

**DATE:** 3/25/2025

**TO:** COUNCILMEMBERS

**FROM:** CITY MANAGER'S OFFICE

**SUBJECT:** COUNCIL Q&A FOR MARCH 25, 2025 CITY COUNCIL REGULAR MEETING

**Agenda Item 1 (Minutes):**

- Regular meeting minutes: Item 13 – The council spent some time discussing the terms on which the new rifles will be purchased (i.e., all at once instead of phased in). Since that was a modification of staff's original proposal, should that be reflected in the Minutes?  
**Answer: Discussion on the item was not included in the minutes. The correction to the terms are provided in the final language of the policy, which was included with the 03/25 agenda packet.**
- Regular meeting minutes: Page 6 (item 14). On the very first substantive line of the page, the minutes reflect that "[t]he City Council directed staff to gather more data on the project. . . ." This was the consideration of an ordinance, not a "project." Please change this to "[t]he City Council directed staff to gather more data on the *impacts of the ordinance* . . . ." or similar words to that effect.  
**Answer: Language was updated and included in redlined minutes.**

**Agenda Item 4 (Police Policy 709):**

- In the attachments, the 709.9 MILITARY EQUIPMENT INVENTORY list and description seems to repeat twice (starting on packet page 38 and again on page 64). The relationship between these two lists is unclear. Is one an update of the other?  
**Answer: The first document is the current policy with current inventory (so it includes the training flashbang kit and Sim training gear that we are asking to remove). The second document is the proposed inventory list with the flashbang training kit and Sim training gear removed, as well as the UAS data-sharing info added in that was requested by Council.**

**Agenda Item 7 (Council Meeting Ordinance):**

- Please explain the phrase "the earlier start time shall prevail" in the proposed, new § B.  
**Answer: If the City Council wishes to change the date of a regular meeting, which has a pre-designated start time of 7:00 p.m., and they change the date, but do not specify the start time of the new meeting, the 7:00 p.m. start time will remain.**
- In Appendix A for the proposed addition to section 2.04.010 Meetings subsection B, shouldn't the second sentence of the Exception read, "If the city council so elects, a resolution shall be adopted which clearly states the duration of the change, or if no

termination is stated, the **revised** start time shall prevail until altered by a resolution of the city council.” The word ‘revised’ is better than the word ‘earlier’ since a later start time could conceivably also be suggested at some point.

**Answer: If the City Council accepts this modification, the language will be updated and presented for final adoption at the regular meeting of 04/08/25.**

#### **Agenda Item 8 (Parking Enforcement Code Update):**

- Proposed new § 1.50.110.C. directs the City to return the deposited fine “together with interest.” What rate of interest? Calculated simply or compound? Is there a reason this is not specified in the proposed ordinance?

**Answer: If the City had received interest on the fine amount while in the City’s custody, the fine and interest would be returned to the individual. City staff is comfortable removing this section if directed.**

- Same concern for the “interest” referred to in proposed § 11.06.120.B.

**Answer: Staff is unclear what this is referring to, but the same as above would apply.**

- Second resolution: The margins are inconsistent on the right-hand side for the second “WHEREAS.”

**Answer: Noted. This will be corrected.**

- Lexipol policy 462: In section 462.6, the text reads “ALPR data gathered via mobile cameras will not be accessible to other jurisdictions.” The very next sentence provides a process for requests to use mobile ALPR data from other jurisdictions to be processed. This is inconsistent; please explain.

**Answer: Other agencies would not be able to “access” LAPD’s data by logging into the system and conducting their own searches. However, we would be able to share information if for example, Mountain View Police was investigating an armed robbery and asked us whether or not a vehicle associated to the robbery was in Los Altos during a particular timeframe. Our Flock administrator would run a query and then would let MVPD know whether or not the vehicle had been in Los Altos. If there was a legitimate law enforcement purpose for requesting information on a particular vehicle, LAPD personnel would conduct the query and would provide the requesting agency with the information. However, other agencies would not have unfettered access to our information and would only get information from us if the Flock administrator or designee queried the information for them. We want to ensure we have the ability to provide another agency with information from our system if it assists them in their investigation. However, this would not be a frequent occurrence.**

- Would the proposed modifications to Section 8.04 allow enforcement officers who are not sworn peace officers to engage in street traffic law enforcement or will this responsibility remain with only sworn peace officers?

