

Martha Alvarez

From: Jennifer Yamamoto <terryandjenyamamoto@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 2:18 PM
To: List - City Council
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Bruce's Beach plaque

CAUTION: This Email is from an EXTERNAL source. Ensure you trust this sender before clicking on any links or attachments.

Hello

I support what the Bruce's Beach History Advisory Board has come up with for the two plaques that will document the history of Bruce's Beach. Please honor the hundreds of hours of research, writing and meetings by this voluntary advisory group.

Manhattan Beach needs to do the right thing and present a fact based historical account of Manhattan Beach's history.

Please don't be swayed by those who want to whitewash our history.

Thank you
Jennifer Yamamoto

Martha Alvarez

From: Jacqueline Zuanich-Ferrell <jzuanichferrell@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:27 PM
To: List - City Council
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Bruce's Beach Plaques

CAUTION: This Email is from an EXTERNAL source. Ensure you trust this sender before clicking on any links or attachments.

My husband and I believe there should be some editing and actual cuts made to the proposed wording of these plaques. There should not be any reference to "speculation" as it is based on a newspaper writer's opinion. There should be a reference to the lawsuit that the Bruces filed and lost, along with the court's decision. Also a mention should be made to the fact that all black property owners EXCEPT the Bruces chose to buy other properties within Manhattan Beach after the eminent domain action.

Thank you.

Jacqueline Zuanich-Ferrell
Joe Ferrell
1018 Duncan Avenue
homeowners since 1971

Martha Alvarez

From: patriciasievers <patriciasievers@aol.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:00 PM
To: List - City Council
Subject: [EXTERNAL] DO NOT APPROVE BB Plaque Language

CAUTION: This Email is from an EXTERNAL source. Ensure you trust this sender before clicking on any links or attachments.

Dear Council members

Please do not approve the language of the Bruce's Beach plaques. They are still full of folklore and do not adequately address the scope of the eminent domain (i.e., other families affected, other families that repurchased . . .), the context of that era, nor the obviously critical court documents. Mayor Hadley justified the history approval because, as a living document, it could change as new information arose. It just seems reckless to approve the language on these permanent plaques before the court documents have been reviewed. What is the big hurry? And don't think that your being tired of the topic is a good answer. This is an issue that divides the city and your job as elected officials is to get to the truth of it. Please do this right. There is too much at stake for these plaques to memorialize a sensationalized folklore instead of the factual accurate truth.

As leaders of this city please have the control and patience to get the facts correct.

Thank you
Patricia Sievers Ambrose

Martha Alvarez

From: Zac Dean <zakdances@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 4:37 PM
To: City Clerk
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Re: Public Comment

CAUTION: This Email is from an EXTERNAL source. Ensure you trust this sender before clicking on any links or attachments.

Forgot to add that I'm a resident of east Manhattan Beach.

On Tue, Jul 20, 2021 at 4:34 PM Zac Dean <zakdances@gmail.com> wrote:
Greeting and Salutations, Honored City Council -

The Department of Housing and Community Development defines household crowding as more than one person per room, excluding bathrooms. Los Angeles County (of which Manhattan Beach is a part) contains some of the highest concentrations of crowded homes in the country. It's actually quite an insidious problem, because from the outside looking in, it is largely invisible. Yet behind closed doors, UCLA and University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill researchers have found that children in crowded homes have poorer health, worse test scores, and more behavioral and emotional problems (tantrums and depression) even after adjusting for poverty. And overcrowded households breathing the same re-circulated air spreads viruses even faster.

Please end bans on housing. Allow mixed-use development (housing above commercial). Allow duplexes on corner lots. It's no exaggeration to say that increasing the housing supply in Manhattan Beach is a matter of life or death.

Please look at this tasteful mixed-use development photo in Palos Verdes as a reference:



F45



Martha Alvarez

From: Lisa Taub <lisamtaub@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:32 PM
To: List - City Council
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Plaques for Bruce's Beach

CAUTION: This Email is from an EXTERNAL source. Ensure you trust this sender before clicking on any links or attachments.

Dear City Council- I would like to address Item J on the agenda tonight. As you know, our city council asked some volunteer residents to work on the history of Bruce's Beach. They spent many hours ensuring they did a good job for our city and then ensured that this information was reviewed by history experts, including UCLA and USC history professors.

As you know the proposed wording follows the same facts that have been placed in newspaper articles around the world. We need to show that we are not afraid to acknowledge this tough but important past of our city.

I am also forwarding you a very concerning anonymous letter that is circulating again in our city. The address has changed but the theme is consistent with the email that was previously circulating by another anonymous source (possibly the same author?) to argue against accepting the history report. Again, we do not even know if this is written by a resident and seems to be following again some of the same logic as the arguments against the history report which was rejected by our City Council.

I urge you to not listen to these anonymous emails that continue to sow misinformation and drive division in our town and to please accept the hard work that was done by the people who volunteered a lot of their time to research the history of Bruce's Beach.

Thank you,
Lisa Taub

Martha Alvarez

From: rogerhughes89 <rogerhughes89@protonmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:24 PM
To: List - City Council
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Bruces Beach Plaque comment

CAUTION: This Email is from an EXTERNAL source. Ensure you trust this sender before clicking on any links or attachments.

Dear Council,

I would recommend changing or removing 2 paragraphs in the Strand plaque suggestions. They are factually incorrect and incendiary, and are in conflict with the information within the Task Force History Report. I respectfully request that the plaque language focuses on the known facts before memorializing them on our public spaces.

Statement 1:

Harassment at Bruce's Beach

Harassment of the Bruces and their guests from some White neighbors occurred immediately after the resort opened. "No Trespassing" signs were posted directly in front of the Bruces' property on a strip of beach owned by subdivider George Peck. Guests of the resort were forced to walk a half mile to reach the water. As Bruce's Beach popularity soared, White residents expressed concerns about an "invasion" by African Americans. In 1924, the Manhattan Beach Board of Trustees passed a series of ordinances aimed to thwart the Bruces' business and drive the Black community out of the City. When these laws failed to discourage Black residents and their guests, the City pursued more aggressive measures.

Issues with Statement 1:

- 1) Is it fair to call an owner placing a "no trespassing" sign on his private property "harassment"?
- 2) The history report does not cite evidence of white residents complaining of an "invasion". According to the history report, the phrase was loosely associated to a single person by an independent author 32 years later.
- 3) The claim that the Trustees tried a series of ordinances and then resorted to eminent domain is contradicted by the History Report. According to the History Report, the eminent domain ordinance (#263) was filed first, in January of 1924. The other ordinances (273-275) did not follow until June. Thus the statement is incorrect and misleading.

Statement 2:

The Racist Motivation Behind the Eminent Domain Action

On July 4, 1924, the *California Eagle* reported that Black fishermen in Redondo Beach were given Ku Klux Klan pamphlets labelled "Colored Folks Beach three miles North." The *Eagle* speculated that the Klan was "operating unrestrictedly along the waterfront," including Manhattan Beach. The article suggested that the Klan influenced the Board of Trustees in condemning Bruce's Beach.

