



**CITY OF PACIFICA
CITY COUNCIL MINUTES**

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

Mayor Sue Digre
Mayor Pro Tem Mike O'Neill
Councilmember Karen Ervin
Councilmember Mary Ann Nihart
Councilmember John Keener

**July 21, 2016 (THURSDAY)
www.cityofpacifica.org**

Mayor Sue Digre called the meeting to order on July 21, 2016 at 7:05 PM

OPEN SESSION

Call to Order

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

Attendee Name	Title	Status	Arrived
Sue Digre	Mayor	Present	
Mike O'Neill	Mayor Pro Tem	Present	
Karen Ervin	Councilmember	Present	
Mary Ann Nihart	Councilmember	Excused	
John Keener	Councilmember	Present	

Staff Present: Lorie Tinfow, City Manager; Michelle Kenyon, City Attorney; Tina Wehrmeister, Planning Director; Dan Steidle, Police Chief; Rich Johnson, Deputy Fire Chief; Mike Perez, PB&R Director; Ann Stedler, Economic Dev. Mgr; Ed Vandehey, MIS Mgr; Kathy O'Connell, City Clerk.

Salute to the Flag led by Councilmember Keener

Closed Session Report - None.

SPECIAL PRESENTATION

CONSENT CALENDAR - NONE.

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

Therese Dyer, Pacifica, stated that, after reading the Tribune and a report on the library, she had a suggestion regarding the City Attorney's mistake for not informing the City Council that they need four people to vote on this issue.

Mayor Digre asked if this was okay or should it wait for the library.

City Attorney Kenyon stated that it was part of the library.

Ms. Dyer stated that she was going to make a suggestion about the City Attorney who made the mistake in the first place and is also not very clear on the initiative that they put on the ballot for the quarry. She stated that, if she can't do the job, they should outsource and get San Mateo County because they have 25 attorneys.

Bill Collins, Pacifica, referred to the mayor bringing up the most important issue facing Pacificans, that is how they get around. He felt that the city was so car dependent it was pathetic. He stated that, when they schedule meeting, they don't think about the thousands of neighbors who do not drive cars, older, young, poor. He mentioned that the goal setting meeting was off the highway and no one walks, bikes or takes buses there. He asked that they look forward to those who want to live in Pacifica and will need ways to get around. He thanked the mayor for bringing it up and he felt it was something for the city to work on.

Dan Stegink, Pacifica, stated that he wanted to mention the financial opportunities the city missed in the past year. He mentioned that San Mateo County handed out \$40 million in priority redevelopment area monies to every city. He stated that he called the county to ask to see Pacifica's submission, and they said we never applied for that money. He stated that the deadline to apply for redevelopment agency refunds was the past January and Pacifica didn't apply for \$3.9 million in money owed. He stated that Brisbane got \$2 million with a one page application. He then referred to a record the city set of 128 days since a 7/Eleven was last robbed in Pacifica but it reset to zero last week. He asked that they look at what we are bringing into town. He stated that, in the last 48 months, we haven't brought a single business into town that's paid more than \$10/hour, stating that 7/Eleven was \$9.49/hour and Grocery Outlet was \$9.68/hour, adding that both of these were replacements. He questioned where we were going to put new companies with affordable jobs paying a living wage and also mentioned national companies that were shipping the money out of town and only paying low wages to people who can't afford to live here.

Mayor Digre requested that people do not clap. She understood the enthusiasms but there are other ways of showing that they like what someone says, such as thumbs up, etc. She then stated that Councilmember Nihart was not present because she was not allowed to be present as she lived within the 500 foot area of the proposed library project. She then mentioned that Millbrae's community center was destroyed, adding that we have sent condolences to them. She stated that they aren't sure what happened but there was a big fire.

COUNCIL COMMUNICATIONS

STAFF COMMUNICATIONS

PUBLIC HEARINGS - NONE.

CONSIDERATION

1. Reconsideration of Council Decision Regarding Resolution Determining that the Public Interest and Necessity Demand the Construction of a New Pacifica Public Library and Its Financing through the Issuance of General Obligation Bonds.

■

PROPOSED ACTION: 1) Adopt a motion to reconsider the Council's July 11, 2016 decision regarding the Resolution Determining that the Public Interest and Necessity Demand Construction of a New Public Library and its Financing Through Issuance of General Obligation Bonds; and if approved by majority vote take one of the following actions:

-
-
- A. Adopt a Resolution Determining that the Public Interest and Necessity Demand the Construction of a New Public Library and the Financing Through the Issuance of General Obligation Bonds; or
 - B. Do not put a bond measure on the November ballot.

Mayor Digre asked City Attorney Kenyon if she wanted to give the reasoning for the voting.

City Attorney Kenyon stated that she wanted to explain to everyone regarding the authority allowing them to be present at this meeting and the action they were asking of the Council. She explained that, at their July 11 meeting, they took the first steps to put a library bond measure on the ballot, which involved adoption of a resolution determining that public interest demanded the construction of a new public library and the vote was 3-1-1. She explained that her office failed to inform the Council that the vote was not sufficient to pass the resolution, which required four votes of the Council or two-thirds vote of entire Council, not just the Council present. She and the City Manager discussed what needed to be done, and the City Manager and Mayor decided to call a special meeting which was allowed under the Brown Act and government code. She then stated that the Council had to adopt a motion of reconsideration, explaining the requirements for that motion, and once passed, they can then get a staff report, return to Council for questions, public comment and back to Council to determine motion to reconsider and, if approved, move on to the next measure to adopt the resolution itself.

Mayor Digre asked clarification that a motion to reconsider was passed by a majority vote, 3 of the 4.

City Attorney Kenyon responded affirmatively.

Mayor Digre asked when the 4 of 4 vote came into play.

City Attorney Kenyon explained that, if the motion to reconsider passes, the Council would then have the authority to go to the second step to consider the resolution and a motion to adopt the resolution would have to pass by 4 votes or a unanimous vote of the Council present.

Mayor Digre stated that she did some studies and attended a sea level rise meeting and had a thought she hadn't had before, and it would be in addition to the resolution. She asked when she presents that.

City Attorney Kenyon stated that it would be after the motion for reconsideration.

Mayor Digre stated she was bothered by that because the Council didn't have that part of the resolution so they aren't voting on it.

City Attorney Kenyon stated that they weren't voting on the resolution in the first motion, just voting whether they want to consider it.

Mayor Digre understood, but thought, if she wants to reconsider something, she would like to know what she was reconsidering. She concluded that she was having a squabble with the law.

City Attorney Kenyon stated that, unless they have specific questions related to what she discussed, she would like to turn it over to the Planning Director with additional comments related to the bond measure.

Mayor pro Tem O'Neill asked clarification that a yes vote means they will hear item #2, library reconsideration and a no vote means the meeting is over and they are done.

City Attorney Kenyon confirmed that on the first motion, if they do not get a majority vote on the motion to reconsider, then there is nothing further to do and the meeting will adjourn.

Councilmember Ervin referred to public comments, and assumed they will take the first motion and take public comment.

City Attorney Kenyon stated that they will take public comment only after the staff report and Council questions before the Council deliberates on either motion.

Mayor Digre stated that the mayor does not have as much power as they like to think.

Planning Director Wehrmeister presented a staff report.

City Manager Tinfow continued the staff report. She then invited Dilip Trivedi of Moffatt & Nichol to give a presentation of the study on sea level rise, adding that the full report was included as part of their packet on July 11 and with the present packet.

Dilip Trivedi, coastal engineer, working in the Bay Area for the past 25 years, then made his presentation.

Councilmember Keener referred to figures he gave, asking if they were additive or not.

Mr. Trivedi stated that they were absolute numbers relative to the NADV datum.

Councilmember Keener then referred to the over topping, stating he mentioned 5 1/2 feet and that there would be no more risk of damage than 3 feet.

Mr. Trivedi stated that it was right, with increasing or decreasing water levels, the contribution of waves versus tides differ. He stated that the lower water surface elevation as a low tide or low sea level rise, the waves break further off shore and the individual contribution of the waves together is a little less.

Councilmember Keener asked if the waves would be less likely to damage anything on shore with lower sea levels.

Mr. Trivedi responded affirmatively, adding that it was with the static exercise which the coastal engineering community has been doing, and he stated that we were assuming a static beach that exists today, but a beach is not static even with seasonal changes. He stated that, with that assumption, they were seeing an increased amount of over topping of the sea wall with higher sea levels, so that it becomes very unsafe or could be dangerous with existing top of sea wall elevation for people to use the promenade. He stated that some work would have to be done to continue pedestrian access.

Councilmember Keener assumed he meant work on the sea wall itself.

Mr. Trivedi responded affirmatively.

Councilmember Keener referred to the work of the Pacific Institute, and asked confirmation that, with bluff erosion, they did not consider the sea wall in those estimates.

