
From: GREEN, BRENDA
Sent: Tuesday, April 4, 2023 11:50 AM
To: TERAN, STACY
Subject: FW: City Council Appointed Advisory Committees and Boards

Brenda Green

City Clerk
City of Costa Mesa
714/754-5221

E-mail correspondence with the City of Costa Mesa (and attachments, if any) may be subject to the California Public Records Act, and as such may, therefore, be subject to public disclosure unless otherwise exempt under the act.

From: Flo Martin <flomama@aol.com>
Sent: Friday, March 31, 2023 12:18 PM
To: MARR, ANDREA <ANDREA.MARR@costamesaca.gov>; REYNOLDS, ARLIS <ARLIS.REYNOLDS@costamesaca.gov>; HARPER, DON <DON.HARPER@costamesaca.gov>; jeff.harlan@costamesaca.gov; STEPHENS, JOHN <JOHN.STEPHENS@costamesaca.gov>; GAMEROS, LOREN <LGAMEROS@costamesaca.gov>; CHAVEZ, MANUEL <MANUEL.CHAVEZ@costamesaca.gov>
Cc: GREEN, BRENDA <brenda.green@costamesaca.gov>
Subject: City Council Appointed Advisory Committees and Boards

Dear City Council members,

I just turned 81 years of age and am "suffering" from what my ex-husband used to call "shit for brains."

As such, I am very, very confused about the apparent conflict between the
***Policy ("...bring community attitudes and needs into focus..."),
***Practices and Procedures ("...based on the need for citizen input on matters of importance to the community...") and the
***Background ("... decreasing the membership, eliminating the Alternate positions, limiting Ad hoc Committees...")

I am also angry that "Individuals may only be a member of one (1) Committee or Board at a time.

Individuals who are actively engaged and willing to serve the City may be "experts" in a variety of fields. I am specifically thinking of Ralph Taboada

and Jenn Tanaka, who serve on multiple committees. Both of them are a positive "force" for improving the lives of Costa Mesans.

Thank you for reading and for considering a NO vote on this item.

Flo Martin

2442 Andover Place, CM 92626

949.933.3699

"It is when we are alone that we are the least alone." St. Augustine

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: GREEN, BRENDA
Sent: Tuesday, April 4, 2023 11:50 AM
To: TERAN, STACY
Subject: FW: Committees

Brenda Green

City Clerk
City of Costa Mesa
714/754-5221

E-mail correspondence with the City of Costa Mesa (and attachments, if any) may be subject to the California Public Records Act, and as such may, therefore, be subject to public disclosure unless otherwise exempt under the act.

From: Ralph Taboada <taboada1@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Sunday, April 2, 2023 4:51 PM
To: STEPHENS, JOHN <JOHN.STEPHENS@costamesaca.gov>; HARLAN, JEFFREY <JEFFREY.HARLAN@costamesaca.gov>; MARR, ANDREA <ANDREA.MARR@costamesaca.gov>; CHAVEZ, MANUEL <MANUEL.CHAVEZ@costamesaca.gov>; GAMEROS, LOREN <LGAMEROS@costamesaca.gov>; HARPER, DON <DON.HARPER@costamesaca.gov>; REYNOLDS, ARLIS <ARLIS.REYNOLDS@costamesaca.gov>; GREEN, BRENDA <brenda.green@costamesaca.gov>
Subject: Committees

To: City Council Members

re: Staff recommendations pertaining to Council Committees.

The recommendations in the staff report will negatively impact the effectiveness of your appointed committees. A common thread in the scope of work for the committees is to obtain community input to assist Council members in your deliberations and decision making. You appoint residents as committee members that include subject matter experts and/or with experience working in the applicable field to provide informed perspectives on topics. This is a GOOD thing. The proposed recommendations will throttle back this effort.

I am very disappointed with the process staff has taken. If staff wanted to have a win win outcome they could of met with liaisons and committee chairs and vice chairs and explained their concerns. I am sure solutions and compromises could be worked out. Committee members want to help and work with staff to improve Costa Mesa. Instead, staff took a sledge hammer to the issue.

