



**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

**May 14, 2018 (MONDAY)
www.cityofpacifica.org**

Mayor John Keener called the meeting to order on May 14, 2018 at 7:10 PM

5:00 PM CLOSED SESSION.

Mayor Keener called the meeting to order at 5:00 p.m., stating that all councilmembers were present and announced that the Council would meet in Closed Session. City Attorney Kenyon announced the business to be discussed.

PURSUANT TO GOVERNMENT CODE SECTION 54957.6 Conference with labor negotiator. Agency negotiator: Janet Cory Sommer. Employee organizations: Pacifica Firefighters Local 2400; Teamsters Local 856 Battalion Chiefs; Department Directors Local 350; Waste Water Treatment Plant Employees Local 856; Miscellaneous Local 856; Managers Local 350; Police Officers Association; police Supervisors Association; Police Management Local 350.

PURSUANT TO GOVERNMENT CODE SECTION 54956.9(d)(1) Name of Case: Change, et al. v. City of Pacifica, et al.; United States District Court Case No. 4:15-cv-04591-SBA

5:45 PM Study Session - Annual Reports from City Commission and Committees

Mayor Keener called the study session to order.

City Clerk stated that City Council adopted Resolution 12-2018 at the April 9, 2018 regular meeting changing the annual report of Commissions and committees to be made at a designated study session rather than at different times during the year. She listed the order in which the reports would be given.

Chair Campbell and Vice Chair Clifford gave the Planning Commission's annual report.

Mayor pro Tem Vaterlaus stated that she looked at attendance which was important to her. She stated that the list from 2017 was dreadful, stating that the highest person had 34% attendance and she wondered if they had increased their attendance since then.

Chair Campbell asked if she said that was the best attendance rate.

Mayor pro Tem Vaterlaus stated that was the highest.

Councilmember O'Neill stated that he had the highest missed meetings.

Chair Campbell didn't think that was correct.

Mayor pro Tem Vaterlaus was trying to find the figures.

Chair Campbell stated that they should take another look at that because he thought their attendance was no where near that bad.

Planning Director Wehrmeister clarified that, in the past Council was interested in absences and that was the absence rate.

Councilmember O'Neill stated that the one with the highest rate was no longer on the Commission.

Councilmember Digre asked, for the public record, if they are like Council and cannot miss three in succession.

Chair Campbell agreed, adding that they haven't had very many unexcused absences.

Vice Chair Clifford stated that, in the last two years, he has missed one meeting.

Councilmember O'Neill stated that, having been on the Planning Commission, he knows what it is like to slug through the documents and he appreciated all the help and work they do as it makes it easier for them to look at it and check it out with recommendations.

Councilmember Digre asked if they had any sentiments or feelings about having a liaison present all the time to give a short paragraph about what happened at their meeting. She realized that it was a lot of extra time and she didn't think she would want to impose that on anyone, but she felt she should be attending or watching the Planning Commission because their work was extremely detailed and difficult and she would be clueless about what is happening.

Chair Campbell thought the idea had merit, but he was concerned about summarizing the meetings in a way that got at what they were doing, and paraphrasing other commissioners' sentiments and he would think about the Brown Act. He acknowledged it was something to think about.

Councilmember Digre stated that, in the reverse, they don't hear about the Council's conversations. She wrestles with that a little bit, having both know what the other is doing.

Chair Campbell reiterated that it was worth exploring. He stated that one is usually at one of the meetings.

Councilmember Digre didn't think they needed to spend any more time on it.

Chair Campbell thought the meetings have gone so well over the last couple of years and he thought it was due to having City Councilmembers there a lot more and it helps moves things a lot smoother and he appreciated that.

Councilmember Martin thanked them for all their hard work and having a liaison to make sure it is recorded. She appreciated all the time they put in as it is a volunteer position with a lot of time on their own studying, etc.

Chair Campbell thanked her and stated that the Commission benefits from the incredible work by the Planning staff.

Mayor Keener appreciated the good work that the Commission does on the legislative matters that will eventually come before Council, such as accessory dwelling units, etc., reflected in the fact that Council doesn't make many changes in their decisions by Council.

Chair Hontalas gave the Beautification Committee's annual report.

Mayor pro Tem Vaterlaus thanked them, adding that things look so much better in the places that have been fixed up.

Councilmember Martin seconded that.

Mayor Keener concluded that was the sentiment of the Council.

Councilmember O'Neill stated that he attends as many meetings as possible but he admits that he misses some because of conflicts. He stated that they were active in reaching out to community groups, especially for Palmetto project. He felt they were very dedicated and keep going and do physically join in and he wanted to thank them.

Councilmember Digre mentioned that the merchants have tried different things in the Manor area and she thought they would be open to something with plantar boxes.

Chair Hontalas stated that they are and the committee was working with them. She stated that it will be on the east side as you are coming down Highway 1, the same side as the Manor going north. She stated that it was a large area to get a landscaper to do the work.

Councilmember Martin thanked them for their work, mentioning that she talked with a Palmetto vendor who had received their formal letter. She asked if there was any matching money as she had questions as to how much it was going to cost and whether she was paying for all of it or is there money coming from somewhere.

Chair Hontalas stated that, with the merchants she spoke to, the cost of the plants would be determined by the size of the planting area they were adopting.

Councilmember Martin stated that she had missed her, and she concluded that the merchant will be paying and maintaining. She stated that she understood all the maintenance part but they weren't sure about the wording and whether there was a matching cost.

Chair Hontalas stated that there were no matching costs but all adoption for two years, maintaining it and picking up the litter, pruning, etc. She stated that most of the planting areas are quite small and she didn't think the cost would be as much as on Linda Mar or Crespi, possibly a couple of hundred dollars.

Councilmember Martin thought it was great and appreciated all their work.

Chair pro Tem Kellogg and Chair Bier gave the Parks, Beaches & Recreation Committee's annual report.

Councilmember Martin thanked them for all they do. She thought it was a fun commission and she misses it a lot, adding that Council is fun too.

Councilmember O'Neill mentioned having a couple of people drown on Rockaway and they were talking about having "do not swim" signs. He asked if there was any follow-up or a resolution to that.

Chair Bier stated that it was a good question and she could come back to him if he would like, adding that Planning Director Wehrmeister might know more about that.

Councilmember O'Neill stated that they talked about it and he thought it was being investigated. He stated that the City Attorney and previous City Manager had issues.

Chair Bier stated that it has not come up on their agenda since she has been on the Commission, just a signage project but not that specific one.

Councilmember O'Neill asked if they can see about that.

Chair Bier agreed that they would.

Councilmember Digre stated that they had the Public Works picture with a black thing with tire tracks and she couldn't tell what it was, such as an outfall being taken away by Public Works, but that would be under Public Works.

Chair Bier stated it was too bad that Director Perez was not present.

Mayor pro Tem Vaterlaus stated she knows what it is. She stated that, on her Beach Coalition tour on Earth Day, they pulled this out, as it was the largest piece of metal in the water of Linda Mar Beach.

Councilmember Digre asked the City Manager about several committees doing signage, and she asked how they interrelate, such as going through the City Manager and he lets them know if they are talking the same language and the right hand knows what the left hand is doing.

City Manager Woodhouse thought that was an excellent question. He stated that one of the processes would be at the executive team meetings as signage is developed and they coordinate that. He was not aware of any specific coordination process between them but he will be talking to the executive team about it.

Councilmember Digre added that we now have a bicycle committee and they are planning signage on bicycles and pedestrian things. She thought they need to make sure that the hard work gets to a local place and she thought it was great, suggesting that he tell staff to bring those things to the executive team.

City Manager Woodhouse stated that the executive team was all the department directors and they will talk about it.

Councilmember Martin stated that she was on the CCAG bike and pedestrian committee and she tries to keep in constant touch with what was going on and coming before the Commission and with Director Ocampo.

Councilmember Digre thought Planning needs to know as well.

Director Lange of PB&R stated that he thought the interim project came about as a starting point to give an inventory of what signs were available. He stated that PB&R and Public Works now have access to the signs. He stated that, if the public were to complain about a sign or ask if there is a sign at a park, they can identify if there is one or if one is needed. He stated that the purpose was to have a reference point.

Mayor pro Tem Vaterlaus thanked them for all the work they do.

JoAnne Arnos stated that the chair was on vacation so they were there to present the Open Space and Parkland Advisory Committee's annual report. Members Sally McKenzie and Ron Maykel introduced themselves.

Councilmember Digre thanked them, stating that it was a very hardworking committee. She gave a shoutout to George Frank for all the hard work he has done, stating that his term was up this month. She stated that it was a very active group.

Councilmember Martin thanked them for their dedication in keeping our spaces open and our health.

Joanne Arnos asked if she could bring up an issue.

Councilmember O'Neill commented that they had two more committee reports and only have 12 minutes left.

Joanne Arnos stated that they would like to address Council with an issue on another day about their objectives and possibly adding an objective.

Mayor Keener agreed.

Chair Johnson thanked the Police for their liaison support as well as City Council's liaison and then gave the Emergency Preparedness and Safety Commission's annual report.

Mayor Keener thanked her for being concise.

Councilmember O'Neill acknowledged that they will have a busy year, mentioning that the fire chief was working with the City Manager on a presentation on escape routes, especially at the back of the valley and working on a presentation for defense regarding plants that will catch on fire. He stated that he served on the commission in the past, mentioning that Frank Erbacher was there then and now.

Chair Johnson thought they have 200 years of experience on their Commission.

Councilmember O'Neill acknowledged that and thanked all of them for their dedication to it.

Councilmember Martin thanked for all the work they do. They are practicing what they preach.

Councilmember Digre stated that the incredible amount of experience was refreshing and they were happy to add another experienced person. She thanked them.

Mayor Keener thanked Captain Clements.

Chair Leal gave the Economic Development Committee's annual report.

Councilmember Digre thanked them, stating that it was a very active committee.

Councilmember O'Neill stated he and Councilmember Digre were the liaisons for the EDC. He stated that they had Kimco as the Voldemort shopping center management and they were telling their plans for Linda Mar Center. He asked if Chair Leal wanted to share their plans.

Chair Leal stated that they will be in their minutes, but there was very low vacancy at Fairmont and Linda Mar which he thought was good. He stated that, in talking to the shopping mall owners, you get an understanding of why certain businesses can't go in and the challenges in some of the spots. He stated that what they heard was exciting as to what will be going in over the next couple of months, such as martial arts studios, etc. He stated that they are definitely investing in Pacifica.

