

**From:** [elita](#)  
**To:** [City Clerk](#)  
**Subject:** Feedback on the proposed commenting suspension  
**Date:** Monday, October 21, 2024 11:53:15 AM

---

City Council,

I am writing to express my concern regarding the proposed extension of the Zoom/phone commenting suspension. As a resident of San Pablo, I believe it is essential that we maintain open lines of communication between our community and its leaders. We should be encouraging participation, not limiting it. Remote commenting is a vital avenue for residents to share their thoughts, and it is particularly important for those who face barriers to in-person attendance.

Accessibility should be a fundamental consideration in our city's governance. Many residents (myself included) have legitimate reasons for preferring remote participation, including health issues, caregiving responsibilities, or transportation challenges. For individuals with disabilities or those who cannot easily access city facilities, remote commenting ensures their voices are still heard. Extending this ban disregards the needs of a significant portion of our community and creates an inequitable situation where only those who can attend in person are able to directly engage. How does this "better serve our San Pablo community," as the City Manager claims?

Additionally, I find it concerning that the justification for this ban is unclear, broad, and mostly based on other cities' experiences and decisions. We can't claim that a ban is necessary to "conduct orderly public meetings," when we haven't proven that remote commenting is inevitably disorderly.

You said that the city "highly encourages" engagement and wants our input on this decision. So I hope you actually listen.

**From:** [joey](#)  
**To:** [City Clerk](#)  
**Subject:** Public Comment on the Remote Participation Ban  
**Date:** Monday, October 21, 2024 11:25:34 AM

---

I am a resident of San Pablo, and I wish to express my strong opposition to the proposed extension of the suspension of remote commenting at city meetings. Extending this suspension to April will effectively impose a one-and-a-half-year ban, which is hardly a "temporary" measure.

The memo from the city manager mentions that other cities are experiencing a "barrage of hate speech." This is the same concern he raised last year and again in April. However, there is no evidence to suggest that such "Zoom bombing" remains a widespread issue.

Regardless, it is essential that we base our decisions on the actual experiences of our city, rather than comparisons with others. Firstly, we have not allowed remote engagement for an entire year, so we do not truly understand what it would look like now in San Pablo. Secondly, the city manager has not provided evidence that hate speech has ever been a problem during our meetings. In fact, his email on March 14 mentioned that the extension was necessary due to potential participation from "Stop Cop City protestors and Palestine/Gaza advocates." This raises a troubling question: do differing opinions or critiques of the city equate to hate speech in your view? Are residents not allowed to express dissent or critique city decisions?

I urge you to reconsider this extension and prioritize inclusivity and transparency in our city's governance. Please do not silence our voices.

**From:** [Cordell Hindler](#)  
**To:** [City Clerk](#)  
**Subject:** Public Comments not on the Agenda  
**Date:** Wednesday, October 16, 2024 6:04:04 PM

---

Hello Leticia,

I AM Submitting the following comments into the record:

1. the Council is Invited to the women's day luncheon & expo on November 10th 2024

12:00 to 4:00 PM Pinole Senior Center

\$40.00 per person

2. Also the council Is Invited to a Performance of Much ado about Nothing October 24-26th 7:00 PM

Salesian College Prep \$15.00 per person

Sincerely  
Cordell