

RICHMOND, CALIFORNIA, March 23, 2021

The Richmond City Council Evening Open Session was called to order at 5:02 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 March 23, 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 Nathaniel Bates, Claudia Jimenez, Eduardo Martinez, Gayle McLaughlin, Melvin Willis, Vice Mayor Demnlus Johnson III, and Mayor Thomas K. Butt.
Absent: None.

PUBLIC COMMENT

The Public Comment Instructional Video was shown.

The city clerk announced the public comment procedures and that the purpose of the Open Session was for the City Council to hear public comments on the following items to be discussed in Closed Session:

CITY COUNCIL

PUBLIC EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE EVALUATION
(Government Code Section 54957):

Title: City Attorney

CONFERENCE WITH LEGAL COUNSEL - EXISTING LITIGATION (paragraph (1) of Subdivision [d] of Government Code Section 54956.9):

Eric Reason, et al. v. Virgil Thomas, et al.

PUBLIC COMMENT BEFORE CLOSED SESSION

There were no public comments.

ADJOURN TO CLOSED SESSION

The Open Session adjourned to Closed Session at 5:12 p.m. Closed Session adjourned at 7:18p.m.

The Regular Meeting of the Richmond City Council was called to order at 7:30 p.m. by Mayor Butt via teleconference.

REGULAR MEETING OF THE RICHMOND CITY COUNCIL

ROLL CALL

Present: Councilmembers Bates, Jimenez, Martinez, McLaughlin, Willis, Vice Mayor Johnson III, and Mayor Butt.
Absent: None.

PUBLIC COMMENT INSTRUCTIONAL VIDEO

The Public Comment Instructional Video was shown.

STATEMENT OF CONFLICT OF INTEREST

None.

AGENDA REVIEW

Mayor Butt stated a correction to Item I-2 and changed the appointment of the liaison to the Community Police Review Commission from Vice Mayor Johnson III to Councilmember Jimenez. A motion was made by Councilmember Willis, seconded by Councilmember McLaughlin, added an emergency proclamation condemning Asian hate crimes, by the unanimous vote of the City Council. Item I-3 was moved and discussed as the first item under Study and Action Session.

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

PROCLAMATIONS

Mayor Butt presented a proclamation declaring March 22, 2021, as the Day of Hope and Healing in the City of Richmond.

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

City Attorney Theresa Stricker stated there were no final actions to report.

REPORT FROM THE CITY MANAGER

City Manager Laura Snideman stated there has been a decrease in Coronavirus cases in Richmond and Contra Costa County moved to a less restrictive tier. Ms. Snideman also

announced that there were in person after school programs and Zumba sessions through the Recreation Department. All safety protocols and guidelines must be followed in order to attend. Councilmember Bates thanked City Manager Snideman and staff for their efforts and progress with cleans up and street repairs made throughout the city.

EMERGENCY ITEM

An emergency proclamation Condemning Asian Hate Crimes was presented by Councilmembers Bates and McLaughlin who gave an overview of the matter. A motion made by Councilmember McLaughlin, seconded by Councilmember Bates, approved the proclamation, by the unanimous vote of the City Council.

OPEN FORUM FOR PUBLIC COMMENT

The following individuals gave comments via teleconference:

Tarnel Abbott gave comments regarding Love Canal being built on toxic land and reiterated that the Zeneca site should not be developed with housing due to its toxicity.

Janet Wicklen, Kurt Jensen, and Lingsie Jensen gave comments against the approval of a Disc Golf Club at Hilltop Lake Park.

Leisa Johnson stated the Cafeteria Building on Canal Boulevard has been overridden by crime, human trafficking, and drug activity and needed to be addressed to eliminate public health issues.

Joey Schlemmer stated that the city should hire an actuary to do an analysis of the Richmond Pension Tax Fund and CalPERS program.

Yenny Garcia stated that the Community Police Review Commission lost its staff person, Shane Johnson, and requested someone be assigned as soon as possible.

STUDY AND ACTION SESSION

I-1. The matter to receive a presentation from Management Partners on the development of a 10-year financial forecast and an interactive budget dashboard tool designed to help understand and address Richmond's current and future fiscal challenges was presented by Deputy City Manager, LaShonda White who gave an overview of the matter. Andy Belknap and Rob Leland from Management Partners, presented a PowerPoint, which highlighted the following: Project Background and Forecast Model; Key Assumptions; Revenue and Expenditure Forecast; and Frozen Positions. Discussion ensued. A list of 55 FTE's and vacant position information would be provided to the City Council.

