



Outlook

Fw: Support Remote Participation Item C.2. Rules Committee 5/13

From Agendadesk <Agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov>**Date** Mon 5/11/2026 10:40 AM**To** Rules and Open Government Committee Agendas <rulescommitteeagenda@sanjoseca.gov>

From: City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>**Sent:** Monday, May 11, 2026 9:42 AM**To:** Agendadesk <Agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov>**Subject:** Fw: Support Remote Participation Item C.2. Rules Committee 5/13**Office of the City Clerk | City of San José**200 E. Santa Clara St., Tower 14th Floor

San Jose, CA 95113

Main: 408-535-1260

Fax: 408-292-6207

How is our service? Your [feedback](#) is appreciated!

From: Tevin Hendess [REDACTED]**Sent:** Saturday, May 9, 2026 7:52 PM**To:** City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>**Subject:** Support Remote Participation Item C.2. Rules Committee 5/13**[External Email.** Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources. [Learn more](#)]You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

Hello,

As someone who works full time, attends school, and looks after family, it is incredibly difficult to get all the way downtown in order to advocate in person for the things that matter to me. Participation from *all* members of the community is a cornerstone to a successful democracy which is why it is so important that we as a city do everything in our power to ensure that people have a voice.

With this in mind, I am strongly requesting that the city implement the Memorandum from Councilmembers Candelas, Ortiz, Cohen, and Casey Item C.2. Rules Committee 5/13 and restore remote participation for this week's upcoming budget discussion.

Thank you.

- Sincerely, Tevin Hendess, District 10

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.



Fw: Support for Reinstating Remote Participation - Item C.2. Rules 5/13

From City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>

Date Wed 5/13/2026 8:24 AM

To Rules and Open Government Committee Agendas <rulescommitteeagenda@sanjoseca.gov>

Office of the City Clerk | City of San José

200 E. Santa Clara St., Tower 14th Floor

San Jose, CA 95113

Main: 408-535-1260

Fax: 408-292-6207

How is our service? Your [feedback](#) is appreciated!

From: Jordan Moldow [REDACTED]

Sent: Tuesday, May 12, 2026 11:56 PM

To: City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>; District1 <district1@sanjoseca.gov>; District4 <District4@sanjoseca.gov>; District7 <District7@sanjoseca.gov>; District8 <district8@sanjoseca.gov>; District9 <district9@sanjoseca.gov>; District5 <District5@sanjoseca.gov>; District 10 <District10@sanjoseca.gov>

Subject: Support for Reinstating Remote Participation - Item C.2. Rules 5/13

[**External Email.** Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources. [Learn more](#)]

Honorable Councilmembers,

Please support the [memorandum from Candelas, Ortiz, Cohen, and Casey](#) regarding reinstating remote participation in public meetings.

I am fortunate to have the means to attend some city meetings in person. That is not the case for many. Having a healthy, equitable democracy means using the tools at our disposal to increase public participation. Remote public comment is one of those important tools.

These days, six years after the start of the COVID 19 pandemic, remote government meetings aren't even innovative anymore they are an expectation, not to mention a crucial prerequisite for achieving true accessibility. VTA, Caltrain, MTC, ABAG, the County of Santa Clara, and most (if not all?) of our neighboring cities have embraced remote public comments. San Jose should demonstrate that it *wants* to offer the same accommodations to its residents, by re adopting virtual public comment *before* the legally required deadline.

It has been 27 months since San Jose decided to get rid of virtual public comment, and 7 months since SB 707 was signed into law. Waiting until July 1st to reinstate virtual commenting isn't going to significantly improve the City's

preparedness. Whereas bringing it back early will make a huge difference for every resident who wants to make a difference in upcoming deliberations, most importantly the budget.

Virtual meetings benefit you as decisionmakers as well. You can occasionally attend remotely for just cause, without the usual Brown Act posting requirements. You don't have to worry about missing a crucial vote due to illness or taking care of a loved one. Without this flexibility, an illness means missing votes or risking getting your staff and colleagues sick.

Please adopt this memo with haste. Given that it is definitely in an existing workplan (San Jose needs to comply by July 1), I hope that it can skip workload analysis and move forwards immediately.

Best,

Jordan Moldow (speaking on my own behalf)

District 3, Japantown, 95112

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.



