by Council and staff to get us to this point and this letter is a way forward.

Bill Collins, Pacifica, thanked staff and Council, and particularly Councilmember Martin, for helping to refine and develop the agenda item. He stated that the project has been around for a long time, and it is a flawed solution to the traffic problems. He stated that more lanes was a discredited 1960s answer to real traffic problems. He thought they have learned that, if you build it, they will come. He stated that empty lanes don't exist and Pacificans are not buying it. He stated that he tried to get this on the ballot years ago, doing all the steps, and there was no interest in putting it on the ballot and he gave up on that, but they worked on electing Councilmembers who are opposed to the widening. He stated that they were elected to make these decisions. He looked at the brochures and he didn't see anyone say, if they elect him, he will pass on this because he can't make up his mind and send it to the public to decide. He stated that it wasn't their job to put everything on the ballot, but make decisions. He felt this was overdue and time to put it to bed. He thought, once the Transportation Agency sees they are serious and turned away from the widening, they will help Pacifica develop the solutions that work for our city to deal with the traffic. He thought it might be a combination of things to get it to work. He stated that, when they go to the TA and ask for redirection of funds, he was a member of the public who will be happy to lobby the TA to redirect the money. He thought the most effective was councilmember to councilmember as the TA is mostly council except for two supervisors. He thought they would get some support from the TA when they make the request.

Ron Maykel, Pacifica, stated he has spoken on this before, as he didn't want to see money go to laying more acreage of asphalt. He felt the northbound turn lanes should be graded for westport, going into East Fairway as they are inadequate. He thought it was comical that the north bound turn lane onto SeaBowl Lane, which was one of the shortest streets of Pacifica, was more adequate than the northbound turn lane for Fassler and Reina del Mar. He stated that the pedestrian infrastructure on the east side of the highway was inadequate and unsafe, especially in the area of the Gorilla BBQ, etc. He referred to the rock slide on the western flank of Sheldance Nursery and the concrete barriers holding the gravel back. He anticipated that Caltrans will have to put retaining walls to fix that as most of it was unstable. He stated that, if that was going to take place, they should consider putting a pedestrian infrastructure so people can walk to Sheldance Nursery to Fairway. He stated the whole area along the east side of the highway needs improvements, beautification and safety enhancements. He stated that people cannot walk from the hotels at Rockaway to the Surf Spot or the bowling alley and of course the light timing is one of the big issues. He stated that there were so many things that need to be done to the highway beyond laying more asphalt and he hoped they took this opportunity to take these into consideration.

David Whitney, Pacifica, thanked Councilmember Martin for bringing this up and sending a letter to Caltrans. He stated that when Caltrans has a project, they don't want any input. Pacifica has tried to give input to Caltrans for years with many lawsuits and he felt they needed to be thoroughly investigated. He stated that everything is falling apart. He had a complaint and had to go through Jerry Hill's office to contact them and he was told that they base decisions after three fatalities and, when they agree that something is wrong, they say it will take three years. He stated that the departments are not connected and he thought getting the improvements on Highway 1 is running into that bureaucracy. He felt they need to be investigated and audited. He gave an example of Caltrans wanting to build a freeway in Hayward through their downtown. The residents didn't want it and they got their automated signals which worked. He agreed with Councilmember Digre that the 21st century technology needs to be explored. He stated that Caltrans is hardheaded and he didn't know what they can do but he thought they should take it up with their state legislation and he was thankful that they presented this letter.

Hal Bohner, Pacifica, was grateful to see this on the agenda and was strongly supportive of sending the letter. He thanked Councilmember Martin. He felt it was visionary and a great idea. He hoped Council supports this. He looked in the audience and saw a very small group of people who wave the flag for Calera Parkway. He was glad they were not present. He hoped the Councilmembers who have been supporting the Calera Parkway will change their mind because it was the right thing to do to say goodbye to Calera Parkway. He stated he has been with PH1A for about five years and trying to get the Council to tell Caltrans that we don't want the Calera Parkway. Until the recent Council, they have refused to see the light. He stated that, by supporting the Calera Parkway, the Council and the supporters have prevented alternatives from happening. He stated that the people who have been subjected to the traffic problems for years and are waiting for the Calera Parkway to happen have been done wrong by the Council. He felt it was time to put the Calera Parkway to bed and move forward on something else that can improve traffic in Pacifica. He hoped to see a unanimous Council voting to support this letter.

