
From: Webb Green <webbgreen1949@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, August 1, 2022 1:32 PM
To: CITY CLERK
Subject: H.R. 8 (Bipartisan /Background Checks Act of 2021

Dear City Clerk: It has come to my attention that H.R. 8 is before the Board tonight. We don't need this ineffectual measure to be passed. I say, No" to this enactment. Webb Green, SSG, U.S.Army, Ret'd.

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: Jim F <rzrjim@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, August 1, 2022 12:33 PM
To: CITY CLERK
Subject: HR 8

To Whom it Should Concern,

Intelligent people realize gun control only affects law abiding citizens and so should you. If only criminals possess firearms we are all going to be victimized by law breakers.

Sincerely,

Jim Freeman
36 year business owner & law abiding citizen

Sent from my iPhone

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: WALT BIESZCZAD <disaster911@verizon.net>
Sent: Monday, August 1, 2022 12:03 PM
To: CITY CLERK
Subject: HR8

Please consider opposing H.R. 8 as an impediment to the free and safe possession of firearms by lawful weapon owners.

Respectfully,

Walt Bieszczad

Retired firefighter/law enforcement officer.

Sent from my iPad

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: HAUSER, JANET
Sent: Monday, August 1, 2022 12:41 PM
To: GREEN, BRENDA; TERAN, STACY
Subject: FW: Hello Ms. Hauser, as a lawful gun owner and responsible and concerned citizen and taxpayer, I strongly oppose H.R. 8, the Bipartisan Background Checks Act of 2021, Thank you. Michael Cantor, RSM, CA 92688

FYI

From: Mike <2020apmi@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, August 1, 2022 12:39 PM
To: HAUSER, JANET <JANET.HAUSER@costamesaca.gov>
Subject: Hello Ms. Hauser, as a lawful gun owner and responsible and concerned citizen and taxpayer, I strongly oppose H.R. 8, the Bipartisan Background Checks Act of 2021, Thank you. Michael Cantor, RSM, CA 92688

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows

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: Richard Berry <richardberry3@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, August 1, 2022 12:00 PM
To: CITY CLERK
Subject: Opposition to H.R. 8, the Bipartisan Background Checks Act of 2021

Respectfully,

I do not know how or why the City Council of Costa Mesa has decided to endorse this un-Constitutional bill, but I and many of my fellow citizens and residents of Costa Mesa do not feel appropriately represented.

Please do not support, back, or endorse HR 8. Thank you.

Richard L. Berry, III
Cell: 562.221.8382

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.

GONZALEZ, GLADYS

From: Michael Cantor <2020apmi@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, August 1, 2022 12:21 PM
To: CITY CLERK
Subject: H.R. 8, the Bipartisan Background Checks Act of 2021,

To whom it may concern, as a lawful gun owner and responsible citizen I strongly oppose H.R. 8, the Bipartisan Background Checks Act of 2021,

Thank you.

Michael Cantor, RSM, CA 92688

--

"Don't let hindsight be 20/20!"

"Veritas Aequitas"

"Amat Victoria Curam"

'Praemonitus, praemunitus'

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: mike peros <surfmaster69@hotmail.com>
Sent: Monday, August 1, 2022 4:39 PM
To: CITY CLERK
Subject: HR8

Keep your hands off the Second Amendment!

Mike & Caroline Peros

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: Marc <marcvukceвич@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 29, 2022 3:17 PM
To: CityManager; CITY CLERK; LE, JENNIFER; STEPHENS, JOHN; MARR, ANDREA; CHAVEZ, MANUEL; GAMEROS, LOREN; HARLAN, JEFFREY; HARPER, DON; REYNOLDS, ARLIS; CITY COUNCIL
Subject: An open letter for an ambitious ballot measure
Attachments: Final_Measure Y Letter.pdf

Dear City Council and Staff,

Attached below is a letter asking for ambitious action on repealing elements of Measure Y with dozens of community members signed on in support of this vision for a ballot measure.

Pleasure consider us, a diverse set of Costa Mesa residents comprised of multiple political parties, homeowners and renters, young and old -- as a more representative sample of what Costa Mesa is than the homeowner class and NIMBY class that city councilmembers hear from more regularly.

