

RICHMOND, CALIFORNIA, July 27, 2021

The Richmond City Council/Richmond Housing Authority Evening Open Session was called to order at 2:00 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/KCRTTV>.

*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 July 27, 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 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.

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

Luis Padilla, et al. v. City of Richmond

LIABILITY CLAIMS - (Government Code Section 54956.9):

Wade Taylor

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

CONFERENCE WITH REAL PROPERTY
NEGOTIATOR (Government Code Section 54956.8):

Property: Terminal One

Agency negotiators: Laura Snideman, Shasa Curl
and Lina Velasco

Negotiating parties: Terminal One Development
LLC

Under negotiation: Price and terms of payment

RICHMOND HOUSING AUTHORITY

CONFERENCE WITH REAL PROPERTY
NEGOTIATOR (Government Code Section 54956.8):

Property: Marina Way South, Virginia, Maine, So. 13th,
So. 15th, and So. 16th , Richmond, CA (Nystrom)

Agency negotiator: Shasa Curl and Nannette Beacham

Negotiating parties: McCormack Baron Salazar (MBS) and
Richmond Neighborhood Housing Services (RNHS)

Under negotiation: Price and terms of payment

PUBLIC COMMENT BEFORE CLOSED SESSION

Yen Do gave comments regarding labor negotiations via
teleconference.

The Open Session adjourned to Closed Session at 2:03 p.m.
Closed Session adjourned at 5:46 p.m.

The Regular Meeting of the Richmond City Council was
called to order at 6:37 p.m. by Mayor Butt via teleconference.

ROLL CALL

Present: Councilmembers Jimenez, Martinez, McLaughlin,
Willis, Vice Mayor Johnson III, and Mayor Butt. **Absent:**
Councilmember Bates.

STATEMENT OF CONFLICT OF INTEREST

City Attorney, Teresa Stricker stated conflict of interest on
Item I-23. Ms. Stricker was a partner at Renne Public Law Group
until October 2020.

AGENDA REVIEW

Items I-16, I-17, I-18, and I-19 were removed from the Consent Calendar for discussion at the end of the agenda. Items I-20 and L-6 were continued to the September 14, 2021, City Council meeting. A motion by Councilmember McLaughlin, seconded by Councilmember Willis, moved Item 1-19 for discussion after Item J-1, by the following vote: **Ayes:** Councilmembers Jimenez, Martinez, McLaughlin, Willis, and Vice Mayor Johnson III. **Noes:** Mayor Butt. **Absent:** Councilmember Bates. **Abstain:** None. Items L-1 and I-19 were moved for discussion immediately following approval of the Consent Calendar.

PRESENTATIONS, PROCLAMATIONS, AND COMMENDATIONS

Items D-1 through D-3 were moved to the Consent Calendar portion of the agenda.

D-1. Proclamation declaring September 2021 as Betty Reid Soskin Month in the City of Richmond.

D-2. Proclamation recognizing former Richmond resident and blues legend Mr. Jimmy McCracklin's Centennial Birthday (posthumously) and declare August 13, 2021, as Richmond Ambassador Blues Legend Jimmy McCracklin Day.

D-3. Announce recent resignation from City of Richmond boards, commissions, and committees; and announce vacancies as of July 21, 2021, and ask that interested individuals send applications to the City Clerk.

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

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

REPORT FROM THE CITY MANAGER

City Manager Laura Snideman urged everyone to get the COVID-19 vaccine.

CRIME REPORT FROM POLICE CHIEF

Chief Bisa French provided a report, which highlighted the following: 1 homicide in the city since the last report; twelve homicides to date this year; 5 shootings over the past 3 weeks; investigated twelve robberies and 9 domestic assaults; a home invasion robbery in the Northern district; human trafficking investigation on 23rd Street; and DUI Checkpoint. Chief French also reported that missing person, Antoine Whitley's body was recovered from the San Pablo Bay.

OPEN FORUM FOR PUBLIC COMMENT

The following individuals gave comments via teleconference:

Jeanne Kortz gave comments regarding Mayor Butt's conduct toward staff at the last City Council meeting.

Deborah DeJeana Burkes and Melinda McCrary invited everyone to Jimmy McCracklin's 100th Birthday celebration on Friday, August 13, 2021, at CoBiz and on August 14, 2021, at Civic Center Plaza.

Mark Wassberg gave comments regarding illegal immigration.

Yenny Garcia invited everyone to a virtual ceremony for the Women's Health and Leadership Program on Friday, July 30, 2021, from 12 p.m. to 2 p.m.

Leisa Johnson gave comments regarding ways to deal with fireworks and sideshows in the city.

Randy Joseph invited everyone to the Stop the Violence Caravan and Put the Guns Down Rally beginning at Civic Center Plaza on Saturday, August 7, 2021, at 11:30 p.m.

Jan Mignone stated speakers should be given a time limit to raise their hand to speak and should not be able to request to speak at any time during the discussion and public comment portion of an agenda item.

Oscar Garcia gave comments regarding the dangers of sideshows and that the city should not condone a designated area to conduct sideshows.

Pam Stello stated that Mayor Butt should be punished for disclosing confidential Closed Session discussions, cancelling City Council meetings, and obstructing city business.

Councilmember Jimenez apologized to City Attorney Teresa Stricker for not speaking out against inappropriate comments directed at her by Mayor Butt at the last council meeting.

Vice Mayor Johnson III encouraged everyone to attend the birthday celebrations held in honor of Jimmy McCracklin.

CITY COUNCIL CONSENT CALENDAR

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

***I-1.** Approved a contract with Net Electric, Inc. in an amount not to exceed \$74,867; and authorized the city manager to execute the Bay Area Air Quality Management District Funding Agreement Amendment No. 2 to complete Project 19EV021 related tasks; and appropriated grant funds in the Fiscal Year 2021-22 Transportation budget.

***I-2.** Approved the minutes of the June 29, 2021, special meeting of the City Council.

***I-3.** Approved appointments to the Commission on Aging: appointed Regina Whitney, new appointment, seat #8, term

expiration date May 19, 2025; and Cate Burkhart, re-appointment, seat #11, term expiration date May 19, 2025.

***I-4.** Approved a three-year contract with Verizon Connect (formerly Networkfleet) for monthly GPS tracking and management in an amount not exceed \$150,000.

***I-5.** Approved the purchase of a HD Tilt Back Tire Changer from Snap-On in an amount not to exceed \$13,500.

***I-6.** Approved a contract for transmission repairs to a Fire Department apparatus (Unit #514; VIN 4S7AT2F997C057106) with AG Transmission Repair, Inc., in an amount not to exceed \$15,000.

***I-7.** Adopted **Resolution No. 96-21**, appropriating funds from the 2019A Wastewater Bond proceeds and approved Veolia Water to manage and award contracts for the BAAQMD permitting for the Grit Removal, Aeration Process Upgrade Project to Yorke Engineering, LLC ("Yorke") and to be managed by Veolia Water in an amount not to exceed \$19,139 [project cost of \$16,428 plus a 16.5 percent mark-up of \$2,711].

***I-8.** Adopted **Resolution No. 97-21**, approving a contract for Veolia Water to manage a subcontract with Myers & Sons Construction in an amount not to exceed \$6,429,791 [Project cost of \$4,839,888, plus 16.5 percent Veolia mark-up \$798,582, plus 15 percent project contingency \$725,983, plus a (9 percent Veolia mark-up of \$65,338)].

***I-9.** Adopted **Resolution No. 98-21**, to accept the Cutting-Carlson-Hoffman Sanitary Sewer Wet Weather Capacity Improvement Project in the Richmond Municipal Sewer District and Amended the Fiscal Year 2021-22 budget in the amount of \$329,550.

***I-10.** Approved a contract with the Local Government Commission in the amount of \$57,000, for two AmeriCorps CivicSpark fellows to support citywide greenhouse gas (GHG) reduction and climate action efforts from September 2021 to August 2022.

***I-11.** Adopted **Resolution No. 99-21**, approving the final recommendation from the Richmond Fund for Children and Youth (RFCY) Oversight Board to award 20 RFCY grants to youth-serving public and nonprofit organizations in a total amount not to exceed \$1,620,000 from July 1, 2021, through June 30, 2022; authorized the city manager or her designee to negotiate and execute Grant Service Agreements with approved grantees; and appropriated an additional \$120,000 to align the Fiscal Year (FY) 2021-22 RDCY budget with the approved FY 2021-22 one percent General Fund allocation.

***I-12.** Approved a recommendation from the Environment & Community Investment Agreement (ECIA) Grant Review Committee to award a Fiscal Year 2021-2022 grant to Mindful Life Project in an amount not to exceed \$12,500 and authorized the city manager to negotiate and execute Grant Service Agreements with the approved grantee.

***I-13.** Adopted **Resolution No. 100-21**, to accept and appropriate the Sexual Assault Law Enforcement Specialized Units

Program grant from the Cal OES funds in the amount of \$204,500 and approved the continuation of a contract with Community Violence Solutions, funded by the Cal OES grant for on-site advocates to assist victims of sexual assault in the amount not to exceed \$94,611.

