

## Meeting Summary

### City of Pacifica Sea Level Rise Community Work Group Meeting #1

Tuesday, January 23, 2018

6:00 to 8:00 p.m.

Pacifica City Council Chambers  
2212 Beach Blvd., 2nd Floor, Pacifica, CA 94044

#### Welcome, Introductions and Agenda Review

Kevin Woodhouse, Pacifica City Manager, opened the meeting by thanking community work group (CWG) members for participating and recognized the importance of their feedback throughout the City's Local Coastal Plan (LCP) Update process.

Ben Gettleman, facilitator, welcomed CWG members and lead introductions. He continued by reviewing the meeting's objectives and agenda, and discussing meeting ground rules including how members of the public could participate and provide comments. Ben then invited clarifying questions from CWG members. A summary of this discussion is listed below:

- Comment (C): There are concerns within the community about the transparency of Pacifica's LCP Update process, including how CWG members were selected and the availability of information shared and developed throughout this process.
  - Response (R): This meeting is being filmed and recorded. A meeting summary will be developed and shared, and the presentation and all handouts will be posted to the City's website. Hopefully these steps address any concerns about transparency.
- Question (Q): How will comments be gathered and presented back to public?
  - R: Comment forms are available to CWG members and members of the public to provide written comments. Comments can be sent via email to Bonny O'Connor ([sealevelrise@ci.pacifica.ca.us](mailto:sealevelrise@ci.pacifica.ca.us)), City of Pacifica, throughout the LCP planning process. We are still working on determining how comments will be summarized and shared back with the public.
- Q: What is the CWG's role in LCP Update process? Are we commenting on draft documents? Will we have homework assignments?
  - R: CWG members are encouraged to provide comments on the draft Vulnerability Assessment and other draft documents, and to serve as project ambassadors by sharing information with and gathering input from the constituencies they represent.

CWG members then participated in an ice-breaker exercise in which CWG members were asked to share their favorite places or activities along Pacifica's coast and their biggest concern related to sea level rise (SLR) in Pacifica. Common themes expressed by CWG members included:

- Recreational opportunities, such as hiking, surfing, biking, kayaking, golfing, dog walking
- Protecting open spaces, vistas, and views
- Concerns around:

- Competing interests among residents
- The need to make hard decisions in the short-term in order to address long-term, sustainable needs for future generations
- Impacts on property values
- Long-term impacts to the economic engines of the City and other assets

### **Local Coastal Plan Background**

Tina Wehrmeister, City of Pacifica, provided an overview of LCPs which are utilized to inform policies that guide development within coastal zones. These policies are developed under the context of the Coastal Act, which also entitles permit authority to the Coastal Commission in coastal zones. The Coastal Act requires that a city or county submit its LCP to the Coastal Commission for approval of adoption. Once an LCP is adopted, the Coastal Commission transfers permitting authority of coastal zones to the city or county while the Coastal Commission retains permanent coastal permit jurisdiction over tidelands, submerged lands, and public trust lands.

Tina continued by reviewing the current status of Pacifica’s LCP. The City has prepared a Draft LCP Update to its existing LCP, which was adopted in 1980. The Draft Update has not been approved by the City nor does it currently consider impacts from SLR or include comprehensive SLR adaptation policies. As such, the City is developing an SLR Adaptation Plan, which will be incorporated into the Draft LCP Update and bring the document into compliance with the Coastal Commission’s policy directives for LCP certification. The Adaptation Plan will identify potential vulnerabilities within Pacifica resulting from SLR, coastal erosion, flooding and severe storms, and also identify options available to help prepare for future climate change impacts. Community benefits of the LCP Update process include:

- Bolster efficacy of public safety efforts
- Help respond to climate change
- Preserve housing and enhance environmental justice
- Promote local economic vitality
- Preserve and enhance coastal access

Tina then invited questions and comments from CWG members. A summary of this discussion is included below.