Thank you.

--

Sincerely,
Marc Vukceвич

Memento Mori

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.

July 29, 2022

Dear Members of the Costa Mesa City Council and Staff:

We write to you in support of an expansive measure to repeal ballot box zoning in Costa Mesa.

The current ballot measure is conservative and limiting.

We also need to repeal Measure Y for the following corridors: (photo below)

E 17th St

Bristol St (from Redhill Ave to Sunflower Ave)

Baker St (from Deodar Ave to Red Hill)

Adams (Mesa Verde Dr E to Fairview)

E 19th St (from Newport Blvd to Fullerton Ave)

W 19th St (All the way to Marina View Park)

Harbor Blvd (All of it)

Placentia Ave (from Joann St to 16th St)

We need to include the following sites:

The former Trinity Broadcasting Center

Fairview Developmental Center (State-owned but transfer of ownership is possible)

Fairgrounds (State-owned but transfer of ownership is possible)

Removing the major barriers of Measure Y on zoning while continuing to prevent major density increases in R-1

For *all of the city*, remove the 8 year and 1/2 mile requirement and change every usage of the word "proposal" and "proposed change in allowable land used" within the text of Measure Y to the words "proposed project." In other words, we need to explicitly remove the Measure Y requirements for our general plan updates, our zoning code, and our overlays. Furthermore, with the new unit of measure being "the proposed project" *for specifically R-1 parcels* change the 40 unit max requirement to 4 units above the as-built condition per parcel to therefore liberally codify Senate Bill 9. If you would like to give future councils zoning flexibility, change the unit max requirement per parcel higher to something like 8 units per parcel for the potential for those zoning changes in the distant distant future to not be subject to the constraints of Measure Y. In other words, use Measure Y to prevent spot zoning in R-1 neighborhoods not to govern larger planning documents.

What this would do:

- Allow for our entire zoning code/general plan to *not* be subject to Measure Y restrictions
- Preserve SFH neighborhoods while not precluding them from gradually altering in the future
- Still allow for some restrictions on individual projects
- Allow for easier usage of Senate Bill 9

A weak ballot measure is untenable

If the ballot measure remains weak then, we, the folks who care about housing the most, the folks who would do everything it takes to repeal Measure Y: recruiting volunteers, phone banking, going door to door, writing Op-Eds, and much more; we would have very little reason to support the measure in such a way. Other action from state regulators and Attorney General Rob Bonta could achieve the greater outcome of a full repeal.

Attachment A:



Thank you for your time and consideration in making a city affordable and inclusive for all, not exclusionary and relegated for the few.

Sincerely from your constituents,

Marc Vukceovich
marcvukceovich@gmail.com
Costa Mesa Resident

Flo Martin
flomama@aol.com
Costa Mesa Resident

David Martinez
davimart06@gmail.com
Costa Mesa Resident

Mike Lingle
m_lingle@yahoo.com
Costa Mesa Resident

Cassius Rutherford
cashrutherford@gmail.com
Costa Mesa Resident

Jenn Tanaka
jletanaka@gmail.com
Costa Mesa Resident

Andrew Nowobilski
andrew.nowobilski@gmail.com
Costa Mesa Resident

Shelby Anderson
ShelbyRAnderson2014@gmail.com
Costa Mesa Resident

Aaron Klemm
aaron_klemm@hotmail.com
Costa Mesa Resident

Elizabeth Hansburg
elizabeth@peopleforhousing.org
Co-founder & Director
People for Housing OC

Becks Heyhoe
becksh@unitedwayoc.org
Executive Director, United to End
Homelessness
Costa Mesa Resident

Keith Diggs
keith@yimbylaw.org
Housing Elements Advocacy Manager
YIMBY Law

Mott Smith
mott@civicenterprise.com
Co-founder & Principal of Civic Enterprise
Adjunct Faculty, USC's Master of Real Estate
Development Program

