

RICHMOND, CALIFORNIA, January 19, 2021

The Regular Meeting of the Richmond City Council was called to order at 6:35 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 January 19, 2021, 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 Claudia Jimenez, Demnlus Johnson III, Eduardo Martinez, Gayle McLaughlin, Melvin Willis, Vice Mayor Nathaniel Bates, and Mayor Thomas K. Butt. **Absent:** None.

STATEMENT OF CONFLICT OF INTEREST

None.

AGENDA REVIEW

Items F-4, F-5, and F-6 were removed from the Consent Calendar for discussion at the end of the agenda.

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

REPORT FROM THE CITY MANAGER

City Manager Laura Snideman provided an update on the COVID-19 vaccinations in Contra Costa County and reported the following items: There were problems with the vaccination supply and distribution system from the federal government. The Contra Costa County Health Department had a website devoted to

COVID-19 vaccinations. Richmond would have a COVID-19 vaccination site in the Richmond Memorial Auditorium. Current COVID-19 testing would continue in Richmond and mobile vaccinations were being discussed. Ms. Snideman announced that an Electrical Vehicles Financial Incentives Clinic was held on January 21, 2021.

Councilmember Johnson commended Ms. Snideman and Information Technology Director Sue Hartman for their immediate response and comprehensive plan to hold the City Council meeting during the current rolling power outages in Richmond.

OPEN FORUM FOR PUBLIC COMMENT

The following individuals gave comments via teleconference:

Franco DeMarinis advised two neighborhoods that requested to have street sweeping signs added to their neighborhood were informed by staff that there was no budget for the request. Mr. DeMarinis gave comments highlighting the unity of the Panhandle Annex neighborhood where he resided.

Tarnel Abbott welcomed newly elected councilmembers, Gayle McLaughlin and Claudia Jimenez and re-elected councilmember, Melvin Willis. Ms. Abbott stated that the battle for Zeneca was ongoing and expressed her opposition to the approved development agreement and proposed housing at the Richmond Campus Bay site.

Nalia Francies gave comments in opposition to potential browning out and closures of fire stations in Richmond. Ms. Francies stated the importance of automated external defibrillators at fire stations for cardiac emergencies. Ms. Francies urged the Council to keep Richmond fire stations open.

CITY COUNCIL CONSENT CALENDAR

On motion of Councilmember Martinez, seconded by Councilmember Johnson, the items marked with an (*) were approved by the unanimous vote of the City Council.

***F-1.** Approved the second amended 2019/20 North Richmond Waste & Recovery Mitigation Fee Expenditure Plan (Exhibit A), and the amended 2020/21 North Richmond Waste & Recovery Mitigation Fee Expenditure Plan (Exhibit B), from July 1, 2020, through June 30, 2021, as recommended by the North Richmond Waste and Recovery Mitigation Fee Joint Expenditure Planning Committee.

***F-2.** Adopted **Resolution No. 2-21** authorizing staff to submit the required 20% local match, or \$10,608, to the Metropolitan Transportation Commission for the Pavement - Technical Assistance Program Round 22 grant for a total project cost of \$53,040.

***F-3.** Received the City's Investment and Cash Balance Report for the month of November 2020.

F-4. Continued to the January 26, 2021, meeting. The matter to approve an appointment to the Design Review Board: appoint Michelle Hook, new appointment, seat #1, filling an unexpired term with an expiration date of March 17, 2021, was introduced by Mayor Butt. The Council requested to see all boards and commission applications submitted for the vacancy. The Council recommended that future boards and commissions appointment items included redacted boards and commissions applications or a summary of qualifications for proposed appointees. The mayor agreed to continue items F-4, F-5, and F-6 to the January 26, 2021, City Council meeting and include the applications for the appointees in the agenda packet. The Council also recommended including the number of applications received for the vacancies and the reason why the appointees were selected.

F-5. Continued to the January 26, 2021, meeting the matter to approve an appointment to the Rent Board: appoint Ayoka Medlock-Nurse, new appointment, seat #4, filling an unexpired term with an expiration date of March 21, 2021.

F-6. Continued to the January 26, 2021, meeting the matter to approve an appointment to the Planning Commission: appoint Jonathan Harrison, new appointment, seat #1, filling an unexpired term with an expiration date of June 30, 2022.

