



**CITY OF PACIFICA
CITY COUNCIL MINUTES**

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

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

February 26, 2018 (MONDAY)

www.cityofpacifica.org

Mayor John Keener called the meeting to order on February 26, 2018 at 7:05 PM

CLOSED SESSION - NONE.

7:00 PM OPEN SESSION

Call to Order

Mayor Keener called the meeting to order at 7:05 p.m.

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

Staff Present: Kevin Woodhouse, City Manager; Michelle Kenyon, City Attorney; Lorenzo Hines, Asst. City Manager; Van Ocampo, Public Works Director; Luis Sun, Public Works Deputy Director; Dan Steidle, Police Chief; Mike Perez, PB&R Director; Kathy O'Connell, City Clerk.

Salute to the Flag led by Mayor Pro Tem Vaterlaus

Closed Session Report

SPECIAL PRESENTATIONS

Voters Choice Act - Mark Church, Chief Elections Officer County Clerk/Recorder

Jim Irizarry, Asst. Assessor County Clerk Recorder and Chief Elections Officer, stated that Mark Church could not be present and he was present to make the presentation. He stated that San Mateo County has been known throughout California as the leader in elections, particularly in the area of all mail ballot elections and are one of 14 counties selected to implement the SB450 California Voters' Choice Act. He then explained that the act was landmark legislation and would fundamentally transform elections to an all mail ballot vote center model with drop off locations and one part of sweeping election reforms to increase voter participation. He stated that it became effective January 1, 2018 and only five of those counties

have elected to hold the June 5, 2018 and November elections as an all mail ballot elections. He stated that all counties in California will be eligible to participate in the California Voters' Choice Act and hold all mail ballot vote center elections starting January 1, 2020 and the 14 counties were pioneering the way for every county to move forward in 2020, and will be translated in the future with possible changes to the legislation for more efficiency. He then gave a brief history of the first historic local consolidated municipal and school district election in California in November 2015 which was a success and led to the creation of SB450, incorporating the lessons learned. He then explained how the California Voters' Choice Act will work followed by addressing the election administration plan which includes a voter education and outreach plan before finalizing the plan. He also explained the process of getting your "I Voted" sticker when voting by mail because it was apparently an important matter to many voters. He also described their security systems to address safety concerns. He also mentioned the costs and savings compared to prior systems. He mentioned that the vote center model allowed them to vote all the way up to Election Day. He then stated he was open to questions.

Councilmember Martin thanked him for the concise presentation. She referred to people being displaced and may be between residences and may not be able to receive mail-ins. She thought that was why they have different locations to drop in but she asked how those people are expected to vote.

Mr. Irizarry stated that the system in place sends all registered voters a ballot and if it is returned to them and they notice that there has been an address change, they will get on to the voter registration data file and call the voter or send a letter or email asking them to come in or provide correct address information and they will resend the ballot. He stated that, if they are a registered voter and didn't get their information, he recommended that they go to the vote center or online and they can obtain a ballot at the vote center with their new address. He added that if there is a question, you will be able to vote conditionally and it will be counted following verifying their registration.

Councilmember Martin thought it sounds great in theory, but she thought about all the phone calls they will be making. She referred to outreach, and suggested posters for local coffee shops or city hall. She then stated that she had a question on E-slates or vote slates.

Mr. Irizarry stated that E-slate machines are voting machines.

Councilmember Martin asked if that was a closed system.

Mr. Irizarry stated that it was an electronic closed voting system made by Heart Inner Civic and it has been in place for about ten years.

Councilmember Martin asked if that system would be used if they had the ballots open.

Mr. Irizarry responded affirmatively, stating that it was a traditional polling place electronic system.

Councilmember O'Neill referred to moving towards almost paperless ballots, and asked if a voter will be able to sign up to get the pamphlet electronically if they wish.

Mr. Irizarry stated that now they have online for disabled voters a web-based sample ballot that you can get through the internet. He stated that they mail it out and they are working towards

being able to provide that service to everyone. He added that there is a ton of information on their website. He stated that they will see the sample ballot on the website but the only difference was that the sample ballot was designed for a community's ballot styles, adding that in an election they will have 70 different unique ballot styles and are the distinctive differences that they don't have available to everyone on line. He added that for disabled voters who sign up, they will send them a remote accessible sample ballot.

Mayor Keener asked if they have voter information pamphlets available on line.

Mr. Irizarry responded affirmatively, adding that they recommend that they go to the website, shapethefuture.com or SMCAcre which is their new website. He stated that it was very easy to navigate and all the information is at their disposal. He stated that they will be holding a Webinar available to all elected city officials and city clerks to go through their website. He stated that it provides all forms of information for average people and elected officials and cities to use. He stated that they can research elections going back 10-15 years and they are using technology to make that information more accessible. He stated that the beauty of that website was that it was a responsive design and they can pull it up on their I-phone or Android.

Mayor Keener thanked him for his presentation.

Mr. Irizarry thanked him for the opportunity to make the presentation.

SAMTRANS Bus Service - Jessica Epstein

Jessica Epstein presented information on SamTrans Bus Service. She stated that they have three run books a year, January, June and August. They are working on the June run book, adding that the only contemplated changes for Pacifica for June would be shutting off the school routes in the summer which is done every year. She stated that they have developed a good process for requests to change their service with a committee to evaluate them from an operations, planning and communications perspective. She stated that they may do some larger changes but now they are not considering anything for the coast. She mentioned that ridership was down all over the county and for almost every bus company in the country and they were working on that. She mentioned the youth mobility study discussed the previous year and they have hired someone whose responsibility was outreach to youth and schools with an increased ridership focus and work with the schools to publicize their service. She mentioned some of the concerns expressed by the public in a survey and how they are trying to address them. She felt they were trying to address all of the concerns of Pacificans and assessing if increase in frequency was a viable option. She then gave some specifics regarding the Coast Study which they have been involved in for some time with public meetings and changes they have made in addressing public feedback, some longer term goals, park and rides and Flex Pacifica. She also addressed the vision of where SamTrans is going in the future, mentioning some specifics. She concluded with addressing their funding plans and the hope to be back in early spring with their draft expenditure plan.

Councilmember Digre asked if they have a definition of the term "coastside."

Ms. Epstein stated that the area they looked at was Half Moon Bay and Pacifica areas and connections between them. She stated that their outreach happened in the two cities, but in publicizing it, it was broader than that.

Councilmember Digre understood but she referred to the past when there was talk of coastside but Pacifica was not involved so she was checking on that.

Ms. Epstein stated that Pacifica is very involved.

Councilmember O'Neill understood that they have express buses to BART which run to San Francisco and the East Bay, and he asked if they have thought of express buses to CalTrain in San Bruno or South San Francisco for those who go to Mountain View or Foster City.

Ms. Epstein stated that there was feedback, adding that they did a lot of maps on where people travel to but there wasn't the density for the areas and she can ask if that was contemplated although it wasn't part of the final recommendation. She can ask if there was a possibility or where that data took them.

Councilmember O'Neill stated that Google runs a bus out of Pacifica but it was a smaller bus going to Yahoo. He stated that when Flex started he thought it did well in Pacifica but died in San Carlos and he asked if it was still going in San Carlos.

Ms. Epstein stated that they have other shuttle services in San Carlos.

Councilmember O'Neill asked if Flex was growing or flat.

Ms. Epstein reiterated that they don't have Flex in San Carlos, then stated that it was holding steady with solid numbers of around 2,000 riders a month since implemented. They hope, with the marketing push, they will be able to jump those numbers.

Councilmember O'Neill thought they had one or two buses on Flex and asked if they will increase the number of buses.

Ms. Epstein stated that the plan was to keep the bus routes the same as they are doing pretty well. If the marketing numbers come out and they are overcrowded buses, they will look at that.

Councilmember Martin thanked her for the presentation and extending the #118, stating that she has heard positive feedback in the community. She was excited about their advancements with digital updates and was looking forward to seeing it progress, as well as ways of funding and mobile ticketing and fleet conversion to electric. She referred to their analysis on the express bus to San Francisco where they felt they can't meet the trip time to and from Pacifica and BART versus into the city. She stated that the analysis was based on ridership and she wondered when the ridership comes into play for their analysis on an express bus. She explained that she talked to a lot of people who would fill up the bus. She asked for her comment on that, referring to the presentation by Millie where she was unsure about the analysis that was done.

Ms. Epstein stated that when the original express bus was taken out, it was due to low ridership issues. She stated that the #118 has good ridership and an express bus would essentially be a competitor with that. She thought, if the #118 were bursting they would have good data about ridership. She stated that the analysis was done based on speed to downtown and if they end up competing with BART, it was a hard thing to justify financially when the bus would be slower than BART and competitive with #118. She will take back the feedback regarding the interest in more depth on the ridership side of things. She stated that everything was a balance and they look at different factors, such as ridership or speed. She stated that they can't make Flex

Pacifica faster, and it was apples and oranges where the true goal was to get people downtown as quickly as possible.

Councilmember Martin stated that she had one argument to that. She stated that, if #118 was bursting at the seams, she didn't think that was a good comparison because someone who had an express bus to the financial district might not choose to go to BART to get to the financial district but use their car and she stated that 25% of all greenhouse gases in Pacifica are created by people driving to San Francisco. She then mentioned programs that relieve traffic congestion, stating that she saw the get-us-moving campaign which they will suggest to the board to support.

Ms. Epstein stated that the get-us-moving is the development of the expenditure plan which will be going to the board in June.

Councilmember Martin asked if they are going to present that as being something they support.

Ms. Epstein asked if she meant as staff recommendation, that was correct.

Councilmember Martin stated that, in terms of how it relates to Pacifica, her concern was that to get buy in from a coastside town, she would like to see how they benefit. She stated that some of the numbers thrown around were very low percentages for local streets and 10-12% of that money would be applicable for Pacifica to apply for grant money and they would be competing with San Mateo County. She stated that, if she wants this to pass, they have to give them something more and 10-12% for local streets and roads will not cut it.

Ms. Epstein stated she would, adding that they don't have percentages set yet.

Councilmember Martin understood that, but when they were looking at the pie, it didn't seem that it will be high enough for people to vote for a tax on it.

Ms. Epstein understood and thanked her for the feedback.

Mayor pro Tem Vaterlaus thanked her for her presentation. She stated that she attended their event and was surprised to see that seniors living on Terra Nova and Oddstad in the largest senior communities in Pacifica have no bus ridership at all when school is out and on the weekends and they feel trapped since they have nothing. She thought the micro bus might be a good idea for them where they could get out on the weekends if they don't drive.

Ms. Epstein stated that she got Terra Nova but asked for the second street.

Mayor pro Tem Vaterlaus stated it was Oddstad. She stated that she has also heard about the express bus and they ask for the return of the express bus. She understood that they have more get-us-moving mailers in the back, stating that it does ask if you would like money for your individual area. She thought they could benefit from that, but not being a transit oriented town, they don't always get funding that they can use as we aren't transit oriented and can't be.

Councilmember Digre stated that at one time they had a gold shuttle which covered Friday nights until 10 pm and Saturdays until 10 pm, Sundays until 6:00 PM and both the youth and seniors loved that, but they lost that one because of ridership. She stated that they had numerous meetings and finally got the little word "or" which is in the SamTrans manuals. She

stated that now she was concerned that ridership was becoming the sole criteria, adding that we can never compete with the El Camino and 101 corridor.

Ms. Epstein stated that one thing they are looking at with the SamTrans business plan was alternative methods of assessment so they are not just looking at a fare box recovery or ridership levels but other ways they can look at assessing the area. She stated that, even with low ridership, they cover a fair amount of the area. She heard about the senior communities at the Pacifica town hall, and it was definitely something they will look at.

