

From: [Shelby S](#)
To: [City Clerk](#); [Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft](#); [John Knox White](#); [Trish Spencer](#); [Tony Daysog](#); [Malia Vella](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Fwd: public comment on 22-1770 agenda item May 3, 2022
Date: Tuesday, May 3, 2022 6:00:39 PM
Attachments: [image.png](#)

Hi-

This correspondence below appears to be missing from the updated agenda. Please add to item 6A for tonights meeting. Thank you, Shelby
Thank you-Shelby Sheehan

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

From: **Shelby S** <sheehan.shelby@gmail.com>
Date: Thu, Apr 28, 2022 at 8:25 PM
Subject: public comment on 22-1770 agenda item May 3, 2022
To: <clerk@alamedaca.gov>

Hi there-

As a matter of record, it is my understanding that use of ARPA funds allocated for emergency housing projects (as defined by Federal Law) is restricted to projects that do NOT have to undergo a discretionary use review.

1. In relation to agenda item 22-1770, the project description includes a proposal for emergency housing as defined by federal law, and therefore would appear to be restricted to zoning areas where they are unconditionally permitted.
2. In an email to Mayor Ashcraft (11/26/2022), Curtis Thomes, Head of the Building Dept and the one responsible for project zoning reviews, specifically states that emergency housing must undergo the conditional use permit process.
(see image below)

Therefore, it appears the project is prohibited from ARPA funding. Please respond to this at the meeting on Tuesday. Thank you.

From: Andrew Thomas

Sent: Saturday, November 27, 2021 8:03 AM

To: Gerry Beaudin <gbeaudin@alamedaca.gov>

Cc: Nishant Joshi <njoshi@alamedaca.gov>; Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft <MEzzyAshcraft@alamedaca.gov>; Eric Levitt <elevitt@alamedaca.gov>; Lisa Maxwell <LMaxwell@alamedaca.gov>; Lois Butler <lbutler@alamedaca.gov>; Yibin Shen <yshen@alamedacityattorney.org>

Subject: Re: 11/24 meeting with Big Whites residents

Hi marilyn. In response to your four questions to me:

1. The Main Street Specific plan allows emergency shelters with a **conditional** use permit.

~~Not true. Building a new one is prohibited using a living area for a shelter.~~

3. Emergency shelters are allowed with use permit.

4. ~~The Big Whites Specific Plan allows for emergency housing in a secondary living area. It also allows for lower income households.~~

Andrew Thomas,
510-774-5361 (c)

--

Shelby
510-435-9263

--

Shelby
510-435-9263

From: [Alans Original](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Cc: [Tubbs Alan](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Item 6A May 3 2022. "direction for Staff RE emergency housing"
Date: Thursday, April 28, 2022 7:11:44 PM

To City Council:

By now, you realize that the action taken back in November of 2021 without the consent nor the informing of the families that live in this neighborhood was a colossal mistake, but not unexpected from your planning department and city government that has a long history of middle of the night deals, huge payouts for lawsuits, wrongful termination and termination of contracts, not to mention the \$millions of dollars paid out in consulting fees and studies to figure out what to do with NAS Alameda. I merely point you to two other military bases that closed as part of the same Base Re-alignment and closure act of 1993 that joined NAS Alameda in closing. McClellan AFB and Mather AFB became hugely successful post use facilities that have showcased how to close a base, how to reuse it, and how to redevelop it. Peter McCuen redeveloped Mather, and Larry Kelley redeveloped McClellan. The city and county address all of the issues that Alameda faces, including an incredibly difficult restoration of land contaminated with radioactive materials on McClellan. I even have a video tape somewhere that was used and filmed here at Alameda Point as the base was closing as a marketing piece that was touted in Sacramento on "how to redevelop a base"! And here we are.... It is unbelievable that this city council and your planning staff could even consider taking family homes that have been occupied for nearly 25 years and attempt to destroy a neighborhood just to grab some federal dollars.

As outlined in the in person meeting (listening session) and the online zoom meeting later, you found and hopefully took note that no one objected to placing a "Family" into a couple of the big whites, aka former military housing here on Alameda Point.

