

From: [Maria Sugranes](#)
To: supplementalcomm@surfcity-hb.org
Subject: City Agenda
Date: Saturday, February 15, 2025 9:30:14 AM

- 1) \$7,000 for a plaque is ridiculous. Don't do it.
- 2) A light show in Central Park will disturb our prized habitat. Move it to the beach.
- 3) Accept the petitions the citizens of HB signed. Move on from this issue.
- 4) Please pay attention to city issues not national ones

--

Maria Sugranes
HB homeowner since 1973

**SUPPLEMENTAL
COMMUNICATION**

Meeting Date: 2/18/2025

Agenda Item No. 22 (25-087)

From: drynerson@earthlink.net
To: [CITY COUNCIL \(INCL. CMO STAFF\)](#); supplementalcomm@surfcity-hb.org
Subject: 2-18-25 Council Meeting
Date: Saturday, February 15, 2025 2:00:04 PM

As the city council considers items 22 and 23 regarding the two petitions to protect our library on the agenda for February 18th, you have choices to make.

You can simply accept the actions requested by the petitions, you can put the items on the next general election ballot, or you can call for a special election for those ballot measures.

Let's take agenda item 22, the request to repeal the ordinance that created the book review committee, first. The ordinance has been in place since March of 2024, yet that commission does not exist, nor has it done any work.

Given that you have a stated goal to make the government more efficient and to cut costs, clearly the most appropriate choice for this item is to simply accept and adopt what the petitions request: the deletion of Chapter 2.66 of title 2, i.e., the abolishment of the Community Parent Guardian Review Board. That decision essentially costs the city nothing to implement and actually saves money by not having to buy multiple copies of books for review. It also streamlines operations by removing the minimum twice a year commission review process that could easily take over a year to approve or reject a book.

The second most responsible decision you can take is to simply decide to put the measure on the next general election ballot. Again, since the commission does not exist and is performing no work, there is no negative impact on operations, and putting a ballot measure on a general election ballot is the least expensive path to a city-wide election.

Calling for a special election is the most expensive option, and, given the city's financial straits, clearly an irresponsible choice.

The choices for item 23 regarding public operation of the library system are much the same.

Accepting what the petitions request has zero financial impact unless the council once again tries to outsource library operations. And given that the library's operational costs are a very small percentage of the city's budget, it's not the most fruitful place to look for cost savings. Perhaps you might look at the city attorney's office whose personnel cost increased 35% since 2022 and whose primary attorney has amongst the highest compensation of any municipal attorney in the state.

Once again, the second most responsible action is to place the measure on the next general election ballot. As with item 22, the most cost-effective method to hold an election is the council chooses not to accept the first option.

And, like with item 22, choosing to call for a special election is the most expensive and least responsible choice to make. (And we all remember that you chose to spend an extra \$300K-\$400K to put measures A, B, and C on the primary ballot, rather than waiting for the general election.)

So we will all be watching closely to see if you really care about being fiscally responsible, or if it's just a buzzword you like to use to attack programs that don't knuckle under to you, while ignoring the fiscal implications of things you like.

Next, on to item 20 – the supposed 50th Anniversary Library Plaque. By now, it cannot be lost on you the amount of outrage that the public has over this abomination of a plaque. Fully 90% of the speakers at the Library and Community Services Commission meeting opposed the plaque in its current form. Supplemental communications were essentially universal in their condemnation. No one is opposed to a plaque celebrating our library – that's what the plaque is supposed to do. The proposed plaque had zero public input, is a massive departure from established design guidelines, violates the library own posting guidelines, and is a celebration of your political point of view – not a celebration of our library. You may think this is some clever one-up on your political opponents, but it's really just another wedge creating more divisiveness in our city. You should be ashamed.

Finally, we come to the Flowers of the Sky proposal – item 24. You saw the public outcry when you tried to slide it through on the consent calendar. You have taken little, if any, of the feedback you received. There have been no public meetings, no discussion of how noise, light, and parking will affect the surrounding neighborhoods and wildlife. The EIR amendment glibly states that lights and speakers are “angled away” from neighborhoods. That shows a fundamental misunderstanding of wave theory and how sound and light propagate, which is omnidirectionally. It also seems to state that, because mats are being used for the walkway, no damage to the area will occur. Really? How about the grandstands, the water basin for the fountains, the walls or fences to partition the area off from the rest of the park? How can these items be in place for eight months of the year without doing damage? How was the \$50,000 restoration fee calculated? Is that per year, or over the three-to-four-year life of the contract? What recourse does the city have if the restoration is not up to snuff? You were encouraged to consider other sites. I see no evidence that you have done so. The only change I see from your previous attempt is that there is now a contract for us to review. What I don't see is any financial analysis that suggests what the net revenue the city can hope to gain from this event. And I emphasize net revenue, because, like in the air show settlement, you are committing the city to provide parking, parking attendants and enforcement, public safety, etc. So, we are incurring expenses for the benefit of the promoter, but I don't see anywhere those expenses are explicitly covered. They apparently are supposed to come out of our revenue from ticket sales and parking, but I see no analysis for the citizens to review. And frankly, with at least two other similar established shows within easy driving distance, I'd like to see some market analysis on the appetite for such shows. Three to four shows a night for six months every year for three years is over a million people a year – more than three times the total population of Huntington Beach. What evidence do you have that there's a market for 3-4 million visitors for this show?

Maybe the decision should be based on something a bit more factual than the fact that Tony's consultant buddy from Ventura brought this to the city council.

David Rynerson

From: [Carol Daus](#)
To: supplementalcomm@surfcity-hb.org; [CITY COUNCIL \(INCL. CMO STAFF\)](#)
Subject: Items 22 & 23
Date: Saturday, February 15, 2025 11:15:29 PM

Dear City Council,

Since holding a special election is costly, it only makes sense to accept the petitions as written. A 21- member library review board is expensive and unnecessary. If it were vital to the community it would have already been implemented. It's been suggested since the fall of 2023!

Outsourcing operations of our library is expensive and that's why LS&S pulled out. Let the HB taxpayers have a say in these matters involving our public library.

Let's move on to more serious matters affecting our community such as a deteriorating infrastructure.

