

Moore, Tania

From: Levin, Shannon
Sent: Saturday, September 2, 2023 1:17 PM
To: supplementalcomm@surfcity-hb.org
Subject: Fwd: HB CC 9/5/2023 Agenda 15

Get [Outlook for iOS](#)

From: Cathey Ryder <the4ryders@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, September 2, 2023 9:19:26 AM
To: CITY COUNCIL (INCL. CMO STAFF) <city.council@surfcity-hb.org>
Subject: HB CC 9/5/2023 Agenda 15

Mayor and Council Members,

Why would our city not want to engage the highest rated lobbying firm to represent us? Is this due to finances? Have we spent tax dollars unwisely elsewhere? We have a very competent city staff and we just don't understand why you are not only rejecting their recommendation, but then selecting the LOWEST ranked firm. Do you not want a firm that obviously has a better ranking? We can read a chart.

This does not appear as if the CC has the best interest of the city as part of their decision making process.

**SUPPLEMENTAL
COMMUNICATION**

Meeting Date: 9/5/2023

Agenda Item No.: 15 (23 - 673)

File #: 23-636

1. Qualifications and experience of the individuals assigned to the project
2. Qualifications and experience of the responding firm
3. Experience and track record conducting similar work for similar clients
4. Understanding and approach to the proposed scope of work in the RFP
5. Proposed Fees

The RFP closed on June 13, 2023, and the City received four proposals. Each proposal was evaluated by a panel of three staff members using the specific criteria. A total of 1500 points was allocated across six criteria in compliance with the RFP. The panel reviewed and scored the proposals per the City's purchasing process. The results are as follows:

Proposers	Scope of Work	Compliance with RFP	References	Qualifications & Experience of the Proposer	Experience Conducting Similar Work in Similar Cities
Van Scoyoc & Assoc.	Federal	140	75	362.5	145
Thorn Run	Federal	135	70	362.5	145
Mercury	Federal & State	135	57.5	325	125
Stapleton & Assoc.	Federal	65	10	175	55

Based on the RFP process as defined by the City's purchasing process, the panel proposes to recommend to the City Council to approve a 2-year proposal for legislative advocacy services with Van Scoyoc & Associations and a 1-year agreement for State legislative advocacy services with Mercury. Each agreement is for one additional year.

Sufficient funds to cover the cost of each agreement is budgeted in the City's 2023-2024 budget.

Please FOLLOW the staff recommendation.

Cathey and Bob Ryder
Voters and Homeowners since 1985

Sent from my iPhone

Moore, Tania

From: Levin, Shannon
Sent: Saturday, September 2, 2023 6:33 PM
To: supplementalcomm@surfcity-hb.org
Subject: Fwd: Questions re agenda items: Lobbying firms, Paradigm Medical Mgmt

Get [Outlook for iOS](#)

From: pacj <pacj_03@yahoo.com>
Sent: Saturday, September 2, 2023 6:31:13 PM
To: Estanislau, Robin <Robin.Estanislau@surfcity-hb.org>; CITY COUNCIL (INCL. CMO STAFF) <city.council@surfcity-hb.org>
Subject: Questions re agenda items: Lobbying firms, Paradigm Medical Mgmt

Re the upcoming council meeting, I have some questions.

Paradigm Medical Mgmt contract: Is this contract for the medical management of but one workers comp claim at an amount not to exceed 2.8 million dollars. Is the 2.8 million dollars Paradigm's fee for managing one wc claim?

On the lobbying firm contracts: I don't see the proposals submitted. I found one lobbying firm named Mercury on the CalAccess website. Mercury's clients are largely agricultural companies/organizations. I see no municipalities as clients on the CalAccess website. Re Van Sycoc, which cities does this lobbying firm represent at the federal level?

Thank you for your response.

Pat Quintana

Moore, Tania

From: Sheila Ellis <sheila.ellis78@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, September 3, 2023 10:33 AM
To: supplementalcomm@surfcity-hb.org; CITY COUNCIL (INCL. CMO STAFF); Van Der Mark, Gracey; Moser, Natalie; McKeon, Casey; Kalmick, Dan; Burns, Pat; Bolton, Rhonda; Strickland, Tony
Subject: Tuesday city council meeting agenda

After reviewing the agenda for Tuesday's city council meeting, I am urging all council members to vote no on agenda item numbers 15, 16, 22, 29, 30, 31, 32, 34, 35.

--

Sheila Ellis
(She/Her)

Moore, Tania

From: Janna Koch <jannapkoch@yahoo.com>
Sent: Sunday, September 3, 2023 4:21 PM
To: supplementalcomm@surfcity-hb.org
Subject: Fw: Vote no on Agenda items: 15,16,22,29,30,31,32,34,35

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: Janna Koch <jannapkoch@yahoo.com>
To: City.Council@surfcity-hb.org <city.council@surfcity-hb.org>
Sent: Sunday, September 3, 2023 at 04:08:32 PM PDT
Subject: Vote no on Agenda items: 15,16,22,29,30,31,32,34,35

To the HB City Council,

RE: City council agenda. VOTE NO on Agenda items
15,16,22,29,30,31,32,34,35!

I am unhappy with the job performance of this City Council. Your actual job is to represent ALL of the voters in HB. Also, to take care of city business and properly maintain the city resources and infrastructure.

You are not only not doing a good job of that, but it has come to my attention that you intend to squander 1.2 million of the City's dollars on an unnecessary special election. If you want to have a PAC...go out and raise YOUR OWN MONEY! Meanwhile the Central Library has bathrooms not working, RATS, the parking lot is rapidly degrading, and a host of other maintenance issues abound including proper ADA access for Seniors and disabled persons.

The City Council is breaking the CA State law by not completing the Housing Element. This is your JOB!

I vote to Censure the HB City Council for not doing it!

It is past time to stop acting like a mimic of the dysfunctional House of Representatives in the US Congress and get the job done! If you do not want to do the job, then please EXIT the HB City Council chambers like Tito and let others who are better qualified to do so get on with it!

We expect to have the same responsibilities and opportunities to vote as every other citizen of the State of California...it is NOT your job to decide otherwise!

It is highly inappropriate to declare the City of Huntington Beach to be a Non-mask mandate city. Again, we expect to have the same protections necessitated in a public health crisis as the rest of the citizens of Orange County. I am Covid At-Risk...my pandemic will NEVER be over. I am also my sole support and need my fellow residents to not make me sick. As to fiscal responsibility, I do not wish the City of HB to have to payout on lawsuits against the city for infecting people by public servants of the city or have to pay for sick days for the entire HB City Hall, HBPD, HBFD, etc. to infect themselves all again. There are areas of public

buildings that are NECESSARY to mask in during a public health crisis. This is because again, the City has FAILED to properly update them, namely places like the tiny, ventilation-impaired bathrooms at the Central Library!!!

Lastly, I value the service of Natalie Mosier on the HB City Council. She represents the People of HB better than any other person on the council. If the City Council members did not have exposure for comments made regarding their integrity, then it would be much more difficult to do so. I would be much less successful than Natalie in keeping a proper demeanor in the same circumstances.

Thank you for your attention to these matters...get the job done!

Janna Koch
Huntington Beach
jannapkoch@yahoo.com

Moore, Tania

From: Linda Law <lindaklaw@aol.com>
Sent: Sunday, September 3, 2023 6:48 PM
To: supplementalcomm@surfcity-hb.org; City Council
Subject: Vote No on Agenda items: 15,16,22,29,30,31,32,34,35

Dear Council Members,

Please vote no on agenda items: 15,16,22,29,30,31,32,34,35 at the September 5, 2023 City Council meeting.

I don't even know where to start with my objections to these agenda items.

The proposed charter amendments are unnecessary and would be extremely costly. Over a million dollars to place these amendments on a March 2024 ballot is ridiculous.

There is no evidence of voter fraud that necessitates the city having a separate local election that requires voter id and requires the monitoring of ballot drop boxes.

The City has gotten itself involved in costly anti-housing lawsuits and settled with the Air Show operator for millions when the city is supposedly broke.

The City Council and or the City Attorney have no business determining what books are available in our public libraries. That is the job of our librarians. Let them do their jobs.

Failing to recognize the transgender community in the revised Statement on Human Dignity is just shameful.

Censuring Council Member Moser for speaking the truth is beyond hypocritical. Having a known racist and anti-semitic on the council should be called out every day. There are photos, tapes, and newspaper articles that prove that relationship.

Against staff recommendations, the mayor is recommending that the city choose the lowest ranked Federal Government Affairs lobbyist. Why is that happening?

Proposing that the city ban broad universal mask and vaccine mandates as a response to Covid 19 or its variants is just ill informed. Covid 19 continues to mutate and having mask and vaccine mandates available is just good public health policy.

Dissolving numerous boards with little or no public input is very troubling to say the least. What's happening with the Climate Action Plan for the City?

Our high standards for the City Clerk position and other positions should continue.

Thank you for your time.

Moore, Tania

From: Levin, Shannon
Sent: Sunday, September 3, 2023 7:19 PM
To: supplementalcomm@surfcity-hb.org
Subject: Fwd: Vote no on Agenda items: 15,16,22,29,30,31,32,34,35

Get [Outlook for iOS](#)

From: Janna Koch <jannapkoch@yahoo.com>
Sent: Sunday, September 3, 2023 4:08:31 PM
To: CITY COUNCIL (INCL. CMO STAFF) <city.council@surfcity-hb.org>
Subject: Vote no on Agenda items: 15,16,22,29,30,31,32,34,35

To the HB City Council,

RE: City council agenda. VOTE NO on Agenda items
15,16,22,29,30,31,32,34,35!

I am unhappy with the job performance of this City Council. Your actual job is to represent ALL of the voters in HB. Also, to take care of city business and properly maintain the city resources and infrastructure.

