

**From:** Kirk kirkcallansmith@mindspring.com  
**Subject:** Agenda item 12.2  
**Date:** August 08, 2016 at 5:14 PM America/Los\_Angeles  
**To:** cmorris@cityofplacerville.org



Hi Cleve,

Is this \$5,000 grant to PDA for a sign something that has to be approved Tuesday night or they will lose the money, or can it come up again in two weeks?

I thought the PDA request this year was to replace the two sawhorse signs that appear on HW40 and HW50 but as I read the report for item 12.2, the money is only for one sign and that is on HW50. Would it truly be a replacement, being placed at the same HW50 spot as has been the case for each downtown event in the past or will it be at some new spot on HW50 and if so where? Was is the HW49 location not mentioned?

When it came to the previous PDA proposal made a year or so ago, that was to make a major change to the stone welcoming sign near Canal Street and for that I can understand why the cost could be as high as \$5,000. But \$5,000 to update two sawhorse signs, that's hard to understand. And when the city is again seeking a sales tax increase, some business like frugality and accountability seems like it would be especially appropriate.

When the city is spending money, it seems like some standards and conditions would be appropriate. Was there competitive bidding used for this proposed print job and why, I am wondering, would we want to give business for meeting city needs to a printing company outside Placerville rather than recover some of the sales tax for the city associated with this printing job by limiting the grant to firms located in the city.

Thank you for your consideration of these issues. Kirk

**From:** Cleve Morris [cmorris@cityofplacerville.org](mailto:cmorris@cityofplacerville.org)  
**Subject:** Re: Agenda item 12.2  
**Date:** August 09, 2016 at 8:54 AM America/Los\_Angeles  
**To:** Kirk [kirkcallansmith@mindspring.com](mailto:kirkcallansmith@mindspring.com)



Kirk: If you look at attachment 2 which is the proposed cost, you will see that this is for 4 signs, 2 for highway 50 and 2 for highway 49, plus 24 inserts for PDA events. The \$5,000 was awarded to PDA in 2014, the purpose of this agenda item is to approve the design for the signs. Since this is not a city project and is under the requirement for competitive bidding anyway, no competitive bidding is required.

Cleve Morris  
City Manager  
City of Placerville  
[cmorris@cityofplacerville.org](mailto:cmorris@cityofplacerville.org)  
[www.cityofplacerville.org](http://www.cityofplacerville.org)  
530-642-5200

----- Forwarded message -----  
From: Kirk <[kirkcallansmith@mindspring.com](mailto:kirkcallansmith@mindspring.com)>  
Date: Mon, Aug 8, 2016 at 5:14 PM  
Subject: Agenda item 12.2  
To: [cmorris@cityofplacerville.org](mailto:cmorris@cityofplacerville.org)

Hi Cleve,

Is this \$5,000 grant to PDA for a sign something that has to be approved Tuesday night or they will lose the money, or can it come up again in two weeks?

I thought the PDA request this year was to replace the two sawhorse signs that appear on HW40 and HW50 but as I read the report for item 12.2, the money is only for one sign and that is on HW50. Would it truly be a replacement, being placed at the same HW50 spot as has been the case for each downtown event in the past or will it be at some new spot on HW50 and if so where? Was is the HW49 location not mentioned?

When it came to the previous PDA proposal made a year or so ago, that was to make a major change to the stone welcoming sign near Canal Street and for that I can understand why the cost could be as high as \$5,000. But \$5,000 to update two sawhorse signs, that's hard to understand. And when the city is again seeking a sales tax increase, some business like frugality and accountability seems like it would be especially appropriate.

When the city is spending money, it seems like some standards and conditions would be appropriate. Was there competitave bidding used for this proposed print job and why, I am wondering, would we want to give business for meeting city needs to a printing company outside Placerville rather than recover some of the sales tax for the city associated with this printing job by limiting the grant to firms located in the city.