**Answer: Staff is proposing uniform definitions for enforcement officers to the code that is consistent with other code sections. The modifications allow these enforcement officers, as approved by resolution of the City Council, to enforce parking**

**violations. Only sworn police officers can enforce street traffic violations (i.e. moving violations).**

- Will the ALPRs retention period be sufficient to provide required evidence of violations, including possible delays due to delinquency notices and/or scheduling a hearing?  
**Answer: Yes. There is a 21-day window for someone to appeal a parking citation, which is within the 30 day retention. If an appeal is requested, the data and photos from the particular violation would be pulled from the system and saved for purposes of an appeal. After a final decision, the data and photos could be deleted.**
- Section 8.04.060 (packet page 116) - Does the proposed language allow crossing guards to direct traffic?  
**Answer: Crossing guards do not direct traffic and are assigned to assist children in crossing the streets. They have not been defined as enforcement officers by resolution of the City Council.**
- Section 8.20.030 (packet page 120) - Why remove the display for sale purpose?  
**Answer: This section was removed at the direction of the City Attorney as part of the code amendments to comply with case law.**
- Section 8.20.240 (packet page 127) - What's the current status of court rulings regarding chalking and the Fourth Amendment?  
**Answer: This item can be addressed during the meeting by the City Attorney.**

**Agenda Item 9 (Weed Abatement Ordinance):**

- Resolution: Section 4: The dates are incorrect. Should be March 25 and April 8.  
**Answer: Noted. This will be corrected in the final ordinance.**
- In the staff report, Analysis section, 1b indicates Council will adopt a resolution annually declaring weeds are a public nuisance. Why does this have to be done every year vs. just a standing resolution that continues until changed?  
**Answer: the passing of a resolution is necessary as the list of properties is subject to change annually. Properties may be added or removed accordingly. This process cannot be a standing action.**
- In the Ordinance, the 3rd whereas has the wrong dates, the first hearing will be 3/25 not 3/11.  
**Answer: Noted. This will be corrected in the final ordinance.**
- Analysis 3(a)(ii) (packet page 133) - "Printed photographs no smaller than 5" by 7"..."  
It's reasonable to expect that most appellants will take photos of weed abatement with their mobile phone, and will want to submit them electronically. Requiring printed hard copies seems like an unnecessary hurdle, particularly because the city presumably prefers to keep most records electronically, and thus would just scan the prints. Can some mechanism be provided for fully electronic filing of appeals?

**Answer: in order to form a record, the city must require some sort of documentation to be submitted. The process could state electronic, or hard copies, however, that will require staff to accept in both forms, which will require additional administrative work. Staff prefers the method of hard copies to be submitted as part of the appeal process, as the appeals will be heard and in-person.**

**Agenda Item 10 (Midyear Budget Update):**

- Would it make sense to budget the purchase of the new Daniel Defense Rifles as part of this update, or does staff prefer to make it a part of the FY 26 budget?

**Answer: Staff is planning to include this in the FY 2025/26 budget in order to utilize grant funds that will be available in the new FY for the purchase.**

- There is a \$21 mm shortfall in actual revenue vs. the total budget as of 1/31/25. Has staff forecasted what the shortfall/excess is anticipated to be by 6/30/25? If so, what are those projections based upon?

