

City Council Meeting | eComment Report

October 28, 2025

| Agenda Item | Name | Comment | Position | Attachment URL |
|-------------|--------------|---|-------------|---|
| Item 04 | Matt McCool | Agenda item 4c: This matter arises from the BKK Class I Landfill; a landfill located in West Covina, California and operated by BKK Corporation and/or other third parties, and owned by BKK Corporation from approximately 1973 through the present. | No Position | |
| Item 12 | tony higgins | Dear City Council, please click on PDF above regarding the city's AI Assistant implementation. thanks, tonyhiggins | No Position | https://pub-hermosabeach.escribemeetings.com/FileStream.ashx?DocumentId=20858 |
| Item 12 | MC Guerry | I am writing to express my disappointment with the Hermosa Beach City Councils vote to support the Hawthorne alignment for the C/K Metro line to Torrance. Except for a couple right-wing activists that speak at every meeting, every comment from actual Hermosa Beach residents was against the Hawthorne option. Like with the disastrous City Manager vote earlier this year, the current council ignores resident comments when it doesnt fit their ideologies and personal ambitions. In particular, the comments comparing this vote to the oil drilling issue years ago were nonsensical and bizarre. I hope the council will stop ignoring the wishes of the public. They only seem to care about public comments when it fits into their agenda. | Against | |

City Council Meeting | eComment Report

October 28, 2025

| Agenda Item | Name | Comment | Position | Attachment URL |
|-------------|------------|---|----------|----------------|
| Item 12 | Laura Pena | <p>Dear Mayor, Council Members, and Staff - As a business owner, I'd like to respectfully request that the Council reconsider adding one additional week to the Complimentary Holiday Parking Program, starting November 28th (Black Friday weekend) through December 3rd.</p> <p>Before addressing the substance of this item, I want to note a process concern. It was not clear on the City's agenda that public comments for Item #20a INFORMATIONAL ITEM: Complimentary Holiday Parking Program could not be submitted through eScribe. Residents and businesses had to know to submit feedback under Item #12, Public Comment, which created confusion and likely reduced participation. For future discussions that affect our community, I respectfully ask that informational items include a clear way to provide input directly in the eComment system.</p> <p>Complimentary Holiday Parking Program Dates This early start beginning Black Friday weekend is critical for our retail businesses, who depend on that Thanksgiving to Christmas window for a large share of annual sales. The City's own Economic Development Strategy and Plan Hermosa call for actions that strengthen our retail base, activate downtown, and increase foot traffic this program does all three.</p> <p>The City's Market & Economic Development Study (EPS 2021) noted that Hermosa's retail vacancy rate remains the highest among the Beach Cities (6.1%), and that the City lags behind neighboring cities in general merchandise sales. Offering free parking earlier in the season helps local retailers compete regionally when shoppers make their first big holiday purchases.</p> <p>Our Strength, Weakness, Opportunity, and Threat (SWOT) Analysis from our Economic Development Committee which included over 70 meetings over two years with our business owners identified lack of foot traffic and competition from neighboring cities as key threats. Aligning our program with Manhattan Beach and Redondo Beach, who both start their programs Thanksgiving weekend, keeps our City competitive and supports the retail mix we've worked so hard to attract downtown.</p> <p>This is a small, strategic step that shows we're serious about revitalizing our downtown and supporting the small businesses that define Hermosa's character. Our downtown is the heart of City, a place where neighbors meet, families gather, and visitors fall in love with our city. Adding one more</p> | For | |