You are not only not doing a good job of that, but it has come to my attention that you intend to squander 1.2 million of the City's dollars on an unnecessary special election. If you want to have a PAC...go out and raise YOUR OWN MONEY! Meanwhile the Central Library has bathrooms not working, RATS, the parking lot is rapidly degrading, and a host of other maintenance issues abound including proper ADA access for Seniors and disabled persons.

The City Council is breaking the CA State law by not completing the Housing Element. This is your JOB!

I vote to Censure the HB City Council for not doing it!

It is past time to stop acting like a mimic of the dysfunctional House of Representatives in the US Congress and get the job done! If you do not want to do the job, then please EXIT the HB City Council chambers like Tito and let others who are better qualified to do so get on with it!

We expect to have the same responsibilities and opportunities to vote as every other citizen of the State of California...it is NOT your job to decide otherwise!

It is highly inappropriate to declare the City of Huntington Beach to be a Non-mask mandate city. Again, we expect to have the same protections necessitated in a public health crisis as the rest of the citizens of Orange County. I am Covid At-Risk...my pandemic will NEVER be over. I am also my sole support and need my fellow residents to not make me sick. As to fiscal responsibility, I do not wish the City of HB to have to payout

on lawsuits against the city for infecting people by public servants of the city or have to pay for sick days for the entire HB City Hall, HBPD, HBFD, etc. to infect themselves all again. There are areas of public buildings that are NECESSARY to mask in during a public health crisis. This is because again, the City has FAILED to properly update them, namely places like the tiny, ventilation-impaired bathrooms at the Central Library!!!

Lastly, I value the service of Natalie Mosier on the HB City Council. She represents the People of HB better than any other person on the council. If the City Council members did not have exposure for comments made regarding their integrity, then it would be much more difficult to do so. I would be much less successful than Natalie in keeping a proper demeanor in the same circumstances.

Thank you for your attention to these matters...get the job done!

Janna Koch
Huntington Beach
jannapkoch@yahoo.com

Moore, Tania

From: Levin, Shannon
Sent: Monday, September 4, 2023 7:37 AM
To: supplementalcomm@surfcity-hb.org
Subject: Fwd: Oppose Item #15B, #30, #31, #32, #34, #35

Get [Outlook for iOS](#)

From: jstone223@aol.com <jstone223@aol.com>
Sent: Monday, September 4, 2023 6:10:16 AM
To: CITY COUNCIL (INCL. CMO STAFF) <city.council@surfcity-hb.org>
Subject: Oppose Item #15B, #30, #31, #32, #34, #35

I am apposed to our council majority and City Attorney attempting to change the very fabric of my city of 25 years.

Jessica Stone

"What if today we were just grateful for everything" Charlie Brown.

Moore, Tania

From: Levin, Shannon
Sent: Monday, September 4, 2023 7:39 AM
To: supplementalcomm@surfcity-hb.org
Subject: Fwd: Comment, 9-5-23 CC mtg., items 15, 16, 30, 31, 32, 34, 35.

Get [Outlook for iOS](#)

From: Dan Jamieson <danjamieson4@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, September 4, 2023 7:36:12 AM
To: CITY COUNCIL (INCL. CMO STAFF) <city.council@surfcity-hb.org>
Subject: Comment, 9-5-23 CC mtg., items 15, 16, 30, 31, 32, 34, 35.

Dear HB City Council:

As a Huntington Beach resident, I appreciate the chance to comment in several items under consideration at the Sept. 5, 2023 council meeting:

Item 15

Please vote NO on item 15, a recommendation to contract with Kahn, Soares, & Conway LLP for State Legislative Advocacy Services and with Stapleton & Associates for Federal Legislative Advocacy Services. It is unclear why these firms were chosen. Stapleton was not highly rated by staff, and Kahn was not rated at all (and appears to focus on agricultural and water law).

HB residents deserve transparency in how lobbying firms are chosen, especially given that the mayor is a professional lobbyist and may have conflicts.

Item 16

Please vote NO on item 16, to redirect staff to develop policy options regarding city library materials and safeguards.

This item continues development of the unconstitutional book-banning proposals pushed by the council majority. Having political actors review and restrict books would be an unconstitutional imposition of extreme religious views into the function of our public library, which is to serve all users regardless of faith or political views. Professional library staff are fully capable of choosing materials for our public library. Concerned parents can screen out anything they feel is unacceptable.

Please stop the book-banning efforts that HB residents clearly oppose.

Item 30

Please vote NO on Administrative Item 30.

The council majority promised HB voters they would refrain from charter amendments. With this item, they go back on that promise.

Charter amendments must be done with a thoughtful, even-handed, transparent process. The proposed batch of amendments in this item is anything but. The amendments were hatched behind closed doors by the council majority looking to consolidate power within the city attorney's office; prevent the council from investigating malfeasance; help the city attorney's wife get elected as city clerk; cement the anti-Pride flag ordinance into the charter; restrict the city's ability to create affordable housing; and improperly interfere with county-run elections in an attempt to cater to election-conspiracy believers.

If charter amendments are needed, they should be done with an open and rigorous process with public notice and comment, and voted on in a November general election, not the lower-turnout primary election.

Item 31

Please vote NO on item 31, dissolving the HB Human Relations Committee, and the Mobile Home Advisory Board.

The city's Human Relations Committee is needed more than ever. Hate incidents and crimes are a continuing problem in our city and county. Dissolving the committee is an affront to the diverse community that lives, works and visits our city.

The Mobile Home Advisory board also serves some of our most economically vulnerable citizens, many of them seniors on limited incomes who face rising rents from aggressive mobile-home park owners. The state Dept. of Housing and Community Development is too far removed from issues impacting local mobile-home residents, and our own advisory board can inform city leaders and HCD about HB-related park issues and violations.

Item 32

Please vote NO on item 32, the Ad Hoc Committee's proposed Policy on Human Dignity.

The proposed new statement on human dignity is a major step backward for the people of HB.

The existing Human Dignity statement promises respect for everyone, regardless of "actual or perceived racial background, their nation of origin, the religion they practice, their sexual orientation, gender, gender identity or gender expression, or disability status." The existing statement has clear definitions of hate incidents and crimes, and promises action against hate crimes. It encourages and instructs on how to report hate crimes, and notes the tragic history that gave rise to the Dignity statement.

The proposed new statement has none of this. It does not even mention hate crimes. Instead, it offers up a generic tough-on-crime policy, offering to pursue "all of those who participate in crimes in our community," warning specifically of child abuse, including "sexual grooming." This language is chilling--right-wing extremists have associated grooming with the LGBTQ community.

In a clumsy attempt to address the issue of trans athletes, the new policy seems to attack trans and non-binary people. It says the city "will recognize from birth the genetic differences between male and female." Will trans and non-binary people be protected? If so, will that protection extend to athletics?

Respectfully, the proposed new Dignity statement is a farce. Instead of a robust statement of support for vulnerable groups, it targets trans and non-binary people and those who might "groom" children (the LGBTQ community). As written, the new statement will be an embarrassment for the city.

Item 34

Please vote NO on item 34, the Move to Censure Council Member Moser.

Councilmember Moser questioned the appointment of the Mayor Pro Tem, who has a history of associating with white nationalists and once shared Holocaust-denial posts, to the sensitive job of writing a new Dignity statement. This was not improper. The council majority knew they might get this reaction. They got it, and now they can engage in more performative posturing with a censure vote.

Item 35

Please vote NO on Councilmember Item 35.

This item submitted by Mayor Pro Tem Van Der Mark on mask and vaccine mandates, is not needed, and would be an infringement on the freedoms of private businesses to decide such policies for themselves. Likewise, the city of HB, through council, can decide for itself to impose mandates or not within its own facilities.

Mayor Pro Tem Van Der Mark attempts to justify this item by misrepresenting facts. The Chicago Sun Times story she quotes reported on the Cochrane study of masks. The Sun Times, along with other right-wing media, misquoted the study. The misreporting was debunked by Factcheck.org, and by Cochrane itself, which set the record straight (the effectiveness of masks is uncertain): "Many commentators have claimed that a recently-updated Cochrane Review shows that 'masks don't work', which is an inaccurate and misleading interpretation," Dr. Karla Soares-Weiser, the editor-in-chief of the Cochrane Library, said in a March 10 statement. (<https://www.factcheck.org/2023/03/scicheck-what-the-cochrane-review-says-about-masks-for-covid-19-and-what-it-doesnt/>)

The LA Times story Mayor Pro Tem Van Der Mark cites reported on a study of records of nearly 800,000 U.S. veterans and the persistence of covid vaccines. Vets protected by the worst performing vaccine, J&J's, were nevertheless 52% less likely to die than their peers who didn't get any shots, according to the story. Other covid vaccines were even more effective. (Because vaccines wear off, booster shots are recommended.)

Vaccines have proven effective. The data are clear. It is troubling that HB's Mayor Pro Tem spouts such blatant misinformation.

