

MINUTES

**CITY OF PACIFICA
PLANNING COMMISSION
COUNCIL CHAMBERS
2212 BEACH BOULEVARD**

June 3, 2024

7:00 p.m.

Chair Hauser called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

ROLL CALL: Present: Commissioners Berman, Ferguson, Godwin, Redfield,
Wright and Chair Hauser
Absent: Commissioner Devine

SALUTE TO FLAG: Led by Commissioner Wright

STAFF PRESENT: Planning Director Murdock
Asst. City Attorney Bazzano
Sr. Planner Cervantes
Asst. Planner Snodgrass (Dial-in)
PW Dep. Director Yip

APPROVAL OF ORDER OF AGENDA: Vice Chair Ferguson moved approval of the Order of Agenda; Commissioner Redfield seconded the motion.

The motion carried **6-0**.

Ayes: Commissioners Berman, Ferguson, Godwin, Redfield,
Wright and Chair Hauser
Noes: None

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: None

DESIGNATION OF LIAISON TO CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF JUNE 10, 2024:

None

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS:

Suzanne Moore, Pacifica, stated that the County's executive summary for the homeless count is out, and she shared what they learned from Dr. Margot Kushel, Div. Chief for UCSF Center for the Vulnerable Population who spoke as a panelist for Assemblyman Marc Berman.

CONSENT ITEMS:

None.

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

- 1. SDP-792-15
CDP-349-15
SUB-225-15
S-113-15** **File No. 2024-018 – Annual review of Site Development Permit SDP-792-15, Coastal Development Permit CDP-349-15, Tentative Subdivision Map SUB-225-15 and Sign Permit S-113-15** for a four-room motel development known as “Anchor Inn” located at 500 San Pedro Ave (APN 023-073-190).
Recommended CEQA Action: Exempt pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15378.

Asst. Planner Snodgrass presented the staff report.

Chair Hauser asked if the owner/operator wished to make a presentation.

Asst. Planner Snodgrass stated that they were here for questions.

Commissioner Redfield stated that there is a letter at the end of the packet regarding some tree issues and he asked if the property manager can speak to that in more depth.

Chair Hauser thought, at this point, they should defer questions to staff and they can ask the property owner.

Planning Director Murdock stated that, in regard to the statement in the applicant’s letter attached to the staff report, Planning staff did follow up with PW Department and their field services division staff confirmed those trees are on private property and they aren’t city trees that require maintenance at this time.

Chair Hauser asked Commissioner Redfield if he wanted to ask that question to the applicant.

Commissioner Redfield said he was fine.

Chair Hauser opened the Public Hearing and, seeing no one, closed the Public Hearing. She thought it was nice to get a report where everything is noted as compliant so she didn’t know if they needed much deliberation.

Vice Chair Ferguson since everything was compliant and, if no one has any comments, he is happy to make a motion.

Chair Hauser agreed with making a motion.

Vice Chair Ferguson moved to ADOPT the attached resolution to FIND the annual review is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act; FIND that the operation of the four unit motel development known as “Anchor Inn” at 500 San Pedro Ave. (APN 023-073-220) is substantially in accord with Site Development Permit SDP 792-15, Coastal Development Permit

Planning Commission Minutes

June 3, 2024

Page 3 of 31

CDP-349-15, Tentative Subdivision Map SUB-225-15 and Sign Permit S-113-15; and INCORPORATE all maps and testimony into the record by reference.

Chair Hauser asked, before a second, staff if they were okay.

Asst. City Attorney Bazzano stated that they were okay, and there was confusion over whether it was for this item or not but it has been sorted out,

Chair Hauser asked if there is a second.

Commissioner Redfield seconded the motion.

The motion carried **6-0**.

Ayes: Commissioners Berman, Ferguson, Godwin, Redfield,
Wright and Chair Hauser

Noes: None

**2. CDP-463-24
TP-9-24**

File No. 2024-016 – Coastal Development Permit CDP-463-24 and Tree Permit TP-9-24 for construction of a 312-sf two-story addition, 88-sf deck, 57-sf front porch, 312-sf single-car garage addition and renovation to an existing 1,076-sf single family residence located at 315 Olympian Way (APN 023-023-030). Recommended CEQA Action: Class 1 Categorical Exemption, CEQA Guidelines Section 15301.

Sr. Planner Cervantes presented the staff report.

Chair Hauser opened the Public Hearing.

Sean Ramsey, Pacifica, clarified that his comment was for another project in the same vicinity.

Chair Hauser understood and assumed that is not on the agenda

Planning Director Murdock agreed, adding that there may have been another notice posted on that street.

Chair Hauser closed the Public Hearing. She thinks this is a simple item and, while she appreciates that there is a large tree protection zone, but she sees that the home is existing and she didn't think there is much more that they could ask and she appreciated that an arborist report was performed. If there are no disagreements, she is ready to entertain a motion.

Vice Chair Ferguson wanted to commend the applicant on an excellent proposal which looks like a very nice project and staff's reading of the conditions of approval seems like they dialed in the Olympian Way conditions as everything he would look for has been included.

Chair Hauser asked if he would like to make a motion following that comment.

Vice Chair Ferguson moved that the Planning Commission FINDS the project is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act; APPROVES Coastal Development Permit CDP-463-24 and Tree Permit TP-9-24 by adopting the attached resolution, including conditions of approval in Exhibit A; and INCORPORATES all maps and testimony into the record by reference; Chair Hauser seconded the motion.

The motion carried **6-0**.

Ayes: Commissioners Berman, Ferguson, Godwin, Redfield,
Wright and Chair Hauser
Noes: None

**3. CDP-455-23
TP-8-24**

File No. 2023-019 – Coastal Development Permit CDP-455-23 and Tree Permit TP-8-24 to construct bicycle and pedestrian improvements in the public right-of-way on Palmetto Avenue from Westline Drive to Esplanade Avenue, Esplanade Avenue from Palmetto Avenue to West Avalon Drive, West Avalon Drive from Esplanade Avenue to Palmetto Avenue and Palmetto Avenue from West Avalon Drive to Paloma Avenue
Recommended CEQA Action: Class 1 Categorical Exemption, CEQA Guidelines Section 15301© and Class 4 Categorical Exemption, CEQA Guidelines Section 15204(h).

Sr. Planner Cervantes stated Consultant Sean Rose will be assisting her with the presentation. She then began the staff report.

Consultant Sean Rose continued the staff report.

Sr. Planner Cervantes completed the staff report.

Chair Hauser stated, on projects where the plans range on a multiple page area where it's large, it would be helpful in the future to have some additional slides, such as color codes where crosswalks are going as it may be hard for the public to follow when most of that is discussed over a text slide so she would appreciate more images.

Commissioner Wright stated he is in favor of adding bike lanes and he loves cross walks which is a great improvement. He stated that, regarding trees, he heard the word curb and he wonders if there is any runoff watering the tree that is being affected by the curbs.

Consultant Rose stated that this project had an arborist report and he didn't note that in his report. He stated that one of the tree protection measures is water during construction, but he isn't aware that a permanent watering has been occurring as they aren't removing any curbs, but rebuilding the curb there, thus, not changing the flow of water from what it has been.

Commissioner Wright asked if there was a study done on how many of those parking spots being removed are actually being used.

