

City Council Special Meeting | February 24, 2026

Agenda Item	Name	Comment	Position	Attachment URL
PUBLIC COMMENT	tony for effective community engagement	<p>Dear City Council,</p> <p>The 2/24 CCM, has the mayorial selection and has been classified as a special meeting even though it has been scheduled for months and has all the hallmarks of a regular meeting with a full consent calendar, public hearings on other business items and misc reports. So what public interest is possibly served by limiting public participation to AGENDA ITEMS ONLY? Normally we are allowed to comment on any item under the council's purview. I really thought transparency would be maximized and arbitrary and capricious restrictions on public comment would be minimized under the new city manager and council majority but the 2/24 agenda proves there is still work to be done. Yes, its true the city MAY restrict public comment in a special meeting to agenda items only, but why would you? This was not an "emergency" type special meeting The brown act does NOT REQUIRE a special session restriction on general participation, it just allows it. Please consider fixing this at the outset of the 2/24 meeting and opening up the public participation to comments on both agenda and non agenda items under the councils purview.</p> <p>Thank you for considering tonyhiggins</p>	No Position	

City Council Special Meeting | February 24, 2026

PUBLIC COMMENT	Howard Lee	<p>Prior to the switch-over in July of 2024 from the Granicus agenda/minutes system contract to the present eScribe agenda/minutes system contract, every agenda had a list of all the remaining scheduled upcoming meetings for the balance of the calendar year at the bottom of the agenda. Why that stopped was never mentioned. That list of all the remaining scheduled meetings for the calendar year was extremely useful and needs to be restored to being displayed at the end of every agenda face. Council and staff, kindly indicate during this February 24, 2026 meeting that such will commence again starting with your March 10 meeting.</p> <p>Thank You, Howard Lee.</p>	For	
----------------	------------	--	-----	--

City Council Special Meeting | February 24, 2026

<p>PUBLIC COMMENT</p>	<p>Howard Lee Re Incorrect Public Comment Item Directions</p>	<p>Notwithstanding that this February 24, 2026 meeting is a de-facto Regular 2nd meeting for the month of February, it was somehow mislabeled as a SPECIAL meeting. It clearly is not a SPECIAL meeting. I had to waste a significant amount of time finding the meeting when this Council set the 2026 Calendar of Meetings for the public to be aware of. The November 17, 2025 meeting was when such was accomplished. In that meeeting Councilmember Jackson said it correctly when he suggested moving the Rotation of Mayor February 12 proposed meeting to the front of the February 24, Regular meeting and thus becoming part of same. Unfortunately there was only a draft resolution provided with the proposed schedule of meetings, and after the Council's convoluted discussion on November 17, 2025, the draft Resolution 25-XXXX, as modified was never returned to the Council, i.e. in the following December meeting, for concurrence by the Council on that meeting's Consent Calendar. The problem is that calling this February 24 a Special meeting, (I could not care less what you call it), caused someone to use the quick and dirty boiler plate for a SPECIAL MEETING when making this November 24 meeting's agenda. It is in actuality a Regular Meeting so the boiler plate was incorrect to use. As such that left directions above the PUBLIC COMMENT item indicating that a member of the public cannot speak on an item in the Councils jurisdiction but which is not listed on the agenda. Thus as an example, the Librarian has already probably figured that she has no right to speak regarding something she may have desired to regarding the Library. (Kindly notify the Librarian that if she desires to speak, she is welcome to attend the meeting and do so.) Also a modified agenda should be posted ASAP indicating that the meetings agenda was mislabeled as a SPECIAL meeting, (IT IS NOT A SPECIAL MEETING) and that the PUBLIC COMMENT period is open for comment in person or by Zoom regarding anything in the Councils jurisdiction as well as to matters on the agenda.</p> <p>Thank You, Howard Lee</p>	<p>For</p>	
-----------------------	---	--	------------	--

City Council Special Meeting | February 24, 2026

Item 9.i	Howard Lee Re This Needs To Go To Plan Comm	Please click/tap this comment and then click/tap the blue attachment to read my eComment.	-	https://pub-hermosabeach.escribemeetings.com/FileStream.aspx?DocumentId=54671
----------	--	--	---	---