Mr. Trivedi responded affirmatively, adding that they used long term recorded rates of erosion, just under a foot over the last century or the last three decades with the increased amount of El Nino being seen, and the rate of erosion north and south of the site. He stated that, with a sea wall in place, you can't measure bluff erosion, but they use erosion rates both north and south to impose it and ignore that the sea wall is there. He stated that they don't characterize liquefaction potential or any other rubble material that might be in the bluffs, adding that much of the bluff was man made fill in place. He stated that they did not assume that the sea wall would continue being in place.

Councilmember Keener asked him to refer to the slide on bluff erosion, asking if it was the USGS.

Mr. Trivedi responded affirmatively.

Councilmember Keener asked where the Pacific Institute bluff erosion would fall in the absence of the sea wall.

Mr. Trivedi stated that, just like the Pacific Institute, they used a similar methodology in terms of the assumptions. He stated that the work done by USGS was much more determined as they took individual contributions of hundred year waves, and it was true 1% just like FEMA does, evaluating the extent of run off associated with the events and add in the recorded bluff erosion rates.

Councilmember Keener asked clarification of "add on."

Mr. Trivedi stated that they add the rate of bluff erosion to the inundation itself. He stated that, while he didn't have the details of the actual study itself and how they processed the information, but assuming a long term trend in bluff erosion over 100 years, that would be 100

feet of erosion. He stated that, if you add 100 feet to limit of run up, he thought in this case the inland limit is about 200 feet from the sea wall.

Councilmember Keener asked him if it was halfway along the Beach Blvd. property.

Mr. Trivedi stated that the proposed library site, just west of Palmetto was about 350 feet. He stated that the site of Palmetto was about 400 to 410 or 420 feet from the sea wall at the moment.

Councilmember Keener stated that, when he looked at the Pacific Institute maps, the bluff erosion, in the absence of the sea wall, was around Palmetto.

Mr. Trivedi questioned whether it was bluff erosion or limit of inundation.

Councilmember Keener stated that it was bluff erosion. He then referred to inundation or flooding, stated that the Pacific Institute showed flooding over much or all of the Beach Blvd. site in a 6.6 feet sea level rise scenario, and he thought 1% annual accedence and access for the water in that scenario was south of the sea wall or at the end of the sea wall.

Mr. Trivedi stated he has seen the maps coming in from the golf course and the lagoons in the golf course. He stated that it was assuming the embankment separating the golf course from the ocean is breached. He thought, under those circumstances, it would be outflanked from the south side. He stated that the tsunami maps are nice because they give you the daylighting, 36 feet, which was a high number compared to tidal inundation and more of the 26 feet elevation. He stated that one thing of note in the profile of how FEMA maps the influence of wave related over topping was that there was an inland extent to which the inundation or flooding can go beyond a certain distance. He stated that the VE zone of 24 doesn't extend in a horizontal line all the way to 24. He stated that the way FEMA will do insurance rate maps for properties along Palmetto would be to look at the base flood elevation. At that point, the wave action has been absorbed or adequately dissipated along Beach Blvd. and at that point it was the 9 foot elevation that applies. At 6 feet of sea level rise, you would be at 15 feet of elevation.

Councilmember Keener stated that he didn't follow the point of that last sentence or two.

Mr. Trivedi stated that coastal areas are going to see a higher amount of inundation which decreases as you go further away. Looking at the 24-foot elevation and extending it back mathematically or graphically is not accurate because the effect of the waves quickly dissipates within 50 feet.

Councilmember Keener stated that he got that, but he thought he said something following that.

Mr. Trivedi stated that it was in reference to the flood insurance rate for FEMA purposes. He hasn't seen the old flood maps and the recent maps are only for the coastal area, but he thought the properties along Palmetto have a base flood elevation of about 9 at the moment, and with sea level rise, you keep adding the amount of waves or bluff erosion, as long as it was taken care of at that one block, it does not change.

Councilmember Keener understood. He didn't think that addressed the mechanism of flooding that Pacific Institute is using.

Mr. Trivedi agreed, adding that the tsunami maps are a good topographical tool and even if the sea wall is protected in this particular case and the golf course's protection has completely failed, then water would come in from the south and outflank the sea wall.

Councilmember Ervin thanked Mr. Trivedi for the in depth report, adding that they all want a very clear understanding of the sea level and tsunami risks involved in this site. She asked him if he gains any benefit from providing a positive report or being in agreement with the position that this is a safe place to build versus a negative report.

Mr. Trivedi stated that they are civil engineers. He would see a benefit if he were to get a contract to design the library, but that was not what they do.

Councilmember Ervin appreciated hearing that, as well as for the public to understand that this was very neutral, and they were seeking information and wanted to know whether or not this is a reasonable area to consider building on with the fear or concern of sea level rise in the next hundreds and thousands of years. She referred to the project he had participated in and she asked for an example of some of the projects he had evaluated.

Mr. Trivedi stated that the most recent one was for San Mateo County, looking at the Colma and San Bruno Creek and performed a resiliency study for the Coastal Conservancy to look at the effects of sea level rise on communities along both Colma and San Bruno in the watersheds. They completed a long term capital study for San Francisco Airport to advise them on planning for sea level rise as they continue maintaining their existing systems with resiliency adaptation studies. Along the coastline, they are also helping San Francisco and the PUC with Ocean Beach shoreline, adding that they are doing a lot of projects along the coast, such as Huntington Beach, Santa Barbara, with sea level rise issues to help cities identify and consider adaptations which should be included in their capital programs.

Councilmember Ervin stated that Pacifica was looking at things potentially 80 years out, and she wondered if he foresaw some significant geotechnical innovations that may help deal with these types of issues, going into the future as we grow.

Mr. Trivedi stated it was a two part response. He stated that, from a technical perspective, they will always see innovations that will help stabilize shore lines, weak bluffs, which can be solidified by additive measures, but a longer term outlook for cities that will have to come in the next few years where their understanding of what should or should not be put in the coastal zone. He thought residential communities are by far the most vulnerable because there is no project life for a residential community. For a library or treatment plant, there are certain time periods over which costs are recouped and loans are amortized, but not in a residential development. Working with a coastal community, they will see changes in the way cities plan their developments, local coastal plans, zoning, etc., probably ripe for changes.

Councilmember Ervin thought that, the better we understand our geology, the better and smarter planning we can do going into the future. She appreciated all his work. She also thanked Councilmember Keener for bringing up the point regarding the Pacific Institute. She stated that she has been reading that and she thought it was important, while they evaluate both his report and the one from the Pacifica Institute, that one does not include the sea wall and it underscores the importance of having the sea wall in that area.

Mr. Trivedi agreed, stating that he sees that the city will have to decide what to do about the sea wall and if it is an important enough asset that should continue to remain with the trail or retreat.

Councilmember Keener thanked the City Manager for coming up with all the numbers which answered most of his questions from the last meeting. He referred to the \$23 per \$100,000 assessed valuation and asked if that was fixed.

City Manager Tinfow stated that it shrinks over time. She stated that, if she understood the analysis from the financial consultant, it starts out at \$23 and over time it gets smaller per assessed valuation because the assessed valuation is expected to increase, and the amount they need every year is fixed but if you spread it over a bigger pool, then the number of dollars per \$100,000 goes down.

Councilmember Keener agreed, adding that what applies is what is fixed is the amount per year.

City Manager Tinfow agreed, stating it was the debt service.

Councilmember Keener asked if it was fixed by law.

City Manager Tinfow stated that it was fixed by the bond documents, which specifies what we expect to happen and how it will work. She stated that every year we will tell the county how much we need to have them assess on the property tax bill.

Councilmember Keener stated that he did a quick multiplication of the amount paid by the average homeowner and the evaluation, and he came up short, basically \$1.5 million, \$45 million over 30 years, and he was thinking that the key was either the assessed valuation of a single family residence such as leaving out other entities that pay property taxes. He asked if that was the issue.

City Manager Tinfow stated that commercial property also pays an amount. She stated what she shared was a single family home because that was typically what most people are interested in, but all properties would pay, adding that businesses such as Kimco would pay more.

Councilmember Keener mentioned apartments as an example.

City Manager Tinfow stated that, depending on the property tax bill, she agrees.

Councilmember Keener assumed that would make up the rest of it.

Councilmember Ervin thanked her for the additional information and answering the questions which she thought was very helpful. She stated that it was approximately \$1 million a year to run each of the libraries, and she asked how much Pacifica pays annually to run the libraries.

City Manager Tinfow stated that we pay zero except for the maintenance which was a lot smaller than \$1 million a year.

Councilmember Ervin asked if she foresees Pacifica having the ability to support both libraries, fully resourced seven days a week with all the necessary resources.

City Manager Tinfow asked if she meant we were going to pull out of the system and have it owned and operated.

