Martha Alvarez

From: LAUREN BURTON <lauren.burton@me.com>
Sent: Tuesday, October 19, 2021 5:14 PM
To: List - City Council
Cc: Kent Burton
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Support Catalina Classic Commemorative Statue

As long time residents of Manhattan Beach, we would like to give our support for the City to accept the gift of the Catalina Classic Commemorative Statue from the South Bay Boardriders and allow it to be installed south of the south Pier parking lot. We encourage all councilmembers to vote "Yes" when this matter comes to a vote.

Thank you for your consideration of our request.

Kent & Lauren Burton
1216 8th Street
Manhattan Beach
310/259-6735

Martha Alvarez

From: Lana Spitz <lanaspitz@verizon.net>
Sent: Tuesday, October 19, 2021 5:29 PM
To: List - City Council
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Mandated Vaccines

I think police and fire fighters should be mandated to have vaccines so that if we need these devices, we do not have to fear getting COVD In ordered to be assisted!!
Lana Spitz, Manhattan Beach resident

Sent from my iPhone

Martha Alvarez

From: MaryEllen Udovich <maryellen.udovich@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, October 19, 2021 4:32 PM
To: List - City Council
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please second the vaccine mandate on our city workers

Hello council,

I am dumbfounded the reasoning behind the city's vaccine mandate- which now includes mandating the booster??

During the council meeting on Sept 21, there was a 4-1 vote for a vaccine policy. Your reasoning was weak:
-it is costing the city too much money (but HR said it was admittedly a rushed contract and there are likely better and cheaper options available. AND vaccinated people can test when they would like, so you can't put the weight of the cost just on the unvaccinated employees)
-the unvaccinated put others at risk (since July, the same amount of vaccinated and unvaccinated city employees tested positive.)

Did each of the 4 of you knowingly vote for a vaccine mandate knowing that it would include the boosters?

What is our emergency plan for the city if we don't have enough officers to respond to emergency calls?

Steve said "we can't make all our own choices"... well yes, we can make our own choices and our city workers don't get their freedoms from city council. There is something I do agree with that Steve said, "They're not children. They're adults, they can handle things just fine." You're absolutely right. Our city employees ARE adults and can make their own personal and private medical choices just fine. It's not city council's job to do it for them.

This policy is divisive and the complete opposite of unifying. Please rescind it.

Best,
MaryEllen
--
MaryEllen Udovich
Maryellen.udovich@gmail.com
646.370.9000

Martha Alvarez

From: CHARLES SOUTHEY <charlessouthey@aol.com>
Sent: Tuesday, October 19, 2021 4:26 PM
To: List - City Council
Cc: charles southey
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Crosswalk

Honorable Council,

I'm writing to give my input on the rainbow crosswalk concept that will be before you tonight.

1. I feel that Manhattan Beach is an incredibly welcoming City but do not like the idea of wearing our heart on our sleeves. Will we color all our crosswalks to tell the world that we accept various views? If this is the plan then I have no problem with it but I would hope there is a long term plan that details how we decide what we support and welcome, and where we draw the line. For instance, will we (The City) support yellow ribbons on our light posts to support our troops, or something that indicates we support our police like a "thin blue line" crosswalk concept, or a green crosswalk that reflects our support of the environment (with the goal of increasing self propulsion versus electric or gasoline) or a purple crosswalk to support our homeless vets. The list goes on. Maybe it will turn out that our town is made of 50 different colored crosswalks dictating what we support.

2. Financially this is a disaster of an idea. I am particularly shocked by a proposition that would cost up to $80,000 for a crosswalk. My understanding is that this funding comes from our Arts budget. $80,000 is a huge sum that could be used for things like art scholarships or the general beautification of our city. It makes me sick to think that we would spend even $5000 on an arm badge when those funds could be used to do so much good. The arts have virtually been eliminated form our public schools. $80,000 would go a long way to bringing them back.

Thank you for your consideration.

Charles
310-480-9835

Martha Alvarez

From: EMYLIN BROWN <emylinb@aol.com>
Sent: Tuesday, October 19, 2021 4:19 PM
To: List - City Council
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Vaccines

I think that COVID vaccines must be required for all employees of M.B city as well as all employees of M. B School District.

Sent from my iPhone

Martha Alvarez

From: Allan Spitz <allancspitz@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, October 19, 2021 4:05 PM
To: List - City Council
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Vaccine Mandates

I support mandates for all fire & police - no exceptions - please do your job & vote yes on approving mandates with no exceptions for all fire & police.

Thank you.

Allan Spitz
629 29th Street
Manhattan Beach, Ca 90266

Martha Alvarez

From: Christina Holman <holmanfam@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, October 19, 2021 3:59 PM
To: City Clerk
Subject: [EXTERNAL] October 19th meeting public comment - It's JUST

To the members of City Council (with the exception of ONE who has the best interests of residents and is FOR THE PEOPLE) who voted for the employee covid vaccine mandate:
We are now over 585 days since we've "shutdown"

IT'S JUST a short shutdown

IT'S JUST 15 days to slow the spread

IT'S JUST social distancing

IT'S JUST 6 feet apart

IT'S JUST working from home

IT'S JUST a temporary layoff

IT'S JUST the non essential

IT'S JUST temporarily closing down your small business

IT'S JUST closing down your church

IT'S JUST to protect others

IT'S JUST a piece of cloth

IT'S JUST ONE injection

IT'S JUST TWO injections

IT'S JUST a few bad reactions

IT'S JUST a few side effects

IT'S JUST a booster

IT'S JUST until we get the new variant under control

IT'S JUST a little card

IT'S JUST another mandate

IT’S JUST another lockdown

IT’S JUST SEPARATING those who chose not to get it

IT’S JUST Giving up some of your freedoms

IT’S JUST so you can provide for your family

IT’S JUST city council members playing doctor and scientist

IT’S JUST city council members making MEDICAL decisions for employees

City employees -
JUST refuse to comply
JUST refuse to submit
JUST STAND UP for your rights - we stand behind you!

Christina

Martha Alvarez

From: Lana Rizika <lanarizika@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, October 19, 2021 3:55 PM
To: City Clerk
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Comment for City Council

Dear City Council,
I am writing to express my full support for the Rainbow crosswalk under consideration tonight. This crosswalk would be a beautiful symbol of acknowledgment of, and, perhaps, will hopefully lead to greater tolerance of, our LGBTQ community. What better lesson to teach our children as well as reinforce to our adult citizens that Manhattan Beach is a welcoming city and all are respected!

Let's get this visual message into our community without hesitation!

Thank you!
Lana Rizika

Martha Alvarez

From: Mary Yollin <mary.yollin@me.com>
Sent: Tuesday, October 19, 2021 3:37 PM
To: List - City Council
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Request for approval of Item 9

Dear Council members,

My mother, Diane Hogan, has live in the senior villa apartment complex for years and the residents deserve a safe pathway built. This should happen right away as this is not something new that they are asking for. I worry about my mom's safety as well as everyone else in the complex.

I appreciate your immediate consideration on this.

Thank you,

Mary Yollin

Sent from my iPhone

Martha Alvarez

From: Christy Miller <christymil@aol.com>
Sent: Tuesday, October 19, 2021 3:27 PM
To: List - City Council
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Catalina Classic Commemorative Statue

As a family of Manhattan Beach we would like to give my support for the City to accept the gift of the Catalina Classic Commemorative Statue from the South Bay Boardriders and allow it to be installed south of the south Pier parking lot. We encourage all councilmembers to vote “Yes” when this matter comes to a vote.
We have 2 members of our family that have paddled the Catalina Classic numerous times. What a great statue to acknowledge all the Watermen that have paddled and will continue to paddle this grueling race.

The Miller Family
Christy, Doug, Bryce,Jake

Martha Alvarez

From: Alison Chavez <coffeychavez@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, October 19, 2021 3:00 PM
To: List - City Council; City Manager
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Rainbow Crosswalk

Dear City Council Members,

I strongly encourage you approve the rainbow crosswalk as a signal that Manhattan Beach is tolerant and accepting of all people.
The Alt Right conservatives who criticize this project as too costly or distracting are merely using any nitpicking excuse to hide their bigotry against the central message.
The repaired crosswalk will save MB money, since the cost will come out of the Arts Trust and not our city's budget. It is a functional statement piece which will reassure many harassed gay youth. Who will this board encourage with their vote? The victims or the bullies? Let this be the first of many beautiful rainbow crosswalks.
Why must MB continue to be the local bastion of antiquated views and prejudices?
Please approve this rainbow which will beautify our recent well-publicized ugliness.

Sincerely,
Alison Chavez

Martha Alvarez

From: Charlene Harding <charjarhar@icloud.com>
Sent: Tuesday, October 19, 2021 2:57 PM
To: List - City Council
Subject: [EXTERNAL] No Vax mandate for city workers Please

I am opposed to mandating the Vax to all city officials, especially our Police.
Remember the lockdown?? Well, those Police officers risked their life to keep us safe during the Pandemic and during nightly riots. Without knowing if they would bring COVID home, they sequestered from their family and friends when they were off duty. We owe these officers a great amount of gratitude and support. A Vax mandate is a kick in the face after all they have done for us. There are many reasons people do not get the Vax and that should be a personal choice. If the Vax was so necessary, our govt would be testing the 100K+ coming across our borders and vaxing them, but they are getting neither before being sent all across our nation.

Martha Alvarez

From: Ann Pitts1 <annpitts@roadrunner.com>
Sent: Tuesday, October 19, 2021 3:35 PM
To: City Clerk; Hildy Stern; Richard Montgomery; Suzanne Hadley; Joe Franklin; Steve Napolitano
Subject: [EXTERNAL] To All members City Council re: Agenda Item 13

Dear Honorable Mayor Stern, City Council, and City Clerk,
Please go above and beyond the state requirements like those other 50 cities so we are ahead of the game.

Particularly, for NEW construction I think we should:

1. Make all **new** buildings electric only
    a. There's the public safety benefit (no power line caused fires)
    b. The public health benefit (there have been studies on how bad it is to burn natural gas (aka fossil gas or frack gas) in our homes
    c. Long term it will decrease GHG emissions
2. Require solar panels on **new** nonresidential buildings (and battery storage)
    a. This way we could be building infrastructure for microgrids in MB, which would increase local electricity and reliability (more prepared if a black out/brown out situation)

Thanks for your consideration.

Sincerely,
Ann

Ann Pitts
310/527-1473

Martha Alvarez

From: Kimberley Stewart <kimstewart88@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, October 19, 2021 11:54 AM
To: kstew88@alumni.stanford.edu
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Recurring Smell

Hello,

I am not sure if this is the appropriate contact but for the past couple of weeks, there is an occasional strong smell that is sweeping the area. It's very intense, to the extent that it has awakened me and several of my neighbors. Is anything being done about this? Where can we find information about this issue, whether it is toxic, and what is being done to fix this?

Thank you,
Kim

Martha Alvarez

From: Diane Forte <Diane.Forte@sce.com>
Sent: Tuesday, October 19, 2021 11:51 AM
To: City Clerk; List - City Council
Cc: Joshua Public Affairs Torres
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Southern California Edison Supports Agenda Item L. 13 Option 2

I am writing on behalf of Southern California Edison (SCE) in regard to item L.13 "Discuss and Provide Direction on Potential Requirements for Increased 21-0258 Energy Efficiency of New Buildings." **SCE is supportive of all-electric new construction due to environmental, health, and cost benefits associated with all-electric construction. We strongly urge the City Council to move forward with a strong reach code** sooner rather than later. SCE can be a partner to the City as it develops and implements such an ordinance. To help support this transition we are developing programs and incentives to make it easier and more affordable for customers to adopt clean, electric appliances powered by an increasingly decarbonized grid.

At SCE we are working to build a clean energy future and are glad to partner with local governments, like Manhattan Beach, who are also committed to addressing the climate crisis and improving local air quality. Addressing emissions from the building sector is an important part of achieving California's carbon neutrality goals. Building decarbonization is also vital in order to keep California on track to meet 2030 and 2045 climate goals. SCE's recently published paper, *Mind the Gap*, details how California needs to accelerate efforts to transition away from fossil fuels. Building electrification is a major portion of the projected decarbonization gap in 2030. Ventura County could help lead the way in Southern California.

We are committed to serving the needs of California's clean energy future. This requires a grid that supports high levels of carbon-free resources, integrates new technologies and services, and remains safe, reliable, affordable and resilient even as the climate continues to evolve. **SCE is modernizing and hardening our distribution system, leveraging increasingly sophisticated hardware and software to manage an increasingly complex and intelligent grid.** This will not only help enable greater adoption of clean energy technologies, but it will also improve general reliability while making the grid more resilient to threats exacerbated by climate change such as wildfires and heatwaves. We are investing between $4-5 billion annually to build a grid that customers can rely upon to support the clean energy future. Customer-owned resources like rooftop solar and battery storage offer an additional level of resiliency. We estimate by 2045 about half of single-family homes in our service territory will have some combination of solar and storage.

Today, an all-electric home produces almost half the greenhouse gas emissions compared to a similar mixed fuel home[1]. The comparative emissions reductions will only grow over time as the grid continues to shift away from fossil fuel generation and eventually reaches carbon neutrality. Because, as the grid gets cleaner, so too does everything that is connected to it. Multiple studies[2,3,4] have shown the health benefits associated with all-electric homes due to improved air quality, particularly for children, older adults, and other vulnerable populations.

There are additional benefits to a clean energy future beyond reducing greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. As we electrify vehicles and buildings, the economics of energy will change**.** The increased load will allow us to spread the fixed costs of delivering electricity across more electrons, putting downward pressure on electricity rates. (Synapse Energy Economics, *Electric Vehicles Are Driving Electric Rates Down*) Electric technologies also tend to be more efficient than combustion technologies, helping customers save money by reducing energy consumption. **By 2045, SCE estimates the average customer spend across all types of energy combined will decrease by one-third on average.**

All-electric new construction is affordable to build and operate. There are many affordable, clean, efficient all-electric options for water heating, space heating, clothes drying, and cooking, all of which can be powered by carbon-free

electricity. Even though fossil fuels are often less expensive per unit of energy than electricity, electric technologies are significantly more efficient, meaning the total cost to operate electric technologies is similar to or less expensive than combustion technologies. Studies[1] have shown that the lifetime costs for all-electric homes are either similar or less expensive than mixed-fuel homes for a large majority of Californians. Although, in coastal communities, like Manhattan Beach, studies show a slight increase in cost for all-electric construction. This is due to the baseline case not having air conditioning. HVAC heat pumps provide both heating and cooling, which make them less expensive to install than a separate furnace and air conditioner, which is especially important for coastal communities adapting to a warming climate. This is very relevant for Manhattan Beach, being one of the fastest warming regions in the lower 48 states[6].

Electric technologies have additional societal benefits. A recent study[5] showed that building electrification can lead to a net increase of over 100,000 good paying jobs statewide. Also, electric heat pump technologies can help balance the grid as we work to incorporate higher and higher levels of renewable energy, helping improve grid reliability.

For all these reasons and more, we urge Manhattan Beach City Council to direct staff to draft an all-electric reach code ordinance. We look forward to continuing to work with the City of Manhattan Beach on building a clean energy future.

Sincerely,

Diane Forte
Government Relations Manager, Local Public Affairs
Southern California Edison

Attachments:
Reliability FAQ
2021 Wildfire Mitigation Plan Update
Mind the Gap: Policies for California's Countdown to 2030

---

[1]Energy + Environmental Economics (E3), *Residential Building Electrification in California*, 2019
[2]Rocky Mountain Institute, *Gas Stoves: Health and Air Quality Impacts and Solutions*, 2020
[3]UCLA Fielding School of Public Health, *Effects of Residential Gas Appliances on Indoor and Outdoor Air Quality and Public Health in California*, 2020
[4]Mullen NA, Li J, Russell ML, Spears M, Less BD, Singer BC. *Results of the California Healthy Homes Indoor Air Quality Study of 2011-2013: impact of natural gas appliances on air pollutant concentrations*, 2015
[5]UCLA Luskin Center for Innovation, *California Building Decarbonization Workforces Needs and Recommendations*, 2019
[6]Wilson, Scott (2019) "Fires, floods and free parking: California's unending fight against climate change," The Washington Post, December 5

Martha Alvarez

From: Marco A Franco <mafranco11@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, October 19, 2021 2:24 PM
To: List - City Council
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Rainbow Crosswalk

Hello City Council,

I personally fully support the Cultural Arts Commission in creating a Rainbow Crosswalk on Manhattan Beach Blvd. I truly believe this is a symbol of diversity, inclusion, and inspiration, especially being in close proximity to schools, parks, and the cultural arts center.

Although there may be concern that Raindbow crosswalks may attract distraction, it has been found by the CA Department of Transportation to be safer than the white limit lines, per Joe Marcy, Manhattan Beach Cultural Arts Commissioner.

This action would put Manhattan Beach on the list of progressive cities to promote such inclusion and cultural diversity, which may also attract more residents, community involvement, and tourism.

Thank you for your time and consideration with approving and passing this project.

Sincerely,

Marco A. Franco
Sr. Retail Services Manager
Kinecta Federal Credit Union

Martha Alvarez

From: Heidi Rayden <heidirayden@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, October 19, 2021 2:13 PM
To: List - City Council
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please Rescind the Vaccine Mandate

Dear Council,

I am writing to request that council reconsiders and rescinds the recent vaccine mandate for all city employees.

Residents, like myself are deeply concerned about how the vaccine mandate will impact public safety in regards to our MBPD ability to keep & hire new officers. Chief Abell stated in the meeting that officers are watching what Police Departments are doing across the state & country and they WILL SEEK employment in those departments that are not mandating the vaccine.

With so few un-vaccinated officers in the department, why mandate them if this will be the result? We cannot afford to lose any officers. Certainly Mayor Stern's argument that "we will only get over the hump of this if everyone is vaccinated" rings hollow given the current state of our wide open borders with epic numbers of people entering (un-tested & not vaccinated) not to mention the increasing large number of "breakthrough" cases which the city has experienced first hand with vaccinated employees getting Covid.

The agenda item was supposed to be a "discussion" .....the only council-members that provided facts and science regarding this major vote were Hadley and Franklin. The science & facts they presented should have at min been debated & why was Cheif Abell's input essentially ignored entirely?

Additionally, there was NO vote on the Booster shots that the city suddenly included in the mandate on the Oct. 15 internal memo (if CDC requires Boosters) not to mention pushing up the exemption deadline date to Nov. 1.

I've spoken with several officers about this and they are very upset...the Booster mandate will additionally push vaccinated officers out.

If Sheriff Villaneuva who oversees a staff of 18,000.....has publicly stated he will not enforce the vaccine mandate...why is our council? Please reconsider. At minimum the exemption process should be simple & not involve a city arbitrator.

As residents, we recognize and greatly appreciate our incredible Chief & PD in Manhattan Beach. This mandate is direct threat on the department's moral and constitutional rights of freedom to chose.

Please reconsider & rescind this mandate.

Thank you for your consideration.

Heidi Rayden Tobias

Martha Alvarez

From: Maureen Leral-Denitz <modenitz@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, October 19, 2021 1:57 PM
To: City Clerk; List - City Council
Subject: [EXTERNAL] rainbow intersection

Dear council members.

We are opposed to a rainbow intersection not because we don't respect the significance of it to some people but because we don't want our city streets to become selective political avenues. Let's keep Manhattan Beach's streets as is. The natural beauty of the waves, our sandy beaches and our stunning sunsets should be the focal point always. If we say yes to rainbows it opens it up to intersections across our town wanting to be used as other expressions by our community. Keep our town classy

Best
Maureen and David Denitz.

Ps disregard our unfinished letter prior. I accidentally hit the send button

Martha Alvarez

From: Anthony A. Lee <member1700@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, October 19, 2021 1:56 PM
To: List - City Council
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Rainbow Crosswalk Proposal

Honorable Council members:

I am writing in support of the Rainbow Crosswalk that is to be installed on Manhattan Beach Boulevard. It will be a wonderful expression of support for the LGBTQ community in Manhattan Beach. Naturally, it is only a symbolic gesture. But symbols are important, and even necessary if we are going to have a welcoming and inclusive city.

Regards,
Anthony A. Lee

Martha Alvarez

From: Maureen Leral-Denitz <modenitz@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, October 19, 2021 1:41 PM
To: List - City Council
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Rainbow artwork

Dear Council Members

I'm opposed to painting an intersection With anything other than beach artwork. Waves vball sun surfing and it would have to stay muted in color to keep it classy. Let's keep personal views and expressions for homeowners to display not p

Martha Alvarez

From: Jacqueline Zuanich-Ferrell <jzuanichferrell@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, October 19, 2021 1:17 PM
To: List - City Council
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Agenda Items

Per the agenda item concerning the mandating of gas-free appliances, this is ill-advised. Appliances such as electric clothes dryers are inefficient. In addition, as the state of California turns to electric more and more, there is a high likelihood of shortages and higher monthly costs.

Per the **mandating** of vaccines including boosters, there is no justification. It probably isn't even necessary to be constantly testing all employees. Those individuals with natural immunity from Covid-19 should be counted as though they were vaccinated. In the history of our country except for deadly smallpox, our nation has not mandated vaccines for adults, yet alone one that had such a shortened testing regimen and has produced so many side effects.

Jacqueline Zuanich-Ferrell
1018 Duncan Avenue
Manhattan Beach

Martha Alvarez

From: Charlene Harding <charjarhar@me.com>
Sent: Tuesday, October 19, 2021 12:14 PM
To: List - City Council
Subject: [EXTERNAL] No Decorative Walkways please

I am opposed to a decorated sidewalk or walkway that is not inclusive for ALL residents. Let's not be an example of virtue signaling and put up art work that represents a few residents. Off the top top of my head, all I can think of that is ALL inclusive would be ocean scenes or the American flag if we had to have some artwork. BUT I'd rather have nothing. Let our beautiful city's natural setting be as is - that is the classiest solution.