***I-14.** Adopted **Resolution No. 101-21**, to accept and appropriate \$68,840 in funding from the Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant (JAG) Program awarded to the Richmond Police Department for the purchase of police safety equipment.

***I-15.** Adopted **Resolution No. 102-21**, to accept and appropriate \$66,080 in funding from the Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant (JAG) Program awarded to the Richmond Police Department for the purchase of police safety equipment.

I-16. Continued to the special August 24, 2021, City Council meeting, the matter to approve a \$90,000 amendment to the legal services agreement with the law firm of Burke Williams & Sorensen, LLP for services rendered from April 1, 2021, through June 30, 2023, for the Hacienda Project and other RHA projects. This item was continued from the cancelled July 20, 2021, meeting.

I-17. Continued to the special August 24, 2021, City Council meeting, the matter to approve an amendment to the legal services agreement with the law firm of Burke, Williams & Sorensen, LLP for services rendered from July 1, 2021, through June 30, 2023, for general municipal and personnel matters. This item was continued from the cancelled July 20, 2021, meeting.

I-18. Continued to the special August 24, 2021, City Council meeting, the matter to approve the legal services agreement with the law firm of Best, Best & Krieger for services rendered from April 1, 2021, through June 30, 2023, for general municipal matters. This item was continued from the cancelled July 20, 2021, meeting.

I-19. The matter to approve a sole-source contract with Rebuilding Together East Bay-North, in an amount not to exceed \$983,975, for a term ending on June 30, 2022, for SOS! Richmond to provide outreach and support services to unsheltered people who reside in encampments and safe parking sites in the City of Richmond was presented Councilmember McLaughlin. Mayor Butt expressed concern that this item did not appear to follow proper procurement procedures and was that the contract was not prepared in collaboration with staff. Discussion ensued. This item was continued from the cancelled July 20, 2021, meeting. The following individuals gave comments via teleconference: Mark Wassberg, Leisa Johnson, Deborah, and Tarnel Abbott. A motion was made by Councilmember McLaughlin, seconded by Councilmember Willis, to approve the contract, passed by the following vote: **Ayes:** Councilmembers Jimenez, Martinez, McLaughlin, Willis, Vice Mayor Johnson III, and Mayor Butt. **Noes:** None. **Absent:** Councilmember Bates. **Abstain:** None.

I-20. Continued to the September 14, 2021, City Council meeting, the matter to approve a legal services agreement in the amount of \$80,000 with Oppenheimer Investigations Group LLP to conduct personnel investigations and a first amendment in an amount of \$40,000 to an existing legal services agreement with the law firm of Bertrand, Fox, Elliot, Osman & Wenzel for a total

contract amount of \$50,000 to provide ongoing labor and employment legal advice to the Human Resources Department. This item was continued from the cancelled July 20, 2021, meeting.

***I-21.** Adopted **Ordinance No. 12-21 N.S.** setting the tax rate for the Tax Override Pension Fund for Fiscal Year 2021-2022 at 0.14 percent.

***I-22.** Approved for the Community Services Department-Recreation Division and Parks and Landscaping Division to superimpose six Pickle Ball Courts onto the Booker T. Anderson Tennis Courts to make it a multi-sport use sport facility.

***I-23.** Approved a contract with Renne Public Law Group to provide professional services to develop a city-wide Community Benefits Policy with the term ending October 31, 2021; and appropriated funds in the amount of \$100,000 for the contract expenditure from the Fiscal Year 2021-2022 Budget.

BUDGET SESSION

J-1. The matter to receive a presentation on options to achieve long-term fiscal sustainability was presented by City Manager, Laura Snideman, Interim Library and Community Services Director, LaShonda Wilson, and Steve Toler of Management Partners, who presented a Powerpoint, which highlighted the following: Richmond's General Fund – Revenues and Expenditures; Five Year Fund Balance Forecast; Ten Year Fund Balance Forecast; Budget Strategies to Resolve Fiscal Gap by FY 2026 and by 2031; Impacts and Overview of the American Rescue Plan Act; Budget Strategies; Fiscal Sustainability Planning; Budget Strategy Opportunities; Revenue Enhancements; Maintaining Service Levels; Expenditure Controls/Cost Shifts; Service Level reductions; Factors for Evaluating Budget Strategies; and Budget Strategy Evaluation Tool. Discussion ensued. The following individuals gave comments via teleconference: Tarnel Abbott, Mark Wassberg, Leisa Johnson, Jan Mignone, Jane Courant, Jim Hanson, Angela Cox, Elsa Stevens, Ahmad Anderson, and Patricia Gallo. The City Council requested an audit of Chevron's energy usage; a job and performance evaluation and audit of city staff; hiring a subject matter expert to hire an independent auditor to do two or three department audits per year; and to develop a strategy to prioritize services at the libraries.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

K-1. The matter to hold a public hearing and adopt a resolution approving a report of sewer service charges for Fiscal Year 2021-22 allowing for the sanitary and stormwater fees to be collected on the annual 2021-22 tax rolls was presented by Project Manager, Water Resource Recovery Division, Mary Phelps. Mayor Butt opened the public hearing. There were no public speakers. Mayor Butt closed the public hearing. A motion was made by Councilmember Willis, seconded by Vice Mayor Johnson III, adopted **Resolution No. 103-21**, by the following vote: **Ayes:** Councilmembers Jimenez, Martinez, McLaughlin, Willis, Vice Mayor Johnson III, and Mayor Butt. **Noes:** None. **Absent:** Councilmember Bates. **Abstain:** None.

STUDY AND ACTION SESSION

L-1. The matter to direct staff (city attorney) to review University of California Berkeley's research, the City Charter and other relevant legal authority to determine if the City Council has the authority to extend voting rights to undocumented Richmond residents to participate in local elections and, upon completion, direct staff to present their findings to Council and, if authority exists, agenda an item for Council to consider such voting rights extension was presented by Councilmembers Jimenez, Martinez, and Vice Mayor Johnson III. This item was continued from the July 6, 2021, and cancelled July 20, 2021, meeting. Mayor Butt stated several guest speakers would not be allowed to make presentations. A motion was made by Councilmember Jimenez, seconded by Councilmember Willis, to allow five minutes for speakers to make a presentation, passed by the following vote: **Ayes:** Councilmembers Jimenez, Martinez, McLaughlin, Willis, and Vice Mayor Johnson III. **Noes:** Mayor Butt. **Absent:** Councilmember Bates. **Abstain:** None. Stephen Menendian, from the Othing and Bettering Institute, gave a presentation, which highlighted the following: How to Promote Civic Engagement; Extending Voting Privileges; and Approach of Implementation. The following individuals gave comments via teleconference: Ali Saidi, Yenny Garcia, Ahmad Anderson, Mark Wassberg, Elsa Stevens, Oscar Garcia, Deborah Bayer, Don Gosney, Garland Ellis, Tania Pulido, Alexa, Anne Janks, Vlara, Annie P, Edith Pastrano, Sadie Egan, Tomasa Espinoza, Keri Contreras, Lety, Randy Joseph, Floy Andrews, Deborah, Emily Ross, David Sharples, Denny Khamphanthong, Leisa Johnson, Yeri, Chandra Davies, Evelyn Perez, Marisol Cantu, Ozmar Huerta, Patricia Aguiar, Andres Soto, Diana Diaz- Noriega, Ceci, Alexa, Maria Franco, Tarnel Abbott, and Jocelyn Khansouvong. Further discussion ensued. A motion was made by Councilmember Willis, seconded by Councilmember Martinez, to approve the item. Mayor Butt made a friendly amendment and requested the cost and process of implementation. The friendly amendment was accepted, and the motion passed by the following vote: **Ayes:** Councilmembers Jimenez, Martinez, McLaughlin, Willis, Vice Mayor Johnson III, and Mayor Butt. **Noes:** None. **Absent:** Councilmember Bates. **Abstain:** None.

*(10:55 p.m. – A motion was made by Councilmember McLaughlin, seconded by Councilmember Jimenez, to extend the meeting and suspend the rules, to discuss Items I-19, K-1, and L-5, passed by the following vote: **Ayes:** Councilmembers Jimenez, Martinez, McLaughlin, Willis, and Vice Mayor Johnson III. **Noes:** Mayor Butt. **Absent:** Councilmember Bates. **Abstain:** None.*

L-2. Continued to the August 24, 2021, City Council meeting, the matter to consider forming an Inter-Agency Liaison Committee between the City of Richmond and AC Transit to discuss transit related matters on a quarterly schedule and direct staff to send a letter of interest to AC Transit. This item was continued from the cancelled July 20, 2021, meeting.

L-3. Continued to the August 24, 2021, City Council meeting, the matter to receive a report from the Richmond-Shimada Friendship Commission.

L-4. Continued to the August 24, 2021, City Council meeting, the matter to receive an annual report from the Richmond Youth Council.

