

Mr. Amory Hanson
8102 Ellis Avenue
Apartment 121
Huntington Beach CA 92646

September 5, 2023

The Mayor of Huntington Beach
2000 Main Street
Huntington Beach CA 92648

My Dear Mister Mayor,

I am writing to express my support for Item XXXIIIz

Sincerely Yours,

Mr. Amory Hanson

CC: The Honorable Grace Vandermark
CC: The Honorable Rhonda Bolton
CC: The Honorable Patrick Burns
CC: The Honorable Daniel Kalmick
CC: The Honorable Casey McKeon
CC: The Honorable Natalie Moser

**SUPPLEMENTAL
COMMUNICATION**

Meeting Date: 9/5/23

Agenda Item No.: 33(23-732)

Moore, Tania

From: Chris Varga <christopher.j.varga@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, September 4, 2023 10:11 AM
To: CITY COUNCIL (INCL. CMO STAFF); supplementalcomm@surfcity-hb.org
Subject: City Council Meeting 9-5-2023

Huntington Beach City Council,

The following is in regards to City Council Meeting scheduled for 9/5/23. I will predict that all of the controversial Agenda Items this week will pass 4-3 with the usual suspects on their side of the fence. The council will again sit through hours of Public Comment as well as many email comments that one would hope might sway at least one council member to vote outside the box. But not this council. The four block majority members of the council continue with their fascist anti-woke agenda even when it doesn't reflect the City of Huntington Beach. I hope they keep you up to 3 AM with public comments this week! Enough with this MAGA agenda playbook.

Anyway, here are my positions on some of the agenda items:

Agenda Item 30 (23-700). NO to any charter changes. The four of you campaigned on NO changes to the charter. Stop the insanity. Stop the Gates family nepotism!

Agenda Item 31 (23-693) NO to all these changes. There are a lot of good coming out of these committees with a lot of free volunteer labor! NO changes!

Agenda item 32 (23-734). NO on the changes to the dignity policy. It was just fine the previous version. No changes needed. Stop making work!

Agenda Item 33 (23-732) Agree with this agenda item. The E-Bikes are out of control! This is a start. But we also have a big problem with persons WITH driving licenses. The beach path is a highway with e-bikes going as fast as they can way too often. We also need fines and enforcement! There is signage at numerous places on the beach path that states "Prohibited: Motor Bicycles / Vehicle without permitted". I was taught in engineering school; electric motors are motors! Either changes the signs, law or enforcement. Right now, everything goes!

Agenda Item 34 (23-731) NO on this agenda item. Natalie Moser was right to question somethings that many in our city have questioned about Council person Van Der Mark.

Agenda Item 35 (27-738). Just stop with this anti safety ban. Mask work! NO on this agenda item. This is just another check mark in the anti-woke Republican agenda item. Wedge issue BS.

Sincerely,

Chris Varga

Huntington Beach

Moore, Tania

From: Steven C Shepherd Architect <steve@shepherdarchitects.com>
Sent: Monday, September 4, 2023 1:20 PM
To: supplementalcomm@surfcity-hb.org; CITY COUNCIL (INCL. CMO STAFF)
Subject: AGENDA ITEM #33 E-BIKE SAFETY: EDUCATION & LICENSING IS NOT ENOUGH

I have been using an e-bike as my primary method of local transit since 2017, and over my six years of e-bike ownership, the proliferation of e-bikes throughout our community and our coastal Orange County region has been very noticeable.

E-bikes offer a low-cost, low environmental impact, and fun way to solve many of Huntington Beach's most pressing issues. By encouraging, empowering, and enabling HB residents to ride e-bikes, we help reduce congestion and pollution while increasing residents' health, community engagement, and general quality of life. I run across many e-bike riders when navigating the arterial roadways of our community, and I am always struck by the wide range of ages and riding backgrounds.

E-bike safety has been a concern in our community for a couple of years now. Our school districts started implementing rider safety requirements, and I applaud any/all efforts by the City of Huntington Beach to collaborate and support these efforts. Many of our youngest riders are particularly vulnerable due to the limited experience on our streets and roadways. The programs initiated by our schools and in collaboration with the HBPD are definitely a step in the right direction for improving public safety.

If you plan to implement a registration or licensing program, I strongly encourage these programs to be online-based and easily navigatable. I would also encourage waiving any proposed fee(s) for the first six months to incentivize compliance.

However, education and licensing alone cannot ensure all roadway users' safety.

The arterial roadways throughout Huntington Beach have been dangerous for decades. The primary danger to pedestrians, cyclists, and other drivers is the reckless and excessive vehicle speed of private vehicles. Our arterial grid features roadways that are wide, long, and straight. This physical environment invites excessive speeds, street racing, and other reckless displays such as donuts, burnouts, and drifting at select intersections. The evidence of these activities is easily observed in our intersections and at the block walls that line these thoroughfares. Even everyday drivers can unknowingly find themselves cruising along these arterial stretches at 50 to 60mph. If you are serious about improving public safety along our roadways, please consider investing in traffic calming devices and more protected bicycle infrastructure. Such an investment would encourage more walking and bicycling and protect drivers of private vehicles from themselves.

