

From: Todd G. Glanz <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, July 26, 2022 3:38 PM
To: CityClerk <CityClerk@chulavistaca.gov>
Subject: Council members: Re. Agenda Item 7.2 7-26-22:

**Warning:
External
Email**

Please consider the proposal for ballot measures as ill-advised, at this time at least. Though drafted and desired by the City Attorney, the proposals have not been fully vetted with the due diligence required. For instance, amendments proposed regarding Legislative Counsel, and the suspension of any Councilmember who is accused of wrongdoing though Not convicted, have Not been actually discussed by the Charter Review Commission, Nor made available for any public input whatsoever.

The materials about the past (not current members) City Council and Commission deliberations, were not discussed or addressed at all by the Charter Review Commission, nor the public. The proposal to do away with the option for Legislative Counsel is in effect a rescission of the Charter that was fully deliberated by the public, and Council, a few years ago. The fact, for instance, that that provision mirrors that provided for California State Legislators, clearly was not presented to and in turn not known or understood, by any City Commission, nor the public.

The proposed amendments will cost the City Citizens hundreds of thousands of dollars, to millions of dollars, just to be placed on the ballot.

There will be a completely new council (4 out of 5 members), and City Attorney, in just over 3 months. The proposed amendments should be considered by the council who will be taking over in a short while, as well as the public, if not the Charter Review Commission.

Other proposals for an updated Charter that are desired by many citizens and constituents, but have not been provided the time to even address, let alone delineate the facts and logic and air the different viewpoints necessary for due diligence deliberation, include residency requirements addressing carpetbagging, a ranked voting type of system, citizens districts like those that exist for the other cities in the county, and more.

With all due respect, the rush to ballot is not necessary, and would be fiscally reckless as well.

Thank you, and I remain,

Sincerely,

Todd G. Glanz, Esq.