Councilmember Ervin responded affirmatively.

City Manager Tinfow responded no as she could not offer a path forward on that at this time.

Councilmember Ervin asked if we were to decide that what we wanted to do was modernize both the existing libraries, we would not necessarily have the money to operate one of them on our own and they would still need to be funded by the JPA.

City Manager Tinfow responded affirmatively, stating that we were fortunate that our JPA does have sufficient funds to operate a library with a generous number of hours and materials.

Councilmember Ervin asked if the JPA would continue to offer current support if we choose to update and support both libraries.

City Manager Tinfow stated that they have not indicated an answer to that question.

Councilmember Ervin stated that a lot of people were interested in keeping our libraries and modernizing them. She stated that they have done a facilities update and report to try to do just that. She asked if she could comment on that facilities report on the needs of the current libraries as they currently exist.

City Manager Tinfow stated that the facility report was on the website if people are interested in looking at it.

Councilmember Ervin acknowledged that the report was presented to Council in November.

City Manager Tinfow responded affirmatively. She then stated that it was insufficient in a number of areas that the architecture firm came in and assessed. She stated that it was not ADA compliant. The entries do not meet accessibility requirements. She stated that, with life and safety, there were insufficient fire life safety features, unsupported cantilever of the building over open space.

Councilmember Ervin asked if she was referring to the Sharp Park facility.

City Manager Tinfow responded affirmatively. She stated that it also had unanchored tall shelving, which was another area where it was not compliant with today's life safety standards. It also had insufficient ventilation, outdated lighting systems. She stated that they had recently updated the plumbing. Architecturally, it has uneven floors, worn finishes, poor acoustics, hardware worn out. In terms of functionality, it was too small with inadequate storage, undersized spaces for collections, inadequate seating, inflexible spaces, and undersized staff space. Regarding technology, it cannot meet the current expectations for technology for a wireless access, etc. She concluded that it was not adequate to meet today's expectations.

Councilmember Ervin asked, if they looked at renovating and expanding Sharp Park which was a consideration, whether she could comment on the conclusions of that assessment.

City Manager Tinfow stated that it was part of the facility's assessment and they asked the question of whether the new library as it was envisioned could fit on either site and, for the Sharp Park site, the answer was "not really." They were able to almost fit a four-story building on that site, but it would not be taking into consideration the easement for the apartment buildings, plus with four stories, two would be underground parking and two would be the actual

library. She stated that it would not fit and would be much more expensive because it would be on a hillside rather than a flat site and they did not ask for any of that information.

Councilmember Ervin understood it has been over a decade of planning and evaluating and exploring different sites throughout Pacifica, and asked if there were any other sites in Pacifica that came close to being a potential site to build on.

City Manager Tinfow stated that there were none that they could identify that would be adequate for the size building that has been determined that we need. She stated that they looked at the parking lot next to the Thai restaurant that the city owns, but what would fit there was something much smaller than the needs assessment indicated. She didn't remember if parking could be accommodated.

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated that the site would be far too small on the surface to accommodate the building and parking and the parking would need to be underground and there has been no assessment as to how much that would cost or if it was even feasible in that area to put underground parking from an engineering perspective.

Councilmember Keener referred to the low interest construction load from the county which they envision to be \$5 or \$6 million. He thought that was a quarter of the construction costs and was in the bond itself.

City Manager Tinfow stated that the construction cost would not include the planning, the soft costs or the furnishings and equipment, adding that she backed those out.

Councilmember Keener stated that he was interested in the source of repayment, and he mentioned that she said it would be either from the bond measure or property sale proceeds. He thought that it was a different cost to the city if you pay it out of the bond measure or the property sale proceeds, and referred to paying out of the bond measure.

City Manager Tinfow stated that you are paying interest from both the .8 plus whatever interest we would be paying on the bond money.

Councilmember Keener agreed, adding that you have the property sales proceeds to apply to other library needs.

City Manager Tinfow agreed that it was much more flexible in terms of what they could use it for with the project.

Councilmember Keener thought, if you repay it with the property sale proceeds, you have the total amount of the bond plus the amount of the loan that you have to pay back.

City Manager Tinfow stated that, if she was understanding him correctly, she thought the county was envisioning that they might be able to borrow the money from them and have a lower bond loan. She stated it would not be additive but would be instead. That was why they offered it. She stated that some other cities have been able to take them up on that offer because they have a different source of money to pay it back and she added that we do not.

Councilmember Keener stated that, following that idea, he asked if that meant that, if they hadn't offered this loan, the bond would have to be even higher.

City Manager Tinfow stated that her understanding was that the city has envisioned the library, unless separate action on the Council's part, we would have the library be capped at \$33.5 million cost . She mentioned that she thought the property sale proceeds and the county loan would actually be best used as a cash flow mechanism for some of the elements of the project that they need to have sooner rather than later. She pointed out that the bond proceeds cannot be used to buy the furnishings. The Library JPA has pledged the vast majority of the money toward the furnishings but there would probably still be an amount they will need to purchase items, and the property sale proceeds can cover that cost and, if needed to borrow from the County to get that to happen, then repay them with the property sale proceeds, that could be a way of using their kind offer. She explained that it was kind of complicated and, until they sit down and figure out what they are going to need and how they can make best use of all the resources, it was difficult to answer questions completely.

Mayor pro Tem O'Neill stated that there was a question from Councilmember Ervin about the JPA, and he explained that the JPA was committed to delivering 60-70 hours.

City Manager Tinfow stated it was 60.

Mayor pro Tem O'Neill continued that it was 60 hours to each city and every city has one library. They granted Pacifica an extra ten hours every year for many years because we had two, as long as we were working towards a single library. He thought, if we were to quit working towards the single library, per the agreement, they would not have any reason to give us more than the 60 hours. He stated that, as part of their funding, they were also taking care of DVDs, books, furniture and upgrades of computers, and that would cease in a second building. He thought \$1 million was probably just the staff costs, but he thought there was a limit to how much funding they were obligated to do.

Mayor Digre thanked PCT for being present. She stated that she would like to get some air circulating, and suggested that they take a short break to stand and wiggle and asked if someone would open the door. She then reconvened the meeting.

Mayor Digre opened public comments.

Jessica Sayres, Pacifica, stated that she understood the process to get a new modern library for Pacifica voters to pass a bond measure. She stated that she will be voting in November and she wants to vote on the library bond. She felt it was important for the community to have a say and asked that they put the measure on the ballot so voters can have an opportunity to have a say.

Sarah Sayres, Pacifica, stated that she has lived in Pacifica her entire life and she feels that we need a new library. She stated that she is a college student and finds it frustrating that there was no where for her to study because the two libraries are so small and busy. She felt putting this on the ballot gives Pacificans the opportunity to let their voices be heard.

Mary Brown, Pacifica, stated that she was a founding member of the Pacifica Library Foundation and she was asking all of them to vote to put this measure on the ballot so they can all vote on it in the fall. She stated that Pacificans have been working on solutions to solve the library problem for years, mentioning the many polls and options considered, and she felt they have finally come to a solution that appears to satisfy the largest group of people. She added that we cannot please everyone and they will always have a few people on different sides for various reasons. They know that and they still work together on other items. She stated that, at

some point in the future, the city will not be able to support the two libraries we have. She stated when she was on the foundation, she watched as things were cut. She asked that they build one beautiful library building while they have this possibility in front of us before our backs are against the wall again. She has been involved in the studies and research that has been done and she believes this is our best option. She asked that they give us the chance to vote on it.

Chris Porter, Pacifica, stated she was the GM of Recology and mentioned that Recology owns two significantly large pieces of property adjacent to where the new library will be built. She stated that she has sat in her office for 33 years and see different projects ramp up and end up not going anywhere. She stated that Pacificans have worked hard on the plan for the library. She stated that she was in the chamber room five years ago when Council gave direction for the library to be built at the sewer treatment plant site. She felt it was important to move forward, give Pacificans the chance to vote. If it passes, great, if not, they will think of something else. She asked that they not take that right away from the citizens.

Gail Benjamin, Pacifica, stated that she has working for the San Mateo County Library in Pacifica for 20 years and she stated that very little has changed in those buildings in 20 years. She asked that the Council vote and give Pacificans the opportunity to decide if they want a new library or not. She felt it was not up to the Council and she urged them to vote yes, mentioning that they have all said on their website or during campaigning that Pacificans should be able to vote, and she agreed that we should be able to vote.