In a February 4, 1927, letter to the *Manhattan Beach News*, the Bruce family wrote: "...the attempt to make a park out of these two blocks was a direct slap at us because we were not born white people." In 1943, Frank Daugherty, a member of the City's 1924 Board of Trustees, admitted to the *Manhattan Beach News*, "Our attorneys advised the members of the council never to admit the real purpose in establishing the park..."

Issues with Statement 2:

- 1) The history report clearly states "no evidence directly linking acts of harassment to the KKK", nor do they cite any evidence the KKK influenced the city council.
- 2) It seems unfair to assume that every other Trustee shared the same motivation as Frank Daugherty. Clearly today's City Council members don't all share the same motivation and opinion. Why would it be different then? The eminent domain action was part of building Live Oak Park as well. Both parks have survived 100 years, and are valuable parts of our city. So it's reasonable to assume some council members thought the parks were good ideas on their own merits.

Martha Alvarez

From: juleen jackson <juleenjackson6@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:23 PM
To: List - City Council
Subject: [EXTERNAL]

CAUTION: This Email is from an EXTERNAL source. Ensure you trust this sender before clicking on any links or attachments.

History Advisory Board's Proposals regarding Bruce's Beach.

Dear Council Members,

I hope you will support the above proposals. I feel that the Advisory Board did a good job and that it deserves to be passed.

Sincerely,

Juleen Jackson

Martha Alvarez

From: DTC Trinidad <dttrinidad@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:18 PM
To: List - City Council
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Wording for our plaques for Bruce's Beach...

CAUTION: This Email is from an EXTERNAL source. Ensure you trust this sender before clicking on any links or attachments.

Dear City Council- I would like to address Item J on the agenda tonight. As you know, our city council asked some volunteer residents to work on the history of Bruce's Beach. They spent many hours ensuring they did a good job for our city and then ensured that this information was reviewed by history experts, including UCLA and USC history professors.

As you know the proposed wording follows the same facts that have been placed in newspaper articles around the world. We need to show that we are not afraid to acknowledge this tough but important past of our city.

I am also forwarding you a very concerning anonymous letter that is circulating again in our city. The address has changed but the theme is consistent with the email that was previously circulating by another anonymous source (possibly the same author?) to argue against accepting the history report. Again, we do not even know if this is written by a resident and seems to be following again some of the same logic as the arguments against the history report which was rejected by our City Council.

I urge you to not listen to these anonymous emails that continue to sow misinformation and drive division in our town and to please accept the hard work that was done by the people who volunteered a lot of their time to research the history of Bruce's Beach.

Thank you,
Donna Thomas

From: SaveBruceBeachPark SaveBruceBeachPark <savebrucebeachpark@gmail.com>
Date: July 20, 2021 at 4:49:38 AM PDT
To: SaveBruceBeachPark SaveBruceBeachPark <savebrucebeachpark@gmail.com>
Subject: Fwd: End the KKK and other rumors on Bruce's Beach Plaques

Today is the last chance to voice your opinion to City Council and push back on the Far Left's agenda for Bruce's Beach.

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Bruce's Beach: Get The Facts <brucebeachgetthefacts@gmail.com>
Date: Tue, Jul 20, 2021
Subject: End the KKK and other rumors on Bruce's Beach Plaques
To: Bruce's Beach: Get The Facts <brucebeachgetthefacts@gmail.com>

IN THIS ISSUE:

City Council should not spend any taxpayer money on new plaques until:

- the missing Eminent Domain court case documents are retrieved so the report and plaque language can be completed,
- the sources used to write the report and plaque language are analyzed by nonpartisan History Research Experts to distinguish facts from rumors.

THE FAR-LEFT HAVE LAUNCHED AN ALL-OUT EFFORT TO PRESSURE CITY COUNCIL TO ADOPT PLAQUE LANGUAGE THAT INCLUDES RUMORS AND HEARSAY AND OMITTS FACTUAL INFORMATION.

ATTEND THE CITY COUNCIL MEETING ON TUESDAY 7/20 AT 6:00 AND VOICE YOUR OPINION ON ZOOM: [click here to join the Zoom meeting](#)

OR YOU CAN ATTEND IN PERSON AT CITY HALL. This is the first time since Covid that in-person attendance is an option. The address is 1400 Highland Ave.

WRITE A COMMENT TO CITY COUNCIL HERE: [e-comment](#) Scroll down to J.6, click on the comment icon and state your opinion!

Dear MB Residents,

The Reparationists, County Supervisor Janice Hahn, the partisan Bruce's Beach Task Force History Report writers, and members of the Bruce Family all want rumors from the History Report to be enshrined on plaques at Bruce's Beach Park.

Twelve reasons why the History Report is NOT a reliable document to use as a resource for language on our city plaques at Bruce's Beach:

1. Mayor Hadley aptly explained that the History Report was never intended to be a "definitive" history.
2. A "definitive" history of Bruce's Beach is the ONLY appropriate source for language on our city plaques because it would clearly identify FACTS.
3. A "definitive" history will clearly separate language that is NOT appropriate for memorials, such as rumors of the KKK in MB, MB police, and local citizens "terrorizing" patrons of Bruce's Beach, etc. These stories are either hearsay, speculation, biased opinions, or interpretations. They are NOT facts yet they are proposed language for the plaques.
4. A "definitive" history will include the important missing Eminent Domain court documents that will add factual content and details to plaque language.
5. The History Report was written by members of the highly partisan Bruce's Beach Task Force. The plaque language must not be written by partisans.
6. After reading the History Report, both of the History Professors who were asked to weigh in on the report noted that the writers are laymen (as stated by the UCLA Professor) and amateurs (as stated by the LMU Professor).
7. The city plaques must be written from definitive history by nonpartisan History Professionals.
8. History Professionals will vet the biased selection of source material relied upon for the vast majority of the report and the wording for the plaques and strive for a more balanced approach. Even the History Professors commented that a notable author on the subject was not included in the report. Known missing material must be included in the plaque wording.
9. The History Report and plaque wording also rely heavily on statements and opinions published by "The American Eagle," an LA-based newspaper that primarily contained one-sided stories and opinions geared towards African Americans.
10. Councilman Napolitano stated the History Report is a 'living document,' meaning it will be added to and changed. If City Council financially invests in plaques now, they will need to be replaced when a definitive history is completed.
11. This would be a wasteful use of taxpayer money.
12. Rumors and hearsay enshrined on the plaques will become cheap fodder used by the Reparationists.

The proposed language for the plaques paints the story of Bruce's Beach from the viewpoint of current-day Reparationists.

For example:

- The Eminent Domain decision affected 30 lots, yet the plaques only highlight the Black lot owners.
- No mention that MB sold property to Blacks when other cities did not.

- No mention that MB did not segregate when selling property to Blacks when segregation was legal and common practice in many cities.
- No mention that some residents in 1920s MB opposed those residents wanting to instill segregation after the Bruce business became successful.
- The language states, "...the MB Board of Trustees passed a series of ordinances aimed to thwart the Bruces' business and *drive the Black community out of the City.*" No one was "driven out." The proposed language does not mention that other Black families affected by the Eminent Domain decision bought other property in MB and only the Bruce's chose not to buy again in MB.

