

## Irma Glidden

---

**From:** +14157934273@textmagic.com  
**Sent:** Monday, June 29, 2020 8:22 PM  
**To:** City Clerk  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] SMS from +14157934273

Councilman Oddie. What is a white "American" name to you? That is an offensive racist comment. Black and indigenous people were here long before white colonizers. Someone's name doesn't represent their ethnicity. It's only the white Alamedans who don't want to change because they fear their power is taken away. What is being done about the HATE CRIME graffiti on the Alameda residents car? Is there any investigation happening? Please stick to the subject.

Message from: +14157934273, 29 Jun 2020 20:21  
To: **Lara Weisiger** (+15107474802)

[View this conversation in SMS Chat](#)

This email was sent to you by TextMagic Ltd.

Salisbury House, Station Road, Cambridge CB1 2LA, United Kingdom

[Terms of Use](#) | [Privacy Policy](#) | [Unsubscribe](#)

## Irma Glidden

---

**From:** +14157934273@textmagic.com  
**Sent:** Monday, June 29, 2020 8:29 PM  
**To:** City Clerk  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] SMS from +14157934273

We know that you are all people. But black Alamedans are not typically treated as so.

Message from: +14157934273, 29 Jun 2020 20:28  
To: **Lara Weisiger** (+15107474802)

[View this conversation in SMS Chat](#)

This email was sent to you by TextMagic Ltd.

Salisbury House, Station Road, Cambridge CB1 2LA, United Kingdom

[Terms of Use](#) | [Privacy Policy](#) | [Unsubscribe](#)



## Irma Glidden

---

**From:** +14157934273@textmagic.com  
**Sent:** Monday, June 29, 2020 8:44 PM  
**To:** City Clerk  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] SMS from +14157934273

Councilmember Daysog- systemic racism is not a joke, and not to be taken lightly. It is also not "systematic" racism.

Message from: +14157934273, 29 Jun 2020 20:43  
To: **Lara Weisiger** (+15107474802)

[View this conversation in SMS Chat](#)

This email was sent to you by TextMagic Ltd.

Salisbury House, Station Road, Cambridge CB1 2LA, United Kingdom

[Terms of Use](#) | [Privacy Policy](#) | [Unsubscribe](#)



## Irma Glidden

---

**From:** Cassandra Inocencio <cassandrainocencio@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, June 29, 2020 9:08 PM  
**To:** City Clerk  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Special city council meeting comment

My feelings from tonight's meeting are that we need more Vice Mayor Knox Whites and Councilmember Malia Vellas representing our community. WE NEED CHANGE. WE NEED TO UNDERSTAND THAT THE COMMUNITY IS HURTING. If some, THEN ALL. If leaders are not chosen to lead, then what are they chosen for? We need all of you in the streets, reaching out and getting your hands into the community soil so to speak. We need the leaders, the community, the police all working together. Now is not the time to give into fear and freeze in awkwardness. STEP UP, SPEAK OUT and join...TOGETHER. Make it happen. No excuses!

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows 10

## Irma Glidden

---

**From:** Fredrick Alexander <fjwka21@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, June 29, 2020 9:49 PM  
**To:** City Clerk  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Meeting Agenda

Hello Mayor Ashcraft, This is Fredrick Alexander (The gentlemen whom you met this weekend concerning the vandalism to my vehicles).. I'm listening in and would like to take part in moving your agenda forward in regards to race relations as well as Police reform! Thanks

--

Fredrick Alexander

## Irma Glidden

---

**From:** Dorothy Freeman <dfreeman@pacbell.net>  
**Sent:** Monday, June 29, 2020 4:31 PM  
**To:** Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft; Jim Oddie; Malia Vella; Tony Daysog; John Knox White; Lara Weisiger  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] City Council Meeting July 7, 2020 Agenda Item 6A

June 29, 2020

City Council Meeting July 7th, Item 6A

Honorable Mayor Ashcraft and Council Members,

Measure A has not stopped Alameda from approving many housing developments during the present housing element. Our 2012 RHNA (Regional Housing Needs Allocation) requirements were set at 1723 housing units and yet Alameda has managed to approve nearly 5000 new housing units, including many apartments, but has not managed to provide the required units for very low and low income units, nor has the very much needed moderate income (work force) housing been provided.