Councilmember O'Neill thanked them for all their hard work.

Councilmember Martin thanked them for their hard work, dedication and motivation. She stated that not many people think about economic development in the town in which they live but their committee keeps us thinking about it and moving in a positive direction.

Mayor pro Tem Vaterlaus thanked all the committees. She stated that this was a good thing for everyone to meet on the same night and hear that there are definitely overlaps in all the committees. She thought it was nice to be together and hear each other.

1. Annual Reports to City Council from the Beautification Advisory Committee, Economic Development Committee, Emergency Preparedness & Safety Commission, Open Space and Parkland Advisory Committee, Parks, Beaches & Recreation Commission, and Planning Commission.

PROPOSED ACTION: This is an informational item. It is requested that the City Council provide feedback and receive and file the annual report of each commission and committee.

7:00 PM OPEN SESSION

Call to Order

Mayor Keener reconvened the regular meeting at 7:10 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; Tina Wehrmeister, Planning Director; Christian Murdock, Sr. Planner; Bonny O'Connor, Asst. Planner; Dan Steidle, Police Chief; Ron Myers, Fire Chief; Kathy O'Connell, City Clerk.

Salute to the Flag led by Mayor Pro Tem Vaterlaus

Closed Session Report

City Attorney Kenyon stated that there was no reportable action.

SPECIAL PRESENTATIONS

Proclamation - Pacifica Mizpah Fellowship

Mayor Keener read a portion of the Proclamation for Pacifica Mizpah Fellowship.

Susan Stallard, President of Mitzpah, stated that they were thrilled with the proclamation, explaining that this May represents their 70th anniversary, they are older than Pacifica as a city, and have volunteered since then, mentioning a few specifics, such as the Pacifica Resource Center.

They then took a picture.

Life Saving Medal - Officer Gomez

Police Chief Steidle stated that he was joined by Officer Joe Gomez whom they are honoring at this time. He acknowledged officers from Pacifica and San Bruno police departments. He referred to a YouTube facility incident of an active shooter who wounded several people. He stated that law enforcement has been training and changing their tactics since the Columbine incident. He mentioned the plus of training with police departments in many cities. He stated that the incident was run by the San Bruno Police Department and seamlessly moved forward working together, and gave a brief description of what Officer Gomez did. He felt they were fortunate to have positive relationships with neighboring police departments. He then read a Pacifica commendation report for Officer Gomez.

Councilmember Digre stated that she had EMT personnel in her family and she felt what he did showed skill and courage. She thanked him.

Officer Gomez thanked her.

Councilmember Martin thanked him for doing what he does.

Officer Gomez thanked her.

Mayor agreed with Councilmember Martin.

Councilmember O'Neill thanked him also.

They then took a picture, including all uniformed personnel.

Mayor Keener called a short break then reconvened the meeting.

CONSENT CALENDAR

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

1. Approval of Disbursements for 04/01/18 through 04/15/18.
PROPOSED ACTION: Move to approve attached list of disbursements for 04/01/18 through 04/15/18.
2. Approval of Minutes
PROPOSED ACTION: Move to approve the minutes of the regular meeting held on April 23, 2018.
3. Proclamation Confirming Existence of Local Emergency of the Pacifica Coastline from Westline Drive to the End of Beach Boulevard.
PROPOSED ACTION: Accept current photos as of May 3, 2018, and move to continue proclamation confirming the existence of local emergency.
4. Resolution Supporting Proposition 68, the California Drought, Water, Parks, Climate, Coastal Protection, and Outdoor Access for All Act of 2018.
PROPOSED ACTION: Approve a resolution supporting Proposition 68, the California Drought, Water, Parks, Climate, Coastal Protection, and Outdoor Access for All Act of 2018, which is a State bond measure that will generate direct funding to the City of Pacifica, as well as grant funding sources, to benefit parks, natural resources protection, climate adaptation, water quality, and flood protection projects.
5. Resolution Supporting Proposition 69 and Opposing Repeal of Senate Bill 1, the Road Repair and Accountability Act of 2017.
PROPOSED ACTION: Approve a resolution supporting Proposition 69, a June 2018 constitutional amendment to prevent new transportation funds from being diverted for non-transportation purposes, and opposing a proposed ballot measure aimed for the November 2018 ballot that would repeal Senate Bill 1, the Road Repair and Accountability Act of 2017.

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

Martin Anaya, PCT, stated he was present to discuss their program PC Honors. While being a fundraiser for the oldest community TV center, it provides them the opportunity to recognize people in the community who have done wonderful things, mentioning several people who will be honored. The program is June 8 and all information is available at pacificcoast.tv. or call them. He mentioned that they were in the process of forming a community radio station, internet to start with and will allow them to honor many people, such as Assembly member Kevin Mullin.

Ron Maykel, Pacifica, stated he wanted to add to the Open Space Parkland Advisory Committee presentation earlier . He stated that he and Jim Sullivan met with a GGNRA staff person at Sheldance Nursery regarding creating signs to direct people crossing the highway at

that point to use the tunnel instead. He stated that he felt, when Caltrans fixes the highway, they have to eliminate that crosswalk.

Delia McGrath, Pacifica, stated that she was present as a member of the Pacifica Climate Committee to call attention to plans for a transit sales tax initiative on the November 2018 for San Mateo voters. She stated that, if the ballot passes for a 30-year tax for transportation, too much money will be used on Highway 101 widening and will not be environmentally beneficial. She stated that they want solutions to get people out of their private cars and think about using public transportation. They felt the language should be redirected to improve public transit and solutions benefitting the whole community, and definitely felt toll lanes for those with the money to spend to allow them fast travel was not a good idea. She asked that they think about the fact that the widening of Highway 101 was not a good use of public funds. She then stated that, as a member of Pacifica Peace People, they are hoping that the Council choose to divest from any investments in weapons manufacturing or company that benefits from violence and war.

Bridget Duffy, Pacifica, stated that across from the Community Center is a senior assisted living facility and her 99-year-old friend on a Harvey and her friends run across the street from the apartment building and she thought a crosswalk would be good there. She stated that she wasn't present to pout about not getting on the Planning Commission but was present to say the same thing she has been saying for three years, the city has a 9-seat Planning Commission that, for three years have been filled with men. She stated that, when she has complained about it, they say no women applied, but this time a woman applied and did not get the seat. She felt that was evident that females are not getting the representation in government that they deserve, adding that she does everything men do in all other areas but, on Board representation women are 20% and those women are in the minority and lack power. She stated that we need equal representation and she didn't think we can wait much longer and she hopes that the next time there is an opening on the important Planning Commission, they will consider trying to get a woman.

Anita Rees, Pacifica, reminded everyone about their volunteer appreciation lunch on May 23 at the American Legion Hall and all volunteers are welcome and mentioned the persons who will be honored at this luncheon. She stated that they are beginning plans for summer program, back to school, etc.

COUNCIL COMMUNICATIONS

Councilmember Martin stated that, while they already talked about Earth Day, she wanted to give an update. She stated that 21 schools received assemblies, reaching 7,500 students and teachers in schools in Pacifica and surrounding schools. She stated that 53 sites were included, listing the various locations, the numbers who worked, the amount of trash, recycling, green waste and 14,873 cigarette butts collected in two hours. She stated that a total of 9,176 volunteers and 225 volunteers to set up, breakdown and wrap up. She thanked everyone and every organization that helped. She worked on a beach cleanup this past weekend as well with 75 volunteers. She referred to the Library Advisory meeting, stating that there was a lot of discussion on outreach and the design. She attended the sea level rise which had a good turnout but most attendees live close to the ocean and she would love greater participation from those living further away from the ocean as we are all affected. They talked about the economics, and that information was on the website. She encouraged attending the next one on May 31.

Councilmember Digre stated that she attended the sea level rise meeting. She thought they were looking for comments by the 17th. She stated that it was a community affair. She attended the Daly City, Pacifica and Colma gun buyback program. She stated it was efficiently done, polite and orderly. She stated that Caltrans was looking for information and asked that people watch their website and the city's website to comment on public transportation in Pacifica. She stated she will be attending a meeting regarding transporting students to Terra Nova. She mentioned Mary Harris was a teacher and artist and they were adjourning the meeting in her honor along with James McNalley. She stated that she keeps getting reports from people who are helping her stay on top of the SF Airport situation. She stated that in the last few weeks there have been more airplanes flying lower over Pacifica. She mentioned there were some safety issues and some of them were about other concerns besides noise and needed to be addressed by the public and leadership. She mentioned that Relay for Life had their kickoff and was a wonderful local organization that could use some more volunteers for the event on July 15.

Councilmember O'Neill stated he was at both sea level rise meetings and attended the joint school districts and North Coast County Water quarterly articulation meeting where they chat about what was going on with the different entities. He also attended the EDC meeting and stated they had a representative from Kimco who took none of the blame for anything as he has only been there for two years. He attended the Relay for Life kickoff. He referred to their budget meeting and complimented the Asst. City Manager as he took everything out of the cupboards and this year it was status quo and next year they will be taking the cupboards off the wall. He thought they will have to study and look at different alternatives. He also attended the Beautification Committee meeting which talked about the different projects and Palmetto. He also attended the Rotary's kickoff for the Sharp Park restaurant which was used by a lot of community group and Rotary Club volunteered and put in a new sound systems, etc.

Mayor pro Tem Vaterlaus stated that she also attended all the sea level meetings and she reiterated that the next meeting is May 31 at the Community Center, adding that it was very important for as many people as possible to go and listen. She went to the state of the County at YouTube with Kevin Mullin, Jerry Hill, Dave Canapa, and Don Horsley gave an interesting update on the county on everything that has been done. She attended the Council of Cities in Half Moon Bay, hearing from the owner of the Half Moon Bay Review which will come into Pacifica. She attended two dates in Sacramento with CCAG and heard from four transportation leaders, Jerry Hill, Kevin Mullin, Phil Ting and Senator Berman. She also attended the Library Committee and the cannabis drawing which was interesting. She stated that they were in the first process with the selected possible licensees. She also attended a meet and greet with Supervisor Don Horsley.