A fair-minded person would not whitewash the facts of the eminent domain decision. They would report the facts given the context of the era of segregation, the good, the bad, and the ugly. But nor would a fair-minded person omit facts or report rumors as facts in order to paint a version of the truth that leads to a predetermined outcome. Our city plaques must reflect accurate and truthful history, not deception.

Read the suggested language for the plaques here: [Scroll down to J.6](#)
 A new organization has used the misleading language in the Bruce's Beach History Report to launch a website to further their agenda for reparations. See here: <https://whereismyland.org/>

The 1920s City Council caved to the pressure by Segregationists that lead to a decision that adversely affected both Black and White residents, the Bruce family, and the city at large. The 2021 City Council has pressure from the Reparationists and their decision could also have long-lasting punitive effects if they too cave to the pressure.

Let's not make the same mistake twice on the subject of Bruce's Beach!!!

~BruceBeachGetTheFacts

PASS THIS EMAIL ONTO YOUR MB FRIENDS!!!

We will always protect the confidentiality and private information of our writers and our subscribers.

All voices have a Constitutional right to be heard whether they choose to include their name or not.

Cancel Culture is very real.

To unsubscribe, please email us back with "Unsubscribe" in the subject line.

--

You received this message because you are subscribed to the Google Groups "MB United" group.

To unsubscribe from this group and stop receiving emails from it, send an email to mbunited-leadership+unsubscribe@googlegroups.com.

To view this discussion on the web visit <https://groups.google.com/d/msgid/mbunited-leadership/CAOMao2R1Nfpub1pYyR7oA9wRExXfhLxCoTKMVYQB8yE%2B2d%2BD2w%40mail.gmail.com>.

Martha Alvarez

From: Scott C. Chambers <mbchambers4@roadrunner.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:14 PM
To: List - City Council
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Bruce's Beach Plaques

CAUTION: This Email is from an EXTERNAL source. Ensure you trust this sender before clicking on any links or attachments.

[Scott Chambers](#) at July 20, 2021 at 3:10pm PDT

Oppose

Please hold off on any plaques till this case is settled. History is still being written. We need everything written on the plaques to be verified. We can't have hearsay on this important memorial. I would suggest hiring an independent professional historian to double check all claims being made.

Regards,
Scott C. Chambers

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows 10

Martha Alvarez

From: Rory O'Brien <Rory.O'Brien@longbeach.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:08 PM
To: List - City Council
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Bruce's Beach fiasco

CAUTION: This Email is from an EXTERNAL source. Ensure you trust this sender before clicking on any links or attachments.

Good Day Mayor et al,

I was requested to send this again to the entire city council.

We, as with the majority of Manhattan Beach, are tired of this typical victimhood occurring all over the US. The issue is well identified but not thru what was reported by the Reparationists. We will state what is obvious and true as opposed to conjecture and opinions

Twelve reasons why the History Report is NOT a reliable document to use as a resource for language on our city plaques at Bruce's Beach:

1. Mayor Hadley aptly explained that the History Report was never intended to be a "definitive" history.
2. A "definitive" history of Bruce's Beach is the ONLY appropriate source for language on our city plaques because it would clearly identify FACTS.
3. A "definitive" history will clearly separate language that is NOT appropriate for memorials, such as rumors of the KKK in MB, MB police, and local citizens "terrorizing" patrons of Bruce's Beach, etc. These stories are either hearsay, speculation, biased opinions, or interpretations. They are NOT facts yet they are proposed language for the plaques.
4. A "definitive" history will include the important missing Eminent Domain court documents that will add factual content and details to plaque language.
5. The History Report was written by members of the highly partisan Bruce's Beach Task Force. The plaque language must not be written by partisans.
6. After reading the History Report, both of the History Professors who were asked to weigh in on the report noted that the writers are laymen (as stated by the UCLA Professor) and amateurs (as stated by the LMU Professor).
7. The city plaques must be written from definitive history by nonpartisan History Professionals.
8. History Professionals will vet the biased selection of source material relied upon for the vast majority of the report and the wording for the plaques and strive for a more balanced approach. Even the History Professors commented that a notable author on the subject was not included in the report. Known missing material must be included in the plaque wording.
9. The History Report and plaque wording also rely heavily on statements and opinions published by "The American Eagle," an LA-based newspaper that primarily contained one-sided stories and opinions geared towards African Americans.
10. Councilman Napolitano stated the History Report is a 'living document,' meaning it will be added to and changed. If City Council financially invests in plaques now, they will need to be replaced when a definitive history is completed.
11. This would be a wasteful use of taxpayer money.
12. Rumors and hearsay enshrined on the plaques will become cheap fodder used by the Reparationists.

The proposed language for the plaques paints the story of Bruce's Beach from the viewpoint of current-day Reparationists.

For example:

- The Eminent Domain decision affected 30 lots, yet the plaques only highlight the Black lot owners.
- No mention that MB sold property to Blacks when other cities did not.

- No mention that MB did not segregate when selling property to Blacks when segregation was legal and common practice in many cities.
- No mention that some residents in 1920s MB opposed those residents wanting to instill segregation after the Bruce business became successful.
- The language states, "...the MB Board of Trustees passed a series of ordinances aimed to thwart the Bruces' business and *drive the Black community out of the City.*" No one was "driven out." The proposed language does not mention that other Black families affected by the Eminent Domain decision bought other property in MB and only the Bruce's chose not to buy again in MB.

Thank You,

Rory & Marie O'Brien
Manhattan Beach (70 years)

Martha Alvarez

From: pps4@aol.com
Sent: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 3:01 PM
To: List - City Council; Suzanne Hadley; Hildy Stern; Richard Montgomery; Steve Napolitano; Joe Franklin
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Comments and input for City Council Meeting July 20 re: City issues re Public Safety

CAUTION: This Email is from an EXTERNAL source. Ensure you trust this sender before clicking on any links or attachments.

Dear City Council Members:

We support the Police department and Chief Abell and all that they have done during the past year and a half- with Covid, Protests etc. We greatly appreciate their efforts in the past and present to keep us safe. We are concerned however about the current vacancies of at least 5 Police Officers . For whatever reasons, we have not been able to fill these positions at this time. We would strongly urge that the City Council make the Police recruitment the highest priority at the City. This action would include having an assigned and focused group in HR do the initial processing of the Police department candidates as a priority and refer them on to the Chief for the next step in the hiring process in an expeditious manner..The Chief then should have as a priority, the interviewing and screening process of these candidates. We understand that this process is of a long term nature (over a year and a half) so we would also recommend adopting the Beverly Hills Model where other policemen are hired on their off days to work for Manhattan Beach until all current vacancies are filled.

We also support:

Purchasing of two shelter beds

Hiring of a Navigator Full Time for Manhattan Beach

And

Hiring/Contracting with the Redondo Beach City Attorney for prosecution of Misdemeanors for our City

Thank you for your time.

