

Jim Pollart

From: Jim Pollart
Sent: Wednesday, January 26, 2011 12:51 PM
To: Duggan, Kevin; Dile, Melissa Stevenson
Cc: Craig Goldman; barry.groves@mvla.net
Subject: Shoreline - questions for 2/8 study session

Thanks Kevin and Melissa:

We also appreciate your on-going cooperation and willingness to respond to our questions. We think everybody benefits when there is open and respectful communication between the city and the public. We will continue to stress that in this process.

We understand Shoreline is not a redevelopment agency. We did not intend to misrepresent that in our letter. We will be careful to point out that distinction in future communications.

We will be sending a letter to the city council within the next several days outlining our thoughts on the Shoreline district. We will copy both of you, and Craig and Barry, on that letter.

In the meantime, attached a list of questions and additional information that we think would be helpful to the City Council (and the public) for the 2/8 study session. We appreciate your efforts to provide as much of this information as possible prior to 2/8.

- What is the total property tax revenue that would have been distributed from Shoreline to MVW and MVLA in 2010-11 if Shoreline did not exist?
- What is the total property tax revenue that would have been distributed from Shoreline to the county in 2010-11 if Shoreline did not exist?
- What is the actual amount that was distributed to the county in FY 2010?
- Can you describe (in simple terms) the specific differences between Shoreline and a typical redevelopment district, in terms of purpose, structure, governance and tax increment financing?
- To the best of your knowledge, why was Shoreline created as a special district versus a redevelopment district.
- Is the Shoreline Golf Links operating deficit (projected at \$812,589 in 2010-11) financed directly or indirectly by Shoreline?
- Please provide the following financial information:
 - Additional detail on Current Expenditures, particularly General government, Public works, and Culture and recreation (Shoreline 2010 Financial Statements; pg 161)
 - Explanation of the \$8.0M long-term advance from the City to Shoreline, payable at 10.0%. What is the basis of the 10.0% rate, as compared to Shoreline's outstanding bonds with rates from 2.0% to 5.6%? (Shoreline 2010 Financial Statements; Footnote 4B)
 - What is the purpose of the \$10.0M Strategic Investment / Property Acquisition Reserve included in the 2010-11 budget?
 - Explanation of \$8.1M contribution to the Water Fund in 2009-10 (2010-11

City Budget, page 4-18)

- List of capital projects partially or fully funded by Shoreline in the last five years.
- List of capital projects projected to be partially or fully funded by Shoreline in the next five years.
- Any additional information which supports staffs projects of the "continuing needs for the District" including basis of revenue projections, operational costs, capital project costs, debt service costs, etc.)

Thanks again for your cooperation!

Jim

From: Duggan, Kevin [mailto:kevin.duggan@mountainview.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, January 25, 2011 3:39 PM
To: Jim Pollart
Cc: Craig Goldman; Dile, Melissa Stevenson
Subject: FW: MV Voice Guest Opinion piece - courtesy notification

Hi Jim,

Thank you very much for sharing your Guest Opinion piece in advance of it running in the Voice. We appreciate the heads up and certainly see this as another example of your efforts to be upfront and respectful in the ongoing dialogue about the Shoreline District.

Regarding the points made in the piece, we certainly understand your desire to have additional property taxes dedicated to schools and agree that our school districts are facing significant needs. As we have communicated in our meetings with MVW and MVLA staff, we are prepared to recommend that the City Council consider increased funding to schools from the Shoreline District. We expect to go to the Council on this topic on February 8.

We are concerned about a few of your statements. We don't think it is appropriate to characterize the Shoreline District is a redevelopment district, since, as you know, it was founded under different a legal framework to serve many ongoing public purposes, not just eliminating blight. Not surprisingly, we also have a different view of the statements that SCD funds have been used outside of the District, and that it generates "excess cash" for the City.

When we report to the Council on February 8 about the financial status of the Shoreline District and the recent communications City staff have had with you and with school district staff, we intend to describe the original intentions of the Shoreline District, the continuing needs for the District, the positive history of collaboration that the City and school districts have had over many years, and our good faith efforts to explore how best to provide additional funding to schools without jeopardizing the City's General Fund and the essential services it provides. We think it will be helpful for the Council to have this dialogue in public and welcome your involvement at that meeting. As we have committed in the past, we will share the report with you as soon as it is public. We expect that will be February 4.

Thanks again,
Kevin