



Memorandum

TO: Honorable Mayor &
City Council

FROM: Toni J. Taber, MMC
City Clerk

SUBJECT: The Public Record
June 11, 2026 – July 30, 2026

DATE: August 5, 2026

ITEMS FILED FOR THE PUBLIC RECORD

Letters from Boards, Commissions, and Committees

1. Letter from the Housing and Community Development Commission, dated June 29, 2026, regarding: The allocation of Measure E Transfer Tax funds for Fiscal Year 2026-27.

Letters from the Public

2. Over 150 emails of substantially the same language were received between June 11 – July 5, 2026, re: Hate Crime Charges for Santana Row Assault Case. One example is enclosed. You may contact the City Clerk's Office to view all letters received.
3. Letter from Soluna Espinosa Pieb, received June 18, 2026, regarding: Ban City-Sponsored Travel to Israel.
4. Letter from Lita Kurth, received June 19, 2026, regarding: expanding the pavillion.
5. Letter from Ruth Callahan, received June 27, 2026, regarding: Taxpayer's Protection Act Ballot Measure November 2-26.
6. Letter from Luis Santos, received July 1, 2026, regarding: From Super Bowl Weekend to the World Cup: Request for a Public Town Hall on Downtown Safety.
7. Letter from Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E), received July 21, 2026, regarding: NOTICE OF PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY'S SHAREHOLDER AWARD REQUEST FOR ITS CORE PROCUREMENT INCENTIVE MECHANISM (CPIM) YEAR 30 APPLICATION TO THE CALIFORNIA PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION (CPUC) A.26-06-025.

Rules and Open Government Committee
August 5, 2026
Subject: Public Record
Page 2



Toni J. Taber, MMC
City Clerk

TJT/tt

June 29, 2026

Dear Honorable Mayor and City Council:

The Housing and Community Development Commission, acting in its capacity as the designated Measure E Community Oversight Committee pursuant to Resolution No. 79608, respectfully submits this letter to share our request regarding the allocation of Measure E Transfer Tax funds for Fiscal Year 2026-27.

Between FY 2020-21 and FY 2024-25, Measure E generated \$315,236,575 in transfer tax revenue. The Commission's review of all five annual expenditure reports reveals a trend: Measure E has gradually evolved from a housing-production funding source into a homelessness-response funding source.

Funds generated from Measure E are for general City services, including affordable housing for seniors, veterans, disabled, and low-income families, and helping families who are homeless move into shelters, permanent housing, or alternative home ownership options. Between FY2020-24 allocation for the creation of new affordable housing (extremely low, low, and moderate income affordable housing) hovered between 70-80%, and homelessness prevention held at a steady 10%.

FY 2026-27 marks the second consecutive year that up to 90% of funds are allocated towards homeless sheltering and support programs, leaving only 10% for homelessness prevention, and zero for the creation of new low-income housing. Therefore, the Commission urges the City Council to increase allocations substantially toward homelessness prevention through rental assistance in the FY 2026-2027 Measure E Spending Plan.

The evidence strongly supports prevention as a higher-value use of limited Measure E resources. MIT's Policy Impacts estimates a **\$2.47 return in public benefits for every \$1 spent on housing assistance**.¹ A randomized controlled trial conducted in Santa Clara County found that emergency financial assistance significantly reduces homelessness.² Academic literature on homelessness prevention consistently demonstrates that targeted rental assistance is less expensive per household than emergency shelter or interim housing. This pattern is reflected in the City's own fair-housing legal-services performance reports, where more than 70% of tenants served were extremely low-income (at or below 30% of Area Median Income), and between 93% and 96% of cases each year arise from nonpayment of rent and the resulting threat of eviction rather than from unlawful discrimination.³ This local evidence reveals that most people were evicted for non-payment of rent or reported challenges paying rent and thus would have

¹ Brian A. Jacob, "Do Homelessness Prevention Programs Work?" *The MIT Press Reader*, October 19, 2023, <https://thereader.mitpress.mit.edu/do-homelessness-prevention-programs-work/>.

