

CLIMATE CRISIS IN THE SAN JOSE CITY CHARTER BEFORE ITS TOO LATE due to our CLIMATE EMERGENCY CODE RED FOR HUMANITY

tessa woodmansee <[REDACTED]>

Sat 11/6/2021 8:57 AM

To: To: Alrie Middlebrook <[REDACTED]>; Andrew Boone <[REDACTED]>; Blaire Beekman <[REDACTED]>; Charter Review Commission 10a <CRC10a@sanjoseca.gov>; Charter Review Commission 10b <CRC10b@sanjoseca.gov>; Charter Review Commission 1a <CRC1a@sanjoseca.gov>; Charter Review Commission 1b <CRC1b@sanjoseca.gov>; Charter Review Commission 2a <CRC2a@sanjoseca.gov>; Charter Review Commission 2b <CRC2b@sanjoseca.gov>; Charter Review Commission 3a <CRC3a@sanjoseca.gov>; Charter Review Commission 3b <CRC3b@sanjoseca.gov>; Charter Review Commission 4a <CRC4a@sanjoseca.gov>; Charter Review Commission 4b <CRC4b@sanjoseca.gov>; Charter Review Commission 5a <CRC5a@sanjoseca.gov>; Charter Review Commission 5b <CRC5b@sanjoseca.gov>; Charter Review Commission 6a <CRC6a@sanjoseca.gov>; Charter Review Commission 6b <CRC6b@sanjoseca.gov>; Charter Review Commission 7a <CRC7a@sanjoseca.gov>; Charter Review Commission 7b <CRC7b@sanjoseca.gov>; Charter Review Commission 8a <CRC8a@sanjoseca.gov>

[External Email]

Dear Charter Review Commission:

This letter is to present below the complete unedited proposed San Jose CHARTER AMENDMENT XX as articulated by the scientific consensus as interpreted by Mr. Catamount "Cat" Woodmansee, 62 yo, born and raised in Chico, California with a Master of Sciences (CSU-Chico) in Biological Sciences, 1991 and California Teaching Credentialed, Life Sciences, Software engineer, data analyst in environmental research and Fortune 500 high tech companies for the last 30 years, husband and father, two children born and raised in San Jose, CA for the past 20 years --to be called:

The CHARTER XX : CLIMATE CRISIS, CLIMATE EMERGENCY and hopefully accepted **BEFORE IT'S TOO LATE** by the full San Jose Charter Review Commission, the San Jose City Council and voted on by the Citizens-- the People of San Jose the below changes to our city charter to SAVE OUR WORLD, SAVE OURSELVES....will you help to MAKE THIS MIRACLE COME TRUE BEFORE IT'S TOO LATE???

MAKE A CHANGE TODAY....BEFORE IT'S TOO LATE!

Please find below the unedited stellar documentation for our Charter amendment as submitted to the subcommittee--the People's Agenda-- the subcommittee--Policing, municipal law, accountability, inclusion and representation for the City of San Jose the guidance for our Charter amendment as submitted to the Charter Review Commission in complete form from the scientific community as understood and presented by Cat Woodmansee and APPROVED in the **matriarchal tradition** of

the **Muwekma Ohlone** Tribe -- comprised of all of the known surviving American Indian lineages aboriginal to the San Francisco Bay Region by his wife of almost 30 years, Tessa Naomi Nadler-Woodmansee, BA in Radio Television, and Film and Masters in Education and Mass Communications, Cal State, Northridge.

PROPOSED SAN JOSE CITY CHARTER AMENDMENT XX:

Global heating, and the associated changes in regional climate, together create a global issue.

We cannot say yet if there will be a global solution, however, we do know with certainty that any harms will be of a local nature. We are already seeing signs of what we can expect from the

future in the horrifying, record-breaking fires, floods, freezes, droughts, cyclones, and the

accelerating breakdown of previously stable parts of the whole Earth system. The most recent

IPCC report suggests we can expect 30 more years at least of increasingly worse outcomes,

with each year potentially breaking records set just the year before.

It seems we find ourselves now at a crossroads, where every step forward takes us further off a

map defined by 8,000 years of Earth systems stability. Beyond here there will be monsters.

People are going to suffer in large numbers, due to changes in the climate. People are going to die.

