

**From:** [Arianna Huhn](#)  
**To:** [Public Comment](#)  
**Subject:** public comment for city council meeting 6/14/2021 - item #17  
**Date:** Monday, June 14, 2021 2:03:31 PM

---

[sorry; I just sent this, but with the wrong agenda # -- it should be 17, not 11]

----- Forwarded message -----

**From:** Arianna Huhn [REDACTED]  
**Date:** Mon, Jun 14, 2021 at 2:01 PM  
**Subject:** public comment for city council meeting 6/14/2021 - item #11  
**To:** <[publiccomment@yucaipa.org](mailto:publiccomment@yucaipa.org)>

To whom it may concern:

I am writing this message as a public comment regarding the agenda for today's city council meeting (Monday, June 14th, 2021). My comments are regarding agenda # 17, a stipend for the members of the Mobile Home Rent Review Commission.

I do not wish to take a position on this issue. However, I would like to raise questions that should be answered before a decision is made, and point out errors in the information provided in the agenda packet. Thus, the point of this public comment is simply that the issue requires additional attention before a decision is made for due diligence in evaluating the policy change. There are four areas in which information provided in the agenda packet is either insufficient or faulty:

First, using a \$35 per meeting stipend in two cities - Carson and Oceanside - to justify a \$75 stipend in Yucaipa seems out of proportion, and the discrepancy is left unexplained.

Second, the two cities cited in the agenda packet that have stipends for committee members also have vacancies on their committees. This does not support the logic that a stipend will help to ensure that the positions are filled. The agenda packet makes clear that "The goal of implementing a stipend, is to provide somewhat of an incentive to encourage citizens to serve on the MRRC."

Third, what makes a person "qualified" to serve on the Mobilehome Rent Review committee is left unstated. This should be reviewed and qualified before any stipend policy is considered or set, given the language in the agenda packet that the stipend is intended to help to find, fill, and maintain the five positions "with qualified candidates that could understand the complexity of the documents associated with the special rent adjustment applications."

Fourth, the information provided in the packet is misleading. Please consider that:  
- Carson, CA does indeed provide a per meeting stipend of \$35 - \$50 for its commissions. However, it does as much for *all* of its commissions (with one exception) This means that their Environmental Commission, their Human Relations Commission, their Parks, Recreation and Cultural Arts Commission, their Public Relations Commission, their Public Safety Commission, their Public Works Commission, their Senior Citizens Advisory Commission, their Veterans Affairs Commission, their Women's Issues Commission, and their Youth Commission members *all receive a stipend*. Likewise, members of their 3 committees

(Measure C and Measure K Budget Oversight Committee; Mobilehome Park Rental Review Board, and Relocation Appeals Board) also receive a stipend, which is \$50 per meeting and a maximum of \$200 per month, according to their website

(<https://ci.carson.ca.us/government/CCBoard.aspx>). This means both that: a) the stipend is erroneously reported at \$35 per meeting in the agenda packet; and b) there is no justification provided as to why it should only be the Mobilehome Rent Review Commission that receives a stipend, and not members of other city commissions and committees, as no example(s) of this sort of system was provided.

- The city of Oceanside is reported in the agenda packet as also providing a stipend for commission members. However, their website does not indicate that this is the case. A phone call to their City Clerk's office confirmed that they do *not* offer a stipend for any committees or commissions. This means that the City of Yucaipa was able to identify only one other city that provides its commission members a stipend. This does not seem like reasonable evidence of best practices.

**Please redact my name from this comment for distribution to council member and for the public record.** This is for personal reasons. I understand that my name may be released along with this comment if requested through FOIA.

Thank you, and have a great day. Arianna