



PUBLIC CORRESPONDENCE

The following is public correspondence received by the City Clerk's Office after the posting of the original agenda. Individual contact information has been redacted for privacy. This may *not* be a comprehensive collection of the public correspondence, but staff makes its best effort to include all correspondence received to date.

To send correspondence to the City Council, on matters listed on the agenda please email PublicComment@losaltosca.gov

From: [Pat Marriot](#)
To: [Public Comment](#)
Subject: PUBLIC COMMENT Item #10 March 8, 2022
Date: Friday, March 4, 2022 2:15:28 PM
Attachments: [10-7-15 daily post quest opinion measure A.pdf](#)

Council Members:

I am strongly in favor of a new police station.

As you put together a financial plan, please recall Measure A back in 2015. The Town Crier reported "[Measure A crushed in election.](#)" Over 71% of voters rejected the \$65M bond.

I was on the team of residents that crushed the measure – for many good reasons. (See attached guest opinion.) We collected about \$8,500 in donations for our campaign for lawn signs, ads and flyers mailed to every household.

The city spent over \$1M on consultants and expenses:

MEASURE

A COSTS

2015

2008-2009	Anderson Brulé Architects:	\$575,861
	Godbe Research:	\$73,475
	Northcross Hill, financial stratEgies	\$28,333
	David J. Power, environmental	\$107,388
	TBWB, public information campaign	\$39,152
	Tramutola LLC, political consultant:	\$82,335
	Consultant total	\$906,543
	PRINTPRO PRINT, FOLD & STUFF 7/6/LS mailer	\$4,977
	PRINTPRO PRINT, FOLD & STUFF 7/6/1L5 mailer	\$435
	PRINTPRO POSTAGE 7/6/LS mailer	\$4,235
	Mailer total	\$9,647
	REGISTRAR OF VOTERS CONSOLIDATE UD	\$182,800

TOTAL

\$1,098,990

Godbe Research told Council there was 67.6% support for a bond measure rate of \$8 per \$100,000 of assessed property value, which would equate to approximately \$20 million in public funding. Council decided to go for \$65M.

If you want to finally get a new police station for Los Altos – as I do! – please learn from the past.

- Use terminology everyone understands. If “public safety building” is the preferred designation, describe exactly what it will include. Provide clear, precise information

about what residents will get for their money.

- Define the obvious problems we have to solve: our police station is X years old, lacks functioning heat and A/C, the basement floods, ... Pictures are worth a thousand words.
- Don't add unnecessary frills. Remember when the new community center was going to be built for \$25M? Then, on September 26, 2017, the mayor said words to this effect: "Are we making a big mistake by skimping at this point? We picked \$25M out of a hat. Could have picked \$30M. This project is overdue by 15 or 20 years. Imagine spending \$25M 10 years ago. Or 2 years ago. Should we increase the budget? In 10 years everything will be more expensive. I understand the financial statements. We have structural surplus of \$3 - \$4M/year. \$5M is year and a half cash flow. \$5M or \$10M more, wouldn't that be smart thing? No borrowing."
- Avoid mission creep. Do NOT add a library, City Hall upgrades or any other building maintenance to this plan or you will surely doom it.

Sincerely,

Pat Marriott



Opinion

NO ON MEASURE A: \$160 MILLION TOO MUCH FOR A “CONCEPT”

There’s no doubt Los Altos needs a new community center. But without a plan, we don’t know whether we’ll get the Taj Mahal or the Titanic.

TOO EXPENSIVE

A \$65 million bond is just the tip of the iceberg. Fees and interest add \$69 million. Plus \$25 million from city reserves for parking—in spite of the budget noting “many competing demands for limited resources.” Add to that over \$900,000 already spent on consultant fees.

The \$160 million total does not include furniture, equipment, moving expenses, temporary facilities during construction, operating costs or maintenance. Quoting the city finance committee: *“Such expenses, potentially amounting to several million dollars, could not be paid for out of bond proceeds and would have to be met out of existing city resources.”*

We’ll pay for every class, every meeting, every swim at a rate that can cover these expenses.

Meanwhile, our up-front “investment” would continue for 30 years, the amount depending on our home’s assessed value. For tax year 2018/2019, a home assessed at \$1 million would pay \$331. And that’s only an estimate. Property tax varies with assessed value and bond interest. Seniors are not exempt.

