

LARA WEISIGER

From: Jill Keimach
Sent: Sunday, December 18, 2016 10:39 PM
To: LARA WEISIGER
Subject: FW: How is the city of Alameda responding to the surge of hate?
Attachments: City-safe_City_Alameda.docx

FYI

From: Trish Spencer
Sent: Tuesday, December 13, 2016 11:58 AM
To: Jill Keimach <JKeimach@alamedaca.gov>; Janet Kern <JKern@alamedacityattorney.org>; Jim Franz <jfranz@alamedaca.gov>
Subject: Fwd: How is the city of Alameda responding to the surge of hate?

FYI

Sent from my Verizon Wireless 4G LTE smartphone

----- Original message -----

From: Moni <moni@sonic.net>
Date: 12/13/2016 11:27 AM (GMT-08:00)
To: Trish Spencer <TSpencer@alamedaca.gov>
Subject: How is the city of Alameda responding to the surge of hate?

Dear **Mayor Spencer and Members of Alameda City Council:**

There has been a surge of [post-election hate incidents](#) in the Bay Area and beyond. Many of our neighbors are deeply concerned about threats to the civil liberties of **Alameda** residents.

As you know, **nearly half** of **Alameda residents** are people of color and about **a quarter** of the city is foreign-born. It is more important than ever to affirm the safety of all **Alameda** residents.

Please see attached letter discussing how we can work together to make Alameda safer for everyone.

Sincerely,

Monisha Gangopadhyay on behalf of 5 Bay Area organizations:

- Alliance of South Asians Taking Action (ASATA)
- Asian Americans for Civil Rights and Equality (AACRE)
- API Equality — Northern California
- Chinese for Affirmative Action (CAA)
- Chinese Progressive Association (CPA)

Dear **Mayor Spencer and Members of Alameda City Council:**

There has been a surge of [post-election hate incidents](#) in the Bay Area and beyond, and many of our neighbors are deeply concerned about threats to the civil liberties of **Alameda** residents.

We're writing on behalf of 5 Bay Area Asian American organizations (the Alliance of South Asians Taking Action, Asian Americans for Civil Rights and Equality, API Equality, Chinese for Affirmative Action, and Chinese Progressive Association). Hate incidents are all over the news: a hate crime murder of a Black man in El Sobrante, a letter to a San Jose mosque threatening genocide, and racist graffiti in San Ramon, Danville, and *Alameda*. Several of our members and their friends have personally experienced post-election hate, like a Sikh student who went for a walk on Thanksgiving with her mom, only to have a man yell racial epithets and throw a bottle at her mom's head.

As you know, **nearly half of Alameda residents** are people of color and about **quarter** of the city is foreign-born. It is more important than ever to affirm the safety of all **Alameda** residents.

We want to know how cities have been responding to this crisis. Have you made statements or taken action against (a) hate incidents, (b) the threat of mass deportation, and/or (c) the threat of mass registration of Muslim Americans?

Bay Area cities of all sizes have started taking action—see the end of this email for a list.

We are encouraging every city to take action before January 20 — a date that might coincide with more hate incidents. Helpful steps can include:

- Passing a resolution and issuing a mayoral-police department co-statement committing to protect residents from hate incidents, religion-based registration, and mass deportation
- Providing or publicizing resources to report, track, and publish hate incidents
- Establishing and maintaining sanctuary city status

We would like to hear from you about how you have approached these issues. Are you free for a call this week? You can reply by email or call me at 510-735-6477. Over the next few weeks, we will be collecting this information from all Bay Area cities and compiling it to help our communities better understand how their cities are protecting them.

The wave of targeted hate incidents has left many of our community members worried, sometimes fearful of leaving the house, and unsure as to whether they can trust police or city services. You have the power to turn that around—and we would love to help you do that.

Monisha Gangopadhyay on behalf of:
Alliance of South Asians Taking Action (ASATA)
Asian Americans for Civil Rights and Equality (AACRE)
API Equality — Northern California
Chinese for Affirmative Action (CAA)
Chinese Progressive Association (CPA)

P.S. Here are examples of what other Bay Area cities/counties have already done to stand up for their residents:

- San Francisco: a firm stance from the [Board of Supervisors](#)
- San Jose: [mayor tells residents "we've got your back"](#)
- Alameda County: [DA establishes new hate crime hotline in response to big spike](#)
- Santa Clara County: [planning to expand legal aid to help residents fight deportation](#)
- Oakland: [resolution in progress, defending residents targeted by race or religion](#)
- Berkeley: [resolution defending all residents just passed](#)
- Richmond: [mayor vows to protect immigrants](#)
- Alameda: held a Human Relations Board meeting Nov 29 to coordinate responses
- Fremont: city officials publicly condemn hate attacks
- Santa Clara: [resolution against hate incidents, and affirming all residents](#)
- Union City: council members developing a statement
- Fremont: working on a resolution
- Redwood City: police department will use all resources to address hate incidents