Dan Jamieson

Huntington Beach

Moore, Tania

From: Mikel Hogan <mhogan072@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, September 4, 2023 8:22 AM
To: supplementalcomm@surfcity-hb.org; CITY COUNCIL (INCL. CMO STAFF)
Subject: Stop the Authoritarian Plans of Huntington Beach City Council

AttentionHuntington Beach City Council Members,

As a 50 year tax paying resident of Huntington Beach, I request you remove the wasteful, distractive, and nondemocratic agenda items from the September 5, 2023 City Council meeting, namely

1. **Remove and stop the censure of councilperson Natalie Moser**
2. **Stop the wasteful anti-housing policy that is costing the HB taxpayers (\$4 million)**
3. **Stop the wasteful and costly special election (\$1.2million) to place unnecessary Charter Amendments on the March 2024 ballot. These undemocratic amendments were designed in secrecy with no expert or community input and promote grossly harmful policies for our city governance.**
4. **Stop the Mayor's recommendation for the City Council to choose the lowest ranked **Federal Government Affairs** respondent against the staff recommendation.**

For Huntington Beach to effectively face the challenges of global climate change and the many related social and economic issues, **we need respectful, inclusive democratic, pro-active governing processes for a strong and resilient Huntington Beach community.**

Dr. Mikel Hogan

Moore, Tania

From: Levin, Shannon
Sent: Monday, September 4, 2023 9:52 AM
To: supplementalcomm@surfcity-hb.org
Subject: Fwd: Vote No on Agenda items: 15,16,22,29,30,31,32,34,35

Get [Outlook for iOS](#)

From: Linda Law <lindaklaw@aol.com>
Sent: Monday, September 4, 2023 9:32:19 AM
To: CITY COUNCIL (INCL. CMO STAFF) <city.council@surfcity-hb.org>
Subject: Vote No on Agenda items: 15,16,22,29,30,31,32,34,35

Dear Council Members,
Please vote no on agenda items: 15,16,22,29,30,31,32,34,35 at the September 5, 2023 City Council meeting.

I don't even know where to start with my objections to these agenda items.

The proposed charter amendments are unnecessary and would be extremely costly. Over a million dollars to place these amendments on a March 2024 ballot is ridiculous.

There is no evidence of voter fraud that necessitates the city having a separate local election that requires voter id and requires the monitoring of ballot drop boxes.

The City has gotten itself involved in costly anti-housing lawsuits and settled with the Air Show operator for millions when the city is supposedly broke.

The City Council and or the City Attorney have no business determining what books are available in our public libraries. That is the job of our librarians. Let them do their jobs.

Failing to recognize the transgender community in the revised Statement on Human Dignity is just shameful.

Censuring Council Member Moser for speaking the truth is beyond hypocritical. Having a known racist and anti-semitic on the council should be called out every day. There are photos, tapes, and newspaper articles that prove that relationship.

Against staff recommendations, the mayor is recommending that the city choose the lowest ranked Federal Government Affairs lobbyist. Why is that happening?

Proposing that the city ban broad universal mask and vaccine mandates as a response to Covid 19 or its variants is just ill informed. Covid 19 continues to mutate and having mask and vaccine mandates available is just good public health policy.

Dissolving numerous boards with little or no public input is very troubling to say the least.
What's happening with the Climate Action Plan for the City?

Our high standards for the City Clerk position and other positions should continue.

Thank you for your time.

Moore, Tania

From: Galassi, Cecelia <cgalassi@gwc.cccd.edu>
Sent: Monday, September 4, 2023 12:58 PM
To: supplementalcomm@surfcity-hb.org; CITY COUNCIL (INCL. CMO STAFF)
Subject: Response to Sept. 5 City Council Agenda

September 4, 2023

To the Huntington Beach City Council:

I am writing to tell you that your latest planned actions are an outrage and that I will join other citizens of HB and Orange County in fighting your efforts now and as long as you try to occupy your current positions. I'm a 12-year homeowner in this city, I work full time in the city, and I'm raising a child here.

As far as I can tell, this is part of what you want to do, starting on Sept. 5:

....Item 15—spend taxpayer money to hire two sets of lobbyists for the city because you want different rules than any other town in the state.

-Item 16 – spend up to 2.8 million dollars to hire a medical management firm to fight and, it looks like, manipulate workers' compensation arrangements that are already in existence.
-Item 19 – refuse to respond to the OC Grand Jury's report on drought.
-Item 22 – spend \$3,831,000 to continue to fight the state of California in your ongoing, tax-guzzling lawsuit (again, as if HB goes by different rules than the rest of the state—uh, no).
-Item 24 – simply steal funds from the Traffic Congestion relief Prop 42 fund to hire a grant writer.
-Items 27, 28 – In total bad faith cancel a number of existing contracts and open up re-bidding (is that because you want to hire a friend's firm?).
-Item 29 – In a total attack on the democratic vote that denied you the opportunity to change City Charter Amendments, you want to fund and arrange a new March 5, 2024 election, so you can try to force your wishes on all of us again.
-Item 30 – Appropriate 1.2 million dollars from taxpayer funds for.... "Business Unit." That's all the explanation you give: Business Unit.

-Item 16-- I will join other citizens to fight your attack on freedom (Item 16) to censor the HB Library and its trained librarians so that citizens have less access to books that you—without training, without any definition of what you mean by “obscene” (there’s an existing Supreme Court ruling on that, by the way) want to pick and choose. You also want to “part ways with the American Library Association.”

What the hell? You don’t get to determine anybody’s reading options. That’s not your job, you aren’t qualified to do it, and it is a complete attack on citizen freedoms. You want to deny the support of experts and the recognized national organization joining libraries across the country.

We know you are attempting to copy what you have seen other power-greedy leaders do in Southern states. It appears you want HB to become like them, and that is a disaster.

- Finally, the cowardly vote to rebuke Councilwoman Moser because she called out Mayor Pro Tem Van Der Mark’s **documented** Holocaust denial record and racism. Van Der Mark’s racism has been publicly known since before 2018, and though she tries to cover it up and claim that her Latino background means she’s not an anti-Semite, she has expressed racist views, and she has posted social media to that effect. In view of the fact that Moser has to watch her and most of you attack our civil liberties and use our money to do it, her frustration is understandable. Van der Mark has shown who she is, and slapping the wrists of someone who calls it out is dishonest and petty.

We see you. We will continue to fight your actions and power grabs.

HB Resident Cecelia Galassi

Moore, Tania

From: laura sire <llaurajane@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, September 4, 2023 4:02 PM
To: supplementalcomm@surfcity-hb.org
Cc: laura sire
Subject: Agenda items: 15,16,22,29,30,31,32,34,35. (Agenda dated Sept 5, 2023)

Dear Mayor Strickland, Mayor Pro Tem Van Der Mark, and Councilmembers Bolton, Burns, Kalmick, and Moser,

My name is Laura Sire. I moved to Huntington Beach with my family when I was 14 years old. I am now 75 years old so I've been here a long time, and have witnessed many changes over the decades. I was a realtor in this city for about 10 years, and then made a career change to teaching and taught 1st grade for 16 years. The last decade or so I've enjoyed volunteering and being of service to HB.

Currently, I've been experiencing some health issues which have necessitated me stepping back from my activities. However, I am writing today out of the urgency of the crisis I see the governance of Huntington Beach facing.

I am appalled at what has occurred since the council majority Strickland, Van Der Mark, McKeon, and Burns were sworn in December 2022. Public comments are heard but not really heard. The "Thank you for being here" mechanically repeated by Mayor Strickland rings hollow as the CC majority deconstructs all that is positive, inclusive, compassionate, and sound city government with their robotic, pre-determined and thoughtless 4-3 votes.

That said, still in hopes of being heard I strongly ask for a NO vote on Agenda items 15,16,22,29,30,31,32,34, and 35.

Although ALL should be voted down, #'s 30,31,32,34 and 35 particularly warrant NO votes:

-30. VOTE NO. Introducing city charter amendment ballot measures for Mar 5, 2023 primary election.

*This item is the epitome of hypocrisy as it was brought forward by councilmembers who have repeatedly stated that we should follow and not deviate from our City Charter. This is written as only ONE agenda item and did not involve the electorate of our city. There are 3 measures but actually include many negative impacts such as wasted \$\$\$, voter ID requirement and other conditions that make voting less accessible especially to those whose voices specifically NEED to be heard.

*This gives the Mayor alone the power to cancel city council meetings.

*\$1,200,000 to be spent from City's general fund which is \$ taxpayer \$.

It solidifies the removal of the Pride Flag flying on city property.g

*Overall #30 must be a NO vote. If it is passed and these amendments are on the March ballot, it will be a HUGE waste of money. When folks understand what these measures truly mean they will be voted down.

There will be a campaign to educate and protect HB and ALL people living here by and before March 5th.

THIS WILL NOT PASS ON MARCH 5TH!

-31 VOTE NO -Approve the dissolution of the various and many boards, commissions, and committees of HB. This is a clear and dangerous move to silence the voice of the people. It reeks of authoritarianism.

-32 VOTE NO, NO NO! Consider adhoc's proposed policy on statement of human dignity. After reading this abhorrent and insulting so called statement of human dignity, I find myself agreeing with Councilmember Burns, however this is the version that should be cancelled. This draft excludes the LGBTQIA+ community with an emphasis on those who identify as transgender. The fear and suffering that this would cause those individuals including the youth in our city is immeasurable and this statement is shameful and reprehensible.

-34 NO on Censure of Councilmember Moser. I watched the exchange between Councilmember Moser and Mayor Pro Tem Van Der Mark multiple times. Why is this on the agenda? Councilmember Moser was in control and simply asked needed questions of Van Der Mark when Mayor Strickland announced that the ad-hoc committee to amend the human dignity statement would include her. Considering Councilmember Van Der Mark's social media history, removal from a school board, and photos with white supremacists, Councilmember Moser was performing her due diligence in representing all of the people of Huntington Beach in making her best effort at obtaining the truth. Councilmember VDM was the one who attacked Councilmember Moser, interrupting her and yelling at her. She was the one who breached decorum. It is obvious to anyone who watches the clip. You owe Councilmember Moser an apology. And because of her highly emotional and hostile denial (which is in opposition to data) we the people of HB are still left wondering and wanting only to know the truth concerning the Councilmember who is in this leadership position.

#35 proposed by Councilmember Van Der Mark is ignorant, reckless, and dangerous to the health and safety of HB residents. VOTE NO!