**Answer: Staff forecasts that the City will exceed budgeted revenues by June 30, 2025. Staff does not have an exact amount that that will be as it will be dependent on a number of factors including whether development fees continue at the current pace, Sales Tax revenues, etc. While some revenue categories may appear under-collected at mid-year, this is normal for this point in the fiscal cycle. The City will receive two more property tax payments in April and June which will account for a significant amount of revenue. In addition, interest income revenues are posted in February for all previous months (approximately \$2 million).**

- First Resolution: the second WHEREAS refers to the Financial Commission's review. However, the DISCUSSION section of the staff report says that "[t]his is a change from what was presented at the Financial Commission meeting. . . ." Since the FC was presented with different recommendations, shouldn't we eliminate the second WHEREAS from that resolution?

**Answer: This Whereas could be deleted.**

- Staff recommends that the City deposit \$6 mm in its PERS Reserve. Where would that put the City with respect to its PERS obligation? What are our short-term, mid-term, and long-term strategies to meet our PERS obligations?

**Answer: For the year ended June 30, 2023 (which is the most recent actuarial data provided by CalPERS), the City's Unfunded Accrued Liability (UAL) is \$51.8 million and the City's overall funding ratio is 70.92%. If the City were to use the funds in the PERS Reserve to pay down the UAL, the funds would go directly towards the UAL and the funding ratio would increase to 74.3%.**

**The Financial Commission has recommended that the City strive to reach a funding ratio of 80% in the next five years. This can be accomplished by continuing to set aside funds each year for additional discretionary payments (ADP) to reach that level.**

**As a mid-term strategy, once the City has reached the targeted funding ratio, the Financial Commission recommends the City open a Section 115 Trust and begin**

funding that trust. The proceeds from the trust can then be used to further offset future expenses.

Long-term, the City will “pay-off” its UAL in approximately 15-20 years (there may be payments in additional years based on a number of factors such as lowering of the Discount Rate, employees working longer, etc.). The City should see a significant drop in annual expenses towards the UAL in approximately 10-12 years. The actions the City takes in the short- and mid-terms (ADPs, establishing a 115 Trust) will help to lower expenses in the long-term.

Staff will regularly review CalPERS actuarial assumptions and provide recommendations for actions to provide a buffer against PERS volatility to the Financial Commission and City Council as appropriate.

- Second Resolution: What is staff asking Council to authorize? Operative clauses two and three direct staff to make determinations. Shouldn't staff make those determinations, explain its reasoning, and discuss alternatives before asking for Council's approval?  
**Answer: The City has six different funds with CalPERS that have unfunded liabilities. Two of these six account for the majority of the City's unfunded liability. These two funds are commonly referred to as Safety Tier 1 and Miscellaneous Tier 1 (also known as "Classic" employees). Should Council authorize the actions in the Resolution, staff will work with CalPERS to determine how much should be paid into these two accounts in order to maximize future cost reductions. PERS typically likes to know that a payment is authorized prior to helping staff determine how much is applied to each fund. The further determination needed is simply how much of the \$6 million will be applied to Safety Tier 1 and how much will be applied to Miscellaneous Tier 1.**
- Third Resolution: The first item under “NOW THEREFORE” is for the CM's annual base pay rate to be \$298,825 as of July 7, 2025. But the contract Council ratified on October 22, 2024 authorized that sum to be effective as of July 1, 2024. Why is this authorization being effected almost one year later than directed by the Council?  
**Answer: This should read “as of July 7, 2024” which was the start of the first pay period after July 1, 2024. Staff will correct the Resolution.**
- Budget vs. Actual Revenues and Expenditures tables (pgs 145-146), shouldn't the first column labeled "FY 2024 Actual" have dates from 7/1/2023 - 1/31/2024?  
**Answer: That is correct. Sorry for the confusion.**
- Page 1 of the Resolution updating the pay schedule (pg 151 of the PDF), shouldn't the City Manager pay schedule be dated effective July 7 2024 rather than July 7, 2025 as stated, "1. Adjusts the City Manager's annual base pay rate to \$298,825 **effective July 7, 2025**, reflecting the amended Employment Agreement;"  
**Answer: This should read “as of July 7, 2024.” Staff will correct the Resolution.**
- Are any reserves required or prudent to bridge impact fee revenues delayed by SB937?  
**Answer: While no reserve is legally required, establishing a designated reserve within Development-related funds could be financially prudent to manage the cash flow impacts of SB 937. The reserve could be based on historic permit volume and fee**

**levels, forecasted affordable housing activity, and carryforward balances in the affected funds**

- Do the increased Workers' Compensation costs reflect any root-cause trend in more frequent injuries among city employees?