Consultant Rose stated he will defer to Planning staff or perhaps the city engineer on that regard. He said that they did go out numerous times and looked at the parking used during normal times, both during the work day and after the work day, and saw that the use from Westline down to the apartment complex was very light on both sides, maybe 1 or 2 cars parked in that entire stretch. He stated that they have a photo showing that condition. He added that, in some of those areas being prohibited, they noted full use of those spaces and the alternate spaces that they will not be affecting that could be used if this moves forward is the area to the north. He stated that it is the same plan they saw before, but now it's an exhibit just focusing on parking and, when you see along the curb line on both sides when you don't see any red, no changes are occurring as those are areas where there is no parking provision and this project will not change that condition. He stated that, when they see red, there are two types of red, one with a gray line through it and red that is just red with no gray line in the middle of it. He stated that, where there is a gray line in the middle, that was where there was already parking prohibited. He stated that, if it is red without a gray line, that is a new parking prohibition for this project. If you look at areas that are

red in general, all the areas from Westline on down will still be available for parking. He stated that it is hard to see, but under the gray street layer, there are actually cars parking under there . He stated, with this project going in, that will be an area where it is read where you won't be able to park that you used to be able to. He stated cars would go up that location as an overflow now to make up for that loss. He stated that, on the upper east side of the street, you can see all red because they are putting in a dedicated bike lane. On the apartment side on the west, you can see it's red but then there is a break because the road widens again and you can see where they're allowing parking on the apartment side all the way down to the intersection with the exception of a couple of locations near driveways and to provide site lines for the crosswalk intersection. Those were areas on the west side that were already indicated no parking and the other areas that could be used for parking would be the elimination of these spaces is the area in Palmetto southward and that is an area that they have seen very lightly parked and they would presume that will be more heavily parked with these spaces being removed. He stated that location and the one north on Palmetto would be the two alternate locations.

Commissioner Wright stated his understanding of what he is seeing and hearing is that they aren't encouraging people to park across the street without the use of a crosswalk to get them safely back across the street. He stated that it looks like a lot of those factors were considered, the amount of use and the safety.

Consultant Rose stated that was one consideration on the east side as there wasn't a way to get across.

Commissioner Berman stated that she has quite a few and stated that anyone who wants to go before her can speak now.

Vice Chair Ferguson stated that he has more comments.

Chair Hauser stated that, before they go to comments, she wants to be sure they hear public comments.

Vice Chair Ferguson stated that he can wait until after public comments.

Commissioner Berman appreciated the improvement, and loved bicycle and pedestrian safety improvements throughout the city as this is a great improvement to help facilitate the development they foresee in the Sharp Park area. She will start with some specific clarification questions. On packet page 130, signing and striping plan-10, there is a raised median near the on ramp where there's already existing curb ramps and a striped walkway between the two, and in the existing condition, the striped walkway doesn't align with the curb ramps and she noticed that there are two black lines that might be mislabeled as they are using keynote 3 which is the shared roadway, bicycle pavement markings, and she wondered if the striped walkway is going to be realigned to those curb ramps and is that the intent of the black lines on this sheet.

Consultant Rose stated that they will be aligning them to the curb ramps near the crosswalks.

Commissioner Berman concluded that the black lines are not new curbs, just straightening.

Consultant Rose asked if she means on the south bound direction near the bus stop.

Commissioner Berman stated in the raised median of the road.

Consultant Rose stated that those are stripes median.

Commissioner Berman thought that is what she figured as it's a raised median but there's striping on it that she believes is supposed to indicate the pedestrian walkway but it isn't currently aligned to the new curb ramps, but the intent is to align that.

Consultant Rose agreed.

Commissioner Berman referred to keynote 16, which is a hardened center line but the detail wasn't included. She asked if that is a standard slightly raised center line in the road or what is intended to be there.

Consultant Rose asked if it is note 16 on that sheet.

Commissioner Berman confirmed, stating mountable median treatment, hard and center line and it refers to Detail F on SS-1 but she couldn't find that detail on SS-1.

Planning Director Murdock stated that he sees she is referencing a key, but he asked if that is called out on this.

Commissioner Berman stated that it is and she can try to find it again as it was pointing to a central line somewhere. She stated that they can circle back to it as the main question she had related to that was, if it is just going to be a maintenance pain in the middle of the road and she was curious about what that detail was going to be.

Consultant Rose stated that they can look at that as it may be referring to the wrong sheet as he was trying to find the sheet that appears on that.

Commissioner Berman referred to the RRFBs and she knows quite a few cities are using the hand waving type as it is a combo push button and hand wave and it seems that they have been well received in other cities, and she asked if that was considered here.

Consultant Rose asked if it is for the beacons.

Commissioner Berman stated for the beacons, the rectangular rapid flashing beacons.

Consultant Rose stated that their specification is that they be audible. He didn't think hand wave is one of the features they are specifying. He asked if the comment is to evaluate and look at it.

Commissioner Berman was curious as to whether it was considered as a few cities in San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties have been using the recently and she was curious if they were considered here as they seem to be well received by the public.

Consultant Rose doesn't know that they have on this project but he will take a look at that.

Commissioner Berman had another clarification question on packet page 130 where the new RRFB will go in the new pedestrian refuge area.

Chair Hauser asked if she can give them the drawing number.

Commissioner Berman stated SS-10.

Chair Hauser confirmed SS-10.

Commissioner Berman responded affirmatively. She wanted to make sure the new RRFB is going to be on top of the new 6-inch curb, not just directly on the asphalt with pavement marking around it, but going to be a true pedestrian refuge area with raised curbs.

Consultant Rose stated that there are two beacons, and asked if she was referring to the one in the southbound or northbound.

Commissioner Berman stated the one in the northbound. She asked if he knows what she means by pedestrian refuge area with raised curbs protecting the pedestrians. She stated that also on SS-10 again, she wanted to know if there were any concerns with the bus stop, having to weave into the bike lane. She knows it probably won't be of ten but, when buses visit that stop, they'll be entirely blocking the bike lane and wanted to know if there were any concerns about that.

Consultant Rose asked if she was referring to both as there are bus stops on this sheet in both directions or is she just referring to the southbound or both.

Commissioner Berman was focused on the northbound one, but he was right that the southbound has another one also where the bus would block the bike lane.

Consultant Rose stated that is fairly common and they are dealing with that shared bike bus scenario with signage and striping and it is up to the driver and the biker to be aware and they are handling it with the paving markings as it's fairly common. He stated that they met with SamTrans bus stop operation people and they were okay with it being shared in the way it plays out.

Commissioner Berman appreciated that they met with SamTrans to get their feedback. She stated that there was a public comment received about how the city will be handling notification of displacing the oversized vehicles that tend to park in areas where no parking will be allowed, and she asked if there was a notification process for that. She understands they aren't permitted oversized vehicle parking areas but, for those who do use this road to park their oversized vehicles, as some people use them for housing, and she asked what the notification process for them. She thinks the community wouldn't want those people to park their oversized vehicles in front of someone's house in the neighborhood.

Asst. City Attorney Bazzano stated she wasn't sure what she was talking about in terms of notice. If the city were to prohibit oversized vehicle parking in this area, they would have to post a sign indicating that it is prohibited and only then could the city enforce that prohibition. She stated that there may be some other type of notice that staff posts to make people who are parking in that area aware of the transition, and she doesn't know if staff is planning to do that, but in terms of enforcing the parking prohibition, there would need to be a sign advising drivers that oversized vehicle parking is prohibited in that area before enforcement could take place.

Commissioner Berman asked, in general, if staff has a plan for notifying the community and public of forthcoming parking restrictions.

Planning Director Murdock thought the City Engineer may need to confirm, but he thought there was a 72-hour advance notification prior to designating a no parking area.

PW Dep. Director Yip stated that they will need to confirm the notification that's needed for a 72-hour changes to the bike area. In terms of oversize vehicle parking, the changes are happening on Esplanade as there is an 8-foot striping that will be in place because of the implementation of the bike lanes and, according to our code and definition of oversize vehicle parking, they start at 7 feet and an oversize vehicle can still park there and they aren't limiting or making changes in terms of availability but in terms of the width. They need to be within that space which includes the entire width of the vehicle, including the mirrors. He stated that they are making that one change on Esplanade to promote their multi-modal use of the area to encourage bicycle and pedestrian improvements and also to make the road accessible to all users, not just vehicular traffic and this follows the bike-ped master plan as Consultant Rose previously mentioned.

Commissioner Berman stated he mentioned that it will be reduced to a 7-foot width and that will have to encompass a whole width of the vehicle, including the side mirrors.

PW Dep. Director Yip stated that it will be striped at 8 feet, and that is the center line as the striping itself can range from 4-6 inches and now it is being proposed for 4-inch striping and that area outside of the striping has to encompass the entire vehicle.

