

RICHMOND, CALIFORNIA, June 29, 2021

The Richmond City Council Special Evening Open Session was called to order at 4:30 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> and <http://www.youtube.com/user/KCRRTV>.

*The methods to submit public comment were via mail, email to cityclerkdept@ci.richmond.ca.us, teleconference, and telephone during the meeting. Written comments received by 1:00 p.m. on June 29, 2021, were put into the record and considered before council action. Written comments received after 1:00 p.m. and up until the public comment period on the relevant agenda item closed, were also put into the record. **Attached herewith are all written public comments received.***

ROLL CALL

Present: Councilmembers Nathaniel Bates, Eduardo Martinez, Gayle McLaughlin, Melvin Willis, Vice Mayor Demnlus Johnson III, and Mayor Thomas K. Butt. **Absent:** Councilmember Claudia Jimenez arrived after the roll was called.

CITY COUNCIL

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

Richmond Shoreline Alliance, SPRAWLDEF, Citizens for East Shore Parks, Sunflower Alliance, and GreenAction for Health and Environmental Justice v. City of Richmond

SPRAWLDEF et al. v. City of Richmond
North Coast Rivers Alliance et al. / Point Molate Alliance et al. v. City of Richmond

CONFERENCE WITH LEGAL COUNSEL -
ANTICIPATED LITIGATION (Significant exposure to litigation pursuant to paragraph (2) or (3) of Subdivision (d) [as applicable] of Government Code Section 54956.9): Three cases.

In light of the California Court of Appeals' decision in Fowler v. City of Lafayette, the City Attorney's Office attached to the agenda two letters regarding the amended judgment and various agreements related to Point Molate. The letters provided the existing facts and circumstances for going into closed session on the items pursuant to California Government Code Section 54956.9(d)(2).

PUBLIC EMPLOYEE DISCIPLINE / DISMISSAL /
RELEASE (Government Code Section 54957):

Titles: City Manager and City Attorney

CONFERENCE WITH LABOR NEGOTIATORS
(Government Code Section 54957.6):

Agency Representatives: Jack Hughes

Employee organizations:

1. SEIU Local 1021 Full-Time Unit
2. SEIU Local 1021 Part-Time Unit
3. IFPTE Local 21 Mid-Level Management Unit
4. IFPTE Local 21 Executive Management Unit
5. Richmond Police Officers Association RPOA
6. Richmond Police Management Association RPMA
7. IAFF Local 188
8. Richmond Fire Management Association RFMA

PUBLIC COMMENT BEFORE CLOSED SESSION

The following individuals gave comments via teleconference:

Jael Myrick, Ben Choi, and Janis Eggleston gave comments regarding the Public Employee Discipline / Dismissal / Release item.

Jim Hanson, Jeanne Kortz, Pam Stello, Doria Mueller-Beilschmidt, and Tarnell Abbott gave comments regarding the existing litigation items. Ms. Kortz, Ms. Stello, and Ms. Abbott also gave comments regarding the Public Employee Discipline / Dismissal / Release item.

Amanda LeGaux gave comments regarding the labor negotiations item.

The Open Session adjourned to Closed Session at 4:50 p.m.
Closed Session adjourned at 7:03 p.m.

The Special Meeting of the Richmond City Council was called to order at 7:17 p.m. by Mayor Butt via teleconference.

ROLL CALL

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

STATEMENT OF CONFLICT OF INTEREST

None.

AGENDA REVIEW

The city clerk announced a correction to Item H-4 on page 45 of the Port of Richmond Terminal Tariff, FMC No. 3, Rules and Regulations attachment under Item 09195. The correct vehicle fee was \$27.95 and not \$27.99.

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

Senior Assistant City Attorney Heather McLaughlin reported that the “Richmond Shoreline Alliance, SPRAWLDEF, Citizens for East Shore Parks, Sunflower Alliance, and GreenAction for Health and Environmental Justice v. City of Richmond” item was not heard during Closed Session. Ms. McLaughlin also stated there were no final actions to report on the existing litigation or labor negotiation items. Ms. McLaughlin announced the council voted five to one to retain the city manager and city attorney, with Councilmember Bates abstaining and Mayor Butt voting no.

REPORT FROM THE CITY MANAGER

City Manager Laura Snideman announced the retirement of Emergency Services Manager Genevieve Pastor-Cohen and the hiring of the new Emergency Services Manager Jim Yoke. Ms. Snideman advised that two virtual public outreach workshops regarding a potential vacant parcel tax were scheduled for July 7 and 13, 2021.

REPORT FROM POLICE CHIEF

Police Chief Bisa French provided a brief report on three recent Richmond shooting incidents and other investigations. The council requested the following: a monthly list of emergency 911 calls data that included the priority label, type of call, and services provided; and an investigations report from the Community Police Review Commission (CPRC) every three months.

OPEN FORUM FOR PUBLIC COMMENT

The following individuals gave the following comments via teleconference:

Mark Wassberg advised that residents must have a mailing address to determine their voting district in Richmond. Mr. Wassberg gave comments against immigration.