Steve and Paula Packwood

Manhattan Beach Residents

Martha Alvarez

From: Kim Brant-Lucich <kbrant007@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 2:07 PM
To: List - City Council
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please accept BB History Advisory Committee Recommendations (Item J6)

CAUTION: This Email is from an EXTERNAL source. Ensure you trust this sender before clicking on any links or attachments.

Dear City Council and City Manager,

I write today to urge you to accept the recommendations of the Bruce's Beach History Advisory Committee being presented at the City Council meeting this evening (Item J6: Consideration of the History Advisory Board's Proposals Regarding 21-0218 Bruce's Beach).

This request is made to help turn around our deteriorating national and international reputation as a city. Following is the context for this statement.

On July 2, 2021 an article about Manhattan Beach and Bruce's Beach appeared in the French newspaper *Le Monde*. *Le Monde* is an internationally recognized newspaper that has been around for more than 75 years, is known for well-researched and truthful journalism, has almost half a million subscribers, and is a staple throughout Europe. Now, its readers know all about Manhattan Beach, *and we are not depicted in a favorable light*. I read the article in its entirety (in French) and, while I am not a translator by profession, let me share some of the salient highlights.

Our town is referred to as a "lily white"/"white as snow" affluent community whose population is lower than 1% Black, the "self-proclaimed" capital of beach volleyball, with multi-million dollar museum-worthy homes. Then, City Council's decision to reject a statement of apology to the Bruce's Beach residents who were deprived of home, property and livelihood through eminent domain in the 1920s is discussed in detail. The "Concerned (but anonymous) Citizens" group is referenced, suggesting that this group (with its criticisms of the "woke" community and "woke" members of the BBTF) resulted in City Council dismissing the Bruce's Beach Task Force. The article quotes Council's statement that "we reject racism, hate, intolerance and exclusion, but the residents today are not responsible for actions committed by others in another century." The article labels Mayor Suzanne Hadley as a "Shock Republican" Mayor who "led the rebellion" against any form of apology for descendants of Bruce's Beach, claiming it would result in legal action that would drain city funds."

The picture painted of our town, our City Council and our Mayor is not flattering. This is no longer just a national story; we have achieved international fame as a community that uses the assertion that current residents are not responsible for actions in the past to deny expressing an apology for what the residents of Bruce's Beach endured.

Please help stop this cycle of denial and defensiveness and adopt the recommendations of the Bruce's Beach History Advisory Committee. *Le Monde* writes that people "make pilgrimages" to Bruce's Beach. Let's move forward in a positive direction by accepting the History Advisory Board's recommendation for the language to be written on the plaques placed at Bruce's Beach, a location that attracts visitors to our town.

Thank you for your consideration.

Regards,

Kim Brant-Lucich, MBA, PMP, FHIMSS

818-371-4318

kbrant007@gmail.com

Martha Alvarez

From: Taylor Gamble <taylormgamble@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 2:05 PM
To: List - City Council
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please approve the Bruce's Beach plaques

CAUTION: This Email is from an EXTERNAL source. Ensure you trust this sender before clicking on any links or attachments.

Dear MB City Councilmembers,

I hope this email finds you well. I am writing in regard to the proposed language and design of both Bruce's Beach plaques. The Bruce's Beach History Advisory committee has done an excellent job throughout the entire process of researching and developing the report, and crafting the language and design for the new plaques. Please approve the proposed language and design so we may educate the public as to the true historical record of Manhattan Beach's history.

Sincerely,
Taylor Gamble
Manhattan Beach Resident

Martha Alvarez

From: Frank Sillman <frank.sillman@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 2:00 PM
To: List - City Council
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Proposed Language for plaques

CAUTION: This Email is from an EXTERNAL source. Ensure you trust this sender before clicking on any links or attachments.

I have read the proposed language for both of the Bruce's Beach plaques. Ideally, the history report would have been reviewed by a true, unbiased historical expert and contain only verified and corroborated facts. Unfortunately, this did not happen.

So it is important that the language on the plaques be unbiased and thoroughly vetted to contain facts only.

The proposed language should not be approved "as is" as it contains inflammatory language, includes hearsay and omits certain key facts that provide a more accurate, unbiased description of MB in the 1920's. Some examples:

Plaque 1:

- Paragraph 1:
 - Use of "Jim Crow-era" is inflammatory and is based on the rhetoric promoted by some today.
 - Should make it clear that MB was one of the only cities at this time that allowed blacks to own property.
- Paragraph 2:
 - Currently reads, "As Bruce's Beach popularity soared, White residents expressed concerns about an "invasion" by African Americans." First, I am sure all White residents did not express this. Second, who came up with "invasion"? This is inflammatory. Sentence, should state something like, "Apparently, some White residents expressed concerns about the African Americans."
- Paragraph 3:
 - The entire 1st paragraph is not supported by facts and needs to be removed entirely. This section is presenting the biased view of certain individuals and the narrative that they want to promote without having facts to back it up. Not factual statements:
 - "The Eagle speculated...";
 - "The article suggested....".
 - In the second paragraph, I don't believe that Frank Daughertt's statements have been corroborated?? If not, this is bent to fit the desired narrative.
- Paragraph 5:
 - Should specifically state how many white people were impacted by the eminent domain proceedings and that all of the people that were impacted were allowed to purchase elsewhere in MB.
- Paragraph 6:

- The 2nd sentence is not true. The Bruce's took the city to court and the court found that they were fairly compensated at the time. Further, the Bruce's chose not to relocate to somewhere else in MB.

Plaque 2:

- **What is the purpose of this?**
- **Where are the white people bios?**
- **Also, are the Slaughter's white? Seems they were only added to the plaque to say that they were allowed to open a boarding house "the same month that the Bruces' resort closed." The two situations can't be compared as it seems the Slaughter's property was not part of the eminent domain proceedings.**

Thank you for your consideration. I sincerely hope that more time is given to ensure the words on these plaques are representative of the facts.

Thanks

Frank

Martha Alvarez

From: Diana Skaar <dianaskaar@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, July 18, 2021 4:33 PM
To: List - City Council; City Clerk
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Approve Bruce's Beach Plaque

CAUTION: This Email is from an EXTERNAL source. Ensure you trust this sender before clicking on any links or attachments.

Hi City Council members,

Please approve the proposed language and design for the Bruce's Beach plaques. The Bruce's Beach History Advisory Board has worked many months with hundreds of hours in research, writings, and meetings to come to this proposal.

Furthermore, The Bruce Family approves of the plaques' proposed language.

Approving the proposed plaque language and design shows that our City Council supports a fact-based and historical record of MB's history.

Thank you,
Diana Skaar
Manhattan Beach Resident

Martha Alvarez

From: Laura Kiely <laurakiely@verizon.net>
Sent: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 1:08 PM
To: List - City Council
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Homeless concerns in MB

CAUTION: This Email is from an EXTERNAL source. Ensure you trust this sender before clicking on any links or attachments.