C. Harding, resident

Martha Alvarez

From: Kathleen Terry <terrymanna2@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, October 19, 2021 12:07 PM
To: List - City Council
Subject: [EXTERNAL] support rainbow sidewalk

I am in support of the rainbow sidewalk

Kathleen Terry
310-938-1538

Martha Alvarez

From: Scott C. Chambers <mbchambers4@roadrunner.com>
Sent: Tuesday, October 19, 2021 12:07 PM
To: List - City Council
Subject: [EXTERNAL] mandates

Dear city council. Please revisit the vaccine mandate.. We can not afford to loose any police officers or firemen. And all city employees should have the freedom of choice. We don't mandate flu shots. That kills up to 600.000 per year. We are already down 7 police officers and probably will loose more if this mandate stays in place. Even the L.A. county sheriff says no to this unconstitutional mandate. The president of the United States has not put anything in written except for a press release. Ask yourself why? Could it be that several state AGs are poised to sue, when he does. Speaking of law suits ,that is what will happen if any city employee gets fired over this. Lawyers are lining up. And god forbid an employee dies from this experimental vaccine. That is NOT FDA approved. That shot that is approved is in Germany and we don't use it here in the U.S. bait and switch. Whistleblowers coming out of the woodwork alone should give you pause. And now you have Newsome says California prison Guards don't have to get the vaccine. With all this going on, you should table this till the dust clears.
Regards,
Scott C. Chambers

Martha Alvarez

From: Sue Kingston <skingston1514@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, October 19, 2021 12:02 PM
To: List - City Council
Subject: [EXTERNAL]

Dear MB City Council,

As a resident of Manhattan Beach, I would like to give my support for the City to accept the gift of the Catalina Classic Commemorative Statue from the South Bay Boardriders and allow it to be installed south of the south Pier parking lot. I encourage all councilmembers to vote "Yes" when this matter comes to a vote.

Sincerely,
Sue and George Kingston
1514 First St.
Manhattan Beach, CA

Martha Alvarez

From: Diane Forte <Diane.Forte@sce.com>
Sent: Tuesday, October 19, 2021 11:51 AM
To: City Clerk; List - City Council
Cc: Joshua Public Affairs Torres
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Southern California Edison Supports Agenda Item L. 13 Option 2

I am writing on behalf of Southern California Edison (SCE) in regard to item L.13 "Discuss and Provide Direction on Potential Requirements for Increased 21-0258 Energy Efficiency of New Buildings." **SCE is supportive of all-electric new construction due to environmental, health, and cost benefits associated with all-electric construction. We strongly urge the City Council to move forward with a strong reach code** sooner rather than later. SCE can be a partner to the City as it develops and implements such an ordinance. To help support this transition we are developing programs and incentives to make it easier and more affordable for customers to adopt clean, electric appliances powered by an increasingly decarbonized grid.

At SCE we are working to build a clean energy future and are glad to partner with local governments, like Manhattan Beach, who are also committed to addressing the climate crisis and improving local air quality. Addressing emissions from the building sector is an important part of achieving California's carbon neutrality goals. Building decarbonization is also vital in order to keep California on track to meet 2030 and 2045 climate goals. SCE's recently published paper, *Mind the Gap*, details how California needs to accelerate efforts to transition away from fossil fuels. Building electrification is a major portion of the projected decarbonization gap in 2030. Ventura County could help lead the way in Southern California.

We are committed to serving the needs of California's clean energy future. This requires a grid that supports high levels of carbon-free resources, integrates new technologies and services, and remains safe, reliable, affordable and resilient even as the climate continues to evolve. **SCE is modernizing and hardening our distribution system, leveraging increasingly sophisticated hardware and software to manage an increasingly complex and intelligent grid.** This will not only help enable greater adoption of clean energy technologies, but it will also improve general reliability while making the grid more resilient to threats exacerbated by climate change such as wildfires and heatwaves. We are investing between $4-5 billion annually to build a grid that customers can rely upon to support the clean energy future. Customer-owned resources like rooftop solar and battery storage offer an additional level of resiliency. We estimate by 2045 about half of single-family homes in our service territory will have some combination of solar and storage.

Today, an all-electric home produces almost half the greenhouse gas emissions compared to a similar mixed fuel home[1]. The comparative emissions reductions will only grow over time as the grid continues to shift away from fossil fuel generation and eventually reaches carbon neutrality. Because, as the grid gets cleaner, so too does everything that is connected to it. Multiple studies[2,3,4] have shown the health benefits associated with all-electric homes due to improved air quality, particularly for children, older adults, and other vulnerable populations.

There are additional benefits to a clean energy future beyond reducing greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. As we electrify vehicles and buildings, the economics of energy will change**.** The increased load will allow us to spread the fixed costs of delivering electricity across more electrons, putting downward pressure on electricity rates. (Synapse Energy Economics, *Electric Vehicles Are Driving Electric Rates Down*) Electric technologies also tend to be more efficient than combustion technologies, helping customers save money by reducing energy consumption. **By 2045, SCE estimates the average customer spend across all types of energy combined will decrease by one-third on average.**

All-electric new construction is affordable to build and operate. There are many affordable, clean, efficient all-electric options for water heating, space heating, clothes drying, and cooking, all of which can be powered by carbon-free

electricity. Even though fossil fuels are often less expensive per unit of energy than electricity, electric technologies are significantly more efficient, meaning the total cost to operate electric technologies is similar to or less expensive than combustion technologies. Studies[1] have shown that the lifetime costs for all-electric homes are either similar or less expensive than mixed-fuel homes for a large majority of Californians. Although, in coastal communities, like Manhattan Beach, studies show a slight increase in cost for all-electric construction. This is due to the baseline case not having air conditioning. HVAC heat pumps provide both heating and cooling, which make them less expensive to install than a separate furnace and air conditioner, which is especially important for coastal communities adapting to a warming climate. This is very relevant for Manhattan Beach, being one of the fastest warming regions in the lower 48 states[6].

Electric technologies have additional societal benefits. A recent study[5] showed that building electrification can lead to a net increase of over 100,000 good paying jobs statewide. Also, electric heat pump technologies can help balance the grid as we work to incorporate higher and higher levels of renewable energy, helping improve grid reliability.

For all these reasons and more, we urge Manhattan Beach City Council to direct staff to draft an all-electric reach code ordinance. We look forward to continuing to work with the City of Manhattan Beach on building a clean energy future.

Sincerely,

Diane Forte
Government Relations Manager, Local Public Affairs
Southern California Edison

Attachments:
Reliability FAQ
2021 Wildfire Mitigation Plan Update
Mind the Gap: Policies for California's Countdown to 2030

---

[1]Energy + Environmental Economics (E3), *Residential Building Electrification in California*, 2019
[2]Rocky Mountain Institute, *Gas Stoves: Health and Air Quality Impacts and Solutions*, 2020
[3]UCLA Fielding School of Public Health, *Effects of Residential Gas Appliances on Indoor and Outdoor Air Quality and Public Health in California*, 2020
[4]Mullen NA, Li J, Russell ML, Spears M, Less BD, Singer BC. *Results of the California Healthy Homes Indoor Air Quality Study of 2011-2013: impact of natural gas appliances on air pollutant concentrations*, 2015
[5]UCLA Luskin Center for Innovation, *California Building Decarbonization Workforces Needs and Recommendations*, 2019
[6]Wilson, Scott (2019) "Fires, floods and free parking: California's unending fight against climate change," The Washington Post, December 5

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

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

KIM LEWAND MARTIN
EVERYDAY ECO HABITS FOR EVERYDAY PEOPLE

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 6:27 PM
To:	List - City Council
Cc:	Portia Cohen; Dana Murray; Kristina Haddad; Terry Tamminen
Subject:	[EXTERNAL] 7GA Support for All-Electric ready Fuel Source Reach Code for New Buildings
Attachments:	7GA Support for MB Building Energy Efficiency.docx; ATT00001.htm; clip_image002.png; ATT00002.htm; clip_image003.png; ATT00003.htm; clip_image001.png; ATT00004.htm; PastedGraphic-3.png; ATT00005.htm

August 2, 2021

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

Re: **Support for an All-Electric Fuel Source Reach Code for New Buildings in Manhattan Beach**

Honorable Mayor Hadley and Council Members:

On behalf of 7th Generation Advisors (7GA), kindly accept this letter in support of decarbonizing and electrifying new buildings. 7GA supports an "All-Electric Reach Code for New Buildings" approach which would require all-electric fuel sources for new construction of buildings. This would be an economically and technically feasible requirement for new development.

Once again, city staff has prepared an accurate and thorough examination and assessment of the energy efficiency, carbon reduction, economics, and cost effectiveness of an all-electric fuel source requirement. We highlight the cost savings portion of the staff report, because we all know that these measures will save carbon and electricity:

> "According to the California Energy Codes & Standards 2019 Cost-effectiveness study: Low-Rise Residential New Construction and California Energy Codes & Standards 2019 Nonresidential New Construction Reach Code Cost Effectiveness Study, completed by the California Energy Codes and Standards group, *a reach code requiring electrification is cost-effective. This means that in the long run, new development owners would see cost savings from installing electric appliances in new construction*.
>
> *Multiple studies*, including Rocky Mountain Institute's The Economics of Electrifying Buildings and Environment and Economics, Inc.'s Residential Building Electrification in California have shown that *using efficient electric heat pumps rather than gas-fired appliances is cost effective in newly constructed buildings and provides significant carbon pollution reductions. All- electric buildings are often cheaper to build due to the elimination of running expensive gas plumbing to the building. These lower first costs generally make all-electric construction more cost-effective on a life-cycle basis. This is particularly true for low-rise residential buildings, where it is also often increasingly more costeffective for the owner to exceed the code by improving efficiency and adding solar. In fact, if one invests the savings from the gas infrastructure in additional PV capacity to offset more of the electricity load, in many cases the building is cost-effective for the owner and society from day one, meaning the building is both less expensive to build and cheaper to operate."*

Once again, we thank you for your foresight in leading this City toward resiliency.

Respectfully,

Portia P. Cohen, Esq., Advisor
7th Generation Advisors
Phone: 310.991.7366
Email: portiaPcohen@gmail.com
Website: www.7thgenerationadvisors.org

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

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

From: Ann Pitts1 <annpitts@roadrunner.com>
Sent: Monday, August 2, 2021 10:49 AM
To: List - City Council
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Environmental policies & protections

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

Martha Alvarez

From: Mike Michalski <mike@realestateedge.com>
Sent: Monday, August 2, 2021 10:04 PM
To: List - City Council; City Clerk
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Item 12 - Energy-Efficient Homebuilding
Attachments: The Blithering Idiocy of California's Energy Policies.docx

Dear Mayor Hadley and Council:

The proposal for potential regulatory actions to increase energy efficiency of buildings seems to be geared at banning natural gas appliances in new construction and remodeling (Item 12, Council Agenda for Aug 3).

If this is indeed on the table, it must be reviewed very carefully as it could prove to be a bad idea - bad for homebuilders and remodelers, bad for homebuyers and bad for our city.

1. Our electricity grid is of dubious reliability and any proposal to require electric appliances in lieu of gas appliances will only add more demand onto our already strained and unstable energy grid (see attached article).
2. Homebuilders will be looking at another construction mandate that may or may not produce higher costs that will have to be passed on to homebuyers (I believe there is a significant savings from not having to put in a gas line and gas connections but the electric appliances themselves may cost more).
3. Homeowners with only electricity as their energy source will be penalized as our electric rates in CA are the 3rd highest in the continental US (see **ChooseEnergy.com**).
4. Some consumers prefer gas, particularly in cooking (gas cooking is quicker and it cooks more evenly) and in fireplaces, but gas would not be an option under the most severe regulatory proscription.
5. Home remodelers may not want to incur the cost of replacing their existing gas appliances if they were planning to keep them in the remodel.
6. The cost-benefit equation must be carefully examined in order to avoid adding another in a long string of costs and regulatory hurdles onto home construction and remodeling here in Manhattan Beach. In particular, new home builders may be finding themselves less and less able to pass those costs along, eventually making home construction unprofitable here in our city, especially in a market downturn (housing markets are cyclical or have we already forgotten the 2008-2012 downturn?)

My recommendation is to do an in-depth study with input from the development community to see if all-electric construction is a practical option. I'll bet that if there is little or no overall construction cost increase but the city makes an effort to improve on its services in terms of expediting the plan approval process, the builders might actually come around, despite the potential for some homebuyer resistance (point 4 above) and the problem with the electric grid (point 1).

But then I'm not a developer, I just sell the finished product.

Mike Michalski
Michalski & Fujita

The Blithering Idiocy of California's Energy Policies

By Susan Shelley | letters@ocregister.com | Orange County Register
PUBLISHED: August 23, 2020 at 9:44 a.m. | UPDATED: August 23, 2020 at 9:49 a.m.

California's blithering idiocy is sometimes very photogenic, as when billions of dollars are wasted on a useless bullet train that never will be completed as advertised, or when idiotic water policies starve the farms into dust in the Central Valley and lead to toilet water recycling in Southern California.

But not all forms of blithering idiocy can be photographed. Some are experienced in total darkness, kind of like a séance. As the table lifts under our trembling fingers, the ghosts of stupid legislation speak to us from the Great Beyond.

"Cancel the contracts with the coal-fired plants!" the disembodied voices wail. "Close down the nuclear plants! Decommission the coastal gas-fired plants! Stop the construction of dams for hydro-electricity!"

Of course, they're not really in the Great Beyond; most of them are still in public office.

As politicians furiously point fingers of blame away from themselves, let's stop and look at a few of the decisions that led to rolling blackouts in California during a triple-digit heatwave.

First, consider the effect of the state's vaunted but idiotic climate policies. They're vaunted because the state's political leaders regard themselves as global leaders. They're idiotic because the entire state of California produces only 1 percent of the world's total global greenhouse gases, so even if you uncritically accept every worst-case scenario about climate change and assign all the blame to humanity, the state's policies have no effect at all on the global climate.

That's usually the point when state leaders tell us they are really global leaders. What they don't tell us is that their climate policies slowly starve the state of reliable electricity while raising the cost of energy to California consumers. Raising the cost of energy raises the cost of everything

else, contributing mightily to the state's highest-in-the-nation poverty rate when the cost of living is taken into account. About 20 percent of Californians live in poverty.

California's climate policies have included legal mandates on utilities that require a percentage of the electricity they sell to be generated from renewable sources. The idea is to gradually reduce greenhouse gases. The initial goal was 20 percent, then in 2011 it was increased to 33 percent. Later it was raised to 50 percent, then 60 percent. In 2018 state lawmakers set a target of 100 percent renewable energy by 2045.

But some renewable energy technology is more equal than others. Wind and solar energy count. But electricity generated from nuclear power or large hydropower plants, even though these are renewable and produce no greenhouse gases, do not count toward the mandate. The cramped definition of "renewable" makes these renewable energy sources financially unsustainable.

One of the problems with wind and solar energy, of course, is that they're non-continuous. This revelation was a problem for the goofy, stimulus-funded solar energy plant located off I-15 near the Nevada border. It works by reflecting the heat from the sun to boil water in tanks on towers, creating steam that turns turbines. But it gets cold at night, so the Ivanpah solar energy plant had to use natural gas to keep the water hot.

The sun goes down. Who knew?

Ivanpah is just one example of the gap between dreams and reality in California's renewable energy policy. As the state has increased the renewable-energy mandate, it has led the nation in electricity imports from other states. From 2013 to 2017, California was the largest net importer of electricity, bringing in an average of 89 million megawatt hours annually. Pennsylvania, a state known for coal production, was the largest net exporter of electricity, with an annual average outflow of 58 million MWh.

That's our "leadership" on climate. Our politicians pretend they're reducing emissions, and then we import electricity from places where people are less precious about it.

In 2010, the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power derived 39 percent of its energy from coal, and at a cost per kilowatt hour that was lower than natural gas, which then made up 26 percent of the total. In 2013, coal-fired plants provided 42 percent of L.A.'s electricity. That was the year Mayor Antonio Villaraigosa announced that LADWP would divest from coal generation at an estimated exit cost of $600 million. Then in 2015, the city raised electricity rates. Then in 2019, Mayor Eric declared that the LADWP would phase out three gas-fired coastal electricity generating plants, declaring the beginning of the end of natural gas. "This is what a Green New Deal looks like," Garcetti said.

A Green New Deal looks a lot like rolling blackouts and power outages as the demand for electricity surges on inevitable hot summer days. The California Independent System Operator, the nonprofit that runs the state's electricity grid and dispatches power, can't dispatch power unless there's a power-generating source that can be turned on when needed to meet peak demand. But in order for plants of that type to be cost-effective, their owners can't be barred by climate laws from having a market for electricity generated by natural gas or nuclear power.

The climate warriors don’t care. “Any third-grader can tell you that we need more solar power, not less,” said one environmentalist who was arguing for more battery storage.

Don’t even ask what your electricity bill will be when your utility passes along the cost of a requirement to buy battery storage for solar energy.

Be careful with those candles. You know how fast the utilities turn off the power when there’s a risk of fire.

Susan Shelley is an editorial writer and columnist for the Southern California News Group. Susan@SusanShelley.com. Twitter: @Susan_Shelley

Martha Alvarez

From: Ray Joseph <rayj310@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 3, 2021 3:01 PM
To: List - City Council
Subject: [EXTERNAL] No On Energy Efficient Homes

NO MORE BANS!!

Do NOT ban Gas Appliances. It will hurt property values and lifestyles.
We live in a moderate climate at the beach, there is no need to force more standards on homeowners and builders.

Thanks,

Ray Joseph
One Pacific Properties
1219 Morningside dr
Manhattan Beach CA 90266
DRE #01397157
310-545-7295
Ray@RJFineHomes.com

The highest compliment my clients can give me is a referral of their friends, family and business associates.

Martha Alvarez

From: Elyse Gura <egura1211@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, October 17, 2021 7:54 PM
To: City Clerk
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Regarding placement of a rainbow crosswalk at the intersection of Manhattan Beach Blvd and Peck Ave.

I learned that Manhattan Beach is planning to place a rainbow crosswalk at the corner of Manhattan Beach Blvd and Peck from a post to the Manhattan Beach Politics Facebook group. While I applaud this initiative, I urge council to select another location -- one where the message of this crosswalk can have a greater impact.

The corner of Manhattan Beach Blvd and Peck Ave is beyond the western edge of Polliwog park. At its northeastern corner, is a nondescript city equipment yard; at the northwest corner begins a series of two story apartment buildings. No one turns north onto Peck at that intersection because Peck stops about 1.5 blocks later, where school and/or administrative buildings -- and their parking lots -- begin. Anyone who has ever turned north there knows that you have to immediately turn west onto 12th street -- a very narrow street that is not easy to get through because there are typically cars parked on both sides of the street and there is only room for one car to get by. That street is "home" to a series of townhomes.. that's why the congestion on the street.

On the south side of Manhattan Beach Blvd at that intersection, Peck descends at a sharp angle (very sharp) to Manhattan Beach Blvd. People avoid that street because of the sharp angle, just like they avoid turning north because it goes nowhere and forces them onto a narrow street.

A rainbow crosswalk has the potential to send an important message -- but NOT AT THAT LOCATION. Why not at Redondo Ave and Manhattan Beach Blvd (there's a traffic light there, it's the eastern edge -- the beginning - of Polliwog Park, wide streets to the north and south. In fact, Manhattan Beach Middle School is just up the street on Redondo Avenue.

Why not closer to MIra Costa High School -- think about how meaningful it could be there. Why not close to where the peace pole will be moved ... so that they mutually emphasize their messaging?

I have heard a rumor that the MBB/Peck intersection was chosen because it was already scheduled for upgrade. Is that true? Surely there have to be better criteria than that for a location with a message.

PLEASE ... please.. do not choose the corner of Peck and Manhattan Beach Blvd. There is a real risk that someone will think "mission accomplished" -- when, in fact, "nothing accomplished"

Martha Alvarez

From: Tracey Ells O'Banion <traceyells@me.com>
Sent: Sunday, October 17, 2021 7:35 AM
To: City Clerk
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Rainbow crosswalk

City council:

I am writing in support of the proposed rainbow crosswalk. As a 64 year old native Manhattan resident I believe our community is inclusive and non racist.

In the past year Manhattan Beach has been pummeled with negative publicity, I'd like to see a positive visual in our community.

Tracey Ells O'Banion

Sent from my iPhone

Martha Alvarez

From: Joanne Hadley <joanne@hadleybiz.com>
Sent: Saturday, October 16, 2021 3:13 PM
To: City Clerk
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Hope for our kids, residents and visitors

A rainbow crosswalk is a wonderful idea for Manhattan Beach. It helps locals and visitors, grown ups and children alike, feel both welcome and welcoming as it's a lovely symbol of diversity and inclusion.

This is something everyone can get behind!

The planning and timing of the project is also well thought out and sensible. Thanks!

J☀

"There is always light

If only we're brave enough to see it

If only we're brave enough to be it."

Martha Alvarez

From: Rita Crabtree-Kampe <eurocrab@hotmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, October 19, 2021 9:54 AM
To: List - City Council
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Rainbow Crosswalk

I am in favor of the Rainbow Crosswalk

The crosswalk has to be painted anyway and our world needs more inclusion and education. This visible step is a step in the right direction

Thank you,
Rita Crabtree-Kampe
432 4th Street

Martha Alvarez

From: Matt Singley <singleymatt@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, October 19, 2021 9:51 AM
To: List - City Council
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Catalina Classic Commemorative Statue

Hello,
Growing up in Manhattan Beach and being a South Bay resident for over 20 years the Catalina Paddle race has always been an inspiration to me and living an active healthy lifestyle around the water...I give my full support for the City to accept the gift of the Catalina Classic Commemorative Statue from the South Bay Boardriders and allow it to be installed south of the south pier parking lot....I encourage all council members to vote "yes" when this matter comes to vote.

Thank You,
Matt Singley

Martha Alvarez

From: Mark Walton <mark.walton@voya.ie>
Sent: Tuesday, October 19, 2021 2:09 AM
To: List - City Council
Cc: Tom Horton
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Catalina Classic Commemorative Statue

Dear Sir/Madam,

Firstly thank you for your time.

In advance of you vote on the Catalina Classic Commemorative Statue on the 16th of November, I just would like to draw your attention to the International Significance of the Catalina Classic race and the meaning this statute has for our community. I visited Manhattan Beach area in the 90s, doing some work experience, where I came across the race and it has been drawing my back since. Sadly, I could not attend last year due to travel restrictions, but I will be there with my friends and family from Ireland and elsewhere in the world next year.

I am based in Sligo Town, in the northwest coast of Ireland and compete internationally in paddle board races. The Catalina Classic is known globally, often won by world champions, male and female. It attracts an elite gathering from around the world, the best 100 paddlers globally by invite, the race could be much larger, but for safety reasons it is kept to 100, so it attracts the very best. It's a true test of endurance, ocean skills and ability. Its completion for many is a lifetime goal.