Mayor Keener attended the cannabis lottery. He stated that Sr. Planner Murdock ran the bingo machine and convinced everyone that it was a completely random drawing and out of 12 applicants, 6 were chosen. He stated that the maximum they can have this go-round was 5, but they will see as the winners have to "jump through some more hoops" before they can open. He attended the sea level rise meetings on adaptations and economic considerations. He stated that the upcoming meeting was a workshop and will be more substantive and he encouraged everyone to attend. He attended the Junior Olympics on Saturday morning, and the kids enjoyed themselves. He also attended the marijuana panel which was organized by Mary Bier and was about how to talk to children about cannabis as well as the counseling aspect. He stated that there was not a large attendance because of a competing school event, but he hoped for better attendance in the future. He attended Harvest Baskets, the PRC's food

giveaway at the American Legion Hall, with another one scheduled along with the appreciation dinner. He attended the Council of Cities.

STAFF COMMUNICATIONS

City Manager Woodhouse stated that many of the items he was going to mention have already been addressed by councilmembers. He referred to the gun buyback program they co-sponsored with Daly City and Colma, stating that they collected 207 guns. He stated that the same day an event was occurring in San Mateo for the rest of the county and they collected in the 400 because of a lot more cities. He stated that, as mentioned by Councilmember Digre, the operation was very smooth. He stated that he and other staff met with Caltrans the previous week and Chief Deputy District Director Dan McElhany covering 8-10 significant collaborations issues between Pacifica and Caltrans which was very productive, adding that there will be followup from that meeting. He stated that the next day he will be at the Chamber of Commerce for an open house speaking about the Council's prioritized goals and budget between 3:30-4:30 if any businesses want to stop by and chat. He and the Mayor will be doing a similar presentation to the Pacifica Democrats Club on the following Saturday regarding budgets and goals.

Councilmember O'Neill asked if he would mention the traffic lights at Fassler and Reina del Mar and what they were doing about that situation.

City Manager Woodhouse stated that they were learning a lot about the adaptive traffic light system. He stated that over recent weeks there have been some snarls and they are turning the system off so that it goes back to the regular Caltrans timing and studying the current data that has been gathered to figure out what was working and what was not working. He stated that the adaptive system wasn't meant to solve the rush hour traffic problems but it was meant to help. He stated that this was a long term analysis of the data and calibration of the lights to see how it can help and they will be pausing to make that analysis and they will report back.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

6. Councilmember call-up of the Planning Commission's approval with conditions of Specific Plan SP-149-14, Transfer of Development Rights TDR-03-14, Subdivision SUB-224-14, and authorization to remove one heritage tree; introduction of an ordinance to adopt Development Plan DP-75-14 and Rezoning with a Development Plan RZ-192-14; certification of a supplement to an Environmental Impact Report; and adoption of Findings of Facts and a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program for the subdivision of airspace and construction of a 24-unit condominium development at 801 Fassler Avenue (APNs 022-083-020 and 022-083-030)

PROPOSED ACTION: Uphold the Planning Commission's approval of Specific Plan SP-149-14, Transfer of Development Rights TDR-03-14, Subdivision SUB-224-14, and authorization to remove one heritage tree, as conditioned; introduction of the proposed ordinance approving Development Plan DP-75-14 and Rezoning with a Development Plan RZ-75-14; certify the Fassler Avenue Residential Project Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Report, State Clearinghouse No. 2006062150, in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act; and adopt the Findings of Fact, Statement of Overriding Considerations, and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program.

Councilmember Digre stated that she didn't recall seeing air space before and it throws her a little. She asked what they were talking about when mentioning air space, such as the land.

Sr. Planner Murdock stated that he doesn't address that point directly in the staff report but it refers to a condominium subdivision. He stated that a typical subdivision carves up land at the surface level by drawing new parcel boundaries but a condominium divides air space in three dimensions rather than two dimensions on the ground and that is what reference to air space means. He then presented the staff report.

Jeff Riley of WRA, stated they were hired by the city to prepare the supplemental EIR and he will provide a brief summary he previously provided for the Planning Commission.

Mayor Keener asked him to list the cumulative impacts that could not be mitigated.

Mr. Riley stated that they were related to noise.

Mayor Keener asked if it was noise during the construction.

Mr. Riley responded affirmatively, adding that it also included the project across the road and other projects in the general vicinity. He will look at his papers and get back to him.

Councilmember Digre stated that he mentioned some unavoidable things such as aesthetics, resources, vistas and she didn't get the last one.

Mr. Riley stated that the unavoidable impacts are AES1 which stands for aesthetics, scenic vistas, scenic resources and visual character of the site and surroundings. He stated that the fourth unavoidable was substantial increase in ambient noise during the construction phase only, which was the project specific unavoidable impacts. He stated that the three unavoidable cumulative impacts relate to aesthetics, biological resources and noise.

Sen. Planner Murdock summarized the staff report.

Mayor Keener asked Planning Commission Vice Chair Clifford if he had anything to add on how the Commission went about the project.

Vice Chair Clifford stated that they heard it three separate times and worked through many renditions of the traffic report and the height restrictions on the building. He thought they gave it a good hearing but the Council decides if they missed something.

Mayor Keener stated that he should comment on why he called this up.

City Attorney Kenyon stated that he does not need to as it was not a regular appeal where they have to give grounds. She stated that he can inform staff and the public as to why but it was not a need.

Mayor Keener stated that he felt the need to do that. He stated that he had four main concerns, with the overriding concern of traffic with people coming up the hill and making a left across the westbound traffic into the development. Additional reasons were the building heights that exceeded 35 feet, the trails and disposition of the land they are on and parking for visitors as there were only three spots reserved for visitors which he didn't think was enough. He stated that he had extensive discussions with staff about these topics and he thought he got most of

them resolved. He favored a traffic light that would be triggered by someone in the left turn lane going into the development. He asked Sr. Planner Murdock if he had a slide of the traffic flow going into the development which would be useful.

Sr. Planner Murdock thought he had the best graphic of the striping plan if that was what he was looking for.

Mayor Keener agreed, stating that people coming up the hill from Highway 1 and turning left across the traffic coming downhill into the condominium development. He thought a traffic light triggered by the left turners would only turn green for them and red for those coming down the hill when there was someone turning left but otherwise it would always be green. He added that there were something called warrants for traffic lights with reasons for the city determining they have to have a traffic light. He stated that, in this case, the easiest to achieve would be for there to be five accidents within a year and they would be entitled to put in a traffic light. He stated that if you put in a traffic light without a warrant, you were subject to a lawsuit if anyone has an accident at the traffic light. They would be suing by questioning the validity of having a traffic light there. He was persuaded that it wasn't feasible at this time and instead Public Works Dir. Ocampo came up with a package of ideas to slow down traffic coming down the hill. He stated that his most important thing was putting dots on the road or grooves to alert westbound drivers that they are coming up on an intersection where someone might be turning left in front of them into the condominium development. He stated that those dots or grooves would be in the downhill through lane and up from the condo development and designed to slow traffic down. Other ideas were mentioned such as vertical separators between lanes and he thought they would also be good. He believed Engineering had modified condition 44 to reflect those.

Planning Director Wehrmeister agreed that the modified condition is in the staff report and it would need to be referenced if the Council does want to change condition 44 recommended by the Planning Commission. She then referred to Packet page 352 has the image on the screen in larger.

Councilmember Digre asked if she could put the page number of 44.

Planning Director Wehrmeister asked if it was the revised condition 44.

Councilmember Digre responded affirmatively.

Sr. Planner Murdock stated that it was on Packet page 111.

Mayor Keener then referred to the building heights, and Planning staff educated him on his concern that the two buildings over 35 feet violated HPD regulations and it would set a bad precedent for the city. He stated that staff informed him that HPD didn't have height regulations and, in this case, the height regulations are set by the planned development. He added that one was just a couple of inches over 35 feet and one was 37 + feet.

Sr. Planner stated that it was 37'1" and 35'4" are the two building heights over 35 feet.

Mayor Keener dropped his challenge on that. He then referred to the trails, stating that he hoped for some sort of arrangement that the public would be allowed to use the trails in the eastern half of the development but the only way it would occur if the city was willing to take over the land as a gift from the developer and would assume liability for anyone walking on the trails which he thought unlikely at this time, adding that he would like to see a provision in the

conditions that would make that possible at a future date. He stated that they discussed it at that meeting.

City Attorney Kenyon stated that they will have that language after public hearing when it gets back to Council for deliberation.

Mayor Keener stated that he needs to get that out for the public hearing. He appreciates the language. He then referred to the parking. He understood there were only three visitor parking spots.

Sr. Planner Murdock thought it was a little bit misleading. He stated that the Hillside Preservation District parking standards essentially break the parking for this type of unit into three different categories. The two car side by side garage requirement for the units themselves, specific guest parking requirement to which he is referring, which was three parking spaces, but it was one space per ten units which for this project results in "three guest" spaces as defined in the zoning, but he stated that there was a third category of parking required, which was an extra half space per unit which can be provided in common within 100 feet of the units and that was what the developer did in this case. In effect, they have 15 guest parking spaces for the project.

Mayor Keener assumed his reference to "in common" was a term of art.

Sr. Planner Murdock stated that they are not designated to be reserved for an individual unit, but open surface parking spaces.

Mayor Keener understood that, in effect, they have 15 spaces. He thought that solves the issue to his satisfaction. He wanted to layout the reasons he called this up and the progress made in resolving those before they have the public speakers in case this would bear on their comments.

Councilmember Digre asked Sr. Planner Murdock if he was giving legislative items and judicial.

Sr. Planner Murdock stated it was adjudicative items.

Councilmember Digre stated that she didn't catch the three adjudicative items. She stated that there was air space and two others.

Sr. Planner Murdock stated that, to build off of air space, they have the tentative subdivision map.

Councilmember Digre stated that she needed the three and she heard air space.

Sr. Planner Murdock recognized that she understood the air space item. He stated that the other two include the specific plan which was essentially the architectural and site design approval for the project and the third was the transfer of development rights, i.e., shifting the development potential from the eastern portion of the site to the western portion of the site.

Councilmember Digre wasn't stating that she understood it, but she wanted to have the three things down.

Mayor Keener opened the public hearing.

City Attorney Kenyon stated that they should probably ask the applicant if they would like to speak now or at the end. They would get ten minutes and three minutes of rebuttal. Since there was no appellant and they don't need time for an appellant.

Mayor Keener asked if the applicant would like to speak.

Jeff Potts, DG Architects, stated that he was present on behalf of the applicants but were here to answer questions. He stated that they indicated that many of the items in question have been worked out and they were in agreement with the Planning Commission's recommendations on the height, colors, etc., and will answer questions and respond to public comments.

