

From: [Grover Wehman-Brown](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Item 6-B - Asset Seizure
Date: Monday, March 1, 2021 7:30:49 PM

Dear Councilmembers and Mayor Ezzy Ashcraft,

The presentation provided by city staff indicates that they currently plan to reappropriate \$21,000 'profit' from the sale of personal property seized by APD for equipment acquisition (presumably equipment for the police department).

While this is a relatively small amount of money compared to other items in the mid-year budget request, I find the proposed reallocation concerning for two reasons.

1. When the department is allowed to seize a person's asset, then those funds stay within the department to further support their already well-funded operations, equipment, etc. there is a direct incentive to seize assets. It seems that, as we continue to look deeply at how the Alameda Police Department impacts the daily life of the people stopped and arrested by the department, that there should be no possible incentive for the individual officer or the force in general to seize property. If the seizure is necessary, it should directly benefit the people most impacted by economic inequality.
2. At a recent city council meeting, Police Chief Fenn said that 29% of people arrested described themselves as transient. That number is alarmingly high, but that's a subject for a different council meeting. The loss of property for a low-income person or family, including unhoused people, can have profound consequences for daily life. Any money made by the police department seizing individual assets and selling them should be directly funneled back into programs that help the lowest-income residents of Alameda; it should not be used to purchase more equipment for the police department to surveil and arrest residents. Emergency housing, emergency food assistance, and other uses where a small amount of funds can have a big impact are a much more appropriate use of funds made by the literal loss of another person's property.

Please, direct these funds to directly benefit Alamedans most in need, not used to purchase more police equipment.

Thank you,

Grover Wehman-Brown

From: [Meredith Hoskin](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Public Comment for Feb 16 | Vote no on APD Mid-Year Budget request until subcommittees have finished their work
Date: Tuesday, February 16, 2021 6:21:49 PM

Hello,

As an Alameda resident, I'd like to provide input on item 6-F of tonight's City Council agenda regarding the Fiscal 2020-2021 budget, in particular the request from the Alameda Police Department for \$171,000 to fund vehicle maintenance and equipment seizure (page 14 of the presentation of mid-year budget requests).

These funds should not be granted until the subcommittees on Racial Equity and Police Reform have provided their recommendations, as the recommendations may include guidance on budget for APD. While I recognize APD needs resources, the city made a commitment to the process of the subcommittees and must see it through. APD can re-submit the budget request once the subcommittee recommendations have been presented and considered.

Additionally, any APD budget requests for vehicle maintenance or upgrades **should not include the armored vehicle that City Council voted to sell.**

Thank you - and appreciate all the work of the City Council.
Best, Meredith

Meredith Hoskin
meredithmawilliams@gmail.com
541-554-5414