Councilmember Digre stated that the express bus has been consistent and it was a shock that they lost it. She referred to her comment that they can't compete with BART, stating that our residents are saying that by the time they get from Pacifica to BART they could have already been in San Francisco if the express bus was available.

Ms. Epstein stated that was not how the math was by their analyst.

Councilmember Digre asked if they were factoring in the time to get to BART.

Ms. Epstein stated that they looked at the #118 to BART and then BART to downtown versus a bus directly to downtown. Due to traffic, the bus to downtown would sit in traffic and was slower. She acknowledged that, with no traffic, it could be a faster ride but they have to deal with commute time traffic which was slow in and out of San Francisco and BART doesn't deal with that traffic.

Councilmember Digre referred to the FLEX which was in the Linda Mar area, and asked why they can't duplicate the flex in the central and northern area of Pacifica. She stated that they are told no, but she didn't understand why.

Ms. Epstein stated that she would take that comment back and see if she can get an answer.

Councilmember Digre stated that it was loved in that area but they don't have it in the other two areas. She mentioned that Scoop has come along, and stated that they have 25 riders from Pacifica to 92 to Foster City which she considered a full shuttle. She wondered why that wouldn't be picked up with a shuttle since they already have the ridership.

Ms. Epstein stated that it was difficult to run one shuttle. They have multiple runs a day and Scoop may run one line with 25 people once, but she asked if that will be 25 people at several different hours to run an actual bus service and cover all the different time slots that would make sense. She reiterated that 25 would be great if it repeated itself over the course of the schedule.

Councilmember Digre thought it was not just twice a day.

Ms. Epstein stated that they do very few that would be just two times a day if any.

Councilmember O'Neill stated that CalTrans was starting to use the VMT as a criteria and he thought that would benefit the coast. He asked if they might consider that as an alternative versus ridership.

Ms. Epstein stated that it was great feedback.

Councilmember O'Neill thought there was a lack of east-west transportation, going up Sharp Road to Skyline College and South San Francisco. He didn't think Genentech has a bus from Pacifica, but there were a lot of Genentech employees in Pacifica.

Mayor Keener stated that Genentech has a van and his wife drives it. He stated that they also have declining ridership. He stated that he has noticed the #110 and #118 start in Linda Mar, go to Daly City and end in Linda Mar and the bus driver is driving that bus from somewhere, probably beyond the BART station on the north end of the route down to Linda Mar with the sign not in service. He stated that when they are done with their runs and go back to the garage, they get to Linda Mar, put the "not in service" sign and drive it back. He asked if they can do something about that. He thought that would be a savings in salaries.

Ms. Epstein stated that they are assessing a lot, and the interplay between the drivers and buses and the most efficient way to move both around is a big conversation in the bus operations department. She stated that they aim for efficiencies and cost savings but the reality was that the buses have a home in their bases and have to go a certain distance before they get on the route and it can be pretty long being not in service.

Mayor Keener asked where the base was for the #110 and #118.

Ms. Epstein stated that she didn't know where those buses live. She stated that they have the north base in South San Francisco but they do some of their rides through contractors which are in a different base in that area.

Mayor Keener suggested that they keep assessing.

Ms. Epstein agreed.

CONSENT CALENDAR

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

1. Approval of Disbursements for 01/16/18 through 01/31/18.
PROPOSED ACTION: Move to approve attached list of disbursements for 01/16/18 through 01/31/18.
2. Approval of Minutes
PROPOSED ACTION: Move to approve the minutes of the regular meeting held on February 12, 2018.
3. Adoption of an Ordinance of the City Council of the City of Pacifica for General Plan Amendment GPA-93-16 and Rezoning RZ-195-16, to change the General Plan Land Use Designation from High Density Residential to Low Density Residential, and to change the zoning classification from the C-3 (Service Commercial) zoning district to the R-1 (Single Family Residential) zoning district, at the project site located at the western terminus of San Pedro Terrace Road, Pacifica (APN 023-075-050). The project area is a vacant triangular-shaped lot located along the southerly bank of San Pedro Creek in the

West Linda Mar neighborhood. Adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) (Second Reading).

PROPOSED ACTION: Move to adopt the ordinance entitled "an Ordinance of the City Council of the City of Pacifica for General Plan Amendment GPA-93-16 and Rezoning RZ-195-16, to change the General Plan Land Use Designation from High Density Residential to Low Density Residential, and to change the zoning classification from the C-3 (Service Commercial) zoning district to the R-1 (Single Family Residential) zoning district, at the project site located at the western terminus of San Pedro Terrace Road, Pacifica (APN 023-075-050). The project area is a vacant triangular-shaped lot located along the southerly bank of San Pedro Creek in the West Linda Mar neighborhood. Adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) (Second Reading)."

4. Third Amendment to the Consultant Services Agreement Between the City of Pacifica and WRA, Inc. in the Amount of \$3,730, creating a new not to exceed amount of \$ 146,455, to Complete the Environmental Review Process in Connection with a Proposed Development of 24 Condominium Units at 801 Fassler Avenue
PROPOSED ACTION: Move to approve Amendment No. 3 to the Consultant Service Agreement between the City of Pacifica and WRA, Inc. for an additional \$ 3,730 to the contract, creating a new not to exceed amount of \$ 146,455, to complete the environmental review services in connection with a proposed project of 24 condominium units at 801 Fassler Avenue (APN 022-083-020 and 022-083-030), and authorize the City Manager to execute the contract amendment.

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

Tygarjas Bigstyk, Pacifica, stated that he was not able to attend the previous meeting but he would have liked to speak on behalf of exactly what they did which was give the Resource Center funding from the ERAF. He would love to see it in the General Fund, but he thanked them for finding the money to make sure the Resource Center is funded.

Ron Maykel, Pacifica, stated he was speaking for Rockaway Beach. He didn't know if the Mayor and City Manager had a chance to go down there after he spoke on it, but he noticed some changes and didn't know if it was by accident or design. He then stated that on the north part of the parking lot, they have a lot of RVs that have been parking there. He was curious as to whether we have an ordinance that regulates vehicle size in our parking lots. If we do, he thought they needed to get an officer down there and get them out. He stated that they have piggy back stalls and they are able to take up two parking spots and make it difficult for you to pull into the parking lot and block visibility in case of an emergency because of their height. He stated that, if there isn't an ordinance regulating vehicle size, maybe they need to look at that as something that needs to be done, possibly a sign saying no RVs as they are problematic. He stated that there are normally two and sometimes three but once there were five. He thought Rockaway has an opportunity to study the effects of boulder armoring. He thought the first boulder armoring in Rockaway was in front of the retaining wall at the Seabreeze Hotel parking lot. He thought it might be the most historic rip rap armoring in Pacifica. He stated that the boulders further away from the wall have barnacles, etc. He stated that the northern beach has lost at least 70% due to boulder armoring, and they were being pulled out slowly. He stated that the southern beach has no armoring at all. He thought it might be a study area to see the

effects of the boulder armoring situation. He just wanted to point it out so they have something to look at.

Gordon Tannura, Pacifica, stated that he was speaking as a sea level rise community worker member. He wanted to identify concerns and suggestions for a more engaging creation of the coastal plan update. He referred to the current process relegating the work group to an editorial role without meaningful feedback, involvement and conversation. He stated that there were no opportunities between now and an unscheduled meeting in May to participate. He stated that, at that point, they will be provided the next draft of ESA's report. He stated that nothing is indicated that they will receive a revised assessment or work in progress or the first draft based on the input received to date. He sees the same for the second report and the final report in the fall. He stated that, in a crucial element of the study, they were not afforded an opportunity to discuss important ingredients, aspects and criteria of the vulnerability assessment for evaluation with no voice except to provide a critique when the cow is almost out of the barn. He stated he emailed comments to staff and he has received no response other than staff is reviewing and no estimated time frame for response to his questions and concerns. He stated that the comment period is closing and no response and they will not have a dialogue until the next draft in May. He didn't think this represented a functional working group. He stated that a message was received that staff was considering additional meetings. He thought that was fantastic and asked when they would hear of the results of that consideration and what will be done as a courtesy to accommodate participant schedules and have a meaningful dialogue and a more defined process, partnership and collaboration in the process. He suggested they invest now in engagement and develop a more robust project plan with some view of intermediate deliverables and distribute all communications broadly to the entire work group. He stated he was doing that and asked that they facilitate that distribution or endorse and acknowledge it and additional meetings may have a budget impact from the initial cost and he asked that they estimate the impact and discuss mitigating measures on expense and additional funding requests from the Coastal Commission and/or the city, engage all owners of vulnerable properties directly in the fashion that the city uses when development projects affect the neighborhood, particularly in the Coastal Zone. He thought a more engaging process can only help ensure a better result and community buy in.

COUNCIL COMMUNICATIONS

Councilmember O'Neill stated he attended the Council of Cities dinner and the LCP meeting. He asked that they adjourn in memory of Charlie English who was the former police chief and city manager. He stated that he was here so long he probably gave Portola a ticket for loitering on the beach. He stated that everyone knew City Hall was a school and Mr. English used to joke that his desk as city manager was in the same spot he was in when in first grade. He stated that he was a nice guy and passed away in ill health.

Councilmember Martin stated that, since January, the Pacifica Beach Coalition has 666 volunteers. She stated that the Oceana students worked the past Wednesday to clean the streets from the school down Salada to the pier, then back to the triangle between Salada and the high school and woodchipped the entire area. On Saturday, East Sharp Park neighbors planted approximately 75 plants. She stated that the Beach Coalition thanked Recology for providing the cardboard to help lay down and Pacifica for providing the wood chips and the community members who helped do that planting. She invited people to drive by that triangle. She stated that Earth Day was coming on April 21 starting at 9 am and the EcoFest starts at 11 am and goes to 2:30. She stated that the library and Beach Coalition are working together on a book to action project, called Garbology, and you can get a copy of it at the library. She stated

that there was opportunity for engagement between now and April 21. She thought they will have the author of the book as a keynote speaker. She stated that they are taking sign ups for action and she was recruiting for volunteers at the dump site which she runs every year and applications for booths. She stated that the Emergency Preparedness group met the past week. They were looking at a couple of disaster relief boxes but also want to look at more as what they have may not be enough. She asked them to get estimates and they will hopefully bring that to Council at the next meeting. She attended the Sports Hall of Fame dinner the previous Saturday. She thanked Horace Hinshaw who puts it together every year. She stated that she didn't grow up in a town that does that, and she felt it was unique. She attended the LCP meeting and reminded everyone to educate themselves and find out what is going on. She stated that the best place to find information was by coming to the meetings and going to the city website. She stated that she has seen emails from the San Mateo County Association of Realtors, Chamber of Commerce, etc., and they were presenting one side of the plan. She stated that there will be many mitigation tactics and she suggested that they know about all of them. She referred to Gordon Tannura stating he was a part of the working group and she suggested they reach out to them. She appreciated his comments. She thought if it was a possibility to be a more engaging process with the community groups she would support that. She was not on the ad hoc committee and she can only tell Pacificans to get educated and not rely on others.

Mayor pro Tem Vaterlaus stated that she attended the CCAG's water committee and she reminded the elected and city officials that they were having a water summit called, "Droughts, Floods and Sea Level Rise, Oh My" on March 30 at Canada College. She stated that there will be a lot of information for elected officials.

Mayor Keener added that members of the public were also welcome.