Thanks,

Carol Daus
HB resident for 30 years

From: [Julie Bixby](#)
To: supplementalcomm@surfcity-hb.org
Subject: Re: Council agenda 2/18/2025, multiple items
Date: Sunday, February 16, 2025 7:46:41 AM

You don't often get email from julie@bixby.org. [Learn why this is important](#)

To Council persons of all genders, faiths and creeds:

RE: Item 25-102 – Design of Library Anniversary Plaque

The City Council is blatantly using a City resource for its own political gain. The font size of the front-and-center MAGA acrostic is so much larger than that of "Huntington Beach Central Library", and there's so much star-spangled fluff around it, that the plaque looks like it's recognizing 50 years of MAGA, a well-known political movement, rather than the City's Library. Further adding to the plaque's political message, it displays the individual names and offices of the loud and proud MAGA elected officials.

The City's Code of Ethics – you did read it, didn't you? – says *"I do not use my office or the resources of the City for personal or political gain."* Plastering a political logo/acronym with your name and office on a City resource sounds very much like **using a City resource for political gain**, which violates the Code of Ethics.

RE: Items 25-087 & 25-126 pertaining to placing the Citizens Initiatives on the ballot

Deputy City Manager Jennifer Carey, who prepared these two RCAs, gets creative – to put it politely – with the fiscal impact of placing the citizen initiatives on the General Election ballot. She writes for both 25-087 & 25-126:

"The next General Election would be November 3, 2026. Should the City Council elect to submit for this date, the cost would range from \$340,515 to \$399,499. If the City Council decides to include the second citizen initiative... an additional cost of approximately \$8,500 would be incurred for both scenarios."

This makes it sound like the cost of including a single initiative on a GE ballot is an astounding six figures, yet somehow tacking on a second initiative adds a mere \$8,500.

This is a **false** narrative. Less than a year ago, the text of a similar RCA, 24-465, which was co-written by Carey, read simple and clear:

"The estimated additional cost to place one Charter amendment measure

on the November 5, 2024 General Election ballot is \$10,000, **bringing the total estimated cost for the November 5, 2024 General Municipal Election to \$310,000. (emphasis added)**

Funds to cover this amount are budgeted in FY 2024/25 Election Account No. 10010201.69505."

How in the world did the cost of adding **one** item to a GE ballot go from \$10,000 to \$300,000+ in less than a year?

It didn't, although the phrasing of the current RCAs implies that it did, thereby misleading the public (and possibly the Council) that adding just one ballot initiative would be an enormous expenditure it can't afford.

Moreover, RCAs 25-087 & 25-126 don't mention that funds are **always** provided in the City's budget to cover basic General Election costs, expanding the false narrative that the City can't afford to put the (supposedly costly) citizen initiatives on a GE ballot. Had the current RCAs been written in the same clear verbiage as the prior 24-465, this false impression wouldn't exist.

The City Council needs to stop playing games and stop fabricating excuses (including the "were you lied to" survey) to avoid placing the lawfully submitted citizen initiatives on the 2026 General Election ballot.

RE: Item 25-017 – Flowers of the Sky License Agreement

I'm disturbed by the City's selling out of its parkland to try to make a quick buck. The ends don't justify the means.

I'm also particularly dismayed by the vendor's obligation of "*Shall provide a complimentary hospitality package that includes 400 complimentary VIP hospitality passes for the event per year for use by City's employees and representatives.*"

400 VIP passes *per year*? It seems a rather excessive number of freebies being doled out. It also begs the question of how, exactly, these hundreds of yearly freebies serve "**a legitimate public purpose of the City... consistent with state law**" per Resolution No. 2013-23. **(emphasis added)**

Requiring the distribution of 400 VIP passes sounds awfully like bribery to me, a "pay to play" scheme (aka, we'll let you hold your event if you give us a bucket load of free passes to attend it).

The City doesn't need to be so greedy. Cutting the number of passes in

half to 200 (or cutting even fewer to 100), you still have a generous allotment for whatever "legitimate public purpose" premise you come up with.

--

Julie Bixby
Huntington Beach

From: [Jen Bledsoe](#)
To: [CITY COUNCIL \(INCL. CMO STAFF\); supplementalcomm@surfcity-hb.org](#)
Subject: Library plaque
Date: Sunday, February 16, 2025 8:33:05 AM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from jenbledsoe66@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Hello,

I am writing to voice my objection to the proposed plaque in honor of the library's 50th. As for the plaque, the presence of the eagle at the center top bears distinct resemblance to the symbol of the luftwaffe (hopefully this was a mistake). The actual library logo is quite small, and I see that you intend to enshrine your names on the plaque which is meant to commemorate the 50th anniversary of the library. The black and gold color selection is offensive as well (proud boys colors, hopefully also a mistake, and not a pattern when considered together with the eagle). To cry about budget shortfalls, while wasting money on this disingenuous "commemoration" in an attempt to flex is petty and divisive. For a town who relies on tourist dollars, I hate to see our city in the national news for stunts like this.

As for the library petitions, I have not received the emails that others have which question whether those who signed were misinformed or misled as to the contents of the petitions. Nor have I received phone calls questioning the same. So, I'd like to get out in front of that: I knowingly signed both petitions, having read their contents ahead of time. Please stop stalling and obfuscating. The signatures were in excess of the number needed, and the OC Registrar of Voters certified. This should proceed to the next step. Please do the will of the people.

And I'm still opposed to the proposed light show in Central Park, though I appreciate Casey's response to my prior email.

Jennifer Bledsoe

From: [Elizabeth Callaghan](#)
To: supplementalcomm@surfcity-hb.org
Subject: Library plague
Date: Sunday, February 16, 2025 8:45:17 AM

You don't often get email from elizabethann.callaghan@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

The plaque does not represent the library at all! It is very ugly...I support moving forward with the library ballots and keep this institution the way it has been the previous 50 years!!!
Elizabeth Callaghan
resident of HB for 40 years

From: cornetto45@earthlink.net
To: supplementalcomm@surfcity-hb.org; CITY COUNCIL (INCL. CMO STAFF)
Subject: item 22, 25-087
Date: Sunday, February 16, 2025 9:18:59 AM

Dear City Council,
Please take option 1 and adopt the petition request
Charles Jackson, a 23 year resident of Huntington Beach

From: [Mark Tonkovich](#)
To: supplementalcomm@surfcity-hb.org
Subject: Flowers of Light and Library plaque
Date: Sunday, February 16, 2025 9:27:30 AM

Dear Mayor Burns, Mayor Pro Tem McKeon and City Council members,

Hope you all are doing well. This e-mail reflects the thoughts of my wife, son and I, two homeowners in HB.