Commissioner Berman asked if it is common to use 7 feet, as she has seen 8 feet.

PW Dep. Director Yip stated that the 7 feet he mentioned was according to our Muni code where oversized vehicles start in terms of what is considered an oversize vehicle width of 7 feet and the striping starts at 8 feet, and that is typical of to have 8-foot parking area.

Commissioner Berman referred to the parking notice notifying the community that certain stretches of the road will soon no longer have parking available for them or the public, and she asked if it was possible to notify them in advance of 72 hours, i.e., posting a notice a month prior and is it something PW can do.

PW Dep. Director Yip stated that they can definitely make postings and notify the neighborhood of that change a month earlier if possible.

Commissioner Berman stated they can discuss it as a Commission but she appreciates the information. She appreciated that curb ramps are being upgraded and she knows they have a consideration item that indicates the city is working to upgrade a lot of the curb ramps throughout the city in the public realm. She asked why the curb ramps in front of Ingrid B. Lacey School are not being upgraded on Palmetto and the cross streets, Surf, Shoreview and Bellavista.

PW Dep. Director Yip stated that the scope of the base of the project was when it was applied for with a grant application and the main bulk of it was sculpted to do the bike lanes and that was the bulk of the budget. He stated that they have added what they could, based on public feedback since when they went to get approval for the consultant agreement and there were some additional comments to add some on Esplanade. He stated that they can continue to try to add as

much as they can but are limited by the budget at this time. He stated, in terms of curb ramps in the whole city, and how they get it prioritized, a further plan could be developed and how to prioritize the angle through the city with the budget that they have available would be the best approach.

Commissioner Berman asked if the curb ramps that were identified for improvement with this plan are in locations where there is no curb ramp at all, currently just a 6-inch curb.

PW Dep. Director Yip stated that was before his time and it was part of the grant application. He thinks a lot of them were located on Esplanade and they are trying to improve that corridor. He thinks that there were just a couple that were chosen to improve with the grant application at that time and that would be the approach when they do curb ramps outside of their paving projects. He stated that the paving projects trigger it because of the Department of Justice requirement that it needs to be done with resources in projects and, outside of that, they don't have a list of public requests and it must have come from public requests.

Commissioner Berman asked if, in front of IBL, there was consideration for RRFBs to be installed for those crosswalks or at least one of them as a traffic calming measure in front of the elementary school. She knows they aren't proposed with this plan but, if they are going to introduce RRFBs, especially they will see in the consideration item later in the meeting that the city has prioritized school crossings for RRFB installation. She thought this was a good opportunity to install at least one in front of IBL.

PW Dep. Director Yip stated that they have a separate project, midblock crossing project, which has installed RRFBs at numerous school locations and IBL has two RRFBs for that project.

Commissioner Berman asked if that project was currently in design.

PW Dep. Director Yip stated it is in construction.

Commissioner Berman stated that she noticed in front of IBL, in Google earth, there are little tiny cones that want to form a pedestrian bulb out and its almost like someone put the cones there to make their own traffic calming measure in front of IBL. She asked if the project he spoke about is going to install a pedestrian bulb out or has it been considered if there is space in the right-of-way for it.

PW Dep. Director Yip stated that Consultant Rose is also the project manager on the project, but he wouldn't say it was included.

Consultant Rose stated that they have considered it, and they were approached by the school about it, and they are aware of those cones. They are on the east side in front of the school and they are in both sides of the crosswalk. He stated that it looks like they're doing it to daylight the crosswalk and they have been approached by the School coordinator for this area who we have worked with on that project. She asked if they could incorporate it in the other project which they can't because they're in construction, but she asked for it to be pursued as part of a future project and potentially this project. He stated that they haven't decided if they're going to incorporate it in this project yet because they are at the upper limit of their budget and that was not included. They have talked to her and she has indicated she could contribute funding to add that. He stated that they are aware of it and looking to add it to either this project or a future project.

Commissioner Berman stated that were all her questions, and added that there are a couple of those items that she would like to hear from other commissioners about later, after public comment.

Vice Chair Ferguson referred to packet page 117, drawing CD2, detailed B, the one ramp corner installation, and as a person who pushes a stroller up and down Palmetto several times a week and the new streetscape is great, he thinks in practice the ramp forces you one of two options, either jump off the curb or enter into the north south going traffic if you're trying to cross north south. He stated that all the ramps direct you toward an east west path of travel and, if you're crossing coming north and south on Palmetto, there is no way to push a stroller or wheelchair without entering into the adjacent traffic lane as its currently oriented. He stated that the detail seems to allow for what he is talking about but, in reality, what's being constructed on Palmetto doesn't have that so he wanted to note that for inspectors to really keep an eye on. He stated that the flares aren't sloped enough to allow you to enter the north south crosswalk without entering into the north south flow of traffic as currently constructed. He also asked if anyone had thought of a condition to require, during any kind of excavation for curb work, especially if left overnight, some kind of physical barrier. He asked because he was riding his bicycle home from a friend's house during the last phase of bicycle improvements and going the wrong way up a one-street to his house, as all West Sharp Park streets are one-way, there was no delineation, signage or anything and he rode into an excavation, when over the handlebars and got pretty beat up. He stated that there was delineation going to path travel, but it was dark and there is no street light there. He stated that, if they are going to leave these things overnight on a weekend as in that case, there was no forming in the excavation and he would love to see at least caution tape and delineated off so people aren't crashing into them at night.

PW Dep. Director Yip agreed, adding that it shouldn't be happening and they will have more presence out there and they are having a lot more presence with their current construction projects and sending inspectors out there to make sure they are secure for the weekends and night time.

Vice Chair Ferguson thought it was a shock to turn your bicycle on your own street and find there is a hole in the pavement when there wasn't the day before. He would like to keep a note on that one.

PW Dep. Director Yip agreed that they will do that on behalf of Public Works. He stated that, for clarification on the pavement work being done on the project, it is a slurs seal so not quite a complete pavement resurfacing as a slurry seal for something else.

Chair Hauser stated that the green thermoplastic on Palmetto done on the phase one streetscape is a nice element and she noticed that they have the green thermoplastic where it crosses the off ramp but they don't have it on the actual Class 2 bike lane. She knows that it is an expense that she guessing is the answer to this question, but she asked if that was considered and, if not, could it be.

Consultant Rose thinks it was a maintenance consideration and the cost of it, given the total length and cost of installing, and the cost of maintaining it over time.

Chair Hauser stated, since it's the same street, it would be cool to have it. She stated she would love to hear Commissioner Berman's thoughts.

Commissioner Berman understands and agrees with her as the green thermoplasty is a fantastic traffic calming measure, especially on roads where cars do go fast. She stated she would have had the same question as her, except that she worked on essentially the same project in a different city and county and the thermoplasty is a maintenance concern and a costly item for such a stretch of road and is a lot to maintain.

Chair Hauser asked if she thought it was confusing to bicyclists.

Commissioner Berman didn't think so, especially in an area where there is less maneuvering, as less intersection and less conflict areas, but it was her opinion that the important locations are where there are actual intersections and conflict areas which the plan proposes. She stated, that if they had unlimited budget, she would definitely fight for more thermoplastic.

Chair Hauser stated that it felt like the crosswalks in the north south direction seemed to be great but there are some east west connections that seemed like they were intended to be there but weren't on the drawings. She referred to SS-5, for the pedestrian safety zone, and she asked if there can be a crosswalk there and her second question is whether there can be trees in the pedestrian as she thought they were more like bulb outs so she asked if there can be landscape pockets and a crosswalk. She thought it would naturally fit there.

Consultant Rose assumed she was referring to the bulb outs that are on SS-5. He stated that those were created specifically for one purpose, which is to calm traffic. To reduce traffic speeds. He doesn't know if that would make sense for crosswalk as they haven't looked at it, but they can take a look at it. He didn't know if that would be something they would be able to do.