Mayor pro Tem Vaterlaus stated that, if you would like to attend, you have to RSVP. She attended the public meeting on sea level rise and there are more meetings yet to be determined. She attended the appreciation reception at Skyline College which was a great event for people who appreciate Skyline College. She stated that the Democrats had a speaker from the ACLU about your rights which was interesting. She stated that, at the Council of Cities, Mark Church gave the presentation they heard at this meeting. She attended the Pacifica Sports Hall of Fame and she also thanked Horace Hinshaw. She stated that four people were inducted in the Hall of Fame. She stated that if you go to the community center there was a wall with everyone's picture and a plaque showing all the people inducted in the Hall of Fame. She stated that Coach Gray drove 1600 miles to be there. She stated that she has attended various meetings on sea level rise and she has heard from some members of the community that February 28 was the last day for public comment on the draft vulnerability. She stated that a lot of people think it is too soon with not enough time to go over it.

Councilmember Digre stated that she went to several meetings, and the school district was looking for a superintendent and want input from the public as what they think the role of the superintendent is. She stated that there is a complicated survey but if you go to pacificasd.org you have until the 28th to put ideas into it. She stated that some people are concerned about teaching our young children the dangers of using chemicals and drugs that can affect their brain. She stated this was the opportunity for the public to put those thoughts in. She stated that every time she tries to go to websites, including the city, she cannot find things such as sea level rise on the city's website.

Councilmember O'Neill stated that there was a button on the front page of the city website.

Mayor pro Tem Vaterlaus stated that there were a couple of buttons and one says sea level rise. You can click on it and it has the questions and answers.

Councilmember Digre stated that she feels dumb because she can never find the button.

Mayor pro Tem Vaterlaus stated that it has the questions and answers and all the sea level rise attachments.

Councilmember Martin agreed that, in terms of making a comment, she was right that it was not very obvious.

Councilmember O'Neill stated it just gives you the email address for the comment.

Councilmember Digre was referring to comments because people like to make comments before it is too late. She stated that the commute.org was one of hers. She referred to the Lime bicycles which stick out, and stated that they actually have motors on them and she suggested that Pacificans might want to take up cycling. She stated that they have a GPS unit and you don't have to worry about a bicycle rack and you ride to your destination and leave it and nobody can steal it because they can find you. She thought she might be able to bicycle again. She attended the San Pedro Coalition which was a long standing coalition. Residents do a tremendous job and it is a fantastic creek with steelhead. She stated that she will give the Council the watershed plan but it was also on line. She encouraged the city to work with the county and work with the Creek Coalition, adding that we have something marvelous there. She stated that, with the San Francisco Airport, they were still moving along. She wanted Council and City Manager to be sure they have time to discuss this. She stated that San Francisco Roundtable for the airport wants to expand and include other cities such as Palo Alto. She was against that as she thought it will dilute our issues. She was concerned about staff time as staff was part time. She didn't think it was smart for Pacifica but she thought Council should have a right to weigh in on that. She stated that a couple of people have mentioned that Pacifica can look tacky when garbage is all over the place when people behave badly, and she questioned what we can do about it. She stated that goal setting was Saturday, all day, and it was an opportunity for Pacificans to weigh in on what they feel the goals for Council should be.

Mayor Keener stated if Pacificans want to go to the countywide sea level rise meeting, they can email him or Mayor pro Tem Vaterlaus and they will send them an invite. He stated that, at the sea level rise workshop, the speaker was the former head of the Coastal Commission who gave them an overview of the process of the local coastal plan and the sea level rise component on which they are working. He stated that it was very worthwhile, but if you didn't make it, there will be more. He attended the congestion management and environmental quality subcommittee of CCAG today with Councilmember O'Neill with discussion of the HOV express lanes on 101 that are part of the get-us-moving program in San Mateo County. He was invited to give an interview at Alma Heights Christian School the previous week. It was a practice run for their technology class and followed by a tour of the school by the assistant and head of school. He attended the Peninsula Clean Energy board meeting. He stated that, at the last meeting, he asked about coastline protection projects and the City Manager has given them the data and there was a total of \$16 million in costs for coastline protection projects from 310 Esplanade where they were falling into the ocean and down to the Milagra Creek outfall and Beach Boulevard sea wall. He stated that amount does not include the construction phase of a new Beach Boulevard sea wall which will be quite a bit more expensive. He stated that the city

has done well, getting grants to cover most of the \$16 million but \$3 million is the city's money toward the projects as matches to the grants.

Councilmember Martin invited everyone to Pacifica's second annual youth and family summit on March 10 at IBL, 10:30 to 2:30, which is put on by the Pacifica Prevention Partnership with workshops on substance abuse, etc.

STAFF COMMUNICATIONS

City Manager Woodhouse mentioned that the badges for him and the City Attorney have disappeared. He thanked Mayor Keener for mentioning the estimated cost related to the coastal protection projects. He added that the full construction cost of the Beach Boulevard sea wall is not included, with estimates for that being in the \$22 million range. He stated that they recently completed applications for two different grants totaling \$1.5 million to begin a study phase for the Beach Boulevard sea wall. He referred to mention of the local coastal plan update process and community work group. He stated that they met the previous week with the consultant team and facilitation team to talk about how to expand the engagement of public participation phase. They were looking at additional grant funding to augment that and look at how to engage more. He stated staff was in receipt of the request regarding extending the deadline and he will be talking with the Planning Director the following day. He mentioned the goal setting meeting coming up on Saturday, stating that the agenda packet was posted for it. He added that there would be breakfast refreshments and lunch provided.

Councilmember O'Neill asked confirmation that there will be time for public comment.

City Manager Woodhouse agreed that there would be time for public comment.

Councilmember O'Neill asked if there was an estimate as to when that would be.

City Manager Woodhouse thought it would be around the noon hour depending on how fast things move along, so it could be as early as 11:00 or 11:30. He stated that the posted agenda has the standard public comment that needs to be provided but it says the public comment is during Agenda Item 1, the goal setting process. He asked the City Clerk if they needed any clarification on that.

City Clerk O'Connell stated that there was an outline on the staff report for the different phases occurring during the meeting and the public comments is listed on the agenda after the staff report with the attachments.

Councilmember Martin stated that the agenda says public comments is about two hours into it which is between 10:30 and noon.

City Manager stated that the working session starts at 9:00 and it would be 11:00 - noon. He encouraged the public to get there earlier to hear the material being presented leading up to that point. He stated that he attended the Sports Hall of Fame dinner and enjoyed learning all of those Pacifica specific stories.

PUBLIC HEARINGS - NONE.

CONSIDERATION

5. Award of Construction Contract to Pacific Trenchless Inc. for the Collection System Rehabilitation and Replacement Project Pedro Point FY 2017-2018 C031A
PROPOSED ACTION: Move to 1) Approve the Award of Construction Contract to Pacific Trenchless, Inc. (Attachment 1) for The Collection System Rehabilitation and Replacement Project Pedro Point FY 2017-2018 C031A in the amount of \$3,495,189.00; 2) Approve Construction Budget of \$4,195,189 (\$3,495,189 + 20% Contingency) 3) Approve the First Amendment to the Consultant Services Agreement between the City of Pacifica and Freyer & Laureta, Inc. in the amount of \$74,700 to provide additional design engineering services during the construction of the project (Attachment 2), and 4) Authorize the City Manager to execute all documents associated with the project.

PW Director Ocampo stated that PW Deputy Director Sun would be presenting the staff report.

PW Deputy Director Sun, first introduced team members then presented the staff report.

Mayor pro Tem Vaterlaus asked, if private people are doing sewer laterals, whether he wanted them to be done at the same time as they are doing the mains.

PW Deputy Director Sun stated she was correct, explaining that the contractor would want them to sign up while the construction was going on. When they are at the streets where the person's house is located would be the time when the sewer lateral work would take place at the same time that the main is being worked on.

Mayor pro Tem Vaterlaus asked if there was a specific cost or does it depend on each one and the depth of each lateral.

PW Deputy Director Sun stated that the way the bids were set up they have a base price for doing the sewer lateral as well as pricing for linear feet. He stated that, depending on how long their laterals are, it can be more.

Mayor pro Tem Vaterlaus asked if the streets will be paved after the whole project is done.

PW Director Ocampo stated that unfortunately the answer is no. He stated that all the trenches or sewer lateral tie ins would be repaved but, as far as overpaying the entire Pedro Point area, we don't have that in the budget.

Councilmember Digre stated that she was looking for the proposed 12-inch sewer area and found it by the shopping center. She asked if that was because it was lower ground and needs to be bigger because everything is coming down by gravity.

PW Director Ocampo stated that she was correct. The larger pipes are normally at the bottom because it collects all the upstream sewer. He pointed out that the property owners were not required to replace their lateral as part of the project but it was very advantageous for them to take the opportunity of replacing it now because, when they constructed the big package for this, they included that. He stated that it was a very competitive bid and the amount is really good. He added that, if the property owner decides to replace their sewer lateral as part of the

project, the encroachment permit process is expedited and there are no fees involved. He stated that it was a big cost saving on the part of the property owner.

Councilmember Martin asked if she heard correctly that, if the owners agree to replace their sewer laterals, there was no cost to them.

PW Director Ocampo stated that there was no cost on the encroachment permit because it was part of the project itself.

Councilmember Martin stated that she hopes that comes up at the meeting on Thursday as it is a huge cost savings. She asked if there will also be letters sent to all those homes or how will those who do not show up at the meeting know that on a Tuesday morning there will be people in front of their house doing this work.

PW Deputy Director Sun stated that they have put invitations or notices on the streets in Pedro Point and they mailed out notices to all the residents in that area.

PW Director Ocampo stated that he would also try to see if our changeable message board can be placed at the end of Pedro Point so the residents will get notified but he wasn't promising that.

Councilmember Digre stated that they utilize pipe bursting and they make sure there is no water in the pipes. She asked what they do then, as she didn't get it.

PW Director Ocampo stated that pipe bursting is when you are using the existing pipe and run a ram that opens it up and at the same time it is followed by a pipe which was why you can replace the pipe without disturbing the top.

Mayor Keener stated that, if they come to the event at the Pedro Point firehouse Thursday night, they will show you. He asked if there will be a cost saving to individual homeowners who do have their laterals replaced versus having them replaced some other time.

PW Director Ocampo stated that there will be a cost savings as part of the project when they reinstall the mainline. He stated that part of the project included tying in the existing lateral up to about five feet of the lateral and instantly they were not paying for the first five feet. Then through the bid process, they were able to get good pricing because it was advertised to include that as part of the bid. So the contractors are forced to put in competitive pricing on that.

Mayor Keener assumed that the contractor has to dig the hole regardless of whether they put in the new lateral or not.

PW Director Ocampo responded affirmatively.

Mayor Keener thought that was a cost savings to the homeowner as well.

PW Director Ocampo stated that was the reason the pricing was good for the property owner to take advantage of this opportunity.

Mayor Keener pointed out that the cease and desist order required by January 1, 2019 that they no longer have SSOs was also the same order that has caused them to put in the equalization basin.

PW Director Ocampo responded that he was correct, adding that it also included some sewer main replacement at lower Linda Mar, and there was another project after the Pedro Point project which was in lower Linda Mar but the upper side of it.

Councilmember O'Neill stated that he was looking at the house at the top of Grand Avenue which was relatively recent construction and he asked if that still needs a new sewer lateral.

PW Director Ocampo stated no, adding that what happens is that there will be inspections through video through the lateral to see if they have root infiltration or disconnected joints or the pipe needs replacement. If there is no need to replace and the pipe is new, they don't have to.

Councilmember O'Neill stated that they have open cuts. He asked why some places were proposed open cuts, meaning you cut the asphalt.

PW Director Ocampo agreed, adding that the reason varies, such as the utility crossings. He stated that every time they do pipe bursting depending on how close the other utility is, especially if it is a gas line, they want to make sure they do open trenches because they don't want to develop leaks. He stated that they try to pipe burst particularly because of the nature of the streets in Pedro Point which are very narrow. He stated that, if you are going to do trenching, it becomes difficult for an emergency vehicle to go through. They try to avoid those things such as public inconvenience.