Councilmember O'Neill asked if they saw Item 44 from the City Engineer.

Mr. Potts stated that he thought it was discussed with the civil engineer and the traffic consultant. He didn't see the latest iterations but he knew it has been worked through with the traffic consultant.

City Attorney Kenyon asked if he has spoken to staff about an irrevocable offer of dedication. She asked if he would put that on the record.

Mr. Potts stated that the applicant has spoken to staff about that.

City Attorney Kenyon asked staff if they would like to explain what they discussed.

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated that she called the project applicant to confirm that they were not going to be able to allow the public on the site for liability concerns and they reiterated that they would be willing to dedicate the land to the city. She added that it was a difficult proposition for the city now with the budget. They said they would be amenable to this irrevocable offer of dedication and if the city is in such a position to accept the offer in the future they can do so. She thought it would be up to the city attorney to be sure they have it worded correctly. She thought, if the GGNRA changed its area or another conservation entity would be willing to accept it and allow public access, they could facilitate that through this offer of dedication.

Councilmember O'Neill stated that he was unclear to her answer to his question. He asked if the applicant was open to No. 44 which is one of the discussion points.

Mr. Potts stated that they were open to the condition on the traffic and they did speak with staff about the irrevocable offer of dedication.

Councilmember O'Neill stated that he wanted to know his thoughts on that.

Mayor Keener opened the public hearing.

JoAnne Arnos, Pacifica, stated that several members of the Open Space Parkland Committee have been in front of them about this project, stating that their issues were his issues. She stated that they were still struggling with the project being developed on the west end. She stated that her personal opinion was that, in the course of the development, the east end of the property was never really developed as a possibility and they were at a different place and it looks like the west will be it, but she personally did not think it was developed to whether it was

a possibility on the east which would be less traffic and less issues that are now on the table. She stated that the United States Department of Transportation and Safety has a recent study done and a left hand turn, in terms of cross traffic, was the worst possible turn in development as a city because of the danger of traffic accidents, mentioning that more people are killed in a left hand turn across traffic than any other configuration of traffic. She commented on the way people travel down Fassler and didn't think the issue of coming up Fassler and taking a left across the traffic was resolved. She appreciated the effort of Planning to cut the height which were major issues, and she was an advocate to have muted colors. She thought they should have a General Plan and doesn't have to be brought up by a citizen that colors would fit into the vistas so it wouldn't be an obstruction such as this project is, and it wasn't originally muted color. She didn't think it was her responsibility as a citizen to bring that up but should be part of our open space. She stated that they hope to meet with them to have their advisory capacity expanded and back to 2013 when they had it taken away.

Bridget Duffy, Pacifica, stated that she knew there was a heritage tree coming down and they were aware of climate change and breakdown which she thought was happening because of so many trees being cut down, specifically the rain forest. She stated that we are still cutting down trees and a mature tree is going to sequester carbon out of the air better than no tree and better than a young tree. She couldn't believe it was not in our climate change plan. She stated that, if we are going to have to take a mature tree down, we would mitigate the loss of something that was taking carbons out of the air. She stated that seaweed was an amazing carbon sequester, and she didn't understand why they weren't incorporating some remedies for climate disruption such as taking trees down. She also mentioned that a lot of buildings are being built with materials other than concrete. She asked, knowing what we know about the climate and the green future that is inevitable, why we aren't building buildings with living roofs. She stated that they have flat roofs on the project and asked if they can change them to living roofs. She stated that people in other countries were conscious about recycling water and recapturing rain water as a part of the design of new buildings. She felt this was the direction in which we should be going if we are going to be putting buildings on open spaces and decimating habitat. She asked how we mitigate the problem and start thinking about it.

Chris Coppola, Pacifica, thanked the Planning Commission and the Planning Department. She understood and wanted to be sure there will be a deed restriction so people cannot hopscotch from this property onto the south part of Rockaway Beach to develop housing there. She also wanted to be sure that the drainage and creek issues of Rockaway Creek are taken care of during and after the building process and the sewers are not of concern. She mentioned that the Rockaway neighborhood didn't know where the development is. She hoped that the city would develop some rules or standards in terms of the use of story poles. She stated that they don't know where the development is, how high it is and what vista is going to be impacted. She understood that when undeveloped land is developed, it is part of the process and she urged them, for this development, it would be nice for them to know that information. She stated that the vista will most impact the people who live on the Bay View street going up and they weren't noticed about these meetings because they don't fall into the 500 feet. She then referred to the unmitigated issue of the noise. She stated that she can hear people talk on Bay View which is more than 500 feet from her house. She stated that the entire valley is going to be impacted by the noise and she asked if they can do something about the hours and days of construction.

Ron Maykel, Pacifica, thanked Commissioner Clifford who pushed hard for the color palette. He stated that he lives in Rockaway and below Seacrest development, 48 units east of the Fassler project and had filed a petition against the project in 1982 but got a letter from the

mayor. His issue was the color and the drainage pipe. He stated that the Seacrest development is almost a glaring white and when you are on Cattle Hill hiking the trails you look down and it is terrible. He stated that next to it is a house of natural wood color and it looks so much nicer and blends in with the landscape, so it was a positive thing that they are looking at the color palettes. He was concerned about the Seacrest development that put in a 36-inch pipe that drained all the non-pervious water off the development and the pipe went down through the greenbelt and emptied into Rockaway Creek. He stated that they can't do that, and have to put more effort into protecting the creeks. He acknowledged that they will not have that 36-inch drain pipe and the color palettes are going to look good. He was still concerned about the traffic issue. He stated that it was a major issue on the previous Prospects development and he thought they needed to look at it closer. He thought a control light would be recommended, but he suggested that they slow the traffic, making it 15 mph speed limit.

Cyvash Mozzani, Pacifica, stated he has been following this project since 2010 and he advised him to come up with a plan like this eight years ago, and he was glad this project was coming before them. He thought it was a good looking plan and was delivering 24 much needed housing units to the city, mentioning that the developer was offering four BMR units which was a good thing for Pacifica. He thought that it was good that they were amenable to hearing and taking traffic mitigation measures into consideration. He stated that there was a cost doing business in the Bay Area as everything was expensive and the fact that they are making concessions to appease Pacifica was a great thing. He liked the connection to Seacrest condominiums. He stated that he has walked that project before and the people who live there will benefit from the open space trails and picnic area. He liked the project and hopes it gets approved.

Stephanie McAuliffe, Pacifica, stated that she had similar concerns as her neighbors. She stated that one of the saving grace to Seacrest was that some trees have grown up to block it, and she would be interested in the developer investing in some mature trees and extensive landscaping, not just on Fassler or between the units but also to the north for the Rockaway and Bay View people to mitigate a stucco and plaster edifice.

Hal Bohner, Pacifica, thanked them for calling this up. He thought it raised some good issues. He referred to condition #44. He stated that he was shocked and troubled that we can't have a traffic signal until they have five accidents. He stated that it seems crazy. He asked staff if they are sure as it doesn't make sense to him. He stated that it was their prerogative to send this matter back to the Planning Commission for further discussion and he would recommend that they do that. He stated that the Planning Commission spent a lot of time on the traffic issues and were concerned about it. He stated that there was a peer review on the design they came up with and he asked that they send it back to them with the ideas on condition #44 and let them work on this. He stated that the traffic issues are a significant item and he thought turning it over to the city engineer to negotiate something with the developer and accept what they negotiate wasn't a good idea. He thought it needs to go back to the Planning Commission, have a public vetting and another peer review and then come back to Council if appropriate. He agreed that there should be story poles required always in Pacifica as it is a matter of public notice to know what is going on before the project is approved which he felt was fair and reasonable. He stated that we shouldn't have to negotiate the color palette for every project but have a reasonable color palette required for any significant development in Pacifica, especially highly visible projects.

Noel Blincoe, Pacifica, stated that he came reluctantly because the Planning Commission had approved this project unanimously and he was extremely saddened, especially over aesthetics

of the project. He referred to mention of story poles which he felt would have been critical on this project because putting up story poles where the project was going to be built would allow you to see from west of Highway 1 throughout the quarry area where the project was going to be. He stated that people in the past valued our hillside and treasured our hillside and the Planning Commission decided to go ahead with this project. He stated that he was on the Open Space Committee for many years and projects were brought before them and they had the opportunity to evaluate different projects. He stated that this was an important element because the Planning Commission paid very little attention to the aesthetics of the project. He felt it was very upsetting, and left the meeting almost crying because of this new era that is coming in for developing on our hillsides. He stated that the Hillside Preservation District protects the hillsides and it was a major mistake to think HPD does not cover this project. He stated that these high buildings are an aesthetic eyesore which goes directly against HPD. He was asking them to reconsider this project and think in terms of open space residential and if the project could be developed at the east end. He stated that, if they had story poles at the east end you would not see the project. He stated that, if you had story poles on the west side of Highway 1, you would have seen all the poles. He stated that the aesthetics will suck with this project because they will have big buildings on our hillside and it will happen after they fought against it for many years.

Tim Flaherty, Pacifica, stated he lives on Driftwood Circle above the proposed transfer site. He asked where the 3.7 and 7.6 acre parcels were, stating that there is no sign in front of the proposed site that would let the public know exactly where the development is going to be placed. He stated that the color shaded parcel designations but he didn't think it tells you where as there are no markings. He thought there should be a proposed map on the site so the public gets an idea of where the development will be. He asked why the development was being moved from the 3.6 acre low density residential partial to a 7.6 acre open space residential parcel. He felt, by moving it to the west, it was on top of the hillside and it was the reason the city developed the Hillside Preservation Act. He stated that, if you are going to give away your hillside views, get rid of the act and mow down the hills and put up developments every which way. He asked why 24 units were approved by the Planning Commission and 32 units are being transferred. He added that he only knows of two other people in the Driftwood area who know of this meeting. He stated that people aren't getting the word and, if there was a proposed development sign, people traveling that route every day would know that there was a proposed development and could have input into it. He asked if the area designated open space residential would be less dense than the low density residential designation on the east side and questioned why they were allowing the density to increase in what he believes is a low density area. He questioned why the Planning Commission has approved adding more units to a low density parcel designated area as open space residential. He asked what the effect of the proposed change is to the view corridor as it sits today. He asked if the code specified an allowance of more units in this area, as he thought the 32 units equals about 4.2 units per acre on the low density site. He asked if this proposal was in line with the Hillside Preservation Act or are exceptions being made for the developer. He felt they needed more public input and felt a full picture of the proposal and impact on the hillside views has not been given to the public and no decision should be made until an accurate picture of the proposal can be provided. He felt building on the east end of the lot would be less visual impact than the site on which they want to transfer to. He stated that the city said the significant impact of the scenic resources was unavoidable, and he felt it was if they don't approve the transfer. He ask that they let the public have a full picture of what is being proposed.