Thank you for your consideration of these issues. Kirk

**From:** Cleve Morris [cmorris@cityofplacerville.org](mailto:cmorris@cityofplacerville.org)  
**Subject:** Fwd: Agenda item 12.2  
**Date:** August 09, 2016 at 8:55 AM America/Los\_Angeles  
**To:** Lisa Crummett [lisa@placerville-downtown.org](mailto:lisa@placerville-downtown.org), Adam Anderson [adam@wealthguardadvisors.com](mailto:adam@wealthguardadvisors.com), Kris Payne [paykris@hughes.net](mailto:paykris@hughes.net)



FYI

Cleve Morris  
City Manager  
City of Placerville  
[cmorris@cityofplacerville.org](mailto:cmorris@cityofplacerville.org)  
[www.cityofplacerville.org](http://www.cityofplacerville.org)  
530-642-5200

----- Forwarded message -----  
From: Kirk <[kirkcallansmith@mindspring.com](mailto:kirkcallansmith@mindspring.com)>  
Date: Mon, Aug 8, 2016 at 5:14 PM  
Subject: Agenda item 12.2  
To: [cmorris@cityofplacerville.org](mailto:cmorris@cityofplacerville.org)

Hi Cleve,

Is this \$5,000 grant to PDA for a sign something that has to be approved Tuesday night or they will lose the money, or can it come up again in two weeks?

I thought the PDA request this year was to replace the two sawhorse signs that appear on HW40 and HW50 but as I read the report for item 12.2, the money is only for one sign and that is on HW50. Would it truly be a replacement, being placed at the same HW50 spot as has been the case for each downtown event in the past or will it be at some new spot on HW50 and if so where? Was is the HW49 location not mentioned?

When it came to the previous PDA proposal made a year or so ago, that was to make a major change to the stone welcoming sign near Canal Street and for that I can understand why the cost could be as high as \$5,000. But \$5,000 to update two sawhorse signs, that's hard to understand. And when the city is again seeking a sales tax increase, some business like frugality and accountability seems like it would be especially appropriate.

When the city is spending money, it seems like some standards and conditions would be appropriate. Was there competitive bidding used for this proposed print job and why, I am wondering, would we want to give business for meeting city needs to a printing company outside Placerville rather than recover some of the sales tax for the city associated with this printing job by limiting the grant to firms located in the city.

Thank you for your consideration of these issues. Kirk

**From:** Lisa Crummett [lisa@placerville-downtown.org](mailto:lisa@placerville-downtown.org)  
**Subject:** Re: Fwd: Agenda item 12.2  
**Date:** August 09, 2016 at 10:57 AM America/Los\_Angeles  
**To:** Cleve Morris [cmorris@cityofplacerville.org](mailto:cmorris@cityofplacerville.org)



Grrrrrrrrr! This guy.....ugh!

By the way, the PDA Board voted at the meeting last Thursday to support the red sign as their first choice. John Clerici was present during this agenda item and can verify this. I believe we had 10 Board Members present (a quorum is anything over 9) and it was unanimous. But if you ask Kirk Smith – who WAS there – he will somehow say it never happened. He did, once again, say at our meeting, it was never brought before PDA previously. Ugh!!!!!!!!!!

Lisa

**From:** [Cleve Morris](#)  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 09, 2016 8:55 AM  
**To:** [Lisa Crummett](#) ; [Adam Anderson](#) ; [Kris Payne](#)  
**Subject:** Fwd: Agenda item 12.2

FYI

Cleve Morris  
City Manager  
City of Placerville  
[cmorris@cityofplacerville.org](mailto:cmorris@cityofplacerville.org)  
[www.cityofplacerville.org](http://www.cityofplacerville.org)  
530-642-5200

----- Forwarded message -----

**From:** Kirk <[kirkcallansmith@mindspring.com](mailto:kirkcallansmith@mindspring.com)>  
**Date:** Mon, Aug 8, 2016 at 5:14 PM  
**Subject:** Agenda item 12.2  
**To:** [cmorris@cityofplacerville.org](mailto:cmorris@cityofplacerville.org)

Hi Cleve,

Is this \$5,000 grant to PDA for a sign something that has to be approved Tuesday night or they will lose the money, or can it come up again in two weeks?

