

City Council and Staff,

Both Agenda Items 6 and 13 deserve more discussion than what is being given as Consent Calendar items

The increased costs to the Bodega Ave project to the tune of \$53,000 represents a 20% increase to the city's cost, not including the contingency. This increase seems from the informational packet to be a requirement by Caltrans, one that seems either so regularly applied that it should have been expected when originally budgeted and considered as part of scheduling. Or so out of the ordinary that such an increase in both cost and time to construction (a full year) would necessitate further discussion so as to avoid this level of delay for future projects.

In particular the evidence suggested for the delay in the project are stated as the cemetery, Burbank farms, and "several other properties within the project area" I would like more specifics on whether any of these suggested properties lie within the Phase I part of the project. Since both the cemetery and Burbank Farms lie within Phase II of the project, which has yet to be funded under this agreement with Wood Rogers, it's not clear why Phase I would be delayed for another year.

The biggest issue here is the delay in road repair. Bodega Ave is rapidly decaying as a result of lack of regular maintenance. It seems that the city regularly relies on funding from outside bodies to even consider paving projects at the expense of continued degradation of our city's roadways. With delays such as this for another year, perhaps the time to rethink how the city prioritizes paving is now.

Which brings us to Agenda item 13. The increased ask of near \$74,000 represents an over 20% increase in the approved cost of the job. The language used in the packet tonight suggests that this increase is actually within budget. However, to reference the March 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2021 meeting minutes for agenda item 6, Award of Contract to Argonaut Constructors for Repaving of Local Streets, I quote, "City Council Action: Approved Award of Contract to Argonaut Constructors for Repaving Local Streets, Contract No 2020-05 and Authorization to City Manager or designee to sign contract documents – **Not to Exceed Amount:** \$355,397.00".

Normally I would want to applaud the decision to fund this project and by all means, please fund the remaining balance. But please also take note that this increased cost was avoidable if council had prioritized paving projects with more regularity. So that rather than expensive road repairs such as this agenda item, more regular road maintenance could be and should be taken by the city.

Let me remind council that at the September 15th 2020 council meeting, we were given an informational presentation on Pavement Maintenance Plan and Capital Improvement by our at the time Engineering Manager Henry Mikus. This report and those like it are invaluable as they provide a clear perspective on the state of infrastructure and the efforts or lack thereof to maintaining and repairing our city's roadways. It is unfortunate that the city has chosen not to actively recruit for the replacement of Mr. Mikus's position, as the continued use of subcontracted workforce in this capacity will result in reports of this kind going absent or lacking the institutional knowledge that comes from a full time city employee committed to the role our city needs which are demonstrated tonight through the claim that the city was unaware of a water main located so shallow. In this report we learned that 1/3 of our city streets are rated as "very poor". Also stated in this report that although historically the majority of pavement project funding has come from a ¼ cent city sales tax, in recent years much of this money has been utilized to balance other general fund expenditures. The report also discusses additional funding sources regularly available to the city in the hundreds of thousands of dollars that could be used to fund transportation, safety, and paving. The report is clear that even with the expected reduction in city revenue due to the pandemic, the city has chosen to reduce even further its efforts in transportation, safety, and paving.

Finally, as to Agenda Item 11, to provide some details on the discussion of revisiting the composition of the Planning Commission it was at the February 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2021 meeting in which council requested staff to return with further guidance regarding suggested changes to the make up of the composition of the Planning Commission. That would be 7 months ago.

Since that time there have been 14 scheduled meetings, of which 2 meetings have been cancelled and at least 1 meeting failed in acquiring a quorum. So in the ~11 meetings that have taken place since Council's delegation of reviewing the planning commission's composition, I would like to know how many times has this item been placed on the agenda of the Planning Commission? What has the discussion amongst the planning commission been thus far? I would expect that 7 months is quite some time not to have resolution on this matter, that now facing a second mid-appointment resignation that will continue to artificially reduce the size of the body without further discussion on the matter for just how much longer?

- Kyle Falbo