

**Online Public Comment Report  
City Council  
June 11, 2024**

## REGULAR AGENDA

27 Recommendation to request City Attorney to draft a resolution condemning all forms of racism, religious or ethnic bias, discrimination, incitement of violence, and hate crimes, and affirming the City's values of inclusivity, diversity, equity, and acceptance in relation to public meetings.

Name

**Comment - 06/10/2024 10:46 PM : (For)**

**Thank you for placing Agenda Item 27, on the Agenda for the June 11, 2024, City Council Meeting.**

***Recommendation to request the City Attorney to draft a resolution condemning all forms of racism, religious or ethnic bias, discrimination, incitement of violence, and hate crimes, and affirming the City's values of inclusivity, diversity, equity, and acceptance in relation to public meetings.***

**Even though it is disconcerting that Long Beach needs a resolution as recommended above, I thank the City and its leaders for recognizing the problem and choosing to publicly address the concerns with this recommendation for a City Resolution.**

**The U.S. Constitution and the Brown Act protect the public's Free Speech rights, however, neither the Brown Act nor the U.S. Constitution mandate that the Mayor and/or City Council Members remain "speechless" and silent when a speaker vilifies an individual or group based on the individual's or group's race, religion, sexual orientation, ethnicity, gender, disability, etc.**

**The speaker has Free Speech rights, but likewise, the Mayor and City Council Members can use their Free Speech rights, not to silence the speaker, but to make contemporaneous statements condemning and abhorring the words of the speaker, either during the comments or when the speaker's time has expired. This would confirm to the public that the Mayor and/or Council Members do not endorse the speaker. *Qui tacet consentire videtur.***

**I would ask that the City Attorney's proposed Resolution incorporate Information and Guidelines, like those adopted by other city governments, to attempt to balance the sometimes competing interests of Freedom of Speech, Disruption of a Meeting, and Hate Speech.**

**Some of the Information and Guidelines (not rules) used by other Cities include:**

- 1. Definition of Free Speech (Private Citizens and Government Officials)**
- 2. Definition of Hate Speech**
- 3. Incorporating in the Resolution a Code of Conduct for The City of Long Beach's Public Meetings and posting the Code with its "Guidelines" for Public Meetings**

**Thank you again.**

## REGULAR AGENDA

27 Recommendation to request City Attorney to draft a resolution condemning all forms of racism, religious or ethnic bias, discrimination, incitement of violence, and hate crimes, and affirming the City's values of inclusivity, diversity, equity, and acceptance in relation to public meetings.

**Name**

**Comment - 06/11/2024 12:23 PM : (For)**

I applaud Long Beach City Council's recommendation to request the city attorney to draft a resolution condemning all forms of racism, religious or ethnic bias, discrimination, incitement of violence, and hate crimes, and affirming the city's values of inclusivity, diversity, equity, and acceptance in relation to public meetings.

While it is sad that a city council needs to make this clear to the general population, Long Beach can once again show why it is a great city by making it known that this type of speech will not be tolerated.

I know you have a job ahead of you and look forward to hearing how the city council will be holding speakers accountable to these guidelines.

This is a win for ALL Long Beach communities. We must continue to hold ourselves to the highest standard.

Pam Rima, MPH  
Proud District 4 resident

## REGULAR AGENDA

30. Recommendation to receive and file a presentation regarding research on potential revenue measures and receive direction from the Mayor and the City Council regarding the placement of revenue measures on the November 2024 ballot. (Citywide)

**Name**

Blake Perez

**Comment - 06/10/2024 10:23 PM : (Against)**

June 10<sup>th</sup>, 2024

Mayor and Members of the Long Beach City Council  
City of Long Beach  
VIA Email

**Subject: June 11th Regular Meeting – Agenda Item 30: Recommendation to receive and file a presentation regarding research on potential revenue measures and receive direction from the Mayor and the City Council regarding the placement of revenue measures on the November 2024 ballot.**

Dear Mayor and Members of the Council,

I write on behalf of the Building Owners and Managers Association Greater Los Angeles (BOMA/GLA), representing over 135 million square feet of commercial office space throughout Los Angeles County, including members within the City of Long Beach.

This letter is to express grave concern over the inclusion of a transfer tax proposal in the menu of options for new revenue. We are **strongly opposed** to any increase or addition to the city's transfer tax rate.

A transfer tax is not the best path forward for a city looking to grow and expand investment within its borders and for its community. We have seen from nearby Measure ULA, that the transfer taxes do not meet expectations for revenue. Instead, the transfer tax often chills the local market.

It is also not accurate to say that the transfer tax would not be factored into the overall price, as stated in the agenda report. Sellers will bake the cost of the transfer tax into their asking price. It is a cost that for multifamily projects, will be factored in when rents are set for the units.

As the report said, it is true that ultimately the market sets prices. However, the market does factor in the cost of transfer taxes on a property. And it is a cost that will have ripple effects on who invests in Long Beach.

Renters would be impacted by this tax indirectly whenever multifamily properties change hands. And with multifamily properties, this happens often. Renters would also be impacted by the potential chilling of the market, which would reduce overall supply and contribute to rising rents. Businesses too would be impacted by the pass-through of the costs.

Other jurisdictions have looked at transfer tax proposals post Measure ULA and have

rejected those ideas. Chicago voters just this past spring rejected the measure at the ballot box and an idea in San Diego failed to make it to voters. The City of Glendale too has thus far declined to put forward a transfer tax ballot measure.

A [study](#) that looked at a transfer tax proposal in Boston conducted in part by Tufts University, found that cities lose 35 to 45 cents for every \$1 they expect to raise in new transfer taxes. Additionally, transfer taxes inhibit property sales. It seems hard to avoid the fact that a new transfer tax in Long Beach would harm its ambitious housing development goals.

Ultimately, a transfer tax would harm more than just commercial real estate in the city. Which is an industry still recovering from the aftereffects of COVID. The transfer tax's impacts would reverberate and extend into housing development, housing affordability, and attracting investments into the city.

We respectfully ask that you remove the transfer tax proposal from the menu of revenue options under consideration for the city.

Thank you for your consideration.

Respectfully,



Blake Perez  
Director of Government and Public Affairs  
BOMA Greater Los Angeles  
Ph: 213-629-2662 ext. 111 | Email: [bperez@bomagla.org](mailto:bperez@bomagla.org)