PW Dep. Director Yip stated that they looked at a crosswalk at Monterey as part of another request and because of the way it curves, there are some site distance issues, around 150 feet as needed, and that equates to around six parking spaces that they would need to get removed for that location. He stated that the most ideal place would be Bill Drake, but they have already added what they could in terms of the budget. They added one on Manor to get it close to the middle, to the overlook area. He stated that the challenge with Bill Drake is that there is around 80 linear feet of sidewalk which would also need to be done and that is just a sidewalk. The curb and gutters are also not in great shape so once you have to replace curb and gutter, you also have to do a one foot asphalt plug and that really increases the cost. He stated that some of these things are constrained by the budget they have and what was originally scoped with the grant, if they can get a list moving forward, then they can definitely add these programs into the city.

Chair Hauser thought the list was helpful as that was her next two questions, i.e., the bulb outs, Bill Drake and Monterey seem to be naturally screaming for a crosswalk in the east west direction. She hears him.

Commissioner Berman stated that there are instances where there are crosswalks and it doesn't have the ideal stopping site distance but there are other measures such as caution signs, pavement markings like shark tooth pavement markings with little triangles. She agree with Chair Hauser that Monterey is such a mean road, especially if they're introducing new bike, school and pedestrian facilities with the plan, and a crosswalk seems pretty natural there. She stated that they want to keep safety in mind but there are other measures that could be implemented in conjunction with the sidewalk, understanding that the stopping site distance isn't ideal.

PW Dep. Director Yip stated that was the recommendation from their traffic engineer who studied that intersection that the best and safest approach was to have around 150 linear feet of parking removed. He stated that they can touch base with them and see if there are additional recommendations but that was the recommendation based on the speed from the traffic they had on the counts.

Chair Hauser stated there may be traffic calming measures that are already being put in place and just adding the bike lane will help with this, and she asked if there was a speed hump that could be put halfway up the hill.

PW Dep. Director Yip stated that they looked extensively at speed humps and the placement as part of the project, but there is no speed hump policy in the city and, once they implement it, they will have to have some sort of policy on how to take in the request and put them in the rest of the city which they currently do not have. He stated that there are challenges with putting in speed humps, as people who request them and live on the blocks are usually in favor but there are traffic challenges for public safety for fire and for police and other vehicles, generally, may complain about them afterwards and then require the removal. He stated that has been the common trend in other cities. He stated that it is challenging and also requires staff to oversee the program for which they are very limited on staff at the moment and they don't have a traffic engineer on staff or another dedicated person to oversee this at the moment.

Chair Hauser asked if it was unusual for a city not to have a speed hump policy as she never heard that before.

PW Dep. Director Yip stated he cannot comment on that but we currently don't have one and it is a limitation because of staffing.

Commissioner Redfield had questions regarding mostly Esplanade, between Bill Drake and probably down to Avalon. He asked if he can clarify the 72-hour notifications as everyone will have to move for both the slurry and the layout for the line. He asked if it was correct that those OSVs can return to those spots once the project is completed.

PW Dep. Director Yip stated that the definition for the OSVs as defined in the Muni code is any vehicle over 7 feet. If a vehicle over 7 feet can be confined within the space that is 8 feet minus the striping, they can return.

Commissioner Redfield asked if that includes appurtenances off the vehicle, i.e., mirrors.

PW Dep. Director Yip stated that needs to include the mirror as it cannot overhand on the striping.

Commissioner Redfield stated that, on 72, this is a phased project uncertain starts at A and ends at B or C, and it's not going to be a complete thing. He stated, with the 72-hour notices, he didn't know how far that's going to go and what is the length of phase A or phase 1, i.e., is that starting at the north end, south end, and is it an all encompassing project. He is assuming it is phased.

PW Dep. Director Yip stated that it's going to go as one bid and, in terms of the timing, they are not planning to phase as in different parts of the project taking place there, but it is going to go over one project and it should be several months of work.

Commissioner Redfield asked if it is accurate that it would include the 72-hour parking restriction for the entire length of the project.

PW Dep. Director Yip stated that the parking restrictions in the notifications for the construction would be separate. They will ask the contractor to do notifications for impacts of whatever they put it. It could be the curb ramps and they need to notify anyone who is being impacted in the immediate area and he asked if this about the OSV notification for future parking or just in general construction.

Commissioner Redfield stated that it essentially involves that, vehicles, regular cars are a bit more easily parked in certain areas and he is concerned about some of the other OSVs that will be displaced temporarily from there and where are they going to go.

PW Dep. Director Yip stated it will be wherever the work is taking place, and there could be different crews for concrete, striping, and if they need the parking spaces they will come in and put in signs for no parking at least 72 hours at max and also notification so all the residents who could be impacted. He stated that the biggest impact would be the slurry seal and, in terms of concrete and striping, the parking impacts would be minor.

Commissioner Redfield stated his other concern with the OSVs is that they have people occupying those vehicles and he asked if PRC has been notified of any possible assistance there in that displacement and is there a contingency for them to move to another spot.

PW Dep. Director Yip stated that PRC has not been notified as they mainly oversee the TSPP, Temporary Safe Parking Program, and this is separate. If there is some designated parking that is shown on their OSV parking on the city's website. He asked if Planning Director Murdock wanted to comment.

Planning Director Murdock stated that the PRC also has unhoused on the coast outreach team that tries to make contact with those who don't have traditional housing arrangements to see if they are interested in supportive services that can include transitioning them to permanent housing options. He stated that the way he is interpreting some of the aspects of his question about parking, he wanted to clarify that any oversized vehicle that may be parking in one of these locations is only allowed to park there up to 72 hours as a general matter in terms of city parking regulations and these should not be particular segments of the street where people are lawfully inhabiting an oversized vehicle for an extended period of time anyway. He stated that the question is, if they are moving ever 72 hours anyway, is there a reasonably place for them to move the vehicle to that is compliant with the existing baseline parking regulations which leads him to the last part of his question. He understands that he wanted to address, not really so much phasing from a project management and project concept standpoint but is the entire area going to be no parking for the entirety of the project or could it be broken up into more logical chunks that, from a practical standpoint, are only being demolished to prepare to construct it in a sequence and the team might move on to another area or is all the demolition occurring along the whole project length and then, all of the next phase and all of the final work such that the entire area is

unavailable to all types of vehicles, including oversized vehicles for the entirety of the project. He asked if that was one of the aspects of his question.

Councilmember Redfield responded affirmatively.

Planning Director Murdock asked Dep. Director Yip if there was any expectation that the project might be functionally broken down into smaller segments, such that the entirety of the linear length would not have to be off limits to parking for the entire duration of the project.

PW Dep. Director Yip stated that, typically, slurry seal is done in a day, roughly 150,000 square feet, but they would have to check exactly how much of Esplanade they do. They could potentially speck it out to admit how much they do on an exact date so all of Esplanade or all of Palmetto or whatever they are doing the slurry is not impacted and there is not a significant number of vehicles that need to move, but that is typically how much they limit the contractor with bid pricing. He stated that the most cost effective way is to come in and do close to 150,000 square feet at one time. If you break it up into two separate days, that is going to drive the cost of the project up.

Commissioner Redfield stated his concern is that, if the project is started all at once, there is quite a bit of on street parking that will not be allowed if that is the effect of starting the project in its entirety, and he asked where those after hours are when they come home from work and going to park with the 72 and that's going to be very tight searching for parking as they know that is a serious issue.

PW Dep. Director Yip stated he would clarify that they aren't requesting for people to remove their cars for a total of 72 hours. The slurry seal would take place for one day and it usually can be opened up within several hours so it's an impact for that one day and people would have to find other areas to park, but it is during work hours as well so there is limited impacts for people who are going to work and they will speck it out so they need to reopen the street by 5:00 p.m. that day.

Commissioner Redfield referred to restrictions as far as the slurry seal as far as weather goes, such as foggy days, and asked what their restrictions are as far as doing the work weatherwise.