Fw: Use of SB 707 Teleconferencing - Item C.2. Rules 5/13

From City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>

Date Wed 5/13/2026 8:24 AM

To Rules and Open Government Committee Agendas <rulescommitteeagenda@sanjoseca.gov>

 1 attachment (311 KB)

BPAC Letter to City Council Advocating for Remote Participation signed.pdf;

Office of the City Clerk | City of San José

200 E. Santa Clara St., Tower 14th Floor

San Jose, CA 95113

Main: 408-535-1260

Fax: 408-292-6207

How is our service? Your [feedback](#) is appreciated!

From: Jordan Moldow [REDACTED]

Sent: Wednesday, May 13, 2026 12:48 AM

To: City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>; District1 <district1@sanjoseca.gov>; District4 <District4@sanjoseca.gov>; District7 <District7@sanjoseca.gov>; District8 <district8@sanjoseca.gov>; District9 <district9@sanjoseca.gov>; District5 <District5@sanjoseca.gov>; District 10 <District10@sanjoseca.gov>

Subject: Use of SB 707 Teleconferencing - Item C.2. Rules 5/13

[**External Email.** Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources. [Learn more](#)]

Honorable Councilmembers,

In addition to the [memorandum from Candelas, Ortiz, Cohen, and Casey](#) regarding reinstating remote participation "for City Council meetings and public hearings", please also:

1. Reintroduce remote participation for all public meetings of all City bodies, including citizen advisory bodies.
2. Approve the use of 54953.8.6(a) of the California Government Code ([SB 707 \(2025\), Durazo](#)), to allow citizen advisory bodies to decide for themselves, every six months, whether to allow their members to participate remotely.

On point 1, participating fully in the public process sometimes requires commenting at standing committees, citizen advisory bodies, or other City public bodies. Remote participation for public comment should be allowed at all of

these. This should similarly be reintroduced with haste.

On point 2, please see the attached memo from the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee, which was adopted at their regular meeting on February 23, 2026 and sent to the City Council.

Best,

Jordan Moldow (speaking on my own behalf)

Chairperson, Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (for identification only)

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

April 6th, 2025

City of San José
200 E. Santa Clara Street
San Jose, CA 95113

RE: Approve the Use of SB 707 Teleconferencing for BPAC Meetings

Dear City of San José,

Pursuant to 54953.8.6(a)(4) of the California Government Code ([SB 707 \(2025\)](#), [Durazo](#)¹), the San José Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC)² requests approval of the use of a two-way audiovisual platform for conducting our public meetings, and for our fellow citizen advisory bodies to conduct their public meetings, so that we may fully meet our obligations to connect with diverse, underrepresented residents.

BPAC duties include “To help [...] improve bicyclist and pedestrian safety” and “to promote and facilitate community engagement in bicycle and pedestrian issues.” Our target audience are members of the public who value safe active mobility on City streets, whether out of personal preference or because they do not have the ability and means to use automobiles for their daily needs. Given the vast geographic size of our City and the incompleteness of the bike network, many in that target audience face barriers to attending in-person meetings to offer public comments. Yet it is precisely those folks whom we need to engage with the most. At least two of our fellow citizen advisory committees have expressed similar concerns.^{3 4}

With 54953.8.6(a), advisory body members can also participate remotely. This enhances our flexibility in case of personal emergency, caregiving need, disability, illness, or other reasonable circumstances, without depriving the public of their right to engage with members in-person. Though 54953.8.6(a) is less restrictive on in-person requirements for citizen advisory bodies, we are committed as a body to meet an in-person quorum at nearly every meeting. As individuals, we are committed to making use of the remote option for just cause or rare circumstances, not for casual use.

Most other cities in our County, and most regional governing bodies (including VTA, MTC, and ABAG) have maintained remote meeting participation since 2020. It is inconsistent with San

¹ https://leginfo.ca.gov/faces/billTextClient.xhtml?bill_id=202520260SB707

² [The BPAC](#) is a City of San José advisory body with the role of advising the Department of Transportation (DOT) on issues affecting active transportation in San José. Our public meetings are subject to the City’s Sunshine Resolution.

³ Youth Commission: “the decision [...] disproportionately affects youth [...] preventing us from actively engaging in civic discourse.”

<https://www.sjpl.org/wp-content/uploads/sites/142/2024/02/Youth-Commission-February-2024-Virtual-Public-Comment.pdf>

⁴ HCDC: <https://sanjose.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=12811796&GUID=41DB9C2B-5749-4F39-9A95-B66AFE3931C7>

DATE

José's identity as a leader in innovation to offer fewer participation options than our neighboring cities. To promote equitable community engagement among those who lack reliable and safe transit options, we respectfully ask you to revise [the City policy](#)⁵ that eliminated remote meeting participation, and to utilize SB 707 flexibility for advisory committee members and for verbal comments from members of the public. This will ensure the residents we serve are not excluded by the very geography and infrastructure we are working to improve.