I also find it notable that staff provides no support or justification to support their individual recommendations. Just the generic 'committees take too much staff time". I know there is concern that staff is not making progress on some topics. But it seems like staff considers the committees liabilities and I thought Council considered them assets. **I urge you all to defer action on the recommendations and then go about setting up meetings between applicable staff and Council liaisons, with the Chairs/Vice Chairs to help resolve concerns and issues. One size fits all is not always the best solution.**

Committee size:

Reducing all committees to seven members could limit the breath of knowledge and/or experience a committee may posses. Council members appoint members based upon an applicant's experience or knowledge in the subject matter. Making sure a committee has breath of expertise in the subject matter is important and may be compromised by limiting all committees to seven members. One size fits all is not a good idea. I think a cap of nine members is reasonable however, depending on circumstances and the subject matter some committees could have less members.

Eliminate Alternate members:

Occasionally a committee meeting may not have a quorum and having an alternate sit in for a regular member allows the meeting to continue with a quorum. Plus an alternate member may have valuable expertise on a topic. This seems to be an arbitrary recommendation without any rational to support it.

Limit of only one Ad Hoc subcommittee:

This will severally limit the effectiveness of committees and I urge you to reject it out of hand. For example, the ATC has multiple subcommittees. They function concurrently which means the committee as a whole is more productive. Three subcommittees can accomplish three times the amount of work one subcommittee working at a time can. And they don't require three times the amount of support from staff. Subcommittees can augment staff's work and this will limit a committees ability to do this. For example, under staff's scenario an ATC Safe Routes to School subcommittee would have to wait for a Capital Projects subcommittee to complete its work or a Pension subcommittee would have to wait for a Budget subcommittee to complete its work. THIS MAKES NO SENSE and may be based on the flawed assumption that the more subcommittees the more staff time required.

Between ATC and FiPAC I have served on several subcommittees. We set our own meetings, we were productive, we didn't require a staff member to be present and we didn't require any or minimal staff support. We did our work and reported findings or recommendations to the full committee.

I urge you to defer action and lets meet with staff, Council liaisons, chairs and vice-chairs to resolve issues and make this a win win.

Appreciate your time and attention to this issue
Ralph Taboada

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.

April 4, 2023

Costa Mesa City Council
77 Fair Drive
Costa Mesa, CA 92626
citycouncil@costamesaca.gov

Dear Members of the City Council:

I am writing to express my dismay at the so-called “Review” of City Committees scheduled for discussion on Tuesday, April 4. It is not a harmless “review”; it is a radical transformation of the structure and purpose of our resident advisory committees. Although the committees should be reformed, the staff’s proposal should be rejected. This proposal also raises questions about the City Manager Office’s handling of committee reform and its commitment to transparency.

To begin, I want to address my potential conflict of interest in regards to the proposed policy revision. As you know I am a member of both the Finance and Pension Advisory Committee (FiPAC) and the Animal Services Committee (ASC), and the proposed policy revision directly affects me. I should note that my term for each committee ends in 2024, but according to the existing City Council Policy 000-2, I serve solely at the discretion of the City Council.

With that being said, my comments are not intended to conflict with the Council's direction for the committees. **If my comments do not align with the Council's stance, I am willing to resign from either or both of my committee positions, effective upon request.**

Committees: are they tools of the Council, or tools of the Staff?

Resident committees are created by *the City Council* in order to aid the *City Council*. They are not tools of the Staff. Yet each proposed reform appears aimed to limit the role of the committees, reduce their burden on Staff’s time, or increase the City Manager’s direct or indirect control over the committees’ agendas.

First, insistence on bimonthly meetings, and prohibiting special meetings without the City Manager’s consent, places enormous discretion in the hands of the City Manager. With no ability to discuss agenda items outside of the committee meetings (especially in light of the proposed ad hoc committee reforms discussed below), a bimonthly schedule will severely limit the committees’ ability to proactively pursue their own projects and proposals *except* to the extent the City Manager approves. Additionally, a rule requiring “prior authorization” from the City Manager to run more than two hours may seem logical on its face, but paired with the bimonthly meeting schedule, it represents yet another limit on committee input and discussion.

