

12/20/23

Oversized Vehicle Ordinance Public Outreach Meeting – 12/20/23

1. Stakeholder attendees – [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
2. Staff attendees – Lisa Murphy (CMO), Lee Butler (PCD), Carter Jones (PD), Gaven Hussey (Parking Program Manager), Siouxsie Oki (Communications; City Manager’s Office); Larry Imwalle (Homelessness Response), Tim Maier (PCD)
3. Permitting process – status update
 - a. Gaven Hussey comments
 - i. 10 permits issued
 1. Most inquirers do not qualify to obtain parking permit related to OVO, or do not need one
 2. Clarified that permits needed for operators of commercial vehicles, hotel patrons
 - ii. Participant comments
 1. [REDACTED] – asked what vehicles do not qualify for issuance of permits
 2. Gaven provided response and clarification
 - b. Lisa Murphy – provided update
 - c. Lisa Murphy - Solicited participant feedback regarding challenges, difficulties encountered in general related to OVO and Safe Parking
 1. Stated that some residents had expressed concern about lack of option for parking of vehicle falling within parameters of ordinance on street in close proximity to their residences without risk of being ticketed
 2. Relayed that some had asked for “carte blanche” permit – i.e., revision to permitting process to allow for parking of vehicles per the above
 - ii. Carter Jones feedback– stated has received dozens of calls to vehicle abatement line – most residents complaining about getting citations for own vehicles
 1. Sometimes – residents with boats getting citations
 - a. Calls received from CSOs – complaints about enforcement
 - b. Residents have asked about whether can get permit to park resident vehicles
 2. Carter – related that over a dozen calls received
 - a. Three or so calls for boats on trailers – others may be trailers related to construction vehicles
 - iii. Lisa – stated that most residents asking for waiver for residential parking
 1. Relayed that Councilmembers have received similar requests
 - iv. [REDACTED] – asked for clarification about ability to obtain residential permit
 1. Gaven – clarified that have to have business license in City of Santa Cruz to receive

- a. Gaven – stated that if is unattached trailer; residential parking permit not issued
 - i. Lisa clarified – residential permit available for trailer associated with permit
 - ii. Lee Butler – clarified that can get 12 AM to 5 AM permit; have trailer that attached, can also get 12 AM to 5 AM permit
 - iii. Lee – stated that unattached trailer – no permit can be obtained
 - v. [REDACTED] – asked how long permit valid
 - 1. Gaven – clarified that permit valid for one year
 - 2. Lee – stated that Coastal Commission had brought up notion of residential waiver
 - 3. Lee – relayed that pros, cons associated with residential waiver – asked for group feedback
 - vi. [REDACTED] – asked what other communities have done
 - 1. Gaven – stated that City of Ventura has similar ordinance, may have residential waiver component
 - vii. [REDACTED] – stated that seems valid for house without driveway to have residential permit
 - viii. [REDACTED] – stated that spirit of discussion about RVs, not boats, trailers
 - ix. [REDACTED] – stated that has neighbor has purchased Sprinter van – permit would allow for parking in proximity to residence
 - x. [REDACTED] – stated that really should be discussing derelict vehicles that trashing neighborhoods
 - 1. [REDACTED] – stated that 8 permits issued, and asked at what cost of program
 - a. Lisa Murphy – replied that purpose of meeting to take in information and not necessarily to answer questions about cost
 - 2. [REDACTED] – stated that seems “no brainer” for residents to be able to park in front of house
 - xi. [REDACTED] – stated that issue about people purchasing recreational vehicles
 - xii. [REDACTED] – stated that concern about people living in vehicles
- d. Lisa Murphy – queried group for feedback about what criteria should quality vehicles for obtaining residential permit
 - e. Carter Jones – stated that 72-hour restriction on parking applies regardless of attainment of residential parkign permit
 - i. Lisa – asked about what documents qualify to prove residency
 - ii. Gaven – stated that documents proving residency, such as mortgage statement, utility bill, phone bill, etc.
 - f. Lee – clarified to Joy Schendledecker that perfectly acceptable to provide feedback following meeting
 - i. Lee- stated that if City does have residential waiver program, thoughts about length limit – for example, some vehicles 40’ long