Supply and demand is not for market rate units which have disproportionately been approved by Alameda City Councils. Alameda's problem with providing affordable house is because Alameda has allowed, by rezoning actions, most of the available land to be build out as market rate, leaving less available land for the very needed affordable housing. Measure A (Article 26-1) has allowed the mom and pop units to remain a major portion of Alameda's lower cost housing units because they were not replaced by corporate landlords building out Alameda with large multi unit apartment buildings. Lower rents in Alameda have allowed the city to become a much more diverse community than it was in the early 1970's. Preserving our neighborhood mom & pop rental units, with their lower than average rents, has and will keep Alameda more diverse than continuing to build large apartment buildings with their corporate landlords who charge market rate rents. At present higher income wage earners who can afford market rate units are predominantly white. Removing Measure A from the City Charter may lead to large, corporate run apartment buildings in our neighborhoods, replacing the mom & pop units.

The incidences of discrimination that Council Member Odie referenced at the City Council meeting of June 2nd, did not include any in Alameda. Prior to the passage of Measure A there were large developments on Bay Farm Island. As he stated he was not able to find any reference to non-white people being pushed out of Alameda, but by his report, he implied that was the case. If additional large developments had been allowed to continuing to build here, then there might have been some of the same discriminator problems Council Member Odie mentioned. But since the large developments were kept out of Alameda by Measure A (Article 26-1), as previously mentioned, Alameda's change to a very diverse community implies it did not become a problem.

Measure A, Articles 26-1 & 26-2 are very important within our city's population. That's why they became part of the City Charter. Time has not made them less relevant. It may be that changes to these articles should be made but now is not the time for this decision to be made. We are in a time that has disrupted everything about our daily lives. People are concerned about other things than what is happening at City Hall. Many people are just trying to find a way to survive.

Forcing these decisions to be made now is improper governance. A decision of both items should be delayed until the 2022 election. There is nothing pressing in the next housing element that makes a need for an imminent decision. There is plenty of time to wait until there can be full community involvement. I employ the full council to vote to delay any decisions regarding Measure A until the general election of 2022.

Respectfully,

Dorothy Freeman

cc: Lara Weisiger, City of Alameda Clerk

## Irma Glidden

---

**From:** Marika Tsagris <marika.tsagris@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, June 29, 2020 4:18 PM  
**To:** City Clerk  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Letter for tonights council meeting

Hello my name is Marika and I am an Alameda native and have lived here my whole life. I am appalled that there is any animosity towards Alameda Police from our council.

I have so much to say but now for this letter is in regards to the only response I received from my email sent to all council members. First, check your spelling. Sergeant is spelled incorrectly in your automated copy pasted response. To your comment regarding council members not acting or commenting in response to the staffing and status of current alameda police employees, you are incorrect. In a tweet posted on the "official" page for a member of council, was a very public comment with the hashtag defund police. As well as a couple of now deleted comments supporting the dismissal of officers which has been seen by citizens across town. People are watching and paying attention to all that is being said and done by council. It appears that it is difficult for some members of council to keep track of what they have said as their narrative changes depending on who is being spoken to.

For the topic of school resource officers being removed from schools, fine, so be it. But who are you going to call when an issue arises? It is terrifying to hear parents wanting the officers out of school, yet Alameda Police is continuously called to act on parenting problems, like kids not doing chores or refusing to get out of bed for school. Nevertheless, council refuses to let alameda police discontinue service to such calls.

Next, speaking on the topic of police policy. These policies are generally created by outside sources like 8 can't wait which is written by activists not policy makers, lawyers, middle ground mediators or any kind of law enforcement specialists. Yet these policies have been openly accepted, self-initiated and applied by APD before the mighty mouths of council decided to speak up. However the narrative put out by council members is that it was their idea, instead of applauding the quick response by APD of adapting these new changes. As well as a muzzle placed on APD by council, not allowing any statements to be made during a pivotal time to keep the police in a positive light. Another great move made by our elected officials.

I do not think it is a lot to ask for our council members to be honest and held accountable for their words. I hope that the citizens know who to blame and it sure as heck isn't the police department.



## Irma Glidden

---

**From:** sjslauson <sslau99950@aol.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, June 29, 2020 3:31 PM  
**To:** City Clerk  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Agenda Item 1 Special Council Meeting June 29, 2020

Mayor Ashcraft and Council Member:

You have insulted the Alameda police department by stating they did something racist involving their handling of a man dancing in the street. The man was out of line with his actions and had nothing to do with the color of his skin. He had no business dancing in the street and may have obstructed traffic. He turned away from the cops while they were talking to him - a clear warning to the cops. Their actions in sub-doing and calming him are a text book example of perfect non-violent apprehension of a suspect. The man wan't roughed up in any way and after he calmed down and could discuss his actions, he was released. The man has already stated he caused the incident.

The council should be considering how to protect Alameda's people and their property from the criminal element associated with the BLM protesters. The boarding up of businesses and shutting them down is not acceptable in Alameda.