L-5. The matter to adopt a resolution amending the City of Richmond City Council Rules of Procedure and Order (initially adopted by Resolution No. 27-06 and amended in subsequent years) to modify the last sentence of Section II A. (1) of this policy to eliminate the authority of the mayor to unilaterally cancel any future regular or special meeting of the City Council, so as to concur with the City of Richmond's democratic process of governance was presented by Councilmembers McLaughlin and Jimenez. *The proposed modification to the last sentence of Section II A was as follows: Any future regular or special meeting may be canceled by a vote of a majority of the members of the City Council during a regular or special meeting.* Discussion ensued. A motion was made by Councilmember McLaughlin, seconded by Councilmember Martinez to end debate. The following individuals gave comments via teleconference: Elsa Stevens, Tarnel Abbott, Jeanne Kortz, Evan Sirchuk, Sally Tobin, Mark Wassberg, Don Gosney, Deborah, Marisol Cantu, Jacqueline Thalberg, Randy Joseph, and Floridalma Bac. Further discussion ensued. Assistant City Attorney Heather McLaughlin stated that there was a portion of the city's harassment policy that protects city employees from harassment and discrimination. A motion was made by Councilmember McLaughlin, seconded by Councilmember Willis, adopted **Resolution No. 104-21**, by the following vote: **Ayes:** Councilmembers Jimenez, Martinez, McLaughlin, Willis, and Vice Mayor Johnson III. **Noes:** Mayor Butt. **Absent:** Councilmember Bates. **Abstain:** None.

L-6. Continued to the September 14, 2021, City Council meeting, to receive a presentation focused on the Richmond Bike Share Program and a discussion regarding transportation priority project implementation strategies.

L-7. Continued to the September 14, City Council meeting, the matter to discuss and provide direction to staff to implement a street sweeping pilot program that engages stakeholders, characteristic of the diversity of communities within the City and conforms to the City's National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Stormwater Discharge Permit.

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

None.

ADJOURNMENT

*A motion was made by Councilmember Willis, seconded by Councilmember McLaughlin, to schedule a special meeting on Tuesday, August 24, 2021, to complete all unfinished items from tonight's agenda, passed by the following vote: **Ayes:** Councilmembers Jimenez, Martinez, McLaughlin, Willis, and Vice Mayor Johnson III. **Noes:** Mayor Butt. **Absent:** Councilmember Bates. **Abstain:** None.*

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 12:33 a.m., in memory of Ella Mae Suel, Lottie Russell, and Antoine Whittley, to meet again on Tuesday, August 24, 2021, at 6:30 p.m.

Clerk of the City of Richmond

(SEAL)

Approved:

Mayor

Pamela Christian

From: Gopal K Acharya <gkacharya1000@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, July 26, 2021 12:00 PM
To: City Clerk Dept User
Subject: Regarding meeting regarding L5_Public Comment

Hello,

Yes, off course we need to stand up with Mrs Gayle McLaughlin and expect to assure that democracy prevails in our city council produces rather than allowing one persons the sole authority to cancel meetings. So, we need to go with Mrs Layle.

Because of my business, I am not able to attend the Virtual meeting. I am so interested to attend and see.

Thanks

Gopal K Acharya
Richmond, CA

Pamela Christian

From: Cordell Hindler <cordellhindler@ymail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 23, 2021 4:09 PM
To: City Clerk Dept User
Subject: Public Comments- Open Forum

good evening Mayor Butt, council Members and City Staff, I have a couple of comments for the record:

1. for the September Meeting, the council should consider Inviting the folks from EBMUD to make a presentation on the sewer rates
2. also the council should reinstate the Agenda & rules committee

Sincerely
Cordell

Pamela Christian

From: Cordell Hindler <cordellhindler@ymail.com>
Sent: Monday, July 26, 2021 11:59 AM
To: City Clerk Dept User
Subject: Public Comments L-5 Study And Action Session

good Evening Mayor Butt, council members and City Staff, I have some comments for the Record:

1. I think that it is Unacceptable that the Mayor has had to cancel regular Meetings because of Personal matters.
2. Other cities in West County has not once cancelled their meetings,

In conclusion I am asking that the Mayor DOES not canceled the meetings because there is Business to take care of?

Sincerely
Cordell

Pamela Christian

From: Cordell Hindler <cordellhindler@ymail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 23, 2021 4:19 PM
To: City Clerk Dept User
Subject: Public Comments L-4 Study & action Session

good evening Mayor Butt, Council Members and city staff, in my opinion I think that the youth council has done a wonderful job with the annual report on their activities

Sincerely
Cordell

Pamela Christian

From: Cordell Hindler <cordellhindler@ymail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 23, 2021 4:01 PM
To: City Clerk Dept User
Subject: Public Comments D-3 Presentations, Proclamations and Commendations

good evening Mayor Butt, council members and city staff, I have some wonderful news

I had spoken with the youth council at their regular meeting this Past Thursday and I have informed them about the remaining vacancies and so the Chair and Myself are going to have a follow up meeting next month

Sincerely
Cordell

Pamela Christian

From: Nicole Sasaki <nicole@baykeeper.org>
Sent: Tuesday, July 27, 2021 12:59 PM
To: City Clerk Dept User
Subject: Public Comments Agenda Item #L7

July 27, 2021

Transmitted Via Electronic Mail

City of Richmond City Council
Attn: City Clerk
440 Civic Center Plaza
Richmond, California 94804
Email: cityclerkdept@ci.richmond.ca.us

RE: July 27, 2021 City Council Meeting Item No. L7

Dear Council Members and Mayor Butt:

I write on behalf of San Francisco Baykeeper (“Baykeeper”) in support of agenda item no. L7, regarding the City of Richmond’s street sweeping pilot program. Baykeeper submits these comments on behalf of its approximately 5,000 members and supporters who live and/or recreate in and around the San Francisco Bay Area. Baykeeper’s mission is to defend San Francisco Bay from the biggest threats and hold polluters and government agencies accountable to create healthier communities and help wildlife thrive. Our team of scientists and lawyers investigate pollution via aerial and on-the-water patrols, strengthen regulations through policy advocacy, and enforce environmental laws on behalf of the public.

Baykeeper supports Councilmember McLaughlin’s proposal to pilot a community self-management program to educate Richmond’s residents about street sweeping schedules in lieu of street sweeping signage and ticketing. This proposal does not, and should not, eliminate street sweeping. Trash is a serious problem for many Bay Area cities, including Richmond, creating pollution and unsafe conditions in our streets, creeks, and San Francisco Bay.

Rather, the proposal stops the inequitable financial penalization of Richmond’s residents who fail to move their cars to facilitate street sweeping. Neighborhoods with sixteen out of forty-six street sweeping routes already employ a community self-management approach, and there is no evidence that ticketing improves compliance. However, unpaid parking tickets can lead to personal hardships, including additional late fees and possible ramifications with the Department of Motor Vehicles, such as refusal to register or renew a car’s registration or a resident’s license.

While the Municipal Regional Stormwater NPDES Permit, Order No. R2-2015-0049, NPDES Permit No. CAS612008 (“Municipal Stormwater Permit”) lists street sweeping as a best management practice to remove trash and other pollutants from city streets to protect stormwater quality, the Municipal Stormwater Permit does not require street sweeping signs, nor does it require strict parking enforcement and ticketing. Protecting San Francisco Bay from municipal trash pollution can be accomplished in an equitable, humane, and non-penalizing manner.

Baykeeper supports Richmond’s proposal to remove the penal component from its street sweeping program and implement a community managed system rooted in equity. I can be reached to discuss these comments via electronic mail at nicole@baykeeper.org.

Very truly yours,

Nicole Sasaki



Keeping an eye on the Bay since 1989

Nicole C. Sasaki, Staff Attorney (she/her)

San Francisco Baykeeper 1736 Franklin Street, Suite 800 | Oakland, CA 94612
Office: 510-735-9700 x110

baykeeper.org



NOTICE TO RECIPIENT: This communication is intended only for the person to whom it is addressed and may be confidential and/or protected by law. If you received this message in error, any review, use, distribution, or copying is strictly prohibited. Please notify the sender immediately of the error and delete this communication and any attached documents from your system. Thank you for your cooperation.

Pamela Christian

From: Joe Toth <joetoth1045@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, July 26, 2021 9:44 PM
To: City Clerk Dept User
Cc: Daran Moghadam
Subject: Public Comments Agenda Item #L-5 Favor

Please make sure this corrupt Mayor is stopped. Refer him to the Federal authorities ASAP.
Respectfully,

Joseph Toth

Pamela Christian

From: David Harris <getastrodave@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, July 26, 2021 2:23 PM
To: City Clerk Dept User
Subject: Public Comments Agenda Item #L-7, Study and Action Session, 7-27-21

City Council Members,

Regarding the proposed street sweeping pilot program:

Instead of installing permanent street sweeping signs in neighborhoods, I suggest that the City provide two portable signs for each side of a block, which could be deployed by volunteer block captains, who could assign themselves and others to set out the signs the evening before the street sweeping day, and remove them after the sweeping schedule. In this way, the streets can be cleared of parked cars for sweeping, and make the placement of permanent signs not necessary in neighborhoods which prefer not to have the permanent signs.

Thank you.
Dave Harris
Richmond resident,
Member, Richmond Annex Neighborhood Council

Pamela Christian

From: Tom Sumner <tomsumner53@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 27, 2021 11:46 AM
To: City Clerk Dept User
Subject: PUBLIC COMMENTS -- OPEN FORUM

Maybe others have in mind some of my concerns as well. Since brevity will preclude me saying all I need to, at any city council meeting, I'm hoping to find others who may have thought about these issues, as this place is getting more and more untenable.

** Lot's of elderly folks are more than likely suffering from the noise from a variety of sources, not allowed by law, but they may be even less inclined than myself these days to call the police, and so remain a group not represented or maybe lightly considered; and this group could include pets and wild animals. Do the councilmembers supporting selfish, rude noise and behavior consider this group?

** All people have an inherent right to "quiet enjoyment of their property". Any attempt by a city or county to interfere with that right by starting to allow illegal noise and behavior, to please an infant-minded populace which seeks to pollute and violate for simple selfish fun, would violate basic constitutional rights of people to not have govt. institute "allowed sideshows" within any city limit, and if the city were to persist with this, a lawsuit against the city again rears it's head.

** Owner accountability: since police are in short supply, I suggest a simple system of letters to both the owner and / or tenant, . Send a warning letter first, as the law requires, and then cite the owner. I am faced with owners who are LLCs with offices in Palo Alto. They ignore my letters asking them to correct the behavior of their tenants. The police could solve a huge variety of non-emergency complaints easily this way, as many owners will hastily comply, probably sending an immediate notice to the tenant to avoid fines.

This is an old idea floated, since it actually is something police easily can do, but for some reason there is a refusal on their part to engage this cost saving approach.

The landlords tell me to call the police. In fact, it's been my whole experience here that all these selfish teen to fifty year old babies readily defy anyone saying to them they are breaking the law. They just plain tell me "go ahead, call the police", because they know nothing will come of it, so the owners must have to be held accountable for the actions of their tenants, as the law requires landlords to have their tenants obey the law.

Why not use the landlords to control people, rather than relying upon a short police supply?

** Allow citizens like me to actually have a venue to bring video which passes "reasonable muster" that will generate a letter to the owner and / or tenant . Follow through on the citation. Don't discourage our complaints and videos. The police have no granted right to give noisemakers permission to make more.

It's bad enough we have "noise on the hoof", the vehicles going by all day, everyday, bass booming and revving illegally modified exhaust, but to have the police join forces with them by allowing stationary noise, is again not tenable. The police need to use their time citing and doing, not coming to my house every time I try to have a noise complaint resolved. They can act on their own at the site of the noise problem, and yet they insist on squandering time "interviewing me", I think trying to find a way to get me out of Richmond or into jail, all because I hate loud circus music noise and all other rude, selfish behaviors being foisted upon me.

Does the city mean to rub the rude, selfish "culture" of noise into my face my whole life here?

** Allow two or more citizens to make a complaint, which is our right, something being denied us regarding 338 Willard Ave. fireworks on July 4th. There are three complainants and an officer I saw blocked by a rocket lit off right in front of their car as they turned onto Willard; and yet no citation has been forthcoming that I've heard about. The cops want to forget about it, but I don't. There's nothing I can do but get a lawyer, I suppose, and start some injunctions against the city.

A cop has the right to act on his own accord and cite for things happening right in front of them. But, if three different residences want 338 Willard Ave. cited, the cops are supposed to help us.

I think they want to avoid any paperwork or cost, they say; but then they swarm (several times I can document by now) my house for yelling at an Hispanic cop on the phone or making valid noise complaints against recurring misdemeanor assaults of noise upon me.

** Rubber has a chemical in it which helps protect it from sun damage.

As the rubber wears, this chemical leaches off into all water courses, inevitably killing off Salmon, for instance. This has been proven already by scientists whom I believe know more than the councilmembers trying to please a selfish group of forty year old juvenile delinquents, maybe trying to get their vote too, if only they can get them legal to do so.

So, sideshows cause environmental damage from burning rubber, leaving heavy traces on the pavement to wash off into our water courses. Tell me, councilmembers who think you think, who is going to prevent all the rubber from washing into our bay?

Who is going to provide the needed police or security for the sideshows, anyway?

** A modified exhaust is a "pre-requisite" for anyone to show their face at a sideshow. Having one will create more noise, which is a main goal, a pain upon reasoning folks nearby being assaulted by it.

Moreover, in most cases, smog law also is being violated. The tuning is configured towards performance and away from state smog standards, and in some cases lots of pollutants are being ejected into the air.

Is the city prepared to face lawsuits pending for willfully helping a whole slew of vehicle owners to drive around here with improper, illegal exhausts -- and then let them have more fun in sanctioned sideshows? Are these crazy councilmembers, or what?

** The right to quiet enjoyment extends to the trucking industry.

Federal, state, county, city law and ordinance all go by a basic

premise: trucks are noisy, dirty, and would represent blight if allowed to operate and exist in residential areas.

Therefore, county areas may allow some instances of parking a truck at home, certainly it's not legal within the City of Richmond.

Our own ordinance says commercial trucks over eighty-four inches wide or higher than seventy-eight inches are not allowed parked upon any street in Richmond between the hours of one a.m. and six a.m. A good example is a "pallet truck" being regularly parked on Leo St., between Willard Ave. and Sanford Ave, owned and operated by 406 Sanford Ave.

This truck the police will argue with me, is not commercial because of size, they'll say. But the truck is used commercially and registered as such. He is being allowed a business out of his home, like 324 Duboce with their tree cutting business illegally operating, but on a small scale.

This truck is eighty-five inches wide and one can see why we have the

law: he blocks Leo somewhat. When he piles an uncovered pallet load on the flatbed, he is over the height limit. His neighbors have to have that eyesore in front of their houses on a regular basis, though he is entirely in violation. There are many other instances of this illegal truck parking.

** Police don't have any right I can find in the noise ordinance enforcement provisions to grant permission to a no-permit party or wedding, or whatever, to proceed and make noise. What I read is they are required to inform the noisemaker there is a complaint, and give warning that after five minutes or within ninety days of this warning they will be cited, found in violation. Instead, the police are granting them rights they have no right to grant.

Who told the cops they could give permission for loud, over the decibel level noise to proceed to any hour they dictate? I had a cop decide to grant two days of noise to one particular address, ignoring my complaint completely, dispatch telling me it was a wedding.

Just this past Sat. / Sun. I had plans to do garden work. The police decided that 233 Vernon now gets to rent out their church for weddings and blast out the neighborhood with loud, raucous, out of tune noise which far exceeded any allowed decibel levels. Cop gave permission, against my complaint and my need to have air and be outside, letting them proceed illegally until eight p.m., as I was informed by dispatch.

Again, Sun. the police allowed the same illegal noise to proceed until eight p.m., forcing me inside for two days of hell, seeing as opening my window in my house for air forced me to hear their selfish godawful noise. So, the city is letting the church raise money or profit from regular weddings at my expense?

Is the city ready to provide me hotel lodging expense and paid security to protect and watch my house while I have to stay away while the city and police appease the selfish, greedy noisemakers and litterbugs?

** Most problem houses are regulars, like 1250 FJW, with monthly noise and fireworks. I have video which I'm sure would fly in civil court, but of course the police demand more than I can give, it seems; but constantly, despite all I really can prove about how rotten they are, the police grant these problem properties the right to make more noise; and it's under the guise of "birthday party", wedding, etcetera.

The problem with the police and I guess the city's new errant viewpoint: our noise ordinance says nothing about letting parties proceed, except to say a permit is required. The permit process allows neighbors to be informed and get out of town if they don't want to hear the permitted, allowed noise.

The police chief cannot rightly grant a permit after the fact to cover letting another assault upon me proceed, as has been continually done by criminal neighbors and police allowing them in most every instance I've documented.

What the police and city do is force someone like me, who's had a glass of wine and a little smoke after my workday here, to now stay at home and have to hear this godawful circus music booming through my walls, all because I had no prior warning from the noisemaker they planned a permitted party. The most important part of the permit process is notifying neighbors, unless you folks think everyone is supposed to like and endure their crap?

Of course, no permits are ever drawn here because the police and city are once again appeasing a very selfish, noisy group of regulars, and the city / police dept. will be held liable if they persist.

Most of these noise events are far exceeding any decibel level the city allows, even with a valid noise permit.

** Sales of fruits / food from roving vehicles or from street carts parked upon the sidewalk is not legal without a valid, current permit from the health dept. The folks there say they are completely overwhelmed by cases of illegal sales I'm describing. They have only one or two people for the whole county I believe, and so nothing gets done against this.

I see sales like this from illegal carts at Target / Home Depot / along streets. If one calls police about it, they won't respond at all, arguing instead, asking how do you know they aren't legal?

A current, valid permit must be on display to the public, and they don't have one in my view, I say to dispatch. Still, police do nothing, and this is a political go around our county health codes to appease a group wanting to make money selling food illegally.

It's incumbent upon the city and the police to enforce against the practice of selling fruit / food without permit, as it violates health laws and represents a blight upon my city. I don't live in a foreign land where street hawkers roam to the peril of anyone possibly getting sick from non-inspected foods. The city / RPD need to help the health dept. by having officers quickly shut them down with citations.

That would let them off the hook a bit, you liberal minded, as the health dept. told me they will seize both the food items and the cart or truck used to sell it, so a citation is nicer, if that's what's required now, instead of having any law and order here at all.

I do not like what happened in Berkeley awhile back, when a good officer cited an illegal food seller, confiscating cash, I believe.

The damn mayor didn't back his police officer about this and I disrespect that whole process highly, where this criminal gets rewarded by the public with gifts of money and the good cop gets in trouble, I suppose. I will not tolerate a Richmond which acts like this, allowing all the above complaints I'm listing, as I need to live here the rest of my life.

If I had a child, I would not want someone selling them food I don't know about out upon the sidewalks as they walk to school. The fact the police and city are allowing this along Rheem, for instance, around near 36th or something where the school crossings are; or, how about near Verde School where street hawkers are hustling food to children as they dodge all the junk and debris brought on by the continued allowed and illegal trucking activity along Giramita, for instance.

These are some of my concerns. It will be worth hiring a good lawyer to settle some of these persistent selective enforcement issues the city and police like to wield as a vicious sword, using power of the city against those not wanting the damn noise and blight.

Tom Sumner

Pamela Christian

From: Cordell Hindler <cordellhindler@ymail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 23, 2021 4:24 PM
To: City Clerk Dept User
Subject: Public Comments J-1 Budget Session

good evening Mayor Butt, council members and city staff, I must commend the city manager's office and Management Partners for this excellent presentation

the funds should be allocated to fill certain Positions

Sincerely
Cordell

Pamela Christian

From: Susan Hybloom <shybloom316@att.net>
Sent: Monday, July 26, 2021 11:40 AM
To: City Clerk Dept User
Subject: Public Comment: Agenda Item L-5

As a Richmond resident I am very concerned that Mayor Butt has the sole authority to cancel City Council meetings when they are to deal with subjects he doesn't like. I don't think that action is democratic. Therefore I support Item L-5 which would stop the Mayor or any one Council member from unilaterally canceling a meeting.

Thank you.
Susan Hybloom
939 28th St
Richmond 94804

[Sent from AT&T Yahoo Mail on Android](#)

Pamela Christian

From: Jeff Royal <jtr.royal@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, July 26, 2021 7:47 PM
To: City Clerk Dept User
Subject: Public comment for agenda L-5

Dear City Council,

I am a Richmond resident urging the Council to support agenda item L-5 at the upcoming City Council meeting. I was surprised to hear that up until now the mayor had the power and ability to cancel City Council meetings at will.

Thank you,
Jeff Royal
District 5, Richmond

Pamela Christian

From: Anna Chavez <annachavez721@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 27, 2021 7:59 AM
To: City Clerk Dept User
Subject: Public Comment Agenda L-5

Dear City Council,

I'm a Richmond resident and I support L-5. Transparency is critical to a functioning democracy. It is not ok for Mayor Butts to cancel meetings that us citizens should have the rights to hear. I urge your support of L-5 as well.

Thank you,

Anna Chavez

Pamela Christian

From: Tom Clancy <tomaclan2000@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 27, 2021 12:41 PM
To: City Clerk Dept User
Subject: Public Comment Agenda Item L-5

Dear City Council: I am writing in support of Item L-5 on today's council agenda. I believe that local democracy is best served if no one person, even the mayor, has the sole authority to cancel meetings. Thank you. -Tom Clancy

Pamela Christian

From: Stacey Frederick <stacey.sargent.frederick@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, July 26, 2021 11:08 AM
To: City Clerk Dept User
Subject: Public Comment Agenda Item L-5 for today's meeting: In strong support of rectify this terrible rule

I was first made aware of this rule from a local news source, where they called out the mayor for canceling a meeting over something that was clearly against his interests rather than allowing the procedures of democracy and I was aghast that a mayor could hold such power.

I have been a Richmond resident for over 4 years and I would like to voice my strong support of today's L-5 agenda item to assure future fair and democrat process for our city.

Thank you for your time,

Stacey Frederick
Resident
4781 Hershey Ct, Richmond, CA 94804

--

Stacey Sargent Frederick
Pronouns: she/her/hers
stacey.sargent.frederick@gmail.com

Pamela Christian

From: Sally Tobin <otwsally@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 27, 2021 11:11 AM
To: City Clerk Dept User; Gayle McLaughlin; Eduardo Martinez; Melvin Willis; Claudia Jimenez; Demnlus Johnson; Tom Butt - external; Nat Bates
Cc: Laura Snideman; Teresa Stricker
Subject: Public Comment Agenda Item L-5

To: City Council Members
City of Richmond

I would like to express my support for Item L-5, which proposes to adopt a resolution that limits the mayor's ability to cancel regularly scheduled meetings of the City Council. This power was probably intended to permit a mayor to deal with unexpected events or emergencies, but has recently been misused by Mayor Butt. It is a shame to lose governmental flexibility, but Mayor Butt's actions have impeded municipal functions and are anti-democratic. Please vote to amend the City of Richmond City Council Rules of Procedure and Order.

Thank you very much,
Sally Tobin
Richmond Resident

Pamela Christian

From: Rita Barouch <rita.learningcircles@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 27, 2021 12:50 AM
To: City Clerk Dept User
Subject: Public comment Agenda item L-5

Please share this email with Mayor Butt and Councilpersons Martinez, McLaughlin, Jimenez, Johnson, Bates, Willis,

I am a 21 year Richmond resident writing to you in strong support of L-5. This is necessary to protect our democratic process in Richmond. No one person should be able to cancel City Council meetings and interfere with important city business.

I am especially concerned about risking the loss of valuable city income if meetings are cancelled.

Thank you for protecting responsible government.

Sincerely,

Rita Barouch MSW

Pamela Christian

From: Nancy Donald <ndonald51@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 27, 2021 9:01 AM
To: City Clerk Dept User
Subject: Public Comment Agenda Item L-5.

[I strongly urge you, the representatives of democratic Richmond, to adopt a resolution amending the City of Richmond City Council Rules of Procedure and Order \(initially adopted by Resolution No. 27-06 and amended in subsequent years\) to modify the last sentence of Section II A. \(1\) of this policy to eliminate the authority of the mayor to unilaterally cancel any future regular or special meeting of the City Council, so as to concur with the City of Richmond's democratic process of governance](#)

Nancy Donald
662 38th St
Richmond CA
94805

Pamela Christian

From: Jim Hite <umbrella27@hotmail.com>
Sent: Monday, July 26, 2021 12:19 PM
To: City Clerk Dept User
Subject: Public Comment Agenda Item L-5

Hi. My name is Jim Hite, Richmond resident. City Council members, please vote yes on Agenda Item L-5 which will change a particular city council procedural rule that is currently being put in play to satisfy a willful member of your body at the expense of most all the citizens of Richmond. The intentional disregard of good and prudent standards and proper conduct is shameful and out of place in decent society. Thank you

Pamela Christian

From: Janet Johnson <electricista545@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 27, 2021 11:17 AM
To: City Clerk Dept User
Subject: Public Comment Agenda Item L-5.

Dear City Clerk, Mayor, and City Council members,

I support agenda item L-5. It is critical that democracy prevails in our city council procedures. Unfortunately, the existing rule that allows one person the sole authority to cancel meetings has been abused, obstructing the democratic process and wasting valuable staff time. Richmond community members deserve to participate fully in council deliberations on the many items that affect them; cancelling council meetings arbitrarily denies them that right. The council can rectify this problem by voting "yes" on item L-5.

Thank you for your consideration!
Janet Johnson

--

[Janet Scoll Johnson](#)

[pronouns: she/her](#)

[Unceded Chochenyo Ohlone Territory, Richmond CA](#)

[Sunflower Alliance](#)

[Richmond Shoreline Alliance](#)

“Not everything that is faced can be changed, but nothing can be changed until it is faced.” — James Baldwin

Pamela Christian

From: Emily Johnson <emilysquest@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, July 26, 2021 2:01 PM
To: City Clerk Dept User
Subject: Public Comment Agenda Item L-5

Hello,

As a Richmond resident I'd like to voice my support for Item L-5, which would change the City Council procedural rule currently allowing City Council meetings to be canceled at the mayor's discretion. Controversial agenda items should be put up for public discussion rather than silenced because the mayor (or any one person) dislikes them.

