

From: [Celina Tracy](#)
To: [Council, City](#)
Subject: oppose exec orders!
Date: Monday, February 24, 2025 10:24:37 AM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Be cautious of opening attachments and clicking on links.

Dear Mayor and Members of the Palo Alto City Council,

I am writing to express my strong support for the resolution opposing recent executive orders from former President Trump, as referenced in the Palo Alto Online article dated February 14, 2025. I urge you to take a firm stand in defense of our community's values of democracy, inclusion, and human rights.

These executive orders threaten the fundamental freedoms and protections that make Palo Alto a welcoming and just place for all. Now more than ever, it is essential that our local government acts decisively to protect our residents and push back against policies that undermine our shared values.

I commend the City Council for taking a leadership role in resisting unjust federal actions and ensuring that Palo Alto remains a city that values equity, diversity, and the rule of law. Please continue to stand strong in the face of these challenges and do everything in your power to uphold the rights and dignity of all members of our community.

Thank you for your commitment to justice and fairness. I respectfully urge you to pass this resolution and take further steps to shield our city from harmful federal overreach.

Sincerely,
Celina Tracy
671 Bryson Ave., Palo Alto

From: [Andrew Bianco](#)
To: [Council, City](#)
Subject: City Council Meeting 2/24 -- Item 8 Comment
Date: Monday, February 24, 2025 12:42:55 AM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Be cautious of opening attachments and clicking on links.

Hello, I live in Palo Alto, and I'm writing to express my support for Item 8 on tomorrow's agenda, "Resolution Underscoring Council's Commitment to Sustaining Palo Alto Values and Interests in the Face of Trump Administration Actions."

It's important to take an early stand against tyranny and remember to not comply in advance. There are real people in our community that are at risk of being impacted by flagrant and illegal abuses of power by the Trump Administration.

Thank you,
- Andrew Bianco

From: [Annette Glanckopf](#)
To: [Council, City](#); [Clerk, City](#)
Subject: Item 8 on tomorrow council agenda - colleague memo.
Date: Sunday, February 23, 2025 8:11:19 PM
Attachments: [Memo to Palo Alto City Council Regards Colleague Memo item 8.docx](#)

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Be cautious of opening attachments and clicking on links.

Please read my comments attached.

I feel the memo, in its present form, will do more harm than good.

Please do not approve.....

Annette Glanckopf

Memo to Palo Alto City Council Regards Colleague Memo item 8

February 24, 2025

Dear Mayor Lauing and Council,

I am very concerned about the colleagues memo and suggest not approving it or a more positive rewrite.

Although I agree with the sentiments, I don't think there are imminent actions that will directly effect Palo Alto on the table now that require a memo? I feel that the tone is confrontational and hostile. Trump has his eye on California and Silicon Valley. Do we really want to put a "bulls eye" on our city.

Yes we do need to make sure that Palo Alto is protected, but is this the best route and best timing? Council needs to consider the timing and ask what funding could we possibly not get – I suggest that Public Safety funding is vulnerable especially for fire ?

I am not sure what this memo hopes to achieve, and I fear reprisals.

I ask you to reject this memo – or consider a rewrite with a more positive tone.

Annette Glanckopf

From: [Sheri Furman](#)
To: [Council, City](#)
Subject: Re: Item 8 Colleagues Memo
Date: Sunday, February 23, 2025 7:25:52 PM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from sher11@earthlink.net. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Mayor Lauing and Council Members,

Sorry to be so blunt, but this action is totally unnecessary and simply smacks of virtual signaling.

We have enough issues to focus on rather than wasting your and staff's time.

Please don't proceed with this.

Respectfully,
Sheri Furman

From: [Kat Snyder](#)
To: [Council, City](#)
Subject: Public Comment: Item 8 Resolution
Date: Sunday, February 23, 2025 6:19:18 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Be cautious of opening attachments and clicking on links.