**Answer: No. The proposed transfer simply reflects that the City has not transferred monies into this Fund for a few years.**

- Increasing plan check service levels to meet higher demand makes sense, particularly given the corresponding revenue increase. What service quality metrics are recorded (wait times, etc.)?

**Answer: current service levels start at 15 business days and are reduced by five business days for every plan check thereafter. In some cases, for large mixed use or multi-family projects the review starts at 20 business days and reduces by five business days thereafter. This is the common industry standard when a public agency utilizes outside plan checking services.**

- Licenses, permits, and fees: What underlying trends are causing this substantial increase? What categories of activities are prompting this, and are they likely to continue at an elevated level?

**Answer: the city began using hdL Business Licensing services in January 2023, which was the first full year with the new platform. In 2024, the city began utilizing additional services which capture businesses without licenses and bring them into compliance. Additionally, in 2024 the city saw increased construction activities which requires additional contractors to obtain a business license to operate within the city limits. It is unlikely that the city will continue to see an increase at this rate in future years, however calendar year 2025 will be a better indicator of this now that the city is utilizes all features and services of hdL Business Licensing.**

- Grants: What unexpected grant(s) gave rise to this substantial increase?

**Answer: The City received a grant award of \$134,591 in January 2024 from the California Office of Emergency Services (Cal OES) under AB102 to support upgrades to the Emergency Operations Center. As the related project activities were not completed by the close of FY 2024, the grant funds were recorded as unearned revenue and have been carried forward into FY 2025, when the expenditures and corresponding revenue recognition will occur. In addition, the City received \$88,425 under the AB1383 Organics Grant Program. These funds were also unspent as of June 30, 2024, and have been rolled into FY 2025 for use in continued implementation of organics and recycling compliance programs.**

- Other: What "other" source accounts for this substantial increase? Is this related to the one-time Legal Reimbursement?

**Answer: Yes, the \$493,000 one-time legal reimbursement is included in the Other category.**

**Other Questions:**

- Gas Leaf Blower Data: What impact does the CARB ban on small off-road engines have on this issue?

**Answer: Small off-road engines (SORE) are spark-ignition engines with rated power at or below 19 kilowatts (25 horsepower). The SORE regulations require new engines to be certified and labeled to meet emission standards and other requirements. Typical equipment types that use SORE include lawn and garden equipment (leaf blowers), portable generators, and pressure washers. CARB regulations require all Model Year equipment from 2024 onward to be ZERO Emissions, meaning that all Leaf Blowers in California that were manufactured from 2024 onward will be electric, effectively the sale of gas-powered leaf blowers is prohibited for all new models produced and sold in California.**



**CITY OF LOS ALTOS  
CITY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES  
TUESDAY, MARCH 11, 2025  
7:00 p.m.  
1 N. San Antonio Rd. ~ Los Altos, CA**

*Pete Dailey, Mayor  
Neysa Fligor, Vice Mayor  
Larry Lang, Councilmember  
Sally Meadows, Councilmember  
Jonathan D. Weinberg, Councilmember*

**CALL MEETING TO ORDER – Pete Dailey, Mayor**, called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

**ESTABLISH QUORUM** – All Councilmember were present.

**PLEDGE ALLEGIANCE TO THE FLAG – Pete Dailey, Mayor**, led the Pledge of Allegiance.

**REPORT ON CLOSED SESSION**

No reportable action was taken during the Closed Session meeting of March 11, 2025, at 6:15 p.m.