***F-7.** Approved the minutes of the December 15 and 22, 2020, January 5, 2021, Regular Meetings of the City Council, and January 12, 2021, Special Swearing.

***F-8.** Adopted **Resolution No. 3-21** to update the 2021 solid waste collection rates.

***F-9.** Authorized the city manager or their designee to execute a quitclaim deed to abandon the City of Richmond's easement for the Hilltop Identification Sign, located adjacent to Interstate-80, so that LBG Hilltop LLC may execute a new easement so they can replace and maintain a new sign.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

G-1. The city clerk announced that it was time, pursuant to public notice, to hold a public hearing to adopt a resolution to quitclaim an unused public utility easement owned by the City of Richmond recorded within the property with APN 507-251-021 adjacent to Dalai Lama Avenue and authorize quitclaim of the easement. Infrastructure Administrator Patrick Phelan gave an oral report. Mayor Butt declared the public hearing open. There were no public speakers. Mayor Butt closed the public hearing. Discussion ensued. On motion of Councilmember Willis, seconded by Councilmember McLaughlin, adopted **Resolution No. 4-21** by the unanimous vote of the City Council.

COUNCIL AS A WHOLE

H-1. The matter to receive an updated staffing presentation from the Police Department to include changes and/or modifications to the services provided to the community based on resource allocations due to financial and efficiency considerations was presented by Police Chief Bisa French and Assistant Police Chief Louie Tirona. Chief French presented a Powerpoint that highlighted 2020 crime trends and 2021 staffing and operational changes. Assistant Chief Tirona presented police reform efforts;

and enhanced police equipment, training, and transparency contract services provided by AXON. Discussion ensued. The council requested the following: the police closure rate for violent crimes in Richmond; the percentage of priority level 4 and 5 police calls; use-of-force data; the percentage of stolen vehicles in Richmond; the Council recommended support for Rich City Rides to qualify for an Environmental and Community Investment Agreement grant for youth cycling activities; raise community awareness to police rewards; an immediate future agenda item reporting what other cities paid for county services compared to the City of Richmond; the number of citations issued annually or monthly with the number of individuals cited that had valid driving licenses; and for staff to reconsider police response policies for noise complaints. Elsa Stevens gave comments.

(Items H-2 and H-3 were discussed together).

H-2. The matter to approve the installation of 575 street sweeping parking restriction signs in the Richmond Annex and Panhandle Annex Neighborhoods was introduced by Public Works Director Yader Bermudez; and

H-3. The matter to discuss and direct staff to suspend ticketing during the COVID-19 Shelter-in-Place Order and come back to the Council in three months with options to modify the Street Sweeping Program for ALL interested neighborhoods was introduced by Councilmembers McLaughlin and Martinez. Discussion ensued. The Council requested staff to verify that the proposed alternatives to street sweeping signs described with item H-3 complied with the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System permit requirements described with item H-2; and to provide the cost for such alternatives. The following speakers gave comments via teleconference: Franco DeMarinis, Garland Ellis, Naomi Williams, Karen Franklin, Kathleen Erwin, Roberta Boucher, Michele Rappaport, and Tarnel Abbott. Further discussion ensued. A motion was made by Councilmember Willis approving item H-3, seconded by Councilmember McLaughlin. Further discussion ensued. The council recommended staff start working on a neighborhood street sweeping notification system immediately to help all neighborhoods begin compliance. The motion suspended ticketing in all neighborhoods with current signage at least until the shelter-in-place was lifted; directed staff to research revisions to the City of Richmond's Street Sweeping Program that included: use of city reminder notifications by email, phone, and/or text to all interested residents on street sweeping days; allowed ALL interested neighborhoods to opt into a voluntary compliance process (with potential removal of signage); ceased any plans to install new signage in any neighborhood while modifications were under study by staff and the Council; explore making temporary signs available to interested residents; and return to the Council in three months with options to consider for modification of the Street Sweeping Program by the following vote: **Ayes:** Councilmembers Jimenez, Johnson, Martinez, McLaughlin, Willis, and Vice Mayor Bates. **Noes:** Mayor Butt. **Absent:** None. **Abstained:** None.

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

Councilmember Willis reported on the increased homelessness in Richmond and potential funding to address the issue. Councilmember Willis urged the Council and his constituents to make sacrifices to address the growing issue together.

