

CITY OF VENTURA  
**CITY COUNCIL AGENDA**

**Supplemental  
Information  
Packet**

**Public Communications and Agenda Related Items  
Received by 4:00 p.m., May 31, 2022.**

**Meeting of May 31, 2022**

**Supplemental Information:**

Any agenda related public documents received and distributed to a majority of the City Council after the Agenda Packet is printed are included in Supplemental Packets. Supplemental Packets are produced as needed. The Supplemental Packet is available in the City Clerk's Office, 501 Poli Street, Room 204, Ventura, during normal business hours as well as on the City's Website – [www.cityofventura.ca.gov](http://www.cityofventura.ca.gov)  
<https://www.cityofventura.ca.gov/1236/City-Council-Public-Hearing-NoticesSuppl>

## **AGENDA ITEM 13B**

### **Redflex Traffic Systems Agreement**

## Michael MacDonald

---

**From:** Ian Gamble [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, May 31, 2022 9:53 AM  
**To:** City Clerk; Sofia Rubalcava; Doug Halter; Lorrie Brown; Jeannette Sanchez-Palacios; Joe Schroeder; Jim Friedman; Mike Johnson  
**Subject:** -EXT- City Council Meeting 5/31 Item 13B

I'm writing to argue that the RedFlex contract isn't worth the expense. From the table on page 4, it's pretty clear that there is possibly a downward trend in driving habits, and the city should be using this as an opportunity to promote and support a "walkable" city. The contract money should be reallocated away from the police and towards creating a robust and reliable public transit system. The future is one without personal vehicles, this is just a fact that we need to come to terms with.

Additionally RedFlex's own statistics don't make for a compelling argument for red light cameras. out of nearly 43 million cars that were detected by the cameras only 15,718 were flagged as potential violations, and of those 15,718 less than half (7,363) were cited. This tells us that red light violations aren't that common (.03% of all drivers are flagged, .017% are cited) and that these cameras aren't very accurate, if less than half of those flagged end up being cited.

And finally, we should all object to the alarming way these cameras are "always on" and in high definition. This is clearly a violation of any right to privacy we may have, as well as the unknown nature of what RedFlex and Ventura Police Department do with the data. Is there a facial recognition program by the PD? Does RedFlex sell this data to third parties?

Please do not renew this contract. There are too many concerns about the company ([https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Redflex\\_Holdings](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Redflex_Holdings)), too many concerns about the effectiveness of the cameras themselves, as well as concerns about privacy and how the data is used. This contract effectively takes taxpayer money and sends it out of the community to administer a dubious program of surveillance. The funds could then be used to uplift our community in ways that promote community cohesion and safety that aren't retributive.

Thanks for your attention.

Ian Gamble

**CAUTION: This email originated from outside the City of Ventura. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.**

**>> Please verify all links and attachments before opening them! <<**

**Michael MacDonald**

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, May 31, 2022 1:36 PM  
**To:** City Clerk  
**Subject:** -EXT- 5/31/22 Agenda 13B Against

Dear Councilmembers,

I am writing to again state I am against the renewal of Redflex and ask for support to vote to sunset RedFlex and not renew and nor renew for any additional term.

- I have always believed the use of RedFlex Traffic System is violation of a person’s civil rights and due process
- In addition, with the renewal of RedFlex the City is potentially exposed to litigation with the California Consumer Privacy Act (CCPA) retroactive and the California Consumer Privacy Rights Act (CPRA) beginning 2023.
- There have historically been disingenuous errors in the system adverse to the public... “yellow light timing & RedFlex Chicago”
- The staff recommendation to renew the RedFlex Traffic Signal Agreement is incongruent and ignores all prior City Council guidance provided to City Staff on September 21, 2020:
- Staff is not transparently presenting prior Council guidance in its published Staff report and recommendation this evening.

Please vote No and Sunset the RedFlex agreement.