Dear City Council Members,

I hope you are able to help mitigate the dire straights faced by the homeless in our community.

- I hope you are able to fund a full time house navigator dedicated to the city of Manhattan Beach.

- I hope you can secure at least 2 shelter beds.

- I hope you can provide those who are homeless with access to the homeless court.

Thank you for your consideration.

Best,
Laura Kiely
MB resident and voter since 1994

Martha Alvarez

From: Michelle Minier <minier.michelle@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 1:02 PM
To: List - City Council
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Proposed Language on Plaques

CAUTION: This Email is from an EXTERNAL source. Ensure you trust this sender before clicking on any links or attachments.

I have read the proposed language for both of the Bruce's Beach plaques. Ideally, the history report would have been reviewed by a true, unbiased historical expert and contain only verified and corroborated facts. Unfortunately, this did not happen.

So it is important that the language on the plaques be unbiased and thoroughly vetted to contain facts only.

The proposed language should not be approved "as is" as it contains inflammatory language, includes hearsay and omits certain key facts that provide a more accurate, unbiased description of MB in the 1920's. Some examples:

Plaque 1:

- Paragraph 1:
 - Use of "Jim Crow-era" is inflammatory and is based on the rhetoric promoted by some today.
 - Should make it clear that MB was one of the only cities at this time that allowed blacks to own property.
- Paragraph 2:
 - Currently reads, "As Bruce's Beach popularity soared, White residents expressed concerns about an "invasion" by African Americans." First, I am sure all White residents did not express this. Second, who came up with "invasion"? This is inflammatory. Sentence, should state something like, "Apparently, some White residents expressed concerns about the African Americans."
- Paragraph 3:
 - The entire 1st paragraph is not supported by facts and needs to be removed entirely. This section is presenting the biased view of certain individuals and the narrative that they want to promote without having facts to back it up. Not factual statements:
 - "The Eagle speculated...";
 - "The article suggested....".
 - In the second paragraph, I don't believe that Frank Daughertt's statements have been corroborated?? If not, this is bent to fit the desired narrative.
- Paragraph 5:

- Should specifically state how many white people were impacted by the eminent domain proceedings and that all of the people that were impacted were allowed to purchase elsewhere in MB.
- Paragraph 6:
 - The 2nd sentence is not true. The Bruce's took the city to court and the court found that they were fairly compensated at the time. Further, the Bruce's chose not to relocate to somewhere else in MB.

Plaque 2:

- **What is the purpose of this?**
- **Where are the white people bios?**
- **Also, are the Slaughter's white? Seems they were only added to the plaque to say that they were allowed to open a boarding house "the same month that the Bruces' resort closed." The two situations can't be compared as it seems the Slaughter's property was not part of the eminent domain proceedings.**

Thank you for your consideration. I sincerely hope that more time is given to ensure the words on these plaques are representative of the facts.

Michelle Miner

Martha Alvarez

From: Laura Kiely <laurakiely@verizon.net>
Sent: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 12:45 PM
To: List - City Council
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Bruce's Beach Plaques

CAUTION: This Email is from an EXTERNAL source. Ensure you trust this sender before clicking on any links or attachments.

Dear City Council Members,

I hope you will approve the language for the plaques that the Bruce family descendants have approved. The BB History committee did a thorough and accurate reporting of the facts, and the plaques reflect such.

Thank you for your consideration.

Best,

Laura Kiely

MB resident and voter since 1994

Sent from my iPhone

Martha Alvarez

From: Leanne Meyers <leannemeyers@mac.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 11:51 AM
To: List - City Council
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Bruce's Beach agenda item at tonight's City council meeting

CAUTION: This Email is from an EXTERNAL source. Ensure you trust this sender before clicking on any links or attachments.

Good morning CC members,

I have read the proposed language for the Bruce's Beach plaques and viewed the pictures. I am thrilled at the thorough research and subsequent language utilized as well as the pictures selected for this overdue recognition of the Bruce family and others.

As a resident of Manhattan Beach for 20 years I personally have a better understanding of the history and evolution of our community. I am grateful that other residents and visitors will now have the same as well. I strongly support the language and entire content and presentation submitted by the Bruce's Beach History Advisory Board.

I would also extend my gratitude to them and to you City Council members as I know we ALL recognize the importance of moving forward with a fact based ,historical record of manhattan Beach history.

Thank you,

Leanne Meyers

Leanne Meyers | Vision Mgmt
1601 N. Sepulveda Blvd. #635
Manhattan Beach, CA 90266
O: 310-796-0536 | C: 310-500-7417

Martha Alvarez

From: Alice Neuhauser <apntrc@msn.com>
Sent: Monday, July 19, 2021 1:16 PM
To: List - City Council
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Bruce's Beach History

CAUTION: This Email is from an EXTERNAL source. Ensure you trust this sender before clicking on any links or attachments.

Ladies and Gentlemen,

I appreciate the work and dedication that has gone into the Bruce's Beach History Advisory Board's recommended language and design for plaques depicting the historical issues at that location. There has now been an enormous amount of factual detail brought to bear, by both that Board and in the three-part series in the Easy Reader.

We all grow and come together in acknowledging our collective pasts, both the good and the bad. We have the opportunity now to advance our world by speaking openly and honestly about actions taken in our City's past. And let's highlight the successes that some of our earliest residents made - including their stories in our current world.

I hope that you will agree to the installation of the recommended plaques.

Thank you.

Alice P. Neuhauser
P: 310-275-7505
apntrc@msn.com



Please consider whether it is necessary to print this email.

Martha Alvarez

From: robertbush dslextreme.com <robertbush@dslextreme.com>
Sent: Monday, July 19, 2021 1:09 PM
To: robertbush @dslextreme.com
Cc: robertbush @dslextreme.com; Steve Napolitano; Richard Montgomery; Suzanne Hadley; Hildy Stern; Joe Franklin; Bruce Moe; Bruce Moe; Quinn Barrow; List - City Council; jfenton; speel; cgraves; jboxer; jcochran; jbowes; kgerger@mbusd.org
Subject: [EXTERNAL] MANDATE - Vaccinations & Indoor masks - Saves Lives

CAUTION: This Email is from an EXTERNAL source. Ensure you trust this sender before clicking on any links or attachments.

MANDATE – Vaccinations & Indoor Masks – Saves Lives

by Robert Bush

San Francisco - Vaccine Mandate San Francisco's bold decision to require all 37,000 of its municipal employees (doctors to janitors) to get vaccinated against COVID-19 has drawn both praise and condemnation and highlights the tension between protecting individual rights and the public good as workplaces finally reopen. Employees will have to get vaccinated against COVID-19 or risk losing their jobs.

1918 Pandemic (H1N1 virus)

1918 influenza pandemic was the most severe pandemic in recent history. It was caused by an H1N1 virus with genes of avian origin. It is estimated that about 500 million people or one-third of the world's population became infected with this virus. The number of deaths was estimated to be at least 50

million worldwide with about 675,000 occurring in the United States.

