

Martha Alvarez

From: Allison Saba <allimsaba@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 9, 2021 3:17 PM
To: City Clerk
Subject: [EXTERNAL] In support of shelter beds and house navigator

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

Hello,

I fully support the effort of our city providing shelter beds as well as a house navigator. I stay in close contact with MB safe and I'm so appreciative of all of the individuals who are making this happen and trying to keep our city safe.

Thank you so much,

Allison Saba

Sent from my iPhone

Martha Alvarez

From: Onyx Homes <onyxhomes28@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 9, 2021 3:50 PM
To: List - City Council
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Stormwater and Urban Runoff

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

Dear Manhattan Beach City Council,

My name is Sergio Patel. I'm a Manhattan Beach resident and local developer. I've been developing residential property in Manhattan Beach for approximately 15 years. I recently became aware that the Stormwater and Urban Runoff Ordinance No. 15-0004 is going before council tonight. I'm writing to address my concern and disapproval of the proposed ordinance. First, I believe water should be diverted away from a home and it's foundation to maintain structural integrity. Second, we, as Manhattan Beach residents have been paying a storm drain assessment fee along with our property taxes. These funds should be managed and spent efficiently to address this issue, rather than imposing this on developers, regardless of the size and scope of their construction project. Third, with added permits, implementation, and inspections, this will significantly increase processing and construction time for a development. Lastly, I know of a few developers who were forced to implement eco-rain systems in their new residential developments in Hermosa Beach and have had many problems with these systems overflowing and causing water damage to the house. They eventually just ended up diverting water from the eco-rain system, essentially making it useless, and sump-pumping the water to the storm drain. Basically, the whole thing created a huge loss of time, planning, and money.

Thank you for your time.

Sergio V. Patel
Builder / Broker
Manhattan Beach, CA 90266
310-245-5998 Phone
CSLB # 944109
DRE # 01447847

Martha Alvarez

From: Bonnie Schwartz <bonschwartz1@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 9, 2021 11:14 AM
To: City Clerk
Subject: [EXTERNAL] E-Comment for Recognition of Outgoing Mayor Hadley Agenda Item 9/9/21

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

Just wanted to thank Mayor Hadley for her phenomenal commitment and support for the new Manhattan Beach Community Center. Her fundraising efforts are greatly appreciated and definitely provide the momentum we need to make this vision a reality.

Thank you very much.

Bonnie Schwartz
Board Member,
Friends of Senior & Scout Community Center

Bonnie Schwartz
Cell: (310) 486-2222

Martha Alvarez

From: Natalie Foley <natalie.foleymb@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, September 8, 2021 6:22 AM
To: City Clerk
Subject: [EXTERNAL] September 9th council meeting supporting comments

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

Dear City Council,

As a 30-year resident of Manhattan Beach, I am writing in support of a full time House Navigator and buying shelter beds.

Anything we can do as a city to help people get out of the cold, reunited with family, and/or the mental health help they need is a blessing for them. May God guide you in all wisdom as you make your decisions at the council meeting and in the days and weeks ahead.

God bless you,
Natalie Foley

Martha Alvarez

From: Angela Nelson <adnelson625@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 7, 2021 9:30 PM
To: City Clerk
Subject: [EXTERNAL] THANK YOU Suzanne Hadley

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

I want to personally thank Suzanne Hadley for her service to this community. Her tenure as Mayor was professional, graceful and one that put our sweet town first! She unified us and did what was best for our residents and not some personal agenda! She showed up at rallies to get our kids back into the classroom! She was visible to the public. She was approachable and personable.

Suzanne Hadley will be missed. Hildy Stern has big shoes to fill.

Thank you,
Angela Nelson

Martha Alvarez

From: Brenda O'Leary <brendajoleary@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 9, 2021 2:20 PM
To: City Clerk
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Comment on Item E1 - Hildy Stern

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

Welcome Hildy Stern!

During this time of continued uncertainty around the pandemic, it's nice to have a Mayor who relies on science.

During this time of heightened conflict and controversy amongst our neighbors, it's nice to have a Mayor who advocates for a peace pole.

Hopefully your leadership will turn the page on a brighter chapter for our community.

All the best,
Brenda O'Leary

Martha Alvarez

From: Sue Murray <Sue.Murray@mangomarketing.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 9, 2021 11:20 AM
To: List - City Council
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Hildy Stern

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

I understand that this evening, you are announcing that Hildy Stern will be our future mayor.

I am sure that you get lots of complaints about the various things you do at the City, so I wanted to let you know that I applaud this decision.

I have contacted Hildy on several occasions asking for various things and she has always responded immediately with relevant, helpful information; I have always been very impressed with her knowledge and the level of service she has offered me and the wider community.

I'm looking forward to having someone so competent in this position and thank you for your decision!

Sue

Sue Murray
Director

PLMR | mango

M.UK +44 7789 993304

M. US +1 310 977 7313

sue.murray@mangomarketing.com

www.plmr.co.uk



Martha Alvarez

From: Jim Burton <jburton@ecokai.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 9, 2021 10:46 AM
To: List - City Council
Cc: Bruce Moe
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Ratification of the BID and DBPA Agreements -

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

Honorable Mayor and Members of Council –

In review of the tonight's agenda, I have a clarification question regarding the ratification of the BID and DBPA agreements and distribution of collected assessment. If the agreement is approved as written, is the money collected for use of public right of way for profit, i.e., "dining decks", now required to stay within the BID as indicated in the Business Improvement and Activity Plan (July 2021) and NOT be allocated into the General Fund? The agreement states Council is approving the July 2021 Plan and the Plan suggests that money paid by businesses for use of public right of way for "dining decks" must stay in the BID allocation:

- Funds collected for use of public right of way in Downtown should stay in BID to be used for security, beautification, cleanliness, shared transportation, etc. Funds should be used for something that benefits all businesses. Not acceptable for it to go into the General Fund.

Public parking money collected in downtown is for ALL stakeholders not simply the BID. I am fine with the business tax assessment for businesses within the BID, but I strongly **oppose** money collected for use of PUBLIC right-of-way (aka dining decks, sidewalk encroachments, massive loss of public street width through re-striping, etc.) being re-allocated away from the General Fund and into a BID only fund.

Any help for my clarification prior to the meeting today would be appreciated.

Respectfully,

Jim Burton
328 11th Street
(310) 376-8939

Martha Alvarez

From: robertbush dslextreme.com <robertbush@dslextreme.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 9, 2021 10:22 AM
To: robertbush @dslextreme.com
Cc: robertbush @dslextreme.com; Steve Napolitano; Richard Montgomery; Suzanne Hadley; Hildy Stern; Bruce Moe; Quinn Barrow; jfenton; Joe Franklin; List - City Council; jfenton; speel; jcochran; jboxer; cgraves
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Manhattan Beach - Reorganization

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

Manhattan Beach City Council – Reorganization by Robert Bush

Manhattan Beach - Mayor Pro Tem should not be installed as Mayor. This small beach town requires a strong leader that can guide the city through the troubled times of the COVID-19 Pandemic. The present Mayor has the ability to work with county and state leaders. Mayor has overall judgement about “science and the laws” of the pandemic and respects the Manhattan Beach Unified School District as a separate governing body.