Dan Stegink, Pacifica, had a question for the City Attorney. He asked if any member of the Council or their firm that produces a shared revenue have a financial interest in a close enough

proximity to Highway 1 that requires their recusal. He asked her to feel free to take a five-minute recess if necessary.

Asst. City Attorney Doherty: I am not permitted to address members of the public during public comment.

Mr. Stegink thanked her and then urged any Councilmember who has a financial interest or a firm member that produces a shared profit or revenue close enough to Highway 1 that requires their recusal to recuse themselves.

Mayor O'Neill closed public comments.

Councilmember Digre: I'm ready to make a motion.

Mayor pro Tem Keener: I just want to say that I'm totally supportive of this letter. I think Deirdre has done a fabulous job as has Van, and I'll definitely vote for this.

Councilmember Vaterlaus: The city of Pacifica in 1988 passed a sales tax measure, a half cent sales tax for transportation. They renewed it in 2004. It passed by 75%. This tax has had better results than any other election in Pacifica. This was for the highway for transportation. Some of the suggestions are to have school buses. I called the Pacifica School District and asked the superintendent, are you ever going to have school buses, are you ever going to change the time for Vallemar School start time. The answer to both of those questions was no. Has anyone ever contacted the TA? I talked to one person at the TA. I asked her, if we turn down this money, are they going to allow us any alternatives or any projects. She actually laughed at me. She thought it was hilarious. So, have we talked to the TA about this? The letter that we got from the TA allows us until October 31, 2017 to come up with alternatives. I'm not saying widen the highway. We have a safety issue on the highway. We need to do something and not talking to them first and sending them a letter saying we're going to just give you back this \$3.75 million that the people in Pacifica have put into their account. While we still have time to provide alternatives I think is throwing the money away and, therefore, I'm not supporting this.

Mayor O'Neill: I have a question for Van, okay. Looking at the letter from the TA, it says in order for the city to retain the remaining allocated \$3.75 million of Measure A funds for the projects, staff is requesting that it provide a letter to the TA with the following information, reason for the project delay. Any obstacles that inhibited the project from advancing have been removed or b) steps that will be taken to resolve any issues in a timely manner with work proceeding forward no later than the first six months of 2018. So, looking at this here, it says any obstacles that inhibited the project from advancing have been removed. So, do you know or can we get information that, what obstacles would be, what are the obstacles that would be considered do you think?

PW Dir. Ocampo: In terms of the obstacle that I can see is that there is that pending litigation that hasn't, we haven't received any final decision on. That is the one I see, but the Council does have the prerogative, if the Council so desires, to go to the Transportation Authority board and asked for the money to be advanced as it is currently programmed. That is what the letter is saying.

Mayor O'Neill: Right. Okay. They're basically asking do we want to move forward or not. Okay.

PW Dir. Ocampo: That is exactly the question.

Mayor O'Neill: And, according to this letter, the way I'm reading it and correct me if I'm wrong, it says reason for the project delay showing a) any obstacles that inhibited the project from advancing have been removed or b) steps that will be taken to resolve any issues in a timely manner with work proceeding forward no later than the first six months of 2018. Well, if we send the letter and we have not done any of these things, then we probably will lose the money, or what?

PW Dir. Ocampo: But, the letter, the proposed letter is addressing the fourth bullet that is currently in that letter.

Mayor O'Neill: Can you point those out?

Councilmember Martin: So, it's saying any one of the following.

Mayor O'Neill: I'm talking to Van.

Councilmember Martin: I'm sorry.

