Alexandria Latragna

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

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

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

Alexandria Latragna

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

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

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.

Alexandria Latragna

From: Roger Hughes <rogerhughes2@protonmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, October 6, 2021 9:05 AM
To: Bruces Beach Task Force
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Bruce's beach proposed language 2

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Comments on the "Highland Ave" plaque.

I think the Patterson paragraph should immediately follow the Prioleau paragraph since they are both concerning the same lot (4).

On the "Other Property Owners" section, do the yellow highlights indicate uncertainty? I would strike "investors" and spell out their full first names. I would also strike the last sentence, which is implying a diminished interest by the White owners which is subjective.

Thus:

Other Property Owners

The remaining 25 lots of land in those two blocks were owned by White property owners. Fourteen of the lots were owned by B.H. Dyer, R.L. Rice, and H.M. Eichelberger and were never developed.

The other lots owned by White property owners were: C.W. Stone - Lot 3, Block 5; George W. Yarrow - Lots 4 and 6, Block 5 and Lot 11, Block 12; Lillie D. Dosta - Lot 7, Block 5; Sarah I. Ambrose, Marion R. Wyser (Southern California Bond & Finance Company) - Lot 7, Block 12; R.C. Ruperd Lot 10, Block 12; Grace R Stuart- Lot 13, Block 12; L.A. Dreisbach (M.W. Mitchell) - Lot 14, Block 12; Clara M. Monroe - Lot 15, Block 12; and H.A. Ecclestone - Lot 16, Block 12.

The "Race war" section confuses the story. The first part of the plaque talks about the NAACP victory, but then this section indicates other acts of racism continued in Manhattan Beach (not in the park). One person calling it a "race war" seems like too little substantiation for such a loaded phrase, which is supported by the Grand Jury's inaction. I would strike this section or develop a clearer vision for what is trying to be communicated.

Alexandria Latragna

From: Roger Hughes <rogerhughes2@protonmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, October 6, 2021 9:04 AM
To: Bruces Beach Task Force
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Bruces Beach proposed language

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

I would like to thank the Task Force for their continued effort on helping the city document and explain the events behind Bruce's beach. They have made great strides, and their hard work if very much evident and appreciated. In an effort to get this language passed with as little friction as possible from the community, I would respectfully make the following suggestions to edit the proposed language:

Plaque 1: Bruce's Beach

I think you should remove the Frank Daugherty paragraph. The racist motivation is obvious in the above paragraphs. This section will be controversial with the public because it is just one man's opinion and he was not on the board during all of these decisions. I would suggest this revision:

The Racist Motivation Behind the Eminent Domain Action [QR CODE 6]

In a February 4, 1927, letter to the *Manhattan Beach News*, the Bruce family wrote: "...the attempt to make a park out of these two blocks was a direct slap at us because we were not born white people."

I would also modify the Legacy paragraph. The amount of money the Bruces requested is irrelevant and often inflated during lawsuits. It is also controversial because the rate of return (~14k for 1.5k investment) was actually very, very good and the settlement amount was ratified by independent appraisers and the courts. Thus better to leave it out and avoid the controversy.

* Could the task force please clarify in today's meeting the exact dates of Daugherty's board service versus the dates of the votes?

* the language suggestion for the additional data behind the QR codes was not provided in the agenda for today, and thus should not be proposed to the council yet.

I would suggest this revision:

The Legacy of Bruce's Beach

On May 16, 1927, the Bruce family left Manhattan Beach. The resort was soon demolished, but the Bruces' legacy would persevere. A series of peaceful protests occurred that summer along the Manhattan Beach shoreline supported by the NAACP that would alter the beachfront landscape of the City indefinitely. Details of this can be found on the additional plaque on Highland Avenue. **[QR CODE 8]**

I think the two plaques should be treated separately, thus emailing comments on the Park plaque separately.