I’M NOT TALKING ABOUT MAYOR PRO TEM - SUZANNE HADLEY. I’M TALKING ABOUT MAYOR PRO TEM – HILDY STERN.

Mayor Pro Tem Hildy Stern’s term as Mayor should be postponed.

Mayor Pro Tem campaign slogan “Bringing Community Together” has failed because of the radical, political discord she has caused – failed

attempt to prevent Mayor Pro Tem Suzanne Hadley from becoming Mayor, MB Divided United, Bruce’s Beach Task Force, Peace Pole - International Symbol in Manhattan Beach Civic Center Plaza and BLM (Black Lives Matter) - Reparations.

Mayor Pro Tem Hildy Stern will be installed as Mayor on September 9, 2021 on Zoom.

Mayor Pro Tem ascension to Mayor, a position that for the last 42 years has rotated automatically every nine months.

On September 9, 2021, we will bid farewell to Mayor Suzanne Hadley - one of the best Mayors that Manhattan Beach has ever elected. (That’s only after Suzanne Hadley vowed to serve as a more unifying figure as Mayor.)

MAYOR SUZANNE HADLEY

Suzanne Hadley vowed to serve as a more unifying figure as mayor.

“My one intention in serving as your mayor will be to unify our community, work with my colleagues and community leaders, and listen to our residents and businesses to make Manhattan Beach the best that it can be,” Hadley wrote. “I want to make sure all voices are heard. Being mayor isn’t going to be about me, it’s going to be about us, about Manhattan Beach. I fully understand that I will be representing all of council and all of our community when I say or do anything and it’s on me to put Manhattan Beach in the best light and act with dignity and respect for all at all times. This I promise.”

Suzanne Hadley – Elect - Manhattan Beach City Council	Mar
2019	
Suzanne Hadley – Mayor Pro Tem for Mayor	Dec
2020	

Suzanne Hadley – Re-elect - Manhattan Beach City Council Nov
2022

From: WeTheParentsMB@gmail.com

Date: Tue, Sep 8, 2021

Subject: Saluting our Mayor, Suzanne Hadley

On behalf of "We The Parents MB" we want to express our gratitude to Suzanne Hadley for her superlative service during her term as Mayor of Manhattan Beach.

She took the reigns of leadership during a time of very difficult political headwinds and served with dignity, prudence, and wisdom throughout.

We encourage your public input in support of Mayor Hadley 'raising the bar' in local governmental service to the city.

Martha Alvarez

From: Kim Brant-Lucich <kbrant007@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, September 8, 2021 10:13 PM
To: List - City Council
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Thank you and Congratulations

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

Dear City Council Members and City Manager,

As we prepare for the Mayoral gavel to be passed, I would like to thank Mayor Hadley for her nine months of service. As Mayor, she has personally responded to every letter I have submitted (and I'm sure all other residents' letters), even though we often disagree. I would also like to congratulate Mayor Pro Tem Hildy Stern as she steps into the role of Mayor. I look forward to Ms. Stern's leadership and continued focus on our community.

While I often disagree with Council decisions, and will continue to let my opinion be known, I appreciate your dedication. I know it can be a thankless job and I thank you for your service.

Regards,

Kim Brant-Lucich

Martha Alvarez

From: dmcphersonla@gmail.com
Sent: Wednesday, September 8, 2021 9:55 PM
To: List - City Council
Cc: Bruce Moe; Liza Tamura; Martha Alvarez; Carrie Tai, AICP
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Opposed to Funding Downtown BID/BPA, Agenda Item N (9)
Attachments: 210909-McP-CC-DMBBID.pdf

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

Per the attachment, I oppose funding the Downtown MB BID, because for two years, information on how the public funds spent totally deficient.

Based on the record, councilmembers have no basis to approve the funding. If transfer of the assessment approved, that implies councilmembers have knowledge about the BID finances not in the public record, a Brown Act violation.

Don McPherson
1014 1st St, Manhattan Beach CA 90266
Cell 310 487 0383
dmcphersonla@gmail.com

AGENDA ITEM N (9). OPPOSED TO FUNDING DMBBID, A BROWN ACT VIOLATION

This email shall serve to oppose transfer of public funds for 2021-2022 to the Downtown Manhattan Beach Business Improvement District and its contractor, the Downtown Manhattan Beach Business and Professional Association [“BID/BPA”].

During the past two years, since the financial disclosure on 18 June 2019, the BID/BPA has neither provided credible financial reports nor documented its accomplishments.

Consequently, per this deficient public record, the city council should not disburse further public funds to the BID/BPA. To do so, will establish that councilmembers act on information not in the record, which violates the Brown Act, Section § 54959.

The Record.

Per the record, the BID/BPA purportedly operated at a loss during 2014-2018. In 2019, however, the profit unexplainably soared to \$61,418, without any change in operations. The 2014-2018 records lack certified financial accounting, so the previous losses questionable.

The 2019 annual report provides detailed financial accounting, although it lacks complete data from the Farmers Market.

Neither the 2020 nor the 2021 annual reports provide valid financial accounting. Specifically, these reports do not confirm that the bank-account total complies with the statutory \$100,000 minimum. Additionally, no evidence exists regarding the bank balance, which in June 2019, totaled \$153,189.73.

Conclusion.

Since July 2019, the BID/DPA has neither provided credible financial accounting nor information that the funding spent on valid purposes. Per the record, therefore, the city council has no basis to transfer public funds to the BID/DPA for 2021-2022. Consequently, approval of the funding will establish that councilmembers act on information not in the public record. That violates the Brown Act.

Martha Alvarez

From: Cynthia STRAND <strands739@verizon.net>
Sent: Wednesday, September 8, 2021 6:16 PM
To: List - City Council
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Thank you Mayor Hadley

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

Dear Council:

We would like to thank Suzanne for her unwavering support of our community and all the hard work she did during her tenure as mayor. Suzanne handled many difficult problems with class and decisiveness and we will forever be thankful.

Proud to have you as our mayor and Councilmember, Suzanne.

Regards
Geof and Cyndi Strand

Sent from my iPad

Martha Alvarez

From: roycasey@aol.com
Sent: Wednesday, September 8, 2021 1:44 PM
To: Quinn Barrow (External)
Cc: List - City Council
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Need to consider revisions to Bruce's Beach History Report

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

I cannot find any indication on the City's website that the History Advisory Board or any of its members are going to consider revisions to the 6/7/21 Bruce's Beach History Report adopted by City Council effective 6/16/21.

