

Moore, Tania

From: Fikes, Cathy
Sent: Monday, December 19, 2022 9:37 AM
To: Agenda Alerts
Subject: FW: NO on Item #33, 12-20-22 Council meeting.

From: Dan Jamieson <danjamieson4@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, December 17, 2022 2:58 PM
To: CITY COUNCIL <city.council@surfcity-hb.org>
Subject: NO on Item #33, 12-20-22 Council meeting.

Dear HB City Councilmember:

Please vote NO on Councilmember Item #33, during the 12-20-22 Council meeting.

Concerns about the RHNA housing allocation echo strongly among HB residents, regardless of political leanings. The new Council majority's attention to this issue is welcome.

However, engaging in protracted litigation with the state is a losing proposition and ultimately, in my view, will limit the City's ability to influence policy coming out of Sacramento and limit the ability of the City and the SCAG to push reform of the RHNA process.

The Councilmember Item notes that local control has eroded in recent years with unfavorable court rulings and additional state legislation. Some of this legislation is specifically designed to include charter cities in state mandates. Much as our City might like to retain full control of housing policy, it is Sacramento that writes the laws. No one city attorney can overcome that disadvantage.

Rather than engage in a scorched-earth litigation strategy over RHNA, the City would be better served in making a good-faith effort to get its Housing Element in compliance, and working with other cities and jurisdictions, and state authorities, in addressing any shortcomings in the RHNA process (of which, I agree, there are several).

Failure to obtain Housing Element compliance could result in lost state funding and possibly open the door to a "builders remedy" that could be far worse than the current plan to meet the Housing Element.

I would respectfully suggest the Council majority hold off on a "sue-the state strategy," and if unable to move the current housing plan, consider further tweaks to that plan, including allowing some residential development on land zoned for industrial, and continue to work toward full compliance.

Sincerely,

Dan Jamieson

Huntington Beach

**SUPPLEMENTAL
COMMUNICATION**

Meeting Date: 12/20/2022

Agenda Item No.: #33(22-1090)

Moore, Tania

From: Russell Heine <abele56156@mypacks.net>
Sent: Saturday, December 17, 2022 9:49 PM
To: CITY COUNCIL
Subject: Congratulations on election AND your Contract With Huntington Beach Voters

To the Huntington Beach City Council,

Congratulations on your recent election.

My name is Russ Heine and I am a resident of Yorba Linda, but an alumni of Huntington Beach in the 70's.

We took note of your "contract with Huntington Beach Voters", which includes the greenlight for the Huntington Beach city attorney to aggressively push back on state housing mandates.

Congratulations, and we are hoping your actions will be an inspiration for the Yorba Linda city council to take similar actions.

Your city attorney likely has this information, but I have attached information about three groups in the state that are aggressively pushing back on arbitrary state mandates.

Keep up the good work representing your citizens!

Respectively ,

Russ Heine

////////////////////////////////////

To The Yorba Linda City Council

My Name is: _____

Lived in Yorba Linda for _____ Years

Yorba Linda received an arbitrary number of mandated dwelling units that was unsupported by factual analysis of true housing needs.

There are a number of organizations throughout California that are currently taking action to oppose these arbitrary actions.

We believe that Yorba Linda should:

- Look at ways to mitigate the large number of High Density clusters in the city

AND

- Assess ways to participate in organized activities that are ongoing throughout the state to rollback these arbitrary mandates

Three groups , in particular, have merit and are gaining momentum.

All host regular zoom meetings to share information about what other locales are doing and plan next steps.

**SUPPLEMENTAL
COMMUNICATION**

1. Community Catalysts for Local Control

<https://catalystsca.org/partners/>

Meeting Date: 12/20/2022

Agenda Item No.: #33(22-1096)

A statewide grassroots network of volunteers and elected officials promoting solutions to affordable housing that is properly supported by infrastructure and the wishes of the neighbors and communities in which the housing is built.

Partnering with cities such as Palos Verdes, Lakewood and Paramount that are taking legal remedy to oppose the housing mandates as unconstitutional.

Organizing a multi-city effort to take legal remedy to challenge the HCD housing # development methodology and force use of correctly calculated housing needs #s.

Support needed:

- 10 cities willing to participate in the HCD law suit and /or supporting the legal action
- Registered members supporting the movement
- Donations

2. Livable California

<https://www.livablecalifornia.org/mission/>

A statewide non-partisan, nonprofit that advocates for empowerment of local governments to foster equitable, livable communities and truly affordable housing.

Bringing a strong consistent voice to Sacramento, via lobbyists, to advocate for the views of our members and allies

Working to assure self-determination of local government

Support needed:

- Cities willing to join in efforts to influence state housing laws
- Registered members supporting the movement
- Donations

3. Our Neighborhood Voices

<https://ourneighborhoodvoices.com>

California neighborhood leaders organizing a 2024 ballot campaign to bring back our ability to speak out about what happens in our own neighborhoods. Working to overturn SB 9 & 10 and return to local control via a statewide voter initiative on the ballot in 2024.

Support needed:

- Cities willing to support efforts to overturn arbitrary state housing laws
- Registered members supporting the movement and assist in efforts to gather signatures in 2023 to place this initiative on the state ballot
- Donations

More extreme housing mandates are already being planned in Sacramento. If cities and citizens don't take action NOW our state will be forever changed.

Signed _____

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

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

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

Sincerely,
Linda Sapiro Moon

**SUPPLEMENTAL
COMMUNICATION**

Meeting Date: 12/20/2022

Agenda Item No.: # 33(22-1096)

Moore, Tania

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

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 understand that the new City Council majority is anxious to make changes and put its mark on the city's future. I fear, however, that several of the Councilmember Items on the December 20, 2022 agenda were hastily thought out and could have negative impacts on the city. I urge your careful consideration and measured approach in moving forward with these proposals. Of greatest concern to me are the following:

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

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

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

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

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

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