(11:00 p.m. – A motion by Councilmember Jimenez to extend the meeting until 11:30 p.m., died for lack of a second.

I-2. Continued to the April 6, 2021, City Council meeting, the matter to approve appointments for the Mayor and Councilmembers to Regional Committees, Ad-Hoc Committees

and Liaison Positions for the year of 2021. This item was continued from the March 16, 2021, meeting. *The Community Police Review Commission liaison was changed from Vice Mayor Johnson III, to Councilmember Jimenez.*

I-3. The matter to adopt an urgency ordinance enacting a temporary moratorium on certain evictions of residential tenants in Richmond impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic through the state of the local emergency and 60 days thereafter, or in the alternative, introduce an ordinance enacting a temporary moratorium on certain evictions of residential tenants in Richmond impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic through the state of the local emergency and 60 days thereafter was presented by Councilmembers McLaughlin and Willis who gave an overview of the matter. Discussion ensued. The following individuals gave comments via teleconference: Elsa Stevens, Anne Tamiko Omura, Lauren Russo, Virginia Garcia Ramirez, Tarnel Abbott, Paul Larudee, Edith Pastrano, Nancy, Andrea Henson, Leisa Johnson, Amanda Lara, Glen, Jeannie Llewellyn, Ritchie Cook, Jackie Zaneri, Denny Khamphanthong, Tuan, Luke Blacklidge, Kristi Laughlin, Christina B., Raul Vasquez, Alma, and Ana Gonzalez. A motion by Councilmember McLaughlin, seconded by Councilmember Willis, adopted **Urgency Ordinance No. 02-21 N.S.**, and included the following amendment to Section 4a to add: *this section does not apply to any writ of possession that was entered before this ordinance took effect*, passed by the following vote: **Ayes:** Councilmembers Jimenez, Martinez, McLaughlin, Willis, and Vice Mayor Johnson III. **Noes:** Councilmember Bates and Mayor Butt. **Absent:** None. **Abstain:** None.

I-4. Continued to the April 6, 2021, City Council meeting, the matter to consider reinstating the Finance, Economic Development and Administrative Services Standing Committee and the Public Services/Safety Committee.

I-5. Continued to the April 6, 2021, City Council meeting, the matter to receive a presentation regarding the Dispatch Communications Center and approve the City of Richmond Position Classification Plan to add the new Communications Dispatcher III classification.

I-6. Continued to the April 6, 2021, City Council meeting, the matter to announce recent resignation from City of Richmond boards, commissions, and committees; and announce vacancies as of March 17, 2021, and ask that interested individuals send applications to the City Clerk.

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

None.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 11:00 p.m., to meet again on Tuesday, April 6, 2021, at 6:30 p.m.

Clerk of the City of Richmond

(SEAL)

Approved:

Mayor

From: [Cordell Hindler](#)
To: [City Clerk Dept](#)
Subject: Public Comment Open Forum
Date: Thursday, March 18, 2021 4:58:57 PM

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

1. as far as my projects goes, it is coming along just exquisite, and i will keep the council informed in May
2. I must remind the council to call or email staff in regarding items on the consent calendar

sincerely
Cordell

From: [Terence Krista](#)
To: [City Clerk Dept](#)
Subject: public comments agenda item I-4 - Open Forum
Date: Monday, March 22, 2021 2:22:39 PM

The city council's recent vote to place the proposed Safe Park program in a busy parking lot in Richmond's Civic Center completely upends the idea of good governance. First, the surrounding neighborhood was never notified such a move was imminent nor informed how such a placement would impact their community. Second, the Civic Center lot is already in regular use by the surrounding community, including Grace Lutheran church, the Laotian temple Wat Lao Rattanaram, the Richmond Art Center, the Richmond Memorial Auditorium, Nevin Plaza Senior Housing and the Wilson & Kratzer Mortuary. In addition this lot has served as the long time home of the weekly Richmond Farmers Market and currently houses a community hub run by Contra Costa County Health Services for those seeking free Covid-19 testing.