Vice Mayor Bates congratulated the new President-elect Joe Biden and Vice President-elect Kamala Harris. Vice Mayor Bates stated that he was looking forward to a better working relationship with the administration in Washington D.C.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 9:20 p.m., in memory of Guanetta Haynes, to meet again on Tuesday, January 26, 2021, at 6:30 p.m.

Clerk of the City of Richmond

(SEAL)

Approved:

Mayor

From: [cordell hindler](#)
To: [City Clerk Dept](#)
Subject: OPEN FORUM FOR PUBLIC COMMENT
Date: Thursday, January 14, 2021 9:28:20 PM

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

1. my projects are coming along exquisitely and i will keep the council informed once i return
- 2, also i would like to see the idea of having the Standing committees on a future Agenda

sincerely
Cordell

From: [Hewot Shankute](#)
To: [City Clerk Dept](#)
Cc: [Naomi Shankute](#)
Subject: Public Comments - Agenda Item H-3
Date: Tuesday, January 19, 2021 9:49:17 AM

Dear Mayor and Councilmembers:

I do not support street sweeping signs being installed in my neighborhood. I support H-3 which directs staff to suspend ticketing for street sweeping during the COVID-19 Shelter-in-Place Order (for neighborhoods with current signage), to refrain from installing new signs in neighborhoods without them, and to come back to the Council in 3 months with options to modify the Street Sweeping Program for **ALL** interested neighborhoods. For months, our Richmond Annex neighborhood came together to support our fellow neighbors with reminders via community emails, flyers, and signs about street sweeping days. We saw great results in neighborhood compliance because of it and took many videos and photos on street sweeping days to document our neighborhood's success. The time, resources, and effort neighbor's expended to send reminders and create signage demonstrates our motivation to do whatever it takes to support street sweeping access and keep the unnecessary burden of ugly signs and punitive fines outside of our neighborhood.

Looking at our demonstrated community efforts, I believe the City could and should play an active role in sending reminders to the community via email, text and/or phone prior to street sweeping days. This will help support the existing community will to bring about compliance for the needed removal of vehicles to allow the street sweeper to get to the curbs.

I acknowledge the importance of keeping our streets and environment clean and healthy. I feel strongly that these signs detract from the beauty of my neighborhood and I fully believe we can get compliance to happen in non-punitive ways with the City's help and without unsightly signs.

Please do not vote to install these signs and vote instead to support Item H-3.

Sincerely,

Hewot Shankute
Naomi Shankute
1346 Merced Street

--

RECIPIENT, PLEASE NOTIFY AND RETURN TO SENDER."

From: [Cheryl Collier](#)
To: [City Clerk Dept](#)
Subject: Public Comments - Agenda Item H-3
Date: Monday, January 18, 2021 12:07:57 PM

Dear Mayor and Council members :

I do not support street sweeping signs being installed in my neighborhood. I support H-3 which direct staff to suspend ticketing for street sweeping during the COVID-19 Shelter-in-Place Order (for neighborhoods with current signs), to refrain from installing new signs in neighborhoods without them, and to come back to the Council in three months with options to modify the Street Sweeping Program for All interested neighborhoods.

I believe the city could and should play an active role in sending reminders to the communities via email, text and or phone prior to street sweeping day. This will help bring about compliance for the needed removal of vehicles to allow the street sweepers to get to the curbs.

I acknowledge the importance of keeping our streets and environment clean and healthy. I feel strongly that these signs detract from the beauty of my neighborhood, and I fully believe we can get compliance to happen in non-punitive ways with the City's help and without unsightly signs.

Please do not vote to install these signs and vote Instead to support Item H-3.

Sincerely,
Cheryl Collier
Past president of PANC

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Christopher Flynn](#)
To: [City Clerk Dept](#)
Cc: gayleforrichmond@gmail.com
Subject: Public Comments - Agenda Item H-3
Date: Saturday, January 16, 2021 1:17:16 PM

Dear Council:

I do not support street sweeping signs being installed in residential neighborhoods.

1. Residential neighborhoods are not the debris problem - the debris problem is industrial neighborhoods and major thoroughfares.

2. Explain the money.

2.a Cost of signs - who makes money installing signs.

-----Provide Richmond City budget Expense Line Item amount to pay for signs.

-----Provide Richmond City budget Revenue Line Item source to fund signs.

-----Identify recipients of these city funds/expenses.

