Casey Richardson

From: roger heyder [redacted]
Sent: Friday, August 7, 2020 8:11 PM
To: City Council; Los Altos Parks & Recreation Commission
Subject: [External Sender]Public Comment - Parks and Rec meeting August 12, 2020

Hello,

These are comments for the public record on Agenda Items 2 and 3 of the August 12, 2020 Parks and Rec meeting.

Item 2 -

It is unclear what relevance the Justice Vanguard discussion has relative to Parks and Rec. Apparently the BLM art work decision has been passed to the Arts Commission. If there is specific relevant content for Parks and Rec, it should appear in the agenda as such. Otherwise there has been no actual public notification on this relevant content, and it should not be discussed.

Providing an open forum is becoming an unacceptable standard practice at Parks and Rec. Recently GreenTown Los Altos presented primarily on Reach Codes. Again a topic that has little to no relevance to Parks and Rec. At least their presentation was provided in the agenda.

If there are no relevant topics for Parks and Rec, it would be much more appropriate to simply cancel the meeting.

Item 3 -

Los Altos should be implementing programs and facilities based on resident need and desire, as opposed to a 'payoff'. 'Free money' is not an appropriate motivation to implement a bocce ball court, or anything, unless a LARGE number of residents want and have requested it. Having a small group request and fund a project, possibly for their own benefit, is grossly inappropriate.

Again this seems to be an alarming trend. Silicon Valley Clean Energy apparently has offered money to Council to agendize an item on Reach Codes, which in Los Altos currently translates to a Natural Gas Ban. Silicon Valley Clean Energy business will be positively impacted by a natural gas ban, so this might again be viewed as a 'payoff'. Even worse, Council shifted residents over to SVCE, such that they had to contact PG&E to remain with PG&E. This means that effectively revenue from many Los Altos residents is being used by SVCE to fund an effort to ban natural gas in Los Altos.

Los Altos should make every effort to remain above being 'paid' to do something. If it is the right thing to do, then just do it, and if it is not, don't do it. Many residents value quality of life over how much money the city can squeeze out of doing the wrong thing.

I would strongly suggest that the Parks and Rec meeting be canceled, unless some specific agendized content specifically relevant to Parks and Rec can be provided.

regards -- Roger Heyder

Casey Richardson

From: PETE DAILEY [redacted]
Sent: Saturday, August 8, 2020 10:08 AM
To: Tanya Lindermeier; Donna Legge
Subject: [External Sender]Fwd: Public Comment - Parks and Rec meeting August 12, 2020

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Please find attached a article discussing access as a key determinant in the quality of public parks. This is explicitly in the context of historical access for people of color. I believe this clearly points out a PARC domain within the social justice discussion.

My hope is that our discussion at the next meeting will result in a resolution stating PARCs position on this social justice issue, and that we can go even further and perhaps state some support for the sentiment behind the BLM art that was posted in Lincoln Park. I understand the ship may have sailed on the art in Lincoln Park, but a resolution affirming support for welcoming all identities: ethnic, religious, sexual orientation or gender identity, and ability levels to Los Altos Parks is in alignment with the best JEDI training available today. I have also include links on JEDI in the parks arena.

https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2016-06-02/a-legacy-of-racism-in-america-s-parks

https://www.americantrails.org/resources/justice-equity-diversity-inclusion-jedi-part-1-the-what-and-why-of-jedi

https://www.publiclandsalliance.org/what-we-do/jedi

Begin forwarded message:

From: roger heyder [redacted]
Subject: Public Comment - Parks and Rec meeting August 12, 2020
Date: August 7, 2020 at 8:10:35 PM PDT
To: City Council <council@losaltosca.gov>, "PARCommission@losaltosca.gov" <PARCommission@losaltosca.gov>

Hello,

These are comments for the public record on Agenda Items 2 and 3 of the August 12, 2020 Parks and Rec meeting.

Item 2 -

It is unclear what relevance the Justice Vanguard discussion has relative to Parks and Rec. Apparently the BLM art work decision has been passed to the Arts Commission. If there is specific relevant content for Parks and Rec, it should appear in the agenda as such. Otherwise there has been no actual public notification on this relevant content, and it should not be discussed.