It is my understanding the city recognized 35 possible sites for the Safe Park program, the majority of which were in empty or unused spaces. It is impossible then to understand why the council chose to place Safe Park in a busy parking lot in the middle of a residential neighborhood. This decision was improperly planned, hastily implemented and distressingly short-sighted. The success of any program is based on the goodwill of all parties involved. Unfortunately, the council's decision has left the Civic Center community feeling confused, anxious and completely disenfranchised.

I urge the council to reconsider and revote to place Safe Park in a location where a program devised to help the unhoused does not completely disrupt and inconvenience the entire surrounding community.

Thank you-

Terence Krista

From: [Cordell Hindler](#)
To: [City Clerk Dept](#)
Subject: Public Comment I-1 Study Session
Date: Thursday, March 18, 2021 5:14:42 PM

hello Sabrina, I do want to Commend the City Managers office and finance department for an exquisite presentation that management partners has made

sincerely
Cordell

From: [Katrinka Ruk](#)
To: [City Clerk Dept](#)
Cc: [Tom Butt - external](#); [Demnlus Johnson III](#); [Nat Bates](#); [jimenez.claudia78@gmail.com](#); [ezedmartin@yahoo.com](#); [gayledirect@gmail.com](#); [Melvin Willis](#); [mrmelvinwillis@gmail.com](#); [Laura Snideman](#); [Belinda Brown](#); [LaShonda White](#)
Subject: !Public comments - Agenda Item#I-1 10-Year Financial Forecast (3/23 City Council Meeting)
Date: Tuesday, March 23, 2021 12:28:03 PM
Attachments: [03.23.21 Fiscal Model, bus lic tx.docx](#)

/email/

To: City Clerk, Richmond

cc: City Manager, City Council

Re: 03/23/21 Richmond City Council / ITEM #I-1 10 YEAR FINANCIAL FORECAST

The Council of Business & Industries (COI) supports the City forecasting its financial health for an extended period of time as this support establishing solid economic and financial policies, programs and budgets. Given the COIVD19 pandemic we would ask that the City be cautious in assuming how quickly local Richmond businesses will be able to return to full business.

The financial forecast provides that the Business License Tax will anticipate additional revenue of \$5.3Mil in FY2022 for a total of \$8.5M (pg28 of presentation). However, according to Measure U and presentations by City Staff, the anticipated revenue is \$9M. In previous presentations by the Finance Department, this \$9M amount included revenue from the gross receipts business license tax, cannabis business tax and property owner's business license tax.

The economic environment of 2019, 2020, etc. is very different from 2018 given the COVID19 pandemic, therefore, the business community has continued to express our concerns with this calculation for the following reasons:

- 1) businesses have closed down and we still don't know if they will reopen
- 2) the service industry (restaurants, hotels/motels, retail) was greatly impacted and it is unknown if this will return to pre-COVID times
- 3) Hilltop Mall is completely closed therefore; the City will not see any gross receipts tax from the retail sector there.
- 4) there are rumors that Walmart will move to Pinole taking with it their sales and gross receipts
- 5) the other largest retail sales businesses are Costco and auto sales - auto dealerships have stated that if the business license progressive tax is not reduced to be equitable to Richmond business standards and in consideration of the impact of the COVID pandemic, they will relocate

6) revenue from hotels/motels have been nonexistent during this pandemic, and, given that three of these businesses will continue to be used for COVID response and homeless housing, the City will not see business license tax revenue from these classifications.

7) in discussions with current businesses, many businesses do not earn gross receipts in the City of Richmond, rather, their revenues come from outside the City, region or state. Under the Business Tax Ordinance, they would then be taxed on payroll which may remain stable or may not increase year to year.

8) unemployment increased limiting buying ability of residents

9) the business license tax amendments provided for exemptions for rent control units, decreasing the tax revenue from this sector originally predicted

10) the City has recognized that additional language needs to be added to the ordinance such that subcontractors and general contractors are not taxed on the same jobs that they are both overseeing in the City of Richmond therefore, previous estimations of potential revenue was overestimated

Secondly, the forecast provides for an increase in the business license tax as follows:

- FY22 \$8.5M
- FY23 \$9.2M increase of 8%
- FY24 \$10.0M increase of 8.7%
- FY25 \$10.3M increase of 3%
- etc.

These projections of an 8% or \$700,000 increase in revenues from FY22 to FY23 are not realistic. Remember, this tax is only on gross receipts earned in the City of Richmond.

According to World Economic Outlook, the global economy is only going to grow 5.5%:

Amid exceptional uncertainty, the global economy is projected to grow **5.5 percent** in 2021 and 4.2 percent in 2022.