PW Dep. Director Yip stated, in terms of summer, they have been able to come in to do a slurry seal on the project. If it's very foggy, the contractors may postpone it for another day and sometimes they aim to try to do a slurry seal in our Indian summer, roughly after the summer and November as October is when there is the best weather in Pacifica. He confirmed you cannot do a slurry seal if it is too foggy or not hot enough and it does need to be with care.

Planning Director Murdock has another clarifying question for Dep. Director Yip. He asked, as they are trying to understand the impact on street parking from the project, whether it is the case that, after the initial slurry seal, there may be a need to come back and do another no parking period to do striping or any other post paving work.

PW Dep. Director Yip stated that there is potential depending upon where the striping lies and it will be one day at a time only during work hours for that scope of work as well. He stated that could be spread out easier compared to the slurry seal. He stated that the impacts they have seen in other areas of the city have been manageable in terms of the amount of parking that gets moved

around for much more denser cities. He stated he comes from Daly City where sometimes there are seven vehicles in a single home and they have to manage for their slurry seal program and people find a way.

Commissioner Berman thought about this when he mentioned construction will occur when we have the best weather, and asked how will this parking affect Fog Fest. She stated that it's probably not something for this project to solve, but she believes a lot of people use parking along Palmetto for Fog Fest which is already tough to park.

PW Dep. Director Yip stated that Fog Fest is in September.

Commissioner Berman stated that they have pretty good weather in September.

PW Dep. Director Yip stated, given the timeframe, as it is already June, he believes they are already outside of that timeframe to go out into construction. He stated that they are coordinating Fog Fest with their other projects as well as they have the Sharp Park Pedestrian Improvement Project that is right in the Sharp Park area that we are bidding and constructing outside of that timeframe.

Commissioner Berman stated that, for Keynote 16, she found where it occurs. It is page SS-7 and it's at the intersection of Esplanade and Manor. She thought, after public comment, if someone could pull up a picture of what is expected there, that would be appreciated.

Consultant Rose stated that was detail F.

Commissioner Berman stated that on that page, it says detail G on SS-1. She stated that, after public comments, if he pulls the photo.

Consultant Rose agreed.

Chair Hauser opened the Public Hearing.

Suzanne Moore, Pacifica, stated her remarks changed because of the conversation that has occurred here with Commission and staff. She shared her thoughts on the parking and safety issues.

Jarod Longenecker, Pacifica, agreed with Ms. Moore and was excited about this, and he shared his thoughts on the issue and asked a question.

Asst. City Attorney Bazzano stated that commissioners cannot answer questions during public comments.

Mr. Longenecker shared his thoughts regarding no RVs can park on his side of Esplanade between Bill Drake and Manor.

Daniel Beckman, Pacifica, appreciated staff's work and shared his thoughts and concerns on this project.

Gabe Church, Pacifica, and shared his concerns about ongoing parking and safety issues before this project and shared his appreciation about this project.

Clif Lawrence, Pacifica, appreciated all the details they addressed, liked the project, and then shared his concerns for oversized vehicles.

Chair Hauser closed the Public Hearing.

Commissioner Berman stated that, regarding the items she noted and wanted to revisit, she was concerned about what the amount able median would be.

Consultant Rose thought that detail was missing from the plan that it was supposed to be on, which Detail G, and was on Detail E, and they will correct that.

Commissioner Berman asked if there was a photo.

Consultant Rose asked if she is referring to what it will look like.

Commissioner Berman responded affirmatively.

Consultant Rose wasn't sure and would have to look into that.

Commissioner Berman wanted to talk about the improvements in front of IBL and she asked if they can remind her of what the other project is doing in front of IBL.

Consultant Rose stated that the current project is installing and refreshing the latter crosswalks on Shoreview and Surf, and taking out the old inground lights and replacing those with new flashing beacons on both sides of the street.

Commissioner Berman assumed both those crosswalks will be new, their RRFB.

Consultant Rose stated that they were already installed within the past week.

Commissioner Berman stated that they briefly discussed adding a pedestrian bulb out and it sounds like the manager of the school is interested in that as well. She stated that it sounds like it could be considered for this project, as even applying a painted surface for the pedestrian bulb out as a traffic calming measure, she guessed it's not a huge cost impact for this project and she would be interested to see that as this is a heavily used school crossing.

Chair Hauser concurs with that.

Commissioner Wright stated he was encouraged to hear that PW is considering a number of other improvements, particularly around the schools. He asked our engineer, if we can't do the speed bump to slow traffic and after hearing a lot of concerned comments on the speed, could we do a rumble strip instead as anything that makes their cars make a whole bunch of noise and encourage them to slow down.

PW Dep. Director Yip thought the intent of a rumble strip is also to reduce the width of the travel lane and that is one that they can do. He stated that there are horizontal measures they can add

into the street, and view markings were mentioned. He stated that they can add channelizers, chicane, add more signage and there are other ones. He stated that they could add some raised crosswalks as a potential but they are very costly, but that is something very beneficial to the pedestrians and also is a horizontal and it acts like a speed bump but only for the crosswalk. He stated that there are a lot of measures they can add to the street, but they need funding.

Commissioner Wright stated it wouldn't interfere with fire trucks and police and ambulance response, something lesser or messier, but still reduce the speed.

PW Dep. Director Yip stated that, in terms of horizontal measures, such as reducing travel lanes and it would not impact public safety vehicles but a raised crosswalk will as they will have to go over it the same as any other vehicle.

Commissioner Wright asked, if it was true that the project they are bringing before the Commission at this meeting to have \$37,000 out of the city's budget, if they are getting us \$1 million worth of safety improvements.

PW Dep. Director Yip stated that is the budget, but they will see when they go out to bid.

Commissioner Wright asked if he can do more of that.

PW Dep. Director Yip stated he can as they are always actively looking for grants and not having to utilize our local funds for bike lanes and safe routes to school projects are the most common grant projects out there and they are always looking for them.

Commissioner Wright stated he doesn't want the perfect to be the enemy of the good and he wants to thank him for what he has done in doing this. He thinks he heard a lot of their concerns for future projects and considerations, particularly with the emphasis round school stuff, as he thinks that is super important as he thinks it's ridiculous that, in front of Terra Nova, you can drive faster than you can up Fassler, which is just his opinion. He appreciates that he is looking into things to make Pacifica a safer, better place.

PW Dep. Director Yip stated that they will definitely be developing lists and getting the public requests in so they can use it for their future applications. Whenever someone sends an email to them, they can utilize that as part of their applications.

Commissioner Wright asked how the public go about doing that.

PW Dep. Director Yip stated that they can just email him directly.

Commissioner Wright asked how they do that.

PW Dep. Director Yip stated that he is email is on the website and he can pass it here if needed. He stated that, when it goes into the engineering emails, that will make its way to him at some point as well.

Commissioner Wright asked, if that includes speed control measures, anything around schools, whether they should be directed to him.

PW Dep. Director Yip responded affirmatively.

Commissioner Berman wanted to know about Vice Chair Ferguson's comment on consideration of the angle and type of curb ramp used. She also pushes a stroller, not in this neighborhood, and she thought that was a really good call out and she didn't even think of herself.

Vice Chair Ferguson stated he heard a lot of talk of extra conditions but he wanted the public to hear his comment. He is a former resident of 455 Esplanade and that problem existed then and not the way it does now. He stated that they hear the public and he suggested that these concerns be brought up consistently at the City Council meetings, as it is outside of the Commission's purview to do anything besides specific projects as they relate to the Commission's pointed scope. He thinks this is a great project and maybe it will help address some of those concerns and hopefully, with the implementation of this project, will start enforcing preexisting laws a little better but that is outside of this body's purview.

Chair Hauser stated that it's awesome that they're doing this and she liked what Commissioner Wright said about letting perfection be the enemy of the good. She will reserve her lovely east west crosswalk for another day. She thinks they are hearing support and she doesn't know that these are conditions as they don't have money to condition them. She thinks it is whether someone wants to make a motion.

