



Memorandum

TO: Honorable Mayor &
City Council

FROM: Toni J. Taber, CMC
City Clerk

SUBJECT: The Public Record
June 10, 2021 – June 17, 2021

DATE: June 23, 2021

ITEMS FILED FOR THE PUBLIC RECORD

Letters from Boards, Commissions, and Committees

Letters from the Public

1. Letter from Bill Dunmyer, dated June 11, 2021, regarding: 'Tenant Welfare' AND Confiscation of Apartments?.
2. Letter from John Turner, received June 11, 2021, regarding: Letter Opposing Opportunity Housing Proposal.
3. Letter from Charlito Bergante, dated June 12, 2021, regarding: More 'Tenant Welfare AND Confiscation of Apartments.
4. Letter from Wallace Gardner, dated June 11, 2021, regarding: Mayor's proposal.
5. Letter from Anthony Samara, dated June 16, 2021, regarding: Fwd: Proposed gun control ordinance.
6. Letter from Kim Nguyen, dated June 16, 2021, regarding: Gun control.
7. Letter from Lawrence, dated June 16, 2021, regarding: please add to agenda, File 21-1393 version 1.
8. Letter from Blair Beekman, dated June 11, 2021, regarding: Blair Beekman. Friday. June 11th, 2021 ___ Measure T public meeting. June 2021.
9. Letter from Delma Hernández, dated June 16, 2021, regarding Strong Support of Memo re AB 1400: Guaranteed Healthcare for All.

Toni J. Taber, CMC
City Clerk

Fw: 'Tenant Welfare' AND Confiscation of Apartments?

Agendadesk <Agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov>

Fri 6/11/2021 8:34 AM

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

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

Sent: Friday, June 11, 2021 8:31 AM

To: Agendadesk <Agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov>

Subject: Fw: 'Tenant Welfare' AND Confiscation of Apartments?

Office of the City Clerk | City of San José200 E. Santa Clara St., Tower 14th Floor

San Jose, CA 95113

Main: 408-535-1260

Fax: 408-292-6207

How is our service? [Please take our short survey.](#)

From: billdunmyer <[REDACTED]>**Sent:** Friday, June 11, 2021 7:05 AM**To:** City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>**Subject:** 'Tenant Welfare' AND Confiscation of Apartments?

[External Email]

I understand the City Council is actually considering passing a law that would require me to give the City the first right of refusal when I try to sell my apartment or home or rental building. This would destroy true values! **If they want an option on my property, you should pay you for it.**

What a bunch of socialist-thinking politicians to even consider using my property to buy tenant votes! In addition, I understand they are considering expanding their forced “tenant welfare” to townhomes, condos, single-family homes, and duplexes. PLUS, they even want to help pay a tenant’s legal cost that would effectively extend their free rent while being evicted. How about paying legal fees for housing providers?

If you want to stop homeless, do the hard thing, if they need mental attention due to reduced mental capacity, put them in a medical facility to provide it, if they are drug addicts same thing, if they won’t work don’t pay them not to work. No free stuff



Virus-free. www.avast.com

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

Fw: Letter Opposing Opportunity Housing Proposal

Agendadesk <Agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov>

Fri 6/11/2021 8:59 AM

To: Rules and Open Government Committee Agendas <rulescommitteeagenda@sanjoseca.gov> 1 attachments (1 MB)

Ltr - Opposing Opportunity Housing Proposal 6-4-2021.pdf;

From: City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>**Sent:** Friday, June 11, 2021 8:33 AM**To:** Agendadesk <Agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov>**Subject:** Fw: Letter Opposing Opportunity Housing Proposal**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? [Please take our short survey.](#)