The bimonthly meeting proposal is especially irksome when paired with the “reforms”, or rather, ***full-blown demolition***, of the subcommittees. Much of the work of the committees is done through subcommittees or ad hoc committees precisely because they offer a more flexible format for collaborating with fellow committee members outside of agendized meetings.

Subcommittees also meet more frequently than the larger committees so that projects can be advanced and research can be updated in real time. With only one ad hoc committee permitted per committee, and additional ad hoc committees requiring City Manager approval, committee work will be hamstrung and reduced to a passive role.

The consistent theme of these reforms is to consolidate the City Manager's control over the committees. While the City Manager and the Staff cannot control the membership of these committees, they will be able to determine, directly or indirectly, what is permitted to be discussed (via control of the agenda), when it should be discussed (if ever – even bimonthly meetings appear to be at the City Manager's total discretion), and, through control of the ad hoc committees, what lines in inquiry they can pursue.

So, I do wonder: what is the point of having resident committees once these reforms are adopted? Is it to provide a sounding board for the City Council five or six times a year? **Or is it to give the mere appearance of public engagement?**

The reform process has been handled very poorly.

Only a few months ago, the FiPAC determined to form three subcommittees to review matters relating to the City's revenue, budget and pension obligations. At no time did the Staff alert us that it was considering an overhaul of the subcommittee rules that would *entirely moot* the work we were doing. If the Council ends up adopting this proposal, we have wasted a substantial amount of the FiPAC's time and energy.

Furthermore, to my knowledge, no communication regarding these proposed changes to the policy has been made to the members of FiPAC/ASC, their committee chairs/vice-chairs, or the Council liaisons. These changes will directly affect the membership, format and meetings of the committees. It would have been a basic courtesy to bring the matters of concern addressed in the agenda (Brown Act compliance, burden on staff time, etc.) to the committee chairs and Council liaisons first before putting this proposal forward to the City Council.

Now, the Staff is presenting this overhaul as a mere "review". The Council is not being asked to "review" the committees, but to eliminate and reform them to fit the Staff's priorities and to consolidate committee control under the City Manager. And the Council is being asked to do so at a time where a number of sitting committee members are in limbo, as their terms have expired but either they've not been reappointed or their seats haven't been filled. **The Staff should have emphasized, and the City Council should be made aware, that approval of this item could lead to the immediate removal of certain current committee members, as their terms are presently expired and may be "attritioned" to meet the new committee size limits.** This may also occur (though the Staff Report is not clear) if a current committee member is a member of multiple committees and his or her term for one of the committees has expired. How and to whom this happens isn't a decision the City Council got to make, because they were never given the opportunity to consider these reforms before terms expired.

Finally, you should be made aware that there is another change the Staff is proposing to make that was not included in the agenda. I have attached a redline of the City Council Policy 000-2 proposed revisions that I had to request from the City Clerk, as it was not included in the public meeting materials. In Section 2(a), the Staff is proposing to make the following change, marked in bold underline:

- a. Appointed committee members must be Costa Mesa residents, **unless otherwise specified by the City Council**.

This raises a bunch of questions. **Why wasn't this change agendaized? Why wasn't a redline provided with the revised proposal (as it always should be)? Who requested this change, and for what purpose?** A short explanation in the Staff Report would have gone a long way to assure Council and the residents that the change is innocuous. But by not addressing it clearly and forthrightly, we are left wondering.¹

The handling of this entire matter has been disappointing. We can do a lot better.

The committees do need reform.