Thank you,
Emily Johnson
5005 State Ave.
Richmond 94804

Pamela Christian

From: cubanelsa@sbcglobal.net
Sent: Monday, July 26, 2021 2:52 PM
To: City Clerk Dept User
Cc: Gayle McLaughlin; Claudia Jimenez; Melvin Willis
Subject: Public Comment Agenda Item L-5

We do not need a ONE-MAN-FILIBUSTER.

Mayor Butt must be stopped from behaving like the infamous Senator Macconnell.

Stop allowing one person (i.e. the Mayor) from cancelling City Council meetings willy nilly.

Richmond has a lot of serious business to accomplish.

Sincerely,
Elsa Stevens
Richmond voter

Pamela Christian

From: Dajenya <dajenya@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, July 26, 2021 5:00 PM
To: City Clerk Dept User
Subject: Public Comment Agenda Item L-5

Regardless of whatever differences in political views of various council members and/or the mayor, I would expect everyone to agree to democratic processes. Democracy means we (or our elected representatives) all decide together. No one wants a dictatorship where one person has the power to force his or her or their views on everyone else, or by silencing people, or by canceling meetings whenever a topic arises that one doesn't like. This is like a kid throwing a tantrum and destroying game equipment if everyone doesn't concede to whatever he wants to happen.

So of course I, (like all democracy-minded people would), support L-5 to assure that democracy prevails in our city council procedures rather than allowing one person the sole authority to cancel meetings.

Thank you,

Dajenya Kafele
Richmond resident since 1984
Richmond business owner and service provider since 2013

Pamela Christian

From: Carolyn Graves <Carolyn.Graves@kp.org>
Sent: Monday, July 26, 2021 11:30 AM
To: City Clerk Dept User
Subject: Public Comment Agenda Item L-5

I support agenda item L-5, to allow the city council to modify the city council procedures so that regular and special City Council meetings can no longer be canceled unilaterally by the Mayor.

Regards,
Carolyn Graves
Richmond resident

NOTICE TO RECIPIENT: If you are not the intended recipient of this e-mail, you are prohibited from sharing, copying, or otherwise using or disclosing its contents. If you have received this e-mail in error, please notify the sender immediately by reply e-mail and permanently delete this e-mail and any attachments without reading, forwarding or saving them. v.173.295 Thank you.

Pamela Christian

From: Helsel Bill <billhelsel@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Monday, July 26, 2021 4:14 PM
To: City Clerk Dept User
Subject: PUBLIC COMMENT AGENDA ITEM L-5 - TUESDAY July 27th

I wish to voice my support of Public Comment Agenda Item L-5 scheduled for Tuesday July 27th City Council Meeting .
I have lived in the City of Richmond for over 40years and voted for Mayor Butt but I DO NOT agree that he should have the ability to unilaterally cancel meetings. That is totally undemocratic . No member of our council should wield that amount of control. Please register that I SUPPORT PUBLIC COMMENT AGENDA ITEM L-5

Thank you

Bill Helsel

Pamela Christian

From: Anne Marie Richard <amrichard70@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, July 26, 2021 12:44 PM
To: City Clerk Dept User
Subject: Public Comment Agenda Item L-5

Dear City Council,

I am a Richmond resident and wish to register my strong support for Agenda Item L-5 on the upcoming City Council meeting. It is important that our city enfranchises all residents and that our City Council has procedures in place to protect democratic participation.

Thank you,
Anne Marie Richard
District 5 resident

Pamela Christian

From: Margaret Helsel <mahelsel@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Monday, July 26, 2021 10:55 AM
To: City Clerk Dept User
Subject: Public Comment Agenda Item L-5

I wish to voice my support of Public Comment Agenda Item L-5. I have lived in the City of Richmond for over 40years and voted for Mayor Butt but I DO NOT agree that he should have the ability to unilaterally cancel meetings or items. That is totally undemocratic . No member of our council should wield that amount of control. Please register that I SUPPORT PUBLIC COMMENT AGENDA ITEM L-5 Thank you Margaret Helsel

Sent from my iPhone

Pamela Christian

From: Laura Thomas <laurakthomas@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, July 26, 2021 10:56 AM
To: City Clerk Dept User
Cc: Gayle McLaughlin
Subject: Public Comment Agenda Item L-5

My name is Laura Thomas, a Richmond resident and homeowner. I am appalled at Mayor Butt's abuse of power in cancelling meetings where he did not like the agenda. I support item L-5 and believe it is crucial to ensure Butt, and others in the future, cannot use their power to impede democracy.

Regards,
Laura Thomas

--

Join the [Richmond Shoreline Alliance](#) in the fight for environmental justice.

Pamela Christian

From: TARNEL ABBOTT <tarnelabbott@comcast.net>
Sent: Tuesday, July 27, 2021 12:48 PM
To: City Clerk Dept User; Laura Snideman
Cc: Tom Butt; Demnlus Johnson; Eduardo Martinez; Gayle McLaughlin; Melvin Willis; Claudia Jimenez; Nat Bates
Subject: Public Comment Agenda Item J 1

Council Members:

RE Agenda Item J 1, Attachment 1 you are again being asked to consider contracting out the Richmond Public Library to the Contra Costa County Library. The last time there was an attempt to eliminate the library from the budget by this method about 200 people lobbied you to keep our city library, Richmond Public Library. Why is this consulting firm being paid a huge contract to recommend something that the people of our community have already resoundingly rejected? The library has been sacrificed to save the budget so many times it is a ghost of its prior self. Libraries are essential infrastructure.

This is your only city educational institution. The needs of this community are unique within Contra Costa County and the Richmond Library has a history and tradition of meeting those unique needs. Richmond deserves a stronger library not a weaker one.

Please advocate for more staff, more open hours, more collections (including databases), more programs and facility improvement. The Richmond Public Library was built in 1949 and has had very little in the way of infrastructure/facility upgrades. There is no HVAC, the radiators are antiquated, the lighting insufficient, the floor tiles should be replaced, the elevator is not 100% reliable, the loading dock should have power assist, etc. Please send a letter to Congressman DeSaulnier in support of this bill to to Build America's Libraries:

“S. 127 — 117th Congress: Build America’s Libraries Act.”

For further information see:

<https://www.ala.org/advocacy/buildlibraries>

Thank you,
Tarnel Abbott

Pamela Christian

From: krserwin@juno.com
Sent: Tuesday, July 27, 2021 11:59 AM
To: City Clerk Dept User
Cc: Claudia Jimenez; Demnlus Johnson; Melvin Willis; Gayle McLaughlin; Eduardo Martinez; Trina Jackson
Subject: City Council Meeting - Public Comment - Item L-1; L-5; L-7

I would like to submit a comment IN STRONG FAVOR OF

- L-5. [ADOPT a resolution amending the City of Richmond City Council Rules of Procedure and Order \(initially adopted by Resolution No. 27-06 and amended in subsequent years\) to modify the last sentence of Section II A. \(1\) of this policy to eliminate the authority of the mayor to unilaterally cancel any future regular or special meeting of the City Council, so as to concur with the City of Richmond's democratic process of governance - Councilmembers Gayle McLaughlin \(510-620-6636\) and Claudia Jimenez \(510-620-6565\).](#)

AND

- L-7. [DISCUSS and PROVIDE direction to staff to implement a street sweeping pilot program that engages stakeholders, characteristic of the diversity of communities within the City and conforms to the City's National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System \(NPDES\) Stormwater Discharge Permit - Public Works Department \(Joe Leach 510-620-5478\).](#)

AND

- L-1. [DIRECT staff \(city attorney\) to review University of California Berkeley's research, the City Charter and other relevant legal authority to determine if the City Council has the authority to extend voting rights to undocumented Richmond residents to participate in local elections and, upon completion, DIRECT staff to present their findings to Council and, if authority exists, agendize an item for Council to consider such voting rights extension - Councilmember Claudia Jimenez \(510-620-6565\), Councilmember Eduardo Martinez \(510-620-6593\) and Vice Mayor Demnlus Johnson, III \(510-620-6568\). This item was continued from the July 6, 2021, and cancelled July 20, 2021, meeting.](#)

I will try to call in during the meeting to comment on this item, but since it seems to be middle of work day, I may not be able to be present.

These are all very important items, and I want to express my STRONG support for all of them.

Thank you!

Kathleen Erwin
Richmond Resident and VOTER
Panhandle Annex Neighborhood

Choose to be safer online.

Opt-in to Cyber Safety with NortonLifeLock.

Get Norton 360 with LifeLock starting at \$9.95/month.*

NetZero.com/NortonLifeLock

Pamela Christian

From: Jeannette Kortz <jeannekortz@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, July 26, 2021 12:28 PM
To: City Clerk Dept User
Subject: Public Comment - Agenda Item L-5

Below is my public comment regarding Agenda Item L-5:

I am writing in support of Agenda Item L-5. A mayor should not have the power to unilaterally cancel a city council meeting simply because he or she does not want to discuss a certain item on the City Council agenda.

