

RICHMOND, CALIFORNIA, December 22, 2020

The Regular Meeting of the Richmond City Council was called to order at 6:30 p.m. by Mayor Thomas K. Butt via teleconference.

Due to the coronavirus (COVID-19) pandemic, Contra Costa County and Governor Gavin Newsom issued multiple orders requiring sheltering in place, social distancing, and reduction of person-to-person contact. Accordingly, Governor Gavin Newsom issued executive orders that allowed cities to hold public meetings via teleconferencing (Executive Order N-29-20).

DUE TO THE SHELTER IN PLACE ORDERS, attendance at the City of Richmond City Council meeting was limited to Councilmembers, essential City of Richmond staff, and members of the news media. Public comment was confined to items appearing on the agenda and was limited to the methods provided below. Consistent with Executive Order N-29-20, this meeting utilized teleconferencing only. The following provides information on how the public participated in the meeting.

The public was able to view the meeting from home on KCRT Comcast Channel 28 or AT&T Uverse Channel 99 and livestream online at <http://www.ci.richmond.ca.us/3178/KCRT-Live>.

*Written public comments were received via email to cityclerkdept@ci.richmond.ca.us. Comments received by 1:00 p.m. on December 22, 2020, were summarized at the meeting, put into the record, and considered before Council action. Comments received via email after 1:00 p.m. and up until the public comment period on the relevant agenda item closed, were put into the record. Public comments were also received via teleconference during the meeting. **Attached herewith all written public comments received.***

ROLL CALL

Present: Councilmembers Ben Choi, Demnlus Johnson III, Eduardo Martinez, Jael Myrick, Vice Mayor Nathaniel Bates, and Mayor Thomas K. Butt. **Absent:** Councilmember Melvin Willis was absent for the entire meeting.

STATEMENT OF CONFLICT OF INTEREST

None.

AGENDA REVIEW

The city clerk announced a typographical error in the staff report, resolution, and side letter for item G-4 that changed the new expiration date for the Memorandum of Understanding from June 30, 2022, to December 31, 2022.

Items G-2 and H-1 were continued to the January 19, 2021, City Council meeting. Items G-9, G-15, and G-17 were removed from the Consent Calendar for discussion at the end of the agenda. Item G-12 was withdrawn from the agenda.

The city clerk announced the public comment procedures published on the agenda.

PRESENTATIONS, PROCLAMATIONS, AND COMMENDATIONS

C-1. Vice Mayor Bates and Mayor Butt recognized the retirement of employees that had served with the City of Richmond for 20 years or more. Mayor Butt announced that the Port Director Jim Matzorkis, scheduled to retire on December 31, 2020, passed away on December 20, 2020, and memorial services were pending.

REPORT FROM THE CITY ATTORNEY ON FINAL DECISIONS MADE DURING CLOSED SESSION

There was no Closed Session.

REPORT FROM THE CITY MANAGER

City Manager Laura Snideman wished the community a wonderful time celebrating the holidays at home with members of their household to safely enter the new year.

OPEN FORUM FOR PUBLIC COMMENT

The following individuals gave comments via teleconference:

Franco DeMarinis gave comments in support of his Richmond neighborhood, the Panhandle Annex. Mr. DeMarinis reported that he and his neighbors conducted cleanups in their neighborhood to help with illegal dumping issues and to keep the area safe and clean.

Ron Sundergill, Gayle McLaughlin, Mike Parker, Kieron Slaughter, Fredrika Newton, Nathalio Gray, Mike Uberti, Carol Yu-Johnson, Terance Barkus, Sarah De La Cerda-Uberti, Xavier Buck, Solomon Wilkins, Kamau Edwards, and Marcellis Ashley gave comments in support of item G-13 and the Black Panther Party.

Tarnell Abbott gave comments in memory of Richmond residents and activists, Ethel and Whitney Dotson. Ms. Abbott expressed her opposition to the construction of housing in Richmond on top of a toxic waste site.

Naila Francies gave comments advocating against proposed rolling brownouts and company reductions to the Richmond Fire Department. Ms. Francies urged the Council to consider different solutions for addressing the budget that did not reduce emergency medical services.