We often do not realise the significance of the events that unfold in our own locality, and how it can touch the lives of many around the world, which is why I am writing this email today. The Catalina Classic for our sport, is our Tour De France, our Super Bowl, our master's Cup, our world Series, it is often just referred to as Catalina. The significance of the race, organised by a group of humble volunteers every year, should not be underestimated. If I could attend in person to impress on you the importance of the event and this statute I would.

So, I would humbly ask, you think kindly on allowing us to find a spiritual home for the extraordinary efforts of truly amazing men women who have competed in this race for decades, many of which are no longer with us in person.

Again, I thank you for your time.

Kind regards,
Mark Walton
CEO & Founder

Finisklin Business Park | Sligo | Ireland | F91 A2PF
Ph: +353-719161872

www.voya.ie **VOYA** *Organic Beauty*
Our opening times are Monday to Friday 8:30am to 5:00pm
VOYABEAUTY

Martha Alvarez

From: Anita Rodal <anitarodal@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, October 18, 2021 10:36 PM
To: List - City Council
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Requesting approval of Item #9 for construction of a safe path up to Park View Avenue

To Whom It May Concern:

As a resident of Manhattan Senior Villas, I request that you approve Item #9, and resolve to award a construction agreement to Gentry General Engineering, Inc. for the Manhattan Village Senior Villas ADA pathway project.

Thank you for your consideration,

Anita Rodal

Anita Rodal, MS

Martha Alvarez

From: Kim Brant-Lucich <kbrant007@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, October 18, 2021 9:22 PM
To: List - City Council
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Environmental Controls and Rainbow Crosswalk

Dear City Council members,

I am pleased to see that the City Council is discussing Agenda Item #13: Discuss and Provide Direction on Potential Requirements for Increased 21-0258 Energy Efficiency of New Buildings. It is critical that we, as a community, take whatever steps we can to focus on environmental controls, whether it's stormwater runoff or energy efficient building. WIth current climate change-related catastrophes, we must be diligent, especially in a beach community. I hope you will vote unanimously to support this agenda item and energy efficient building.

A also urge you to support the Rainbow Flag crosswalk proposal. Placing this Art in a crosswalk is a wonderful way to demonstrate that we are a welcoming and inclusive community. I do question its placement in an area that may not be highly visible. If there is the option to recommend that the Rainbow Flag be placed in a populous downtown area (at one of the all direction crosswalks on MBB, for example), I think that would be an even stronger statement.

Thank you for your consideration.

Regards,

Kim Brant-Lucich
kbrant007@gmail.com

Martha Alvarez

From: roycasey@aol.com
Sent: Monday, October 18, 2021 5:04 PM
To: Bruces Beach Task Force
Cc: List - City Council; Quinn Barrow
Subject: [EXTERNAL] LA Superior Court documents related to Complaint of Eminent Domain filed in 1924

First of all, thank you for recently adding Bruce's Beach related source material to postings on the City's website, like Board of Trustee minutes, maps, newspaper articles, historical ordinances, etc.

Please add a posting on the City's website of the LA Superior Court documents received by Kristin Long of the History Advisory Board in regards to the filing of a Complaint of Eminent Domain by the City of Manhattan Beach in November 1924 wherein a final judgment was issued on June 10, 1929 in the case known as City of Manhattan Beach v. B.H. Dyer, et al.

Please include all related documents, for example, responses by affected property owners, comments and reports by Court Referees, motions, filings, pleadings, evidence, discovery, depositions, findings, judgments, statements by interested parties, including the judge.

In addition to documents received by the History Advisory Board, please include all documents or print outs of micro phish or microfilm records that are related to the matters described above and that are in the possession of the City of Manhattan or any outside attorneys retained by the City that may have been received in the past and currently included in the files of the City, the City Attorney, outside counsel and stored in archives.

It would be helpful to me and other residents that are tracking these proceedings and analyzing the work product of the History Advisory Board if all the documents referenced above were posted on the City's website in advance of the next History Advisory Board meeting, which is currently scheduled for October 20, 2021.

Thanks,

Roy Casey

Martha Alvarez

From: Andy Dellenbach <andy@jimmymillerfoundation.org>
Sent: Monday, October 18, 2021 4:48 PM
To: List - City Council
Cc: Tom Horton; Kevin Barry; Steve Napolitano; Hildy Stern; Richard Montgomery; Joe Franklin; Suzanne Hadley
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Catalina Classic Paddleboard Race Commemorative Statue
Attachments: JMMF Letter of Support - Catalina Classic Statue MB Pier.doc

Dear MB City Council Members and Mayor Stern,

Please see the attached letter of support for the proposed Catalina Classic Paddleboard Race commemorative statue that is being contemplated for the south end of the south parking lot of the MB Pier. As you will read in the letter, the Catalina Classic race is very near and dear to the Jimmy Miller Memorial Foundation on several levels. Not only did Jimmy participate multiple times, but it has been a source of healing, connection and building teamwork among our veterans and those suffering from dependency issues, mental health issues, depression, anxiety and suicidal ideation.

The Jimmy Miller Foundation, based in Manhattan Beach, is at the forefront of using the ocean as basis of alternative therapy for those suffering from trauma-related issues. We currently work with 8 different youth organizations in LA, veterans, active duty Marines at Camp Pendleton and now local frontline healthcare workers from Torrance Memorial Hospital in our Ocean Therapy Program.

We wholeheartedly support the installation of a commemorative statue.

Thank you for your consideration!

Andy Dellenbach
Chief Executive Officer
M: 310-968-4259

THE JIMMY MILLER FOUNDATION

Jimmy Miller Memorial Foundation
2711 N. Sepulveda Blvd. #331
Manhattan Beach, CA 90266
www.jimmymillerfoundation.org
info@jimmymillerfoundation.org
501(c)(3)-tax exempt 20-1702191

Dear Mayor and Councilmembers,

The Jimmy Miller Memorial Foundation (JMMF) fully supports the creation of a statue commemorating the Catalina Classic Paddleboard Race. As one of the most iconic paddleboard races in the world, participation in the “Granddaddy” is a rite of passage to be considered a true waterman. When people around the world hear about Manhattan Beach, they often associate our city with this distinctive race, so it is only fitting that the City should cement our historical legacy with a statue.

A commemorative statue is not just an homage to an elite group of paddlers that have participated in and completed the race; it is also a public acknowledgement that the South Bay, and Manhattan Beach in particular, is home to some of the greatest, bravest and fittest ocean pioneers in the world. Akin to the Surfer’s Walk of Fame on the Hermosa pier and the Manhattan Beach Open volleyball winners on the MB pier, the commemorative statue salutes the best of the best in the paddling world.

The Catalina Classic is very near and dear to the Jimmy Miller Memorial Foundation. Not only did Jimmy Miller participate multiple times in the race (5 or 6 – we lost count), we believe that had Jimmy’s shoulder injury not kept him out of the ocean and paddling, he would still be with us today. Tragically, Jimmy took his own life in 2004 and JMMF has been at the finish line every year since Jimmy’s passing to greet and congratulate the paddlers. We have had multiple paddlers and teams raise money to support our Ocean Therapy Program which aids those suffering from mental illness, anxiety, depression and other trauma related illness.

In 2010, JMMF organized the first ever all-military veteran relay paddle team to participate in the Catalina Classic. All of the veterans who paddled have struggled with PTSD (Post Traumatic Stress Disorder) or TBI (Traumatic Brain Injury) as a result of their military service. For one of the participants on the relay team, the race helped her overcome her suicidal ideations and she is now thriving.

JMMF’s Program Director, Kevin Sousa, used his training regimen for the Catalina Classic as a basis for his Master’s Thesis in becoming a licensed therapist. Kevin attributes paddling and the Catalina Classic as instrumental in helping him overcome his addiction and alcoholism.

We at the JMMF believe that a commemorative statue would be a tourism draw for Manhattan Beach, would visually improve a blighted area south of the pier parking lot, celebrate the 32-mile paddling accomplishment and will help to continue to raise awareness about how outdoor, recreational pursuits like paddling can be effective forms of alternative therapy for those suffering from mental illness, depression, anxiety, addiction, dependency and suicidal ideation.

A Catalina Classic statue would be a permanent reminder that anyone can overcome their fears and challenges, they can ride and not fight the troughs and valleys in life, and no matter your circumstances, you are not alone even in the biggest of oceans.

Please join the paddleboard, surfing and local waterman in making this commemorative statue a reality and an attraction for Manhattan Beach.

Kind regards,
Andy Dellenbach
Chief Executive Officer

Martha Alvarez

From: Jill Lamkin <jill@downtownmanhattanbeach.com>
Sent: Monday, October 18, 2021 4:44 PM
To: List - City Council
Cc: Ed McKeegan; Mike Simms
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Support for Catalina Classic Statue
Attachments: Letter to Council - Catalina Classic Statue .docx; ATT00001.htm

October 18, 2021

Mayor Hildy Stern
Members of City Council
City Manager Bruce Moe

City of Manhattan Beach
1400 Highland Avenue
Manhattan Beach, CA 90266

Dear Mayor Stern et al,

The DBPA would like to extend our support for the installation of the statue commemorating the Catalina Classic Ocean Paddleboard Race. Its location at the south end of the lower Strand parking lot would bring more public art close to Downtown and create visual recognition for this annual event that is beloved by our community.

Respectfully,

Mike Simms
President, DBPA

Jill Lamkin
Executive Director, DBPA

Martha Alvarez

From: emma hite <e_hite@hotmail.com>
Sent: Monday, October 18, 2021 3:46 PM
To: List - City Council
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Support for the proposed rainbow crosswalk on MB Blvd

Dear Mayor Stern, Mayor Pro Tem Napolitano, Councilmember Montgomery, Councilmember Franklin and Councilmember Hadley,

I am a resident of Manhattan Beach and reside in the Meadows neighborhood. I am a bit late in writing in support for the proposed rainbow crosswalk on Manhattan Beach Blvd- but nonetheless my family and I strongly support this act of inclusion.

This is EXACTLY what our City and community needs to showcase how welcoming our community is and our commitment to the support of the LGBTQ communities. The simple act of displaying this iconic symbol🏳️‍🌈 in our town, next to a park, will certainly show everyone - not just those who are part of the LGBTQ community - but those struggling to come out that WE SUPPORT YOU and are SO PROUD to have them as part of what makes MB such an incredible place to reside. It is the right choice and sends a message of LOVE. Can you think of another item on the list that says that??

My children will grow up knowing that everyone is welcome in our home- but I would love to have them know that their town too.

Lets make this happen-- let us show off how much this means to us and send a message to the world while we are at it.

We appreciate your consideration, and really hope to see more rainbows in the future. 🌈🌈
Warmly,

🏳️‍🌈🏳️‍🌈Emma Hite🏳️‍🌈🏳️‍🌈
1900 Magnolia Avenue

Martha Alvarez

From: Suzanne Kretschmer <skretschmer@verizon.net>
Sent: Monday, October 18, 2021 2:32 PM
To: List - City Council
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Paddleboard Statue

Dear MB City Council members,

I am in strong support of adding the paddleboarding statue to the beach!

Suzanne Kretschmer
skretschmer@verizon.net

Martha Alvarez

From: Birkel, Julia L. <jbirkel@hfbllp.com>
Sent: Monday, October 18, 2021 1:58 PM
To: List - City Council
Subject: [EXTERNAL] 10/19/21 City Council Meeting - Rainbow Crosswalk

Dear Mayor Stern and Councilmembers,
I love the Cultural Arts Commission's proposal of a Rainbow Crosswalk and hope you vote in favor.
I'm also a fan of the original proposed location at Manhattan Beach Blvd. and Redondo, for higher visibility.
What a truly welcoming and inclusive message to those of us returning home or those coming to visit.
Best,
Julie Birkel

HILL FARRER
Established 1923

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 | GLOBALAW

Martha Alvarez

From: Diana Skaar <dianaskaar@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, October 18, 2021 1:19 PM
To: List - City Council
Cc: City Clerk
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Support for the Rainbow Crosswalk

Hi City Councilmembers,

The Rainbow Crosswalk is a beautiful idea to show that MB is welcoming and inclusive, especially to our LGBTQ+ community. I hope City Council supports this Cultural Arts Commission idea. I understand that Manhattan Beach Blvd and Peck was suggested as a cost-savings option as that intersection has to be re-done anyways. I'm curious if a more prominent location like Redondo Avenue and Manhattan Beach Blvd (where there is more pedestrian traffic to Polliwog and MBMS) would be considered and what the added cost would be to the City.

Thank you,

--
Diana Skaar
Manhattan Beach Resident

Martha Alvarez

From: Marc Theodore <theologian@verizon.net>
Sent: Monday, October 18, 2021 12:49 PM
To: List - City Council
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Catalina Classic Commemorative Statue

As a lifelong resident of Manhattan Beach, I would like to voice my support for the gift of the Catalina Classic Commemorative Statue by the South Bay Boardriders and the statue installation just to the south of the south Pier parking lot. Council members please vote “Yes” when this matter comes to a vote.

Sincerely,

Marc Theodore

Martha Alvarez

From: Sheehan Chris <chris.sheehan9@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, October 18, 2021 12:40 PM
To: List - City Council
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Catalina Classic Statue

Dear city council,

I have raced in the Catalina Classic 3 times and think that this is such a special and unique event that highlights the community's history and relationship with the ocean. I cannot think of a better way to memorialize this amazing tradition than with the proposed statue. I fully support the city's acceptance of the statue from the South Bay Boardriders and can't wait to see it's installation south of the Manhattan Beach pier. Please vote YES when this matter comes to a vote.

Thank you!

Chris Sheehan
2516 Palm Ave, Manhattan Beach, CA 90266
562.688.8502

Martha Alvarez

From: Ted Iantuono <tiantuono@verizon.net>
Sent: Monday, October 18, 2021 12:14 PM
To: List - City Council
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Catalina Classic Statue

Dear Council Members:

As a resident of Manhattan Beach and one-time, hobbled finisher of the Catalina Classic, I would like to encourage all interested parties to accept the gift of the Catalina Classic Commemorative Statue from the South Bay Boardriders, and allow it to be installed south of the south pier parking lot. I hope that all Council Members will approve this matter when it comes to vote. Thank you for your consideration.

Best,

Ted Iantuono

Ted Iantuono
310-487-6665
Tiantuono@verizon.net

Martha Alvarez

From: Kevin Coye <kevcoye@me.com>
Sent: Monday, October 18, 2021 12:13 PM
To: List - City Council
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Catalina Commemorative Statue

As a former resident of Manhattan Beach I would like to give my support for the City to accept the gift of the Catalina Classic Commemorative Statue from the South Bay Boardriders and allow it to be installed south of the south Pier parking lot. I encourage all councilmembers to vote "Yes" when this matter comes to a vote.

Sent from my iPhone

Martha Alvarez

From: Laura Kiely <laurakiely@verizon.net>
Sent: Monday, October 18, 2021 11:47 AM
To: List - City Council
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Re: Rainbow crosswalk - Yes ✋ updated comment

Dear City Council,
I'd like to be more specific about my previous email supporting a MB rainbow crosswalk.

I'd like to support the original recommendation that it be on Redondo Avenue, near the Middle School. I think it would be a positive symbolic gesture of support for so many students and families.

Thank you for your consideration.

Best,
Laura Kiely
MB resident since 1994

Sent from my iPhone

> On Oct 18, 2021, at 10:31 AM, Laura Kiely <laurakiely@verizon.net> wrote:
>
> Dear City Council,
> I support the rainbow crosswalk in Manhattan Beach! Thank you for considering this.
> Best,
> Laura Kiely
> Manhattan Beach resident since 1994
>
> Sent from my iPhone

Martha Alvarez

From: Cutler, Jeff (NBCUniversal) <Jeff.Cutler@nbcuni.com>
Sent: Monday, October 18, 2021 11:46 AM
To: List - City Council
Subject: [EXTERNAL] In Support Of The Catalina Classic Statue

Dear City Council,

I am a life long resident of Manhattan Beach, and am fortunate enough to have had the honor of raising my family in this incredible town.

Growing up a surfer in Manhattan Beach, I was introduced to the sport of prone paddling by the close-knit and ever growing community of watermen/women and ocean enthusiasts that reside in the South Bay. The Catalina Classic was always a thing of myth and legend to us young local surfers. An accomplishment well beyond many of our imagination, yet always something we wanted to conquer in the back of our minds. When I learned of the incredibly colorful history of "The Classic" (Tom Blake, Greg Noll, Tom Zahn, Ricky Grigg, Buddy Bohn, Gibby Gibson to name a few of the legends involved in the early days) what was a very far fetched goal of mine became a must do. A rite of passage that was indeed something I needed to be a part of.

I participated in the Classic in 2007 and 2008, finishing both times. I've subsequently served on the board of the race, have had the blessing of working alongside both Buddy Bohn and Gibby Gibson, and crewed numerous times for close friends. I've spent hundreds of hours of my life dedicated to either participating in, or helping with the Catalina Classic for one reason…the incredibly rich history that The Classic boasts.

I don't think that participants alone should have knowledge of the Catalina Classic history. I think whoever walks along the strand and stares out to Catalina should know the history. They should get a glimpse into the grit and the honor those paddlers embraced as they made the 32 mile journey home. They should understand that the race is a celebration of the unique relationship many South Bay residents have with the ocean. People should understand that the race embodies community. Not only the community of paddlers, the but the community that embraces the paddlers when they pass the orange buoy at the and of the pier, ultimately making it to the sand to be embraced with tears of joy from their friends, family (even grandchildren in many cases – insert Gene Boyer, Bob Wyler and many others here) and completely anonymous admirers.

The statue would permanently memorialize and pay tribute to those that have conquered the Catalina Classic, while inspiring new watermen/women to do the same. All the while, the statue would be a symbol of a small sector of our community that year over year inspires the broader community to embrace our town's beautiful history and push themselves beyond their limits just to be part of it.

I, obviously, am in support of the Catalina Classic statue. Let's make this happen!

Jeff

Jeff Cutler (Cara and Mac Cutler too)
1561 21st Street
MB

Jeff Cutler
Director, Sports Partnerships Development

NBCU Local
100 Universal City Plaza | Bldg 2120 – 3rd Floor | Universal City, CA 91608
O: 818-684-5991 | M: 310-940-5923
jeff.cutler@nbcuni.com

Martha Alvarez

From: Kim Castner <kimcastner@outlook.com>
Sent: Monday, October 18, 2021 11:15 AM
To: List - City Council
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please vote yes!

To Whom It May Concern,
As a life long resident of Manhattan Beach I would like to give my support for the City to accept the gift of the Catalina Classic Commemorative Statue from the South Bay Boardriders and allow it to be installed south of the south Pier parking lot. The Catalina Classic is a part of our city's history…..I encourage all councilmembers to vote "Yes" when this matter comes to a vote.

Kim Castner
624 Marine Avenue
Manhattan Beach

Martha Alvarez

From: Nicole Cokkinos <nicolecokkinos@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, October 18, 2021 10:44 AM
To: List - City Council
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Items #9

I request Approval of items#9. Regarding MANHATTAN VILLAGE SENIOR 21-0270 Villas ADA PathwaY Project:
A resolution Awarding a Construction Agreement to Gentry General Engineering, Inc, for the Manhattan Village Senior Villas ADA Pathway Project.

Nicole Cokkinos
1304 Parkview Ave #315, Manhattan Beach, CA 90266

Sent from my iPhone

Martha Alvarez

From: Laura Kiely <laurakiely@verizon.net>
Sent: Monday, October 18, 2021 10:31 AM
To: List - City Council
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Rainbow crosswalk - Yes

Dear City Council,
I support the rainbow crosswalk in Manhattan Beach! Thank you for considering this.
Best,
Laura Kiely
Manhattan Beach resident since 1994

Sent from my iPhone

Martha Alvarez

From: Chris Bredesen <christopher.bredesen@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, October 18, 2021 10:28 AM
To: List - City Council
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Catalina Classic Commemorative Statue from the South Bay Boardriders

"***As a resident of Manhattan Beach I would like to give my support for the City to accept the gift of the Catalina Classic Commemorative Statue from the South Bay Boardriders and allow it to be installed south of the south Pier parking lot. I encourage all councilmembers to vote "Yes" when this matter comes to a vote."***

--

Christopher Bredesen
Cell: (310) 292 4395

CXB
SERVICES MANAGEMENT LLC
PROPERTY MANAGEMENT • REAL ESTATE • RESTAURANTS

Martha Alvarez

From: Bradley Losson <bradlosson@mac.com>
Sent: Monday, October 18, 2021 10:24 AM
To: List - City Council
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Catalina Classic Statue

Hello,

I am a 54 year resident of Manhattan Beach. I know and love our history, embrace our evolving culture and a proponent of civic pride that memorializes embraces both.

Manhattan Beach is known as the birthplace of beach volleyball. And we have physical displays of beach volleyball's importance in our history and culture. It is time we also recognize the importance of the Catalina Classic. In fact I'd argue the Classic should have been recognized before or alongside the City's physical display of volleyball's part in our history and culture. The Classic preceded beach volleyball. The original beach volleyball tournament (what has now become the Manhattan Open) was started to provide entertainment to spectators waiting for the paddlers of the Catalina Classic to finish the race. One can argue The Classic is what put MB on the map as the birthplace of beach volleyball and open ocean paddleboard racing.

The Classic is a defining element of our history and culture. I support The City accepting the gift of the Catalina Classic Commemorative Statue from the South Bay Boardriders and allow it to be installed at the south end of the Pier Parking Lot, or even a more prominent location. I encourage all council members to vote "yes" when it's opportunity comes to vote.

Thank you,

Brad Losson
(650) 776-3577

Martha Alvarez

From: ron roebuck <roebeedude@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, October 18, 2021 10:20 AM
To: List - City Council
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Catalina Classic statue

Hi- as a former resident of Manhattan Beach (currently residing in Redondo Beach)
I encourage the council to accept the gift of the Catalina Classic statue from the Boardriders club. The race is an amazing and integral part of the history of Manhattan Beach and the South Bay in general, and this statue greatly honors those who have accomplished this great feat.
I encourage you to vote "yes" on the statue!
Thanks,
Ron Roebuck

Martha Alvarez

From: CHRIS PLANK <chrisplank@aol.com>
Sent: Monday, October 18, 2021 10:10 AM
To: List - City Council
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Catalina Classic Commemorative Statue

Dear City Council,

As a lifelong resident of Manhattan Beach, I would like to give my support for the City to accept the gift of the Catalina Classic Commemorative Statue from the South Bay Boardriders and allow it to be installed south of the south Pier parking lot. I encourage all council members to vote “Yes” when this matter comes to a vote. Thank you.