Dear City Council,

I appreciate you for crafting this resolution. I particularly appreciate the data privacy section. Things have been moving very quickly on a national scale. We now know ICE is not just arresting and deporting criminals, but often folks that are just easy to locate via surveillance technology (e.g. folks wearing ankle monitors as they wait for asylum hearings). So, I'd ask for more emphasis on the surveillance technology part of our Surveillance and Privacy Protection Ordinance within this resolution.

In my December 2nd public comment on the Police Department's Flock contract, I think some of my concerns may have seemed hypothetical. I'm copying that email below for reference, because I find those concerns even more pressing today.

Thanks for your time,
~Kat Snyder
Palo Alto Resident

I have concerns about expanding our use of Flock cameras, particularly in the current political climate. When the Trump administration takes over, we will have more surveillance around women's doctor appointments and around immigrants living their lives. As a Sanctuary city and county, I worry that setting up the infrastructure for this surveillance can easily lead to it being used for purposes we didn't choose.

The ACLU warns against using Flock cameras - they note that the default use of Flock sets up a nationwide surveillance network that can be accessed by more than just law enforcement - in fact, private entities can make their own "hot lists." Flock wants to become the default surveillance system for law enforcement across the country and sharing data with their customers all across the country is part of their competitive advantage.

I'm grateful that we chose much more stringent data management than the default but I'm worried that it clashes with Flock's bottom line. How do we know that, when it comes down to it, they will respect our data privacy? I say this because a few years ago Palantir swore that their products were not used by ICE when, in fact, they were behind the largest immigration enforcement workplace raid in US history.

What verification systems do we have set up to make sure Flock is doing what they say? Once the cameras are in place, do we have a way to verify that the data they collect (license plate, make/model, color, bumper stickers) cannot expand beyond that to, for example, facial recognition? The company plans to enter into facial recognition and other AI/ML spaces, so this is not just an idle question.

There are many more concerns about Flock but in the interest of keeping this brief, I will just drop a link to the ACLU's white paper on Flock in case it is of interest:

https://www.aclu.org/wp-content/uploads/publications/flock_1.pdf

Take care,
~Kat Snyder
Palo Alto Resident

P.S. According to [an article that just came out 2 hours ago](#), Flock says they "don't entertain hypotheticals" when asked whether they would engage in a contract pertaining to mass deportations.

From: [Nichole Boaz](#)
To: [Council, City](#)
Subject: City Council Meeting 2/24 -- Item 8 Comment
Date: Sunday, February 23, 2025 3:19:47 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Be cautious of opening attachments and clicking on links.

Hello,

I live in Palo Alto, and I'm writing to express my support for Item 8 on tomorrow's agenda, "Resolution Underscoring Council's Commitment to Sustaining Palo Alto Values and Interests in the Face of Trump Administration Actions."

While this resolution is mostly symbolic, rather than substantive, it is still important. I am worried about my neighbors who have already been directly impacted by the Trump Administration's illegal overreaches: federal workers; undocumented immigrants; and the myriad of industries that rely on federal grants for funding. It's important for people who are living in fear to know that their local elected officials will do their best to support and protect them.

I understand that some people may think this resolution is a bad idea because it will only serve to draw the negative attention of Trump administration officials. I think the opposite: it is now more important than ever to make it clear what we Palo Altans stand for, and what lines we will not cross. I would encourage you to think of a phrase I've been seeing a lot lately: "do not comply in advance."

This does not mean it will be easy to stand up to the Trump administration. There is a real risk of federal backlash to this kind of resolution. But that risk should not stop you from doing the right thing.

In the future, I hope to see even more substantive action from the city council. In particular, I am concerned about Elon Musk and his "DOGE" task force, which has illegally gained unprecedented access to financial records. While this is a federal issue, the fact that Tesla's engineering HQ is located in Palo Alto makes this a local issue as well. Elon Musk is an unelected official who is in charge of an illegal government takeover, and he should not be allowed to operate his businesses in our city.

Thank you.

-Nichole Boaz

From: a_m_mason@yahoo.com
To: [Council, City](#)
Subject: Strong Support for Resolution Opposing Trump's Executive Orders
Date: Sunday, February 23, 2025 1:45:42 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Be cautious of opening attachments and clicking on links.

