Grand Jury Report
RESPONSE FORM

Grand Jury Report Title: Trials and Tribulations of Running a Small City

Report Dated: May 14, 2010

Response Form Submitted By:

Paul Cayler JOHN SHERMAN
City Manager CODE ENFORCEMENT OFFICER
111 E. Commercial Street
Willits, CA 95490

Response MUST be submitted, per Penal Code §933.05, no later than:

July 14, 2010

I have reviewed the report and submit my responses to the <u>FINDINGS</u> portion of the report as follows:

☑ I (we) agree with the Findings numbered:
12 & 13

☐ I (we) disagree wholly or partially with the Findings numbered below, and have ***<u>attached, as required</u>***, a statement specifying any portion of the Finding that are disputed with an explanation of the reasons therefore.

I have reviewed the report and submit my responses to the <u>RECOMMENDATIONS</u> portion of the report as follows:

☐ The following Recommendation(s) have have been implemented and ***<u>attached, as required</u>***, is a summary describing the implemented actions:

☑ The following Recommendation(s) have not yet been implemented, but will be implemented in the future, ***<u>attached, as required</u>*** is a time frame for implementation:
WHEN ECONOMIC RECOVERY ALLOWS

☐ The following Recommendation(s) require further analysis, and ***attached as required.*** is an explanation and the scope and parameters of the planned analysis, and a time frame for the matter to be prepared, discussed and approved by the officer and/or director of the agency or department being investigated or reviewed: (This time frame shall not exceed six (6) months from the date of publication of the Grand Jury Report)

_____

☐ The following Recommendations will NOT be implemented because they are not warranted and/or are not deemed reasonable, ***attached, as required*** is an explanation therefore:

_____

I have completed the above responses, and have attached, as required the following number of pages to this response form:

Number of Pages attached: 1

I understand that responses to Grand Jury Reports are public records. They will be posted on the Grand Jury website: www.co.mendocino.ca.us/grandjury. The clerk of the responding agency is required to maintain a copy of the response.

I understand that I must submit this signed response form and any attachments as follows:

First Step: E-mail (word documents or scanned pdf file format) to:

- The Grand Jury Foreperson at: grandjury@co.mendocino.ca.us
- The Presiding Judge: grandjury@mendocino.courts.ca.gov
- The County's Executive Office: ceo@co.mendocino.ca.us

Second Step: Mail all originals to:

Mendocino County Grand Jury
P.O. Box 939
Ukiah, CA 95482

Printed Name: John Sherman
Title: Code Enforcement Officer
Signed: John Sherman Date: 6/24/10

Response to Recommendations

June 24, 2010

Mendocino County Grand Jury
PO Box 939
Ukiah, Ca. 95482

Subject: Response to Grand Jury Report entitled "Trials and Tribulations of Running a Small City."

Dear Grand Jury Members

Per your request I am responding to Findings numbers 12 and 13 and Recommendations numbers 7 and 8.

Response:

Findings number 12 is correct.
Findings number 13 is also correct.

Recommendations number 7; I have discussed this issue with the City Manager as well as several members of the City Council and while most agree that we need to revise this ordinance to better accommodate the needs of the community, the City Manager, Community Development Director and I are currently overburdened with day to day duties of providing services to City residents to address this situation. For now we are relying on our best judgment to suspend enforcement of this ordinance when enforcement would create a hardship and use is otherwise reasonable. As soon as economic recovery allows us to backfill some of our vacant staff positions and free up my time I will be working on a revision or this ordinance.

My response to Recommendations number 8 is similar to my response to Recommendation number 7 in that the City Manager, the Community Development Director and myself fully intend to revise this ordinance when we have the time to address it but this issue will take quite a bit more interaction with members of the community to determine the balance between the levels of privacy and safety they desire. We know there is a safety issue there but the statistics are not conclusive when it comes to establishing specific height requirements. Infill lots will require separate regulation as the safety concerns are different than corner lots. The problems we have with this ordinance is the result of its being adopted from another Municipal Code as a blanket solution with general requirements and the residents of our City seem to be much more focused on their individual needs to allow blanket solutions and their needs are the needs we must respond to.
Sincerely,

John Sherman
Code Enforcement Officer
City of Willits