
From: Jennifer Tanaka <jletanaka@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 8, 2024 10:02 AM
To: PACS Comments
Cc: CITY CLERK
Subject: PACS Commission - Public Comment Re: Monthly Report #1 (Park Ranger Report)

Dear Members of the Parks and Community Services Commission:

I am writing to express my concern regarding the new format of the monthly park ranger reports. It has come to my attention that these reports will no longer cite specific references to Costa Mesa code violations but instead only provide summary statistics of calls for service, patrol checks, citations, arrests and reports. While the new narrative disclosure and the additional detail about calls for service and patrol checks further the clear public interest in transparency and accountability, removing disclosure about the specific grounds for citations and arrests does not.

The omission of specific references to code violations undermines the City's ability to use these reports to spot issues in our parks. Without detailed information, it becomes challenging for both the PACS Commission and the community at large to understand the nature and severity of the violations occurring in our public spaces. For example, you could use the old reports to track month-to-month fluctuations in the types of violations being cited, from off-trail trespassing to leash law violations to illegal camping. Now, we will only be able to rely on the park ranger's narrative disclosure to spot such trends. While such disclosure may cover all matters material to the city as a whole, it may *not* cover issues that are salient to individual parks, residents or PACS Commission members.

Our prior level of transparency has borne real, positive fruit in the past. Just recently some members of our community relied in part on the data provided by the old park ranger reports to determine that bicycle licensing laws were being disproportionately enforced on the City's Westside, a pattern that may not have even been consciously understood by city enforcement. This discovery led not only to city-level reform but also a change in state law (you can read about this story here: <https://www.latimes.com/socal/daily-pilot/news/story/2023-02-24/state-incorporates-ideas-of-2-costa-mesans-in-ban-of-bike-licensing-laws-they-called-selectively-enforced>).

Our park ranger reports should err on the side of more detail rather than less. I hope the CMPD will reconsider its approach.

Best,
Jenn Tanaka
321 Broadway
Costa Mesa, CA

P.S.: Also, I noticed that the park ranger reports for October, November and December of 2023 have not been disclosed, at least not to the PACS Commission.

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. Report any suspicious activities to the Information Technology Department.

From: Kim Hendricks <kimhendricks26@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 8, 2024 11:05 AM
To: PACS Comments
Cc: Priscilla Rocco; DALTON, KELLY M.; T Brooks; Andrew Campbell
Subject: Revision to public comments - Feb. 8, 2024

Greetings,

Please accept my revision of my public comments for tonight's meeting under New Business, Item #1 - Donation of two trees, bench, and plaque in Fairview Park.

I understand why a family would like to do this but I have a few concerns about the location.

My first concern is putting two trees in Fairview Park that have not been reviewed by the MIG consulting team that is currently updating the Fairview Park Master Plan or Mr. Dalton, the City of Costa Mesa's Fairview Park Administrator. I see the letter by the Moon family refers to the Open Space Master Plan but Fairview Park is more discreetly governed by the Fairview Park Master Plan because of its endangered and threatened resources.

Are the trees native? What kind of trees are they? I see that they are proposed to be planted on the grassy area near the Placentia Ave. entrance. There is an ecosystem being restored next to the grassy area that seeds or new shade might negatively impact, so any planting in Fairview Park should be reviewed by the experts on the consulting team and the city's own Fairview Park Administrator first since that is what they are currently working on.

Secondly, with all due respect to the family, there have been requests by residents in the past for benches, plaques, and trees in Fairview Park that have been more instrumental in saving Fairview Park and they HAVE been denied. Is this setting a precedent for the other people to apply again who did have a role in saving Fairview Park?

Like, Dr. Richard Mehren who sat on the original Fairview Park Citizens Advisory Committee as well as the later committee. He spent his life dedicated to saving Fairview Park from development. He helped start a political action committee, Fairview Park Preservation Alliance (FPPA), helped write Measure AA, and campaigned for months to pass it with a result of 70.9% of Costa Mesa residents passing it.

He also stayed on when FPPA became a nonprofit and shortened its name to Fairview Park Alliance (FPA) and led us for years in protecting, restoring, and preserving Fairview Park before passing away last year.

There was also Cindy Black who worked diligently to save Banning Ranch, Talbert Nature Preserve, and Fairview Park. She was on the Banning Ranch Conservancy Board for over 20 years, and was on FPPA and FPA board as well as the city's Fairview Park Steering Committee. Cindy passed away in 2020 and her dedication and love for Fairview Park showed in her work to save it. A request for a bench, plaque, and tree for her never made it past the Fairview Park Administrator. Don't forget the Dr. Jan Vandersloot restoration area next to the Placentia Ave. entrance that was expanded in 2014 by Christian Redman's Eagle Scout Group. Christian was promised a plaque for this work but to this day has never received it. Christian's father, Lynn Redman, still weeds the area and that is why it looks so good.

There are clearly others who weren't just residents enjoying Fairview Park but spent their lives saving it.

If this item passes then expect more to by-pass the Fairview Park Administrator and expert consulting team which is not a good thing because it undermines the unique resources at Fairview Park.

Looking at the family's letter, I see that Fairview Park is referred to as the location in their first sentence but after that it is just 'a park' on the west side. There are other parks on the west side that do not have endangered and threatened species and would benefit from a couple trees, and a bench, like Canyon Park, Vista Park, or Tewinkle Park.

I suggest that a different park location be used for this item.

Thank you,
Kim Hendricks

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. Report any suspicious activities to the Information Technology Department.
