

Melissa Thurman

From: Couture, Terri <Terri.Couture@cbnorcal.com>
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2024 2:30 PM
To: Public Comment
Subject: city council meeting 2/27 - Public comment for agenda item #8

Dear city council members

We applaud the staff for recommending to renew Ordinance No. 2023-489 by re-introducing and waiving further reading of the Ordinance approving Los Altos Police Policy 709 pertaining to the funding, acquisition, and use of military equipment.

I grew up in Los Altos, from the age of 5 years old, and we have been safe. Even now, it is of the utmost importance, as our citizens want to be safe. A safe community can only be assured by a strong police department. Our police department needs all the tools possible to protect our community.

thank you,

Terri Couture

***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.

Melissa Thurman

From: Cindy Sidaris <csidaris@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2024 10:43 PM
To: Public Comment; Administration
Subject: Public comment on Agenda Item 8 (Police Policy 709) 2/27/2024 meeting

To: Los Altos City Council
Los Altos City Manager

I am disappointed and concerned that City staff and Police Department staff are, again, not following the process requirements of AB 481. I am also concerned about the request for drones for indoor and outdoor use could present risks to privacy and civil rights.

- 1) The proposed Policy 709 documents should have been made available on the department website, with announcements to the public about its availability through many forums (not just a city council meeting agenda item). The "current" policy should remain on the website while the "proposed" policy is well-labeled as such.
- 2) A 30-day public review clock should have started at the time of that posting.
- 3) AFTER the 30-day period a well-advertised public meeting should be held during which the public can ask questions of the police department regarding the policy document, the equipment inventory, and the new equipment requests.
- 4) In the interest of transparency, the police department should have released the updated proposed Policy 709 document with editing markups so that it is easily apparent what changes are being requested to the policy.
- 5) Is the cost of the drones justified (\$44,576 plus \$13,693 for a total of \$58,269) given the current crime statistics in Los Altos? Will the drones truly make a difference in solving crimes in our city? Are those hoped for improvements worth the risk to our privacy and civil rights?

The errors in following the mandated review process were raised to the City Council and Police Department in March 2023. That the same errors are occurring again this year is concerning. We citizens of Los Altos deserve better.

Sincerely,
Cindy Sidaris

Melissa Thurman

From: caroline horn <caroline_horn@hotmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2024 11:06 PM
To: Public Comment
Subject: February 27, 2024 Los Altos City Council, Agenda item 1.c

To whom it may concern,

To improve safety for all road users, I suggest that Los Altos use the new AB43 state law to lower speed limits in areas where fatal or serious accidents have occurred. This will help reduce the number of serious accidents for all.

If the roads are safer, more people will bike, scooter, or walk, rather than drive.

Many thanks,
Caroline

Melissa Thurman

From: Eric Muller <eric.muller@efele.net>
Sent: Tuesday, February 27, 2024 11:57 AM
To: Public Comment
Subject: Public comment agenda item #8 - February 27, 2023 - Los Altos Police Policy 709

I concur with Cindy Sidaris' public comment pointing out that the process requirements have not been followed.

Also, rather than spending money on drones for hypothetical benefits, I would prefer the Police Department to enforce the speed limits in our streets, in particular near schools. Less glamorous, but much more relevant to public safety in my opinion.

Sincerely,
Eric Muller

Melissa Thurman

From: Eric Muller <eric.muller@efele.net>
Sent: Tuesday, February 27, 2024 1:20 PM
To: Public Comment
Subject: Public comment - February 27, 2023 Study Session, Environmental Commission work plan

Dear Council,

A suggestion regarding the Environmental Commission work plan and specifically about the item "EV Fair". I fully support the education of the Los Altos community on EVs. My suggestion is to extend this into a "Mobility Fair", to encompass other climate-friendly solutions, such as public transit, bicycles, walking, ride sharing; and education about their benefits.

Sincerely,
Eric Muller.