² Ibid.

³ City of San José, [Housing & Community Development Commission, Meeting Agenda](#), October 10, 2019.

benefited from rental subsidies, financial assistance, and supportive services to help them regain stability.⁴

The Commission recognizes that emergency shelter and interim housing serve essential functions within the homelessness response continuum. However, the City has increasingly relied on Measure E to finance operational costs. Given Measure E's limited resources, **the City should evaluate whether directing a larger share of funding toward prevention would reduce homelessness more cost-effectively over the long term.**

In closing, the Commission is honored to serve in its oversight role and recognizes the dedication of Housing Department staff in administering a complex, multi-year, multi-program fund. These recommendations are not a criticism of that effort. Rather, they reflect the Commission's responsibility, on behalf of the residents who approved this measure, to ensure that Measure E funds are deployed with fidelity, transparency, and maximum impact.

The commission, along with San Jose residents who support Measure E share the hope that this transfer tax will play a part in creating a city where every resident, regardless of socioeconomic status, can access safe and affordable housing.

Sincerely,

Housing and Community Development Commission

⁴ Roberta Moore, "[Fair Housing Claims Made by Renters: Analysis of City Reported FY 2024–25, First 3 Quarters](#)" (PowerPoint presentation, May 2025)



CITY OF SAN JOSE, CALIFORNIA

Office of the City Clerk
200 East Santa Clara Street
San José, California 95113
Telephone (408) 535-1260
FAX (408) 292-6207

Toni J. Taber, MMC
City Clerk

August 5, 2026

I received over 150 letters with substantially the same content as the email attached to this cover memo.

To view all letters, please contact the City Clerk's office at city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov or come in person to:

City of San Jose
200 E Santa Clara Street
Tower, 14th floor
San José, CA 95113

Toni J. Taber, MMC
City Clerk



FW: Action Required: Hate Crime Charges for Santana Row Assault Case

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

Date Mon 7/6/2026 7:12 AM

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

-----Original Message-----

From: Heidi North [REDACTED]

Sent: Sunday, July 5, 2026 5:29 AM

To: senator.seyarto@senate.ca.gov; rob.bonta@doj.ca.gov; assemblymember.schultz@assembly.ca.gov; senator.arreguin@senate.ca.gov; assemblymember.alanis@assembly.ca.gov

Cc: District4 <District4@sanjoseca.gov>; City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>; senator.laird@senate.ca.gov; nathan.barankin@gov.ca.gov; District2 <District2@sanjoseca.gov>; District1 <district1@sanjoseca.gov>; District8 <district8@sanjoseca.gov>; ca16casework@mail.house.gov; District3 <district3@sanjoseca.gov>; District9 <district9@sanjoseca.gov>; The Office of Mayor Matt Mahan <mayor@sanjoseca.gov>; jimmy.panetta@mail.house.gov; senator.cortese@senate.ca.gov; District5 <District5@sanjoseca.gov>; senator.wahab@senate.ca.gov; assemblymember.ahrens@assembly.ca.gov; District 6 <district6@sanjoseca.gov>; assemblymember.pellerin@assembly.ca.gov; District7 <District7@sanjoseca.gov>; jrosen@dao.sccgov.org; assemblymember.kalra@assembly.ca.gov; District 10 <District10@sanjoseca.gov>; zoe.lofgren@mail.house.gov; assemblymember.lee@assembly.ca.gov
Subject: Action Required: Hate Crime Charges for Santana Row Assault Case

[External Email. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources. Learn more <<https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>>]

[You don't often get email from heidinorth@mac.com. Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

Note Additional Recipients: President Donald J. Trump, Vice President JD Vance, U.S. Attorney General Todd Blanche, Senior Counsel to the Assistant Attorney General for Civil Rights and Chair of the Justice Department Task Force on Antisemitism Leo Terrell, Governor Gavin Newsom, Senator Alex Padilla, Senator Adam Schiff, Chair of the California Senate Public Safety Committee Senator Jesse Arreguin, Chair of the California Assembly Public Safety Committee Assemblymember Nick Schultz, Christians United for Israel (CUFI), Members of the Press

Dear Attorney General Bonta,

I write to urge your office to review the prosecution of Bruneil Henry Chamaki and co-defendants Roma Akoyans and Ramon Akoyans prior to the July 23, 2026 hearing and to add a hate crime charge or hate crime enhancement under California law.