**CHANGES TO THE ORDER OF THE AGENDA**

There were no changes to the order of the agenda.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS ON ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA**

There following member of the public spoke during Public Comment:

- Dianne Connelly

**CONSENT CALENDAR**

Motion by Weinberg and Second by Lang to approve the Consent Calendar. **Motion carried unanimously by roll call vote.**

**1. Approval of Meeting Minutes**

Approve the Draft Special and Regular Meeting Minutes for the Meeting of February 25, 2025

**2. Contract Award for Hetch Hetchy ADA Improvements Project**

Two actions for Council consideration:

1. Adopt a Resolution Authorizing the City Manager to execute an Agreement with SAE Consulting Engineering for Construction Services for the Intersection Access Barrier Removal project in the amount of \$97,923.00 and up to 15% contingency, if needed, in the amount not to exceed \$14,688.00; and

2. Adopt a Resolution increasing the Intersection Access Barrier Removal, TS-01058, project budget to \$127,300



**3. Contract Amendment with Civic Plus LLC**

Approve a resolution authorizing the City Manager to execute Amendment No. 1 with CivicPlus LLC. for an amount not to exceed \$125,000.00 for development and implementation of a new city website

**4. Adoption of Resolution - 2024 Annual Housing Element Program Report**

Adopt a Resolution of the City Council of the City of Los Altos Accepting the Housing Element Annual Progress Report for Calendar Year 2024 and Authorizing Staff to Submit the Report to the California Department of Housing and Community Development and find that this action is exempt from the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) per CEQA Guidelines Section 15378(b)(5)

**5. Independent Intake Official (IIO) Yearly Report for 2024**

Receive the Independent Intake Official (IIO) Yearly Report for 2024

**6. Annual Comprehensive Financial Report**

Accept the Annual Comprehensive Financial Report and compliance reports for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2024

**7. Designation of Enforcement Officers**

Adopt a Resolution of the City Council of the City of Los Altos Designating Certain Employees or Agents as Enforcement Officers

**8. City Council Strategic Goals**

Adopt a Resolution affirming the City Council Strategic Goals

**9. Regional Board Assignments – VTA PAC Representatives and LAC Alternate**

Affirm Mayoral Appointment to the Valley Transportation Authority Policy Advisory Committee (VTA-PAC) and Santa Clara County Cities Association – Legislative Action Committee (LAC)

**PUBLIC HEARINGS**

**10. Library Patio Appeal 1**

Deny the appeal and uphold the decision of the Los Altos Historical Commission for Historical Alteration Permit (H24-0003) for a new library courtyard, and affirming that the proposed project is categorically exempt from environmental review pursuant to Section 15301 (Existing Facilities) and Section 15303 (New Construction and Conversion of Small Structures), of the State Guidelines implementing the California

Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) of 1970 and that none of the exceptions outlined in Section 15300.2 apply

**Pete Dailey, Mayor**, opened the Public Hearing.

**Maria Bautista, Resident**, requested the Public Hearing be continued to a future meeting date.

**Pete Dailey, Mayor**, denied the request for continuance.

**Alice Mansell, Appellant**, was absent from the Public Hearing.

The following members of the public spoke during the Public Hearing:

- Jon Baer
- Maria Bautista
- Robert Specker
- Catherine Nunes

**Pete Dailey, Mayor**, closed the Public Hearing.

The City Council deliberated, and due to the appellant's failure to exhaust her administrative remedy and failure to appear, the decision was made to deny the appeal.

Motion by Weinberg and Second by Dailey to deny the appeal and uphold the decision of the Los Altos Historical Commission for Historical Alteration Permit (H24-0003) for a new library courtyard, and affirming that the proposed project is categorically exempt from environmental review pursuant to Section 15301 (Existing Facilities) and Section 15303 (New Construction and Conversion of Small Structures), of the State Guidelines implementing the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) of 1970 and that none of the exceptions outlined in Section 15300.2 apply, and further find that the appellant has failed to exhaust her administrative remedy by failing to appear for the Public Hearing. **Motion carried unanimously by roll call vote.**

#### **11. Library Patio Appeal 2**

Deny the appeal and uphold the decision of the Los Altos Planning Commission for Design Review Permit (DR24-0002) for a new library courtyard, and affirming that the proposed project is categorically exempt from environmental review pursuant to Section 15301 (Existing Facilities) and Section 15303 (New Construction and Conversion of Small Structures), of the State Guidelines implementing the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) of 1970 and that none of the exceptions outlined in Section 15300.2 apply

**Pete Dailey, Mayor**, opened the Public Hearing.

**Maria Bautista, Appellant**, presented the appeal and requested to continue the item to a future meeting date.

The City Council did not provide a motion to continue the item.