PW Dir. Ocampo: Yeah. It's addressing any of the following, but it's primarily addressing the fourth bullet that talks about, you know, if the proposed scope of work has changed, demonstrate how the project still meets the established Highway 1 program called for project criteria, any specific deviation will require the board approval. So in essence, you know, what the letter is asking for is for the remaining \$3.75 million to be repurposed into study the alternatives that are a combination thereof and still the purpose is to provide the solution to the congestion which is the primary goal of the Calera Parkway project.

Mayor O'Neill: Correct. So, if we send the letter, a proposed scope of work is changed, demonstrate how the project still meets the established highway program call for projects criteria. Now, you said the letter that was written by Councilmember Martin, let's see, demonstrate how the project. I don't. Am I missing it or where does it show here that our letter is addressing the proposed scope of work has changed and demonstrate how our letter still meets the established highway program call.

PW Dir. Ocampo: What the letter is trying to do - what the letter is requesting is that the amount, the \$3.75 million that is currently there, program for the Calera Parkway project, be used to further study the alternatives, if there are any alternatives that were not considered as part of the final EIR or the combination of the alternatives that are in the final EIR. That's what it's doing. The letter is not saying that we have identified the solution. What it is saying is that use that money to identify the solutions outside of the widening that can also address the congestion.

Mayor O'Neill: Correct. Okay. I hear what you're saying but if you look at this, I don't see how we're demonstrating how our alternatives will meet the established - I mean, I'm not a bit keen on the highway widening. I'm concerned is, the Pacifica taxpayers have been paying this tax for 30 years, we will continue to be paying this tax for another many years, but we're not getting any benefits out of this, you know, and I also believe part of the balance, what is the second issue I'll have after we finish this discussion. But, I'm concerned, their letter lists the criteria they

want in order for us to keep the \$3.75 million but are we addressing that in the letter we're sending.

PW Dir. Ocampo: Honorable Mayor, the way I look at it is that the letter was sent by staff, okay, this was sent by staff.

Mayor O'Neill: This April Chan.

PW Dir. Ocampo: Yeah, April Chan is staff member of the TA. The Council, as a body, is now requesting the board, I mean through their staff and Caltrans, if even though this is what staff is saying and we feel that we are, in a way, addressing the letter through the fourth bullet, it's still up to the board of the Transportation Authority to either grant the request of the city or for the TA board also to consider this as an appropriate response to the letter that was sent by staff of the TA.

Mayor O'Neill: Then, would it be prudent for the city to have some sort of public meetings to flesh out, because the alternatives have always been thrown around, you know, buses and pedestrian overpasses, etc., but there's never been any meeting to show that there is public support, that this is what we want them to look at.

PW Dir. Ocampo: Well, the way the letter is formulated, it is basically asking Caltrans and the TA, I mean for the TA to fund Caltrans in search of 1) any alternative that wasn't described or listed in the final EIR that is out there right now, and then 2) and particularly No. 2 is the consideration of the alternatives, a combination of those alternatives, you know, what the goal is to find how each of the alternatives will, you know, kind of nibble the delays in order for a project to be produced that would address the congestion.

Mayor O'Neill: Or a combination of the alternatives.

PW Dir. Ocampo: Yeah, you know, each of the improvement may reduce the travel time here and there and ultimately, through a combination of these alternatives, you may be able to achieve the solution. We are not telling the state or Caltrans and the TA which alternative to use, but what we're saying is that look at the alternatives that you have and see if there are other alternatives that you can add to it and, by a combination, hopefully you can find a solution to the congestion outside of the widening.

Mayor O'Neill: Okay. But, one of the issues is that a lot of the alternatives still don't have a shoulder or bypass they need to look at because the proposed - if I remember correct, the thing was any widening of more than four feet requires a public vote. So, a shoulder, if I remember right, they said a four-foot shoulder but most lanes are 12 feet. So, if a car breaks down right now, it can't even pull over to get off the shoulder.

Mayor pro Tem Keener: What the ordinance says is that any through lanes, any additional through lanes requires a public vote.

