

**Switzer, Donna**

---

**From:** Fikes, Cathy  
**Sent:** Friday, January 31, 2020 2:05 PM  
**To:** Agenda Alerts  
**Subject:** FW: Agenda item 21

---

**From:** Kathy Carrick <carrick92647@hotmail.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, January 31, 2020 12:28 PM  
**To:** CITY COUNCIL <city.council@surfcity-hb.org>  
**Subject:** Agenda item 21

Dear Mayor Semeta and council members:

At the last city council meeting, during a discussion regarding Item 31- Appeal of Planning Commission Approval of Coastal Development Permit No. 19-001 and Conditional Use Permit No. 19-001 (3rd Street Commercial Building) Council member Carr eloquently spoke of her concern regarding government overreach. So it seems ironic that, when I examined the agenda for the upcoming city council meeting on February 3, 2020 I saw Agenda Item 21- Review and consider the Community Choice Energy (CCE) Feasibility Study options. If anything would qualify as "government overreach" it would be the city taking over functions of a public utility.

Other cities of comparable size to Huntington Beach have paid for feasibility studies. They show an upfront cost of \$10 Million dollars with a "promised" savings of up to 2%. Where do you think that \$10 million dollars will come from? That is the taxpayer's money. If you spend this money, you are violating the public trust. Even if you are convinced that you can finance the upfront costs with a bond measure, the money must be repaid with interest. And you are willing to put our city at risk for what? A 2% savings which I suspect we will never see.

I urge you to vote for Option B on Agenda Item 21. I do not want you to continue this discussion for another minute!

Best regards,  
Kathy Carrick

Sent from my Verizon, Samsung Galaxy smartphone

**SUPPLEMENTAL  
COMMUNICATION**

Meeting Date: 2/3/2020

Agenda Item No.: 21 (20-1375)

**Switzer, Donna**

---

**From:** Fikes, Cathy  
**Sent:** Friday, January 31, 2020 2:06 PM  
**To:** Agenda Alerts  
**Subject:** FW: Agenda Item #21

-----Original Message-----

From: Elizabeth Esparza <elizabeth@executivesoundpros.com>  
Sent: Friday, January 31, 2020 10:37 AM  
To: CITY COUNCIL <city.council@surfcity-hb.org>  
Subject: Agenda Item #21

Dear Mayor Semeta and council members,

As I've called the city about various items to be fixed, alleys, streets, park equipment, etc I'm constantly told it's not in the budget. The alley behind my house has been on the repair "list" for 20 years. So, when I see Agenda Item 21 on Monday night's city council agenda, I'm concerned.

We don't have the money to do the most basic of functions expected of a city government, yet there is \$66,000 for a feasibility study regarding a function that local government should have no part? That doesn't just seem troubling. It seems reckless.

I urge you to vote for option B on Agenda Item 21.

Thank you,

Elizabeth Esparza

**SUPPLEMENTAL  
COMMUNICATION**

Meeting Date: 2/3/2020

Agenda Item No.: 21(20-1375)

**Switzer, Donna**

---

**From:** Fikes, Cathy  
**Sent:** Friday, January 31, 2020 2:08 PM  
**To:** Agenda Alerts  
**Subject:** FW: Agenda item 21

**Importance:** High

---

**From:** Gary Tarkington <garytarkington@msn.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, January 31, 2020 5:53 AM  
**To:** CITY COUNCIL <city.council@surfcity-hb.org>  
**Subject:** Agenda item 21  
**Importance:** High

Dear Mayor Semeta and council members:

At the last city council meeting, during a discussion regarding Item 31- Appeal of Planning Commission Approval of Coastal Development Permit No. 19-001 and Conditional Use Permit No. 19-001 (3rd Street Commercial Building) Councilmember Carr eloquently spoke of her concern regarding government overreach. So it seems ironic that, when I examined the agenda for the upcoming city council meeting on February 3, 2020 I saw Agenda Item 21- Review and consider the Community Choice Energy (CCE) Feasibility Study options. If anything would qualify as "government overreach" it would be the city taking over functions of a public utility.

Other cities of comparable size to Huntington Beach have paid for feasibility studies. They show an upfront cost of \$10 Million dollars with a "promised" savings of up to 2%. Where do you think that \$10 million dollars will come from? That is the taxpayer's money. If you spend this money, you are violating the public trust. Even if you are convinced that you can finance the upfront costs with a bond measure, the money must be repaid with interest. And you are willing to put our city at risk for what? A 2% savings which I suspect we will never see.

I urge you to vote for Option B on Agenda Item 21. I do not want you to continue this discussion for another minute!

Best regards,  
Ann Tarkington  
92646

**SUPPLEMENTAL  
COMMUNICATION**

Meeting Date: 2/3/2020

Agenda Item No.: 21(20-1375)

**Switzer, Donna**

---

**From:** Fikes, Cathy  
**Sent:** Friday, January 31, 2020 2:07 PM  
**To:** Agenda Alerts  
**Subject:** FW: Agenda Item 21

---

**From:** Pam Walker <pamw@brandingbusiness.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, January 31, 2020 9:47 AM  
**To:** CITY COUNCIL <city.council@surfcity-hb.org>  
**Subject:** Agenda Item 21

Dear Mayor Semeta and council members,

I am concerned about the feasibility study being considered regarding Community Choice Aggregation. This seems like a waste of \$66,000 that could be used for better purpose. Examples I can think of are pothole repair and cleanup around the homeless population.

Why don't you review studies done by other cities? Sharing of information should be a cost saving measure for all cities.

Please vote for option B on Agenda Item 21.

Best regards,

Pam Walker  
Huntington Beach Resident

**SUPPLEMENTAL  
COMMUNICATION**

Meeting Date: 2/3/2020

Agenda Item No.: 21(20-1375)