With no vaccine to protect against influenza infection and no antibiotics to treat secondary bacterial infections that can be associated with influenza infections, control efforts worldwide were limited to non-pharmaceutical interventions such as isolation, quarantine, good personal hygiene, use of disinfectants, and limitations of public gatherings, which were applied unevenly.

COVID-19 Pandemic	Global - Deaths
4,091,672 Global - Cases	190,526,225 United States - Deaths
614,507	

1918 Pandemic (H1N1 virus)	Global – Deaths
50,000,000 Global - Cases	500,000,000 United States – Deaths
675,000	

It has been 100 years since the 1918 Pandemic (H1N1 virus) and there are many people that refuse to wear masks and get vaccinated.

Contact the following organizations to make sure that everyone is vaccinated against COVID-19 highly transmissible Delta variant:

Make sure that the California Legislature and L.A. County Board of Supervisors act as fast on Mandated Vaccinations as

they did when they returned Bruce’s Beach to the Bruce Family.

United States	CDC <u>Centers for Disease Control and Prevention</u>
California	California Legislature
L.A. County	L.A County Board of Supervisors
Manhattan Beach	City Council

Once a COVID vaccine or vaccines are made available, could states mandate that people get them?

The short answer is yes. States have the legal and constitutional authority to require that the people who live in that state be vaccinated, or to introduce a vaccine mandate.

The authority for the state being able to compel vaccination—the affirmation of that authority—goes all the way back to a U.S. Supreme Court case in 1905 called *Jacobson v. Massachusetts*. That case arose in the midst of an outbreak of smallpox in Cambridge, Massachusetts, in 1902. Cambridge introduced an ordinance requiring all adults be vaccinated or revaccinated against smallpox. If they didn’t [get vaccinated], they would have to pay a fine of \$5.

Jacobson was a resident of Cambridge who, for a number of reasons, objected to the vaccination mandate and brought a lawsuit against Massachusetts for the mandate. He raised a number of arguments, including one that his constitutionally protected liberty interests were being infringed by this mandate.

In that case, the Supreme Court—and —said that states have under their police powers, which is under the Constitution, the authority to

enact reasonable regulations as necessary to protect public health, public safety, and the common good. Vaccination mandates constitute exactly that kind of permissible state action to protect the public's health. Even though it's 115 years old, this continues to be the benchmark case on the state's power to mandate vaccination.

In response to the argument about this individual liberty interest, the court said that sometimes individual interests might have to yield to state laws that endeavour to protect the health of everybody—the “common good.” The court said: “The rights of the individual may at times, under the pressure of great dangers, be subjected to such restraint to be enforced by reasonable regulations as the safety of the general public may demand.”

So, yes: Once COVID vaccines are available, states could elect to require that people who live within that state be vaccinated.

Superintendent Austin Beutner announced that all L.A. students will be required to get vaccinated, saying that the mandate is “no different than students who are vaccinated for measles or mumps,” comparing students and staff to those who “are tested for tuberculosis before they come on campus,” according to the *Los Angeles Times*. He added, “That’s the best way we know to keep all on a campus safe.”

“Given the increased intermingling among unmasked people where vaccination status is unknown, the millions of people still unvaccinated, and the increased circulation of the highly transmissible Delta variant, we are seeing a rapid increase in COVID-19 infection,” county Public Health Director Barbara Ferrer said in a statement.

“The alarming increases in cases, positivity rates and the increase in hospitalizations signals immediate action must be taken to slow the spread of COVID-19.

Otherwise, we may quickly see more devastating illness and death among the millions of residents,” said L.A. County Health Officer Dr. Muntu Davis.

L.A. County’s massive public hospital system has not had to hospitalize anyone for COVID-19 who has been fully vaccinated, Health Services Director Dr. Christina Ghaly said.

Los Angeles County on Saturday confirmed 1,827 new coronavirus cases — the second-largest daily total the region has seen in months — and an uptick that public health officials are saying is evidence of an alarming trend of increased community spread.

Los Angeles County’s jump in coronavirus cases continued Saturday as a new rule requiring masks in public indoor settings was set to take effect, a restriction officials hope will slow the spread of the virus among the unvaccinated.

National officials and experts have begun to endorse the county’s move, given the sharp rise in cases, to require masks

by everyone indoors, regardless of vaccination status, a mandate set to take effect Saturday at 11:59 p.m.

People who have received vaccinations are extraordinarily protected from the coronavirus, including the Delta variant. But officials are asking them to wear masks indoors as a way of also forcing unvaccinated people — who are at risk — to do the same. About 52% of L.A. County residents are [fully vaccinated](#), and roughly 60% have gotten at least one shot. But given the region's enormous population, that still leaves millions vulnerable.

The good news is that vaccinated people are far more protected against severe illness and death. Nationally, unvaccinated people make up 97% of patients in the hospital now for COVID-19, according to Dr. Rochelle Walensky, director of the U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

The vaccines are extraordinarily protective against severe disease and death. Between Dec. 7 and June 7, unvaccinated people in L.A. County accounted for 99.6% of its coronavirus cases, 98.7% of COVID-19 hospitalizations and 99.8% of deaths.

Under L.A. County's [order](#), masks will be required to be worn in all indoor public settings, such as theaters, stores, gyms, offices and workplaces, and in restaurants when not eating and drinking. Those [exempted](#) include children younger than 2.

Indoor dining is still allowed, but patrons are asked to wear masks when they are not eating or drinking.

Martha Alvarez

From: robertbush dslextreme.com <robertbush@dslextreme.com>
Sent: Monday, July 19, 2021 12:53 PM
To: robertbush @dslextreme.com
Cc: robertbush @dslextreme.com; Steve Napolitano; Richard Montgomery; Suzanne Hadley; Hildy Stern; Joe Franklin; Bruce Moe; Quinn Barrow; List - City Council; jfenton; jfenton; speel; cgraves; jboxer; jcochran; jbowes@mbusd.org
Subject: [EXTERNAL] MANDATE - Vaccinations & Indoor Masks - Saves Lives

CAUTION: This Email is from an EXTERNAL source. Ensure you trust this sender before clicking on any links or attachments.

MANDATE – Vaccinations & Indoor Masks – Saves Lives

by Robert Bush

San Francisco - Vaccine Mandate San Francisco's bold decision to require all 37,000 of its municipal employees (doctors to janitors) to get vaccinated against COVID-19 has drawn both praise and condemnation and highlights the tension between protecting individual rights and the public good as workplaces finally reopen. Employees will have to get vaccinated against COVID-19 or risk losing their jobs.

1918 Pandemic (H1N1 virus)

1918 influenza pandemic was the most severe pandemic in recent history. It was caused by an H1N1 virus with genes of avian origin. It is estimated that about 500 million people or one-third of the world's population became infected with this virus. The number of deaths was estimated to be at least 50

million worldwide with about 675,000 occurring in the United States.

With no vaccine to protect against influenza infection and no antibiotics to treat secondary bacterial infections that can be associated with influenza infections, control efforts worldwide were limited to non-pharmaceutical interventions such as isolation, quarantine, good personal hygiene, use of disinfectants, and limitations of public gatherings, which were applied unevenly.