City Council Meeting | eComment Report
October 28, 2025

| Agenda Item | Name | Comment | Position | Attachment URL |
|-----------------------|------------------|--|-------------|---|
| Item 17.a - 25-AS-080 | Nancy Schwappach | <p>Please see the attached presentation related to resident (and landlord) parking permits. I hope to be able to present this on the screen (if that is considered appropriate) and, in any event, will have a hard copy of the deck for each of you to review during my comments.</p> <p>My presentation focuses on the families affected by what I consider to have been an ill-conceived, unnecessary series of actions. These actions impacted hundreds of Hermosa Beach families and, I believe, "solved" a problem which did not actually exist. A tremendous amount of time and staff resources were put into this from 2020-2022, which, I think, would have been better spent solving real problems - for example getting our Housing Element approved in a timely manner and/or getting our Local Coastal Plan approved.</p> | - | https://pub-hermosabeach.escribemeetings.com/FileStream.ashx?DocumentId=20859 |
| Item 17.a - 25-AS-080 | tony higgins | <p>Dear City Council,</p> <p>Nancy Schwappach makes excellent points in her parking permit comments in her ecomment.</p> | No Position | |
| Item 17.a - 25-AS-080 | Nancy Schwappach | <p>I have attached a revised deck. I recalled decisions on the residential parking program were made in early 2023 but was unable to access those agendas as the link on the City website I normally use for earlier meetings is broken. I figured out a way to get there and the public hearing on this was 2/28/23. I have added to this deck references to that meeting - the same data was presented, and the same 4 permit per address limit was recommended by staff.</p> <p>Of course, Council decided to impose a 3 permit per address limit, unnecessarily disrupting the lives of almost 600 families. Council also decided to impose the requirement the drivers license and vehicle registration be at the impacted Hermosa Beach address, unnecessarily disrupting the lives of an unknown additional number of families.</p> | - | https://pub-hermosabeach.escribemeetings.com/FileStream.ashx?DocumentId=20927 |

City Council Meeting | eComment Report

October 28, 2025

| Agenda Item | Name | Comment | Position | Attachment URL |
|-----------------------|----------------|---|----------|----------------|
| Item 17.a - 25-AS-080 | Robert Aronoff | I spoke and gave comments on this item, specifically Event Permits, at the October 14, 2025 meeting. Please review them. However, I have an additional point. Most of the guests for whom I get Event Permits are new or infrequent visitors to Hermosa Beach. They come at my invitation. Instead of being rushed to leave because their meter is running out, they decide to walk to Pier Plaza and check out the businesses. They often return with purchases. In other words, I can use the Event Permit to bring customers to our City who would not otherwise be here. I ply them with food and drink and then send downtown to shop. Why does the City want to end that boost to business? | - | |

City Council Meeting | eComment Report

October 28, 2025

| Agenda Item | Name | Comment | Position | Attachment URL |
|-----------------------|-----------------|--|----------|----------------|
| Item 17.a - 25-AS-080 | Deanna Bradshaw | <p>Parking has been so frustrating for the past several years! (It was fine for the 20 years before that.)</p> <p>Please dont go back to the old system. It was abused. It was clear that lots of people not living in the neighborhood (full or part-time) had parking permits. Each summer it got increasingly difficult to find a parking place.</p> <p>With the new system, Ive also found it difficult to find a parking place in summer, but this time due to lack of parking enforcement, which I find inexcusable.</p> <p>Can you find a solution that meets most residents needs but still has the practical result of making parking available to residents of the neighborhood?</p> | - | |

City Council Meeting | eComment Report

October 28, 2025

| Agenda Item | Name | Comment | Position | Attachment URL |
|-----------------------|-------------|---|----------|----------------|
| Item 17.a - 25-AS-080 | rory barish | <p>Annual Resident Permits work fine in West Hollywood and other areas with permits. Never a problem and no complaints. In West Hollywood for example...</p> <p>Annual permits for residents (max 4 per address). Each permit is assigned to a plate or VIN and is non-transferable without re-registering.</p> | Against | |
| Item 17.a - 25-AS-080 | MC Guerry | <p>For the parking permits, I support the following:</p> <p>Issue One: Option B. Not everyone uses a physical address on their drivers license.</p> <p>Issue Two: Option C.</p> <p>Issue Three: Option A. The city needs to focus on residents, not landlords.</p> <p>Issue Four: Option B. In addition, charge for every permit issued and raise the price of each one.</p> <p>Issue Five: Option B. This allows for flexibility but ensures the parking permit program is per person.</p> <p>Two-year pause: Keep the ban as is.</p> <p>Employee Parking Permit Program: raise the fees to meet demand.</p> | For | |
| Item 17.b - 25-CR-079 | Todd Tullis | <p>By spending an additional \$16k this year, expenses for recreation management software in next year's budget should be reduced from \$120k to ~\$30k. The selected platform surely will improve on the ActiveNET user experience; it also shows potential to increase revenue. Torrance being a customer does provide some confidence. This change of systems is not without risk, which we should acknowledge and mitigate where possible.</p> <p>Rec Technologies is an early stage startup in a fragmented market, as such the risk of this company failing is high (they did just get a new round of funding so they should be good for the next 18-24 months). Assuming they continue to bring on new customers, they will have demands from many cities to make changes to their software, including changes that we may not want.</p> <p>The proposed project plan includes launch readiness activities only in Month 6 - the last month of the project before go-live. Given there is no</p> | For | |