Naomi Williams requested clarification regarding the requirement of four councilmembers to constitute a quorum. Ms. Williams suggested that four councilmembers should always be visible on the Zoom teleconference video during City Council meetings.

Marisol Cantu read a petition that she stated was signed by 518 community members in support of the Reimagining Public Safety (RPS) Task Force proposals. Ms. Cantu gave comments

regarding an email response from Councilmember Bates to an Oakland community member.

Ben Therriault gave comments regarding alleged false information regarding Richmond police use of force data that was publicly posted. Mr. Therriault suggested that the council liaison to the CPRC should present to the council issues raised at the CPRC meetings.

Brenden Dreaper gave comments in support of the RPS Task Force proposals and the allocation of funding from the Police Department's budget to fund the proposed new safety programs.

Leisa Johnson expressed concerns regarding actions by the council, decorum on the dais, and potential Brown Act violations at its June 21, 2021, meeting.

Randy Joseph invited community members over 16 years of age to apply for the Richmond YouthWORKS program for employment. Mr. Joesph gave comments regarding emails sent by Councilmember Bates concerning individuals that work and live in Richmond.

Eli Moore gave comments regarding Richmond police use of force data that he publicly posted.

Bobbi Lopez expressed concerns regarding the council's decorum. Ms. Lopez clarified alleged false information regarding the City of Oakland's police budget. Ms. Lopez read comments made by Councilmember Bates to an Oakland resident.

Yenny Garcia invited the council to a vigil at Saint Mark's Catholic Church on July 3, 2021, in solidarity to demand a pathway to citizenship for undocumented immigrants.

Demnlus Johnson III requested from the city attorney the status of the votes given at the June 21, 2021, City Council meeting for the budget session items. Mr. Johnson III apologized for his decorum at that meeting.

Councilmember Bates gave comments regarding his response to an email that he received from an Oakland resident.

CITY COUNCIL CONSENT CALENDAR

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

***H-1.** Approved appointments for the mayor and councilmembers to regional committees, ad-hoc committees and liaison positions for the year of 2021.

***H-2.** Approved the appointment of Ameila Morgan to the Oakland Airport-Community Noise Management Forum.

***H-3.** Approved the contract addendum to the Production Agreement with Pyro Spectaculars North Inc., for the cancellation and payment of liquidated damages in the amount of \$20,000 for the fireworks celebrations on July 3, 2020, and July 3, 2021; extended the contract to include the July 3, 2022, fireworks celebrations; and accepted a fifty percent credit from the vendor in

the amount of \$10,000 to apply towards the July 3, 2022, fireworks celebrations.

***H-4.** Adopted **Resolution No. 75-21** to amend the Port of Richmond FMC Tariff No.3 reflecting a two (2) percent increase in tariff rates as approved by the Executive Committee of the California Association of Port Authorities. *(The corrected vehicle fee on page 45 of the Rules and Regulations attachment under Item 09195 was \$27.95 and not \$27.99).*

BUDGET SESSION

I-1. The matter to adopt a resolution approving the Fiscal Year (FY) 2021-2022 Annual Operating Budget which includes the use of \$8,550,000 in American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) funds; adopt a resolution approving the Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) for FYs 2021-2022 through 2025-2026 and adopting the CIP Budget for FY 2021-2022; and adopt a resolution approving the carry-over and appropriation of FY 2020-2021 funds to the FY 2021-2022 Annual Operating or CIP budgets, was introduced by City Manager Laura Snideman. Senior Assistant City Attorney Heather McLaughlin addressed the alleged Brown Act violations concerning the June 21, 2021, City Council budget session items. Interim Deputy City Manager Internal Services Anil Comelo and Accounting Manager Antonio Banuelos presented a Powerpoint that highlighted the following: CIP overview; ARPA funding; Reimaging Public Safety (RPS) Task Force Option E; FY 2021-2022 CIP and Annual Operating Budgets; allocation of FY 2020-2021 excess funds; position control; pension and other post-employment benefits liability; and FY 2021-2022 budget achievements. Discussion ensued. The council requested a detailed negative cash balance report that showed how the balances were repaid. The following individuals gave comments via teleconference: Elsa Stevens, Edith Pastrano, Mark Wassberg, Katrinka Ruk, Sara Theiss, Jovanka Beckles, Michael Gilksohn, Sara Cantor, Marisol Cantu, Randy Joseph, Leisa Johnson, Angela Cox, Jacqueline Thalberg, Lisa Cody, Alix Mazuet, Ben Therriault, Lila Sheira, Cynthia Black, Patricia (last name unknown), Eli Moore, Alicia Gallo, Janet S. Johnson, Raul Vasquez, Chandra Davies, Ozmar Huerta, Emily Ross, Mike Parker, Steve Bishoff, David Sharples, Jocelyn Khansouvang, Aleta Toure, Rob Lopez, and Jamie McBean. Further discussion ensued. The council recommended staff not to use the “defund” language and utilize uniformity with language. The council encouraged staff to collaborate with the RPS Task Force on the implementation of the Reimagining Initiative with dialogue that involved decision-making staff. On motion of Councilmember Jimenez, seconded by Councilmember McLaughlin, adopted **Resolution Numbers 76-21, 77-21, and 78-21** approving said budgets; directed staff to move the funding for two community service officer positions from the Police Department budget to the RPS Task Force budget for further discussion on implementation with staff collaborating with the RPS Task Force; and allocated \$8,703 surplus funds (half and half) to the Richmond Juneteenth and Cinco de Mayo FY 2021-2022 celebrations, by the following vote: **Ayes:** Councilmembers Jimenez, Martinez, McLaughlin, Willis, and Vice Mayor Johnson III. **Noes:** Councilmember Bates and Mayor Butt. **Abstained:** None. **Absent:** None.