Margaret Goodale, Pacifica, stated that everyone in the room loves libraries and agrees that Pacifica deserves the same services as other residents of the county, librarians deserve excellent working conditions, but she thought closing a library was not fair to half of all Pacificans. She felt one library in either the northern or southern end forces us to abandon half our children who will have no easy access to libraries and information and will have to travel the highway for that access. She stated that, while we are trying to get people out of their cars, this plan that chooses to eliminate a library will cause more, not fewer, car trips. She questioned whether parents will be willing to drive children to the library and will be adding to greenhouse gases when we should reducing them. She referred to a boy scout motto - be prepared - and she stated that the previous winter storm didn't count as 100 year storms, but she asked to imagine those storms on top of even a 3-foot sea level rise. She stated that, before we propose that Pacificans should pay for a library that may have to be continually defended from the ocean in addition to the bond and its interest, she asked that the consider the Pacific Institute and our coast and future maps. She stated that the term, underwater mortgage, may take on a whole literal meaning. She stated that we need to be prepared for sea level rise for the sake of future generations and need to continue using our creativity. She felt we need to think in those terms.

Stan Zeavin, Pacifica, stated that he looked at the Moffitt and Nichols report, concentrating on the sea level rise sections. He felt the report didn't consider the effects of beach erosion. He stated that there was a simple rule that sea walls lead to beach loss. He stated that the beach has already shrunk over the years without significant SLR. He stated that he understood that a narrow beach leads to larger waves breaking closer to the shore with a higher wave runup and over topping which leads to flood extension eastward. He stated that the summary of 2100 projects for the SLR top out at 5.5 feet, but the report chooses to only show that wave topping is, for the most part, limited to 40 feet from sea wall. He stated that what happened the past winter was almost as bad as what they are predicting for 2100. He stated that latest studies show there could be up to 10 feet of sea level rise in 50 years, and while he didn't think it would happen, he thought Pacificans deserve as much information as possible to make the decision in

their best interest, with the city asking for up to \$66 million for the new library. He stated that the SLR report was a group of studies commissioned by the city and see highway widening and Harmony One that can only be characterized as soft, i.e., showing best case scenarios without discussing real world problems that inevitably arise. He was not arguing with their figures, except for the above omissions. It was a best case scenario and his problem was no discussion of probable scenarios where their numbers don't cover the range of future possibilities. He felt they need those figures to make an informed decision. He was for the library but against the location, adding that a lot of things can go wrong and they are not mentioned in any reports he has seen. He referred to the hidden cost of building a sea wall for 20-30 years to help those who have homes already, but stated building this library will force them to build a sea wall beyond when it won't be cost efficient. He stated that it was a serious problem that they may not think about it, but future generations will.

Ben Ron, Pacifica, stated that he has lived at Rockaway for 39 years, owned and operated a land surveying business in San Francisco for 35 years, completing projects such as AT&T Park, Exploratorium, etc. with future projects that sit by the Bay and have been designed and engineered to withstand the effects of climate change. He stated that two different experienced engineering firms studied this specific site. They came to the same conclusion that the presence of the beach and sea wall and continued maintenance of the elements the site to any exposure to flooding from tides, waves and sea level rise. He stated that the library will not be located where they were meeting, but at the corner of Palmetto and Montecino. He stated that the Coastal Commission has given its stamp of approval for placing a library on this site and they are conservative. The city owns the land, it is shovel ready and large enough for a library that will serve our community and was centrally located. He stated that there were people present from all over Pacifica and our middle school is right up the street. He stated that this site works for the new library. He stated that he wasn't a regular library user but he will vote yes on the bond measure because he strongly believes that a library is of great value to a community, open to everyone. There is experienced help and they are not trying to sell you anything. He felt this was the right time and place and he asked that they vote yes to give Pacificans the opportunity to vote on the library bond measure.

Peter Menard, Pacifica, stated that, following hearing about the revote, he thought he should make a public comment and take a position on the library but he remembered that the vote to place the library bond on the ballot or not was not in favor or against the library but a vote about whether the community will have the opportunity to discuss the issue affecting the library or whether a technicality will be taken advantage of to prevent that discussion. The discussion he was referring to was whether to invest in and protect the Sharp Park neighborhood near the pier or to retreat from it. He thought, in a perfect world, Pacificans would be able to vote on a bond measure to rebuild the sea wall before the library, but that was not what history has provided, but he felt it was the same choice. He thought that allowing the community to vote on a library bond measure in its current location during a presidential election year is the best way available for assessing what Pacificans want to protect or retreat. He stated that voting against placing the library bond measure on the ballot is a vote against hearing from Pacificans. A no library bond vote in November means more uncertainty, more paralysis, for every decision made. He felt a vote to put the measure on the ballot was not an expression of support for the library but a vote in support of listening to citizens and three months of democratic engagement and finding out how the advocates propose protecting Sharp Park and how the retreat from Sharp Park advocates propose supporting residents and businesses impacted by the retreat. He acknowledged that, if the bond measure passes, it leads to difficult decisions of how to protect the neighborhood. If it doesn't pass, it leads to difficult decisions about how to responsibly abandon part of a neighborhood, both difficult. If they don't find out what the community wants,

they are deprived of a clear direction to pursue. He stated that, if one of them vote no, Pacifica will continue to not know what it wants to do, protect or retreat, and efforts to do either will be stymied. He stated that, if he is in favor of the current plan, he want a vote and will have to persuade two-thirds of the voters to agree, but if not in favor of the plan, he still wants a vote and only has to convince one-third of the voters to agree. He stated we don't want to be in a position of not going what direction to go because a Councilmember didn't let them find out. His comment was directed to Pacificans opposed to the current plan. He asked that they not interpret a yes vote as a Councilmember not listening to them, but as a vote for all citizens to be heard.by the Council and fellow citizens.

Lisa Weiss, Pacifica, stated that her experience with the Pacifica Library has been through early childhood education. She stated that, for the past three years, she and her son have attended library story times and programs for young children. She stated that the programs and staff are superb but the facilities are not with inadequate space to accommodate all attendees and it was painful to hear how unsafe the facilities are. She stated that, at both libraries, they cram into the small children areas with spilling into other areas of the library. She was advocating for updated, safe and spacious facilities for our children to help nurture their ongoing participation in the libraries' excellent programs and activities.

Connie Menefee, Pacifica, stated that she lives in Park Pacifica, within walking distance of Sanchez Library. She stated that this library will forever inhabit a special place in her heart. She stated that her toddlers loved story time with the wonderful children's librarian, Barbara Amberg. She stated that, as her children have outgrown the little branch, so has the Pacifican community outgrown the quaint notion of retaining two small outdated, overcrowded branch libraries with restricted hours and reduced services. She supports one centralized state of the art library at the wastewater treatment plant site. She stated that the current coastal study by reputable marine engineers concluded that the proposed library site at Beach Blvd. was suitable for development. She resented Councilmember Keener's personal agenda of advocating for managed retreat robs her of her right to vote on the library bond measure. She asked why the happenstance of Councilmember Nihart's recusal give him de facto veto power. She felt that, contrary to his own campaign literature of promising Pacifica voters the opportunity to vote on the library bond issue, by his no vote he will personally responsible for disenfranchising the voters of this community. She asked that he reconsider his vote.

Therese Dyer, Pacifica, stated that Connie Menefee was out of order because, when they come to the podium, they address all councilmembers, not one. She also read in the Pacifica Tribune that our City Manager said that this location was centrally located. She disagreed with her, as well as her Economic Developer, because she went to one of her sessions also. She thought centrally located would be more like in Vallemar, but she was opposed to this location as you cannot depend on Mother Nature and they have a nice library on Terra Nova that serves all the seniors, ample room to expand on the first level or to build up. She stated that it was a disgrace because it was not being kept up by Public Works. She stated that the landscaping was terrible. She felt it was a beautiful library and that was where it should be located. She was for one library but she disregards this location and she will vote no.

Anna Boothe, Pacifica, was glad to see so many people present who care about libraries. She stated that they may be there until midnight as they were the last time they considered it. She was wondering why they were present at all. She stated that, at the last meeting, they failed to give the proper four vote support to the same library measure. She asked why they were hearing the same measure again and giving people a second chance to get it right. She stated that, in her 20 years' experience, they have never considered an agenda item head to head exactly the same. She stated that they were doing it because of a resolution from our mayor

who says, among other things, that this is a necessity. They have been talking about the library for years and she didn't think it was a necessity. She referred to being told that they need four votes in favor and not three and was an item of necessity, and they all still have to vote for it. She didn't think they will do that because, as she has said before, they were taking some real risks as they don't know that the property will be free from sea damage in so many years. She stated that you don't build on risky property. She added that they were risking a lawsuit by a lawyer who is fuming and he will sue the Council in Superior Court and hold this up until past the election as was done on the widening of the highway. She asked why they insist on having another meeting on this and make the city look bad. She stated that this whole thing began as a resolution of the City Manager who does not propose legislation but is a hired employer and is our staff and office manager and they allowed her to propose it and pass it with no notification to the public. She stated, if she knew she was going to propose, she would have gone against it. She stated that this is not a popularity contest but considering whether they have a right to do it or should do it. She stated that it was wrong and she told them not to put this item on the November ballot or they are risking a lawsuit in Superior Court and risking due process.