Avery Counts
avecounts@gmail.com
Political Director
Costa Mesa Democratic Club

Brenda Vasquez
brendavasquez46@gmail.com
Costa Mesa Resident

Rachel Baxter
rachelbaxter11@gmail.com
Costa Mesa Resident

Max Hamilton
max@basketcase.gallery
Costa Mesa Resident

Angely Andrade Vallarta
angelyaandrade@gmail.com
Costa Mesa Resident

Xavier Vallarta
xgvallarta@gmail.com
Costa Mesa Resident

Kelly Bird
Kellyabird1998@gmail.com
Costa Mesa Resident

Gracia Vukceovich
gracia_vs@hotmail.com
Costa Mesa Resident

Kathryn Hoist
kathrynhairartistry@gmail.com
Costa Mesa Resident

Alec Daigle
alecdaigle@gmail.com
Costa Mesa Resident

Michelle Fay
michellefay@gmail.com
Costa Mesa Resident

Matthew Sheehan
matthewmsheehan3@gmail.com
Costa Mesa Resident

Lindsey Borrego
lborrowgo@elon.edu
Costa Mesa Resident

Shannon Hagman
shan.hagman@gmail.com
Costa Mesa Resident

Ethan Doss-Fillmore
edfillmor@protonmail.com
Costa Mesa Resident

Liam Cavanaugh
l.o.t.cavanaugh@gmail.com
Costa Mesa Resident

Cristina Vera
cristinavera664@gmail.com
Costa Mesa Resident

Cameron Law
cameron_law@yahoo.com
Costa Mesa Resident

From: Charlene <charlene.ashendorf@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2022 9:18 PM
To: CITY CLERK
Subject: Comments for Agenda ITEM NUMBER: OB-1

**RE: SUBJECT: APPROVAL OF A CITY BALLOT INITIATIVE
ENTITLED "THE CITY OF COSTA MESA REVITALIZATION AND
RESIDENTIAL NEIGHBORHOODS PROTECTION MEASURE"**

Dear Mayor Stephens, Mayor ProTem Marr, and Members of the City Council:

I would like to express my support for the recommendation of the City Council's Housing Ad Hoc Committee for the revitalization of Costa Mesa's commercial and industrial corridors. The risk to the community is too great not to act in order to comply with and demonstrate that Costa Mesa will meet the state's mandate for housing units.

Costa Mesa is recognized as a city of the arts, a destination for fine dining and shopping, well-maintained parks and fields and an open, welcoming community for all.

Booming educational institutions, as well as small businesses have made Costa Mesa its home.

However, we must recognize that out-of-date, aging and underused retail and commercial areas exist along Harbor and Newport Boulevards. The Ad Hoc committee's recommendations allow the community an opportunity to create a balance of housing and business growth in our community.

Expanding employment opportunities like Anduril Industries are creating a demand for housing. Where will these employees find homes?

Opportunities for housing exist near the expanding Van's as well as areas surrounding the 405.

Several years ago the public voiced its support for a diverse reimagined Fairview Development Center which would include housing, business, parks and arts. Years later, costs increase and so does the demand for housing.

Put people to work while working toward increasing our housing supply.

With developers paying impact fees. the city can ensure improvements to our traffic concerns, expanded and new parks, and open space as well as an opportunity to elevate the arts in Costa Mesa.

It is easy to say NO and close off Costa Mesa. There is, however, a danger in being too comfortable. Comfort may provide a floor and walls, but comfort does not put a roof over young adults, workers, and our aging senior population.

I urge you to say YES to the recommendation of the City Council's Housing Ad Hoc Committee for the revitalization of Costa Mesa's commercial and industrial corridors.

Thank you for giving my point of view your consideration.

Charlene Ashendorf, 20+ year Costa Mesa resident
3210 Montana Avenue

Building A Better Community

All things Costa Mesa: Arts, Parks & Seniors

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: Manny Khoshbin <Manny@khoshbin.com>
Sent: Monday, August 1, 2022 8:44 AM
To: CITY COUNCIL
Subject: Urgent please read
Attachments: Measure Y.pdf

I sincerely appreciate it if you could please consider my property per the attached letter.