Thank you,

George Amandola  
Resident Ventura Council District 1

+++++  
+++++

Supporting Information:

Ventura City Council Meeting  
21-Sep-20  
Video

City Council Meeting - Special Meeting - September 21 - Sep 21st, 2020 ([granicus.com](https://cityofventura.granicus.com/))  
[https://cityofventura.granicus.com/MediaPlayer.php?view\\_id=17&clip\\_id=1669](https://cityofventura.granicus.com/MediaPlayer.php?view_id=17&clip_id=1669)

Time Stamp Start: 03:54- 2:20:19

Councilmember Nasarenko Council Motion Recap, clarification, and vote:  
Time Stamp 2:17:13- 2:20:19

“...Red Flex not be awardee...”  
Brown Question  
“With the intention to sunset or use other technology to replace RedFlex”

### 3 Public Speakers

Time Stamp Begin 28:09- 39:09

George Amandola comments

Time Stamp 36:59- 39:09

Councilmember Brown

Questions: Time Stamp: 40:32 - 1:02:15

Comments: Time Stamp:

"...red light offenders (collision) statistic report", "...Ventura turned it off years ago..."

Council Member Weir Questions:

Questions: Time Stamp: 1:02:17 – 1:19:05

Comments: Time Stamp:

Council Member Heitman Questions:

Questions: Time Stamp: 1:19:10 -1:38:49

Comments: Time Stamp:

" voted against it every time....not enough data to continue....not continue after this renewal."

Challenged success

"" ...data is lacking for past nine years... unnecessary... and two years will give chief enough time to reallocate his budget... want to sunset..."

Deputy Mayor Rubalcava Questions:

Questions: Time Stamp: 1:18:52 -1:49:13

Motion Comments 2:09:

Comments: Time Stamp:

" ...what is demographic data on people who received citations: who are these drivers? ... Age, residents, visitors, ..." "... supports Councilmember Brown comments about helping with outside evaluator of effectiveness..." "supports canceling after this renewal...city making a profit...traffic engineering making road safer..."

Councilmember Nasarenko Questions and Motion Discussion:

Questions: Time Stamp: 1:49:15 -

Comments: Time Stamp:

" Agree with Weir, Heitman, Rubalcava," "... city should phase down reliance on RedFlex..."

"...unnecessary and time consuming lightning rod.." "...sunset relationship with RedFlex at end of two year extension..." "...Goal is to withdraw from RedFlex..."

Discussion Brown Amendment to Motions and Nasarenko Amendments discussions.

Councilmember Friedman Questions:

Questions: Time Stamp: 1:51 –

Comments: Time Stamp:

Motion Maker "... do not renew in 2022... incorporating need for data study"

Questions about Narasenko Motion, "on Council when originally did this." "...drivers are slowing down..." "...Get questions answered sooner than later."

Mayor LaVere Questions:

Questions: Time Stamp: 40:32 –

Per City Manager McIntyre- "...Menlo Park reverted back to having no cameras..."

**12. FORMAL ITEMS**

**\*12B. Approve Second Extension - Redflex Traffic Systems Agreement**

**SPEAKERS**

**Presenters** Chief of Police Darin Schindler, Commander Rick Murray, City Attorney Gregory Diaz, Principal Civil Engineer Jeff Hereford, Assistant City Attorney Andy Viets and City Manager Alex D. McIntyre

Edward Tiedje, Redflex Representative

**Public** Jay Beeber; Marilyn; John Carvello; and George Arandola

**DOCUMENTS**

City Clerk Antoinette Mann stated that all comments received through electronic communications have been posted online in the Supplemental Packets. All names will be reflected into the record.

**Comments-via Email** Jim Lissner (3); R. Allen Baylis, R.A. Baylis & Associates; Jay Beeber, Safer Streets; Marilyn Kellar; Sarah Aspell; Janet Allen; Judy Alexandre; and Steven Smith

**PowerPoint**

**Supplemental Packet** All Public Communications are listed and posted online

Councilmember Nasarenko moved to approve the amended recommendation to:

- a. Approve and authorize the City Manager to execute the Second Extension to the Redflex Traffic System Agreement (Agreement Number 2015-022) for two years, effective May 10, 2020 to May 9, 2022, for \$473,040 annually or \$946,080 over two years.
- b. Staff needs to look at Traffic Safety beyond a Red-Light Camera system. At the end of the current two year contract, and prior to issuing an Request for Proposal for a new Red Light Camera System, a comprehensive collision analysis and data be performed by an external source and evaluated to determine if such a camera system is still needed for Traffic Safety.