COVID-19 Pandemic	Global - Deaths
4,091,672 Global - Cases	190,526,225 United States - Deaths
614,507	

1918 Pandemic (H1N1 virus)	Global – Deaths
50,000,000 Global - Cases	500,000,000 United States – Deaths
675,000	

It has been 100 years since the 1918 Pandemic (H1N1 virus) and there are many people that refuse to wear masks and get vaccinated.

Contact the following organizations to make sure that everyone is vaccinated against COVID-19 highly transmissible Delta variant:

Make sure that the California Legislature and L.A. County Board of Supervisors act as fast on Mandated Vaccinations as

they did when they returned Bruce’s Beach to the Bruce Family.

United States	CDC <u>Centers for Disease Control and Prevention</u>
California	California Legislature
L.A. County	L.A County Board of Supervisors
Manhattan Beach	City Council

Once a COVID vaccine or vaccines are made available, could states mandate that people get them?

The short answer is yes. States have the legal and constitutional authority to require that the people who live in that state be vaccinated, or to introduce a vaccine mandate.

The authority for the state being able to compel vaccination—the affirmation of that authority—goes all the way back to a U.S. Supreme Court case in 1905 called *Jacobson v. Massachusetts*. That case arose in the midst of an outbreak of smallpox in Cambridge, Massachusetts, in 1902. Cambridge introduced an ordinance requiring all adults be vaccinated or revaccinated against smallpox. If they didn’t [get vaccinated], they would have to pay a fine of \$5.

Jacobson was a resident of Cambridge who, for a number of reasons, objected to the vaccination mandate and brought a lawsuit against Massachusetts for the mandate. He raised a number of arguments, including one that his constitutionally protected liberty interests were being infringed by this mandate.

In that case, the Supreme Court—and —said that states have under their police powers, which is under the Constitution, the authority to enact reasonable regulations as necessary to protect public health, public safety, and the common good. Vaccination mandates constitute exactly that kind of permissible state action to protect the public’s health. Even though it’s 115 years old, this continues to be the benchmark case on the state’s power to mandate vaccination.

In response to the argument about this individual liberty interest, the court said that sometimes individual interests might have to yield to state laws that endeavour to protect the health of everybody—the “common good.” The court said: “The rights of the individual may at times, under the pressure of great dangers, be subjected to such restraint to be enforced by reasonable regulations as the safety of the general public may demand.”

So, yes: Once COVID vaccines are available, states could elect to require that people who live within that state be vaccinated.

Superintendent Austin Beutner announced that all L.A. students will be required to get vaccinated, saying that the mandate is “no different than students who are vaccinated for measles or mumps,” comparing students and staff to those who “are tested for tuberculosis before they come on campus,” according to the *Los Angeles Times*. He added, “That’s the best way we know to keep all on a campus safe.”

“Given the increased intermingling among unmasked people where vaccination status is unknown, the millions of people still unvaccinated, and the increased circulation of the highly transmissible Delta variant, we are seeing a rapid increase in

COVID-19 infection,” county Public Health Director Barbara Ferrer said in a statement.

“The alarming increases in cases, positivity rates and the increase in hospitalizations signals immediate action must be taken to slow the spread of COVID-19.

Otherwise, we may quickly see more devastating illness and death among the millions of residents,” said L.A. County Health Officer Dr. Muntu Davis.

L.A. County’s massive public hospital system has not had to hospitalize anyone for COVID-19 who has been fully vaccinated, Health Services Director Dr. Christina Ghaly said.

Los Angeles County on Saturday confirmed 1,827 new coronavirus cases — the second-largest daily total the region has seen in months — and an uptick that public health officials are saying is evidence of an alarming trend of increased community spread.

Los Angeles County’s jump in coronavirus cases continued Saturday as a new rule requiring masks in public indoor settings was set to take effect, a restriction officials hope will slow the spread of the virus among the unvaccinated.

National officials and experts have begun to endorse the county's move, given the sharp rise in cases, to require masks by everyone indoors, regardless of vaccination status, a mandate set to take effect Saturday at 11:59 p.m.

People who have received vaccinations are extraordinarily protected from the coronavirus, including the Delta variant. But officials are asking them to wear masks indoors as a way of also forcing unvaccinated people — who are at risk — to do the same. About 52% of L.A. County residents are [fully vaccinated](#), and roughly 60% have gotten at least one shot. But given the region's enormous population, that still leaves millions vulnerable.

The good news is that vaccinated people are far more protected against severe illness and death. Nationally, unvaccinated people make up 97% of patients in the hospital now for COVID-19, according to Dr. Rochelle Walensky, director of the U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

The vaccines are extraordinarily protective against severe disease and death. Between Dec. 7 and June 7, unvaccinated people in L.A. County accounted for 99.6% of its coronavirus cases, 98.7% of COVID-19 hospitalizations and 99.8% of deaths.

Under L.A. County's [order](#), masks will be required to be worn in all indoor public settings, such as theaters, stores, gyms,

offices and workplaces, and in restaurants when not eating and drinking. Those [exempted](#) include children younger than 2. Indoor dining is still allowed, but patrons are asked to wear masks when they are not eating or drinking.

email – latest

Manhattan Beach City Council

snapolitano@citymb.info; rmontgomery@citymb.info;

shadley@citymb.info hstern@citymb.info qbarrow@citymb.info

bmoeb@citymb.info; citycouncil@citymb.info jfranklin@citymb.info

MBUSD Board of Trustees

jfenton@mbusd.org; jspeel@mbusd.org; cgraves@mbusd.org jboxer@mbusd.org

jcochran@mbusd.org; jbowes@mbusd.org; kgerger@mbusd.org

Victorwill@alumni.brown.edu.

rideformbef@yahoo.com _____

Martha Alvarez

From: Birkel, Julia L. <jbirkel@hfbllp.com>
Sent: Monday, July 19, 2021 10:16 AM
To: List - City Council; City Manager; Suzanne Hadley; Hildy Stern; Steve Napolitano; Richard Montgomery; Joe Franklin
Subject: [EXTERNAL] RE: City Council Meeting July 19th: Bruce's Beach Plaque

CAUTION: This Email is from an EXTERNAL source. Ensure you trust this sender before clicking on any links or attachments.

Dear Esteemed City Council:

I am in awe of the incredible work done by the Bruce's Beach History Advisory Board and fully support its proposed language for the plaque. Their tireless devotion to researching the history and presenting the facts in such a beautifully written piece deserves high praise.

It would speak so well for the City if the Council would unanimously approve it.

Thank you very much.

Julie Birkel

30+ year resident of Manhattan Beach



Julia L. Birkel | Partner | Hill, Farrer & Burrill LLP

One California Plaza | 300 So. Grand Ave., 37th Fl. | Los Angeles, CA 90071

Dir: 213.621.0857 | Main: 213.620.0460

jbirkel@hillfarrer.com | www.hillfarrer.com | [v card](#) | 

===== The information contained in this electronic mail message is confidential information intended only for the use of the individual or entity named above, and may be privileged. The information herein may also be protected by the Electronic Communications Privacy Act, 18 USC Sections 2510-2521. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please immediately notify us by telephone (213-620-0460), and delete the original message. Thank you.