Chris Plank

Martha Alvarez

From: Todd N.Taugner, SIOR <toddt@klabin.com>
Sent: Monday, October 18, 2021 10:03 AM
To: List - City Council
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Todd Taugner re: Catalina Classic statue.

Good morning: I am writing to encourage the City Council to approve of this statue. It is a wonderful opportunity for the City of MB to celebrate it's historic roots as a founding participant in paddle board racing. Thank you.

TODD N.TAUGNER, SIOR | Principal
O: 310.329.9000 x1070 | DRE 00870018 | toddt@klabin.com
THE KLABIN COMPANY / CORFAC INTERNATIONAL
19700 S. Vermont Ave., Suite 100, Torrance, CA 90502
Corporate DRE 00824993 | **klabin.com**

Martha Alvarez

From: Scott C. Chambers <mbchambers4@roadrunner.com>
Sent: Sunday, October 17, 2021 8:41 PM
To: List - City Council
Subject: [EXTERNAL] The big lie about solar panels.

This is so wrong about banning gas appliances. Please watch this short video from one of the most esteem environmentalists alive!
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=N-yALPEpV4w

Sent from Mail for Windows

Martha Alvarez

From: hanna otto <hannaot123@icloud.com>
Sent: Sunday, October 17, 2021 5:44 PM
To: List - City Council
Subject: [EXTERNAL] NO on electric appliances

NO ON ELECTRIC APPLIANCES!!!!

Why are you taking away all our choices?

Why would you want more nuclear power?

Hanna Otto

Martha Alvarez

From: Sue Murray <Sue.Murray@mangomarketing.com>
Sent: Sunday, October 17, 2021 4:20 PM
To: List - City Council
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Catalina Classic Commemorative Statue

I read about the planned statue in Easy Reader and wondered where the statue will be located?

Would you be kind enough to confirm please?

Many thanks

Sue Murray
Director

P L M R | mango

M.UK +44 7789 993304
M. US +1 310 977 7313
sue.murray@mangomarketing.com
www.plmr.co.uk

Martha Alvarez

From: sera nj <najariansera@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, October 17, 2021 3:11 PM
To: List - City Council
Subject: [EXTERNAL] No On electric appliances

To City Council,

No on electric appliances and all electric buildings.

Thank you,

Sera Najarian
3104032200

Sent from my iPhone

Martha Alvarez

From: Spencer McFarland <spenceremcfarland@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, October 17, 2021 1:44 PM
To: List - City Council
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Catalina classic statue support

Dear city council,
I'm writing you to voice my support for accepting the Catalina classic statue. I grew up in Manhattan Beach and am now raising a family of my own here. I'm also a multiple finisher of the Catalina Classic Paddleboard race, and a training recurrent LA county lifeguard. This race is an important part of our local history and for that I believe a monument should stand honoring the event and the thousands of watermen and women who have made the crossing since it's inception in 1955.

Thanks for your consideration and reading this message,

Spencer McFarland

Martha Alvarez

From: Katie McAuley <katie0627@aol.com>
Sent: Sunday, October 17, 2021 11:42 AM
To: List - City Council
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please Approve Item #9 Consideration of the Following Regarding the Manhattan Village Senior Villas ADA Pathway Project

Greetings Council members, I am a resident of the Manhattan Village Senior Villas and whole heartily agree with the other residence here needing the pathway. Many residence can not take the steps up to the village, and using the entrance / exit driveway is very dangerous with the soccer field being so busy, especially on weekends. (Soccer parents always seem to be running late and pay no attention to who is walking up or down the drive, or pay attention to the stop signs coming out of each parking area...very dangerous parking lot before and after matches)

So, PLEASE, vote YES on #9 on your October 19th, agenda, but it is #1 in the hearts of us Seniors residing in Manhattan Village Senior Villas.

Thank you for your time and consideration,
Kathleen McAuley
Resident of Manhattan Village Senior Villas

Martha Alvarez

From: Laurence Saper <everglow9@yahoo.com>
Sent: Saturday, October 16, 2021 5:47 PM
To: List - City Council
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Manhattan Village Senior 21-0270 Villas ADA Pathway Project

Please approve Item #9

Sincerely,
Laurence Saper

Martha Alvarez

From: Heather Freelin <hfreelin@me.com>
Sent: Saturday, October 16, 2021 2:47 PM
To: List - City Council
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Support for Rainbow crosswalk

Dear City Council members,

I support the Cultural Arts Commission's unanimous recommendation to install a rainbow crosswalk on MB Blvd.

I am a thirteen year MB resident residing on Chestnut Avenue near Meadows elementary where I have a fifth grader. I also have a freshman at Mira Costa. I'm a Girl Scout leader, a member of Amigos Unidos, a frequent school volunteer, and an active member of my church, MBCC on Peck. I believe in creating and nurturing an inclusive and welcoming community for our kids and adults of all sexual orientations, races, and genders. That is the type of community that I want to live in and that I want my kids to grow up in.

My family visits and uses Polliwog Park frequently and I believe the proposed location of the rainbow sidewalk would be a good one in terms of its connection to the park and the nearby arts center.

Thank you for all that each of you do for our city, especially in these divisive times.

Sincerely, Heather Freelin

Martha Alvarez

From: Christine Troxel <singertroxie@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, October 16, 2021 2:26 PM
To: List - City Council; Christine Troxel
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Item #9 for Safe Path up to Parkview Ave

I live at the Villa and really appreciate your doiing this

Christine Troxel, apt. 126

Martha Alvarez

From: HOGAN1126@roadrunner.com
Sent: Saturday, October 16, 2021 11:27 AM
To: List - City Council
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Item 9 Approval

Dear City Council, please approve Item 9 - a safe pathway to Park View. I have lived in the Manhattan Village Senior Villas for 9 years and walk 3 miles a day, often up and down the access road to Park View with cars going by me. Many of our residents also use this walkway and we have been waiting several years for a safe walkway. Thank you, Diane Hogan, apartment 235

Martha Alvarez

From: Alex Mortensen <alexpmortensen@outlook.com>
Sent: Saturday, October 16, 2021 10:51 AM
To: List - City Council
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Catalina Classic statue support

Dear City Council,

As a resident of Manhattan Beach, I would like to give my support for the City to accept the gift of the Catalina Classic Commemorative Statue from the South Bay Boardriders and allow it to be installed south of the south Pier parking lot. I encourage all council members to vote "Yes" when this matter comes to a vote.

thank you,

Alex Mortensen
626-841-8413

Martha Alvarez

From: Jane Kim <jwk54321@yahoo.com>
Sent: Saturday, October 16, 2021 10:19 AM
To: List - City Council
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Support for the proposed rainbow crosswalk on MB Blvd

Dear Mayor Stern, Mayor Pro Tem Napolitano, Councilmember Montgomery, Councilmember Franklin and Councilmember Hadley,

I hope you are all doing well. I am writing today to express my support for the proposed rainbow crosswalk on Manhattan Beach Blvd that is unanimously recommended by the Cultural Arts Commission.

Symbols of inclusion like rainbows show the LGBTQ+ communities and other disenfranchised groups that they are accepted and welcome in the Manhattan Beach community. Symbols of inclusion in a public area sends a significant message of inclusion and tolerance to the community at large, from the old to the young. These expressions are necessary and promote tolerance to those who visit Manhattan Beach.

Thank you for your consideration of this matter. I see it as a continuation of welcoming efforts toward the LGBTQ community started when Councilman Napolitano and others helped to fly the rainbow flag over City Hall a few years back. These actions have such heartwarming consequences.

Sincerely,

Jane Kim
1501 Magnolia Ave

Martha Alvarez

From: Isabel Mullin <isabelmullin@verizon.net>
Sent: Saturday, October 16, 2021 10:05 AM
To: List - City Council
Subject: [EXTERNAL] New crosswalk☺

I wanted just to let you all know that I am in support fully of installing a rainbow crosswalk at the intersection of Manhattan Beach Blvd. and Redondo. We have lived here for 32 years at 1405 Magnolia and are so proud of how our city is inclusive and supportive to all.
Thank you,
Isabel Mullin

Isabel Mullin
310-614-5062
isabelmullin@verizon.net
Sent from my iPad

Martha Alvarez

From: Kelly Hamm <khamm@cchomedesign.com>
Sent: Saturday, October 16, 2021 7:44 AM
To: List - City Council
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Proposed ban on gas appliances

Dear City Council,

My name is Kelly Hamm and I am a local architect/builder in the City of Manhattan Beach and other South Bay Cities. I was recently sent an email about an upcoming agenda item regarding banning natural gas appliances in the City. I wanted to say at this time, I am **opposed** to this decision. I am an environmentalist. On my projects, I constantly look for options to recycle, use more electric appliances, add insulation or solar, etc., but I am not in favor of an outright ban on natural gas lines or appliances at this time. Our world is in a rapid transition to clean renewable energy to address a looming climate crisis. Daily, we are hearing of new ideas and options to either remove carbon from the energy cycle thru carbon capture or new and less expensive ways to generate green hydrogren. Green hydrogen is made by using renewable energy to split water into hydrogren and oxygen. Many European countries are studying methods to heat homes and fuel cars and trucks using green hydrogen.

1. By banning natural gas lines into homes you will be removing a future green energy option to heat the home. The homeowner will not be able to bring green hydrogen into their homes.
2. You will eliminate people's choice of having a natural gas fireplace. I don't think it is just to require people to use electrical fireplaces when they aren't that attractive at this time.
3. It is very expensive to heat water using electricity. In fact, I still really haven't seen a good electric tankless water heater and I have been searching.

At this time, I think is it too soon to consider such a drastic measure. I am for a gradual approach following the Energy Commissions guidelines requiring more heat pumps and increased solar.

Thank you,

Kelly Hamm, AIA
Coastal Creations Architecture-Build

Martha Alvarez

From: Madeline Kaplan <madbiest@yahoo.com>
Sent: Saturday, October 16, 2021 7:33 AM
To: List - City Council
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Support for the proposed rainbow crosswalk on MB Blvd

Dear Mayor Stern, Mayor Pro Tem Napolitano, Councilmember Montgomery, Councilmember Franklin and Councilmember Hadley,

I hope you are all doing well. I am writing today to express my support for the proposed rainbow crosswalk on Manhattan Beach Blvd that is unanimously recommended by the Cultural Arts Commission.

Like so many people, I have extended family members who are gay. I know that symbols of inclusion like rainbows show them that they are loved, accepted, and welcome in the community. As a child, I spent my summers in the small town of Julian where my gay second cousin was unwelcome by so many. I have seen what that looks like up close, from a child's perspective. It was ugly, and it was heartbreaking to see his neighbors reject him for his identity.

I see the rainbow crosswalk as the opposite of the ugliness I witnessed as a child. It is inclusion. Inclusion feels good. We have gay families in our Manhattan Beach neighborhood now, and I love how the unanimous recommendation for this crosswalk sends a message that I can imagine is received as, "You are welcome here."

Thank you for your consideration of this matter. I see it as a continuation of welcoming efforts toward the LGBTQ community started when Councilman Napolitano and others helped to fly the rainbow flag over City Hall a few years back. These actions have such heartwarming consequences.

Sincerely,

Madeline Kaplan
1708 Magnolia Ave

Martha Alvarez

From: Ann O'Brien <obrienshome@roadrunner.com>
Sent: Saturday, October 16, 2021 1:42 AM
To: List - City Council
Subject: [EXTERNAL] In Support of Rainbow crosswalk

Dear City Council Members,

I support the Cultural Arts Commission's unanimous recommendation to install a rainbow crosswalk on MB Blvd.

I am a resident of MB (18th Street) and have two children in the district, one who attends MBMS, and who would enjoy seeing a supportive and inclusive piece of art like the crosswalk as he bikes to school.

I also drive through this crosswalk daily and would be proud to know that our leaders endorsed this expression of awareness that so many seem frightened by.

Understanding of others is the only way we'll begin to build acceptance and peace.

This art is a beautiful example of how we can show our children, and visitors coming to our city, that all people matter.

Thank you,

Ann O'Brien

Sent from my iPhone

Martha Alvarez

From: CityOfManhattanBeach@manhattanbeach.gov on behalf of City of Manhattan Beach <CityOfManhattanBeach@manhattanbeach.gov>
Sent: Friday, October 15, 2021 8:28 PM
To: List - City Council
Subject: Bruce Beach 1920's

Message submitted from the <City of Manhattan Beach> website.

Site Visitor Name: Gina Young
Site Visitor Email: ginayng@yahoo.com

Hello,

My Great Great Aunt Elizabeth Patterson was one of the owner of the Bruce Beach properties in the 1920's. What are you doing for the descendants of these people? In the article I have included below it seems like a photo of her was taken off one of my ancestry pages to be included in the story.

https://www.manhattanbeach.gov/home/showpublisheddocument/46745/637575505998870000

CITY OF MANHATTAN BEACH
CITY ENOTIFICATION

(310) 802-5000
CityofManhattanBeach@manhattanbeach.gov

CITY OF MANHATTAN BEACH 1400 Highland Avenue Manhattan Beach, CA 90266
Office Hours: M-Th 8:00 AM-5:00 PM | Fridays 8:00 AM-4:00 PM | Not Applicable to Public Safety
Reach Manhattan Beach Here for you 24/7, use our click and fix it app
Download the mobile app now

Martha Alvarez

From: Gary Otto <garyotto@jhrep.com>
Sent: Friday, October 15, 2021 5:20 PM
To: List - City Council
Subject: [EXTERNAL] No on All Electric

I am a resident of Manhattan Beach, I would like to urge you all to vote no on Tuesday evening on the “All Electric” vote to eliminate gas appliances.

Thank you

Martha Alvarez

From: Rodman Amiri <rodman@meritrealestate.com>
Sent: Friday, October 15, 2021 4:13 PM
To: List - City Council
Subject: [EXTERNAL] opposition to a ban on gas-powered appliances

Hello, I am writing to express both mine and my company's opposition of the proposed potential ban on gas-powered appliances. We are a real estate brokerage specializing in new construction, and property management, and the outright ban of new gas appliances is very extreme and overreaching. I feel that there are intermediary measures that could be implemented, heat pumps, recirculation pumps, ratios of electric/gas appliances, etc. rather than an outright ban. Gas is efficient and effective in Southern California, and as far as energy consumption goes, it is a clean resource. We urge you not to vote for agenda item #13.

Thank you for hearing me out.

Rodman Amiri
CA BRE 01760226
Merit Real Estate, Inc.

Martha Alvarez

From: Vincent Vanacore <vvanacore15@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, October 15, 2021 2:28 PM
To: List - City Council
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Catalina Classic Commemorative Statue

Dear MB City Council,

As a Manhattan Beach resident I would like to give my support for the City to accept the gift of the Catalina Classic Commemorative Statue from the South Bay Boardriders and allow it to be installed south of the south Pier parking lot. I support all council members voting "Yes" when this matter comes to a vote.

Thank you,

Vincent Vanacore

1208 Tennyson St., #3

Manhattan Beach, CA 90266

Martha Alvarez

From: Katherine Patton Herdman <Katherine.Herdman@addonnetworks.com>
Sent: Friday, October 15, 2021 10:53 AM
To: List - City Council
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Rainbow Crosswalk at MB Blvd

HI my name is Katie Patton and I am a home owner here in Manhattan Beach, I have lived here for over 10 years at 1330 18th street. I support the installation of a rainbow crosswalk on MB Blvd. This is around the corner from my house and I think it would be a wonderful addition. I think showing our city is a place of unity and inclusion is so important and this is a simple but large way to do that. Thanks

Martha Alvarez

From: Ben Corbett <ben@zivecdevelopment.com>
Sent: Friday, October 15, 2021 6:30 AM
To: List - City Council
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Commits on Gas Appliance

To Whom it may concern
As a builder and resident of Manhattan Beach I would like to commit on the this proposed ban on gas appliances in new construction, that I strongly disagree with the elimination of gas appliances. Today's appliances are very efficient and don't need additional restrictions. This change is policy will make it even more difficult to the current challenges we builders face in this city and to source alternative choices for appliance will create addental cost burdens and delays.

I vote no Ban on Gas Appliances !

Best
Ben

Ben Corbett
Zivec & Corbett Development, Inc.
310-722-0032 cell
310-545-3777 fax
www.zivecdevelopment.com

Martha Alvarez

From: Ray Joseph <rayj310@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, October 14, 2021 10:02 PM
To: List - City Council
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Keep Gas appliances

Keep gas appliances. Of all my utility bills, gas is the cheapest. The number 1 fuel used in power plants in California is Natural Gas. It's highly inefficient to use natural gas to produce electricity to use in an appliance to create heat. PG&E is one of the utilities behind the all-electric push. Why do you ask? It's simple: they make more money selling electricity. All electric homes push homeowners into higher, more expensive tiers.

Ultimately, there are companies trying to profit from all electric homes. These companies donate to the California power politicians and these politicians invest in these companies. Look at Pelosi investing in Tesla before her nephew Newsom passed a bill to require electric vehicles. They are all corrupt. Stop following their lead.

We have high-end homeowners that want high-end appliances and they are not electric.

The Dark Side of Renewable Energy
https://www.altenergymag.com/article/2015/08/the-dark-side-of-renewable-energy-negative-impacts-of-renewables-on-the-environment/20963/

Fuels used or California Power Plants.
https://www.energy.ca.gov/data-reports/energy-almanac/california-electricity-data/2020-total-system-electric-generation/2018

Fuel Type	California In-State Generation (GWh)	Percent of California In-State Generation
Coal	294	0.15%
Large Hydro	22,096	11.34%
Natural Gas	90,691	46.54%
Nuclear	18,268	9.38%
Oil	35	0.02%

Thanks,

Ray Joseph
One Pacific Properties
1219 Morningside dr
Manhattan Beach CA 90266
DRE #01397157
310-545-7295
Ray@RJFineHomes.com

The highest compliment my clients can give me is a referral of their friends, family and business associates.

Martha Alvarez

From: John Altamura <john@altamuragroup.net>
Sent: Thursday, October 14, 2021 6:12 PM
To: List - City Council
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Gas Ban

Do you all remember Gold Medalion Homes. The all new electric homes. It was touted as the “Wave of the Future” Until homeowners started getting the electric bills. that stopped real quick. No one would buy those home then and no one will buy them now. Gas is clean and it’s inexpensive. Please consider the extra costs and burden you will be putting on the homeowners and contractor’s, who will pass these costs on to the buyers.
Thank You. John Altamura

Sent from my iPhone

Martha Alvarez

From: Dave Salzman <dave@davesalzman.com>
Sent: Thursday, October 14, 2021 2:56 PM
To: List - City Council
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Gas appliance ban consideration

Councilpersons
Ms. Stern, Ms. Hadley, Mr. Napolitano, Mr. Montgomery, Mr. Franklin
As we each consider what we can do to slow and then reverse the course of global warming we also have to stay in touch with the hard fact that we live in a civilized word that is in transition from older forms of energy supplies to newer forms.
Transitions are often long, slow, hard, painful and disruptive.
This one certainly will be.
Balancing progress as against pain and disruption is the role of leaders like you as well as all citizens of this planet.
These decisions must be kept in context.
The banning of gas appliances in a city our size would be extremely disruptive as well as expensive and will do essentially nothing to impact global warming.
The incremental electrical energy needed to "fire" these additional electrical appliances must come from renewable sources or we net nothing if it comes from burning fossil fuels at the plant level.
I suggest we consider putting our precious time, energy and efforts into courses of action that could have an actual positive impact on the issue and avoid the pain and disruption that this ban would entail.

In your considerations next Tuesday please do not implement this ban and let's do what we can instead to implement the recommendations of the CA Energy Commission.
Thanks for your time and for your service to the citizens of the great City of Manhattan Beach!
Dave

Dave Salzman, Broker
ENGEL & VÖLKERS • LA - South Bay
800 Manhattan Beach Blvd 203
Manhattan Beach CA 90266
310 545 2260 o
310 871 5314 c
CA# 00952732
AZ# BR010967000
Website: www.salzmanteam.com

Martha Alvarez

From: Sterling Hayden <sir@sunspeed.com>
Sent: Thursday, October 14, 2021 11:21 AM
To: List - City Council; susan@susanshelley.com
Subject: [EXTERNAL] de-zoning and then there's this

https://urldefense.com/v3/__https://www.breitbart.com/economy/2021/10/13/nytimes-suburban-de-zoning-doubles-housing-prices/__;!!AxJhxnnVZ8w!crnqBdCgMhUnaRSnyZQegX5tBWhLg3kpABPz-VVTNWpqJWCTdUVQBsU8AVI0ZwH-216QQA$

Seems to not be a solution to "the housing crisis" whatever that is.
but, does seem to be the solution to more democrat controlled mini-cities

That is, in creating more of them.

Since no one is stopping it. Best that we get in on it.

SH

Martha Alvarez

From: Sterling Hayden <sir@sunspeed.com>
Sent: Thursday, October 14, 2021 11:10 AM
To: List - City Council; susan@susanshelley.com
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Mexifornia eliminating single family homes

https://urldefense.com/v3/__https://www.breitbart.com/politics/2021/10/13/california-crushing-suburban-american-dream-by-eliminating-single-family-homes-enriching-multi-unit-developers/__;!!AxJhxnnVZ8w!chjIVJ_Gr7GAkY6v6Sa6SVbEbrFEAx7yrEdxO3H5GxADRW_JoqqWJ-FZTe5QgGtjZOVhFA$

The above article is on today's Breitbart So, it's the end of suburbia?

But, nobody's doing a thing about it. Why not?

Maybe because we're all greedy.
Developers love this de-zoning
Realtors love it
Perhaps cities also love the increase in revenue We're going to have to learn to accept it and profit from it.
No sense watching our neighbor develop 10 units while we try to preserve simple life in a 3 bedroom with back yard.

Who else loves it?
Maybe local markets see it as more customers densely living near them Anyway, no one is fighting against it.

Yes that includes our own City.
Well prior to the recall election our City (Council) should've put out publicity on these measures and Newscum Full page in The Beach Reporter would not cost much.
Payment could come from the developers' art fund that is being used to glorify Bruce Beach.

Previously had been directed to a Cities' organization founded by a Torrance guy.
But, didn't see any action plan to fight the de-zoning We're suspicious that too many stand to benefit financially for there to be any fight against SB 9 & 10 and similar power grabs by Sacramento Dems.
Are we wrong on that?
What real action has our City taken to defeat these de-zoning measures?