Here is a list of the reasons I believe revisions to the BB History Report should be considered in order make sure it reflects an "accurate history" of Bruce's Beach:

1. The 3 tasks approved by City Council in 2020 were (i) to obtain an "Accurate History of Bruce's Beach," (ii) consider a need for changing the existing plaque and (iii) to commission artwork to reflect the accurate history.
2. The BB History Report is posted on the City's website as the history adopted by City Council, so it must be an "accurate history"
3. It has been well established during many Council meetings that the BB History Report is subject to change based on new evidence and new input, like the issues raised at the 7/20/21 Council meeting (see below).
4. The BB History Report is an integral part of the information provided to the public via plaques because a QR code on plaques will make the History Report posted on the City's website available to the public.
5. Many of the issues raised by City Council during the 7/20/21 meeting involved language contained in the History Report that should be considered for removal or modification based on comments made by Council Members during that meeting and further research, as follows:
 - KKK influence on Board of Trustees,
 - KKK involvement in running the Bruce's and other Black property owners out of town,
 - KKK stories on pp36-39 of the History Report were referred to by Council Member Franklin as lacking credibility and in some cases being openly stated as speculation,
 - Changes to the history report regarding KKK involvement and other damaging stories as requested by Dwayne Shepherd, spokesman for the Bruce's family that has threatened a lawsuit against MB for damages, generational wealth and future income
 - The story about Elizabeth Cali being arrested for violating "No Trespassing" signs was told as if it proved racial discrimination; however, both her lawsuit and appeal failed to prove her complaint of racial discrimination,
 - Was "invasion of African Americans" stated by George Lindsay in the 1920's to influence the Board of Trustees or coined by Robert Brigham when writing his Thesis in the 1950's?
 - Stories about Race Wars and a MB Grand Jury investigation as told in the History Report are referred to on plaques even though it involved uncorroborated stories about racial violence 4 years after the Eminent Domain decision,
 - Stories about the Slaughter family being allowed to operate a beach house for people of color and being included as active members of the community seems to tell a story of inclusion that is not told on the plaques,
 - The fact that all black property owners affected by Eminent Domain rebought property in MB, except the Bruce's was not told on the plaques, even though it showed MB being welcoming and inclusive
 - Council Member Napolitano brought up the fact that Fair Compensation to the Bruce's remains an open issue. Since that time it has been discovered that the History Advisory Board had copies of the court documents on 6/2/21 as revealed during a Board meeting on that date. A review and analysis of these court documents should settle that issue, as well as, provide input on how the Court resolved the Bruce's claim for damages of \$50,000 related to racial discrimination,
 - Council Member Franklin complained that the BB History Report relied too heavily on op-eds in Black Activist newspapers and needed more sources to strike a fair balance, like a book by Dr. Josh Sides
 - Franklin also complained about statements included in the BB History Report that are obviously speculation, quoting examples from p36 of the report taken directly from Brigham's Thesis that used the word "speculation,"

- Council Member Montgomery complained that there is no information on white property owners affected by Eminent Domain, which will require more research that should be added to the BB History Report.
- During the 7/20/21 meeting, the issue of a need for editing, fair and balanced language and a proper context throughout was discussed at length, but not resolved, other than agreement that anybody can take a shot, even residents.
- After reflecting on the original task of obtaining an "accurate history" as approved by City Council, Montgomery went on to say, "I don't want a selective history. If you are going to do it right, do it right the entire way, don't stop halfway. If it takes six months more, take six months more. We have to address the issues our residents want to see."
- Mayor Hadley added "When I voted for an accurate history of Bruce's Beach, it wasn't the story, it was the facts."

Here are the actions that I believe are warranted in light of the circumstances described above, and I would appreciate a response to this email by the City's Attorney as to whether these or other actions will be taken:

1. Based on the high number and substantive nature of issues raised by City Council on 7/20/21 (see partial list above and previous email), the History Advisory Board or a subcommittee thereof should be reconvened to consider changes to the BB History Report and related plaque language.
2. If so, how far in advance will the meeting date be posted, will the public be allowed to view the meeting and make comments?
3. How soon after the meeting will a video of the meeting be posted on the City's website?
4. How far in advance of a City Council meeting to discuss said changes will a draft of a revised History Report and revised plaque language be posted on the City's website?
5. When City Council meets to consider a revised History Report draft, will there be a vote to "adopt" the report as was done on 6/16/21 for the history report draft dated 6/7/21?

Thanks for considering my comments as a resident of Manhattan Beach and I look forward to a response in the near future,

Roy Casey

Martha Alvarez

From: Charles Southey <charlessouthey@aol.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 7, 2021 2:29 PM
To: List - City Council
Subject: [EXTERNAL] No vote for any new taxes or fees for water run off
Importance: High

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

Honorable Council,

I have reviewed the legislation text and a few major things stand out. Although I commend the environmentally friendly ideal but it does not seem that it is thoroughly vetted.

1. If the city is thinking about forcing residents to comply with the LID best practices, shouldn't the city first implement these practices at the city level? I can't tell you how often I see broken city sprinklers running unattended, water fountains that don't turn off, sprinklers thoroughly watering the street, flooded park sod because of water breaks and above ground sprinklers running endlessly in day light hours.
2. Standing water. Before I rebuilt my house I had sunken covered sump pumps in the back yards and although they were "Mandated" by city code, they were a breeding ground for mosquitos. it wasn't too long ago that we had a Zica scare and a west nile scare. I would stay far away from mandating anything that leads to standing water on small properties.
3. Do we not have a stormwater assessment on our property tax bill. Where is this money going?
4. Any "Contractor" fee for new regulations is a tax payor fee. Don't we pay enough?
5. Can someone please share who is on the sustainability task force?

In summation, please support Option 2: Continue with business as usual and not add any additional runoff regulations to new construction. Currently, Manhattan Beach has Ordinance No. 15-0004 requiring certain new developments to retain or filter stormwater runoff, which matches the Regional Water Quality Control Board's requirements

Sincerely,

Charles Southey
743 27th Street, Manhattan Beach, CA 90266

Martha Alvarez

From: cynthia palm <galcapale11@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, September 3, 2021 2:15 PM
To: List - City Council
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Homelessness in MB

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

Good Afternoon all.

Thank you for adding the homelessness issue to the agenda for the 9/9 meeting.

I want to send you my thoughts.

- 1) I am in full agreement with the hiring of a full time House Navigator.
- 2) I am in full agreement with the procurement of two shelter beds to assist in the housing transition.

Personally, as a professional fiduciary, I have navigated these waters for several of my clients who were homeless despite having support from family members through Special Needs Trusts. I am familiar with the challenges, the limitations of housing and finding the right types of services.

It is absolutely the hardest work I have ever done and I value and appreciate the work being done in our city by our volunteers and staff dedicated to this issue.

Thank you for taking the time to consider these action items and your continued work on behalf of our city.

Have a great three day weekend.

Cindy Palm
Resident
Business Owner

Martha Alvarez

From: roycasey@aol.com
Sent: Thursday, September 2, 2021 11:48 PM
To: Bruces Beach Task Force
Cc: List - City Council
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Bruce's Beach History Report and Plaques

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

To all members of the History Advisory Board of Manhattan Beach:

First of all, thanks for all of the many hours each of you invested into this project.