As a committee member I agree that the committee scope, format and process should be reformed. Here are some suggestions that I believe would address the Staff's time management concerns and improve the committee effectiveness:

- 1) **Define the scope of work and purpose of each committee first, then determine size, meeting schedule, etc.** The scope of work of each committee hasn't been reviewed by the City Council for years and they *should* be revisited. But let's decide what we want these committees to do first, and then decide how they should do it. Some committees may need more members than others. Some may need more ad hoc committees and some may not need any at all. But making a one-size-fits-all determination for each committee without regard to scope or purpose doesn't serve the City Council or the residents.
- 2) **Make the Council liaisons voting members.** Unfortunately, Staff responses to resident committees are deprioritized compared to responses to the City Council. Now, this can be entirely appropriate given the advisory (and unelected) nature of the committees, but it also means that committee business can slow to a halt if Staff cannot provide it with timely information. Therefore, perhaps the City Council liaison members should become voting members of the committees, taking their own seats in lieu of nominating a member of the public. This would improve liaison attendance at these meetings, which has been an ongoing issue, and it would also encourage the City Council to actively monitor committee productivity.

¹ As an aside, I am having a very difficult time seeing the use of allowing non-residents to serve on *resident advisory committees*. Nor do I understand why we would insert optional language when the City Council can revise its own policies at a later date, in the event this corner-corner-case ever becomes relevant.

- 3) Restart remote attendance by both the public and committee members, and make meeting videos available either to committee members or the public.** Committees only represent a tiny fraction of the overall resident population, and no reform will change that. What we can address is how open we are to residents voicing their concerns at committee meetings, and how broad a net we cast for committee members. Remote viewing and participation in committee meetings was one COVID policy that made a meaningful, positive difference. It allows new people to access the process who hadn't before, and opens up membership to demographics that find the in-person meetings very difficult to attend.

Furthermore, we should make meeting recordings available for later viewing, either by the committee members or by the general public. We have the technology to do this for Commission and City Council meetings, and we managed to hold Zoom committee meetings without issue during COVID. By making our records public, we are fulfilling the City's stated commitment to transparency and creating a useful record for later reference.

Once again, I urge you to reject the Staff's "review" proposal. Instead, I hope you will take an independent look at the committees and reform them to fit **your** needs, and not Staff's wishes. Some of our committees truly have changed Costa Mesa for the better. The residents want to help make that happen.

Please, take control of this process.

Best,
Jenn Tanaka
321 Broadway
Costa Mesa, CA 92627

CITY OF COSTA MESA, CALIFORNIA

COUNCIL POLICY

SUBJECT	POLICY NUMBER	EFFECTIVE DATE	PAGE
CITY COUNCIL APPOINTED ADVISORY COMMITTEES AND BOARDS	000-2	2/1/99 REV: 3/03 REV: 10/18/11 REV: 6/5/12 REV: 4/4/23	1 of 3

BACKGROUND

Revisions to this Policy occurred in March, 2003, ~~and~~ October, 2011, and June 2012. The City Council has modified the recruitment, criteria, and selection of committee and board members. The City Council also approved the decrease in membership of the committees and boards through attrition and to be reflected in the Commissions/Committees/Boards Handbook. On May 5, 2012, the City Council modified the Policy indicating that the expiration of all committee and board-terms shall be in April. ~~Council Policy 000-2 has been changed to cover only the City's appointed committees and boards.~~ On April 4, 2023 the City Council modified the Policy decreasing the membership, eliminating the Alternate positions, limiting Ad Hoc Committees, and allowing the City Manager the flexibility to adjust dates, durations, and times of meetings.

PURPOSE

To provide clear and cohesive policies which assist appointed committee and board members in performing their duties, and procedures for new standing and ad hoc committee formation.

POLICY

1. Bring community attitudes and needs into focus by providing valuable communication links between the community and the government of the City.
2. Facilitate recommendations from the community, which aid City Council in making sound decisions concerning policy formulation and resource allocation.
3. Establish and maintain a streamlined mechanism to facilitate committee formation; membership, interaction, work programs, and evaluations.

PRACTICES AND PROCEDURES

1. Formation and Membership
 - a. Based upon the need for citizen input on matters of importance to the community, requests to form a committee may be made by individual Council Members. "Committee Formation Application Forms" and "Committee Interest Forms" shall be made available to all interested parties through the City Clerk's Office.
 - b. Upon review of completed Formation Request Forms, City Council may create a new committee by formal action. Such action will establish the purpose of the committee and the number of members.
 - ~~c. Individuals may only be a member of one (1) Committee or Board at a time. apply to serve concurrently on more than one committee assuming there is no conflict.~~

CITY OF COSTA MESA, CALIFORNIA

COUNCIL POLICY

C.

