

From: Brad Malamud [REDACTED]

Sent: Saturday, August 3, 2024 8:04 AM

To: Cabral, Victor <CabralV@san-clemente.org>; Knoblock, Steve <KnoblockS@san-clemente.org>; Duncan, Chris <DuncanC@san-clemente.org>; Enmeier, Mark <EnmeierM@san-clemente.org>; Campagnolo, Laura <CampagnoloL@san-clemente.org>; Hall, Andy <HallA@san-clemente.org>; Loeffler, Rick <LoefflerR@san-clemente.org>

Subject: Pledge

Council members:

Before being elected, at least two Council members took a pledge not to raise taxes. This would include not placing new taxes on the ballot that requires their votes.. Yet it appears that at least one of you will go back on his pledge and vote to place the sales tax measure on the ballot.

I have not heard publicly why you changed your mind and are letting down so many voters who voted for you based partially on that pledge.

For most of us, Our word is our bond. Yet it appears that this is yet another unfortunate result of a Washington or political mentality that words mean nothing. Either you keep your pledges or you don't. Everyone will know on Tuesday.

Well, I have been very vocal on getting all the facts out and Andy Hall is gone a long way towards making the fact public. In fact, the current agenda report replaces the virtually empty agenda report previously used on this item. The council should recognize Mr. Hall's efforts and for the most part this was the best agenda report I have seen from a city manager in over 20 years. However, it is not complete and on that basis, some supplemental details are required, which I understand will be provided for the most part to the council on Tuesday night, hopefully this is a trend that agenda reports will carefully and fully provide council members and the public with most if not all relevant details both actual and legal that relate to issues before the council members. I remind you that council members are there to set policy and the staff, including the city manager, are there to an act policy and to provide the council members with details necessary to make informed decisions. This appears to be a good starting point for future agenda reports.

it is important that the council consider before voting to impose a ballot measure that could lead to sales tax increase that very limited amount of beach will be covered by sand even spending \$10 million a year and that it is virtually guaranteed that the sand will not remain on the beach for any significant period of time.

The city has approximately 6 miles of coastline and 2 1/2 miles of beaches. It appears that for \$10 million a year and you should verify this number with Mr. Hall, given that sand will be placed approximately 50 feet deep on the shore and 15 feet in depth, that only about 6 to 700 yards of the 2 1/2 miles will be covered for any period of time by new sand. It also appears that under the coastal act, the city cannot even build a sandbox which would permanently retain sand on the shore, while absurd, this is the restraint put on sand retention by the coastal act and by the bureaucrats in California. Unfortunately, the city is hot, tied by these laws.

one thing is certain, all sand placed on the beach will eventually be washed off the beach through natural process. The issue is how long the sand will be retained yet. I find no discussion of this critical issue anywhere and Mr. Hall's gender report or in discussions before the council, nor is there any certainty, other than the sand will not remain permanently on the beach. For if that was the case, annual sand replacement would not be required. There is no indication that a lack of sand has any effect on the number of surfers. Could somebody verify that via the survey or otherwise? There is no indication at this time that anyone does not attend the beach because there is no sand. it is unlikely that anyone outside of cities close to including San Clemente are even aware that the beach does not have sand to the Vikings of the city council or others.

Yes, lack of sand is not ideal. But many conditions, including crime, homeless, expensive, housing, prices, crime, slow processing of permits, business license fees, are all issues that affect residence every day. Yet those problems are not being addressed by this council.

Instead, the major focus of this council is sound replenishment, even though it did not appear in the survey to be a top priority of the residents.

On that note, I think the council should attend eyes a new ruler ordinance that surveys should not be undertaken without council approval. I asked one or all of you to attend this item as it appears at the waste of money on surveys by survey companies who advertised they will get any result desired or similar such language in what appears to be a no-bid process the resulted in \$25,000 expenditure for 433 input and the results of which has still not been provided to the residence and other than summary form and which were hidden from the residence for a significant amount of time before being released under pressure from a council member, Should be implemented soon to stop this waste of money.