SH

Martha Alvarez

From: lanatalie2000@aol.com
Sent: Tuesday, October 12, 2021 10:37 AM
To: List - City Council
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Support for Catalina Classic Commemorative Statue

Dear MB CITY COUNCIL,

As a resident of Manhattan Beach I would like to give my support for the City to accept the gift of the Catalina Classic Commemorative Statue from the South Bay Boardriders and allow it to be installed south of the south Pier parking lot. I encourage all councilmembers to vote "Yes" when this matter comes to a vote.

Sincerely,
Dave and Natalie Shaby
1561 Nelson Ave
Manhattan Beach, Ca 90266

Martha Alvarez

From: Patricia Jones <patricia@psiloveyoufoundation.org>
Sent: Monday, October 11, 2021 5:37 PM
To: List - City Council
Cc: Patricia Jones
Subject: [EXTERNAL] City Approval to support Catalina Classic Statue

Dear Board,

I hope this note finds you well and safe.

As a resident of the community, I would like to give my support for the City to accept the gift of the Catalina Classic Commemorative Statue from the South Bay Boardriders. THe SBBR are an amazing group and allowing it to be installed south of the south Pier parking lot, will bring recognition and inspiration to all. I do hope council members to vote "Yes" when this matter comes to a vote.

Thank you for your attention to my request.
Warmly,
Patricia

Patricia Jones
Founder, PS I Love You Foundation
Author, Social Emotional Learning Educator, CBEST, Educational Right Holder, Certified Diversity Specialist, Foster Legal Network, Realtor
Direct: 310-420-4717
General: Patricia.Jonesy@gmail.com
Philanthropy: Patricia@PSILoveYouFoundation.org
www.PSILoveYouFoundation.org

"All of us on this planet are not standing in a line, look closely. We are all standing in a circle holding hands. Whatever you give to the person standing next to you, eventually comes back to you."Direct:

Martha Alvarez

From: STEPHEN BURRIN <sjburrin@aol.com>
Sent: Monday, October 11, 2021 5:12 PM
To: List - City Council
Cc: Russ Lesser; edmcleegan@meirealty.com
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Catalina Classic Ocean Paddleboard Race and Stautue

Council, I am strongly in support of the Catalina Classic Ocean Paddleboard Race and Statue

Sent from my iPad

Martha Alvarez

From: Brigitte Pratt <bpratt@strandhill.com>
Sent: Monday, October 11, 2021 4:12 PM
To: List - City Council
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Catalina Classic Commemorative Statue

As a resident of Manhattan Beach I would like to give my support for the City to accept the gift of the Catalina Classic Commemorative Statue from the South Bay Boardriders and allow it to be installed south of the south Pier parking lot. I encourage all councilmembers to vote "Yes" when this matter comes to a vote.

With kind regards,

BRIGITTE PRATT
REALTOR | CalDRE#01910418

Strand Hill | Christie's International Real Estate
D + 310.613.6609 | O + 310.545.0707
bpratt@strandhill.com | prattbeachproperties.com

Search the MLS like a Realtor:
http://www.crmls.org/servlet/lDisplayListings?LA=EN

I have not and will not verify or investigate the information supplied by third parties.

Martha Alvarez

From: CityOfManhattanBeach@manhattanbeach.gov on behalf of City of Manhattan Beach <CityOfManhattanBeach@manhattanbeach.gov>
Sent: Monday, October 11, 2021 2:09 PM
To: List - City Council
Subject: Proposed Sculpture honoring the Catalina Classic

Message submitted from the <City of Manhattan Beach> website.

Site Visitor Name: Rosalie Olson
Site Visitor Email: rosaliee@verizon.net

Love the honoring of the world famous volleyball championships on the pier. But I don't a statue honoring the Catalina Classic is worthy of a place of honor on the public beach. I know there are statues everywhere in other countries honoring national heroes, but the Catalina Classic isn't worthy of such honor.

CITY OF MANHATTAN BEACH
CITY ENOTIFICATION

(310) 802-5000
CityofManhattanBeach@manhattanbeach.gov

Martha Alvarez

From: Tina Ohmstede <tina.ohmstede@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, October 11, 2021 9:05 AM
To: List - City Council
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Support for Catalina Classic Commemorative Statue

Dear Manhattan Beach City Council:

I am a long time resident of Manhattan Beach and I am writing to give my support for the City to accept the gift of the Catalina Classic Commemorative Statue from the South Bay Boardriders and allow it to be installed south of the south Pier parking lot.

I urge all council members to vote "yes" when this matter comes to a vote, this will be a lovely and meaningful addition to our community.

Sincerely,
Tina

Tina Ohmstede
1304 12th Street, Unit B
Manhattan Beach 90266

Martha Alvarez

From: Laura and Dan Inlow <dlkcinlow@aol.com>
Sent: Monday, October 11, 2021 8:34 AM
To: List - City Council
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Catalina Classic Statue and Outside Decks

Dear City Council,

First, as a resident of Manhattan Beach I would like to give my support for the City to accept the gift of the Catalina Classic Commemorative Statue from the South Bay Boardriders and allow it to be installed south of the south Pier parking lot. I encourage all councilmembers to vote “Yes” when this matter comes to a vote.

Also, please preserve as much outdoor deck dining as possible--it is fantastic and has revitalized downtown. Thanks for all your hard work on our behalf.
Laura Inlow

Martha Alvarez

From: PFLAG-MB Treasurer <pflag.mb.treasurer@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, October 8, 2021 2:47 PM
To: List - City Council
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Re: Cultural Arts Commission rainbow crosswalk proposal
Attachments: 2022-PFLAG-RainbowCrosswalk-Council.pdf

City Council Members,

Please see the attached letter from the PFLAG Manhattan Beach/South Bay chapter Board of Directors regarding a rainbow crosswalk art installation proposed by the Cultural Arts Commission. Our board is unanimous in its support and encourages the council to approve this proposal.

Sincerely,

Frank Hanzel, Treasurer
PFLAG Manhattan Beach/South Bay

--

PFLAG
Manhattan Beach / South Bay
Supporting Families – Nurturing Acceptance – Building Community
Frank Hanzel • he/him/his
Treasurer of the Board
310.753.3247 • PFLAG.MB.Treasurer@gmail.com
WWW.PFLAGMANHATTANBEACH.ORG

PFLAG
Manhattan Beach / South Bay
Supporting Families ~ Nurturing Acceptance ~ Building Community

October 6, 2021

City Council
City of Manhattan Beach
1400 Highland Avenue
Manhattan Beach, CA 90266

Dear City Council Members,

We are unanimous in our support for the installation of a rainbow crosswalk proposed by the Cultural Arts Commission.

PFLAG Manhattan Beach/South Bay was founded three years ago to unite LGBTQ+ people , their families, and allies through mutual support, education, and advocacy. We envision a future where all people are respected, valued and affirmed in our communities throughout the South Bay.

A rainbow crosswalk, when located on Manhattan Beach Blvd. and North Redondo Avenue, will provide critically important emotional support to one of our most vulnerable LGBTQ+ populations - middle-school students - who are discovering their identity and faced with painful bullying and discrimination by their peers. The City Council's decision to approve the crosswalk at this location sends a powerful message of support not only to LGBTQ+ identified students/staff, but also sends a signal of inclusion that will be seen and internalized by all students.

We applaud the Cultural Arts Commission proposal and encourage the City Council to enthusiastically support a Rainbow Crosswalk.

Sincerely,

PFLAG Manhattan Beach / South Bay Board of Directors

Cindy Byrne *President*	Frank Hanzel *Treasurer*	Tyler Wilde *Secretary*

Kathryn Davis *Member-at-Large*	Jeff Gottlieb *Member-at-Large*	Carol Kole *Member-at-Large*	Christine MacInnis *Member-at-Large*

Linda K. Reeves, LSMFT *Member-at-Large*	TJ Roper *Member-at-Large*	Isabelle Royer *Member-at-Large*	Crystal Segura *Member-at-Large*	Wendy Warren *Member-at-Large*

c: Cultural Arts Commission, City of Manhattan Beach

PFLAG Manhattan Beach/South Bay is a 501(c)(3) nonprofit organization, Federal Tax ID# 83-1723642

Martha Alvarez

From: Seidah Rasheed <rasheedseidah@yahoo.com>
Sent: Friday, October 8, 2021 10:20 AM
Subject: [EXTERNAL] We Need More EV Chargers

Electric Vehicles are being bought faster than EV Chargers are being built.

When I first started driving an Electric Vehicle, it was easy to find a charge. However, now with the EV demands, it's getting tough to find an available charger just to drive to and from work.

On a Level 2 charger, Electronic vehicles take a maximum of 5 hours to charge if on E. Every fifth of a battery's charge time is one hour.

Level 1 chargers (home wall outlets) take 12 hours if on E.

Level 3 chargers are 45 minutes, but not all EV's are capable of a Fast Charge.

Thus, Level 2 is the common denominator of chargers.

The evolution of EVs is rapidly showing the selfishness of individual drivers. People will plug in their vehicle on a neighborhood/business Level 2 charger, and leave it all night or all day unattended. It could be that they just do not have the knowledge of how long an EV battery takes to recharge.
Contrarily, that is not really an excuse on a public charger. The result is panic and anxiety amongst other EV drivers on the road trying to find an available charge to get home or from or to work.

In Los Angeles County, an acquaintance to the problem is simply that many residents live in homes that do not have driveways to access a level 1 charge. Also, apartment buildings often times only have street parking leaving residents with unrest when finding a charge. If it takes five hours to charge, drivers will leave their car charging overnight (which is more than five hours) and inconveniences other EV drivers with the same mental pressure as the prior. Other drivers may sleep in their cars for five hours, which can cause unrest between work shifts.

In conclusion, we need more accessible EV Chargers in neighborhoods (police stations, sheriff stations, street poles, and parking lots, workplaces, and at apartment with lots) to help drivers and ease the mental strain of electronic commuting.

Seidah R.
Sei De'Art
213-419-8564

Martha Alvarez

From: Jon Chaykowski <rideformbef@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, October 7, 2021 4:34 PM
To: List - City Council
Subject: [EXTERNAL] More on Time for a new name

Councilmembers,

Now may not appear to be an ideal time to change the park name. On the other hand, it may be the best time.

The Bruce family property will be returned. And, the media, interest groups, the County Supervisors and the Governor have been and are throwing MB under the bus.

AND, the actual return of the Bruce property will take many more months. No doubt, changing the park's name, regardless of when it is done, may have some media and "interest groups" attack MB as being, petty and/or vindictive.

So, when is a good time? In one month, six months, one year, two years, …?

Add this wrinkle. I see no near term quieting of the uneasy times we are witnessing with the current political movements. Some media now are saying no lives matter UNTIL black lives matter. It is unfortunate that the movement is not all lives matter. Seriously and logically think about the above. When do we say we have achieved black lives matter and move forward? What is the measurement? Seriously, try to define a quantifiable measure that will be accepted. Is it equity of racial percentages that are homeless? that are earning more than $100K/year? that earn college degrees? that drive Tesla vehicles? that die from cancer? that go into the army? that live in MB, Beverly Hills, …? Do you use one factor, all or even more factors?

Do not misread the above questioning. I am very serious. Measuring a "societal goal" is very multi-feceted. Trust me, I did PhD studies on multi-disciplined decision theory and know how complex such a model becomes.

So when should MB change the park name?
I suggested/requested a name change many, many months ago. Discussion was started but nothing was done.

There may not be "politically correct" time to do it for a VERY long time. But, the name is inappropriate and it needs to be changed, notwithstanding MB may get thrown under bus regardless of what we do. The expression "damned if we do and damned if we don't" comes to mind.

Therefore, now that the Bruce family is getting what they want, it is time to stop sitting on our hands. And, the fact that the Bruce family is "happy" right now gives MB a "better" window of opportunity to give the park a new and more appropriate name.

Let's move forward.

Sincerely,
Jon Chaykowski

Martha Alvarez

From: roycasey@aol.com
Sent: Thursday, October 7, 2021 4:10 PM
To: Kristin L. Drew
Cc: Bruces Beach Task Force; brucebeachgetthefacts@gmail.com; Gary McAulay; mike@realestateedge.com; ryan90274@yahoo.com; Alexandria Latragna; List - City Council
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Re: Correspondence with History Advisory Board

The tone you use to describe how I exercise my First Amendment Right to Free Speech is a perfect example of what Council Member Hadley raised an issue with during the City Council meeting on 7/20/21.

Your selection of words taken as a whole create a tone or spin that appears to "put a thumb on the scale."

My recent communications with the History Advisory Board have been centered around encouraging the Board to properly address the major issues raised by 4 Council Members during their 7/20/21 meeting regarding the Board's drafts of plaque language and History Report on Bruce's Beach.

I also expressed concerns about issues that arose after the 7/20/21 Council meeting, as follows:

It was revealed to me while watching the 5/17/21 History Advisory Board meeting that members were collaborated extensively with Dwayne Shepherd without disclosing it to the public.

In addition, I found evidence on my own that the HAB's primary and uncorroborated witness for racial discrimination, Frank Daugherty, told many lies during his statements, including a lie that he was a member of the Board of Trustees when it voted to enact Eminent Domain.

Based on your email to me shown below, I now understand that I have been wasting my time trying to persuade the History Advisory Board to properly address and resolve the major issues raised by City Council Members concerning your work product and subsequent issues described above.

I agree with Council Member Hadley that when City Council decided to appoint residents of MB to compile an accurate history of Bruce's Beach, there was little to no chance of finding any historical experts by using that approach.

Unfortunately, care was not taken to appoint a fair and balanced committee of residents, albeit amateurs, which would have ensured that all viewpoints of residents were represented equally, like the "Gang of 8" in DC.

As a result, I agree with you that "further dialogue is unproductive" because all members of the History Advisory Board share only one viewpoint in an echo chamber and do not give proper consideration of opposing viewpoints, not even the critical issues raised by City Council on 7/20/21.

However, I do appreciate all of the time that you and your team and the Task Force before you spent on this project.

MB residents have been very patient over the last 14 months as our City has been smeared nationally by the press based on drafts of the Bruce's Beach History Report prepared by your Board and the Task Force before you was posted on our City's website long before they were complete or reviewed by anyone.

Allowing these unvetted and incomplete drafts to be posted on MB's website resulted in what may have been a premature decision in March to issue a Resolution of Condemnation for actions of MB residents and Board of Trustees over a hundred years ago that may not have been "factually accurate" based on issues raised by City Council on 7/20/21 and more recent revelations that call into question the reliability of the uncorroborated testimony of Frank Daugherty and the previously undisclosed influence of Dwayne Shepherd on the History Advisory Board.

I hope that City Council will indeed thank you for your hard work and forward your most recent drafts of the history report and plaque language to a bipartisan history firm to "take it from here."

Residents of the City of Manhattan Beach deserve to get what City Council voted for in August 2020 - A FACTUALLY ACCURATE HISTORY OF BRUCE'S BEACH that passes muster with bipartisan history experts that will analyze sources, add sources, separate facts from uncorroborated stories, opinions and speculation and edit the report and plaque language in a fair and balanced manner.

"Just the Facts Ma'am" as so accurately summarized in one short statement by Council Member Hadley, and this sentiment was echoed by Council Members Montgomery and Franklin.

Thanks,
Roy Casey

-----Original Message-----
From: Kristin Long <klongs@gmail.com>
To: roycasey@aol.com
Cc: brucesbeachtaskforce@citymb.info <brucesbeachtaskforce@citymb.info>; brucebeachgetthefacts@gmail.com <brucebeachgetthefacts@gmail.com>; gary.mcaulay@gmail.com <gary.mcaulay@gmail.com>; mike@realestateedge.com <mike@realestateedge.com>; ryan90274@yahoo.com <ryan90274@yahoo.com>; alatragna@manhattanbeach.gov <alatragna@manhattanbeach.gov>; citycouncil@citymb.info <citycouncil@citymb.info>
Sent: Thu, Oct 7, 2021 11:32 am
Subject: Re: Correspondence with History Advisory Board

Mr. Casey,
We appreciate your input as we've appreciated the input from many during this process.

We have spent considerable time addressing your concerns and supporting our responses with citations and sources. Despite these best efforts, you have been both dismissive and accusatory, labeling us and this process as some conspiracy of liberal bias which we've corrected you on more than once. We appreciate differences of opinion, however, there comes a point where further dialogue is unproductive when one side frames the issues in such a way. Thus, we're moving on and aren't going to relitigate work we've already sourced.

If you have new, additional information you'd like to add, we'll certainly consider it. As to further debate of what we've already addressed, please direct your comments to the City Council who will make the final decision as to either accept or reject our work.

Thank you for your understanding and your time.
The History Advisory Board

On Tue, Oct 5, 2021 at 8:56 PM <roycasey@aol.com> wrote:

> Thanks for taking the time to respond to my comments, even though it comes less than 24 hours before the last scheduled HAB meeting.
>
> My comments back to the History Advisory Board are highlighted in yellow.
>
> After taking all of your comments into serious consideration, City Council must retain the services of a bipartisan history firm to analyze the history report and plaque language submitted by the HAB in order to fulfill their fiduciary duty to the residents of Manhattan Beach, to protect the reputation of the City of Manhattan Beach and take measure to guard against threats made against the City by people like Dwayne Shepherd.
>
> Thanks,
> Roy
>
> -----Original Message-----
> From: Kristin Long <klongs@gmail.com>
> To: roycasey@aol.com

Cc: Bruces Beach Task Force <brucesbeachtaskforce@citymb.info>; Bruce's Beach: Get The Facts <brucebeachgetthefacts@gmail.com>; Gary McAulay <gary.mcaulay@gmail.com>; Mike Michalski <mike@realestateedge.com>; Joseph Ryan <ryan90274@yahoo.com>; Alexandria Latragna <alatragna@manhattanbeach.gov>
Sent: Tue, Oct 5, 2021 3:10 pm
Subject: From the History Advisory Board

Mr. Casey:
On behalf of the History Advisory Board, thank you for the time you've put into listing your comments and concerns regarding our report. Our responses to your comments are below in red and blue, with the appropriate source that relates to your comment. All documents can be found at this link under the HISTORY ADVISORY BOARD heading. Where possible, we have provided an exact link to that document and the page number where it can be found. If you have any issues finding anything or questions, please let us know.

1. Evidence may be inadequate that Eminent Domain was racially motivated after all issues are resolved. Re-evaluate this position after all issues & related evidence have been researched, analyzed and re-evaluated.

Your long list of "evidence" is dated after the decision to enact Eminent Domain. In addition, history experts do accept single sources and newspaper articles composed on op-eds, speculation and uncorroborated stories as factual evidence. And your primary evidence for an opinion of racial discrimination is based on statements made by Frank Daugherty, which are completely without merit (see #10 below). The History Advisory Board's consistent refusal to report the facts and unwillingness to include a historical context throughout the plaque and history report and keeping your obviously biased thumb on the scale by always expressing a Far Left viewpoint are primary reasons why City Council must retain a bipartisan history firm of experts to analyze all sources, add new sources and edit the report and plaque language. This will also clear the air of the obvious appearance of a blatant conflict of interest from the Board collaborating with Dwayne Shepherd and not disclosing it to the public until I shed light on the issue and an obvious need to edit the report and plaque language from an unbiased viewpoint.

Here is a list of evidence that shows racial motivation behind the eminent domain proceedings.

*The **name in parenthesis** is the name of the full PDF file where this source document can be found on the City's website under the heading **HISTORY ADVISORY BOARD > HISTORY ADVISORY BOARD REPORTS AND SOURCE FILES** and the page number is where the specific document can be found in that PDF file.*

1915 October 18 Letter From Price (letter From Price)

1924 April 11 Peck Pavilion (Newspaper Articles, Page 11)

1926-9-26 Manhattan Globe (Newspaper Articles, Pages 14-16)

1927-2-11 MBNews OpEd Recall (Newspaper Articles, Page 20, Page 19)

1928-2-15 Pasadena_Evening_Post_Wed__Feb_15__1928_ (Newspaper Articles, Page 30)

1928-2-15 San Diego Evening Tribune-pdf (Newspaper Articles, Page 31)

1928-2-15 The_Record_Wed__Feb_15__1928_ (Newspaper Articles, Page 32)

1928-2-15_Venice_Evening_Vanguard_Wed__P1_ (Newspaper Articles, Page 33

1928-2-15-Los_Angeles_Evening_Express_GrandJury_ (Newspaper Articles, Page 36)

1928-2-16 LARecord Race WarThe_Record_Thu__Feb_16__1928_ (Newspaper Articles, Page 37)

1928-2-16 LAtimes Oustings in Terrorizing Plot Loom LATimes (Newspaper Articles, Page 38)

1928-2-16 Oregonian_FiresLaid (Newspaper Articles, Page 39)

1928-2-17 CAEagle Manhattan Beach Atrocities Up To Grand Jury (Newspaper Articles, Page 40)

1928-2-17 LA Times Secrecy in Terrorism Plan.pdf (Newspaper Articles, Page 41)

1928-2-17 Venice_Evening_Vanguard_Fri__Feb_17__1928_ (Newspaper Articles, Page 42)

1928-2-20 LAEveExp P3 - LOS Angeles Evening Express .pdf (Newspaper Articles, Page 11)

1928-2-23 VenEveVan Part IFeb 1928, pi .pdf (Newspaper Articles, Page 43)

1928-2-23 VenEveVan Part 2 23 Feb 1928.pdf (Newspaper Articles, Page 44)

1928-2-25 IndianapolisRecorder_ Race Clash. pdf (Newspaper Articles, Page 47)

1928-2-25 Race war- pdf (Newspaper Articles, Page 48 *From "Light: America's News Magazine)*

1928-2-27 LATimes No Charges - More evidence. pdf (Newspaper Articles, Page 49)

1928-2-28 LA Times Forecast Upset By Grand Jury .pdf (Newspaper Articles, Page 51)

1930-4-11 MBNews John F. Jones (Newspaper Articles, Page 54)

1933 July 21 Noncaucasian Children (Newspaper Articles, Page 59)

Additional documents can be found on the Bruce's Beach page of the City's website, which is located here, or in the History Report, located here.

2. History Report will be linked to plaques via QR codes and used for school curriculums. Therefore, the History Report must be updated, as well as plaque language, to reflect resolution of all issues.