2.b Revenue made from sign enforcement

-----Provide Richmond City budget Revenue Line Item budgeting income from sign enforcement.

-----Provide Richmond City budget Expense Line Item budgeting expense of sign enforcement.

Thanks
Chris Flynn
Richmond

From: [Deirdre McCarthy](#)
To: [City Clerk Dept](#)
Subject: Public Comments - Agenda Item H-3
Date: Saturday, January 16, 2021 1:05:33 PM

Dear Mayor and Councilmembers:

I do not support street sweeping signs being installed in my neighborhood. I support H-3 which directs staff to suspend ticketing for street sweeping during the COVID-19 Shelter-in-Place Order (for neighborhoods with current signage), to refrain from installing new signs in neighborhoods without them, and to come back to the Council in 3 months with options to modify the Street Sweeping Program for ALL interested neighborhoods.

I believe the City could and should play an active role in sending reminders to the community via email, text and/or phone prior to street sweeping days. This will help bring about compliance for the needed removal of vehicles to allow the street sweeper to get to the curbs.

I acknowledge the importance of keeping our streets and environment clean and healthy. I feel strongly that these signs detract from the beauty of my neighborhood and I fully believe we can get compliance to happen in non-punitive ways with the City's help and without unsightly signs.

Please do not vote to install these signs and vote instead to support Item H-3.

Sincerely,

Deirdre McCarthy

--

Senior Photo Retouch Artist, ILM (San Francisco)

Photo-retoucher, Graphic Artist + UI Designer

415-846-3970

<http://deirdre-mccarthy-artist.squarespace.com>

From: [Dorothy Gilbert](#)
To: [City Clerk Dept](#)
Subject: Public Comments -- Agenda Item H-3
Date: Tuesday, January 19, 2021 12:45:13 PM

Dear Mayor and Councilmembers:

I do not support street sweeping signs being installed in my neighborhood. I support H-3 which directs staff to suspend ticketing for street sweeping during the COVID-19 Shelter-in-Place Order (for neighborhoods with current signage), to refrain from installing new signs in neighborhoods without them, and to come back to the Council in 3 months with options to modify the Street Sweeping Program for ALL interested neighborhoods.

I believe the City could and should play an active role in sending reminders to the community via email, text and/or phone prior to street sweeping days. This will help bring about compliance for the needed removal of vehicles to allow the street sweeper to get to the curbs.

I acknowledge the importance of keeping our streets and environment clean and healthy. I feel strongly that these signs detract from the beauty of my neighborhood and I fully believe we can get compliance to happen in non-punitive ways with the City's help and without unsightly signs.

Please do not vote to install these signs and vote instead to support Item H-3.
Thank you very much for your attention to my letter.

Sincerely,

Dorothy Gilbert (Richmond homeowner 22 years)

From: [ellen_celidore](#)
To: [City Clerk Dept](#)
Subject: Public Comments - Agenda Item H-3
Date: Saturday, January 16, 2021 4:00:28 PM

Dear Mayor and Councilmembers:

I do not support street sweeping signs being installed in my neighborhood. I support H-3 which directs staff to suspend ticketing for street sweeping during the COVID-19 Shelter-in-Place Order (for neighborhoods with current signage), to refrain from installing new signs in neighborhoods without them, and to come back to the Council in 3 months with options to modify the Street Sweeping Program for ALL interested neighborhoods.

I believe the City could and should play an active role in sending reminders to the community via email, text and/or phone prior to street sweeping days. This will help bring about compliance for the needed removal of vehicles to allow the street sweeper to get to the curbs.

I acknowledge the importance of keeping our streets and environment clean and healthy. I feel strongly that these signs detract from the beauty of my neighborhood and I fully believe we can get compliance to happen in non-punitive ways with the City's help and without unsightly signs.

Please do not vote to install these signs and vote instead to support Item H-3.

Sincerely,

Ellen Celidore
2501 San Mateo St
Richmond, 94804

From: [Karen Franklin](#)
To: [City Clerk Dept](#)
Subject: Public Comments - Agenda Item H-3
Date: Tuesday, January 19, 2021 11:09:29 AM

Dear Mayor and City Council Members,

I do NOT support street sweeping signs being installed in my neighborhood, the Panhandle Annex. I support H-3 which directs staff to refrain from installing new signs in neighborhoods without them, and to come back to the Council in three months with more carefully considered options. I support proposals for the City to play an active role in sending out street-sweeping reminders via email, text and/or phone, to help ensure compliance and allow the street sweeper to do his job.