Commissioner Berman stated she is happy to make a motion, but before she makes a motion, she agrees that they have a lot of requests but we aren't going to condition this project for them but they hope staff can take these requests back to their team and see if they can incorporate them into the budget, especially as it involves safety in one of our most popular neighborhoods.

Commissioner Berman moved that the Planning Commission FINDS the project is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act; APPROVES Coastal Development Permit CDP-455-23 and Tree Permit TP-8-24 by adopting the attached resolution, including conditions of approval in Exhibit A; and INCORPORATES all maps and testimony into the record by reference; Vice Chair Ferguson seconded the motion.

The motion carried **6-0**.

Ayes: Commissioners Berman, Ferguson, Godwin, Redfield,
Wright and Chair Hauser
Noes: None

Commissioner Berman stated, from her perspective, it isn't a question of budget and getting in the CIP because they have a very long CIP list and a lot of the items have been on there since before she was on Planning Commission. It is an improvement that needs to be documented somewhere but has never been documented and is just pushed around, thus, in her opinion, it's never going to get improved. She asked if it was possible to either add that to this program or make it a clear clarification of an already existing item here. She knows there are trail improvements and a lot of grants are available for coastal access, pedestrian access, trail improvement and there are funds that the city has planned for allocations for future developments that will get contributed to that and she asked if this segment of improvement should be included in one of the aspects that are already planned for.

PW Dep. Director Yip will look into adding this into the upcoming report. At the very least, they will get it in there as a project and it will be in the forecasted year and can be on the lookout and they can have it as a discussion topic for her. He will have to run it by Finance along with their other projects that go with the base budget and every single project is looked at in terms of where it is getting pulled in. The General Fund is impacted so, if it gets requested from the General Fund or even any other funds a lot of the park dedication and all of that has been getting requested on other projects already and it will have to be looked at with the other projects in the city.

Commissioner Berman asked, if the answer is this will be included for next year's CIP, how Planning Commission gets to look at the CIP before it gets solidified and locked in to where they can't add anything to it.

Chair Hauser thought it would be helpful if she clarified the dimension of what they are talking about as Dep. Director Yip was probably not at the hearing where this came up. She stated that Commissioner Berman has been talking about this for years and the answer they get is the same every year which is frustrating. She can appreciate that he wasn't present for those years.

Commissioner Berman stated that a width of 5 feet, and could be 4 feet, for a length of maybe 8.

Consultant Rose stated it is a small piece of sidewalk.

Commissioner Berman stated it is a small piece of sidewalk that lies in a questionable zone where no one knows if it's the top of all property or city property. She stated that south of Taco Bell is the city parking lot with a pump station and the trail traverses east of Taco Bell but where it crosses the property line, there is no pass so it's not ADA compliant. She stated that our General Plan and Pedestrian and Bike Plan call for that to be a Class 1 facility and ADA compliant but it's not. She stated, in her opinion, she could argue that the CIP is not consistent with the General Plan because the General Plan asks for improvement in that segment to be ADA compliant in a consistent Class 1 trail but it's not.

Asst. City Attorney Bazzano stated, before Dep. Director Yip responds, that she wants to remind the Planning Commission that at this meeting, the task before them is fairly narrow. They are being asked to look at the CIP that is before them and confirm that the projects that are identified are consistent with the General Plan and, as Planning Director Murdock mentioned, the Planning Commission can approve the list but provide some comments or recommendations to Council as this will go to Council for their approval. She stated that talking about projects that are not on the list go a bit beyond what is before them at this meeting. She wouldn't encourage much

discussion on this topic and Dep. Director Yip has heard what their request or recommendation was and he has indicated that he will continue to review that recommendation and she believes he said he would present it to Council as well.

PW Dep. Director Yip stated that he will present it to the Finance Department as they review the base budget next year when they approve the new projects to be added onto the CIP list.

Commissioner Berman stated that they probably spent 30 minutes a month ago when they were reviewing the project at Taco Bell talking about this and she was told they couldn't talk about it during that meeting and that we have to talk about it during this CIP meeting, and now she is being told she isn't allowed to talk about it here either, and she felt it was challenging for her to navigate.

Planning Director Murdock stated that they aren't telling her not to talk about but saying that it's not the Planning Commission's role to specify the CIP, as their role is to find the projects consistent or not consistent with the General Plan. He stated that is a limitation on the Planning Commission's role as City Council determines what the CIP will be. They are saying that this information can be carried forward to the extent they remark about the Planning Commission's action in determining General Plan consistency and they can indicate that in the staff report or perhaps as a recital resolution being adopted but they aren't able to allow the Planning Commission to change the CIP or add projects to the CIP as that's not the Planning Commission's role.

Chair Hauser asked when the CIP is going to City Council.

PW Dep. Director Yip stated that it is the second meeting of June.

Chair Hauser stated that the agenda at this meeting did not ask for a designation of a liaison but she thinks one is warranted, as what she is hearing Commissioner Berman say after years of bringing up 40 square feet of pavement for ADA compliance in our coastal zone and she doesn't necessarily find the CIP to be consistent with the General Plan and that makes this a more difficult conversation. She thought what they can do to make it easier is designate a liaison to that Council meeting so this can be specifically talked about and not missed for another year. She asked if that is a fair solution.

Asst. City Attorney Bazzano stated that Commissioner Berman can attend the Council meeting as an individual and express her concerns to the Council directly but there was not any designation of liaison on the agenda at this meeting and that won't happen at this meeting and she doesn't believe there is another Planning Commission before the Council meeting.

Planning Director Murdock doesn't anticipate that they will have another Planning Commission meeting before the Council meeting.

Commissioner Berman asked if it is for the 10th or is it the first or second meeting.

Planning Director Murdock thought Dep. Director Yip was anticipating June 24 for the City Council meeting to consider adoption of the CIP.

Commissioner Berman understood and stated that she will try to attend it, not as a liaison.

Vice Chair Ferguson stated he had a clarification question as he have misunderstood this. For certifying this is consistent with the General Plan, that doesn't include error by omission, but just what is written in the CIP.

Planning Director Murdock responded affirmatively, and on thinking through the thought process of what this requirement is in state law, there is a General Plan that says the city shouldn't be developed in the westward direction and infrastructure, sewer, streets, etc., should be built to support that development that is anticipated. The city puts forth a CIP that builds some road into the eastward direction, not serving a development that is contemplated in the General Plan, but a very text book simplistic example, such as that the project likely would not be consistent with the General Plan is not relating to any development or services that are contemplated. He stated, not to determine all the projects that would be needed to effectuate the General Plan but ensuring that the projects that are contemplated and put forth in the five-year plan are consistent with the General Plan. He stated that they have done analysis to demonstrate, from staff's perspective, that they are. He stated that there is a lot of repair and maintenance and upkeep of existing type of infrastructure for the most part but unfortunately, they don't have funding to do significant, robust new infrastructure projects in most cases. He stated that it's not determining what is missing but determining what's here is not inconsistent and is consistent with the General Plan.

Commissioner Wright stated he tends to agree. He stated this is a \$1000 project they have been talking about and they spent more than \$1000 worth of their time talking about it. He is sure they have a discretionary budget and thinks they see the level of passion and concern about having it not be ADA compliant on city land, and it is a safety issue and compliance with the General Plan issue for us. He asked if there is any way staff could squeeze out the ability to do that tiny little bit of sidewalk, it would be greatly appreciated and at the very least, if staff goes to look at it, that would also be appreciated so staff will understand what the Commission is talking about. He apologized for putting staff on the spot but it's not their fault.

Planning Director Murdock asked Dep. Director Yip to let him know if he agrees with the statement that projects that seem simple often are not. He stated that, if this project does interface with private property and they require a survey which adds additional expense and complexity, there are potentially a variety of factors that can make this a much more involved and expensive project than the Commission might describe it to be. He added that the Commission has provided pretty clear feedback to the city engineer that all reasonable efforts within his power and control should be explored to figure out the most expedient way to undertake this project if that is something that's possible to be done.