By the way, not all two-wheeled electric vehicles are "e-bikes." A two-wheeled electrical vehicle that cannot be propelled via physical pedaling is an electric motorcycle, not an e-bike.

Steve Shepherd
Huntington Beach 92646

Moore, Tania

From: Jeanne Paris <jeannemarieparis@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, September 4, 2023 2:11 PM
To: supplementalcomm@surfcity-hb.org
Subject: Yes on Agenda Items 32, 33, 34 and 35

To the City Council,

I strongly support Agenda item's 32, 33, 34 and 35.

I especially support Agenda item #35 regarding declaring the city to be a no mask and no vaccine Mandate City. The over the top, authoritarian reaction from government officials during covid was appalling and completely unnecessary. The damage done to small businesses, public school children as well as our totally economy will take years to recover.

This was a power grab the likes we have never seen.

If you want to wear a mask and get a vaccine, please feel free. But this should never have been tolerated as a mandate across the state.

Thank you.

Jeanne Paris
Huntington Beach Resident

Moore, Tania

From: StarsStripes <starsstripes@me.com>
Sent: Monday, September 4, 2023 2:44 PM
To: supplementalcomm@surfcity-hb.org
Subject: City Council Meeting 9-5-23 Re: Item # 33

I do support Item 33 for the following reasons:

- Requires **non drivers licensed holders** to get a city ebike license.
- Mandates Rental business require a safety Video for customers to view prior to renting them an EBike
- Requires **non drivers Licensed holders** to take a rules of the road safety class

Most of the issues I see on the road are from younger riders and their lack of awareness no knowledge of Rules of the road. I have not seen this behavior from older adult riders. They are aware of their surroundings and do ride defensively. The older riders also drive a lot slower.

The only thing I would not support is a Helmet law. I personally do not ride more than 5 mph and simply do not want to wear a Helmet for that speed.

Sincerely,

Robert Cloyd

City of Huntington Beach Resident

Moore, Tania

From: Linda Moon <lsapiro048@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, September 4, 2023 2:58 PM
To: supplementalcomm@surfcity-hb.org; CITY COUNCIL (INCL. CMO STAFF)
Subject: September 5, 2023 City Council Agenda

I write in opposition to Agenda Items 16, 30 (A-E), 31(A-K), 32, 33, and 34.

16. The City Council has absolutely no business addressing or determining standards for selection of materials in the public library. The Library is managed and operated by well-educated professional librarians, who have done an outstanding job in selecting materials. There was no public call for council interference until Councilmember Vandermark created a false issue, using a list of materials provided by the radical conservative group Moms for Liberty. Statements that “young children have access to obscene materials” have been proven false. The questioned sexually explicit materials were in the Adult section of the library. Items in the Children’s Library relating to homosexuality are age appropriate and subject to parental selection. No “young children” arrive at and select materials without an adult present and parents are notified by email regarding all materials checked out by their children. I’ve yet to see a toddler arrive at the library alone, and few have the ability to read any written text or understand the context of the items of concern.

30. The proposed charter amendments may not legally be put before the voters on a primary election ballot. Election Code 9255 specifically requires that any charter amendments proposed by the governing body be considered on the General Election ballot. There is no exception that would apply to the proposed action.

The proposed Amendments have been steamrolled through without the opportunity for full public scrutiny. The mostly self-serving amendments have been commingled in a confusing and insufficiently descriptive manner. While charter revision commissions are not mandated by the charter or state statute, they are provided for therein and have been the traditional manner of amending the charter in Huntington Beach. Review by the charter commission, empaneled pursuant to state law, allows input by the public and experts over an extended period of time. Submission on the General Election Ballot allows for their consideration by the largest voting population. The proponent councilmembers are obviously relying on a low-turnout Primary Election to ramrod through amendments that only facilitate their further concentration of control.

After making drastic budget cuts for city services due to reduced revenue and increased costs of litigation and judgments against the city, the expenditure of \$1,200,000 is unconscionable.

31. The dissolution of boards and commissions which have provided important and significant input and expertise to the City over many decades is shameful and indicates an unjustified

arrogance of the proponent councilmembers in assuming that they know everything there is to know about everything and need no public input. The new council members all promised to listen to the public and invite their participation in decisions relating to the future of the city. This item flies in the face of those promises.