I thought the PDA request this year was to replace the two sawhorse signs that appear on HW40 and HW50 but as I read the report for item 12.2, the money is only for one sign and that is on HW50. Would it truly be a replacement, being placed at the same HW50 spot as has been the case for each downtown event in the past or will it be at some new spot on HW50 and if so where? Was is the HW49 location not mentioned?

When it came to the previous PDA proposal made a year or so ago, that was to make a major change to the stone welcoming sign near Canal Street and for that I can understand why the cost could be as high as \$5,000. But \$5,000 to update two sawhorse signs, that's hard to understand. And when the city is again seeking a sales tax increase, some business like frugality and accountability seems like it would be especially appropriate.

When the city is spending money, it seems like some standards and conditions would be appropriate. Was there competitive bidding used for this proposed print job and why, I am wondering, would we want to give business for meeting city needs to a printing company outside Placerville rather than recover some of the sales tax for the city associated with this printing job by limiting the grant to firms located in the city.

Thank you for your consideration of these issues. Kirk



**From:** Kirk kirkcallansmith@mindspring.com  
**Subject:** RE: Agenda item 12.2  
**Date:** August 09, 2016 at 1:15 PM America/Los\_Angeles  
**To:** cmorris@cityofplacerville.org



Cleve,

Thank you for the information. To be clear, there is no controversy about modifying the present signs since the "street closed" language gives readers the idea that businesses are closed at those times, a concern raised as recently as the December 2015 PDA meeting. All PDA members want that done

But the problem, a big one, is that PDA members did not have a chance to get answers to basic questions that many had. While it was discussed at the July meeting, that item was not on the agenda so a significant number of directors were not present and they should have been informed about this proposed \$5,000 expenditure. Furthermore, PDA members were told at the August last week that if the PDA did not address this at tonight's city council meeting PDA would lose the chance to have this money. You know, kind of like saying that the city had to approve moving our courthouse because our courts would lose \$90 million and that the state had otherwise. So is that true, if the council does not approve this grant, in any form, Tuesday night, will PDA lose its chance to get money for signs?

I looked at the first attachment and only mentions HW50, nothing about HW49. <http://www.cityofplacerville.org/civicax/filebank/blobdload.aspx?BlobID=11579> The second attachment <http://www.cityofplacerville.org/civicax/filebank/blobdload.aspx?BlobID=11594> is the estimate from the non-city printer and it mentions four signs but I see nothing about the anything about the location. Neither attachments mention HW49 or gives information about the location. Hence, my question, where will the signs be located?

If the "street closed" language is required by law, as was stated at last Thursday's PDA meeting, how large does the letter have to be? The subject was mentioned at the July meeting but was not on the agenda and a number of PDA directors who could not make that meeting did not know the issue would be raised at that time. A number of us felt that the design should have been emailed <file:///E:/Brewfest.pdf> prior to the meeting. The fact that 10 PDA members voted to give officers the requested directive to make the request for money tonight, it is because we were all told that if it was not done tonight, PDA would lose its chance to get money for the signs. I would appreciate knowing if those representations are correct. Thank you again for your time. Kirk

**From:** Cleve Morris [mailto:cmorris@cityofplacerville.org]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 9, 2016 8:55 AM  
**To:** Kirk <kirkcallansmith@mindspring.com>  
**Subject:** Re: Agenda item 12.2

Kirk: If you look at attachment 2 which is the proposed cost, you will see that this is for 4 signs, 2 for highway 50 and 2 for highway 49, plus 24 inserts for PDA events. The \$5,000 was awarded to PDA in 2014, the purpose of this agenda item is to approve the design for the signs. Since this is not a city project and is under the requirement for competitive bidding anyway, no competitive bidding is required.

Cleve Morris  
City Manager  
City of Placerville  
[cmorris@cityofplacerville.org](mailto:cmorris@cityofplacerville.org)

[www.cityofplacerville.org](http://www.cityofplacerville.org)

530-642-5200

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Kirk** <[kirkcallansmith@mindspring.com](mailto:kirkcallansmith@mindspring.com)>

Date: Mon, Aug 8, 2016 at 5:14 PM

Subject: Agenda item 12.2

To: [cmorris@cityofplacerville.org](mailto:cmorris@cityofplacerville.org)

Hi Cleve,

Is this \$5,000 grant to PDA for a sign something that has to be approved Tuesday night or they will lose the money, or can it come up again in two weeks?

