

From: [D.G](#)
To: supplementalcomm@surfcity-hb.org; [CITY COUNCIL \(INCL. CMO STAFF\)](#)
Subject: Air Show items on cc 9/2/25 agenda
Date: Friday, August 29, 2025 2:42:40 PM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from paq0424@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Council members:

The State Auditor is in litigation with the City to obtain access to air show settlement documents in part to ascertain the appropriate expenditure of public funds. I don't understand how you can move forward with any further expenditures until the legitimacy of that settlement is obtained. Please move to permit the State Auditor access and delay further payments.

Thank you for your consideration,

Pat Quintana

From: [mari beth vierra](mailto:mari_beth_vierra)
To: supplementalcomm@surfcity-hb.org
Subject: City Council Meeting 9/3/2025
Date: Monday, September 1, 2025 7:58:10 AM

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

Hello. I am a longtime resident of Huntington Beach. As a citizen and registered voter, I wish to express my opposition to the following:

1. I am opposed to the Pacific Airshow on the basis of economic and environmental impact.

2. I am opposed to the use of aerial flashbangs and "blast balls" for critical incident response as this only aggravates difficult situations and encourages violence.

3. I oppose any efforts by the City of Huntington Beach to interfere with the Special Election for Redistricting.

Thank you.

[Mari Beth Vierra](#)
[CA Realtor](#)
[Appraiser](#)
[714/747-9690](#)

From: [Elizabeth SanFilippo](#)
To: [CITY COUNCIL \(INCL. CMO STAFF\)](#); supplementalcomm@surfcity-hb.org
Subject: Airshow Concern -- Environment and Taxpayer Money
Date: Monday, September 1, 2025 2:45:22 PM

I am a Huntington Beach resident for over 40 years and a homeowner. I am concerned about the City's financial support for the Airshow. This is a for profit business and it should not be subsidized by city funds; this is a misuse of taxpayer money. Further, I am concerned about the environmental impact of the Airshow. The Airshow must be compliant with all state laws and regulations regarding the environment as well as air safety.

Thank you for your consideration.

Elizabeth San Filippo

From: [Paula Schaefer](#)
To: [CITY COUNCIL \(INCL. CMO STAFF\)](#); city.manager@surfcity-hb.org; supplementalcomm@surfcity-hb.org; mike.vigliotta@surfcity-hb.org
Subject: VOTE NO on all Pacific Airshow actions 9/2/2025 Agenda Item 25-623
Date: Friday, August 29, 2025 4:46:23 PM

Council Members, City Manager, and City Attorney

VOTE NO on the Pacific Airshow

I encourage you to come to your senses and vote NO to any additional airshows promoted by Kevin Elliott, Pacific Airshow LLC (PA), or Code Four.

Mr. Elliott and PA have failed for a number of years to obtain the necessary permit from the CA Coastal Commission, as we all learned via the recently held CCC meeting. His company has agreed to pay approximately \$247,000 as a penalty for prior failures and the most recent request - due late 2024, was submitted late again. This is obviously an organization that does not carefully follow the law and yet has been allowed to pursue additional airshows in Huntington Beach, and if the Event Agreement is approved, PA will be allowed to continue for years.

As evidenced by the Airshow Event Agreement, the City is agreeing to give over an extraordinary amount of money to PA. WHY?

A brief summary of the "giveaways" are:

- 1) exclusive use and monetization rights for City parking,
- 2) waiving City fees and costs for all public safety fees such as marine safety, police, fire, etc., application fees, permit fees, beach maintenance fees, setup & take-down fees, banner placement fees, public works, electrician/electrical, and restroom maintenance/cleaning fees, road and street closure fees, pollution prevention fees;
- 3) assisting PA by mitigating third-party costs by providing City resources for public safety, public works, and operational needs when possible;
- 4) paying for the EIR, which is normally an expense of the event promoter; and
- 5) authorizing an additional \$250,000 for environmental mitigation monitoring, again normally an promoter's expense.

It is of questionable legal validity that the City is agreeing to indemnify PA for CEQA challenges caused or undertaken by the City and to add insult to injury, the Agreement allows PA to sell the rights to the event and stick future City Councils with this one-sided agreement.

I did notice that you've taken care of yourselves though with Paragraph #27.

What is the City receiving?

PA continues to tout that the "region" receives between \$70 and \$120 million dollars in economic benefit from a 3 day event.

Tell your friends at PA to prove these numbers. I beg you to provide even a modicum of data to support these numbers.

Paula A. Schaefer