



**City of
Santa Clara**
The Center of What's Possible

CITY OF SANTA CLARA
OFFICE OF THE CITY CLERK

2023 APR 28 PM 3: 23

CITY COUNCIL WRITTEN PETITION_____

Date: 04/28/23

I, Mary O. Grizzle, hereby request that the following subject be placed on the City of Santa Clara Council and Authorities Concurrent Meeting Agenda:

Santa Clara Civic Center Relocation Study Flaw: Change Two of the Study's Focus Cities

For more information about this subject, please see below: _____

Reclaiming Our Downtown deeply appreciates the fact that the city is spending \$353,000 on this study. We want to make sure that we are getting accurate case studies to evaluate at the conclusion of the study.

Reclaiming Our Downtown requested this study to understand the financial and private investment benefits that these cities are experiencing including:

1. The generation of private Downtown development as proven by these other American cities
2. Significant reduction of construction costs while adding a potential revenue stream to the city with a mixed-use City Hall as evidenced by these other American cities.
3. The revenue stream that we see in other Bay Area cities once we have a completed Downtown.
4. Also, specific to Santa Clara, the examination of the revenues that would be produced by the sale of the ten acres on Warburton (for potential housing)

after the
return
of their
City
Hall

Our group spent over 14 months identifying cities across the country who had either returned a City Hall back into their Downtown or built a new City Hall as a unique focal point for the Downtown. Our volunteers then spoke to each city's leadership about the impact after City Hall was completed.

On March 14th, 2023, WRT presented the six cities to the Downtown Task Force (DCTF). While ROD agrees with four of the six cities, we are deeply concerned that the cities of Watsonville and Sonoma do not meet the criteria stated above nor the spirit of the study.

Watsonville:

Only moved their City Hall across the street from the old city hall. There is little difference between the new and old city hall. Retail was attempted but all that has been added is a Subway sandwich shop. The architect designer did little to make it an "epicenter" of the Downtown. The economy is another issue: according to Data USA, the largest industries in Watsonville are farming, fishing, and hunting. Per Data USA, Santa Clara largest industries are professional, scientific, and technical services.

As the Watsonville example moved the City Hall to a different location in Downtown, Winter Garden Florida should be used instead. Winter Garden moved their City Hall to the very **center** of the Downtown. Per their Economic Development Director: The City Hall was not designed for City Government but to CREATE Downtown activity. Its lobby is the city's art gallery; they structured the front of the building for entertainment and speaking venues; Chambers are now used for community events, and they even painted it white to show movies and light shows on it at night.

Sonoma:

This example should not be used as the BUILDING was NEVER BUILT. All the analysis WRT developed, while very detailed, cannot be proven as the building was built.

Why use a non-existent building when you have a **perfect recreation of the Santa Clara City Hall Story?**

Sandusky Ohio should replace Sonoma – Sandusky, like Santa Clara had their original City Hall Downtown. They moved their City Hall out of Downtown (we did the same 5 years later). Sandusky Moved Back Downtown in 2017 into a restored historical building.

Some of the arguments from our last meeting against Sandusky are irrelevant and illogical:

1. Sandusky wasn't considered as the population. The population of Watsonville is under 50,000. Also, per their City Manager, they attract 200,000 over weekend and Summer due to their proximity of Cedar Point Amusement Park (this never used to happen until the Downtown was revitalized). The 2nd point is that here is a city that moves their City Hall back, we need to look at the \$100 Million in private development that followed.
2. They "Restored" an existing building vs. building new. **Sonoma didn't build at all!** The city spends \$30 Million (which is more like \$40-50M today) to restore three buildings Downtown – avoiding the negative environmental and historical effects of demolition and rebuilding. Sandusky must replace Sonoma.

We ask that this be put on the Council agenda for discussion. Reclaiming Our Downtown can provide any back up material and would like to do a brief five-minute presentation prior to this discussion.

By submitting this form, I am confirming that I am the requestor herein listed and that the information provided is truthful and correct to the best of my knowledge. I understand that it is important that I attend the meeting in the event there are any questions the Mayor and/or Council wishes to ask me. I also understand that the City may not place my item on the Agenda if it is not verifiable and within the subject matter jurisdiction of the City.

1167 Monroe St.

mogrizzle2@gmail.com

Street Address (Optional)

Email

408-242-1851

Santa Clara, CA 95050

City

Zip

Telephone

NOTE: This is a public document.