Kevin Casey, Pacifica, stated he lives on Rockaway Beach Avenue and none of his neighbors knows what the project is or where it is. He emphasized the story poles. He stated that parking on Roberts would be the only option for someone who can't find a parking place if all the 15

spots are taken and it was a long upward hike on Fassler. He stated that the condos at the top of the hill could go onto Crespi and was concerned about the number of parking places. He was also concerned about trees. He would see more trees being planted to offset the heritage tree and adding to the aesthetics. He stated that Rockaway Beach's big concern was sediment runoff coming down into the creek, as there is sediment and they only have 3 feet left. He stated that it would be wonderful to have a sidewalk that goes all the way up the north side of Fassler as he has to run across the street on Fassler at Robert's Road because the north sidewalk stops and changes to the south side. He stated that he makes the left turn into Rockaway Beach and he didn't know how they haven't had five accidents on that left turn. He stated that cars are always coming down fast on Fassler and there doesn't seem anything they can do about it.

Patrick Kobernus, Pacifica, stated that he lives in the Seacrest development. He has some concerns about more trees being planted because they already have had one wildfire come up that canyon, adding that there is a lot of fuel in that canyon. He felt more trees would exacerbate the problem. He also stated that the Monterey pines and cypress were not native trees. He realized they look good in some situations, but it was a concern. He thought it was a win-win situation for promoting some trail use public open space even if it is down the road for the public to use the trails. He stated that Seacrest was isolated with no sidewalks and it was nice to have the opportunity to have a place to hike. He stated that it was dangerous for people to cross Fassler to get to the open space on the other side to go for a walk.

Mr. Potts stated he would try to do his best to go in order and respond. He referred to the west end versus the east end and the transfer of development rights, and stated that part of why they started on the west end was that was where the old project was approved and that was the direction they were given. He added that, on looking at it, development on the east would impact the closest neighbors more and would be more visible to them. He stated that the location of the current development is lower on the hill and a flatter portion of the site. He reiterated that the east end was steeper and closer to the neighbors and that was the main reason why the development is located where it is. He referred to mention of the heritage tree removal and adding trees, stating that he was not the landscape architect but they went through the drawings and they were adding in excess of 75 trees to the project as screening and accent trees around the edge. He stated the north side was mentioned, and he stated that there was a significant screen line of trees added along that north side. He referred to mention of the drainage, and the current designed drainage will meet and exceed all of the new water quality requirements and detention requirements. He stated that they have detention on the site that will collect the runoff and meter it out so they won't have a 36-inch pipe with major runoff into the creek. He stated that the water will be cleaned before it goes into the creek. He referred to the colors and they agreed to a condition of approval to adjust the colors. He stated that they have discussed condition #44 and were amenable to features mentioned in the condition. He stated that there has been a ton of discussion about the traffic on the project, and it was very important. He wanted to be clear that the traffic and intersection has been studied by the applicant and his traffic engineer, the city's traffic engineer, peer review traffic engineer and they were the experts and have come to the conclusion of what was right, best, safest, and he leaves that to them if it is a further question. He referred to question on the 32 unit transfer versus the 24 units and stated that the site has a development potential of more units than what they are proposing. He stated that the units are being relocated within the site as a whole, but it was also being reduced by 9-11 units. He stated that the 32 discussed was what would be developable on the low density residential site at the east end. He thought there was an additional unit that could be developed on the larger site and they were combining the units and asking for 24 units on the overall site and giving up the rights to all of the additional units. He

referred to the site parking, and there was a two-car garage for every unit and there were 15 parking spaces on site and was more than one per duplex as a guest space and they believe the parking is adequate. He stated that the applicant is placing a sidewalk up the entire frontage of their property on Fassler.

Mayor Keener closed the public hearing.

Mayor Keener thought condition #44 was the best he thought they could get. He stated that he pushed for more in his discussions with the city engineer, City Attorney and Planning Department. He tried to explain that we were faced with a situation that we can't just put in a light which he thought would be safer and be free and clear of liability for doing that. He stated that the city engineer realized the problem and that was the best solution he could come up with at this time. He thought story poles were a good idea although he stated it was too late for this development but he thought they could require them or put together legislation that would require them for larger developments like this. He stated that notices on the property were too late for this development but it was a simple thing and he thought it was a good idea. He stated that was another thing they should do or prepare some legislation to do.

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated that she would be happy to do more research and work with the City Attorney's office. She stated that they did discuss it at the Planning Commission and after talking to the building official the ground disturbance would be pretty significant in order to get a story pole as it was a 44-foot high story pole and to make sure it was safe and not falling over was another problem. She stated that they can look at it and report back.

Councilmember Martin appreciated everyone who showed up to talk and their different perspectives, particularly those who live close to it. She mentioned that she acknowledged the danger of a left turn from Fassler to Rockaway Beach as she has done it to make a U-turn. She acknowledged that they will be conscious of the construction noise and the hours being done, mentioning that she can hear people talking in Crespi homes when she is on Terra Nova. She stated that it will be loud but no matter what, there is going to be construction somewhere and they appreciate their patience. She asked if any of the trees being planted will be mature. She stated that her main concerns were the same as Mayor Keener's and specifically the traffic. She stated that when she met with Engineering, Planning and City Manager, every question had already been asked and discussed. She stated that they were all trying to think outside the box. She acknowledged that we need housing and it will happen and the traffic will be bad. While she doesn't like it now, this is the reality of what is going to happen, and she was curious as to how many cars will be coming out of that lot during rush hour, which she understood was upward of 20 cars. She stated that when she is stuck on Fassler to make a right onto Highway 1, there will be about 20 more cars coming out of that development, but she acknowledged that we need housing. She stated that they thought about the Hillside Preservation District, although maybe it wasn't discussed in detail at the Planning Commission meeting. She stated that they have representation and it is important. She stated that she would be open in the future to discussing the Open Space having more input on projects on the hillsides. She stated that they have issues on major thoroughways and her request was that the developer consider putting guard rails in. She mentioned that it is dangerous to walk on Fassler and she has visions of riding her bike down with her surfboard to go surfing but it won't happen because of being too nervous. She stated that they stopped having cleanups on Fassler because there were too many near misses with cars. She mentioned that there was a guard rail now with no sidewalk, and she asked that the developer consider a guard rail in when they put in the sidewalk.

Mayor pro Tem Vaterlaus thought all of them talked to the Engineer, Planning and Public Works and they went into detail with the traffic plan and why they are more comfortable with it. She stated that this project has been going on since 2010 and she urged everyone to get on the automatic emails for Planning and for City Council because she didn't think there was any other way to notify every person about a coming project. She stated that they had three public hearings on this project, and she attended lots of them when it was the Prospects. She thought the story poles were an interesting idea and she can see how CEQA would be a problem. She stated that you can't stop at that property and, if they put up a sign, you would have to drive to Robert's Road and walk up as there wasn't a way to put something at that property. She mentioned that this packet was 1,191 pages and probably no one spent time to read through it all. She felt they need the trees and she didn't think they were a fire hazard as they will be green trees. She thought the number being planted to replace one heritage tree was admirable.

Councilmember Digre stated that she goes back to Prospects of 16 years ago and she asked if this configuration would the hillside look like Connemara and sitting on top and, when coming down driving Highway 1, are you going to see the development like Connemara.

Sr. Planner Murdock thought there was a potential for that, and that significant visual impact is the aspect of the project identified in the environmental review as being significant and unavoidable given the topography of the site and placement of the project on the site.

Councilmember Digre stated that she looked at the existing General Plan and it goes along with the history of the 16 years that she has been here and how the community went through the Connemara project and got to the one where it is. She stated that there were supposed to be trees on Connemara, with a park, and when you came down from Highway 1 from the north into Pacifica, you would be looking at trees with a scenic Pacifica. She mentioned that the Commission "went to the mat" on the Prospects for all pluses of scenic views, open space, respect for natural habitat, traffic, etc. She then referred to "going to the mat" for Harmony One, mentioning supporting it because it was into the hills, etc., and now they have new owners and its gone. She asked where the respect was for the input of the community. She was concerned that, in today's world, affordable housing was extremely important, and they fought for inclusionary housing. She asked what the annual salary needed for someone to afford those four below market housing.

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated that it was set annually. She stated that she can find the information.

Councilmember Digre stated that it was on line and she thought that, for a family of four, they will need \$120,000 annual salary. She stated that she attended a meeting about six months ago where the affordable housing in Pacifica's mobile home park was \$800,000 for a one bedroom mobile. She stated that she has a hard time about affordable. She mentioned that the General Plan says Pacifica is a coastal, environmental city and should respect it and retain it and keep the vistas.

Councilmember O'Neill stated that the price of the BMR units will be \$449,180.

Councilmember Digre agreed that was an improvement to \$800,000 in the mobile home park, but she asked how much of an annual salary do you need for that.

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated that, for a family of four to be considered low income in San Mateo County was over \$105,000.

Councilmember Digre concluded that would be what you have to earn.

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated that anything under that. Once you get over \$105,000, you are in the moderate income category.

Councilmember Digre stated that this was going to cost \$400,000.

Councilmember O'Neill responded affirmatively.

Councilmember Digre asked, if it costs \$400,000, how much a family of four has to make to pay the mortgage for that.

Councilmember O'Neill stated that it depends on how much they are putting down.

Councilmember Digre stated that they are talking about affordable housing, and she asked what they were talking about in dollars and cents and who will be able to move into that housing when they build it.

Councilmember Martin stated that it would be someone who makes less than \$105,000 a year will be able to buy one of the units that are going to cost \$429,000. She didn't know if they will be comfortable, but she was comfortable with those numbers.

Sr. Planner Murdock stated that what Councilmember O'Neill stated was an example calculation on this year's income levels and the sales price could go up or down at the time of calculation.

Councilmember Digre understood and she thought they were getting her drift. She then stated that no one has mentioned the retaining walls, the debris flows, and she was coming from 1983 where they were building and the debris flows and they lost two children. She stated that there was a report and it was difficult to read but she got the debris flow. She saw that mentioned in this report and they want to dig out 9,000 cubic yards and fill in with 11,000 and she stated that they are building up the surface and they will jut out and creating a mountain and they will need retaining walls to keep it there.

