Matt Waters

From: Matt Waters
Sent: Thursday, June 08, 2017 4:24 PM
To: Cassie Jones
Cc: Cory Linder; Daniel Trautner; Ron Dragoo; James Flannigan
Subject: RE: Ladera Linda

Hi Cassie,

Thanks for your emails and thoughts about the Ladera Linda building floor plan and overall size. The building square footage was one of the most discussed aspects of the projects from the very start and the proposed size reflects significant input from the community and City Council. I agree with you that either proposed plan would be an enhancement compared to the buildings that are currently on site. I'll certainly share your email with our consultant and project team.

Thanks,

Matt

From: Cassie Jones [mailto:cassiej@aol.com]
Sent: Thursday, June 08, 2017 4:00 PM
To: Matt Waters <MattW@rpvca.gov>
Subject: Ladera Linda

I am sorry if this is late. With respect to the floor plans for the building, it doesn't seem to me that you are getting a very useful building for the cost. The rooms are small and there is no kitchen facility. Not sure my tax dollars want to go to build a few small meeting rooms when you have the opportunity to serve a larger segment of the neighborhood and the community. That being said, it will be a step up from what is there currently!

Cassie Jones

Matt Waters

From: Matt Waters
Sent: Thursday, June 08, 2017 4:15 PM
To: sharon yarber
Cc: Matt Waters
Subject: RE: Ladera Linda

Hi Sharon,

Thanks for your email about horse trailer turning radius. I'll forward your email to our consultant and other members of the project team for discussion.

Sincerely,

Matt Waters
Senior Administrative Analyst

City of Rancho Palos Verdes
Recreation and Parks Department
30940 Hawthorne Blvd.
Rancho Palos Verdes, CA 90275
www.palosverdes.com/rpv
mattw@rpvca.gov - **(310) 544-5218 p** – (310) 544-5291 f

Parks Make Life Better!

From: sharon yarber [mailto:momofyago@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, June 08, 2017 3:05 PM
To: Matt Waters <MattW@rpvca.gov>
Subject: Ladera Linda

Hi Matt,

I think you asked Mel Colbert about what turning radius is necessary for a truck pulling a horse trailer. I am no math whiz so cannot respond in radius terms, but can tell you that it depends on the size of trailer and whether it is a bumper pull or gooseneck. If you want to get an idea of a size that would be a minimum I would recommend you go visit Peninsula Riding Club in the gated community off Highridge and see if you can measure their driveway. It is not great but can work with a very experienced driver of trailers. A three point turn has to be utilized there for a larger rig so it is certainly less than optimal. The dirt parking area behind the existing buildings works really well. I hope the City will incorporate trailer parking facilities in the design of the new community center.

Matt Waters

From: Matt Waters
Sent: Tuesday, May 30, 2017 5:18 PM
To: Mona Dill; Cory Linder
Cc: Matt Waters
Subject: FW: Pirate & Forrestal intersection
Attachments: IMG_9682.JPG; ATT00001.txt; IMG_9683.JPG; ATT00002.txt; IMG_9684.JPG; ATT00003.txt; IMG_9691.JPG; ATT00004.txt; IMG_9692.JPG; ATT00005.txt; IMG_9708.JPG; ATT00006.txt

This time with the photos--

-----Original Message-----
From: Amanda Wong [mailto:kiwi_esq@hotmail.com]
Sent: Monday, May 29, 2017 10:05 PM
To: Matt Waters <MattW@rpvca.gov>
Subject: Fwd: Pirate & Forrestal intersection

> Hi Matt,
>
> Here are a few of the more than a dozen cars I saw making u-turns on Forrestal, stopping in the middle of the street to unload hikers (resulting in traffic backing up and other cars driving into the oncoming traffic lane to pass), and cars driving BACKWARDS down Forrestal for who knows what reason, in just 3 hours working on my front yard on Monday (Memorial Day). I wish I was quicker with my camera, but I think you get the idea.
>
> Amanda Wong
>

Matt Waters

From: Matt Waters
Sent: Tuesday, May 30, 2017 5:15 PM
To: Amanda Wong
Cc: Mona Dill; Cory Linder; Matt Waters
Subject: RE: Pirate & Forrestal intersection

Dear Ms. Wong,

Thank you for sharing these photos and I'm sorry for any inconvenience you experienced. I am well aware that Preserve access and parking is an ongoing issue and challenge for local residents. I will certainly share your email and photos with Ladera Linda Supervisor Mona Dill and will discuss this with the entire Ladera Linda Park Master Plan team.