Mayor O'Neill: Through lanes, okay. So, if they want to put, if as one of their alternatives is a shoulder, safety shoulder, that would be okay. Because, basically, the widening was an ingress and egress lane, okay. Because, all we hear about is how it's armageddon at that Reina del Mar when you have three lanes of traffic go into two lanes above Reina del Mar. But, it is perfectly permissible for five lanes to enter at Fassler into two lanes, correct? That's what you're saying?

Councilmember Martin: I'm not saying any of that.

Mayor O'Neill: Well, yeah. If you don't allow the ingress and egress lane starting from Fassler to go to Westport, you are taking and the five lanes of traffic that go into Highway 1, go into two lanes at Fassler.

Councilmember Martin: If that's a question, I'm not answering it because that's not what we're talking about here.

Mayor O'Neill: Well, no, we're talking about the potential highway widening, sending a letter and basically it's a board decision at this thing for whether or not we're going to lose the money, right? Because they could just as easily say, no, we're not going to look at alternatives. We're going to give the money to Brisbane or South City or whoever. Correct?

Councilmember Martin: Absolutely. And, if we are not going to widen the highway and they're not going to give us the money for alternatives, the money was never ours.

Mayor O'Neill: Okay, but it is allocated to us now.

Councilmember Martin: Exactly, which is why we formatted the letter.

Mayor O'Neill: If we meet these four criteria.

Councilmember Martin: We reformatted the letter to include alternatives. The more specific we get, the harder it is. You're looking at different pools of money.

Mayor O'Neill: No, I can agree with that.

Councilmember Martin: That's why we took those things out. So, there are alternatives that Caltrans is aware of, right? And shoulders is one of them. So, they're going to look at all those, and we're going to all probably come back to us to talk about those alternatives. So, for now, the transportation authority didn't send this to just us. They sent it to everyone figuring out.

Mayor O'Neill: I knew they were sending that letter out, yeah.

Councilmember Martin: It was not just us. We're not in the hot seat. But, this issue is a hot seat and it's done. We already - we want to tell them to take it off the table and let us use the money for alternatives. What is your best strategy for asking them to use the money for alternatives? If this isn't it, what is a better strategy?

Mayor O'Neill: I just think that we're taking a big risk. I mean, if you look at the projections, the traffic will be backed up past Crespi on Highway 1. And on Fassler, the traffic will be backed up to where that road where the water tank is on Fassler, almost to the condos that are heading down the hill on the right hand side.

Councilmember Martin: Right.

Mayor O'Neill: That's where the traffic will be backed up because you then.

Councilmember Martin: If we don't widen the highway? We're not going to widen the highway.

Mayor O'Neill: No, they're talking about what their estimate of the traffic will be in the year 2035, okay.

Councilmember Martin: I didn't know that was what we were talking about.

Mayor O'Neill: Okay. No, I'm talking about what their projections are for traffic congestion, and you're looking at the wait time doubling for someone at Fassler where you have five lanes of traffic going into two, okay, because you are not having the ingress and the egress lane, okay, because the widening is adding a lane so that traffic from Fassler can go into that third lane and then, at the other end at Reina del Mar, the cars making the right turn will then be going into Reina del Mar and off the main flow of the two lanes.

Councilmember Martin: I think you're getting off topic, actually, because I think you're talking about the actual project. So, I think my suggestion would be we come back to the actual topic and talk more about the actual letter and whether or not we want, as a Council, to send it.

Mayor O'Neill: Okay. Then think that we should change, maybe, the letter to the majority, maybe not the entire Council.

Councilmember Digre: What?

Mayor O'Neill: Change the letter.

Councilmember Martin: I disagree.

Councilmember Digre: What was that again? I missed that.

Mayor O'Neill: Okay. Assume we have - Sue Vaterlaus says she will be voting no. Okay, the letter states that the Council strongly feels. The Council majority - I would add the word majority - feel that widening Highway 1 is not the solution.

Councilmember Vaterlaus: And I have to disagree on - the money wasn't ours in the first place. We, as a community, put that money in there. That's our money.