Sr. Planner Murdock stated that it was an estimated removal of 9,000 cubic yards and a fill of 19,100 for a net fill or addition of 10,100 cubic yards and he thought the project designer could talk more about why it was necessary. He stated that it does require leveling certain parts of the area to make build able pads.

Councilmember Digre stated that it was a little concerning. She then mentioned that the airport tells them there is nothing they can do but we are going to fight that one, but she asked how old this traffic situation and you have to have five accidents before they will consider something like a traffic light. She asked when that became an ordinance or law.

Bob Grande with Fehr and Peers, an on call traffic engineering consultant, and he has been a practicing registered traffic engineer for 32 years. He stated that the manual and uniform traffic control device warrants have been the same for that 32 year period. He stated that was one of nine different criteria. He stated that was the one that would be most likely to be met in the future.

Councilmember Digre asked what he meant by most likely to be met.

Mr. Grande stated that there are nine other standards that they look at for installing a traffic signal, and the accident criteria is one of nine tests.

Councilmember Digre asked if that was the easier one.

Mr. Grande stated that this intersection would unlikely ever meet the other eight tests they apply.

Councilmember Digre stated that they are talking about a 32-year old standard.

Mr. Grande stated that it has been the same as long as he has been practicing.

Councilmember Digre didn't know about the rest of them, but she drives all over this county and within the last two years to get from Burlingame to San Jose to take care of her grandchildren, she could leave at 4:00 or 5:00 and get there in an hour but not anymore. Now it takes three hours because of the flow of traffic. She stated that her concern was being willing to accept those kind of standards. She mentioned putting grooves and bumps in the road, stating that she hates the bumps but they work. She thinks the traffic situation needs more education or signs. She would like Council to reconsider at least something more than one thing and will get the attention so cars will slow down as they are getting close to Seacrest. She stated that Council has the right that Planning doesn't have and can look at things legislatively and adjudicative. She asked Sr. Planner Murdock to reiterate what their powers are under those two things.

Sr. Planner Murdock stated that he will start with the adjudicative authority that the Council has, as a call up from the Planning Commission which has the same level of authority on matters like this. He stated that the adjudicative process requires Council to balance facts about the project and compare the evidence and facts to findings that must be made for approval of a specific permit. He stated that Council isn't allowed to act arbitrarily and say they don't feel like it should be approved, but needs to point to specific evidence or facts in the record when making its decision to approve, deny or add a condition, basically acting like a judge and weighing the evidence. He stated that Council has much more discretion on legislative items as the law making body of the city and can weigh its personal beliefs and perceptions of morals of the community and determine whether or not making that new law, in this case zoning, is warranted. He stated that they have a lot more discretion are not bound by the same rigor of making an adjudicative decision.

Councilmember Digre thought that helps. She stated that, on looking at the existing General Plan, she stated that with the legislative option, based on the history of this community and the General Plan statement on page 12.

Councilmember O'Neill asked page 12 of what.

Councilmember Digre stated that it was of the General Plan. She then read a statement on conserving the unique qualities of Pacifica as a coastal community while making the city the best possible place to live, where the city will strive to provide a decent home while satisfying environment for each resident, etc. She believes that Prospects, Harmony One, Connemara, all had the vetting of the community and she felt it was concerning that people were present again saying that they didn't know about it. She wasn't surprised because the capital improvement plan for the overcrossing in Manor is there, and people are questioning that they haven't heard about it. She felt it behooves them to slow down and let people know about it and she felt it

comes on them to say Prospects “went to the mat” and were in the minutes of the recent Planning Commission. She felt they have to send this back to Planning for condition#44.

Mayor Keener stated that they don't and they can make that approval.

Councilmember Digre thought the HPD interpretation which she read in the present documents was a departure from the history of looking at HPD. She urged them to think about this and consider it.

Mayor pro Tem Vaterlaus stated that they have 2,927 acres of regional parks and beaches in Pacifica and most of the community is open space. She stated that this property is owned and by the zoning they could have built 33 homes there and were building 24. She states that everyone talks about the affordable issue and having more housing instead of rent control. She stated that the more houses the better and it helps Pacifica as their income is from property tax. She stated that Pacifica needs more property tax and she has read studies that show housing and services balance each other out. She has heard studies that say housing creates income for cities other than services. She felt they have limited the number, have gone through this since 2010 and every meeting they have about every project, someone comes and says they never heard about the project. She didn't think they can help everyone with that and someone will still come to every meeting and say they never heard of the project even though it has been going on since 2010.

Councilmember O'Neill stated that several people mentioned the drainage but this will be handled through state law and any flow has to be handled on site and he understood they have the retention basin which will collect all the water and, based on the comments by the architect, it will sit there until it drains somewhere. He asked if it was draining to Rockaway Beach Avenue.

Sr. Planner Murdock understood that the drainage for this project would go into the city storm drain system along Fassler Avenue and wherever the ultimate destination of the water, the project has been designed to comply with what is known as the C3 or new construction guidelines of the municipal regional permit for discharge of storm water. The C3 standards for new development require that you capture a significant amount of rain water where most of the contaminants are contained from depositing from the air, etc., and the first flush is captured in this design and it uses various mechanisms such as plant material, etc., to have the water permeate through and scrub the pollutants from the water before discharged. He stated that there are cleaning, treatment and phasing or timing components. As mentioned by the applicant, it has a delay effect and similarly reflects the natural disbursement of that water and not the instant large volume high intensity flow that they get in highly impermeable urbanized environments. He stated that it has two benefits and the project has been designed to accommodate those requirements.

Councilmember O'Neill concluded that the only water flow getting near Rockaway Creek will be which falls off the hill naturally and all project generated water is going to go to the retention basin and then to the Fassler storm system.

Sr. Planner Murdock agreed, adding that all the impermeable surfaces have been accounted for and are called drainage management areas and all go into the treatment system he described and, after being treated and retained for some time, enter the city's storm drain system and the only flows going down the slope will be those vegetated permeable surfaces that currently drain down towards Rockaway Creek.

Councilmember O'Neill concluded that there won't be any change in that respect.

Sr. Planner Murdock agreed that it was the design intent of the project.

Councilmember O'Neill stated that he would like to look at story poles. He mentioned a couple of projects by the car wash that had them and it was pretty illustrative for people to see. He asked what color the color palette will be.

Sr. Planner Murdock stated that the color palette is subject to the Planning Director's review and approval. He stated that the condition of approval that the Planning Commission adopted said a muted earth tone color palette.

Councilmember O'Neill asked if it will cover the roofs also.

Sr. Planner Murdock stated that it talked about building colors and he assumed it will be inclusive of all the building materials.

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated that the Planning Commission also incorporated that requirement into the CCNR condition and when it is repainted in the future it maintains that intent.

Councilmember O'Neill asked that, if you are on Rockaway or Highway 1 and looking up the hill, how tall is the tallest wall you see. He stated that the height was 35 or so but he thought that was measured from the lowest point. He concluded that the tallest wall you will see coming down Highway 1 will be 35 feet.

Sr. Planner Murdock wasn't sure he had the figure but the applicant's architect may be able to speak to the greatest dimension of the exposed building surface from downhill.

Councilmember O'Neill agreed.

Sr. Planner Murdock stated that they had a particular way of measuring the height for the zoning from the lowest point covered by the structure but it was not always the best reflection of the perceived size or height of the building.

Councilmember O'Neill stated that it was the visual impact as driving down. He asked if the architect knows what that will be.

Mr. Potts stated that the building steps up the hill so the wall that you will see will be the lowest level of the rear of building B and, with the adjustments made to the pitches of the roofs, it will be roughly 25 feet and it steps back.

Councilmember O'Neill asked him what page he was on.

Mr. Potts stated that, looking at page 804, you can see the whole side of the building.

Councilmember O'Neill asked if he was talking about 804 in the big plans.

Mr. Potts stated it was A04.

Sr. Planner Murdock stated it was Packet page 364.

Councilmember O'Neill asked if he was referring to Building B.

Mr. Potts stated that the lighter square area you see will be the wall that was furthest down the hill and the other wall that goes higher actually steps further away from the bottom of the hill and the building steps up. He stated that you can see that if you go to A07 and on looking at the rear and the left and right, the stepping of that building, the angled portions have been flattened out. He stated that the higher part of that white triangular wall was actually flat at that height and it has dropped down significantly from there.

Councilmember O'Neill pointed out that it was the view you get from Highway 1 and Rockaway Beach Avenue.

Mr. Potts stated that the rear elevation side of that view was what you would see but the white square in the center and to the right are what is closest and the whole thing steps another 15 feet away and then is a taller portion.

Councilmember O'Neill stated that it would probably be covered under the muted earth tone.

Sr. Planner Murdock agreed that the bright white color you see would be a muted earth tone color as the rest of the building.

Councilmember O'Neill thought trees would be nice but the problem was that you are blocking the view of the people who buy these units.

Sr. Planner Murdock responded affirmatively.

Councilmember O'Neill asked if it would be possible to have a cedar shingle that was mentioned.

Mr. Potts stated that they do have the wood elements already on there and they can certainly have those colored more in a shingle cedar. He stated that they were already a wood tone and they can darken it up to best approximate stained cedar.

Councilmember O'Neill stated that, when driving down the highway and up Fassler, it would look more like it was melded into the hill than if it was even a muted earth tone. He stated that it was his opinion that it would be more visually appealing. He then referred to the below market rate housing, and he asked if they will look any different than the market rate housing. He stated that he would be concerned if someone came in and mentioned that those were the poor residents.

Mr. Potts stated that, because they were duplexes, they were within the same building as a market rate house typically and from the exterior you would not be able to tell that they were different. From an interior point of view, buyers will be selecting options for flooring and countertops, etc., and those prices could increase.

Councilmember O'Neill was concerned about a stigma that it was affordable housing.

Mr. Potts stated that it would not be discernable from the exterior.

Planning Director Wehrmeister added that it was also a requirement of the inclusionary housing ordinance that the exterior is essentially indistinguishable.

Councilmember O'Neill stated that the biggest issue for him was the traffic but he admits that he asked the same questions and they were thinking about the 3-4 foot poles on the road and he thought the life expectancy would be one commute morning and it would not work. He has to trust that traffic engineers know what they are doing. He asked if a yellow flashing light that was activated by the left turn was possible or legal.

