

---

**From:** Ralph Taboada <[taboada1@sbcglobal.net](mailto:taboada1@sbcglobal.net)>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, May 8, 2024 10:56 AM  
**To:** CITY CLERK <[CITYCLERK@costamesaca.gov](mailto:CITYCLERK@costamesaca.gov)>  
**Subject:** Parks - Capital Projects

To City Clerk staff

Will you please forward this email with attachment to the PAC commissioners in preparation for Thursday's PAC meeting.

Thank you  
Ralph

To: PAC Chair and Commissioners

I believe the Capital review/approval process can be improved and that the PAC can be a part of the improvement process. Including additional basic information will provide for what I believe to be a more transparent and improved process.

Included in every annual budget is a "Five Year Capital Improvement Program" (CIP). This is the Council approved plan of Capital projects for future years. As the approved plan for future years I believe the CIP should be used as the baseline for reviewing proposed annual budgets, while acknowledging that it is subject to updating, depending on changing priorities, funding issues, and/or unanticipated events. Changes however, should be transparent and understood

The current process includes a presentation of the proposed Capital projects for the upcoming year, in this case fiscal 24/25. There is no comparison with the CIP so PAC does not know how the projects proposed compare to the projects in the approved CIP. I believe this is a gap or weakness in the process. The process should be more transparent by comparing proposed projects vs CIP projects so variances can be reviewed and evaluated. Plus, no optional projects are presented other than the proposed projects. In my view the process comes off as a "take it or leave it" proposition.

In addition, I believe there should be more focus on the proposed Five Year CIP with staff and the PAC collaborating on prioritization of future projects. The more consensus on the Five Year CIP the better it can be used for long range planning. Currently there are many changes from year to year in the Five Year CIP which makes it less reliable for long range planning.

I have attached a recommended format that incorporates a comparison of the proposed projects with the approved CIP for fiscal 24/25. Variances are shown and should be explained and I think should be evaluated by the PAC.

Thank you  
Ralph Taboada

---

**CAUTION:** This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. Report any suspicious activities to the

Comparison between Approved Capital Improvement Program (CIP) and Staff Proposed Projects			
For Fiscal 24/25		\$ Thousands	
Recommended Format			
Projects	Current Proposed	Capital Improve Program	Variance Increase/ (Decrease)
Butterfly Gardens		50	-50
Fairview Park - Educational Hubs and Signage		88	-88
Fairview Park - Fencing - Signage - Trail Restoration		75	-75
Fairview Park - Master Plan Implementation	75	200	-125
Gisler Park - Light Poles Replacement		90	-90
Harper Park - Playground Replacement		190	-190
Jack Hammett Sports Complex - Relevel Fields 1 and 2	400		400
Lions park - Open Space improvements		50	-50
Luke Davis Field Improvements	45		45
Marina View Park - Playground Replacement		190	-190
Park Security Lighting Replacement Program		100	-100
Park Sidewalk / Accessibility Program	50	50	0
TeWinkle Athletic Fields - Batting Cage & Other	325		325
Various Parks - Parking Lot Rehabilitation		50	-50
Various Parks - Playground Repairs & Replacement	50	50	0
Victoria Avenue Corridor Development		650	-650
Westside Park Development		3,000	-3,000
Wimbledon Park - Exercise Equipment Replacement	110	110	0
<b>Total Parks</b>	<b>1,055</b>	<b>4,943</b>	<b>-3,888</b>