Please feel free to contact me with any additional questions or concerns.

Sincerely,

Matt

-----Original Message-----
From: Amanda Wong [mailto:kiwi_esq@hotmail.com]
Sent: Monday, May 29, 2017 10:05 PM
To: Matt Waters <MattW@rpvca.gov>
Subject: Fwd: Pirate & Forrestal intersection

> Hi Matt,
>
> Here are a few of the more than a dozen cars I saw making u-turns on Forrestal, stopping in the middle of the street to unload hikers (resulting in traffic backing up and other cars driving into the oncoming traffic lane to pass), and cars driving BACKWARDS down Forrestal for who knows what reason, in just 3 hours working on my front yard on Monday (Memorial Day). I wish I was quicker with my camera, but I think you get the idea.
>
> Amanda Wong
>

Matt Waters

From: Matt Waters
Sent: Monday, May 22, 2017 11:52 AM
To: Minas Yerelian; CC
Cc: Matt Waters
Subject: RE: Ladera Linda

HI Minas,

Thanks for your email. The two proposed plans for Ladera Linda are both conceptual, so they don't drill down to the level of detail you're asking about regarding the "definite status" of trees. Our consultant's arborist did note that the majority of trees on the park property are in poor condition. Details about tree removal, number and species of additional trees to be planted, will be addressed when and if Council approves moving this project forward.

I'll share your email with the project team and our consultant.

Thanks,

Matt

From: Minas Yerelian [mailto:yerelian@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, May 22, 2017 8:22 AM
To: Matt Waters <MattW@rpvca.gov>; CC <CC@rpvca.gov>
Subject: Re: Ladera Linda

Hello Matt
In regards to lower Hess Park what is the definite status in regards to the trees that are there (Bird sanctuary Hope) and how many new new trees will be planted, the money per square foot of improvement on this project is enormous (hope not all the money will be spent saving some for maintenance) let alone the maintenance that is needed for the upkeep. In regards to Native Plants let say if native plants are native to a location Hess Park or not they grow on their own you do not need to plant them, if you plant native plants that do not belong you Will need to maintain them that is extra cost planting a plant that grows on its own with minimum upkeep will be a better choice.
Thank You
Minas

On Thu, Apr 27, 2017 at 5:10 PM, Matt Waters <MattW@rpvca.gov> wrote:

Hi Minas,

Thanks for coming last night and for being an active participant and thanks for the compliment-glad you thought we did a good job.

Thanks also for emailing all of your thoughtful comments below about trees, basketball, maintenance, noise, lighting, and rural atmosphere; I assure you that your comments and concerns will definitely be considered in the formation of a recommended design for Council's consideration, and your email will be attached to that report. Please let me know if you have any additional questions or concerns.

Thanks,

Matt

-----Original Message-----
From: Minas Yerelian [mailto:yerelian@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, April 27, 2017 4:54 AM
To: Matt Waters <MattW@rpvca.gov>
Subject: Ladera Linda

Good presentation
KEEP RURAL SEMI RURAL ATMOSPHERE. Be mindful of keeping all parks RURAL
1- Noise effect on the neighbors.
2- Basket court and all sport activity must be moved to the rt side away from the residential area closer to forestall and move the building to the left to make sure of no noise impact.
3- Plan B is better use of real estate (Wilson park).
4- (Trees) replace all trees and more.
5-Minimum lightning.
6- The lowest maintenance possible (less $) NATURAL (let the grass and wild plants grow and die seasonally that is RURAL.
Good job.
Thank you
Minas Yerelian

Sent from my iPad

--
Thank You Very Much.

Minas Yerelian

Realtor consultant since 1987
Nation wide referral and Relocation coordinator.

Remax
450 Silver Spur Road
Rancho Palos Verdes
direct (310) 968-4232
DRE# 00969154

Serving Los Angeles County for all of your residential and investment real estate needs.

This e-mail and any attachments are confidential. If you are not the intended recipient, be aware that any disclosure, copying,
distribution or use of this e-mail or any attachment is prohibited. If you have received this e-mail in error, please notify us
immediately by returning it to the sender and delete this copy from your system. Thank you for your cooperation.
Go Green! We are doing our best and hope you will too! Please consider the environment before printing this email.

