

**From:** [Jenice Anderson](#)  
**To:** [Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft](#); [Malia Vella](#); [City Clerk](#); [John Knox White](#); [Eric Levitt](#)  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Consent Calendar  
**Date:** Tuesday, May 3, 2022 5:06:24 PM

---

Dear Council,

I find it disturbing that after all of the discussion in 2020 about police accountability and transparency that this item would be on the consent calendar. When the police Reform Steering Committee was formed there was so much discourse, from you, about community engagement and making this a safer place for ALL Alamedans. Which I now understand to be absolute nonsense that you never intended to follow through on. Even the evening of Mario Gonzalez's one year Angelversary I got to hear praise for APD. Almost zero recognition from our "leadership" about the importance of the date or the homicide that was perpetrated by our police.

Approval of this item without genuine community input completely goes against all that you espoused in forming those committees. I don't recall a recommendation for APD to acquire things like a kinetic energy weapon, or a battering ram for the ERV. I see APD wants to maintain and acquire a certain amount of tear gas, for what? When was the last time tear gas was used in Alameda? The last time it was used on a National level was during the summer and fall of 2020. In cities like Portland it was used to such an extent against protesters that women are suffering reproductive issues and children still have respiratory problems.

I answered APD's survey honestly and without a filter. Because I absolutely do not think they need militarized weapons to keep this city safe.

I know this letter, like many I have written will go ignored. Because the rhetoric about being a safer place for ALL Alamedans was exactly that, non binding political rhetoric.

Sincerely,  
Jenice Anderson

**From:** [Jennifer Rakowski](#)  
**To:** [John Knox White](#); [Manager Manager](#); [Matthew McMullen](#); [Nishant Joshi](#); [Trish Spencer](#); [City Clerk](#); [Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft](#); [Malia Vella](#); [Tony Daysog](#)  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Military Equipment Use  
**Date:** Tuesday, May 3, 2022 4:13:33 PM

---

Dear City Council,

Item 5-D Recommendation to Accept Transmittal of the Police Department Military Equipment Use Policy, should be pulled from the consent calendar.

AB 481 recognized that the acquisition and deployment of military grade equipment across police departments adversely impacts the public's safety, increases the risk of civilian deaths, presents risks to civil liberties, and carries significant financial costs. The state found that "Decisions regarding whether and how military equipment is funded, acquired, or used should give strong consideration to the public welfare, safety, civil rights, and civil liberties and should be based on meaningful public input."

More than two weeks ago, I used the police department's feedback system and got a personalized response from Captain Matt McMullen. However, looking at the posted draft policy on the city council's website even the most basic non- controversial change to the boiler plate policy, listing Alameda City Council as the elected governing body has not been updated. I see neighboring cities make customizations to local needs including; City Council's holding workshops, discussing the issues over multiple meetings, and having publicly available policy and inventory lists with version control and viewable track changes.

**Recommended change: 707.1 Governing Body- Alameda City Council**

AB 481 direct local government to only approve a military equipment use policy if it determines that the military equipment;

- is necessary because there is no reasonable alternative.
- the policy safeguard's public welfare, safety, civil rights, and civil liberties.
- the purchase equipment is reasonably cost effective compared to available alternatives.
- Clear systems are in place to remedy any non-compliance with the policy.

This is a discussion worth having. These decisions should be made with strong local input.

I can understand why a neighboring city with a large land mass and few roads would invest

in a search and rescue drone, similar to why our department requires a swimming test. But it does not make sense to me that Alameda is buying equipment and justifying its acquisition as necessary to respond to the non-existent riots with our community.

**Recommended change: Remove authorization or further explore both need for and alternatives to munitions containing tear gas, Category 12.**

This policy impacts what equipment Alameda Police Department owns and uses but also what other enforcement agencies acting within our territorial jurisdiction can use. There are examples within our own county of cities making different choices of what to stockpile or spend valuable officer training time on. Let's be strategic, thoughtful, fiscally responsible, and have real meaningful debate. **Recommended change: 707.6 Other law enforcement agencies acting within the jurisdictional territory of Alameda will report into the city the incidents of use and purpose for each use of any authorized military equipment for inclusion in the city's annual report.**

The military equipment policy requires an annual report. **Recommended change: 707.7 The report should include;**