The City has been woefully deficient in keeping us informed on this matter. The ONLY official communication we have had was last July 16th, when the Public Works Department sent a letter informing residents of the Panhandle neighborhood 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.

In response to that letter, our neighborhood sprung into action to demonstrate voluntary compliance. 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; I sent you a few sample photos in my previous letter of Dec. 13, 2020.

So imagine our shock when, after all of our success, we learned that the City has totally ignored our voluntary compliance, and is pushing to approve street-sweeping signs anyways!

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 woefully out of touch and not responsive to 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 but 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 -- not penalizing residents who are voluntarily doing what it asks.

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](#)
Cc: [Tom Butt - external](#); [Nat Bates](#); [Eduardo Martinez](#); [Claudia Jimenez](#); [Demnlus Johnson](#); [Gayle McLaughlin](#); [Melvin Willis](#)
Subject: Public Comments - Agenda Item H-3
Date: Tuesday, January 19, 2021 6:17:14 AM

Dear Mayor and Council members,

I do not want my Annex neighborhood's street sweeping sign exemption thrown out. To be discussing installing these signs during our current pandemic, when we are so restricted in our movements, feels capricious and cruel.

I support measure H-3. The City should take the time to examine the initial goals of our policy and explore how it could be more effective in keeping streets clean, protecting our Bay, and promoting equality among all residents.

Putting up signs that are twice as big as those used in surrounding municipalities does not enhance any part of Richmond. Looking at our residential areas, you will find these unsightly signs located in neighborhoods with lower per capita incomes and non-existent in "upscale" neighborhoods. Accordingly, punitive fines are being disproportionately levied on people least able to pay them.

What could make our City better? I suggest that reminders of the sweeping schedule be sent to all residents on a regular basis. Educate the public on the connection between keeping curbs litter free and clean water runoff. Where signs are deemed necessary, or need replacing, use the 12" x 18" signs used universally by our neighbors. Pertinent data and additional ideas will certainly be generated with more study.

Please do not vote in favor of H-2 to install these hideous signs — vote instead in support of Item H-3.

Sincerely,
Linda Kalin

From: marshavaughn3@att.net
To: [City Clerk Dept](#)
Subject: Public Comments - Agenda Item H-3
Date: Saturday, January 16, 2021 12:27:35 PM

Dear Mayor and All Councilmembers:

I am writing again to say that I do not support street sweeping signs being installed in my neighborhood. It is a huge waste of tax payers money. We need our street repaved more urgently.

I support H-3 which directs staff to suspend ticketing for street sweeping during the COVID-19 Shelter-in-Place Order (for neighborhoods with current signage), to refrain from installing new signs in neighborhoods without them, and to come back to the Council in 3 months with options to modify the Street Sweeping Program for ALL interested neighborhoods.

The City can and should play an active role in sending reminders to the community via email, text and/or phone prior to street sweeping days. During our 90 day trial period, many of us took this upon ourselves to alert our neighbors to move their cars only to discover that the street sweeper truck had broken down or was not scheduled, after all. If the city owned its responsibility for this, it would help bring about compliance for the needed removal of vehicles to allow the street sweeper to get to the curbs as well as build positive credibility with the citizens.

I agree that it is important to keep our streets and environment clean and healthy. However, at the same time, I have seen very little litter or anything but leaf debris during my daily walks through the Annex. I feel strongly that these signs detract from the beauty of my neighborhood and I fully believe we can get compliance to happen in non-punitive ways with the City's help and without unsightly signs.

Please do not vote to install these signs and vote instead to support Item H-3.