We do not feel it is proper of Symphony of Flowers to take over a good portion of our Central Park. This is not a small task and will deprive us of this area of the park for months upon end. It will disrupt the use of the park and have an effect on the surrounding area. Please do not enact this.

As for the library plaque, We voted for Trump 3 times, I have several MAGA hats and Trump flag. We voted for all of you too. As much as I agree with MAGA, we do not feel its incorporation into the plaque is the right thing to do, it actually seems immature. We recommend redesign it without the MAGA.

We also feel the library petitions are just wasting our taxes. How much was spent on signature verification? If, in fact, this has to move forward, use the least costly method, a General Municipal Election, not a special election to cut our losses.

Thank you for the consideration.

Best,

Mark Tonkovich and family.

From: [Sue Welfringer](#)
To: supplementalcomm@surfcity-hb.org
Subject: Re: Administrative Items 25-087 and 25-126
Date: Sunday, February 16, 2025 2:08:38 PM

I support the statements on both petitions:

- Repeal Ordinance No. 4318 – We do not need a politically-appointed committee to choose what books should be in our library.
- Adopt Ordinance No. 4330, assuring our community that our public libraries will be operated by our city and not an outside entity.

This council has made it abundantly clear that you do not care about the voices of library patrons, volunteers, and supporters. I ask you: please consider the actual people, real-live Huntington Beach registered voters, behind THOUSANDS of signatures on these petitions. Sadly, I know that I ask in vain. I have yet to see a single, independent thinker on the current council. I expect you will do whatever you can to dismiss our voices.

Incidentally, the fact that I received four emails questioning whether I knew what I was doing when I signed the petitions is insulting. It feels like bullying. It feels like over-reaching government. It feels like desperation. Be better than that.

Sincerely,

Sue Welfringer
HB Resident & Community Volunteer since 1997

From: [Judy Brusslan](#)
To: supplementalcomm@surfcity-hb.org
Subject: NO on MAGA Library Plaque, NO on Symphony of Flowers, YES on library petitions
Date: Sunday, February 16, 2025 8:04:07 PM

You don't often get email from brusslanlab@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

The MAGA plaque is partisan and our library is not.

The Symphony of Flowers will destroy wildlife habitats in our Central Park.

The petitions were approved by the OC Registrar and the people in HB should be given the chance to vote on the petitions they signed. I had the ordinance in hand when people signed the petition. They could read the word "PROCUREMENT", this is not moving books, this means not purchasing books. This is the definition of book banning: they cannot be procured by the library. Maybe you need to look up the word "PROCUREMENT"?

Thank you,
Dr. Judy Brusslan
Huntington Beach Resident

From: [Lindsay K](#)
To: supplementalcomm@surfcity-hb.org
Subject: Receive and File this Report of Effect of Proposed Initiative for Citizen Initiative to Repeal Ordinance No. 4318 by Deleting Huntington Beach Municipal Code Chapter 2.66
Date: Monday, February 17, 2025 9:01:58 AM

Hello HB City Council,

I'm writing regarding agenda items 25-087 and 250126. I personally have received an email attempting to discredit the library petition gathering process and have heard others have received phone calls from an out-of-state number inquiring about the petition as well. Stop harassing HB citizens who have signed the two library petitions and put them to a vote by calling a special election. Let the citizens of HB and the democratic process determine the fate of our beloved Huntington Beach Public Library. What are you so afraid of?

Sincerely,

Lindsay Klick
Mother, HB Resident, Librarian

From: [Linda Rose](#)
To: supplementalcomm@surfcity-hb.org
Subject: My message to our city council
Date: Monday, February 17, 2025 11:15:45 AM

[You don't often get email from Irlindarose3@icloud.com. Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

Council members, why do you encourage deivision in our city? City council is not supposed to be political. You encourage this by using a MAGA sign on our library. Two past mayors , Shirley Dettloff and Ralph Bauer, were in different parties but no one knew this and we own the beautiful and well used Senior Center that they worked hard to establish. We should not even know what party you belong to but you propagate it!

I thought your party stands for individual rights, less government. Now you are proposing taking away our public library and deciding what books our children can read? Should that not be a parent's right to choose?

I have been a homeowner here in over 40 years and am tired of paying for the law suits you loose by refusing to follow CA laws. Wouldn't you be happier in Florida. Tito Ortiz is where he belongs . Linda Rose
Sent from my iPad

From: [JEAN GARREN](#)
To: supplementalcomm@surfcity-hb.org
Subject: Everything going on
Date: Monday, February 17, 2025 11:25:25 AM

You don't often get email from bun44@aol.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

1. Leave the library alone.
2. Get the maga sign off the library.
3. Stop supporting trump and muskrats horrible agenda that is hurting most Americans!!
4. Bring back diversity to HB.
5. Good riddance to Micheal Gates.

Thank you
Jean Garren

I

[Sent from the all new AOL app for iOS](#)

From: [Paula Schaefer](#)
To: [CITY COUNCIL \(INCL. CMO STAFF\)](#); supplementalcomm@surfcity-hb.org
Subject: Save \$\$\$ and Adopt Proposed Ordinance - 25-087
Date: Monday, February 17, 2025 2:43:35 PM

City Council Members:

I urge you to save money by adopting the proposed ordinance to rescind the Book Review Committee and return curation authority to the City's librarians. You can do this on 2/18/2025.

I personally spoke with over one thousand HB voters about the Book Committee. The vast majority of these voters believe that the proposed Committee restricted their rights as parents or guardians to make the appropriate selection of reading material for their children. The Library's professionals have shown that, in tandem with parents and guardians, the City's libraries are a source of enriching reading material for everyone.

Stop your culture war antics and focus on the obligations that you swore an oath to uphold. Focus your efforts on the City's budget, improving the City's infrastructure, and putting an end to the politically motivated litigation.

These are the efforts that are worthy of your time and effort.