California Penal Code Section 422.6 prohibits a criminal act committed, in whole or in part, because of the victim's actual or perceived protected characteristic, including religion, nationality or national origin, race or ethnicity, or association with a protected group.

California Penal Code Section 422.55 defines a hate crime as a criminal act committed, in whole or in part, because of the victim's actual or perceived protected characteristic. [1] [2]

California Penal Codes Section 422.7 and Section 422.75 provide enhanced sentences for hate crimes. [3] [4]

California Rule of Court 4.427 was adopted to assist judges in sentencing felony hate crime cases, reflecting the state's recognition that such crimes warrant heightened attention at every stage of the proceeding. [5]

The allegations leading to the charges are as follows: On March 8, 2026, Bruneil Chamaki and two other assailants attacked two Jewish Americans who were speaking Hebrew -- conduct that San Jose Police Department officers formally classified as a hate crime in their official investigative report. The victims were punched and beaten in a group assault. Video footage shows that the perpetrators repeatedly punched the victims in the head and face and held their legs down to prevent them from running away. The three defendants screamed "F-- Jews" and "Don't f-- with Iran" while pummeling the Jewish men. One victim lost consciousness; both men were hospitalized. [6] [7]

Defendant Chamaki is an attorney who portrays himself as a tattoo-covered mixed martial arts fighter, who, on the day after the attack, posted a new tattoo on his upper arm, showing three skulls with knives in their jaws. Beneath the skulls is the Latin phrase "interfice hostem," meaning "kill the enemy." [8]

There is still time for prosecutors to complete a full review of the available video, witness statements, police reports, and any other documented evidence of anti-Jewish or anti-Israeli motive, and to amend the charging document to add a hate-crime count or enhancement. Treating this case with the seriousness it demands is crucial.

The reported evidence in this case, including the victims speaking Hebrew, anti-Jewish slurs, and a violent group assault, speaks directly to California's legal standard. California law recognizes that when violence is driven in whole or in part by anti-Jewish bias, the hate-based motive must also be addressed through the charging decision.

This issue carries consequences far beyond one criminal case. The U.S. Department of Justice recognizes that hate crimes carry broader harm than most offenses, affecting not only direct victims but also those who share their identity, their families, their communities, and at times the nation as a whole. When anti-Jewish violence is not charged in a manner that reflects its apparent bias motive, the resulting message to Jews is that they may be attacked for speaking Hebrew or being visibly identifiable as Jewish or Israeli without the full protection and recognition the law is meant to provide. [9]

That broader harm is not abstract. California's hate-crime system and public anti-hate resources exist

because bias-motivated violence intimidates entire communities and can normalize fear if it is minimized or mislabeled. Failing to pursue a hate-crime charge in a case with reported anti-Jewish slurs, identity-linked targeting, and a violent assault risks weakening public trust in the justice system and undermining the safety of Jews in San Jose, throughout California, and nationally.

This case therefore matters not only for the two men who were attacked, but also for the precedent it sets. San Jose is a major and diverse American city, and how its institutions respond to a reported antisemitic assault will be watched well beyond Santa Clara County. Charging this case in a way that accurately reflects any proven bias motive would send a clear message that anti-Jewish violence will be recognized and prosecuted for what it is. Failing to do so would send the opposite message.

For these reasons, I respectfully ask your office to review the available video and witness testimony and to add a hate crime charge or enhancement under California law before the July 23 hearing.

If the evidence shows that anti-Jewish or anti-Israeli bias played any part in the assault, then justice requires that the prosecution name the crime accordingly. At a minimum, this case warrants a full and transparent explanation of why the reported anti-Jewish and anti-Israeli evidence does not satisfy California's hate-crime standards.

