

Moore, Tania

From: Fikes, Cathy
Sent: Sunday, February 5, 2023 1:22 PM
To: Agenda Alerts
Subject: FW: Feb 7 Agenda Item #31 23-118-Support

From: Steve Barnes <stevebarneshb@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, February 3, 2023 4:59 PM
To: CITY COUNCIL <city.council@surfcity-hb.org>
Subject: Feb 7 Agenda Item #31 23-118-Support

I support the City challenge of SB9 & SB10 in order to protect my home value, preserve the aesthetics of my neighborhood and my tranquil lifestyle.

Best Regards,

Steve Barnes

**SUPPLEMENTAL
COMMUNICATION**

Meeting Date: 2/7/2023

Agenda Item No.: #31 (23-118)

Moore, Tania

From: Fikes, Cathy
Sent: Sunday, February 5, 2023 7:07 PM
To: Agenda Alerts
Subject: FW: Feb 7 Meeting Agenda Items

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

From: James Taylor <jtaylor2@socal.rr.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 4, 2023 4:11 PM
To: CITY COUNCIL <city.council@surfcity-hb.org>
Subject: Feb 7 Meeting Agenda Items

Dear City Council Members:

As a 45-year resident of HB, I have comments on several of the agenda items on the February 7 agenda:

Item 11 — I don't support the idea of allowing more money in politics, particularly from out of the City. This increase will allow special interests to have even more influence on our City affairs. A broader contribution base of relatively small donors would be much more representative of our community. Please do not approve this increase.

Item 12 — Requiring in-person complaints will discourage people who have the most visibility into code violations from pointing them out. For example, restaurant workers who observe dangerous health code violations may be hesitant to report them for fear of losing their jobs. Also, neighbors who observe violation of building codes may not report them for fear of retribution. This proposal sounds like a very bad idea.

Item 30 — I support this one. We should not be flying special interest flags, which we may not all agree with, on city flag poles. POW/MIA flags should be OK and non-controversial, but all others should not be allowed.

Item 31 — Although I do not support the State housing regulations being challenged, spending more City money to challenge them seems like a waste of taxpayer money and staff time. The current City Attorney has not had a record of success with these challenges, and there is no reason to believe the same City Attorney will do any better in the future. We should accept the fact that these regulations exist, and try to find a way to comply with them in an absolutely minimal way. Money could be more productively spent by exploring how we could best comply with the letter (if not the spirit) of the rules.

Item 32 — Given that the COVID threat is much reduced (especially for people who get the available boosters), I see no reason to reverse the Mayor's decree.

James J Taylor
16851 Phelps Lane
Huntington Beach

SUPPLEMENTAL COMMUNICATION

Meeting Date: 2/7/2023

Agenda Item No.: #31 (23-118)

Moore, Tania

From: Fikes, Cathy
Sent: Sunday, February 5, 2023 7:45 PM
To: Agenda Alerts
Subject: FW: Vote NO on Councilmember item #31 at the 2-7-23 council meeting.

From: Dan Jamieson <danjamieson4@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, February 5, 2023 12:58 PM
To: CITY COUNCIL <city.council@surfcity-hb.org>
Subject: Vote NO on Councilmember item #31 at the 2-7-23 council meeting.

Dear HB city council:

Please vote NO on Councilmember item #31 at the 2-7-23 council meeting.

The item requests city staff to wade into an analysis of SB 9 and SB 10.

This action is unnecessary. As the item proposal notes, the city has not adopted rules to implement SB 10, which would basically streamline zoning for small apartment projects.

SB 9 allows owners of single-family homes to redevelop their sites into duplexes and, in some cases, quadplexes. While in theory SB 9 could increase densities in single-family neighborhoods, in practice this is unlikely to happen on a large scale in that homeowners who want to engage in "lot splits" will be required to live in one of the redone units for three years. Few existing homeowners will want to move out during a major rebuild process and then move back into the redeveloped parcel for at least three years.

As a result, a review of SB 9 and SB 10 is not needed, nor will a legal challenge to these laws succeed.

Please vote NO on Councilmember item #31.