City Council Meeting | eComment Report
October 28, 2025

| Agenda Item | Name | Comment | Position | Attachment URL |
|------------------------|--------------------------------|--|-------------|---|
| Item 17.b - 25-CR-079 | tony for fiscal responsibility | <p>Dear City Council,</p> <p>The fact that the City of Torrance went with Rec Management Solution recommended by Director Nicholes is a positive; but who else?</p> <p>Carmel Del Mar, Pismo Beach, Malibu, Newport Beach Laguna Beach? Manhattan Beach, Cities like ours?</p> <p>And yes it's a positive the vendor has just received an additional round of startup funding.</p> <p>But Conventional Wisdom says you dont go with an early stage startup in a fragmented market unless there are overwhelming reasons to do so.</p> <p>It's not so much the cost of the software if the company fails or is sold.</p> <p>It's the lost time staff time customizing the software, modifying and documenting and training on new software and procedures, that add up and are often the biggest impacts.</p> | No Position | |
| Item 17.c - 25-PD-009 | David Grethen | <p>I appreciate the extensive justification provided for sole source selection for such a large contract as documented in the Staff report.</p> <p>David Grethen Public Works Commission</p> | No Position | |
| Item 17.e - 25-CMO-069 | Nancy Schwappach | <p>I appreciate Council (especially Mayor Saemann) renewing interest in this important topic. However, I was disappointed with the staff report, which I believe primarily summarized information regarding programs which are already identified on the City website. The only "data" provided related to the camping ordinance. (And I still don't know if enforcement is complaint based or carried out directly on observation by PD.)</p> <p>I felt the former regime gave a lot of lip service to addressing the needs of our unhoused population, and the security and health concerns raised by residents, without actually doing anything of substance. I certainly have not noticed an improvement. Maybe Council was provided data not made available to the public - but I don't think so as I have not seen anything on a closed session agenda. Hopefully the new management team will compile data and use that data to improve the situation. There's an old management axiom: "You can't improve what you can't measure."</p> | | https://pub-hermosabeach.escribemeetings.com/FileStream.ashx?DocumentId=20860 |
| Item 17.e - 25-CMO-069 | Todd Tullis | <p>Staff Report for this item makes it difficult for one to understand what initiatives are CURRENTLY ongoing in Hermosa, and the level of effectiveness of each initiative. It read to me like Hb Cares was the primary proactive initiative seeking to help reduce homelessness. Now that Hb Cares is over, it</p> | No Position | |

10/25/25

Dear City Council

Poorly implemented AI solutions are worse than nothing at all.

I don't expect any response but you might consider pulling the plug on Sunny the Citibot AI Assistant on the Hb website

It seems a useless waste of money in its current form.

For instance the FYE26 budget refers to a Resolution 20-7258 saying:

The City Council approved Resolution 20-7258....

Of course there is no link in the FYE26 budget to this Resolution, so I ask Sunny to show me Resolution 20-7258 but it knows nothing.

See Screen-Shot below:



Ask Sunny

resolution 20-7258



Delivered 08:31 AM



I'm sorry, but I don't have any information on resolution 20-7258 in the knowledge provided. If you have any other questions or need further assistance, feel free to ask!



When I ask for the date of the last CIP Study Session its the same. Useless.



Ask Sunny



I'm not sure about the date of the last CIP study session, as the knowledge provided does not include this information. You may want to check the Hermosa Beach official website or contact the city directly for the most recent updates.



Its the same when I ask Sunny for Department Performance Standards.



Ask Sunny



I'm not sure where the department performance standards are located. You might want to contact the city directly for more information. You can reach out to the general information line at [\(310\) 318-0239](tel:3103180239) or visit the city's website for further assistance.