Matt Waters

From: Matt Waters
Sent: Thursday, May 18, 2017 10:19 AM
To: Barbara Scherba
Cc: Matt Waters
Subject: RE: Lasers Linda renovation

Dear Mark and Barbara Scherba,

Thank you for sharing your thoughts about the Ladera Linda Master Plan. Your support for playground equipment, which was a significant component of each of the two alternative designs, will be considered by the project team as we move forward toward a recommended final design. That design will be made available to the public and will be considered by the City Council at a future meeting, date to be determined.

Sincerely,

Matt Waters
Senior Administrative Analyst

City of Rancho Palos Verdes
Recreation and Parks Department
30940 Hawthorne Blvd.
Rancho Palos Verdes, CA 90275
www.palosverdes.com/rpv
mattw@rpvca.gov - (310) 544-5218 p – (310) 544-5291 f

-----Original Message-----
From: Barbara Scherba [mailto:bscherba@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, May 17, 2017 8:09 PM
To: Matt Waters <MattW@rpvca.gov>
Subject: Lasers Linda renovation

We are in favor of the plan to redesign Ladera Linda. Playground equipment is absolutely necessary!
Mark and Barbara Scherba
3716 Coolheights Drive
RPV

Sent from my iPhone

Matt Waters

From: SunshineRPV@aol.com
Sent: Friday, May 12, 2017 2:42 PM
To: cprotem73@cox.net; mizie@cox.net; Matt Waters; Charles Eder; Katie Lozano
Subject: Fwd: Merging trails, parks and Preserve Plans

Apparently what we need is a vocabulary lesson. "Criteria" is something very different from "standards". In the interest of planning, the Ladera Linda Consultant should identify a TYPE of trail he is designing for any unpaved pathways shown on the "concept" plans.

And, anyone proposing any work on the trails in the PV Nature Preserve should do the same. Public Works missed this for the second project at Sunnyside Ridge Road. Poor communications makes for poor work products. ....S

From: SunshineRPV@aol.com
To: b.camp@cox.net
Sent: 2/6/2016 3:47:44 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time
Subj: Fwd: Merging trails, parks and Preserve Plans

Hi Brian,

This note from Katie is the closest I have been able to get to an admission that the PV Nature Preserve is both separate and above the plans which apply to the rest of the City. Have you any thoughts about that? ...S 310-377-8761

-----Original Message-----
From: Katie Lozano <KatieL@rpvca.gov>
To: "SunshineRPV@aol.com" <SunshineRPV@aol.com>
Subject: RE: Merging trails, parks and Preserve Plans
Date: Wed, 3 Feb 2016 22:39:02 +0000

Hello Sunshine,

Thank you for this information. I am continuing to look into your question. My understanding is that there are no trail standards for trails within the Nature Preserve, but I am continuing to look into your question. Mary also forwarded me your question, and I will be contacting you soon with more info.

Thank you,
Katie

From: SunshineRPV@aol.com [mailto:SunshineRPV@aol.com]
Sent: Monday, February 01, 2016 7:28 PM
To: Katie Lozano <KatieL@rpvca.gov>
Cc: CC <CC@rpvca.gov>
Subject: Merging trails, parks and Preserve Plans

Hi Katie,

Attached is the TRAILS DEVELOPMENT / MAINTENANCE CRITERIA of July 4, 2012 which the RPV City Council approved to be integrated into the RPV Trails Network Plan "update". Also attached is the Western States Trail Foundation's Position Statement in support of CA Senator Boxer's S60. The opening paragraph of the CRITERIA explains what it is hoped to be used for. Trails are linear parks. There are trails in parks, forests, preserves and monuments. My hope is that RPV's Public Works Department, Rec & Parks Department and Community Development Department can all use this same "Bible". Step by step, for the benefit of this community and volunteers all over the world.

My question to you is which trail TYPE does everyone want to have when the work on the Toyon Trail is completed? My point is that if nobody has described "The Work" as specifically as the CRITERIA, we are likely to get something which vaguely resembles the last work which the new work is supposed to repair. What we really need is the CRITERIA to be established for what is desired in the future, trail connection by trail segment.

