



Memorandum

TO: Honorable Mayor &
City Council

FROM: Toni J. Taber, MMC
City Clerk

SUBJECT: The Public Record
January 22, 2026 – January 29, 2026

DATE: February 4, 2026

ITEMS FILED FOR THE PUBLIC RECORD

Letters from Boards, Commissions, and Committees

Letters from the Public

1. Letter from Elizabeth Agramont-Justiniano, dated January 22, 2026, regarding: ICE + Flock Cameras.
2. Letter from Victoria Via, dated January 23, 2026, regarding: Pleasant Hills: Need More Housing that Supports Fiscal Health of City.
3. Letter from Jessica Goswick, dated January 26, 2026, regarding: Pleasant Hills Should Match the Needs of Our Community.
4. Letter from Martin Reinders, dated January 27, 2026, regarding: Council members during public comment.
5. Letter from Martin Reinders, dated January 27, 2026, regarding: City council meeting.
6. Letter from Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E), received January 29, 2026, regarding: NOTICE OF PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY'S RATE DECREASE REQUEST FOR ITS INCOME QUALIFIED PROGRAMS APPLICATION TO THE CALIFORNIA PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION (CPUC) (A.26-01-003).

Toni J. Taber, MMC
City Clerk



Outlook

Fw: ICE + Flock Cameras

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

Date Fri 1/23/2026 8:36 AM

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

Office of the City Clerk | City of San José

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

San Jose, CA 95113

Main: 408-535-1260

Fax: 408-292-6207

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

From: E A [REDACTED]

Sent: Thursday, January 22, 2026 12:13 PM

To: The Office of Mayor Matt Mahan <mayor@sanjoseca.gov>; The Office of Mayor Matt Mahan <mayor@sanjoseca.gov>; Kamei, Rosemary <Rosemary.Kamei@sanjoseca.gov>; Campos, Pamela <Pamela.Campos@sanjoseca.gov>; Doan, Bien <Bien.Doan@sanjoseca.gov>; Cohen, David <David.Cohen@sanjoseca.gov>; District3 <district3@sanjoseca.gov>; District 6 <district6@sanjoseca.gov>; Ortiz, Peter <Peter.Ortiz@sanjoseca.gov>; District 10 <District10@sanjoseca.gov>; Candelas, Domingo <Domingo.Candelas@sanjoseca.gov>; District9 <district9@sanjoseca.gov>; City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>; City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>; ImmigrantAffairs <ImmigrantAffairs@sanjoseca.gov>

Subject: ICE + Flock Cameras

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

Dear Mayor and City Council! and Office of Race and Social Equity:

Today, I just learned that ICE says it's officers can forcibly enter people homes during immigration operations without a judicial warrant and instead using an administrative warrant.

Source: NBC News

<https://search.app/4tYH8>

Children have been tricked to getting their parents to open the door by ICE, this is absolutely horrendous.

https://www.cbsnews.com/minnesota/news/5_year_old_boy_ice_custody_minnesota_abandoned_dis_claims/

This is shocking and scary especially to me as a Black and Latina woman and the daughter of an immigrant. I have a will continue to contact Congress:

<https://www.acceaction.org/defundice>

I have seen too many posts rg ICE arresting someone in our community. I am in strong opposition to FLOCK cameras data being accessible to ICE and the federal government. The City of Santa Cruz just recently banned Flock Cameras and we should too!

Santa Cruz leaders vote to terminate contract with Flock - Santa Cruz Local

<https://share.google/jVQnrBIGmzSaMU5DT>

I am requesting an official written response from my councilmember, Councilmember Tordillos with regards to whether you support not using Flock cameras in our city?

I fully understand the importance in wanting to protect our community from people speeding and accidents. Let's look in to other alternatives to prevent fatalities and accidents that do not require these cameras.

Thank you!

--

Sign Petitions:

Protect Inclusionary Housing Ordinance <https://form.jotform.com/260031040852038>

Symbols of Identity and Belonging at City Hall: <https://form.jotform.com/253548517960062>

Enhance Civic Participation: <https://form.jotform.com/253544303745153>

Here4You Homeless Shelter Hotline: 

Elizabeth Agramont-Justiniano
she/her/ella/GIRLLL!

