

Policing safety issues

J'Carlin [REDACTED]

Sat 11/13/2021 10:31 AM

To: CharterReview <CharterReview@sanjoseca.gov>

Cc: Jones, Chappie <Chappie.Jones@sanjoseca.gov>; District7 <District7@sanjoseca.gov>; Susan Ellenberg
[REDACTED]

 1 attachments (31 KB)

A Technological Solution for Police Safety Issues..pdf;

[External Email]

I understand District 7 has a pilot project on video policing, and Supervisor Ellenberg and Vice Mayor Jones are studying the attached pdf. I believe video enforcement solves most of the police issues we are facing currently. "Bad apples" can be reassigned to non-contact enforcement duties, the rest of the police can greatly increase enforcement productivity by limiting personal enforcement to situations requiring it.

Thank you for your consideration of this proposal.

Carlin Black
District 1
San Jose, CA

--

Carlin Black

Aka J'Carlin

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

Traffic injuries and fatalities are the most serious public safety issue in cities today. However there are serious real and perceived dangers to officers and violators involved in live police intervention. It would seem from news reports that the net lives saved from police intervention in traffic and other violations is negative.

To deal with this issue the way in which police officers deal with violations must be changed from direct intervention to non-contact technology. Officers should be issued video cameras to record all offenses, traffic and others. All officers regardless of their previous assignments would be reassigned to traffic enforcement to protect the lives of pedestrians, bicyclists, and personal mobility device users from unsafe drivers.

Video police records would be accepted as evidence in courts and as support to issue a citation by the police station staff. Smart phone videos are already used in court in cases of assault and rioting. The officer would have discretion to flag each video as a citation violation, a warning, or simply file before uploading to the station. For speeding violations radar data is ported to the video. Traffic officers would be trained to capture a readable license plate and a recognizable video of the driver as part of the incident video report. Non-vehicle violations would be processed using modern recognition technologies. Mistaken identifications would be contested in court.

Officers could operate from the safety of a sidewalk or a pedestrian island and wouldn't be subject to the potential danger of an in person intervention. Their only contact with a perpetrator would be in court for a contested violation.

The productivity of traffic officers would be greatly increased as would traffic ticket revenue since there is no time lost in chasing down violators to issue citations. Traffic fines could become a major source of revenue for cities as it is for many small rural towns.

These officers could also perform traditional neighborhood enforcement in their assigned neighborhoods, videoing minor social infractions for use on neighborhood social media for social pressure enforcement as is currently done in Washington State with surveillance videos. Major violations would be captured on video and regular enforcement procedures followed.

Officers preferring more traditional police work would be reassigned after completing specialized training. Deescalation procedures and mental health awareness for 911 responders is essential. Mental health professionals, and teachers deal with these issues daily with few injuries. Horseback crowd control training for protests has been extremely effective for most of the 20th century. The million person Viet Nam protests in the 1970s were controlled with horseback officers using no military equipment with essentially no injuries or fatalities to officers or the public.

Video law enforcement would improve public safety by ensuring that most violators are cited or warned by cost effective technological policing. Police and the public would no longer be subjected to dangerous personal encounters.

NEW CHARTER ARTICLE XX: AN ACT TO ELIMINATE GREENHOUSE GASES, BUILD RESILIENT COMMUNITIES AND MAKE THE EARTH A GARDEN AGAIN.

tessa woodmansee <[REDACTED]>

Mon 11/15/2021 9:29 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 Commissioners and City Council Members,

I know that the commissioners and the council will be considering adding ARTICLES to the City Charter... Please add the proposed **climate crisis ARTICLE**:

We urgently need added to our City Charter : AN ACT TO ELIMINATE GREENHOUSE GASES, BUILD RESILIENT COMMUNITIES AND MAKE THE EARTH A GARDEN AGAIN added **Into our city Charter**: A **municipal charter** is the basic document that defines the organization, powers, functions and essential procedures of the **city** government.