I thought the PDA request this year was to replace the two sawhorse signs that appear on HW40 and HW50 but as I read the report for item 12.2, the money is only for one sign and that is on HW50. Would it truly be a replacement, being placed at the same HW50 spot as has been the case for each downtown event in the past or will it be at some new spot on HW50 and if so where? Was is the HW49 location not mentioned?

When it came to the previous PDA proposal made a year or so ago, that was to make a major change to the stone welcoming sign near Canal Street and for that I can understand why the cost could be as high as \$5,000. But \$5,000 to update two sawhorse signs, that's hard to understand. And when the city is again seeking a sales tax increase, some business like frugality and accountability seems like it would be especially appropriate.

When the city is spending money, it seems like some standards and conditions would be appropriate. Was there competitive bidding used for this proposed print job and why, I am wondering, would we want to give business for meeting city needs to a printing company outside Placerville rather than recover some of the sales tax for the city associated with this printing job by limiting the grant to firms located in the city.

Thank you for your consideration of these issues. Kirk

**From:** Cleve Morris [cmorris@cityofplacerville.org](mailto:cmorris@cityofplacerville.org)  
**Subject:** Re: Agenda item 12.2  
**Date:** August 09, 2016 at 1:40 PM America/Los\_Angeles  
**To:** Kirk [kirkcallansmith@mindspring.com](mailto:kirkcallansmith@mindspring.com)



As mentioned previously, these signs are being produced to replace the existing signs. Therefore the location will be approximately the same location as they are now. The grant has already been approved. We are not approving funding tonight, only the design. I assume if it is not approved tonight a new design could be brought back for consideration but that will be the Council's decision.

Cleve

Cleve Morris  
City Manager  
City of Placerville  
[cmorris@cityofplacerville.org](mailto:cmorris@cityofplacerville.org)  
[www.cityofplacerville.org](http://www.cityofplacerville.org)  
530-642-5200

On Tue, Aug 9, 2016 at 1:15 PM, Kirk <[kirkcallansmith@mindspring.com](mailto:kirkcallansmith@mindspring.com)> wrote:  
Cleve,

Thank you for the information. To be clear, there is no controversy about modifying the present signs since the "street closed" language gives readers the idea that businesses are closed at those times, a concern raised as recently as the December 2015 PDA meeting. All PDA members want that done

But the problem, a big one, is that PDA members did not have a chance to get answers to basic questions that many had. While it was discussed at the July meeting, that item was not on the agenda so a significant number of directors were not present and they should have been informed about this proposed \$5,000 expenditure. Furthermore, PDA members were told at the August last week that if the PDA did not address this at tonight's city council meeting PDA would lose the chance to have this money. You know, kind of like saying that the city had to approve moving our courthouse because our courts would lose \$90 million and that the state had otherwise. So is that true, if the council does not approve this grant, in any form, Tuesday night, will PDA lose its chance to get money for signs?

I looked at the first attachment and only mentions HW50, nothing about HW49. <http://www.cityofplacerville.org/civicax/filebank/blobdload.aspx?BlobID=11579> The second attachment <http://www.cityofplacerville.org/civicax/filebank/blobdload.aspx?BlobID=11594> is the estimate from the non-city printer and it mentions four signs but I see nothing about the anything about the location. Neither attachments mention HW49 or gives information about the location. Hence, my question, where will the signs be located?