Mayor Keener imagined that, once they get to the work, they will have some means of notifying each group of homeowners in the area in which they will be working.

PW Director Ocampo agreed, adding that they will see their barricades that say no parking and will be there 24-72 hours in advance. He stated that not only the contractor, but they have city staff visible in the area and the residents can approach staff for any questions.

Mayor Keener asked how homeowners will know who to contact for their lateral scoping and replacement.

PW Director Ocampo stated that during the meeting they will have a staff contact person be named, adding that it will probably be collection manager Brian Martinez who will be doing that and his contact information will be available.

Mayor Keener asked if they have considered mailing information to each homeowner in Pedro Point as that wasn't that many people.

PW Director Ocampo asked if he meant in terms of the schedule.

Mayor Keener stated in terms of the schedule as well as the potential for their lateral replacement to get maximum participation.

PW Director Ocampo stated that they can do that, but he cautioned everyone regarding putting a schedule together that a schedule was always tentative because of the progress of the work. He stated that they don't want to be nailed to a certain date and they will get complaints. He stated that there was a likelihood of delays in any construction project, especially for a major project. He stated that underground projects were number 1 with regard to delays because of the unknown of what was underneath the ground which was not visible to the naked eye.

Mayor Keener stated that he was more concerned about reaching the homeowners who don't attend the town hall meeting and they should make attempts to reach them which will probably increase participation.

There were no public comments.

Councilmember O'Neill moved 1) to approve the Award of Construction Contract to Pacific Trenchless, Inc. (Attachment 1) for the Collection System Rehabilitation and Replacement Project Pedro Point FY 2017-2018 C031A in the amount of \$3,495,189.00; 2) Approve Construction Budget of \$4,195,189 ((\$3,495,189 + 20% Contingency); 3) Approve the First Amendment to the Consultant Services Agreement between the City of Pacifica and Freyer & Laureta, Inc., in the amount of \$74,700 to provide additional design engineering services during the construction of the project (Attachment 2); and 4) Authorize the City Manager to execute all documents associated with the project; seconded by Mayor pro Tem Vaterlaus.

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

6. 2017-18 Mid-Year Budget Update

PROPOSED ACTION: Move to adopt the resolutions: 1) Increasing the adopted budget appropriation to \$31,618.000 for FY 2017-18, revised to reflect revenue and departmental budgets based on current information, and 2) Authorizing the job descriptions for the Senior Services Assistant Supervisor and the Recreation Assistant Supervisor.

Asst. City Manager Hines presented the staff report.

Mayor Keener asked if they were new positions or trades for existing positions.

Asst. City Manager Hines stated that there will be a little trading going on. They anticipate that the change will be budget neutral if PB&R Director Perez goes through with it which is why there is no change in the budget appropriation. He thought it was a matter of more efficient alignment of positions. He completed the staff report.

Mayor Keener opened public comments.

Dan Stegink, Pacifica, stated he was unclear whether these were three new full time employees or new job descriptions for existing employees.

Mayor Keener closed public comments.

Mayor Keener stated that he asked that question and there were two positions, not three. He stated that they can say there is no change in the Parks, Beaches and Rec budget.

Asst. City Manager Hines responded affirmatively.

Mayor Keener stated that they appear not to be new jobs per se but rather new job descriptions.

Asst. City Manager Hines responded affirmatively.

Mayor Keener thought that answered Mr. Stegink's question.

Councilmember Digre referred to fire, and asked if it was normal for them not to have the information at this time and did they expect anything dramatic.

City Manager Woodhouse stated that they have been working with fire regarding overtime costs and salary savings costs, adding that it was a complicated formula to figure out. He stated that, at the last minute, they didn't have the accurate number they needed to bring back to Council and he pulled the fire piece out of it to resolve the complexities. He stated that, when they return to Council, they will have an accurate and needed request.

Councilmember Digre asked if they anticipate anything dramatic.

City Manager Woodhouse believed there will need to be an adjustment to cover the overtime but the magnitude of the adjustment is not known at this time.

Councilmember Digre asked if it was because of all the fires.

City Manager Woodhouse stated that was part of the mix because of the deployment reimbursements and the levels of the reimbursements and the administrative costs reimbursed. He stated that piece was basically cost neutral but has ramifications for the overtime required for those who are covering those deployed staffing holes.

Councilmember O'Neill asked if the \$131,000 surplus they have could be plus or minus for the fire department adjustment.

City Manager Woodhouse agreed, explaining that, depending on what the adjustment was, if it was larger than \$130,000, they will need to identify the source to cover it, otherwise they will still be neutral.

Councilmember Martin moved to adopt the resolutions; 1) Increasing the adopted budget appropriation to \$31,618,000 for FY 2017-18, revised to reflect revenue and departmental budgets based on current information; and 2) Authorizing the job descriptions for the Senior Services Assistant Supervisor and the Recreation Assistant Supervisor; seconded by Mayor pro Tem Vaterlaus.

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

7. Long Term Financial Plan Update 2018-2023

PROPOSED ACTION: Accept the Long Term Financial Plan 2018-2023.

Asst. City Manager Hines presented the staff report.

Mayor Keener stated that the projection for this year's total pension cost in the budget was around \$4.8 million and in five years it will go up to \$8.7 million, almost a \$4 million increase.

Asst. City Manager Hines agreed, adding that he will post the slides on line.

Mayor Keener asked where they will be posted.

Asst. City Manager Hines stated that there was a tab for the Finance Department and the same area where they post the budget, CAFR, and because they are starting this process, they will start a new category called 2018-19 budget and this will be the first document posted.

Mayor Keener asked if they could have a button on the front page accessing that.

Asst. City Manager Hines agreed, stating that was not a problem, adding that he enjoyed doing those. He completed the staff report.

Councilmember O'Neill referred to the loan from the wastewater treatment plant, and he noticed they were paying the \$147,000 back now and they were done in two years. He asked what the current outstanding balance was.

Asst. City Manager Hines stated they paid the \$171,000 this year and there was probably about \$2 million.

Councilmember O'Neill concluded that they have been making headway and it was being done.

Asst. City Manager Hines stated that the first payment is built into the 2017-18 budget and they will be making that sometime in the spring.

Councilmember O'Neill stated that CalPers guidance was that the discount rate was going to be the 7% for the next three years.

Asst. City Manager Hines stated that it will decrease over the next three years.

Councilmember O'Neill thought that it would make our liability more and make the payments higher down the road.

Asst. City Manager Hines responded affirmatively.

Councilmember O'Neill asked what CalPers UAL was.

Asst. City Manager Hines stated that was the unfunded liability for CalPers.

Councilmember O'Neill thought it was higher than this.

Asst. City Manager Hines stated that the numbers they have been showing them were citywide and what they have done today was to isolate the General Fund portion, adding that the General Fund was typically about 85% of the total so there is another 15% they are used to seeing that isn't there.

Councilmember O'Neill stated that the projections also didn't address the repayment of the outstanding interfund loans, but he asked if he missed it and referred to mention of Funds 19 and 22.

Asst. City Manager Hines stated that it was Funds 9 and 22. He stated that this doesn't address fixing that situation.

Councilmember O'Neill understood but added that it was still kind of a morally legal obligation the city has.

Asst. City Manager Hines agreed that when one of the other funds is in the negative, that negative is essentially a liability of the General Fund.

Councilmember O'Neill understood, but he didn't see the amounts the city owes in the CAFR as it goes to the state and was not internal.

Asst. City Manager Hines responded affirmatively.

Councilmember O'Neill asked, so that people don't think they are totally messed up, if he could elaborate on the liabilities other cities are facing.

Asst. City Manager Hines stated that he didn't have specifics but he thought their liabilities were higher than Pacifica's.

Councilmember O'Neill understood they were far worse than ours.

Asst. City Manager Hines responded affirmatively.

Mayor pro Tem Vaterlaus stated that she was looking forward to a projection of marijuana sales tax into the budget. She understand it wasn't put in because he didn't know but she will look forward to that in the future.

Asst. City Manager Hines acknowledged that, stating that they have initially estimated a little over \$400,000 once everything got up and running but they have to get to that point.

Mayor Keener thought it was \$800,000 for a full year.

Asst. City Manager Hines understood, and thanked the mayor.

Councilmember Martin felt they were all very concerning numbers. She referred to Councilmember O'Neill attending a meeting where he had seen some of these numbers and what other cities are up against, mentioning that he said 43 cents of every payroll dollar would have to go to pension obligations. She asked if that was current.

Councilmember O'Neill stated that 2022 to 2023 was about the same time frame as here.

Councilmember Martin again said it was concerning and asked if there was any talk about what can be done and if there was any help. She thought that there was a big vote in Sacramento at the end of this year on some of this, and she asked if they have heard anything.

Asst. City Manager Hines stated that there was a lot of conversation and a lot of concern with a lot of vocal cities. He stated that there is a lively conversation going on among the locals and with PERS, adding that he didn't know if the governor's office was involved. He stated that everyone was aware of the devastating impact this could have on some cities.

City Attorney Kenyon stated that this is one of the League board of directors' high priority goals to address this issue. She stated that the League lobbyists were working on legislation now with CalPers, the governor and legislators to address this issue. She stated that Councilmembers O'Neill and Martin were very accurate in their estimate that this is facing all cities in California and the League board of directors were interested in making this one of their priorities.

Councilmember O'Neill commented that the City Manager attended the city managers' league thing and that was the topic of a heated discussion.

City Manager Woodhouse agreed and stated that they are all accurate in their statements and actually understated, adding that at the city managers' meeting of the League of Cities there was a session directly with CalPers' financial people and the governor's office representative. He stated that it was an outrageous topic that will collectively challenge all cities across the state with some more than it will Pacifica. He stated that, if something is not done about it, it will be a dramatic impact to public service across the state.

Councilmember O'Neill referred to a comment he made about the guy from CalPers saying that there was this issue, but if they all survive 20 years they will be fine.

City Manager Woodhouse added that the direct quote was more or less if they can get past the next two decades they will be fine. He stated that for city managers it was not an option, likening it to being on the Titanic and you see the iceberg.

Mayor Keener stated that, with respect to shortfalls, they show a General Fund deficit that climbs steadily to 2022 or 2023 but he thought he has said that he will present Council with a balanced budget and he believes that is a statutory requirement.

Asst. City Manager Hines agreed, stating that they will always present them with a balanced budget. He stated that this shows the internal struggle. He mentioned that when they start building the 2018-19 budget, the directors already know they have an almost \$500,000 to \$600,000 hole before anyone has asked for anything. He stated that on the last year's balance they were out \$1.7 million but they are able to give them a balance of \$31.129 million budget. He added that he wasn't saying it was easy and it was stressful for staff and didn't make him the most popular person in the city, but they managed to get it done.

Mayor Keener asked if there was a motion required.

Asst. City Manager Hines stated it was just to accept the Plan.

There were no public comments.

RESULT:	NO VOTE REQUIRED
----------------	-------------------------

8. Consideration and Direction for Processing and issuing a Request for Qualifications and Request for Proposals for the 2212 Beach Boulevard Development Opportunity Site
PROPOSED ACTION: Move to authorize staff to prepare a new Request for Qualifications (RFQ) and Request for Proposals (RFP) and issue a RFQ to solicit hotel, retail and restaurant development proposals for the 2212 Beach Boulevard site.

City Manager Woodhouse presented the staff report.