- Q: What is meant by “enhance environmental justice”?
  - R: The City and its consultants are paying close attention to SLR’s impacts on vulnerable communities, especially residents who are low-income or seniors and may not have the opportunity to fully participate in the LCP process.
- Q: Is the draft LCP developed in 2014 available to the public?
  - R: Yes, it is available on the City’s website (found [here](#)).
- Q: What was the process for the City applying for and receiving a grant from the Coastal Commission for the LCP Update?
  - R: The Coastal Commission issued a request for applications. In response, the City submitted a City Council-approved application, which was approved by the Coastal Commission and resulted in the grant being issued. A link to the application can be found [here](#). The final grant award can be found [here](#).

## Sea Level Rise & Adaptation Planning Process

James Jackson, Environmental Science Associates (ESA), reviewed the Coastal Commission's process guidance for sea level rise and adaptation planning and noted the City's progress to date. After having identified SLR projections and potential impacts, the City is currently assessing risks to coastal resources and infrastructure. Once the City has completed this assessment, it will reference the following potential adaptation measures to develop an adaptation plan to address the risks.

- Accommodate: establishing siting and design standards; retrofitting existing structures; and stormwater management.
- Protect: developing hard protection (i.e. sea walls) and/or soft protection and soft shorelines and establishing and protecting agricultural barriers as a means of flood protection.
- Retreat: limiting new development in hazardous areas and areas adjacent to wetlands, environmentally sensitive habitat areas, and other habitats; removing vulnerable developments; and promoting preservation and conservation of open space.
- Hybrid: accommodating existing developments over the short-term and relocation of them over the long-term; updating land use designations and zoning ordinances; and instituting redevelopment restrictions and permit conditions.

Once an adaptation measure and/or LCP policy option has been identified, proposed updates to the current LCP will be reviewed by the City of Pacifica's Planning Commission and City Council before being submitted to the Coastal Commission for approval.

James continued by discussing the CWG's role throughout the process, which includes assisting in the identification of data gaps, identifying key considerations and perspectives of the constituencies they represent, and providing feedback on draft deliverables. Future deliverables include the identification of adaptation strategies and a corresponding cost-benefit analysis of those strategies as well as a draft adaptation plan and draft policy language for the Pacifica LCP Update.

After the presentation, James invited questions from CWG members. A summary of that discussion is listed below.

- Q: Will the City provide maps that include specific addresses within the hazard areas?
  - R: The City and its consultants will need to discuss this request internally. Generally, the analysis does not usually go down to that level of detail.
- C: Private property owners need to be directly informed as to whether their properties will be impacted. Additionally, residents need to be provided with a list of public property assets that are vulnerable.
- Q: When will financial impacts be evaluated?
  - R: When the City and its consultants look at adaptation alternatives, we will review the monetary value of all assets. The draft Vulnerability Assessment indicates what is at risk and the next step will include the evaluation of the monetary implications of adaptation alternatives.
- Q: Will the CWG be able to provide comments on the draft Vulnerability Assessment?
  - R: Comments on the assessment can be submitted until February 28, 2018. Comments will be received on adaptation measure and LCP policy options during those subsequent steps of the LCP Update.

- C: I am concerned the City is using inadequate data. The current documents and maps show 5.7ft of SLR. Other studies encourage utilizing H++ assessment. NOAA is using 6ft SLR projections and the Pacific Institute is using even higher projections.
  - R: The City and its consultants are considering the H++ scenario. We can only use data that is public and readily available given ESA's scope of work and the budget of the grant.
- Q: There are areas in Pacifica that need to be revitalized and redeveloped now. Will they only be addressed once the LCP is adopted? How long will it take for redevelopment work to begin once the LCP is adopted?
  - R: The City recognizes that critical infrastructure needs to be addressed immediately and the City Council is looking to fund those needs as soon as possible. Completing the assessment will allow the City to seek funding for additional work.
- Q: Will draft Vulnerability Assessment be finalized the next time the CWG meets?
  - R: Yes, it will be finalized by then and will incorporate feedback received between now and February 28, 2018. The next round of meetings will discuss developing adaptation options.
- Q: Can CWG members be provided a hard copy of the LCP schedule?
  - R: Yes
- Q: How will the City show all comments it has received?
  - R: They will be incorporated into a report and potentially be listed as an appendix in the LCP Update.
- Q: How will work from the San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC) be integrated into the City's LCP Update?
  - R: BCDC's work focuses on work within the San Francisco Bay. San Mateo County has developed its own study, which the City will be building off of.
- Q: Is the City considering businesses and residences as assets in the assessment?
  - R: Yes, private property and associated values have been identified.
- Q: What makes an asset critical?
  - R: Critical assets are those needed at the community-wide level, such as drinking water and maintaining Pacific Gas & Electric infrastructure, among others.
- Q: Private property is not being deemed as a critical asset?
  - R: Identifying assets as critical does not necessarily mean they are more important than non-critical assets.
- Q: Why is the Coastal Sediment Management Plan, which is still a draft, being used as source material for the assessment?
  - R: The erosion projections that are used in the Coastal Sediment Management Plan are final.
- Q: Does the CWG have access to the State's guidance on SLR projections?
  - R: The City can send out those links. Links posted to the City's [website under Sea Level Rise Hazard Data and Adaptation Guidance](#).