Respectfully request you table this item until it can be brought up in a regular full participation meeting.

Stephen Slauson

## Irma Glidden

---

**From:** sjslauson <sslau99950@aol.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, June 29, 2020 3:00 PM  
**To:** City Clerk  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Special Council Meeting June 29, 2020

Mayor Ashcraft and Council Members:

This is a request to table the agenda due to the current economic crisis and civil unrest. This subject requires full participation of the public in an open face to face discussion in a city hall meeting. This matter needs to be rescheduled at a future date.

Stephen Slauson  
2426 Otis Drive

## Irma Glidden

---

**From:** Don Sherratt <drsherratt@comcast.net>  
**Sent:** Monday, June 29, 2020 1:26 PM  
**To:** City Clerk  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Letter to Mayor, Council members  
**Attachments:** Letter to the Editor.doc; ATT00001.htm

Hello:

Please send the attached letters to our Mayor and City Council members.

Thank you.

Don Sherratt  
[drsherratt@comcast.net](mailto:drsherratt@comcast.net)  
510 846-3073

To: Alameda Mayor Ashcroftt  
Members of the City Council  
City Manager Levitt  
From: Don and Margie Sherratt, retired educators and residents of Alameda  
Subject: Support of Police Chief Paul Rolleri

We are fortunate to live in Alameda with a strong Police Department, led by Chief Paul Rolleri. Paul has been an Alameda Police Officer for more than 30 years, moving up through the ranks. For the past seven years, he has done an outstanding job as our Chief of Police. Paul is known for leading and enhancing his Police force's skills and knowledge through Officer trainings to learn new approaches in policing. With strong leadership skills, Paul makes sure that his Officers are ready for any and all incidents that may occur.

Chief Rolleri was born and raised in Alameda. He knows and loves our town and its people and gives of his personal time and efforts to community organizations. Paul is a true "stand up" man. Most importantly, regardless of race, religion, economic status, he values all Alamedans and takes pride in his work.

During these alarming and unsettled times, we are fortunate to have a Chief who works hard and diligently to right wrongdoings, and to improve and grow his Department. We support Chief Rolleri and are grateful to have him serving as our Police Chief.

Sincerely,

Don Sherratt  
Margie Sherratt

cc: Alameda Sun  
Alameda Journal  
East Bay Times

## Irma Glidden

---

**From:** Wo'O Ideafarm <ideafarmcity@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, June 29, 2020 12:38 PM  
**To:** City Clerk  
**Cc:** Darryl Derespini  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Public comment for Special City Council Meeting June 29 @ 1730: Agenda item 3a 2020-8095: "Fixing" Alameda's Police Department

I respectfully hereby address the City Council to urge the Council, "Don't Fix What Ain't Broke!" I am a 66 year old activist wanderer and sometime (homeless) resident of Alameda. My activism consists largely of speaking with signs and a megaphone on busy streets throughout the Bay Area, from Santa Cruz to San Francisco and Oakland. My civic and political speech is provocative and "politically incorrect", so it is dangerous for me and I have many encounters with both violent "welcoming committees" as well as with police officers. I've been active in this way for 15 years, and the many experiences that I have had give me an uncommon familiarity both with the challenges that police officers face and with the violent disorder that can manifest, do its harm, and then disappear into the shadows even with a fully empowered policing agency on the watch.

I've never met a bad cop. But I've had to deal with overwhelming unlawful police interference with my speech operations that is directed "from above". My experiences with police officers fall into four incident types: First, is the type of incident where there is no violence or threat of violence but someone in authority has told the policing agency to get rid of me as a speaker. (Yes, this really happens. I've had two different police officers, one a San Mateo County Sheriff, and the other a City of Burbank Police Department officer, give me an essentially identical explanation of why they contacted me.) Second, is the type of "pure enforcement" incident where the police officer is investigating a possible violation of the law or citing me for such a violation. Third, is the type of incident in which I am being confronted violently and the police officers arrive to save my life. Fourth, is the type of incident in which the police officers violate my rights (usually by arresting and imprisoning me without probable cause) in order to save my life. The last type would require some explanation. In lieu of explaining now, just take my word for it that part of the job of a police officer is to understand "street politics" and to keep the peace in ways that use unlawful police methods (such as arresting me) to achieve a lawful result (such as saving my life). I am not speaking hypothetically; I have particular incidents in mind.