- **How often the equipment in any of the 15 categories was used,**
- **The purpose the equipment was used for each time of use, including training use.**
- **Any injuries to employees or the public related to equipment use.**
- **The perceived race/ gender of members of the public directly impacted by equipments use,**
- **The number and types of complaints received by the city either internally reported by an officer or externally reported by a member of the public.**
- **Use by community beat including map of incidents**
- **List of time APD equipment was used in cities outside of Alameda and the names of the cities**
- **List of incidents an outside enforcement agencies used military equipment in any of the 15 categories within the jurisdictional territory of the city of**

**Alameda.**

Thank you for your time and consideration,

Jennifer Rakowski

**From:** [Alexia Arocha](#)  
**To:** [Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft](#); [Tony Daysog](#); [John Knox White](#); [Trish Spencer](#); [Manager Manager](#); [Malia Vella](#)  
**Cc:** [City Clerk](#)  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Item 5-D  
**Date:** Tuesday, May 3, 2022 3:48:11 PM

---

Dear Mayor Ezzy-Ashcraft and All,

Hope this finds you well in these troubling times.

Re Item 5-D: I'm writing to ask that you remove this item from the consent calendar and that you **do not** approve Alameda Police Department's (APD) military equipment use policy due to cost, lack of need, and gross implications that come with approving the proposed policy.

First, as you are well aware, APD already receives almost 1/3 of the city's budget and yet they are constantly asking for more and more funding from the general fund. The BATT, which Council previously voted to get rid of and then APD directly ignored such a vote and kept anyway, had an initial cost of \$172,927.21 (taken from the general fund in 2013). ADP now wants to create (yet another) new position - "Military Equipment Coordinator" which would be entirely unnecessary if it weren't for all of the superfluous military equipment they currently have and continue to seek. Going down the list and seeing all these costs add up are baffling. We have serious local issues (eg- access to housing) that could greatly benefit and meanwhile the priority here seems to be criminalizing folks and preparing for a worst case scenario that will never come.

Second, as noted time and time again APD wants money from Alameda's general fund even though they take so much of the city's budget *but for what?* As has been shown before, their clearance rates for serious crimes are astronomically low (except for rape, likely due to the fact most victims of rape know their rapist). Why do they need all of this military equipment, for what articulable purpose? Just to serve and please their supportive base that continues to show up for them and meanwhile Black and Brown folks here live in fear; or don't come to Alameda at all, considering "Klanameda" is one of this island's nicknames. We know that the BATT was used in Oakland during the 2020 protests and in fact has almost always been used *outside* of Alameda - so how are we supposed to believe that this is not just as a backup for Oakland? Easy answer - we can't. Most of the equipment listed hasn't been used because there is no use for it here in Alameda. AB 481 directs local government to approve military equipment that is "necessary" with "no reasonable alternative" and such standard has not been met here.

Third, an incredibly disconcerting message is being sent to the community when APD is able to do whatever they want. They were told to get rid of the BATT, they didn't. They were going to have community meetings - they basically invited supporters, didn't spread notice widely, and didn't make it accessible (eg- was only in-person). Even now, their current survey regarding this policy is not widespread and was not conducted in a way that would have wide community input. The fact an email and name is required automatically eliminates many folks from wanting to give APD their honest opinions.

I am aware their proposed policy calls for "community engagement", but the community has been loud and clear for years, we do not need increased APD funding or militarized tactics here in Alameda. It is disappointing how easily swayed Council has been depending on what is popular - in 2020 it was respecting and advocating for Black and Brown lives and reducing

police involvement, but now in 2022 it appears to be appeasing fear mongering (mostly, if not all, white) locals and instead increasing possible police involvement. Please do not approve this and if you intend to, please wait until there can be legitimate community input.

Thank you for your time,

Alexia Arocha

**From:** [Marilyn Rothman](#)  
**To:** [City Clerk](#)  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] 5-D  
**Date:** Tuesday, May 3, 2022 3:26:25 PM

---

This item should be pulled from consent calendar.

Nothing has been done per AB481 to justify the shocking amount of military hardware APD already has, let alone to justify more. Past usage shows that the armored vehicle was only used 3 times in Alameda as of 2020. This is not a city given to riots where military equipment might be needed.

Why do we need to keep adding to Alameda's arsenal? It is expensive and useless.

Signed,

Marilyn Rothman

Alameda homeowner