Communication from Public

Name:	
Date Submitted:	06/12/2026 05:23 PM
Council File No:	24-1168
Comments for Public Posting:	I understand this is active litigation and some discussion may need to happen in closed session. But the public still deserves basic fiscal transparency before the City spends more money on outside counsel. The City has already received an unfavorable ruling in this case. The court already issued a judgment, a writ of mandate, and ordered the City to issue permits. Because of that, I believe there is a real risk the City may lose this appeal. If the City loses, the cost could be much higher than the outside counsel contract. The City could face more legal fees, damages, court costs, or a settlement. Other California cities have faced major costs in similar land use and housing related cases. Lockaway Storage v. County of Alameda involved nearly $1 million in damages and over $700,000 in attorney fees. City of San Mateo settled a Housing Accountability Act case for $450,000. City of La Cañada Flintridge agreed to pay over $1.2 million in attorney fees and costs in housing litigation. So my question is simple: What is the City's financial exposure if it loses this appeal? Please explain whether the outside counsel amount is capped or only an initial retainer, whether more funding may be requested later, what fund is paying for this, and what the potential taxpayer risk could be. I am not asking for confidential legal strategy. I am asking for basic accountability before more public money is spent.