Sincerely,
Laura Sire
(she/her)

PS I along with other residents will be watching Tuesday.

Moore, Tania

From: george sire <gunahound@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, September 4, 2023 4:55 PM
To: laura sire; supplementalcomm@surfcity-hb.org
Cc: laura sire
Subject: Re: Agenda items: 15,16,22,29,30,31,32,34,35. (Agenda dated Sept 5, 2023)

Nicely put together.

Sent from Yahoo Mail for iPhone

On Monday, September 4, 2023, 4:02 PM, laura sire <llaurajane@yahoo.com> wrote:

Dear Mayor Strickland, Mayor Pro Tem Van Der Mark, and Councilmembers Bolton, Burns, Kalmick, and Moser,

My name is Laura Sire. I moved to Huntington Beach with my family when I was 14 years old. I am now 75 years old so I've been here a long time, and have witnessed many changes over the decades. I was a realtor in this city for about 10 years, and then made a career change to teaching and taught 1st grade for 16 years. The last decade or so I've enjoyed volunteering and being of service to HB.

Currently, I've been experiencing some health issues which have necessitated me stepping back from my activities. However, I am writing today out of the urgency of the crisis I see the governance of Huntington Beach facing.

I am appalled at what has occurred since the council majority Strickland, Van Der Mark, McKeon, and Burns were sworn in December 2022. Public comments are heard but not really heard.

The "Thank you for being here" mechanically repeated by Mayor Strickland rings hollow as the CC majority deconstructs all that is positive, inclusive, compassionate, and sound city government with their robotic, pre-determined and thoughtless 4-3 votes.

That said, still in hopes of being heard I strongly ask for a NO vote on Agenda items 15,16,22,29,30,31,32,34, and 35.

Although ALL should be voted down, #'s 30,31,32,34 and 35 particularly warrant NO votes:

-30. VOTE NO. Introducing city charter amendment ballot measures for Mar 5, 2023 primary election.

*This item is the epitome of hypocrisy as it was brought forward by councilmembers who have repeatedly stated that we should follow and not deviate from our City Charter. This is written as only ONE agenda item and did not involve the electorate of our city. There are 3 measures but actually include many negative impacts such as wasted \$\$\$, voter ID requirement and other conditions that make voting less accessible especially to those whose voices specifically NEED to be heard.

*This gives the Mayor alone the power to cancel city council meetings.

*\$1,200,000 to be spent from City's general fund which is \$ taxpayer \$.

It solidifies the removal of the Pride Flag flying on city property.g

*Overall #30 must be a NO vote. If it is passed and these amendments are on the March ballot, it will be a HUGE waste of money. When folks understand what these measures truly mean they will be voted down.

There will be a campaign to educate and protect HB and ALL people living here by and before March 5th.

THIS WILL NOT PASS ON MARCH 5TH!

-31 VOTE NO -Approve the dissolution of the various and many boards, commissions, and committees of HB. This is a clear and dangerous move to silence the voice of the people. It reeks of authoritarianism.

-32 VOTE NO, NO NO! Consider adhoc's proposed policy on statement of human dignity. After reading this abhorrent and insulting so called statement of human dignity, I find myself agreeing with Councilmember Burns, however this is the version that should be cancelled. This draft excludes the LGBTQIA+ community with an emphasis on those who identify as transgender. The fear and suffering that this would cause those individuals including the youth in our city is immeasurable and this statement is shameful and reprehensible.

-34 NO on Censure of Councilmember Moser. I watched the exchange between Councilmember Moser and Mayor Pro Tem Van Der Mark multiple times. Why is this on the agenda? Councilmember Moser was in control and simply asked needed questions of Van Der Mark when Mayor Strickland announced that the ad-hoc committee to amend the human dignity statement would include her. Considering Councilmember Van Der Mark's social media history, removal from a school board, and photos with white supremacists, Councilmember Moser was performing her due diligence in representing all of the people of Huntington Beach in making her best effort at obtaining the truth. Councilmember VDM was the one who attacked Councilmember Moser, interrupting her and yelling at her. She was the one who breached decorum. It is obvious to anyone who watches the clip.

You owe Councilmember Moser an apology. And because of her highly emotional and hostile denial (which is in opposition to data) we the people of HB are still left wondering and wanting only to know the truth concerning the Councilmember who is in this leadership position.

#35 proposed by Councilmember Van Der Mark is ignorant, reckless, and dangerous to the health and safety of HB residents. VOTE NO!

Sincerely,
Laura Sire
(she/her)

PS I along with other residents will be watching Tuesday.

Moore, Tania

From: vanessaweb@aol.com
Sent: Monday, September 4, 2023 4:47 PM
To: laura sire; supplementalcomm@surfcity-hb.org
Cc: laura sire
Subject: Re: Agenda items: 15,16,22,29,30,31,32,34,35. (Agenda dated Sept 5, 2023)

Laura, that is a great letter!! Thanks for letting me read it. I know you'll be there in spirit tomorrow night. V

Sent from the all new AOL app for iOS

On Monday, September 4, 2023, 4:02 PM, laura sire <llaurajane@yahoo.com> wrote:

Dear Mayor Strickland, Mayor Pro Tem Van Der Mark, and Councilmembers Bolton, Burns, Kalmick, and Moser,

My name is Laura Sire. I moved to Huntington Beach with my family when I was 14 years old. I am now 75 years old so I've been here a long time, and have witnessed many changes over the decades. I was a realtor in this city for about 10 years, and then made a career change to teaching and taught 1st grade for 16 years. The last decade or so I've enjoyed volunteering and being of service to HB.

Currently, I've been experiencing some health issues which have necessitated me stepping back from my activities. However, I am writing today out of the urgency of the crisis I see the governance of Huntington Beach facing.

I am appalled at what has occurred since the council majority Strickland, Van Der Mark, McKeon, and Burns were sworn in December 2022. Public comments are heard but not really heard.

The "Thank you for being here" mechanically repeated by Mayor Strickland rings hollow as the CC majority deconstructs all that is positive, inclusive, compassionate, and sound city government with their robotic, pre-determined and thoughtless 4-3 votes.

That said, still in hopes of being heard I strongly ask for a NO vote on Agenda items 15,16,22,29,30,31,32,34, and 35.

Although ALL should be voted down, #'s 30,31,32,34 and 35 particularly warrant NO votes:

-30. VOTE NO. Introducing city charter amendment ballot measures for Mar 5, 2023 primary election.

*This item is the epitome of hypocrisy as it was brought forward by councilmembers who have repeatedly stated that we should follow and not deviate from our City Charter. This is written as only ONE agenda item and did not involve the electorate of our city. There are 3 measures but actually include many negative impacts such as wasted \$\$\$, voter ID requirement and other conditions that make voting less accessible especially to those whose voices specifically NEED to be heard.

*This gives the Mayor alone the power to cancel city council meetings.
*\$1,200,000 to be spent from City's general fund which is \$ taxpayer \$.
It solidifies the removal of the Pride Flag flying on city property.g

*Overall #30 must be a NO vote. If it is passed and these amendments are on the March ballot, it will be a HUGE waste of money. When folks understand what these measures truly mean they will be voted down.
There will be a campaign to educate and protect HB and ALL people living here by and before March 5th.
THIS WILL NOT PASS ON MARCH 5TH!

-31 VOTE NO -Approve the dissolution of the various and many boards, commissions, and committees of HB. This is a clear and dangerous move to silence the voice of the people. It reeks of authoritarianism.

-32 VOTE NO, NO NO! Consider adhoc's proposed policy on statement of human dignity. After reading this abhorrent and insulting so called statement of human dignity, I find myself agreeing with Councilmember Burns, however this is the version that should be cancelled. This draft excludes the LGBTQIA+ community with an emphasis on those who identify as transgender. The fear and suffering that this would cause those individuals including the youth in our city is immeasurable and this statement is shameful and reprehensible.

-34 NO on Censure of Councilmember Moser. I watched the exchange between Councilmember Moser and Mayor Pro Tem Van Der Mark multiple times. Why is this on the agenda? Councilmember Moser was in control and simply asked needed questions of Van Der Mark when Mayor Strickland announced that the ad-hoc committee to amend the human dignity statement would include her. Considering Councilmember Van Der Mark's social media history, removal from a school board, and photos with white supremacists, Councilmember Moser was performing her due diligence in representing all of the people of Huntington Beach in making her best effort at obtaining the truth. Councilmember VDM was the one who attacked Councilmember Moser, interrupting her and yelling at her. She was the one who breached decorum. It is obvious to anyone who watches the clip.
You owe Councilmember Moser an apology. And because of her highly emotional and hostile denial (which is in opposition to data) we the people of HB are still left wondering and wanting only to know the truth concerning the Councilmember who is in this leadership position.

#35 proposed by Councilmember Van Der Mark is ignorant, reckless, and dangerous to the health and safety of HB residents. VOTE NO!

Sincerely,
Laura Sire
(she/her)

PS I along with other residents will be watching Tuesday.

Switzer, Donna

From: Jessamyn Garner <jessamyngarner@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 5, 2023 9:33 AM
To: supplementalcomm@surfcity-hb.org; CITY COUNCIL (INCL. CMO STAFF)
Subject: Please oppose agenda items 15, 16, 29, 30, 31, 32, 34, 35

Dear Huntington Beach City Council,

I wish I could attend the meeting tonight, but unfortunately I was exposed to Covid over the weekend. I want to keep my neighbors safe so I plan to stay home.

As a resident of Huntington Beach, I am appalled by many items on tonight's agenda. The policies and decisions that are being considered are hurtful to minorities in this community and they do not represent my values of inclusion and integrity.

I urge you to oppose agenda items 15, 16, 29, 30, 31, 32, 34, and 35.