My personal brand:

- Creativity**
- Compassion**
- Commitment**
- Consistency**
- Courage**
- Community Centeredness**

Artist/Creative

Expand TRUST in SJ! Mental Health Matters!

Political Ambassador, Afro UPRIS/Black Democratic Club of SCC: Black Lives and Black Permanency Matters!

Chair Ad Hoc Committee on Housing and Homelessness, SCCDP

Choir+ Member of Urban Sanctuary
Build the Bench 2025 Cohort, Member of SVYD
Civic Leadership 2026 Cohort, Silicon Valley at Home
Housing Justice Advocate
Downtown Resident of District 3: St. James/Julian Neighborhood

Values: Honesty, Kindness, Compassion, Courage, Justice

"Democracy only works when we work for it. When we fight for it, when we demand it." ~Stacey Abrams

Thank you!

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



Outlook

Fw: Pleasant Hills: Need More Housing that Supports Fiscal Health of City

From Agendadesk <Agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov>**Date** Fri 1/23/2026 11:30 AM**To** Rules and Open Government Committee Agendas <rulescommitteeagenda@sanjoseca.gov>

From: City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>**Sent:** Friday, January 23, 2026 11:23 AM**To:** Agendadesk <Agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov>**Subject:** Fw: Pleasant Hills: Need More Housing that Supports Fiscal Health of City**Office of the City Clerk | City of San José**200 E. Santa Clara St., Tower 14th Floor

San Jose, CA 95113

Main: 408-535-1260

Fax: 408-292-6207

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

From: Victoria Via [REDACTED]**Sent:** Friday, January 23, 2026 11:04 AM**To:** The Office of Mayor Matt Mahan <mayor@sanjoseca.gov>; Mahan, Matt <Matt.Mahan@sanjoseca.gov>; Burton, Chris <Christopher.Burton@sanjoseca.gov>; City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>; Adera, Teddy <Teddy.Adera@sanjoseca.gov>; Candelas, Domingo <Domingo.Candelas@sanjoseca.gov>; Rocha, Vincent <Vincent.Rocha@sanjoseca.gov>; Ferguson, Jerad <Jerad.Ferguson@sanjoseca.gov>; Flores, Michelle <michelle.flores@sanjoseca.gov>; Sandhir, Manira <Manira.Sandhir@sanjoseca.gov>; Mahamood, Reema <reema.mahamood@sanjoseca.gov>; Maurer, Laura <Laura.Maurer@sanjoseca.gov>; Lee, Jason <Jason.Lee@sanjoseca.gov>; Tapia, Leonel <Leonel.Tapia@sanjoseca.gov>; Moody, Doug <doug.moody@sanjoseca.gov>; [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]**Subject:** Pleasant Hills: Need More Housing that Supports Fiscal Health of City**[External Email.** Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources. [Learn more](#)]You don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Councilmember Candelas, Mayor Mahan, & Planning staff,

I do not support the current design for the redevelopment of Pleasant Hills.

Our land is a limited resource, and we should use it to its best and highest potential. I am supportive of new housing, but we need even more housing on this site. We should build even more housing on this land and not settle for the current low-density proposal.

Beyond housing needs, it would be **irresponsible for City leadership to accept a proposal that would be a burden on the city's finances**. Per City analysis, the current proposal does not meet the minimum density that would allow the City to breakeven on its costs to deliver services.

It is unacceptable to commit the city to losing money every year for the lifespan of this development and to worsening schools, parks, emergency services, and more, for everyone.

More broadly, all the budget cuts we see for critical government services are directly tied to poor land use decisions. Especially in a time when federal funding is threatened, San Jose needs to get serious about being financially resilient. It would be shortsighted to move forward with this proposal.

Please demand that the development team provide the minimum amount of housing that will support the fiscal health of the City. I support the creation of a more vibrant, sustainable, and affordable development at Pleasant Hills--but this proposal isn't it.