- ii. Lee – asked if anyone not interested in residential waiver existing
 - g. ██████ – stated that neighbor with vehicle such as Sprinter van should be allowed to park in front of house
 - i. ██████ - stated that limit should be 3 days for parking
 - h. ██████ – asked about aspects of equity related to parking vehicles –
 - i. ██████ – stated that has asked about
 - ii. Carter – stated that significantly more expensive to park RV in City than farther away
 - i. ██████ – stated that would be helpful to know where vehicle storage lots located – map should be provided
 - i. ██████ – stated that part of cost of owning RV
 - ii. ██████ – stated that not responsibility of City to provide
 - 1. ██████. – said that people should think through
 - j. Lee – asked whether anyone thinks existence of residential parking program a bad idea
 - i. ██████ – stated that RV park in which he lives allows as many vehicles as can fit on driveway allowed; but should it be allowed to
 - ii. Larry Imwalle – clarified that no outright objection from stakeholder group about existence of residential waiver, but clarified that specifics of limitations important to know
 - k. Siouxsie – stated that receiving comments about people complaining about length of vehicle of 22’ or so and receiving citations
- 4. Lisa – provided overview of safe parking program
 - a. Larry – provided update – since implementation of OV ordinance, sharp uptick in demand for tier 2 (Overnight-Only Safe Parkign) – current enrollment of 31 vehicles
 - i. Larry – stated that City has been adding lots based on demand of program
 - 1. Larry – stated that have been enrolling 3-6 vehicles per week
 - a. Stated that a lot of activity immediately before Dec. 4
 - b. Stated that big uptick in inquiries immediately before Dec. 4, but has trailed off since;
 - c. Stated that Overnight-Only safe parking program runs 8 AM to 8 PM
 - d. Stated that renewing on 15th of each month – just to be able to administer program for longer period
 - b. Gaven – clarified that, after January, 30-day permits to be enacted
 - c. ██████ – asked about sharp uptick in demand for Tier 3 parking spaces?
 - i. Larry – stated that has not received recent data
 - d. ██████ – stated that lives on Delaware Ave and a has witnessed a lot of improvement – only 2 RVs parked there and those likely not operable
 - i. ██████ – relayed that a lot of misinformation
 - ii. ██████ – stated that incorrect phone number posted
 - 1. ██████ – stated that concerned that homeless postings – stating that programs all full, people should not heed such information
 - 2. Siouxsie – stated that can only control information on City channels – City has provided hundreds of flyers

3. Siouxsie – stated that has received calls – people asking for information about City programs
 - e. [REDACTED] – asked about how many vehicles that arrive to parking program for 8 PM to 8 AM registered
 - i. [REDACTED] – asked if it should not be important to protect rest of community – should vehicles not be compelled to become registered
 - f. [REDACTED] – stated that Santa Cruz Neighbors as 501(c)(3) – would be interested in collecting donations for gas cards – want to distribute through social services
 - g. [REDACTED] – asked about any liability to City if unregistered vehicle if vehicle traveling to safe parking space
 - i. Lee replied that purpose is to create low-barrier program – driver may have to choose between paying vehicle registration and paying medical bill
 - ii. Lee stated that vehicle can be ticketed if more than 6 months without registration
 - iii. Carter – clarified that liability only incurred when directing someone to do something
 1. City merely providing service and not directing RV driver into lot
 - h. [REDACTED] – asked whether PD pulls vehicle over
 - i. [REDACTED] – asked whether City has ever reached out to DMV
 - i. [REDACTED] – relayed that may be possible to ask for waiver for requirements for vehicle registration
 - j. [REDACTED] – asked whether have reached capacity for Rier 1 to Tier 2
 - i. Larry – stated that have been at capacity for Tier 1, Tier 2 every night that program has been in place
 - ii. Siouxsie – relayed that flyers distributed along with Free Guide
 - k. Lee -stated that question on application form asking whether safe parking participant interested in receiving social services
 - l. [REDACTED] – stated that Homeward Bound another program that important
5. Lisa – introduced discussion of enforcement
 - a. Gaven – state that Parking has issued 158 citations since Dec. 4
 - i. 83 reduced to warnings
 - ii. 66 still pending – second citations
 - iii. 6 citations under appeal for review
 - iv. 90 vehciles cited out of total of 158
 - v. Gaven – have witnessed repeat offenders
 - b. [REDACTED] – asked whether first citation waived
 - c. [REDACTED] – asked whether first citation prompts action on behalf of recipient
 - i. Siouxsie, Gaven – clarified that first citation reduced to warning but relayed that sometimes, people go to Parking Office to get more information, anyway
 - ii. Carter - relayed that flyers provided with citations
 - d. [REDACTED] – asked about addition of workload, etc.
 - i. Carter – stated that had redirected PD’s focus to handle
 - ii. Carter – stated that in last 2 nights, have not issued citation