It is time we accept the challenge to save the people. All the people, but starting with the people

in our fair city.

The political class certainly understands the challenge, but perceived political expedience

prevents timely, realistic actions in response. For the moment it seems the political class cannot

save the people. The financial and business classes also understand the challenge but apart

from the insurance sector they cannot generally consider threats any further out than the next

quarterly results. The insurance sector in particular has seen the future of climate impacts and is

canceling policies. Obviously, this will not save the people, either.

It appears the people must for now endeavor to save themselves.

The purpose of a city is to serve the needs of people. The laws and regulations of the city are created with the intent to provide a civilized experience for all. Today we consider amendments

to the Charter of the City of San Jose, to add language that will inform the City's response to a looming global climate crisis, so as to save the people, and in so doing to preserve civilization.

Permit me now to outline what such Charter language should contain.

Consider an approach like a stool with three legs. In our case, one leg is data collection concerning carbon emissions and fossil fuel consumption for the sake of transparency and

decision-making. Another leg is identifying communities in harm's way and ensuring they become resilient to climate disasters where resilience is lacking, focusing in particular on historically under-served communities. And the third leg is the creation of a commission of the people to ensure that the political and business elites understand the importance of saving the people.

I will now provide some details on how this could work, starting with the first leg, data collection.

The Charter should be amended with language to require City departments and services to

analyze and report their current and projected annual fossil fuel consumption and other sources of greenhouse gas emissions, and to report how they are mitigating these emissions if at all,

and if not how they might reduce them or mitigate, and if they cannot why then they cannot. The

exact same requirement would apply to private enterprises operating inside the City or providing

goods or services to the City.

The Charter should also require analyzing the fossil fuel consumption and greenhouse gas emissions of citizens in aggregate. For example, how often and where citizens drive, commute

patterns into and out of the City, adoption rates for electric vehicles, bicycles, and mass transit, mass transit passenger-mile carbon emissions, the expansion of suburbs, freeway passenger

miles, densification of the urban core, the pace and locations of new home construction, and the like. It is potentially a long list, the actual measures would also evolve over time so the Charter

must specify the need for this data as an aid to planning and not the exact kinds of data. Data collection of citizen emission patterns could be via surveys and/or longitudinal studies and should be completely anonymized.

As described above, the first leg of our approach would be used to identify areas where the City and local businesses could and likely should reduce fossil fuel consumption and greenhouse gas emissions, a first step toward paring down our contribution to the problem. The actual numerical goals for this work, meaning the targets for reductions, might come to the City via state law, or federal law, or even international treaties, but there is nothing to stop the City from having more aggressive goals either for itself, the citizens, or the business community. Where multiple goals for reductions exist at different levels of governance including international agreements, or via different jurisdictions, the City will take on the more aggressive target. The ultimate target for fossil fuels consumption by the City, citizens, and businesses within the City is taken to be numerically zero, meaning no consumption of any kind. Likewise, the ultimate goal of carbon emissions is taken as zero. These are difficult goals to be sure, and will be deemed politically unpalatable or in other ways impossible, but like it or not these are the real goals of the work being described here even if lesser, more acceptable, targets are pursued instead.

But reducing fossil fuel reliance is not just about doing with less for the sake of less, it can be viewed as a strategic, defensive measure where reducing reliance can forestall serious local economic damage in the event that national or state climate actions require us to take on a sudden, forced, and dramatic reduction in fossil fuel and energy consumption. The sooner the City, the citizens, and businesses can operate without significant reliance on fossil fuel consumption, the least harm will be felt when energy supplies become deliberately curtailed or the price of fuels enter the stratosphere. These are trends we can anticipate as global heating begins to bite, and national governments take concerted, draconian steps to save the human world from disaster.

The second leg of our approach is to create resilient communities. All communities of the City will be impacted by global heating. No neighborhood or ZIP code can escape this. Extreme heat events, water usage curtailments, large-area flooding, strategic power cut-offs and restrictions, food disruptions, and civil unrest are on the shortlist of what we can realistically expect at some point. These will affect all the people of

the City at one time or another, and probably everyone at once in particular cases. Some neighborhoods will suffer weeks of disruption and multiple threats at the same time, like large-area excessive heat coupled with regional power interruptions and resulting food shortages. Threats from global heating will generally impact large areas of the City, overwhelming emergency services, dislocating people by the thousands, and resulting in potential mass casualty events that overwhelm first responders, hospitals, and morgues.