Providing an open forum is becoming an unacceptable standard practice at Parks and Rec. Recently GreenTown Los Altos presented primarily on Reach Codes. Again a topic that has little to no relevance to Parks and Rec. At least their presentation was provided in the agenda.

If there are no relevant topics for Parks and Rec, it would be much more appropriate to simply cancel the meeting.

Item 3 -

Los Altos should be implementing programs and facilities based on resident need and desire, as opposed to a 'payoff'. 'Free money' is not an appropriate motivation to implement a bocce ball court, or anything, unless a LARGE number of residents want and have requested it. Having a small group request and fund a project, possibly for their own benefit, is grossly inappropriate.

Again this seems to be an alarming trend. Silicon Valley Clean Energy apparently has offered money to Council to agendize an item on Reach Codes, which in Los Altos currently translates to a Natural Gas Ban. Silicon Valley Clean Energy business will be positively impacted by a natural gas ban, so this might again be viewed as a 'payoff'. Even worse, Council shifted residents over to SVCE, such that they had to contact PG&E to remain with PG&E. This means that effectively revenue from many Los Altos residents is being used by SVCE to fund an effort to ban natural gas in Los Altos.

Los Altos should make every effort to remain above being 'paid' to do something. If it is the right thing to do, then just do it, and if it is not, don't do it. Many residents value quality of life over how much money the city can squeeze out of doing the wrong thing.

I would strongly suggest that the Parks and Rec meeting be canceled, unless some specific agendized content specifically relevant to Parks and Rec can be provided.

regards -- Roger Heyder

Casey Richardson

From: Roberta Phillips [redacted]
Sent: Monday, August 10, 2020 10:27 AM
To: Los Altos Parks & Recreation Commission; Donna Legge
Subject: Public Arts Guidelines. Aug 12th meeting Letter
Attachments: Public Art Quidelines.pdf

Dear Parks Commissioners
Please see the attached Public Arts guidelines which states "

Ineligible Works of Art:

Art that signifies a political or religious statement.

This was signed by City Council on Oct 23,2018

This policy is a good one because one religious group or one group with a political agenda, does not get precedence over another group with a different point of view. At an extreme , hypothetically, a pro-life group might propose art in the park while a group wanting freedom of choice migh also want their view illustrated through a piece of art. Someone might, for example, want a "Blue Lives Matter "piece of art in the Park. Our parks should be for people to enjoy nature, play, attend recreational activities, picnic, relax and enjoy themselves.

Throughout history there have been many great pieces of art that are controversial, but they are housed in Museums. where professional curators evaluate the merit of the art , and viewers pay to see the exhibit. I do not believe that there are members of the Parks and Recreation Commision who have the background or education to evaluate the merits of one piece of art vs another in our park.

My education is in Art Education, attending Buffalo University and Hunter College. I was an art teacher for 12 years.

Please follow the guidelines our city has codified.

Sincerely

Roberta Phillips

[redacted]

Casey Richardson

From: Wendy Reynolds [redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, August 12, 2020 12:40 PM
To: Donna Legge
Subject: BLM Mural on Main Street

In your meeting tonight PLEASE do NOT recommend to the council to pass the request of "Justice Vanguard Foundation" to paint a BLM mural on Main Street, or any other street in our town. With all the stigma around the national BLM group (rioting, looting, burning the American Flag) this mural DOES NOT earn a place on our streets. I know this group says they don't associate with the national group but their mural would read BLACK LIVES MATTER. I have owned a home here for 45 years and personally I would not drive down or shop in that block of Main Street.
If this request is granted, I hope this would not be a permanent mural. If it is granted will the city have to pay for maintenance? Does the city have enough of our tax dollars to cover any lawsuits? You know if this is allowed you will have to consider any other group's request to paint their message on our streets. I'm sure you wouldn't a MEGA mural.
I also DO NOT want my tax dollars to go to a group (JVF) that supports defunding our Police Department.
In reading the agenda for tonight's meeting, why does the whole meeting consist of social equality, social justice, diversity and inclusion?
Thank you
Wendy Reynolds

Sent from my iPad