Councilmember Martin: I didn't decide to widen the highway when that tax was voted on, so it wasn't my money.

Councilmember Vaterlaus: You've been paying it for the years that you've been here and I've been here since 1979.

Councilmember Martin: I have no choice.

Councilmember Digre: The whole concept was for congestion management, if I'm not mistaken, and I appreciate your hard work, Van. I think we're beating a dead horse here. It seems that we're indicating that the TA is going to be mean-spirited and stick to the letter of the law - bad choice of words - the letter of whatever regarding traffic congestion and a 1980 something prescription that was the best thing at that time. I think we've had this discussion numerous times. We've had elections. To think that they're going to be mean-spirited and say, well, you didn't go along with that 1980 choice of dealing with traffic congestion and we sit here as the TA in 2017 are going to ignore that there are any 21st century intelligent strategies and alternatives

so, we're going to send our money somewhere else. I find a hard time following this. This is really - and we have - we've always heard. The time I've been on Council, which doesn't go back to 1988. I wasn't even in this city, but I've always heard that it is the prerogative of the community in which we are talking about, and that's us, prerogative of the City Council to make choices. And, we just haven't made that choice, and we have the opportunity, once again, or better still, finally, to make a choice. So, I just think that some of this is circular, and let's redo this again for the millionth time, and let's just say, get it going. Take the vote.

Mayor O'Neill: Well, what I'm advocating is that it goes to a public vote because I think it is a big enough decision and the major decision for the city that I think it just goes to a public vote, and that's all I'm advocating for. I'm not advocating for the widening.

Councilmember Digre: We've had public votes. I mean. I can't believe.

Mayor O'Neill: When? When was there a vote on the highway?

Councilmember Digre: Anyway, I would suggest Councilwoman Deidre Martin that you make the recommendation and somebody second it and we vote it down.

Councilmember Martin: I am ready to make a motion. I just want to make one more comment. Mike, you say you want it to go to a vote, but then you're previous sentence you say, you want to add majority Council strongly feels - well, that makes me think that you're going to go out to other TA and start saying, well, it wasn't me.

Mayor O'Neill: No, no, no, no. I'm not.

Councilmember Martin: That's actual concerning to me.

Mayor O'Neill: No, I do believe, okay, if you sit on a governing body, once the body has made their vote, whether I agree or disagree with the vote, I have to support what the majority of the Council says.

Councilmember Martin: And, I'm ready to make a motion.

Mayor O'Neill: No, so I'm not going to go, you know, I've never done that and never will do that. Okay. But I do feel that, you know, you keep saying we've had elections, we've had elections. If you look at all of the elections for the past three times, a majority of the voters have voted - have not voted for the people that have made Highway 1 widening the center of their platform, okay. If you run and you say, I'm against Highway 1, the majority of voters have not voted for that, and I think that's why you don't want to go to a public vote. Okay.

Councilmember Martin: You can think that.

Councilmember Digre: I would encourage you, Councilwoman Martin, to make.

Councilmember Martin: I'd like to make a motion.

Councilmember Digre: I'll second it.

Mayor O'Neill: Is there a call for the vote? No more discussion?

Mayor pro Tem Keener: Well, she's got to make the motion.

Councilmember Martin: I'm ready to make a motion.

Mayor O'Neill: Oh, I thought she just did. She just seconded it.

Councilmember Digre: Yeah, I thought you did too.

Councilmember Martin: Well, I didn't actually say, I mean, if the recommended action - I'll make a motion to move to authorize transmitting the attached letter, addressed to Caltrans, stating the city's desire for Caltrans to abandon the proposed widening of Highway 1 and for San Mateo County Transportation Authority to repurpose the funds previously designated for the design phase of the Calera Parkway widening of Highway 1 towards the study of other alternatives or the combination thereof, to solve the peak hour congestion along the Highway 1.

Councilmember Digre: Second.

Mayor O'Neill: And that motion passes, 3-2. So, the letter will be sent out.