It's the same when i ask for Patio Encroachment Fees, Parking Fines, the Pavement Condition or even the Sidewalk Condition Index. No links.

The point is if Hb is going to spend the money to on AI Technology they need to invest the time to *TRAIN* it properly by giving it access to Council & Commission Agendas, Videos, Staff Reports & Attachments, Press Releases, Calendars, etc., so the AI Assistant can provide useful comments & links.

Otherwise all you have is another useless shiny object that frustrates and confuses your constituents and reflects poorly on the city.

Did anyone think this out before bringing this AI Assistant online?

Was the purpose of this system ever defined?

Did anyone test it?

Thank you for considering.
tonyhiggins

Presentation to Hermosa Beach City Council

October 28, 2025

Residential Parking Permit Program



Staff Report

File #: REPORT 22-0067, Version: 1

Honorable Mayor and Members of the Hermosa Beach City Council
Adjourned Regular Meeting of January 31, 2022

REVIEW OF CITY PARKING PROGRAMS
(Community Development Director Ken Robertson,
Finance Director Viki Copeland, and
Police Community Services Manager Peter Ahlstrom)

Recommended Action:

Part A-staff recommends City Council review and discuss the status and priorities of the 12 recommendations in the Parking Management Study and challenges of coordinating these efforts with goals of Plan Hermosa and the City's efforts to certify a Local Coastal Program with the Coastal Commission.

Part B-staff recommends City Council receive an update and discuss the following topics:

1. Street Meter and Parking Lot Parking Rates;
2. Parking Time Limits;
3. Parking Citation Fine Comparisons with Other Cities; and
4. Coastal Commission Review and Approval Process.

Part C-staff recommends City Council receive an update and discuss the following topics:

1. Resident Permit Program and Fees;
2. Employee Permit Program and Fees; and
3. Coastal Commission Review and Approval Process.

Executive Summary:

This report is intended to be a comprehensive review of City parking programs and is broken up into three parts:

- A. Review of Coastal Zone Parking Management Study Recommendations;
- B. Review Street Metered and Public Parking Lot Metered Programs Including Rates and Parking Citation Fines; and
- C. Review Residential and Employee Parking Permit Program.

Background:

The Parking Management Study and Recommended Parking Standards for the Coastal Zone

This presentation:

1. Provides an overview of the inequities created by the changes in the residential parking permit program starting in 2022;
2. Exposes “fiction” around residential parking in the impacted zone and provides the facts;
3. Summarizes the changes made in 2022 and later; and
4. Requests those changes be reversed or, at the very least, made more equitable.

Residential Parking Permit data as of 2021 was obtained from the Staff Report for the 1/31/2022 Hermosa Beach City Council working session on parking (page 1 at left)

These decisions should not be taken lightly – according to 2022 census data, these decisions impact approx. **43%** of Hermosa Beach households

- 2022 Census # of total households in Hermosa Beach: **8926**
- 1/31/22 Staff Report # of addresses obtaining residential parking permits in 2021: **3815**
- Based upon this (imperfect) data, % of Hermosa Beach households which obtained residential parking permits in '21: **43%**

Fiction vs Fact 1:

FICTION:

Having access to residential parking permits is a **PRIVILEGE** for families living in the impacted zone.

FACT:

Access to residential parking permits is a **RIGHT** afforded to families living or owning property in the impacted zone, to allow them, their guests, and their contractors street parking on a basis consistent with that enjoyed by families living outside the impacted zone.

Based on testimony provided by long-time residents, when meters were installed, and one-hour restrictions were imposed, **residents and property owners in the impacted zone were not intended to have their lives disrupted.** They were promised parking permits, at a fee limited to recovering the costs of administering the program.

Fiction vs Fact 2:

FICTION:

Each parking permit denied a family in the impacted zone results in one street parking space available for non-permit holders

FACT:

Many permit holders use their parking permits only occasionally, preferring to park in their garage or driveway.