Eileen Barsi, Pacifica, stated that she has lived in Pacifica since 1970. She was a senior citizen now and enjoy her library more than ever, but often has to wait for the types of things that she likes to read or view. She was aware of how we are in need of an update. She took a moment to be silent, then stating that was what will happen to her as a voter if they do not allow her to raise her voice and speak what she would like to have happen in her city.

Vickie Flores, Pacifica, stated she came as a longtime resident and as a CEO of the Pacifica Chamber of Commerce. She was glad to see so many people present to voice their opinion about the library project and about other items as well, because that was what a democratic society does. It listens and discusses ideas and requests options and goals. It then debates and attempts to compromise and then votes on their decision. She didn't see the democratic process completely taking place here. She was specifically talking about taking the community right to vote on the library project away based solely on one person's personal decision and agenda. She stated that sounds more like a dictatorship. She asked if this was what Pacifica has to look forward to. She personally would like to know what each Councilmember's description of managed retreat is and if they believe that this is a solution for Pacifica, specifically the areas west of highway 1. Per the Coastal Commission description, managed retreat means do nothing and basically let Mother Nature takes its course and we would not build a new library, not improve Palmetto Avenue, do not repair Beach Blvd., do not build in the quarry and do not widen Highway 1, with no discussion, no vote, just simply do nothing. If any family homes or apartments are in danger of falling into the ocean, so be it, as they will not get any support. She stated that she lives off of Palmetto so she assumes it includes her and her family. She stated that this reminds her of a saying people use when they don't care about others, "as long as it's not in my backyard." She stated that, if there is a Councilmember who believes and supports this description for Pacifica, don't hide behind closed doors but stand up and say so. She will then say to that Councilmember that, "you have outlived your usefulness to this city. If you don't believe in supporting us, then we no longer support you." She stated that, as the CEO of the Chamber of Commerce, she stated managed retreat means no support for all the businesses in the city such as Nick's Restaurant which has been a stable of this community for almost 89 years, and mentioning many more and concluding that they no longer support them.

Celeste Chernicky, Pacifica, stated that she has lived in Park Pacifica for 40 years. She stated that it was good to be back and talk about putting the library bond issue on the ballot in November. She stated previously that she lives in the Sanchez Library but she has to drive five

minutes to get there, not open 40% of the time she would like to go there and the chance is less than 50% of the time that the books she wants will be there because it has a limited collection because it is a small library. She felt it was time to consolidate our resources and build a bigger and better library. She stated that we need a modern new facility that has space for our children and adults to work in, places for programs and groups to meet, etc., open and staffed seven days a week. She stated that we need to take the money from the San Mateo County Library system and funnel it into one facility instead of dividing the money between two inadequate facilities. She urged Council to vote yes to put the bond issue on the ballot in November. She stated that, if they have any doubts about this issue, let the people decide.

Fran Quartini, Pacifica, stated that she has lived in Pacifica about 40 years, an elementary school teacher for 20 years. She stated that we have a great school system and we deserve a 21st century library to match educational needs. She stated that libraries help build knowledge, inform, offer a safe, quiet refuge for teens and everyone to study, think, mingle. She stated that the new library will offer spaces for all these things plus a dedicated place for our teens to meet which we don't have now. She lives near the Sanchez Library and she agreed with what Celeste Chernicky said, often going there and not finding what she needs. She was willing to sacrifice her local and limited library for the common good of the whole community to have one great library with all the resources with personnel all in one place. She stated it was not just for students, but everyone. She asked that they consider passing this.

Linda Jonas, Pacifica, stated that she has been living and working in Pacifica for almost 41 years. She was on the Library Foundation board and worked hard with other wonderful people to come to this point. She states that her kids and grandkids live at the north end of town and she thinks they will be happy with the new central library. Her main point is that she has been a very active community person, working on lots of different good causes. She felt she has earned the right to have a say whether this goes to a bond measure or not. She was asking that they vote yes to put the bond measure on the ballot in November.

Laverne Villalobis, Pacifica, stated that she was a parent of four teenagers and a Pacifica School Board member. She stated that ten years ago she was a parent volunteer in the library at Ortega School. She loved it so much that she decided to go back to school and get her certificate in library technology. She saw the love of books, the development of the library and saw the negatives. She stated that, when her children had a book report due, she would go to Sanchez Library and they didn't have the resources needed for them to do the report. They would have to change the information they were going to use. They would go to Sharp Park and then she would take them to a San Francisco Public Library or Redwood City. She sees a need for one central, updated, modernized library where the resources can be available to make a computer lab with 21st century technology. She asked the Council to let the people of Pacifica decide and give them the opportunity to vote in November for the new library.

Toni Boykin, Pacifica, stated that, as a Park Pacifica resident, she was concerned that there has not been financial evaluation of the other possibilities. She stated that it was mentioned earlier that there has been no study of what it would have cost to look at the other lot by the Thai restaurant. She was concerned about Park Pacifica being left without the facility. She stated that there was a whole school of students, seniors and so little public transportation that it would very much limit. She stated that, in the arguments, there is an assumption that everyone drives. She stated that her main objection was that, she wants to vote, but she doesn't want this to be the only option for libraries in Pacifica.

Wayne Lorentz, Pacifica, stated that he has lived in Pacifica since 1992. He realized that the board has a responsibility to the people to act in a responsible manner and take a hard look at what business is conducted and foremost reason for Council is to get business done. He was for a library. He understood why people question the location. He stated that, if there is a no vote, he will volunteer to shorten up the process to get this ball rolling. He stated that, if a better location could be found, he was all for that. He felt the business should be conducted quickly as he was all for the new library.

Jerry Crow, Pacifica, stated that he lives in Linda Mar. He was concerned that they have access to the most accurate data when discussing the issue of sea level rise, an important variable in considerations. He stated that the data was readily available on the internet. He gave an example of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administrations website which relies on satellite data. They report an average of .11 inches per year of sea level rise over the last 20 years. He stated that nine years gives you an inch of sea level rise at the existing trend. He stated that the University of Colorado publishes a figure of .13 inches per year which translates to an inch every eight years. He stated that National Geographic reports .14 inches per year, and that was equivalent to one inch ever seven years. He stated that these figures are significantly less than some of the projections we have heard from other learned sources, and he hopes we base our decisions on the most accurate direct access to good data.

Juanita Mercado, Pacifica, stated that she was a graduate with a bachelor's in geology. She stated that the discussion on sea level rise rubs her the wrong way. She explained that this issue we are discussing today requires a very deep analysis and a very deep understanding of the data at which you are looking. She stated that she has read the reports downloaded from Google search. She stated that, in our area, there were two bodies of water, the Pacific Ocean which defines our coastline and the San Francisco Bay that defines a different parameter, as far as sea level rise because the geology is different, the land form is different and the behavior of water is going to be different. When she read those two reports, one mentioned earlier and by Scripps Institute, she noticed that any discussion on sea level rise that creates flooding was focused on the San Francisco Bay. She stated that, if you look at that area, it stands to reason because it was an enclosed area and there was a lot of low lying areas around it. She asked if we see that kind of behavior, by observation, on the coast when we have bluffs that are 10-20 feet high. She stated that the issue on the coast was not flooding due to sea level rise but rather is bluff erosion which we have given some consideration but not enough. She stated that the engineering solution to handle bluff erosion is going to be way different than handling flooding. She hope they give this strong consideration. She stated this was why we need a library and she was all for it.

Bridget Duffy, Pacifica, reiterated what she sees happening. She stated that there was something passed around to try to get enough votes to get this put on the ballot. They did not get enough votes, but that wasn't good enough. The City Manager had to vote on it. They got 3/4 but you have to have 4 to get this on the ballot, and cannot have just three. So, even though the first thing failed and the second thing failed, they were here again. She asked who owns property on Palmetto, as she felt it was all about money and being turned into a divisive issue, like a football game. We have two libraries and no one is against the library. She stated that this was a loan that was going to cost the people of Pacifica \$60-\$75 million. She stated that we have two perfectly good libraries, and people who need housing, a huge crisis in sea level rise which, whether you believe it or not, is happening. She stated that this property was not going to last long. She felt this was something that everyone working in the city needs to face up to the idea that they might have to come out of the closet and point the finger to whomever is manipulating our governmental system, tax dollars, for personal benefit. She did

an exit survey to any brave soul who wants to do a no vote. She stated she couldn't find anyone who actually uses the library and everyone lives in this area and, when she asked them if they are afraid. She stated that this is being called a retreat from Sharp Park. She asked who said that, if we don't put \$30 million in a tsunami zone that is going to be an abandonment of Sharp Park. It is not an abandonment. Sharp Park is the best part of Pacifica as far as she is concerned and we need to rethink how we make money from it.