From: Gab <[REDACTED]>**Sent:** Monday, June 7, 2021 9:09 AM

To: Liccardo, Sam <sam.liccardo@sanjoseca.gov>; Sykes, Dave <Dave.Sykes@sanjoseca.gov>; Jones, Chappie <Chappie.Jones@sanjoseca.gov>; Jimenez, Sergio <sergio.jimenez@sanjoseca.gov>; Peralez, Raul <Raul.Peralez@sanjoseca.gov>; Cohen, David <David.Cohen@sanjoseca.gov>; magdalena.carrasco@sanjoseca.gov <magdalena.carrasco@sanjoseca.gov>; Davis, Dev <dev.davis@sanjoseca.gov>; Esparza, Maya <Maya.Esparza@sanjoseca.gov>; Arenas, Sylvia <sylvia.arenas@sanjoseca.gov>; Foley, Pam <Pam.Foley@sanjoseca.gov>; Mahan, Matt <Matt.Mahan@sanjoseca.gov>; Hughey, Rosalynn <Rosalynn.Hughey@sanjoseca.gov>; Brilliot, Michael <Michael.Brilliot@sanjoseca.gov>; Planning Commission 1 <PlanningCom1@sanjoseca.gov>; Planning Commission 2 <PlanningCom2@sanjoseca.gov>; Planning Commission 3 <PlanningCom3@sanjoseca.gov>; Planning Commission 4 <PlanningCom4@sanjoseca.gov>; Planning Commission 5 <PlanningCom5@sanjoseca.gov>; Planning Commission 6 <PlanningCom6@sanjoseca.gov>; Planning Commission 7 <PlanningCom7@sanjoseca.gov>; Chima, Vicrim <Vicrim.Chima@sanjoseca.gov>; Peak, Dana <Dana.Peak@sanjoseca.gov>; District1 <district1@sanjoseca.gov>; District2 <District2@sanjoseca.gov>; District3 <district3@sanjoseca.gov>; District4 <District4@sanjoseca.gov>; District5 <District5@sanjoseca.gov>; District 6 <district6@sanjoseca.gov>; District7 <District7@sanjoseca.gov>; District8 <district8@sanjoseca.gov>; District9 <district9@sanjoseca.gov>; The Office of Mayor Sam Liccardo <TheOfficeofMayorSamLiccardo@sanjoseca.gov>; District 10 <District10@sanjoseca.gov>; City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>

Subject: Letter Opposing Opportunity Housing Proposal

[External Email]

Dear All:

My name is John Turner and I am the President of the Naglee Park Campus Community Association (CCA). Attached is a letter stating our opposition to the Opportunity Housing Proposal and explaining our reasons why.

Please take a moment to read it so you understand our concerns.

Thank you.

John Turner
President - CCA

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



(Photo shows upzoning from Seattle. 1523 1st Ave West was built in 2009 between a 1912 home (right) and a 1908 home (left).

The Naglee Park Campus Community Association has been closely examining the City Council's upcoming vote to decide whether to study 'Opportunity Housing' citywide, as was recommended by the Envision 2040 Task Force. Our neighborhood represents 600 homes and approximately 1,100 residents, located in a Conservation area in Downtown.

While we understand that there is a need for more housing in San Jose, proceeding with this proposal is not the way to create the type of housing that is needed.

Our opposition to this proposal stems from concerns on many different fronts.

- Naglee Park is an historic neighborhood with the majority of homes built before 1910. Approximately 50 years ago, the neighborhood was determined to be blighted from neglect and too much density, caused by an over concentration of care homes and student rentals. Homeowners in Naglee Park began a concerted effort to reclaim the neighborhood, and the resulting stately homes and heritage trees are the result of the caring of a committed community and thousands of hours of volunteer work.
- The Opportunity Housing proposal is also a huge threat to the historic resources in the city. The city does not have a current updated Historic Resources inventory. Many of the homes that should be on the inventory are in areas that will be eyed by developers. The city should not proceed with any city-wide zoning

changes until and unless a current city wide historic resources inventory is completed.