The procedural history in this case makes for a critical moment. A review must be conducted immediately to ensure justice is done.

The reported facts in this case fit the framework for a hate crime, yet inexplicably no hate crime charge or enhancement has been issued against the assailants as of this date.

Sincerely,

Heidi North

References:

[1]https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displaySection.xhtml?lawCode=PEN§ionNum=422.55

[2]https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displaySection.xhtml?lawCode=PEN§ionNum=422.6

[3]https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displaySection.xhtml?lawCode=PEN§ionNum=422.7

[4]https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displaySection.xhtml?lawCode=PEN§ionNum=422.75

[5] https://courts.ca.gov/cms/rules/index/four/rule4_427

[6] <https://abc7news.com/post/caught-video-sjpd-investigating-possible-hate-crime-2-jewish-men-attacked-santana-row-san-jose/18700623/>

[7] <https://www.ktvu.com/news/santana-row-attck-no-hate-crime-charges>

[8] <https://jweekly.com/2026/05/11/israeli-santana-row-assault-victim-faces-trial-on-hate-crime-allegation-in-separate-case/>

[9] <https://www.justice.gov/hatecrimes/learn-about-hate-crimes>

Sent from my iPhone

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



Outlook

Fw: Ban City-Sponsored Travel to Israel

From Agendadesk <Agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov>**Date** Mon 6/22/2026 8:40 AM**To** Rules and Open Government Committee Agendas <rulescommitteeagenda@sanjoseca.gov>

From: City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>**Sent:** Monday, June 22, 2026 7:46 AM**To:** Agendadesk <Agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov>**Subject:** FW: Ban City-Sponsored Travel to Israel

From: Soluna Espinosa Pieb [REDACTED]**Sent:** Thursday, June 18, 2026 7:04 PM**To:** City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>**Subject:** Ban City-Sponsored Travel to Israel

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

San Jose City Clerk ,

I urge you to take action and ban city authorized travel to Israel. In 2022, the City Council blocked then Mayor Sam Liccardo from traveling to Qatar due to concerns about that country's human rights record, yet said nothing when he made a taxpayer-funded official trip to Israel in 2019. As Israel's extreme violations of human rights grow day by day, I ask that you act consistently and institute a policy ending official City travel to Israel.

Today, residents of San Jose are hurting, witnessing families and innocent civilians being killed by Israel in Gaza, the West Bank, and East Jerusalem. Over the past 100+ days, Israel has killed over 27,000 Palestinians, besieged educational, cultural, and medical institutions in Gaza, and committed countless human rights violations against the Palestinian people. According to the United Nations Human Rights Office in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, these violations include the targeted destruction of civilian infrastructure, the intentional deprivation of food, water, and healthcare from the civilian population of Gaza, and the indefinite detention of Gazans without trial.

In 2019, the City Council rejected then Mayor Liccardo's trip to Qatar based on a report by Amnesty International that Qatar had committed human rights abuses. Here is how

Amnesty International described Israel's human rights record before that country began its military invasion of Gaza:

"Israel's continuing oppressive and discriminatory system of governing Palestinians in Israel and the Occupied Palestinian Territories (OPT) constituted a system of apartheid, and Israeli officials committed the crime of apartheid under international law."

The Amnesty International report further noted that Israel has "imposed arbitrary restrictions on freedom of movement and closures that amounted to collective punishment" and employs "torture and other ill treatment" against Palestinian detainees. These are serious and ongoing human rights abuses that require our City to act consistently and institute a policy against official travel to Israel to avoid lending legitimacy to these unconscionable acts.

We cannot ignore the humanitarian crisis in Gaza. We need to see concrete action from the San Jose City Council to pressure Israel as it carries out a genocide with the U.S.'s financial and diplomatic backing. I ask that you safeguard our city's commitment to human rights just as you did in 2022. Ban city authorized travel to Israel now.