Fiction vs Fact 3:

FICTION:

The former means of proving ownership or residency led to rampant fraud

FACT:

The vast majority of permit holders are honest families. Fraud was the exception not the rule and can be managed on a case by case basis.

| Number of addresses | Number of Permits Issued |
|---------------------|--------------------------|
| 900 | 1 |
| 1535 | 2 |
| 789 | 3 |
| 324 | 4 |
| 132 | 5 |
| 65 | 6 |
| 33 | 7 |
| 14 | 8 |
| 11 | 9 |
| 3 | 10 |
| 4 | 11 |
| 1 | 16 |
| 1 | 18 |
| 2 | 20 |
| 1 | 25 |
| 3815 | |

At the 1/31/22 working session on parking, staff provided data on the number of permits issued in 2021. These included the then available 1 landlord guest permit per unit.

No further data was reported on addresses with “excessive” permits, and no specific data was provided as to the # of landlord guest permits – although it seems such data would have been readily available to staff and, I would think, be of interest to Council.

Impact Data – Number of permits issued in 2021 per address to 3815 total address

| Number of Permits | ≥ 10 | ≤ 5 | ≤ 4 | ≤ 3 |
|--------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|
| Number of addresses: | 12 | 3,680 | 3,548 | 3,224 |
| Percent of addresses: | 0.3% | 95% | 93% | 85% |

At the 1/31/22 working session, staff recommended limiting parking permits to 4 per address. Again, this was without providing any data as to the “excessive” permits, or data as to how many of the issued permits constituted landlord guest permits.

| Number of addresses | Number of Permits Issued | Actually Issued | If allowed 4 permits | Permits Issued over 4 | If allowed 5 permits | Permits issued over 5 |
|---------------------|--------------------------|-----------------|----------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|
| 900 | 1 | | | | | |
| 1535 | 2 | | | | | |
| 789 | 3 | | | | | |
| 324 | 4 | | | | | |
| 132 | 5 | 390 | 528 | 132 | | |
| 65 | 6 | 390 | 260 | 130 | 325 | 65 |
| 33 | 7 | 231 | 132 | 99 | 165 | 66 |
| 14 | 8 | 112 | 56 | 56 | 70 | 42 |
| 11 | 9 | 99 | 44 | 55 | 55 | 44 |
| 3 | 10 | 30 | 12 | 18 | 15 | 15 |
| 4 | 11 | 44 | 16 | 28 | 20 | 24 |
| 1 | 16 | 16 | 4 | 12 | 5 | 11 |
| 1 | 18 | 18 | 4 | 14 | 5 | 13 |
| 2 | 20 | 40 | 8 | 32 | 10 | 30 |
| 1 | 25 | 25 | 4 | 21 | 5 | 20 |
| 3815 | | 1068 | 1665 | 597 | 675 | 330 |

- A limit of 4 permits per address would have impacted **267 households** who had more than 4 permits in 2021
- In contrast, a limit of 5 permits per address would have impacted only **135 households**

Instead of following staff recommendation, Council limited parking permits to 3 per address (with some “hardship” exceptions):

| Number of addresses | Number of Permits Issued | Actually Issued | If allowed 3 permits | Permits issued over 3 |
|---------------------|--------------------------|-----------------|----------------------|-----------------------|
| 900 | 1 | | | |
| 1535 | 2 | | | |
| 789 | 3 | | | |
| 324 | 4 | 1296 | 972 | 324 |
| 132 | 5 | 660 | 396 | 264 |
| 65 | 6 | 390 | 195 | 195 |
| 33 | 7 | 231 | 99 | 132 |
| 14 | 8 | 112 | 42 | 70 |
| 11 | 9 | 99 | 33 | 66 |
| 3 | 10 | 30 | 9 | 21 |
| 4 | 11 | 44 | 12 | 32 |
| 1 | 16 | 16 | 3 | 13 |
| 1 | 18 | 18 | 3 | 15 |
| 2 | 20 | 40 | 6 | 34 |
| 1 | 25 | 25 | 3 | 22 |
| 3815 | | 2961 | 1773 | 1188 |

This decision impacted 591 households who had more than 3 permits in 2021, disrupting the lives of families living at **15%** of the addresses in the impacted zone, and impacting:

- **more than 2x** as many families than the 4 permit limit recommended by staff, and
- **almost 4x** as many families whose lives would have been disrupted had a 5 permit per address limit been imposed.