Melissa Thurman

From: Laura Larghi <laura_larghi@hotmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 27, 2024 1:20 PM
To: Public Comment
Subject: Subject: February 27, 2024 Los Altos City Council, Agenda item 1.c

To whom it may concern,

To improve safety for all road users, I suggest that Los Altos use the new AB43 state law to lower speed limits in areas where fatal or serious accidents have occurred. This will help reduce the number of serious accidents for all.

Many thanks,
Laura

Melissa Thurman

From: admin@shinwei.net
Sent: Tuesday, February 27, 2024 5:55 PM
To: Public Comment
Subject: PUBLIC COMMENT – NOT ON THE AGENDA
Attachments: Revenue_20_19_18_17.pdf; Revenue_24_23_22_21.pdf; Multiyear Budget to Actual 17-20.pdf; Multiyear Budget to Actual 21-24.pdf

I am writing tonight to share with you the financials of the Tiny Tots program. I've attached the financials here, but they are also available to the public at <https://losaltos.school/>. The financials show that the program brought in \$150,328 in 2023 with expenses of \$233,463 resulting in a loss of \$83,135. The Tiny Tots program currently costs residents about \$4,000/yr for 5 day/week attendance compared to roughly \$15,000/yr for comparable programs run by Children's House and Children's Corner, which have [registered for the RFP](#). The statements show that a 55% increase in revenue would be necessary for the program to break even based on 2023's numbers. Increasing tuition for the first time in over a decade would allow the program to remain available at *less than half the cost* of comparable programs.

In addition to increasing tuition, many other changes could be made to the improve the financials of the program. Lunch and Play, the extended hours program, has very low attendance typically running with about as many teachers as students and could be eliminated or better advertised. Promotion could also help fully enroll Playschool - since the Town Crier article stating that the program was being *cancelled*, three new families have enrolled showing how poorly advertised this program is! With 60 years of alumni, the community could certainly get the word out about this program if given the chance. The Playschool program could be extended to 5 days per week - the same teachers still work there as when a 5 day/week program was offered, so staffing would not be an issue for such a change. We could also do a better job letting the community know that they can rent out San Antonio Club outside school hours. And we could reduce any staffing pressures by having the highly involved parents at the school volunteer as subs as is often done at many local co-ops.

[City Manager Engeland cited losses of up to \\$180,000-300,000 annually in the Town Crier](#) - far out of line with the actual loss of \$83,135 above. I will be generous to the City Manager and assume he was mistaken rather than attempting to mislead the public. However, this raises the question of how we're cancelling a program without a basic understanding of the facts. As a [recent editorial](#) stated, community input on this topic has been lacking, and it seems that there's a desire to simply ram this change through without due consideration. If the city staff has had concerns about this program, why did they not raise tuition before this or pursue any of the above changes? KinderPrep has a waiting list every year and could clearly absorb a tuition increase.

A trained eye may observe in the attached financials that the loss isn't actually caused by the program itself, but by the administrative costs of the program. E.g. see that the program was profitable in 2017 before administrative costs were allocated to the program. But the administrative costs aren't going anywhere. The city would not eliminate any administrative positions and city staff will have to administer the new program. And teachers are often asked to work at the senior center, as facilities attendants, at Family Fun Days, at the Farmers Market table, at the art fair table, at the Spring Egg Hunt, at summer concerts, and at summer camp. If we lose these teachers as city staff we will incur large new staffing costs to cover all of their current duties. The city's steps here are out-of-line with surrounding cities like

Mountain View, Sunnyvale, and Cupertino, which continue to offer city-run preschool programs. And finally, I will note that the teachers in this program are not licensed and do not need to be given the way that the program is currently run. If we hand over the program to a licensed private operator, it is likely that they will be unable to retain the teachers due to licensing issues causing irreparable harm to the program and community.

I would urge the council to review any proposal before the city signs a contract with a new provider. Please do not let this decades-old Los Altos institution, which is a cornerstone of the community, end in a haphazard fashion on your watch.