Soluna Espinosa Pieb



San Jose, California 95128



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



Fw: expanding the pavillion

From Agendadesk <Agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov>

Date Mon 6/22/2026 8:55 AM

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

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

Sent: Monday, June 22, 2026 7:55 AM

To: Agendadesk <Agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov>

Subject: FW: expanding the pavillion

From: L A Kurth [REDACTED]

Sent: Friday, June 19, 2026 7:22 PM

To: Councilmember George Casey <district10@sjdistrict10.org>

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

Subject: Re: expanding the pavillion

[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 councilors and mayor,

I'm concerned about the 93 trees many of them large heritage trees, that are scheduled to be destroyed to enlarge the st. James leavitt pavillion.

Surely we can do better than deal such a blow to our environment.

If the pavilion is going to be that big, will the park still be a public space at all? Will concerts always be free or will this public space be privatized once the PR is over ?

Where will crowds for No Kings rallies go?

San jose is already park-poor. Do we really need more concrete?

Lita Kurth

District 6

On Tue, Jun 16, 2026, 5:15 PM Councilmember George Casey <district10@sjdistrict10.org> wrote:

Fun Summer 2026 Events

TUESDAY, JUNE 16, 2026

[Follow Us](#)

[Contact Us](#)

Levitt Pavilion SJ — Free Concert Series

Free, family friendly concerts are back in St. James Park! The Friends of Levitt Pavilion San Jose welcome you to the lawn for 9 incredible concerts this summer, featuring regional jazz, blues, latin and souldies acts, and even a Prince tribute band! Food trucks, beer / wine garden, kids play area and terrific vibes are all provided. Bring a chair, blanket, and a few friends - and we guarantee you'll make some new ones.

[Learn More](#)

Make Music Day SJ

Make Music San Jose is a community curated celebration of music on June 21.

- All locations free and open to all.

- The District 10 locations are:

- Cahalan Park: 12 - 2 pm, West Valley College Bass Clarinet Quartet
- Glenview Park: 4 - 9 pm, ADB Karaoke group

[Learn More](#)

South Bay Soccer Fest

We are hosting a FIFA watch party at Almaden Lake Park on July 3 with Vice Mayor Pam Foley! Funded by San Jose Sports Authority.

- Free and open to all, no RSVP required!

Almaden Summer Concert Series

Located at Greystone Park on the corner of Mt. Carmel and Camden Avenue.

Dates: July 9, 16, 23, 30

Free and open to all, no RSVP required!

[D10 Website](#)

[City Website](#)

[View email in browser](#)

[Office of Council District 10 · 200 E Santa Clara Street · 18th Floor · San Jose, CA 95113 · USA](#)

[update your preferences or unsubscribe](#)

-
- [This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.](#)
-



Fw: Taxpayer's Protection Act Ballot Measure November 2-26

From Agendadesk <Agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov>

Date Tue 6/30/2026 8:36 AM

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

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

Sent: Monday, June 29, 2026 8:28 AM

To: Agendadesk <Agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov>

Subject: FW: Taxpayer's Protection Act Ballot Measure November 2-26

From: Ruth Callahan [REDACTED]

Sent: Saturday, June 27, 2026 3:58 PM

To: Foley, Pam <Pam.Foley@sanjoseca.gov>; Cohen, David <David.Cohen@sanjoseca.gov>; The Office of Mayor Matt Mahan <mayor@sanjoseca.gov>; CAO Main <cao.main@sanjoseca.gov>; Webmaster Manager <webmaster.manager@sanjoseca.gov>; City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>

Subject: Taxpayer's Protection Act Ballot Measure November 2-26

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

Dear Public Officials:

At a recent San Jose City Council meeting Pam Foley and David Cohen told a lie. A big fat one.

The hysteria of the two of them commenting that this Taxpayer Protection Act would threaten the budgets, cause grave harm to the ability of the city to function and devastate the welfare funds for the homeless is complete hyperbole.

The cries of panic, bemoaning the cession of tax revenue for housing, transportation and social welfare shortfalls is a **falsehood**.

Please read the summery of the text below and amend your lies and falsehoods.