The 2021 forecast is revised up 0.3 percentage point relative to the previous forecast, reflecting expectations of a

vaccine-powered strengthening of activity later in the year and additional policy support in a few large economies.

[World Economic Outlook Update, January 2021: Policy ...](#)

www.imf.org/en/Publications/WEO/Issues/2021/01/26/2021-world-economic-out

We ask that the City staff reconsider this forecast for a more reasonable reflection of current and future impacts on the Richmond City businesses.

Respectfully,

Katrinka Ruk

Executive Director

CC: COI Board of Directors

Katrinka Ruk
Executive Director
Council of Business & Industries
510)260-4820 cell
www.councilofindustries.com

From: [Al M](#)
To: [City Clerk Dept](#); [Tom Butt - external](#); [Nat Bates](#); [Gayle McLaughlin](#); [Eduardo Martinez](#); [Demnlus Johnson](#); [Melvin Willis](#); [Claudia Jimenez](#)
Subject: March 23, Item 12: Appointing Councilmembers to Regional Committees, Ad Hoc Committees and Liaison positions to City Boards and Commissions
Date: Tuesday, March 23, 2021 12:10:35 PM

Dear Mayor Butt and Councilmembers:

I want to offer my support to Councilmember Jimenez as second liaison to Community Police Review Commission.

Councilmember Jimenez already demonstrated a humane, community-oriented interest and involvement in local law enforcement oversight and transparency. Because she acts and makes decisions in all fairness to the wide array of Richmond residents, she has the ability to collaborate across sectors and various standpoints. Having strong ties with the Richmond community, she easily engages with residents, who, in turn, feel comfortable and safe to voice their concerns to her. In addition, Councilmember Jimenez is a strong advocate of reducing harmful impacts of over-policing and mass incarceration, and of working with independent investigators to ensure lawful and democratic practices within the Police Department. These are just two of the progressive measures she proposes to ensure that Richmond be a safe and flourishing city for all of its residents and property owners.

The City of Richmond and its Police Department need Councilmember Jimenez on the Community Police Review Commission. Her deep sense of justice and fairness to all, along with the trust she has built with the people of Richmond makes her the perfect candidate for serving as liaison to this Commission. There is no doubt in my mind that she will bring a fresh look at everything, while serving neutrally and always remaining fair and objective.

Cordially,

Alix Mazuet

Richmond resident and property owner

From: [Leisa Johnson](#)
To: [City Clerk Dept](#)
Cc: [Leisa Johnson](#)
Subject: Written Public Comments for Item I-3, for supplemental materials.
Date: Tuesday, March 23, 2021 8:15:36 PM

Dear Madam Clerk,

Can you please include my below comments in the supplemental materials attached to the meeting minutes for Item I-3 on March 23, 2021?

Thank you,
Leisa

Dear Mayor Butt, Vice Mayor Johnson, Councilmembers, City Attorney Stricker and City Manager Snideman:

As per Item I-3, RPA Councilmembers McLaughlin & Willis are trying to adopt an urgency ordinance or regular ordinance (first reading) enacting a temporary moratorium on certain evictions of residential tenants in Richmond impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic **through the state of the local emergency** and 60 days thereafter.

As per their agenda report, It is not entirely clear to me what criteria they wish to “strengthen” given that they cannot stop the same two and only criteria that can currently be used to pursue an eviction in Richmond Superior Court and which the sheriff can legally enforce/serve.

This item is based on a KQED article written by Molly Solomon (<https://www.kqed.org/news/11856817/more-than-500-bay-area-residents-have-been-evicted-during-the-pandemic-despite-protections>).

Neither Ms. Solomon nor Councilmembers McLaughlin and Willis have done their due diligence. It’s not even clear where some of the numbers provided in the agenda report come from as there is no citation provided, and to my knowledge, they were not published in the KQED article. Moreover, the manner in which they are represented in the staff report is intentionally designed to create a manipulated narrative.

Point 1: Deceiving rates of eviction in Richmond that don’t make any sense.

- The agenda report claims that Richmond evictions occurred at a rate of 118.2 evictions per 100,000 renter households. (*Source not provided*)
 - Given that Richmond has ~17,600 renter households (Source: Rent Program 2020 report), that’s ~ 20.8 evictions in Richmond.
- The second claim in their report is that Richmond has “28 times more evictions than Oakland”. (*Source not provided*)
 - 21 evictions / 28 = .75 evictions.
 - How can Oakland evict .75 of a renter household (are they evicting body parts)?

