

**eComments Report for City Council Meeting Agenda of October 15, 2019**

Item	Name	E-mail	Street	Neighborhood	City	State	Zip	Comment	Received
13. (19-1033) Recommendation to request City Attorney to amend the Polystyrene Food Packaging ordinance in the Long Beach Municipal Code (Chapter 8.63) to remove the exemption for #6 plastic lids to encourage a transition to recyclable alternatives; include language that all straws be made available only upon request in any food establishment and that those straws must not be plastic or bio-plastic; and  Request City Manager to work with Public Works Environmental Services Bureau and other appropriate departments to align implementation of these amendments with Phase 3 of the Expanded Polystyrene Ordinance, on December 3, 2019.	Whitney Amaya	whitney.amaya@gmail.com						While it is important to shift away from products that are not truly recyclable or compostable, a concern in aligning the implementation of those amendments with Phase 3 on December 3, 2019, is the possible impact on small, "mom & pop," businesses. These small businesses should be able to have more time than larger businesses and access to resources to transition into alternatives due to higher costs they may incur. I also challenge City Council to take a more holistic approach on plastic pollution and transition away from fossil fuel extraction, as plastic is a fossil fuel based product, and from harmful waste management practices like landfilling and incinerating waste at SERRF, as they have negative health impacts to community residents. Burning plastic releases harmful air pollutants that harm the respiratory/reproductive system and can be cancer-causing, and leaves behind toxic ash sent to landfills that can leach into the soil and groundwater.	10/15/2019
26. (19-1047) Recommendation to adopt resolution in support of Los Angeles County's Amicus Brief urging the U.S. Supreme Court to take up a challenge to the 9th Circuit Court of Appeals decision in Martin v. City of Boise.	Christina Cervantes	christinamargaret@gmail.com						What if instead we showed care and concern for our most vulnerable residents by focusing on solutions that help them, such as supportive housing and affordable housing? I don't not support this erasure of the symptoms of our failure to care for each other.	10/15/2019
26. (19-1047) Recommendation to adopt resolution in support of Los Angeles County's Amicus Brief urging the U.S. Supreme Court to take up a challenge to the 9th Circuit Court of Appeals decision in Martin v. City of Boise.	Sandra Kroll	sdkroll10@gmail.com						I'm opposed to this, especially for two reasons. They are: It will create criminals out of people who are already burdened by poverty, bad luck, poor health, and other calamities. The money that would be spent on enforcement needs to be used to RELIEVE the homeless situation, not deepen it.	10/15/2019

**eComments Report for City Council Meeting Agenda of October 15, 2019**

<b>Item</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>E-mail</b>	<b>Street</b>	<b>Neighborhood</b>	<b>City</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>Zip</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Received</b>
26. (19-1047) Recommendation to adopt resolution in support of Los Angeles County's Amicus Brief urging the U.S. Supreme Court to take up a challenge to the 9th Circuit Court of Appeals decision in Martin v. City of Boise.	Jordan Riley	arceus2010@gmail.com						I urge the council to oppose this resolution. The 9th Circuit Court of Appeals correctly said it was against a person's civil rights to cite and ban someone from sleeping in public spaces. Siding with the Amicus Brief is a step in the wrong direction, and further stigmatizes homelessness. It is already challenging enough for our city to aid our transient population, and supporting this brief supports policies that make people experiencing homelessness less visible and more suspect to criminal punishment. Homelessness is not a crime, and we should not be treating our neighbors in this way.	10/15/2019
26. (19-1047) Recommendation to adopt resolution in support of Los Angeles County's Amicus Brief urging the U.S. Supreme Court to take up a challenge to the 9th Circuit Court of Appeals decision in Martin v. City of Boise.	Gretchen Swanson	gretchen.swanson3@gmail.com						Do not adopt this inhumane, ineffective and punitive measure. Considering this recommendation flies in face of the city's collective efforts with Homelessness Task Force, the related coalitions and the City's Health Department's expanding response efforts. Not until we have a living unit for every resident, not until we have broad-based easily accessed mental health services and not until we remove those that prey on our homeless residents should we consider any broad measure - and then only with humane values.	10/15/2019

eComments Report for City Council Meeting Agenda of October 15, 2019

Item	Name	E-mail	Street	Neighborhood	City	State	Zip	Comment	Received
<p>27. (19-1048) Recommendation to authorize City Manager, or designee, to execute all documents necessary for a Lease Agreement with MWN Community Hospital, a California limited liability company, for the operation and potential development of City-owned property, located at 1720 Termino Avenue, 1760 Termino Avenue, and 4111 East Wilton Street, including the provision of an acute care hospital, for a period of 45 years, with the option of two 10-year extensions;</p> <p>Amend the grant deed restriction to allow a for-profit health care organization to operate an acute care hospital, and allow for non-acute care health services upon the occurrence of certain conditions at the Subject Property; and</p> <p>Authorize City Manager to reimburse Tenant up to \$1,000,000 per year on an annual basis for the first five years, and up to \$2,000,000 per year on an annual basis for years 6 through 15 of the Lease, to assist with seismic retrofit construction costs of the hospital facility. (District 4)</p>	Pat Lynch	p.a.lynch@earthlink.net						<p>Please do NOT approve the lease for the proposed Community Hospital. 1. Tenant "expressly" makes no representation it can open or operate an acute care center. 2. City staff clearly warn that the lease terms provide an incentive for Tenant to terminate the lease at any time, &amp; this is the MOST likely scenario. 3. Substantial obstacles remain to opening &amp; running such a costly facility. 4. It's highly unlikely Tenant will be able to hire the staff and purchase the equipment required by the State in the next two weeks before the inspection, which means the facility won't be approved &amp; Tenant is free to do with the property as it wishes. 5. Termination of the lease, which is permissible upon signing a lease, is likely to result in the City's selling the property to a for-profit organization, which is under no obligation to open &amp; run an acute care facility. The lease terms, which heavily favor NOT opening this critically needed facility, raise multiple red flags.</p>	10/15/2019