



Fwd: Feedback in advance of the Thursday Jan 25 Police Station Project - Special City Council Meeting

Nancy Twomey [REDACTED] >
To: City of Carmel-by-the-Sea <cityclerk@ci.carmel.ca.us>

Mon, Jan 22, 2024 at 10:33 PM

For inclusion in the packet for this meeting.

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Nancy Twomey <[REDACTED]>

Date: Mon, Jan 22, 2024 at 10:32 PM

Subject: Feedback in advance of the Thursday Jan 25 Police Station Project - Special City Council Meeting

To: Dave Potter <dpotter@ci.carmel.ca.us>, Jeff Baron <jbaron@ci.carmel.ca.us>, Paul Tomasi <ptomasi@ci.carmel.ca.us>

Cc: Chip Rerig <crerig@ci.carmel.ca.us>, Brandon Swanson <bswanson@ci.carmel.ca.us>, Tim Twomey-Husband [REDACTED] >, Nancy Twomey <[REDACTED]>

General for all Ad Hoc projects - beyond this Police Station Project.

- The named Ad Hoc committees, if actively working to compile findings or report, must include members of the public and/or have routine public/community updates - reporting on work in progress - prior to any recommendations being compiled.
- Especially any major capital project or community "sensitive" topic especially requires direct community participation and transparency.
- We highly recommend a roster of Ad Hoc committee, with its members and their general status is updated routinely on the City Website. If capacity or priorities are delaying active progress on a committee - this is OK - but this info should be publicly available.

Specific to Police Station Project

1. We've known for some time that this Police Station project had an Ad Hoc team and city staff working on this project. Folks are very frustrated that these recommendations were compiled before receiving public community input or involvement. And many are frustrated with why decisions were made at the end of the Jan 8th meeting to OK schematics for the Vista Lobos location....when this meeting called out that decisions were not to be made at this session.
2. With the legacy expert residents in our Village - they can and do bring other insights and recommendations to the table that may not have been considered when Ad Hoc teams are working without the public.
3. This project was approved and funded as a remodel. It was a surprise to hear that this was no longer a path forward. There should have been a public review of these findings, presenting more detailed rationale and gathering community input before assumptions on alternate locations were considered and more of the budget was spent.

4. In the Indigo report provided with the January 8th Special City Council topic...this shows only the executive summary and conclusion. Where is the FULL report? Why wasn't this provided?
5. Very few of our residents have ever been beyond the lobby of our current facilities. Given the large capital expense of this project - again - it is essential to provide a walk through video (not highly polished) showing beyond the lobby - so your constituents have improved insights on why the current facility is inadequate.
6. As this project began with Police Station needs - it has now expanded to include the Public Works facility. This shift once again is a significant point where the community should be made aware of this scope expansion with supporting rationale. This is not to say that this decision/recommendation is unwise - it is simply that this is a major change warranting community awareness.
7. Is there a scope/needs roster for Public Works for their function completed yet? Even if in draft form?
8. We understand and support that this cannot be kicked down the road, as mentioned "time is not our friend". Something must be done and at a larger scale (no bandaids) than originally anticipated and on a timely and priority basis.
9. To keep this moving forward we highly recommend the following approach - with community input/involvement:
 1. Create 3 sub groups: **1 Wants/Needs, 2 Location Options, 3 Capital Financing** These 3 groups - can run in parallel but must be mutually aware/interdependent.
 2. **Wants/Needs** team can explore ideas such as using other facilities for community meetings and/or training, sharing with other regional facilities and where a smaller scope of the facilities may or may not be wise for the longer term.
 3. **Location Options** - this should include some more insights reflected in the reports from Jan 8th, but may expand to others. And again, will need to understand Public Works needs and "interim" facilities as the finished building/facilities are prepared.
 4. **Capital Financing** team won't have a good handle on total cost at this time, but it is known that this is a major expense (multiple millions, likely 10's of millions). This group should explore funding options from a joint public/private model, floating a bond (with what's involved in making this happen), creating a proposed reserve fund from ToT or other sources with pros/cons and timing estimates.
 5. And/or is there a need for a separate subgroup on Public Works as well?

Thank you in advance for your consideration of these concerns and possible recommendations. We are looking forward to Thursday's meeting.

--

Tim Twomey & Nancy Twomey

Residents Carmel-by-the-Sea

Tim - C-916-335-3399 timtwomey@aol.com

Nancy - C-650-740-3477 twomeyconnection@gmail.com

--

Nancy Ann Twomey

C-650-740-3477 twomeyconnection@gmail.com