Sincerely,

Dan Jamieson

Huntington Beach

**SUPPLEMENTAL
COMMUNICATION**

Meeting Date: 2/7/2023

Agenda Item No.: #31 (23-118)

Moore, Tania

From: Fikes, Cathy
Sent: Monday, February 6, 2023 8:51 AM
To: Agenda Alerts
Subject: FW: February 7 meeting

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

From: Pam Taylor <catspjs@socal.rr.com>
Sent: Monday, February 6, 2023 7:12 AM
To: CITY COUNCIL <city.council@surfcity-hb.org>
Subject: February 7 meeting

Dear City Council Members,

Concerning Agenda Item 11

I think it is a bad idea to increase the allowed amount of campaign contributions. This invites influence from a small number of people who then expect votes for their special interests. Please vote no.

Concerning Item 12

Anonymous complaints protect employees from retribution from employers. Please vote no.

Concerning Item 31

A previous attempt to sue the state ended in a loss and spent a substantial amount of city money. Clearly a waste of taxpayer dollars. Please don't do it again.

Pamela Taylor
16851 Phelps Lane
Huntington Beach

Resident and Homeowner since 1976

**SUPPLEMENTAL
COMMUNICATION**

Meeting Date: 2/7/2023

Agenda Item No.: #31 (23-118)

Moore, Tania

From: Fikes, Cathy
Sent: Tuesday, February 7, 2023 8:54 AM
To: Agenda Alerts
Subject: FW: City Council Agenda Items February 7, 2023

From: Linda Moon <lsapiro048@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 6, 2023 8:42 PM
To: CITY COUNCIL <city.council@surfcity-hb.org>
Subject: City Council Agenda Items February 7, 2023

**SUPPLEMENTAL
COMMUNICATION**

Meeting Date: 2/7/2023

Agenda Item No.: #31 (23-118)



Dear Mayor Strickland and City Council Members:

I have been a resident and homeowner in Huntington Beach for 48 years and maintained a law office in Huntington Beach for 40 years until my retirement. I have followed the work of the City Council for many years. I have serious concerns about several items on the February 7, 2023 agenda. I urge your careful consideration and measured approach in moving forward with these proposals. Of greatest concern to me are the following:

Item 11, An ordinance raising political campaign contribution limits beyond the inflation standards previously established will result in an unfortunate scenario in which only candidates with wealthy and corporate supporters can possibly be elected. This is a recipe for council corruption and the elimination of diversity on the city's governing body. I urge you to vote NO on enactment of this ordinance.

Item 12, An ordinance prohibiting anonymous reports against businesses and requiring identification and public disclosure of reporters, will be intimidating to the public and have a chilling effect on legitimate reports regarding potentially dangerous Code violations. The public should not be made to fear retaliation or retribution for reporting dangerous conditions or be required to submit to public disclosure of their identity and address. The City Code Enforcement employees can quickly determine whether reports are valid or frivolous. The ordinance language makes an upfront assumption that all reports are wrongful. The opposite should be true. Code enforcement practices should best serve the residents, employees and customers, not make them targets and endanger the safety of reporters and their families. A member of the public providing information for investigation by a city agency is not the official "accuser" as the term is used in criminal prosecution. The City itself would be the complainant in a Code Enforcement action and would be charged with making its own investigation. The reporting person is not even an official witness, only a reporter. Only if the City itself finds a violation of a Code would any action be taken against a business. The ordinance as written will only have the effect of discouraging legitimate reports. I urge you to vote NO on enactment of this ordinance.

Item 30, A proposal by Councilmember Burns to allow only government and POW/MIA flags to be flown at City buildings is obviously targeted at the Pride flag allowed for a few weeks of the year. The council action allowing the flying of the Pride flag was a small act, intended to show compassion and demonstrate that Huntington Beach is a welcoming safe place for all. The flag was perceived by most residents as a minor unthreatening symbol of acceptance. An ordinance disallowing the Pride flag, however, would have far more

significance than the action authorizing the flag, as it sends a clear message of rejection and discrimination. Whatever your feelings about the Pride movement, this ordinance will result in the City being publicly branded as discriminatory and unwelcoming. I urge you to reject this proposed ordinance.

Item 31, Authorizing the City attorney to take all actions necessary to challenge the requirements of AB9 and SB 10, will most certainly result in unnecessary significant cost to the city. Huntington Beach does not exist in a vacuum. Like it or not, we are part of the State of California and subject to its housing laws. Most of the council members have had little education, to date, regarding how and why housing mandates exist. We have already paid millions of dollars to fines that could have gone to good use in our city for defying housing statutes. Continued defiance will not be productive or in the best interests of the residents of Huntington Beach. The argument that more housing in Huntington Beach is incorrect and uninformed. We have had an increase in our city's population and there is almost no housing availability for workers needed in the city, or anyone earning less than \$100,000 per year. The existing population has also created the need for housing for households it created. The children who grew up in your homes become adults needing their own homes, adding to the number of household dwellings required. You want your children and grandchildren to remain here in Huntington Beach so they will need housing. Allowing for Duplexes, Accessory Dwelling Units and subdivision of residential lots is the least impactful way to increase available housing without drastically changing the character of our neighborhoods. If you do not want to allow high density residential construction, you need to at least accept the minor impacts of the new state legislation. I urge your rejection of this item.