- 'Opportunity Housing' is a glorified phrase for "infill" housing. The supply of affordable housing should not be the responsibility of single-family neighborhoods. Currently, high-rise developers in San Jose are not mandated to include affordable housing in their projects. Developers who choose to opt out of providing these units had been asked to pay 'in lieu' fees instead, but even that was deemed to be too much of a burden, so the 'in lieu' fees were waived in the past and the exemption has been extended until 2023. This is unfair to the residents who choose to live in a single-family neighborhood, worked hard to buy their homes, and are now being told they have to live with multi-unit housing and the inconveniences and degradation of their properties this will bring.
- Affordable Housing will not be increased with 'Opportunity Housing.' There are no provisions as proposed to mandate that the units created rent for less than market rate. The housing crisis stems from the high cost of land, which remains no matter how many units are added. What developer, investor, speculator or homeowner wants less than a market rate return on their investment?
- San Jose already has a jobs-to-housing imbalance. The City cannot currently afford the services its residents deserve. Police, fire, and emergency services are already at an unacceptable level; the local hospital was torn down; the sewer and power capacities are already maxed out. We in Naglee Park often suffer power outages, yet our power costs are rising, as are our water costs.
- This proposal is environmentally unsound. California is experiencing yet another drought, which limits water for established communities. Trees will be cut down to make room for the new units, and with more hardscape and less landscaping there'll be increased water runoff and less ability to recharge the water table.
- Since Opportunity Housing makes no provisions for additional cars, there will be less room for trash and recycle bins when needed.
- More residents will also overly burden the existing schools.
- The developers of these units do not need to provide parks, infrastructure improvements, or amenities to their renters.
- Although there has been upzoning in other cities, we do not yet have enough data to determine whether sweeping zoning changes meet their objectives. There is, to date, no evidence that "upzoning" or rezoning land for a higher density use results in more affordable housing.
- Upzoning can displace the very people it is meant to assist, creating more displacement than previously.
- The impact of additional units on parking cannot be overstated. San Jose does not have a robust mass transit structure. Most people own cars. Most families own more than one. Children must be taken to school and daycare, people commute to jobs, and many people need a car to carry tools, gardening equipment, etc. Building along transit corridors that don't supply comprehensive public transit makes no sense.

The residents of Naglee Park, and in many other parts of the city, do not want the City to spend millions of dollars exploring and developing a proposal that will not succeed. The EIR for the proposal will likely cost millions of dollars. The proposal will cost millions of dollars in staff time and resources. In a city that has lost its hotel tax, convention tax, and huge amounts of sales tax, this hardly seems like a fiscally responsible expenditure.

It makes more sense to proceed with intelligent, community-based infill in areas that are zoned for higher density, and where higher density is supported by the community. It makes more sense to build out the already planned Urban Villages and determine what the consequences are from that before adding more into the mix.

It also makes sense to wait a bit to see what the effects of the pandemic are on work habits before making changes that are geared to a pre-pandemic model. Will workers continue to work from home? Will the current trend, documented by Freddie Mac, of leaving cities for the suburbs continue? Will more people buy cars out of fear of infection?

A massive change in city zoning now and the disruption of neighborhoods is not the answer. To succeed with the goals of Opportunity Housing, the city cannot allow the demolition of the very housing stock it purports to support. The Naglee Park Campus Community Association requests that no additional resources be spent exploring or developing the Opportunity Housing proposal.

Signed:

John Turner, President



Naglee Park Campus Community Association
April 9, 2021

Fw: More 'Tenant Welfare AND Confiscation of Apartments.

Agendadesk <Agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov>

Mon 6/14/2021 9:38 AM

To: Rules and Open Government Committee Agendas <rulescommitteeagenda@sanjoseca.gov>**From:** City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>**Sent:** Monday, June 14, 2021 8:09 AM**To:** Agendadesk <Agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov>**Subject:** Fw: More 'Tenant Welfare AND Confiscation of Apartments.

From: Charlito Bergante <[REDACTED]>**Sent:** Saturday, June 12, 2021 12:07 AM**To:** The Office of Mayor Sam Liccardo <TheOfficeofMayorSamLiccardo@sanjoseca.gov>; District 6 <district6@sanjoseca.gov>; District1 <district1@sanjoseca.gov>; District7 <District7@sanjoseca.gov>; District2 <District2@sanjoseca.gov>; District8 <district8@sanjoseca.gov>; District3 <district3@sanjoseca.gov>; District9 <district9@sanjoseca.gov>; District4 <District4@sanjoseca.gov>; District 10 <District10@sanjoseca.gov>; District5 <District5@sanjoseca.gov>; City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>**Subject:** More 'Tenant Welfare AND Confiscation of Apartments.