Dear Mayor Lauing and Members of the Palo Alto City Council,

I am writing to express my strong support for the resolution opposing recent executive orders from former President Trump, as referenced in the Palo Alto Online article dated February 14, 2025. I urge you to take a firm stand in defense of our community's values of democracy, inclusion, and human rights.

These executive orders threaten the fundamental freedoms and protections that make Palo Alto a welcoming and just place for all. Now more than ever, it is essential that our local government acts decisively to protect our residents and push back against policies that undermine our shared values.

I commend the City Council for taking a leadership role in resisting unjust federal actions and ensuring that Palo Alto remains a city that values equity, diversity, and the rule of law. Please continue to stand strong in the face of these challenges and do everything in your power to uphold the rights and dignity of all members of our community.

Thank you for your commitment to justice and fairness. I respectfully urge you to pass this resolution and take further steps to shield our city from harmful federal overreach.

Sincerely,
A. Mason
a_m_mason@ieee.org

From: [Tasha Souter](#)
To: [Council, City](#)
Subject: Strong support for resolution opposing trumps's executive orders
Date: Sunday, February 23, 2025 1:26:50 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Be cautious of opening attachments and clicking on links.

Dear Mayor Lauing and Members of the City Council,

I am writing to express my strong support for the resolution opposing recent executive orders from president Trump. I urge you to take a firm stand in defense of our community's values grounded in democracy, inclusion, and human rights.

These executive orders threaten the fundamental freedoms and protections that make Palo Alto a welcoming and just place for all. Now, more than ever, it is vital that our local government act decisively to protect our residents and push back against policies that harm our community and undermine our shared values.

I commend the City Council for showing moral leadership for resisting unjust federal actions and taking steps to ensure that Palo Alto remains a place that values equity, diversity, and the rule of law. Please continue to stand strong in the face of these challenges and to do everything in your power to uphold the rights and dignity of all members of our community and to resist the current trend toward fascism, oligarchy, elitism, discrimination and greed.

I respectfully urge you to pass this resolution and take further steps to protect our community and our values.

Sincerely,

Tasha Souter

Baker Avenue, Palo Alto

souter9000@gmail.com

From: [Cindy Nelson](#)
To: [Council, City](#)
Subject: I support the anti-authoritarian resolution
Date: Sunday, February 23, 2025 8:46:20 AM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Be cautious of opening attachments and clicking on links.

Palo Alto City Council:

As a 40 year citizen of Palo Alto, and a believer in resurrecting democratic America, I emphatically support The City of Palo Alto's resolution to publicly state and engage in support for the rule of law and values that keep our city safe, peaceful, and in line with the United States Constitution.

In the bay area, we have several billionaire elitists who seem to have concluded that it's okay to use their fortune, forgetting that it was mostly earned off the back of many others' work, to dominate others who disagree with them. They unfairly grab power, money and influence for their own extravagant whims, ignoring their responsibility to now work even harder to further the ideals and laws of the United States of America, to preserve and improve the democratic system that allowed them to invent products and bring them to market, and therefore become extraordinarily wealthy.

It has become clear that absolute power, money, and fame corrupts absolutely. Once-principled tech billionaires, with no one willing to question or resist their strange and hostile ideas and actions, often fall into a society-damaging addiction to "more money, fame and power" at all costs, and a belief of one's own superiority that justifies illegal and immoral decision-making.

The current explicitly corrupt administration is led by a self-proclaimed "king," and a billionaire hacker who wants to remove safety and environmental regulations that get in the way of his own companies' and his personal profits. The hacker, who at one time invented a revolutionizing car that offered huge potential benefits to the earth, has turned his back on democratic America that (in retrospect dangerously) allowed his accumulation of billions.

Dismantling Democracy, Pretending to Save Money

This administration is illegally attempting to dismantle the US government without any oversight, and is damaging our democratic system irreparably. They pretend to cut "waste," misrepresenting millions as billions to lie to the public. Make no mistake, they instead are plotting to slash taxes as early as March 14 on the wealthiest Americans, including themselves, so that they can become richer. Two yachts are clearly better than one, while the less-privileged masses work for pittance wages and try to keep their children fed.