City Council Special Meeting | February 24, 2026

Item 9.i	Bob K	<p>Honorable Mayor and Members of the City Council,</p> <p>I respectfully request that Item 9.i (Public Convenience or Necessity determination for 1272 The Strand) be removed from the Consent Calendar and scheduled for full deliberation. This is a discretionary determination under Business and Professions Code §23958 in an overconcentrated census tract. The tract is authorized for six on-sale licenses and currently contains twenty-eight. Approval would authorize a twenty-ninth license, requiring the Council to affirmatively find that issuance would serve public convenience or necessity and would not tend to create a law enforcement problem. The Police Department memorandum acknowledges that the downtown area generates a disproportionate share of calls for service and notes a correlation between late-night alcohol establishments and assault, DUI, and nuisance activity. The memorandum indicates support for the PCN if certain mitigation measures are implemented. However, those measures are expressly described as recommendations to the Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control (ABC), which retains discretion to accept, modify, or reject them. The memo also clarifies that any ABC conditions would not modify the existing Conditional Use Permit. Accordingly, the Council is being asked to make a no law enforcement problem finding while relying on mitigation measures that are not binding City conditions and are outside the City's direct control. If the Council's determination depends on those measures, the record should clearly reflect that reliance and explain how the finding remains supported if ABC does not adopt them in full. In addition, the staff report relies on the CEQA Common Sense Exemption. Given that the Police memorandum acknowledges potential public safety impacts associated with additional alcohol service in this area, careful deliberation before invoking that exemption would strengthen the City's record. Because this is a discretionary statutory override in an overconcentrated area with acknowledged public safety considerations, placement on the Consent Calendar limits meaningful public discussion and the opportunity for the Council to articulate findings on the record. Removal from Consent would allow transparent deliberation and ensure that the administrative record reflects thoughtful consideration of the statutory criteria.</p>	Against	
----------	-------	---	---------	--

		<p>There is no statutory urgency requiring action tonight; §23958 provides a 90-day period for local determination. Removing this item from Consent would not prejudice the applicant but would allow a more complete and defensible process. For these reasons, I respectfully request that Item 9.i be removed from the Consent Calendar and scheduled for full consideration.</p>		
--	--	--	--	--

City Council Special Meeting | February 24, 2026

Item 9.i	A. Anderson	We don't need yet another bar in Hermosa. How are these people getting this through. This has a smell of corruption. They don't even sell food its just more alcohol and more drunk idiots causing problems.	Against	
Item 9.i	Jacene Dimson	With new & local ownership, this beloved local bar is back and refreshed. This space would be completely unused and an empty eyesore if it weren't for them. They are responsible business owners separately -- and together, I trust that they will take care of this space and the responsibility of managing it with the addition of this license. Our local businesses deserve support. Please grant their license.	For	
Item 9.i	BELINDA L OAKES	I am writing to express my strong support for the approval of the Public Convenience or Necessity determination for The Deck at 1272 The Strand in connection with their request for a Type 42 ABC License. The Decks reopening has been a positive addition to Hermosa Beach. After sitting vacant for years, I was so happy that it was brought back to life by local business owners who are not only deeply invested in their businesses, but deeply invested in our community. While open over the past summer, The Deck delivered exactly what residents and visitors appreciate: a relaxed, welcoming, smallscale gathering space that fits the spirit and character of Hermosa Beach. The Deck add vitality to The Strand without adding disruption. Approving this Type 42 license will allow The Deck to operate as intended a casual beerandwine space, supporting local economy, local community members, as well as local tourism.	For	

City Council Special Meeting | February 24, 2026

<p>PUBLIC COMMENT</p>	<p>tony</p>	<p>Dear City Council,</p> <p>Once again BBK law is providing the city with biased legal advice narrowly tailored to exploit laws to support the City Managers position that is arbitrarily limiting general public comment in tonights Feb 24 council meeting. And to that end BBK Law provided factually inaccurate misleading half-truth that fails to opine on whether to allow public comment on non agenda items in a Special meeting is allowed not whether it can be prohibited. BBK law's attached email claims general participation cannot be allowed in a special meeting is simply not true. This meeting was scheduled as a REGULAR meeting with a light agenda on Nov 17. There are no emergency items on the agenda, the meeting been scheduled for months and NO urgent public interest is served by limiting this meeting to comment on agenda items only. But as it was in Suja's administration, the city has decided that the first place it is going to look to control meeting length and decorum and maintain behavioral norms is to limit general participation. There is nothing that prohibits having a public comment period during the mayoral transition but the city cleverly scheduled this item as a presentation not an agenda item so that eliminates the need for a dedicated public comment. We should be able to speak to the mayoral transition without giving our up general participation time. And there is nothing that prohibits public comment before the mayor selection and then having a general participation period before the consent calendar. IN FACT THAT IS THE WAY IT WAS DONE FOR YEARS! In California, a city council is not prohibited by state law from allowing general public comment at a special meeting, but it is not required to do so. Under the Ralph M. Brown Act, the specific rules for public participation differ between regular and special meetings. In California, a city council is not prohibited by state law from allowing general public comment at a special meeting, but it is not required to do so. Under the Ralph M. Brown Act, the specific rules for public participation differ between regular and special meetings Regular Meetings: The council MUST provide an opportunity for members of the public to address the body on any item of interest within its subject</p>	<p>No Position</p>	
-----------------------	-------------	--	--------------------	--

matter jurisdiction, even if those items are not on the agenda. Special Meetings: The law states that the agenda must provide an opportunity for the public to address the body concerning any item on the agenda. Crucially, while the law does not require a general public comment period for non-agenda items at a special meeting, THERE is nothing in the Brown Act that prohibits a council from voluntarily including one on the agenda.

BBK email

Good Morning MrHiggins,

The following responses are provided to your email below of February 22, 2026:

There is no prohibition on scheduling a special meeting on a date that would otherwise have been a regular meeting date. The special meeting was properly noticed within the 24-hour written notice period and lists all business to be transacted in accordance with the Brown Act (California Government Code section 54956).

Unfortunately, the City Council (Council) may not discuss or take action on any matter that is not otherwise specifically listed on the special meeting agenda.

The Council has been provided a copy of your Cure and Correct Demand Letter (Demand). The Council has 30 days to respond to your Demand under the Brown Act, and the Council taking no action on said Demand is deemed a decision not to cure after 30 days pursuant to California Government Code section 54960.1(c)(2). The proposed contract with the Hermosa Beach Chamber of Commerce has not been executed yet. Should you have any additional questions, please contact the Interim City Clerk by telephone at (310) 318-0204 or email at rguzman@hermosabeach.gov.

Respectfully,

Alyssa Murray

City Council Special Meeting | February 24, 2026

PUBLIC COMMENT	Kent Allen	<p>Is no one going to ask how The Deck was open and serving alcohol for six months without an on-premise liquor license? Lets not pretend this was a string of daily catered events. Catering licenses are for occasional off-site events, not for running a bar thats open to the public every day. Rotating five or six different permits to keep the drinks flowing isnt a loophole; its an illegal workaround. And now were going to reward this by telling the ABC that this is a Public Necessity? Come on. Whats nextthe Treasure Chest turning into a beer bar for the summer? How are we overlooking all this while dragging Roberts Liquor through countless hearings and a CUP modification for far less? I hope you will follow the Police Chief Phills recomendations and incorporate his points into a new CUP.</p>	No Position	
----------------	------------	---	-------------	--

City Council Special Meeting | February 24, 2026

Item 9.i	Kent Allen	Is no one going to ask how The Deck was open and serving alcohol for six months without an on-premise liquor license? Lets not pretend this was a string of daily catered events. Catering licenses are for occasional off-site events, not for running a bar thats open to the public every day. Rotating five or six different permits to keep the drinks flowing isnt a loophole; its an illegal workaround. And now were going to reward this by telling the ABC that this is a Public Necessity? Come on. Whats nextthe Treasure Chest turning into a beer bar for the summer? How are we overlooking all this while dragging Roberts Liquor through countless hearings and a CUP modification for far less? I hope you will follow the Police Chief Phills recomendations and incorporate his points into a new CUP.	Against	
PUBLIC COMMENT	Nancy Schwappach	Please see the attached related to the election of a new Mayor Pro Tem	No Position	https://pub-hermosabeach.escribemeetings.com/FileStream.aspx?DocumentId=54672