Mayor Keener thought they owed the public some explanation of what went wrong with the previous developer which he thought was laid out in the criteria for the RFQ and RFP. He gave the example that they want only a hotel/restaurant and not accepting any bids with part residential. They no longer have the library site complicating the development of the hotel on the property and have laid out the card check requirement which they didn't do previously. He thought most of the respondents to the last RFQ and RFP fully expected to have to reimburse the city for expenses but it was a sticking point with the developer they chose. He asked if there were any other major changes in the RFQs and RFPs that would shed light on what happened in the past.

City Manager Woodhouse stated that he hit all the major points related to the previous negotiations.

Councilmember O'Neill thought they talked about prevailing wage preferred for the construction.

City Manager Woodhouse stated that it was in there but not called out on the slides. He stated that it was in the middle of RFP evaluation criteria on packet page 124, and read it.

Councilmember O'Neill suggested that they not only put in Mori Point but Golden Gate National Recreation Area, adding that there was an archery range in Sharp Park. He also wanted to add that, for the retail operations on Palmetto, they could be outfitted for a restaurant as an initial construction was easier to do than a retrofit. He stated that one issue they have in Pacifica was no conference or a place for 200 people to have dinner, adding that was why the Grosvenor in South San Francisco gets the Sports Hall of Fame and he didn't know if that would be feasible.

Mayor pro Tem Vaterlaus stated that there were meeting spaces.

Councilmember O'Neill clarified that there was meeting space and also full meal service.

Councilmember Martin thought they were getting very specific.

Councilmember Digre stated that this was question time and that was a good question.

Councilmember O'Neill stated that a conference room would supply the large meeting room for people.

Mayor Keener suggested they consider that under discussion.

Councilmember Digre had quite a few things to say and ask. She asked if they have the information of when the last developer first got locked into it and no one else could be considered, adding that she thought it was 2015.

City Manager Woodhouse stated that the Council made that selection in late 2015.

City Attorney Kenyon thought it was in October 2016.

City Manager Woodhouse stated that he could look to see if he had that information.

Mayor Keener opened public comments.

City Manager Woodhouse confirmed that it was October 26, 2015.

Councilmember Digre added that they just made public that they mutually pulled out the previous Wednesday.

City Manager Woodhouse responded affirmatively.

Dave Plumb, Pacifica, stated he was in support of a hotel on the whole area. He had heard of a possibility of an alternative non-profit proposal and he was against such an alternative proposal as he thought it was important that the city make maximum revenue from a big hotel and restaurant on the whole site.

MaryAnn Edson-Plumb, Pacifica, stated she was also speaking out in support of this proposal. She felt it was much better thought out and well written than previously and she has high hopes that it will be successful. Following the financial information presented by the Asst. City Manager, she thought it was clear that we need to do something revenue producing sooner than later. She thought adding hotel rooms gave them a big tax benefit, including ancillary restaurants, etc. She was strongly in favor of this.

Dan Stegink, Pacifica, stated he was speaking as a private individual. He stated that, if they are going to build a hotel, let's build it as high and expensive as possible. He stated that we really need the money and the city gets 12% of the revenue. He then stated that he would like to get a price estimate on the property. He stated that, in 2007, they had Carnegie Bloom evaluated at \$7.8 million and a COLA adjustment to today would be almost \$11 million, but in July 2016, City Manager Tinfow stated that Beach Boulevard and Sanchez parcel together had a value of only \$2-5 million. He would like to see as wide a net as possible cast there. He wasn't sure how familiar they were with how the original process was built but it was placed on a rather obscure website only. He stated that the EDC chairman at that time was a gentlemen who less than a year earlier had made a proposal to buy the same property. He thought it was a conflict, but he would like to see as wide a net as possible cast with every possible marketing channel, write to every major hotel developer to get the best and biggest they can on the site. He thought they missed an opportunity in 2016 to have the federal government pay to protect Sharp Park by putting a new sea wall and replace some other infrastructure. He stated that he talked to former City Manager Tinfow about this many times and she was adamant that the threshold of \$53 million was only per city. He stated that it was not and could be combined through the whole county or state. He stated that, in 2010, Governor Christie in New Jersey obtained blizzard money of \$53 million for the whole state through FEMA and Washington in 2009 got \$53 million to rebuild their salmon industry. He felt there was a lot of potential opportunity. He stated that, between December 2016 and March 2017, there were a lot of incidents with eight different sink holes and the city could benchmark that as the exact time the sea wall was destroyed. He wasn't sure what the current estimate on the replacement is but he was guessing a minimum of \$50 million. He stated that he spoke to Jackie Speier who said she got a quote to replace the pier of \$8 million which he thought was so low as to not be credible. He thought, between the sea wall and the pier alone, the city could almost go back to 2016 and apply for federal disaster funds and protect Sharp Park residents by getting the federal government to shoulder the burden of this with paperwork but if necessary they could combine with another city in the county or state.

Steve Patton, Pacifica, stated he was the executive director of the Pacifica Ocean Discovery and Research Center and referred people to their website for any further information. He stated that the project started over 20 years ago and the city had three charrettes to which the public was invited to decide what to do with that property and this Ocean Discovery Center rose to the top and beat all the other recommendations. He stated that he would like to be included in the

discussions of building on this site. He stated that they have been waiting many years and now have funding from large foundations eager to invest and pay for the entire Ocean Discovery Center project and they would like to be included in the study session with the Council and City Manager. He stated that he can go over the details, adding that they have architects on staff who are waiting for him to redo the originals. He stated that it was all feasible now, explaining that they didn't have Silicon Valley billionaires 20 years ago but now they do. He stated that they can find him at his website if they have any questions or talk to him after the meeting.

Cynthia Gomez, San Francisco, stated that she was a research analyst at Unite Here Local 2 and they have heard her a number of times when she came to Council to speak about this project in its previous phases. She stated that they were making the same request made before to bring the best possible project to Pacifica. She stated that they asked previously and will be asking now that, among all the different things they consider with the developers, they consider the quality of the jobs. They believe that in the present economy, developers of hotels which are an extremely profitable industry should agree to build hotels 100% union so the jobs go to people who can afford to live in their communities and have a good quality of life. She stated that they should sign a card check neutrality agreement which guarantees nothing more than a fair process for hotel workers to join a union. She stated that those kinds of guarantees provide everyone an opportunity to know that there was an enforceable commitment to good jobs and the project will lift up the community instead of dragging it down. She stated that they will pay close attention to the project and return when it is time to select a different developer and get to the ENA and the DDA process.

Mayor Keener closed public comments.

Councilmember Digre stated that when they got into a lock down with the last developer in 2015 one of the things they mentioned as to what went wrong was the dragging of feet. She stated that the previous City Manager mentioned what was going on and no response had come from the developer. She stated that they were waiting for an election to take place which took place in 2016 and then another delay from the developer when they were waiting for the library issue which recently left the entire property. She stated that it still dragged on until there was mutual agreement which they were not able to announce until Wednesday. She thought that, because of other things mentioned and other history, the words so far are too restraining and shuts out anything like a Pacifica Ocean Discovery Center or anything else. She stated that she was not against the hotel but she was saying that they don't want to cut it that tight as it was premature. She thought they could discuss the Pacifica Ocean Discover Center at goal setting or in a study session. She felt the public has understood that a hotel was going there since 1999, mentioning that it was Swenson at that time which had a good reputation, and there is still no hotel, or a hotel conference center, and the latest developer is not here. She didn't want to be narrow or shut it out and she was urging Council to discuss the issues and at the very least not make a decision at this meeting as she thought it was too soon for the public and she would rather have public input, adding that the public just learned about it last week. She reminded everyone that once there was Brownfield and a lot of charrettes and Brownfield staff had an economist. She stated that the Planning Director at the time said there was only one entry that dotted all i's and crossed all T's which was the Ocean Discovery Center. She thought that would carry a lot of weight, but the powers that be at the time chose to go with the hotel conference center which did not dot all i's and cross all T's. It was from Swenson which had a good name and they thought at least in 18 months it would be up and going and bringing increased economy. She referred to the Ritz in Half Moon Bay, stating that she heard it was not doing well and has been bought by another company that thinks they can do a better job. She thought she heard that we were leaving the TOT flat. She stated that the Brownfield economist said, in referring to the

Ocean Discovery Center, “if you build it they will come in good times and in bad” and what makes her feel comfortable about the projection was that, even if the economy goes bad, something like that will continue to be a destination and bring people. She didn’t think we were trying to be in competition with Monterey. She contacted Julie Packard and asked her what she thought. Her response was, “if you have enough people who will come, certainly it will pencil out for you.” She stated that based on those thoughts and her history of the place, she urged them to give this serious thought and not shut it out by the wording of the RFP and RFQ.

Councilmember Martin agreed that they have waited for years and they couldn’t make it work with the last developer, and they agreed by consensus. She also agreed that we were limiting ourselves, stating that, if you have seen any of the proposals for the Pacifica Ocean Discovery and Research Center, it wouldn’t just be a destination for people and children but a research center for scholars, which she thought could also be a moneymaker. She agreed with Councilmember Digre that they should not limit themselves. She didn’t think it would mean to make a decision at this meeting, because they could potentially have a study session. She questioned if goal setting was the right venue to talk about it but she thought it was definitely part of one of our existing goals of economic development. She also encouraged holding off making a decision now and opening up the RFQ.

Councilmember O’Neill asked the City Manager what the time line was, if they OK’d this at this meeting, to get the RFQ and how long to have it dispersed and then an RFP, before they get to the ENA portion.

City Manager Woodhouse stated that he would defer to the City Attorney who was involved in the past process. He mentioned that they have a lot of the building blocks for the RFQ and RFP and he imagined staff could turn it around in a reasonable time frame, such as a month, and then asked the city attorney how long the solicitation process was out.

City Attorney Kenyon stated that they had a two-phased process for the solicitation. She imagined that getting the RFQ out within a month was plenty of time to get it out. In terms of allowing for solicitations to come back, she thought you generally wait at least 60 days or longer if they want to be sure they have given every developer the opportunity to submit. She stated that was 120 days from now and at that time staff would review the submittals and send another offering to Council in terms of who they want to send out the request for a proposal, following review of that by Council in 140 days, and go out providing another 60-90 days and they were looking at six months before it would come back to Council to consider picking a potential developer. She stated that it usually only takes 3-6 months to negotiate an exclusive negotiating agreement. She explained that what happened with the last developer was unusual and resulted in the ultimate parting of the ways. She stated that, after entering into the exclusive negotiating agreement, it would take another few months to negotiate a disposition and development agreement and then processing the application would follow that.

Councilmember O’Neill thought that, even with approval at this meeting, they were looking at about three years down the road before shovel to the dirt.

City Attorney Kenyon agreed that it would be at least that long.

Councilmember O’Neill stated that they still had the Coastal Commission.

City Attorney Kenyon apologized for not addressing that.

Councilmember O'Neill stated that he was only asking for an estimate which would be three years before they would hit the shovel in the dirt part.

Mayor pro Tem Vaterlaus stated that the Ocean Discovery Center has talked to them for the last 20 years about what they are going to do and never once have they shown the money. She stated that there has been no financial consideration for Pacifica as far as Ocean Discovery. She asked, if you are a non-profit, how much does the city get from that, and concluded nothing. She stated that they have more people coming but they aren't paying TOT tax and the city is not making money on an Ocean Discovery Center. She thought they could talk to one of the hotels to see if they will be very generous and give them space, but she didn't see it. She stated that they have had studies and consultants and they all say they need to put a hotel in this spot, except for one that she heard say they needed housing. She acknowledged that no one wants housing. She stated that they have the TOT tax with hotels but she doesn't see it from the Ocean Discovery Center.