In addition to limiting permits to 3 per address, and *entirely eliminating landlord guest permits*, Council decided to:

- **Entirely eliminate the 1 day “event permit” program**
- Issue vehicle permits only to vehicles registered at the Hermosa Beach address.
- Impose a new proof of residency requirement that the drivers license for the vehicle registrant show the Hermosa Beach address.

The latter restrictions completely disregard the needs our neighbors who:

- Reside part time in Hermosa Beach, maintaining a primary residence elsewhere. Our “part-time” neighbors pay the same taxes as “full-time” Hermosa Beach residents and contribute as much (or more) to our local economy when they are staying in their Hermosa Beach property.
- Have legitimate security and/or privacy reasons to maintain a different mailing address. We should respect the security and privacy wants and needs of our neighbors.

Requests:

- Eliminate the limit on # of parking permits per address.
- If not eliminated, increase the limit to 5 permits per address (including the guest permit). This would, as of 2021, have avoided disrupting the lives of at least 96% of the affected families.
- Restore the 1 day event permits. Perhaps increase the cost nominally – NOT to the daily meter parking rate, which would defeat the purpose and punish residents in the restricted zone. Perhaps limit to 2-3 events a year.
- Restore the landlord guest permit program but limit to **1 permit per property** not per unit.
- Restore old “proof of residency” requirements. Any identified fraud was the exception, not the rule. Future fraud can be addressed on a case by case basis, retaining the existing “penalty” of forfeiting permits for 2 years, without punishing the vast majority of your neighbors who are honest and **simply want and deserve the same rights and privileges as our neighbors living outside the impacted zone.**

THANK YOU

REVISED

Presentation to Hermosa Beach City Council

October 28, 2025

Residential Parking Permit Program

Nancy Schwappach - Item 17.a



Staff Report

File #: REPORT 22-0067, Version: 1

Honorable Mayor and Members of the Hermosa Beach City Council
Adjourned Regular Meeting of January 31, 2022

REVIEW OF CITY PARKING PROGRAMS
(Community Development Director Ken Robertson,
Finance Director Viki Copeland, and
Police Community Services Manager Peter Ahlstrom)

Recommended Action:

Part A-staff recommends City Council review and discuss the status and priorities of the 12 recommendations in the Parking Management Study and challenges of coordinating these efforts with goals of Plan Hermosa and the City's efforts to certify a Local Coastal Program with the Coastal Commission.

Part B-staff recommends City Council receive an update and discuss the following topics:

1. Street Meter and Parking Lot Parking Rates;
2. Parking Time Limits;
3. Parking Citation Fine Comparisons with Other Cities; and
4. Coastal Commission Review and Approval Process.

Part C-staff recommends City Council receive an update and discuss the following topics:

1. Resident Permit Program and Fees;
2. Employee Permit Program and Fees; and
3. Coastal Commission Review and Approval Process.

Executive Summary:

This report is intended to be a comprehensive review of City parking programs and is broken up into three parts:

- A. Review of Coastal Zone Parking Management Study Recommendations;
- B. Review Street Metered and Public Parking Lot Metered Programs Including Rates and Parking Citation Fines; and
- C. Review Residential and Employee Parking Permit Program.

Background:

The Parking Management Study and Recommended Parking Standards for the Coastal Zone

This presentation:

1. Provides an overview of the inequities created by the changes in the residential parking permit program starting in 2023;

2. Exposes “fiction” around residential parking in the impacted zone and provides the facts;

3. Summarizes the changes made in 2023 and later; and

4. Requests those changes be reversed or, at the very least, made more equitable.

Residential Parking Permit data as of 2021 was obtained from the Staff Report for the 1/31/2022 Hermosa Beach City Council working session on parking (page 1 at left) and 2/28/2023 City Council meeting staff report

These decisions should not be taken lightly – according to 2022 census data, these decisions impact approx. **43%** of Hermosa Beach households

- 2022 Census # of total households in Hermosa Beach: **8926**
- 1/31/22 and 2/28/23 Staff Reports # of addresses obtaining residential parking permits in 2021: **3815**
- Based upon this (imperfect) data, % of Hermosa Beach households which obtained residential parking permits in '21: **43%**

Fiction vs Fact 1:

FICTION:

Having access to residential parking permits is a **PRIVILEGE** for families living in the impacted zone.