Commissioner Redfield stated that, on packet page 192, he noticed an item labeled Rockaway to Pacifica State Beach trail rehabilitation and he was curious if the item they're talking about could possibly be worked into that. He stated that finance wise is obviously the hiccup, but he doesn't know what the scope of that line item is and if it is possible to incorporate that into what they are talking about.

PW Dep. Director Yip thanked him for his comment. He stated that, if they turn to the actual page that has the CIP forms, i.e., the project and description, project manager and funding, they have numerous projects that are like this in the CIP report. He stated that there is funding for this for design of \$50,000 and construction of \$300,000 which is unfunded. He stated that it is projected for the next year's CIP. He stated that what is most likely to happen is that he will

bring this in front of Finance and ask them if they have \$50,000 for design and they will look at it with the rest of their projects to see if they have funding. He stated that there are a lot of projects in the report that get added and for discussion to see, when they reach that year, if then can add it to the CIP but that is going to depend on funding from Finance whether we have the money or can we get it from a grant. He stated there is also assistance with grant applications so they have a long list of projects that they can go after grants for, but this project, even if they can add it, is currently unfunded so it is still back to the question with Finance as to whether we have funding for this project.

Commissioner Wright had a question for Asst. City Attorney. If they said no and for some reason this did not pass, and it was to come back to them, what would be the result of a no vote.

Asst. City Attorney Bazzano stated that the capital improvement program would not move on to Council and they would need to get specific reasons from Planning Commission as to why the projects that are identified in the CIP do not conform to the General Plan. She stated that it can't be that they want another project that's not on the list that they do think conforms with the General Plan, but would have to be that one of the projects on the list does not conform with the General Plan with specific reasons why the Commission believes that to be the case.

Planning Director Murdock thought another potential outcome is a City Councilmember that wants the city to be able to carry out the CIP in an efficient way may call up the Planning Commission's action and act on the Planning Commission's behalf in their effectively appellant capacity and he thinks it would be potentially additional time and staff resources committed to that extraneous process if they weren't able to find the CIP consistent with the General Plan at this meeting.

Vice Chair Ferguson asked if there has ever been an analysis done to how much time and effort they spent looking at projects that don't get designed or constructed because he stated that this is his sixth CIP budget and most of the things there have been on for all of them. He was on the Library Commission where they cancelled every meeting for two years, but not without effort and time done. He asked if some analysis has ever been done to clean up some of this CIP list, as on going through them, a handful of great projects are on that they just approved are done every year and there are 50 more on it that seem to sit there. He wondered if there is an actual process for reconfirming them every year or someone going through and saying that they don't have a road forward for an item and suggests that they take it off.

Planning Director Murdock stated he will start and asked Dep. Director Yip to correct or supplement his response. He stated that, within the last 2 or 3 years, they have tried to streamline this process for the Planning Commission by just bringing forward new projects or change projects so they aren't requiring a full analysis in all of the discussion and consideration by the Commission on all the projects in the CIP. He stated that it has been an effort in recent years to try to streamline the process. He believes there has been some effort to try to pare down some of the projects that have no realistic expectation of ever being funded and to try to get this to be a realistic range of projects that the city might undertake, but he thinks there is some strategy involved with having projects in the CIP in the event that funding does become available from grants or other sources. He stated that it would be difficult for the city to pursue if projects were not in the CIP. He understands the view of that.

Vice Chair Ferguson stated that they would love to do it but we don't have any money, and this is what we're actually going to do, and there is no effort given to a priority list. He asked that they understand his frustration when it feels like there is an almost at random list of everything someone might have identified one time except for anything brought up by other people. He stated that it's a list of a million projects that sit there every year, and he has to imagine that staff time being done to recreate this packet every year.

Planning Director Murdock stated that is true and he thinks the challenge is that this is reflective, in part, of the city's significant capital needs but lack of identified budget. He stated that it isn't that these projects are dreamed up but needs of the city where there is no steady stream of funding and they need to be in the Capital Improvement Program so the city can capitalize on grant funding that might be available from year to year or other opportunities to secure funding that might not be known but, if not in the CIP, it is much more difficult, if not impossible in many cases, for the city to capitalize on those grant opportunities.

Asst. City Attorney Bazzano added that Council will typically review the CIP in significant detail and they can remove projects if they so desire and they can also prioritize projects if they so desire.

PW Dep. Director Yip stated he will add on to Planning Director Murdock's comments. He stated that a lot of it is correct in terms of having something projected out here and being able to use that for grant applications and having something on the books and aware of a project need. He stated that, in terms of the formatting of the report, there are some improvements that can be made, one is how revenue is shown on the report. He stated that, when they have enough staffing, they can possibly make changes to this report and get a consultant on board and they could project it out ten years so it is a little more realistic than constantly having new projects show up the next year, such as the one that was just brought up. It will be back when they project out next year, but realistically will it be next year. He stated that if they project it out ten years, maybe they can have some realistic time lines in terms of the projects that they can try to accomplish in a certain year. He stated that he is trying to advocate for staffing, and they are 25% less than a lot of neighboring agencies around us, with a staff size at least in engineering division that's not that much bigger than a population of 5,000 or 6,000 residents. He stated that limits our ability to carry out the projects, even if funding were to come in. He knows suggestions have been made in terms of getting consultants on board, but even for them to deal with staff reports and issues that come up with consultant managed projects, it doesn't remove all their workload when consultants manage the project. He stated that they have to have a certain staff size in order to carry out the number of projects they have and just to maintain permitting processes and dealing with resident requests and projects that come through. They need a certain level of staff just to do that work that constantly comes in. He would advocate for that as that is one thing they need, even if we were to get the funding in place and funding is the first thing to look at.

Commissioner Redfield referred to page 192, and going off on Vice Chair Ferguson's question, and referring to Rockaway Beach parking structure, he stated it was his recollection that several years ago that was discussed and removed from the CIP list and it is still on there. He stated that, if it's in there as a want, that could work towards the future to have it in the CIP, and it has been unfunded for many years. He asked if that would go with that particular item.

Planning Director Murdock thought that was an interesting example where the city for many years has recognized a desire to construct a parking structure in Rockaway Beach to support the

long term objectives as a visitor destination and shopping destination. He stated that, having this in the CIP, it is one important factor to support the city's effort a few years ago to update that in lieu parking fee, so it went from a \$3,000 per parking space fee that had been in place for many years to something upwards of \$40,000 justified per space and that was justified in part by recognizing the city plans and desires to have a parking structure which is a much more expensive method of providing off street parking in space constrained locations like Rockaway Beach, and the pieces fit together but it is just the time horizon and the vision needs to be there and they don't always align in the way they would desire to effectuate projects on a near term basis. Without planning or inclusion in the Capital Improvement Program, he didn't think you get past go in terms of planning and seeking funding for these kinds of projects.

Chair Hauser thinks there have been a lot of good conversations and she understands where everybody fits on this. She thinks it is unfortunate that they can't designate a liaison because she thinks the entire Commission seems to be in agreement over this item and she think that they would unanimously designate Commissioner Berman. She wonders if they could vote to recommend the CIP consistency with the General Plan and then figure out if there is a way to have Commissioner Berman there as a liaison rather than as a member of the public which seems like a waste.

Asst. City Attorney Bazzano stated that there wasn't any liaison appointment on the agenda this evening and there is no meeting before the next June Council meeting where the CIP is going to be presented to Council and, as she mentioned, there is nothing that prohibits Commissioner Berman from attending the Council meeting as an individual and the same would be for Commissioner Wright.

Chair Hauser acknowledged it could be for anybody on the Commission. She stated that she only asked because they have very often had a designation of liaison on the agenda like they have at this meeting and it says none and they double check and sometimes it changes and sometimes it doesn't. She wants everybody to be happy.

Asst. City Attorney Bazzano stated that she can't speak to that, but they have already passed that item on the agenda and said there was no need for appointment for a designated liaison.

Chair Hauser understood that.

Commissioner Wright asked if it is a Brown Act violation if they all email from their Planning Commission email address to each and every City Councilmember saying that they would like to see this thing.