I write to give you a clue that we are in a "cold civil war". I operate 9 servers, and a significant portion of my time is spent hardening them against the constant attacks that hit them over the Internet. As a street speaker, a significant amount of my effort goes to being prepared and ready for the harm that I know will come my way, in the hope that I will live through the afternoon. There are many people right here in Alameda and in Oakland who are violent and who have no respect whatsoever for my right to speak and your right to hear what would be spoken. **THE ONLY THING THAT KEEPS THEM IN CHECK IS MY WEAPON, MY BODY CAMERA, AND MY ABILITY TO SUMMON THE POLICE.**

If you defund or in any other way "declaw" your policing agency, violence will INCREASE for four different reasons. First, criminals will have the run of your town. Second, property owners and storekeepers will "tool up" with shotguns, rifles, and automatic pistols. Third, you can kiss any thoughts of disarming the population goodbye; every man with half of a brain will start open carrying, not even waiting for the legislature to repeal Penal Code 25850, which will happen in short order. Fourth, lone speakers like me who are minimally armed with hunting knives will be replaced with heavily armed groups of men. Fifth, and perhaps most important, is that the loss of effective policing will destroy any possibility of multiracial unity. In the absence of lawful order

and "rule of law", the overwhelming need for safety and order will compel people to fall back into the racial tribal social pattern that has been used since the dawn of history. Effective policing, together with our "liberty and justice for all" laws and institutions, is the only force that makes it possible for us to all live in peace together without fear.

I have extensive experience with how policing is done in Mountain View, San Fransisco, Santa Cruz, Oakland, and San Jose, as well as significant experience with other agencies throughout the Bay Area. Most of these agencies get the job done by breaking the rules. I've only had two experiences with Alameda police officers. Both of those experiences give me the impression that Alameda has one of the few, and perhaps the only, policing agency in the Bay Area that gets the job done without breaking the rules. I give the Alameda Police Department the highest grade for professionalism.

Officer Derespini asked me to tell the City Council what I told him that I thought of his professional handling (with another officer) of an incident yesterday. At the end of that incident, I told them both that they handled the incident completely professionally and that In my experience throughout the Bay Area such policing is rare. City of Alameda, don't fix what ain't broke!

-----  
NOTICE: This conversation will be published on [IDEAFARM.COM](http://IDEAFARM.COM). (Click "privacy" there.)  
-----

## Irma Glidden

---

**From:** johnsen cyndy <cyndyjohnsen@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, June 29, 2020 12:03 PM  
**To:** Tony Daysog; Jim Oddie; Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft; John Knox White; Malia Vella; Manager  
Manager  
**Cc:** City Clerk  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Reimagining Street Safety: 6/29 City Council Meeting, Item 3-A

Bike Walk Alameda Comments for 6/29 City Council Meeting, Item 3-A

Dear Mayor Ashcraft, City Councilmembers, and City Manager Levitt,

Our approach to street safety, heavily reliant on police enforcement, is flawed in important ways. Because police enforcement itself is often an issue for people of color, we think the [unbundling](#) exercise proposed in the Work Plan will be an especially worthwhile one. As it pertains to street safety, we hope it will include an audit of existing services and costs, an analysis of traffic data and safety metrics, and an exploration of prioritizing alternative approaches that can dramatically impact street safety, such as transportation planning and physical infrastructure design.

We know street safety for all is doable and look forward to your leadership in making it a reality.

Thank you for your consideration,

Bike Walk Alameda Board

## Irma Glidden

---

**From:** Linda Asbury <linda@westalamedabusiness.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, June 29, 2020 11:49 AM  
**To:** Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft; John Knox White; Malia Vella; Tony Daysog; Jim Oddie; City Clerk; Eric Levitt  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Council Agenda Item 2020-8095 - 6/29/20

Mayor Ashcraft, Vice Mayor Knox White and fellow Council Members:

Thank you in advance for the intensive process of community policing needs for Alameda. And please know we support the APD and will be an active partner for our community. This letter is intended for your review and will not be read into Public Comment.

The West End has historically faced its own systemic disadvantages, including the closure of the base in 1997 and the lack of a major economic driver such a high school, theater, or city hall within walking distance of our commercial corridor. This district has moved forward solely based on the grit and passion of our customers and business owners. Over the past several years, we have faced new and increasing challenges from shifting social dynamics in our community. Currently, we not only have an increase in homelessness but a highly visible encampment at the front door of our district. Since the start of the Covid-19 shutdown, merchants have come toe-to-toe with loitering vagrants, vandalism of their storefronts, human waste in front of their businesses, groups drinking in our public plazas, lewd acts on the streets, and garbage taken from the cans and strewn across the sidewalk. This dynamic is the opposite of the safe, inviting ambiance merchants need to entice customers to Webster Street. Until earlier this month, our primary tool for assistance has been to call Alameda PD through the non-emergency number.