The following members of the public spoke during the Public Hearing:

- Robert Specker
- Catherine Nunes

**Maria Bautista, Appellant**, provided a rebuttal.

**Pete Dailey, Mayor**, closed the Public Hearing.

Motion by Weinberg and Second by Meadows to deny the appeal and uphold the decision of the Los Altos Planning Commission for Design Review Permit (DR24-0002) for a new library courtyard, and affirming that the proposed project is categorically exempt from environmental review pursuant to Section 15301 (Existing Facilities) and Section 15303 (New Construction and Conversion of Small Structures), of the State Guidelines implementing the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) of 1970 and that none of the exceptions outlined in Section 15300.2 apply, and as a separate and distinct grounds for appeal, find that the appellant lacks standing to bring the appeal. **Motion carried unanimously by roll call vote.**

### **12. Library Patio Appeal 3**

Deny the appeal and uphold the decision of the Los Altos Historical Commission for Historical Alteration Permit (H24-0003) and the Los Altos Planning Commission for Design Review Permit (DR24-0002) for a new library courtyard, and affirming that the proposed project is categorically exempt from environmental review pursuant to Section 15301 (Existing Facilities) and Section 15303 (New Construction and Conversion of Small Structures), of the State Guidelines implementing the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) of 1970 and that none of the exceptions outlined in Section 15300.2 apply

**Pete Dailey, Mayor**, opened the Public Hearing.

**Catherine Nunes, Appellant**, presented the appeal.

The following members of the public spoke during the Public Hearing:

- Chip Lion
- Maria Bautista
- Teresa Morris

**Catherine Nunes, Appellant**, provided a rebuttal.

**Pete Dailey, Mayor**, closed the Public Hearing.

Motion by Weinberg and Second by Dailey to deny the appeal and uphold the decision of the Los Altos Historical Commission for Historical Alteration Permit (H24-0003) and the Los Altos Planning Commission for Design Review Permit (DR24-0002) for a new library courtyard, and affirming that the proposed project is categorically exempt from environmental review pursuant to Section 15301 (Existing Facilities) and Section 15303 (New Construction and Conversion of

Small Structures), of the State Guidelines implementing the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) of 1970 and that none of the exceptions outlined in Section 15300.2 apply, and that as a separate and distinct basis for denial that the Council find that the appeal is untimely.

**Motion carried unanimously by roll call vote.**

The City Council recessed at 9:35 p.m.

The City Council reconvened at 9:52 p.m.

## **DISCUSSION ITEMS**

### **13. AB481 Military Equipment Use Annual Report for 2024**

Waive the first and second reading, affirm and adopt the Ordinance approving Los Altos Police Policy 709 pertaining to the funding, acquisition and use of military equipment as mandated by Assembly Bill 481 and approve the acquisition of new military equipment, removal of training items and addition of new uses for drones

**Katie Krauss, Police Captain**, presented the report.

The following members of the public spoke regarding the item:

- John Lindsay-Poland
- Toni Moos
- Brian Jones
- Jeanine Valadez
- Freddie Wheeler

Motion by Dailey and Second by Meadows to waive the first and second reading, and affirm and adopt the ordinance approving Los Altos Police Policy 709 pertaining to the funding, acquisition and use of military equipment as mandated by Assembly Bill 481, and to approve the acquisition of new military equipment, removal of training items and addition of new uses for drones.