**12. FORMAL ITEMS (continued)**

Approving this motion will allow us to gradually withdrawal from Redflex as this contract sunsets, that as an organization, we cannot rely upon these funds in the future but we need to be open and mindful of the data collected. If the data shows we still need a Red-Light camera, that should be pursued but it is the strong preference of current City Council, not to award the contract to Redflex.

Councilmember Weir seconded. The vote was as follows:

AYES: Councilmembers Nasarenko, Brown, Friedman, Weir,  
Heitmann, Deputy Mayor Rubalcava and Mayor LaVere  
NOES: Councilmember Heitmann  
ABSENT: None

City Clerk Antoinette M. Mann declared the motion carried, 6-Yes and 1-No  
(Councilmember Heitmann)

**CAUTION: This email originated from outside the City of Ventura. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.**

**>> Please verify all links and attachments before opening them! <<**

## **AGENDA ITEM 8**

### **Public Communications**



## Michael MacDonald

---

**From:** Judith Vasquez [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Thursday, May 26, 2022 1:24 AM  
**To:** City Clerk  
**Cc:** Sofia Rubalcava; Joe Schroeder; Lorrie Brown; Jim Friedman; Doug Halter; Mike Johnson; Jeannette Sanchez-Palacios  
**Subject:** -EXT- 13A: Support Retroactive No Fault, Just Cause Eviction Protection Ordinance for Substantial Remodels

Dear Ventura City Council,

I am writing to urge you to vote in support of a retroactive eviction protection ordinance for substantial remodels that includes relocation assistance equal to three months of market-rate rent for a similarly sized unit. Tenants living in the Casa Del Pueblo apartments received an eviction notice immediately after a Los Angeles-based real estate company bought the building for \$2.9 million. This model of predatory investment follows a common pattern: investors buy apartments where low-income people live, shortly thereafter, they evict them. Afterwards, the landlord makes very superficial renovations (painting, laying new floors) to rent the apartment at high-market rate-prices. This owner states that the building is in need of "substantial remodel," but the City has not yet received completed building permits. Still, Casa del Pueblo tenants only have a week until their eviction date and many of the tenants are at high risk of homelessness. We urgently need stronger regulations for these types of evictions as the City closes loopholes in state law. Specifically, the ordinance should:

1. Create a notification system, where the landlord sends a letter of "intent to remodel and possible evictions" to tenants when applying for the City's work permits.
2. Create a verification system by a third party inspector, such as city code enforcement, to determine if planned renovations meet the legal definition of "substantial" and can be completed in less than 30 days. If renovations are not substantial enough to require more than 30 days of units being vacant, the landlord will not be able to evict the tenants.
3. Include three months of relocation assistance for those affected by evictions due to renovations. If the remodeling of the unit is deemed substantial and families truly need to leave their homes, the minimum amount of assistance required by state law-equivalent to one month's rent-would not adequately cover the cost of rental application fees, the security deposit and first and last month's rent. This results in evicted families ending up on our streets or being pushed out of our community altogether, instead of being able to find new housing. As written, relocation assistance would be weaker than the Long Beach ordinance cited in the staff report and nearby cities with just cause ordinances like Santa Barbara and Oxnard. If this eviction were taking place in the city of Santa Barbara, the tenants would be entitled to three months of relocation assistance for a similar size market rate unit.

Landlords must be required to have approved permits before they can issue eviction notices. As "renovictions" become more and more common in Ventura, there need to be better regulations that prevent mass housing displacement of Ventura families and renters. "Renovictions" are a tactic often used by speculative real estate investors to avoid renter protections and push longtime tenants from their homes in order to raise rents and market buildings to a wealthier clientele. The result is a loss of working-class families and neighborhoods, destroying the diversity of our city. We need to protect our neighbors from displacement!