Thank you,

Manny Khoshbin
President

The Khoshbin Company
18071 Fitch Suite 100
Irvine, CA 92614
949-394-2701 Cell
949-863-9390 Tel
949-863-9391 Fax
Manny@Khoshbin.com

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.

Khoshbin Tower LP.

18071 Fitch suite 100

Irvine, CA 92614

July 31, 2022

Honorable Mayor and City Council:

Please allow me to introduce myself. My name is Manny Khoshbin and I am the owner of the former Trinity Broadcasting Network property ("Property"), located at 3150 Bear Street.

As a attendee of Costa Mesa High School, I care deeply about the City of Costa Mesa's desire to address the State's Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) numbers while preserving our community's quality of life.

As you may be aware, the Property is zoned Administrative and Professional Office and sits on 6.2 acres along the I-405 Freeway. It is ideally situated in close proximity to 405 and State Route 73 off-ramps. The current zoning substantially restricts the potential for beneficial development of the property.

For these reasons, I respectfully request the Property be placed on the list of locations to be included in the ballot measure under consideration.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Manny Khoshbin



Khoshbin Tower LP
Managing partner

From: Priscilla Rocco <dementedgardensprite@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, August 1, 2022 11:30 AM
To: CITY CLERK
Cc: costamesa1st@gmail.com
Subject: Affordable Housing and Gutting Measure Y

City Council,

Costa Mesa needs all sorts of housing, but market-rate housing will always be built. The chronic need is for low-income housing, which is why the state requires it be 40% of the RHNA units. So please stop talking about a 15% affordable housing ordinance and write it. Talk is cheap, and your sympathy does nothing to help the residents who come here pleading for housing help. We need your action! Otherwise this is just more political theatre.

Speaking of which, you are guttin Measure Y, taking away residents' legal right to have input into development, while simultaneously promising residents they will have input on new projects in an 'imaging' process, to ensure projects are well designed and fit into their neighborhoods. Exactly how does that work?

The Housing Element outreach was just a public relations stunt structured to allow no input from residents on issues that concerned them. And for decades neighbors have attended Planning Commission meetings to voice concerns about projects being built next to them, only to be ignored in favor of the developers. The Ford Road project is a perfect example. The commission almost eliminated any set back - the only green space in the project - allowing three-story condos to tower over one-story homes. The only open space was the parking lot, creating a heat zone in summer and no rain percolation in the winter. (Oh and they gave the developer a public street in the bargain.) What magically is going to change now that developers have no codes, rules and regulations, where profit is their only motivation?!

Magical thinking and promises about Chelsea flats is not going to plant more trees or provide green space on Harbor Boulevard when developers start building concrete tenements up to the sidewalk, like the prison blocks across from Trader Joe's. You say you want to engage the public?! Then start by answering these questions from the dias tonight, and write a 15% affordability ordinance now to accompany the new initiative. Because if it isn't in the code, it's just more talk.

Priscilla Rocco

From: Dianne Russell <diannelrussell@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, August 1, 2022 3:03 PM
To: CITY CLERK
Subject: Old Business 1
Attachments: OB 1 -Support letter.docx

Please forward this letter in support of "The City of Costa Mesa Revitalization and Residential Neighborhoods Protection Measure" to the council.

Thank you,
Dianne Russell

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.

August 1, 2022

Dear Mayor Stephens and City Council Members,

As a housing advocate I was opposed to Measure Y when it was on the ballot. Many of us were concerned about its effect on the development of housing in general in the city and specifically the development of affordable housing. These concerns have proven to be well founded. There has not been significant development of multifamily or affordable housing since the measure was enacted.

It is understandable in 2016 that residents were concerned about the direction the city was going and the negative impacts created by the types of development that were approved in the city. Residents of single-family neighborhoods were worried about the impact on their homes. Residents in multi-family housing were concerned about gentrification and displacement.

In the last six years many things have changed. You as a council are more responsive to neighborhood concerns. The state has created more mandates for increasing affordable housing in our community with stronger penalties for noncompliance. Many residents in the city agree that there is a need to do more to expand housing opportunities in Costa Mesa. It is time for city policies to change. You as a council can start that change tonight and let residents have their say at the ballot box.

