

**Moore, Tania**

---

**From:** Dan Jamieson <danjamieson4@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, December 19, 2022 2:55 PM  
**To:** CITY COUNCIL  
**Subject:** NO vote on Councilmember Item #27, 12-20-22 Council meeting.

Dear HB City Councilmembers:

I urge a NO vote on Councilmember Item #27 of the 12-20-22 Council meeting.

The item proposes increasing campaign contribution limits to \$4,900--the state default limit--from the current \$620 city limit. (Tellingly, the item fails to disclose specifically the \$4,900 figure, a 700% increase from the current limit).

This proposal would create far more influence in city elections by wealthy special interests. Currently, very few individual contributors to city council elections max out at \$620. The exceptions are wealthy special interests who have business before the city--for example, auto dealers, developers and hotels, who (unlike most individuals) also use family members, employees and trade groups to make multiple maximum contributions. This proposal is specifically designed to massively increase contributions from these business interests.

The proposal claims the higher limits will reduce influence by independent expenditure groups. This is likely false. Independent expenditures will continue, and in fact, some independent groups will increase spending with a \$4,900 individual cap if they oppose candidates funded by special interests that can afford the higher individual limit.

Please vote NO on Councilmember Item #27. Special interests do not need more power at city hall.

Sincerely,

Dan Jamieson

Huntington Beach

**SUPPLEMENTAL  
COMMUNICATION**

Meeting Date: 12/20/2022

Agenda Item No.: #27(22-1093)

**Moore, Tania**

---

**From:** Linda Moon <lsapiro048@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, December 19, 2022 3:54 PM  
**To:** CITY COUNCIL  
**Subject:** 12-20-23 City Council Agenda

**SUPPLEMENTAL  
COMMUNICATION**

Meeting Date: 12/20/2022

Dear Mayor Strickland and City Council Members:

Agenda Item No.: #27 (22-1093)

I have been a resident and homeowner in Huntington Beach for 48 years and maintained a law office in Huntington Beach for 40 years until my retirement. I have followed the work of the City Council for many years. I understand that the new City Council majority is anxious to make changes and put its mark on the city's future. I fear, however, that several of the Councilmember Items on the December 20, 2022 agenda were hastily thought out and could have negative impacts on the city. I urge your careful consideration and measured approach in moving forward with these proposals. Of greatest concern to me are the following:

Item 11 would raise the salary of the current City Attorney, who had no training or experience in Municipal Law prior to coming into office, beyond that of all but one other City Attorney in the state, many of whom are far more experienced, and from wealthier communities. While the City Attorney should be fairly compensated, the current proposal is concerning.

Item 26, prohibiting anonymous complaints against businesses and requiring in-person filing will be intimidating to the public and have a chilling effect on legitimate complaints regarding potentially dangerous Code violations. The public should not be made to fear retaliation or retribution for reporting dangerous conditions or be required to appear in person during business hours, something impossible for many residents. The City Code Enforcement employees can quickly determine whether reports are valid or frivolous. The proposal makes an upfront assumption that all reports are wrongful. The opposite should be true. Code enforcement practices should best serve the residents, employees and customers, not make them targets and endanger the safety of reporters and their families.

Item 27 seeking to raise political campaign contribution limits beyond the inflation standards previously established will result in an unfortunate scenario in which only candidates with wealthy and corporate supporters can possibly be elected. This is a recipe for council corruption and the elimination of diversity on the city's governing body.

Item 28 appears to be an inappropriate gift of public funds for the cost of a CEQA Environmental Impact Review, which would ordinarily be paid by the event sponsor. The benefit to the city in hosting that event does not warrant the cost proposed.

Item 29 smacks of a full-on attack on services to the homeless. I suggest that the Council avail itself of the knowledge of your competent staff to become educated regarding state laws protecting the homeless and the benefits of the services now provided, before seeking to dismantle them.

Item 30 regarding the Orange County Power Authority may be better considered after full reporting on the status of the Community Choice Power Aggregate and its potential for reducing dangerous greenhouse gasses and saving money for consumers. As noted by the County Audit serious concerns exist regarding the current operation of the OCPA. But throwing the baby out with the bathwater may not be the best strategy.

Item 33 will most certainly result in the city incurring significant fines for "challenging" and defying state laws. Huntington Beach does not exist in a vacuum. Like it or not, we are part of the State of California and subject to its housing laws. Most of the council members have had little education, to date, regarding how and why housing mandates exist. We have already paid millions of dollars to fines that could have gone to good use in our city for defying housing statutes. Continued defiance will not be productive or in the best interests of the residents of Huntington Beach.

Item 34 regarding the RWG report appears to be political payback at its worst. I sincerely doubt the legality of this city council "waiving" the Attorney Client privileges of the prior council. The report, previously made public, explains to Huntington Beach residents why over 1.5 Million dollars had to be paid to former employees and litigants who were the subject of age discriminatory tactics by the City Attorney. A desire to cleanse Mr. Gates' record to facilitate his future political aspirations is entirely inappropriate. Mr. Steele, unlike Mr. Gates, has many decades of Municipal Law experience and training. The point of the report was to educate the council and serious issues came to light. Sweeping problems under the rug is not in the best interests of the City and its residents.