RESULT:	ADOPTED AS AMENDED [3 TO 2]
MOVER:	Deirdre Martin, Councilmember
SECONDER:	Sue Digre, Councilmember
AYES:	Keener, Digre, Martin
NAYS:	O'Neill, Vaterlaus

16. Introduction of an Ordinance Amending Title 9, Chapter 5 – Growth Management Ordinance of the Pacifica Municipal Code (TA-107-17) to Extend it for Five Years
Move to introduce and waive the first reading of the ordinance entitled “An Ordinance of the City Council of the City of Pacifica Amending Chapter 5 of Title 9 of the Pacifica Municipal Code to Extend the Growth Management Ordinance (TA-107-17).”

This was moved to Public Hearings as second item.

Asst. Planner O'Connor presented the staff report.

Mayor pro Tem Keener stated that the changes would only be in the dates in the final termination clause. He circled a few dates that are out of date, and he asked what impact that would have on the ordinance. He thought the first instance under the findings, letter D, regarding fiscal resources, doesn't have much of an impact and he suggested that they delete the fiscal year and say the budget of Pacifica and financial statement of Pacifica subject to Council's agreement.

Mayor O'Neill asked what page they were on.

Councilmember Martin said it was page 390.

Mayor pro Tem Keener stated that it was half way down. He again stated that it was in the findings and wouldn't have any effect except to clarify things. He then referred to packet page 392 regarding annual allotment during fiscal year through June 30, 1997, and he thought that date should possibly be eliminated. He then referred to similar language on page 393 regarding agricultural land through June 30, 1997, and he would again delete the date. He asked the City

Attorney for an opinion. He then referred to page 394 regarding hillside protection and the date was through June 30, 1977, and he would delete that date also. He asked the City Attorney if any of those suggested changes would have a material effect on enforcement of the ordinance.

Asst. City Attorney Doherty stated that he has aptly pointed out some ambiguities created by the amendments of the ordinance. She stated that the amendments as drafted would not materially impact the enforcement of this ordinance. She recommended, if it was Council's pleasure to see that the dates are removed, they bring it back with those amendments or they can approve the ordinance as proposed and extend the date and, at a later time, come back with a clean up of amendments. She thought staff would recommend moving forward with the amendments to extend the ordinance, because the termination period is looming. They will commit to returning with some cleanup changes pursuant to Mayor pro Tem Keener's recommendations.

Mayor pro Tem Keener asked, since they are simply deletions and five or six in total, if they could incorporate them into the motion.

Asst. City Attorney Doherty stated that, because the resolution and ordinance as drafted, do not contain those amendments and they haven't properly noticed the public of those changes, and she would prefer to bring it back at a later time.

Mayor pro Tem Keener commented that, with other resolutions, they have made changes from the dais and he didn't see the distinction between them and this situation.

Asst. City Attorney Doherty stated that, not knowing what those other ordinances and resolutions are, she thought these changes were substantial enough that they should return at a later time.

Mayor pro Tem Keener understood. He agreed that they should pass it at this meeting or June 26. He thought, since it is an ordinance, they should pass it at this meeting. He asked that staff put it on the agenda to come back before fall.

Councilmember Vaterlaus stated that she was surprised to have a balance of 1,483 houses that they could build.

Councilmember Digre stated that she attended the Planning Commission meeting and thought they did a thorough job, adding that she was proud of what they did that evening.

Mayor O'Neill stated that he had no problem voting yes on this, but he was curious as to whether there were any issues in the ordinance that would conflict with Senator Wiener's recently passed state law. He stated that he didn't know if she was familiar with it as it was three years old.

Asst. City Attorney Doherty stated she was not and asked if he could elaborate on that.

Mayor O'Neill explained that, regarding building housing, first and foremost was what we need to do. He didn't know if there were conflicts in this and they may need to amend to conform to state law.

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated that she was not familiar with this bill specifically, but she stated that with the ordinance as written, as well as the number of allocation accumulated over

the years, they were not in jeopardy of violating their RHNA allocation in any way. She stated that, with this ordinance in place, they continue to meet their housing element obligations.