Robine Runneals, Pacifica, stated she was a 40 year resident of West Sharp Park. She lives 200 yards off of the east gate of the old sewer plant site. She asked that people who support the library as she does and believe it should be put on the ballot stand up so Council can see. She asked that, for the sake of her neighbors and businesses and those with a long investment in working to put together sound projects, etc., to get something done in the neighborhood, Council give everyone an opportunity to vote on it. She stated that, as mentioned by an earlier speaker, it was not whether it was going to be the library or not, or whether they have the confidence that this is the area where they are going to see the projects go on in the future. She stated that it means a lot to those who live within a block or two of the beach. She stated that the people who live there would like to see the neighborhood saved and see the projects and other things happen in the neighborhood that bring people down and for businesses to succeed. She asked they also invest in Fog Fest by putting it on the ballot and give Pacificans the opportunity to vote on it. She stated that, if anyone doesn't vote on this, she would like to hear the specific reasons outlined and explained to her and those who live and work in the neighborhood why.

Jeanne Bellinger, Pacifica, stated that she was a 7th/8th grade teacher at Ocean Shore School. She stated that sometimes people are a little bit unrealistic with their expectations and with what they think they understand when they read something on the internet. She stated that, when she listened to the Coastal Commission report and engineers come up and say it is a safe place to build a library, she tends to trust them, but she isn't a conspiracy theorist, just a well educated Pacifican. She appreciated the Councilmembers' hard work. She cannot imagine why they do what they do, but she thanks them for it, adding better them than her. She respectfully asked them to vote to put it on the ballot. She stated that this debate wasn't whether or not this is a good idea for Pacifica. She supports the new library and she will vote yes on the bond, but the vote is to put the measure on the ballot so Pacificans can argue, fight, etc., between now and election day because we deserve the right to make the decision for ourselves. She asked that the Council allow the democratic process to proceed and vote to put it on the ballot in November.

Dan Stegink, Pacifica, stated that he didn't think anyone who lives on Beach Blvd. thinks they are adequately protected. He stated that they have a \$20 million quote to replace the retaining wall, an \$8 million quote to replace the pier. He stated that, in the analysis of all the pier costs, that \$8 million was extremely low, stating that Redondo Beach's pier is going to be \$250 million. He stated that no one has bid on the \$20 million to replace the retaining wall. He stated that, if they are able to postulate that the retaining sea wall is going to cost \$28 million to replace and the pier is going to cost \$25 million to replace, they would breach the \$53 million cap required for state of California emergency funds from single day events. He stated that the consultant from Walnut Creek had stated that the average was 5.8 feet, but we have had this year alone we have 29-foot waves coming on. He thought the City Attorney might have made a mistake, and he think a bigger mistake that was made was the presentation that passing this bond measure could still preserve the Sanchez Library. He thought that was an inaccuracy that probably should be corrected. He was now going to talk about what we should do if the library bond does not pass at the end of November. He would like to see a smaller bond, \$10 or \$15

million at a safer place if it doesn't pass and something that saves the Sanchez Library. He stated that there are a lot of seniors, and 65% on the poll thinks this hurts seniors and 67% of Linda Mar residents near Sanchez think this is a bad idea and 71% think coastal erosion is the most important topic, 72% said no one else in their family had used the library in the last year. He stated that the City Manager has a perfect record on library bonds, in 2000, it didn't pass. Measure R in 2005 didn't pass. Proposition 81 in 2006 didn't pass. Three out of three library bonds by this City Manager in Walnut Creek didn't pass. He stated that, if it doesn't pass in November, let's make the size of the bond smaller, move it in, get a consensus. He stated that everyone in the room loves libraries and no one would put up with this ridiculousness if they did not. He stated that, if the bond does not pass at the end of November, make a smaller bond in a different location and see if we can get a new library and keep Sanchez open.

Chris Fogel, Pacifica, stated that he lives in the lower Linda Mar area. He came to talk about this library issue with respect. He stated that they have heard a lot of strong opinions, adding that he has strong opinions as well. As he gets older, he has learned that often the opinion he holds is wrong. He stated that, in a measure as important as this, he can't pretend he knows what is right, and he thinks it is appropriate that this item go forward and be placed on the ballot so that 15,000 opinions can be tabulated. He stated that, whatever our opinions might be, we may be surprised to find out that whatever opinion we hold might be wrong. He thought it was time for the city and Council to have had their discussion about the merits of this project. During the last 10-15 years when it came up during numerous Council study sessions, goal setting meetings, etc., all these concerns should have been brought up at that time. He stated that at this time now, it was transitioning from our city government to we the people and he urged that they allow Pacificans to vote on it. He felt that, if they were worried about a not vote discouraging the Library Foundation, they know what they are doing and have worked on this project very hard for a number of years and they are willing to take this risk. He asked, if they shut it down and not allow the project to go forward to a vote, how that will affect people and what their willingness would be to engage with the city going forward if they know they can work had on a project and have it shut down at the last minute.

Robert Beckmeyer, Pacifica, stated that he has lived in Pacifica his entire life and will be turning 18 this August and will be casting his first ballot in November. He stated that the ballot holds a very special place in their family, not only numerous debates but the running of both Donald Trump and Bernie Sanders but it should be the end of a certain bond campaign that he has been a witness to since almost before he can remember. He recalls several school projects in that time that would have benefitted greatly from the resources a modern library could have provided, and the thought that Pacifica will be denied even a vote on the subject of that thought he finds hard to stomach. He stated that Terra Nova High School is quite a lot like Pacifica, with the school having several kids' friends groups, football players, band kids, theater kids, with different opinions about the school and you can find people from every group in the school's library, just as you can find people from every political group of Pacifica in the Pacifica community libraries. He stated his point was that libraries bring together communities of all kinds and it would be ashamed to deny Pacifica even a vote to build a new one. He felt that the next step in building of a new library, a central building in any community, should be left to a vote of the whole city of Pacifica and not be blocked by a vote of a small handful of Pacificans. He was looking forward to his first ballot in November in voting for the new library, adding that he is not alone in this. He concluded that they let the people vote.

John Beckmeyer, Pacifica, stated that there was nothing left to say. He lived in the Linda Mar section of Pacifica. He stated that he has lived here 20+ years and he showed the library card he carries, the Mountain View library card, because Pacifica's libraries are small and cramped,

noisy, collections are thin, and he never knows when they are open. He stated that they are very sad places. He stated that there is a well reviewed plan for a building that is spacious and well lit and provides for different activities such that they don't impinge on each other, and a space that would allow the current collections to be consolidated and more richly maintained, as well as adequately staffed and consistently available, a place that is not pathetic. He stated that, if they say libraries are dead, he challenge them to stand in front of the Millbrae or Mountain View library and watch the constant stream of people going in and out of those libraries. He stated that, if they say sea level will rise and wipe out the library, the science that predicts the sea level rise is the same science that has been used to evaluate the projects. He stated that the libraries will be here for his kids and their kids and he didn't think we needed to shrivel up and die as a town and community while we await the next 100 years. He stated that, if they say it is not fair that it will be in the north end of the town, he tells them that's a tragedy or geography, but we can't afford two libraries. He asked them to look at the libraries and tell him they are a success, adding that if you measure success by the tenacity land scrappiness of staff, they are, but the structures are hardly more than civil defense shelters pretending to be libraries. He states that close to two-thirds of voters want a new library. He stated that they can pick part surveys all day but it is hardest to keep the big picture in mind by arising above the fray and doing great things. He stated that Pacifica has doubled in population since 1960s and sentimentality aside, the library in Linda Mar Valley, built in the 1980s was hardly a solution then and certainly not now. He stated that our city needs a proper library. He suggested we get rid of the eyesore of the delapidated sewage treatment plant and put something in its place that can serve as a catalyst for economic development of our downtown area. He encouraged them to favorably receive the proposal and place the bond measure on the November ballot to vote on it. He asked that Council give us a shot at a great library for generations to come.

Pamela Wiston Charbonneau, Pacifica, stated that she has had a business in town for almost 20 years. She voted for most of the Council to be forward thinkers, and she was hoping they think forward and put the library on the ballot. She felt it was important, not only to her but her children and their children. She stated that we need a new library and it was time for state of the art and for Pacifica to grow which is knowledge. She hoped they rethink the situation about putting it on the ballot for the library because it was so important. She was surprised that it didn't pass to be on the ballot in the first place, adding that she wasn't sure what happened. She was in support of the new library wherever it may be and she hoped they were forward thinkers and we need a new library.