You also explained recently to the public that in future years, there's a significant problem with revenue being sufficient to cover city expenses. How will the city ever find funds short of cutting services which at this point the city claims are all necessary services? New taxes? Does anyone think that after this vote, either way, the citizens would be willing to approve any additional taxes? I don't, as we have seen in the past that school taxes are rejected as well as transit occupancy taxes. If this council has not address the issue that resident of San Clemente are reluctant to pass new taxes, even further children, and even which, for the most part they do not pay. If the council believes otherwise, before approving this and spending the money to place, this measure on the ballot in the

first place, I suggest each of the council members is in favor explain why they think, absent these questionable Results the citizens would do about face and vote to approve any additional tax member especially this very costly that one council member describes the cuppa coffee a week. Well, that may in fact be true. People buy coffee because they enjoy a cup of coffee apparently that councilmember is suggesting they stop drinking coffee so they can pay taxes to play sand on the beach. That sentence was missing. You have it now.

It is important for further discussion to take place before the council votes on this extraordinarily detrimental and expensive option.

In addition, the city has not discussed the incredibly regressive nature of sales taxes. I would think that the liberal members of the council would be against regressive taxes. Am I wrong about that?

The tax will significantly impact the poor residents of San Clemente to the tune of approximately \$400 to \$1,000 or more per family per year

While mr. Hall estimates the cost per resident at approximately \$15 per month per person or \$180 per year, for a family simply multiply that times the number of family member members. A family of five could be paying close to \$1000 a year

the city has failed to explore other options, including cutting services. Yet it recently has significantly increased salaries. No cuts were made to the relatively unnecessary fourth fire person on each truck added a few years ago.

Nor has the city reviewed optimizing its workforce or measured the efficiency of any of its departments. I have asked Mr. Hall for details on the efficiency of code enforcement, no statistics have been forthcoming. I still await those numbers.

I know that Intel corporation, one of America's largest corporations, recently laid off 17,000 workers While this is not optimal, it is what companies do when hard times hit. Yet the city has failed to even consider, freezing department expenditures or cutting departments by 5 or 10% after discussing the effects of such cuts on service levels. Each of these ideas should be explored before any sales taxes are placed on the ballot. Adding new taxes in any form simply encourages wasteful spending. Every year the city spends virtually every dollar available at least according to the budget. If you give government more money, it spends more money. Unfortunately, that is a fact. And the money comes from the taxpayers.

such an expensive ask of the residence should include a grandfather clause at 6 years. That is sufficient time to allow the city administration and council to review the sand replenishment program I urge all of you to demand that if the voters approve the sales tax if it is even put on the ballot. I note that the clean ocean fee had a grandfather clause or a sunset clause, and was not placed on the ballot when the fee ended.

, there is nothing in the agenda report which discusses the efforts taken by the city to obtain funds

from other governmental agencies and charities to bring sand to the beach and the potential for that money to be obtained by the city. Nothing stops the city from creating a volunteer staff to work on submissions for funding from outside sources. This is done by many charities to obtain funding. There are so many people in San Clemente who are willing and able to engage in that effort. That option should be discussed on Tuesday night. San Clemente is a small town that has a lot of activists and yet the city seems to freeze them out rather than encourage them to volunteer and assist. Maybe it is time for the city to encourage its own residents to become involved in fundraising efforts.

New issue: Mr. Cabral's questionable request for funding a private trip to Sacramento

It is important for the council to vote down

Mr. Cabral's request for \$550 to go to a surf-related event in Sacramento at the taxpayers' expense. Again, this isn't the Washington swamp. If Mr. Cabral is interested, he like all the residents of San Clemente can pay his own way. The agenda report fails to provide any reason for the city to expend this money. It is always what is not in the agenda report that must be reviewed and all expenditures of money by council members for their personal benefit should be viewed with skepticism. I am not against Mr. Cabral, attending such events, but simply not at the taxpayers' expense.

Thank you for your consideration

Please excuse any typographical or Syntex errors as I am dictating this on my phone as I walk early this morning and I'm not correcting these errors.

Brad Malamud
Sent from my gmail account: