

**From:** tony higgins <tony.higgins123@gmail.com>

**Sent:** Monday, November 4, 2019 10:42 AM

**To:** Ann Yang <anny@hermosabeach.gov>

**Subject:** Fwd: Status of survey to determine level of RESIDENT support for large special events

Dear City Council:

I believe the city has acknowledged the need to conduct an impartial SURVEY that reaches-out to RESIDENTS to determine which large, annually recurring special events are strongly supported by a broad cross-section of the community, and more important those that are not.

Do we really want two fiestas, an AVP in Hermosa and Manhattan a teen challenge and so on?

It would seem especially important to reach out to those residential neighborhoods that bear most of the negative impacts of trash, noise, traffic and parking shortages, etc., from these events. I thought there was general agreement on this.

3 months ago I was told the city was working on such a survey and that the survey would NOT be designed by any vested interests that stand to benefit disproportionately from these events.

Here I'm talking about members of the chamber of commerce AND the business community that may be looking for ways to increase their customer base as their primary goal, OR city bureaucrats that might see a benefit in their department budgets or staffing levels as a result of increased special event activity.

The need for this survey was also briefly discussed in the recent joint Parks Commission & City Council meeting a couple of months back.

Last month, I once again asked the Parks Commission to provide a brief status on this survey. If they couldn't provide a brief status I asked it be agendaized for future discussion, or referred this to staff an update OR that the commission briefly discuss the issue at the conclusion of oral comments and provide some direction.

All of these actions are specifically permitted by the BROWN act.

But the city lawyer at the meeting, rather than explaining the options (like voting to agendaize, or providing a brief status update, etc.); the lawyer simply advised commission NOT to answer my question or provide a brief status update in response to my query, even at the end of oral communications where there would be no danger of god-forbid, an interactive, on the record discussion with a member of the public.

Why did the lawyer NOT encourage Brown Act compliant options that could have facilitated a transparent and direct answer to a simple survey question?

The culture of our city under past and present city managers and attorneys is heavily skewed to suppress and obfuscate information that might point out flaws in the planning process.

My question is what is the status of this survey and questions about how the survey was being

developed in an impartial, and scientific manner were reasonable, pertinent and consistent with concerns many residents have raised.

Instead of facilitating an answer compliant with the Brown act and the cities parliamentary rules, the city attorney slammed the door in the Public's face offering only stonewalls and not a way forward.

So once again, I ask what is the status of this RESIDENT survey?

My hypothesis is simple: we have reached the point where our road, parking and police infrastructure cannot support the growth in the business community without extracting significant quality of life and property rights costs from vulnerable neighborhoods.

It's time the chamber of commerce and city government to live within the means of the existing infrastructure and stop asking for more.

If that means declining commercial property values or commercial revenue then so be it.

Residents are tired of being asked to subsidize business community growth with our quality of life.

We have already outgrown our infrastructure.

Tony Higgins