Naomi Williams requested assistance from the City of Richmond to address an issue with recreational vehicles parked near Beck and South Street littering in the area. Ms. Williams also announced that the Pullman neighborhood was working to have a street named after Richmond resident and activist, Ethel Dotson.

Debbie Bayer recommended that a dumpster be placed in the area of Beck and South Street to eliminate littering.

Eduardo Martinez announced that the City of Richmond had robust relationships with three sister cities. Mr. Martinez read a letter from the City of Richmond's Zhoushan sister city extending condolences in memory of Richmond Port Director Jim Matzorkis.

CITY COUNCIL CONSENT CALENDAR

On motion of Councilmember Martinez, seconded by Councilmember Johnson, the items marked with an (*) were approved by the following vote: **Ayes:** Councilmembers Choi, Johnson, Martinez, Myrick, Vice Mayor Bates, and Mayor Butt. **Noes:** None. **Absent:** Councilmember Willis. **Abstained:** None.

***G-1.** Approved a contract amendment with Axon Enterprise in an amount not to exceed \$2,500,000. The proposed contract amendment extended the term of the contract for five years for a total contract amount not to exceed \$3,500,000.

G-2. Continued to the January 19, 2021, City Council meeting the matter to introduce an ordinance (first reading) amending RMC chapter 14.46 Neighborhood Parking Regulations, section 14.46.005 Definitions, section 14.46.010 (a) Neighborhood parking zones, section 14.46.010 (b) Electric Vehicle Charging, section 14.46.010 (c) Car Share, section 14.46.020 Installation and maintenance of parking revenue equipment, section 14.46.030 Curbs, street lines, markings and parklets, section 14.46.050 Unlawful parking in on-street parking spaces, section 14.46.070 Unlawful parking in off-street parking spaces, section 14.46.030, 14.46.100 Rates charged for use of parking spaces, 14.46.130 Notice of parking violation and vehicle removal, section 14.46.140 Disposition and use of revenue, 14.56 Neighborhood Permit Parking, section 14.56.020 (a) Legislative Findings, section (b) Specific Findings, section 14.56.030 (k) Definitions, section 14.56.060 (b) Designation process of a neighborhood permit parking area, section 14.56.080 (b)(3) Issuance of vehicle parking permits, section 14.56.090 Visitor permits, section 14.56.150 Revocation of permits, section 14.56.170 (b) Deletion of streets from neighborhood permit parking areas, section 14.44 Stopping, Standing, or Parking Restricted or Prohibited on Certain Streets, section 14.40.150 Parking in city-owned or operated lots, section 14.40.210 Parking areas for electric or low emission vehicles, section 14.08 Traffic Administration, and section 2.62 Administrative Citations.

***G-3.** Approved the minutes of the November 24 and December 1, 2020, regular Meetings of the City Council.

***G-4.** Adopted **Resolution No. 144-20** approving the Side Letter between the Richmond Police Management Association (RPMA) and the City of Richmond. *(A correction was made to this item during Agenda Review changing the new expiration date for the Memorandum of Understanding from June 30, 2022, to December 31, 2022).*

***G-5.** Adopted **Ordinance No. 31-20 N.S.** (second reading) to establish compensation for: Human Resources Manager (new salary range 090A \$11,580- \$14,076/month).

***G-6.** Approved Amendment No. 2 to the Auto Warehousing (AWC) lease agreement.

***G-7.** Adopted **Resolution No. 145-20** to accept and appropriate grant-funds in the amount of \$250,000 from the Contra Costa County Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) program for the Martin Luther King Field Turf Replacement Project.

***G-8.** Approved a contract with Russ Branson Consulting to provide financial consulting services during the labor negotiation process through June 30, 2021, and in an amount not to exceed \$15,000.