LARA WEISIGER

From: Trish Spencer
Sent: Friday, December 16, 2016 11:40 AM
To: LARA WEISIGER; Janet Kern; Jill Keimach
Subject: Fwd: Sanctuary City Proposal

Sent from my Verizon Wireless 4G LTE smartphone

----- Original message -----

From: Owen Bottler <owenbottler@hotmail.com>
Date: 12/16/2016 11:08 AM (GMT-08:00)
To: Trish Spencer <TSpencer@alamedaca.gov>, Frank Matarrese <FMatarrese@alamedaca.gov>, Tony Daysog <TDaysog@alamedaca.gov>, Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft <MEzzyAshcraft@alamedaca.gov>, Jim Oddie <JOddie@alamedaca.gov>
Cc: Janet Kern <JKern@alamedacityattorney.org>, City Manager <MANAGER@alamedaca.gov>
Subject: Sanctuary City Proposal

Dear City Mothers and Fathers:

Here we go again catering to Special Interest Groups. This time ILLEGAL IMMIGRANTS. What part of illegal doesn't the City Council understand. Maybe the City Attorney can define the term in a way that will get you past the emotions of the moment.

I do believe the Constitution of the United States reserves the right and authority for citizenship and the conduct of foreign policy to the Federal Government, and not the City Council of the City of Alameda, or did we pass a Constitutional Amendment that I missed granting those powers to the City. I find it interesting where the City Council by virtue of passing an Ordinance can pick and choose which overriding laws it wishes to follow or ignore. Does that mean I can pass an ordinance and pick and choose which city, county, state or federal laws I will follow or not follow. I do not think so. I would be subject to whatever sanctions, fines or other penalty required by law.

It is time for the City Council, the City Manager, and City Staff to manage the city within the constraints of the City Charter, along with the laws, and regulations of higher authorities and manage the City's business and represent itself as a law biding entity. The way to change to laws you don't like is to work with the responsible parties not to take it upon yourself to change a law over which you have no authority. Change is slow, particularly in this area, but there is a right way and a wrong way, and yours is clearly a violation of the Constitution and Federal Law. It is time to return to a Nation of Laws and away from being a Nation of Political Correctness. I ma sorry if we offend someone because their agenda falls in the area of illegal activity. There is a right way and wrong way to immigrate to this country. Sanctuary City Status clouds the issue and says it is alright to break the law.

There was an interesting article in the December 1, 2016 issue of Rolling Stone Magazine. The article was a recap and Monday Morning Quarterback assessment of the recent election. It is titled "Trump's Payback". It should be required reading of all who represent the people or try to influence the people. I believe it addresses not just why President-Elect Trump won the Electoral College vote, but further addresses separation of understanding between the politicians, experts and special interests against the everyday voter. To paraphrase George Bernard Shaw - Politicians and voters are two entities separated by a common language.

Who pays for the needs of the illegal protected by this type of proposal. The taxpayer. We have enough unfilled needs and demands on city services not to draw on our limited resources to support a proposal which is by far outside any authority of the City Charter and therefore the City Council. We have potholes and streets that need resurfacing, we have Alameda Point which we are allowing to rot, we have unfunded pension issues, we have educational needs which are unresolved. The list goes on. So if you are looking for something to work on, please concentrate on those issues and problems where you can make a difference and leave those outside of your purview and authorities to those who are responsible for their resolution.

Time to understand the limitations of your office and authorities and stop overreaching into areas of responsibility reserved by law to a higher level of government, and being reserved to that level for a good reason. We can not have thousands of different versions of laws on issues which effect the nation as a whole.

Respectfully,

Owen D. Bottler Jr.
3247 Thompson Ave.
Alameda, CA 94501-1729
Phone: 510-522-0199
Email: owenbottler@hotmail.com

LARA WEISIGER

From: Trish Spencer
Sent: Thursday, December 15, 2016 6:17 PM
To: LARA WEISIGER; Janet Kern; Jill Keimach
Subject: Fwd: Sanctuary City

Sent from my Verizon Wireless 4G LTE smartphone

----- Original message -----

From: Frank Contreras <fcon@pacbell.net>
Date: 12/15/2016 1:16 PM (GMT-08:00)
To: Trish Spencer <TSpencer@alamedaca.gov>
Subject: Sanctuary City

From: Frank Contreras
1309 Pearl Street
Alameda CA 94501
510-521-0847
fcon@pacbell.net

To: Mayor Trish Spencer
Alameda CA

Dear Mayor:

I'm a lifelong Alameda resident that opposes any proposal that would make Alameda a sanctuary city.