Anne DeJarnatt, Pacifica, thanked Council for this exercise in civil liberty which was taking a lot of time. She stated that she was asked by a member of the Library Foundation to read an address as she could not be present. She read the letter from Trish Moran Showl, from North Linda Mar, which mentioned her ardent support for a new Pacifica library. She read a quote from James Freeman Clark, " a politician thinks of the next election, a statesman of the next generation." She hoped all Councilmembers take the viewpoint of a statesman as we have wasted a generation trying to bring a modern cornerstone of democracy to our beautiful and deserving community. She urged Councilmembers to do the right think for this and future generations and put this matter before Pacifican voters in November.

Thom Ball, Pacifica, stated that he was a 15 year resident and homeowner in Pacifica, living in Pacific Manor. He stated that he was an employee of the San Mateo County Library and from 2005 to 2014, he was the manager of the Pacifica libraries. He was both professionally and personally in favor of a 21st century library in Pacifica but he was speaking as a private citizen. He stated that, as a librarian, seeing this many people talking about libraries at this hour of night, he can't tell them what it does. He stated that all Pacificans agree that Pacifica is a

special place, a creative nexus, an environmental gem, blessed with a high performing school system and infused with the spirit of volunteerism which speaks directly to the character of our residents and their commitment to engage with their community and helping those in need when times get tough. He felt a strong public library dedicated to bridging divides and promoting educated participation in the Democratic process that is housed in a facility fully capable of meeting the needs of the population is an essential part of maintaining our civic character and spirit and benefits everyone in ways that are particular to the individual and the community. He stated that the bond measure is 17 years in the making by hundreds of volunteers and thousands of hours of dedication to the idea and reality of a modern public library in Pacifica, and he thought two-thirds of the voters believe that a modern 21st century library in Pacifica, not in Millbrae or anyplace else and will be willing to invest in their own community and its future by sharing in the cost of constructing a modern facility, adding that we won't know that unless we get a chance to vote on it and he respectfully asks Council to put this issue before the voters of Pacifica to determine our own future as our right and obligation.

Ellen Ron, Pacifica, stated she is the president of the Pacifica Library Foundation. She explained that, for over 13 years, they have been advocating for one modern library for Pacifica. She stated in 6 1/2 years of doing outreach for the PLF, the questions asked the most concern the cost, the site and Sanchez Library. She stated that she was start with the cost, mentioning that \$33.5 million is a huge number, but she asked what that means for homeowners and property owners. They will pay \$23 for every \$100,000 of assessed value, such as if your home is assessed at \$100,000, you will pay \$23 a year, less than \$2 a month. If assessed at \$1 million, you will pay \$230 a year. She stated that the average home in town has an assessed value around \$400,000 which is \$93 a year or under \$8 a month. She then mentioned Sanchez, stating that, with two libraries, we will have limited open hours and small collections. She stated that one central library means having a building open seven days a week for a total of 60 hours of access with many more items to choose from and much more space for what Pacificans want in their library. She stated that, when the library opens, the Sharp Park and Sanchez sites will be sold and the money will go toward the new library. She hears people speak of their fondness for Sanchez Library, and she acknowledged that it was in a really pretty location but what really matters is what is inside a library, and it has no program space, no teen or children's rooms, no quiet reading or study areas, no enclosed meeting space, etc. She stated that the building has eight computers, six tables and four chairs where you can relax and read and only open four days a week. Most patrons drive there. She acknowledged that it was convenient for those in the back of the Valley but for them to get to the Wednesday Farmer's Market or a drug store, etc., they have to come to Highway 1 and flow north, and it didn't seem that closing Sanchez will prevent them from coming to a centrally located library. She stated that there were ways to provide library access and services to the non-driving seniors and disabled who live in the back of the valley or across from the community center or in the Good Shepherd complex. She asked that they don't let all their hard work for a modern library go to waste and put the library on the November ballot.

Ashley Larsen, Pacifica, stated she was a librarian in Pacifica but was speaking as a private citizen. She thanked them for attending this extra meeting and considering giving the people of Pacifica a chance to make up their own minds in November. She acknowledged that the new library was an issue that both sides feel very passionate about. She felt that the only way to know the answer to the question of whether Pacifica wants a new library was to put it to a vote. Once it is on the ballot, they will have three months to do research on this carefully chosen location vetted by a team of extremely dedicated people for 17 years. She understood that some peopel think we are better off with two libraries, but we don't have two libraries, but two half libraries, each with half the hours and stuff and less than half the space, books, movies and

computers we need. Also, having two library locations leads to confusion. She stated that almost who regularly uses the libraries has had the experience of going to Sharp Park only to discover that the book they ordered or program they were planning to attend were at Sanchez or vice versa and while you think they don't like driving to one, they don't like having to drive to two. She mentions some of the reasons given for not needing a library, but she stated that they are using the libraries and they are packed. She mentioned that they have volunteers who deliver books to homebound seniors and they regularly go to visit the senior center, local schools and day cares. She stated that, if they weren't stretched between two locations, they would be able to expand those services to those who are unable to get to any library. She knows the Pacifica Library Foundation was eager to pursue other transportation option to get to the new library and easier to change the schedule to get to one central library than to get to two libraries, one remote and both only open half the week. She wished there were a team of citizens as dedicated and organized as those on the Library Foundation to make it happen but they can't wait for the teams to appear before they act on this opportunity. She didn't want to wait another 17 years for a new library for her kids.

Brent Ritz, Pacifica, stated that he likes to deal with facts vs hallucinations. He stated that they had the most noted expert in the area who testified that we have a retaining wall on Beach Blvd., not a sea wall. He stated that he lives there and everyone knows we don't have enough revetment. He stated that the picture taken for the city were taken off his deck and he sees it every day. He stated that it is a simple problem. He stated he will take his chance if the sea water is going to rise. He stated that anyone who feels unsafe, there is an emergency exit and they can do a managed retreat if it is unsafe. He stated that he has talked to many citizens and not a single one does not want it on the ballot.

Ron Maykel, Pacifica, stated that he supports a new library or any new building in Pacifica. He supports developing this site as this property makes this neighborhood look like an industrial ghetto, but he didn't support a library on this location. He believes that the empty lot between the Thai restaurant and the new Pacifica Historical Museum would be a great location, higher elevation, two story building, underground parking and it would be a great municipal center with City Hall also. He thought it would have been nice with options on the ballot so they could not just choose on all the bond money but choose on a location.

Sue Vaterlaus, Pacifica, referred to Ron Maykel saying that the site by the Thai restaurant would work, but he was talking about one story. She felt it would never work because it is not large enough. She stated that this is a large site and part of the downtown we have worked for years to develop. She referred to the saying that a great community deserves a great library. Our community was Pacifica, not Linda Mar, etc. she stated that she lives in the north end and has never had a library. She felt a 21st century central library is perfect for Pacifica. She thanked Council for voting on this to let the people vote.

Laurie Frater, Pacifica, stated that there were two parts to his comment. He stated that, until about a dozen years ago, he thought of libraries like he grew up. He stated that he had an interview in Walnut Creek and he was told to meet him at the library because he booked a room. He was amazed at the facility and he has considered our libraries and felt we needed a new updated library. He encouraged anyone inclined to vote no to look at some of the other libraries around because there was a world of difference. He stated that the main point was that everything else to be built will be on Beach Blvd with the library behind it on Palmetto. He stated that, if you have a developer who will be spending more than \$30 million building on the sea front why can't we put something behind it and have a new modern library as part of it. He

didn't see the argument about the sea level rise as everything is a risk, as putting it on the ballot. He asked them to allow democracy to function and let us vote on it.

Paula Teixeira, Pacifica, stated that she has worked at both Pacifica branches for the past ten years, but she was present as a Pacifica resident. She stated that she lives on Terra Nova Blvd., within walking distance of the Sanchez Library and she was 100% in favor of the library bond and she asked that they move forward to put this on the ballot in November. She hears people saying they aren't going to the libraries anymore. She gave some statistics, as of May, 86,975 people came to Sharp Park Library and 55,135 visited Sanchez. She stated that they are used and, if we build a new modern library, more will come. She stated that we need one library open seven days a week for all of Pacifica and Pacificans should vote on this. She asked them not to obstruct democracy.

Tony Sladeh, Pacifica, stated that he has a different point. He didn't understand why four votes are required for this. He stated that it seems that the member recused is automatically counted as a no, and he understood in an absentee situation, that they count the total councilmembers but a recused situation may not be the same. He stated that he would like clarification on this. He stated that two-thirds majority of four people should be three votes and he asked why they automatically count her as a no instead of removing her from the voting process.

Sue Beckmeyer, Pacifica, thanked Council and staff for their support of this project. She stated that they have now arrived at a critical juncture, the same juncture as on the 11th. She stated that after years of advocacy, planning and focused work on the part of many volunteers and staff, they have before them the decision of whether to place a measure on the November ballot to issue general obligation bonds to build a new library. She urged them to vote yes to affirm the work that began 17 years ago and give Pacificans a chance to let them know that they want a new library for Pacifica. She stated that those present are prepared to launch a focused dedicated campaign to reach the required two-thirds majority. She asked that they vote to place the library bond on the November ballot which is good for our kids and our community. She asked that they give the people the right to vote on it.