Point 2: Actual numbers of eviction in Richmond.

- Between **March 19, 2020 - December 31, 2021**, Councilmembers McLaughlin &

Willis state that Richmond had 332 "Notices of Termination", which is different than actual evictions.

- 249 for nonpayment of rent
- 39 based on breach of lease (it is unclear why the authors of this item called this out separately since nonpayment of rent & nuisance can be classified as a breach of lease)
- 36 based on nuisance
- 8 based on owner move-ins
- The Council needs to understand the difference between a notice and an eviction. Housing providers must serve notices to cure a legal breach of contract. This is reported as a "Notice of Termination", but the vast majority of these are rectified, never pursued in the court, and never result in an eviction.
- In fact, Councilmembers McLaughlin & Willis both even acknowledge in their agenda report that, **"It is unclear how many of these Notices of Termination resulted in actual evictions."**
- Despite numerous requests from housing providers, the Rent Program continues to report a notice as an eviction. It is important to track Notices of Breach/Termination vs. actual Evictions. Both numbers are important to understand what is happening in Richmond.
- The KQED reporter also states in her article, on which this agenda item is based, "The data from sheriffs' offices showing 527 lockouts in the Bay Area **didn't include reasons for the evictions and may include cases involving a health and safety threat.**"
- Since the KQED reporter as well as Councilmembers McLaughlin & Willis failed to do any due diligence on what is actually happening & to report the **true number of evictions & their root causes**, I did a PRA request to obtain these numbers from the Contra Costa County Sheriff **and** Richmond Superior Court/Superior Court of California (see attached).
 - There were 34 court-approved evictions that were served by the Sheriff from **March 4, 2020 and Jan 31, 2021.**
 - Adjusted for KQED's timeframe, **March 19th through December 31st, 2020**, the number of evictions drops to 25 (still not possible to have 28 times more than Oakland, since the number is below 28).
 - The Superior Court of California, Contra Costa County indicated via email on March 22nd that ~ 20 of these 34 cases from March 4 - Jan 31, 2021 were post lockdown.
 - This Wednesday, March 24th, I will review those cases and record the cited cause for eviction:
 - Public Health & Safety threat to another tenant, housing provider and/or neighbor;
 - Ellis Act (removing unit from the rental market); or
 - Some other reason that is currently disallowed due to the eviction moratorium.
 - **Until you have all of this data, you cannot properly define the issue let alone what exactly you are trying to rectify.**

Point 3: SB 91 specifically states that local jurisdictions can discuss (and adopt) potential modifications to an existing eviction moratorium, but they cannot go into effect before July 1, 2021.

- **SEC. 21.**

Section 1179.05 of the Code of Civil Procedure is amended to read:

1179.05.

(a) Any ordinance, resolution, regulation, or administrative action adopted by a city, county, or city and county in response to the COVID-19 pandemic to protect tenants from eviction is subject to all of the following:

1. Any extension, expansion, renewal, reenactment, or new adoption of a measure, however delineated, that occurs between August 19, 2020, and June 30, 2021, shall have no effect before July 1, 2021.
 2. https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill_id=202120220SB91
- This happened in Berkeley. Original Eviction Moratorium was created in March 2020; modification to the moratorium was voted on by Council on December 8, 2020 to go into effect when AB 3088 expired (January 31, 2021), but then SB 91 went into effect which extended that date to June 30, 2021.
 - Berkeley's City Attorney stated that **theirs was on hold** even though they made a modification on December 8, 2020.

Small mom and pop housing providers serve an essential local service, yet many have not collected rent for over a year. Throughout this state, they have been demonized and seem to be the only small business that is being asked to offer their service for free, or at a significant discount if they're one of the lucky ones that get some money through SB-91. Many are elderly and require this money to live and pay their own bills, mortgages, insurance, taxes, and to upkeep the property as required by law. Please do not be fooled, SB-91 does not make landlords whole in any way. Some will receive no owed rent via SB-91 and will instead have to go through the courts and still be left with no recourse.

I hope that you will review and consider this pertinent information regarding Item I-3.

Thank you.