[External Email]

Dear Mayor/All,

We are in the business of providing housing and keeping our renters happy. We know we have to share the burden of this virus. Help us out! Pass a moratorium so that we can defer our mortgage payments, property taxes and utility bills and then we can defer the rent for the renters who need our help. We're asking that Government share the burden and allow housing providers to also defer our expenses not just costs and losses. First you pass the tenant welfare or rent control even though votes voted no on proposition 10, if you are moving toward socialism or communism, you and the entire state legislature are doing a great job. You want to want to win votes at our expense. It is unfortunate reality that our federal government and the Republican party have sold the country to Russia and will sell their mother, wife, and daughter to Russia or the highest bidder, we all know it is a FACT. Democrats are also nothing but hypocrites since they want to implement socialism and communism throughout this city, state, and country by placing state and local ordinance and controls on private property, housing, rent control or as they like to call it housing crises simply to win elections at property owner and housing provider's expense. At least the Republicans are being paid by Putin and Russia what is your excuse? If the state bureaucrats continue on this wild goose chase simply to win elections eventually all the rental properties will be owned by corporations who will ultimately make contributions to whichever party benefits them to win elections, etc. Democrats are such a bunch of hypocrites. The politicians so called housing crises was not created by us why are we the only one's bearing the burden or being forced to bear all the costs due to your negligence and incompetence. This country was founded and has prospered based on Capitalism and free Enterprise for the past two centuries. If you and the incompetent bureaucrats that are to be working for the people of California as oppose to Russia and China like socialism and communism so much perhaps it is time for you to move to Russia or China and see how much you enjoy living in a socialist and communist regime. I wonder if any of you idiots have ever read the constitution or ever attended any schooling that teach you the basic law of supply and demand. We have worked long and hard all of our life, are retired and the rental income is our income. We are renting below market rents, with the state rent control, local ordinances, the pandemic are on

the verge of bankruptcy Thank you very much to you morons. Who will employ me at my age? How would you like to work for free? Guns do not kill people; it is incompetent idiots like you that is destroying everything this country once upon time stood for.



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

Fw: Mayor's proposal

City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>

Fri 6/11/2021 11:19 AM

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

Office of the City Clerk | City of San José200 E. Santa Clara St., Tower 14th Floor

San Jose, CA 95113

Main: 408-535-1260

Fax: 408-292-6207

How is our service? [Please take our short survey.](#)

From: Wallace Gardner <[REDACTED]>**Sent:** Friday, June 11, 2021 10:47 AM**To:** City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>**Subject:** Mayor's proposal

[External Email]

Please forward this to all members of the City Council and to the Rules Committee.

Article by Brittany Bernstein, 6/10/21 found on ATT.Net. The Mayor is reintroducing his Gun Owners Insurance and Annual Tax (fee?) on law abiding gun owners which will go to the Rules Committee next week.

When this came up the first time I inquired of my homeowners insurance agent. I was told I might be covered in event of an accident. But, if I was charged with any crime there would be no coverage.

If this gun owner tax passes it should be kept in a separate account to be used only for gun violence cases. There should be an annual audit of the expenses a copy of which should be published in the local media. If any of the funds are used for anything other than cases involving gun violence the contents of the fund should immediately be distributed to the gun owners and the tax repealed.

If the annual tax (fee?) were to be adopted it should in fairness cover any weapon or tool capable of injuring someone during a crime. A police officer told me hammers were a popular weapon. Also sharpened screw drivers have been mentioned in the media. Then there is the stolen auto used to evade police at high speed with no regard to law abiding human life. If this passes anyone owning screw drivers, hammers, knives, ball bats, automobiles, etc. should pay an equal annual tax (fee?).

If the gun control or violence prevention measure taxes are too high they will add to the economic division in our country. The have nots will be prohibited by cost from owning any of the devices covered by the tax. Only the upper class will be able to own the devices covered by the tax. A two tiered society, the not rich and the rich.