**Motion carried unanimously by roll call vote.**

### **14. Introduction of Ordinance - Underground Utilities**

Introduce an Ordinance of the City Council of the City of Los Altos Adding Chapter 11.25 Underground Utilities to Title 11 Miscellaneous Property Regulations of the Los Altos Municipal Code and find that this action is Exempt from Environmental Review Pursuant to Section 15061(b)(3) of the State Guidelines Implementing the California Environmental Quality Act of 1970

**Nick Zornes, Assistant City Manager of Land Use**, presented the report.

The following members of the public spoke regarding the item:

- Les Poltrack
- Gaurav Jain

The City Council directed staff to ~~gather more data on the project and~~ conduct further research and determine if the ~~project-item~~ should return at a future meeting date.

### **INFORMATIONAL ITEMS ONLY**

*There will be no discussion or action on Informational Items*

### **COUNCIL/STAFF REPORTS AND DIRECTIONS ON FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS**

15. Tentative Council Calendar and Housing Element Update Implementation Calendar

### **COUNCIL/STAFF REPORTS AND DIRECTIONS ON FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS**

**Jonathan D. Weinberg, Councilmember** – Requested a future agenda item:

- Discuss the raising of the Juneteenth and Progress Pride flags in June 2025 (*Full support*)

**ADJOURNMENT** – The regular meeting adjourned at 12:10 a.m. on March 13, 2025.

The meeting minutes were prepared by Melissa Thurman, City Clerk, for approval at the regular meeting on March 25, 2025.

---

Pete Dailey  
Mayor

---

Melissa Thurman, MMC  
City Clerk

The March 11, 2025, City Council meeting recording may be viewed via the following external website: <https://www.youtube.com/@CityofLosAltosCA>

The City of Los Altos does not own or operate YouTube. The video referenced in these minutes was live at the time the minutes were published.

**RESOLUTION NO. 2025-\_\_**

**A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF LOS ALTOS  
APPROVING FISCAL YEAR 2024/25 MID-YEAR FINANCIAL UPDATE AND  
BUDGET ADJUSTMENTS**

**WHEREAS**, on June 11, 2024, the City Council adopted the Fiscal Year 2024/25 Operating Budget; and

~~**WHEREAS**, on February 10, 2025, the Financial Commission reviewed the Fiscal Year 2024/25 Mid-Year Financial Update; and~~

**WHEREAS**, the City Council has reviewed the Fiscal Year 2024/25 Mid-Year Financial Update.

**NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED**, that the City Council of the City of Los Altos does hereby approve the following Fiscal Year 2024/25 Mid-Year budget adjustments:

1. Workers Compensation Insurance Fund (\$1,000,000 from General Fund)
2. Equipment Replacement Fund (\$98,000 from General Fund)
3. Development Services Department (\$500,000 Increase from General Fund Revenue & Expenditure)
4. LEAP Grant Reimbursement (\$150,000 Increase in General Fund Revenue)
5. Legal Reimbursement (\$493,000 Increase in General Fund Revenue)
6. Legislative Department (\$50,000 from General Fund)
7. Council Chambers AV Maintenance (\$50,000 from PEG Fund)
8. Los Altos Youth Center Improvements (\$810,000 from CIP Fund)
9. Downtown Lighting Improvements (\$100,000 from Downtown Parking Fund)

**NOW THEREFORE, BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED**, that the City Council of the City of Los Altos does hereby approve the following assignments of Unassigned General Fund Balance dollars:

1. PERS Reserve - \$6,000,000
2. Facility Maintenance Fund - \$10,000,000
3. Fleet Vehicle Fund - \$1,000,000
4. Liability Fund - \$500,000
5. Technology Fund - \$500,000

**I HEREBY CERTIFY** that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of a resolution passed and adopted by the City Council of the City of Los Altos at a meeting thereof on the 25th day of March 2025, by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSTAIN:

ABSENT:

---

Pete Dailey  
Mayor

ATTEST:

---

Melissa Thurman, MMC  
City Clerk

**RESOLUTION NO. 2025-\_\_**

**A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF LOS ALTOS  
APPROVING AN UPDATED FISCAL YEAR 2024/25 PAY SCHEDULE TO COMPLY  
WITH CALIFORNIA PUBLIC EMPLOYEES' RETIREMENT SYSTEM (CALPERS)  
STATUTORY AND REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS FOR COMPENSATION  
EARNABLE AND PUBLICLY AVAILABLE PAY SCHEDULES**

**WHEREAS**, all employers must comply with the compensation earnable and publicly available pay schedules provisions contained within California Government Code (GC) section 20636(d) and California Code of Regulations (CCR) 570.5; and

**WHEREAS**, it is necessary for the City Council to review and duly approve and adopt in accordance with requirements of applicable public meetings laws a publicly available pay schedule; and

**WHEREAS**, attached to this resolution and incorporated by reference is the City's comprehensive pay schedule which will be made publicly available on the City's external website and provided upon request; and

**WHEREAS**, the City reviews and may revise employee compensation and pay schedule ranges; and

**WHEREAS**, the City benefits from a highly qualified, municipal workforce; and

**WHEREAS**, to assist in retaining such a workforce, it is critical that the City's compensation levels are competitive in the marketplace; and

**WHEREAS**, the City should adjust pay to reflect changes in the region's cost of living; and

**WHEREAS**, represented classifications are covered by current contracts which specify the amount of the pay adjustments in the fiscal year; and

**NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED**, that the City Council of the City of Los Altos hereby:

1. Adjusts the City Manager's annual base pay rate to \$298,825 effective July 7, ~~2025~~2024, reflecting the amended Employment Agreement; and
2. Adjusts the City Council Member monthly stipend to \$950.00 effective December 10, 2024 following Councils reorganization; and
3. Reflects the market adjustments for the Los Altos Peace Officers' Association effective December 22, 2024, as a result of the Side Letter Agreement that was previously adopted; and
4. Adjusts the minimum wage to \$18.20 per hour to comply with the City's Minimum Wage Ordinance effective the pay period including January 1, 2025; and
5. Retitles the classification Transportation Services Manager to Public Works Manager effective 03/02/2025; and
6. Approves adding the part-time classification, Records Management Assistant effective 03/02/2025; and



7. Adjusts the Senior HR Analyst classification pay range at the 50<sup>th</sup> percentile compared to market peers effective 03/16/2025; and
8. Adjust the HR Analyst II classification to align with the Management Analyst II classification effective 03/16/2025; and
9. Retitles the classification Facilities Coordinator to Recreation Assistant and adjust the classification pay range at the 50<sup>th</sup> percentile compared to market peers effective 03/16/2025; and
10. Retitles the classification Planning Manager to Housing Services Manager effective 03/16/2025; and
11. Retitles the classification Senior Engineer to Senior Civil Engineer reflecting the Professional Engineer License requirement of the classification effective 03/16/2025; and
12. Retitles the classification of Assistant Civil Engineer to Assistant Engineer reflecting the that the classification does not require a Professional Engineer License requirement effective 03/16/2025; and
13. Retitles the part-time classification Camp Director to Senior Recreation Leader effective 03/16/2025; and
14. Approves adding the full-time classification, Police Lieutenant effective 03/16/2025; and
15. Approves removing the full-time classifications, Junior Engineer and Administrative Officer effective 03/16/2025; and
16. Approves moving the Civil Senior Engineer and Public Information Coordinator classifications into the unrepresented group effective 03/16/2025 after meeting and conferring with the Los Altos Municipal Employee Association; and
17. Adopts an Updated Fiscal Year 2024/25 Pay Schedule reflecting these adjustments effective the pay period including March 25<sup>th</sup>, 2025.

**I HEREBY CERTIFY** that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of a Resolution passed and adopted by the City Council of the City of Los Altos at a meeting thereof on the \_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_, 2025 by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

ABSTAIN:

---

Pete Dailey, MAYOR

Attest:

---

Melissa Thurman, CITY CLERK