Sincerely,

Victoria Via

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



Fw: Pleasant Hills Should Match the Needs of Our Community

From Agendadesk <Agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov>

Date Mon 1/26/2026 9:25 AM

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

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

Sent: Monday, January 26, 2026 9:21 AM

To: Agendadesk <Agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov>

Subject: FW: Pleasant Hills Should Match the Needs of Our Community

From: Jessica Goswick [REDACTED]

Sent: Monday, January 26, 2026 8:51 AM

To: The Office of Mayor Matt Mahan <mayor@sanjoseca.gov>; Mahan, Matt <Matt.Mahan@sanjoseca.gov>; Burton, Chris <Christopher.Burton@sanjoseca.gov>; City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>; Adera, Teddy <Teddy.Adera@sanjoseca.gov>; Candelas, Domingo <Domingo.Candelas@sanjoseca.gov>; Rocha, Vincent <Vincent.Rocha@sanjoseca.gov>; Ferguson, Jerad <Jerad.Ferguson@sanjoseca.gov>; Flores, Michelle <michelle.flores@sanjoseca.gov>; Sandhir, Manira <Manira.Sandhir@sanjoseca.gov>; Mahamood, Reema <reema.mahamood@sanjoseca.gov>; Maurer, Laura <Laura.Maurer@sanjoseca.gov>; Lee, Jason <Jason.Lee@sanjoseca.gov>; Tapia, Leonel <Leonel.Tapia@sanjoseca.gov>; Moody, Doug <doug.moody@sanjoseca.gov>; [REDACTED]

Subject: Pleasant Hills Should Match the Needs of Our Community

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

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Councilmember Candelas, Mayor Mahan, & Planning staff,

I support the creation of a more vibrant, sustainable, and affordable development at Pleasant Hills.

Unfortunately, the current proposal for redeveloping Pleasant Hills repeats our past mistakes. It is a low-density proposal straight out of 1950. If the City approves this proposal as is, it would do little to address worsening traffic, rising carbon emissions, duller neighborhoods, a lack of affordable housing, and continuing displacement of our loved ones from this region.

Beyond being a missed opportunity for more housing, the city's analysis shows that this development will be a forever-burden on the City's finances. The minimum density for the City to be revenue-positive from property taxes is 55 du/ac, while this development is only 30 du/ac. The City will forever need to maintain all that new roadway/infrastructure at significant cost.

We know what happens when communities are not able to pay for their own infrastructure, they slowly erode over time and act as a drain on our City's budget.

This could be different,

You can go to the developer and say, "This design isn't what we need. Let's start again."

I want a Pleasant Hills like the one envisioned in the Guiding Principles document: one that is a walkable, green, mixed-use neighborhood with a lot more housing, especially affordable housing.

Don't settle for a second-rate San Jose. For this city to thrive in the future, it needs to transform now. And for you and San Jose to be truly pro-housing, you need to support as many homes as possible on sites like this one. Your voice will make a big difference on Pleasant Hills. Please use it.

Tell your colleagues in City Hall and the developer that the current proposal needs to be updated to reflect the needs of our community.

Sincerely,

Jessica Goswick

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



Outlook

Fw: Council members during public comment

From Agendadesk <Agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov>**Date** Wed 1/28/2026 8:47 AM**To** Rules and Open Government Committee Agendas <rulescommitteeagenda@sanjoseca.gov>

From: City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>**Sent:** Wednesday, January 28, 2026 8:00 AM**To:** Agendadesk <Agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov>**Subject:** FW: Council members during public comment

From: Martin Reinders [REDACTED]**Sent:** Tuesday, January 27, 2026 6:07 PM**To:** The Office of Mayor Matt Mahan <mayor@sanjoseca.gov>; Marge Lundberg [REDACTED] City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>**Subject:** Council members during public comment

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

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

It's absolutely disrespectful that over 1/2 of the council members are missing from their seats during public comment.