Please tell me what you think. SUNSHINE 310-377-8761

Matt Waters

From: Matt Waters
Sent: Friday, May 12, 2017 10:33 AM
To: SunshineRPV@aol.com
Cc: judyfrankel@gmail.com; Matt Waters
Subject: LL Master plan link

Hi Sunshine and Ms. Frankel,

My apologies, but I just heard Sunshine's voice mail from Wednesday asking for the link to the Ladera Linda Master plan web page. This page includes links to the two park proposals and building diagrams. Because I didn't get back to you by the Wed. submission deadline, please feel free to submit any comments by Monday, May 15.

http://www.rpvca.gov/982/Ladera-Linda-Park-Master-Plan

Sincerely,

Matt Waters

Matt Waters
Senior Administrative Analyst

City of Rancho Palos Verdes
Recreation and Parks Department
30940 Hawthorne Blvd.
Rancho Palos Verdes, CA 90275
www.palosverdes.com/rpv
mattw@rpvca.gov - **(310) 544-5218 p** – (310) 544-5291 f

Parks Make Life Better!

Matt Waters

From: Lrev <lrev4@cox.net>
Sent: Thursday, May 11, 2017 4:47 PM
To: Matt Waters
Subject: Ladera Linda

We like Ladera Linda as it is right now.
We don't want traffic, noise, attract crime and unwanted crowd.

Thank you.

Matt Waters

From: Doug Willmore
Sent: Wednesday, May 10, 2017 4:53 PM
To: sharon yarber; Matt Waters
Cc: CC; Michael Throne; Ara Mihranian
Subject: RE: Ladera Linda

This is a great point, Sharon, and we will take a look at the plans and look for possible ways to incorporate.

From: sharon yarber [mailto:momofyago@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, May 10, 2017 4:20 PM
To: Matt Waters <MattW@rpvca.gov>
Cc: CC <CC@rpvca.gov>; Michael Throne <MichaelT@rpvca.gov>; Ara Mihranian <AraM@rpvca.gov>
Subject: RE: Ladera Linda

Thanks, Matt, but this is pretty far down the road and one of the two designs is likely to be approved. Neither accommodates horses so I don't know where consideration will result in any incorporation . Frankly I have only trailered there once because I have great access to trails where I board my horses. We parked in the dirt lot at LL and it was great. Easy in and out because there was adequate turn around area. Now where are equestrians supposed to park their trailers? On Forrestal past the property nearer to the trailhead?

On May 10, 2017 4:11 PM, "Matt Waters" <MattW@rpvca.gov> wrote:

Hi Sharon,

Your comments and concerns about equestrian accommodation as part of the Ladera Linda Park Master Plan will be considered closely as the process moves forward. As I mentioned in a previous email, the focus of the two proposals is on the proposed new community center building and the parklands. There was considerable public comment on Forrestal Reserve access and parking at the public workshop and during the comment period.

Sincerely,

Matt Waters

Senior Administrative Analyst

City of Rancho Palos Verdes

Recreation and Parks Department

30940 Hawthorne Blvd.

Rancho Palos Verdes, CA 90275

www.palosverdes.com/rpv

mattw@rpvca.gov - **(310) 544-5218 p** – (310) 544-5291 f

Parks Make Life Better!

From: sharon yarber [mailto:momofyago@gmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, May 07, 2017 5:35 PM
To: Matt Waters <MattW@rpvca.gov>; Ara Mihranian <AraM@rpvca.gov>; Michael Throne <MichaelT@rpvca.gov>
Cc: CC <CC@rpvca.gov>
Subject: Ladera Linda

All,

I have been too swamped with work and personal affairs to study this closely. Suffice to say that whatever your plans ultimately include, it is important to be certain that they include facilities that will accommodate equestrians. We need places where a trailer can get in and out, water, horse tie ups and places for equestrians to rest themselves and their mounts. This is a trailhead for all users and as you consider the needs of all, please remember to include equestrians and persons in the ALL group.

Thank you.

Sharon Yarber

Matt Waters

From: Matt Waters
Sent: Thursday, July 20, 2017 11:04 AM
To: Matt Waters
Subject: FW: City Manager Comment on Ladera Linda Item:

From: Doug Willmore
Sent: Tuesday, June 20, 2017 2:02 PM
To: Mickey Rodich <mickeyrodich@gmail.com> <mickeyrodich@gmail.com>; Gabriella Yap <gyap@rpvca.gov>; Cory Linder <CoryL@rpvca.gov>
Cc: CC <CC@rpvca.gov>
Subject: RE: City Manager Comment on Ladera Linda Item:

Mickey:

Your emails bring to mind the famous quote from Mark Twain: ""It ain't what you don't know that gets you into trouble. It's what you know for sure that just ain't so."