I fully support the Housing Ad Hoc Committee recommendation to move "The City of Costa Mesa Revitalization and Residential Neighborhoods Protection Measure" forward for residents to vote on in November. The proposed measure does several good things.

- It maintains the integrity of our single-family neighborhoods.
- It allows us to zone for the over 11,000 units of housing required in our Housing Element and keeps us in compliance with state law.
- It provides for a visioning process that will allow residents to have input on how our corridors are planned.

Your vote tonight is just one step. It is a good first step. Ultimately the voters will decide in November whether they want to approve it. If they do, resident input will be solicited and new specific plans can be created. There are a number of areas in the city that are badly in need of a new vision. This measure will help move us towards creating more walkable and bikeable neighborhoods with appropriate housing densities and small businesses. These are things that make a city thrive and stay vibrant.

I thank the Ad Hoc Committee and city staff for their work on this measure and I thank the council for its careful consideration in moving it forward.

Sincerely,

Dianne Russell

Dianne Russell
Costa Mesa Resident

From: Wendy Leece <leecefam@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Monday, August 1, 2022 10:09 PM
To: CITY COUNCIL
Cc: CITY CLERK
Subject: Please vote NO
Attachments: Opposing Argument to 2022 Ballot Measure re Y.docx

Thank you for your consideration,
Wendy Leece

Wendy Leece

"The test of the morality of a society is what it does for its children." Dietrich Bonhoeffer

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.

1. I think the effort is way too broad. It is difficult for the average person to understand. Some are in survival mode.
2. Your residents are already overwhelmed with inflation, pandemic fear, AND changes in the mid term elections with re districting. All that is in our heads.
3. And now you are asking us to process this ballot initiative? We are out of brain space to process A HOUSING ELEMENT (which most people are not willing to understand because it is “government speak” and MANDATED BY THE STATE WITH THE COUNCIL’S DESIRE TO PROVIDE AFFORDABLE HOUSING FOR WORKERS. **The latter is commendable but not compatible with the Housing Element.**
4. The ballot initiative puts the cart before the horse. The visioning should come before the approval of the vote.
5. We won’t vote on visioning until “after” it passes. There could be a new council. That’s leaving too much up to chance. That’s why we the people of this nearly 70 year old city which we love passed “Y”.
6. The timeline is too short. You should have pitched this months ago when Jay was pestering you during public comments. You ignored him and here we are. That was disrespectful.
7. Where is the hard data, not anecdotal evidence, perhaps a chart, of the projects that didn’t happen because of Y? Could the project have been scaled back to comply with Y?
8. **The benefit is for the developers**, not your residents because projection of traffic (ie 19th and Whittier with Ayres) has not been thought out thoroughly. Many of those who were on the Housing Element webinars during COVID who gave input input expressed affordable housing “desires” over the REALITY of traffic, public safety, infrastructure. We are nearly 70 years old and built out.
9. Having the meetings at the same time as the Concerts was not fair. Costa Mesans are VERY intelligent (i.e. AA and Y), but going to the concert is more fun than digging into a boring ballot initiative, especially after lockdowns.
10. This initiative as a whole is very condescending to those of us who want to preserve Costa Mesa’s excellent quality of life. It leaves too much up to chance.
11. Other cities are standing up to the State and not operating on fear of “losing money”, etc. I have not studied by there is an initiative for 2024 which supports LOCAL CONTROL. Your initiative does not support LOCAL CONTROL.

August 2, 2022

Via Email

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

Dear Members of the City Council:

First, I want to thank the Ad Hoc Committee for its hard work and dedication to the cause of bringing more housing to Costa Mesa. I recognize that crafting one of the few self-initiated reform measures to address ballot box zoning ever attempted in California is a daunting task. I appreciate also that, given the large margin of victory enjoyed by Measure Y when it was adopted in 2016, asking the voters to revisit it so soon must give every reformer pause. So I applaud the work done so far, and I am very pleased to see that additional corridors are under consideration for inclusion in the proposed initiative. I hope the Council gives those additions serious thought, as Option 2 would certainly be a significant improvement.