I watched the 7/20/21 City Council meeting wherein proposed plaque language and portions of the underlying history report adopted by City Council on 6/16/21 were sent back to the History Advisory Board for issues raised during the meeting. I wanted to watch the History Advisory Board meeting to address those issues; however I could not find any mention of a scheduled meeting on the City's website. Therefore, I decided to submit my comments for the Board to consider in writing via this email.

Before I comment on the issues raised during the 7/20/21 meeting, I would like to present some other comments for the Board's consideration:

1. **Frank Daugherty** - During the Board meetings on 5/26/21 & 6/28/21, after the history report was adopted by City Council, the question was raised if there was any actual evidence that Frank Daugherty was a member of the Board of Trustees of Manhattan Beach when the Board voted to enact a Complaint of Eminent Domain [and, if so, did he attend and vote at that meeting]. But I could not find where this question was resolved. I assume that someone on the Board has access to the minutes from this meeting of the Board of Trustees wherein the attendees and their votes would be documented. The whole question of racial motivation for Eminent Domain could hinge on this determination because after the issues raised during the 7/20/21 Council meeting, this uncorroborated story from Frank Daugherty told 30 years after the fact, might be the only story remaining to raise doubt about the true motivation of the Board of Trustees.
2. **"Professional Review Feedback"** document presented by the Board - First of all, this is not what the public expressed a need for during public comments. It is obvious from the bios provided that there was no attempt whatsoever to obtain "review feedback" from a bipartisan group of history experts, which was the primary complaint via public comments. Dr. Gross and other Far Left reviewers made substantive changes, provided input and heavily edited many portions of the history report and plaque language. And the Board did not identify their specific input. Professor Rosenthal from LMU submitted a preliminary review in a letter dated 6/13/21 that called out the need for a bipartisan approach that would include reading and analysis of all sources, placing uncorroborated stories and contested memories in the footnotes of the report below the main body so as to not confuse with the factual portion of the report, researching additional sources to include conservative voices, adding a proper context throughout the report vs one small comment in the forward and professional, bipartisan editing that would include removal of biased phrases and wording like the ones Mayor Hadley called out **during the 7/20/21 Council meeting**. Council Member Franklin called out the inclusion of statements that started with introductory phrases like "It has been speculated" and other phrases that call into question the factual nature of many statements in the report, like op-eds from Black activist newspaper bi-lines and op-eds, which should be moved to the footnotes. Mr. Franklin also recommended Dr. Josh Sides as an additional source. **At the 7/20/21 meeting**, all Council Members called out the need for editing but nobody had an answer on how to get it done and even invited the general public to submit their edits rather than mention the obvious solution to hire bipartisan experts. Lindsay Fox summarized the sentiment of the Board very well by saying "Dr. Gross is all we need" (6/7/21 Board Meeting 36min:08sec). As additional evidence that the Board had no appreciation whatsoever for the public outcry for an independent analysis by a fair and balanced team of bipartisan history experts, at the 5/26/21 meeting at 1hr:30min:40sec, Tyler St. Bernard made a comment that the Board using their select group of "reviewers" aligned with public comments that the Board should use professional historians.
3. A **"mystery copywriter"** was often referred to by Lindsay Fox in Board meetings that was not identified by name and it is unclear if that person is included in the list of professional contributors.

4. **Anthony Bruce**, a descendant of the Bruce's that stands to gain from the lawsuit threatened by Dwayne Shepherd, requested via Isla Garraway that a positive quote from Bernard Bruce to be removed from the history report. Bernard had made a statement after the public ceremony to rename the park after the Bruce's that the family was happy (See 5/26/21 Board meeting 25min:30sec). And, Anthony Bruce's input is not disclosed anywhere.
5. **Dr. Allison Jefferson**, a racial activist, provided input on plaque language by adding her opinion that Willa Bruce had a dream of opening a Beach House for Blacks and she was a visionary (5/26/21 Board meeting 33min:45sec) and other recommendations. However, her contributions were not disclosed in the Board's document entitled "Professional Review Feedback."
6. **Dwayne Shepherd**, noted spokesman for the Bruce's descendants, provided substantive input for the history report during Board meetings and perhaps during Task Force meetings. But this was not disclosed to the public. The Board completely ignored the fact that Shepherd has threatened publicly on many occasions to sue the City of Manhattan Beach for damages, "even if we get our land back" [while quoting stories directly from the history report as the basis for damages]. All of his input that I was able to identify during the Board meetings from 5/17/21 through 7/12/21 is clearly aimed at enhancing his chances of prevailing in litigation and increasing the amount of rewards for damages. For example, Isla Garraway and Lindsay Fox read from wording provided via email from Dwayne Shepherd, as follows:
 - **KKK** - 5/17/21 Board Meeting (1hr:19min) - Add KKK involvement harassment of Bruce's and their patrons and influence over the Board of Trustees of MB to enact Eminent Domain. After it was pointed out that the KKK was not active in the area until 3 or 4 years after the Eminent Domain decision, Isla argued that the Bruce's family feels like the role or influence or presence of the KKK is an important part of this story and we should mention it somewhere. During the 5/26/21 meeting, Board members openly explored possible wording to add a reference to KKK involvement and influence (e.g., KKK presence was evident, the growing KKK presence was evident, KKK activity increased, racist actions escalated, in response to exclusionary practices along the shoreline, etc.) Nothing was settled but the final thought was "What did the California Eagle say?" (a Black owned newspaper known for activism against segregation).
 - **Increase claim for damages** - Change the description of the facility from "dressing rooms" to "beach bath house" and add a list of amenities.
 - **Increase claim for damages** - 5/26/21 Board meeting (42min:28sec) - Add a statement that the Bruce's added 2 new structures.
 - **Racial Motive** - 5/17/21 Board meeting (1hr:38min) - Shepherd requested through Isla Garraway that the report include some confusing language from Brigham's Thesis that makes it sound like George Lindsay used the term "negro invasion" when it may have been Robert Brigham. Isla Garraway argued that we [the Board] definitely wanted the family [Bruce's] to give us [the Board] insight as to what they [Bruce's] wanted in their family story and I [Isla] was just thinking from the point of view of the family that he [George Lindsay] was a really important player in the community and came up with the whole idea of Eminent Domain that the City adopted. This is an important issue because misleading readers could advance a cause like giving back the land taken from the Bruce's and all the other land owners affected by Eminent Domain.
 - **Raising questions re Fair Compensation** - Isla then said that Shepherd wanted to add "On 5/16/27, the Bruce's were forced to give up their land for less than market value." Kristan Long Drew pointed out that the Bruce's received more than market value. Also, during the 6/2/21 & 6/7/21 Board meetings, Kristan Long revealed having received copies of the court documents that show the Bruce's waived their right to trial by jury and trial by 3 Court appointed Referees, even though they were represented by a NAACP lawyer, and instead relied upon a valuation determined by a group of 3 Court appointed valuation Referees. Yet, the history report continues to leave this issue of fair compensation open as an unanswered question to ponder if the Bruce's were fairly compensated. And the report does not make it clear that the Board did receive and review the court documents and came up with nothing to support claims of racial discrimination or unfair compensation. This has misled readers of this report to believe that the Bruce Family should receive reparations.
 - **Grand Jury investigation of KKK, Race Wars, Gun Shots, Fires, etc.** The Board showed awareness that these stories about racial violence occurred 4 to 5 years after the Eminent Domain decision in various parts of the country and have nothing to do with Bruce's Beach, but decided to level these stories in the history report anyway.
 - **Uncorroborated stories included in the history report** about MB police harassing and arresting patrons of Bruce Beach Lodge, citizens slashing tires and setting fires to buildings are quoted by Dwayne Shepherd when making statement that he will file a lawsuit against MB for damages.