What you did hear is that there is 100% objecting by everyone to housing what you consider as a flop house for homeless individuals into homes that were made, designed, and used as FAMILY housing. Your pursuit of federal dollars at all costs just really shows you don't have a very good handle on how to straighten out the budget of Alameda, and rely on other dollars no matter what the social cost is to the residents here.

Now that you have attempted to ignore and change the original plan, that this city council approved years ago to "preserve" these homes as historical, and then go about and non-maintain them hoping they will fall down so you can redevelop 18 home sites into 200 or whatever the developers have promised you, is damn near criminal. You have by circumventing original approve plans elevated the mistrust that already exists between the residents you serve and the city council.

You do not need to make Alameda look like Emeryville or every other city around the bay. That's not why people live here.

Money would be better spent to take a small section across from the skate park and wall off the equivalent space needed as TEMPORARY housing until these people get on their feet and move on. I also notice that you have a growing transitory set of camps that are parking along the estuary. My time working hurricane Maria in Puerto Rico and Hurricane Harvey in Texas made me aware of a large group of "storm chasers" that move from disaster to disaster using up valuable resources, handouts and things at the expense of the local residents that were actually affected by the disaster. We (you) should not spend any of our tax dollars on any of this, as there are clearly a growing camp that are just people moving from one city to another, at the expense, as you said during the ZOOM call that "all of the homeless here in Alameda have a connection to Alameda" and that is patently not true. The mobile homeless are using up resources that were meant for Alamedan's affected by incredibly high housing prices, taxes and inflation.

Finally, stop turning Alameda Point into your personal dumping ground for what you don't want to see. The West End has become incredibly burdened with the majority of all of Alameda's problems and at the same time there are good projects that are coming into "portions" of Alameda point, all at risk of being destroyed and undervalued as you

continue to float terrible ideas such as this. You already have homeless trying to make the brand new park on Seaplane Lagoon unsafe and unuseable. If you haven't walked around out there at night, you really should try it some time.

I do not support the current plan that was proposed in November, nor ANY plan that moves anything other than ONE FAMILY into ONE HOME in these historical residences.

I have lived in one of these Historical Residences since July of 2004, of which I have paid approximately around \$600K to date, in Rent to the City of Alameda. You should focus on what is keeping this end of town afloat, not add more to weigh it down and destroy it.

Alan Tubbs
Alameda Point Resident

From: [Shelby S](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] revised --Fwd: RE City Council item 6-A2022-1770 6-B2022-1873 7 Recommendation to Provide Direction to City Staff on Emergency Supportive Housing for Three City-Owned Vacant Homes at Alameda Point. (Community Development 10061833) [Continued...]
Date: Sunday, April 24, 2022 10:43:12 PM

Revised to correct typo

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

From: **Shelby S** <sheehan.shelby@gmail.com>
Date: Sun, Apr 24, 2022 at 9:57 PM
Subject: RE City Council item 6-A2022-1770 6-B2022-1873 7 Recommendation to Provide Direction to City Staff on Emergency Supportive Housing for Three City-Owned Vacant Homes at Alameda Point. (Community Development 10061833) [Continued from April 19, 2022]
To: <clerk@alamedaca.gov>

To City Council:

RE" Item 6A May 3 2022. "direction for Staff RE emergency housing)

My main concern with this project proposed in the Historic District is that it is seriously misguided, and a catastrophic waste of money that could be better spent. To that end, I continue to wonder why the City is trying so hard to push this project. As designed, it will help very few people, and will not make a dent in the Main St encampment.

For example, by the City's own admission the project wont be ready for months, and the City has been doing nothing for the Main St encampment in the meantime or for the last six months.

Money would be better spent on implementing what the City has previously promised –which is to get as many people inside and as soon as possible--this project wont do anything to remedy the most urgent issues faced by those barely surviving outside, living on the side of the road in tents, cars and shacks.

According to the Main St Campers themselves, they report that they need:

- IMMEDIATE hotel vouchers or other safe places to sleep, (which they were promised last November)
- safe overnight parking for people in cars and RVs (that could be easily located next to Village of Love)
- bathroom facilities (there isn't even one porta potty though they were also promised last November)
- regular and frequent garbage pick up,
- city funded equivalents of EBT cards and transit passes that don't require id,
- and most important in the long term: a navigation center that can assess and connect people with treatment and permanent housing.