You did not address my point that the history report must be updated NOW along with revised plaque language to reflect the proper resolution of all issues raised by City Council members during the 7/20/21 meeting, which are enumerated herein.
It is absolutely our intention to update the report as more information becomes available.

3. MB allowed the Black Slaughter Family to open a Beach House that was in violation of a City Ordinance. Make a point that this behavior conflicts with position that the Board of Trustees was racially motivated and tried to run Black property owners out of town.
You state that the Slaughter's capitalized on the existing popularity of the Bruces' which means it was marketed as a place to support a day or weekend at the beach and not a boarding house, which would be a short term residence for renters sleep overnight for weeks and months on end. Your plaque language also fails to include context about the ordinances wherein all new cities were using ordinances as a way to separate residential areas from amusement or commercial areas because many of the cities were not incorporated and/or did not have planning commissions or zoning laws in place to accomplish this normal and ordinary task of all cities.
Your stories about racial violence in 1927 & 1928 was long after the Eminent Domain decision, so they have nothing to do with the History of Bruce's Beach and/or reasons why the land was turned into a park and are therefore misleading to include in the history of Bruce's Beach.
The Slaughters opened a 10-room boarding house – advertised as the Slaughter Apartments -- at 120 26th Street. Unlike the Bruces' resort that was located on the Strand, the Slaughters' property was a block off the Strand, between Ocean and Manhattan Avenues, on the South Side of the street. Based on advertisements in the California Eagle, it appears that the Slaughters sought to capitalize on the existing popularity of the Bruces', marketing itself as "formerly Bruce's Beach". It's unclear if the Bruces supported their enterprise or if they even had any involvement in it.

The City did not maintain extensive records insofar as business licenses from that time. There is one incomplete book of "business licenses" housed at the Historical Society that is more like a ledger. The Slaughters are not listed in there. (page 31)

We don't know that the city "allowed" the Slaughters to open their boarding house, but given that it supposedly existed from May 1927 until 1930, they must not have shut it down.
It is also important to note that the Slaughters didn't violate the ordinances that the city passed that may or may not have been directly aimed at the Black residents and businesses. They did not open a bathhouse. They did not open a dance hall or pool hall. They didn't provide temporary structures for individuals to change into their bathing attire.

Numerous reports in newspapers from that era stated that there was attempted arson and alleged dynamiting of the Slaughter residence, but these incidents were thwarted by the Slaughters themselves, who the Eagle described as not being of "the running kind". (Page 36) There are also reports and a personal recollection listed in Robert Brigham's thesis about a fiery cross near or across from the Slaughters that the L.A. District Attorney's office investigated. (pages 36 and 39)

3 Black Families owned property immediately next to Eminent Domain property but it was not taken. Make a point that this behavior conflicts with position that the Board of Trustees was racially motivated and tried to run Black property owners out of town.
Again, your counter arguments are even misleading as they were in Section #2 about the Slaughters. I know that there were no restrictive covenants on the land purchased by the Slaughters. My point is that in order for the plaques and history report to tell an accurate story, you must include context that this was an era when segregation of neighborhoods and red-lining certain area was both legal and common place during this time period. And if the developer and/or the Board of Trustees did not want people of color to buy property in Manhattan Beach they could have conspired together

to make that happen but they did not do so. This serves as indirect evidence that Manhattan Beach officials took a stand against the more popular trend of segregation of land ownership.
The Slaughters purchased their property in 1926 after the condemnation proceedings began and, as stated before, alleged attempts to scare them were unsuccessful. There were no racially restrictive covenants on their property, and the city could not have prohibited the sale or the purchase of their land.

There are some possible explanations – and these are taken from the evidence -- for why the city did not try to condemn the other black-owned properties:
a. Blocks 5 and 12 of Peck's Manhattan Beach had the greatest concentration of Black-owned properties. One argument says that they believed that by closing down the Bruces' bathhouse, it would discourage Black people from coming to Manhattan because the Bruces' were the center point, the meeting place. In a 1927 editorial, the Manhattan Beach News says: While the purchase of the property does not eliminate colored people from Manhattan Beach entirely, the steps taken to acquire the former stronghold of the negroes in this city, while having respect for the rights of the colored man, did not desire that he should make it his playground.
b. Within Blocks 5 and 12, no white property owners had built cottages or homes or continued to live there.

4. The Black Slaughter Family was included in the MB community as a "prominent" family. Make a point that this behavior conflicts with position that the Board of Trustees was racially motivated and tried to run Black property owners out of town.
The plaque language does not say these positive things you stated below about the Slaughters being included in the MB community. And, the arson and dynamiting stories have nothing to do with the history of Bruce's Beach. And these stories are about 1927 & 1928 after the Bruce's Beach facility was demolished and certainly had nothing to do with the reason why the Board of Trustees enacted Eminent Domain.

They were prominent in that they were a Black family that continued to live here, year-round, enroll at least one child in the Manhattan Beach school system and be a part of the community even after the condemnation proceedings. As stated above, there are reports that their property was the target of arson and dynamiting.

5. Arresting a person of color for trespassing on private property is not Racist.
Remove the story about Elizabeth Cali as being off-topic and lacking evidence of Racism.
Your own statements below represent great arguments that this story should be deleted completely from the history report and plaques. In addition, this entire story occurred long after the decision to enact Eminent Domain and after the Bruce's facility was demolished and had nothing to do with Bruce's Beach. During the 7/20/21 City Council meeting, Council Member Napolitano raised these issues that arresting a Black woman for trespassing is not Racist and these events occurred long after the decision to enact Eminent Domain and he questioned why this story was in the history of Bruce's Beach.
Elizabeth Catley was the only one arrested on the beach that day despite other visitors being in the water alongside her. We discuss this on page 32 of the report, citing articles from the California Eagle and Los Angeles Times (pages 52). We have sent a request to the Los Angeles Superior Court for the records of her suit against Alexander Haddock, but have not yet heard back. We also inquired about the "Manhattan Beach Court Docket" that Brigham references in his thesis, but the City does not have it.

6. Was it George Lindsey who used the term "Invasion" in 1920's or was it Brigham in his 1954 Thesis? There is no evidence it was George Lindsey, therefore, remove entire subject matter.

Again, your statements below support my argument. And this issue was raised by Council Member Napolitano that use of the term "invasion" has no place in this history just because Brigham used the word in his Thesis. Mr. Napolitano also pointed out that the wording was confusing by making it appear that Lindsey used the term, when Brigham was the person that used the term. Perhaps, if you were writing about the history of Racism in America, it would be appropriate to use this term, but this was not the task assigned to you by City Council.

"Negro Invasion" was a phrase used at that time to simplify the fear of white property owners who felt they were being outnumbered by Black property owners. It's not clear why Brigham used the quotation marks as he did. But Brigham's thesis serves as the only record of personal interviews with individuals who were alive and involved in the eminent domain proceedings. The evidence suggests that the white community considered the Black homeowners and guests "undesirables".

Please see the following articles for just a few examples:

1924 April 11 Peck Pavilion (Newspaper Articles, Page 11)

1926-9-26 Manhattan Globe (Newspaper Articles, Pages 14-16)

1927-2-11 MBNews OpEd Recall (Newspaper Articles, Page 20, Page 19)

1930-4-11 MBNews John F. Jones (Newspaper Articles, Page 54)

1933 July 21 Noncaucasian Children (Newspaper Articles, Page 59)

7. Language recommended by Bruce Family made it falsely appear that Lindsey said "invasion" in the 1920's. Remove this entire story of "invasion" from everywhere in the History Report and plaque language.

The same argument used in #6 above applies here as well. Just because a newspaper article in St, Louis used the "invasion" term is no reason to include it in this report and, in fact, it makes the report and plaque language mislead readers into thinking that residents of MB were commonly using this term and hence influenced the Board of Trustees to enact Eminent Domain to stop the invasion.

It would be wrong and subjective to remove "this entire story of 'invasion'" because it is a part of the local contextual history, and it was a phrase commonly used at that time.

Please see:

1911-12-17 NYT Negro Invasion (NewspaperArticles, Page 4)

As well as the supplemental information provided for this week's agenda that includes a list of Newspaper Articles from the state of California and other United States papers beginning on page 4.

8. There is NO evidence of KKK involvement or influence on the Board of Trustees in deciding to enact Eminent Domain and the idea of including stories about the KKK came from Dwayne Shepherd on behalf of Bruce's.

Again, the HAB is misleading readers by referring to KKK activity in 1927 and 1928 long after the decision to enact Eminent Domain and the uncorroborated story about the men on the Redondo Beach Pier is not by any means supporting evidence of KKK activity in the South Bay. During the 7/20/21 City Council meeting, Council Member Napolitano raised this issue by asking you the same question 8 times in a row after and never did receive a valid answer from you as to why there is a reference to KKK activity in the history of Bruce's Beach. As one point in the long question and answer session, you stated that Dwayne Shepherd had asked for a reference to the KKK and Isla Garraway argued aggressive to put it in somewhere.

That's accurate. But it would be shortsighted and ignorant of the local contextual history not to mention the apparent growth of the Klan in the South Bay after 1924. The evidence implies that there may have been some influence by the Klan, what with the alleged cross burnings, "midnight conclaves", and -- following the Inglewood raids -- increased evidence of the Klan. It would be limiting not to question whether or not the Klan was involved in these activities. We have, however, removed reference to that in the plaque.

9. Dwayne Shepherd recommended wording that would seem to justify higher claims in a threatened lawsuit. All input from the Bruce Family should be reanalyzed for correctness and evaluation of factual content.

This is not true. Maybe you need to go back and watch the video of the 5/17/21 HAB meeting wherein Isla Garraway was reading an email from Dwayne Shepherd that contained specific recommendations for language in the history report and plaques. Isla continued with her arguments for a long time wherein she aggressively advocated for including everything Dwayne Shepherd said he wanted to be included such as KKK involvement and influence on the Board of Trustees, language to make it appear the Bruce's facility was loaded with costly amenities, and a statement that the Bruce's were intimidated from the start by the KKK and White residents. You told Isla Garraway that was not accurate because it started as a small stand in 1912, inferring that it would not have drawn much attention when it first opened and you said the KKK was not around until 1927 or 1928. Despite these clearly known facts, the language still appears on the plaque that White people intimidated patrons of Bruces' Beach when it first opened. This kind of blatant disregard for the truth alone makes it imperative that City Council retain a bipartisan history firm to produce a factually accurate history report.

We analyzed everything for "correctness" and evaluated the factual content of every statement we included. Many of Dwayne Shepard's comments came to us during public comment, much like yours and all others who have submitted ideas, criticisms, questions, and concerns. One of the board members consulted with him, just as other board members consulted with other individuals independently. We then returned to the entire Board, during public meetings, with reports of those conversations, so as not to violate the Brown Act.

If we could not support a statement or claim with more than one source, we admitted that and omitted it.

10. ALERT - Frank Daugherty was not on MB Board of Trustees when Eminent Domain resolution was passed. Mr. Daugherty's testimony was the foundational evidence for motive of racial discrimination (see #1 above).

First of all, everyone on the HAB had several chances to put a simple statement of truth in the plaque language and history report that Frank Daugherty was not a member of the Board of Trustees when the vote was taken to enact Eminent Domain, but chose each time to avoid the truth. During HAB meetings, Board members justified this omission by stating that his dates of service are shown in the history report. The plaque language also carefully omits lies included in Daugherty's statement wherein he states 'We voted to condemn these 2 blocks" and "Being a member of the board, I had to participate" and then he went on to make statements on behalf of board members regarding how bad they felt about what they had done, etc. In this case, omissions are deceptive to a point of telling lies. This again shows why the residents of MB deserve to have a bipartisan history firm turn this one-sided report and plaque language into an accurate history.

Frank Daugherty was indeed a member of the Board of Trustees off-and-on since the City's inception. He was on the Board in 1923 when the city received and filed a petition from the citizens of Manhattan Beach seeking to condemn Blocks 5 and 12 in Peck's Manhattan Beach. He proposed the Ordinance in January 1924 to condemn those two blocks for public park purposes, and he was on the board when Ordinance 263 was approved.

PLEASE SEE:

- 1923-11-15 PetitionOfCondemnation_CC_-_Minutes (Board of Trustees (City Council) Minutes, page 5-6)
- 1924-1-3_CC_-_Minutes_-_Intro 263 (Board of Trustees (City Council) Minutes Page 7-9 and Historical Ordinances Pages 9)
- 1924-2-7_-_Minutes_-_2-7-1924_Ordinance263_CC (Board of Trustees (City Council Minutes, Page. 11)

11. There is no evidence of a Grand Jury investigation or Racial Violence in MB during time of Eminent Domain.
Remove all of these stories from the History Report and plaque language.
Again, you are making my point by showing below that all the articles about a Grand Jury and Racial Violence are in 1928, which is 3 years after Eminent Domain was enacted and a year after the Bruce's Beach facility was demolished. Council Member Napolitano raised this issue during the 7/20/21 Council meeting and said these stories had nothing to do with the history of Bruce's Beach. Council Member stated that these events were reported to have occurred long after the history of Bruce's Beach and there was no factual evidence of convening a Grand Jury or what may have been discovered.

Please see the following:

1928-2-15 Pasadena_Evening_Post_Wed__Feb_15__1928_ (Newspaper Articles, Page 30)

1928-2-15 San Diego Evening Tribune-pdf (Newspaper Articles, Page 31)

1928-2-15 The_Record_Wed__Feb_15__1928_ (Newspaper Articles, Page 32)

1928-2-15_Venice_Evening_Vanguard_Wed__P1_ (Newspaper Articles, Page 33

1928-2-15-Los_Angeles_Evening_Express_GrandJury_ (Newspaper Articles, Page 36)

1928-2-16 LARecord Race WarThe_Record_Thu__Feb_16__1928_ (Newspaper Articles, Page 37)

1928-2-16 LAtimes Oustings in Terrorizing Plot Loom LATimes (Newspaper Articles, Page 38)

1928-2-16 Oregonian_FiresLaid (Newspaper Articles, Page 39)

1928-2-17 CAEagle Manhattan Beach Atrocities Up To Grand Jury (Newspaper Articles, Page 40)

1928-2-17 LA Times Secrecy in Terrorism Plan.pdf (Newspaper Articles, Page 41)

1928-2-17 Venice_Evening_Vanguard_Fri__Feb_17__1928_ (Newspaper Articles, Page 42)

1928-2-20 LAEveExp P3 - LOS Angeles Evening Express .pdf (Newspaper Articles, Page 11)

1928-2-23 VenEveVan Part IFeb 1928, pi .pdf (Newspaper Articles, Page 43)

1928-2-23 VenEveVan Part 2 23 Feb 1928.pdf (Newspaper Articles, Page 44)

1928-2-25 IndianapolisRecorder_ Race Clash. pdf (Newspaper Articles, Page 47)

1928-2-25 Race war- pdf (Newspaper Articles, Page 48 *From "Light: America's News Magazine)*

1928-2-27 LATimes No Charges - More evidence. pdf (Newspaper Articles, Page 49)

1928-2-28 LA Times Forecast Upset By Grand Jury .pdf (Newspaper Articles, Page 51)

12. Open Question about Unfair Compensation to Bruce Family.
Simply state the Bruce's were paid above market value for their property and received due process of law.
Again, you are making my point. Instead of making a simple statement on the plaque that the Bruce's received compensation that was higher than market value, the HAB decided to omit this critical information in an apparent attempt to mislead readers. And below you continue to justify this deception by telling me that this critical information is on pages 40-44 of the history report. Also, during your last HAB meeting you brought up the idea of adding context AGAIN by asking everyone if they wanted to include this critical fact on the plaque. You also mentioned other critical facts that could be included, like the fact that the Bruce's never contested the amount and that the court had appointed an independent team of 3 Referees to calculate the value after the Bruce's waived their right to trial by jury and their right to trial by Referees. But you and other members of the HAB sat silent and moved on to the next section after again choosing to leave out this critical information. During the 7/20/21 City Council meeting, Council Member Napolitano raised the issue that the question of fair compensation to the Bruces' seemed to remain as an open point, Napolitano also commented that the Court documents were not available and you failed to mention that you did in fact receive those Court documents, which you mentioned during a HAB meeting in early June.
That information is available on pages 40-44 of the history report.

13. All Black Families affected by Eminent Domain repurchased property in MB, except the Bruce's. Make a point that this behavior conflicts with position that the Board of Trustees was racially motivated and
tried to run Black property owners out of town.
Your argument below that this critical information is shown on page 27 of the history report and not on the plaque shows the need for bipartisan analysis of all sources and editing of the report and plaque language. Even an amateur historian knows that reporting 4 out of 5 Black Families repurchased land in MB presents a fair picture. But this information conflicts with an unsupported opinion in the plaque that the Board of Trustees was trying to run Black property owners out of town. So, being an amateur is not excuse, this is willful deception.
We do say that in the report – page 27. This neither supports nor conflicts with the argument that the board's actions were racially motivated or an attempt to drive Black property owners out of town. They did try, but they failed, as evidenced by the fact that four of the five Black families repurchased property in Manhattan Beach. This was also the primary argument of the Taxpayers Protective League as expressed in the piece by one of its leaders, R.F. Wedler, in the June 9, 1926 issue. Reference:

1926-9-26 Manhattan Globe (Newspaper Articles, Pages 14-16)

14. There is no evidence the Board of Trustees intended to drive black residents out of town. Remove this language from the History Report and plaque language (See also item #'s 3, 4, 5 & 14 above).
Again, there is evidence that they intended to drive Black residents out of town.
I do not see any factual evidence that the Board of Trustees took actions that were motivated by an attempt to run Blacks out of town. The only evidence I see is uncorroborated stories, op-

eds and reports of racial violence long after the history of Bruce's Beach. Please explain further if you have factual evidence and cite you evidence on the plaque.

1915 October 18 Letter From Price

1924 April 11 Peck Pavilion (Newspaper Articles, Page 11)

1926-9-26 Manhattan Globe (Newspaper Articles, Pages 14-16)

1927-2-11 MBNews OpEd Recall (Newspaper Articles, Page 20, Page 19)

1928-2-15 Pasadena_Evening_Post_Wed__Feb_15__1928_ (Newspaper Articles, Page 30)

1928-2-15 San Diego Evening Tribune-pdf (Newspaper Articles, Page 31)

1928-2-15 The_Record_Wed__Feb_15__1928_ (Newspaper Articles, Page 32)

1928-2-15_Venice_Evening_Vanguard_Wed__P1_ (Newspaper Articles, Page 33

1928-2-15-Los_Angeles_Evening_Express_GrandJury_ (Newspaper Articles, Page 36)

1928-2-16 LARecord Race WarThe_Record_Thu__Feb_16__1928_ (Newspaper Articles, Page 37)

1928-2-16 LAtimes Oustings in Terrorizing Plot Loom LATimes (Newspaper Articles, Page 38)

1928-2-16 Oregonian_FiresLaid (Newspaper Articles, Page 39)

1928-2-17 CAEagle Manhattan Beach Atrocities Up To Grand Jury (Newspaper Articles, Page 40)

1928-2-17 LA Times Secrecy in Terrorism Plan.pdf (Newspaper Articles, Page 41)

1928-2-17 Venice_Evening_Vanguard_Fri__Feb_17__1928_ (Newspaper Articles, Page 42)

1928-2-20 LAEveExp P3 - LOS Angeles Evening Express .pdf (Newspaper Articles, Page 11)

1928-2-23 VenEveVan Part IFeb 1928, pi .pdf (Newspaper Articles, Page 43)

1928-2-23 VenEveVan Part 2 23 Feb 1928.pdf (Newspaper Articles, Page 44)

1928-2-25 IndianapolisRecorder_ Race Clash. pdf (Newspaper Articles, Page 47)

1928-2-25 Race war- pdf (Newspaper Articles, Page 48 *From "Light: America's News Magazine)*

1928-2-27 LATimes No Charges - More evidence. pdf (Newspaper Articles, Page 49)

1928-2-28 LA Times Forecast Upset By Grand Jury .pdf (Newspaper Articles, Page 51)

1930-4-11 MBNews John F. Jones (Newspaper Articles, Page 54)

1933 July 21 Noncaucasian Children (Newspaper Articles, Page 59)

15. There is a severe lack of historical context and all sources used express liberal viewpoints. Research and analyze more balanced source material and add a proper historical context throughout.
Your excuse does not hold water and its not even plausible. When writing the history of racially charged events that happened a hundred years ago, there is no single element more important than including historical context throughout the document. And, Dr. Gross, your most relied upon "reviewer" referred to many times during HAB meetings, told you the same thing - "More historical context would be useful, and preferably not in an addendum at the end" when she was critiquing the history report. In addition, several Council Members raised the issue of a need for historical context during the 7/20/21 meeting and they also said there was absolutely no rush to complete this project. Lindsey Fox said during one of the HAB meetings that inserting historical context throughout would take too much time. It is a well known fact that solid facts can be turned into lies by omitting the proper context and inserting your own viewpoint or spin.
You are probably right about the lack of broader historical context, but we were tasked with focusing on the history of Bruce's Beach in the city of Manhattan Beach and that's what we did. We have utilized every resource available to us during a pandemic and then some, regardless of the writer or writers' political position.

16. Many stories of pure speculation are used to support a position taken of racial motivation. Analyze all source material to identify speculation and remove these stories from the Report & plaques.
As stated in the letter from Professor Rosenthal of LMU to City Council many months ago, stories that are uncorroborated, "contested memories," speculation and opinions should be removed from the main body of a history report and shown in the footnotes only. This mean that only facts should be used as evidence to tell the main story or a factually accurate history. However, Members of the HAB have consistently ignored that well established standard for writing a factually accurate history. This consistent pattern seems to show a strong willingness on the part of HAB members to use anything to support a predetermined narrative, even if it is not factual. And then you justify your actions by proving a lame excuse, as follows: "we cite whether incidents are based on speculation and did not not have support from any other source." The point is that by doing so, you are misleading readers. And not stating below that "most government agencies do not maintain records from a hundred years ago" is no excuse to make statements and draw conclusions that are not supported by factual evidence.
We cite whether incidents are based on speculation and did not have support from any other source. Unfortunately, most government agencies do not maintain records from a hundred years ago, though we continue to seek out that information.

17. Stories from black owned newspapers are most often opinions and bi-lines to promote desegregation.
Reanalyze these source materials to identify opinions, uncorroborated stories & speculation& treat accordingly.