Sincerely,



Jordan Moldow, Chairperson

⁵ <https://www.sanjoseca.gov/home/showdocument?id=108761>



Fw: Rules and Open Government Agenda item 2. May 13th 2026

From City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>

Date Wed 5/13/2026 11:28 AM

To Rules and Open Government Committee Agendas <rulescommitteeagenda@sanjoseca.gov>

Office of the City Clerk | City of San José

200 E. Santa Clara St., Tower 14th Floor

San Jose, CA 95113

Main: 408-535-1260

Fax: 408-292-6207

How is our service? Your [feedback](#) is appreciated!

From: brian darby <[REDACTED]>

Sent: Wednesday, May 13, 2026 11:24 AM

To: City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>

Subject: Rules and Open Government Agenda item 2. May 13th 2026

[External Email. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources. [Learn more](#)]

Technical Report: Securing Public Meetings Against Disruptive Online Behavior

Rules and Open Government Agenda item 2. May 13th 2026

Brian Darby [REDACTED]

Subject: Brown Act-Compliant Strategies for Digital Meeting Security

1. Some Ideas that might help prevent Zoom Interruptions.

The challenge of hosting online city council meetings is the requirement for **unrestricted public access** under the **Brown Act**, which often leaves the "digital door" open to anonymous disruptors. The goal of this report is to move the City from a "Live-to-Air" model to a "**Protected Broadcast**" model. By implementing a **20-second audio delay** and utilizing **Webinar-specific controls**, the City can effectively "silence" slurs and disruptions before they ever reach the public ear, without requiring user registration or identification.

2. The "Broadcast Shield" (Delay Mechanism)

The most critical vulnerability in current meetings is the lack of a "dump button." When a speaker uses a slur, it is heard instantly by everyone watching.

The Solution: Managed Latency

- **The Workflow:** Instead of streaming directly from Zoom to YouTube, the City should route the Zoom feed through a software intermediary like **OBS Studio** (Open Broadcaster Software).
- **Technical Implementation:** Inside OBS, a **20 to 30-second "Stream Delay"** is enabled in the Advanced Settings.
- **The "Kill Switch":** A staff member monitors the *real-time* Zoom feed. If a disruption occurs, they have a 20-second window to hit "Mute" or "Stop Stream" in OBS.
- **The Result:** The speaker is cut off on the public broadcast **before** their audio ever reaches the 20-second mark in the stream. The public sees a seamless transition to a "Technical Difficulty" slide.

3. Strategic Zoom Configuration

To prevent "visual" disruptions and unauthorized screen sharing, the meeting must be configured as a **Zoom Webinar**, not a standard Zoom Meeting.

Feature	Requirement	Benefit
Participant Role	View-Only Attendee	Prevents participants from turning on video or unmuting themselves.
Screen Sharing	Host Only	Eliminates the risk of "visual bombing" via shared graphics/videos.
Waiting Room	Enabled	Allows staff to scan for offensive usernames and "Remove" them before entry.
Chat/Q&A	Disabled	Prevents the text-based broadcast of slurs or links to harmful websites.

4. Brown Act Compliance & Public Comment

Per **Government Code § 54953.3**, we cannot require names or registration. We can, however, maintain order through these compliant steps:

- **Anonymous Entry:** Allow users to join with generic names (e.g., "Guest 1").
- **The "Allow to Talk" Protocol:** During public comment, the Clerk identifies a person (e.g., "The caller with the last four digits 1234"). The Clerk clicks "Allow to Talk." This grants the user **audio only** access.
- **SB 707 (2026) Authority:** Under the latest updates to California law, the presiding officer has the authority to remove individuals for "willful interruption." Utilizing a delay to mute a slur is a legal application of this authority to maintain the decorum required for a legislative session.

5. Operational Roles

For this to succeed, a **two-person moderation team** is recommended:

1. **The Meeting Moderator (City Clerk):** Manages the "Raise Hand" queue and calls on speakers.
2. **The Technical Safety Officer (IT/AV Staff):** Manages the OBS Delay and the "Kill Switch." This person focuses exclusively on the audio feed to ensure no inappropriate content bypasses the 20-second buffer.

6. Conclusion

By decoupling the "Active Meeting" (Council and Speakers) from the "Public Broadcast" (YouTube/Cable), the City of San Jose can provide a safe, professional environment for governance. This technical solution removes the "incentive" for trolls—the guaranteed audience—thereby protecting both the Council and the community from harassment. I hope you find it helpful.

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.