If the "street closed" language is required by law, as was stated at last Thursday's PDA meeting, how large does the letter have to be? The subject was mentioned at the July meeting but was not on the agenda and a number of PDA directors who could not make that meeting did not know the issue would be [raised.at](#) that time. A number of us felt that the design should have been emailed file:///E:/Brewfest.pdf prior to the meeting. The fact that 10 PDA members voted to give officers the requested directive to make the request for money tonight, it is because we were all told that if it was not done tonight, PDA would lose its chance to get money for the signs. I would appreciate knowing if those representations are correct. Thank you again for your time. Kirk

**From:** Cleve Morris [mailto:[cmorris@cityofplacerville.org](mailto:cmorris@cityofplacerville.org)]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 9, 2016 8:55 AM  
**To:** Kirk <[kirkcallansmith@mindspring.com](mailto:kirkcallansmith@mindspring.com)>  
**Subject:** Re: Agenda item 12.2

Kirk: If you look at attachment 2 which is the proposed cost, you will see that this is for 4 signs, 2 for highway 50 and 2 for highway 49, plus 24 inserts for PDA events. The \$5,000 was awarded to PDA in 2014, the purpose of this agenda item is to approve the design for the signs. Since this is not a city project and is under the requirement for competitive bidding anyway, no competitive bidding is required.

Cleve Morris  
City Manager  
City of Placerville  
[cmorris@cityofplacerville.org](mailto:cmorris@cityofplacerville.org)  
[www.cityofplacerville.org](http://www.cityofplacerville.org)  
[530-642-5200](tel:530-642-5200)

----- Forwarded message -----

**From:** Kirk <[kirkcallansmith@mindspring.com](mailto:kirkcallansmith@mindspring.com)>  
**Date:** Mon, Aug 8, 2016 at 5:14 PM  
**Subject:** Agenda item 12.2  
**To:** [cmorris@cityofplacerville.org](mailto:cmorris@cityofplacerville.org)

Hi Cleve,

Is this \$5,000 grant to PDA for a sign something that has to be approved Tuesday night or they will lose the money, or can it come up again in two weeks?

I thought the PDA request this year was to replace the two sawhorse signs that appear on HW40 and HW50 but as I read the report for item 12.2, the money is only for one sign and that is on HW50. Would it truly be a replacement, being placed at the same HW50 spot as has been the case for each downtown event in the past or will it be at some new spot on HW50 and if so where? Was the HW49 location not mentioned?

When it came to the previous PDA proposal made a year or so ago, that was to make a major change to the stone welcoming sign near Canal Street and for that I can understand why the cost could be as high as \$5,000. But \$5,000 to update two sawhorse signs, that's hard to understand. And when the city is again seeking a sales tax increase, some business like frugality and accountability seems like it would be especially appropriate.

When the city is spending money, it seems like some standards and conditions would be appropriate. Was there competitive bidding used for this proposed print job and why, I am wondering, would we want to give business for meeting city needs to a printing company outside Placerville rather than recover some of the sales tax for the city associated with this printing job by limiting the grant to firms located in the city.

Thank you for your consideration of these issues. Kirk



**From:** Cleve Morris [cmorris@cityofplacerville.org](mailto:cmorris@cityofplacerville.org)  
**Subject:** Fwd: Agenda item 12.2  
**Date:** August 09, 2016 at 1:41 PM America/Los\_Angeles  
**To:** Lisa Crummett [lisa@placerville-downtown.org](mailto:lisa@placerville-downtown.org), Adam Anderson [adam@wealthguardadvisors.com](mailto:adam@wealthguardadvisors.com), Kris Payne [paykris@hughes.net](mailto:paykris@hughes.net)



FYI

Cleve Morris  
City Manager  
City of Placerville  
[cmorris@cityofplacerville.org](mailto:cmorris@cityofplacerville.org)  
[www.cityofplacerville.org](http://www.cityofplacerville.org)  
530-642-5200

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Kirk <[kirkcallansmith@mindspring.com](mailto:kirkcallansmith@mindspring.com)>  
Date: Tue, Aug 9, 2016 at 1:15 PM  
Subject: RE: Agenda item 12.2  
To: [cmorris@cityofplacerville.org](mailto:cmorris@cityofplacerville.org)

Cleve,

Thank you for the information. To be clear, there is no controversy about modifying the present signs since the "street closed" language gives readers the idea that businesses are closed at those times, a concern raised as recently as the December 2015 PDA meeting. All PDA members want that done

But the problem, a big one, is that PDA members did not have a chance to get answers to basic questions that many had. While it was discussed at the July meeting, that item was not on the agenda so a significant number of directors were not present and they should have been informed about this proposed \$5,000 expenditure. Furthermore, PDA members were told at the August last week that if the PDA did not address this at tonight's city council meeting PDA would lose the chance to have this money. You know, kind of like saying that the city had to approve moving our courthouse because our courts would lose \$90 million and that the state had otherwise. So is that true, if the council does not approve this grant, in any form, Tuesday night, will PDA lose its chance to get money for signs?

