

From: [Carla Kramer](#)
To: [City Plan](#)
Subject: Delaware Ave clean-up
Date: Thursday, February 1, 2024 11:45:13 AM

Because I live at DeAnza, I travel up and down Delaware Avenue very often. It is such a relief to see the difference our new parking regulations and the enforcement of same have made. There are still a couple of offenders, and for some reason a number of people still think it's OK to leave bags of trash on Delaware, but we have come along, long way. Thank you so much.

Carla Kramer
2395 Delaware Ave.
Santa Cruz
Sent from my iPhone

From: [Jonathan Hicken](#)
To: [City Plan](#)
Subject: OVO is successful
Date: Thursday, February 1, 2024 2:50:11 PM

Dear Commission,

Working daily at UCSC's Seymour Marine Discovery Center, I noticed a near overnight difference from the ordinance.

More cyclists. More walkers/joggers. More families on the move.

For the first time in years, I recommended to a community partner that they park on Delaware and walk to Seymour Center so that they didn't have to pay for parking. Prior to the OVO, I would not have felt that was a safe recommendation to make.

I do believe that the ordinance has created a safer entrance to a beloved public space in the Seymour Center.

Thank you,
Jonathan

From: [Reggie Meisler](#)
To: [City Plan](#)
Cc: [Bonnie Bush](#); [Lisa Murphy](#)
Subject: Re: Omission of public correspondence?
Date: Thursday, February 1, 2024 2:49:12 PM

I don't want to tell you that you are lying about that, but I think I must. Please ensure this makes it into today's public correspondence packet.

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

From: **Jamie Perkins** <emailjamieperkins@gmail.com>
Date: Tue, Jan 30, 2024, 1:57 PM
Subject: OVO stakeholder feedback and public correspondence on planning commission agenda item 2
To: cityplan@santacruzca.gov <lmurphy@santacruzca.gov>

Dear Coastal Commission,

I am writing to express my concerns and frustration regarding the stakeholders group. I attended the meeting in October 2023 and, unfortunately, am left feeling unheard as none of my questions or comments were reflected in the meeting notes. Nor have I been directly contacted to address my concerns.

Firstly, I want to clarify that I did not volunteer for the position and am unsure of how I was chosen. Despite this, I was willing to contribute and do my part. However, I want to emphasize that I am not willing to be a token for the city of Santa Cruz merely for appearances. It is crucial that the guidelines set forth by the Coastal Commission are genuinely followed and not just given the illusion of compliance.

I unfortunately arrived late to the meeting in October. This was a disadvantage because I had no clue who was friend and who was foe. I also felt as if I represented the problem at hand. Putting my feelings aside I actively participated in the conversation, addressing the concerns of myself and others living in RVs affected by the ordinance. Some of the questions, comments, and concerns I raised include:

1. The significant concern of some that black water is possibly being dumped by people living in RVs and the absence of a waste disposal location on the Westside.
2. Challenges for individuals working later than 12 am or before 5 am in moving their RVs.
3. Concerns about the safety of my car when I park it to drive my RV to a safe parking lot, fearing police ticketing or towing.
4. I asked if it the common practice of police giving 72-hour tow notices to everyone parked on a street. My understanding is those notices are to be used after a vehicle has been parked unmoved for a documented, set amount of days or a vehicle is clearly abandoned or poses a hazard. Instead police just put notices on every vehicle on the streets where RVs park. That was done on Delaware the day of the meeting.
5. The need for the city to provide restitution to those who received and paid tickets and/or

impound fees. Also to the those who lost their vehicle impounded due to fines. The City of Santa Cruz did not have the right to issue the tickets or install the signs without prior Coastal Commission approval. The City of Santa Cruz chose to install the signs and enforce the parking restrictions for years knowing they were violating the coastal commission act. The signs were finally removed a few months prior to the OVO approval.

- My brother and I spent over \$10,000 getting our RVs out of impound. We paid over \$26,000 for the 2 RVs and to lose them would have been a great financial loss.

When we got them back they had been ransacked and anything of value had been taken. This included the batteries, the keys, a solar generator, the brain from one RV, tools, electronics, jewelry and personal items.

The tow yard's response was the items weren't listed on their paperwork.

We are not the only ones who this happened to.

- When this was read at the meeting I was told by the woman conducting the meeting she would talk to me later about it. Then she quickly went on to the next comment. She never spoke to me about it.

6. The lack of information on resources available to help RV owners get current on registration and insurance.

7. I also addressed the issue of littering, acknowledging that while it is a concern, it is often caused by a few individuals rather than the majority. Lack of places to dispose of trash doesn't help the situation. It's not as if there is a place to take a single bag of garbage and pay to dispose of it.

In November when I received the minutes from that meeting in October not one of my concerns were addressed or recorded.

I really thought this was supposed to be a community working together to find a way to coexist. In my opinion the city of Santa Cruz is only holding these meetings because they have no other choice.

In the past few months, I have witnessed numerous RVs being towed away, leaving people on the side of the road with their belongings, often in tears and losing hope.

The behavior of some of the police officers was unprofessional and malicious. I witnessed officers standing around laughing and making jokes as people's homes are getting towed away. I have yet to hear of anyone being given information about available resources. This process has left many in difficult situations.

Now tents are replacing RVs on Delaware and surrounding streets.

How could that possibly be better for the environment? Where do they think many of these people now living in tents without a bathroom will go?