G-9. The matter to adopt a resolution approving the City's inventory of leased and owned properties pursuant to Government Code section 50569, declaring 14 parcels as "Surplus Land," and 71 parcels as "Exempt Surplus Land" in accordance with the Surplus Lands Act was introduced by Deputy City Manager Economic Development Shasa Curl. Management Analyst Thomas Omolo presented a Powerpoint that highlighted the following: California Assembly Bill 1486; ARCGIS software and the City of Richmond's parcels; exempt surplus criteria, marketing, and surplus lands inventory; community outreach; next steps; and the parcel located at 45 1st Street utilized by the Happy Lot Farm and Garden. Discussion ensued. Gayle McLaughlin gave comments via teleconference. Further discussion ensued. A motion was made by Councilmember Myrick to adopt said resolution with the exception of the parcel located at 45 1st Street. Further discussion ensued. The motion was seconded by Vice Mayor Bates with a friendly amendment to include an emphasis on smaller units for sale to younger less financially fortunate individuals. The friendly amendment was accepted. A substitute motion was made by Mayor Butt to approve said resolution as presented, incorporate the friendly amendment to focus on affordable housing, and direct staff to identify the utilizers of the parcel at 45 1st Street to help find another location. The substitute motion was seconded by Vice Mayor Bates. Another friendly amendment made by Vice Mayor Bates requesting staff to return to a future meeting with an approximate appraised value of each proposed surplus parcel was accepted. Tarnell Abbott gave comments via teleconference. Further discussion ensued. The substitute motion adopted **Resolution No. 146-20** as presented with no exceptions, directed staff to focus on affordable housing, identify the utilizers of the lot at 45 1st Street to find another location, and return to the Council with appraised values for the proposed surplus parcels by the following vote: **Ayes:** Councilmembers Choi, Johnson, Vice Mayor Bates, and Mayor Butt. **Noes:** Councilmember Martinez. **Abstentions:** Councilmember Myrick. **Absent:** Councilmember Willis.

***G-10.** Approved a second amendment to legal services agreement with Shartsis Friese LLP (Kathleen Keeler Bryski and Jodi Fedor) to continue representation of the City of Richmond in connection with implementation of the disposition and development agreement with the Point Molate master developer (the "DDA") and to increase the payment limit by \$250,000 with a total payment limit of \$700,000 to be paid with funds deposited by the master developer pursuant to the DDA.

***G-11.** Adopted **Ordinance No. 32-20 N.S.** (second reading) amending the Zoning Map to rezone the Richmond Country Club Residential Project site from Parks and Recreation (PR) to Open Space (OS) and Single-Family Low-Density Residential (RL-2) District.

G-12. Withdrawn from the agenda, the matter to approve an appointment to the Planning Commission: appoint Michelle Hook, new appointment, seat #1, filling an unexpired term with an expiration date of June 30, 2022.

***G-13.** Adopted **Resolution No. 147-20** urging the National Park Service to initiate a Reconnaissance Survey to analyze the appropriateness of a National Park or National Monument in Oakland, California and throughout the greater San Francisco Bay Area dedicated to the Black Panther Party.

***G-14.** Received an update from the Richmond City Attorney regarding development of a revised request for qualifications process for legal services agreements and new measures to increase transparency related to retention of outside counsel; and approved legal services agreements for \$100,000 with the law firm of Allen, Glaessner, Hazelwood & Werth LLP for dangerous condition of public property/personal injury cases, for \$100,000 with the law firm of Orbach Huff Suarez & Henderson LLP for police/tort cases, and for \$325,000 with Colantuono, Highsmith and Whatley PC for municipal law/land use litigation defense, for services rendered September 1, 2020, to June 30, 2022.

G-15. The matter to approve the third amendment to the contract with Liebert, Cassidy, Whitmore, in the amount of \$700,000, which would increase the total contract amount to \$875,000 for the continuation of labor negotiations and other legal services through June 30, 2022, was introduced by Human Resources Director Anil Comelo. Discussion ensued. The Council suggested staff to submit memorandums to the Council regarding the handling of matters by internal and external legal counsel. The following speakers gave comments via teleconference: Deborah Bayer, Mike Parker, and Tarnel Abbott. On motion of Councilmember Choi, seconded by Vice Mayor Bates, approved said contract amendment by the following vote: **Ayes:** Councilmembers Choi, Johnson, Vice Mayor Bates, and Mayor Butt. **Noes:** Councilmember Martinez. **Abstentions:** None. **Absent:** Councilmembers Myrick and Willis.