PW Director Ocampo asked Councilmember O'Neill to elaborate more. He asked if he was talking about the ones for in ground rain pavement lights.

Councilmember O'Neill stated that you would have your standard road and then you have that cop looking speed thing and you would put a flashing red light that would be activated when someone wants to make a left turn. He asked if that was legal or possible.

Mr. Potts stated that you were talking about performing the same function as a traffic signal which would be to stop traffic to allow that left turn to be made.

Councilmember O'Neill was thinking about a flashing yellow to caution that there is someone making a left turn.

Mr. Potts stated that he didn't think that was a traffic control device. He stated that there are other things that have been incorporated into the design as part of the revised condition #44, and there are a number of different things that would be done but putting a flashing yellow light would not be one that was applicable.

Councilmember O'Neill stated that, from Harmony One, you can't make a left and go down the hill, and only a right. He stated that on this project they were allowing someone to come out of this project and make either a left to go up the hill or right to go up the hill. He asked why this was being allowed to cross two lanes of traffic and go up the hill while Harmony was not.

PW Director Ocampo stated that, for this particular project, you only have one ingress and egress compared to Harmony that has two, one on Robert's Road and one on Fassler Avenue and there was a big difference in terms of safety of getting in and out. He referred to the former question, and he was talking about a light that will be visible for westbound Fassler Avenue to let them know that there was a car coming to make a left but it was more dangerous because it provides a false sense of security on the part of the people making left to make that cross instead of looking for the gap to cross safely.

Councilmember O'Neill assumed he would know it was there, but he would yield to the experts.

PW Director Ocampo stated that it will defeat the purpose because there will be no explanation on what that light is all about and will be more confusing.

Councilmember O'Neill referred to one issue on Harmony One that the Fire Department wanted two exits and entrances, and he asked if he misunderstood that, and asked why this one gets only one.

Mr. Potts stated that he didn't know about Harmony One but they did review this design several years ago with the Fire Department and they felt that the one ingress/egress was adequate.

They did have to adjust some street grades and turns to meet their requirements but Fire has reviewed the project.

Councilmember O'Neill stated that Seacrest has a fire lane and a fire entrance and there was a chain that can be removed for ambulances to get in there. He stated that, if the Fire Department okayed it, he would yield to them.

Mayor Keener asked about the potential deed restriction.

City Attorney Kenyon asked staff if they have the language to read into the record.

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated that it was pretty lengthy and she asked if they want her to read it now.

Mayor Keener stated that they have to read it sometime.

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated that this would be a condition that Council would add through their motion if they accept the condition.

City Attorney Kenyon asked what condition number it would be.

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated that it would be the last condition to add to this resolution, #67. She then read the proposed condition.

Mayor Keener would support approving motions 1 and 2. He asked which motion gets the condition.

City Attorney Kenyon stated that it was the first one.

Councilmember O'Neill stated that there would also be a deed restriction on the BMR units so that they are permanently BMR.

Sr. Planner Murdock stated that it was not permanently but for the term of affordability set forth in the city's ordinance.

Councilmember O'Neill asked what that was roughly.

Sr. Planner Murdock stated that it was 45 years.

Councilmember O'Neill concluded that they will be BMR for 45 years.

Sr. Planner Murdock responded affirmatively.

Councilmember O'Neill asked if there was support for his suggestion of the cedar shingles to reduce the visual impact from Highway 1.

Mayor pro Tem Vaterlaus stated that they asked for darker colors so they blend in and she thinks that they leave the color choice to the Planning Director.

Councilmember O'Neill stated that he just used that term of cedar shingles, but he wanted to just reduce the visual impact as you are going down Highway 1 or coming up Fassler.

Mayor Keener thought the original idea of earth tones which he believed was actually proposed by Commissioner Clifford and subject to approval by the Planning Director.

Councilmember O'Neill trusts the Planning Director.

Councilmember Digre asked why they want to leave that to the discretion of the Planning Director.

Mayor Keener stated that Councilmember O'Neill's idea was his idea also. He thought that the Planning Director would know better than he would as to what is going to blend in and whether the earth tones chosen will blend in.

Councilmember Digre assumed they were still sticking to the earth tones and were not giving that up.

Mayor Keener responded affirmatively. He offered support of approval of motion 1 and 2, motion 1 with the revised condition #44 and the new condition #67 which was the deed restriction.

Mayor pro Tem Vaterlaus stated so moved.

Mayor Keener asked if he had a second.

Councilmember O'Neill seconded the motion.

Councilmember Digre asked if they were voting on those two things.

Mayor Keener stated that they were voting on motion 1. He asked if they have to vote on them separately.

City Attorney Kenyon stated that she would prefer that.

5-0

Mayor Keener asked if they have a motion for motion 2.

Councilmember Digre asked if that was the deed restriction.

Councilmember O'Neill asked if that starts with proposed action to uphold the Planning Commission's approval.

City Attorney Kenyon stated that motion 2 which was move to introduce and waive the first reading and read by title only the ordinance entitled an ordinance of the City Council of the City of Pacifica Approving Development DP 75-14 and Rezoning RZ 75-14 to Establish a Planned Development (P-D) Zoning District with Development Plan at 801 Fassler Fassler Avenue (APNs 022-083-030 and 022-083-030). and Repealing Ordinance No. 753 C.S.

Councilmember O'Neill made a motion to what the City Attorney just said.

City Attorney Kenyon stated that it was motion 2 on the legislative approval to waive the first reading of the ordinance entitled an Ordinance of the City Council of the City of Pacifica approving development of DP-75-14 and Rezoning RZ-75-14 and establish a planned development zoning district.

Mayor pro Tem Vaterlaus seconded the motion.

5-1 (Digre)

Councilmember Digre stated that her reason for voting no was that she felt the development did not conform to existing General Plan page 12 and that page 12 was not referred to regarding unique qualities of Pacifica as a coastal community and the fundamental character with a sensitivity for the individual neighborhood.

Councilmember O'Neill asked the City Manager about talking to him about those two ideas and he asked if this was the appropriate time to bring them to Council or asked to have them scheduled at the next meeting.

Mayor Keener called a five-minute break then resumed the meeting.

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

CONSIDERATION

7. Proposed 2018-19 General Fund Budget - Departmental Briefings
PROPOSED ACTION: Receive presentations on the proposed 2018-19 General Fund Budget for the Pacifica Police Department, North County Fire Authority, General Government, and the Planning & Building Department.

Asst. City Manager Hines stated that they were present to begin the department presentations for the 2018-19 General Fund budget. The departments over the next two Council meetings will present their individual budgets for Council's review and consideration. He presented the staff report.

Councilmember O'Neill stated that the Economic Development Committee would have liked to have some money when they did the Palmetto Streetscape kickoff. He stated that he has an increase of almost \$100,000 and he asked what that increase will be used for.

Asst. City Manager Hines stated that the increase reflects that they have a full time Economic Development Manager and the \$149,000 represents their hope that they will have an Economic Development Manager by mid-year 2017-18 and they have the Economic Development Manager now and they anticipate a full year cost of about \$242,000 for that entire function.

Councilmember O'Neill concluded that the proposed they are looking at should be 2018-19.

Asst. City Manager responded affirmatively.

Mayor Keener asked how the total staffing remains at 15 if they have a new Economic Development Manager and another Human Resources Manager.

Asst. City Manager Hines stated that they have always included the Economic Development Manager in whole and they would only fund it at half time. He stated that, on the other half of the Human Resources person, he forgot to add the .5.

Mayor Keener concluded that it should be 15.5.

Asst. City Manager Hines responded affirmatively. He continued with the staff report.

Police Chief Steidle presented the Police Department's budget presentation.

Asst. City Manager Hines continued staff report.

Councilmember O'Neill asked the Police Chief what the breakdown between field officers and investigative administrative.

Police Chief Steidle stated that they have four positions in detectives, and of the 37.4 actual detectives, one is a full time evidence technician and a half is a property clerk and that was 5.5 for the investigation division. The administrative division includes the two full time front office clerks and a half time administrative assistant for his office and the rest go to patrol for field services.

Mayor Keener concluded that was 29 or 30 on patrol.

Police Chief Steidle responded affirmatively.

Mayor Keener pointed out the low cost recovery of the Police Department. He stated that, in most departments, they like to see a tremendous cost recovery but they admire the Police Department for keeping their cost recovery low.

Councilmember O'Neill thought they would want cost recovery to be high, adding that he may not understand it.

Police Chief Steidle stated that the majority of their work has been field services in the investigative division is community oriented and crime prevention and crime solving. He stated that any enforcement efforts they have such as citations are not meant to generate revenue but to change behavior. They don't focus their enforcement efforts to generate revenue but to change behavior. He stated that areas where they are allowed to have cost recovery, such as fees they charge for things, adding that it is not enforcement based and prevention was the majority of their work.

Asst. City Manager Hines continued the staff report.

Police Chief Steidle continued his report on the police budget.

Fire Chief Meyers and D.C. Lauderdale presented the North County Fire Authority budget.

Mayor Keener asked what a good intent call was.

Fire Chief Meyers stated that it was if someone things that they see smoke or heard a car accident or someone has an incident. A distinguished difference would be an actual false alarm and they make those different. He stated that they didn't come up with them but what they have to report nationally to a database. If someone thinks something is going on and they call, then it turns out there is not really an emergency.

Councilmember Digre asked if that was the 911 number.

Fire Chief Meyers stated that you dial 911 because you think there is an emergency and there is not as opposed to an alarm sound and it comes in and they respond to a building that has an alarm in it.

Fire Chief Meyers continued the North County Fire Authority budget.

Councilmember O'Neill stated that they run their own academy, and he asked if that was cost efficient versus sharing it with someone else, as they don't have a lot of turnover.

Fire Chief Meyers stated that the reason they run their own academy because the countywide fire chief association has one academy but it was only one time a year and in the fall. He stated that people don't commit to retirement until December and they wait a whole year paying overtime to get people back into a job and they decided to run their own academy and get it done quicker, get people back on the job and minimize the overtime cost associated with it. He stated that they open it up to other agencies and have had other fire departments put people into our academy to share in some of the cost.

Councilmember O'Neill thought it didn't seem efficient to have one or two people.

Fire Chief Meyers stated that when they do one, like a quick one in December when they did the hiring because they needed three people and the next academy in July will have nine people in it.

Councilmember O'Neill asked if we have that much turnover.

Fire Chief Meyers stated that it is due to retirements and injury retirements, but not so much people leaving to take other jobs.