I-2. On motion of Councilmember McLaughlin, seconded by Councilmember Willis, adopted **Resolution No. 79-21** approving the Fiscal Year 2021-22 appropriations limit for the City of Richmond pursuant to Article XIII B of the Constitution of the State of California, by the following vote: **Ayes:** Councilmembers Bates, Jimenez, Martinez, McLaughlin, Willis, and Vice Mayor Johnson III. **Noes:** Mayor Butt. **Abstained:** None. **Absent:** None.

COUNCIL AS A WHOLE

J-1. The matter to direct staff to research into filing a lawsuit against Caltrans regarding the condition of our highways was introduced by Councilmember Bates. Discussion ensued. Mark Wassberg gave comments. On motion of Councilmember Martinez, seconded by Councilmember Bates, directed staff to coordinate with Contra Costa County and other west county cities with the aid of the West Contra Costa Transportation Advisory Committee and Association of Bay Area Governments to petition the State of California for solutions in the cleaning of the freeways, by the following vote: **Ayes:** Councilmembers Bates, Jimenez, Martinez, McLaughlin, Vice Mayor Johnson III, and Mayor Butt. **Noes:** None. **Abstained:** None. **Absent:** Councilmember Willis.

J-2. Mayor Butt announced recent resignations from City of Richmond boards, commissions, and committees; and announced vacancies as of June 23, 2021, and asked 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 10:41 p.m., to meet again on Tuesday, July 6, 2021, at 6:30 p.m.

Clerk of the City of Richmond

(SEAL)

Approved:

Mayor

From: [Cordell Hindler](#)
To: [City Clerk Dept User](#)
Subject: Public Comments- Open Session Prior to Closed Session
Date: Thursday, June 24, 2021 3:08:55 PM

good Afternoon, Mayor Butt, Council Members and City Staff. I have a couple of Comments for the Record

1. I would not terminate the city Manager and City Attorney, Because it is going to put the City in a very delicate Situation
2. also it is going to cost money to hire a Consultant to fill these positions

I am asking that the Council would be careful not to take action

Sincerely
Cordell

From: [Janis E. Eggleston](#)
To: [Melvin Willis](#); [Gayle McLaughlin](#); [Demnlus Johnson](#); [Eduardo Martinez](#); [Claudia Jimenez](#); [Nat Bates](#); [Tom Butt - external](#)
Cc: [City Clerk Dept User](#); [Shannon Moore](#)
Subject: Full public Statement of Janis Eggleston re: closed session re: Public Employee Discipline
Date: Tuesday, June 29, 2021 5:14:30 PM
Attachments: [PUBLIC COMMENT ON CLOSED SESSION ITEMS. 6.29.21.pdf](#)
Importance: High

Dear Mayor Butt, City Council Members, City Clerk and Sr. Asst. City Attorney Moore:

Attached is a revised copy of the outline of the remarks I intended to make during the public comment portion of the closed session. However, given the time limits, I was not able to provide the full statement I had prepared and the rationale to urge the City Council to prevent the proposed personnel action against the City Attorney and City Manager and to take corrective action against the Mayor for his violation of the Brown Act. So that you have the full benefit of my statement, I have attached my outline here.

I have also included Sr. Asst. City Attorney Moore on this email so that she is aware of my recommendations for the corrective action I seek to have the City Council take against the Mayor. I trust you will fully consider my comments and analysis.

Thank you,
Janis

Janis E. Eggleston
LAW OFFICE OF JANIS E. EGGLESTON
1101 Marina Village Parkway, Suite 201
Alameda, CA 94501-6472
Telephone: 510-735-9986
Facsimile: (877) 863-3714
E-mail: Janis@JEgglestonLaw.com
Website: www.jegglestonlaw.com

The information in this email is intended for the sole use of the intended recipient. It may contain proprietary and/or confidential information which is the exclusive property of the Law Office of Janis E. Eggleston. This e-mail may also contain privileged information that is protected by the attorney-client privilege and/or attorney work product, pursuant to Evidence Code Sections 952 and 954 and Code of Civil Procedure Sections 2018.020-2018.040. If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender immediately by replying to this email and permanently destroying and deleting all copies without disclosing the contents to anyone. You are hereby notified that any review, disclosure, dissemination, copying distribution, or the taking of any action in reliance on the contents of this information is strictly prohibited. Email is covered by the Electronic Communications Privacy Act, 18 U.S.C. §§ 2510-2521 and is legally privileged.