32. The proposed amendment of the City's well-crafted compassionate Policy on Human Dignity is an apparent attempt to diminish the importance of protecting traditionally targeted people of identified classifications. It further denies the existence of those who do not fit into a binary gender classification. An improper religious reference is also relied upon to justify its provisions. The city has no legal control over the limitation of gender participation in activities and the human dignity statement is without any legal significance to the enforcement of civil rights. However, it does identify the city as one that is either welcoming and protective to all or one in which the residents and their leaders are intolerant and discriminatory. I hope we will not be seen as the latter.

33. This item creates another costly bureaucracy that would improperly distinguish rules for the operation of e-bikes from those of surrounding cities in a manner that could not be easily enforced. If the City is concerned about e-bikes, the issues of concern and appropriate amendments to the California Vehicle Code should be discussed with our State Representatives.

34. This proposal to censure Councilmember Moser is outrageous. It highlights the vindictiveness and personal animosity of the proponent councilmembers. Those councilmembers have declined to support any standards of decorum for council meetings and have repeatedly condoned assaultive language being used in reference to Councilmembers Kalmick, Moser and Bolton by members of the public and themselves. The attempt to censure Councilmember Moser for asking that Councilmember Vandermark acknowledge the existence of the Holocaust before taking a position on the Human Relations Commission is absurd. It was Councilmember Vandermark who responded with a screaming nonresponsive diatribe. This item will likely be heard in the early hours of the morning when there will be little audience for this totally unwarranted action. A mature and reasonable action would be to request that staff draft a rational policy of council decorum.

Linda Sapiro Moon

lsapiro048@gmail.com

Moore, Tania

From: J C <qhlady@me.com>
Sent: Monday, September 4, 2023 3:07 PM
To: supplementalcomm@surfcity-hb.org
Subject: Agenda Item 33, 9-5-23

I support Agenda Item 33

With one reservation; please do not make helmets a requirement to ride an E-bike.

If you must, helmet regulation only for 17 yrs and under.

Jean Cloyd

Resident of Huntington Beach

Moore, Tania

From: Levin, Shannon
Sent: Monday, September 4, 2023 4:38 PM
To: supplementalcomm@surfcity-hb.org
Subject: Fwd: City Council Meeting 9-5-23 re: Item 33

Get [Outlook for iOS](#)

From: StarsStripes <starsstripes@me.com>
Sent: Monday, September 4, 2023 2:35:36 PM
To: CITY COUNCIL (INCL. CMO STAFF) <city.council@surfcity-hb.org>
Subject: City Council Meeting 9-5-23 re: Item 33

I do support Item 33 for the following reasons:

- Requires **non drivers licensed holders** to get a city ebike license.
- Mandates Rental business require a safety Video for customers to view prior to renting them an EBike
- Requires **non drivers Licensed holders** to take a rules of the road safety class

Most of the issues I see on the road are from younger riders and their lack of awareness no knowledge of Rules of the road. I have not seen this behavior from older adult riders. They are aware of their surroundings and do ride defensively. The older riders also drive a lot slower.

The only thing I would not support is a Helmet law. I personally do not ride more than 5 mph and simply do not want to wear a Helmet for that speed.

Sincerely,

Robert Cloyd

City of Huntington Beach Resident

Moore, Tania

From: Levin, Shannon
Sent: Monday, September 4, 2023 4:41 PM
To: supplementalcomm@surfcity-hb.org
Subject: Fwd: Agenda Item 33, 9-5-23

Get [Outlook for iOS](#)

From: J C <qhlady@me.com>
Sent: Monday, September 4, 2023 3:05:26 PM
To: CITY COUNCIL (INCL. CMO STAFF) <city.council@surfcity-hb.org>
Subject: Agenda Item 33, 9-5-23

I support Agenda Item 33

With one reservation; please do not make helmets a requirement to ride an E-bike.

If you must, helmet regulation only for 17 yrs and under.

Jean Cloyd

Resident of Huntington Beach

Moore, Tania

From: Levin, Shannon
Sent: Monday, September 4, 2023 4:43 PM
To: supplementalcomm@surfcity-hb.org
Subject: Fwd: Ebikes

Get [Outlook for iOS](#)

From: Andriisa Dominguez <andrissahb@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, September 4, 2023 3:26:57 PM
To: CITY COUNCIL (INCL. CMO STAFF) <city.council@surfcity-hb.org>
Subject: Ebikes

Thank you for taking the ebike problem seriously

Andriisa Dominguez

714 369 3107

Moore, Tania

From: Paula Shawa <PShawa@outlook.com>
Sent: Monday, September 4, 2023 8:18 PM
To: supplementalcomm@surfcity-hb.org
Subject: Agenda Item 33 / E bikes / City Council Meeting Sept. 5

I strongly support looking into what can be done to better manage E-bike traffic in Huntington Beach but find it amusing that Council Members McKeon and Burns have the audacity to whine about the state not regulating them. If the state were to do so, you can be sure these guys would be complaining to high heaven about interference in local governance.

Paula Shawa, 16822 Edgewater Lane, HB

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 & Associates 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