Respectfully,
Wallace S. Gardner



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

Fw: Proposed gun control ordinance

City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>

Wed 6/16/2021 11:48 AM

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

Office of the City Clerk | City of San José200 E. Santa Clara St., Tower 14th Floor

San Jose, CA 95113

Main: 408-535-1260

Fax: 408-292-6207

How is our service? [Please take our short survey.](#)

From: Anthony Samara <[REDACTED]>**Sent:** Wednesday, June 16, 2021 11:12 AM**To:** City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>**Subject:** Fwd: Proposed gun control ordinance

[External Email]

Hello Governing body of San Jose,

I wanted to voice my opinion regarding this gun control ordinance that you are attempting to pass. It will only burden gun stores and home ffl's to record all transactions via video and audio. I did not mention the other items in the ordinance because they are already California law.

I can only assume that this was done as a knee jerk reaction to the shooting in San Jose recently. My heart goes out to the families that were affected and this should have never happened.

The main cause of this issue was the mental health of the killer. He was already being watched by authorities after being found with terrorism information but was not stopped for some reason. If the authorities were watching him closely, this would not have happened. He is a threat to society and we all found out the hard way.

The killer could have also done this with bombs as well but the easiest way to handle this is to burden law abiding citizens with more gun control laws. The gun control measures that you are trying to enact will only burden the people that want to arm themselves legally and defend against attacks.

Even one of the workers in the VTA said that they had wished they had a gun to stop the killer but the county sheriff, Laurie Smith, does not allow concealed carrying weapons unless you donate a very large amount of money to her campaigns. By attempting to protect yourself from people that would cause mass shootings, you would become a felon if caught with a concealed weapon.

With the covid pandemic causing a huge mental burden on the citizens of San Jose, your time would be best spent trying to help people with mental health issues vs trying to harm law abiding gun owners that just want to keep their families and friends safe if needed.

Thank you for your time and I hope you take my words into consideration.

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

Fw: Gun control

City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>

Wed 6/16/2021 11:48 AM

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

Office of the City Clerk | City of San José200 E. Santa Clara St., Tower 14th Floor

San Jose, CA 95113

Main: 408-535-1260

Fax: 408-292-6207

How is our service? [Please take our short survey.](#)

From: Kim Nguyen [REDACTED]**Sent:** Wednesday, June 16, 2021 11:02 AM**To:** The Office of Mayor Sam Liccardo <TheOfficeofMayorSamLiccardo@sanjoseca.gov>; City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>**Subject:** Gun control

[External Email]

Good day honorable mayor.

Mr. Mayor, you have made a mistake by requesting that the city forces every law abiding gun owners to pay fees (insurance) for owning guns. Making law abiding citizens pay for criminal doings is unfair and unjust. If this is forced on the people, law enforcement officers and all government officials that own guns will all have to pay the same fees. The right to keep and bear arms is guaranteed to every American under the Constitution of the United states of America. You are going against the Constitution that you swore to uphold and protect.

You also want video and audio recordings of all legal gun transactions. That is invading privacy and forcing that upon the RIGHT that's protected under the Constitution is illegal. Not every store has the capacity to be able to record videos and audio of every transaction and keep it long term, will the city provide such services and equipment?

You are overreaching and placing huge financial burden on law abiding citizens and firearm store owners to help criminals get what they want. Criminals do not follow any laws hence why they are criminals. Criminals wants and loves when new gun control laws gets pushed through because it helps them commit crimes with confidence, knowing no one is armed to fight back. Gun control laws is like a free pass for criminals. Gun free zone basically tells criminals that it is safe to commit crimes there because nobody is armed to fight back.

Criminals will never obey the gun laws and will never pay any fees to own guns. They all get guns illegally from the black market. Recently the cartels hijacked a truck in mexico that has 7million rounds of ammunition. Those ammunition will be going on sale in the black market. So, instead of creating BURDENING laws on law abiding citizens and INFRINGING on our rights, why not focus on reducing illegal activities like the black market and cartel related crimes? Why go after law abiding tax paying citizens who OBEYS the law? Government should have courage to go after the real criminals.

Every legal gun owners and I respectfully demand that you drop these unconstitutional proposals. On behalf of all gun owners in this city and state, thank you.