--

Paula A. Schaefer

From: [Tim Holland](#)
To: supplementalcomm@surfcity-hb.org
Subject: The Public Library issues
Date: Monday, February 17, 2025 2:47:47 PM

You don't often get email from tim.holland20@yahoo.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

The Public Library issues have been legally proposed and forwarded by signatures of Huntington Beach citizens. The legal process now has the next step to be determined by the city council people. So please end these childish delays and hidden agenda attacks on the process and let those citizens that followed legal processes to get the questions before all voters to decide the questions. Your bias should be put aside to allow the process to move forward. Your opposition to the issues is your opinion. You have done a great disservice to the reputation of the city council by bending the truths to meet your interpretation and thwart the voice of the citizens. That's fine-- that's your right but it is also the right of citizens with differing view to vote on the issues. Personally I think it is shameful the tact you have taken.

It's a public library not yours not mine. I don't have any right to decide what neighbor kids read and neither do you. That is a parents right only. A public library is public so all citizens should be able to raise their own kids not letting a committee of strangers decide what information is available in a public library.

Thanks, Tim Holland

From: [Heidi Pallares](#)
To: supplementalcomm@surfcity-hb.org; [CITY COUNCIL \(INCL. CMO STAFF\)](#)
Subject: Public Comment for 2/18/25 City Council Meeting: Agenda Items 25-102, 25-087 and 25-126
Date: Monday, February 17, 2025 3:15:58 PM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from heidijungpr@hotmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

To the Huntington Beach City Council-

I plead with you to please listen to the residents of this community about what is happening at our library.

Elements of this message were sent to the Community and Library Services Commission last week for their meeting regarding the anniversary plaque design, and each of you were copied. Despite the outreach from myself and 300+ others (as reported in multiple media outlets), in addition to the dozens who spoke out against it in person, did not impact the voting of the commission. It seems clear that their minds were already made up to approve it, regardless of the passionate public input from residents.

I hope that is not the case for the City Council, and that you listen to your constituents who you were elected to represent. You owe it to each and every resident in Huntington Beach. I may be one resident representing a family of four, but I speak for many others who are as troubled as we are about what is happening in Huntington Beach.

I am a lifelong resident of Huntington Beach who has been a visitor to the public library at Central Park since my childhood in the 1980's. I now relish taking my own two children there to foster their love of reading and discovering new books and authors. We love the circular walkway down to the lower level, the fountain - all of the things that remind me of my own childhood days in the library, and places my son and daughter get to discover themselves.

When I read about and saw the proposed plaque that will be discussed and voted on for the library's anniversary, I gasped. It is the least appropriate and subtle way to try and insert the MAGA agenda into our beloved library system. The "Magical, Alluring, Galvanizing, Adventurous" reference is offensive and inappropriate. No one is fooled by this design or its intention.

The alternate design from Councilmember Williams adding, "Through hope and change our nation has built back together to the golden era of Make America Great Again," is even more offensive. You are not listening to the people you represent. This is, in fact, ignoring the pleas of concerned residents and doubling down on your own personal agendas to attract attention for yourselves. This is not what the residents of Huntington Beach need or want.

Although the current HB city council is aligned in their politics, I would like to remind everyone in city leadership that you are meant to represent ALL residents. We do not all share your views about national politics, nor how you are trying to display them so overtly throughout our city.

I spoke to several neighbors who agree we do not want to commemorate our library's anniversary with a plaque that divides our residents and insults the community cohesion and curiosity fostered inside the library, and the foundation on which it was built 50 years ago.

Please do not approve a plaque that will tarnish the legacy of our beloved library. There are many other words and designs that would better mark this occasion and honor what the library means to everyone in Huntington Beach.

Additionally, you owe it to this community to take the two library petitions seriously and adopt the initiatives in Agenda items 25-087 and 25-126. Our library books and stellar operations are not in need of further disruption from this council. The library belongs to the residents of this community and we do not want its reputation tarnished with the council's actions.

There are numerous issues in our city that absolutely need your attention and action. Housing. Homelessness. Budget. Infrastructure. These are big items that require strategic planning and coordination with stakeholders across the community.

I want nothing more than to focus my attention to these matters and to hopefully support your efforts to improve the lives of all who live in this city. I hope this is something we can all agree on.

Sincerely,

Heidi Pallares

From: vanessaweb@aol.com
To: supplementalcomm@surfcity-hb.org
Subject: Council Meeting
Date: Monday, February 17, 2025 3:19:16 PM

Dear Members of City Council,

Three comments.....

It seems that council members are ready to sell out our Central Park to recoup money they have wasted.

I'm with Steve Engel that this would only disrupt our flora and fauna including mating bald eagles. It doesn't seem feasible to repair our park after the shows. Parking seems to be a big issue as well.

The plaque honoring the anniversary of our beautiful library and the dedicated people who have worked/work there should not be a bizarre, unattractive partisan effort to keep your names in the public eye. Remember that your job is non partisan.

The two petition library items must be put on the ballot for our citizens to vote on. The petitions have been verified and now our citizens deserve a chance to have their voice heard.

Thank you, Vanessa and Jeff Webster
40 year residents

[Sent from the all new AOL app for iOS](#)

From: [Laura Janssen](#)
To: supplementalcomm@surfcity-hb.org
Subject: Agenda Item 25-087
Date: Monday, February 17, 2025 3:50:20 PM

Dear Council Members,

I support the Citizen Initiative to Repeal Ordinance No. 4318. It should be put to the vote by the citizens of our community. I don't agree a parent-guardian review board that would oversee the book titles selected for our library, and that is appointed by the current city council, would be fair and impartial. This is government over reach, pure and simple.

Thank you.

Sincerely,
Laura Janssen

From: [H Meyers](#)
To: supplementalcomm@surfcity-hb.org
Subject: City Council meeting 2/18/25
Date: Monday, February 17, 2025 5:16:59 PM

I urge you to oppose agenda item #20, the plaque for the Huntington Beach library's 50th anniversary. This is a divisive and blatantly political plaque that does not honor the library. If the City Council wants to honor the library, it should support its work instead of interfering with professional librarians and threatening to outsource the library's management.

Please select option C in agenda items #22 and 23 to show actual support for the Huntington Beach library.

I also urge you to vote against agenda item #24 regarding a light show in Central Park. The proposed light show would cause multiple harms to the environment, degrading the habitat for birds and other creatures. The negative impacts would far outweigh any financial or other supposed benefits.