Fire Chief Meyers continued the budget report.

Councilmember Digre asked what was accessory.

Fire Chief Meyers stated that was assembly like churches, bowling alleys.

Councilmember Digre asked again what was the meaning of accessory.

Fire Chief Meyers stated that it was for agricultural buildings, such as barns, stables and we don't have a lot of those. He then continued the budget report.

Asst. City Manager Hines continued the staff report.

Fire Chief Meyers added to the staff report.

Councilmember Digre asked about the turnout the chemical that protect them wear out and she asked the life span.

Fire Chief Meyers stated that every five years they buy turnouts but they keep a second set in reserve and it was every ten years, and they have two sets and if one gets contaminated, there is a second set put in service and they ship out the turnouts to be cleaned and if damaged, they are inspected, repaired and returned to them.

Mayor Keener stated that they have to extend the meeting.

Mayor pro Tem Vaterlaus moved to extend to 11:30; seconded by Councilmember Digre.

5-0

Planning Director Wehrmeister presented the Planning Department's budget report.

Mayor Keener asked if that was one inspector.

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated that their inspection services are provided by CSG and they have one full time inspector and that is what he does all day, and they have a part time building official and he was usually in the office because there was a lot of demand for him but occasionally he goes in the field to augment. She stated that part of the contract was that, when they need additional services, CSG is able to send more inspectors so that there is not a long time after a request for inspection. She stated that the weather was getting better. They had needed another inspector for a couple of days but they can typically do it with one inspector.

Councilmember Digre asked about the number of applications.

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated that those were entitlement applications and that was just what came across their counter in 2017. She continued the budget report.

Councilmember Digre asked if it was the Palmetto Plan.

Mayor pro Tem Vaterlaus stated that it says Rockaway.

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated that they corrected the slides.

Mayor Keener referred to the Palmetto specific plan and the quarry site specific plan, and he asked if they will get to vote on those.

Planning Director Wehrmeister asked if on the actual plans themselves.

Mayor Keener stated on spending the money for them.

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated that this was Council's opportunity to give them some feedback on the budget. She stated that, for the Palmetto specific plan, they did hear and understand the Council's direction to investigate whether or not there are other studies that can be done short of a full specific plan and are less expensive. She stated that now the full budget is included because they haven't done that yet but they will.

City Manager Woodhouse asked if that answered his question.

Mayor Keener stated that it answered about Palmetto.

City Manager Woodhouse stated that, on both the Palmetto specific plan and the quarry site specific plan, Council prioritized major projects and in adopting the goals that was the direction for them to pursue them, and this was the budget recommendation to be able to begin those during this fiscal year. He stated that, related to Palmetto, as they begin the process, the first step would be scoping out the alternatives to how it can be phased and specific costs.

Mayor Keener stated that there wasn't a Council vote on either of those. He stated that it was all sort of soft and fuzzy. He thought they should have a specific vote for them as it was several hundred thousand dollars. He stated that they have votes to spend that much money on a wastewater contract and he thought they should have a vote on these.

City Manager Woodhouse thought that this was a planning process and the Council voted as a goal to begin this project this next fiscal year, and he stated that it would be up to the Council if they want to revise that direction. He stated that the contracts would come back to the Council for approval if they exceeded \$50,000.

Mayor Keener stated that would satisfy him.

Councilmember Digre asked where was erosion in there.

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated that sea level rise planning was already something they were doing and the slide is specifically showing new items in the budget associated with the Council's goals but the sea level rise planning was already a part of the baseline budget.

Councilmember Digre asked about erosion and assumed that would be part of sea level rise.

City Manager Woodhouse asked her if she was talking about Esplanade projects and other types of projects.

Councilmember Digre stated she was talking about erosion on the hills. She stated that someone came to talk about Manor. She stated that they have had debris flows on the street in the back near Oddstad.

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated doing geotechnical analysis was part of their regular process for building permits and development review.

Asst. City Manager Hines completed staff report.

Councilmember Digre stated that all the departments with the staff they have and the work they do was extremely impressive and appreciated.

Councilmember O'Neill stated that he has a suggestion to see if there was Council support. He stated that there was a problem in Pacifica for substance abuse with issues at Terra Nova and Oceana. He stated that the problem was that, by eighth grade, most of the kids have chosen their drug or alcohol of choice. He wanted to propose that a fixed amount of the marijuana revenue would be used to start a program for drug education in fourth grade. He stated that he has researched cities that have done this. He stated that Santa Clarita has a program that goes from 4th through 12th grade. He stated that, at the joint articulation meeting, there was very good

support from both school districts that this needs to be done. He stated that he has talked to Don Horsley and his aide and they were willing to look to see, if Pacifica puts in some money, and try to come up with some sort of matching funds. He would like to have that discussion when appropriate with Council.

Councilmember Digre stated that she would second that, even starting at second or third grade. She stated that by fourth grade the peer pressure can be stronger.

Councilmember O'Neill thought there was support to put this up for a discussion item.

City Manager Woodhouse asked for more clarity on the direction. He stated that, in terms of this budget, the appropriate time for a discussion about use of revenues would be the June 11 hearing, as the next study session was PB&R and Public Works. He stated that, if they were talking about use of cannabis business program revenues to fund a program like that, he stated that the policy decision the Council already made for this next year, that money was treated as one time money and the question for consideration is whether it will be intended to be an ongoing program or one time.

Councilmember O'Neill stated that he would like to do more research and he has talked to Mary Bier about this as an ongoing program that goes from 4th to the 12th grades. He stated that, by 12th grade, over 90% of the kids are substance free. He felt that, given the issues in Pacifica, he thought that was a very good track record to break the cycle. He would say that it would be a commitment that the Council would have to make. They could be looking to see at the county level if there is some money they can give Pacifica for matching funds. He assumed there was probable more initial start up costs. He would want to structure a percentage of the cannabis up to a maximum so it is easier to budget. He also asked that they have a business plan from North County partnership and how they would want to implement it, and get a commitment from the school districts as they may not have the resources to do the budget but commitment in terms of facilities and maybe some personnel.

City Manager Woodhouse stated that the other aspect was the city's projection about cannabis business program revenues was that it will not start flowing until mid next fiscal year, and there wouldn't be those revenues until that time and they don't know how much that will be until that time. He stated that it was entirely dependent on how the various dispensaries are being brought on line and the length of time it takes them to come on line. He concluded that there was a time line before those revenues start showing up.

Councilmember O'Neill thought that would give them the opportunity to do a good job learning about it and researching.

City Manager Woodhouse agreed.

Councilmember O'Neill stated that he wasn't expecting to start it on July 1 but a delay of about 4-5 months would give them the opportunity to put a really good program together.

City Manager Woodhouse stated that, with those two factors, for the June discussion, what type of description should be brought back. He asked if the step was over the first 4-5 months of the new fiscal year to look into and research and talk with partners about how the program could be built. He stated that anyone who has raised kids in Pacifica knows it is an issue and they have been facing this for years and people don't own up to it.

Councilmember Digre encouraged them to approach the Youth Advisory Board to see what their thoughts are on the matter. She stated that a lot of this will be picking the right types of educational activities and materials to get the point across.

City Manager Woodhouse stated that the other question he has is this a program that the city is leading and running or a program that they were contributing money to and someone else is running with the staffing question related to that.

Councilmember Martin stated that she was going to make the point that they should not be owning the actual program but dedicating money to set aside for a program to be developed or implemented.

Councilmember O'Neill stated that part of the goal with the cannabis money was that they said they would set aside money for education and he thought this would be education. He stated that the Santa Clarita program is a partnership between the school districts, sheriff's department and the city. He added that the new high school superintendent came from Santa Clarita and was familiar with the program and she would be a resource in setting this up. She stated that they have a high school that the kids can go to that was a sober high school and all the kids are recovering or doing what they need to do to get it together. He stated that they couldn't do that as they only have four high schools.

Councilmember Martin thought the question from the City Manager is whether Council wants it to be a partnership in the work they were asking them to do or more directed towards that type of research. She asked if that was his question.

City Manager Woodhouse thought it was understanding that, if the Council is going to make a decision in this budget to say mid year they are going to allocate some cannabis revenues, depending on what is coming in, to a program like this, then part of the next year could be some minimal staff time spent on going to partners and talking to the school districts saying that they are going to have some funding and ask what their where with all to put a program together.

Councilmember O'Neill stated that he would be willing to do a lot of the leg work for that as he thinks that this was something that Pacifica could use.

Councilmember Digre added that he has a partnership already that is pretty well connected, and they know how to get grants and understand the problem.

Councilmember O'Neill thought this was something for which they would definitely reach out and look at the resources, including the county resources as they may already have some aspects of this program available. He stated that they don't have anything in the schools now.

Councilmember Digre stated that Director Perez goes to those partnership meetings and they are with alcohol and tobacco, although they are in the high school rather than the grade school.

Councilmember O'Neill stated that the issue starts in grammar school, mentioning how many kids got expelled or suspended because of the use. He added that there needs to be some parental education as well.

Councilmember Digre stated that the partnership understands and already do it, and Director Perez is a regular attendee.

Councilmember O'Neill stated that he would look at the partnership as a partner in this as well as the school districts.

City Manager Woodhouse stated that he has enough information to come back with some conceptual approach to this as part of the budget package. He thought the actual program decisions and amount of funding would be something the Council would make later on in the next fiscal year when they have a sense of the money and how the cannabis program is going.

Councilmember O'Neill asked if he was talking fiscal year 2018-19 or 2019-20.

City Manager Woodhouse stated that in the beginning of the next fiscal year, 2018-19, they explore with other partners about this concept and then at some point in late whenever the funds start flowing in then the Council could make a decision about how much money, depending on what their research turned up. He stated that they would need to make a decision about how much they can commit to in just one year to start with or more, depending on the long term stability of the cannabis program revenue at this point in time. He stated that essentially the Council was saying that, at this point in time, they would like the policy direction to start exploring this during the next fiscal year but they don't have the resources to spend a lot of staff time on doing that but they can tap into their existing resources and networks and see.

Mayor Keener thought they do it without spending any money.

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

ADJOURN

Mayor Keener adjourned the meeting at 11:30 p.m., in honor of Mary Harris and James McNalley.

Transcribed by Barbara Medina, Public Meeting Stenographer.

Respectfully submitted,

Kathy O'Connell, City Clerk

APPROVED:

John Keener, Mayor