Sincerely,

Kim Nguyen

Resident of San Jose, California

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

Fw: please add to agenda, File 21-1393 version 1

City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>

Wed 6/16/2021 2:36 PM

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? [Please take our short survey.](#)

From: Lawrence [REDACTED] >

Sent: Wednesday, June 16, 2021 2:08 PM

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

Subject: please add to agenda, File 21-1393 version 1

[External Email]

Hello Governing body of San Jose, I wanted to voice my opinion regarding this gun control ordinance that you are attempting to pass. It will only burden gun stores and home ffl's to record all transactions via video and audio. I did not mention the other items in the ordinance because they are already California law. I can only assume that this was done as a knee jerk reaction to the shooting in San Jose recently. My heart goes out to the families that were affected and this should have never happened. The main cause of this issue was the mental health of the killer. He was already being watched by authorities after being found with terrorism information but was not stopped for some reason. If the authorities were watching him closely, this would not have happened. He is a threat to society and we all found out the hard way. The killer could have also done this with bombs as well but the easiest way to handle this is to burden law abiding citizens with more gun control laws. The gun control measures that you are trying to enact will only burden the people that want to arm themselves legally and

defend against attacks and causes financial hurdles for law-abiding minorities wishing to exercise their right to self-defense. Even one of the workers in the VTA said that they had wished they had a gun to stop the killer but the county sheriff, Laurie Smith, does not allow concealed carrying weapons unless you donate a very large amount of money to her campaigns. By attempting to protect yourself from people that would cause mass shootings, you would become a felon if caught with a concealed weapon. With the covid pandemic causing a huge mental burden on the citizens of San Jose, your time would be best spent trying to help people with mental health issues vs trying to harm law abiding gun owners that just want to keep their families and friends safe if needed. Thank you for your time and I hope you take my words into consideration.

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

Blair Beekman. Friday. June 11th, 2021 __ Measure T public meeting. June 2021.

b. beekman <[REDACTED]>

Fri 6/11/2021 3:15 PM

To: IPA <ipa@sanjoseca.gov>; Greene, Shasta <shasta.greene@sanjoseca.gov>; Harkness, Kip <Kip.Harkness@sanjoseca.gov>; Ristow, John <John.Ristow@sanjoseca.gov>; Cano, Matt <Matt.Cano@sanjoseca.gov>; San Jose Airport Customer Services <AirportCustomerServices@sanjoseca.gov>; SJFD - Feedback <SJFDFeedback@sanjoseca.gov>; Mata, Anthony <ANTHONY.MATA@sanjoseca.gov>; S.J. Arena Authority [REDACTED]; Randol, Heather <HEATHER.RANDOL@sanjoseca.gov>; Traffic.Signals <Traffic.Signals@sanjoseca.gov>; Tran, David <david.tran@sanjoseca.gov>; Parra-Garcia, Sabrina <Sabrina.Parra-Garcia@sanjoseca.gov>; Lopez, Robert (HSG) <Robert.Lopez@sanjoseca.gov>; Doyle, Richard <Richard.Doyle@sanjoseca.gov>; Nurre, Shivaun <Shivaun.Nurre@sanjoseca.gov>; Walesh, Kim <Kim.Walesh@sanjoseca.gov>; Wells, Laura <Laura.Wells@sanjoseca.gov>; Kihmm, Michael <MICHAEL.KIHMM@sanjoseca.gov>; Maciel, Zulma <zulma.maciel@sanjoseca.gov>

[External Email]

Dear sj city govt staff,

What has happened, yesterday, with the Measure T, public oversight meeting, that was scheduled, for Thursday June 10th? The zoom notice, on the agenda, for the meeting, did not work, suggesting either a mix-up, or to make the public meeting process more exclusive & secretive.

I've spoken at public comment time recently, to specifically address the ideas, to try to balance mourning, and how to continue, open government practices.

Can thr mixed up, Measure T, public meeting yesterday, be an example, that we may still have, a few problems, with the ideas of mourning, after the events of VTA. And the need, of solace & reflection, as a local community.