Thank you,
Hildy Meyers
Huntington Beach resident

From: [Jan Madnick](mailto:Jan.Madnick@surfcity-hb.org)
To: supplementalcomm@surfcity-hb.org
Subject: Agenda item 25-087
Date: Monday, February 17, 2025 5:25:22 PM

Aside from the fact that the City Council members are working hard to discredit the hard work of HB citizens who obtained the sufficient number of signatures to qualify putting the issue of the Community Parent-Guardian Review Board to a vote of HB Citizens, there is no real reason you just can't accept Ordinance 4239 and move on. We don't have to have the expense of an election. Patrons of the library have ALWAYS had the power to complain about books they think are inappropriate.

Just acknowledge the fact that librarians ARE NOT "groomers" and "pedophiles" and actually do have the knowledge and good sense to purchase appropriate books for our library system. Cities like Irvine are spending more money on their libraries , books, AND the hiring of librarians, and we have and are losing many of our beloved librarians because of this false narrative.

At a time when the City Council is bemoaning the state of the City budget, maybe the expense of whatever books would have to be purchased and reviewed for this committee (21 copies of each?) might be another argument against it. Watching how the Library Commission bowed to the horrific plaque proposal, however, indicates just the kind of citizens who would be picked for this Board---which would make it, too, unrepresentative of HB citizens. Just accept Ordinance 4239,
Jan Madnick

From: [Pat Goodman](#)
To: [CITY COUNCIL \(INCL. CMO STAFF\); supplementalcomm@surfcity-hb.org](#)
Subject: Vote Yes on Agenda Item 22 B) and Agenda Item 23 B)
Date: Monday, February 17, 2025 6:06:29 PM

Please vote yes on Agenda Item # 22 Deleting Huntington Beach Municipal Code Chapter 2.66 - Community-Parent Guardian Review Board for Procurement of Children’s Library materials, and Adding Section 2.30.090 - Selection and Use of Library Materials; and B) Adopt Ordinance No. 4239, “An Ordinance of the City Council of the City of Huntington Beach Amending the Huntington Beach Municipal Code by Deleting Chapter 2.66 Thereof and Adding New Section 2.30.090 Thereof;”

And vote yes on Agenda Item # 23 Proposed Initiative for Citizen Initiative “An Ordinance to Amend the Huntington Beach Municipal Code by Adding New Section 2.30.100, Entitled ‘Public Operation of Library Services;’” B) Adopt Ordinance No. 4330, “An Ordinance of the City Council of the City of Huntington Beach Amending the Huntington Beach Municipal Code by Adding New Section 2.30.100, Entitled ‘Public Operation of Library Services;’”

By voting yes on option B) of these two items you return operations of the library to the standard for a public library operated by professional librarians. For more than 100 years the city has engaged professional librarians to manage its operations with safeguards to protect against pornography and censorship as well as provide objective standards to curate the library collection.

Vote yes on Agenda Items # 22 B) and # 23 B).

Thank you,

Pat Goodman
Huntington Beach

From: [Buffie Channel](#)
To: [CITY COUNCIL \(INCL. CMO STAFF\)](#); supplementalcomm@surfcity-hb.org
Subject: CC Meeting Feb 18, 2025 - Oppose Agenda Items 20 & 24
Date: Monday, February 17, 2025 7:38:27 PM

To City Council Members:

Congratulations on your continued embarrassing political middle-school level stunts like the **hideous library plaque** that was clearly designed by Gracey, Luke and Valentina. It's ugly, juvenile and trashy. I have no doubt you'll vote for it because you are itching to get MAGA on the wall of the library. It's a juvenile design and an obvious lame attempt to put your names on a commemoration for the library that you had no hand in creating, improving, or protecting. It IS the perfect symbol of your hypocrisy though, so kudos for preserving your special "Sellout7" legacy. If you do decide to defy all of the speakers and letters from the public (whom you clearly detest hearing from), I'd go with design #2, just to solidify your historical mark as the worst City Council in Huntington Beach history, and to ensure laughs from residents for years to come. **To clarify, I oppose agenda item 20 and this stolen heroism plaque with either of these two hideous designs and the names of the City Council members on the plaque, names of people that have done nothing but attack and try to destroy our beloved library.**

I vehemently oppose the Symphony of Flowers light show and agenda item 24. This is another short-sighted idea brought to us by Tony and his corporate cronies. Selling out our public parks is just a slap in the face to the residents who have paid for those parks to be maintained and restored and should remain for PUBLIC USE ONLY.

Yet once again, the Sellout7 wants to destroy the things that mean the most to the citizens of our city. Find your revenue somewhere else. Don't sell our open space to the highest bidder. Weren't you all about "NO HIGH DENSITY, PRESERVE OUR OPEN SPACES, WE CARE ABOUT THE ENVIRONMENT"?? HaHaHa. What a joke. If you were actually good at attracting business, you should actually, um, attract business with long-term benefits that don't exploit our natural parks and open spaces that we hold dear.

Do you ACTUALLY believe that we will sell out several shows a night for months and months?

Where will everyone park? 2000 people several times a night? Really? Will the nearby residents suffer massive increased traffic and parking nightmares in their neighborhoods by attendees trying to avoid the parking fees?

How will you build, manage and maintain a 180x50 foot water basin? Will it be a drowning hazard for kids? Will it be a mosquito haven?

Will the walkways near the event site be closed to the public? That is not right.

How will you protect the migrating birds? The Bald Eagle pair? The owls? All of the other birds and wildlife? You won't. Your \$50,000 budget to manage repairs and damage to the area won't bring back the wildlife that will escape the chaos that this show will bring. Your "report" is useless because you don't know the TRUE impact this will have on the park and the wildlife.

And...why the rush? Is the owner of the show promising Tony campaign donations? Tick tock. We can smell the corruption and back room deal a mile away.

Library Petitions - stop trying to create some kind of doubt in the legitimacy of the petitions. Obey the law and either adopt the resolutions for both petitions or put them on the next election ballot. Stop with your weird breach of confidentiality survey emails and phone calls attempting to smear the petitioners - and acting like the citizens are stupid and didn't know what they were signing.

Obey the law.

Considering the budget shortfalls and failing infrastructure problems, the continued problems with downtown, and the need for long-term business and tourism attraction issues, perhaps you should focus on solving these problems and enhancing the lives of the citizens by ensuring our beautiful parks are for PUBLIC USE ONLY and our Central Library receives the dignified celebration it deserves, instead of playing petty political games.