I looked at the first attachment and only mentions HW50, nothing about HW49. <http://www.cityofplacerville.org/civicax/filebank/blobdload.aspx?BlobID=11579> The second attachment <http://www.cityofplacerville.org/civicax/filebank/blobdload.aspx?BlobID=11594> is the estimate from the non-city printer and it mentions four signs but I see nothing about the anything about the location. Neither attachments mention HW49 or gives information about the location. Hence, my question, where will the signs be located?

If the "street closed" language is required by law, as was stated at last Thursday's PDA meeting, how large does the letter have to be? The subject was mentioned at the July meeting but was not on the agenda and a number of PDA directors who could not make that meeting did not know the issue would be [raised.at](#) that time. A number of us felt that the design should have been emailed file:///E:/Brewfest.pdf prior to the meeting. The fact that 10 PDA members voted to give officers the requested directive to make the request for money tonight, it is because we were all told that if it was not done tonight, PDA would lose its chance to get money for the signs. I would appreciate knowing if those representations are correct. Thank you again for your time. Kirk

**From:** Cleve Morris [mailto:[cmorris@cityofplacerville.org](mailto:cmorris@cityofplacerville.org)]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 9, 2016 8:55 AM  
**To:** Kirk <[kirkcallansmith@mindspring.com](mailto:kirkcallansmith@mindspring.com)>  
**Subject:** Re: Agenda item 12.2

Kirk: If you look at attachment 2 which is the proposed cost, you will see that this is for 4 signs, 2 for highway 50 and 2 for highway 49, plus 24 inserts for PDA events. The \$5,000 was awarded to PDA in 2014, the purpose of this agenda item is to approve the design for the signs. Since this is not a city project and is under the requirement for competitive bidding anyway, no competitive bidding is required.

Cleve Morris  
City Manager  
City of Placerville  
[cmorris@cityofplacerville.org](mailto:cmorris@cityofplacerville.org)  
[www.cityofplacerville.org](http://www.cityofplacerville.org)  
[530-642-5200](tel:530-642-5200)

----- Forwarded message -----

**From:** Kirk <[kirkcallansmith@mindspring.com](mailto:kirkcallansmith@mindspring.com)>  
**Date:** Mon, Aug 8, 2016 at 5:14 PM  
**Subject:** Agenda item 12.2  
**To:** [cmorris@cityofplacerville.org](mailto:cmorris@cityofplacerville.org)

Hi Cleve,

Is this \$5,000 grant to PDA for a sign something that has to be approved Tuesday night or they will lose the money, or can it come up again in two weeks?

I thought the PDA request this year was to replace the two sawhorse signs that appear on HW40 and HW50 but as I read the report for item 12.2, the money is only for one sign and that is on HW50. Would it truly be a replacement, being placed at the same HW50 spot as has been the case for each downtown event in the past or will it be at some new spot on HW50 and if so where? Was is the HW49 location not mentioned?

When it came to the previous PDA proposal made a year or so ago, that was to make a major change to the stone welcoming sign near Canal Street and for that I can understand why the cost could be as high as \$5,000. But \$5,000 to update two sawhorse signs, that's hard to understand. And when the city is again seeking a sales tax increase, some business like frugality and accountability seems like it would be especially appropriate.

When the city is spending money, it seems like some standards and conditions would be appropriate. Was there competitive bidding used for this proposed print job and why, I am wondering, would we want to give business for meeting city needs to a printing company outside Placerville rather than recover some of the sales tax for the city associated with this printing job by limiting the grant to firms located in the city.

Thank you for your consideration of these issues. Kirk