Currently there is not even a semblance of a navigation center in Alameda. That is a problem.

In the last six months, after the City gave a lot of lip service about "Caring for the homeless" at last November's meeting, the Main St population has expanded, the filth has increased, the crime and safety issues have increased, and there still are no vouchers, no overnight parking, and essentially, they have been totally abandoned despite all the promises made back in November.

The most urgent population in need in Alameda is on Main Street, however, the proposed project will remedy nothing for the Main Street Campers.

Emergency housing and other services needed by this population requires a large enough space for a full-service and well-funded navigation center in a centrally-located commercial district **where** it is compatible with the current zoning. More importantly, the emergency services project should be in a commercial building with:

- 30-bed minimum overnight bed space
- enough rooms for counseling of individuals and large groups,
- large kitchen and meal capacity
- regulation separate bathrooms and shower areas by gender

- a large entrance with reception area
- storage room for files, bedding, donations, and other materials etc
- disabled access
- sufficient parking
- client proximity to jobs, stores, medical care, educational opportunities, social services, transit
- 24-hour security,
- on-site assessment, treatment, and counselors,
- safe overnight parking for vehicles and RVs

That is where City funds should be spent.

None of this could be achieved in a small, isolated, residential Historic district with aging homes that have restricted use per the Navy EDC. It is also important to recognize the proposed homes are NOT tax-payer funded “City facilities”, they are highly desirable revenue-generating assets that—but for the City purposely withholding them from the market (for up to a year)--- could be providing desperately needed housing to Alamedans during a time when there is a scarcity of available rentals in Alameda.

The good news is the City does in fact have “underutilized/vacant” tax-payer funded facilities that are much better suited for this purpose. These homes are not those.

As is, the proposed project appears still to face enormous legal and logistical challenges akin to the similar project presented a few months ago. However, the current agenda and attached materials do not contain sufficient information about the project and relies heavily on references to a so-called “Fact-sheet” that is not publicly-available and not provided for review. This is a serious omission of information.

Despite this, given the nature of the project activity and the site specific project area characteristics, the following feasibility issues are STILL applicable:

Point 1. CEQA and zoning issues

The scant details for this project are too vague still, and given the so-called fact sheet is not available for public review, it is impossible for the public to evaluate the veracity of the claims therein. I also see the agenda item claims this project is CEQA exempt, but there is nothing in the plan as presented that provides enough detail for a legal CEQA determination, and a preliminary review shows this project requires a conditional use permit as it is in fact an incompatible zoning use with this neighborhood.

In addition to a change in use, it is foreseeable the Project will increase traffic, it is proposed in a historic district, and it doesn’t comply with the Navy MOU use restrictions. All of these are CEQA-triggering issues.

Point 2. HUD and disabled access issues RE changes

The standard that these homes would need to pass HUD inspection for the proposed project is stricter than that of residential use. For example, the homes **will be** required to have disabled access, but Historic District restrictions (and other regulations) do not allow structural changes to architectural elements, and therefore widening doors for disabled access is prohibited, and therefore entrances, bedroom and bathroom doorway **changes are** not feasible. In addition, City staff has stated they will carpet the homes, but the wood floors are another “Character-defining” element and change is prohibited. Other planned changes have not been disclosed, but should be carefully reviewed by the Historic Advisory Committee as well as reviewed for cost estimates.

POINT 3 Saturation/fair share

There is also the issue of neighborhood saturation and nuisance -- these issues have been successfully challenged in court, blocking implementation of **such** projects.

Point 4. Use of city facilities

As stated above, these residential homes are not “underutilized and/or vacant city facilities that are tax payer funded”. They are revenue producing city assets that the city has withheld from the market for almost a year, foregoing the revenue they could be bringing in. These homes are always rented nearly immediately when available so it makes no fiscal sense to remove them for this purpose, and I would wonder about the legalities of **it for** this project as well.

Point 5. already scarce housing

Again, this project would take scarce affordable housing out of the inventory in a time when it is needed most.

It just makes no sense from any perspective.

Point 6. Alternatives/ Cost comparison

As for alternatives, you have many—none of which have undergone a comparative cost breakdown.