1. Citizen-Initiated Special Taxes (The *Upland* Loophole)

- **What it targets:** Local special taxes (including some property-related taxes) that were passed via citizen initiatives with only a **simple majority (50% + 1)** rather than the traditional two-thirds supermajority.

- **The Retroactive Rule:** If approved by voters, the measure will **invalidate** any property-related special taxes previously adopted via citizen initiative with an approval rate *below* two-thirds.
- **The Grace Period:** These taxes do not become null and void overnight. **They are given a two-year sunset period (until December 31, two years post-enactment). During this window, local jurisdictions have the opportunity to place them back on the ballot to be reauthorized by a proper two-thirds vote.**

2. Charter City Real Estate Transfer Taxes

- **What it targets:** Real estate transfer taxes enacted by charter cities (such as Los Angeles's Measure ULA "mansion tax" or similar measures in cities like San Francisco, Berkeley, and Oakland) that exceed the standard statutory rate of 0.11% (\$0.275 per \$500 of value).
- **The Retroactive Rule:** The act prohibits charter cities from levying these higher local real estate transfer taxes.
- **The Grace Period:** **Similar to the special taxes, any existing charter city-only transfer taxes that exceed the limit will sunset and be invalidated two years following the enactment of the initiative.**

Summary: What is *Not* Voided?

- **Standard Bond Measures:** Traditional local bond measures (like school bonds) that already cleared their legally required voter thresholds (such as 55% for school bonds or two-thirds for general obligation bonds) are **not** affected or voided.
- **Taxes that met the 2/3 threshold:** Any local special tax or transfer tax that originally achieved a two-thirds supermajority vote will remain completely valid and intact.

Essentially, the act forces any local property-related special tax that bypassed the two-thirds rule via the citizen-initiative loophole to either win a two-thirds supermajority within two years or face invalidation.

I would suggest you get your Brown Acts together and you put a measure on the ballot and see if you can get it legally passed with 2/3's.

If not, the body politic wins and you lose.

It will be harder now that we have seen how the scurrilus Political Power Class has spent Measure E; the bond measures that didn't get 55% will be void as well.

I know that all the homeowners will be vote yes to stop the steal of our earned equity!

--

Ruth A Callahan

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



Fw: From Super Bowl Weekend to the World Cup: Request for a Public Town Hall on Downtown Safety

From Agendadesk <Agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov>

Date Thu 7/2/2026 8:33 AM

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

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

Sent: Thursday, July 2, 2026 7:35 AM

To: Agendadesk <Agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov>

Subject: FW: From Super Bowl Weekend to the World Cup: Request for a Public Town Hall on Downtown Safety

Public record?

From: Luis Santos [REDACTED] >

Sent: Wednesday, July 1, 2026 5:13 PM

To: The Office of Mayor Matt Mahan <mayor@sanjoseca.gov>; District3 <district3@sanjoseca.gov>; Maguire, Jennifer <jennifer.maguire@sanjoseca.gov>; CulturalAffairs <culturalaffairs@sanjoseca.gov>

Cc: City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>; District9 <district9@sanjoseca.gov>; District 10 <District10@sanjoseca.gov>; sanpedro@sjdowntown.com

Subject: From Super Bowl Weekend to the World Cup: Request for a Public Town Hall on Downtown Safety

[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](#)
July 1, 2026

Mayor Matt Mahan
Councilmember Anthony Tordillos (District 3)
City Manager Jennifer Maguire
Office of Cultural Affairs
San José Police Department Leadership

Re: Public Safety Concerns Following the June 30 World Cup Watch Party at San Pedro Square

Dear Mayor Mahan, Councilmember Tordillos, and City Officials,

I am a homeowner in downtown San José, living within walking distance of both San Pedro Square and San José State University. I am proud to call downtown home and support the City's efforts to create a vibrant urban core through cultural, sporting, and community events. First and foremost, my intent is not to discourage public celebrations. On the contrary, I want San José to continue hosting events that bring people together and highlight the best of our community.