As we know the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) is waiting for funding to build an outpatient clinic at Alameda Point that will offer health care for at least 9,000 local veterans, and National Cemetery for our veterans. Jim's proposal if brought forward and passed could kill it's the funding.

I'm a Vietnam veteran belonging to American Legion post 647 here in the in the City. I have lost many friends, playmates, classmates and crosstown rivals to that war. I also worked at the Naval Aviation Depot from 1968 thru 1996 with thousands of active, retired, and veterans from WWII, Korean, and Vietnam wars. I have friends and family maimed in wars, living with post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) and others that have died or are living with illness's acquired serving this Nation. They need this Clinic, Now!

I ask you now to persuade Jim Oddie not bring his proposal forward and if he does reject it.

I am looking forward to your response.

Sincerely,
Frank Contreras

LARA WEISIGER

From: Trish Spencer
Sent: Wednesday, December 14, 2016 3:22 AM
To: LARA WEISIGER; Jill Keimach; Janet Kern
Subject: Fwd: Agenda Item 9-B, City Council Meeting 12/20/2016

Sent from my Verizon Wireless 4G LTE smartphone

----- Original message -----

From: Dan Westerlin <danwesterlin@comcast.net>
Date: 12/09/2016 7:44 AM (GMT-08:00)
To: Trish Spencer <TSpencer@alamedaca.gov>
Cc: Kathy Haenftling <haenftling@comcast.net>
Subject: Agenda Item 9-B, City Council Meeting 12/20/2016

December 9, 2016

Hon. Trish Herrera Spencer
Mayor, City of Alameda, CA

Dear Mayor Spencer.

I fully support the City Council's proposal to direct staff to analyze the "potential and realistic financial impacts of declaring Alameda a sanctuary city", as listed under Item 9-B on the Agenda for the meeting of December 20, 2016. It is appropriate to fully vet and understand any such proposal. However, staff should also investigate and subsequently report on both the significant legal and environmental impacts at the same time.

Legally, if the City of Alameda formally declares it will not enforce Federal Law, what civil and criminal ramifications are anticipated? Would the City, its elected officials and staff potentially be subject to civil litigation or criminal prosecution? One local and obvious example is the recent murder of Kate Steinle by Francisco Sanchez, an illegal immigrant who had been deported five times, and yet was released by the City of San Francisco to subsequently commit this heinous crime. Would the City of Alameda also facilitate the release of criminals into our community and fully accept culpability for such actions?

Environmentally, serious and significant impacts can be foreseen and must also be fully investigated and ultimately mitigated. The City should not and cannot adopt a Negative Declaration

and proceed to creating policy without appropriate study. Certainly without any such analysis the City's action would be challenged under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

Most importantly, the adoption of any policy regarding a "sanctuary city" will have immense implications for each and every one of the nearly 80,000 residents and voters of Alameda, and all deserve a voice in this important issue. I urge the Council to give Alameda that voice by letting our Citizens vote on this policy rather than having the Council take action.

This discussion has been on-going for decades, and yet now proponents are demanding swift and immediate action? Public discussion has so far been limited to one hastily called and little publicized meeting of the SSHRB, and a Council meeting preceding a major Holiday? That is not how Democracy should work. Certainly, directing staff to investigate and report is a positive step forward, but no policy should be adopted until all of us in Alameda have our say in the voting booth.

This important decision should not solely be within the purview of the City Council alone. If the policy's proponents believe strongly in their cause, let them go through the process of placing the matter on the ballot for consideration by all Alameda voters rather than our elected officials. Let them convince their fellow citizens of the appropriate course, rather than to demand immediate action. Let Alameda have a voice.

Alternatively, if a majority of the Council believes the City should act, let them place the issue on the ballot, but do not take away the people's decision.

If the Council chooses to move forward from investigation to policy without a vote by its citizens, they will have taken away that choice and stolen that vote.

If Alameda voters decide to take no action, then so be it. However, if we as a unified City determine to resolve to become a "sanctuary city", then the proponents of this issue will have a powerful tool. Until then, please, do not strip away the people's choice by enacting policy on this important issue. Let the people decide.

Dan Westerlin