This dominance by morally corrupt and money-addicted billionaires is exactly what our Founding Fathers warned us against: they referred to it as tyranny.

Advancing White Supremacist Agendas

Donald Trump, Elon Musk, and his White-Nationalist packed cabinet and staff of Project 2025 architects, led by Russell Voght, Stephen Miller, and most recently, Darren Beattie, are attempting to destroy the American ideal of liberty, equality, and freedom. They are supporting the firing of not just important and necessary civil servants, like the FAA staff, the Nuclear Energy safety staff, but are now explicitly going after women and people of color who hold positions of power.

Using Money to Win is Un-American

They are not only dismantling important democratic voting laws in order to allow their minority perspectives to dominate our country on an ongoing basis, they are holding Republican senators hostage to their demands for 100% alignment with the would-be king, and financing both existential and political primary threats using an un-elected billionaire's cash donations. Colluding with them are several corrupted and dishonored, but still acting Supreme Court Justices who have proven themselves complicit in their attempts to steal democratic elections.

The list of unlawful executive actions add up to an obvious attempt to curtail the balancing influence of

the United States voting population, the House of Representatives, the Senate, and the Judiciary that was so carefully crafted JUST to avoid the the selfish and society-killing unilateral governance of King George, and any who might try to follow in his footsteps.

It is time to stand up and resist this regime with every bit of energy and commitment we can muster.

Cynthia Nelson

SECTION 1. The City Council of the City of Palo Alto, consistent with our statement of values, hereby • Supports the rule of law, in contrast to the Administration's actions ignoring constitutional and other legal norms; already necessitating the filing of numerous lawsuits to restrain such behavior. • Strongly opposes freezing federal grant funding or cancelling federal contracts upon which the City government or residents rely, such as Community Development Block Grants for local human services nonprofits, COPS funding, and airport and grade separation grants. Palo Alto has recently received grants from HUD, DOI, DOJ, DOT, Treasury, NEH, HHS, and Homeland Security; • Supports federal workers providing valuable services for the City and its residents, such as the critical safety services provided by the Federal Aviation Administration; and denounces attempts to subvert the civil service system with unlawful terminations; and further denounces disregard for the critical expertise of government workers; • Denounces reversing climate action and environmental justice policies, such as pulling out of the Paris Accords and ramping up oil and gas production on federal lands, and opposes attempts to limit local authority to address climate change; NOT YET APPROVED • Supports the safety of sensitive data of the City, our residents, and our businesses, and objects to improper access to critical information that violates privacy rights and risks misuse of valuable proprietary information; • Opposes threatening the safety of Palo Altans by diminishing the ability of the FBI and CIA to respond to security threats, protect innovation, and prevent domestic terrorism; • Supports science and denounces replacing experts with lay decision makers on issues of scientific protocol and funding priorities; • Strongly objects to any illegal and inhumane immigration enforcement; and • Supports equity and racial justice and commits to continuing the City's DEI efforts and priority to be a place of belonging for all. SECTION 2. In furtherance of these positions, the City will • Share this Resolution with our Congressional representatives and offer our support to advocate for these principles • Communicate with residents about risks to the City and its residents due to Administration activity inconsistent with these positions, and about the City's response; • Seek Council approval to bring or join lawsuits or file or join in amicus briefs consistent with these positions, our statement of values, and council-approved legislative guidelines; and • Support other cities and counties taking similar actions, and partner with others to build collective action.

From: [Douglas Moran](#)
To: [Council, City](#)
Subject: RE: Colleague's Memo, Item #8 on the 2025-02-25 City Council Agenda,
Date: Sunday, February 23, 2025 5:21:35 AM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Be cautious of opening attachments and clicking on links.

Honorable City Council members:
RE: Colleague's Memo, Item #8 on the 2025-02-25 City Council Agenda

I strongly urge you to vote down the proposed resolution: It is entirely inappropriate to be endorsed as representing the City of Palo Alto and its residents. It is blatantly a partisan document, the sort that candidates issue as a reaffirmation of fealty to their national Party's agenda and dogma.