Creating resilient communities is hard work, is politically unpopular, and it can be difficult to quantify success. Charter language that requires resilience must specify resilient outcomes based on models of expected harms. For example, identifying the requirement to provide cooling centers to neighborhoods against the expectation of weeks-long extreme heat events. It would fall to City planners to then figure out how cooling centers are to be made available, how and when people can be notified to seek shelter, and how shelters will be kept working in the event of power curtailments. Where cooling centers do not exist, how they should be created and operated, and how to pay for this. How far a citizen can be expected to travel in safety and by what means to get to a shelter. How they will be fed while at the shelter, and for how long this can be expected to go on.

All of that is just cooling centers and just for extreme heat events. But this is what it takes to save the people, if saving the people is indeed what we intend.

It is extremely important to recognize a historic trend to sidestep the needs of certain communities in City planning, a practice that creates unnecessary islands of vulnerability, and to make sure this practice does not continue into an era of climate-driven catastrophes. Poor, unrepresented, and under-served people are in no position to go it alone in the struggle against global heating and climate change impacts. They will need help, education, and services where these are lacking or are not suitable to purpose. As the City rolls out resilience measures into communities, whatever those turn out to be, the measures must be distributed in the most equitable way possible as a moral imperative. The Charter language should require

the identification of all vulnerable communities, the exact nature of their vulnerabilities -- which will be multiple -- and then direct City planners and leaders to ensure these communities are not left to suffer and perish.

All communities will need support during a regional or City-wide climate-driven calamity. The scope of this challenge could at times be absolutely massive, but the more the City can get out

in front of the problem, starting with the most vulnerable among us, the better will be the outcomes. This simply cannot be overstated. Again, it is a matter of the highest moral imperative that we do this right.

That is the second leg of our approach to saving the people. Creating resilience is a daunting task, one fraught with political landmines, budget-busting expenses, class struggle, festering grievances, and everything else that comes with societal change on a massive scale. But juggling all that is the challenge before us, now and into the future. If you intend to keep your civilization, then this is how you keep your civilization.

The third leg of our approach is to create what I will call here a Climate Crisis Commission. C3, for short. Or for conversation, the Commission. The C3 will be the interface between the people, who sense their own growing and present vulnerability to climate changes, and the political and business classes, which are at present apparently not as concerned. Because of this mismatch in goals, I feel compelled to state from the outset what the Commission is not. This is not another political playground. It is not a business roundtable. It is not an academic sideshow. It is not a place to discuss economic growth, jobs, innovation, or anything related even if more jobs and innovation are seen as a good thing for an under-served community. The C3 scope of work is here expressly directed away from economic, political, or budgetary considerations. If that appears harsh, unrealistic, or arbitrary, it is actually none of those. It is an honest assessment of what it will take to save people from destruction. We can

have our politics, economics, and budgets back after we have saved the people. I should hope this is obvious, if it is not obvious then we need to take a collective moment to realign our moral

compasses.

Put simply, the C3 -- indeed the entire Charter amendment language outline here -- all are expressly constructed to preserve the lives and livelihoods of the most number of people possible, in the very teeth of the greatest threat to survival the human project has seen in probably 70,000 years.

Now to the structure of the C3 itself. As this is the gravitational center of the work I am identifying, I spend more time on this component than the others. I think the Commission

represents the most challenging to implement, and its proper working the best chance for total success.

The Commission will be grounded in the work of two communities that need to inform our

climate crisis response; the community of scientists acting in an advisory capacity, and the

non-science public who need a specific understanding of how climate challenges will impact

their communities so they can respond to preserve themselves.

The Charter language here should here specify the C3 be created by the City and funded to the

extent required for its given purpose, being data collection, analysis, outreach, and internal

operations required for regular meetings. The C3 will not implement policy or direct City budgets

but will by regular reports inform the City Council of the challenges people are facing and will

face in the future, and recommend mitigations and projects. The C3 will submit reports from

meetings to the City Council and into the public record on a regular basis. The C3 should have

some representation at Council meetings to answer questions or provide critical updates.

