

IRMA Glidden

From: Catherine Pauling <cjpauling@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 6, 2020 5:00 PM
To: LARA WEISIGER; Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft; John Knox White; Malia Vella; Jim Oddie; Tony Daysog
Subject: Letter for tonight's agenda attached
Attachments: AJA letter to City Council 5-6-20.docx

*** **CAUTION:** This email message is coming from a non-City email address. Do not click links or open attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact the Help Desk with any questions. ***

Dear Mayor and City Council Members,

Attached is our Alameda Justice Alliance letter asking you as the Mayor and City Councilmembers to postpone tonight's agenda.

Thank you for your consideration. We look forward to your response

Sincerely,

Catherine Pauling
on behalf of the Alameda Justice Alliance

Alameda Renters Coalition
Renewed HOPE
Alameda Firefighters
Alameda Labor Council
Alameda Progressives

Alameda Justice Alliance

To: City Clerk for

Date: May 6, 2020

Re: Agenda Comment for Tonight's Meeting May 6, 2020

Dear Madame Mayor and Council Members,

The last-minute decision to schedule two additional council meetings this week on various aspects of the city charter revision process troubles us deeply. We don't understand the rush to push forward these changes that have nothing to do with the immediate welfare of Alamedans who are facing lack of childcare for essential workers, unemployment, food and housing insecurity, and worries over family mental health and general well-being.

Furthermore, this is an unnecessary burden on city staff. For example, why is working on the new state program for helping local restaurants and seniors too burdensome for staff, but three meetings are directing work to city staff on recommended city charter language?

Given the small numbers of letters submitted to council, it is evident that online council meetings are not being attended by the usual numbers of the public. Your insistence on holding three meetings this week on charter amendments is exactly what the public fears in a time of crisis: government taking advantage of public distraction to force through major changes. Alamedans have the right to consider these detailed and important matters when they're calm and secure again.

We understand that the item on tonight's agenda involves recommending language concerning the relationship between elected council members and the city manager. If you must consider this item tonight, the Alameda Justice Alliance supports the language put forward by Councilmember John Knox White which is informed by existing ordinances in other cities.

As we stated previously, our network is ready and willing to roll up our sleeves and work with the council and city staff to put Alamedans back to work, support seniors and families in transition, re-open and support our small businesses and provide our students with the help they need.

Sincerely,

Catherine Pauling for
Alameda Justice Alliance including:
Alameda Renters Coalition
Alameda Firefighters
Alameda Progressives
Renewed HOPE Housing Advocates
Alameda Labor Council

IRMA Glidden

From: karenmillercrs@gmail.com
Sent: Wednesday, May 6, 2020 5:16 PM
To: LARA WEISIGER
Subject: tonights Council meeting Please read at todays meeting

*** **CAUTION:** This email message is coming from a non-City email address. Do not click links or open attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact the Help Desk with any questions. ***

Dear Mayor and Councilmembers,

I strongly object to the Council considering significant Charter changes during the Shelter in Place orders. I think these issues need to be discussed in open session with the public being able to weigh in. I realize you may be trying to make an election date deadline but matters of this importance should not be rushed through. I ask you to please reconsider your decision to go forward with these changes until the public is able to address you in person and not have a one sided conversation. We are all having to wait to get on with our lives and this matter is not so urgent that it can't wait as well. Thank you.

Regards,
Karen Miller

Regards,

Karen Miller CRS / Realtor®

DRE 01378335



WINDERMERE BAY AREA PROPERTIES ALAMEDA

1700 Park St Suite 220
Alameda CA 94501
CELL/TEXT 510 388-2501
OFFICE 510 865-1111

Working By Referral



windermere.com / [Windermere Foundation](#)

This email communication, its contents and attachments may contain confidential and/or legally privileged information which is solely for the use of the intended recipient(s), and the information contained herein shall not be forwarded, copied, printed, or otherwise used without the permission of the sender. Additionally, unauthorized interception, review, dissemination, downloading, or disclosure is strictly prohibited and may violate applicable law, including the Electronic Communications Privacy Act. If you are not the intended recipient, please immediately notify the sender by reply email, delete the communication, and destroy all copies. I have not verified or investigated, nor will I verify or investigate, information supplied by third parties.



This email has been checked for viruses by Avast antivirus software.
www.avast.com

IRMA Glidden

From: Dorothy Freeman <dfreeman@pacbell.net>
Sent: Wednesday, May 6, 2020 5:28 PM
To: LARA WEISIGER; Manager Manager
Subject: Charter changes being discussed tonight

*** **CAUTION:** This email message is coming from a non-City email address. Do not click links or open attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact the Help Desk with any questions. ***

Good Evening,

Making changes to the City Charter during a national emergency is not good governance. The citizens of Alameda are presently worried about things that are of a more urgent nature than these proposals. None of the proposed changes to the City Charter are of such an urgent nature that they cannot be delayed until the 2022 national election.