City Council Special Meeting | February 24, 2026

Item 9.i	David Brandin	<p>I strongly support approving the Type 42 license for The Deck at 1272 The Strand. Hermosa Beach thrives when local businesses are given the opportunity to succeed. The Deck is a long standing part of our community and its reopening brings life, activity, and economic support to the Strand. In a time when many small businesses are struggling, we should be focused on reducing unnecessary barriers rather than creating additional red tape.</p> <p>This request is not about expanding nightlife beyond reason. It is about allowing a local establishment to operate competitively and sustainably within the framework already permitted by the city. Supporting responsible operators helps preserve the character of Hermosa while keeping storefronts occupied, employees working, and visitors spending locally.</p> <p>-David</p>	For	
Item 9.i	Stephen McCall	<p>Strong support. The Deck has long been an iconic, casual spot along our beachfront. Supporting The Deck means supporting local ownership, local jobs, local tourism and Hermosa times.</p>	For	
Item 9.i	Richard A.	<p>I strongly support approval of The Decks beer and wine license. The owners have a proven track record as responsible, community-minded operators through Uncorked Wine Shop and Hermosa Brewing Company, both of which have consistently demonstrated professionalism, compliance, and respect for our neighborhood. Granting this license would allow them to bring back a community gathering spot that has been a treasured part of Hermosa Beach and the South Bay for 60+ years. I respectfully urge the Hermosa Beach City Council to approve this application.</p>	For	

City Council Special Meeting | February 24, 2026

PUBLIC COMMENT	Howard Lee 2026 Regular Meetings Sched Approved By City Council In Nov 2025	Click/Tap this comment and then click/tap the attachment to view a list of all "Regular" Council Meetings for 2026 as agreed to by the Council Nov 17, 2025. (list is From Agenda/Minutes page of the city website) Two meetings are study sessions as colored. Click/Tab attachment. The Mayor Rotation was also a Regular Meeting. None are "Special" meetings.	-	https://pub-hermosabeach.escribemeetings.com/FileStream.aspx?DocumentId=54673
PUBLIC COMMENT	mc guerry	I would like to thank Mike Deto for listening to the residents of Hermosa Beach. For example, on two controversial votes, one being the decision about the last City Manager and the other one being the alignment of the K line to Torrance, over 95% of the public comments from actual Hermosa Beach residents were in favor of the way he voted. This shows his priority is Hermosa Beach, rather than personal grievances or outside loyalties.	No Position	
PUBLIC COMMENT	mc guerry	I think Nancy Schwappach's concerns about Ray Jackson are unwarranted. The city benefits by his representation on the CCC. It would hurt the city if a councilmember were punished for trying to work with the state.	No Position	
Item 9.i	Solange Comer	The Deck has been a local treasure and I hope it will continue to be for a long time. I am in full support of a beer and wine request.	For	

City Council Special Meeting | February 24, 2026

Item 9.i	Eric Horne	<p>Hello Mayor and Council. This is a rare opportunity in Hermosa Beach. The new owners of The Deck have done something we almost never see anymore: they've taken a classic Hermosa institution and brought it back with the same spirit that made it special in the first place. Year after year we watch legacy businesses close. Many of the new additions to town are phenomenal, but continuity matters too. People want to walk down to the Pier and grab a cocktail at a place that's been part of Hermosa's story for decades. That sense of local history and identity is part of what makes downtown feel like Hermosa. The Police Department does not oppose this request. And the owners are local, responsible members of this community, not an outside bar group testing the limits of our town. This is not a new bar concept pushing into a quiet neighborhood. It is a reopening of an historic location in a district our General Plan designates as a social and commercial center. If we want to be a business-friendly city—and I believe everyone on this Council has said that we do—this is the moment to demonstrate it. Placing this on consent and granting the Public Convenience or Necessity determination spares the local business owners from unnecessary delay and bureaucracy. In an era of inflation and tight margins, allowing them to operate a full bar lets them compete on equal footing with their neighbors. This is a no-brainer. Let's welcome back a new and improved Hermosa classic and approve the PCN tonight.</p>	For	
----------	------------	---	-----	--