The C3 will meet at a location and time determined by C3 participants, or else via remote

technology, as agreed or required. Either the location or the time can change from meeting to

meeting, or be static. Meetings must be held within the City of San Jose, in either public or

private venue with a budget provided for any site-specific expenses, but the best solution is to

hold meetings via remote technology if at all possible.

The C3 will consist of a Citizens' Panel and a Science Panel, the latter acting in a specific

advisory capacity, with a Commission Chair selected in rotation.

As the City currently consists of ten Districts there will be that many Citizen Panel caucuses on

the C3, each caucus consisting of two voting district citizen representatives and one or more

nonvoting alternates. The initial participants in the C3 will be selected by serving City Councilmembers, who will submit their recommendations for the Citizen Panel, selected using

whatever recruitment process the Councilmember deems suitable, provided that each Citizen

Panelist will submit into the public record a written statement describing their background, the

nature of their interest in the work of the C3, acceptance of the consensus science concerning

global heating and climate change, and an expressed agreement to support the mission of the

C3 to save the people. Citizen Panelists will serve on the C3 for no more than a year, but can

return to serve again after the lapse of a year. They can resign at will, to be replaced by an

alternate. After the initial selection of C3 Citizen Panelists, new members will be brought forward

by the district caucus along with their written letter as described above, the applicant's inclusion

to be subject to a majority (51%) vote of the rest of the combined panels of the C3.

A nonvoting Commission Chair will be selected from the current rotation district caucus by that

caucus (reducing their vote by one) to serve as Chair for one meeting of the Commission. The

position of Chair will rotate in a round-robin fashion through all the districts, changing for each

meeting, and the Chair will be announced by the next district in rotation in advance of the

meetings as part of the next agenda. The Chair of the first meeting of the C3 will be taken from

District 1, with rotation into the other districts after that.

The Science Panel will consist of at least three participants granted voting rights on Commission

matters, and having the necessary skills and expertise to address the complex nature of climate

science, having knowledge of scientific reporting such as that issued by the IPCC (Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change), and understanding how climate impacts will

intersect with local concerns such as the emergency provision and continuity of water supply,

food supply, electrical power, and transportation.

The Science Panel can be drawn from the academic community, local citizenry, out-of-town

experts, or City staff, this list not being exhaustive at all. The sole requirement for inclusion in

the Science Panel is that the participant expressly and in writing accepts the consensus science

regarding global heating and climate change, has an understanding of known and expected

threats to human welfare, can speak to mitigation strategies regarding climate threats, and

supports the aim of saving the people of the City as a first priority. Potential participants will

signify their interest in sitting on the Panel by submitting into the public record a written

statement of intent addressing the above points, and further describing their areas of expertise,

experiences in the field as these might apply to the aims of the Commission, and an acceptance

of the C3 mission to save the people from disruption and mortality caused by climate changes.

Anyone submitting the desired profile can sit on the Science Panel at any time and provide

advice, but only three can be designated to vote on Commission work. There is no district-level

caucus or exact limit in the number of participants from the science community but there is a

Charter requirement that three voting Science Panelists be present during Commission

meetings, with at least one nonvoting alternate to fill any unforeseen gaps in attendance.

The Science Panel informs the Citizens' Panel, and thus all the people, concerning their most

likely future under climate change, to the best extent this can be known at any given time, so

that the Citizens' Panel can in aggregate plot their course toward a comprehensive and

equitable resilience for the people.

The Citizen's Panel, once formed, will be tasked with seating the Science Panel and designating

the three voting participants, based on submitted letters of interest from potential participants in

the scientific and technical communities. A simple majority (51%) vote of acceptance from the

Citizens' Panel will suffice for this.

The Citizens' Panel and Science Panel voting members vote as equals on all matters before the

C3, except for those matters already designated to district caucuses. Matters before the

Commission will be passed with a majority (51%) vote.

The C3 will meet on a cadence to be determined by the C3 in session, meaning the C3 will be in

a position to dynamically address the urgency of the work or the complexity of the challenges

being taken on, as the Commission itself sees these.