The Business Association needs the support of our police department to keep our streets safe and we also welcome reimagining of how our resources are allocated to best address the social issues affecting our community. We ask that Alameda PD continue to offer the same level of assistance to the merchants they have extended to date until a thoughtful plan for transition has been identified and implemented. We also ask that the transition plan include appropriate messaging to the business community what these changes will be and what the new resources are.

Finally, as the West End continues to grow with the development of the base we would recommend that the city consider reinstating an **Alameda PD annex** station on Webster Street. This option would give officers the opportunity to better understand the unique and changing demographics of our district and more directly engage on a day-to-day basis with the more diverse population of the West End.

We look forward to continuing to work with the city, police department, and any future social support services to help keep our business district clean, safe, and thriving. Linda

Linda Asbury  
Executive Director  
West Alameda Business Association  
[linda@westalamedabusiness.com](mailto:linda@westalamedabusiness.com)  
510.523.5955



## Irma Glidden

---

**From:** Laurence Padway <lpadway@padway.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, June 29, 2020 10:09 AM  
**To:** City Clerk  
**Cc:** Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft; Eric Levitt; John Knox White; Jim Oddie; Tony Daysog  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] City Council Meeting 6/29/2020 -- POINT OF ORDER

Hon. Mayor and Councilmembers:

I write to raise a point of order and request that it be addressed prior to items 2 and 3A on the agenda for this meeting. We need a full discussion of the creation of an ongoing process to ensure the civil rights of all citizens, with special emphasis on the historically less empowered sections of the community, including those who are black, handicapped and economically disadvantaged.

There is a tendency, however, in these discussions, to discuss particular City personnel. In the community discussion surrounding the particular incident which gives rise to this meeting, there have been comments about whether or not certain personnel actions should be taken, or whether the City manager or police chief should be directed to take a particular personnel action. The City Charter prohibits the Council from hiring and firing personnel, or meddling in those decisions.

It is CRITICALLY IMPORTANT for the council and public both to remember that this meeting may not discuss the propriety of the action or inaction of any City employee. The agenda calls for a discussion of establishing a process to improve city policies and procedures, and in that discussion, what a particular city employee did or did not do on a particular occasion means little as it is only illustrative of one occasion, when we need a broad vision which improves everyone.

Please, let's stay focused on moving forward with creating a system which better protects the civil rights of all of us, with special attention to those who have been disadvantaged in the past, while honoring our City Charter by avoiding discussion of actions by particular City employees on a particular occasion.

Two years ago we taxpayers paid more than \$25 for every man, woman and child in the City of Alameda for a legal settlement arising from allegations that certain council members interfered in a personnel matter. I ask my fellow taxpayers and the council to scrupulously avoid such a mistake here.

We have a longstanding ongoing problem to address. Let's do that, and do it in a way in which we can measure our ongoing success or failure.

## Irma Glidden

---

**From:** Grover Wehman-Brown <groverwehman@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, June 28, 2020 7:53 PM  
**To:** City Clerk  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Comments to include in the Public Meeting on 6/29

Dear Councilmembers,

As you develop the work plan this evening, I ask the council to use every means available to you to immediately and meaningfully cut the number of our tax dollars spent to fund the Alameda Police Department, expanding on Councilmember Vella's proposal to stop maintaining military-grade equipment. This is a start, but much more is needed. I support the call from the ACLU People Power to cut the budget by 50%. You might start by directing the City Manager & Chief Roller to suspend pay from the officers who harmed Mr. Watkins or any number of the 14 officers who participated in the violence that led to Mr. Gattenby's death in 2018 and open investigations into the conduct of officers.

As you decide on the work plan for steering committees tonight, I hope the committees are created in a manner that will enable major shifts from the APD to creating non-officer community response to harm and investment in community wellbeing. In order for any steering committee or oversight board to be able to make meaningful change and not merely be a symbolic response, I ask the following questions:

1. What kind of decision making power or "teeth" will these steering committees have?
2. Who will decide who is on the committees and how do the criteria serve the goals being demanded by residents? I ask you to develop precision and clarity so the steering committee is made up of a range of people committed to ending white supremacy in Alameda, and are open to divesting funds from the police budget and investing those funds into community programs.

Councilmember Knox White, I appreciate that you shared a proposal publicly before this meeting. The proposal you shared on Facebook says residents must be "from Alameda"- a highly charged category- if you mean "lives in Alameda, please clarify that." The proposal also names three members representing 'community interest groups' and two representing the business community. I ask that you sharpen the parameters to include, for example, community interest groups whose mission or purpose is to directly impact racial inequality in some form.

Thank you,

Grover Wehman-Brown