What about portables erected and contiguous with the Village of Love? Those are extremely cost effective and better suited for this purpose. Also, I believe the FEMA trailers are vacant and could be used. How about locating something at Lum elementary?

What about one of the airplane hangars on the Base?

I have seen no cost analysis for rehabbing vacant Navy buildings and I bet the Council hasn't either. How can we be assured that this project is the best cost effective choice? Since we haven't seen any analysis, I seriously doubt this proposed project is the best option, even if it could pass legal muster.

From a legal perspective, Mr Shen should take a close look at this proposed project, and in my in my opinion, The city council would be well-advised by Mr Shen not to touch this project with a ten foot pole.

Please consider these issues when directing staff how to proceed.

Regards,

Shelby Sheehan

--

Shelby
510-435-9263

--

Shelby
510-435-9263

From: [Mike Friedrich](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Council agenda item 7-D, April 19
Date: Saturday, April 16, 2022 11:33:28 AM

April 16, 2022

To: Alameda City Council

Re: Item 7-D (2022-1770) of April 19 City Council agenda

My name is Rev Mike Friedrich. I serve as a Deacon at Twin Towers United Methodist Church, 1411 Oak Street, Alameda. More specifically, I serve on the Twin Towers “Care, Share and Serve” committee, which works to assist families and singles in need of housing in Alameda as well as other community healing projects. In this work we have come to support the local agency Village of Love.

We believe Village of Love would be a very good partner for the City of Alameda in providing emergency supportive housing and job training, based on the quality of services they have been providing homeless people in Alameda. We therefore urge you to direct City Staff to contract with Village of Love to provide its services to the three City-owned vacant homes at Alameda Point.

Thank you!

Mayor Ashcraft and Members of the Alameda City Council

I am writing to you in support of the interim housing program proposed for Alameda Point. As one of the homeless service providers working to end homelessness in the City of Alameda, we have worked diligently to establish a continuum of services that meet the needs of Alameda's homelessness. Having participated in the thoughtful and thorough process leading to adoption of Alameda's Homeless Strategic Plan, we agree that there is a need within that continuum for and value in providing low-barrier interim housing solutions (Strategy 2.2).

Village of Love has been an important partner in the effort to end homelessness since they began the Drop-in and designated parking program at Alameda Point. They have been effective in creating a supportive space where clients can access services and begin the journey from homelessness to housed. Interim housing will be an important step along the way.

For approximately four years DINE AND CONNECT, a group of volunteers from the different faith traditions/ religions here in Alameda have provided meals for those who are without homes. It has been our privilege to have served hundreds of guests delicious, warm meals weekly at 5 participating Churches. Most especially, we have seen each other as brothers and sisters here in the ONE community of Alameda. We are in support of those programs that provide basic human services for those in need, and who see each one as a unique human with gifts to offer us. We are in support of the interim housing program at Alameda Point.

I ask that you approve staff's recommendations to implement an interim housing program at Alameda Point using City owned housing.

**This letter is signed by Sister Pat Nagle on behalf
of the Dine and Connect Steering Committee and Volunteers for
Dine and Connect.**

From: [Cindy Houts](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Letter of Support for interim Housing Program
Date: Wednesday, March 30, 2022 4:08:20 PM

Dear Mayor Ashcraft and Members of the Alameda City Council,

I am writing to you in support of the interim housing program proposed for Alameda Point. As one of the homeless service providers working to end homelessness in the City of Alameda, we have worked diligently to establish a continuum of services that meet the needs of Alameda's homelessness. Having participated in the thoughtful and thorough process leading to adoption of Alameda's Homeless Strategic Plan, we agree that there is a need within that continuum for and value in providing low-barrier interim housing solutions (Strategy 2.2).

Village of Love has been an important partner in the effort to end homelessness since they began the Drop-in and designated parking program at Alameda Point. They have been effective in creating a supportive space where clients can access services and begin the journey from homelessness to housed. Interim housing will be an important step along the way.

The Alameda Food Bank has been an active partner in the city's efforts to end homelessness. We provide the food for the weekly Dine & Connect dinners, and act as their fiscal agent. We also provide food for the residents at the FEMA trailers and the hotel program, and snacks and supplies for the shower program at Christ Church. We also currently partner with Village of Love, providing snacks and water, and can commit to providing food for the interim housing project.