Thank you.

Judith Vasquez

**CAUTION: This email originated from outside the City of Ventura. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.**

**>> Please verify all links and attachments before opening them! <<**

John Whitman

Ventura, Calif. 93001

May 26, 2022

Mayor Ms. Sofia Rubalcava  
Deputy Mayor Mr. Joe Schroeder

City Councilpersons:  
Ms. Lorrie Brown, Mr. Jim Friedman, Mr. Doug Halter,  
Mr. Mike Johnson, and Ms. Jannette Sanchez-Palacios

City Manager, Mr. Alex McIntyre

Re: Residential Exterior Lighting Ordinance

My wife and I are asking the City to develop and implement an ordinance regarding residential exterior lighting.

It has come to my attention that the Buena Ventura City Municipal Codes have no ordinances regarding residential exterior light uses, control, or interference by light spillage onto neighboring residences.

This is an issue to us as we have a neighboring house that has a lighting fixture that spills light onto and into our home. The referenced light interferes with the full enjoyment of our home. The offending light shines into our living and bedrooms.

I have asked the neighbor to correct this situation, but he has refused.


Last year, I contacted the Code Enforcement office at the City Hall by phone. I spoke to Melissa who identified herself as the secretary for the department. She subsequently arranged for a phone conversation with one of the code enforcement officers. I do not recall his name. He informed me that there is nothing he could do to help as there is no ordinance to enforce within the City Municipal Codes regarding residential light interference from one neighbor to another.

We have put up with this intrusion for a greater part of a year. The situation has changed a couple of months ago. The light seems to be brighter and appears to now be on a dusk to dawn sensor switch. The exposed light bulb also now appears to be lower in the fixture allowing a greater light exposure to our home.

I have researched ordinances and have knowledge of lighting as a former lighting director in the television industry.

Attached is the lift from the City of Calimesa, Ca. for your reference and assistance to pursue an ordinance to resolve this issue.

Regards,



John Whitman, 

Calimesa, Ca.

<https://www.codepublishing.com/CA/Calimesa/html/Calimesa18/Calimesa18120.html>

**18.120.010 Purpose and intent.**

It is the purpose and intent of this chapter to establish regulations and standards which will reduce light pollution generated by residential, commercial and industrial lighting fixtures and devices, minimize light pollution which has a detrimental effect on the environment and the enjoyment of the night sky, reduce and minimize lighting and lighting practices which cause unnecessary illumination of adjacent properties, correct problems of glare and light trespass, reduce energy use, comply with the regulations set forth in the California Building Efficiency Standards (Title 24, Parts 1 and 6 of the California Code of Regulations, enacted pursuant to California Public Resources Code Section 25402.1, or successor statute), and implement the Calimesa general plan. [Ord. 294 § 15, 2009.]

**18.120.020 Definitions.**

"Glare" means the brightness of a light source that causes annoyance, discomfort, or loss in visual performance and visibility to the eye.

"Light trespass" means light emitted by a lighting installation which shines beyond the boundaries of the property on which the installation is sited.

"Nuisance glare" means glare that (A) creates an annoyance or aggravation but does not create a potentially hazardous situation, or (B) creates an annoyance or aggravation that impairs or impedes a person's right of quiet enjoyment of his/her property.

"Spillover light" means light trespass.

**18.120.030 Exempt lighting.**

The following lighting systems are prohibited except as otherwise indicated:

B. Lighting fixtures mounted in such a way as to illuminate a roof, or aimed only towards a property line, or which cause disabling glare or light trespass, as determined by the community development director

**18.120.050 Nonconforming lighting.**

Additionally, should it be determined that a nonconforming light fixture results in light trespass, the community development director may require that the light be shielded, filtered, redirected, replaced with a less intense light source, removed or a combination thereof, to eliminate light trespass.

<b>Subject</b>	<b>Requirement</b>
	applicable residential zone. If attached to a single-family residence the lighting shall not exceed the height of the roof eave.