Sincerely,

B. Channel

36 year resident, homeowner and voter

From: [Tim Channel](#)
To: [CITY COUNCIL \(INCL. CMO STAFF\)](#); supplementalcomm@surfcity-hb.org
Subject: Agenda Items for 02182025 Council Meeting
Date: Monday, February 17, 2025 8:02:08 PM

Hello,

I urge the council to consider the below comments:

Item #20 (25-102) - STRONGLY AGAINST. The library is for all residents and should never be politicized. Just because you control the council does not mean that the council owns the library. The obvious MAGA reference is inappropriate for a public non-partisan institution in the public square.

Item #22 (25-087) - To use your own words "THE VOTERS HAVE SPOKEN" . Let the people vote. The signatures were approved by the OC Registrar of Voters. This item needs to be immediately approved or put on the ballot as soon as possible for the VOTERS TO DECIDE.

Item #23 (25-126) - Congratulations if your intent was to destroy the careers of our city's experienced and dedicated library personnel for some anti- woke political victory. Some have left for greener pastures because it was obvious to them that you do not even support your own employees. To use your own words "THE VOTERS HAVE SPOKEN" . Let the people vote. The signatures were approved by the OC Registrar of Voters. This item needs to be immediately approved or put on the ballot as soon as possible for the VOTERS TO DECIDE.

Item #24 (25-017) - STRONGLY AGAINST. Huntington Beach Central Park belongs to the citizens of this fair city. The enactment of this proposal would deny access to residents to parts of the park for extended periods of time. How is this good for us?

Thank you for your consideration,
Tim Channel
Huntington Beach

From: [Celeste Rybicki](#)
To: [CITY COUNCIL \(INCL. CMO STAFF\); supplementalcomm@surfcity-hb.org](#)
Subject: Agenda item 25-102
Date: Monday, February 17, 2025 10:32:26 PM

Hello,

I'm writing to request you reconsider the design of the plaque meant to commemorate the 50th anniversary of our great library. It's a lovely idea to have a plaque donated to honor HBPL but the design does not send a message of honor or respect to the intended recipients. There should be no religious or political messaging (per the library's own policy!) and the focus on "MAGA" is childish, both in the random and awkward adjectives chosen and in its trolling nature. There are plenty of non-controversial examples already existing on the library's walls and it would be so much more effective and less divisive to follow their formats.

I'm also in support of both the library petitions either being accepted and adopted as is or I look forward to seeing them on the ballot in the general election.

I am concerned that the plaque drama is a distraction tactic to take some of the heat off our city's "mediocre" infrastructure report card. I would like to see much more focus from the council on improving our city right now for its residents rather than all the flashy, grabby, fox news nonsense.

Thank you

Huntington Beach City Council Meeting comments on Agenda for 2/18/2025

Mayor and City Councilmembers:

APPROVE:

Item 19 – We recommend you approve of the City of HB proceeding with the Staff recommendation on Actions A and B, though we’re puzzled that this represents accepting funding from CalPFA, a political subdivision of the State of California, via bonds, to subsidize HD housing, albeit for Seniors. Wondering how the CC (specifically McKeon) rationalizes that with HB suing the State over mandating precisely what this seems to be.

Item 22 – ‘Selection and Use of Library Materials’ - We recommend you approve of the City of HB proceeding with the Staff recommendation on Actions A and B, or C. We don’t approve of proceeding with Part D, as that would cost the City too much to pay for a Special Election when it could be held at a fraction of the cost in the scheduled 2026 General Election.

Item 23 – ‘Public Operation of Library Services’ - We recommend you approve of the City of HB proceeding with the Staff recommendation on Actions A and B, or C. We don’t approve of proceeding with Part D, as that would cost the City too much to pay for a Special Election when it could be held at a fraction of the cost in the scheduled 2026 General Election.

DENY:

Item 20 – Deny or postpone the approval of the ‘Design of the Plaque Celebrating the Huntington Beach Public Library’s 50th Anniversary as Recommended by the Community & Library Services Commission’. Under no circumstances should the design of this plaque reflect the letters MAGA in any configuration or composition that groups the letters together, or are emphasized in any other way. It is very clearly a biased political acronym that is universally recognized throughout the USA. It does not belong on this, or any other plaque, placed at any property considered to be Public or City property.

Item 24 – Deny or postpone the execution of a License Agreement Between the City of Huntington Beach and Flowers of the Sky Entertainment, LLC, for the management and operation of Symphony of Flowers at Huntington Central Park East, as well as the Addendum to the Final Master Environmental Impact Report (FMEIR) for Master Plan of Recreation Uses for Central Park, City of Huntington Beach, California, until one or more public forums can be scheduled by the City Council, Symphony of Flowers ‘authorized’ representatives and other City Officials to garner wider public comments and questions.

At this juncture in time, there are still far too many questions and issues needing better definition and explanation to enter into any legal Agreement between parties. As the tentative date proposed to commence the opening of the shows isn’t until September of 2025, we have adequate time to allow for one or more public forums to occur to more thoroughly address residents’ concerns.

Sincerely,

Larry and Susan Slonim
(714) 357-9600

From: [Sharon Hathaway](#)
To: [CITY COUNCIL \(INCL. CMO STAFF\); supplementalcomm@surfcity-hb.org](#)
Subject: Regarding 25-087
Date: Tuesday, February 18, 2025 12:39:23 AM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from hathawayslee@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Thousands of residents, who are registered voters of Huntington Beach, felt it important to take a stand to repeal Ordinance #4318 on having a parent/guardian review board, taking the place of professionally trained Librarians in the procurement of Children's Library materials, that they freely signed a petition to repeal this ordinance.

I urge the council to listen to these constituents, as you are supposed to represent the entire population of Huntington Beach, not just those that voted for you. Based on public comments, I am sure some of those signatures voted for you, but don't agree with the action you have taken. Will any of you stand up for the city as a whole?

While your personal views, and your faith-based views are yours to live by, it is not your role to negate other personal views that may be different.

I request that you repeal Ordinance #4318, or set an election date for the voters to decide.