TOO BIG

City documents describe “a framework for the proposed project” and say “once funding is secured ... the design phase can be initiated.”

In fact, we won’t have a design—or actual construction costs—until the city spends \$10 million to “underwrite design and engineering.”

Even with the most meticulous plans, government projects are prone to exceed estimates, yet we’re asked to invest in a “conceptual design” – and a rather grandiose one:

- 55,600 square feet—3 times larger than existing structures—built out for classes and rental, reducing green space and recreation parkland.
- A 38,500-square-foot, 3-pool aquatic center. The city council “will make a decision about the method of managing pool operations after funding is secured to construct the project.”

It’s inconceivable that we’re asked to fund a pool complex—or anything else—without a business plan to assure us that these facilities can be self-supporting.

WRONG PRIORITIES

We're told this is a "scaled down" plan. But the price tag has gone up while important facilities have been cut.

A financial commission report says, *"The 2009 Master Plan called for multiple phases of development, the first of which would include a new police station, city hall and community center, at a total estimated cost of \$81 million. Athletic fields, a library and a theater were to be included in later phases with a swim pool to be funded entirely by outside community groups."*

Six years later, the asking price is \$90 million—just for a community center, with pools now financed entirely by taxpayers. There's no plan for funding facilities that dropped off the list. Will these buildings continue to deteriorate while we construct an extravagant community center? Or are there additional bonds on the horizon?

While the city spends \$25 million on parking—at \$80,000/underground space—the budget shows \$16.8 million in unfunded projects including parks, traffic calming and pedestrian/bicycle safety.

NO PLAN, NO ANALYSIS OF COMMUNITY NEEDS

After years of costly surveys, studies and "charrettes," the city still has no clear understanding of how the community center will be used, how much it will cost to operate, how it will integrate with other parks and facilities or how it will connect to downtown.

Only in the last few weeks has the city finally taken notice of senior residents' wishes for dedicated space. A council member (stating personal views) said, "One area of legitimate need for more specificity: How do we intend to respond to the needs of seniors? The conceptual design was based, erroneously in my opinion, on the 'multigenerational' model."

Council is now scrambling to respond to a senior commission request for a 10,000-square-foot "Senior Wing," so as not to lose the senior vote. But the fact remains that the bond represents a "conceptual design" without specifics and without commitments.

Moreover, the city is planning a "visioning process" for downtown—again with high-priced consultants—which would not include any city facilities. This piecemeal planning is not in our best financial or strategic interests.

We deserve a fiscally-responsible plan for a right-sized, revitalized community center that accommodates all our community needs. Measure A is not that plan.

Get more facts at WWW.LOSALTOSNEIGHBORS.COM

Pat Marriott is a member of the Los Altos ad hoc downtown buildings committee. This column represents her personal views.

From: [Couture, Terri](#)
To: [Public Comment](#)
Subject: [External Sender]City council meeting March 8 agenda #10
Date: Saturday, March 5, 2022 5:40:44 PM

The agenda item you are voting on is NOT specific, as the language states to fund "facilities improvement'. This bond will fail without very specific descriptions, plans and declarations. The country and our local economy are very fragile, and inflation is impacting every single person.

The only tax that should be considered is a sales tax. There is a better chance this can pass than any other tax. Far too many of our Los Altans are struggling with the many economic disasters and a bleak looking 2022. The parcel and utility taxes will penalize Los Altans, while a sales tax can broaden the base who pays. Other municipalities have a sales tax. Do not exempt certain groups, as that alienates the populace.

NOW is the time to bring Los Altans together.

From Terri Couture (as a private citizen and not a member of the art committee) and Fred Tuerk

***Wire Fraud is Real*. Before wiring any money, call the intended recipient at a number you know is valid to confirm the instructions.** Additionally, please note that the sender does not have authority to bind a party to a real estate contract via written or verbal communication.

From: [Roberta Phillips](#)
To: [City Council](#); [Public Comment](#)
Subject: [External Sender]City Council March 8, Item #10 Police facility Study Session Public Comment
Date: Sunday, March 6, 2022 12:36:59 PM

Dear Council

I would appreciate it if you would consider paying for a professional scientific pole prior to spending \$200,000 for bond consultants etc. I do not want to waste the money if the community does not support the measure or will only support an amount that is short of the needed money.

Neysa suggested this approach at the last meeting and I agree.