What is funny about this whole thing is the people who are making the biggest fight against the RVs are in their warm homes in a comfy bed sound asleep between 12 am and 5 am. When they go to work in the morning the RVs are there and when they come home the RVs are still there.

The only things that have changed is more gas being burned to drive the RVs to the safe

parking lots and back.

And life for people who are working and trying to better their situation gets harder. You can't sleep well for fear of oversleeping and getting more tickets.

I am exhausted all the time.

You can't enjoy a late night out or a night away because the RV has to be moved.

Panic sets in at any sign of a mechanical problem.

Twice a day everything has to be secured for the move.

I recently parked in a "safe parking lot" at depot park. The Santa Cruz police advised us to go there.

I received an important phone call at around 8am that I had to take. When I was finished I stepped out of my RV to find both my RV and car had received \$43 tickets for not paying for parking.

The meter maid was still there and I tried to explain what happened and she didn't care. She just said go get a parking permit.

Would it have been so hard for her to knock on the door and let us know it was after 8am and we needed to move? She clearly knew we didn't have a parking permit and were not aware of the strict enforcement of the hours. Also note that there were maybe 3 cars in the parking lot and there were 2 other RVs still parked there.

One of those RVs belongs to a single father with a baby. He told me he also received a ticket that day.

He told me he has received 4 tickets since parking in the "safe parking lot" and fears having his RV towed due to tickets.

He told me of an encounter he had with a parking enforcement worker.

He said it was just after 8 am and his son was still in bed sleeping. He told this to the worker.

The worker told him he needed to move and told him to make sure the baby was safe (not in a car seat) and to just drive slow. He also started counting how many parking spaces he was taking up and threatened to ticket him for each parking space but only issued the ticket for one space. He also told him that he was at risk of getting kicked out of the safe parking program.

Seems to me the safe parking lots are the first order of business for the parking enforcement office.

I realize they need to clear the RVs out to provide parking for the public. I think knocking on the door first and letting them know they need to move would be a better approach. Possibly giving out warnings notices and then a ticket after 3 warnings have been issued for staying past 8 am. would be fair.

These are some issues I would have shared at the stakeholders meeting.

I just refuse to waste my time. The City of Santa Cruz is totally biased. They have their agenda and these meetings are just a formality.

When we had the wild fires in 2020 everyone showed concern and support to those of us who lost our homes.

Affordable housing is hard to find on a good day in Santa Cruz. Then add 100s of people homeless from the wild fires and a pandemic and eviction moratorium to the mix.

For many living in an RV was the only option. FEMA houses people in RVs all the time. Now we are looked at as a nuisance.

Environmental concerns are important. I agree. However, RV living leaves a much smaller

carbon foot print than living in a house.

And I honestly have never seen any black water/waste dumped anywhere around here.

I read that the Coastal Commission is considering issuing over 4 million dollars in fines to Aptos home owners for blocking access to the beach.

The city of Santa Cruz took people's homes and just about everything they had to the dumps.

The city of Santa Cruz issued hundreds of thousands of dollars in citations.

They caused hundreds of people pain and stress. People not only lost their homes some lost jobs, pets and children.

They did all of this knowing what they were doing was a violation and therefore illegal.

Is the city above the law? This is not a victimless crime.

I think concern over beach access is nothing in comparison to the OVO. People had their homes taken by the City of Santa Cruz and you gave them the green light to keep doing it.

On December 4th I along with many others woke up to a \$50 ticket on my windshield. We were all under the assumption that the OVO would begin the evening of the 4th. Not at 12.01 am on the 4th. The City of Santa Cruz is practically gloating about issuing 200 tickets in the first month of the OVO. That's \$10,000 in fines given to people who they know can't afford to pay them. That's not counting tickets issued in the "safe parking lots". This is just another tactic by the City of Santa Cruz to take more RVs/homes.

I know hundreds of people including myself who would like to be reimbursed and compensated for our losses. The City of Santa Cruz expects us to pay our tickets or risk having our RVs impounded. The the City of Santa Cruz should be forced to provide restitution to those they illegally ticketed. If it was an individual who knowingly committed an illegal act they would be fined, jailed and order to pay restitution.

Santa Cruz is one of if not the most expensive place to live in the country. We should feel as if our government is looking out for the best interest of all of us.

Thank you for taking the time to hear my side on this matter.

Sincerely ,

Jamie P

On Thu, Feb 1, 2024 at 2:45 PM City Plan <cityplan@santacruzca.gov> wrote:

Dear Mr. Meisler,

I am the clerk for the Planning Commission and monitor the public correspondence received to the cityplan inbox. The correspondence you were referring to was not originally sent to the cityplan inbox, it was sent directly to another city employee who forwarded it to planning staff, not cityplan. Staff forwarded it to me this afternoon and I posted it to the record of the item and forwarded to the Planning Commissioners for their review. I hope that answers your question.

Thank you,

Tess Fitzgerald

From: Reggie Meisler <reggie.meisler@gmail.com>

Sent: Thursday, February 1, 2024 11:43 AM

To: City Plan <cityplan@santacruzca.gov>; Bonnie Bush <bbush@santacruzca.gov>; Lisa Murphy <LMurphy@santacruzca.gov>

Subject: Omission of public correspondence?

I am not seeing public correspondence that was sent in by Jamie Perkins, one of the OVO stakeholders. She submitted her correspondence by email on Tuesday before 3pm. I see other public correspondence in this packet from people who submitted emails after she sent hers. I am wondering if it was filtered out for some reason.

Reggie