Specifically, as a member of the LGBTQ+ community, I reject the statement of Human Dignity that has been warped to include transphobic rhetoric that will directly impact my ability to live in this community.

I know based on previous behavior and voting records from the council that this email and the hundreds of other comments you will receive in the next 18 hours will not likely change your minds. Just know that your constituents are paying attention to your actions and we will vote accordingly. Making it harder for us to vote and passing threatening policies will not deter us from showing up to the polls. On the contrary, it will galvanize us and we will show up in even greater numbers.

We won't allow this city to continue to be led by hateful rhetoric and exclusionary policies.

--
Jessamyn Garner
(they/them)

Switzer, Donna

From: LISE MILLER <genereaux@aol.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 5, 2023 8:56 AM
To: supplementalcomm@surfcity-hb.org; CITY COUNCIL (INCL. CMO STAFF)
Subject: Oppose 15B, 30, 31, 32, 34, and 35

Dear Council,

Please consider the following recommendations:

Oppose Item #15B

There is no explanation why the Council would hire the lowest rated advocacy firm when judged by our own Intergovernmental Relations Committee. A rubric was developed for evaluating the proposals that were submitted in response to the RFP and then the IRC recommended hiring the highest ranked firm, but the Council is poised to hire the lowest ranked firm instead. Without explanation, this seems to be a waste of our tax dollars.

Oppose Item #30

I strongly oppose moving any of the proposed charter amendments to the primary ballot. They were not drafted in accordance with our own rules or charter requirements. There was no citizen commission, only a 3 person ad hoc committee that developed these behind closed doors. None of them are needed for good governance of our city.

Oppose Item #31

I strongly oppose dissolving the city's commissions and committees. They are made up of citizens which allow the Council to have the most direct input from our citizens on varying topics of concern in our city.

Oppose Item #32

I strongly oppose the adoption of the ad hoc committee's "rewrite" of the Policy on Human Dignity. The 2021 version was thorough, complete and inclusive. Not only is this new version incomplete, it is actually exclusive and transphobic. I would be embarrassed for people to know that I live in a city that has published such a horrible document.

Oppose Item #34

I strongly oppose censuring Councilmember Moser for asking a relevant question. When Mayor Pro Tem Van Der Mark was selected to be part of the ad hoc committee to reevaluate a policy that addresses the Holocaust and hate crimes, it is certainly relevant to know if any of the 3 members charged with that task holds any biases. Van Der Mark has never publicly answered the questions that have been swirling around the community for years. I am more concerned that Van Der Mark responded to the reasonable query by shouting and calling Moser a liar. That seems a much more egregious offense.

Oppose Item #35

There have been no mask or vaccine mandates in place for months, if not years. This agenda item seems to be placed just to get people riled up (as if there isn't enough on this agenda). I oppose this waste of time.

Thank you!
Sent from my iPad

Switzer, Donna

From: Levin, Shannon
Sent: Tuesday, September 5, 2023 8:45 AM
To: supplementalcomm@surfcity-hb.org
Subject: FW: [External] Re: Notice of Intent to Award and related public documents - evaluation factors
Attachments: intent to award Federal and State Advocacy _ SL.docx; Staff Report(1).pdf; Minutes Int Govt Mttg HB.pdf

From: Crum, Jim <jcrum@vsadc.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 5, 2023 8:18 AM
To: Anderson, Jennifer <Jennifer.Anderson@surfcity-hb.org>; Levin, Shannon <Shannon.Levin@surfcity-hb.org>; CITY COUNCIL (INCL. CMO STAFF) <city.council@surfcity-hb.org>
Subject: FW: [External] Re: Notice of Intent to Award and related public documents - evaluation factors

Jennifer and Shannon: this email is intended to serve as a contact to the designated City staff in accordance with RFP No: 23-0613 but is also being sent to the City Council members as additional information for the Council meeting and Agenda scheduled for September 5th, 2023.

The VSA team, who has provided a proposal to RFP NO: 23-0613, has reviewed the "Notice of Intent to Award" (below), the public document File #23-636; Subject: Legislative Advocacy RFP Update summarizing the staff's review of qualifications and recommendations, and the public document; minutes from the July 20, 2023 meeting of the Intergovernmental Relations Committee (IRC).

Although we clearly understand the range of recommendations the IRC can make in regard to a selection, we would like to note formally our concerns around the "Notice of Intent to Award" document as it identifies Stapleton and Associates as the potential award for Federal Legislative Services.

The "Notice of Intent to Award" lists criteria utilized to evaluate the proposals which are also listed in the RFP itself and the Staff Review report. These are:

- Compliance with the RFP Requirements
- Approach, Understanding of Project and Methodology
- Qualifications and Experience
- Experience
- Proposed Cost, Price, Fees
- References

The IRC's selected firm for the Federal Legislative Services was not consistent with the staff's recommendation and based on the above criteria, was the least qualified firm based on the staff evaluation and assigned point scores. The staff's independent review and ranking scores are showed below:

Proposers	Scope of Work	Compliance with RFP	References	Qualifications & Experience of the Proposer	Experience Conducting Similar Work for Similar Cities	Understanding and Approach to Scope	Cost Proposal	
Van Scoyoc & Assoc.	Federal	140	75	362.5	145	337.5	350	1
Thorn Run	Federal	135	70	362.5	145	337.5	300	1
Mercury	Federal & State	135	57.5	325	125	356.25	250	1
Stapleton & Assoc.	Federal	65	10	175	55	212.5	250	7

Van Scoyoc Associates would like to appeal the IRC's decision based on the following reasons. Although we recognize that the RFP does not describe appeal procedures, we request that this email serve as the basis for our appeal and consideration. We also request that this appeal be provided to the City Council.

1. The point difference for Stapleton & Assoc for "Compliance with the RFP" is significantly different that all other proposers. By their point score, it can be concluded that Stapleton & Assoc is non-compliant with at least half of the requirements in the RFP (score of 65).
2. Stapleton & Assoc does not demonstrate sufficient references to validate their past experience in the type of work being requested in the RFP (score of 10).
3. Stapleton & Assoc does not appear to have the experience (score 55) working with similar cities to represent Huntington Beach which is further validated by their lack of references.
4. Stapleton & Assoc appears to lack the understanding of portions of the Scope of Work compared to the more experienced firms.

Our intent with this appeal is not just for reconsideration but to express concern that the City of Huntington Beach obtain Federal Legislative Advocacy Services with the highest level of expertise and experience.

Very respectfully, Jim Crum
Vice President; Van Scoyoc Associates.

Jim Crum; P.E.

Van Scoyoc Associates
800 Maine Ave SW
Washington DC 20024
202-638-1950
(C) 202-236-8084



Caution: This e-mail originated outside the firm. Do not click any links or attachments unless you are certain it is genuine.



CITY OF HUNTINGTON BEACH

Finance Department

NOTICE OF INTENT TO AWARD

Date:	August 14, 2023
Project:	Federal & State Legislative Advocacy Services

The City evaluated proposals using a Qualifications-Based Selection (QBS) process incorporating a multitude of factors aside from, but including, pricing. The criteria utilized to evaluate the proposals are as follows:

- Compliance with the RFP Requirements
- Approach, Understanding of Project and Methodology
- Qualifications and Experience
- Experience
- Proposed Cost, Price, Fees
- References

The results of the evaluation panel were reviewed at the July 20, 2023 Intergovernmental Relations Committee (IRC) meeting. IRC made the following recommendations for award at the September 5, 2023 City Council meeting:

Federal Legislative Services	State Legislative Services
Stapleton & Associates	Kahn, Soares, & Conway LLC via Mercury Public Affairs

The City would like to thank all proposers for the time and resources contributed toward this RFP process. Non-selected proposers are highly encouraged to stay registered on the City's PlanetBids portal. This will enable proposers to register on the City's procurement system based on commodity and/or service offerings and be automatically contacted for future opportunities.

With regards,

Jennifer Anderson

Sr. Buyer

714.374.1569

Jennifer.Anderson@surfcity-hb.org



CITY OF HUNTINGTON BEACH

Finance Department

NOTICE OF INTENT TO AWARD

Date:	August 14, 2023
Project:	Federal & State Legislative Advocacy Services

The City evaluated proposals using a Qualifications-Based Selection (QBS) process incorporating a multitude of factors aside from, but including, pricing. The criteria utilized to evaluate the proposals are as follows:

- Compliance with the RFP Requirements
- Approach, Understanding of Project and Methodology
- Qualifications and Experience
- Experience
- Proposed Cost, Price, Fees
- References

The results of the evaluation panel were reviewed at the July 20, 2023 Intergovernmental Relations Committee (IRC) meeting. IRC made the following recommendations for award at the September 5, 2023 City Council meeting:

Federal Legislative Services	State Legislative Services
Stapleton & Associates	Kahn, Soares, & Conway LLC via Mercury Public Affairs

The City would like to thank all proposers for the time and resources contributed toward this RFP process. Non-selected proposers are highly encouraged to stay registered on the City's PlanetBids portal. This will enable proposers to register on the City's procurement system based on commodity and/or service offerings and be automatically contacted for future opportunities.



City of Huntington Beach

File #: 23-636

MEETING DATE: 7/20/2023

Subject:

Legislative Advocacy RFP Update

Statement of Issue:

Following an extensive Request for Proposals (RFP) process, staff has identified two consultants, Van Scoyoc & Associates and Mercury Public Affairs to provide Federal and State legislative advocacy services, respectively. Staff seeks additional input from the Intergovernmental Relations Committee, prior to placing both contracts on the August 1, 2023 City Council agenda for further consideration.

Financial Impact:

Sufficient funds are budgeted in the FY23-24 Operating Budget under business unit 10030101.69365. Funds for future years will be included in their respective years' budgets.