The ability to get proper information out to the public between now and the November election is very much in doubt. Campaigning will be very difficult for any item on the November ballot. We don't even know that our local newspaper will be able to survive this economic downturn. Not having a local newspaper will inhibit the ability to get pro and con information out. We also know that a return to "normal" is going to take a lot longer than just removing the Shelter In Place order. People will remain in turmoil for an extended period as they work to recover from this disruption to every aspect of our lives. I doubt that changes to the City of Alameda Charter will be high on their list of things they need to be concerned with.

I strongly urge the City Council to delay all discussions of Charter changes and any plans to place any Charter changes on the 2020 national election ballot. We need to have full participation of our citizens in making these very important decisions.

Regarding Item 3A charter items 7A and 7B on tonight's agenda. I propose an outside, independent prosecutor be used to determine the outcome of any investigation resulting from a council member's interference in actions or decision that are the responsibility of the City Manager, including any department or personnel under the City Manager's responsibility. A prosecutor working for the City in the legal department, by nature of their employment, cannot be "independent".

Thank You

IRMA Glidden

From: Catherine Bierwith <catherine@grr8lif.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 6, 2020 5:29 PM
To: LARA WEISIGER
Subject: FW: Charter changes PLEASE READ AT COUNCIL MEETING RE: 3A

*** **CAUTION:** This email message is coming from a non-City email address. Do not click links or open attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact the Help Desk with any questions. ***

Subject: Charter changes

Dear Mayor and Councilmembers,

I strongly object to the Council considering significant Charter changes during the Shelter in Place orders. I think these issues need to be discussed in open session with the public being able to weigh in. I realize you may be trying to make an election date deadline but matters of this importance should not be rushed through. I ask you to please reconsider your decision to go forward with these changes until the public is able to address you in person and not have a one sided conversation. We are all having to wait to get on with our lives and this matter is not so urgent that it can't wait as well. Thank you.

Regards,

Catherine Bierwith

catherine@grr8lif.com

510.418.3731

IRMA Glidden

From: ps4man@comcast.net
Sent: Wednesday, May 6, 2020 5:36 PM
To: City Clerk
Subject: Comment from Paul Foreman on Item 3A. Please read at tonight's meeting.

*** **CAUTION:** This email message is coming from a non-City email address. Do not click links or open attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact the Help Desk with any questions. ***

*** **CAUTION:** This email message is coming from a non-City email address. Do not click links or open attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact the Help Desk with any questions. ***

On behalf of Alameda Citizens Task Force, we strongly object to Council considering amending our Charter during the current Shelter in Place Order. We are even more dismayed by you proceeding with only the scant 7 day notice required by law because 1) many members of the public will not be aware of these meetings and 2) community organizations such as ACT are being forced to respond to all of these issues in a very short time frame.

Neither Article 7-3 proposal responds to the concerns of Mr. Jenkins as quoted in the Subcommittee Report. Mr. Jenkins was critical of the broad "attempting to influence" language of Article 7-3, stating that a Councilmember should be able to discuss the hiring process with the City Manager. He suggested that any amendment clearly define the specific actions that constitute malfeasance.

Both Mr. Daysog's and Mr. Knox-White,s proposals contradict Mr. Jenkins. Mr. Daysog maintains the original language of the Article 7-3. Mr. Knox-White, instead of narrowing the description of the offense, broadens it to prohibit a Councilmember to, in any manner, directly or indirectly, direct, request or take part in an appointment, discipline or removal of any person. This language inappropriately muzzles a Councilmember from expressing concerns about the employment process.

The final sentence of the Knox-White proposal appears to suggest an alternative adjudication process to that now established by California Law via the Civil Grand Jury and the Superior Court. He has advised us that this is not his intent. That being the case, the last sentence of his proposal should be deleted and replaced by language clarifying that the process will be thru the Civil Grand Jury and Superior Court.

There remains an unaddressed major defect in both the current and proposed Charter Article. No process is provided for triggering an investigation of possible malfeasance. We suggest the inclusion of a provision in Art. 7-3 that requires the City Prosecutor to investigate such an allegation, independently of Council, The City Manager, and the City Attorney, followed by filing a complaint with the Grand Jury, if warranted. The details of how he proceeds can be established by ordinance.

We disagree with Mr. Daysog's proposal to require the District Attorney's concurrence in the Civil Grand Jury's finding. This is not required by California Law. We also see no basis for Mr. Daysog's suggestion of a recall election. Article 2-7 of the Charter covers the filling of vacancies, so no additional procedure for filling the vacancy is required.