This addition to our CITY CHARTER IS essential if we are to have a government! As Noam Chompsky says: Now aged 90, Noam Chomsky WHO continues to write, and is co-teaching a course on politics and global crises at the University of Arizona...Apart from his paradigm-creating work in linguistics, Chomsky has been an outspoken and cogent critic of American foreign policy and its connection with human rights violations and military aggression around the world. In recent years, Chomsky has turned his prodigious mind to **the existential threat of global warming, a “threat to the perpetuation of organized human life,” on par with nuclear war.**

Adding direction to the city about climate change is essential for the well being and survival of the citizens of this city. Since the role of government is to

protect the people from harm we need this ARTICLE : AN ACT TO ELIMINATE GREENHOUSE GASES, BUILD RESILIENT COMMUNITIES AND MAKE THE EARTH A GARDEN AGAIN.

In addition, the Subcommittee on Accountability, Inclusion and Representation has NOT included two of the legs suggested by Scientist, futurist Cat Woodmansee into the Climate Crisis Article after the last San Jose city charter article XIX : An Act to Limit Urban Sprawl and the Fiscal and Environmental Effects of Specified Development in Outlying Areas.

THE THREE LEGS FOR OUR CHARTER ARTICLE ARE written BELOW AS written by Scientist, educator Cat Woodmansee, BS Biology:

“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.”

We urgently need the new ARTICLE XX : AN ACT TO ELIMINATE GREENHOUSE GASES, BUILD RESILIENT COMMUNITIES AND MAKE THE EARTH A GARDEN AGAIN.

This addition into the charter is essential since this change is so integral to our survival and demands transformational change that the politicians our so called leaders who serve businesses can NOT do this job.

Business is all about fossil fuels, this is the way we make money, business and money is all about fossil fuels. We need to go back to the way we lived before business, before fossil fuels, before money—abstract tokens of exchange— not REAL GOODS. MONEY which was brought to us by the Romans starting in about **400 BC** who were the first invaders and capitalists –**exploiting people and nature for profit.**

So adding **the three legs of this document below** included into the Article : CLIMATE CRISIS: AN ACT TO ELIMINATE GREENHOUSE GASES, BUILD RESILIENT COMMUNITIES, AND MAKE THE EARTH A GARDEN

AGAIN is essential not just the Subcommittees proposed **Climate Crisis Commission C3** but the fossil fuel use **data collection** and the **building resilient communities** as written by Cat Woodmansee, Master Biologist, Science Teacher, Historian, and Futurist :

AS SCIENTIST CAT WOODMANSEE SAYS:

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.

So please add ARTICLE XX: We urgently need added to our City Charter : AN ACT TO ELIMINATE GREENHOUSE GASES, BUILD RESILIENT COMMUNITIES AND MAKE THE EARTH A GARDEN AGAIN added Into our city Charter:

Warm Regards.

Tessa Woodmansee
MA Mass Communications and Education,CSUN

COMPLETE PROPOSED CHARTER ARTICLE WRITTEN BY CAT WOODMANSEE, MS BIOLOGY, ECOSYSTEMS ECOLOGIST, CREDENTIALLED SCIENCE TEACHER,CSU

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 known 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 undue 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.

--

Clean Air and Quiet Neighborhoods--A Natural Right.

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

Re: NEW CHARTER ARTICLE XX: AN ACT TO ELIMINATE GREENHOUSE GASES, BUILD RESILIENT COMMUNITIES AND MAKE THE EARTH A GARDEN AGAIN.

Charter Review Commission 4b <CRC4b@sanjoseca.gov>

Mon 11/15/2021 11:03 AM

To: tessa woodmansee [REDACTED]; To: Alrie Middlebrook [REDACTED]; Andrew Boone [REDACTED]; Blaire Beekman [REDACTED]; City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>; District 10 <District10@sanjoseca.gov>; District 6 <district6@sanjoseca.gov>; District1 <district1@sanjoseca.gov>; District2 <District2@sanjoseca.gov>; District3 <district3@sanjoseca.gov>; District4 <District4@sanjoseca.gov>; District5 <District5@sanjoseca.gov>; District7 <District7@sanjoseca.gov>; District8 <district8@sanjoseca.gov>; Gladwyn D'Souza [REDACTED]; Kathryn Mathewson <[REDACTED]>; District9 <district9@sanjoseca.gov>; Roche, Megan <megan.roche@sanjoseca.gov>; Rules and Open Government Committee Agendas <rulescommitteeagenda@sanjoseca.gov>; Meredith Muller <[REDACTED]>

Good morning Tessa,

Thank you for being present on all of our Commission meetings. I have removed the emails of the other commissioners so as not to violate the Brown Act. I left every other email you included for transparency.