SUBJECT	POLICY NUMBER	EFFECTIVE DATE	PAGE
CITY COUNCIL APPOINTED ADVISORY COMMITTEES AND BOARDS	000-2	2/1/99 REV: 3/03 REV: 10/18/11 REV: 6/5/12 REV: 4/4/23	2 of 3

- d. The City Council will appoint members to various committees and boards with staggered terms.
- e. The Mayor shall designate at least one member of City Council to serve as a non-voting liaison to each committee.

2. Membership Terms

- a. Appointed committee members must be Costa Mesa residents, unless otherwise specified by the City Council.
- b. Committee members shall be appointed or reappointed for a term of two (2) years (staggered) unless otherwise specified by City Council.
- c. The expiration of all committee and board-terms shall be in April.
- d. To vacate a position on a committee or board, the person shall file a written resignation with the Staff Liaison. Vacancies may be filled immediately if alternate members exist, or held open until a regular appointment time period occurs.
- e. The City Council, at any time, may request the resignation of or terminate membership of any committee member.
- f. ~~Alternates shall automatically fill vacancies left by the departure of full members, based on the alternate's length of time serving on the committee.~~

3. Work Program/Committee Review Process

- a. Each February, all committees shall prepare and submit a Work Program for City Council review. The Work Program shall include:
 - Evaluation of the previous years' progress;
 - Delineation of the upcoming year's program, goals and objectives; and
 - Proposed budget requests.
- b. The City Council shall conduct a Committee Review Process once a year in February to review the role and progress of committees to determine their effectiveness. In doing so, City Council reserves the right to revise the status of various committees based upon their need and benefit to the community.

SUBJECT	POLICY NUMBER	EFFECTIVE DATE	PAGE
CITY COUNCIL APPOINTED ADVISORY COMMITTEES AND BOARDS	000-2	2/1/99 REV: 3/03 REV: 10/18/11 REV: 6/5/12 REV: 4/4/23	3 of 3

4. General Information and Procedures

Except as provided in this policy all committees and boards shall be guided by the policies set forth in the Commissions/Committees/Boards Handbook. In case of any inconsistencies between this policy and the Handbook, the provisions in this policy shall govern these committees and boards.

5. Quorum Due to Vacancies

- a. Where there are no vacancies by resignation of members, the quorum for a committee formed by City Council shall be a majority of the members of such body.
- b. Where the membership on a committee is reduced to less than a majority of the members of such a body due to vacancies by resignation of its members, the quorum shall be a majority of the remaining members of such body until the vacancies are filled by City Council; provided, however, that under no circumstances would the quorum be lowered to less than three (3) committee members. (For example, a committee formed by City Council, which has seven members, would need four members to be present for the committee to take formal action on a matter on the agenda for the meeting. If vacancies occur due to resignations of the members, the quorum would be adjusted to require a minimum of three members to be present for the committee to take formal action on a matter on the agenda while the vacancies have not been filled by City Council. Once the vacancies are filled, the quorum would return to the requirement of four members.)

6. Ad Hoc Committees

- b. Ad Hoc Committees shall be limited to one (1) at a time per Committee or Board, unless due to special circumstances, the City Manager authorizes one (1) additional Ad Hoc Committee. Each Ad Hoc Committee will be set for a specific duration which shall not exceed six (6) months. There shall be no standing committees, subcommittees or working groups of a Committee or Board.

From: Jennifer Tanaka <jletanaka@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, April 4, 2023 6:55 PM
To: CITY COUNCIL
Cc: CITY CLERK
Subject: PolicyLink Article on Inclusionary Housing

Members of the City Council:

Please find via the link below the article I referenced in my public comments this evening re: inclusionary housing. It is a bit out of date (2007) but it has a great overview of the costs associated with such programs and some ways to mitigate them.



DELIVERING PROMISE INCLUSIONARY ZONING_FINAL
PDF Document · 1.5 MB

Best,
Jenn Tanaka

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.