Recommended Action:

Based on the RFP process as defined by the City's purchasing policies and the panel's rankings staff proposes to recommend to the City Council to approve a 2-year professional services agreement for Federal legislative advocacy services with Van Scoyoc & Associates and another 2-year professional services agreement for State legislative advocacy services with Mercury Public Affairs. Provide feedback to staff and recommend next steps such as interviews or negotiations with the recommended firms.

Alternative Action:

Do not approve the recommended action and direct staff accordingly. Alternate actions include conducting interviews with all firms, proceed with negotiations, or re-issue the State Legislative Advocacy RFP given that only one proposal was received.

Analysis

The City of Huntington Beach issued an RFP on May 8, 2023 from well-qualified firms to provide both Federal and State legislative advocacy services in support of the City Council's policies and priorities. Firms were asked to submit proposals for either or both the Federal and State legislative advocacy services.

The RFP asked firms to detail their qualifications and their proposed approach to the scope of work, which includes: work with the City to establish legislative priorities (i.e., develop a Legislative Policy Platform), advocate on the City's behalf to federal and state legislative bodies and agencies, conduct legislative research and analysis, support the City in Washington, D.C. and/or Sacramento, and support the City's financial outlook by developing a plan supplemented through federal or state appropriations and grant funding.

The RFP specified that responses must include:

1. Cover Letter
2. Firm Qualifications
3. Understanding of and Proposed Approach to the RFP Scope of Work
4. References
5. Pricing Proposal

Additionally, the RFP identified specific criteria that would be used in the evaluation process:

1. Qualifications and experience of the individuals assigned to the contract
2. Qualifications and experience of the responding firm
3. Experience and track record conducting similar work for similar cities
4. Understanding and approach to the proposed scope of work in Huntington Beach
5. Proposed Fees

The RFP closed on June 13, 2023, and the City received four proposals. Proposals were independently evaluated by a panel of three staff members using the specific criteria listed in the RFP. A weighted scale up to 1500 points was allocated across six criteria in compliance with the RFP. Each panelist independently reviewed and scored the proposals per the City's purchasing procurement policies, and the ranking is as follows:

Proposers	Scope of Work	Compliance with RFP	References	Qualifications & Experience of the Proposer	Experience Conducting Similar Work for Similar Cities	Understanding and Approach to Scope	Cost Proposal	Total Points
Van Scoyoc & Assoc.	Federal	140	75	362.5	145	337.5	350	1,410.00
Thorn Run	Federal	135	70	362.5	145	337.5	300	1,350.00
Mercury	Federal & State	135	57.5	325	125	356.25	250	1,248.75
Stapleton & Assoc.	Federal	65	10	175	55	212.5	250	767.50

Based on the RFP process as defined by the City's purchasing policies and the panel's rankings, staff proposes to recommend to the City Council to approve a 2-year professional services agreement for Federal legislative advocacy services with Van Scoyoc & Associations and another 2-year professional services agreement for State legislative advocacy services with Mercury. Each agreement has an option to exercise one additional year.

Sufficient funds to cover the cost of each agreement is budgeted in the FY2023-24 Operating Budget under business unit 10030101.69365.

Attachment(s):

1. Request for Proposals - Federal & State Legislative Advocacy Services (RFP No. 23-0613)



CITY COUNCIL
INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS COMMITTEE

MINUTES FROM JULY 20, 2023
2000 MAIN STREET, Lower Level Room B-7
HUNTINGTON BEACH, CA 92648

Call to Order at 2:33 PM.

Roll Call

- Council Liaisons: (Present) Mayor Strickland, Mayor Pro Tem Van Der Mark, Council Member Burns
- Staff: Hopkins, Levin, Frakes

Public Comments (2 minutes per speaker): *Mark Sheldon encouraged the IRC to hire a legislative advocacy contractor.*

Approve Minutes from June 21, 2023 meeting: *APPROVED* 3-0 (Burns abstained)

ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS

1. LEGISLATIVE ADVOCACY RFP UPDATE: The Federal and State Legislative Advocacy proposals were reviewed by a panel of 3 staff, and based on the combined, independent ratings of the review panel, staff's recommended professional service providers are as follows:

- a. Van Scoyoc & Associates – (proposed Federal) – Award Federal Advocacy Thorn Run – (proposed Federal)
- b. Mercury – (proposed both Federal & State) – Award State Advocacy
- c. Stapleton & Associates – (proposed Federal)

Staff recommended Van Scoyoc & Associates for Federal Legislative services, and Mercury for State Legislative Services. IRC voted to contract with Stapleton & Associates for Federal services based on his knowledge of them, and Mercury Public Affairs for State services. Mayor Strickland mentioned that Stapleton & Associates would reduce their monthly retainer from \$10,000 to \$7,500.

Approved 3-0.

2. GENERAL UPDATES: Levin gave an update on the IRC's last month legislative positions, and that all position letters were mailed out after the City Council vote at the July 18, 2023 meeting.
3. ITEMS FOR NEXT MEETING: Mayor Strickland asked staff to reach out to local State and Federal representatives' offices and invite them or their staff to the next IRC meeting. Mayor Strickland also would like to add the 405 Freeway Naming effort from Steel's office on the next IRC agenda. Levin suggested a recap of status of the legislative items discussed at IRC year to date.

Adjournment – 2:41 PM

The next regularly scheduled meeting will be on August 16, 2023 at 4:00PM.

Switzer, Donna

From: Fran Delaney <francesbdelaney@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 5, 2023 11:13 AM
To: supplementalcomm@surfcity-hb.org
Subject: Re: Current City Council Agenda Items

Thank you for following up. These are the items that I would like to be given NO votes by City Council:

15,16,22,29,30,31,32,34, and 35.

On Tue, Sep 5, 2023 at 9:37 AM, supplementalcomm@surfcity-hb.org <supplementalcomm@surfcity-hb.org> wrote:

Good morning, Fran:

Would you please clarify which agenda item you were referring to when you stated "724-240" in the list below?

Thank you.

Sincerely,



Donna Switzer, CMC

Senior Deputy City Clerk

City of Huntington Beach, City Clerk's Office

Work (714) 374-1649

From: Fran Delaney <francesbdelaney@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, September 3, 2023 2:51 PM
To: CITY COUNCIL (INCL. CMO STAFF) <city.council@surfcity-hb.org>; supplementalcomm@surfcity-hb.org
Subject: Current City Council Agenda Items

City Council Members,

I am a Huntington Beach resident and have lived at my home for 33 years. I am shocked and embarrassed on behalf of all residents by the outlandish and dangerous proposals put forth in the August 1, 2023 meeting and items on the agenda for the September 5th meeting.

I emphatically ask that you vote against these agenda items on September 5, 2023, City Council Meeting:

724-240

23-700 and all recommended actions

23-683 and all recommendations

23-734 and all recommended actions

23-731

23-738

I highly disapprove of the censure Councilwoman Moser for her comments made as concern for who would be placed on an Ad Hoc committee for changes to the Declaration of Policy on Human Dignity. She questioned underlying associations with Neo-Nazis and Proud Boys which have never been addressed. Councilwoman Van Der Merck's response was out of order and hysterical and by far more deserving of a censure.

I strongly disapprove of 1) streamlining, consolidating, and/or dissolving a select number of the City's Boards, Commissions, and Committees and Council Committees 2) the attempt to require voter ID's and monitoring on drop off ballot boxes, 3) changing the election cycles for the City Clerk and City Treasure, 4) changing the requirements for City Clerk. All of these actions are an attempt to control and limit the voice and votes of residents and are unnecessary and most likely illegal.

I am shocked at the proposed changes to the City's Declaration of Policy on Human Dignity and strongly oppose them. The verbiage is a direct attack on trans individuals, adults, and children and a veiled attempt to find reasons to ban books in the public library. These actions will also be found illegal and the City will become responsible for even more expensive court proceedings and fines.

In addition, the rapid and unstudied withdrawal from OCPA will result in a multimillion-dollar fine. This will be layered atop the unprecedented settlement to maintain partnerships for the air show, the legal fees to fight the State of California, the senseless and inflated salary increase for the City Attorney, and certainly the many fines and court proceedings that will take place, as a result, of the proposed actions in the September 5th meeting. All of these bloated expenses were unnecessary and made with little knowledge or care for fiscal responsibility and will most likely result in a needed tax increase for residents in the future. It's shameful both morally and fiscally.

Finally, an attempt to limit election access, and to attempt to stack elections to favor themselves and strip away the rights of particular groups of individuals is moving toward fascism, which I find atrocious and shameful for all of us who reside in this city. For those who don't see the similarity of these action to fascism, please read some of the descriptions of what these actions are, taken from Merriam Webster dictionary:

"... severe economic and social regimentation and forcible oppression of the opposition. A tendency toward or actual exercise of strong autocratic or dictatorial control."

If the City tampers with elections such as what is proposed, that is exactly where we are.

Please read my requests and vote against the proposals listed above.

--
Fran Delaney-Barron

"Never underestimate the power of a small group of committed people to change the world. In fact, it is the only thing that
ever has." ~ Margaret Mead

Switzer, Donna

From: Karen Marie Carroll <dockaren44@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 5, 2023 8:06 AM
To: supplementalcomm@surfcity-hb.org
Subject: Agenda Items

Mayor Strickland and Members of the City Council

I am writing in opposition to or with serious concern regarding the following items on the 9/5/23 City Council Meeting Agenda: **Item 30. 23-700, 31. 23-693, 26. 23-707, Item 27. 23-704, Item 28. 23-733, 15 23-700, and 16. 23-741**

Item 30. 23-700- This item marks acceleration of a trajectory putting control of our city into the hands of extremists who are already providing their friends and associates opportunities to profit through secret settlements and now a re-do of bidding for contracts.