Respectfully,
Leisa Johnson

From: [Edith Pastrano](#)
To: [City Clerk Dept](#)
Subject: PUblic Comments Item I-3
Date: Tuesday, March 23, 2021 12:59:51 PM
Attachments: [Richmond City Council.docx](#)

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Ning Su Ong** <ningsu_ong@yahoo.com>
Date: Sun, Mar 21, 2021 at 6:24 PM
Subject: March 23, 2021 Richmond City Council
To: David Sharples <dsharples@calorganize.org>

Hello David Sharples:

I am sening you attached letter to be given to the Ricmond City Council on March 23,, 2021. Thank you for sending this letter of my personal experience during this housing crisis.

Edith Pastrano gave me the list of points that would assist in writing the letter and she recommended that the letter be written for my voice to be heard.

Thank you for all of your effort to assist people in need of tenant's right and representation.

Wishing you be well and safe,

Ning Su Ong

March 23, 2021

To: Richmond City Council

Re: Richmond Eviction Moratorium

Hello,

I am a seventy-eight-year-old woman living in Richmond. I am extremely close to being unable to pay my rent. I have tried all assistance options I know of. My savings is almost depleted. My understanding is that if I stop paying rent, I will owe all the months of back rent I am unable to pay now. That does not help, as I would not be able to pay those back months of rent. I asked my landlord if she would lower the rent, but the answer was no.

I have tried to find a less expensive place to live but have not been able to find anything. I have tried to apply for affordable housing in different areas, but it has been mostly impossible to even get on their wait lists; wait lists are closed. When I have been able to get on a wait list (twice), then the applications are chosen by lottery. I have been trying to get into affordable housing for 5 years.

My attempts have been frustrating. I feel hopeless. It seems that there is no place to get assistance. At my age, and given physical limitations I have, getting a job is not an option. It is extremely difficult to live with such uncertainty about my living situation. NO one should have to go through this. It is a human right to have a safe and decent place to live without fear of evictions. There absolutely needs to be laws that protect tenants from evictions here in Richmond.

Sincerely,

Ning Su Ong

From: [Taylor Sims](#)
To: [City Clerk Dept](#)
Subject: PUBLIC COMMENT AGENDA ITEM I-3
Date: Tuesday, March 23, 2021 10:39:25 AM

Dear Council,

My name is Taylor Sims and I am the Special Projects Coordinator for Lift Up Contra Costa, a coalition of nine organizations looking to uplift marginalized voices within Contra Costa County. I am writing to you all today to join the many people supporting an eviction moratorium for the city of Richmond. Without an eviction moratorium, Richmond tenants are vulnerable to being evicted during the pandemic. State law does not have enough protections, which is why tenants in Richmond continue to be evicted throughout the pandemic. Cities in the Bay Area with real eviction moratoriums have had a much lower eviction rate during the pandemic. Richmond has had one of the higher eviction rates in the Bay Area during the pandemic. Richmond tenants are currently unprotected from eviction for nearly all causes for eviction during the pandemic. This leaves tenants vulnerable to displacement out of Richmond and/or homelessness, and is a public health risk. Evictions are tied to COVID-19 cases. No one can shelter in place if they don't have a home. Families who are displaced are often forced into overcrowded conditions. The COVID-19 Pandemic will be in the history books as will the cities who decided to help protect their residents from eviction. Which side of history do you all want to be on? Do the right thing for Richmond! Thank you for your time.

Taylor Sims
Special Projects Coordinator
(925) 478-9465
(She/Her/Hers)



Lift Up Contra Costa members include Alliance of Californians for Community Empowerment (ACCE), Asian Pacific Environmental Network (APEN), Communities for a Better Environment, The Contra Costa AFL-CIO Labor Council, East Bay Alliance for a Sustainable Economy, SEIU Local 1021, SEIU Local 2015, Safe Return Project, and the Richmond Progressive Alliance

From: [Cordell Hindler](#)
To: [City Clerk Dept](#)
Subject: Public Comment I-4 Study and action session
Date: Thursday, March 18, 2021 5:21:54 PM

hello Sabrina, I think that the Council should Consider reinstate the Finance and Public Standing committees

sincerely
Cordell

From: [Cordell Hindler](#)
To: [City Clerk Dept](#)
Subject: Public Comments I-6 Study Session
Date: Thursday, March 18, 2021 5:28:09 PM

hello Sabrina, i have some wonderful news, i did contact richmond and de anza high and they are interested in hearing about the youth council

sincerely
Cordell