To ensure compliance with Treasury Regulations (31 CFR Part 10, Sec. 10.35), we inform you that any tax advice contained in this correspondence was not intended or written by us to be used, and cannot be used by you or anyone else, for the purpose of avoiding penalties imposed by the Internal Revenue Code.

Janis Eggleston's
PUBLIC COMMENT ON CLOSED SESSION ITEMS, June 29th

Introduction:

- Mayor Butt, City Council Members, City staff members
- Janis Eggleston, Resident to District 5, Plaintiff's Employment lawyer, who for 30 years has represented public entity employees in their claims against their public entity employers.
 - I have regularly filed charges of discrimination, harassment, and retaliation with the DFEH, Dept. of Fair Employment and Housing and whistleblower retaliation claims, under the Labor Code.

Thank you for the opportunity to petition our City govt. officials to effect productive positive changes in our City.

Purpose: Address the Third Item on the Closed Session Calendar—Personnel matters

- I. URGE the City Council to deny the Mayor's Demand that the City Attorney and City Manager Resign; and
 - to VOTE NO on any discipline/dismissal/ or release for each;

Rational for Requested Action:

- Under FEHA, (Fair Employment and Housing Act), the City has an affirmative mandatory duty to investigate and take remedial action to correct any complaints of discrimination, harassment, and retaliation.
 - The Mayor wants to discipline, fire, force the resignation of, or otherwise sever the employment relationship with the City Attorney/City Manager's because they performed their duties required by statute. He has made clear his underlying retaliatory motives and should be disciplined for having done so.
- II. ASK the Mayor to Resign or City Council to discipline him, per Govt. Code § 54963(c)(2) and (d) of the Brown Act, for having violated the Brown Act; and

ASK the City Council to refer to the Grand Jury for investigation, per Govt. Code §54963(c)(3), the Mayor's intentional violation of the Brown Act when he made a 6/23 public disclosure on his E-Forum of the confidential content of the 6/22 closed session meeting and to investigate his underlying shenanigans that gave rise to the original complaints.

- Closed session for threatened litigation was announced on the 6/22 Agenda by way of the attached *Reese-Brown v. City of Richmond* DFEH Notice of the Right-to-Sue letter that identified that the EEOC, under its work-sharing agreement, would conduct the investigation;
- *Following Closed Session meeting:* Mayor Butt publicly disclosed the claims and allegations made by the employee that went well beyond the scope of any DFEH claim

and addressed the more salient whistleblower retaliation claims under Labor Code §1102.5(b),(c) and (e).

The Rationale for Requested Action:

The Mayor should be disciplined or removed from his position as Mayor for his breach of confidentiality and public disclosure of the apparent content of closed session meetings.

Moreover, the Grand Jury should investigate his Brown Act violation and the underlying crimes that led to the originally filed *Reese-Brown v. City of Richmond* DFEH Right to Sue letter.

The Brown Act provides remedies for public disclosures of confidential closed-session meetings: Gov. Code § 54963(c)(1); Gov. Code § 54963(c)(2) and (d); and Gov. Code § 54963(c)(3). I ask the City Council to initiate these remedies against the Mayor.

Conclusion:

Our City cannot continue to tolerate this level of abuse of the laws of the State of California by our City Mayor. I implore you to take the appropriate corrective action against him.

From: [Cordell Hindler](#)
To: [City Clerk Dept User](#)
Subject: Public Comments- Open Forum
Date: Thursday, June 24, 2021 3:16:48 PM

good Evening Mayor Butt, Council Members and City Staff, I have a Couple of comments for the Record

1. for a future agenda, is to have Jon Kaufman to provide a Presentation on Wildfire Prevention in East Bay Hills
2. Also to have Lesa McIntosh, to provide a presentation on Proposed Rates

Sincerely
Cordell

From: [Leisa Johnson](#)
To: [City Clerk Dept User](#)
Cc: [Leisa Johnson](#)
Subject: City Council Meeting June 29th: Open Forum Comments
Date: Tuesday, June 29, 2021 7:41:12 PM

Dear City CLerk,

Can you please include the below written comments as part of the formal record as supplementary material?

Thank you.

Sincerely,
Leisa

Dear Mayor, Vice Mayor, Councilmembers, & City Staff:

I wanted to speak tonight regarding concerns amongst several members of the community regarding actions by this council.

Decorum on the dais remains an ongoing concern and is disrespectful to your colleagues, Staff and the Public. Please represent your office and this City with the respect it deserves.

At the June 21st meeting, there were several confirmed Brown Act Violations. Vice Mayor Johnson voted via the chat 3 times and Councilmember Jimenez once.

There is also concern that members of the Council had to be reminded that they cannot communicate substantive matters about City business using the chat feature when a majority of the Council is present. How often has this occurred and what was discussed?