Thank you,

Marsha Vaughn
2513 San Mateo Street
Richmond

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

From: [NAOMI SHANKUTE](#)
To: [City Clerk Dept](#)
Subject: Public Comments- Agenda Item H-3
Date: Tuesday, January 19, 2021 10:07:08 AM

Dear Mayor and Councilmembers,

My name is Naomi Shankute and I was one of the many neighbors involved in the organizing efforts to proactively alert, communicate, and track compliance of the removal of cars on street sweeping days. I (along with many others) flyer every vehicle in the panhandle annex and communicated upcoming street sweeping days. I personally walked throughout the neighborhood and placed small flyers developed by our neighborhood president on cars and also placed removable self-made signs to alert of street sweeping days. I am a new home owner coming up on 1 year in this vibrant and beautiful neighborhood. Street sweeping signs are not a good investment of our tax dollars, let us redirect those funds to supporting and enriching our community. Help support these efforts through partnering with us on reminders. Let us get to a future where we are discussing pedestrian safety projects, improved pavement conditions and street markings, traffic calming and alternative transportation initiatives for our community not punitive and unsightly measures. Our active community constantly organizes to remove litter and clean our streets. Where is the city in partnering with us on these important and crucial matters? We are taking it upon ourselves to improve our neighborhood and it is important that we have the city supporting us in these efforts, not diminishing the beauty and value of our neighborhood.

I took it upon myself to monitor compliance each morning of street sweeping and following the street sweeper and compare our compliance (after the flyer and communication efforts) against those neighborhoods with street sweeping signs. I have photos to confirm that our compliance was superior to the neighborhoods with street sweeping signs.

I do not support street sweeping signs being installed in my neighborhood. I support H-3 which directs staff to suspend ticketing for street sweeping during the COVID-19 Shelter in place order (for neighborhoods with current signage), to refrain from installing new signs in neighborhoods without them, and come back to the Council in 3 months with options to modify the street sweeping program for all interested neighborhoods.

I believe the city could and should play an active role in sending reminders to the community via email, text and/or phone prior to street sweeping days. This will help bring about compliance for the needed removal of vehicles to allow for street sweeper to get to the curbs.

I acknowledge the importance of keeping our streets and environment clean and healthy. I feel strongly that these signs detract from the beauty of my neighborhood and I fully believe we can get compliance to happen in non-punitive ways with the city's help and without unsightly signs.

Please do not vote to install these signs and vote instead to support item H-3.

Naomi Shankute, MPH

From: [Peter Spiro](#)
To: [City Clerk Dept](#)
Subject: Public Comments - Agenda Item H-3
Date: Sunday, January 17, 2021 12:00:13 PM

Dear Mayor and Council members:

My neighborhood, the Richmond Annex, is in desperate need of STOP signs, not street sweeping signs.

The Annex has many intersections with no traffic controls in any direction, leading to accidents and near-accidents.

Please designate signage funding for addressing this important safety issue, rather than for street sweeping.

Regarding street sweeping, I believe the City should send reminders to the community via email, text and/or phone prior to street sweeping days. This will help bring about compliance for the needed removal of vehicles to allow the street sweeper to get to the curbs.

Street sweeping signs would detract from the beauty of my neighborhood. I fully believe we can get compliance to happen in non-punitive ways with the City's help and without unsightly signs.

Please vote to support H-3.

Sincerely,
Peter Spiro

5701 Fresno Ave.
Richmond, CA 94804

From: [Roberta Boucher](#)
To: [City Clerk Dept](#)
Subject: Public Comments - Agenda Item H-3 | Roberta Boucher
Date: Monday, January 18, 2021 3:13:33 PM

Esteemed Members of the Council,

As a 17 year Annex resident I HIGHLY oppose the addition of street sweeping signs to the neighborhood.

1) I don't believe we have had the benefit of reviewing any sort of financial impact statement for the installation/revenue results of these signs. Have the costs to fabricate and install, along with the back end administrative costs associated with this process been studied? There are SO MANY "hidden costs" associated with installing and enforcing these signs. It would be irresponsible to proceed without considering ALL the costs vs. perceived revenue.

2) The Annex is a unique community that banded together to not only object to addition of signs in 2003, but to successfully meet the City requirement to uphold the honor system of moving cars on sweeping days. I believe that the turnover of real estate in the neighborhood, along with in the increase in rental units has cause a temporary glitch in the communication of street sweeping days - this is EASILY remedied with an advance notice system! The cost of such a notification system is pennies compared to the cost of installing signs.

3) The signs are unsightly and will diminish the aesthetic of this lovely neighborhood.

I SUPPORT H-3 and ask that Council vote to refrain from installing new signs in neighborhoods without them, and to come back to the Council in 3 months with options to modify the Street Sweeping Program for ALL interested neighborhoods.