Thank You,
Sharon Hathaway
25 year resident

From: [Levin, Shannon](#)
To: supplementalcomm@surfcity-hb.org
Subject: FW: City Council Meeting 2/18/25 Comments
Date: Tuesday, February 18, 2025 8:00:23 AM

From: Chris Varga <christopher.j.varga@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, February 16, 2025 3:01 PM
To: CITY COUNCIL (INCL. CMO STAFF) <city.council@surfcity-hb.org>
Subject: City Council Meeting 2/18/25 Comments

Huntington Beach City Council,

In regards to the agenda for Huntington Beach City Council Meeting on 2/18/25 I have the following comments :

Agenda Item 25-102 – NO to the MAGA plaque for the 50th Anniversary of our wonderful central Library. This brazen political statement has no place in our celebrating this milestone. Do we even need to waste money on any plaque?

Agenda Items 25-087 and 25-126 – In regards to both of these approved and signature validated petitions on the future of the Library I support either approving the petitions as is or put them to the people of Huntington Beach to vote on. There isn't another option.

Agenda Item 25-017 – NO to the Central Park Light show. What a hokey idea. Just leave the park alone!

Sincerely,

Chris Varga
Huntington Beach

From: [Levin, Shannon](#)
To: supplementalcomm@surfcity-hb.org
Subject: FW: Library petitions and signature gatherers
Date: Tuesday, February 18, 2025 8:11:24 AM

From: ellen riley <2ellenriley@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 17, 2025 12:47 AM
To: CITY COUNCIL (INCL. CMO STAFF) <city.council@surfcity-hb.org>
Subject: Library petitions and signature gatherers

Some people who received this message don't often get email from 2ellenriley@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

My experience with the signature gatherers for the two Huntington Beach library petitions was that they were friendly, knowledgeable and willing to answer any questions those passing-by might have. There was no mis-information. Conversely, those complaining to the City Council may have been the very individuals who harassed and yelled at the signature gatherers. I saw one such threatening individual whom the collectors called HBPD on. HBPD showed up, counseled and told the harasser to move on. Subsequently there were other hateful, shouting individuals. Please respect the concerns of the thousands of library goers, many of whom supported Your election.

Ellen Riley
warner avenue
2ellenriley@gmail.com

From: [Levin, Shannon](#)
To: supplementalcomm@surfcity-hb.org
Subject: FW: Council agenda 2/18/2025, multiple items
Date: Tuesday, February 18, 2025 8:17:59 AM

From: Julie Bixby <julie@bixby.org>
Sent: Monday, February 17, 2025 2:00 PM
To: CITY COUNCIL (INCL. CMO STAFF) <city.council@surfcity-hb.org>
Subject: Council agenda 2/18/2025, multiple items

Some people who received this message don't often get email from julie@bixby.org. [Learn why this is important](#)

To Council persons of all genders, faiths and creeds:

RE: Item 25-102 - Proposed Library Anniversary Plaque

The City Council is blatantly using a City resource for its own political gain. The font size of the front-and-center MAGA acrostic is so much larger than that of "Huntington Beach Central Library", and there's so much star-spangled fluff around it, that the plaque looks like it's recognizing 50 years of MAGA, a well-known political movement, rather than the City's Library. Further adding to the plaque's political message, it displays the individual names and offices of the loud and proud MAGA elected officials.

The City's Code of Ethics – you did read it, didn't you? – says "*I do not use my office or the resources of the City for personal or political gain.*" Plastering a political logo/acronym with your name and office on a City resource sounds very much like **using a City resource for political gain**, which violates the Code of Ethics.

RE: Items 25-087 & 25-126 pertaining to placing the Citizens Initiatives on the ballot

Deputy City Manager Jennifer Carey, who prepared these two RCAs, gets creative – to put it politely - with the fiscal impact of placing the citizen initiatives on the General Election ballot. She writes for both 25-087 & 25-126:

"The next General Election would be November 3, 2026. Should the City Council elect to submit for this date, the cost would range from \$340,515 to \$399,499. If the City Council decides to include the second citizen initiative... an additional cost of approximately \$8,500 would be incurred for both scenarios."

This makes it sound like the cost of including a single initiative on a GE

ballot is an astounding six figures, yet somehow tacking on a second initiative adds a mere \$8,500.

This is a **false** narrative. Less than a year ago, the text of a similar RCA, 24-465, which was co-written by Carey, read simple and clear:

*"The estimated additional cost to place one Charter amendment measure on the November 5, 2024 General Election ballot is \$10,000, **bringing the total estimated cost for the November 5, 2024 General Municipal Election to \$310,000. (emphasis added)***

Funds to cover this amount are budgeted in FY 2024/25 Election Account No. 10010201.69505."

How in the world did the cost of adding **one** item to a GE ballot go from \$10,000 to \$300,000+ in less than a year?

It didn't, although the phrasing of the current RCAs implies that it did, thereby misleading the public (and possibly the Council) that adding just one ballot initiative would be an enormous expenditure it can't afford.

Moreover, RCAs 25-087 & 25-126 don't mention that funds are **always** provided in the City's budget to cover basic General Election costs, expanding the false narrative that the City can't afford to put the (supposedly costly) citizen initiatives on a GE ballot. Had the current RCAs been written in the same clear verbiage as the prior 24-465, this false impression wouldn't exist.

The City Council needs to stop playing games and stop fabricating excuses (including the "were you lied to" survey) to avoid placing the lawfully submitted citizen initiatives on the 2026 General Election ballot.

RE: Item 25-017 – Flowers of the Sky License Agreement

I'm disturbed by the City's selling out of its parkland to try to make a quick buck. The ends don't justify the means.

I'm also particularly dismayed by the vendor's obligation of *"Shall provide a complimentary hospitality package that includes 400 complimentary VIP hospitality passes for the event per year for use by City's employees and representatives."*

400 VIP passes *per year*? It seems a rather excessive number of freebies being doled out. It also begs the question of how, exactly, these hundreds of yearly freebies serve *"a legitimate public purpose of the City... consistent with state law"* per Resolution No. 2013-23. **(emphasis**

added)

Requiring the distribution of 400 VIP passes sounds awfully like bribery to me, a "pay to play" scheme (aka, we'll let you hold your event if you give us a bucket load of free passes to attend it).

The City doesn't need to be so greedy. Cutting the number of passes in half to 200 (or cutting even fewer to 100), you still have a generous allotment for whatever "legitimate public purpose" premise you come up with.

