

3.3

From: Hillary Smith <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, June 30, 2020 7:50 AM
To: City Clerk <[REDACTED]>
Subject: 6/30/20 Council Meeting - Agenda Item 3.3 - Public Comment

[External Email]

Dear council members,

My name is Hillary Smith and I live in District 5.

Agenda item 3.3 is problematic because it is another instance of performative allyship. Please stop trying to distract the public from the fact that you are not listening to what the community has been saying for years. We know that the IPA has limited funding and has limited scope because of the POA contract. This is not action.

Thank you,

Hillary

From: Jonathan Gomez <[REDACTED]>

Sent: Tuesday, June 30, 2020 7:27 AM

To: City Clerk <[REDACTED]>

Subject: Agenda Item 3.3



[External Email]

Greetings,

This item should be rejected. The IPA has not created a system of accountability for SJPD officers. Echoing the voices of many many community members, I understand that a police audit without the public at the table is false accountability.

--

Dr. Jonathan D. Gomez

From: Ambar Gonzalez <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, June 30, 2020 4:57 AM
To: City Clerk <[REDACTED]> Liccardo, Sam <[REDACTED]> Jones, Chappie <[REDACTED]> Jimenez, Sergio <[REDACTED]> Peralez, Raul <[REDACTED]> Diep, Lan <[REDACTED]> Carrasco, Magdalena <[REDACTED]> Davis, Dev <[REDACTED]> Esparza, Maya <[REDACTED]> Arenas, Sylvia <[REDACTED]> Foley, Pam <[REDACTED]> Khamis, Johnny <[REDACTED]>
Subject: 6/30/20 Agenda Item 3.3 - Public Comment -

[?]

[External Email]

I'm Ambar from District 3

The beauty in proposing expanding authority in an independent police auditor (IPA) lies in it's distracting nature. And that's about it.

You continue to ignore the people with this proposal, and distracting others from the incredible danger the police poses to the community members that make our city run.

Who better to audit the police than the first hand witnesses of their abuse and terror. The community has seen enough death and violence from police to know they are not worth trying to reform. No need to waste your time or our money on an IPA you didn't even assure would have sufficient funds to execute their jobs correctly in the 2020-2021 budget.

Hard pass on this item. Instead, to our City Council Members, I implore you to focus your energies on defunding the police. Show imagination in solving crime and protecting us.

Ambar Gonzalez

On Tue, Jun 30, 2020, 3:48 AM Ambar Gonzalez <[REDACTED]> wrote:

My name is Ambar Gonzalez and I live in District 3.

Straight to the point: Any major change to the city charter should have a real and substantial process for community engagement -- but that's something alarmingly missing from the proposal to the Council (Agenda Item 3.10) for 6/30/20.

It is unnecessary to grant the mayor an extra two years in office without voters being given that question directly. If we didn't get a chance to vote, they do not get to stay extra years. Especially since it's Sam Liccardo, who has consistently harmed community members with the power already granted to him. This proposed charter amendment is a power grab, that would move power into the office of the mayor. This would diminish the voices of people of color -- who would find their council members' power reduced, and replaced with a stronger mayor. Given that there has been few people of color to hold this office, the net effects of moving so much power into that office will be to reduce the power of communities of color in San Jose. It's these questions that would benefit from a thorough community process. I ask that the Council reject placing anything on the November 2020 ballot, and first convene a process for community review of our current council-manager form of government to provide recommendation for a ballot proposal. It is irresponsible to hastily place an initiative on the November 2020 ballot which could cost up to \$1.7 million, while the City faces roughly a \$100 million deficit. The City Council spent hours debating how to shift around a little over a million dollars during the final budget meeting, so how do we suddenly have the funding for this? It's appalling that Sam Liccardo, who has had over a decade of influence over SJPD as a Councilmember and Mayor, is using these awful incidents by the Police Department as reason that he needs more power. This PD behavior isn't new, and more power for Sam Liccardo isn't the answer. P.S. Sam Liccardo, we all saw that tweet about teachers that you've now deleted. Sincerely, A Concerned Citizen

You don't get to bypass us in your decision-making. City council members, start acting like representatives, and stop self-serving and wasting our money on Sam. It's embarrassing.