However, as grateful as I am for the Ad Hoc Committee's efforts, and as much as I see certain benefits in the proposed initiative, I write to express my disappointment in the process chosen to bring this proposal to the public and to place it on the ballot.

A flawed process and missed opportunities

The only public meeting of the Ad Hoc Committee occurred in January of this year. I attended that Zoom meeting and I recall that the Ad Hoc Committee did not present any direction as to how they intended to "address" Measure Y. I and many other commenters strongly encouraged the Ad Hoc Committee to pursue an ambitious reform of Measure Y, if not its outright repeal. The next opportunity did not come up until the Ad Hoc Committee held a joint study session with the City Council on July 12. Although the agenda referenced a ballot initiative, once again, the specifics of such initiative were not disclosed. With nothing to shoot at, housing advocates could only repeat their general support for amending or repealing Measure Y. The text of the initiative wasn't shared until the last City Council meeting.

Now, given the deadlines to place the initiative on the ballot, and given that no structural changes have been made to the initiative in response to feedback received at the ***only public meeting to discuss its text***, it is apparent that the intent is to call for an up-or-down vote on the initiative without significant alterations from either the public or members of the City Council that do not sit on the Ad Hoc Committee.

I believe that, in doing so, the City has missed an opportunity to propose reforms to Measure Y in a more effective and broadly supported way. I have spent the last two weeks reaching out to stakeholders across the spectrum of the issue of housing, and it is apparent to me that areas of potential agreement *may* exist:

- There is deep concern about preferential spot zoning of parcels, which gives the appearance of corruption and threatens to make dramatic changes to the city landscape.
- There is little appetite to *permanently* prevent the City Council, in conjunction with staff and the Planning Commission, from enacting broad based reforms aimed at bringing to market the developments intended by the spirit of the existing zoning code.
- We desperately need more housing, in particular housing that is accessible to people making at or below median income.

IF this initiative had been presented in a public forum earlier in the year, when it would have been possible to make significant changes, I believe these areas of general agreement would have become apparent. I also believe that the initiative's shortcomings in relation to such general agreement would have become equally apparent.

First, it would have been clear that a geographic, piecemeal repeal of Measure Y would not address the valid concerns about spot zoning. Such an approach actually exacerbates those concerns, by loosening controls in exactly the places where residents feared large, landscape-altering projects would be proposed.

Second, perhaps we would have debated the wisdom of leaving huge swaths of the City unable to benefit from the proposed reforms. For example, several members of the City Council have expressed an interest in exploring form based codes, which theoretically could open up opportunities for contextually sensitive "missing middle" developments in our R1 neighborhoods. Yet I think such a discussion would have revealed how difficult applying form based codes, or really any meaningful zoning reform in the "protected" areas, would become *after the ballot initiative passes*. Residents asked to vote to "protect" their neighborhoods today will inevitably question why they should undo that "protection" the next election, even if such reforms are in the public interest.

Third, I want to believe there would have been a meaningful examination of the initiative's references to an inclusionary housing ordinance and the effect of such ordinance on the production of affordable housing. I hope that such an examination would have pushed the Ad Hoc Committee, or some other appropriate body, to propose an actual draft ordinance to be approved alongside the initiative. Then we could have sat down and asked ourselves whether the proposed ordinance would help meet our affordable housing goals, or not. As inclusionary housing ordinances are only as good as the amount of overall housing development they permit to be brought to market, having that discussion *in advance* of the ballot initiative would have been vital to evaluating the proposal as a whole.

Through all of these discussions, and given the flexibility of additional time, I wonder if other approaches might have been favored instead. Maybe we would have decided that reforms to Measure Y itself, rather than focusing on parcel-by-parcel repeals, would avoid the apparent unfairness and the logistical difficulties of having radically different land use regimes governing adjacent buildings. Maybe we would have narrowed Measure Y so that it focused only on its specific concerns, such as spot zoning, while freeing the City Council to enact more generalized reforms. Maybe we would have abandoned the approach of starting with the robotic RHNA requirements and scoring rubrics and instead started with a great plan for Costa Mesa, with the State's needs fitted in where possible.