Also the resolution says:

" AUTHORIZING THE CITY MANAGER TO ALLOCATE PARK IN LIEU FUNDS IN AN AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED \$200,000 FOR THE APPOINTMENT OF A MUNICIPAL ADVISOR, BALLOT MEASURE CONSULTANT, AND A POLLING COMPANY AND AMENDING THE FY22 OPERATING BUDGET

WHEREAS, it is the desire of the City Council to explore the possibility of a bond measure to fund facilities improvement certain designated locations within Los Altos."

This is confusing. Is the bond for a new police department building or is it to fund facility improvements across several facilities ? What facilities ?

Also the resolution and report says the money will come from Park-in Lieu fees. I understand that the Park-In-Lieu funds are restricted funds. According to our Ordinance and Municipal codes :

Use of and basis for **in-lieu** fees. The money collected pursuant to the provisions of this section shall be used only for the purpose of providing **park** or recreational facilities reasonably related to serving the subdivision from which fees are collected. Fees so collected shall be used to purchase land or, if the council deems that there is sufficient land available for the subdivision, for improving such land for **park** and recreational purposes, buying equipment, or constructing improvements **in** neighborhood and district **park** and recreational facilities. The fee so required shall be based on the fair market value of the lands available for **park** purchase as determined by the provisions of subsection G of this section.

Please follow the rules.

Given our budget challenges please consider only doing the initial polling needed to find out if a property tax, parcel tax, utility tax. or sales tax increase will actually result in a win when it is put to a vote on a ballot.

Sincerely

Roberta Phillips



From: [Pat Marriot](#)
To: [Public Comment](#)
Subject: [External Sender]RE: PUBLIC COMMENT ITEM #10 March 8, 2022 police building bond
Date: Sunday, March 6, 2022 11:56:05 AM

Council Members:

Just where will the money come from for the consultant studies? Would the park in lieu funds be transferred to the General Fund?

I've had two people call me this morning asking about this, so I'm not the only one who's confused.

Thanks,

Pat Marriott

Agenda Item 10:

Police Facility Study Session Follow Up: Consider report, discuss and provide direction to staff including adoption of a resolution authorizing the City Manager to allocate **park in lieu funds** in an amount not to exceed \$200,000 for the appointment of a Municipal Advisor, Ballot Measure Consultant, and a Polling Company and amending the Fiscal Year Operating Budget (G. Engeland)

Staff Report:

Fiscal Impact:

If approved, up to \$200,000 will be allocated from the City's **General Fund**, and a budget adjustment of \$200,000 will be included in the current Fiscal Year budget.

RESOLUTION

**A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF LOS ALTOS
AUTHORIZING THE CITY MANAGER TO ALLOCATE **PARK IN LIEU FUNDS** IN AN
AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED \$200,000 FOR THE APPOINTMENT OF A MUNICIPAL
ADVISOR, BALLOT MEASURE CONSULTANT, AND A POLLING COMPANY AND
AMENDING THE FY22 OPERATING BUDGET**

WHEREAS, it is the desire of the City Council to explore the possibility of a bond measure to **fund facilities improvement certain designated locations** within Los Altos; and

WHEREAS, on March 8, 2022, City Council authorized increasing the current FY 2022 Operating Budget by \$200,000 to be appropriated from the **General Fund** for use to appoint a Municipal Advisor, A Ballot Measure Consultant and a Polling Agent o explore the possibility of a bond measure to fund facilities improvement certain designated locations within Los Altos; and

... The FY22 **General Fund operating budget shall be amended such that the FY22 appropriation in the Operating Budget is increased by \$200,000** for

From: Pat Marriot [mailto: [REDACTED]]
Sent: Sunday, March 06, 2022 10:24 AM
To: PublicComment@losaltosca.gov
Subject: PUBLIC COMMENT ITEM #10 March 8, 2022 police building bond

Council Members:

Regarding the \$200,000 needed for up-front studies, I don't see how it can be legal to use park in-lieu funds. A police station in no way qualifies as park or recreation facilities.

You will be alienating many residents right at the start of this process if you rob the parks fund. Parks and open space are important to residents of all ages and become even more essential when we consider the RHNA requirements for adding so many more households. We already have less parkland than most cities.

I suggest you look into the CIP budget, which stands at \$75,815,837 for 68 projects. Surely you can find \$200,000 there.

Thanks,

Pat Marriott