Ambar Gonzalez

From: Fiona Cheung [mailto: [REDACTED]]
Sent: Tuesday, June 30, 2020 10:27 AM
To: City Clerk < [REDACTED]>
Subject: Comment - San Jose Council Meeting - 2.24 and 3.3



[External Email]

Dear City Council,

I have been a resident of San Jose for almost all my life and am e-mailing today to express my concerns around extending the police union contract and expanding the Independent Police Auditor review authority.

I understand gaining (or regaining) the public trust has always been a priority at the San Jose City Council and as you may guess, trust is currently eroding daily. I have reviewed the contract with SJPOA signed in 2017 and understand this contract expires today, June 30, 2020. The initial 10% raise in fiscal year 2017 seemed excessive; while I understand the continued retention bonuses seem necessary to maintain staffing, I hope you also hear the voices of many families who have lost their loved ones to police violence and shootings. I hope you will consider the historic lack of accountability and transparency within the police unions, and reverse this narrative by encouraging transparency in your negotiations with the police union. Back in 2019, it was the San Jose Police Union that tried to overturn AB392 with SB230, trying to skirt around police accountability in their use of force. Thus, our residents have reason to distrust the police unions and their protection over SJPD, and to demand fair, transparent negotiations in the contract.

To support my points about increasing accountability for police actions, I support you expanding the Independent Police Auditor review authorities, and I hope that your actions will truly reflect this. I want to note that many citizens feel skeptical of this item and have observed that your 2020-2021 budget did not increase funding towards the IPA. As such, I urge you to please prove your citizens wrong and truly grant them the power, funding, and control to conduct these independent reviews and increase police accountability.

Thank you for your time, and I hope you all stay healthy and well.

Best,
Fiona Cheung
Resident of San Jose, CA

From: Kaila Silveira [mailto: [REDACTED]]
Sent: Tuesday, June 30, 2020 10:26 AM
To: City Clerk < [REDACTED]>
Subject: June 30th SJ Council Meeting



[External Email]

Dear San Jose Councilmembers,

My name is Kaila Silveira, and I am emailing you as a concerned citizen about the agenda items 2.24, 2.27, 3.3, and 3.10 that you will be voting on in today's council meeting.

For item 2.24 (Extending the Police Union Contract), I urge you to **VOTE AGAINST AND DO NOT EXTEND THIS ACTION** as it continues to fund SJPd when those funds should be distributed to other community services.

For action item 2.27 (BLM Resolution), I urge you to **MAKE POLICY AND GIVE OPPORTUNITY THAT SUPPORTS THE BLM MOVEMENT** not just proclaim the resolution. You have a job to protect and serve your citizens so your actions need to speak louder than words!

For action item 3.3 (Expanding Independent Police Auditor Review Authority), I urge you to **VOTE AGAINST THIS ACTION** as the historically the IPA has not been very active or powerful in helping produce productive change.

For action item 3.10 (Increasing Power of Mayor Liccardo by Extending His Term by Two Years), I urge you to **VOTE AGAINST THIS ACTION**. By extending his term, you will allow him to continue ignoring the BLM movement demands and blocking policy that could implicate change. We need new leadership that will **FIGHT AND ACTUALLY REPRESENT** what the citizens need.

For weeks, we've have been peacefully protesting, sharing our ideas, and collaborating on how to implement change. We've spoken so now it's up to you to make it happen. We need policies that will provide opportunity and protection **FOR EVERYONE**.

A concerned citizen,

Kaila

From: Maria Guttenbeil [mailto: [REDACTED]]
Sent: Tuesday, June 30, 2020 9:08 AM
To: City Clerk < [REDACTED]>
Subject: Agenda Item 3.3



[External Email]

Hello,

I oppose expanding the authority of the independent police auditor. We need real change in the way the SJPDPolices our community.