I also want to thank you and your partner for a very thorough proposal regarding the creation of a Climate Change Commission.

I do have a lot of questions about the proposal, and recognizing that you and your partner put in a lot of work on this, I wanted to pose it directly to you ahead of tonight's meeting to get your thoughts. Let me ask the biggest question I have for you, which is why you believe that this Commission must be included in the Charter. I ask because for this to happen, the Council will have to vet your proposal and prepare it for presentation before the voters. I assume that part of this process may include a referral to staff to dig deeper into it as well. I don't believe that this is something that the Council or staff would recommend adopting outright because there needs to be a deeper analysis of whether your proposed structure is the most effective, inclusive, and accountable way to work towards fighting climate change (a goal which I believe the vast majority of people - elected or not - would support). Additionally, each commission in our City is assigned to specific departments for support and staffing. There would need to be some analysis about which department would work with your proposed commission as well.

All of this is meant to say that taking the extra step of putting this Commission into the Charter will take more time away from the work that this new proposed Commission should be doing. To have it included in the Charter would require voter approval. I have no idea what the current staff or council capacity is, but we have elections coming up in 7 and 11 months respectively. That may seem like enough time to do the work necessary to get this vote prepared for an election, but that assumes that they have sufficient capacity to do this *on top of* everything else. If the City cannot get through this process in time for either of the 2022 elections, we would have to wait until the 2024 elections.

I agree 100% with you that climate change is something that we have to address, and we cannot hold back on bold ideas to get it done. That said, chartering a brand new commission isn't necessarily a bold idea. All we are doing is trying to create some new platform or medium for where ideas can be generated and considered when there has been no indication that what we currently have is holding us back.

Two thoughts for you and your partner to consider. First, are you open to creating this commission outside of the charter process? That saves all of us time, effort, and money, which provides the opportunity for your proposed commission to be created sooner and get to work faster and still get to

your goals. It also gives us the flexibility to adjust or modify the Commission structure if we discover ways to improve its work (any commission that exists in the charter CANNOT be modified without voter approval). Second, do you have specific proposals outside of creating a commission (related to emission standards, development, or transportation for example) that you want considered by our elected officials?

Huy Tran
District 4 Commissioner
Charter Review Commission

From: tessa woodmansee <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, November 15, 2021 9:29 AM
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>; Charter Review Commission 8b <CRC8b@sanjoseca.gov>; Charter Review Commission 9a <CRC9a@sanjoseca.gov>; Charter Review Commission 9b <CRC9b@sanjoseca.gov>; Charter Review Commission Chair <CRCCChair@sanjoseca.gov>; Charter Review Commission Citywide 1 <CRCCW1@sanjoseca.gov>; Charter Review Commission Citywide 2 <CRCCW2@sanjoseca.gov>; CharterReview <CharterReview@sanjoseca.gov>; City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>; District 10 <District10@sanjoseca.gov>; District 6 <district6@sanjoseca.gov>; District1 <district1@sanjoseca.gov>; District2 <District2@sanjoseca.gov>; District3 <district3@sanjoseca.gov>; District4 <District4@sanjoseca.gov>; District5 <District5@sanjoseca.gov>; District7 <District7@sanjoseca.gov>; District8 <district8@sanjoseca.gov>; Gladwyn D'Souza <[REDACTED]>; Kathryn Mathewson <[REDACTED]>; District9 <district9@sanjoseca.gov>; Roche, Megan <megan.roche@sanjoseca.gov>; Rules and Open Government Committee Agendas <rulescommitteeagenda@sanjoseca.gov>; tessa woodmansee <[REDACTED]>; Meredith Muller <[REDACTED]>; Marty Stuczynski <[REDACTED]>
Subject: NEW CHARTER ARTICLE XX: AN ACT TO ELIMINATE GREENHOUSE GASES, BUILD RESILIENT COMMUNITIES AND MAKE THE EARTH A GARDEN AGAIN.

