

MINUTES OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE, STATE OF CALIFORNIA



9.9

During the oral communication section of the agenda for Tuesday, May 8, 2012, Paul Jacobs requested that the Board not charge parking fees for Board meetings.

**ATTACHMENTS FILED WITH
CLERK OF THE BOARD**

**AGENDA NO.
9.9**

**Riverside County Board of Supervisors
Request to Speak**

Submit request to Clerk of Board (right of podium),
Speakers are entitled to three (3) minutes, subject
Board Rules listed on the reverse side of this form.

SPEAKER'S NAME: Paul Jacobs

Address: 32370 Corte Zamora
(only if follow-up mail response requested)

City: Temecula **Zip:** 92592

Phone #: 951-676-1950

Date: 5/8/2012 **Agenda #** Public Comment

PLEASE STATE YOUR POSITION BELOW:

Position on "Regular" (non-appealed) Agenda Item:

Support **Oppose** **Neutral**

Note: If you are here for an agenda item that is filed
for "Appeal", please state separately your position on
the appeal below:

Support **Oppose** **Neutral**

I give my 3 minutes to: _____

Paul Jacobs
32370 Corte Zamora
Temecula, CA 92592-6368
Res: 951-676-1950
Email: TemeculaPaul@aol.com

May 8, 2012

Honorable Supervisors and County Counsel:

As I have tried to relate in repeated public comments, I believe the County damages the public trust in charging parking fees to citizens attending public meetings. I believe the policy enacted in February of 2010 ceasing validated parking tramples on laws designed to protect public access to government.

Please provide me with information as to when, why and by whom the new policy was initiated after decades of validating parking for citizens attending public meetings. Please provide a fiscal analysis used to arrive at a decision I must assume was made for budgetary reasons. Please consider this a California Public Records Act request or notify me of the proper format the county requires for a citizen to obtain public records.

There appears to be no fiscal justification for creating a "tollbooth on democracy" and I believe charging citizens for parking is in violation of Government Code 54961 stating, "*No legislative body of a local agency shall conduct any meeting in any facility that prohibits the admittance of any person, or persons, on the basis of ancestry or any characteristic listed or defined in Section 11135, or which is inaccessible to disabled persons, or where members of the public may not be present without making a payment or purchase.*"

I am retired on a fixed income and have nothing better to do than to pursue this matter, but I will gladly stand down if the County can demonstrate justification for the impediment to democracy that has been created. It would be more expedient and much less expensive for the County to simply do the right thing in bringing back some form of validated parking for the involved citizens that attend public meetings. I am happy to be of help in finding a workable solution.

With all due respect, the case law cited by County Counsel on the resolved issue of parking for the disabled (*Spicer v. City of Camarillo*) was a bit shoddy in that it had no application to parking structures. Does the County want to waste additional resources and risk further embarrassment defending a policy that serves to obstruct public participation in government?

In addition to advice of counsel, you might consult your political advisers what side you should take when it comes to public access to government.

The intent of the Brown Act and other law protecting public access to government is clear. Riverside County impedes public access by holding the meetings during a weekday at 9:00 in the morning and placing public comment at the end of the morning agenda. The addition of parking fees creates an additional unwarranted penalty for public participation in government.

There must be some solution other than making a bigger deal out of the fundamental issue of access to government. I hope a County Supervisor will take the lead in resolving this matter in the interest of democracy.



Paul Jacobs

Submitted by Jacobs
5-8-12 (date) Item ORAL

Paul Jacobs
32370 Corte Zamora
Temecula, CA 92592-6368
Res: 951-676-1950
Email: TemeculaPaul@aol.com

May 8, 2012

Honorable Supervisors and County Counsel:

As I have tried to relate in repeated public comments, I believe the County damages the public trust in charging parking fees to citizens attending public meetings. I believe the policy enacted in February of 2010 ceasing validated parking tramples on laws designed to protect public access to government.

Please provide me with information as to when, why and by whom the new policy was initiated after decades of validating parking for citizens attending public meetings. Please provide a fiscal analysis used to arrive at a decision I must assume was made for budgetary reasons. Please consider this a California Public Records Act request or notify me of the proper format the county requires for a citizen to obtain public records.

There appears to be no fiscal justification for creating a "tollbooth on democracy" and I believe charging citizens for parking is in violation of Government Code 54961 stating, "*No legislative body of a local agency shall conduct any meeting in any facility that prohibits the admittance of any person, or persons, on the basis of ancestry or any characteristic listed or defined in Section 11135, or which is inaccessible to disabled persons, or where members of the public may not be present without making a payment or purchase.*"

I am retired on a fixed income and have nothing better to do than to pursue this matter, but I will gladly stand down if the County can demonstrate justification for the impediment to democracy that has been created. It would be more expedient and much less expensive for the County to simply do the right thing in bringing back some form of validated parking for the involved citizens that attend public meetings. I am happy to be of help in finding a workable solution.

With all due respect, the case law cited by County Counsel on the resolved issue of parking for the disabled (*Spicer v. City of Camarillo*) was a bit shoddy in that it had no application to parking structures. Does the County want to waste additional resources and risk further embarrassment defending a policy that serves to obstruct public participation in government?

In addition to advice of counsel, you might consult your political advisers what side you should take when it comes to public access to government.

The intent of the Brown Act and other law protecting public access to government is clear. Riverside County impedes public access by holding the meetings during a weekday at 9:00 in the morning and placing public comment at the end of the morning agenda. The addition of parking fees creates an additional unwarranted penalty for public participation in government.

There must be some solution other than making a bigger deal out of the fundamental issue of access to government. I hope a County Supervisor will take the lead in resolving this matter in the interest of democracy.



Paul Jacobs

Submitted by Jacobs
5-8-12 (date) Item BEAL