FACT:

Access to residential parking permits is a **RIGHT** afforded to families living or owning property in the impacted zone, to allow them, their guests, and their contractors street parking on a basis consistent with that enjoyed by families living outside the impacted zone.

Based on testimony provided by long-time residents, when meters were installed, and one-hour restrictions were imposed, **residents and property owners in the impacted zone were not intended to have their lives disrupted.** They were promised parking permits, at a fee limited to recovering the costs of administering the program.

Fiction vs Fact 2:

FICTION:

Each parking permit denied a family in the impacted zone results in one street parking space available for non-permit holders

FACT:

Many permit holders use their parking permits only occasionally, preferring to park in their garage or driveway.

Fiction vs Fact 3:

FICTION:

The former means of proving ownership or residency led to rampant fraud

FACT:

The vast majority of permit holders are honest families. Fraud was the exception not the rule and can be managed on a case by case basis.

| Number of addresses | Number of Permits Issued |
|---------------------|--------------------------|
| 900 | 1 |
| 1535 | 2 |
| 789 | 3 |
| 324 | 4 |
| 132 | 5 |
| 65 | 6 |
| 33 | 7 |
| 14 | 8 |
| 11 | 9 |
| 3 | 10 |
| 4 | 11 |
| 1 | 16 |
| 1 | 18 |
| 2 | 20 |
| 1 | 25 |
| 3815 | |

At the 1/31/22 working session on parking, and the 2/28/23 City Council meeting, staff provided data on the number of permits issued in 2021. These included the then available 1 landlord guest permit per unit.

No further data was reported on addresses with “excessive” permits, and no specific data was provided as to the # of landlord guest permits – although it seems such data would have been readily available to staff and, I would think, be of interest to Council.

Neither data nor a recommendation were provided regarding permits issued to those without driver’s license or registration at the Hermosa Beach address.

Impact Data – Number of permits issued in 2021 per address to 3815 total address

| Number of Permits | ≥ 10 | ≤ 5 | ≤ 4 | ≤ 3 |
|--------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|
| Number of addresses: | 12 | 3,680 | 3,548 | 3,224 |
| Percent of addresses: | 0.3% | 95% | 93% | 85% |

At the 1/31/22 working session and 2/28/23 Council meeting, staff recommended limiting parking permits to 4 per address. Again, this was without providing any data as to the “excessive” permits, or data as to how many of the issued permits constituted landlord guest permits.

| Number of addresses | Number of Permits Issued | Actually Issued | If allowed 4 permits | Permits Issued over 4 | If allowed 5 permits | Permits issued over 5 |
|---------------------|--------------------------|-----------------|----------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|
| 900 | 1 | | | | | |
| 1535 | 2 | | | | | |
| 789 | 3 | | | | | |
| 324 | 4 | | | | | |
| 132 | 5 | 390 | 528 | 132 | | |
| 65 | 6 | 390 | 260 | 130 | 325 | 65 |
| 33 | 7 | 231 | 132 | 99 | 165 | 66 |
| 14 | 8 | 112 | 56 | 56 | 70 | 42 |
| 11 | 9 | 99 | 44 | 55 | 55 | 44 |
| 3 | 10 | 30 | 12 | 18 | 15 | 15 |
| 4 | 11 | 44 | 16 | 28 | 20 | 24 |
| 1 | 16 | 16 | 4 | 12 | 5 | 11 |
| 1 | 18 | 18 | 4 | 14 | 5 | 13 |
| 2 | 20 | 40 | 8 | 32 | 10 | 30 |
| 1 | 25 | 25 | 4 | 21 | 5 | 20 |
| 3815 | | 1068 | 1665 | 597 | 675 | 330 |

- A limit of 4 permits per address would have impacted **267 households** who had more than 4 permits in 2021
- In contrast, a limit of 5 permits per address would have impacted only **135 households**