IRMA Glidden

From: Jay <garsurg@comcast.net>
Sent: Wednesday, May 6, 2020 6:06 PM
To: City Clerk
Subject: RE: Item 7-3

*** **CAUTION:** This email message is coming from a non-City email address. Do not click links or open attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact the Help Desk with any questions. ***

*** **CAUTION:** This email message is coming from a non-City email address. Do not click links or open attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact the Help Desk with any questions. ***

Re: 7-3

From Jay Garfinkle

Honorable Mayor and Members of the City Council,

It appears to me that the proposal made by Staff regarding the topic of Item 7-3 is incomplete and leaves too many details un-addressed. I don't pretend to have all of the answers but would respectfully make the following suggestions for the Council's consideration:

1. For purposes of this policy the term Councilmember shall be understood to include the Mayor.
2. A member of the Council should be precluded from communicating opinions to the City Manager , Assistant City Manager and Department Heads regarding hiring, firing, and various contracts for services and the purchase of materials. If a Councilmember wishes to express any such opinion, it should be done through and after formal public discussion with and majority agreement of the Council with the Mayor then doing any subsequent communication with management regarding the issues discussed.
3. Determine a mechanism(s) defining how an investigation can be initiated.
4. A method of determining guilt or innocence should be defined and the process should be carried out in a public forum.
5. If and when a Councilmember, including the Mayor, are found to have violated this non-interference policy he/she shall immediately, be removed from office and shall be precluded from running for and holding of elective office in the City.
6. The policy should address a mechanism for replacing a removed Councilmember.
7. Involving the County and/or incorporating elections has the significant potential for inappropriately delaying the process of removing a "guilty" party.
8. Deferring to State law is neither required nor necessary and doing so removes control from the Citizens of Alameda.

IRMA Glidden

From: Catherine Pauling <cjpauling@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 6, 2020 6:10 PM
To: LARA WEISIGER
Subject: Re: Letter for tonight's agenda attached

*** **CAUTION:** This email message is coming from a non-City email address. Do not click links or open attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact the Help Desk with any questions. ***

Toni Grimm's e-mail
not read

On May 6, 2020, at 5:06 PM, LARA WEISIGER <LWEISIGER@alamedaca.gov> wrote:

Hi Catherine,
I'll read this in the record.
Thanks,
Lara

From: Catherine Pauling [mailto:cjpauling@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, May 06, 2020 5:00 PM
To: LARA WEISIGER <LWEISIGER@alamedaca.gov>; Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft <MEzzyAshcraft@alamedaca.gov>; John Knox White <JknoxWhite@alamedaca.gov>; Malia Vella <MVella@alamedaca.gov>; Jim Oddie <JOddie@alamedaca.gov>; Tony Daysog <TDaysog@alamedaca.gov>
Subject: Letter for tonight's agenda attached

*** **CAUTION:** This email message is coming from a non-City email address. Do not click links or open attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact the Help Desk with any questions. ***

Dear Mayor and City Council Members,

Attached is our Alameda Justice Alliance letter asking you as the Mayor and City Councilmembers to postpone tonight's agenda.

Thank you for your consideration. We look forward to your response

Sincerely,

Catherine Pauling
on behalf of the Alameda Justice Alliance

Alameda Renters Coalition

Renewed HOPE
Alameda Firefighters
Alameda Labor Council
Alameda Progressives

--

IRMA Glidden

From: Toni Grimm <tonigrimlin@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Wednesday, May 6, 2020 1:28 PM
To: City Clerk
Cc: Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft; John Knox White; Malia Vella; Jim Oddie; Tony Daysog
Subject: Public Comment for City Council meeting May 6, 2020

*** **CAUTION:** This email message is coming from a non-City email address. Do not click links or open attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact the Help Desk with any questions. ***

*** **CAUTION:** This email message is coming from a non-City email address. Do not click links or open attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact the Help Desk with any questions. ***

Last night I watched the City Council meeting broadcast on Comcast Channel 15. There were multiple interruptions in the sound. Some silences were only for a few seconds, but enough to blot out all or part of what a council member was saying. Another time the sound was completely missing when the city clerk read two letters intended for Public Comment at the beginning of the meeting. (Those letters have not been heard and should be re-read). In a previous City Council meeting, there were even more serious sound problems, blotting out large parts of the meeting.

I understand that the governor has approved teleconferencing for city council meetings, but I believe that he is assuming that a city's technology is working so that all of the meeting can be heard. This is not the case in Alameda. Therefore, these meetings are not completely transparent and are very frustrating for the viewers.

In addition, I am disappointed that the council has seen fit to call two special meetings on topics that are not emergencies. Tonight's and tomorrow's meetings are scheduled for what is a common dinner time, which will make it less likely for many people, especially those with children, to watch. Furthermore, neither of these meetings have been noticed as often or as widely as other special meetings usually are and they are occurring back-to-back with a regular council meeting. I believe these factors will greatly reduce the public's attendance. I could understand the urgency for these special meetings if the council was considering emergency ordinances or relief for the current health and financial emergencies, but this is not the case. While not emergencies, these agenda items are important and should be presented at a time and in a venue when public participation can be easily made.

I understand that the council has to move forward with the city's business even during extraordinary times, but the way the city of Alameda is going about this right now is to sacrifice transparency and I believe this is not in the spirit of the Sunshine Ordinance.

Toni Grimm
Alameda resident