You are missing the point altogether that the *American Eagle, The Liberator and Venice Vanguard* were not known for publishing factual news reports and are, therefore, not reliable as evidence for a history report other than to be mentioned in footnotes. Council Member Franklin raised this issue during the 7/20/21 Council meeting by reading from research he had performed that documented the fact that these Black owned newspapers took in income by running ads for job and housing opportunities for Blacks but were primarily in the business of encouraging Blacks to fight segregation by publishing opinion pieces and sensationalized stories that were uncorroborated or pure speculation. Council Member Franklin also read from a book that could have been used as a reliable source of information about Blacks in California during the time of Bruce's Beach and requested that the HAB add more sources, but this and other issues raised by City Council were not addressed until you wrote this email today.
It is imperative that we use stories from "black owned newspapers" because during that time in our nation's history, it was rare for newspapers to report on stories from all races. The Liberator and the California Eagle provided a voice that was not represented in the Manhattan Beach News – the social columns alone prove that.

18. Corroborating evidence that Bruce's received fair compensation was presented by Council Member Franklin.
Research & analyze this corroborating evidence for comfort Bruce's received fair compensation (See also #13).
Wow! The accurate history of Bruce's Beach as your assigned task was limited to 2 main questions. 1. Was Eminent Domain enacted to close down Bruce's Beach and run Blacks out of town. 2. Did the Bruce's receive fair compensation? And the History Advisory Board is choosing to leave the answer about fair compensation hidden on page 42 of the history report rather than adding 6 words to the plaque ...., which was above fair market value." And HAB is unflappable on taking this stance even after Council Members raised this issue during the 7/20/21 meeting AND in spite of the fact that the HAB has the Court documents. Again, it is high time for City Council to thank you guys for your efforts and more along with retaining the services of a bipartisan history firm that will use experts to provide a factually accurate history.

This evidence was initially presented in detail on page 42 of our report.

19. Plight of White property owners affected by Eminent Domain is not covered in the History Report of Plaques.
Council Member Montgomery raised this issue during the 7/20/21 Council Meeting. The Black property owners did not "develop" their land according to your own words in the history report and plaques. There were 2 portable cottages erected on 1 full size lot and 2 half lots that supported day trips to the beach and nobody slept overnight except the Bruces'. But the plaque language tells the story as if an established Black "Community" or "Black Enclave" was run out of town. And that false perception could have been avoided by not using misleading words like Community and Enclave and simply stating that 4 out of 5 Black property owners affected by Eminent Domain repurchased land in MB. But the HAB has willfully chosen to omit critical information and is guilty again of deception.
The evidence shows there was no "plight" of white property owners of Blocks 5 and 12 in the eminent domain process. They had not developed their land and only three entities (out of 10) actually answered the complaint of condemnation. This, too, is in our Report, page 19.

20. A need to edit the History Report & plaque language was recognized and discussed extensively by City Council. Apply a concentrated effort to perform a bipartisan edit of the History Report and plaque language.
It was Mayor Hadley that raised the issue during the 7/20/21 meeting that there was an apparent need for editing because it seemed to her that there was a "thumb on the scale" when many of the

words used on the plaques were taken as a whole. Council Member Napolitano added that everyone was encouraged to submit their edits.
That the History Advisory Board is not a bipartisan effort is an assumption on your part and is not accurate.

21. Tone lacks balance; a factually accurate history is the primary goal and extra time is not a concern.
Take the time necessary to formulate a fair and balanced tone and a factually accurate history.
During the 7/20/21 Council meeting, Mayor Hadley listed about 20 words that she raised an issue with their inclusion in the history report or plaques. If you are interested in finding those words, they are shown in the 16 page report I sent to the HAB wherein the 22 points covered herein are presented in more detail.
As mentioned earlier, we intend to take the appropriate and necessary amount of time to present the most thorough history of the eminent domain actions in Manhattan Beach in the 1920s, and we appreciate that we are not being rushed into this.

We cite every statement with more than one source and in instances where additional sources were not available, we question the validity of those statements.

22. The Mayor and most Council Members expressed concern about a recent discovery that the Bruce's weighed-in on the History Report and plaque language even though they are not residents of MB and not on the Board. All input from the Bruce's Family should be re-evaluated for factual content due to appearance of a conflict.
As stated above, Dwayne Shepherd was afforded special privileges of working in private directly with Isla Garraway wherein Shepherd provided Isla Garraway with precise language he wanted to see included in the report and plaque language and she fought hard for its inclusion. The painfully obvious problem is that Dwayne Shepherd is a self-proclaimed representative of the Bruces' heirs, he is not a resident of MB and he has vowed on many public occasions to sue MB for past and future income of Bruce's Beach and damages for racial discrimination "even if [we] get [our] land back." I only watched 7 of the 13 HAB meeting videos from starting with the 5/17/21 meeting and the only time I heard Dwayne Shepherd make a public comment was at the beginning of the last meeting before HAB submitted plaque language to City Council for consideration at the 7/20/21 Council meeting wherein he thanked members of the HAB for being so cooperative in allowing him to make recommendations, etc.
As stated before, Dwayne Shepard participated in public comment, along with members of the Prioleau family and current residents of Manhattan Beach throughout the entire process.

Some feedback was sent to individual members of the History Advisory Board, which was then relayed to the rest of the board during our meetings, which are all a part of the public record. This was not limited to comments from the Bruce family. We consulted longtime Manhattan Beach residents who are respected for their familiarity with the city's history and supplied guidance and information to the History Advisory Board throughout the process.

Additionally, I understand that you were unable to find the recordings of previous meetings, but they are located on the Bruce's Beach page of the City's website, here:
https://www.manhattanbeach.gov/government/city-manager/bruce-s-beach-task-force

Please click the arrow next to "HISTORY ADVISORY BOARD", and you will see the heading "MEETING RECORDINGS".

Thank you again for your time, and please let us know if more questions remain.

Martha Alvarez

From: Jon Chaykowski <rideformbef@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, October 7, 2021 12:39 PM
To: List - City Council
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Time for a new name

Dear Councilmembers,

The park at 27th and Highland once was called Parque Culiacan. Then, our association with Culiacan City ended and it was time to rename the park. So, we decided to rename the park. Because of an association with the Bruce family property, we renamed the park "Bruce's Beach".

A similar time for change exists now.

Our City's association with the Bruce family property no longer exists. Years ago, we deeded that property to LA County. More importantly, our association has been further severed by the actions of LA County and California State leaders. Specifically, LA County has taken the lead role of addressing the Bruce family property history and is doing what LA County leaders wish to do with that property. (Manhattan Beach had no involvement in LA County's nor California State's actions. Further, our Governor's words disassociated Manhattan Beach from efforts for the Bruce family.)

Now it is time that our MB leaders (1) note that the Bruce family property is not part of MB City, (2) realize that LA County is dealing with the return of prior family property to the Bruce family, and (3) recognize that the park property situated between Manhattan Avenue and Highland Avenue, is not a "beach" and not on nor adjacent to the beach (it is two LA County blocks away from the beach).

Therefore, it is time for MB leaders to change the name of that Manhattan Beach PARK to an appropriate name. And, it should have a "Park" name, not a "Beach" name. Calling it Bruce's Beach is very inappropriate, and some may say it is ridiculous following LA County's plans to return beach front property to the family.

I have suggested to our Council a more appropriate name before and I re-suggest it now. That new name is "Reflection Park".

I request that our City Council place the renaming of the park on the Council agenda immediately and move forward in renaming that park as a "Park", like "Reflection Park".

Sincerely,
Jon Chaykowski

Martha Alvarez

From: Blake Smith <blakesmithca@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, October 6, 2021 2:20 PM
To: List - City Council
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Covid vaccination mandate in LA

Hello MB City Council,
I hope you are well. In the event that you may be considering a similar mandate as has just passed in Los Angeles, I would like to share the message I sent to LA City Council. I hope that some portion of it resonates, and we are able to retain some semblance of common sense and personal freedom in Manhattan Beach.

I was extremely discouraged to see the 4-1 vote to mandate vaccination for MB city employees. Under NO circumstance should a covid vaccine be mandated for anyone. It is not your right to force a medical decision on someone based on your personal beliefs. This is an unproven, non-FDA approved experimental medicine (Cominrty is not available in the US) and people are suffering real damage and death as a result of the vaccine. Children should not be required to be vaccinated until the full, multi-year FDA approval process can be completed. Newsom has made a gross overstep in his authority, and hundreds of thousands of children will suffer as a result.

Here is my message to LA City Council. I am sharing in hopes this is **NOT** on the table for Manhattan Beach.

Kind regards,
Blake Smith
MB resident

****

City Council,
I am writing to urge you to **VOTE NO** for mandatory covid vaccination for the city of Los Angeles. I would like to remind you that you have been elected to your position to represent the majority of your constituents, not to advance your personal beliefs. Residents of LA should continue to have a CHOICE in their personal health. Businesses should be allowed to continue their recovery from the pandemic and be able to welcome ALL customers indoors. Many businesses are already struggling to find enough employees to staff their operations, and this forces unvaccinated employees to seek employment outside of the city. Residents of LA County should not be required to vaccinate in order to keep their jobs or to be able to visit indoor businesses in the city. Children should not be required to risk their health to vaccinate against a virus that hardly affects them. You are not qualified to make health decisions for residents of the county. Nor should the decision be left to personal opinion of what you feel is right.

Positive COVID cases have declined every day for the last 30 days in LA County. Deaths and hospitalizations will continue to decline. The worst is over. Why institute such a damaging mandate at this late stage? There is no need to institute an unenforceable mandate like this for the following reasons:

- Vaccination does not prevent transmission of covid. Vaccinated adults can transmit the virus the same way unvaccinated adults can, so requiring vaccination does not stop the spread of the virus. Vaccine efficacy is waning over time and becoming less effective. There are many examples, but here is one documented outbreak of vaccinated individuals.
- Those at greatest risk have been vaccinated. Vaccinated individuals are largely protected from severe symptoms and death, thus the only expected gain of requiring vaccination is to keep people from getting sick. Why would the city be willing to crush businesses, destroy livelihoods and force people against their will to prevent the equivalent of a severe cold? The flu vaccine is not mandatory and people die from the flu each year- why should covid be mandatory?

- Mandating vaccination would strip unvaccinated people of their livelihoods and further damage already hurting businesses. If individuals choose not to be vaccinated, it is their personal decision. If the vaccine is as effective as advertised, these people will not be harming those who have been vaccinated. Those who choose not to be vaccinated are doing so at their own risk, and understand the consequences of their decision. Therefore this is **not a public health issue** and should not be mandated at the city, county or state level.
- There is no justification for stripping people of personal choice. If people are fearful of getting sick, they can choose not to enter businesses. Requiring vaccination prevents people from going to work against their will, and prevents patrons from visiting stores they would otherwise choose to enter. This negatively impacts businesses of all sizes. It will exacerbate employment shortages and forces qualified, unvaccinated employees to seek work in neighboring cities. You would be further damaging struggling businesses in the county. More businesses will be forced to close.
- You are intentionally discriminating against an entire population of people, and will be disproportionately targeting African American and Latinx populations within the city. This is inexcusable and an abuse of power.
- This type of mandate is not enforceable, thus is useless to pass. There is no way to begin to monitor this, nor there any evidence that it would have any impact on community transmission. Covid rates vary widely across the city and county, and it makes no sense to institute yet another "one-size-fits-all" policy for such a large and diverse population.
- The vaccine is not FDA approved and is only authorized for use under an Emergency Use Authorization. The only FDA approved vaccine available at this time is Cominrty, which is not available within the U.S. It is unethical to force unproven medicine on people that is still in early, experimental stages and is not FDA approved. In fact, mandating products authorized for Emergency Use Authorization violates federal law.
- People and their loved ones are experiencing real, harmful impacts from covid vaccinations. Deaths and severe health consequences have been widely documented. The vaccine is not right for everyone, and that determination should be made by the individual in consultation with a medical professional, not by any branch of the government.
- Children are NOT at great risk from covid and do not need to be "protected." Through age 19, children and adolescents have a 99.9973% COVID-19 survival rate. Reported COVID-19 hospitalizations have been grossly inflated for children, and in fact pediatric COVID hospitalization rates are vanishingly small. Parents should have the right to make the best decision for their child's health and wellbeing.
- Myocarditis is a real risk for youth that is being downplayed in an effort to push vaccinations. According to a new study, healthy boys between the ages of 12 and 15, with no underlying medical conditions, were four to six times more likely to be diagnosed with vaccine-related myocarditis than they were to be hospitalized with COVID. More boys aged 14-17 have been hospitalized for vaccine-induced myocarditis than for COVID. In February, studies out of Israel were already showing the Pfizer shot was causing "mortality hundreds of times greater in young people compared to mortality from coronavirus without the vaccine, and dozens of times more in the elderly." **Mandating vaccination to attend school is unethical, dangerous and WRONG.**

Mandating the covid vaccine is a significant overstep in personal freedom for a very marginal return. The goal is not to prevent sickness. Masks need to come off, vaccines should remain optional, and people should be free to go about their lives based on their own individual risk tolerance. Please allow us to move on with our lives and work toward a brighter future.

For those of you who believe you are doing what's best to protect the population of Los Angeles, you should know that forcing vaccinations is in fact a dangerous and harmful act. In particular for our youth.

Thank you for **NOT** voting to mandate vaccination in indoor spaces across the county. It is the compassionate decision for our residents and our community.

Sincerely,
Blake Smith
Lifetime resident of LA county

Martha Alvarez

From: roycasey@aol.com
Sent: Tuesday, October 5, 2021 8:56 PM
To: Kristin L. Drew
Cc: Bruces Beach Task Force; brucebeachgetthefacts@gmail.com; Gary McAulay; mike@realestateedge.com; ryan90274@yahoo.com; Alexandria Latragna; List - City Council
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Correspondence with History Advisory Board

Thanks for taking the time to respond to my comments, even though it comes less than 24 hours before the last scheduled HAB meeting.

My comments back to the History Advisory Board are highlighted in yellow.

After taking all of your comments into serious consideration, City Council must retain the services of a bipartisan history firm to analyze the history report and plaque language submitted by the HAB in order to fulfill their fiduciary duty to the residents of Manhattan Beach, to protect the reputation of the City of Manhattan Beach and take measure to guard against threats made against the City by people like Dwayne Shepherd.

Thanks,
Roy

-----Original Message-----
From: Kristin Long <klongs@gmail.com>
To: roycasey@aol.com
Cc: Bruces Beach Task Force <brucesbeachtaskforce@citymb.info>; Bruce's Beach: Get The Facts <brucebeachgetthefacts@gmail.com>; Gary McAulay <gary.mcaulay@gmail.com>; Mike Michalski <mike@realestateedge.com>; Joseph Ryan <ryan90274@yahoo.com>; Alexandria Latragna <alatragna@manhattanbeach.gov>
Sent: Tue, Oct 5, 2021 3:10 pm
Subject: From the History Advisory Board

Mr. Casey:
On behalf of the History Advisory Board, thank you for the time you've put into listing your comments and concerns regarding our report. Our responses to your comments are below in red and blue, with the appropriate source that relates to your comment. All documents can be found at this link under the HISTORY ADVISORY BOARD heading. Where possible, we have provided an exact link to that document and the page number where it can be found. If you have any issues finding anything or questions, please let us know.

1. Evidence may be inadequate that Eminent Domain was racially motivated after all issues are resolved. Re-evaluate this position after all issues & related evidence have been researched, analyzed and re-evaluated.

Your long list of "evidence" is dated after the decision to enact Eminent Domain. In addition, history experts do accept single sources and newspaper articles composed on op-eds, speculation and uncorroborated stories as factual evidence. And your primary evidence for an opinion of racial discrimination is based on statements made by Frank Daugherty, which are completely without merit (see #10 below). The History Advisory Board's consistent refusal to report the facts and unwillingness to include a historical context throughout the plaque and history report and keeping your obviously biased thumb on the scale by always expressing a

Far Left viewpoint are primary reasons why City Council must retain a bipartisan history firm of experts to analyze all sources, add new sources and edit the report and plaque language. This will also clear the air of the obvious appearance of a blatant conflict of interest from the Board collaborating with Dwayne Shepherd and not disclosing it to the public until I shed light on the issue and an obvious need to edit the report and plaque language from an unbiased viewpoint.

Here is a list of evidence that shows racial motivation behind the eminent domain proceedings.

*The **name in parenthesis** is the name of the full PDF file where this source document can be found on the City's website under the heading **HISTORY ADVISORY BOARD > HISTORY ADVISORY BOARD REPORTS AND SOURCE FILES** and the page number is where the specific document can be found in that PDF file.*

1915 October 18 Letter From Price (letter From Price)

1924 April 11 Peck Pavilion (Newspaper Articles, Page 11)

1926-9-26 Manhattan Globe (Newspaper Articles, Pages 14-16)

1927-2-11 MBNews OpEd Recall (Newspaper Articles, Page 20, Page 19)

1928-2-15 Pasadena_Evening_Post_Wed__Feb_15__1928_ (Newspaper Articles, Page 30)

1928-2-15 San Diego Evening Tribune-pdf (Newspaper Articles, Page 31)

1928-2-15 The_Record_Wed__Feb_15__1928_ (Newspaper Articles, Page 32)

1928-2-15_Venice_Evening_Vanguard_Wed__P1_ (Newspaper Articles, Page 33

1928-2-15-Los_Angeles_Evening_Express_GrandJury_ (Newspaper Articles, Page 36)

1928-2-16 LARecord Race WarThe_Record_Thu__Feb_16__1928_ (Newspaper Articles, Page 37)

1928-2-16 LAtimes Oustings in Terrorizing Plot Loom LATimes (Newspaper Articles, Page 38)

1928-2-16 Oregonian_FiresLaid (Newspaper Articles, Page 39)

1928-2-17 CAEagle Manhattan Beach Atrocities Up To Grand Jury (Newspaper Articles, Page 40)

1928-2-17 LA Times Secrecy in Terrorism Plan.pdf (Newspaper Articles, Page 41)

1928-2-17 Venice_Evening_Vanguard_Fri__Feb_17__1928_ (Newspaper Articles, Page 42)

1928-2-20 LAEveExp P3 - LOS Angeles Evening Express .pdf (Newspaper Articles, Page 11)

1928-2-23 VenEveVan Part IFeb 1928, pi .pdf (Newspaper Articles, Page 43)

1928-2-23 VenEveVan Part 2 23 Feb 1928.pdf (Newspaper Articles, Page 44)

1928-2-25 IndianapolisRecorder_ Race Clash. pdf (Newspaper Articles, Page 47)

1928-2-25 Race war- pdf (Newspaper Articles, Page 48 *From "Light: America's News Magazine)*

1928-2-27 LATimes No Charges - More evidence. pdf (Newspaper Articles, Page 49)

1928-2-28 LA Times Forecast Upset By Grand Jury .pdf (Newspaper Articles, Page 51)

1930-4-11 MBNews John F. Jones (Newspaper Articles, Page 54)

1933 July 21 Noncaucasian Children (Newspaper Articles, Page 59)

Additional documents can be found on the Bruce's Beach page of the City's website, which is located here, or in the History Report, located here.

2. History Report will be linked to plaques via QR codes and used for school curriculums.
Therefore, the History Report must be updated, as well as plaque language, to reflect resolution of all issues.
You did not address my point that the history report must be updated NOW along with revised plaque language to reflect the proper resolution of all issues raised by City Council members during the 7/20/21 meeting, which are enumerated herein.
It is absolutely our intention to update the report as more information becomes available.

3. MB allowed the Black Slaughter Family to open a Beach House that was in violation of a City Ordinance. Make a point that this behavior conflicts with position that the Board of Trustees was racially motivated and tried to run Black property owners out of town.
You state that the Slaughter's capitalized on the existing popularity of the Bruces' which means it was marketed as a place to support a day or weekend at the beach and not a boarding house, which would be a short term residence for renters sleep overnight for weeks and months on end. Your plaque language also fails to include context about the ordinances wherein all new cities were using ordinances as a way to separate residential areas from amusement or commercial areas because many of the cities were not incorporated and/or did not have planning commissions or zoning laws in place to accomplish this normal and ordinary task of all cities.
Your stories about racial violence in 1927 & 1928 was long after the Eminent Domain decision, so they have nothing to do with the History of Bruce's Beach and/or reasons why the land was turned into a park and are therefore misleading to include in the history of Bruce's Beach.
The Slaughters opened a 10-room boarding house – advertised as the Slaughter Apartments -- at 120 26th Street. Unlike the Bruces' resort that was located on the Strand, the Slaughters' property was a block off the Strand, between Ocean and Manhattan Avenues, on the South Side of the street. Based on advertisements in the California Eagle, it appears that the Slaughters sought to capitalize on the existing popularity of the Bruces', marketing itself as "formerly Bruce's Beach". It's unclear if the Bruces supported their enterprise or if they even had any involvement in it.

The City did not maintain extensive records insofar as business licenses from that time. There is one incomplete book of "business licenses" housed at the Historical Society that is more like a ledger. The Slaughters are not listed in there. (page 31)

We don't know that the city "allowed" the Slaughters to open their boarding house, but given that it supposedly existed from May 1927 until 1930, they must not have shut it down.
It is also important to note that the Slaughters didn't violate the ordinances that the city passed that may or may not have been directly aimed at the Black residents and businesses. They did not open a bathhouse. They did not open a dance hall or pool hall. They didn't provide temporary structures for individuals to change into their bathing attire.

Numerous reports in newspapers from that era stated that there was attempted arson and alleged dynamiting of the Slaughter residence, but these incidents were thwarted by the Slaughters themselves, who the Eagle described as not being of "the running kind". (Page 36) There are also reports and a personal recollection listed in Robert Brigham's thesis about a fiery cross near or across from the Slaughters that the L.A. District Attorney's office investigated. (pages 36 and 39)

3 Black Families owned property immediately next to Eminent Domain property but it was not taken. Make a point that this behavior conflicts with position that the Board of Trustees was racially motivated and tried to run Black property owners out of town.

Again, your counter arguments are even misleading as they were in Section #2 about the Slaughters. I know that there were no restrictive covenants on the land purchased by the Slaughters. My point is that in order for the plaques and history report to tell an accurate story, you must include context that this was an era when segregation of neighborhoods and red-lining certain area was both legal and common place during this time period. And if the developer and/or the Board of Trustees did not want people of color to buy property in Manhattan Beach they could have conspired together to make that happen but they did not do so. This serves as indirect evidence that Manhattan Beach officials took a stand against the more popular trend of segregation of land ownership.

