

**Switzer, Donna**

---

**From:** Dan Jamieson <broker\_advocate@hotmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, July 20, 2020 11:41 AM  
**To:** supplementalcomm@surfcity-hb.org  
**Subject:** Vote NO on Item 22 of the July 20, 2020 City Council agenda

Dear Council:

Please vote no on Item 22 of the July 20, 2020 City Council agenda, "a Consideration of a Prohibition on the City's use of Public Funds for any Tax Measure Advocacy."

As the item itself notes, state law already bans public agencies from using public funds to advocate for or against ballot measures, including tax measures. So taxpayers are already protected from government overreach into the ballot process.

What this resolution apparently seeks, though, is a wholesale restriction on how the City could communicate to residents about "any tax measure," not just ballot measures.

Precisely what the city attorney would be instructed to do is unclear. The proposed resolution would prohibit using public funds "for informational or educational campaigns regarding any local tax measure." So, what is a tax measure? Would it be a proposal to tax short-term rentals? Sharing tax receipts with influential local businesses? What exactly would an "informational" or "educational" campaign be? Who would make that determination? If the city attorney apes the Newport Beach resolution, HB citizens would no longer be provided with City-funded "public education, public opinion polling, studies, or written or verbal communication regarding tax measures." Only if residents specifically ask will we be told anything about what our tax options might be. Would we then be given only privately funded information, which may have hidden agendas?

While I am no legal expert, such an overreaching and vague restriction on communication to City residents would seem to be unconstitutional. Citizens should not be starved for accurate, unbiased advice from public servants and hired experts about tax policies. If there is indeed an issue with tax information provided by City staff, the Council is always free to ignore it or direct the City Manager to address the issue.

Please vote no on Item 22.

Sincerely,

Dan Jamieson  
Huntington Beach

**SUPPLEMENTAL  
COMMUNICATION**

###

Meeting Date: 7/20/20

Agenda Item No.: 22 (20-1700)

**Switzer, Donna**

---

**From:** Fikes, Cathy  
**Sent:** Thursday, July 16, 2020 11:26 AM  
**To:** Agenda Alerts  
**Subject:** FW: Item 20 July 20, 2020 supplemental communication

**From:** pacj <pacj\_03@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, July 15, 2020 10:33 PM  
**To:** Estanislau, Robin <Robin.Estanislau@surfcity-hb.org>; CITY COUNCIL <city.council@surfcity-hb.org>  
**Subject:** Item 20 July 20, 2020 supplemental communication

Dear Mayor Semeta and council members:

Please provide more details on this item.

It sounds like you want to prohibit formal City advocacy (through public funds) on any proposed tax measure. So that if the council at some time in the future were to propose a tax hike, it would be prohibited from campaigning in support of that tax hike.

On the surface this does not make sense to me. Is the Council at this time, or post November election, considering a tax hike for voter approval to cover anticipated budget shortfalls? Why is this item being suggested now? What prompted it? Please elaborate.

Thank you.

Pat Quintana

**SUPPLEMENTAL  
COMMUNICATION**

Meeting Date: 7/20/20

Agenda Item No.: 22  
20(20-1760)