- iii. Carter – stated that 1/3 of total tickets issued thus far written in first night of enforcement
 - 1. State that numbers of tickets issued has reduced since then – parking enforcement having desired outcome
 - iv. Gaven – stated that first citation a warning
 - v. ██████ – asked about how much time passes between first and second citations
 - 1. Carter – provided response
 - 2. Carter – stated that first night of enforcement – number of tickets issued very high
 - 3. Stated that, by fifth night of enforcement, citations in single digits and has remained that way since
 - vi. ██████ – asked about communication with CHP about data of oversized vehicles now parked elsewhere
 - 1. Siouxsie – provided response
 - 2. Gaven – stated that 90 vehicles cited, about 31 new safe parking program participants
 - 3. Carter – stated that has not received complaints from counterparts elsewhere in County that a large uptick in number of vehicles parked elsewhere
 - vii. ██████ – asked about the relationship that City has with County
 - 1. Lisa – clarified that City staff very much focused on what happening outside City limits
 - 2. Lee – stated that has had ongoing conversations with County staff
 - e. ██████ – asked again about how much time passes between the first citation and the second citation
 - i. Carter – clarified that only one citation issued per 24-hour-period
 - f. ██████ – stated that 2 RVs – one RV abandoned; can City tow
 - i. Carter – stated that abandoned vehicle falls under abandoned vehicle ordinance
 - ii. Carter – stated that has had contact with RV on Delaware Ave. that is not operational which someone living in – have sympathy but cannot wait for endless period for progress to be made for repair to be completed
- 6. Siouxsie – provided overview of City’s outreach efforts
 - a. Siouxsie – stated that began with outreach about 30 days prior to beginning of enforcement
 - b. City has sent 4000 flyers, have had two social media campaigns – community saturated with information
- 7. Lee - Discussion of next steps
 - a. Lee – stated that City went to CCC in May 2023 – given one-year approval of Coastal Permit
 - i. Lee – stated that May timeframe fast approaching for expiration of one-year permit
 - ii. State that Coastal Permit to be considered by Planning Commission at hearing – could be heard by Zoning Administrator but will be referred to PC

- iii. Relayed that PC date on Feb. 1
- iv. State that staff report available during next stakeholder meeting
 - 1. Stated that, if appealed Coastal Permit would be heard by City Council – if appealed again, would be considered by Coastal Commission in May timeframe
 - 2. Stated that, if Council acts in March, may go to CCC in May
 - 3. stated that, ideally, would have more time – but necessary to comply with deadline
- v. [REDACTED] – asked when report available – not much time to review
 - 1. Staff provided response
 - 2. Lee – relayed that all notes (of Stakeholder meetings) to be attached to staff report
 - 3. Lee – stated that public comment also attached to staff report
- vi. [REDACTED] – asked whether updated data will be included in further permits
 - 1. Staff provided response
- vii. [REDACTED] – stated that program has resulted in distinctive improvement (of parking of RVs on Delaware Ave.)
 - 1. [REDACTED] – stated that all trailers gone, all encampments gone – significant improvement since implementation of program
- viii. Lee – stated that numbers of citations have been reduced, number of vehicles in safe parking program have increased – both indicate success of program
 - 1. Lee – stated that improvement in environmental impact – vehicles parked for long periods of time, outdoor toilets, etc. – reduced
 - 2. Lee – stated that access to coast improved along with reduction in number of RVs parked on coast
- ix. Carter – stated that everyone’s notion of success different
 - 1. Carter – stated that his notion of success is to get people into services