City Council Special Meeting | February 24, 2026

Item 9.i	Mark West	With new local ownership, this beloved neighborhood bar has been thoughtfully refreshed and brought back to life. Without their investment and stewardship, this space would likely remain vacant and become an eyesore for the community. The owners, and their individual establishments, have demonstrated themselves to be responsible operators both individually and as a team. I am confident they will continue to manage this space with care and professionalism as they take on the responsibilities associated with this license. Our local businesses thrive when dedicated owners step forward to revitalize community spaces. I respectfully encourage approval of their license.	For	
Item 9.i	Barbara Ellman	I strongly support granting a full alcohol license to The Deck. The owners have consistently demonstrated that they are responsible, community-minded business operators who contribute positively to our city. Beyond running a successful establishments, they have generously donated their time and resources to numerous local charities and community events. I believe they have earned the trust and support of our city.	For	
Item 9.i	Kristina Cantelli	This establishment carries a deep sense of history and nostalgia. It's a genuine nod to Hermosa's surf-town roots and rich local culture. The owners clearly respect that legacy and have been intentional about preserving it. Replacing that would be a real shame, and would undo the thoughtful work they've done to ensure this remains a well-run bar that's respectful of the community.	For	
Item 9.i	Dan Cavanagh	In this climate where it is so hard for local businesses we need to become a business friendly community. This space that many in the community have loved has been closed for a long time. Let's support the new owners trying to make a difference in our community not to mention generate tax dollars.	For	

**SUPPLEMENTAL eComment testimony to the Tuesday, Feb-24-2026,
6-PM Hermosa Beach City Council Meeting for Consent Item-9.i**

To: Hermosa Beach City Council, City Manager, BB&K Contract City Attorney,
City Clerk, and others:

From: Howard Lee, Hermosa Beach Resident

Posted to these eComments and advance-copied to HB city officials February 23, 2026

Full agenda direct link..

<https://pub-hermosabeach.escribemeetings.com/Meeting.aspx?Id=9d8078dd-ee03-4235-a490-ac503f2ac408&lang=English>

Go to full agenda, drill down to Consent Item 9.i to view the following item's attachments and other possible eComments per the eScribe's far from user-friendly agenda/minutes system process.

RE: CONSENT ITEM 9.i *(as printed on the posted Agenda face)*

REQUEST FOR A PUBLIC CONVENIENCE OR NECESSITY DETERMINATION FOR A DEPARTMENT OF ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE CONTROL LICENSE TYPE 42 (ON-SALE BEER & WINE) FOR THE DECK AT 1272 THE STRAND - 26-CDD-021

This item has attachments.

CEQA: Determine that the project is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to Section 15061(b)(3) of the CEQA Guidelines. (Community Development Director Alison Becker)

Recommended Action:

Staff recommends City Council:

1- Find that the action is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to Section 15061(b)(3) of the CEQA Guidelines;

2- Determine that the issuance of a liquor license at The Deck, located at 1272 The Strand, will serve Public Convenience or Necessity and would not tend to create a law enforcement problem;

3- Grant the application for determination of Public Convenience or Necessity for the sale of alcoholic beverages, beer only, for on-sale consumption at The Deck, located at 1272 The Strand; and

4- Instruct City staff to transmit this determination to the California Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control as required findings under Business and Professions Code Section 23958.4.

- continue to next page -

**SUPPLEMENTAL testimony from Howard Lee
to the 02-24-2026, 6-PM HB City Council
Meeting's Consent Item 9.i.**

Honorable Council and others:

Now with all due respect to all concerned. How this 'ABC bar item' got on the Consent Calendar of this February 24, 2026 Council meeting, with zero involvement of the Planning Commission, is the BIG question? The item and process seems to be designed to actually hurt the business owner, and/or the property owner.

This item unquestionably is a complete and unadulterated sham, whether intentional, or just plain stupidly handled. Actually it appears to be some kind of GOOD-OLE-BOY 'railroad-job' to perhaps benefit this business owner, or the property owner, or both -- but in actuality to do the complete opposite? Who knows what's going on?

Pulling off this kind of scam in an election year especially is even dumber than dumb. There has been no public involvement in determining a public convenience and/or necessity for this business to again sell beer and wine and stay open until 2-AM that I've heard of.

And the police department statements regarding this and that (see attachments) supposedly agreed to by the business are all but meaningless given there's been no amendment to the CUP (Conditional Use Permit) specifying such agreement(s) in writing. The CUP, worse yet, is an ancient one dating back some 54 years to 1972 for beer and wine. If the ABC needs this letter from the City, that's fine, but it needs to be done correctly and honorably, not this filthy, rotten, sneaky, Good Ole Boy way by sneaking it through!