BELOW IS AN OPEN ITEM LISTING OF "ISSUES, CONCERNS & REQUESTS FOR CHANGES & EVIDENCE"

This recap is intended to help the Board, Council Members and residents keep track of this comprehensive list of open items raised by City Council on 7/20/21 and to help make the issues easier to understand.

BIG REVEAL DURING MEETING - THERE IS NO EVIDENCE OF KKK INVOLVEMENT OR INFLUENCE

A shocking reveal occurred **during the 7/20/21 meeting** by what can be described as an intensely scripted courtroom scene from *Law and Order* with Council Member Napolitano acting as interrogator of a witness played by Kristan Long. During this long exchange, Council Member Napolitano asked Ms. Long the same basic question 7 times in a row: Is there any evidence of KKK involvement in Bruce's Beach or KKK influence over the MB Board of Trustees to enact Eminent Domain to take away the Bruce's land and business (paraphrased)?

Ms. Long's final answer about no evidence was "In so far as the Klan's involvement, I don't know."

DOES ADEQUATE EVIDENCE REMAIN OF RACIAL MOTIVATION FOR ACTIONS BY MB BOARD OF TRUSTEES?

KKK involvement and influence was the primary evidence to support a conclusion in the history report that Eminent Domain was racially motivated. Most of these stories about KKK involvement included in the history report came from black activists newspapers. And at the end of 10 months, out of nowhere, **it was revealed during the 7/20/21 Council Meeting** that there is no credible evidence for this claim. So, what evidence remains?

The history reports states that Robert Brigham's amateur level Master's Thesis from 1956 (32 years after the Eminent Domain) "served as a primary resource on the history of Bruce's Beach," which was quoted and used as an authoritative reference 21 times in the history report. And, articles and opinions from black activist newspapers were relied upon as source material 20 times in the history report.

Mr. Brigham himself issued a warning about misinformation in his Thesis: "The misinformation the author encountered in seeking data on the Bruce's and other individuals and incidents related to his subject is significant as it indicates the ease with which fallacy can become 'fact' in a situation of this type."

Council Member Franklin pointed out **during the 7/20/21 meeting** that key statements in the history report taken from Brigham's Thesis included terms like "it was speculated" or "it's understood," which means these statements are not factual evidence. It is abundantly clear that most quotes from Brigham's Thesis are pure speculation based on frequent use of phrases like: "so-and-so wrote, said, claimed, reported, indicated or relayed a story about," or "it is understood that" or "allegedly, it has been said," or "Brigham speculated, Brigham reports, Brigham wrote," etc.

Mr. Franklin made an observation **during the 7/20/21 meeting** that black activist publications were heavily relied upon as sources in the history report (*The California Eagle, Venice Vanguard & Liberator*). It is well known that black activist publications expressed viewpoints and opinions to help fight segregation. To prove a point that these newspapers are not credible sources for facts, Mr. Franklin read a quote from the book, *LA City Limits African American Los Angeles from the Great Depression to the Present*, written by a renowned authority on the subject, Dr. Josh Sides: "The black press of Los Angeles played a crucial role in politicizing its readers more than simply conveying newsworthy information, the California Eagle and the Los Angeles Sentinel, the city's two most influential black newspapers, prodded their leadership to challenge racial discrimination."

The history report itself states, "These accounts [stories] were recited nearly 30 years after they were alleged to have occurred, and some were not from first-hand experience, calling into question the validity and credibility." "These accounts" being referred to include uncorroborated stories like the ones below:

- A "story relayed" in a 1987 letter to *The Beach Reporter* by a resident that was 14 years old in 1924 about a realtor that "allegedly approached the Board of Trustees in 1921 requesting action to discourage African Americans from establishing residency in MB" and later informed the Board that condemnation could be used to "shut down the Bruce's resort."
- During an interview conducted by Brigham, a lawyer for 2 black property owners "said air was let out of tires in cars parked near the Bruce's resort while owners were at the beach."
- "A member of the 1924 Board of Trustees 'claimed' that one night he 'followed a siren to Bruce's Lodge where someone ('supposedly' a Klansman) had set fire to a mattress under the main building."
- "A daughter of black property owner affected by Eminent Domain "relayed a story of a Black-owned home on 23RD Street that was partially burned in 1926, 'allegedly' by a White neighbor, upset that an African-American woman had purchased it."
- Another interviewee "reported "10 Minutes Only" parking signs that were posted on Highland near the home of her mother (Mary Sanders) to make parking inconvenient for their friends and visitors."

After the statement in the history report questioning the validity and credibility of stories included in the report, the report say "we discovered reports by a variety of sources that corroborate acts of violence against members of the Black community in MB." The report went on to express reliance on grand jury investigations in 1928 long after the 1924 Eminent Domain action. Ms. Long admitted **during the 7/20/21 meeting** that the grand jury investigations did not seem to go anywhere and hoped that someone could find those documents.

As a result of heavy reliance on these types of sources, lots of opinions, op-eds, speculation and uncorroborated stories that are included in the main body of the history report and mixed-in with factual statements, which makes the report misleading because it is difficult to distinguish facts from mere stories.

WHY IS IT IMPORTANT FOR THE HISTORY REPORT TO BE FACTUALLY ACCURATE?

- The plaques will have QR codes to link the history report and video posted on the City's website to individuals that want to learn more when reading a brief summary of history on the plaques.
- The report was already used by MBUSD to justify appointment of a "Commission on Diversity, Equity, Social Justice and Inclusion," plus compliance audits by CLEAR. And the Bruce's Beach Task Force previously recommended a similar commission and audits for our City Government & Police Dept.

- The report, as written now, can be used as the poster-child by the state for a recently appointed reparations committee and justification for LA County to give back land and pay heirs of the Bruce Family.
- Uncorroborated stories included in the main body of the report are treated like factual accounts, which can be used as evidence to support a lawsuit against MB already threatened by a spokesman for heirs of the Bruce Family for damages (supported by uncorroborated stories) and lost income from their business “even we get our land back.” Court documents will show the Bruce’s were already paid for their business.
- If the report is used to justify reparations, restitution and/or a successful lawsuit against MB by the Bruce’s, then the report will likely be used as evidence by heirs of other property owners affected by Eminent Domain to file lawsuits against the City related to land owned by the City that is worth about \$150mil.

