

Moore, Tania

From: Dan Jamieson <danjamieson4@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, December 19, 2022 2:57 PM
To: CITY COUNCIL
Subject: NO vote on Councilmember Item #28, 12-20-22 Council meeting

Dear HB City Councilmembers:

I urge a NO vote on Councilmember Item #28 of the 12-20-22 Council meeting.

The item proposes that the city should consider a CEQA review of the Pacific Air Show. Such a review would apparently be paid for by city taxpayers.

It is unclear if the air show needs a CEQA review, and if so, why the city should be involved in it and why taxpayers should pay for it.

This proposal follows years of city subsidies for the air show.

While residents of the city and elsewhere generally support and enjoy the air show, it is a private venture and should stand on its own.

Sincerely,

Dan Jamieson

Huntington Beach

**SUPPLEMENTAL
COMMUNICATION**

Meeting Date: 12/20/2022

Agenda Item No.: #28(22-1105)

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

**SUPPLEMENTAL
COMMUNICATION**

Meeting Date: 12/20/2022

Agenda Item No.: #28(22-1105)

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.

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