And maybe, at the end of the day, we would have ended up with the same initiative, but this time borne of a collaborative process that generated stakeholders. Or maybe this approach would have led diehards to torpedo reform at all costs, which could have either ended progress all together or freed the Ad Hoc Committee's hands to be more ambitious. Maybe, maybe, maybe.

Looking past this initiative to what comes next

But we have what we have. Regardless of your approach to the proposed ballot initiative before you, we must look beyond it to the future. Because *no matter what*, Measure Y will continue to apply to the vast majority of residentially zoned land in the City. So I hope we will next look at reforms available both inside and outside the zoning code.

Assuming the ballot initiative passes, I hope we will reach out to a wide variety of developers, both market rate and those specializing in affordable housing, and gather input from them regarding the economic feasibility of delivering units at different income levels. At the end of the day, developers sell **floor space**, not land. To the extent we learn that our default land use regulations require the minimum housing unit to consume too much valuable **land** to be delivered at an affordable price, we should revisit how many buildable square feet of floor space per unit of land we allow. FAR, height restrictions, parking requirements, setback and minimum lot sizes should all be on the table. In other words, I encourage you to look at what price point of dwellings you want to see delivered first, and then work backwards to determine the rules needed to permit their efficient development.

This also means that we may need to revisit our collective idea of "minimally acceptable housing". No home should be without heat, water, waste disposal, electricity, ventilation, working appliances, fire safety and structural soundness. But once those basic needs are met, more luxurious items, such as extra floor space, full kitchens, ample parking, open space, electric charging stations, solar panels, amenities, low building heights, etc., should be optional, not mandatory. We should interrogate the entire building process, from concept to permitting to driving nails, to determine the extent to which we are inadvertently discouraging low-income housing by setting the minimally acceptable housing standard too high. **As the minimum wage is always zero, the minimally acceptable housing is always *no housing*.** People are leaving Costa Mesa due to the cost burden of housing, and homelessness induced by the

affordability crisis is a real and growing problem. We shouldn't let our vision of ideal housing get in the way of delivering actual housing.

Note that doing this doesn't mean everything that is built will be basic. We live in a beautiful place with wonderful weather and lots of amenities and good paying jobs. Our land will always be valuable, and the demand to live here will always be inelastic. Plenty of attractive, market-rate housing will be built regardless of our minimum requirements. We just shouldn't effectively outlaw basic, clean, dignified housing through our development standards.

We should also look at streamlining our permitting process for areas both inside and outside the target corridors. If the zoning code represents our collective vision for the City, any building within that zoning should be permitted *by right*, and not be subject to lengthy design reviews. This permitting should involve as few steps as possible and as little discretion as possible. If we are limited in our ability to amend our zoning code, perhaps we can at least address administrative inefficiencies that trip up property owners when attempting small-scale intensifications of their properties.

Finally, outside our zoning code, nothing in Measure Y stops us from making meaningful reforms to the largest amount of land owned or controlled by the City: our streets. We must reimagine our roadways within the corridors alongside any reimagining of land use. As these roadways are now ***mixed-use*** streets, there must be a new emphasis on value, pleasantness and safety in their design. This means slowing traffic, building meaningful walking and bicycling infrastructure, and adding safety features that would be appropriate in a residential setting. We must also resist attempts by State and regional agencies to wrest control of our streets and repurpose them as freeway arterials that prioritize speed, throughput and LOS. **If Sacramento wants us to build housing on our arterial streets, it cannot also require us to make those streets incompatible with residential use.** We must be ready to make that argument early, often, and as loudly as possible.

Getting to this point has required an enormous amount of work, and again, I thank the Ad Hoc Committee for their efforts. I cannot stress enough that just bringing a ballot initiative of this nature to the Council chambers is borderline revolutionary. But getting through the next phase of zoning, "visioning" and implementation will be even harder, and it will require the collective effort of many stakeholders across the spectrum. I have been very encouraged by my discussions that there *is* common ground. Hopefully next time we will have a process that can find it.