Martha Alvarez

From: Lauradotson <lauradotson@roadrunner.com>
Sent: Monday, July 19, 2021 9:53 AM
To: List - City Council
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Bruce's Beach plaques

CAUTION: This Email is from an EXTERNAL source. Ensure you trust this sender before clicking on any links or attachments.

As a long time Manhattan Beach Resident, I urge the council to approve plaques commemorating the honest and accurate history of Bruce's Beach both at the site and on the strand, as recommended by the history advisory board.

Laura Dotson
575 35th Street
Manhattan Beach

Sent from my iPhone

Martha Alvarez

From: Cecilia Ball <cball6@earthlink.net>
Sent: Friday, July 16, 2021 7:23 PM
To: List - City Council; City Manager
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Bruce's Beach History Advisory Board Recommendations

CAUTION: This Email is from an EXTERNAL source. Ensure you trust this sender before clicking on any links or attachments.

To City Council and City Manager,

I wholeheartedly support the efforts of the History Advisory Board. It is important that the city document and embrace a fact-based, historical record of Manhattan Beach's history. Installation of the two plaques recommended by the advisory board will show that the city of Manhattan Beach is facing its past and working towards a better future in terms of race relations.

If the council chooses to ignore or re-write Bruce's Beach history, this city will fall into the category of cities, particularly in the South, who are doing the same. And that will be a sad day for Manhattan Beach.

One final note - "anonymous" comments, complaints and recommendations should not even be entertained by the city or the council. If a person or a group of people don't have the courage of their convictions, then whatever they have to say should be ignored.

Cecilia Ball
Resident of Manhattan Beach since 1972

Martha Alvarez

From: PAMELA DAVIDSON <davidson@ucla.edu>
Sent: Friday, July 16, 2021 7:44 AM
To: List - City Council; City Clerk
Subject: [EXTERNAL] How to Best Respond to Affordable Housing & Homelessness

CAUTION: This Email is from an EXTERNAL source. Ensure you trust this sender before clicking on any links or attachments.

Dear Mayor Hadley and Council Members Montgomery, Franklin, Napolitano and Stern:

Since the next City Council Hearing will address our city's response to Homelessness, will it be possible to extend the agenda to address the "affordable housing crisis" in California and the State overreach proposed in California SB9: <https://www.latimes.com/opinion/story/2021-07-09/california-affordable-housing-sb9>

- As you know, a letter to the Governor was signed by 120 elected officials and 48 jurisdictions asking the Governor to veto SB9: <https://www.latimes.com/opinion/story/2021-07-09/california-affordable-housing-sb9>
- Additionally, many are concerned about the recent action by the Redondo Beach City Council that approved rezoning for 2500 new homes mostly in north Redondo Beach.
- What can the MB City Council and citizens do to protect against SB9 as an illogical solution to the housing crisis, not to mention the State overreach into local jurisdiction that dramatically affects population density and our quality of life in the Southbay?

Thanks for your consideration, Pamela Davidson

Martha Alvarez

From: Lucia La Rosa <larosa_lucia@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 15, 2021 7:52 PM
To: List - City Council
Subject: [EXTERNAL] allocation of financial resources to homelessness issues

CAUTION: This Email is from an EXTERNAL source. Ensure you trust this sender before clicking on any links or attachments.

Dear Mayor Hadley and Council Members Franklin, Montgomery, Napolitano and Stern:

I am writing to advocate that the City allocates the necessary financial resources to address the following:

- 1) Contract a full-time house navigator.
- 2) Resort to SHARE! for housing and secure 2 shelter beds.
- 3) Access to the Redondo Beach Homeless Court

1) **The City needs to contract a full-time house navigator**

We currently have one Harbor Interfaith House Navigator for homeless outreach, and we share him with Hermosa Beach and Redondo Beach. Because of the quantity of the cases assigned to him, his activity is reactive in nature—he intervenes when called, unless he is not engaged somewhere else.

Our understanding is that the current contract with Harbor Interfaith allocates his supervision in the Director of Harbor Interfaith, who in her turn answers to the City as the City is the client. And our Homeless Liaison is the City representative under the contract.

Manhattan Beach needs to have a pro-active approach, which might provide the city with a clear understanding of the number of homeless people in Manhattan Beach and the causes of their condition.

This means the city needs to secure a full-time house navigator who is exclusively dedicated to our city and whose tenure is independent from if and when funding will be granted by the county.

In the City of Santa Monica, the homeless outreach team hired by the City performs daily “walk through” the city aiming at contacting and engaging the homeless individuals proactively and consistently. Our house navigator should do the same and he should respond to the city representative, the Homeless Liaison, directly and keep the city and the community informed. This is possible only if Manhattan Beach has its own house navigator paid with its own city funds.

2) The City needs a short term and long term housing solution. This means securing at least 2 -hopefully 3- shelter beds and resorting to SHARE! for permanent housing the homeless people.

Our goal as a city needs to remain connecting homeless people to services and housing in a rapid and efficient way. We advocate that the City of Manhattan Beach resort to SHARE! to secure housing for local homeless people.

As Homeless Liaison Gabriel's report has confirmed, homeless individuals located in Manhattan Beach who have accepted services and housing have been rapidly housed through SHARE!

SHARE! provides a real solution because house the homeless in actual shared apartments, while they continue to be supported by social and mental health services. When a homeless individual is willing to accept help, SHARE! has been able to secure a shared apartment in as little as 72 hours. Sometimes it might take longer, but in that case MBSAFE has assisted the transition to housing.

The visible increase of homeless individuals require that the city invests resources in facilitating such transition by securing, through SHARE! or otherwise, shelter beds to offer a temporary alternative to the streets while permanent housing is procured. The number of 2 shelter beds is not arbitrary but takes in account the time which has been necessary to secure permanent housing through SHARE! in past cases, and, therefore, the possible timing of the turnover from temporary shelter beds to permanent SHARE! housing.

3) The city should access to the Redondo Beach Homeless Court

As the American Bar Association describes:” *For participants, the Court hearing is an opportunity to separate the past from the present and future by presenting the accomplishments described in the advocacy letters, planning for the future, and reconciling their cases. For the community, the Homeless Court engages people in a gainful process, removing homeless people from doorways, parks, and gathering places, where they are susceptible to arrest and being unwanted. These people can then rebuild their lives by addressing the legal issues that often create barriers to accessing housing, employment, public assistance, and treatment programs.*”

The Homeless Court has a proved record of success in cities and counties where it has been implemented because it addresses the causes of crimes and by capitalizing on the involvement with the homeless programs for the fulfillment of court orders, reduce the incidence of recidivism.

<https://www.courts.ca.gov/documents/homeless-community-court-blueprint.pdf>

https://www.sandag.org/uploads/publicationid/publicationid_1113_5390.pdf

Thank you for your attention and consideration.

Lucia La Rosa Ames