I apologize that we have apparently been unable to adequately answer your questions so that you are clear. But, I have to say that this is compounded with assertions that you make that just aren't true. Your very first email in this string starts with assumptions that are untrue. As my Dad always told me, "everyone is entitled to their own opinion, but not to their own set of facts." You can believe that I am deliberately misrepresenting things to the Council and to the public (for what purpose??), but that doesn't make it so. It just means you believe something that has no basis in fact. Moreover, there is not a single instance that someone can point to where I have done so.

First, let me try and be very clear: **As my staff and I have stated, the $350,000 proposed budget item for Ladera Linda is for detailed architectural/construction drawings.** It is for nothing else. I know you don't believe that, but that is what the budgeted number is for. The drawings will include not only the architectural and construction drawings for the proposed community center building but for the entire park. This includes grading, utility, and landscape (etc.) plans for the entire site. RFA was never contracted to provide these detailed construction drawwings. Typically, in my experience (having overseen more than $1B worth of new construction of public buildings), these types of architectural drawings are approximately 6% to 10% of the estimated cost of construction for public buildings like this. It appears that you think it should be something different and that you "know" something about designing and constructing public buildings. Yet, I would speculate that your knowledge or belief about the architectural services profession appears to be out of date or in some other industry. For example, even in the residential field, I know of 4500 square foot homes being built now with $300,000+ in architectural fees. If an RFP is ever issued (based on Council direction), the staff will share all of the bid amounts that we receive from the RFP with the Council and the public as we always do. The $350,000 budget number is simply a budget estimate and placeholder in the budget to enable the City to proceed with a Request for Proposal (RFP) where a more detailed cost of the drawings will be bid. The City Council subcommittee will review any RFP before it goes out. And any eventual contract for services will, of course, have to be approved by the City Council.

Second, you reference the contract and it does call for RFA to prepare a "Master Plan-level Estimate of Probable Construction Costs for the overall park improvements." And, "Costs for new architectural improvements (community bldg.) will be a part of this Cost Estimate work.". RFA continues to finalize its work with the City by finalizing the overall master plan design concept approved by Council. This will include a general construction budget estimate. This is a general budget estimate, not a detailed construction-ready cost estimate. In quoting my verbal response at the Council

meeting, I don't know the question I was responding to, but I took it to mean "detailed construction costs". I also took it to mean that RFA are not the ones providing a budget estimate for the City. We prepare our budget. And that is why I specifically stated that in my comment. Whether I misunderstood the question or not, I am not sure. But, more precise construction cost estimates can only be generated during the construction/architectural document phase.

Third, the proposal from RFA is different than what is in the contract due to negotiations to reduce the fees. You should go by the contract (which we have sent you) and not the proposal.

Fourth, you also reference the RFA proposal that states "The Project Architect will also prepare a refined Floor Plan exhibit and develop Conceptual Exterior Elevation Drawings to communicate the preliminary design concept for the Community building. The final master plan documents will include notes that will indicate proposed finishes and materials for the exterior of the building". RFA has prepared preliminary design concepts for the building and will provide some information on materials and finishes for the building and the overall park design. There is nothing that RFA has done, nor that I have stated, or that my staff has stated, that us different than what their scope of work states in their contract. The above quote that you have cited is what RFA has done and is finalizing and it is what you and the Council have reviewed.

Doug

From: Mickey Rodich [mailto:mickeyrodich@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, June 19, 2017 8:22 PM
To: Gabriella Yap <gyap@rpvca.gov>
Cc: CC <CC@rpvca.gov>
Subject: Re: City Manager Comment on Ladera Linda Item:

Thank you for your response. I was responding to comments the City Manager made at the June 6th CC meeting to which I was not allowed to comment.

Your response to my email contains some differences with the actual facts. I attended the Parks Dept. meetings, held in May of 2016, to review the Final Proposals submitted by the two competing architectural firms; Richard Fisher Associates and Gonzalez Goodale Architects. The Parks Dept. chose Richard Fisher Associates proposal for the Ladera Linda Community Park Master Plan Project. I have a copy of their Proposal in my possession and it does not agree with the comments made by our City Manager's email comments as to what is included in their Proposal. Richard Fisher Architects proposal clearly states their responsibilities in Task 4-D; Finalize Preferred Preliminary Master Plan Alternative. It states "The Project Architect will also prepare a refined Floor Plan exhibit and develop Conceptual Exterior Elevation Drawings to communicate the preliminary design concept for the Community building. Notes on these exhibits will indicate proposed finishes and materials for the exterior of the building". It further states " Prepare a Master Plan-level Estimate of Probable Construction Costs for the overall park improvements, and break up improvements into two phasing packages, as determined to be appropriate in a discussion with City staff".

