

December 28, 2015

RECEIVED
CITY CLERK

16 JAN -4 PM 2:52

CITY OF COSTA MESA
BY *[Signature]*

Costa Mesa City Council
P.O. Box 1200
Costa Mesa, CA 92628-1200

Dear City Council:

Please consider revising the parking permit pass policy for guests of those of us that live on permit streets. I often times will leave for the weekend with a friend and I will have a friend's car parked out on the street. The pass is only good for one day and I always have to try and find someone to come by and switch out the pass for the 3 days we are gone.

I hate the parking passes and ideally, I wish they would be eliminated on Iowa Street.

I never signed a petition or agreed to permitted parking on our street, nor did the eight of my closest neighbors here in the Mesa Verde Villas (condos on Iowa Street).

While I have your attention, we need speed bumps on Iowa Street. I have lost THREE, yes, THREE cars (one that was completely totalled out by the insurance company) to accidents to my PARKED car on the curve in front of 1654 Iowa Street. It has been a very expensive problem because of the cars that speed down Iowa Street.

Thanks for allowing me to have input into this matter,

[Handwritten Signature]

Janine Ranes



Costa Mesa, CA 92626

/jrr

2865 Drake Ave.
Costa Mesa, CA 92626

RECEIVED
CITY CLERK
16 JAN -4 PM 2:52
CITY OF COSTA MESA
BY 

December 29, 2015

Costa Mesa City Council
P.O. Box 1200
Costa Mesa, CA 92628

Re: Proposed "Residents Only" Parking Permits Resolution

Dear City Council Members,

I propose two matters for your consideration related to the "residents only" policy.

The current fine of \$111 is excessive. It is far greater than needed to make the policy effective. It appears to be more a revenue producing policy. A fine of \$35 would be sufficient sanction to deter intentional un-permitted parking.

The signs should accurately reflect the fine. The current signs on my block show a fine of \$100 when in actuality it is \$111.

Respectfully submitted,



Dennis McNutt

ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTS - PH-2

Darrell and Linda Twedt
[REDACTED]
Costa Mesa CA 92627

RECEIVED
CITY CLERK

16 JAN -4 PM 2:52

CITY OF COSTA MESA
BY *[Signature]*

Costa Mesa City Council
P.O. Box 1200
Costa Mesa, CA 92628-1200

RE: Proposed changes to "Resident Only" parking restriction changes
January 5, 2016 City Council Agenda

Dear Sir or Madam,

My wife and I, who reside alone on Towne Street, **oppose any changes** to the "Resident Only" parking restriction program that would **increase** the program's **bureaucracy and expense** and **support changes** that would streamline the process and **minimize city employee labor** needed for other R-1 neighborhoods to implement resident permit restrictions.

"Resident Only" restrictions have been a godsend on Towne Street. My wife and I each have work-issued vehicles as well as personal vehicles, and utilize two street parking spaces. Prior to the restriction, we often had to park several houses away, and watched residents of the apartments on Monrovia, Center Street, and Placentia consume all available parking on Towne Street. Now we always have a space in front of our house. In addition to the convenience, the program has enhanced neighborhood safety as vehicle traffic, particularly fast moving vehicles looking for parking spaces, has diminished significantly, as has pedestrian traffic across the uncontrolled intersection at Placentia. Prior to the restriction, almost daily we witnessed whole families, with children pushed in strollers, attempting to cross the busy 40 mph thoroughfare of Placentia, to and from apartments on the east side Placentia to access their vehicles parked on Towne Street. And at least once a year we saw the aftermath of an apparent fatal pedestrian collision.

That said, the system appears to be working well, and we **do not see any need to increase the cost and city employee burden** as would be required to implement many of the proposed changes. We recommend the city cancel:

- **Oppose limiting the number of permits per household**, as this would increase the burden on city employees to keep track of permits issued, and consequently the cost of the program, and is not necessary. The program, as it is, has lowered number of vehicles on the street to an acceptable level. While we only park two vehicles on the street, we appreciate the convenience of having four stickers in order to rotate which vehicle we park on the street without risk of getting a ticket for forgetting the temporary permit. Limiting the number of permits to two would also inhibit the ability of residents to rent out rooms to supplement their income.