NEED FOR EDITING OF HISTORY REPORT AND PLAQUE LANGUAGE

There was lots of discussion between Council Members about **who was going to tackle the job of editing the revised plaque language after it comes back from the History Committee**, in order to craft language that strikes a fair and balanced tone, adds more context and separates the “story” from the facts. In other words to “get it right.”

Mayor Hadley said the language needs to be “fair” and “accurate” or “we want nothing” and “there is no rush.” She went on to say “our History Advisory Board is staffed with amateurs” but the language “must be right.” The Mayor also said “every word does matter,” and that she “voted for an accurate history of Bruce’s Beach; it wasn’t the story, it was the facts” and also asked for removal of a long list of 15 words and phrases (“pioneer, racially diverse, Jim Crowe era, exclusionary, immediately, soared, invasion, drive the black community out of the city, speculated, encouraged by the Bruce’s success, the legacy, far less, demolished, compelled, and abandoned”).

Council Member Montgomery made his case for an “accurate history” no matter how long it takes, as follows: The History Committee is “charged with” providing “fair, historical, factually accurate plaques.” “We have to address the issues residents want to see,” by asking the History Committee to “re-write accurate verbiage and we’ll go from there.” And we should “take our time to do it the right way,” even “if it takes six (6) months more.”

PLIGHT OF WHITE PROPERTY OWNERS NOT REPORTED IN PLAQUE LANGUAGE

Council Member Montgomery pointed out that the plaque language only focuses on black families that had their property taken away by Eminent Domain. There were 20 property owners of the 30 lots taken by Eminent Domain, including only 6 black owners of 4 lots. Nonpartisan historical experts always focus on ensuring a fair and balanced history and will perform whatever level of research is necessary to report all the facts accurately.

NEED CREDIBLE EVIDENCE THAT FIRE WAS SET TO SLAUGHTER’S PROPERTY

Ms. Long repeated a story from the history report about the Slaughters finding gasoline under their house after it started to smoke and caught fire and a burning cross placed across the street. the time frame seems to be long after the Eminent Domain decision and there is no indication if it was supposedly perpetrated by MB residents. It is not clear if this is a corroborated, factual story, and it conflicts with MB being so welcoming to this family (see below).

WAS “INVASION BY AFRICAN AMERICANS” IN THE REPORT USED IN THE 1920’s OR FABRICATED IN THE 1950’s BY ROBERT BRIGHAM, AUTHOR OF THE THESIS USED AS A SOURCE 21 TIMES?

Council Member Napolitano asked Ms. Long about inclusion of the phrase “invasion by African Americans” by asking “where did the word invasion come from?” Ms. Long replied, “So in this context, it came about in Brigham’s Thesis. And it was unclear that whether or not it was just George Lindsay who said that he feared an invasion or if Brigham was saying invasion.”

WERE THE BRUCE’S ADEQUATELY COMPENSATED?

In addition to determining if racial discrimination motivated the Board of Trustees to enact Eminent Domain, the other critical question is adequate compensation to the Bruce’s for their land, improvements and business. However, nobody seems to have a grip on this answer after 10 months of work by this amateur history committee.

Council Member Napolitano said, “although they received compensation, it was far less than they requested for their property and thriving business. So that goes to the question of whether the compensation was fair or not and who judges whether it’s fair or not?”

Kristan Long replied that it was “above market value” but it was the Bruce’s had requested \$150,000, including \$50,000 for damages. Napolitano then stated “Again the implication is though that there was something wrong about the compensation.” Ms. Long stated “I understand the implication. We don’t know what the exact value of the business was but we can only tell you what the value of the property was.”

Council Member Franklin later pointed out that the Bruce’s were able to purchase a home at 1042-1044 East 20th Street in Los Angeles for about \$7,500. And in 1932 Willa and her son, Harvey Bruce, purchased two commercial properties at 724 East 33rd Street in Los Angeles and 1339 East 18th Street.

Here are some interesting facts. The present value of the \$14,500 settlement is \$60mil, which would be a huge payoff equivalent to \$24mil for 2 lots on the strand (based on \$2,911.23 paid for 1 lot adjacent to the Bruce’s), leaving \$36mil paid for the business and buildings. This would be a huge payout by anyone’s calculation.

HISTORY SHOWS MB WAS INCLUSIVE & WELCOMING, BUT NOT SHOWN IN PLAQUE LANGUAGE

Council Member Stern stated that there were 3 other properties in MB owned by black families on the south side of 26th Street that were not taken by Eminent Domain proceedings (McCastill, Urban and Slaughter). These properties were located directly across from the 30 lots now known as Bruce's Beach and would have been easy to include the Eminent Domain if the intent of the Board of Trustees was to take land from black property owners.

Kristan Long stated that the Slaughters were a prominent black family in MB that was a "part of the community," their 7 children attended MB schools, and they owned and operated a 10 room beach, boarding house for black patrons at 120 26th St adjacent to the properties taken by Eminent Domain. Ms. Drew further stated that one daughter was a member of the Glee Club in a MB school and was featured on the front page of the Manhattan Beach news. Ms. Long also stated that the Slaughters were allowed to open a beach-boarding house in 1927 that operated until 1930 when the back took it over.

But the history report failed to highlight the fact that this was after the City passed ordinances on 6/19/24 that "prohibited new or additional development of bath houses" per the history report.

Council Member Napolitano pointed out that the history report says 4 out of 5 black families affected by Eminent Domain bought replacement property in MB. Then he asked Ms. Long why there was no mention of this on the plaques. Ms. Long replied, "I think it was just for condense, for you know, being succinct" and "as a writer, everyone knows no one likes to read."

Even though it was commonplace during this era of legal segregation, MB did not restrict ownership of land by people of color in any way and permitted connection to city services and utilities for structures but this fact is not highlighted in the report or included in the proposed plaque language.

Mrs. Bruce agreed the MB was welcoming and inclusive per a quote from her in the LA Times, "Wherever we have tried to buy land for a beach resort [in other cities] we have been refused."

All these stories conflict with misleading statements in the history report that will be read via QR codes that the Board of Trustees of MB passed "ordinances aimed to thwart the Bruce's business and drive the black community out of the city" and the "city pursued more aggressive measures."

NEED COURT DOCUMENTS RE BLACK LADY THAT SUED MB POLICE FOR DAMAGES

Ms. Long repeated another story from the history report that is based on newspaper articles from a black activist newspaper (*California Eagle*). Ms. Long said that a black friend of one of the Slaughter girls named Elizabeth Catley was "the young lady who was arrested and not allowed to get her clothes before she went into the jail in Redondo, because she defied the order of the local [MB] policeman who said she was not allowed to go into the water here [MB]." The history report states that Ms. Catley "was arrested for swimming and 'trespassing' on the private beach" and filed suit for damages against the arresting officer and the MB Board of Trustees."

Council Member Napolitano asked Ms. Long, "since when is it racist to put a no trespassing sign on private property." Ms. Long replied, "Well it's not racist to put a no trespassing sign on private property except for the fact that the only people who were told they could not cross over this land to get to the water were the black visitors to the beach." Ms. Catley lost her lawsuit in City Court and appeal filed in LA Superior Court.

