

Candidates Answers to *Audience Question #1*:

From: Jeff Guillet: The ESA Sea Level Rise Adaption Plan has a lot of references that are not scientific and have not been PEER reviewed. If you could change something about the ESA Report on SLR, what would it be?

Sue Beckmeyer:

Before implementing a plan with the long-reaching impact and consequences that this one will have, we first need to come to a general agreement about the facts at issue and also have confidence that the data the Plan relies upon is based upon accurate science.

Just as there's nothing unusual about a patient obtaining a second opinion from a doctor before undergoing a significant medical procedure, it would be appropriate to allow others to examine the ESA Report to make sure it is accurate and utilizes correct scientific methods before we go ahead with policy based upon its findings.

There are two changes that I'd like to see:

(1) Removal of references to "managed retreat," as directly stated or implied. It is generally agreed that sea level rise will not be something our city faces until after the LCP's lifespan. To put it another way, the LCP will be in place for approximately 30 years. During that time, it is projected that there is only a 0.5% chance of sea level rise in the 1'-2' range. Again, let's make sure we have the data correct before we adopt a mitigation strategy for something projected to occur decades in the future, but which will have immediately impact our bond ratings, insurance rates, and home values.

(2) I would like to see is a scaling-back of what appears to be an aggressive implementation timeline. I find myself asking: "What's the rush?" This Plan will guide significant land use policy for decades to come. There's no reason to rush this process; in fact, it's prudent to slow down and take the time to make sure we have this right.

Mary Bier:

Community members have mobilized and feel it is important to have another firm conduct an additional analysis citing different sources. If there is funding for this then I feel that the community deserves another look at this complicated issue. The communities voice should be heard. I do not feel the plan needs to be changed. Pacifica's Local Coastal Plan Update has been released and it recommends what many of us have always known; in order to protect ourselves, our homes and our businesses we must armour and protect our coastline. I am committed to participating in regional planning that involves sea level rise. We cannot work in silos when addressing this issue. Working regionally will help us acquire the information and funding that will bring our City to capacity and protect us from the effects of climate change. Working together will help to turn our plans into reality.

Bridget Duffy:

The Sea level Adaptation Plan Update is something that there is currently much fear mongering going on about. And much like the "No new taxes" campaign, which was premised on a blatant lie, it still accomplished its goal. It deceived, confused, and scared the public.

(See city council meeting of Pacifica 11/27/17, concerning that lie)

Sue Digre asked the city attorney: is there a tax involved in the establishment of rent stabilization?

City attorney said: There was a fee to landlords. (\$2 per unit, money to pay expenses of regulating rents)

"Yes," Sue said, "but is that a tax?"

"No." City attorney said.

A real managed retreat would involve not building an \$80M seawall to protect a downtown that hasn't been built yet. So, since Pacifica is planning to do just that, whether they put the words 'managed retreat' in the plan or not, they are not actually doing it.

The City of Pacifica has plans to build a \$80M sea wall to protect a downtown that hasn't been built yet. So, this discussion should not be happening. These tactics have hijacked our government policies for too long.

The people less fortunate can no longer abide.

In a republic, which is what this country is, government policies should reflect the will of the people. Everything is everybody's business, not just a handful of profiteers.

Vickie Flores:

There are a couple of things that I would request one is that the plan be peer reviewed and second would be that all revisions be made available to the public with an emphasis on the changes and who requested them. If you look at the last report it was revision 7 where are the other 6? I would also recommend that the public be given more time to review the report prior to a public meeting being called.

John Keener – Incumbent:

Waiting for response.

Mike O'Neill – Incumbent:

Waiting for response.

Adonica Shaw-Porter:

I would change the fact that it's not peer reviewed. If I could make a second change it would be to make sure regional or even county officials were required to sign off on it as well. Since SLR is a regional issue, I feel they should work with the community to come up with a response to the plan that makes sense for everyone on the coast.