This is highly undemocratic, and the last sentence of Section II of the Richmond City Council Rules of Procedure and Order (initially adopted by Resolution No. 27-06 and amended in subsequent years) that currently gives the mayor the power to unilaterally cancel a city council meeting, serves as a tool that is currently being abused by Mayor Butt because there is a particular agenda item that he does not want discussed at the City Council meetings. Canceling city council meetings based on non-emergency reasons, and giving the mayor sole authority to cancel meetings, costs the city money. We cannot afford this.

Again, in the name of democracy and moving forward with important City business, I urge the City Council to support this agenda item.

Thank you for your time

Jeanne Kortz
Richmond Resident

Pamela Christian

From: Janis E. Eggleston <janis@jegglestonlaw.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 27, 2021 12:10 PM
To: City Clerk Dept User
Cc: Gayle McLaughlin
Subject: Public Comment to Approve Item # L-5 to adopt a resolution to the City Council Rules of Procedure and Order to Remove the Mayor's Discretionary Authority to Unilaterally Cancel any Future Special or Regular meeting on the Agenda

Importance: High

Dear City Clerk and City Council Members:

I strongly urge the City Council to adopt a resolution to the City Council Rules of Procedure and Order, cited in the last sentence of Section II, A.(1), to strike the provision of the Rule that grants the Mayor discretionary authority to unilaterally cancel any future Special or Regular Meeting already on the Agenda. Instead, I ask the City Council to amend the language of this provision to require a vote of a majority of City Council Members to cancel any Special or Regular Meeting. This Amendment to the Rules of Procedure and Order is necessary and urgent.

The Mayor has demonstrated that he has abused his discretion when he removed at least two items on the **(1)** July 20th Special Meeting Agenda, Item # L-5 re: the Campus Bay Development (*See*, Tom Butts E-Forum public comments, dated 7/24/21 entitled “Campus Bay, the RPA, and the City Attorney,”) to justify his abusive, obstructionist machinations during the July 22nd public City Council Meeting, which he described as a “Shitshow” and for which he took no responsibility for having created; and **(2)** July 20th Item # I-21 from the Consent Calendar re: the Oppenheimer Investigator Group, LLC’s, which would investigate Personnel Matters as required by law, including the FEHA.

At the July 22nd City Council Meeting, the Mayor openly abused the City Attorney in a manner that is unlawful under FEHA, and distracted, obstructed, and interfered with Councilmember McLaughlin’s two- part motion to address the Mayor’s abuse of his discretionary authority to cancel Special and Regular Meetings so that he could delay public hearing on certain Agenda Items.

The Mayor’s Abuse of the City Attorney at a Public Meeting

The Mayor abused the City Attorney by telling her she was “full of it;” “flat wrong;” that “ I just don’t think you are very smart;” she is “not right;” “is wrong;” and that “she is not all knowing.” He also accused the City Attorney of “being complicit in a plot of overturn the Brown Act” and that she is “sworn to uphold the law, not collaborate with City Council members to try to get around the law.” I believe the Mayor’s public comments about the City Attorney violate the FEHA and requires the City to take corrective action against him.

The Mayor also grossly and materially misrepresented to the public and City Council members that they had no authority to confer with the City Attorney and she had no authority to advise them. A clear reading of the City Attorney’s duties posted on the City’s webpage states that one of the City

Attorney's primary responsibilities is to: "Serve[ing] as the primary legal advisor and legal representative to the City and City Council."

The Mayor, by and through his conduct on July 22nd, has signaled that he will go to great lengths to achieve his nefarious ends. His abuse of his discretionary authority needs to stop. Thus, I urge the City Council to remove his discretionary authority to cancel Special and Regular meetings and adopt the proposed resolution to require a majority vote of the City Council members before any Special or Regular meeting may be cancelled.

The Mayor Is No Authority on the Brown Act and Repeatedly Violates It by Publicly Disclosing the Content of Confidential Closed Session Meetings on His E-Forum.

The Mayor has, at least twice, publicly disclosed the contents of confidential closed session items, on his public E-Forum.

First, he disclosed the contents of the City Council's June 22nd Closed Session discussion regarding the Anticipated Litigation re: the Reese-Brown DFEH Right-to-Sue letter that announced the threat of litigation. In his June 23rd E-Forum calling for the Resignation of the City Manager and City Attorney, he openly discussed what he alleged to be conflicting allegations made by City employee, Ms. Reese-Brown.

Second, he publicly disclosed the contents of the City Council's Closed Session discussions when he announced he wanted the DA to investigate the City Attorney and City Manager because of an independent investigation contract and expenditure into personnel matters, which they are required, by FEHA to conduct, once presented with the City employee complaint of discrimination, harassment, or retaliation.

In both instances, there was no vote by the City Council to authorize the Mayor's public disclosure of confidential closed sessions discussions, as required by the Brown Act. Thus, the Mayor has violated the Brown Act.

The previously noticed July 20th Consent Calendar Item # I-21, and current Consent Calendar Item # I-20, are efforts to resolve the Mayor's threatened actions against the City Manager and City Attorney, who acted to fulfill their statutory duties, as required by FEHA, which requires among other things for the City to conduct immediate and effective investigations into personnel matters. The Mayor abused his discretionary authority to cancel these attempts to authorize expenditures to conduct investigations into personnel matters and the Mayor's alleged wrongful conduct.

Thus, I urge the City Council to strike the Mayor's discretionary authority from the Section II, A. 1 of the Rules of Procedure and Order and instead required a majority vote by the City Council to cancel any Regular or Special meeting.

Madame City Clerk, please distribute this email to the City Council prior to this evening's City Council Meeting.

Thank you,

Janis E. Eggleston
District 5, City of Richmond Resident

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.

Pamela Christian

From: Leisa Johnson <leisa_johnson@icloud.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 27, 2021 7:06 PM
To: City Clerk Dept User
Cc: Leisa Johnson
Subject: Open Forum - Written Comments for Supplementary Material, July 27th, 2021 council meeting

Dear City Clerk,

Could you please confirm receipt of this request & include these comments as part of the City Council meeting supplementary material?

Thank you.

Sincerely,
Leisa

Good Evening Mayor, Vice Mayor, City Councilmembers and City Staff -

I am speaking out tonight on the discussion that occurred last Thursday regarding fireworks & sideshows.

I know I speak for many when I say that the RPA 5 councilmembers completely disrespected the vast majority of Richmond residents and businesses regarding illegal fireworks and sideshows.

You expressed more concern for the people who are doing the illegal activities than for the public health & safety of this entire community, including many who suffer from PTSD, such as some of our veterans, and who are traumatized by these activities. A homeowner's dog died on July 4th in response to the firework battleground now as Richmond.

Councilmember Martinez & Vice Mayor Johnson expressed more concern for 12, 13 and 14 year olds, implying they are the primary ones blowing up fireworks and doing sideshows.

- First of all, they are not the ones spending thousands of \$ buying fireworks;
- Nor are they allowed to drive let alone do a sideshow; and
- Any parent or adult who is letting them light these powerful fireworks or drive, let alone participate in a sideshow, could even be charged with child endangerment.

Councilmember Martinez wants to devote land for folks to conduct illegal sideshows.

- As one speaker appropriately noted, he appeared to be more concerned about finding land to support this than helping our unhoused residents.
- What resident or business would want this next to them?
- Wouldn't this violate our City's Noise Ordinance?
- This is also a bay area issue; if he wants to find land to support sideshows, then he should work with other cities on such an endeavor.

Regarding preventive measures - there are numerous city-sponsored firework shows that families and adults can attend, and Richmond plans to have a show again in 2022.

These folks are spending thousands on fireworks and tires (if the sideshow vehicles aren't stolen), and as other cities crack down on sideshows, they will only continue to increase in Richmond if we don't similarly send a strong message that they won't be tolerated in Richmond.

The RPA has no problem fining ma & pa landlords \$10K or higher for a minor first time infraction.

Why do you think illegal fireworks & sideshows aren't worthy of appropriate fines coupled with community service as well as impounding cars and suspending drivers license? Moreover, many of these participants do not even live in Richmond.

I also hope that Vice Mayor Johnson and Councilmember Martinez plan to address the property owner(s) whose home or business is destroyed or, god forbid, whose child is seriously injured or killed resulting from illegal fireworks. When you defund RPD and eliminate several RPD positions, you should have the courage to step up and own your actions instead of expecting RPD or RFD to deliver such difficult news.

Please show some respect for your community that has been begging for proactive and effective solutions.

Thank you.

Respectfully,
Leisa Johnson
21-year Richmond resident

Good evening Mayor, council members and city staff. My name is María López and I am a member of the West County Regional Group sponsored by First 5 Contra Costa.

I am here today to speak about the right to vote in local elections in our community. For our group the most important values are human dignity, respect, and justice. We work very hard to create healthy, safe and equitable communities for children and families. All residents of our city are a part of the same ecosystem, and we all deserve to have the same value and rights.