What is being proposed appears to build on actions already taken that clearly benefit the new majority – along with their friends and family. Financial gain and political ambition are equally apparent. I point to the following:

- 1) At the outset of your terms, you upped the limits on campaign contributions that give you quite an advantage in campaigns to come. I contributed to several candidates in the last election, and it was difficult for me financially. But I gave the limit and thought it was fair because there were limitations in place for all candidates. The current majority, however, was strategically supported by investors and groups many of which are outside of our city.
- 2) You propose re-arranging election cycles that would permit City Attorney Michael Gates and his wife Kelly Gates to run together, without reasonable limits on what they could spend together in a very well financed campaign. Included is a reduction of the requirements for City Clerk, which would permit Ms. Gates to run. Moving election oversight from the County to the City Attorney and City Clerk is ridiculous, unnecessary, and expensive. The optics are terrible! Further, it plays to the myth that there is election fraud here, for which there is no evidence.

Items 31. 23-693, particularly points I), J), and K)

This agenda item would change the application requirements for local contracts that open the door for persons, agencies, or firms that organize our local events. Will Code Four and Kevin Elliot be selected to run the 4th of July Parade and other city events too? We have heard that the Blue Angels

and other armed forces units arrange airshows without a middleman like Mr. Elliott. That is the way it is done in other locations, such as Seattle.

Item 15. 23-673

I question the change to accept the staff recommendations for federal lobbying consultants. Why accept the lowest ranked vendor to provide legislative analysis for our city? I understand that Mayor Strickland has received political contributions from that contractor. Really, this is the best that Huntington Beach deserves? Could there be any more evidence of political payback?

Item 16. 23-741

Cultural issues outside of the those that actually matter to all residents were presented with a strategy of shock. Are you saying the extreme examples you found were in books in our library and schools in our city? I think not. I assure you, most of us do not want you to take on our parenting, just do the normal business of governing our city.

Switzer, Donna

From: Celeste Rybicki <celeste@celesterybicki.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 5, 2023 7:53 AM
To: CITY COUNCIL (INCL. CMO STAFF); supplementalcomm@surfcity-hb.org
Subject: Disgusted but not Defeated, NO on items 15,16, 22, 29, 30, 31, 32, 34, 35

Dear City Council Majority,

I am sure I'm not the first to mention that the attempt to throw all these issues on the agenda today, the day after a holiday long weekend, is a slimy attempt to sneak them all in without giving the public adequate time to realize what you're doing. I don't believe this will change how you vote, you've proven time and time again you do not care how the residents of Huntington Beach really feel. However, I am writing to have it on record, so you cannot deny that your constituents have reached out in opposition.

I am strongly against censuring Councilwoman Moser. Nothing she said was incorrect or inappropriate, she repeated the same concerns many of us have about the Mayor Pro Tem. I do feel that GVDM lashing out against her, interrupting and calling her a liar was unprofessional and inappropriate. If you're going to consider censure I would direct that towards VanDerMark.

I am against the proposed amendments to the city charter. For a group that ran on keeping the city charter as is... I am so confused as to why this is even happening. I didn't vote for any of you so I'm not particularly shocked or disappointed but I assume many who voted for you do feel deceived.

I am so, so, so opposed to the modified Policy on Human Dignity. It is, to put it lightly, wholly undignified. If this offensive monstrosity passes I expect there to be so much public pushback causing embarrassment (and very likely loss of business) for our city. I can say from personal experience, in the past year I have had 3 pride flags stolen from my front yard and in the past 8 years I have had zero attempts at grooming or anything inappropriate towards my children by the HB librarians or public school system or drag queens, for that matter.

I'm writing this morning, not from a place of fear - because I am not afraid that you four (plus Gates, that's a whole other corrupt mess) can truly destroy our city. I'm writing because I have hope that the good, kind, honest and loving community I know here far far outnumbers you and your small-minded attempts. So here's one more email letting you know we see what you're trying to do. I oppose items 15,16, 22, 29, 30, 31, 32, 34, 35. I oppose your fascist, bigoted power grabs.

Celeste Rybicki
HB resident and mother of 3

Switzer, Donna

From: Levin, Shannon
Sent: Tuesday, September 5, 2023 6:07 AM
To: supplementalcomm@surfcity-hb.org
Subject: Fwd: Proposed Agenda for Sept. 5

Get [Outlook for iOS](#)

From: Jeanne Whitesell <jswhitesell3211@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, September 4, 2023 10:19:12 PM
To: CITY COUNCIL (INCL. CMO STAFF) <city.council@surfcity-hb.org>
Subject: Proposed Agenda for Sept. 5

Dear City Councils members,

I read the Agenda for the September 5 City Council meeting and want to state my concerns.

First I am appalled at **Item 32**, the Human Dignity document, which results in NO Dignity for some Huntington Beach citizens. Are we trying to take Huntington Beach back to the Dark Ages?

Second, I'm also against **Item 22**, which will use reserve funds for lawyers' fees. Why are we supporting lawyers to bring more unnecessary lawsuits? There needs to be more information and openness on where this money is going.

Third, I'm concerned about **Item 16** which seems to me to be an effort to damage one of the great institutions in HB, our wonderful libraries and librarians.

Other Agenda Items I'm opposed to are 15, 29, 30, 31, 34 and 35.

Sincerely,

Jeanne Whitesell
17922 Shoreham Lane
Huntington Beach, CA 92649
714-846-8978
jswhitesell3211@yahoo.com

Switzer, Donna

From: Diane <dianesgotopnions@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 5, 2023 1:01 AM
To: supplementalcomm@surfcity-hb.org; CITY COUNCIL (INCL. CMO STAFF)
Subject: Oppose Item #15B

There is no explanation why the Council would hire the lowest rated advocacy firm when judged by the city's own Intergovernmental Relations Committee (IRC). A rubric was developed for evaluating the proposals that were submitted in response to the RFP and then the IRC recommended hiring the highest ranked firm (Van Scoyoc & Assoc), but the Council is poised to hire the lowest ranked firm instead (Stapleton & Assoc).

There are rumors that this decision is due to Mayor Strickland having a prior relationship with the low ranking firm. If that is true, I sincerely hope that he will recuse himself from the vote in order to remove even the appearance of a conflict of interest.

I urge the council to follow the conclusions of the IRC and issue a 2-year professional agreement with the highest ranking firm, Van Scoyoc & Assoc.

Sincerely,
Diane James

Switzer, Donna

From: Scott Malabarba <scott@malabarba.org>
Sent: Monday, September 4, 2023 11:16 PM
To: supplementalcomm@surfcity-hb.org; CITY COUNCIL (INCL. CMO STAFF)
Subject: regarding multiple agenda items for the Sept 5 council meeting

Dear Huntington Beach City Council members,

Council members Moser, Kalmick, and Bolton, thank you for your ongoing courage and integrity.

For the council as a whole, my comments on a number of agenda items for September 5 follow.

In (wary) support of 23-732, e-bikes

This looks like a genuine effort to address a real problem that falls with the city council's purview. Excellent, please do more of that!

In opposition to 23-731, censure of Natalie Moser

The Proud Boys is an hate group that harbors criminals, terrorists, and traitors to this nation. Its purpose is to do harm to entire segments of the American population, including tens of thousands of citizens of the city you serve. So, yes, if an elected official has any association with this organization or espouses its beliefs, such as that the Holocaust was a hoax, that is relevant. And it is fair to ask if they are the right person to revise a policy that was authored to take a stand against those very beliefs.

This censure not about civility. It is a blatant attempt to silence a council member who asked a question that some don't want answered.

In opposition to 23-734, revising the policy on human dignity.

"Protect children!" Of course -- everyone wants to protect children.

If you were sincere, you would know that queer and trans youth face drastically elevated risk of bullying, harassment, sexual assault, and suicide, and you would use your position to support and protect them.

Most of us are not looking to the city government to tell us how gender roles should work or what they suppose the differences between the sexes to be. Furthermore, given the history of this city council in attacking librarians and educators, I find this wording around sports to be concerning. Will you next target PE teachers?

I am not sure what to make of the paragraph stating that the council will "...vigorously fight criminal activity that risks some one's [sic] freedoms..." Does it mean to imply that the police and city authorities have *not* been pursuing the apprehension of criminals? Or perhaps, in light of the censure of Ms. Moser, it's a threat: *violate our freedom to hurt queer people without consequence and we'll turn the law on you.*

"...lend your voice in support of treating and respecting all people equally." An admirable sentiment, and I look forward to you all joining me with *your* voice in support of treating and respecting queer and trans people equally.

Let's be honest -- this was never a good faith attempt. It was only ever about erasing the original intent of a policy on human dignity that has been in place for decades. You could just leave it alone and move on.

In opposition to 23-700, special election and charter amendment

Prior to and during the June 26 special council meeting, we were told that the city was facing budget shortfalls in the upcoming years and that major cuts across most city departments would be necessary. The city will be paying out 8 million+ dollars in lawsuits. So how can the city afford 1.2 million for this election, plus ongoing and unspecified costs for items like running elections?

The structure of the proposed ballot measures is manipulative. Consistently, I see a prominent voter-baiting item (election takeover, ban Pride flags at City Hall) mixed in with completely unrelated items that look innocuous but add power and reduce accountability for the council majority and city attorney.

Every ballot item is a terrible idea (with the possible exception of the Measure C update, which sounds benign, but at this point who knows?).

Good-faith and well-authored ballot measures would be clearly and simply structured and allow voters to separately choose on unrelated items. This special election will probably happen, so I can only hope that HB votes smarter this time around.

Comment on 23-741, "safeguards" for library materials.