Have an agenda item in the Planning Commission to approve such letter to the ABC or have the P.C. make a recommendation for or against such letter to the City Council, who can then do whatever they damn well desire.

Is this now the way the bar district is going to be reinstated to 2 AM and with anything goes? Btw, the present business owner, whoever they are, could quickly sell the business to a sleaze operator once the ABC grants them their Type 42 license again.

In any event, please so state in your meeting, if such is now the Council's agenda, that the Council finds a need to reinstate the bar district to 2-AM with all the chaos and need for police foot patrols and more. I know nothing about how this got on the Council's Agenda as a Consent Item but something stinks to high heavens and it does not serve anyone on the present Council well to rubber-stamp this essentially railroad-job-item, and as if no one is going to notice. (please continue to next page)

Evidently there's perhaps a new filthy, rotten process of fast-track governance in the City of Hermosa Beach, maybe based on who's going to give a campaign donation? Sorry but that's what it appears to be?

***SUPPLEMENTAL testimony from Howard Lee
to the 02-24-2026, 6-PM HB City Council
Meeting's Consent Item 9.i.***

It's bad enough that Suja and company (Good Riddance) started placing all kinds of crap on the Consent Calendar (where seldom pulled for discussion) and now we get this from an essentially new Council/City Manager/Community Development Director group. It seems like a token nothing item, however it really is not. It's a damn right sneaky Item with all due respect, in my view. Pull it off the Consent Calendar and simply refer it to the Planning Commission for whatever review is appropriate. Sorry, but you're not helping the business owner by this Consent Item Good-Ole-Boy scam, imv.

Most Respectfully,

Howard Lee (Resident)

***SUPPLEMENTAL testimony from Howard Lee
to the 02-24-2026, 6-PM HB City Council
Meeting's Consent Item 9.i.***

This statement supports my public comment in which I will state I do not believe Councilmember Jackson should be elected Mayor Pro Tem due to an, in my mind, irreconcilable conflict between his duties and responsibilities to the residents and business and property owners of Hermosa Beach, and his duties and responsibilities as a member of the California Coastal Commission (CCC).

Several times, including at the 12/9/25 City Council meeting, Councilmember Jackson has basically threatened to weaponize his position on the CCC to the detriment of the residents, business owners and property owners of Hermosa Beach, the City he was elected to serve. See the below link for video of the 12/9/25 Council meeting.

<https://pub-hermosabeach.escribemeetings.com/Players/ISISStandAlonePlayer.aspx?Id=d55ec880-3f72-4c85-9d37-764bff16938a>

Councilmember Jackson's glaring hypocrisy related to the parking program is cited by a resident at time stamp 2:15:53 of the video. Councilmember Jackson's comments related to the residential parking program begins at time 2:24:38. In addition to his veiled threats, there are two glaring omissions/misstatements in his statements:

1. He references the new Manhattan Beach restricted parking zones with a limit of 3 passes per household. He fails to mention that Manhattan Beach restricted parking zones are established by a VOTE OF THE IMPACTED RESIDENTS who voluntarily agree to limit their own street parking. The zones are not imposed upon them, as were the restricted parking zones in Hermosa Beach.
2. In his threats against us related to the CCC and the changes in parking, he says the CCC consequences will be real and specific. He says the CCC disapproves NEW preferred parking programs. This is not a new program. This was approved by the CCC in 1984, with a revised permit issued in 2004. The changes approved by Council in the past year were simply to restore some sanity to the program, after then Councilmember Massey, with Councilmember Jackson's full support, created a straw man "problem" – where there was not a problem – and took a wrecking ball to the program.

I submitted a public records request and was told no data exists as to the number of residential parking passes issued in 2004, when the program was last reviewed by the Coastal Commission. I suspect, but apparently data does not exist to validate this suspicion, that there were no more, and probably fewer, residential permits issued in 2019, when the City Prepared its Parking Management Study, than in 2004, when the City last updated its CCC permit. At least in my area, new construction has de-densified the area as many formerly multi-family properties were existing non-conforming as to lot size and were required to convert to single family. I simply do not understand how Council decided it needed to gut the residential parking program without that data.