For this reason, I'm here today. Because at this time part of our community does not have the right to vote due to their immigration status. Our community needs equity for all, it is important that everyone casts their vote regardless of their immigration status. Not allowing all residents of a city to vote in local elections is a form of voter oppression. And in times like these, when so many voter oppression laws are being passed across the country, Richmond has the opportunity to be the example of inclusion, and be a leader for immigrant rights.

We are a community rich in diversity and all decisions made in this community affect or benefit us all. Voting is a basic right to which all human beings should have access to.

The solution for our community is that all Richmond residents be allowed to take part in local elections, which directly affects our daily lives.

You can support us to make this dream come true where we can all feel integrated and part of the community. Take action today by approving Council Member Jimenez's proposal and investigating the possibility of allowing non-citizen Richmond residents to vote in local elections. Thanks

Pamela Christian

From: Linda Watson <ladylindawatson@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 27, 2021 4:59 PM
To: City Clerk Dept User
Subject: Public Comment Agenda Item #L-1

Good Evening Mayor, Council Members and Staff. My name is Linda Wiggins and I am a volunteer with the West County Regional Group sponsored by First 5 Contra Costa.

I'm writing to you today to discuss my support for Councilmember Jimenez's proposal to expanding voting rights to Richmond residents, regardless of immigration status. Our group is a multi-cultural advocacy group with organizational values that work to make West Contra Costa a healthier, safer, more equitable place to live. We promote increased representation of low-income families and families of color in local decision-making.

Our United States, noted as the Land of the Free, is a democracy, in which our government officials are elected by vote by the very people they represent. The fact that non-citizen immigrants in the U.S. are not allowed to vote is a form of voter suppression. Laws like the poll tax were struck down because our courts decided that financial barriers to voting were unconstitutional.

But how are the financial barriers of becoming a citizen any different? I support allowing noncitizens to vote! I humbly submit and argue that prohibiting them from doing so is unjust because of barriers to naturalization; that prohibiting them from voting encourages discriminatory public policy; that allowing noncitizens to vote does not discourage them from seeking citizenship; and that allowing noncitizens to vote promotes policy that benefits society as a whole as opposed to just the elites.

I am a registered voter. I'm asking you to please take action by supporting staff to research expanding voting to noncitizens in our local elections. We need your help! Our democracy depends on your action.

Thank you, West County Regional Group advocate,
Ms Linda Wiggins

Buenas tardes señor alcalde, concejales y personal de la ciudad. Mi nombre es María López y soy miembro del Grupo Regional del Oeste del Condado patrocinado por Los Primeros 5 de Contra Costa.

Hoy estoy aquí para hablar sobre el derecho al voto en las elecciones locales de nuestra comunidad. Para nuestro grupo los valores más importantes son la dignidad humana, el respeto, y la justicia. Trabajamos muy duro para crear comunidades saludables, seguras y equitativas para los niños y familias. Todos los residentes de nuestra ciudad forman parte del mismo ecosistema, y todos merecemos tener el mismo valor y derechos.

Por esta razón me dirijo a ustedes, porque en este momento parte de nuestra comunidad no tiene el derecho a votar debido a su estatus migratorio. Nuestra comunidad necesita equidad para todos, es importante que cada quien ejerza el voto sin importar su estatus migratorio. El no permitir a todos los residentes de una ciudad votar en las elecciones locales es una forma de opresión de voto. Y en tiempos como estos donde tantas leyes de opresión de voto se están aprobando a lo largo del país, Richmond tiene la oportunidad de ser el ejemplo de inclusión, y ser un líder por los derechos de los inmigrantes.

Somos una comunidad rica en diversidad y todas las decisiones que se tomen en esta comunidad nos afecta o nos beneficia a todos. El voto es un derecho básico al cual todos los seres humanos deberíamos detener acceso.

La solución para nuestra comunidad es que se nos permita a todos los residentes de Richmond formar parte de las elecciones locales, las cuales afectan nuestra vida diaria directamente.

Ustedes nos pueden apoyar para poder realizar este sueño donde todos nos podamos sentir integrados y parte de la comunidad. Tomen acción hoy, al aprobar la propuesta del concejal Jiménez e investigar la posibilidad de permitir a los residentes de Richmond no ciudadanos votar en las elecciones locales. Gracias

Pamela Christian

From: Michael Gliksohn <mgliksohn@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 27, 2021 2:05 PM
To: City Clerk Dept User
Subject: Public Comment on Item L-5

Dear City Clerk, Mayor and Council Members,

I am writing to express my support for item L-5, the resolution [amending the City of Richmond City Council Rules of Procedure and Order](#). I urge a Yes vote.

Thank you,
Michael Gliksohn
Richmond resident

Pamela Christian

From: Leisa Johnson <leisa_johnson@icloud.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 27, 2021 11:22 PM
To: City Clerk Dept User
Cc: Leisa Johnson
Subject: Written Public Comments for Item I-19, July 27th, 2021 City Council meeting

Dear City Clerk,

Could you please confirm receipt of this request & include these comments as part of the City Council meeting supplementary material?

Thank you.

Sincerely,
Leisa

Good evening Mayor, Council and Staff -

The Public agrees that we have a crisis with our unhoused population in Richmond which needs support.

However, you can't violate City Policy in the process, especially when dealing with \$1M of taxpayer money.

This item is for a **\$1M sole-source contract**. Were this any other matter doing something comparable, the RPA would be having a coronary if someone else had put this on the consent calendar. You can't sit on the dais and cry that there is a lack of functioning democracy when this action is not following Richmond policy as well as a fair bidding, negotiation & public review process.

As per RMC 2.52.326 and sole source procurement. "A contract **may** be awarded without competition **when the City determines in writing, after conducting a good faith review of available sources, that there is only one source for the required goods or service. The City Manager shall conduct negotiations, as appropriate, as to price, delivery, and terms. A written statement of the basis for the sole source determination** shall be placed in the contract file."

I would like the City Manager & City Attorney to please clarify for the Public why policy wasn't followed? RMC code doesn't support this action but the City Attorney basically just said, "Oh well".

1. Is the contract with Rebuilding Together East Bay-North or is this a work around on paper and the contract is really with SOS! Richmond, who does **not** have the current in-house capabilities to oversee such a large contract being paid for with Richmond **taxpayer** money?

2. As per RMC, did you **conduct a good faith review** of all available sources **& determine** that there is no other source besides Rebuilding Together East Bay-North to provide the required goods or service that SOS can't? That is the question and Councilmember McLaughlin is not directly addressing it.

If so, please provide the public with the relevant information pertaining to this review & determination.

3. Rebuilding Together East Bay-North is based in Berkeley and doesn't currently exist in Richmond. Which other non-profit agencies/entities were contacted, especially in Richmond?

4. As per RMC, did you conduct negotiations regarding price, delivery & terms?

The responsibility of items 2-4 lies with the City Manager, **not** Councilmembers McLaughlin or Jimenez.

5. Where is the written statement of the basis for this sole source determination?

6. What are the metrics of success and failure?

7. What audit mechanisms are in place?

This might very well be the best combo but who has vetted Rebuilding Together? Who has researched other options? Who has defined the proposal requirements? Until the proposal requirements/outcomes/measurement criteria & methodology are clearly defined, and until the call for services is broadcast through whatever social service channels exist, and until the contracts have been negotiated, we are shortchanging the process for everyone involved. None of this has to take an inordinately long time, but why not lay a solid foundation for success?

Thank you.

Respectfully,
Leisa Johnson
21-year Richmond Resident

Pamela Christian

From: Joaquin Montalvo <menicia@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Tuesday, July 27, 2021 6:00 PM
To: City Clerk Dept User; Cecilia Perez-Mejia
Subject: public comments agenda Item#

Good evening Mayor, council members and city staff. My name is Enicia Montalvo and I am a volunteer with the West County Regional Group, sponsored by First 5 Contra Costa. WCRG promotes healthy, safe and equitable communities for all families and children. I am also a pastor of a church within the Hispanic community.

I am here today to speak in support of the proposal to investigate the possibility of Richmond residents having the right to vote in local elections regardless of their immigration status.

The immigrant community is full of highly qualified people with good conduct, integrity, morals and principles, and we're active in our community. We are also people who have bright and intelligent minds, with good ideas and creativity. We fight for our families and for our community.

The problem is that because some are undocumented immigrants or non-citizen immigrants of this country, they are not allowed to exercise the right to vote. We're being deprived of the opportunity to elect worthy and valuable representatives to represent us in the decision-making. The immigrant community is also being deprived from expressing our valuable opinion and to have a just democracy.

We as an immigrant community equally deserve to have a voice just like other Richmond residents. We participate in enriching this city and it is only fair that we have a voice in how it is run.

Please take positive action by supporting an investigation into the possibility of allowing undocumented immigrants and / or non-citizens to be active participants in the City of Richmond elections. Be the leaders we need right now and please support this proposal.

Thanks

Enicia Montalvo, Pastor of the Hispanic community