I also believe the City could and should play an active role in sending reminders to the community via email, text and/or phone prior to street sweeping days. This will help bring about compliance for the needed removal of vehicles to allow the street sweeper to get to the curbs.

Sincerely,
~ Roberta Boucher
1685 Merced Street
robertaboucher@yahoo.com
510-685-1484

From: [Scott Parker](#)
To: [City Clerk Dept](#)
Subject: Public Comments - Agenda Item H-3
Date: Tuesday, January 19, 2021 1:03:45 PM

Dear Mayor and Councilmembers:

While I agree wholeheartedly that the creation and collection of any additional fines should be suspended for the duration of the pandemic—and in particular the shelter-in-place orders that have been issued by state and local government—I cannot support resolution H3, particularly in its current form.

Though I believe H3 to be created from good intentions, as I understand it the resistance to change comes from a desire to avoid additional signage that would effectively detract from the beautification of the neighborhood. Though I do not necessarily agree with the idea that adding signs on the street would necessarily lead to overall visual degradation, my objection to H3 is not based in aesthetics.

In fact, I find that the solutions proposed in the name of aesthetics—while presented as a progressive issue—are instead profoundly anti-egalitarian and potentially unfair for many residents in our community.

Fairness:

For parking in particular, the fairest approach is to clearly mark the areas of enforcement and include clear notification that location of when potential fines may occur.

- Messages delivered in the form of email, text messages, phone calls, and even hand-painted community generated signage, necessarily target a smaller audience such as those who are registered with the city email or phone notification system, those who choose to opt-in, those who have access to email, and so on.

However, the possibility of being fined includes everyone who might park in a given (un-marked) location at a given time, even those who are unable to receive electronic notification. This creates a condition of privilege where those community members who have the means of receiving notifications are empowered to move their vehicles at the designated time, whereas those who cannot will bear the financial burden of paying a fine for reasons that were not clearly stated to them.

- Clearly marked and standardized signs are likely to be more clearly understood by all members of the community, regardless of individual levels of numeracy, literacy, or technological abilities. The same cannot be said for messages delivered in email or text. Automated emails, texts, and even phone calls may be filtered as SPAM. Phone numbers and email addresses may change. And in this difficult economy, access to these tools may be more of a burden than they were previously.
- Challenges to fines could arguably be more frequent in a system that notifies via text, email, or phone calls. If this is the case, appeals to fines to happen, but again there is an unfair burden placed on community members who may not have the time, background knowledge, or legal standing to put forward an appeal. A clearly marked sign placed where a fine might be incurred creates a more level and fair set of conditions for individuals to gain the knowledge they need to plan and make choices that will avoid a financial burden.

Costs:

In the text of H3 the cost of ongoing maintenance of signs is given as an objection. However, there is no costing or even ballpark estimates given. My assumption is that the average life of a road sign is measured in years, and notwithstanding unscheduled repair and replacement due to damage, the signs do not require frequent maintenance.

The same cannot be said for the proposed email/text/phone system. Does the city of Richmond possess the technical infrastructure to create and maintain a system of automated emails and calls? If so, are there additional administration and operational costs associated with creating and maintaining this functionality. If not, are there

estimates regarding the procurement and deployment of the system, including testing, rollout strategy and public notifications, and ongoing administration and troubleshooting? Do nearby jurisdictions such as Albany that have rolled out similar systems have deployment and maintenance costs that can be shared?

In summary:

If the intention of the city government is to begin levying fines for parking in areas that are scheduled for street cleaning, then the only fair and equitable situation is to post clearly worded and standardized signage at the place of enforcement.

Thank you for the opportunity to share my opinions on the matter.

Scott Parker
Panhandle Annex, Richmond

From: [cordell hindler](#)
To: [City Clerk Dept](#)
Subject: Public Comment I-1 Resolutions
Date: Thursday, January 14, 2021 9:46:40 PM

hello Sabrina, the Reason that the council should approve the Resolution is because i like how it is written and also i do agree about a class and comp study being to address the matter

sincerely
Cordell

From: [cordell hindler](#)
To: [City Clerk Dept](#)
Subject: Public Comments J-2 Council as a whole
Date: Thursday, January 14, 2021 9:59:19 PM

hello Sabrina, i have some comments for the Record

i am against the idea of street sweeping signs because i have spoken with the councils and they do not feel that these signs will not benefit the residents

i will ask that if the council do not approve it

sincerely
Cordell