Back to Councilmember Jackson's actual conflict of interest. At the 12/12/25 CCC meeting, where he dressed as an elf and reported his attendance by saying "The Elf is on the Commission Shelf" (time stamp 0:32), "Commissioner" Jackson let pass on the consent calendar, without any comment, the Coastal Commission's new attack on our walk street property owners. See time stamp 43:28 of the meeting video, link below. To my knowledge, he has yet to state a public position on this issue which is extremely important to "Councilmember" Jackson's constituents.

https://cal-span.org/meeting/ccc_20251212/

Until council member Jackson makes perfectly clear that he understands his primary duty and loyalty lies to and with this City's residents, who elected him to office, and its business and property owners, I believe he should recuse himself from any agenda items, which would even remotely impact our relationship with the Coastal Commission. It would be difficult for him to run a meeting in the Mayor's absence if he has to recuse himself from such important matters.

CITY COUNCIL MEETING SCHEDULE FOR 2026
 (Regular Meeting Times: Closed Sessions at 5:00 PM and Open Sessions at 6:00 PM)

	January 5–7, 2026: CCCA Legislative Tour in Sacramento, CA
JANUARY 13, 2026	January 15, 2026: State of the City Address
JANUARY 27, 2026	January 21–23, 2026 (Sacramento): League of California Cities New Mayors & Council Members Academy
FEBRUARY 3, 2026	January 28–30, 2026: U.S. Conference of Mayors Winter Meeting in D.C.
FEBRUARY 24, 2026 (ELECTION OF MAYOR AND MAYOR PRO TEMPORE)	February 9-13, 2026: HBCSD Ski Week February 20-22, 2026: ICA Winter Seminar in Santa Barbara, CA
MARCH 10, 2026	
MARCH 24, 2026	Passover begins at sunset on April 1, 2026 and ends at nightfall on April 9, 2026 (No work permitted)
APRIL 14, 2026	April 6–10, 2026: HBCSD Spring Break
APRIL 28, 2026 FY 2026–2027 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM STUDY SESSION	CIP Study Session in place of Regular Meeting
MAY 12, 2026	May 7–8, 2026: SCAG Regional Conference and General Assembly in Palm Desert, CA
MAY 26, 2026	May 14–17, 2026 (Tentative Dates): CCCA Annual Municipal Seminar
THURSDAY, MAY 28, 2026 FY 2026–2027 BUDGET STUDY SESSION	
JUNE 9, 2026 (ADOPTION OF FISCAL YEAR 2026–2027 BUDGET)	June 4–7, 2026: U.S. Conference of Mayors Annual Meeting in Long Beach, CA
JUNE 23, 2026	June 12, 2026: HBCSD Summer Break Begins
NO MEETING JULY 14, 2026 (DARK)	July 9–12, 2026: ICA Summer Seminar
JULY 28, 2026	Summer Vacation Season

CITY COUNCIL MEETING SCHEDULE FOR 2026
 (Regular Meeting Times: Closed Sessions at 5:00 PM and Open Sessions at 6:00 PM)

NO MEETING AUGUST 11, 2026 (DARK)	← Summer Vacation Season
AUGUST 25, 2026	September 4–6, 2026 (Tentative Dates): CCCA Annual Fall Educational Summit
SEPTEMBER 8, 2026	Rosh Hashanah begins at sunset on September 11, 2026 and ends at nightfall on September 13, 2026 (No work permitted)
SEPTEMBER 22, 2026	Yom Kippur begins at sunset on September 20, 2026 and ends at nightfall on September 21, 2026 (No work permitted)
OCTOBER 13, 2026	September 23–25, 2026: League of California Cities Annual Conference at Anaheim Convention Center
OCTOBER 27, 2026	
NOVEMBER 10, 2026	← November 3, 2026: General Election (Three City Council Seats)
	← November 11, 2026: Veteran's Day Holiday
NO MEETING NOVEMBER 24, 2026 (DARK)	← Thanksgiving Week
THURSDAY, DECEMBER 3, 2026 CERTIFICATON OF NOVEMBER 2026 ELECTION, INSTALLATION OF NEW OFFICERS, AND ELECTION OF MAYOR AND MAYOR PRO TEMPORE	
DECEMBER 8, 2026	← Chanukah begins sunset of December 4, 2026 and ends nightfall of December 12, 2026 (work permitted, except Shabbat – Friday evening to Saturday evening)
NO MEETING DECEMBER 22, 2026 (DARK)	← Winter Holiday Season