There were also two items discussed and approved by the RPA majority council at the June 21st meeting re: ARPA funds:

1. The Public was not allowed to review **any** information regarding Councilmember McLaughlin's green-blue-new deal and request for \$300K of Public ARPA funds for a consultant;

2. The Public was not allowed to review **any** information regarding Council's approval for \$1M for the Richmond Rescue fund. Several members of the council and speakers repeatedly referred to a proposal that they submitted for review.

When you represent you and/or the special interest groups that support your campaigns at the expense of the community at large, it is extremely disrespectful and I urge the City Clerk, City Attorney and City Manager to stop these abuses from occurring in real time going forward.

Thank you.

Respectfully,
Leisa Johnson

From: [Annie Pennell](#)
To: [City Clerk Dept User](#)
Subject: Public Comment for Agenda Item I-1
Date: Monday, June 28, 2021 8:24:49 PM

As a Richmond community member, I support agenda item I-1 to adopt a resolution approving the FY 2021-2022 annual operating budget, including the use of \$8,550,000 in ARPA funds. I supported City Council approving option E previously and am very glad that it was voted on and approved. It is crucial that we expand our concept of who is doing public safety work, as the task force recommendations **increase** the number of the city's public safety staff, despite the Mayor and RPOA's false narrative that police will be laid off and decrease public safety.

Thank you,

Annie Pennell
Resident, Richmond District 6

From: [Cecilia Lucas](#)
To: [City Clerk Dept User](#)
Subject: Public Comment Agenda Item I-1
Date: Tuesday, June 29, 2021 11:50:02 AM

Good evening. My name is Cecilia Cissell Lucas. I am a Richmond resident and UC Berkeley faculty member.

I support the proposals put forward by the Reimagine Richmond Public Safety Community Task Force to reallocate \$6.3 million from the RPD budget to fund community safety programs.

The fact that 40% of our general funds go to policing, whereas only 2.8% goes to community services is a depressing reflection of our misplaced values as a city.

The proposals put forward by the task force are evidence-based and will actually prevent violence and crimes, and will contribute to public safety in ways that policing is simply unable to do.

We have a choice.

We can continue to live in the kind of fear that leads us to believe we have to rely on sanctioned violence (and the threat of it) to solve all our problems, or we can recognize that this actually creates greater problems and instead invest in programs that strengthen our social fabric.

This is also a racial justice issue. Do you really want to choose to rely on a punitive system that was created to catch runaway slaves and is one of the biggest institutions recreating white supremacy today, regardless of the better or worse actions of individual officers? Especially when there are viable effective alternatives at our fingertips?

If you believe Black lives matter, back that up with concrete actions. The primary demand of the national movement for Black life is to defund the police and redirect those resources towards programs that create community vitality and safety.

And the proposal on the table here isn't even defunding the police, and not a single officer will be laid off as a result of this proposal!

What is being put forward by the task force is a bare minimum next step rooted in a commitment to actually taking care of people on the ground, not in abstract ideologies or political debates.

Budgets are moral documents. I hope you will engage this one as such. Thank you.

From: [Cordell Hindler](#)
To: [City Clerk Dept User](#)
Subject: Public Comments- I-1 Budget Session
Date: Thursday, June 24, 2021 3:24:49 PM

good Evening Mayor Butt, Council Members and City Staff, I have some comments for the Record

1. I must commend the City Manager's office with Finance's assistance, this is the best budget summary that I have ever witnessed
2. I am asking that the council approve the Resolution as it has been presented

Sincerely
Cordell

From: [Fiona Dunbar](#)
To: [City Clerk Dept User](#)
Subject: Public comments - Open Forum
Date: Tuesday, June 29, 2021 12:24:43 PM

Dear Members of City Hall,

I am writing in support of Reimagine Richmond's proposals to take action to make our city safer, more welcoming, and more community based by redistributing money into violence prevention, homelessness and crime prevention, and community building efforts. Our tax dollars should be divested from the police force, weaponry, and criminalization of BIPOC and the marginalized and instead be INvested into community service officers, mental health workers and services, youth engagement, and other positive efforts.

Please include the proposals of the Reimagine Public Safety Community Task Force today when determining the next fiscal year budget

Thank you,
Fiona Dunbar
35th Street, North and East resident

From: [Glenn Moniz](#)
To: [City Clerk Dept User](#)
Subject: Reimage p d
Date: Tuesday, June 29, 2021 5:34:48 PM

I urge c c to approve the buget no cops will lose jobs and p d will get more money this year and next
glen acce member 40 year rich resident

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Hannah Geitner](#)
To: [City Clerk Dept User](#)
Subject: Public Comments Agenda Item #1-1
Date: Tuesday, June 29, 2021 12:59:38 PM