Mayor O'Neill read that the RHNA numbers were a focus of that bill, and cities could be penalized if they don't meet those numbers, and he wanted to be sure Pacifica was covered.

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated that she didn't have the RHNA allocation memorized but she stated that the allocations under growth management that are available well exceed their reallocation.

Mayor O'Neill stated that he knew it passed the Senate and he thought the Assembly, but he didn't know if the governor has signed it.

Asst. City Attorney Doherty was not aware but when they bring it back they can include some analysis if that bill has been signed into law.

Mayor O'Neill thought it would be interesting to see, because it was major legislation in regard to housing, how it would impact Pacifica.

Mayor pro Tem Keener thought that may be a separate issue from this He thought, if it has passed, they should know about it or start with something to the Planning Commission as it would fall under their bailiwick, and then bring it to Council.

Mayor O'Neill stated that he wasn't trying to amend or change this resolution, but was concerned that, if they amend it, they amend it to do what they want it to do and conform to state law.

Mayor pro Tem Keener stated that they were changing two dates and that is it.

Mayor O'Neill opened the Public Hearing, and seeing no one, closed the Public Hearing..

Mayor pro Tem Keener moved to introduce and waive the first reading of the ordinance entitled "An Ordinance of the City Council of the City of Pacifica Amending Chapter 5 of Title 9 of the Pacifica Municipal Code to Extend the Growth Management Ordinance (TA-107-17)"; seconded by Councilmember Vaterlaus.

Mayor O'Neill called a five-minute break then reconvened the meeting.

RESULT:	ADOPTED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER:	John Keener, Mayor Pro Tem
SECONDER:	Sue Vaterlaus, Councilmember
AYES:	O'Neill, Keener, Digre, Vaterlaus, Martin

17. Illegal Fireworks Task Force Recommendations
PROPOSED ACTION: Move to accept the recommendations of the Illegal Fireworks Task Force.

Police Chief Steidle presented the staff report.

Mayor O'Neill asked how they were disseminating the app.

Police Chief Steidle stated that was something they will have to put out via email lists and all the different venues he mentioned for public outreach strategies.

Mayor O'Neill asked if they were going to have something about installing the app, because the Hostess show, pay the dough, was good for the perpetrator but for them to get neighbors and citizens to download the app and use it, they never talked about that.

Police Chief Steidle agreed, adding that they were going to utilize all the venues they possibly can to get that information out there. They are also going to be working with TNT Fireworks as Revel Communications does have experience with this and they have worked with other cities that have been able to use it successfully, and they will listen to what they have to say as well. He added that the app service to the city was free.

Councilmember Martin asked if they already printed the flyer.

Police Chief Steidle asked what flyer.

Councilmember Martin stated, hostess show, pay the dough.

Police Chief Steidle stated they have not.

Councilmember Martin thought that might be one spot where they have a down load an app to report violators, might be a good spot for the app link.

Police Chief Steidle thought that was not a bad idea.

Mayor O'Neill thought it would be good to put them at the fireworks booths.

Councilmember Digre thanked him, and she thanked the task force, adding that she liked their slogan.

Councilmember Martin moved to accept the recommendations of the illegal Fireworks Task Force; seconded by Councilmember Vaterlaus.

Mayor O'Neill asked if they were done with their meetings.

Police Chief Steidle stated that they will be having one shortly after the July 4 and, unless further direction from Council, he believes it sunsets one year after the day they first sat, and he thought they will be meeting again before it sunsets and they will take it from there.

RESULT:	ADOPTED [4 TO 0]
MOVER:	Deirdre Martin, Councilmember
SECONDER:	Sue Vaterlaus, Councilmember
AYES:	O'Neill, Digre, Vaterlaus, Martin
RECUSED:	Keener

ADJOURN

Mayor O'Neill adjourned the meeting at 11:45 p.m.

Transcribed by Barbara Medina, Public Meeting Stenographer.

Respectfully submitted,

Kathy O'Connell
City Clerk

APPROVED:

Mike O'Neill, Mayor