

Harper, Gloria

From: Estanislau, Robin
Sent: Thursday, June 14, 2018 6:09 AM
To: pacj
Cc: Harper, Gloria; Esparza, Patty
Subject: Re: City council agenda item re Advocacy and IRC supplemental communication for June 18 2018

Received.

Sent from my iPad

On Jun 13, 2018, at 7:35 PM, pacj <pacj_03@yahoo.com> wrote:

Advocacy and IRC

It makes sense that since the IRC was created to focus on state and federal legislation which impacts local agencies, that advocacy should be coordinated through the IRC. However, I don't understand why anyone other than the IRC members would make advocacy trips. Please explain.

There is mention within this agenda item that advocacy travel to Sacramento and Washington DC is often coordinated through local organizations. What organizations coordinate this advocacy? Is the advocacy travel made public prior to the travel or post travel? Why would Washington DC advocacy travel be necessary? The city has a paid lobbying firm.

Thank you

Pat Quintana

**SUPPLEMENTAL
COMMUNICATION**

Meeting Date: 6/18/18

Agenda Item No.: 24

Harper, Gloria

From: Spencer Hagaman <spencerchagaman@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, June 18, 2018 9:40 AM
To: CITY COUNCIL
Cc: Fikes, Cathy; Harper, Gloria; Graham, Antonia
Subject: Opposition to Item #24 in Tonight's CC Agenda

Good morning City Council!

I oppose Item #24: Councilmember Federal and State Advocacy Travel on the following grounds:

First, the item does nothing to solve any of the major issues facing the City: CalPERS, homelessness, public safety, ageing infrastructure, etc. In fact, it hurts the city's ability to solve these issues as it would hinder Council efforts to work with state and federal officials to find solutions. Citizens would actually be negatively impacted as Councilmembers' efforts to work with the FAA on jet noise, the EPA and Coast Guard on coastal odors, and on other issues would be impeded.

Second, the approval of advocacy trips falls outside the scope of the IRC. According to the description of the IRC on the city's website, the IRC was founded to allow for a more comprehensive focus on pending legislation that could impact the City. Nowhere does it state that advocacy trips of other Councilmembers fall under its jurisdiction.

Third, Councilmembers are all equal and do not have the authority to decide whether or not a colleague can meet with state and federal legislators to discuss an issue. Potentially, the mayor may have such authority, and if the problem in the Statement of Issue of this item is truly a problem, then if an advocacy trip is impacted by Councilmembers desiring to attend, it should be mayor's prerogative to decide who goes, not the IRC.

Fourth, and finally, the item's recommended action is too broad. the proposed solution gives the IRC more power than necessary to mitigate the supposed issue. The problem in the submitted Statement of Issue is that the Brown Act limits the number of Councilmembers who can attend sponsored advocacy trips and there is no procedure to decide which Councilmembers get to attend. However, the recommended action potentially gives the IRC authority over all CC advocacy requests.

I encourage the Council to review Item #24 again and vote 'No.' The item creates an unnecessary extra layer of government, reduces government efficiency, and fails to alleviate any of Huntington Beach's most dire problems.

I hope you will do the right thing for the citizens of HB!

--
-Spencer Hagaman

BF, Yale College '21

B.A. Political Science
spencerchagaman@gmail.com | (714) 293 3572

**SUPPLEMENTAL
COMMUNICATION**

Meeting Date: 6/18/18

Agenda Item No.: 24