***G-16.** Approved the Fiscal Year 2020-21 Multi-year Comparative Position Listing, a list of Council-approved employee positions, which will have no net negative impact to the City's Operating Budget.

G-17. The matter to adopt a resolution authorizing the city manager, pursuant to Article IV Section 1(b)(1) of the City Charter, to modify the position control, the list of Council-approved employee positions, as long as there is no net negative impact to the City's Operating Budget; and specifying that the city manager will seek City Council approval prior to instituting any proposed change that would result in additional budgetary impacts was introduced by Interim Deputy City Manager Internal Services LaShonda White. Discussion ensued. The following speakers gave comments via teleconference: Mike Parker, Deborah Bayer, and Tarnel Abbott. A motion was made by Councilmember

Martinez to adopt said resolution with an amendment to the third whereas statement, “*WHEREAS, the City Manager would like authority to modify the position control, as necessary, as long as there is no net negative impact to the City’s Operating Budget or transfer of funding from one department to another*”; and another amendment to the last statement, “*NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Richmond City Council authorizes the City Manager to modify the position control **within budgeted department, in order to meet the operational needs of the City***”. Further discussion ensued. The motion failed for the lack of a second. Further discussion ensued. On motion of Vice Mayor Bates, seconded by Councilmember Choi, adopted **Resolution No. 148-20** as presented with no changes by the following vote: **Ayes:** Councilmembers Choi, Johnson, Vice Mayor Bates, and Mayor Butt. **Noes:** Councilmember Martinez. **Absent:** Councilmembers Myrick and Willis. **Abstained:** None.

COUNCIL AS A WHOLE

H-1. Continued to the January 19, 2021, City Council meeting the matter to approve the installation of 575 street sweeping parking restriction signs in the Richmond Annex and Panhandle Annex Neighborhoods.

H-2. Mayor Butt announced recent resignations from City of Richmond boards, commissions, and committees; and announced vacancies as of December 16, 2020, and asked that interested individuals send applications to the City Clerk.

REPORTS OF OFFICERS: REFERRALS TO STAFF, AND GENERAL REPORTS (INCLUDING AB 1234 REPORTS)

The Council agreed to hold a special Closed Session meeting on Tuesday, December 29, 2020, and an Open Session meeting on Tuesday, January 5, 2021.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 8:53 p.m., in memory of Richmond Port Director Jim Matzorkis, to meet again on Tuesday, December 29, 2020.

Clerk of the City of Richmond

(SEAL)

Approved:

Mayor

From: [Cordell Hindler](#)
To: [City Clerk Dept](#)
Subject: Public Comments C-1
Date: Thursday, December 17, 2020 10:06:43 PM

hello Sabrina, i have some Comments to share for the Record

i am going to miss Janet Johnson because she has been a wonderful employee,

sincerely
Cordell

From: [Cordell Hindler](#)
To: [City Clerk Dept](#)
Subject: OPEN FORUM FOR PUBLIC COMMENT
Date: Thursday, December 17, 2020 10:15:42 PM

hello Sabrina, i have a couple of comments for the Record

1. as far as G-16 and G-17 goes, i am in full support of the idea of the position control that the city manager has outline
- 2, the Reason that the Standing committees should be revised is because i had spoken with City of Berkeley and they do have committee meetings every month

sincerely
Cordell

From: [Olivia](#)
To: [City Clerk Dept](#)
Subject: Public comment agenda item G-13
Date: Monday, December 21, 2020 1:57:30 PM

Dear Richmond City Council Members,

I would like to express my support for the city council to adopt agenda item G-13 in support of a National Park in recognition of Black Panther Party (BPP). It is important to recognize and acknowledge the contributions of the BPP to this nation at the heart of its founding in the Bay Area. Thank you.

