

From: [Annemarie](#)
To: [Lemos, June](#); [Peters, Lindy](#); [Norvell, Bernie](#); [Morsell-Haye, Jessica](#); [Rafanan, Marcia](#); [Albin-Smith, Tess](#)
Subject: public comments, please pull consent calendar items # 5B, 5D, 5F, and 5H 3-14-22
Date: Monday, March 14, 2022 4:54:18 PM

To City Council members and clerk,

Hi,

I am asking you to pull 5B, 5D, 5F, and 5H, from the consent calendar.

Item 5B: Telephonic Meetings should be replaced by onsite meetings with a hybrid option right away.

Item 5F: Please pull this item to discuss apparent deficiencies in the scope of work that are likely setting the City up for failure from the start. There should be some discussion and possible amendment of the scope of work in this RFP that doesn't assume the consultant will be able to reuse the existing studies that were specifically at issue in the objections and litigation concerning the prior MND. This looks as if the scope of work is just going to basically simialr of what has already been determined to not be sufficient. The MND was not ok! We can't pretend that the rest of the MND was fine. This item shouldn't be buried in a consent calendar because how we set up the new CEQA review will set the framework and will set the City up for a likely successful or unsuccessful subsequent review.

Item 5H: As there is no draft letter how can you and the public get more information prior to considering commenting on it. By not providing anything in advance no one is kept abreast. How can you review and approve a letter that you haven't seen? Transparency please!

Item 5D: Please pull this item to discuss how this particular firm was selected and if there were any other proposals. This did not go out for RFP. I am concerned about several aspects of the proposed agreement, including the selection of LACO Associates to provide the Use Permit planning. LACO was the same firm that totally messed up the Grocery Outlet project along with the same staff who are assigned to this planning application review. The projected scope of work and the areas of focus for the CEQA review are leaving off the most controversial areas of study, which includes a complete lack of discussion concerning the traffic flow and pedestrian safety issues presented by moving from the current Pudding Creek location to this site further north and accessed directly off of Highway One where there is no dedicated turn lane or pedestrian facilities. In addition, the site includes a significant public parking prescriptive easement that is not being addressed appropriately (or at least there is no indication that it is being addressed). This proposal also assumes that the project won't need a full EIR, which it will for this complex site.

Thanks, Annemarie Weibel