- **Oppose two year expiration and serial numbering**, as it would increase the cost and burden on city employees, and is not necessary to achieve the program's goals. Any benefit this may provide does not justify making it a city employee's full time job to reissue over 4000 permits every two years, to include mailing out expiration notices, maintaining and updating a database, and processing fees. The current system of simply requiring a resident to show vehicle registration is sufficient. Unless there is evidence of massive permit diversion and abuse, which I do not see, there is no reason create such an expensive bureaucracy.

- **Oppose parking zones**, as it would increase the cost, with no real benefit. There is no reason to believe residents in one zone would park in another zone, except perhaps in the R-1 zones near the college and fairgrounds. If there is evidence that residents near the college and fairgrounds are experiencing significant parking encroachment by permit holders from other neighborhoods, we would support a two or three-zone system, with respective zones for the college, fair, and everywhere else.

We do not oppose a reasonable per-permit fee (\$5-\$20) to support the program costs, but only after a full accounting is made of the proceeds generated by ticket revenue. The fine for not displaying a resident parking permit is \$100, and the additional ticket revenue should be sufficient to cover the cost of signage.

Sincerely,

Darrell Twedt

my NAME IS FRED JONES my ADDRESS IS

██████████. I JUST WANTED TO SAY THAT SINCE WE'VE HAD THE PERMIT PARKING MY FAMILY HAS PLACES TO PARK WHEN THEY COME TO VISIT. I HAVE NOTICED THAT OUR STREET IS A LOT CLEANER. I WOULD HOPE THAT YOU KEEP OUR STREET WITH PERMIT PARKING ONLY.

THANK YOU,

Fred Jones

RECEIVED
CITY CLERK

16 JAN -4 AM 11:12

CITY OF COSTA MESA
BY mtroyer

MEJIA, JESSICA

Subject: FW: Resident Only Permit Parking

From: Carol Morrison [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, January 01, 2016 2:15 PM
To: CITY CLERK <CITYCLERK@ci.costa-mesa.ca.us>
Subject: Resident Only Permit Parking

Members of the City Council,

We live in Zone 4, College Park I, and we appreciate the need during the Orange County Fair for having parking limited to permit holders and guest permits since it has eliminated a lot of the noise and trash left by fairgoers. However, it is a considerable inconvenience that every time we have vendors (plumbers, electricians, house cleaners) and friends visit, we need to supply them with a guest pass or risk their vehicles being ticketed. We would like to eliminate the requirement for guest passes for any time except when the Orange County Fair is being held. Furthermore, we are in total disagreement with limiting the permits to two (we have three vehicles); charging for the permits; and limiting guest passes to 100 per year. Respectfully submitted, Carol and Jack Morrison

MEJIA, JESSICA

Subject: FW: Changes to the Temporary Sign Code/Policy - Please continue to have Costa Mesa TV staff televise candidate forums in the upcoming election cycle

From: Bill McCarty [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, January 04, 2016 8:23 AM
To: HATCH, THOMAS <THOMAS.HATCH@costamesaca.gov>
Subject: RE: Changes to the Temporary Sign Code/Policy - Please continue to have Costa Mesa TV staff televise candidate forums in the upcoming election cycle

Dear CEO Hatch -

Continuing to use the Costa Mesa TV staff to televise candidate forums in the upcoming election cycle will ensure that Costa Mesa voters have reasonable access to the information they need to make well-informed decisions.

If cost is a concern, I would prefer to see a reduction in less important activities like "Cost Mesa Minute" and coverage of activities like lighting the Snoopy House. Election-related coverage should be a priority and take precedence over other activities.

Thanks you for your consideration in this matter.

Sincerely

Bill McCarty
[REDACTED]
Costa Mesa, CA 92626
[REDACTED]

MEJIA, JESSICA

Subject: FW: Subject: CMTV

From: Melissa Lippard [REDACTED]
Sent: Saturday, January 02, 2016 8:59 AM
To: HATCH, THOMAS <THOMAS.HATCH@costamesaca.gov>
Subject: Subject: CMTV

As a very long time resident of Costa Mesa, I urge you to do what you can to save CMTV. I one of the CM citizens who have a difficult time attending the meetings in person and rely on CMTV. If the majority on the council propose alternate technologies that could replace CMTV, please suggest that both are offered for the next year - one reason is to test the new technology. Another is to give citizens a chance to learn how it works, make sure we have the proper tools to access, etc.