Councilmember Digre stated that she would like to refute the 20-year history. She stated that the hotels were chosen in spite of the fact that the Ocean Discovery Center had come through with all the I's and T's and the city was asking to vote at this meeting on having someone come forward to dot the I's and cross the T's but they had those exclusive rights for a minimum of four years. She also stated that negotiations were going well for a time share and that wasn't here, so she concluded that the hotels have been there and had their exclusive rights. She stated that a non-profit will not be able to get funding unless it can show that there is some kind of "smile" from the city. She explained that she works for a non-profit and to get any kind of funding you have to show that you are collaborating with a lot of agencies to show a sense of others than yourself. She stated that the Historical Society made it clear that they could not get anywhere unless they had a "smile" from the city, and she pointed out the amazing thing they have done at the Little Brown Church. She stated that it started to change and get the funding when the city chose to give them the lease for a possible token fee of \$2. She stated that looking at a history of 20 years and coming forward with nothing, she concluded that they came forward with a lot and were snubbed. She questioned writing something up and crossing them out when the hotel stuff went down the past Wednesday and they have goal setting with no public input and wondered how many people know that the hotel situation isn't still going on. She felt they needed to be careful. She stated that she was not against the hotel but was against wording that was going to be so precise that they repeat their history of hotels but never get one. She acknowledged that Mayor pro Tem Vaterlaus gave a reason why she doesn't agree and she has gone on about why she is for it. She asked why they should be so restrictive.

Mayor pro Tem Vaterlaus stated that one of their qualifications was financial history and equity and debt arrangements.

Councilmember Digre agreed, and questioned being so micro managing in taking what they wanted for a hotel since 1999 but if they wanted to go just for a hotel she would think it was awesome.

Mayor pro Tem Vaterlaus asked if the city should give their property to a non-profit who can't show any financials.

Councilmember Digre stated that she was not saying that, but saying to give them a chance to be part of the process to prove it, just as they want the hotel to prove it. She stated they should

enable them or anyone else to come to the table to prove it or not. She stated that, if they want to go just for a hotel, she was fine with all those very strict things to get it done.

Mayor Keener stated that part of it was about risk. He believes that the hotel concept is the lowest risk to the city with the greatest return. He stated that what he has been saying over the past six months regarding the Ocean Discovery Center was that their place in this may come when the Coastal Commission reviews the application of the hotel for permits and says that it is great that they have a hotel and restaurant but ask what else they have. He thought then the developer might be interested in the Ocean Discovery Center. He felt a responsibility to Pacificans to get, if not the maximum dollar, most of it out of the property. He stated that it has been fallow for 20 years for various reasons, but if they can get off the dime and get a hotel project going, he would be strongly in favor of that. He agreed with Mayor pro Tem Vaterlaus that he didn't see how the Ocean Discovery Center was going to generate revenue like a hotel. He stated that the Ocean Discovery Center was a nice concept but he thought it was a riskier concept than a hotel and far from guaranteeing to pay the city money every year the way a hotel will. He stated that he endorsed the hotel and the whole list of items under the RFQ and RFP. He stated that he didn't know how to integrate the Ocean Discovery Center or other potentially non-profit type activities that might go on the property into the RFQ and RFP because they were so different from a hotel that it was hard to know what qualifications they would write down to accommodate both of them.

Councilmember Martin stated that, if what Councilmember Digre is saying is true about the history in terms of the site with hotels and what looked favorable, she would pose the argument that the community should weigh in again. She stated that, if Council was not willing to postpone the meeting to have a study session then they might agree to open the RFQ up for the Ocean Discovery Center to throw their name in the hat. She agreed that a hotel was the lowest risk for the greatest return but she thought the Discovery Center could give them something that a hotel can never give, which is repeat business with people who come from Oakland each weekend to show their children these things or scholars from SF State University, which she felt was absolutely different from the hotel. She understood it was riskier but no riskier than the site sitting as it is now. She suggested that they open it up, adding that if they are not willing to do that at this meeting, they should at least have community input about their options for the site. She stated that in 2015 when the RFQ went out, there were only three developers they could have considered and out of the three only two were being considered by Council. She stated that, with the one that was picked, it wasn't pretty what went down with him. She stated that it had nothing to do with anyone personally but the last developer did not have any experience in California on the coast. She questioned picking this developer out of all the developers, stating that we wasted all those years to get to this point and she asked what was another year. She suggested that they have a study session or open it up to public comment. She wasn't saying it was the Ocean Discovery Center but saying that it is also them. She stated that, if you stop by their booth at the EcoFest, you will find that they have their stuff together. She suggested that they check it out and open their mind. She reiterated that she was not against the hotel, and thought it was a good deal, but she felt this was prime real estate for something like a Discovery Center and would put Pacifica on the map.

Mayor Keener asked what a study session would look like.

Councilmember Martin thought a study session would be more about the community showing up and having input. She stated that they talk about the hotel, but she has had emails from people who live in the neighborhood who are not happy with a hotel and she would be interested in hearing from the people opposed to a hotel. She questioned if they would be for

something different and if so what. She suggested that they go back to the drawing board with the community. She stated that they are doing the same thing for a local coastal plan and this is the coast and what was going to be planned. She concluded that she didn't think they needed to make a decision at this meeting.

Councilmember Digre agreed that the big thing is when the public actually had an opportunity to weigh in. She stated that when going for the lowest with the greatest return, that was what was said in 1999 and these are repeat things about a hotel and they want to be a destination and foot traffic for their small businesses, things for our children to do, be different and a unique destination. She thought this was a vision thing and part of it, as mentioned by Councilmember Martin, was that she didn't want to be an extreme visionary and thought the more you involve the public the more you get a more grounded perception. She stated that they have goal setting in four days. She stated that, when asked to put down their what-ifs, this was on her list and they were taking her what-ifs away from her. She stated that she wasn't suggesting that they do it at goal setting as it is difficult in one day, but she liked the idea of a study session, but not in 6-8 months but sooner, to hear from the public and come to conclusions. She mentioned focusing in on the non-profit issue and thought they might like to find a hotel to be part of it. She stated that they had big issues with the library because of sea level rise and asked if that was why they haven't heard from other developers who are concerned about sea level rise. She thought the public was most important in allowing them to be visionary and chiseling it down rather than going for the status quo of a hotel. She stated that Holiday Inn has not expanded and she asked how long they have been waiting for that. She referred to the Moonraker Hotel, asking if she heard that they also just changed hands. She stated that the Ritz in Half Moon Bay just changed hands. She asked if, for at least 30 or 60 days, they can not be so restrictive.

Mayor Keener thought the public has not been aware for very long of the city's difficulties or failure to reach an agreement with the previous developer and the need for a new RFP and RFQ. He stated that as pointed out it just came to light the previous Wednesday when the agenda was published. He could see the need for a study session but before going in that direction he wanted to hear what Councilmember O'Neill has to say.

Councilmember O'Neill stated he would like to correct a couple of misstatements. He referred to developer Swenson, and the city kicked him out when he came a day late with a check. He thought that they got 7 or 8 developers interested in building a hotel when they did the last RFP and to say it was only 2 or 3 was not correct.

Councilmember Martin stated that was the final numbers.

Councilmember O'Neill reiterated that they received 7 or 8.

Councilmember Martin reiterated that only 2 or 3 passed the mustard.

Councilmember O'Neill acknowledged that there were a couple of them that there was no way they would be picked. If they were to consider an Ocean Discovery Center, he wanted to point out that they have been in business for 20 years and lost their non-profit status and he didn't believe they had a board of directors for quite a while. He stated that they keep saying they have someone but they don't see anybody. He thought they should have financial statements, business plan, marketing plan to see if it was viable.

Councilmember Martin stated she has seen them.

Councilmember O'Neill stated that none of that was forthcoming, adding that the speaker tonight said that they can't disclose. He stated that they have been saying that for many years and that was his concern. He stated that he would like to see a non-partial economic analysis of possible revenue from a non-profit such as the Ocean Discovery Center before any serious discussion to consider that project.. He stated that when he went to an event of one of the leagues, there were a couple of companies that would do an economic analysis to see what the revenue would be from something like the Ocean Discovery Center. He was willing to move ahead on a hotel at this meeting to issue an RFQ. He then referred to Councilmember Digre's comment and stated that the reason to get restrictive and detailed in the RFQ is the experience they had with the other developer. He stated that if there were issues she thought were too restrictive and she didn't want it in there, she should mention it so they can discuss it.

Mayor Keener stated that he found it compelling that the public has not had much chance to weigh in on a reissue of the RFQ and RFP and he thought they should. He thought the majority of the public would come down on the side of the hotel, but he thought they should have a study session to determine that so that it doesn't take over the goal setting session as he thought they could spend the entire day arguing about this issue there. He proposed that they have a study session within the next month. He asked the City Manager of that was possible.

City Manager Woodhouse stated that he had several questions for the Council to deliberate. He was unclear about what the purpose of a study session would be and asked for more clarification. He stated that in his prior experience a study session was for staff to prepare a lot of the facts on all sides of an issue and Council has a more informal setting to dig into all that information. He thought it would be very challenging to come up with the type of financial analysis needed for anything other than a hotel. He stated that, if it was to allow the public to comment on ideas, it was more a public hearing than a study session. He asked if the potential outcome was to hear a bunch of different ideas or visions for the site, and then be directed to spend a lot of consultant dollars to analyze the feasibility of all of those options and bring those back to Council for an actual study session to dig into the economic outlook for different options. He asked for more direction on the idea of the study session. He thought they have a significant short term workload coming up along with being in the midst of sea level rise and local coastal plan process which impacts planning significantly and he has staffing constraints to work with.

Mayor Keener stated that he made excellent points. He explained that his thinking was in terms of public input and he understood his point was that it was more of a public hearing than a study session. He thought they could table this until the next meeting after providing more publicity on it so the public can come and give them their opinions on this and make a decision at that time. He stated that he was in favor of and ready to move forward with the hotel and the RFQs, but he recognized that it was only since last Wednesday that anyone outside the Council has had an idea that they were almost starting over with a new RFQ and RFP.

Councilmember Digre stated that she was on Council when Swenson was given his walking papers and she knows why and how that happened. She asked if there was some legal way for the public hearing to be narrowed in on whether the public wanted exclusively a hotel or allow the Ocean Discovery Center have its opportunity to provide what was reasonable from them.

City Attorney Kenyon stated that the agenda description and the staff report could make clear what kind of input the Council was looking for from the public. She stated that, if that was the input Council wanted from the public, it can happen. She stated that the Council could provide longer than three minutes if they didn't feel that was enough time to get the input.

Councilmember Digre stated that she just didn't want them to start all over and be all over the place with everything and anything.

City Attorney Kenyon stated that was what the City Manager was requesting in terms of direction. If they are looking for an additional public session that would be at a public meeting, rather than a study session, staff needed to know what kind of direction they were looking for in terms of a staff workload with additional information to be provided from staff. If that is the case, she stated that staff needs to know exactly what that work is and if not, they will probably get a very similar staff report to what they got at this meeting with an additional paragraph about the Council's discussion at this meeting, adding that if Council gives direction in the next session of deliberation to have public sentiment focused on whether or not the RFP should be issued as described in the February 26 agenda report or should Council consider opening it up to the concept of an Ocean Discovery Museum, then that is what the topic would be and what they would be asking the speakers to comment upon, not other potential development proposals. She concluded that they can narrow the discussion.

Mayor Keener stated that it was 10:49 and they need to give themselves another hour.

Councilmember O'Neill moved that they end the meeting no later than 11:30.

Mayor Keener thought it should be 12:00.

Councilmember O'Neill moved that they end no later than 12:00; seconded by Mayor pro Tem Vaterlaus.