Item 32, Restoring remote public participation in City Council meetings is essential to allow the public the opportunity to address the council, other than in person or in writing. Many residents, including me, are unable to address the council in person, for numerous reasons. In my case, I care for my 99 year old mother and cannot expose myself to any viruses that may be present in the council chamber. Other residents have transportation, employment, disability and child/elder care responsibilities that make in person appearances impossible. You have all championed expansion of the public's right to speak at council meetings. I urge you to support restoration of remote participation.

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

Sincerely,
Linda Sapiro Moon

Moore, Tania

From: Cari Swan <cswanie@aol.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 7, 2023 11:33 AM
To: CITY COUNCIL; supplementalcomm@surfcity-hb.org
Subject: Support Agenda Items #30, #31, #33 and #34

Dear Mayor Stickland and Council Members,

I am writing in support of four agenda items for tonight's council meeting: Items 30, 31, 33 and 34.

In particular, I wish to share my thoughts on my support for Agenda Item 30.

I spoke against Councilman Kalmick's agenda item on May 3, 2021 in which he proposed create a Flag Policy thus opening the door to deep divisiveness and controversy. I would like to thank Councilman Kalmick for proving me right, once again. As I browse the comments sent as Supplemental Communications, it is quite clear that Mr. Kalmick created a completely unnecessary and divisive issue when he authored this action in 2021. When I spoke against this issue in 2021, I reminded city council that their role as leaders should focus on the ENTIRE community and that every single person in our great city is already solidly represented by the American flag, State and County flags. Since that time, I notice that many other cities have debated the issue and a significant majority of cities in Orange County have concluded the same thing: special interest flags other than the American flag, State and County are considered divisive.

I also observed that many of the Supplemental Communications are coming from outside the City of Huntington Beach, no doubt a result of the many social media campaigns promoted by activists throughout Southern California.

I urge a vote in favor of Agenda Item 30, along with 31, 33 and 34

Respectfully,
Cari Swan
Huntington Beach resident

**SUPPLEMENTAL
COMMUNICATION**

Meeting Date: 2/7/2023

Agenda Item No.: #31 (23-118)

Moore, Tania

From: Russell Neal <russneal@ieee.org>
Sent: Tuesday, February 7, 2023 11:48 AM
To: Cari Swan
Cc: CITY COUNCIL; supplementalcomm@surfcity-hb.org
Subject: Re: Support Agenda Items #30, #31, #33 and #34

Well said!

On Tue, Feb 7, 2023 at 11:33 AM Cari Swan <cswanie@aol.com> wrote:

Dear Mayor Stickland and Council Members,

I am writing in support of four agenda items for tonight's council meeting: Items 30, 31, 33 and 34.

In particular, I wish to share my thoughts on my support for Agenda Item 30.

I spoke against Councilman Kalmick's agenda item on May 3, 2021 in which he proposed create a Flag Policy thus opening the door to deep divisiveness and controversy. I would like to thank Councilman Kalmick for proving me right, once again. As I browse the comments sent as Supplemental Communications, it is quite clear that Mr. Kalmick created a completely unnecessary and divisive issue when he authored this action in 2021. When I spoke against this issue in 2021, I reminded city council that their role as leaders should focus on the ENTIRE community and that every single person in our great city is already solidly represented by the American flag, State and County flags. Since that time, I notice that many other cities have debated the issue and a significant majority of cities in Orange County have concluded the same thing: special interest flags other than the American flag, State and County are considered divisive.

I also observed that many of the Supplemental Communications are coming from outside the City of Huntington Beach, no doubt a result of the many social media campaigns promoted by activists throughout Southern California.

I urge a vote in favor of Agenda Item 30, along with 31, 33 and 34

Respectfully,

Cari Swan

Huntington Beach resident

**SUPPLEMENTAL
COMMUNICATION**

Meeting Date: 2/7/2023

Agenda Item No.: #31(23-118)