

From: [Chris Jordan](#)
To: [City Council](#)
Cc: christopher.diaz@bbklaw.com; [Dennis Hawkins](#); [Donna Legge](#); [Jaime Chew](#); [Sharif Etman](#)
Subject: Agenda Questions
Date: Tuesday, September 10, 2019 9:31:21 AM

Council –

We received some questions from a council member regarding tonight's agenda. Responses are below.

In addition, a Council member has let us know her intention to remove #4 (adoption of amendments to the CRS zone) from the consent agenda.

Chris

Study session re: User Fee Study

In the PowerPoint slides near the end, the page for "Building" does a nice job of indicating that current cost recover is 71% and that the suggested fees would bump that to 95%, with a net increase in fees of 28%. From this, one can infer that the actual "costs" allocated rose about 4%. This presumably is a department-wide summary, but there is no way to parse the same info for individual fees. It would be helpful to have similar data for some of the major fees that have significant changes in other departments, too. Without such, one doesn't know if the fee changes (up or down) are because costs are up/down or because there are policy recommendations to make significant changes in the subsidy. For example, p. 29 of the User Fee Study, lines 13-17, have some significant changes in the dollar amount (far right column). However, even though the current fee is shown, there is no way to determine if the suggested changes are the result of cost changes, subsidy changes, or a combination (if the latter - which is the more significant). Regarding new fees, it would be helpful to know if these are new services or if these are services the city has previously been providing "free." Am not looking to nit pick every fee, but please plan to explain, during the session, those with substantial changes and/or that yield the most significant total revenue to the city. [Nothing in this document indicates which fees are the most significant.]

Response: Neither current staff nor the consultant are aware of the decision making that went into establishing the current fees structure or how much of the current fees are based on actual costs as opposed to how much the City decided to subsidize. The objective with this process is provide the Council with the necessary information to make the decision regarding the subsidizing of specific fees. After this, we will plan to address our fee structure on an annual basis with a thorough review every few years.

The consultant will be prepared tonight to discuss the largest revenue generating fees.

Minutes, July 30, 2019, item 2 (as reported on page 4), should note that the motion was split into two actions because the first group represent funds already expended and the second represent amendments to authorize future expenditures.

Response: The City Clerk is reviewing the video from the meeting and will provided amended minutes on the dais.

Agenda item #2: is it legal/appropriate to designate someone who is not a city employee (Director of the History Museum) to sign the application and, more significantly, to be the administrator of a grant? Is the County ok with that?

Response:

From Elisabeth Ward: Yes, because the grant funds and the grant administration and the grant application are all coming from the Association of the Los Altos Historical Museum, the non-profit 501(c)3 which operates the Museum per the agreement with the City. We are the grant applicant, not the City. The city is only the property owner. So think of it as getting permission for a renter to renovate a bathroom if the renter is paying for all the renovations themselves. You'd want the renter to be the person taking on the financial responsibility.