Eric Ruchames, Pacifica, stated that it has been a long passionate night. He stated that five years ago, the Council voted to put the library on this site and that was what they were looking at. He stated that they have complied thousands of hours of work with consultants, staff, community, meetings and that was in front of them, a new library on this site and only one library in this town. He stated that Councils before that time and since have voted and signed off on that and it has been studied sufficiently. He stated that there will always be naysayers. He stated that the oddity of California politics is that we need two-thirds vote for the bond and the reality was that they have polled over 60% support and that is gigantic majority and, if that was what they needed, they would be holding this meeting in the community room of a new library but they have the oddity of needing two-thirds and now they discover that they don't need two-thirds of Council but a unanimous Council to move this forward. He stated that he has not spoken to Councilmember Keener but he suspect that he was as surprised as any of them to find out that his no vote could sink the whole project after the last meeting. He thought that, if he had known that ahead of time, that would not have been the vote. He had his reservations, which are fine but he did not think his intent was to sink the project. He stated that, if they are talking about numbers, they can see the turnout of the constituency who want the opportunity to vote on this project. He stated that leadership is about bringing the community forward not finding reasons not to do things, but finding ways to make things happen. He felt this was a great community with great people, and he felt they could challenge the national trend of calling

each other names and making up facts to support our positions, but work together and build a new library that we will all be proud of and he would like to see us move forward with a unanimous vote to support and put the library on the ballot with a unanimous Council make that happen in November.

Mayor Digre closed public comments.

Councilmember Ervin moved to adopt a motion to reconsider the Council's July 11, 2016 decision regarding the resolution determining that the public interest and necessity demand, construction of a new public library and its financing through issuance of general obligation bonds and, if approved, by majority vote, take one of the following actions; seconded by Mayor pro Tem O'Neill.

Councilmember Keener stated that he has gotten a few emails on this topic. He stated that all the emails have been polite on both sides and they have raised issues and made him think even more about this decision. He stated that he can skip over a lot of what he was going to say because it has all been said. He had planned to talk briefly about how he got here and why he voted no the previous Monday but he will skip that. He stated a fair number have an email from him on why he voted no. He stated that over the last two days, he has changed his mind about the library bond measure, basically what a lot of them have said, which was let the people vote this year. He will be voting for the resolution of necessity and other necessary measures at the next meeting to put the library bond on the ballot this fall. He stated that on November 8, he will join those voters who would like a new library but think that the risk of flooding and sea level rise is too great for the Beach Blvd. location. He will vote yes tonight to put it on the ballot, he will vote no in November.

Mayor pro Tem O'Neill stated that one gentleman was unclear as to why we were here tonight and how we got to this part, and he requested that we go over that.

City Attorney Kenyon stated that, as she stated earlier, because at the July 11 meeting, the Council I took a vote on this same resolution and the vote came out 3-1 with 1 abstention. She stated that the resolution required a four vote of the Council as it requires a two-third vote of the entire Council, not just the Council present at the meeting. She stated that, upon learning that, she was in discussion with the City Manager as to whether or not a special meeting could be called to reconsider the resolution. They determined that it could be held, and the City Manager was in consultation with the mayor to determine that the mayor did want a special meeting to be called, the City Manager agendized it, and put on the agenda the motion to reconsider the resolution which they voted on in the past and the Council has the authority and legal ability at this time to vote on the resolution that was before them on July 11 and is now before them again at this time.

Councilmember Ervin stated that she was thrilled to hear what Councilmember Keener just said and would like to thank him for being open-minded. She understood that this has not been an easy week, but she would like to think every single one of them who was in the audience, both pro and con, is exactly what democracy is all about, to be here, speak and be heard and to listen and debate. She stated that we are never going to agree on everything but have this vote go to the will of the people. She knows all the many hours of work that have gone into this for 17 years of planning. The site has been approved by Council and was something that could be

so wonderful. She commended the city staff and the Library Foundation and Friends of the Library, the JPA, as well as the county for doing due diligence over the many years exploring all the various sites and facilities, including this site, and providing a clear and concise report at this meeting to alleviate potential concerns that people may have and they have something that people can go to openly explore what we are looking at and be data driven in their decision making and think about what they are asking for and the consequences. She stated that they have a lot of information, and she commended everyone. This was a wonderful experience for her personally and hopefully for the community and she was ready to vote.

Mayor Digre stated that she made a couple of comments at the July 11 meeting which she would like to reiterate in a short form. She asked the Library Foundation and supporters to be open-minded about the sea level rise issue and she definitely was always in favor of a public vote and appreciated them for speaking up. She stated that, for those concerned about the Sanchez Library, she noted that she lived in Burlingame with the same JPA situation and the Burlingame residences found a way of saving their smaller library and she was willing to commit herself to help in anyway, but that will not bother any other entity. She stated that, on going over the notes of the July 11 meeting and attending the County sea level rise meeting on the 20th at the next steps group and from there she would like Council to consider something that was not earth shaking but she would like them to consider it and she asked the City Attorney if it was okay. She asked the Council to consider including another finding in the resolution that would require the city to consider the impact of sea level rising in any required mitigation measures during the design phase. She stated that she could not send this to the Council because of the Brown Act and it has to be done in front of them.

Councilmember Ervin imagined that these modifications are being considered at all times during the design and was part of the design currently that sea level rise issues would potentially go into consideration in their design. They would look at the site and evaluate and create the design based on what was appropriate for that site.

City Manager Tinfof stated that, up to now, there has not been a discussion of designing the library to accommodate sea level rise explicitly. They cannot predict what will come out of the conversations with the architect. She stated that it would not surprise her if this is an issue they will raise, but it has not been raised up until now. She stated that it was possible it could add some cost to the library, but she could not say for sure at this time. She stated that, if they wanted a recommendation, she thought it would be a fine addition to the resolution and would make sense to consider the full impact of the site as they move forward to design the library.

Mayor Digre asked if there were any other comments as she did not want to risk a no vote and she would pull it if someone has a hard time with this and does not want to do it.

Councilmember Keener stated that, on one hand it seems like a laudable effort to insert this language as one more whereas in the resolution.

City Attorney Kenyon would recommend that they make it a new section 4 and resolves and renumber the remainder, coming right after section 3 and they would make a new section 4 that would read substantially in the form described by the major.

Councilmember Keener assumed that it would be on the resolution, not the ordinance.

City Attorney Kenyon responded affirmatively.

Councilmember Keener stated that his personal feeling was that the site has risk of sea level rise and flooding over the next 60 years or so. They didn't know when it will come, how much it will be but they know it will come eventually. He stated that this may give them false security, but if it was incorporated into the resolution, he was going to vote for the resolution.

Mayor Digre stated that she had a couple of questions, stating that she didn't want to hamper getting the vote on the ballot.

Mayor pro Tem O'Neill stated that he understood where she was coming from, and he thought sea level rise is going to happen, but he also thought that the professionals know that this is happening and it is going to be incorporated. When they build a building in downtown San Francisco, they dig deep enough to the point and they find old ships and they accommodate that because it was an onsite change order to do that. He stated that, when they were remodeling the schools, they ran across change orders, and he thought this was just a change order that will be a part of the project from the beginning of the design phase.

Mayor Digre concluded that they don't need an addition.

Mayor pro Tem O'Neill stated that he didn't feel they needed an addition because at that point they are micromanaging the project. He stated that a lot of people think he isn't qualified for a lot of things, but he knows he is not a civil engineer or a construction person, and he would prefer not to have that in there and he thinks they have enough data and staff will communicate the concerns of Council as they move forward with the resolution as stated.

Mayor Digre stated that her main reason was that she was anxious for Pacifica to move forward on sea level rise issues, and she didn't need to use this forum for that. She will withdraw that.

Mayor pro Tem O'Neill asked the City Attorney if he needs to read the entire resolution.

City Attorney Kenyon responded affirmatively.

Mayor pro Tem O'Neill moved to adopt a resolution of the City Council of the City of Pacifica, California, determining that the public interest and necessity demand the construction of a new public library and its financing through the issuance of general obligation bonds; seconded by Councilmember Ervin.

4-0

RESULT:	ADOPTED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER:	Karen Ervin, Councilmember
SECONDER:	Mike O'Neill, Mayor Pro Tem
AYES:	Digre, O'Neill, Ervin, Keener
ABSENT:	Nihart

ADJOURN

Mayor Digre thanked everyone for their time and patience and adjourned the meeting at 10:30 p.m.

Transcribed by Barbara Medina, Public Meeting Stenographer.

Respectfully submitted,

Kathy O'Connell, City Clerk

APPROVED: 5-0; 8/8/16

Sue Digre, Mayor