THE MAJORITY OF SOURCES FOR HISTORY REPORT WERE LEFT LEANING

Council Member Franklin made another valid point that the authors of the history report should have used a broader spectrum of sources. Franklin made the same point during the 6/15/21 Council meeting when he proposed adjudication by non-partisan history experts, but his idea was shut down. See discussion of heavy dependence on black activist newspapers and an amateur level Thesis under the subject line above that questions the credibility of evidence remaining that the Board of Trustees acted out of racial motives.

NEED FOR ADDITIONAL SOURCES AND CONTEXT TO BE FAIR AND BALANCED

Council Member Franklin read other excerpts from the book written by Dr. Josh Sides, an award winning professor of CA history at Cal State Northridge and Director of the Center for Southern California Studies as referred to above (*LA City Limits*). The history report had only 1 casual reference to this book. Dr. Sides was also recommended to City Council by Dr. Ariel Gross, professor of law and history at USC, to be part of a balanced team of historical experts. Here is a quote in his book from Jefferson Elman, editor of the black LA newspaper the *Liberator* in 1902: "California is the greatest state for the negro." And in 1911, Elman elaborated "only a few years ago the bulk of your present-colored population came here from the south without any money in search of better things and we are not disappointed. The hospitable white people received them kindly, employed at good wages, treated them as men and women, furnished their children with the best educational advantages everywhere, feeling perfectly safe, the colored population planted themselves."

Again, thanks for your long hours of work and I hope this memo helps the Board conclude its scope of work.

Roy Casey

Martha Alvarez

From: Ben Harris <ben@lawaterkeeper.org>
Sent: Monday, August 2, 2021 11:59 AM
To: List - City Council
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Comment Letter on Agenda Item 11 for August 3, 2021
Attachments: Benjamin Harris Agenda Item 11 Comment Letter (8.2.21).pdf

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

Hello,

Please see the attached comment letter regarding Agenda Item 11 for the August 3, 2021 City Council meeting.

Best regards,

BENJAMIN HARRIS

Staff Attorney

ben@lawaterkeeper.org

(415) 233-1590



Honorable Mayor and Members of the City Council
Bruce Moe, City Manager
City of Manhattan Beach

August 2, 2021

To the Manhattan Beach City Council:

My name is Benjamin Harris, and I am a staff attorney at Los Angeles Waterkeeper. I submit this comment letter in regard to Agenda Item 11 for the August 3, 2021 City Council meeting. I support the recommendations of the City of Manhattan Beach Sustainability Task Force, as well as staff for the Manhattan Beach City Council, to make updates to the City's Low Impact Development (LID) ordinances in order to reduce stormwater runoff from new development throughout the City.

Communities in the City, and visitors to the City's beautiful beaches and waterways, would be harmed by new development projects that lock in increased stormwater runoff for decades to come. Stormwater continues to be the largest source of water pollution in Los Angeles County, and the diverse array of pollutants in stormwater—including pesticides, heavy metals, oil and grease, toxic substances, and bacteria—can have significant public health impacts for people that recreate in water receiving stormwater discharges. Allowing stormwater pollution to persist from new development projects will continue this trend indefinitely.

Through stronger LID ordinances, the City could take a significant step to improve the quality of its local waterways as the City continues to evolve and grow. Reducing stormwater discharges in the City will result in cleaner water for the City's beaches and waterways, improving the health of local communities and increasing the value of tourism and ocean recreation activities. New development or redevelopment projects are an important focus to ensure that stormwater discharges decrease over time as the City improves housing and services for residents and visitors alike.

The Sustainability Task Force's recommendation to remove the minimum size threshold requirements for LID measures is necessary to hold all new development projects to the same standards for reducing stormwater runoff. In Ordinance 15-0004, Section 5.84.100 of the City's Municipal Code exempts development projects of different types from implementing best practices for reducing stormwater runoff, if those projects fall within certain size thresholds. As the Staff recommendation letter shows, most residential and commercial development in the City is currently exempt from the LID requirements, with only 192 single-family residential development and 318 commercial properties falling within the existing size thresholds. Removing these size thresholds would close these loopholes and expand beneficial LID measures to the rest of the City's development projects.



As the City Council has acknowledged, the City of Santa Monica offers an effective model of applying LID requirements across all types of new development or re-development projects, with limited exceptions where infeasible. *See* Santa Monica Municipal Code Section 7.10.090. Approving similar new LID regulations that eliminate a minimum project threshold would ensure that all new development projects in the City, no matter the size, type, or location, will not contribute to stormwater runoff and will instead utilize rainwater effectively for onsite reuse and/or groundwater infiltration.

Expanding LID requirements to all types of development projects will not impose a financial burden on developers. As the Staff recommendation letter acknowledges, the various best practices in LID ordinances are inexpensive solutions to reduce stormwater runoff from new development, while simultaneously enhancing project aesthetics and increasing the value of the property over time. Any small increases in up-front costs for developers are well worth the improvements in water quality around the Manhattan Beach pier, which is located adjacent to the City's stormwater outfall pipe.

Additionally, LID requirements and water conservation go hand-in-hand, and water conservation is of peak concern during drought conditions like those we are currently experiencing. Stronger LID requirements applicable to all development projects would reduce the need to enforce the City's existing Water Conservation Ordinance (Ordinance 15-0008). If expanded to all new development projects, the best practices in the City's current LID measures would reduce the risk that residential or commercial buildings in the City cause non-stormwater discharges to enter the municipal storm drain system, which is prohibited by Section 7.44.020(D)(2) of the Water Conservation Ordinance. Removing the significant exceptions for LID measures through the size threshold triggers, therefore, will harmonize the City's efforts to reduce water pollution from stormwater runoff with water conservation needs.

I urge the City Council to approve the recommendation of Staff, and the Sustainability Task Force, by pursuing and approving new LID regulations that eliminate minimum project thresholds. Thank you for your time and consideration on this important issue.

Sincerely,

Benjamin Harris
Staff Attorney
Los Angeles Waterkeeper

From: Kim Martin <kim@kimlewandmartin.com>
Sent: Monday, August 2, 2021 2:57 PM
To: List - City Council
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Support of Item 11 Option 1; and Item 12 Option 2

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

Esteemed Manhattan Beach Council Members,

Most of you know me as a founder of Grades of Green and a member of the City's Sustainability Task Force, but the thing I am most proud of is my role as a resident of the City of Manhattan Beach. Manhattan Beach has always been a leader in protecting the environmental health of its citizens and environmental resources, and I urge the City to do so again via Items 11 and 12 in this week's City Council Agenda.