-Olivia Anglade

--

-Olivia

From: [Deborah Bayer](#)
To: [City Clerk Dept](#)
Subject: Public Comment Agenda Item G2
Date: Tuesday, December 22, 2020 11:14:07 AM

This agenda item is long and contains a boring list of parking restriction changes whose locations are not immediately clear. AND it was put on the Consent Calendar as if it was a no-brainer. On looking at the supporting documents it became clear that one of the changes was to prevent overnight parking on Rydin Road, near the Point Isabel dog park, thus kicking out many people currently surviving there in their RVs. Wow. Three days before Christmas and in the middle of a pandemic and economic disaster. Do you really want to do that?

I must say it is kind of annoying when I drive from my warm house, complete with electricity and plumbing and have to see evidence of people who have so much less. It does disturb my chi. As Scrooge says in the Christmas Carol, "Are there no prisons for the poor?"

I have not had time to check out all the locations listed, so do not know if there are any other places designed to make life harder for people already barely getting by. Please do not vote for this item.

Sincerely,
Deborah Bayer
Richmond

From: [Dena Nelson](#)
To: [City Clerk Dept](#)
Cc: [Nat Bates](#); [Demnlus Johnson](#); [Jael Myrick](#); [Ben Choi](#); [Eduardo Martinez](#); [Melvin Willis](#); shasha.drury@yahoo.com; [Laura Snideman](#)
Subject: public comments agenda item #G-2
Date: Monday, December 21, 2020 7:37:50 PM

Dear Richmond City Council,

My name is Dena Nelson and I live in Richmond Annex and am currently serving on the Richmond Housing Advisory Commission. I am very concerned about the proposal to restrict parking on Rydin Road and Central Avenue and to establish it as a commercial permit zone. I strongly urge the council to prioritize the needs of the vulnerable vehicle dwellers in this area.

I live near Central Avenue and I run and walk on the Bay Trail in this area very frequently. In my experience, the people sheltering along Central Ave and Rydin Road are respectful neighbors. I have never had a negative interaction. Now more than ever, this community needs our support.

This summer, the [CDC released guidance](#) for local officials related to homelessness. It states clearly, "If individual housing options are not available, allow people who are living unsheltered or in encampments to remain where they are. Clearing encampments can cause people to disperse throughout the community and break connections with service providers. This increases the potential for infectious disease spread."

As the city manager's agenda report states, "The COVID-19 pandemic has negatively impacted resources that are normally available to shelter the homeless." The people living along Rydin and Central are Richmond residents. They should not be forced out period. But they especially should not be forced out without guaranteed safe alternative arrangements.

The agenda report also states that the city has extensively consulted with the impacted commercial stakeholders to discuss actions to ensure adequate parking. Has the city consulted with the impacted Richmond residents living in this area?

We are currently in a shelter-in-place order. We should always be crafting our city's policies in ways that put the most vulnerable first--but if there was any time to prioritize the need of Richmond residents attempting to shelter-in-place, it is now, and this is our opportunity.

Thank you,
Dena Nelson
5732 San Jose Ave

From: [Cordell Hindler](#)
To: [City Clerk Dept](#)
Subject: Public Comments H-1
Date: Thursday, December 17, 2020 10:22:46 PM

hello Sabrina, i would like to share some comments for the record

i think the idea of having street sweeping signs in the Richmond and Panhandle Annexes is unacceptable, there are ways that the money should be utilized, i am proposing that the youth should take pictures of Street sweeping signs in Park Plaza and Laurel Park.

to see how often they get their streets swept

sincerely
Cordell

From: [David Harris](#)
To: [City Clerk Dept](#)
Cc: [Garland Ellis](#)
Subject: Public comments, Agenda Item - #H-1, RCC Meeting December 22, 2020
Date: Friday, December 18, 2020 10:35:40 PM

Mayor and City Council Members:

On behalf residents of Richmond Annex I would like to register a general disapproval of the proposed installation of the 575 street sweeping parking restriction signs in the Annex and the Panhandle areas. At many Richmond Annex Neighborhood Council (RANC) meetings of the past few years our local residents have consistently opposed this idea. Some of the reasons are:

- 1) when residents comply on the dates for their block, the sweeper would very often arrive before the scheduled start time, before the resident was expected to move his/her vehicle;
- 2) when residents would move their vehicles the evening before the scheduled sweep, other persons, mainly non-residents of the block, would park their vehicles in front of the resident's house, thereby negating the resident's effort to comply.
- 3) residents have considered such signs in front of their homes as unsightly and spoiling their front strip areas.