I ask that you approve staff's recommendations to implement an interim housing program at Alameda Point using City owned housing.

Regards,

Cindy Houts

Executive Director
Alameda Food Bank
P.O. Box 2167
Alameda, CA 94501

www.alamedafoodbank.org

cell: 510-388-4988

Feeding the Island Community since 1977

Eden I&R, Inc.

"linking people and resources"

570 B Street ☉ Hayward, CA 94541 ☉ 510-537-2710 ☉ FAX 510-537-0986



March 30, 2022

Mayor Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft
Vice Mayor Malia Vella
Councilmember Tony Daysog
Councilmember Trish Hererra Spencer
Councilmember John Knox White

Dear Mayor Ezzy Ashcraft and Members of the Alameda City Council,

I am writing in support of the interim housing program proposed for Alameda Point. As a critical agency providing information and resources to the unhoused, and a partner with other homeless service providers working to end homelessness in the City of Alameda, we are very supportive of those who have worked diligently to establish a continuum of services that meet the needs of Alameda's homelessness. Having participated in the thoughtful and thorough process leading to adoption of Alameda's Homeless Strategic Plan, we agree that there is a need within that continuum for and value in providing low-barrier interim housing solutions (Strategy 2.2).

Village of Love has been an important partner in the effort to end homelessness since they began the drop-in and designated parking program at Alameda Point. The organization has been effective in creating a supportive space where clients can access services and begin the journey from homelessness to housed. Interim housing will be an important step along the way. Eden I&R operates 211 Alameda County, the 24/7 multilingual information and referral system. 211, the countywide call center for Alameda County's Coordinated Entry System (CES), refers literally homeless city of Alameda callers to Village of Love for CES and other services.

I ask that you approve staff's recommendations to implement an interim housing program at Alameda Point using City-owned housing.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Alison DeJung".

Alison DeJung
Executive Director

From: [Sarah Henry](#)
To: [Annie Cox](#)
Cc: [Lois Butler](#); [Lisa Maxwell](#)
Subject: FW: [EXTERNAL] Fwd: Dignity Village - Parcel No. 074-1356-023-00
Date: Monday, March 21, 2022 2:36:03 PM

Hi Annie,

Please add this to the correspondence you have been collecting.

Many thanks,
Sarah

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

From: **Jeanette Younger** <jyounger07@gmail.com>
Date: Mon, Mar 21, 2022 at 12:51 PM
Subject: Dignity Village - Parcel No. 074-1356-023-00
To: <planning@alamedaca.gov>, <CITYCOUNCIL-List@alamedaca.gov>

Good Afternoon:

I am writing to you about the housing project recently approved for the parcel referenced in the above subject line for Dignity Village. I would like to preface my inquiry with my appreciation for the city's effort to provide assistance to the homeless individuals of Alameda. Over the past two years in particular when the situation significantly worsened due to the pandemic, I have observed the programs in action and I am thankful for the solutions the city has put forth.

As a resident of the West End, particularly Bayport, my home is close to nearly, if not all, the city-wide assistance provided to the unhoused. Being near to all of this assistance has never bothered me and I have been proud that Alameda provides the assistance that it does. However, being near these great resources does affect my family's daily life on a regular basis. I frequently observe unhoused individuals roaming at the base, yelling at cars, people, the sky, etc. when I drop my child off to preschool at Small Size Big Mind on PanAm Way. There are also individuals roaming around at Alameda Landing Shopping Center, again yelling at people, cars, etc on a regular basis. The bus stops near Alameda Landing routinely have clothing discarded and trash spread all around them. My next door neighbor had an unhoused male ring her doorbell and bang on her door with her two young children sleeping at 3am and sit on her porch for over an hour while she and her husband waited for APD to respond but never came.

While I am not by any means up to speed on all the projects happening in Alameda, I also understand with the next phase of the Base Renovation, there are plans to build yet another shelter for Women and Veterans at the corner of West Midway & Main Street. If this Dignity Village project is going to move forward, Bayport is practically surrounded by housing solutions for the unhoused. I understand that Alameda is an island community and there is only so much open land to develop; however, there is a considerable amount of land on Bay Farm that, to my knowledge, has never been tapped for such housing, and there are parcels of similar size to the land earmarked for Dignity Village on the East End.