Asst. City Attorney Bazzano stated that they can all individually email a Councilmember of your choosing, as long as they don't copy each other, and express your opinion and concern about it and that is not a Brown Act violation.

Commissioner Berman appreciates everyone's suggestions on this report. She feels on something she was passionate about before coming on the Planning Commission, she plan on attending the Council meeting.

Planning Director Murdock wanted to bring up one other option he mentioned earlier. He stated that it is a short resolution in the packet, Council tends to read the information carefully and the

Commission could add a recital with it's motion related to encouraging City Council to consider the project at the first opportunity to close the coastal trail gap south of Taco Bell along Linda Mar State Beach and it may hold some weight as an official action of the Commission even though the Commission cannot add it to the CIP.

Chair Hauser thought that was true and there are only two recitals.

Planning Director Murdock stated he didn't think it will get lost on page 17 of 49 in a typical resolution they would see.

Chair Hauser thought that was a good idea and asked Commissioners thoughts on that.

Commissioner Berman thought that was creative. She asked how would he suggest they form a motion that recommends that.

Planning Director Murdock stated that he would recommend that the motion that is suggested in the packet with the addition of a recital to encourage City Council to consider a project at the first opportunity to close the coastal trail pavement gap that exists south of Taco Bell along Linda Mar State Beach.

Commissioner Berman asked if staff would draft that recital.

Planning Director Murdock stated that they are reading it in substantially the same form as it would be but he will defer to Asst. City Attorney.

Asst. City Attorney Bazzano stated that the Commission can give direction to staff to prepare a recital along the lines that Planning Director Murdock mentioned or they can craft it themselves now to state whatever they want it to state.

Commissioner Berman thinks the point is pretty clear and she doesn't feel a need to craft it themselves.

Commissioner Wright thinks it's important to mention how small a piece it is as it is not a big ask, and that is a lot of the reason that it keeps slipping through the cracks because it's such a small thing that gets forgotten easily, but it doesn't make it any less important. He thinks they should include something that the scope is very small.

Chair Hauser suggested an approximate square footage.

Planning Director Murdock added that some remark along the lines that it is designated as an important accessible trail in the General Plan and to relate it their task this evening which is related to CIP consistency with the General Plan and not just a wish list of nice things in the community.

Commissioner Wright appreciates staff's support on this as that makes it feel better to him.

Commissioner Berman appreciated Planning Director Murdock. She stated she was looking for the motion.

Planning Director Murdock stated that packet pages were off.

Asst. City Attorney Bazzano stated it was on page 177.

Commissioner Berman moved that the Planning Commission adopts the resolution included in Attachment A finding that the proposed 2024-2029 Capital Improvement Program is consistent with the 2040 General Plan and asks that staff develop a recital that requests Council to consider improvement of the coastal trail along Linda Mar Beach that closes the small gap of approximately X square feet of sidewalk improvement.

Planning Director Murdock added as the trail is identified as key for structure in the General Plan.

Commissioner Berman added as this trail is identified as a key trail and accessible access and coastal access in the General Plan.

Vice Chair Ferguson seconded the motion.

The motion carried **6-0**.

Ayes: Commissioners Berman, Ferguson, Godwin, Redfield,
Wright and Chair Hauser
Noes: None

COMMISSION COMMUNICATIONS:

Chair Hauser thought it would be wonderful if someone who attended the Committee and Commission presentations could report on that.

Commissioner Berman stated that she and Commissioner Godwin presented to the City Council their annual report and they went first. Council was in awe with how much work they have done, not only this year but the past couple of years, and they are appreciative of how closely they look at the details of each item before them, and all the considerations they give and their connection with the public in really listening to public input.

Commissioner Godwin added that the thing that struck him that wasn't brought up was that they indicated how different our last couple of years have been and how much more rigorous and how much more volume of work that needed to be done and were quite appreciative that people stepped up and did that and didn't let it go.

Chair Hauser thanked them both for attending. She knows it is hard to present in the middle of the work and they have had other presentations. She stated that she wants to thank Planning Director Murdock for being with us for the last many years as she thinks this is the last Commission meeting with him and he will be heartily missed and they really appreciate him.

Planning Director Murdock thanked her.

Berman agreed and thanked him for how much knowledge he brought to the city and she has learned so much from him.

Planning Director Murdock thanked her.

Commissioner Godwin added the same for him and he gave him a lot more confidence in doing this job with a clear eyed view.

Planning Director Murdock thanked him.

Commissioner Redfield stated that they need to get a shock collar on him to keep him within Pacifica's city limits. He congratulated him, adding that they will miss him greatly as he has been fantastic.

Planning Director Murdock thanked him.

Commissioner Wright is very happy for him for his future and very sad for Pacifica as he has brought a level of professionalism and expectation that is going to be hard for anybody to fill those shoes, not just from the work he has done, and the amount of care in balancing of all the different pressures and concerns that so many people aren't aware of. He stated tonight is a perfect example about a little piece of concrete and he figured out a way to get the message across for them and he has done that for years for all of them. He stated he knows because he hears and asks, but his staff also respects him and he has watched as he has been doing his thing and they will be very lucky if they get somebody that does as good a job as what he has done. He stated that Planning Director Murdock isn't the only one leaving us. He believes that they are losing Shariah and Joey as well, our PCT who are also going to be ending their internship tonight and he

has appreciated them being here, such as never hearing complaints about the water department because the water always turns on when you turn on the faucet which is the same with them as they are there for us every meeting. He thanked them for all their hard work and he wishes them nothing but the best in the future.

Vice Chair Ferguson stated he doesn't want to be the only Commissioner not to thank Planning Director Murdock for his service. He stated that it has been quite an education and he thinks public servants like him are hard to find and he will be missed, but no one begrudges him for his career move as he thinks it is great and well-deserved. He thinks it will be hard to find a replacement for him.

Planning Director thanked him and Commissioner Wright.

STAFF COMMUNICATIONS:

Planning Director Murdock stated that it has been said that sometimes your thunder is stolen and so was his on this evening. He stated, as mentioned, this is his last meeting with the Planning Commission and his last day in Pacifica is Wednesday, June 5. He worked with the city for ten years and it has been an incredible journey, with many late nights in these Council Chambers that looked very different when he started here ten years ago. He stated that the orange hue will be forever burned into his retinas from the carpet, wood paneling, etc. He has enjoyed those evenings and the many hours on weekends, phone conversations, Zoom and getting to know so many of them and their predecessors. He has come to learn so much more about the pressures they face and the sacrifices they make to serve their community. He is in awe of how much care they show and express for the work they do and they don't get paid for it but just do it because they love the community and do it because it's the right thing to do to give back. He is humbled by that and appreciated the opportunity in various capacities over the years as his role has changed to support all of them and try to get them where they wanted to go and where they believed the community to go, even when it didn't always align with his professional judgment in all cases. He stated that is the beauty of our process that there is staff to provide insight and advice and ultimately options for the Commission and this has been an interesting testing ground for him to hone his craft to figure out, i.e., maybe he didn't think of that and wouldn't have recommended that but that is where the Commission wants to go and he will do his best to get them there. He feels there have been a lot of opportunities to do that over the years. Even as he is leaving, he thanked them all for the trust they have shown, expressed and invested in him and, while he will be gone, they will be in good hands with the capable staff that he has had the pleasure of assembling over the last couple of years in the Planning Department and also the excellent staff in the City Attorney's office that will make sure the good work they have done continues into the future. He thanked them so much for the opportunities and the memories.

Commissioner Wright stated, if they don't adjourn, they get to keep him.

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further business for discussion, Vice Chair Ferguson moved to adjourn the meeting at 9:24 p.m.; Commissioner Berman seconded the motion.

The motion carried **6-0**.

Ayes: Commissioners Berman, Ferguson, Godwin, Redfield,

Noes: Wright and Chair Hauser
None

Respectfully submitted,

Barbara Medina
Public Meeting Stenographer

APPROVED:

Planning Director Murdock