Yet, this is the time of June. And there are important needs, of sharing policy ideas & budgets, between local govts & Sacramento.

Public input and public comment, are simply vital, to the process, at this time. Yet it may be excluded at this time, in the name of, some questionable ideas, of what exactly can be mourning.

The events of the VTA shooting, were over 2 weeks ago now. The mourning process, and the need for quietness, solitude, and reflection, can no longer be at the price, or excuse, to exclude public comment time, or the open public process.

I ask again, to question and balance, your own feelings of loss, at this time, compared with the always dire need, of good, open public policy practices.

We are still in zoom meetings, so there, should be no fear, there will be an out of control public, that can physically hurt government committee persons. Or that will become too unruly, to hurt a thinking process, of a session.

June can always be, a frazzled time. Please be aware, how we always should have coping skills for this time of year.

And that overall, the open public process can help, in addressing the ideas, of sunshine, openness, positiveness good thought, and good ideas, that can help take away, the fears and chills, the recent murders & death, at the VTA, have caused, for all of us.

This may be a fraught time, but it's open, public practices, that is what can help all of us feel, we are making good decisions.

And what can help return ourselves, to our regular routines, and good practices.

Please work on this, as San Jose City government, for this month of June, the July summer break, and into August.

Please do not continue, to close down the public meeting process It is openness and it's positiveness, and the continued efforts of good communication and feelings, that can best address, the ideas of mourning, at this more at this time.

sincerely,
blair beekman

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

Fw: Strong Support of Memo re AB 1400: Guaranteed Healthcare for All

Agendadesk <Agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov>

Thu 6/17/2021 9:27 AM

To: Rules and Open Government Committee Agendas <rulescommitteeagenda@sanjoseca.gov>**From:** City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>**Sent:** Thursday, June 17, 2021 8:59 AM**To:** Agendadesk <Agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov>**Subject:** Fw: Strong Support of Memo re AB 1400: Guaranteed Healthcare for All**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? [Please take our short survey.](#)

From: [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]>**Sent:** Wednesday, June 16, 2021 9:00 PM**To:** Jones, Chappie <Chappie.Jones@sanjoseca.gov>; Peralez, Raul <Raul.Peralez@sanjoseca.gov>; Davis, Dev <dev.davis@sanjoseca.gov>; Arenas, Sylvia <sylvia.arenas@sanjoseca.gov>; Cohen, David <David.Cohen@sanjoseca.gov>; City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>**Cc:** Sykes, Dave <Dave.Sykes@sanjoseca.gov>**Subject:** Strong Support of Memo re AB 1400: Guaranteed Healthcare for All

[External Email]

Dear Chair Jones, Vice Chair Peralez, and Members of the Rules Committee, We urge you to advance and support the Memorandum regarding ASSEMBLY BILL 1400: GUARANTEED HEALTHCARE FOR ALL. The pandemic has established through gross loss of lives and livelihoods that commodified, inaccessible healthcare, health disparities, and inequitable COVID-19 responses COST everyone. Our broken healthcare system cannot continue as it is. This pandemic has been exponentially worsened and exponentially more costly to all, including our City, because of grave systemic injustices and dysfunctional, if not foolish, approaches to a basic human need. Future emergent health crises will be no different unless we commit ourselves to a universal, equitable, and strategic approach to healthcare. AB-1400 is a step we must take. A lawsuit filed by MALDEF against state officials for Medi-Cal discrimination against Latinos demonstrates that our communal, municipal voice is necessary to correct inaction and error. Fiscal and moral responsibility compels you. The enormous costs of COVID-19 in lost lives of loved ones and in financial recovery for scores gives all of us a vastly differently lens to assess costs of universal

health care. The costs of maintaining unequal, disparate, inequitable, inaccessible healthcare are far, far greater than systems change through AB-1400. We push you to push our Council to push our State - for our suffering San Jose families and all San Jose residents. Our lives and economy cannot be left to risks that we have all seen realized during this pandemic. You are urged to advance and support the Memorandum on AB-1400 (Kalra et al).

Sincerely,
Delma Hernández
San Jose Resident

Sent from my iPhone

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