5-0

Councilmember Martin stated she was thinking in terms of a public hearing, and she stated that the City Attorney described what one would look like if they were to only open it up to consideration for Pacifica Ocean Discovery Center. She acknowledged that it would be noticed publicly and they would open the floor for discussion. She asked if there would be an online public comment time line or could they do that.

City Attorney Kenyon thought they could direct staff to have a staff report prepared sooner than the Wednesday before the Monday meeting so notice could go out next Friday that this was happening and they were soliciting comments from the public regarding a meeting to be held on March 12. She stated that staff can do whatever the Council wishes as there were no legal requirements, with no noticing requirements other than 72 hours, and if they want to make it longer than that, they have the ability to do that provided that staff can prepare it in time.

Councilmember Martin suggested that, if they are holding a public hearing, they open it up to solicit comments on line.

City Manager Woodhouse stated that they use the peak democracy tool which he thought was the City Hall Listens function and pose a question to gather data.

Councilmember Martin thought that was great and they could narrow it down. She stated that she didn't think there was a rush or any pressure to make this decision at this meeting. She felt they needed to take a step back and do this.

Mayor Keener stated that he has indicated his willingness to do that, but he would like it to be the next meeting on March 12. He thought the City Attorney described it pretty well, with the staff report staying the same with a few more paragraphs addressing the additional information and the public can comment on the Ocean Discovery Center or other ideas but they had better be fleshed out and feasible.

Mayor pro Tem Vaterlaus asked, if they are going to open it up, why are they limiting it to the Ocean Discovery Center. She thought maybe Marine World wants to do a small thing and maybe a huge affordable housing project that Pacifica desperately needs that wants to come in to build a project. She suggested that, if they are going to open it up, they not limit it to two things. She understood that was a can of worms but thought there are other options besides these two.

Councilmember O'Neill was trying to clarify what he was hearing. He concluded that they were going to have a more in depth study of this issue at a regular Council meeting and not a study session.

Mayor Keener responded affirmatively.

Councilmember O'Neill thought that, to be accurate and fair to everyone, they need more information from the Ocean Discovery Center as they didn't know their board of directors, their funding source, their business plan, their marketing plan, no conceptual drawings. He saw their Facebook page. He knows everyone knows what a hotel is, but they need to have a clearer concept of what they were talking about. He stated that he has heard the word partnership with the city in the past and he asked what that meant, such as is the city supposed to help build the facility, supplying employees, how much money will the city have to put into it. He stated that he wants to see some financials for an operating budget to show that it is a viable choice, adding that it doesn't have to be done by staff but by the Ocean Discovery Center. He stated that they have been around for 20 years and must have some of that information. He stated that, if they want to make a decision on the city's biggest asset at this point, they need more information before moving forward. He thought that was a reasonable assumption.

Councilmember Martin stated that you can't ask that, because you can't ask the hotel developers to provide them with their financial information ahead of time.

Councilmember O'Neill stated that they are for the hotel.

Councilmember Martin stated that she was hearing that he was asking the Ocean Discovery Center to provide information before an RFP and RFQ will go out.

Councilmember O'Neill stated that before the meeting they are having.

Councilmember Martin stated that they can't do that.

Councilmember O'Neill concluded that she was willing to give an option to a group that has no financials, no business plan, nothing to the city and give them the biggest asset the city has.

Councilmember Martin clarified that she was saying they cannot ask that of any organization unless they are going to do the same thing with developers, as that is called equity. She thought what he was asking was illegal.

Councilmember O'Neill thought the RFQ they just proposed had a lot of the criteria that Councilmember Digre was saying was too detailed. He concluded that she was saying she wants to turn over to the Ocean Discovery Center the option to have some of the property with no criteria. He didn't say it has to be an 8x10 glossy power point but some basic information as to what their display is going to be.

Councilmember Martin thought it would have been nice to have that from FRIEND too.

Councilmember O'Neill stated that they did get the pictures and conceptual drawings.

Councilmember Martin stated it was after the RFQ.

Councilmember O'Neill stated he can't support the CEO of the Ocean Discovery Center saying they want a chunk of the city's land without supplying any conceptual drawings, operating budgets, source of funding.

Councilmember Digre stated that was what they were talking about now. She stated he is saying they need to give it now, but they are saying, just like any hotel, they don't know who they are. She stated that they just open it up so they can show their goods or not. She stated they weren't saying to give it to them.

Councilmember O'Neill stated that they were looking for people. He pointed to the RFQ criteria of financial history and equity and debt arrangements for prior hotel development, prior designers, hotel operators and restaurants.

Councilmember Digre stated that they haven't voted on that.

Councilmember O'Neill continued listing experience with coastline destination. He stated that she was saying they weren't asking that same stuff for a hotel.

Councilmember Martin stated that was exactly what they were saying. That RFQ and RFP is too narrow to allow for not just the Ocean Discovery Center. She agreed with Mayor pro Tem Vaterlaus that you can open it up even wider.

Councilmember O'Neill thought they were doing double talk in saying that this is too detailed but asking them for some sort of ability to perform financially is not.

Councilmember Martin stated that he was mixing ideas. She stated that they were not saying that there would not be the possibility, but they were saying if they want them to approve an RFP and RFQ at this meeting it would have to be revised.

Councilmember O'Neill stated that he was okay going to the next meeting but he was saying that at that next meeting there has to be some meat on the bone of what the Ocean Discovery Center is.

Councilmember Martin stated that, if they want to show up for stuff for the public, she thought that was a good idea; however, she didn't think it should be a necessity because she felt they would have to ask that same question of any developer that was going to be included.

Councilmember O'Neill stated that it was if they put it in the RFQ.

Councilmember Martin stated that she felt they were mis-communicating because that is exactly what they would ask of not just the Pacifica Ocean Discovery Center but any other organization that would want to apply.

Councilmember O'Neill asked how many Ocean Discoveries or aquariums have they built.

Councilmember Martin thought that was a silly question and she didn't know why he was asking it.

Councilmember O'Neill stated that she wants that criteria for a hotel.

Councilmember Digre thought this conversation was getting convoluted and argumentative over nothing. She asked that they move on.

Councilmember Martin thought the next meeting was too soon for public input. She thought they needed two meetings out. She stated that they mentioned city staff constraints and they were going to ask them in the next two weeks to post something on line, compile public comment, get it back to Council, get it out to the public by the following Monday and everyone will have to read it and then have a public hearing. She was concerned about the time line for city staff and resources. She thought March 12 was too soon even for city staff. She stated that she didn't want to argue. She stated that he has valid statements but she believes that, if he wants equity in the process, he can't just ask one organization to come to the table and not another. She stated that they are giving some credit because this organization has been around a while.

Mayor pro Tem Vaterlaus asked what she expects that the staff is going to do. She stated that the people knew about the budget, and she stated that they didn't come out. She stated that they always put out their agenda on a Wednesday and everyone who is interested in what was going on comes to the meeting.

Councilmember Martin stated that Mayor Keener said that everybody just found out on Wednesday night.

Mayor pro Tem Vaterlaus stated that was just like every other meeting they ever have.

Councilmember Digre stated that they were asking not to be like always but asking for some step forward. She stated what the two of them are asking for is that the Ocean Discovery comes on the 12th having everything, all i's dotted, for now and they don't even have a developer who is there and that was where she sees that there is not equity.

Mayor pro Tem Vaterlaus stated that she didn't say that.

Councilmember Digre stated that she was questioning why they want to do it.

Mayor pro Tem Vaterlaus stated that she was not. She asked what extra the staff is supposed to do here than they would normally do. She stated they can send out a Pacifica Listens survey and ask about this.

Councilmember Digre thought that was a legitimate question and you are going to get answers to that survey. She asked if she feels like she was capable of dealing with that.

City Manager Woodhouse asked if he could chime in. He stated that, in thinking about the survey, if they are going to do an additional meeting, what question would they be asking the public. He was thinking about the questions that would be raised or following that meeting, what was the potential outcome. He stated that staff was in the business of gathering information and providing it to the Council to make an informed and transparent decision. He stated that, in this case, they have a lot of information about what a hotel would look like on this site and the potential TOT revenue that would raise and how it would work, and the process for selecting that. He stated that, regarding other ideas, they don't have that information. He stated that out of the potential next hearing would come a lot of questions that the Council would have to direct staff to do research on and come back with that information. He questioned what stuff will come out and what the next step will be following that meeting and suggested that they think that through in making this decision at this time.

Mayor Keener stated what he envisions was that the question to the public would be whether they want Council to proceed with a hotel. He stated that they realize they had almost no time to find out about this and give their opinion. He stated that this way they will have two more weeks which he thought was a good amount of time. He referred to the Ocean Discovery Center and suggested that they give them time to make a presentation from the podium with as much time as they need within reason, maybe 10 or 15 minutes, and everyone else 3 minutes as usual.

Councilmember O'Neill thought they could handle it like they do a planning issue.

Mayor Keener agreed. He stated that the basic question remains whether they want a hotel on this site with this RFQ and RFP which they already have in the staff report.

Councilmember Martin thought that was a good question, but she thought that was not the only question. She asked if it was a yes or no question.

Mayor Keener responded affirmatively.

Councilmember Martin stated that it was yes or no.

Mayor Keener stated that, if no, then they say you don't want a hotel on the site and they are back to the drawing board.

Councilmember Martin referred to the City Manager's comment if they get 100 and they get 75 no's then what was their next step. She thought that was what they were being tasked to think about now.

Mayor Keener thought the next step, if they believe 75 no's are representative of the opinion of the community, they are back to square one. If the community does not want a hotel on the site, the question is what do they want on the site. He thought there was a universe of possibilities.

Councilmember Martin stated that, at that meeting, the consideration would be if they receive a certain amount of no they don't want a hotel, then they would make a decision on either revising the existing RFQ, RFP and/or moving forward with that RFQ, RFP. She stated that sounds better to her. She agrees with what he is saying and she was saying that they follow up with the next steps. She stated that, at the next meeting and they get a certain amount of yes or no, they consider those answers and from that the decision and direction is proceed with the

existing RFQ, RFP if everybody wants a hotel or if no they need to go back to the drawing board and revise the RFQ, RFP to open it up or a next step. She asked if that sounded like a good summary. In the meantime, they have a hearing and public comment.

Mayor Keener stated, if they get a no, Council has to recognize that they were into a new ballgame and staff is into a new ballgame. He hoped they can make a decision at the next time but time will tell.

Mayor pro Tem Vaterlaus thought it would have to be more significant than 75 answers. Councilmember Martin stated she was using the 100 as an even number. She stated that maybe they only get 75 people to answer.

Councilmember Digre asked if they turned it into a yes or no thing on the hotel and that is all.

Councilmember Martin stated that the question to the public is do you want a hotel here, yes or not, instead of do you want a Pacifica Ocean Discovery Center because there were a lot of reasons why not to ask that exact question. She stated for the past years they have been considering a hotel and that was the question to the public as to whether they thought the Council should move forward with consideration for a hotel. If they click no, they may get to elaborate on ideas.

Mayor Keener stated that it was a practical matter because they have been considering a hotel for the last few years and now they have a staff report that is proposing that they go out for an RFQ and RFP and do they accept that or not. He stated that is the subject of the next meeting and the majority rules.

Councilmember Digre assumes that the conversation just goes back to basically deciding to make sure that the public has input into whether or not they want to do the RFQ, RFP.

Councilmember Martin stated that the specific question to the public is whether they want a hotel on this site and is the answer to the question on the dais.

Councilmember Digre stated that at one time they said there would be no housing and they are opening that up again as well.

Councilmember Martin stated that they weren't asking that question.

Mayor Keener stated that they are asking the question of whether they should proceed with the hotel. If the answer is no, then they back up and say they have to rethink all the possibilities.