It is a shame how the bullies who sit on our council have managed to chance the character of Costa Mesa without regard to the citizens who mistakenly put them there. CMTV is one way concerned citizens have an opportunity to see what candidates represent and how incumbents behave when in office.

Thank you.

Melissa Lippard
[REDACTED]

Costa Mesa, CA
[REDACTED]

MEJIA, JESSICA

Subject: FW: Candidate Forums Taping

From: Judy Lindsay [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, January 04, 2016 2:06 PM
To: HATCH, THOMAS <THOMAS.HATCH@costamesaca.gov>
Subject: Candidate Forums Taping

I am very disturbed that a decision is being considered to stop video taping of candidate forums. How will informed decisions at the voting booths be made without educating all the citizens who care about our city? Many of us are handicapped; unable to drive; work nites; have young children and are basically not able to attend the forums. The videos were done so professionally in the past and available at all hours for home viewing. Please share my concerns with the City Council members.

Seeing the expenditures in Tuesdays agenda I question monies for shirts, consultation by Mr Jordon (I am aware the Snoopy House was his "baby"), legal fees are out of sight and temporary employee fees. My tax payer monies need to be spent more wisely and keeping all citizens informed should have monetary priority!!!

Thank you.

Judy Lindsay
[REDACTED]
Costa Mesa, CA



LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF ORANGE COAST

Aliso Viejo, Costa Mesa, Lake Forest, Huntington Beach, Irvine, Laguna Beach, Laguna Hills,
Laguna Woods, Mission Viejo, Newport Beach, Rancho Santa Margarita, Seal Beach
P.O.Box 1065, Huntington Beach, CA 92647

January 4, 2016

Dear Costa Mesa City Council Members,

The League of Women Voters of Orange Coast opposes the Council's discontinuing the videotaping and airing of candidates forums for those running for the Costa Mesa City Council in the November 2016 election. Democratic government depends upon informed and active participation of voters in all levels of government. It is a citizen's right to have full access to public meetings such as candidates forums. We strongly support a Council's vote to continue filming and airing these forums.

Diane Nied, Grace Winchell and Barbara Wood

Co-Presidents, League of Women Voters of Orange Coast

MEJIA, JESSICA

Subject: FW: Transparency

-----Original Message-----

From: Bob Simonson [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, January 05, 2016 1:44 AM
To: CityManager <CityManager@ci.costa-mesa.ca.us>
Cc: MONAHAN, GARY <GARY.MONAHAN@costamesaca.gov>; RIGHEIMER, JIM <JIM.RIGHEIMER@costamesaca.gov>; FOLEY, KATRINA <KATRINA.FOLEY@costamesaca.gov>; GENIS, SANDRA <SANDRA.GENIS@costamesaca.gov>; MENSINGER, STEPHEN <STEPHEN.MENSINGER@costamesaca.gov>
Subject: Transparency

Dear CEO Hatch,

I have tried to not bother you for quite some time. But you and (a small part of) City Staff plus the City's Legal Counsel (perhaps others) have pissed me off.

I am especially angry about the last paragraph in New Business Item 1 scheduled for Council discussion January 5, 2016. Why do you and your Staff Writers repeatedly bury important issues into agenda items where I believe you suspect they will not be noticed.

Shame on you CEO.

You are responsible for employee ethical standards. You are not setting a good example with regard to City transparency.

You should be embarrassed by the following language in NB-1.

"As to filming of candidate's forums, staff and the City Attorney would also recommend that City staff be directed to not participate in the filming or video production of any candidates' forums and that such forums recordings not be placed on the City's website. Staff feels that with the new technology available today there are many alternatives and options available for City residents to view the various forums without involvement of City staff."

I suspect this proclamation may be very problematic.

I suggest that you and Council agree (during your pre-meeting dinner) to have the Mayor ask for the removal of such language from NB-1 prior to voting on it.