Instead of following staff recommendation, Council limited parking permits to 3 per address (with some “hardship” exceptions):

| Number of addresses | Number of Permits Issued | Actually Issued | If allowed 3 permits | Permits issued over 3 |
|---------------------|--------------------------|-----------------|----------------------|-----------------------|
| 900 | 1 | | | |
| 1535 | 2 | | | |
| 789 | 3 | | | |
| 324 | 4 | 1296 | 972 | 324 |
| 132 | 5 | 660 | 396 | 264 |
| 65 | 6 | 390 | 195 | 195 |
| 33 | 7 | 231 | 99 | 132 |
| 14 | 8 | 112 | 42 | 70 |
| 11 | 9 | 99 | 33 | 66 |
| 3 | 10 | 30 | 9 | 21 |
| 4 | 11 | 44 | 12 | 32 |
| 1 | 16 | 16 | 3 | 13 |
| 1 | 18 | 18 | 3 | 15 |
| 2 | 20 | 40 | 6 | 34 |
| 1 | 25 | 25 | 3 | 22 |
| 3815 | | 2961 | 1773 | 1188 |

This decision alone impacted 591 households who had more than 3 permits in 2021, disrupting the lives of families living at **15%** of the addresses in the impacted zone, and impacting:

- **more than 2x** as many families than the 4 permit limit recommended by staff, and
- **more than 4x** as many families whose lives would have been disrupted had a 5 permit per address limit been imposed.

The decision requiring a driver’s license and vehicle registration at the Hermosa Beach address disrupted the lives of **an unknown number of additional families**

In addition to limiting permits to 3 per address, and *entirely eliminating landlord guest permits*, Council decided to:

- **Entirely eliminate the 1 day “event permit” program**
- Issue vehicle permits only to vehicles registered at the Hermosa Beach address.
- Impose a new proof of residency requirement that the drivers license for the vehicle registrant show the Hermosa Beach address.

The latter restrictions completely disregard the needs, and unnecessarily disrupted the lives, of our neighbors who:

- Reside part time in Hermosa Beach, maintaining a primary residence elsewhere. Our “part-time” neighbors pay the same taxes as “full-time” Hermosa Beach residents and contribute as much (or more) to our local economy when they are staying in their Hermosa Beach property.
- Have legitimate security and/or privacy reasons to maintain a different mailing address. We should respect the security and privacy wants and needs of our neighbors.

Requests:

- Eliminate the limit on # of parking permits per address.
- If not eliminated, increase the limit to 5 permits per address (including the guest permit). This would, as of 2021, have avoided disrupting the lives of at least 96% of the affected families.
- Restore the 1 day event permits. Perhaps increase the cost nominally – NOT to the daily meter parking rate, which would defeat the purpose and punish residents in the restricted zone. Perhaps limit to 2-3 events a year.
- Restore the landlord guest permit program but limit to **1 permit per property** not per unit.
- Restore old “proof of residency” requirements. Any identified fraud was the exception, not the rule. Future fraud can be addressed on a case by case basis, retaining the existing “penalty” of forfeiting permits for 2 years, without punishing the vast majority of your neighbors who are honest and **simply want and deserve the same rights and privileges as our neighbors living outside the impacted zone.**

THANK YOU

Homeless

City Press Release 10/31/24

<https://www.hermosabeach.gov/Home/Components/News/News/4107/>

CITY OF HERMOSA BEACH PARTNERS WITH SOUTH BAY CITIES COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS ON FUNCTIONAL ZERO HOMELESS INITIATIVE

- It has been a full year – what do the data show?

Press Release Highlights:

To achieve Functional Zero, the number of individuals placed in interim or permanent housing must be greater than the number of individuals who become homeless over a six-month period, and the homeless population must have a median duration on the streets of less than 90 days.

- *Where does HB stand on achieving this goal?*

Mobile Crisis Response: The City is assessing its impact on reducing police demand and aiding homeless individuals to see if it can be expanded regionally.

- *Funding has ended – what did the assessment show?*

Cities participating in the Functional Zero program conduct weekly case conferencing with the SBCCOG's Homeless Services team, at which time a roster of individuals is updated, and person-centric interventions are discussed. Using a framework designed by SBCCOG's Homeless Services Manager Ronson Chu, data is examined at a macro level to evaluate the resource investments and opportunities.

- *Obviously, privacy and HIPAA concerns preclude providing reports by name – but where is the data describing, for example, the progress or outcome with "Individual A?"*