

Tammy Cloud-McMinn

From: Teresa Acosta
Sent: Monday, June 10, 2024 4:13 PM
To: City Clerk
Subject: FW: Prop H

All Receive - Agenda Item # 15
For the Information of the:
CITY COUNCIL
Date 6/11/24 CA ✓ CC ✓
CM ✓ ACM ✓ DCM (3) ✓

FYI

From: Larson <ejlarson1949@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, June 10, 2024 2:49 PM
To: Teresa Acosta <teresa.acosta@carlsbadca.gov>
Subject: Prop H

Councilmember Acosta,

Just a quick note on Prop H in the event it is agreed to move forward with a ballot measure(s). As the chair of the committee that brought you the suggestion to consider an update on Prop H, I did some checking with members of the community. There was no concern about raising the base from \$1 million. In fact, a common comment was that \$5 million could be acceptable. The \$3.09 in the draft measure is well below that. Also, there was zero concern about an annual escalator. The only concerns raised were if the exemptions moved beyond public safety.

Regards,
Eric Larson

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Tammy Cloud-McMinn

From: Council Internet Email
Sent: Tuesday, June 11, 2024 8:09 AM
To: City Clerk
Subject: FW: Agenda item 14¹⁵ Proposition H proposed changes - question and concern

From: Bradford Robbins <bradfordrobbins@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, June 10, 2024 8:13 PM
To: Council Internet Email <council@carlsbadca.gov>
Cc: Lori Robbins <silentmeowing@gmail.com>
Subject: Agenda item 14 Proposition H proposed changes - question and concern

Dear Carlsbad City Council Members,

I hope this message finds you well. I am writing to express my thoughts and seek clarification on the proposed changes to Proposition H that will be discussed in the upcoming meeting. While I appreciate the efforts to update and refine the proposition, I have specific concerns regarding two proposed changes with questions bolded below.

1. Increase the amount requiring public vote from \$1M to \$3.1M with annual inflation adjustments: This adjustment seems reasonable and aligns with the increase in construction costs since 1982. It ensures that the threshold remains relevant in today's economic context.
2. The change in wording to allow amendments "from time to time": The proposed wording change to allow the proposition to be amended "from time to time" raises a concern. My primary worry is the potential for this change to enable amendments without a public vote. If this is the intent, it would undermine the original purpose of Proposition H, which is to ensure public participation in large capital spending decisions. It is crucial that any changes to Proposition H maintain the requirement for a public vote on large capital expenditures to preserve its integrity and public trust.

Could you please clarify what "amended" means in this context?

3. Exempt Public Safety spending from Proposition H: This exemption seems unreasonable, as large public safety projects should still be subject to public vote. Given that many of these projects exceed \$10M, the cost and effort required for a public vote (\$170,000) is relatively minor. Moreover, large projects typically have a sufficient planning horizon to accommodate the time needed for public voting. Exempting public safety spending could lead to significant expenditures without adequate public involvement. I believe it is vital to maintain the requirement for a public vote on such large-scale projects to ensure transparency and public accountability.

Why exclude these long time horizon, large capital spending decisions?

Thank you for considering my perspective. I look forward to your response.

Best regards,

Brad Robbins, Carlsbad Resident

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.