Marty Reinders

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



Fw: City council meeting

From Agendadesk <Agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov>

Date Wed 1/28/2026 8:48 AM

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

From: Martin Reinders [REDACTED]

Sent: Tuesday, January 27, 2026 9:03 PM

To: City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>; The Office of Mayor Matt Mahan <mayor@sanjoseca.gov>; Mulcahy, Michael <Michael.Mulcahy@sanjoseca.gov>; Campos, Pamela <Pamela.Campos@sanjoseca.gov>; Agendadesk <Agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov>; WILLIAM CORTRIGHT <bcortrig@comcast.net>; Kamei, Rosemary <Rosemary.Kamei@sanjoseca.gov>; Casey, George <George.Casey@sanjoseca.gov>; Tordillos, Anthony <Anthony.Tordillos@sanjoseca.gov>; Foley, Pam <Pam.Foley@sanjoseca.gov>; Doan, Bien <Bien.Doan@sanjoseca.gov>; Cohen, David <David.Cohen@sanjoseca.gov>; Ortiz, Peter <Peter.Ortiz@sanjoseca.gov>; Candelas, Domingo <Domingo.Candelas@sanjoseca.gov>; Marge Lundberg [REDACTED]

Subject: City council meeting

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

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

I was there Tuesday night from 5PM until the end. Stayed in my seat, and watched the entire proceedings. You, on multiple occasions, chastised the public about being respectful to city council members.

Let me tell you. When you and the entire council randomly get up and walk out, sometimes leaving more than half you seats empty; then sitting there giving zero attention to speakers. THAT'S DISRESPECTFUL.

Shame on all of you.

Marty Reinders

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

DATE: January 26, 2026

TO: STATE, CITY AND LOCAL OFFICIALS

NOTICE OF PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY'S RATE DECREASE REQUEST FOR ITS INCOME QUALIFIED PROGRAMS APPLICATION TO THE CALIFORNIA PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION (CPUC) (A.26-01-003)

What is being requested?

PG&E is requesting \$1,025.2 million in revenue for program years 2028 through 2033, which is lower than the revenue authorized for the current income-qualified program cycle. The request covers administrative and program costs for the California Alternate Rates for Energy (CARE), Family Electric Rate Assistance (FERA), and Energy Savings Assistance (ESA) Programs, as well as costs for the Concurrent Application System.

Estimated decrease in electric rates (2028–2033)

If approved, residential electric rates for income-qualified programs will decrease overall for the 2028–2033 program cycle compared to current rates. This decrease will be phased in over the program cycle years. Actual changes in rates may vary by year. Detailed rate information will be sent directly to customers in a bill insert in January 2026.

Estimated change in gas rates (2028–2033)

If approved, residential gas rates for income-qualified programs will change overall for the 2028–2033 program cycle compared to current rates. This rate change will be phased in over the program cycle years. Actual changes in rates may vary by year, with most years reflecting decreases and one year (2032) showing a very small residential increase of approximately 0.03%. Detailed rate information will be sent directly to customers in a bill insert in January 2026.

How would this impact the typical residential customer?

If the request is approved, a typical residential electric customer using 500 kWh per month would see a bill decrease of approximately \$0.01 per month. A typical residential gas customer using 31 therms would see a bill increase of approximately \$0.03 per month. Actual impacts will vary depending on usage and are subject to CPUC regulatory approval.

Additional information

An administrative law judge will hold hearings, consider evidence, testimony and public comments before drafting a proposed decision on this application. CPUC Commissioners will then vote on a final decision at a public meeting.

You can read more about PG&E's request and make public comment by visiting apps.cpuc.ca.gov/c/A2601003. For questions about participating in CPUC matters, you can contact the Public Advisor's Office at Public.Advisor@cpuc.ca.gov, 1-866-849-8390, or 505 Van Ness Ave., San Francisco, CA 94102. Please reference A.26-01-003 in any communication with the CPUC.

Questions about the request

If you have questions about PG&E's filing, please contact PG&E at 1-800-743-5000. For TTY, call 711. Para obtener más información sobre cómo este cambio podría afectar su pago mensual, llame al **1-800-660-6789** • 詳情請致電 **1-800-893-9555**.

If you would like an electronic copy of the filing and exhibits, please write to the address below:

Pacific Gas and Electric Company
2028-33 Income Qualified Programs Funding Application (A.26-01-003)
P.O. Box 1018
Oakland, CA 94604-1018

RECEIVED
SAN JOSE CITY CLERK
2026 JAN 29 AM 10:29

PL

Mar 1