I hope the City Council will fully deliberate and consider the need for, effects and ramifications of the above proposals, with the focus on serving the best interests of the City and its residents.

Sincerely,  
Linda Sapiro Moon

**Moore, Tania**

---

**From:** Andrew Einhorn <andreweinhornpt@icloud.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 20, 2022 11:33 AM  
**To:** CITY COUNCIL  
**Subject:** 12.20.22 Meeting

Hi Council, I wanted to contact you and voice my opinion on two subjects. I am against giving the city attorney a raise during a time period that non governmental employees are not receiving raises. Currently he makes a lot more money than most. No raise!

I am against raising the amount of **money council members** can take during **campaigns**. Big business will supply council big money and then expect favors. I know because I use to lobby council members! The citizens need to be people that provide the input to the council members with small donations. Too often more money translates into ugly lust for political power.

Andrew Einhorn  
17391 Gibson Circle  
Huntington Beach, CA 92647

**SUPPLEMENTAL  
COMMUNICATION**

Meeting Date: 12/20/2022  
Agenda Item No.: #27 (22-1093)

**Moore, Tania**

---

**From:** Walker, Renee  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 20, 2022 1:56 PM  
**To:** AgendaAlerts@surfcity-hb.org  
**Subject:** Agenda Items #9, #27, and #30 on the City Council Meeting 12-20-2022

**SUPPLEMENTAL  
COMMUNICATION**

**From:** Joclyn Rabbitt-Sire <joclynsire@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 20, 2022 1:50 PM  
**To:** CITY COUNCIL <city.council@surfcity-hb.org>  
**Subject:** Agenda Items #9, #27, and #30 on the City Council Meeting 12-20-2022

**Meeting Date:** 12/20/2022  
**Agenda Item No.:** #27 (22-1093)

Dear City Councilmembers,

I wish to welcome the new members on the council, and to thank the continuing three for their steadfast service to Huntington Beach. The agenda for tonight's meeting is replete with consequential decisions, and I wanted to take a moment to voice my concern on three of them. I will do so briefly below, in the order in which they fall on the agenda.

Concerning agenda item #9, 22-1041, I ask that you give more deliberation to some of your assignments. Given the portfolio of experience each of you brings to your duties on city council, I believe it would serve the citizens of Huntington Beach best to match up council members with particular committees and citizens groups with which they have garnered years of experience. In particular, I request that you reconsider assignments to the citizens groups: Homeless Task Force and Oak View Community Meetings, and those to the council committee of Housing.

Concerning agenda item #27, 22-1093, I am concerned about any policy that encourages individuals to contribute more to our local campaigns, because it favors candidates who are well connected with a large pool of wealthy donors, and penalizes those who are not. I agree that Huntington Beach has prodigious geography to cover, but access to more money per donor is not the answer. We need to do more to put candidates from diverse backgrounds and income levels on a level playing field instead of mounting hurdles in their paths.

Finally, concerning agenda item #30, 22-1108, I urge you to halt consideration and action altogether. Our commitment to the Orange County Power Authority has made Huntington Beach a leader in Orange County and California as a whole, by allowing citizens to choose the sources of their electricity. Community Choice Aggregators, or CCA's, may be new to our town, but you probably already know that they have gained popularity across California and the nation since 2010, precisely because they have delivered on their promise of clean, reliable energy, returning profits back to communities instead of to shareholders. There are now 19 CCA's in California in 160 towns, cities, and counties, including Alhambra, Culver City, Downey and Santa Monica. I want to have a choice in terms of how much of my electricity is derived from renewable sources, and I want my family, friends, and neighbors in Huntington Beach to have that same choice. Please stay with the OCPA to ensure this choice to all of Huntington Beach! Additionally, please do NOT move the default rate from 100% Renewable Choice to the Basic Rate. Customers can easily make the shift to a cheaper rate employing less renewable energy sources by using their website. Residents can also easily opt out of OCPA there as well. However, I don't even see any reason why ratepayers would want to opt out when the Basic Choice rate with OCPA has already reached parity with SCE. Even better, the Basic Rate will become 2% *lower* than SCE's generation rates just a month from now! Staying with the 100% default rate produces city-wide benefits to public health and the environment for all residents, as it is expected to reduce fossil fuel pollution by 1 million metric tons! That is the equivalent of taking 200,000 cars off the road in terms of air pollutants. For these reasons, I would enjoin you to maintain our membership in the OCPA and to leave our default city rate at the 100% Renewable Choice.

Thanks very much for your consideration of all these matters, and thank you for your commitment to our city!

Sincerely,  
Joclyn Rabbitt-Sire