Reallocating funds to serve the community in things like mental health services, serving the homeless population, addressing rent increases that lead to more families on the street, these are the items we should focus on funding etc.

Best,
M. Maria Guttenbeil

From: Jessica Gutierrez [mailto: [REDACTED]]
Sent: Tuesday, June 30, 2020 10:45 AM
To: City Clerk < [REDACTED]>
Subject: Agenda Item 3.3



[External Email]

It's hard to trust that this agenda item will make any substantial changes because the IPA historically has not been a very active or powerful office. It is restricted by limited funding and the POA contract.

We should be critical of proposed solutions to make change through the IPA, particularly when the approved 2020-21 budget did not increase IPA funding.

Let's not let this distract us from the city official's refusal to change. This is not action, this is another instance of performative allyship by city council.

--

Jessica Gutierrez

From: Natalia Cortes [mailto: [REDACTED]]
Sent: Tuesday, June 30, 2020 11:56 AM
To: City Clerk < [REDACTED] > CouncilMeeting < [REDACTED] > District7
< [REDACTED] >
Subject: Items 2.24, 2.7, 3.3, 3.10: District 7 Resident - No Room for Performative Allyship

?

[External Email]

Hello,

My name is Natalia Cortes, I am a resident in District 7, and I would like for everyone on city council to know that we have seen thousands and thousands of people on our streets giving specific recommendations about how to gain our trust, and how many times you have disregarded them.

Item 2.24: Both Alum Rock and East Side School Districts have listened to their students and constituents, why can't you? Vote NO on extending your contract with the San Jose Police Association

Item 2.7: You are all in no position to claim your support Black Lives Matter. This is meaningless if you don't start addressing police violence in this city. Otherwise, it's acts of performative allyship.

Item 3.3: A broken system cannot fix itself without a complete overhaul, and that IPA hasn't had any success in mitigating any violence. Any added money should go directly to our communities. Vote NO

Item 3.10: Mayor Liccardo has not listened to San Jose's working people. It's obvious that he has catered to those with access to wealth, and is leaving people in need to fend for themselves. Vote NO on extending his term.

--

Natalia Cortes

From: b. beekman [REDACTED] >

Sent: Tuesday, June 30, 2020 8:25 PM

To: CouncilMeeting <CouncilMeeting@sanjoseca.gov>; Agendadesk <Agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov>

Subject: Blair Beekman. sj council. item 3.3. June 30, 2020.

[External Email]

Dear community of San Jose, and city govt.

With an understandable, initial fear of violence & the unknown, Friday May 28, in San Jose,

It is important to note, there may have been, a substantial build up, by the SJPd, of equipment and training, pre Covid-19.

To try to address, the city council review, of SJPd, this August.

And the issues, of de-militarization, defunding, relocation, and reform.

Long term questions,

- To question, how the police perceive, the threat level of violence and protest.
- What can be, better day to day police practices
- How to develop ideas, of equity, to work on everyday community issues.
- How can San Jose, more openly introduce, previous & future community policing ideas.

Day to day policing issues.

- How can Mental health worker's, begin to work more independently, and more often, within emergency calls.

The city of Berkeley, can be, a good beginning example.

- To openly review, a new level of equipment, surveillance technology, and its training, now being used, by SJPd.

- How can body camera footage, become a more open process, with the public.

- To ask, the Digital Inclusion community, and city govt., to take a more open, proactive effort, to help everyday community understand, the health and safety issues, of broadband & 5G.

- And to be sure, telecoms, are offering, good public notification practices.

Sincerely,
Blair Beekman

From: k r <kakikat@gmail.com>

Sent: Tuesday, June 30, 2020 9:15 PM

To: City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>; Esparza, Maya <Maya.Esparza@sanjoseca.gov>

Subject: public comment 3.3

[External Email]

the IPA does not have enough power, neither will this proposal grant it enough power to actually hold SJPD accountable. The IPA was the compromise to a civilian review board demanded by the people. Clearly, it has not been sufficient. Civilian review boards with power have proven more effective. It's time for San Jose to go back to plan A.

K R, district 7