I am an educator in WCCUSD and family member and care taker to a number of Richmond residents. I am asking the city council to reallocate the recommended \$10.3 million from the RPD budget to support new and existing preventative programs. These programs would provide the necessary support to individuals who are in need, not to mention, the supports provided by these programs are the exact opposite of what RPD currently provides and can provide to the community. For example, they cannot prevent violence the police department by design is a reactive organization, they show up after an incident has occurred and in my experience, escalate the situation rather than provide care and support to those affected. The police department cannot provide diverse youth employment opportunities like programs like YouthWorks does, all they can offer is a militaristic youth officer program that grooms them to become part of a system that has and continues to oppress them and their community members. They do not provide any services to unhoused residents like SOS, in fact, they support Caltrans and other entities in their eviction of our community members and confiscate their belongings (all while not wearing masks during a global pandemic). They do not and are not trained to or capable of providing adequate mental health support to those in crisis like CCRP, in fact, they escalate the situation and typically arrest, tase, or shoot the individual in crisis. How would you respond to me as an educator if I pulled out a gun, handcuffs, or a taser on my students who were having a tough day? This would not even be a discussion in that situation but because we are talking about the police, a system that was created to oppress Black individuals, it seems to be confusing for some. I encourage you to hear the voices of stakeholders you normally wouldn't, to prioritize community safety and future successes, and make Richmond a safe place.

Hannah Geitner

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Janis Hashe](#)
To: [City Clerk Dept User](#)
Subject: Public Comment for Agenda Item I-1
Date: Tuesday, June 29, 2021 11:14:44 AM

City Council Members:

As a Richmond resident, I support the budget proposals submitted by Reimagine Richmond, and modified to the amounts and sources that will be voted on tonight.

It is not possible to arrest and incarcerate our way out of problems that must be addressed at their root causes: poverty, racism, lack of opportunity, and, in some cases, mental illness and addiction. The budget proposals address these causes, and will lead to a more fair and more safe Richmond.

We need a police force. But the phrase "defund the police" has been hijacked by those who don't wish to address these root causes and use it as a cudgel in the culture wars. Even the majority of police agree that they should not be the first responders to most mental health/unhoused residents issues, and that policing cannot solve the problems created by ongoing poverty.

I urge you to vote "yes" on the budget proposals.

Sincerely,
Janis Hashe


Richmond, CA 94801

From: [Kathleen Maclay](#)
To: [City Clerk Dept User](#)
Subject: Public Comments Agenda Item 1,-1
Date: Tuesday, June 29, 2021 12:18:13 PM

Policing in Richmond must be revamped to incorporate social and community services.

City police costs -- in dollars, safety, wellbeing, reputation and lives -- is too high and unsustainable.

This is no time to bend to the powerful police lobby or for lazy, antiquated thinking.

Regards,

Kathleen Maclay
23 Shoreline Ct.
Richmond

[Sent from Yahoo Mail on Android](#)

From: [Katrinka Ruk](#)
To: [City Clerk Dept User](#)
Cc: [Tom Butt - external](#); [Demnlus Johnson](#); [Nat Bates](#); [claudia jimenez](#); [Eduardo Martinez](#); [Gayle McLaughlin](#); [Melvin Willis](#); [Laura Snideman](#)
Subject: Public Comments Agenda Item #1-1 FY21-22 Annual Operating Budget
Date: Tuesday, June 29, 2021 12:15:07 PM
Attachments: [06.29.21 #1-1 FY21-22 Budget.docx](#)

June 28, 2021

/ email/

To: City Clerk

To: Mayor, Vice Mayor, City Council, City Manager

Re: 06/29/21 City Council; Item I-1 adopt a resolution approving the FY21-22 Annual Operating Budget with includes the use of \$8,550,000 in America Rescue Plan Act (ARPA)funds.

On behalf of the Council of Business and Industries (COI) the following comments are being submitted for your review. The amount of information provided regarding the FY21-22 budget revenues and expenses goes into a great amount of detail, however, it is unclear how the council can adopt this when there are so many gaps in information, items did not have proper public review, and there are discrepancies in the numbers presented. Specifically:

<!--[if !supportLists]-->1) <!--[endif]-->General Fund: The \$1.3Mil should not be removed from the RPD budget. Instead, the city should reallocate \$1.3Mil from either the 2020-21 surplus budget or ARPA funding. The surplus revenue was achieved primarily because the police and fire reduced and frozen positions. ARPA specifically provides for distribution of the funding to replace displaced workers. Both of these are legitimate uses of available revenue.

<!--[if !supportLists]-->2) <!--[endif]-->Staff claims they have provided a balanced operating budget for approval. However, the Agenda Report shows a \$90Million deficit on pg 2 and \$85.3Million deficit on pg 5. The nearly \$100Million difference between Operating Budget and Operating Expenses are far from balanced. The public and city council deserve to see an accurate budget before it is approved. What is available online and presented today should not be approved due to significant inaccuracies.

<!--[if !supportLists]-->3) <!--[endif]-->There is no attachment describing the key expenditures for Department Personnel Requests, not allowing for public review.