### **Draft Sea Level Rise Vulnerability Assessment**

James then discussed ESA's approach for developing the draft SLR Vulnerability Assessment, including incorporating the following elements and studies conducted by nonprofits and federal, state, and regional agencies:

- SLR Scenarios for 2050 and 2100 that are in-line with the Coastal Commission's guidance and the State of California's projection
- Hazard data pertaining to coastal flooding and erosion, via FEMA, Our Coast Our Future, the Pacific Institute, and the San Francisco Recreation and Parks Department
- Hazard exposure relating to long-term erosion and tidal inundation, storm wave damage, and storm flooding
- The identification of public access locations, recreational areas, and built and natural assets as well as data gaps pertaining to asset identification (discussed in further detail below).

James concluded by reviewing asset data gaps that ESA is hoping to address through collaboration with CWG members. These gaps include the locations of drinking water resources, AT&T communications and Pacific Gas & Electric Infrastructure, additional public access and recreation areas, natural assets (i.e. critical species habitat), and economic considerations that will inform the cost-benefit analysis of adaptation strategies. James requested that CWG members provide information on data gaps and any feedback they may have on the draft Vulnerability Assessment by February 28, 2018.

### **Mapping Exercise**

Following the question and answer session, James introduced a mapping exercise in which CWG members were asked to identify various assets throughout Pacifica. Maps indicating public access, recreation, ecology, land use, and hazard mitigation were provided for the project area. CWG members were asked to place post-it notes on the various maps to indicate high use areas, areas of concern, areas where they have missing asset data, and/or areas where there are existing adaptation SLR plans. A summary of input provided during this exercise is available in Appendix A.

### **Action Items and Next Steps**

After the mapping exercise, Ben reconvened CWG members and concluded the meeting by recapping action items and next steps for the CWG, noting the following:

- The meeting agenda and PPT presentation are available for reference on the Public Participation page of the project website.  
([http://www.cityofpacific.org/depts/planning/sea\\_level\\_rise\\_public\\_participation.asp](http://www.cityofpacific.org/depts/planning/sea_level_rise_public_participation.asp))
- All documents discussed during the meeting are available in the Deliverables section of the Project website: [www.cityofpacific.org/sealevelrise](http://www.cityofpacific.org/sealevelrise). CWG members were asked to review the Draft Sea Level Rise Vulnerability Assessment and send any comments on the draft to Bonny O'Connor ([sealevelrise@ci.pacific.ca.us](mailto:sealevelrise@ci.pacific.ca.us)), Assistant Planner, City of Pacifica, by **February 28, 2018**.
- Kearns & West will develop a meeting summary which will be shared with CWG members and posted on the City's website.
- The first Pacifica Sea Level Rise public workshop will occur on Tuesday, February 13<sup>th</sup> at 6:00 pm (Pacifica Council Chambers, 2212 Beach Blvd., 2nd Floor).
- The next CWG meeting is anticipated to be held in May 2018.