--

Julie Bixby
Huntington Beach

From: [Levin, Shannon](#)
To: supplementalcomm@surfcity-hb.org
Subject: FW: Agenda Items for meeting February 18, 2025
Date: Tuesday, February 18, 2025 8:22:43 AM

From: Sue Fullerton <stevie_fullerton@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, February 17, 2025 9:02 PM
To: CITY COUNCIL (INCL. CMO STAFF) <city.council@surfcity-hb.org>
Subject: Agenda Items for meeting February 18, 2025

Some people who received this message don't often get email from stevie_fullerton@yahoo.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Agenda Item 25-087 - yes repeal ordinance No. 4318

Agenda Item 25-126 - yes amend Municipal Code by adding New Section 2.30.090

From: Levin, Shannon
To: supplementalcomm@surfcity-hb.org
Subject: FW: Please register my voice
Date: Tuesday, February 18, 2025 8:23:01 AM

From: Allie Plum <skyedawg007@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 17, 2025 9:43 PM
To: CITY COUNCIL (INCL. CMO STAFF) <city.council@surfcity-hb.org>
Subject: Please register my voice

Dear CC and Staff

I wish to once again express my disapproval for the overpriced MAGA library plaque. It displays a tiny ode (books) to the actual library and a big eagle, a In God we trust, and some other furled drapes which seem more apt on money. Back to the drawing board for less please.

I am also against The Symphony of Flowers in Central Park taking away a large part of the public park and possibly disrupting the local wildlife. This is too long in time and too invasive.

Also the petitions which were signed clearly for the HB Public Library to go back to no interference by a "Board" appointed by the far right City Council. There is no balance or representation for the other half of HB. Please put it to the vote of the people.

Thank you for having an open mind and collaborating to make the community included.

Sincerely,

Allison E. Plum
19251 Brookhurst St.
HB

From: [April Downs](#)
To: supplementalcomm@surfcity-hb.org
Subject: Removal of Citizen Library Review Board
Date: Tuesday, February 18, 2025 8:23:23 AM

People in the community of spoken, and their wishes need to be followed. Allowing citizens to vote on whether we want random citizens deciding what's in our library is Not what we have chosen. This needs to be put to a citizen vote.

April Downs

Sent from my iPhone

Huntington Beach City Council Meeting comments on Agenda for 2/18/2025

Mayor and City Councilmembers:

APPROVE:

Item 19 – We recommend you approve of the City of HB proceeding with the Staff recommendation on Actions A and B, though we're puzzled that this represents accepting funding from CalPFA, a political subdivision of the State of California, via bonds, to subsidize HD housing, albeit for Seniors. Wondering how the CC (specifically McKeon) rationalizes that with HB suing the State over mandating precisely what this seems to be.

Item 22 – 'Selection and Use of Library Materials' - We recommend you approve of the City of HB proceeding with the Staff recommendation on Actions A and B, or C. We don't approve of proceeding with Part D, as that would cost the City too much to pay for a Special Election when it could be held at a fraction of the cost in the scheduled 2026 General Election.

Item 23 – 'Public Operation of Library Services' - We recommend you approve of the City of HB proceeding with the Staff recommendation on Actions A and B, or C. We don't approve of proceeding with Part D, as that would cost the City too much to pay for a Special Election when it could be held at a fraction of the cost in the scheduled 2026 General Election.

DENY:

Item 20 – Deny or postpone the approval of the 'Design of the Plaque Celebrating the Huntington Beach Public Library's 50th Anniversary as Recommended by the Community & Library Services Commission'. Under no circumstances should the design of this plaque reflect the letters MAGA in any configuration or composition that groups the letters together, or are emphasized in any other way. It is very clearly a biased political acronym that is universally recognized throughout the USA. It does not belong on this, or any other plaque, placed at any property considered to be Public or City property.

Item 24 – Deny or postpone the execution of a License Agreement Between the City of Huntington Beach and Flowers of the Sky Entertainment, LLC, for the management and operation of Symphony of Flowers at Huntington Central Park East, as well as the Addendum to the Final Master Environmental Impact Report (FMEIR) for Master Plan of Recreation Uses for Central Park, City of Huntington Beach, California, until one or more public forums can be scheduled by the City Council, Symphony of Flowers 'authorized' representatives and other City Officials to garner wider public comments and questions.

At this juncture in time, there are still far too many questions and issues needing better definition and explanation to enter into any legal Agreement between parties. As the tentative date proposed to commence the opening of the shows isn't until September of 2025, we have adequate time to allow for one or more public forums to occur to more thoroughly address residents' concerns.

Sincerely,

Larry and Susan Slonim
(714) 357-9600

From: [Levin, Shannon](#)
To: supplementalcomm@surfcity-hb.org
Subject: FW: Citizen against Parent-Guardian Review Board of HB Children's Library Materials
Date: Tuesday, February 18, 2025 8:24:09 AM

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

From: Patricia King <jkpkkmk@verizon.net>
Sent: Tuesday, February 18, 2025 6:54 AM
To: CITY COUNCIL (INCL. CMO STAFF) <city.council@surfcity-hb.org>
Subject: Citizen against Parent-Guardian Review Board of HB Children's Library Materials

[Some people who received this message don't often get email from jkpkkmk@verizon.net. Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

As a resident of the City of HB for 35 years, I do not wish you to establish parent-guardian review board of HB Children's library materials. You have the right to say what your children read but you have no right the control what my children read.
Patricia King, HB Resident

From: [Levin, Shannon](#)
To: supplementalcomm@surfcity-hb.org
Subject: FW: Opposition to library privatization and review committee
Date: Tuesday, February 18, 2025 8:24:49 AM

From: johnkinghb@verizon.net <johnkinghb@verizon.net>
Sent: Tuesday, February 18, 2025 7:10 AM
To: CITY COUNCIL (INCL. CMO STAFF) <city.council@surfcity-hb.org>
Subject: Opposition to library privatization and review committee

Some people who received this message don't often get email from johnkinghb@verizon.net. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear City Council-

I want to express my opposition to any library privatization efforts, as this will result in reduced services. My family members are active library users and have been for many years, and this would be a tragedy

I also want to express my extreme concern regarding any review committee activities regarding book selection- this proposed activity is ridiculous. As a 34 year resident of Huntington Beach and parent of two children who used the library extensively, library book freedom is essential in our society.

John

John King
johnkinghb@verizon.net
714 262 0826
|