This proposed resolution seems little more than a regurgitation of Democratic Party talking points.

- The source is not credible. Do you want to put the City adjacent to that reputation. Talking points are designed to be persuasive and can be expected to have a little sloppiness with facts. However, that's not what I hear: It's smears and too many statements ranging from disingenuous to deceptive to ones long proven to be false (aka lies). Eventually the admonition kicks in:
"Assume they are lying. It saves time."
- I don't see thought given to what message will be received by people *"outside the filter bubble"/"true believers"*. Basic PR training is that it can easily be contrary to what was intended.
- I don't see positions that have been adapted to the news in the first month of the Trump administration.
- Some of the bullet points display rank hypocrisy beyond partisanship into cluelessness.

The details (below) are very long and I have negligible expectation that Council members will have time to read them. A goal is to have in the public record a sense of what was known at the time this resolution was debated.

The tone of this letter is intentionally mocking, to illustrate a likely category of responses should this become an official resolution.

Warning: The Republican Party is irrelevant to my discussion here. Nothing I say or don't say should be interpreted as flowing from my attitude toward that Party.

Details related to the bullet points in Section 1

Bullet 1: *"Supports the rule of law, in contrast to the Administration's actions ignoring constitutional and other legal norms; already necessitating the filing of numerous lawsuits to restrain such behavior."*

- **Message:**

Don't waste time reading the resolution! If you are interested in this topic, you will almost certainly have heard versions of the bullet points many times already.

— OR —

"Everything's been said, but not everybody has said it." - Congressman Morris "Mo" Udall (D-AZ, 1961-1991).

- **Message:** This is intended only as propaganda.
 - Contrary to the desired inference, the filing of a lawsuit is not evidence that an action was illegal/improper. Some of these lawsuits are being dismissed as frivolous. Is it credible that an entity that for years has engaged in non-stop lawfare as a substitute for persuasion wouldn't continue to do so?
It's so easy to go "*judge shopping*", that is, find a "*friendly*" judge — so much easier than winning elections.
 - What is the credible basis for the claim that Trump has ignored the US Constitution? A partisan claiming a violation is hardly enough: It could be a smear or a display of willful ignorance.
- "*Supports the rule of law*" is rank hypocrisy. Where were the resolutions in response to the many of the Biden administration? (crickets)
An appendix lists some of the *low-lights*.

Bullet 2: Opposes freezing grants or contracts. The initial examinations are finding massive fraud, with grants and contracts being used like shell corporations in classic money laundering schemes.

Ask yourselves: "*Just how are the reformers going to quickly distinguish the legitimate operations from ones that are part of the frauds??*" Examples:

- The US Treasury has thwarted oversight for decades by having incomplete and inadequate records of payments.
- US Agency for International Development (U.S.A.I.D. or USAID but not US AID) was created to primarily provide coordinated covers for covert and some overt activities by the CIA, State Department, Defense Department, ... This has not been a secret for decades, but the lure of money intended to corrupt important people in target countries can be too much for those people to resist.
 - It has large networks of "*Non-Government Organizations*" (NGO) whose interrelationships are similar to those in sophisticated money-laundering scheme. Funding does not simply go through a chain of *pass-throughs*. Money flows to the pass-throughs from multiple sources and is sent on to multiple other pass-throughs where it is intermingled with funds from other pass-throughs and sources.
 - USAID has defied and thwarted attempts at Congressional oversight for years. Where there is that much money — \$40 billion annually — sloshing around in such circumstances, is it only an invitation or an outright inducement for frauds, be they massive or more modest.
 - USAID has funded media outlets in other countries as part of influence operations and as part of efforts to create events leading to *regime change*. As a result of the freeze, it became public that USAID was the crucial funder for most media outlets in Ukraine.

Also discovered was how much USAID was running "*influence operations*" **in the US**. Politico and the NY Times are prominently mentioned as receiving moneys through channels in addition to grants.

Question for City Council members: What if you discovered that City Staff diverting public moneys to support the election campaigns of opponents??