## Appendix A: Mapping Exercise to Identify Pacifica's Coastal Resources

### Sharp Park

- Old Wastewater Treatment Plant – economic asset
- Surfing, fishing
- Potential Plover habitat
- Snake and frog protective area
- Sharp Park Golf Course
- GGNRA – Mori Point Trails
- Open Salada Creek to ocean
- Berm Trails
- Mori Point trailheads for neighborhoods
- Mori Road/Trail Beach access from Moose Lodge
- Palmetto Ave: historic district and home of Pacific Coast Fog Fest
- What is being used to consider the life of new/current projects and cost/benefit ratio?
- Whale watching at Sharp Park beach
- Golf course acts as a protective structure
- What is the current level of environmental asset loss including sand on beaches?
- Whale watching at Mori Point
- Sharp Park usage statistics should be available from SF Parks & Rec
- Boardwalk to Mori Point was a million dollar built a few years ago
- Snake and frog habitat in Sharp Park, particularly in the golf course, is not identified. This should be well documented in litigation that has occurred for years
- Promenade structure is not maintained – need to reuse it
- Beach Boulevard homes need a protective structure, not a promenade
- Gap at Clarendon and levee
- Promenade too low to protect the neighborhood
- WSP and Fairway Park = protective levee
- What is cost to environmental assets for SLR protective structure?
- Sharp Park Golf Course acts as flood control infrastructure
- Wetland at golf course acts as hazard mitigation
- Lake in golf course is too shallow and always floods
- Water from Highway 1 flooding inundates golf course

### Fairmont

- Tobin's Folly photographic spot
- Manmade historic spot
- GGNRA Mussel Rock Trails
- Parking/trail access
- Hang gliding area
- Mussel Rock hiking and dog walking
- Heavy rains leads to flooding

## Manor

- Trailheads for Milagra Ridge Trail
- Bluff/gateway to Pacifica
- Economic center
- Structures hang over bluffs
- Coastal trail loss

## Rockaway

- How do we assess vulnerability of Highway 1?
- Lack of data for potential restoration of historical wildlife corridors along Highway 1 (Mori Point, Rockaway, San Pedro Creek)
- Quarry has an accessible trail
- Could city purchase quarry to keep it open as a barrier?
- North Coastal trail provides beach access
- Viewpoint
- Fishing
- What current open space areas can we use for flood mitigation?

## Pedro Point

- Construction at Parks Building?
- Why does sewage overflow at danger zones?
- Linda Mar Boulevard floods
- SLR level of 5.7ft could underestimate flooding which will affect approval of new development, cost of protecting current assets, adequacy of protection options, effects on environmental assets
- Spring flowers along coastline
- Surfing at Linda Mar Beach
- Biking/running trails
- San Pedro Creel Tail – wildlife EOR & creek
- Public restroom and permeable surfaces
- Wildlife concern along Linda Mar Trail – potential to raise land?
- Trail concern along Linda Mar Beach St. up hill to Rockaway
- How are we considering hazard avoidance for new developments vs. existing infrastructure? According to NRA document, we should avoid new building (and San Pedro Creek area)
- Pacific Institute 2100 flooding map is not correct in Pedro Point Field – flooding is much higher
- For fishing numbers, contact game warden for number of license checks and get data from the two fishing licenses purchased
- Plans to relocate gas stations?
- Adaptation requirements for local businesses?
- Adaptation to floods along river as sea level rises?
- Storage unit concerns
- Work with school to update infrastructure adaptation plan

## Appendix B: Meeting Attendees

(Additional members of the public did not sign-in)

Name
<i>CWG Member</i>
Cindy Abbott
Lindsey Bales
Tonia Boykin
Sam Casillas
Leswin D’Cunha
Shanlini Desroches
Maureen Garcia
Peter Guzman-Garcia
Jim Kremer
Julie Lancelle
Ron Maykel
Connie Menefee
Eileen O’Reilly
Robine Runneals
Jim Steele
Gordon Tannura
<i>Members of the Public</i>
Tom Dennison
Chris Redfield
<i>City of Pacifica/Support Staff</i>
Bonny O’Connor, City of Pacifica, Planning Department
Tina Wehrmeister, City of Pacifica, Planning Department
Kevin Woodhouse, City of Pacifica, City Manager’s Office
Bob Battalio, ESA
James Jackson, ESA
Phil King, San Francisco State University
Ben Gettleman, Kearns & West
Matt Marvin, Kearns & West