Thank you.

Dave Harris
Annex Resident,
Member of RANC

From: [Karen Franklin](#)
To: [City Clerk Dept](#)
Cc: [Gayle McLaughlin](#)
Subject: Public Comment - Agenda Item H-1
Date: Monday, December 21, 2020 2:25:14 PM

Dear Mayor and City Council Members,

On July 16, the city's Public Works Department sent a letter to residents of the Panhandle neighborhood, informing us of a three-month "trial phase" in which we could demonstrate voluntary compliance in moving our vehicles for monthly street-sweeping. The letter warned that street-sweeping poles and signs would be installed "if there is not satisfactory compliance" during the trial phase.

We immediately sprung into action. Volunteers deployed a combination of email alerts, flyers printed up and placed on vehicles, and homemade, movable street signs to ensure community awareness. We knocked on doors and spoke personally with residents to urge them to move their cars and inoperable vehicles.

The campaign was a phenomenal success. As the street-sweeper himself could attest, the streets were almost entirely cleared of vehicles on street-sweeping days. We have dozens of photos of every block from each of the trial months to prove this; here are a few examples from September:



So imagine our shock when, after all of our success, we learned of an item on the December 1 City Council agenda to approve street-sweeping signs for the Panhandle!

As I said in my “open forum” remarks on December 1, the Panhandle is recognized by the city as an independent neighborhood. We should not be lumped in with others, over whom we have no control. The plan to impose street-sweeping signs on our neighborhood despite our remarkable compliance during the “trial phase” (and during a global pandemic, no less!) is yet one more example of a city government that is out of touch and not responsive to its residents.

While the Panhandle’s streets were cleared without the need for unsightly signage, the two major arteries abutting our neighborhood – South 55th and Carlson – have street-sweeping signs yet no one moves their cars, there is no enforcement, and the streets are filthy except when we organize our own volunteer clean-up events.

If the city is concerned (as it should be) about complying with the federal Clean Water Act, it should start by enforcing existing regulations and cleaning up such arterial eyesores.

I urge you not to betray our trust by approving this unnecessary, unsightly and punitive plan.

Thank you in advance,

Karen Franklin
Panhandle Resident

-->

From: [Linda Kalin](#)
To: [City Clerk Dept](#); [Laura Snideman](#); [Tom Butt - external](#); [Melvin Willis](#); [Jael Myrick](#); [Ben Choi](#); [Demnlus Johnson](#); [Nat Bates](#); richcityservant@gmail.com
Subject: Public Comment - Agenda Item H-1
Date: Tuesday, December 22, 2020 7:45:10 AM

Good evening City Clerk, Mr. Mayor, and Council Members

I ask that Item H-1 be removed from the agenda and carried over until January 19th. The policy behind H-1 needs more extensive examination and, as it will impact specific neighborhoods, those district representatives should be included in any discussion or vote.

Also, I strongly object to the wording of Item H-1, which implies or suggests auto approval by the council.

Whether the Annex and Panhandle Annex has or has not moved x number of cars is not the question to be asking, but whether the street sweeping policy, as currently implemented, is the best way for Richmond to move forward with an eye to residential fairness and a cleaner Bay.

There are multiple long range aspects to consider. I've listed a few:

- *Perhaps we need **less** residential signs.*

Informing people of the street sweeping schedule by mail or text seems infinitely cheaper than sign installation. Given the income demographics of neighborhoods paying the most in fines, this would be a more equitable arrangement for all Richmond residents. Stop targeting and extracting money from Richmond's least-advantaged communities.

Neighborhoods wanting signs with the tow/fine component, as was the case with some originally advocating for this policy in order to get abandoned cars removed from their streets, might have an option to have them. Or the City could better enforce its existing laws on unmoved vehicles.

