



A

City of Huntington Beach, Charter Amendment Measure No. 1

Shall proposed Charter Amendment No. 1, which provides that commencing in 2026, for all municipal elections, the City: may require Voter Identification for elections; provide more in-person voting locations; and monitor ballot drop-boxes, be approved?

What your vote means

YES

A “yes” vote on this measure would add new Section 705 to the Charter, and add the conflict resolution language to current Section 702.

NO

A “no” vote on this measure would not add new Section 705, and leave Section 702 in place as it currently exists.

For and against

FOR

Tony Strickland
Mayor

Gracey Van Der Mark
Mayor Pro Tem

AGAINST

Dan Kalmick
Councilmember

Natalie Moser
Councilmember

Rhonda Bolton
Councilmember

 Ballot Measures-AFull Text of Measure A
City of Huntington BeachEXHIBIT A
CHARTER AMENDMENT MEASURES
PROPOSED ADDITIONS SHOWN AS UNDERLINED
PROPOSED DELETIONS SHOWN AS ~~STRIKETHROUGH~~

Charter Amendment Measure No. 1

Section 702. PROCEDURE FOR HOLDING ELECTIONS.

All elections shall be held in accordance with the provisions of the Elections Code of the State of California, as the same now exists or hereafter may be amended, for the holding of municipal elections, so far as the same are not in conflict with this Charter. In the event of such conflict, the provisions of this Charter shall control and prevail, in accordance with Section 103 of this Charter.

Section 705. SPECIAL PROVISIONS RELATING TO MUNICIPAL ELECTIONS

As in Section 300, the City Charter shall determine the term of the City's elective officers, the length of term, and the election cycle in which the election for those offices occur for the City's elective officers.

(a) Beginning in 2026, for all municipal elections:

- (1) "Elector" means a person who is a United States citizen 18 years of age or older, and a resident of the City on or before the day of an election.
- (2) The City may verify the eligibility of Electors by voter identification.
- (3) The City may provide at least 20 Americans with Disabilities Act compliant voting locations for in-person voting dispersed evenly throughout the City, in addition to any City facility voting locations.
- (4) The City may monitor ballot drop boxes located within the City for compliance with all applicable laws.

Impartial Analysis
City of Huntington Beach
Measure A

CITY ATTORNEY'S IMPARTIAL ANALYSIS OF MEASURE 1

This proposed Charter amendment, if adopted, would amend the Charter related to City elections. Huntington Beach is a Charter City which is authorized by the State Constitution to determine how it conducts City elections. The Charter currently provides that all elections shall be held in accordance with the provisions of the California Elections Code, so far as they do not conflict with the Charter.

This ballot measure proposes to amend Section 702 of the Charter to provide that in the event of a conflict between the Elections Code and the Charter, the provisions of the Charter shall control and prevail. This ballot measure also proposes to add new Section 705 to the Charter, which would: reaffirm the Charter's authority over the term of the City's elective officers, their length of term and their election cycle; and beginning in 2026, define the qualifications of an Elector in a City election as a United States citizen at least 18 years of age, and a resident of the City on or before the day of an election.

This ballot measure would also authorize, but not require, the City to: verify the eligibility of Electors by voter identification; provide at least 20 ADA compliant voting locations for in-person voting dispersed throughout the City, in addition to any City facility voting locations; and monitor ballot drop boxes located within the City for compliance with all applicable laws.

The adoption of this Measure may result in additional, currently undetermined costs to the City, because the City does not currently perform the described election activities; if the Measure is adopted, and the City chooses to implement the described election activities, it will increase the City's election related costs in an amount that cannot be precisely determined at this time.

A "yes" vote on this measure would add new Section 705 to the Charter, and add the conflict resolution language to current Section 702. A "no" vote on this measure would not add new Section 705, and leave Section 702 in place as it currently exists.

This Measure was placed on the ballot by the City Council.



Ballot Measures-A

Argument in Favor of Measure A

Huntington Beach voters deserve the right to know that our elections are secure. It is crucial for our democracy that voters have faith in our election results. That trust in the outcome of elections comes into question when we can't always be certain who is voting.

California's Constitution gives Charter Cities like Huntington Beach the power to govern how local elections are conducted. Some cities, like San Francisco, have used that power to let illegal immigrants cast ballots. And now those extreme policies have been spreading and are being pushed as close as Santa Ana.

This Charter Amendment Measure would permanently protect the election process in Huntington Beach by requiring three things. It would require voters to provide any government issued photo identification, it adds more handicapped accessible polling locations throughout the City so everyone has a polling place nearby, and it requires monitoring of all ballot drop boxes up through Election Day.

Enshrining these simple steps into our City Charter would forever protect Huntington Beach's elections. There are no excuses for failing to protect our votes.