However, vibrant public spaces and successful public events depend on a strong commitment to public safety. Effective event management requires more than reacting when violence or disorder occurs. It requires anticipating foreseeable risks, understanding crowd behavior, planning for safe movement and dispersal, and investing in preventive measures that protect residents, visitors, businesses, and first responders alike.

The violence that followed the Mexico Ecuador World Cup watch party on June 30 raises serious questions about whether the City adequately anticipated and planned for the risks associated with an extremely large and emotionally charged gathering. Reports indicate that two people were stabbed, arrests were made, an unlawful assembly was declared, and emergency responders encountered difficulties providing care.

My concern is not simply about criminal acts committed by individuals. My concern is whether the City's planning relied too heavily on reacting to disorder rather than preventing foreseeable risks.

This concern is heightened by a troubling pattern of serious incidents associated with major gatherings in downtown San José. Earlier this year, during Super Bowl weekend, two men were fatally shot near Paseo de San Antonio. That double homicide, combined with recent violence near the World Cup fan zone and the June 30 incident, raises legitimate questions about whether the City's public safety strategy is keeping pace with the scale of these events.

Given these concerns, I respectfully ask the City to answer the following questions:

1. What formal risk assessment was conducted before approving the June 30 watch party?
2. How were police, private security, and emergency medical staffing levels determined?
3. What crowd-capacity thresholds were established, and how was attendance monitored?
4. What dispersal strategy existed before the event began?
5. What lessons from recent downtown incidents, including the Super Bowl weekend double homicide, were incorporated into World Cup planning?
6. What changes will be implemented before future large public gatherings?

As a downtown resident, I want to feel confident that the City is applying lessons learned from these incidents and taking meaningful steps to improve public safety.

Rather than providing a written response to this letter, which I have shared with neighbors, downtown HOA representatives, and the Naglee Park CCA, I respectfully request that the City convene a public community meeting or town hall focused on public safety planning for major downtown events. Residents, business owners, public safety officials, and elected representatives should have an opportunity to openly discuss recent incidents, review lessons learned, and identify improvements before future events.

Transparency is essential to maintaining public trust. Residents deserve to understand what planning assumptions were made, what worked, what failed, and what specific changes will be implemented going forward. I therefore request that the City publicly release an after-action review and schedule a public meeting with opportunities for both in-person and virtual participation.

Thank you for your time and service to our community.

Respectfully,

Luis Santos-Koess
Downtown San José Resident

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

DATE: July 16, 2026

TO: STATE, CITY AND LOCAL OFFICIALS

**NOTICE OF PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY'S SHAREHOLDER AWARD
REQUEST FOR ITS CORE PROCUREMENT INCENTIVE MECHANISM (CPIM)
YEAR 30 APPLICATION TO THE CALIFORNIA PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
(CPUC) A.26-06-025**

What is Being Requested?

PG&E is requesting to allocate \$26.629 million as a shareholder award for savings achieved when purchasing natural gas for its core gas customers from November 1, 2022 – October 31, 2023 (CPIM Year 30). This request reflects PG&E's savings of approximately \$170 million for customers through gas procurement at the lowest reasonable cost. These natural gas purchases are reviewed under the CPIM, which encourages utilities to secure lower-priced natural gas and share savings with customers and shareholders.

How Would This Impact the Typical Residential Customer?

If the request is approved, a typical residential customer using 31 therms per month would see a rate increase of approximately \$.41 per month. The actual impact will vary based 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 the utility's request and make public comment by visiting apps.cpuc.ca.gov/c/A2606025. 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.26-06-025 in any communication with the CPUC.

Questions About the Request

Detailed rate information will be sent directly to customers in a bill insert in July 2026.

If you have questions about PG&E's request, 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
Core Procurement Incentive Mechanism Year 30 Application (**A.26-06-025**)
P.O. Box 1018
Oakland, CA 94604-1018

Message paid for by customers.

RECEIVED
SAN JOSE CITY CLERK
2026 JUL 21 AM 10:12

PL

Ma. I