The Slaughters purchased their property in 1926 after the condemnation proceedings began and, as stated before, alleged attempts to scare them were unsuccessful. There were no racially restrictive covenants on their property, and the city could not have prohibited the sale or the purchase of their land.

There are some possible explanations – and these are taken from the evidence -- for why the city did not try to condemn the other black-owned properties:

a. Blocks 5 and 12 of Peck's Manhattan Beach had the greatest concentration of Black-owned properties. One argument says that they believed that by closing down the Bruces' bathhouse, it would discourage Black people from coming to Manhattan because the Bruces' were the center point, the meeting place. In a 1927 editorial, the Manhattan Beach News says: While the purchase of the property does not eliminate colored people from Manhattan Beach entirely, the steps taken to acquire the former stronghold of the negroes in this city, while having respect for the rights of the colored man, did not desire that he should make it his playground.

b. Within Blocks 5 and 12, no white property owners had built cottages or homes or continued to live there.

4. The Black Slaughter Family was included in the MB community as a "prominent" family.
Make a point that this behavior conflicts with position that the Board of Trustees was racially motivated and tried to run Black property owners out of town.

The plaque language does not say these positive things you stated below about the Slaughters being included in the MB community. And, the arson and dynamiting stories have nothing to do with the history of Bruce's Beach. And these stories are about 1927 & 1928 after the Bruce's Beach facility was demolished and certainly had nothing to do with the reason why the Board of Trustees enacted Eminent Domain.

They were prominent in that they were a Black family that continued to live here, year-round, enroll at least one child in the Manhattan Beach school system and be a part of the community even after the condemnation proceedings. As stated above, there are reports that their property was the target of arson and dynamiting.

5. Arresting a person of color for trespassing on private property is not Racist.
Remove the story about Elizabeth Cali as being off-topic and lacking evidence of Racism.

Your own statements below represent great arguments that this story should be deleted completely from the history report and plaques. In addition, this entire story occurred long after the decision to enact Eminent Domain and after the Bruce's facility was demolished and had nothing to do with Bruce's Beach. During the 7/20/21 City Council meeting, Council Member Napolitano raised these issues that arresting a Black woman for trespassing is not Racist and these events occurred long after the decision to enact Eminent Domain and he questioned why this story was in the history of Bruce's Beach.

Elizabeth Catley was the only one arrested on the beach that day despite other visitors being in the water alongside her. We discuss this on page 32 of the report, citing articles from the California Eagle and Los Angeles Times (pages 52). We have sent a request to the Los Angeles Superior Court for the records of her suit against Alexander Haddock, but have not yet heard back. We also inquired about the "Manhattan Beach Court Docket" that Brigham references in his thesis, but the City does not have it.

6. Was it George Lindsey who used the term "Invasion" in 1920's or was it Brigham in his 1954 Thesis? There is no evidence it was George Lindsey, therefore, remove entire subject matter.

Again, your statements below support my argument. And this issue was raised by Council Member Napolitano that use of the term "invasion" has no place in this history just because Brigham used the word in his Thesis. Mr. Napolitano also pointed out that the wording was confusing by making it appear that Lindsey used the term, when Brigham was the person that used the term. Perhaps, if you were writing about the history of Racism in America, it would be appropriate to use this term, but this was not the task assigned to you by City Council.

"Negro Invasion" was a phrase used at that time to simplify the fear of white property owners who felt they were being outnumbered by Black property owners. It's not clear why Brigham used the quotation marks as he did. But Brigham's thesis serves as the only record of personal interviews with individuals who were alive and involved in the eminent domain proceedings. The evidence suggests that the white community considered the Black homeowners and guests "undesirables".

Please see the following articles for just a few examples:

1924 April 11 Peck Pavilion (Newspaper Articles, Page 11)

1926-9-26 Manhattan Globe (Newspaper Articles, Pages 14-16)

1927-2-11 MBNews OpEd Recall (Newspaper Articles, Page 20, Page 19)

1930-4-11 MBNews John F. Jones (Newspaper Articles, Page 54)

1933 July 21 Noncaucasian Children (Newspaper Articles, Page 59)

7. Language recommended by Bruce Family made it falsely appear that Lindsey said "invasion" in the 1920's. Remove this entire story of "invasion" from everywhere in the History Report and plaque language.

The same argument used in #6 above applies here as well. Just because a newspaper article in St, Louis used the "invasion" term is no reason to include it in this report and, in fact, it makes the report and plaque language mislead readers into thinking that residents of MB were commonly using this term and hence influenced the Board of Trustees to enact Eminent Domain to stop the invasion.

It would be wrong and subjective to remove "this entire story of 'invasion'" because it is a part of the local contextual history, and it was a phrase commonly used at that time.

Please see:

1911-12-17 NYT Negro Invasion (NewspaperArticles, Page 4)

As well as the supplemental information provided for this week's agenda that includes a list of Newspaper Articles from the state of California and other United States papers beginning on page 4.

8. There is NO evidence of KKK involvement or influence on the Board of Trustees in deciding to enact Eminent Domain and the idea of including stories about the KKK came from Dwayne Shepherd on behalf of Bruce's.

Again, the HAB is misleading readers by referring to KKK activity in 1927 and 1928 long after the decision to enact Eminent Domain and the uncorroborated story about the men on the Redondo Beach Pier is not by any means supporting evidence of KKK activity in the South Bay. During the 7/20/21 City Council meeting, Council Member Napolitano raised this issue by asking you the same question 8 times in a row after and never did receive a valid answer from you as to why there is a reference to KKK activity in the history of Bruce's Beach. As one point in the long question and answer session, you stated that Dwayne Shepherd had asked for a reference to the KKK and Isla Garraway argued aggressive to put it in somewhere.

That's accurate. But it would be shortsighted and ignorant of the local contextual history not to mention the apparent growth of the Klan in the South Bay after 1924. The evidence implies that there may have been some influence by the Klan, what with the alleged cross burnings, "midnight conclaves", and -- following the Inglewood raids -- increased evidence of the Klan. It would be limiting not to question whether or not the Klan was involved in these activities. We have, however, removed reference to that in the plaque.

9. Dwayne Shepherd recommended wording that would seem to justify higher claims in a threatened lawsuit. All input from the Bruce Family should be reanalyzed for correctness and evaluation of factual content.

This is not true. Maybe you need to go back and watch the video of the 5/17/21 HAB meeting wherein Isla Garraway was reading an email from Dwayne Shepherd that contained specific recommendations for language in the history report and plaques. Isla continued with her arguments for a long time wherein she aggressively advocated for including everything Dwayne Shepherd said he wanted to be included such as KKK involvement and influence on the Board of Trustees, language to make it appear the Bruce's facility was loaded with costly amenities, and a statement that the Bruce's were intimidated from the start by the KKK and White residents. You told Isla Garraway that was not accurate because it started as a small stand in 1912, inferring that it would not have drawn much attention when it first opened and you said the KKK was not around until 1927 or 1928. Despite these clearly known facts, the language still appears on the plaque that White people intimidated patrons of Bruces' Beach when it first opened. This kind of blatant disregard for the truth alone makes it imperative that City Council retain a bipartisan history firm to produce a factually accurate history report.

We analyzed everything for "correctness" and evaluated the factual content of every statement we included. Many of Dwayne Shepard's comments came to us during public comment, much like yours and all others who have submitted ideas, criticisms, questions, and concerns. One of the board members consulted with him, just as other board members consulted with other individuals independently. We then returned to the entire Board, during public meetings, with reports of those conversations, so as not to violate the Brown Act.

If we could not support a statement or claim with more than one source, we admitted that and omitted it.

10. ALERT - Frank Daugherty was not on MB Board of Trustees when Eminent Domain resolution was passed. Mr. Daugherty's testimony was the foundational evidence for motive of racial discrimination (see #1 above).

First of all, everyone on the HAB had several chances to put a simple statement of truth in the plaque language and history report that Frank Daugherty was not a member of the Board of Trustees when the vote was taken to enact Eminent Domain, but chose each time to avoid the truth. During HAB meetings, Board members justified this omission by stating that his dates of service are shown in the history report. The plaque language also carefully omits lies included in Daugherty's statement wherein he states 'We voted to condemn these 2 blocks" and "Being a member of the board, I had to participate" and then he went on to make statements on behalf of board members regarding how bad they felt about what they had done, etc. In this case, omissions are deceptive to a point of telling lies. This again shows why the residents of MB deserve to have a bipartisan history firm turn this one-sided report and plaque language into an accurate history.

Frank Daugherty was indeed a member of the Board of Trustees off-and-on since the City's inception. He was on the Board in 1923 when the city received and filed a petition from the citizens of Manhattan Beach seeking to condemn Blocks 5 and 12 in Peck's Manhattan Beach. He proposed the Ordinance in January 1924 to

condemn those two blocks for public park purposes, and he was on the board when Ordinance 263 was approved.
PLEASE SEE:

- 1923-11-15 PetitionOfCondemnation_CC_-_Minutes (Board of Trustees (City Council) Minutes, page 5-6)
- 1924-1-3_CC_-_Minutes_-_Intro 263 (Board of Trustees (City Council) Minutes Page 7-9 and Historical Ordinances Pages 9)
- 1924-2-7_-_Minutes_-_2-7-1924_Ordinance263_CC (Board of Trustees (City Council Minutes, Page. 11)

11. There is no evidence of a Grand Jury investigation or Racial Violence in MB during time of Eminent Domain.
Remove all of these stories from the History Report and plaque language.
Again, you are making my point by showing below that all the articles about a Grand Jury and Racial Violence are in 1928, which is 3 years after Eminent Domain was enacted and a year after the Bruce's Beach facility was demolished. Council Member Napolitano raised this issue during the 7/20/21 Council meeting and said these stories had nothing to do with the history of Bruce's Beach. Council Member stated that these events were reported to have occurred long after the history of Bruce's Beach and there was no factual evidence of convening a Grand Jury or what may have been discovered.

Please see the following:

1928-2-15 Pasadena_Evening_Post_Wed__Feb_15__1928_ (Newspaper Articles, Page 30)

1928-2-15 San Diego Evening Tribune-pdf (Newspaper Articles, Page 31)

1928-2-15 The_Record_Wed__Feb_15__1928_ (Newspaper Articles, Page 32)

1928-2-15_Venice_Evening_Vanguard_Wed__P1_ (Newspaper Articles, Page 33

1928-2-15-Los_Angeles_Evening_Express_GrandJury_ (Newspaper Articles, Page 36)

1928-2-16 LARecord Race WarThe_Record_Thu__Feb_16__1928_ (Newspaper Articles, Page 37)

1928-2-16 LAtimes Oustings in Terrorizing Plot Loom LATimes (Newspaper Articles, Page 38)

1928-2-16 Oregonian_FiresLaid (Newspaper Articles, Page 39)

1928-2-17 CAEagle Manhattan Beach Atrocities Up To Grand Jury (Newspaper Articles, Page 40)

1928-2-17 LA Times Secrecy in Terrorism Plan.pdf (Newspaper Articles, Page 41)

1928-2-17 Venice_Evening_Vanguard_Fri__Feb_17__1928_ (Newspaper Articles, Page 42)

1928-2-20 LAEveExp P3 - LOS Angeles Evening Express .pdf (Newspaper Articles, Page 11)

1928-2-23 VenEveVan Part IFeb 1928, pi .pdf (Newspaper Articles, Page 43)

1928-2-23 VenEveVan Part 2 23 Feb 1928.pdf (Newspaper Articles, Page 44)

1928-2-25 IndianapolisRecorder_Race Clash. pdf (Newspaper Articles, Page 47)

1928-2-25 Race war- pdf (Newspaper Articles, Page 48 *From "Light: America's News Magazine)*

1928-2-27 LATimes No Charges - More evidence. pdf (Newspaper Articles, Page 49)

1928-2-28 LA Times Forecast Upset By Grand Jury .pdf (Newspaper Articles, Page 51)

12. Open Question about Unfair Compensation to Bruce Family.
Simply state the Bruce's were paid above market value for their property and received due process of law.
Again, you are making my point. Instead of making a simple statement on the plaque that the Bruce's received compensation that was higher than market value, the HAB decided to omit this critical information in an apparent attempt to mislead readers. And below you continue to justify this deception by telling me that this critical information is on pages 40-44 of the history report. Also, during your last HAB meeting you brought up the idea of adding context AGAIN by asking everyone if they wanted to include this critical fact on the plaque. You also mentioned other critical facts that could be included, like the fact that the Bruce's never contested the amount and that the court had appointed an independent team of 3 Referees to calculate the value after the Bruce's waived their right to trial by jury and their right to trial by Referees. But you and other members of the HAB sat silent and moved on to the next section after again choosing to leave out this critical information. During the 7/20/21 City Council meeting, Council Member Napolitano raised the issue that the question of fair compensation to the Bruces' seemed to remain as an open point, Napolitano also commented that the Court documents were not available and you failed to mention that you did in fact receive those Court documents, which you mentioned during a HAB meeting in early June.
That information is available on pages 40-44 of the history report.

13. All Black Families affected by Eminent Domain repurchased property in MB, except the Bruce's.
Make a point that this behavior conflicts with position that the Board of Trustees was racially motivated and tried to run Black property owners out of town.
Your argument below that this critical information is shown on page 27 of the history report and not on the plaque shows the need for bipartisan analysis of all sources and editing of the report and plaque language. Even an amateur historian knows that reporting 4 out of 5 Black Families repurchased land in MB presents a fair picture. But this information conflicts with an unsupported opinion in the plaque that the Board of Trustees was trying to run Black property owners out of town. So, being an amateur is not excuse, this is willful deception.
We do say that in the report – page 27. This neither supports nor conflicts with the argument that the board's actions were racially motivated or an attempt to drive Black property owners out of town. They did try, but they failed, as evidenced by the fact that four of the five Black families repurchased property in Manhattan Beach. This was also the primary argument of the Taxpayers Protective League as expressed in the piece by one of its leaders, R.F. Wedler, in the June 9, 1926 issue. Reference:

1926-9-26 Manhattan Globe (Newspaper Articles, Pages 14-16)

14. There is no evidence the Board of Trustees intended to drive black residents out of town.
Remove this language from the History Report and plaque language (See also item #'s 3, 4, 5 & 14 above).
Again, there is evidence that they intended to drive Black residents out of town.

I do not see any factual evidence that the Board of Trustees took actions that were motivated by an attempt to run Blacks out of town. The only evidence I see is uncorroborated stories, op-eds and reports of racial violence long after the history of Bruce's Beach. Please explain further if you have factual evidence and cite you evidence on the plaque.

1915 October 18 Letter From Price

15. There is a severe lack of historical context and all sources used express liberal viewpoints.
Research and analyze more balanced source material and add a proper historical context throughout.
Your excuse does not hold water and its not even plausible. When writing the history of racially charged events that happened a hundred years ago, there is no single element more important than including historical context throughout the document. And, Dr. Gross, your most relied upon "reviewer" referred to many times during HAB meetings, told you the same thing - "More historical context would be useful, and preferably not in an addendum at the end" when she was critiquing the history report. In addition, several Council Members raised the issue of a need for historical context during the 7/20/21 meeting and they also said there was absolutely no rush to complete this project. Lindsey Fox said during one of the HAB meetings that inserting historical context throughout would take too much time. It is a well known fact that solid facts can be turned into lies by omitting the proper context and inserting your own viewpoint or spin.
You are probably right about the lack of broader historical context, but we were tasked with focusing on the history of Bruce's Beach in the city of Manhattan Beach and that's what we did. We have utilized every resource available to us during a pandemic and then some, regardless of the writer or writers' political position.

16. Many stories of pure speculation are used to support a position taken of racial motivation.
Analyze all source material to identify speculation and remove these stories from the Report & plaques.
As stated in the letter from Professor Rosenthal of LMU to City Council many months ago, stories that are uncorroborated, "contested memories," speculation and opinions should be removed from the main body of a history report and shown in the footnotes only. This mean that only facts should be used as evidence to tell the main story or a factually accurate history. However, Members of the HAB have consistently ignored that well established standard for writing a factually accurate history. This consistent pattern seems to show a strong willingness on the part of HAB members to use anything to support a predetermined narrative, even if it is not factual. And then you justify your actions by proving a lame excuse, as follows: "we cite whether incidents are based on speculation and did not not have support from any other source." The point is that by doing so, you are misleading readers. And not stating below that "most government agencies do not maintain records from a hundred years ago" is no excuse to make statements and draw conclusions that are not supported by factual evidence.
We cite whether incidents are based on speculation and did not have support from any other source. Unfortunately, most government agencies do not maintain records from a hundred years ago, though we continue to seek out that information.

17. Stories from black owned newspapers are most often opinions and bi-lines to promote desegregation.
Reanalyze these source materials to identify opinions, uncorroborated stories & speculation& treat accordingly.
You are missing the point altogether that the *American Eagle, The Liberator and Venice Vanguard* were not known for publishing factual news reports and are, therefore, not reliable as evidence for a history report other than to be mentioned in footnotes. Council Member Franklin raised this issue during the 7/20/21 Council meeting by reading from research he had performed that documented the fact that these Black owned newspapers took in income by running ads for job and housing opportunities for Blacks but were primarily in the business of encouraging Blacks to fight segregation by publishing opinion pieces and sensationalized stories that were uncorroborated or pure speculation. Council Member Franklin also read from a book that could have been used as a reliable source of information about Blacks in California during the time of Bruce's Beach and requested that the HAB add more sources, but this and other issues raised by City Council were not addressed until you wrote this email today.
It is imperative that we use stories from "black owned newspapers" because during that time in our nation's history, it was rare for newspapers to report on stories from <u>all</u> races. The Liberator and the California Eagle provided a voice that was not represented in the Manhattan Beach News – the social columns alone prove that.

18. Corroborating evidence that Bruce's received fair compensation was presented by Council Member Franklin.
Research & analyze this corroborating evidence for comfort Bruce's received fair compensation (See also #13).
Wow! The accurate history of Bruce's Beach as your assigned task was limited to 2 main questions. 1. Was Eminent Domain enacted to close down Bruce's Beach and run Blacks out of town. 2. Did the Bruce's receive fair compensation? And the History Advisory Board is choosing to leave the answer about fair compensation hidden on page 42 of the history report rather than adding 6 words to the plaque ...., which was above fair market value." And HAB is unflappable on taking this stance even after Council Members raised this issue during the 7/20/21 meeting AND in spite of the fact that the HAB has the Court documents. Again, it is high time for City Council to thank you guys for your efforts and more along with retaining the services of a bipartisan history firm that will use experts to provide a factually accurate history.

This evidence was initially presented in detail on page 42 of our report.

19. Plight of White property owners affected by Eminent Domain is not covered in the History Report of Plaques.
Council Member Montgomery raised this issue during the 7/20/21 Council Meeting. The Black property owners did not "develop" their land according to your own words in the history report and plaques. There were 2 portable cottages erected on 1 full size lot and 2 half lots that supported day trips to the beach and nobody slept overnight except the Bruces'. But the plaque language tells the story as if an established Black "Community" or "Black Enclave" was run out of town. And that false perception could have been avoided by not using misleading words like Community and Enclave and simply stating that 4 out of 5 Black property owners affected by Eminent Domain repurchased land in MB. But the HAB has willfully chosen to omit critical information and is guilty again of deception.
The evidence shows there was no "plight" of white property owners of Blocks 5 and 12 in the eminent domain process. They had not developed their land and only three entities (out of 10) actually answered the complaint of condemnation. This, too, is in our Report, page 19.

20. A need to edit the History Report & plaque language was recognized and discussed extensively by City Council. Apply a concentrated effort to perform a bipartisan edit of the History Report and plaque language.
It was Mayor Hadley that raised the issue during the 7/20/21 meeting that there was an apparent need for editing because it seemed to her that there was a "thumb on the scale" when many of the words used on the plaques were taken as a whole. Council Member Napolitano added that everyone was encouraged to submit their edits.
That the History Advisory Board is not a bipartisan effort is an assumption on your part and is not accurate.

21. Tone lacks balance; a factually accurate history is the primary goal and extra time is not a concern.
Take the time necessary to formulate a fair and balanced tone and a factually accurate history.
During the 7/20/21 Council meeting, Mayor Hadley listed about 20 words that she raised an issue with their inclusion in the history report or plaques. If you are interested in finding those words, they are shown in the 16 page report I sent to the HAB wherein the 22 points covered herein are presented in more detail.
As mentioned earlier, we intend to take the appropriate and necessary amount of time to present the most thorough history of the eminent domain actions in Manhattan Beach in the 1920s, and we appreciate that we are not being rushed into this.

We cite every statement with more than one source and in instances where additional sources were not available, we question the validity of those statements.

22. The Mayor and most Council Members expressed concern about a recent discovery that the Bruce's weighed-in on the History Report and plaque language even though they are not residents of MB and not on the Board. All input from the Bruce's Family should be re-evaluated for factual content due to appearance of a conflict.

As stated above, Dwayne Shepherd was afforded special privileges of working in private directly with Isla Garraway wherein Shepherd provided Isla Garraway with precise language he wanted to see included in the report and plaque language and she fought hard for its inclusion. The painfully obvious problem is that Dwayne Shepherd is a self-proclaimed representative of the Bruces' heirs, he is not a resident of MB and he has vowed on many public occasions to sue MB for past and future income of Bruce's Beach and damages for racial discrimination "even if [we] get [our] land back." I only watched 7 of the 13 HAB meeting videos from starting with the 5/17/21 meeting and the only time I heard Dwayne Shepherd make a public comment was at the beginning of the last meeting before HAB submitted plaque language to City Council for consideration at the 7/20/21 Council meeting wherein he thanked members of the HAB for being so cooperative in allowing him to make recommendations, etc.

As stated before, Dwayne Shepard participated in public comment, along with members of the Prioleau family and current residents of Manhattan Beach throughout the entire process.

Some feedback was sent to individual members of the History Advisory Board, which was then relayed to the rest of the board during our meetings, which are all a part of the public record. This was not limited to comments from the Bruce family. We consulted longtime Manhattan Beach residents who are respected for their familiarity with the city's history and supplied guidance and information to the History Advisory Board throughout the process.

Additionally, I understand that you were unable to find the recordings of previous meetings, but they are located on the Bruce's Beach page of the City's website, here:
https://www.manhattanbeach.gov/government/city-manager/bruce-s-beach-task-force

Please click the arrow next to "HISTORY ADVISORY BOARD", and you will see the heading "MEETING RECORDINGS".

Thank you again for your time, and please let us know if more questions remain.