Please, vote YES on Charter Amendment Measure 1.

s/ Tony Strickland
Mayor

s/ Gracey Van Der Mark
Mayor Pro Tem

Rebuttal to Argument in Favor of Measure A

Our elections are ALREADY SECURE, overseen by the award-winning, ISO-certified Orange County Registrar of Voters. Measure 1 misleads voters, threatening this security by potentially forcing Huntington Beach to conduct its own elections, a task for which the city is **UNPREPARED** and **LACKS INFRASTRUCTURE**. This could cost millions, an unnecessary financial burden.

Claims that this measure requires government-issued photo identification are **MISLEADING**; this requirement is absent from the amendment. Federal law already requires accessibility at all polling places for those with disabilities, making additional ADA-compliant locations **REDUNDANT**. The proposed monitoring of ballot drop boxes is a form of **VOTER INTIMIDATION**, creating fear and uncertainty. These items are all subject to challenge under state and federal law. Again, more of our money flowing out of the city, spent on needless court costs.

The argument that San Francisco allows non-citizens to vote in municipal elections is **FACTUALLY INCORRECT**. Non-citizens are only permitted in school board elections. This misrepresentation reveals the true intent of Measure 1: rooted in **FEAR** and **DIVISIVENESS**, not in enhancing election security.

Using the term "illegal immigrant" is outdated and indicative of the measure's intent—to sow division. Our current election system is secure, efficient, and cost-effective. There is **NO EVIDENCE** of voter fraud in Huntington Beach that justifies such a drastic, costly, and risky overhaul.

For our city's stability, fiscal responsibility, and the integrity of our elections, **VOTE NO** on Measure 1.

s/ Dan Kalmick
City Council Member

s/ Natalie Moser
City Council Member

s/ Rhonda Bolton
City Council Member



Ballot Measures-A

Argument Against Measure A

Rebuttal to Argument Against Measure A

VOTE NO on Measure 1. Here are the issues every citizen should understand before casting their vote:

COSTLY and RISKY: Our city is UNPREPARED for this shift. The Orange County Registrar of Voters implied Huntington Beach may have to manage its OWN separate elections. With NO prior experience, this could become a logistical NIGHTMARE.

LEGAL CONCERNS: California's Attorney General and Secretary of State have ALERTED Huntington Beach that this measure could be UNLAWFUL. This uncertainty poses legal and financial RISKS for our city.

UNCERTAIN COSTS: With the rush to put this on the ballot, very little financial analysis was completed. The financial implications remain UNKNOWN. The potential for costs running into the MILLIONS looms large. Is a move away from our current RELIABLE and economical system worth this?

AMBIGUOUS TERMS: The term "voter identification" is GLARINGLY undefined in this measure. Such vagueness is a DANGEROUS precedent and could COMPROMISE our citizens' constitutional right to vote.

POLITICAL MANEUVERING: Mayor Tony Strickland's recent arrival and quick push for this change raises eyebrows. Is this truly for the betterment of Huntington Beach, or a POLITICAL PLAY?

WHY FIX WHAT ISN'T BROKEN?: There has been NO evidence of voter fraud presented to justify this drastic shift. Our current system is SECURE and PROVEN. Why fix what's NOT BROKEN?

WASTEFUL SPENDING: The Council Majority has already SPENT nearly \$500,000 just to place this measure on the ballot. Is it WORTH further uncertain costs?

For the sake of Huntington Beach's STABILITY and FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY, **VOTE NO on Measure 1.**

s/ Dan Kalmick
Councilmember

s/ Natalie Moser
Councilmember

s/ Rhonda Bolton
Councilmember

Opponents of ensuring safe and fair elections in Huntington Beach have exposed just how weak their arguments are. Instead of sticking to the facts, they've resorted to lies and attempts to mislead voters. It makes you wonder whose side they're on?

The truth is the Registrar of Voters has made NO such comments about the future of governing elections in Huntington Beach. Not a word on cost. Not a word on managing our own elections. Not a word, period.

The opponents of Voter ID are simply making this up, shamefully lying to Huntington Beach voters. The best they can do is cite that the Bay Area liberal Attorney General disagrees with us is in itself incredibly telling. Of course he disagrees; he's someone who has long advocated letting felons vote!

Instead of protecting our elections from potential fraud, would opponents rather we follow Bonta's lead and let felons vote in Huntington Beach?

Another way to tell that opponents have nothing is all the equivocation they display: "Implied," "may have to," "could become," "could be," "potential," "could compromise." These are all just ways of avoiding making any concrete arguments against Voter ID.

The truth is that voters in Huntington Beach deserve to know, without question, that their elections are secure. And that is what Measure 1 is about.

Please join Mayor Tony Strickland, Mayor Pro-Tem Gracey Van Der Mark, Councilmember Casey McKeon, Councilmember Pat Burns, and City Attorney Michael Gates in supporting Voter ID for Huntington Beach.

More information, please visit: www.yesonhbcharter.com

s/ Tony Strickland
Mayor

s/ Gracey Van Der Mark
Mayor Pro Tem