Councilmember Martin stated that Pacifica Ocean Discovery Center could potentially be one of them.

Councilmember O'Neill stated all he wants is the people to make an informed decision and that was why he wanted that information. He asked if they were now talking about the Ocean Discovery Center getting the entire three acres.

Councilmember Martin stated that it was there.

Councilmember O'Neill stated that they were asking yes or no to a hotel, and that means if it is no, all three acres are open.

Councilmember Martin stated that it means they are back to the drawing board as the mayor said.

Mayor pro Tem Vaterlaus stated that it was to anybody at all.

Councilmember Digre referred to no to the hotel, and stated that the hotel was said no to in 1999 but the public said no and the experts said the Ocean Discovery Center was better but the powers that be went with the hotel, and she asked what their problem was.

Councilmember O'Neill asked if they have that in a document so they can read the reasons why an Ocean Discovery Center was better.

Councilmember Digre stated that the city keeps that kind of stuff as it was a response to an RFP, RFQ. For the proceedings, she has the tapes and if he has a machine he can stick the tapes in.

Mayor pro Tem Vaterlaus stated that she was on Economic Development when a consultant came and talked to people all over town and everyone on Economic Development to decide what to do with the site. She stated that it was considerably later than 1999 and he decided that there should be a hotel.

Councilmember Digre stated that was a consultant. She stated that this was going on and on, and she was trying to add a little bit of visionary decision making but it has backed down to nothing but yes or no on the hotel which was better than nothing.

Councilmember O'Neill thought the economy has changed quite a bit. He stated that Al Gore invented the internet since 1999 and he thought the economy has changed and he didn't know how valid.

Councilmember Martin stated that ultimately the community was going to have a say in it now.

Councilmember Digre thought it was prejudicial where they have been and where they are going at this meeting. She stated that they were assuming a non-profit can't do it, just assuming that they don't have anything, so they were going right back to do you want a hotel or not. She stated that she was all for the public knowing and making a decision about whether they want a hotel or not but she thought this was not any kind of visionary.

Councilmember Martin stated the question on the table at this meeting is whether they are going to move forward with the hotel RFP, RFQ or not and that is the question they are going to pose to the public. If the public comes back and says they are not in favor of a hotel, then the visioning begins.

Councilmember Digre stated that at this meeting they were going to say the way it was actually written and she thought they moved from the way it was actually written, asking for a legal statement to cut down on this all over the place and could it be expressed in a way not needing all the staff time for many details and she thought the City Attorney stated it very well that it would work for an open hearing where the people could come and speak and that they have the Ocean Discovery with their moment in the sun and if they are only going to say they can't tell them, then the public will say either not good enough or they can say they want to hear more.

Councilmember Martin didn't think they have enough time to do that with everyone but her and Councilmember Digre not wanting to postpone it any longer and wanted it discussed at a public hearing.

Councilmember Digre stated that they were going with that on the 12th.

Councilmember Martin agreed, adding that what would have to happen is that people would have to wait to see a presentation on the 12th and they wouldn't have any time for public comment.

Councilmember Digre understood what she was saying for the survey inside.

Councilmember Martin stated that not everyone can come and people want to comment. She asked if it was possible, if everyone agrees, that they can keep the comment period open after the hearing.

Mayor pro Tem Vaterlaus stated that they can't have public comment after the decision as it wouldn't affect what they were doing.

Councilmember Martin stated that it was a good point and that was why she thought two weeks was too soon. She thought they could do a presentation on the 12th and then go to the next meeting for the hearing.

Mayor pro Tem Vaterlaus stated that, if they make a presentation and then they have public comment and then they postpone it again, the same people who came to do public comment can come again and speak again.

Councilmember Martin suggested that they just do a special presentation but not a public hearing on the 12th as people cannot comment on special presentations.

Councilmember O'Neill stated that they could during orals.

Councilmember Martin agreed that they could.

Councilmember Digre asked if there were any comments from staff.

City Attorney Kenyon heard what Council was saying, and going back to what she thought she heard in terms of what the Council wanted for the 12th was a staff report that essentially included the discussion from this meeting which was basically does the Council or public want to expand the RFQ, RFP to include the possibility for a hotel or an Ocean Discover Museum. She stated that if they are going to have a question for the 12th, it should probably be the same as the focus of whatever the staff report is. If they want to narrow the survey to just a question of whether or not they want a hotel on the site, then that should probably be the focus of the staff report. She stated it can be either way. She thought that, if the Council wants to include, as suggested by Councilmember Digre, some discussion about the Ocean Discovery Museum, they can put that in the staff report for the 12th, have the presentation on the 12th and make their question out there before the 12th be the same. She agreed that they will not have the benefit of the presentation on the 12th but she thought they would want the same input for the question that is going to go out as they are going to put in the staff report. She stated her point was that they should be the same.

Mayor Keener agreed with that. He thought it should be do you want a hotel and the staff report should be very much the same, possibly a few paragraphs longer if someone has some thoughts about the morass they have wandered into. He stated that the main thing for him was to give the public a chance to weigh in on this as he didn't believe they have had the chance. He would like to give them a little comfort that they are proceeding in the general direction that the public wants. He asked that they rule in or out the hotel now and if it is not going to be a hotel, then they have a lot more work to do especially staff to figure out what they do want. He asked if that makes sense.

City Attorney Kenyon stated that the question is whether they want to move forward with the RFQ which is solely related to a hotel on the site.

Mayor Keener responded affirmatively.

Councilmember Digre stated that they were again precluding enlarging that and she was thinking that the Ocean Discovery Center and the hotel would be something that would go together but she wasn't going to tell them they need to do that. She stated that the way he phrased it has precluded that. She was hearing that, if they say they like the hotel but they would also like the Ocean Discovery Center, they don't have a right to say that.

Mayor Keener stated that the public can say whatever they want to say.

Councilmember O'Neill stated that they can't the way he has the question phrased. He stated that the question is do they want a hotel or not which is what he heard him say, and what Councilmember Digre was saying was there some middle ground. He also thinks in the staff report they have to have the numbers. The hotel is a potential \$780,000 a year in transit occupancy tax and they just got numbers at this meeting of how big their deficits are going to be. He wanted to find out what the definition of partnership was with the Ocean Discovery Center as he doubted that it would generate \$700,000 a year.

Councilmember Martin stated that she would like to make a motion. She asked if he thought they were ready for it.

Mayor Keener thought they were.

Councilmember Digre asked if they know what they are voting on.

Councilmember Martin moved that they bring this item back on March 12 and at that meeting they ask Pacifica Ocean Discovery Center to make a presentation. Prior to that they open an online question with the question do you think Council should proceed with an RFQ, RFP for a hotel at the site or do they want a hotel at the site with the verbiage refined and based on those answers, and the public hearing that night and they will discuss at that night whether or not they move forward with this RFQ, RFP and, if not, they will advise the next steps at that meeting.

Councilmember O'Neill thought they open the telephone survey after the presentation because people will not know.

Councilmember Martin stated that was not a public hearing.

Councilmember O'Neill stated that she said in her motion a phone survey and then the presentation.

Councilmember Martin stated it was a web survey.

Councilmember O'Neill agreed it was a web survey, and she was asking everyone to vote prior to the meeting yes or no on the hotel without knowing the alternative.

Councilmember Martin stated that was what they said. She asked if that was how they have to do it.

Councilmember O'Neill stated that she was the one talking about equity.

Councilmember Martin stated she was with him. She wanted it to happen that way, but it has to be the 26th.

Councilmember O'Neill stated that people have to know what the alternative is if it is not a hotel.

Councilmember Martin stated that it then has to go to the 26th and it can't happen on the 12th.

Councilmember O'Neill stated if she wanted to have it later if they need time for prep, he has no problem with that.

Councilmember Martin thought that was great and suggested that they do it on the 26th if everyone else agrees.

Councilmember O'Neill asked if she can restate her motion to be sure they all know what it is.

Mayor Keener asked what Councilmember O'Neill was proposing.

Councilmember O'Neill stated that her motion was a web survey before the presentation on the 12th. They were asking the public to say yes or no to the hotel prior to knowing what the alternative is but they don't know what an Ocean Discovery Center is. He stated he has heard of it for 20 years but he doesn't know exactly what their plans are. He asked if it was a big fish tank with a guy waving at them or what else. He thought the only equitable and fair thing is they have a presentation so people know what they are voting on and then they do the web survey.

Councilmember Martin agreed.

Councilmember O'Neill stated that, if they want to postpone it because they need prep time, then he has no problem with the 26th.

City Manager Woodhouse asked to clarify before they move on the motion. He asked, if they do an Ocean Discovery Center presentation on the 12th and then they post the web survey. He asked if the web survey will be giving the choice just between those two.

Mayor Keener liked the simple thing of - do you want a hotel on this site - and if they decide yes based on the responses then it's over and they go to the RFQ and RFP as written. If the answer is no, then they go back to square one. He thought they could do that on March 12. He stated that the Ocean Discovery Center can make a more in depth presentation than he had time to do at this meeting and they could give him 10 minutes to flesh out his proposal like Councilmember O'Neill wanted, and he thought that would influence some votes on the hotel.

He thought the fundamental question was still whether they want a hotel or not. He thought that was what three of them have in mind.

Councilmember Martin thought it was still not a bad idea to postpone it until the 26th just to give staff more time and get more people to answer the question even if the question is do you want a hotel. She stated that it literally only gives them six days. She asked when the question would potentially get on the website if they give direction at this meeting.

City Manager Woodhouse didn't know the precise mechanics of it but his guess was that it was pretty easy to put it up and then it was a matter of pushing out the question so people know to go to it which they can also do through NextDoor and other means. He was confident that they can get a question up and then have the next meeting on the 12th and they would have a solid week of survey respondents and they would not necessarily need to cut off for the report release deadline and they could provide the survey respondents at the meeting so it was a week and a half. The staff report would be this staff report with an attachment of a brief cover saying what they have done and they would schedule a 10-minute presentation as part of the item for the Ocean Discovery Center on the 12th.

Councilmember Martin stated that if they got the question out the following day, they would have 13 days of questioning.

City Manager Woodhouse stated that they could push it to Connect with Pacifica on Friday and take the survey. He stated that was almost two weeks of input. He stated that they could have preliminary results for the report and the final results at the meeting.

Councilmember Digre stated for clarity that members of the public could say they would like both of them to be considered.

City Manager Woodhouse stated that he was seeking the Council's clarity on the question because that was what was confusing or misleading.

Mayor Keener stated not on that question. He stated that, on the public hearing that night, people can say whatever they want, but the question on the web would have to be should they proceed with the RFQ and RFP which people can read for a hotel project yes or no.

Mayor pro Tem Vaterlaus moved that they proceed with a Pacifica questionnaire asking if people would like to proceed with the RFP, RFQ for a hotel at this site, yes or no; and this will come back at the March 12 meeting as it is, with a presentation allowed and the public can make their normal comments on an item on the agenda.

Councilmember O'Neill suggested they not put RFQ or RFP in there and just say hotel.

Councilmember Martin agreed.

Mayor pro Tem Vaterlaus accepted that amendment to her motion.

Councilmember O'Neill seconded the motion.

Councilmember Martin asked if they have what they need to make this motion.

Mayor Keener asked if there was any last minute discussion before they vote.

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

ADJOURN

Mayor Keener adjourned the meeting at 11:33 p.m., in memory of Charlie English, who was hired as a police officer in Pacifica in 1966 and he retired as police chief in 1996.

Transcribed by Barbara Medina, Public Meeting Stenographer.

Respectfully submitted,

Kathy O'Connell, City Clerk

APPROVED: 3/12/18; 5-0

John Keener, Mayor