Of course the library staff has asked for more time -- you have presented them with an insuperable problem.

The library contains thousands of books that many reasonable parents would agree are inappropriate for young readers: most of the horror, thriller, suspense, and true crime sections; much of fantasy, science fiction, and literature; some history; and the entire romance section (most of us, of course, just pay attention to our kids and don't expect these books to be locked up). If you were sincere, you would be concerned about all of these and not just *Genderqueer*.

If you were sincere, you would have also noted that commercial bookstores stock the *same* books. There's little point in "protecting" children from these books at the library if they can just read them at Barnes and Noble. So you'll need to go tell store management that they must rearrange their displays to meet your requirements. And then get sued (again).

I hope some of you have realized that this whole effort is a can of worms that will accomplish nothing and cost the city time, money, and people. You could just make a note to better publicize the library's existing policies and move on.

Comment on 23-726, payouts from litigation reserves

These lawsuits predate current leadership. However, I would hope that upon having to pay out millions of dollars in taxpayer money, the city would learn its lesson and *not do it again*. Yet, the city is constantly embroiled in lawsuits over housing; the current council has doubled down on its stubborn refusal to comply with decades-old state law. It's not "fighting for HB" if you keep losing.

In opposition to 23-738, anti-mask and anti-vax nonsense

This is pure theater. Attempting to override any county or state policies will probably just get the city sued (again). What is most amusing about this item is that the people who are cheering for it never really cared, not even when people were dying of Covid in HB every day. They certainly are not waiting for permission from the city council to rip off their masks. This accomplishes nothing and makes HB look stupid.

Comment on 23-693, dissolve various committees and boards

I have no background on this matter. Perhaps it is entirely benign. However, in the context of other activities of the current city council, such as 23-700, I am suspicious about the unexplained dissolution of the Environmental and Sustainability Board, the Smart Cities and Technology Committed, and the Youth Board.

Comment on 23-673, IRC contracts

I would never have noticed this were it not pointed out to me.

"...staff proposes to recommend to the City Council to approve a 2-year professional services agreement for Federal legislative advocacy services with Van Scoyoc & Associations and another 2-year professional services agreement for State legislative advocacy services with Mercury"

But the plan is to "to execute a Professional Services Contract between the City of Huntington Beach and Stapleton & Associates for Federal Legislative Advocacy Services", the lowest-ranked vendor with just over half the overall score of the recommended vendor?

I have no background on this matter. Again, however, in the context of other activities of the current city council, such as 23-700, it looks suspicious and I have to wonder what underlying motives might be at play.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,

Scott Malabarba, HB resident

Switzer, Donna

From: Levin, Shannon
Sent: Monday, September 4, 2023 10:00 PM
To: supplementalcomm@surfcity-hb.org
Subject: Fwd: Oppose Items # 15, 16, 30, 32, 34, and 35 on the September 5, 2023 HB City Council Agenda

Get [Outlook for iOS](#)

From: Pat Goodman <patgoodman@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, September 4, 2023 9:26:33 PM
To: Strickland, Tony <Tony.Strickland@surfcity-hb.org>; CITY COUNCIL (INCL. CMO STAFF) <city.council@surfcity-hb.org>
Cc: Fikes, Cathy <CFikes@surfcity-hb.org>
Subject: Oppose Items # 15, 16, 30, 32, 34, and 35 on the September 5, 2023 HB City Council Agenda

Dear Mayor Strickland and City Council,

I submit my comments in addition to my previous email to **Oppose Agenda Items # 31 C and # 34**, to you with the understanding that not one of you received a majority of eligible votes in the elections in which you were elected to office. With this consideration in mind, I hope that your votes on Tuesday night will reflect the best interest of all of the people who look to you to represent them, and do what is best to have a well-run American beach city in the 21st century.

Oppose # 15- Consider Intergovernmental Relations Committee (IRC) recommendation to approve and authorize execution of Professional Services Contracts with Kahn, Soares, & Conway LLP for State Legislative Advocacy Services and with Stapleton & Associates for Federal Legislative Advocacy Services

Why would the council approve a contract with the least qualified applicant, Stapleton & Associates, per the RFP analysis?

In addition there are 3 contracts identified in items # 26, 27, 28 that are to be rescinded. Why? The RFP process is very costly and time consuming, and in these cases for projects that will benefit residents. Why would the city go back to the beginning of the RFP process. Please explain the need to do this.

Oppose #16, 30, 32, and 35 these items have no place in the operation of a well-run American beach city in the 21st century. These items appear to be political statements addressed to a minority of people and political supporters in city that highlight ideological differences between neighbors and family members and will only serve to anger and agitate the community and stain the reputation of Huntington Beach. Please withdraw these items from the agenda.

Oppose # 16 - Redirect staff to return to City Council on October 17, 2023 with actionable policy options regarding City library materials and safeguards

We are blessed with an excellent library system here in Huntington Beach with excellent staff, enthusiastic volunteers, and wonderful patrons. Our library has a system in place to review questionable items raised by members of the community. There is a library commission, responsive library staff and ways for parents to monitor their child's book selections. Use the tools in place to address any questions or concerns.

Oppose # 30 - Consider the submission of 3 Charter amendment ballot measures for voter approval at the March 5, 2024 Statewide Primary Election, and the adoption of Resolution Nos. 2023-42, 2023-43, 2023-44 and 2023-45

Please reconsider these charter amendments. You've not engaged the community to identify the citizens' concerns around these issues. Take the time needed to include the public in this process in order for a successful outcome.

Amendment # 1

Voter ID – what's wrong with the current system of signature verification?
More In-person voting locations – will there be separate municipal ballots? Will voters be able to mail them to the City Clerk or OC Registrar of Voters?
Monitoring (Ballot?) Drop Boxes – who monitors?

Several questions on the election administration, cost to the city, and coordination with the county. What benefit is derived from pursuing the administration of the municipal elections? What are the costs? What problems and challenges have occurred with the current administration of elections in Huntington Beach? How do these measures protect from voter intimidation?

Clarify voters elect the City Attorney as the city's legal counsel free from interference from city officials

I am most concerned with Amendment #1 office of City Attorney amendments. This is a consolidation of power around the office of City Attorney and a blow to voter protections.

This is a tremendous overreach and consolidation of power including the issues of independence, transparency, accountability by the City Attorney. This office serves the legal interests of the city (the people) and by extension the city council. If there is a conflict of interest by the city attorney's office on a legal matter such as wrongful termination claims from employees and the City Attorney. How can the City Attorney represent and defend the city and her/himself in such a case? The council must solicit legal opinion from an independent attorney outside of the city's employees in order to defend itself. The City Attorney must take direction from the Council and be a resource to the City

Manager, Police and Fire chiefs and other city leadership, and if, for some reason he/she cannot fulfill their role to defend the city.

Amendment # 2

Provide that the only flags that shall be displayed by the City on City property are: the U.S., County of Orange, City of HB flags, and the Pow, Armed Forces flags

Adopt a Two -Year Budget

City Clerk * City Treasurer elections to the gubernatorial cycle

These are mostly unnecessary, except the adoption of a Two Year Budget. Some economy will be realized. – enough said.

Amendment # 3

Require voter approval of any City transaction that forgives, etc. the collection of property (taxes) in excess of \$100,000 per year, except acquisition of property for parks or infrastructure.

Why do we elect representatives? I hope to carry out the business of the city. Why handcuff councilmembers from resources to address inadequate housing opportunities for its residents. The two properties brought in to provide middle income housing and encourage the possibility of living – working – playing in the same city. Why not provide an opportunity for people to live according to their means and aspire to owning a home in the same city? Wouldn't that provide economic advantage to the city in the long term? The # 1 responsibility for the city is to address the housing needs of its residents. You do that through zoning and developer incentives. This action is not forced on any council.

Oppose Item # 31 B, C, D, E, F, and H – this sweeping agenda item to dissolve and consolidate boards and commissions. Huntington Beach takes pride in its citizen participation and volunteerism. Boards and commissions provide support and oversight functions to the city by interested citizens willing to volunteer their time and expertise on particular subjects.

Update exceptions to Sec. 612 (Measure C) to allow certain children's playground equipment, park-related utility structures and public restrooms be built or improved with limitation

Please be careful to not encroach on precious open space.

Update the procedures to cancel a regular City Council meeting

Another example of consolidation of power into the hands of one elected official. Please don't approve this.

Oppose # 35 - Submitted by Mayor Pro Tem Van Der Mark – Resolution Declaring City to be a "No Mask and No Vaccine Mandate" City

The County of Orange has the responsibility, and resources to issue public health safe guards. Viruses don't have any bounds. Please don't meddle in an arena of public health that the city has no expertise or resources to manage.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Pat Goodman

Switzer, Donna

From: MICKIE REINERTSON <hephatha@aol.com>
Sent: Monday, September 4, 2023 9:48 PM
To: supplementalcomm@surfcity-hb.org
Subject: Council agenda for September 5, 2023

I have read the agenda for the upcoming council meeting. I sincerely hope the council considers each item in light of the whole community and realize that many of the items do not represent a large portion of the population. I for one do not think many of the ideas are needed and some are harmful to the future of the city. For instance, eliminating volunteer citizens boards and commissions is the opposite of what is needed to ensure the people have a voice. Particularly the environmental and the youth boards. I have not understood what is gained by eliminating these boards.

It seems that money is being spent in areas that I question the need. Why would Huntington Beach need a lobbyist? Also the payouts for questionable lawsuits. I hope the public is able to hear the reasoning behind each expenditure.

Please have an open mind to people who may not agree with your opinions. Give everyone a chance to voice their opinion and learn from people who have a different perspective. I know I have learned from people who I have disagreed with and found valued information when I gave them a chance to explain their ideas.