Best,
Jenn Tanaka
321 Broadway
Costa Mesa, CA 92627

CC:
Brenda Green, City Clerk (cityclerk@costamesaca.gov)

From: cmcdonald.home@gmail.com
Sent: Tuesday, August 2, 2022 11:43 AM
To: STEPHENS, JOHN; HARLAN, JEFFREY; REYNOLDS, ARLIS; MARR, ANDREA; CHAVEZ, MANUEL; GAMEROS, LOREN; HARPER, DON
Cc: CITY CLERK
Subject: Old Business Item 1 - Approval of a City ballot initiative entitled "The City of Costa Mesa Revitalization and Residential Neighborhoods Protection Measure"

You can't fool all the people all the time.

I oppose the deceptive ballot measure the City is proposing for the following reasons:

1. **DOES NOT CREATE AFFORDABLE HOUSING.** The City has not adopted an inclusionary housing ordinance. There has only been a promise and no details. Therefore, the provision that states that any new development must have affordable units is likely unenforceable. Developers will be able to entitle large developments with NO AFFORDABLE HOUSING, pay a fee to avoid having to provide affordable housing, or use a development agreement to circumvent this requirement. Also, there is no guarantee that the projects will be housing developments; they may be large commercial buildings.
2. **IT REPEALS MEASURE Y, THE RESIDENTS' RIGHT TO CONTROL THEIR FUTURE.** City Councils come and go. Large projects will be here for 40 years, and the residents are the ones who must suffer with poor decisions by the City. We need to have a voice in what is appropriate on our corridors and in our neighborhoods. We don't want another tower on 19th Street that sticks out like a sore thumb.



3. **IMPACTS!** The City states that this ballot measure won't apply to R-1 housing, but R-2 and upwards will be open season. What about impacts? There has been no transportation study, natural resources study, noise analysis, study of the impacts on public services and parks, etc. WHAT IS THE FINANCIAL IMPACT TO THE CITY'S FINANCES? When the 2016 General Plan update was analyzed, the report was that dense projects in the wrong places would lead to a financial loss for the City. That hasn't changed.

4. **DISPLACEMENT OF EXISTING RESIDENTS AND LOSS OF JOBS.** There is no provision that existing residents will be relocated or compensated if they must uproot their families when a developer starts construction of a new project. Many of properties that are identified on the maps are where existing multi-family homes or viable businesses are located.
5. **THE PROCESS IS BACKWARDS.** A true visioning process, led by a professional consultant who understands how real public outreach works, should have been done first. An inclusionary housing ordinance should have been adopted years ago. The LAST effort should have been loosening the reins of Measure Y.
6. **PROCESS WAS RUSHED.** There was little time for detailed analysis and public comment on the actual ballot measure. You said so yourself.

THIS BALLOT MEASURE IS EITHER POORLY DRAFTED, OR INTENTIONALLY DRAFTED TO GIVE DEVELOPERS AN EASY OUT.

I urge you to vote "No" tonight.

Thank you for your consideration.

Cynthia McDonald

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: [Scott Brail](#)
To: [CITY CLERK](#)
Subject: The City of Costa Mesa Revitalization and Residential Neighborhoods Protection Measure
Date: Tuesday, August 2, 2022 1:32:27 PM

Dear Mayor and City Council,

Thank you to all dedicated volunteers who worked collectively and collaboratively on this proposed Measure. Most citizens agree that the status quo prohibits blighted land and undesirable businesses to redevelop because of complications from Measure Y and that the complications should be removed from Measure Y. This proposal starts a process that protects SFD neighborhoods, in many instances would reduce traffic, provide jobs and economic development to the city. Please eliminate from the proposed Measure all the delays, bureaucracy and complications that will occur once the Measure passes. Please don't go from one complication under Measure Y to a host of other future complications. Have a simple Measure that allows the designated areas to build quality office, retail and housing under the current and future laws of Costa Mesa as promulgated by you, the elected officials of Costa Mesa. The same rules and process should apply to all projects. Give the voters a clean City of Costa Mesa Revitalization and Residential Neighborhoods Protection Measure Act with no additional complications. Thank you. .

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.