- *What about the **efficacy of the truck** itself?*

Is replacing a fragile mechanical sweeper cost effective or in keeping with Richmond's goals for a greener environment? I've observed a lot of curb sweeping missed whether cars are there or not. Something as simple as a dark spot in the road can cause the sweeper to cruise down the center of the street.

Could other programs be implemented as supplemental or alternative? Educating residents about keeping debris out of curb areas might be a win-win for cleaner storm drain water and less urban trash.

- *How did Richmond end up using **signs twice the size of any of our neighbors**?*

The signs themselves were never, as I recall, up for public discussion. Jose Urquilla characterizes these signs as "standard", when clearly they are not. A short drive down San Pablo will confirm, not only do not all cities have street sweeping signs, but that Richmond is the only place where these oversized signs are used. They are wildly out of scale on residential streets and likely more costly to manufacture than smaller signs. Why waste money creating more? If they must be used, use the 12" x 18" signs that cities around us have.

What about frequency? Jose Urquilla states that this is up to the City Council. Has this ever been discussed?

Many reasons exist not to rush into installing a new bunch of signs until this policy issue is more understood. Wait until next year and we have district representation.

Linda Kalin

From: marshavaughn3@att.net
To: [City Clerk Dept](#)
Subject: Public Comment - Agenda Item H-1
Date: Saturday, December 19, 2020 3:38:11 PM

Hello,

I am writing to request that Agenda Item H-1 be held over until the Council meets next year. It is too important for a hasty decision at this juncture.

Thank you,

Marsha Vaughn
2513 San Mateo Street
Richmond, CA 94804

Take time to laugh. It is the music of the soul.

From: [nancy.stern](#)
To: [City Clerk Dept](#)
Subject: Public Comment - Agenda Item H-1
Date: Saturday, December 19, 2020 7:57:02 PM

To everyone concerned,

I would like to request that you hold over this agenda item until the recently elected City Council members are sworn in in early January. I feel that there are some ideas that can and will be brought forth regarding an alternative to street sweeping signs.

Please remove Item H-1 from the agenda on the 22nd and carry it over until January 19th, the first meeting of the new City Council.

Sincerely,

Nancy Stern

From: [Cordell Hindler](#)
To: [City Clerk Dept](#)
Subject: Public Comments H-2
Date: Thursday, December 17, 2020 10:26:08 PM

hello Sabrina, i have some fabulous news for the Record

i did receive a couple of emails from Richmond and De Anza High in regarding about the vacancies on the oversight board, Library Commission and the youth council,

sincerely
Cordell

From: [Sharon Greenblum](#)
To: [City Clerk Dept](#)
Cc: [Nat Bates](#); [Demnlus Johnson](#); [Jael Myrick](#); [Ben Choi](#); [Eduardo Martinez](#); [Melvin Willis](#); [shasha.drury@yahoo.com](#); [Laura Snideman](#)
Subject: Public Comment on Agenda Item G-2
Date: Tuesday, December 22, 2020 2:45:03 PM

Dear Richmond City Council,

My name is Sharon Greenblum and I am a Richmond resident. I recently learned of the proposal to establish the area at Rydin Road, currently used as a living space for many unhoused individuals and families, as a commercial permit zone. I believe this is an unnecessary and destructive action that would not serve the people of Richmond in any way.

I frequently ride my bike along that section of the Bay Trail, and until March was riding there every day as part of my morning and evening commute. There were many times I felt slightly nervous about riding after dark - but these feelings stemmed from the prospect of traversing the long unlit sections with no one in sight. In fact, the community living at Rydin Road has always appeared to me as friendly and neighborly, and their presence made me feel safer. The priority of the Richmond Council should be to help them feel safer as well, especially in this critical period of unrest and health threats.

I see no reason to uproot any Richmond dwellers who have caused no harm, now or in the future. I hope you will put more effort toward policies that enrich the lives of the people who call Richmond home (better lighting, clean and accessible utilities), rather than adding to the current chaos.

Thank you,
Sharon Greenblum
951 Marina Way South