<!--[if !supportLists]-->4) <!--[endif]-->The Agenda Report, Attachment B and the Resolution provide different numbers for the General Fund. The Agenda Report states: “The proposed Fiscal Year 2021-2022 Annual General Fund Budget is balanced with revenues totaling \$188.5 million, expenditures totaling \$187.85 million, and a set aside for reserves of \$3.6 million.” However, Attachment B pg4 provides General Fund revenues for FY 21-22 as \$178,514,614 and expenses as \$179,948,582 (pg5) with **a deficit of \$1,433,968.** The Resolution provides for the General Fund revenues of: **\$187,833,521.** ***What is the General Fund Budget for FY21-22?***

<!--[if !supportLists]-->5) <!--[endif]-->Regarding Capital Improvement Plan Funds, the Agenda Report provides that “of the \$33,943,629 [in expenditures], \$1,520,00 in funding sources will come from the General Fund’s FY20-21 residual revenue...” (pg7) however, this is not noted in Attachment B (pg4,5) which lists the expenditures for the General Fund.

<!--[if !supportLists]-->6) <!--[endif]-->Use of FY 2020-2021 Carry-Over Residual Funds: Staff proposes to use \$2.3M of the \$15.6M for employee compensation but it is not stated how the money would be distributed.

<!--[if !supportLists]-->7) <!--[endif]-->The Agenda Report lists position changes as – elimination of 12 sworn officer positions in the Police Department, unfreezes 11 positions, adds 14.2 positions, and moves 1 position (pg3). There is no summary of what these positions are and in what department. Attachment G only notes 22 positions.

<!--[if !supportLists]-->8) <!--[endif]-->It is unclear why public safety staffing should have positions eliminated when other departments are seeing an increase in staffing for administrative and support positions. The State of California specifically identified “city police departments and fire stations” as essential workforce during the most challenging public safety crisis we’ve seen in our lifetime. Yet, Richmond relied on them to cut their staff amidst the pandemic and

now preventing having them be fully staffed while other non-essential workforce positions are increasing. <https://covid19.ca.gov/essential-workforce/>

<!--[if !supportLists]-->9) <!--[endif]-->ARPA funds were not agendized for public review when council voted to allocate additional funding. The council’s action is currently being reviewed for a Brown Act violation and the following should not be included in tonight’s budget approval:

<!--[if !supportLists]-->• <!--[endif]-->Environmental Planning Consultant \$300,000.00: This should be removed from the budget. Councilmember McLaughlin presented a recommendation for a consultant for a “green-blue” project/program during the meeting and was not on the agenda nor does it qualify as an urgency item; therefore, it did not allow for public review or comment. On tonight’s agenda we see \$300,000 in ARPA funding for an “Environmental Planning Consultant” – we can only assume this is the same consultant Councilmember McLaughlin had presented, however, there is no information in the agenda packet as to what to the scope of this consultant’s responsibilities. Due to the dollar amount and scope of the project, a presentation should be made in a study session to allow opportunity for true public review, and, per City procedures, be vetted through the RFP/RFP process.

<!--[if !supportLists]-->• <!--[endif]-->Housing & Development Initiatives/Richmond Rapid Response Fund \$1,000,000.00: This should be removed from the budget. This recommendation was presented by Councilmember McLaughlin following a request from a representative of the Richmond Rapid Response Fund during public comment. It was not on the agenda and it does not qualify as an urgency item. As such, there was no opportunity for public comment as it was discussed by council after public comment period was closed. Due to the amount and scope of the program, a presentation should be made in a study session to allow opportunity for true public review, and an RFP/RFQ be posted; it should not be automatically funded.

<!--[if !supportLists]-->10) <!--[endif]-->Attachment B – the following pages have no information noted:

<!--[if !supportLists]-->• <!--[endif]-->FY2021-22 Proposed Budget Summary CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS (pg22)

<!--[if !supportLists]-->• <!--[endif]-->FY2021-22 Proposed Budget Summary PENSION TRUST Revenues & Expenditures (pg46, 47)

The public needs to see accurate information, and an accounting for statements made. Overall, ARPA funds received should be applied to the 12 vacant sworn officer positions; it should be clear what the budget numbers are; the Environmental Planning Consultant and Housing & Development Initiatives should be removed from the budget to allow for proper vetting by the public, and go through the RFP/RFQ process.

Katrinka Ruk

Executive Director

/

Katrinka Ruk
Executive Director
Council of Business & Industries
510)260-4820 cell
<http://www.councilofindustries.com>

This transmission may contain information that is privileged, confidential, proprietary, and exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, distribution, or use of the information contained herein (including any reliance thereon) is STRICTLY PROHIBITED. If you received this transmission in error, please contact the sender and delete the material from any computer immediately. Thank you.

From: [Kerry Dunigan](#)
To: [Sabrina Lundy](#)
Subject: Public Comments: Not in Support of Reimagine Richmond
Date: Tuesday, June 29, 2021 12:38:01 PM

Dear Mayor Butts and City Councilmembers,

I am a resident of District 6. I do not support the Reimagine Richmond proposals. I have lived here 5 years and have watched crime increase. I have to call RPD on a regular basis to report illegal activity in front of my home from stolen vehicles, illegal dumping, property theft, car fires, and more. I live across from the fire station and Michelle Obama Elementary and watch cars flying through the stop signs, doing donuts in the intersection constantly. In the 5 years I've lived here, I've experienced more crime than in all my years combined times ten. It's out of control and for those of us near San Pablo, it's a daily occurrence and we are sick of it.