[External Email]

Dear Charter Review Commissioners and City Council Members,

I know that the commissioners and the council will be considering adding ARTICLES to the City Charter... Please add the proposed **climate crisis ARTICLE**:

We urgently need added to our City Charter : AN ACT TO ELIMINATE GREENHOUSE GASES, BUILD RESILIENT COMMUNITIES AND MAKE

THE EARTH A GARDEN AGAIN added **Into our city Charter:** A **municipal charter** is the basic document that defines the organization, powers, functions and essential procedures of the **city** government.

This addition to our CITY CHARTER IS essential if we are to have a government! As Noam Chomsky says: Now aged 90, Noam Chomsky WHO continues to write, and is co-teaching a course on politics and global crises at the University of Arizona...Apart from his paradigm-creating work in linguistics, Chomsky has been an outspoken and cogent critic of American foreign policy and its connection with human rights violations and military aggression around the world. In recent years, Chomsky has turned his prodigious mind to **the existential threat of global warming, a “threat to the perpetuation of organized human life,” on par with nuclear war.**

Adding direction to the city about climate change is essential for the well being and survival of the citizens of this city. Since the role of government is to protect the people from harm we need this **ARTICLE : AN ACT TO ELIMINATE GREENHOUSE GASES, BUILD RESILIENT COMMUNITIES AND MAKE THE EARTH A GARDEN AGAIN.**

In addition, the Subcommittee on Accountability, Inclusion and Representation has NOT included two of the legs suggested by Scientist, futurist Cat Woodmansee into the Climate Crisis Article after the last San Jose city charter article XIX : An Act to Limit Urban Sprawl and the Fiscal and Environmental Effects of Specified Development in Outlying Areas.

THE THREE LEGS FOR OUR CHARTER ARTICLE ARE written BELOW AS written by Scientist, educator Cat Woodmansee, BS Biology:

“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.”

We urgently need the new ARTICLE XX : AN ACT TO ELIMINATE GREENHOUSE GASES, BUILD RESILIENT COMMUNITIES AND MAKE THE EARTH A GARDEN AGAIN.

This addition into the charter is essential since this change is so integral to our survival and demands transformational change that the politicians our so called leaders who serve businesses can NOT do this job.

Business is all about fossil fuels, this is the way we make money, business and money is all about fossil fuels. We need to go back to the way we lived before business, before fossil fuels, before money—abstract tokens of exchange— not REAL GOODS. MONEY which was brought to us by the Romans starting in about **400 BC** who were the first invaders and capitalists —**exploiting people and nature for profit.**

So adding **the three legs of this document below** included into the Article : CLIMATE CRISIS: AN ACT TO ELIMINATE GREENHOUSE GASES, BUILD RESILIENT COMMUNITIES, AND MAKE THE EARTH A GARDEN AGAIN is essential not just the Subcommittees proposed **Climate Crisis Commission C3** but the fossil fuel use **data collection** and the **building resilient communities** as written by Cat Woodmansee, Master Biologist, Science Teacher, Historian, and Futurist :

AS SCIENTIST CAT WOODMANSEE SAYS:

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.

So please add ARTICLE XX: We urgently need added to our City Charter : AN ACT TO ELIMINATE GREENHOUSE GASES, BUILD RESILIENT COMMUNITIES AND MAKE THE EARTH A GARDEN AGAIN added Into our city Charter:

Warm Regards.

Tessa Woodmansee

MA Mass Communications and Education,CSUN

COMPLETE PROPOSED CHARTER ARTICLE WRITTEN BY CAT
WOODMANSEE, MS BIOLOGY, ECOSYSTEMS ECOLOGIST,
CREDENTIALLED SCIENCE TEACHER,CSU

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 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 known 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 undue 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 unfolds, 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 targeted 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.

--

Clean Air and Quiet Neighborhoods--A Natural Right.

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