Item 11: I support Option 1

Before founding Grades of Green, I was an environmental lawyer who specialized on water quality impacts and, in particular, urban and stormwater runoff impacts to water quality from developments. That work has led me back to my current position as the Associate Director of the Los Angeles Waterkeeper (LA Waterkeeper), a former client when I was practicing. LA Waterkeeper has already submitted a comment letter regarding Item 11 on tomorrow night's City Council agenda related to "Additional Water Runoff Measures in the City for New and Commercial Residential Construction." I echo and support LA Waterkeeper's comments on Item 11 and wanted to add my own voice as a concerned citizen of Manhattan Beach a proud member of your Sustainability Council, and someone who has direct expertise on this subject. I strongly support Option 1 from the Staff Report recommending the City develop a policy for Low Impact Development (LID) Best Management Practices (BMPs) and remove the minimum size threshold to require such policy for all new development. I have personally worked with major developers to achieve such BMPs and can attest to the fact that they are doable and impactful, providing innumerable benefits to replenishing our water tables and precious coastal resources. Those coastal resources are what is at the heart of Manhattan Beach - people live and visit here precisely to recreate our beaches and waters. Thus, this won't just positively impact our coastal resources, but, as a consequence, also positively impact home values and tourism rates. I was so encouraged when the City pursued and obtained grants to add pervious surfaces to numerous City parking lots. Such ideas are needed for development in the City as well, particularly because so much development is constantly occurring in this town. The staff report provides thorough reasoning for the City to take this step. I thus hope the City will protect the health of our waterways and our community members, as well as the fiscal health of the City, by choosing Option 1.

Item12: I support Option 2

For Item 12, it will come as no surprise to you that I support Option 2. While my environmental legal career did not cover energy, mitigating climate change has been my passion project while on the Sustainability Task Force. I strongly believe climate change is the single biggest issue facing society today. The City has already taken several major steps to combat climate change, which I applaud. Notably it entered into a contract with Clean Energy Alliance, and then opted first the City, and then citizens, up to the 100% threshold level. By increasing the energy efficiency of buildings, Options 2 of Item 12 provides another mechanism for the City to do its part in mitigating climate impacts. Again, the staff report lays the issue out very clearly and provides extensive reasons for the City to take this approach. Staff has correctly stated the impacts of development on our climate crisis and it is truly an all hands on deck approach to address our climate crisis. I therefore support

Option 2 requiring All-Electric Reach Code for New Buildings. It is a critical step for the future of our city and planet.

Thank you for your consideration,

Kim



WEBSITE: kimlewandmartin.com

SOCIAL: @kim_ecohabits

EMAIL: kim@kimlewandmartin.com

PHONE: 310-291-4476

Martha Alvarez

From: Portia Cohen <portiapcohen@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, August 2, 2021 12:19 PM
To: List - City Council
Cc: Dana Murray; Kristina Haddad; Terry Tamminen
Subject: [EXTERNAL] 7th Generation Advisors Support for Enhanced Water Quality Protection
Attachments: 7GA Support for MB Water Runoff Measures copy.docx; ATT00001.htm; image.png; ATT00002.htm

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

Honorable Mayor Hadley and Council Members,

Thank you for addressing the issue of water quality. Kindly accept our letter in support for enhanced measures as outlined in the attached.

August 2, 2021



Honorable Mayor Suzanne Hadley
Honorable City Council Members
City of Manhattan Beach, California

Re: Support for LID policy to enhance Water Runoff Reduction Measures

Honorable Mayor Hadley and Council Members:

On behalf of 7th Generation Advisors (7GA), kindly accept this letter in support of the adoption of a Low Impact Development (LID) policy for all new development, without size limitation, in the city's efforts to increase water quality and supply, and protect human and environmental health.

Manhattan Beach has been a leader in environmental sustainability and resilience. Your work is so important, and so appreciated, and will continue to be so for future generations.

The dangers to human and environmental health from polluted water runoff are no strangers to us – we see them locally and afar; and they are becoming more impactful. The challenge is how to minimize and manage it while still going about our business. It is fortunate that we have neighboring cities from which to benchmark.

The MB citizen's Sustainability Task Force carefully studied options and expressed support for the City to go beyond regulatory agency requirements to reduce urban runoff, capture more stormwater, reduce water pollution, and reduce water consumption. It is clear that protecting the quality and supply of water is of high priority to residents. And staff has thoroughly studied our options and laid out alternative paths.

7GA strongly supports the city staff and Sustainability Task Force recommendations to develop a LID policy and remove the minimum size threshold to require LID for all new development. Measures that will improve the city's permeability and runoff protection are reasonably inexpensive for developers and homeowners. The Los Angeles County Department of Public Works conducted a Benefit-Cost analysis on several LID approaches and deemed that tree plantings, construction of infiltration basins and storm drain systems are cost-effective. What's more, we have the advantage of benchmarking our neighbor cities of Hermosa Beach, Santa Monica and others who have successfully implemented these measures and are headed toward better water quality and supply.

Here in Manhattan Beach, we too have the means to employ the best practices to ensure our future; and we have the citizen will to do it. We are blessed.

Thank you for your consideration, respectfully

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Portia P. Cohen".

Portia P. Cohen, Esq., Advisor
7th Generation Advisors
Phone: 310.991.7366

Seventh Generation Advisors is a 501c3 non-profit corporation (Tax ID: 20-8771636).
Mailing Address: 1223 Wilshire Blvd., #776 Santa Monica, CA 90403
Website: <https://7thgenerationadvisors.org>

Email: portiaPcohen@gmail.com

From: Ann Pitts1 <annpitts@roadrunner.com>
Sent: Monday, August 2, 2021 10:49 AM
To: List - City Council
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Environmental policies & protections
CAUTION: This Email is from an EXTERNAL source. Ensure you trust this sender before clicking on any links or attachments.

Dear Honorable Mayor Hadley and City Council Members, Some upcoming decisions affect water quality and contamination, and improving energy efficiency. I support item 11 to prevent contaminated water from draining into the ocean, and item 12 to shift away from fossil fuel appliances to more advanced alternatives and clean energy in new construction. I think imposing tighter restrictions is your job governing a sea-dwelling ocean dependent community. We can't leave it up to individuals or corporations to speed progress on environmental issues when they are more concerned with the bottom line. If they're reasonable please move forward towards protecting our resources and assets.

Thanks,
Ann

Ann Pitts
861 3rd St.
MB, CA 90266
310/527-1473

From: Charlotte Marshall

squaremealcoat@gmail.com

Sent: Saturday, July 31, 2021 9:36 AM

To: List - City Council; City Manager

Subject: [EXTERNAL] City Council

Dear Council Members,

I would like to voice my sincere support for both environmental issues that appear on the Agenda this week. While I realize that these initiatives will increase the cost of building, please take into consideration that these added costs are the price we must pay to ensure that we don't totally destroy our planet. The practices we have been following for many, many years...allowing runoff to freely flow into the ocean (polluting it), and utilizing gas to power our appliances (instead of clean energy)...have not taken into consideration what damage is done as a result. The fires, the floods, and other catastrophic weather-related events we have experienced recently must be curtailed...and these initiatives will help. Please continue to make decisions that will benefit, not destroy our City and planet.

Thank you for your consideration of my opinion.

Charlotte Marshall