Eliminating officers or choosing NOT to fill RPD vacancies is a huge mistake. They are already understaffed. Every single councilmember should be working with our state and national representatives and leaders to increase funding to cities instead of cutting much needed services. California tax revenues are high - this is not the time to cut essential workers. I'm a teacher - I know what happens when positions are cut. Services deteriorate and you never make up for what was lost.

Kerry Dunigan
Richmond, Ca

From: [Laura Bowles](#)
To: [City Clerk Dept User](#)
Subject: Public Comment- Agenda Item I-1
Date: Tuesday, June 29, 2021 12:59:39 PM

Good afternoon City Counselors,

I am a Richmond resident who is raising a young child in our community and I want nothing more than to raise him in a community that is safe for him and all of our neighbors. I implore you to believe us, your constituents, when we say that increasing safety and increasing police budgets and presence in our community are not synonymous. The recent proposals by the Reimagine Public Safety Community Task Force clearly laid out a comprehensive plan to address the root causes of violence in our community. I am frustrated to learn that despite recent votes honoring the intent and proposals set forth by the task force, the city continues to push forward with a city budget that does not honor the intent or substance of the tremendous work this community group put forward to provide a comprehensive and genuinely impressive approach to reimagining safety in our city. We need a systematic approach to addressing the root causes of crime, not increased resources to punitively respond. We need a budget that reflects our values and commitment to safety for my young son and ALL of our neighbors.

Sincerely,
Laura Bowles

From: [Leisa Johnson](#)
To: [City Clerk Dept User](#)
Cc: [Leisa Johnson](#)
Subject: City Council Meeting 6/29/2021: Public Comments for Item I-1 (Budget)
Date: Tuesday, June 29, 2021 9:08:33 PM

Dear City CLerk,

Can you please include the below written comments as part of the formal record as supplementary material?

Thank you.

Sincerely,
Leisa

Dear Mayor, Vice Mayor, Councilmembers, & City Staff:

1. Richmond is currently being audited by the state given its significant financial risk, including being #1 in the state for unfunded pension liability risk and ranking # 5 in overall financial risk.
2. Why are none of the FY2020/21 Carry-Over Residual Funds of \$15.6M addressing this serious financial risk?
3. Staff proposes to use \$2.3M of the \$15.6M for employee compensation but it is not stated how the money would be distributed. Why is there no transparency around this?
4. Will taxpayers finally recoup the hundreds of thousands of \$ that were inappropriately distributed to some employees as discretionary pay increases?
5. There are several inconsistencies throughout the documents making it difficult to know what exactly is going on and what the true deficit is.
6. Why are we not seeing a line item budget? As I recall, Staff stated a few weeks ago that this would be provided at the final budget session.
7. The Agenda Report indicates the elimination of 12 RPD sworn officer positions, unfreezing 11 positions, adding 14.2 positions, and moving 1 position. However, there is no summary of what these positions are and in what department. Why?
8. Regarding the two additional ARPA programs that this council approved last week were done so without any transparency. There was and still is a clear failure to properly notify and describe the programs which significantly limits the Public from making informed comments on these items.

Of the 200+ pages for the budget session, there are only two extremely brief references in the staff report. Moreover, the illusive proposal that several Councilmembers and Public

speakers discussed on June 21st are still missing from Public access. Apparently, the RPA and the special interest groups who fund their campaigns are able to draft & secure funding for secret proposals.

9. How were the Measure U revenue numbers arrived at to support this budget?

10. Lastly, how is Richmond going to achieve a structurally balanced budget and when? Some union members continue to say we don't have a structural budget deficit, and that the state's audit and ranking of our City's fiscal issues are all myths.

Facts are facts, and you can't tax your way out of this impending disaster and fiscal insolvency. Tough decisions need to be made and soon.

Thank you.

Respectfully,
Leisa Johnson
21-year Richmond Resident

From: [Nancy Johnson](#)
To: [City Clerk Dept User](#)
Cc: reimaginerichmond@gmail.com
Subject: Reimagine Richmond
Date: Monday, June 28, 2021 8:12:12 PM

A little late in asking for community input when the city council already voted on it. I do not support the Reimagine Richmond proposals.
Nancy Johnson

From: [Cordell Hindler](#)
To: [City Clerk Dept User](#)
Subject: Public Comments 1-2 Budget Session
Date: Thursday, June 24, 2021 3:31:17 PM

good evening Mayor Butt, Council Members and City Staff, I am asking to adopt the Resolution as presented by finance and City Manager's office

Sincerely
Cordell

From: [Cordell Hindler](#)
To: [City Clerk Dept User](#)
Subject: Public Comments J-2 Council as a Whole
Date: Thursday, June 24, 2021 3:34:20 PM

good Evening Mayor Butt, council Members and City Staff, I have some wonderful news. I had a meeting with the Chair of the youth council and we have been contacted by De Anza and Richmond High to come onto the campus and talk with the students about the youth council

Sincerely
Cordell