CMTV is a service provided by local taxpayers and should be dedicated to the benefit of Costa Mesa residents.

Please do the right thing.

Take care, Bob

MEJIA, JESSICA

Subject: FW: Comment for January 5, 2016 City Council Meeting

From: Joseph Cryer [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, January 05, 2016 2:17 PM
To: CITY CLERK <CITYCLERK@ci.costamesa.ca.us>
Subject: Comment for January 5, 2016 City Council Meeting

January 5, 2016

Dear Honorable Costa Mesa City Council Members and Public,

This comment is in regard to the January 5, 2016 Costa Mesa City Council Meeting agenda item #2 "Resident Only Parking Restriction on Public Streets – Policies and Procedures." The proposed ordinance being discussed will modify guidelines and procedures for the City's Resident Permit Parking Program. Below are two of the proposed modifications, followed by my comment on each.

Proposed Modification: "Permit parking requests will only be considered in single-family neighborhoods with R-1 zoning."

Comment: There is no justification in the agenda document for restricting permits to single-family neighborhoods. Restricting permit zones to areas with R-1 zoning will prevent residents living in multi-family housing from exercising the same right to park on city streets. In order to fairly distribute parking privileges all residential areas within the city should be eligible for permit parking zones.

Proposed Modification: Eliminate the determination of the level of parking intrusion by vehicles unrelated to the proposed area using license plate data and substitute it with an overall parking utilization assessment of the subject street. Staff recommends a seventy (70) percent threshold of usage of on-street and visible off-street parking (driveways) available to residents in making this determination.

Comment: A utilization threshold of 85%, instead of 70%, should be used as a target. This figure is recommended for parking management by parking expert and UCLA Distinguished Professor of Urban Planning, Donald Shoup.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Joseph Cryer
Costa Mesa Resident
Transportation Planner

John and Eileen Huntley

Costa Mesa

We live right across the street from Wilson Park, and feel bad for the people who have parties, etc, there, because they do not have a place to park. Is there anyway for them, when they reserve the park to also get some kind of one day permit?

One of the problems on parking is that two cars will drive up, and they will park one and drive away in one. Then the next day come back and get it.

Also much of the time cars park there that are for sale, on Craig's list. Etc.

It has been good to be able to have a place to park in front of our house, with out it, it will be just like on the west side of the street. Bumper to bumper, .but hope some kind of compromise can be worked out

John and Eileen Huntley

RECEIVED
CITY CLERK
16 JAN -5 PM 3:00
CITY OF COSTA MESA
BY _____

MEJIA, JESSICA

Subject: FW: Resident Only Parking Restrictions

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, January 05, 2016 2:19 PM
To: CITY COUNCIL <CITYCOUNCIL@ci.costamesa.ca.us>
Subject: Resident Only Parking Restrictions

Honorable Mayor and City Council,
First I would like to thank you for approving Resident Only Parking on Warren Ln and the surrounding Halecrest area.
The majority of the parking problems practically disappeared the moment the signs went up. It is so nice to have our street back to the way it should be. Thank You

I have read the proposed changes to Resident Only Parking, most changes seem acceptable. How ever I would like to share a few thoughts.

1. 100 visitor parking permits does not seem like it will be enough for 12 months. That's less then 2 (1.9) visitors per week. Even with the one time extra 25 permits, it is still less than 3 (2.4) visitors a week. I'm sure this limit is set to stop those that abuse the system, but not everyone should pay for the actions of others.
2. Limiting the number of Permits to 2 per household does not seem like it is enough. Most households have more than 2 vehicles. I feel I should be able to permit all of my vehicles and not have to use up visitor permits when I choose to park on the street in front of my own home.
3. Adding a fee for resident parking permits to recover costs is also reasonable, if the fee is actually reasonable. I am willing to pay something to cover the cost of signs, stickers, etc... I am willing to pay just to have the parking issues on my street resolved. How ever I feel residents should not be punished or charged a unreasonable fee, when others have caused the problem that is requiring permit parking.

Sincerely
Chris Yagerlener
[REDACTED]
Costa Mesa, CA 92626
[REDACTED]