As you can likely deduct, I am concerned about yet another housing resource for the unhoused to be built across the street from my community when residents of this area are already feeling the impacts not felt by other areas of the city due to the concentration of the housing surrounding Bayport. I am concerned that a housing project like Dignity Village will bring more crime, drugs, trash and unwanted encounters with unhinged individuals to my doorstep or daily walks around my neighborhood with my children.

I have several questions I'm hoping that either the city council or the planning department may be able to address:

1. Why are all of the city's housing resources concentrated in one area of our city (West End)? Is this the equitable thing to do?
2. Are there any studies from neighboring cities which you can share with me as to the effects on the immediately surrounding area when a housing facility, such as Dignity Village, is built?
3. Are there any plans to increase police surveillance/response time, trash pickup, etc. of this area once this facility opens?
4. Is there any opportunity to challenge the building of Dignity Village? If so, how?
5. Will there be any standards established as to who may utilize the housing at Dignity Village, or rules which must be abided by to continue residency there?

I appreciate your response to my questions and any additional insight you might be able to share about this housing project. I look forward to receiving your response.

Best,
Jeanette Younger
Mobile: 714-262-3449
Email: jyounger07@gmail.com

--

Jeanette Younger
Mobile: 714-262-3449
Email: jyounger07@gmail.com

From: [Marilyn Alwan](#)
To: [Annie Cox](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Community listening session
Date: Friday, March 18, 2022 2:14:35 PM

Hello,

I would like to suggest, as there is a scarcity of permanent housing, that the City rehab the remaining three Big White houses so that they can be rented to deserving families. Or perhaps be used for the families that complete their stay at the temporary houses.

I would like to suggest that admission/eligibility criteria for the transitional housing be formalized and made available to potential candidates and the public.

Thank you.

Marilyn Alwan

From: [GWYN JOHNSON](#)
To: [Annie Cox](#)
Cc: [Lisa Maxwell](#); [Lois Butler](#); [Sarah Henry](#); [GWYN JOHNSON](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Input for April City Council meeting regarding homeless shelters at Alameda Point
Date: Sunday, March 13, 2022 12:29:34 PM

Good afternoon Ms. Cox,

At the listening session this past week the issue of maintenance of the homes at Alameda Point was raised. The specific question was if the City will repair the many serious maintenance issues in these homes prior to using them as homeless shelters and, if not, why not? And, if the City intends to repair the existing large scale maintenance issues in these homes why are they not remediating the same maintenance issues in the homes currently occupied by tenants.

City staff instructed attendees to engage the property manager for all maintenance issues. However, the property manager has a limited budget authority to repair large scale issues and proposals are sent to the City for approval or disapproval. Many such proposals are currently pending with the City. In my house alone proposals are pending for:

The repair of a cracked foundation to the sunroom which results in the windows not closing completely making them unable to protect from the weather or provide property security,

Addressing the severely degraded windows in need of repair or replacement throughout the house which results in excessive condensation and moisture throughout the house, including mold growing on the window frames, and

A garage door that has not opened for several years due to complete degradation.

I am told that the property manager cannot authorize these repairs but has submitted proposals to the City and is waiting for approval/disapproval. Given that all of these homes were built in the same time period, it is likely that all of the homes have similar issues.

Additionally, a building inspector sent to my home by River Rock Property Group, identified more than 50 items in need of repair, many of which I, as a lay person and not a building inspector, would not have had familiarity with. He identified extensive dry rot, electrical outlets that are not properly grounded and thus not safe, outdated smoke/fire/carbon monoxide alarms and many other issues. The property manager indicates that remediating these issues amounts to 50-70 hours of work by four maintenance people. Again, the homes are all roughly the same age and likely have similar issues.

So, the response from City staff is fine for minor repairs, but the question remains about major repairs -- will the City undertake major repairs prior to housing formerly homeless individuals and, if not, why not? And, if the City is undertaking those

repairs to ensure the habitability of the homes for formerly homeless individuals why are they not addressing the same issues for current tenants?

I request that this question be submitted and responded to ahead of the April City Council meeting.

Gwyn Johnson