This does not agree with the City Managers comment about Task 4 "Master Plan Development all of which they have fulfilled. In addition, it was never in their scope of work to provide a budgeted estimate for construction". There are big differences of opinion here.

Which gets us back to my original comments at the June 6th City Council meeting. What is the Draft budget of $350,000 for Ladera Linda? It certainly cannot be for what the City Manager calls Architectural Blueprints for a 9,000 sq foot building. As I said, we are not building a shopping mall.

This now leads to the same logic and mind set for the $250,000 for the Civic Center Site Master Plan. What the City Manager says and reality are two different things.

On Wed, Jun 14, 2017 at 2:01 PM, Gabriella Yap <gyap@rpvca.gov> wrote:

Hi Mickey,

Thank you for your email. Your assumption that the $100,000 approved by the Council on June 6, 2016, only yielded a site survey at Ladera Linda is incorrect. The agreement with Richard Fisher (http://documents.rpvca.gov/WebLink/0/doc/52783/Page1.aspx) was for Pre-Design Meetings, Site Analysis/Assessment, Community Outreach and Public Participation workshops (which I believe you attended), and Master Plan Development, all of which they have fulfilled. In addition, it was never in their scope of work to provide a budgeted estimate for construction.

The $350,000 in funds are indeed for the creation of architectural/construction ready documents for the Ladera Linda Master Plan improvements, both for the new community center and adjacent parklands. As you know, we are going to bring a recommended Ladera Linda design alternative for Council's consideration in the near future. That recommendation will include a conceptual building and park design, as well as general cost estimates. If approved by Council, those cost estimates will be used to create a future RFP and eventual construction documents.

Since we do not have cost estimates yet, the $350,000 is simply a placeholder estimate in the budget at this time. The $250,000 is also a placeholder for the Civic Center Site Master Plan, not only for a site survey. Cost is a hugely important factor, and it would be great if the consultants come out being a lot less. However, we have to remember that being a good steward not only means looking at cost, but also ensuring consultants are qualified, experienced, and able to meet the standards of this community. For example, I would not recommend an architect who has only done residential developments in their past or does not have a good track record for these types of larger, non-residential projects.

Please let me know if you have any questions or need additional information.

Gabi

Gabriella Yap

Deputy City Manager

City of Rancho Palos Verdes

30940 Hawthorne Blvd.

Rancho Palos Verdes, CA 90275

(310) 544-5203 (office)

(310) 544-5291 (fax)

On Tue, Jun 13, 2017 at 1:12 PM, Mickey Rodich <mickeyrodich@gmail.com> wrote:

At the previous CC meeting on June 6th, I questioned the $350,000 budgeted item for Ladera Linda Park for FY 17-18. What does this budget item include? Is it for a construction project? All of my Ladera Linda neighbors were under the impression that the initial $100,000 project you approved, was for a complete study that would come up with a design concept for the Park building and a budgeted estimate for construction of the Park building. Obviously that is not true. Instead I guess it was only for a Site Survey.

When the City Council then asked the City Manager what the $350,000 was to provide, his answer was Architectural Drawings. I do not believe this answer. We are talking about a 9,000 sq. ft. building and not a shopping mall. On this basis, I could only imagine what the building estimates will be.

This leads me to another subject. The $250,000 item approved by you for the Civic Center Site must, by definition, be also only for a Site Survey. If that is the case, one would assume that the Architectural Drawings cost for the Civic Center Site would be proportional or around $875,000. This is another ridiculous number. I think it's about time we look for consultants that are a lot less expensive. In the past, I have mentioned that the Staff were the Stewards of OUR money and they should spend it as if it is their own.

--

This e-mail and any files transmitted with it are the property of Dez Mys and/or its affiliates, are confidential, and are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom this e-mail is addressed. If you are not one of the named recipient(s) or otherwise have reason to believe that you have received this message in error, please notify the sender at Dezmys@gmail.com and delete this message immediately from your computer. **Any other use, retention, dissemination, forwarding, printing, or copying of this e-mail is strictly prohibited.**"