The next meeting agenda work of the C3 will be determined at the end of a given meeting, as

will the rotating Chair, as will the location and time of the next meeting if this is allowed to

change. Any item can be added to the next meeting agenda, the entire agenda and Chair will be

accepted by the current meeting assembly by a majority vote.

The C3 will be the audience for the data reporting mentioned as the first leg of the Charter

language. The Citizens and Scientists together will determine the suitability for purpose of the

reporting or any needed clarifications, will determine if and how to publish the reporting for the

benefit of the larger community, and will pass the reporting with comments and

recommendations for actions to the City Council when it is deemed complete, not less than once per year.

The Commission is otherwise free to determine what else will constitute their work. Where that

work requires funding, the Commission will need to approach either private funding sources or

the City. At the very least, C3 work will likely consist of work such as:

1. Identify the most likely climate threats to afflict the people of the City of San Jose.

This

should include direct threats such as flood, fire and heat, as well as indirect threats such

as water curtailments, power outages, and food supply interruptions. The list almost writes itself, but how these threats play out across the city will be harder to determine.

2. Create a process to identify non-overlapping, culturally distinct communities, if there are

such, consisting of no fewer than 5,000 citizens each. Publish a written description of these communities and their distinct and defining cultural attributes, as well as their unique and defining requirements to survive as a distinct culture during a crisis.

These

cultural communities may have a recognized neighborhood structure or not.

3. Commission work will identify the boundary extent of under-served communities, whether culturally distinct or not. This can be broadly defined, it need not be an actual

map of streets and intersections. At the same time, and working with community representatives, determine what the community will require to endure the kinds of previously defined climate impacts.

4. Commission work to identify where described communities lack basic services critical to

surviving climate change impacts, where these omissions present a threat to community integrity, and how to mitigate that threat. Mitigations can span multiple communities but must be large enough to adequately serve a significant part of communities that need mitigation. This work will be submitted annually to the City Council.

5. The Commission will identify best climate mitigation and defense practices for anticipated climate impacts as these have been developed in other cities and regions, and describe how these might be incorporated into the effort to increase resilience among citizens of the City.

6. Identify goals for fossil fuel consumption reduction targets, and for carbon emission reduction targets, using the best science and technological solutions that apply. This can be done for individual City departments or services where reductions seem most warranted, for example in first responders who are ultimately the most vulnerable to fuel shortages or restrictions, or fuel cost increases.
7. Report annually to Council the state of the climate science, and the state of knowledge of how climate changes are expected to cause harm to the City and the citizens and businesses. Report instances of impacts having occurred in the City and how these might have been caused by global heating or climate changes. Academic rigor is not the goal, a simple statement recognizing impacting events and how these tie into the work of the Commission is sufficient.
8. Work to develop resilience definitions around know impact vectors such as extreme heat, floods, food crises, water disruptions, and the like will reduce resilience across the City. Catalog what would be required in the best case to protect the most number of people and vulnerable communities from undo harm or excessive mortality.
9. Perform climate crisis modeling and response. This need not be an academically or scientifically rigorous approach, it could instead be a set of narrative scenarios focusing on likely single or combined impacting events, across a few or many communities, with supporting data drawn from real-world disasters in similar situations as what exist in San Jose. To be published as completed to the City Council, with recommendations if any recommendations make sense.

That is a good start at a list of work for the C3, no doubt a much longer list could develop as a discovery process unwinds, and unseen vulnerabilities and solutions alike come to the surface.

So those are the three-legs of an approach to how the City of San Jose might be instructed, via

the Charter, to accept the challenge of saving the people. Data collection, identifying vulnerable communities and likely impacts, and forming a Commission to represent the goal of the people to save themselves from massive dislocations, suffering, and mortality. The recommendations here are not meant to be dystopian or punitive, no particular business, City service or class of people are called out or targetted for blame since doing so would not promote survival. The purpose is simply to accept the challenge, and to then to set aside egos and grievances and past practices and venture as a unified community of people into that unknown future dynamic planetary system, where lay the monsters. Where the Earth's own global engines are already set in grinding motion against us. Against all of us. We will none of us flourish alone in this struggle. But we may just make it to the end with most of our institutions, our precious cultures, our neighborhoods, and our civilization intact. In this, I wish us all good luck. And thank you for your time and consideration.

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