- The new head of the US EPA (Environmental Protection Agency) just announced finding

a \$2 Billion grant to Stacy Abrams, a prominent Democratic Party politician. That \$2B was to be passed through to other groups. The EPA head claimed that the contracts with those secondary recipients were written to impede/prevent oversight of where the money then went and how that money was used.

- A long-time complaint has been that no matter how much money is spent on social welfare programs, the problem just keeps getting worse.
No surprise: Such programs are designed with incentives to achieve these negative results. The programs are suppose to fail, but not so badly that they are terminated. This enables fat salaries and benefits for the CEO and staff as well as benefits to associates.
- Take a lesson from Mark Zuckerberg's attempt to improve the public schools in Newark NJ. He contributed \$100M and raised another \$100M. The assessment was that it made little difference, with virtually none of that \$200M made it down to the level of the students.

Message: Fiduciary Responsibilities/Duties are implicitly rejected.

The Democratic Party talking point in response to a report of a discovery of \$20B fraud was *"It's only 1% of the budget."*

- Being dismissive of this report strongly implies that there are many more multi-billion dollar instances of fraud, abuse and waste to come.
- The dismissive attitude underlying such excuses are not to be condone, regardless of the percentage involved.
- The talking point is disingenuous, if not outright deceptive. The budget is dominated by non-discretionary items: entitlements, interest payments, ... Then remove defense spending from the calculation and the percentage becomes significant.

Why *"implicit"*? It was licensed by the relationship/entwinement with other Democratic Party talking points included in this resolution.

Bullet 3: Support federal workers: Again, unwarranted assumptions.

The Democratic Party supports the **primacy** of professional staff/bureaucrats over elected officials and by extension, the citizenry. Office holders can become hostages to the need for staff to make them look good at a cost of not pushing accountability from the professional/permanent staff.

The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) is cited explicitly. The recent mid-air collision over Washington DC killed 67 people. A nation-wide shortage of air traffic controllers was tentatively cited as a contributing cause. What caused that shortage? The Obama administration changed the application process to promote diversity. Having experience as an air traffic controller in the military or being a pilot no longer mattered. What did? Playing multiple sports in high school, for example. The discrimination lawsuit is still working its way through the courts.

Bullet 9: Support for continuing DEI.

A viral moment during the LA fires came when a woman complained about firefighters that lacked the strength to carry her husband out of a burning building. The Deputy Chief heading the Equity and Human Resources Bureau flippant reply was *"He got himself in the wrong place if I have to carry him out of a fire."*

Message: Did the bullet point give any hint of awareness of the major problems with DEI? The first step to solving a problem is to recognize what it is.

I am personally appalled by the current version and practice of DEI: At its core is the subordination of the individual to the identity group. However, I recognize that this area elects officials that campaign on these policies. Joe Biden was elected promising to revoke Trump's

Executive Order #13950 "*Executive Order on Combating Race and Sex Stereotyping*" and he did so on his first day in office.

To understand my perspective, and probably that of many others, consider what was so important and urgent for Democrats to reinstate:

- Revoke Trump's ban on teaching "*one race or sex is inherently superior to another race or sex.*"
- **Revoke** the ban on promoting within the Federal Government "*divisive concepts*" such as
 - "*an individual should be discriminated against or receive adverse treatment solely or partly because of his or her race or sex*";
 - "*an individual, by virtue of his or her race or sex, bears responsibility for actions committed in the past by other members of the same race or sex*";
 - "*meritocracy or traits such as a hard work ethic are racist or sexist, or were created by a particular race to oppress another race*".

I blogged about this after it was a topic in the first Presidential Debate (2020-09-29):

<https://www.paloaltoonline.com/blogs/p/2020/10/01/the-most-important-question-and-biggest-lie-of-the-presidential-debate--relevance-to-palo-alto>

Bullet 8: Immigration enforcement

Solid majorities of Democrats in both houses of Congress and repeatedly voted against the *Laken Riley Act* — Laken Riley was the Georgia nursing student raped and murdered by an illegal alien (official legal term) who had previously been arrested. After horrific crimes by illegal aliens, some leaders of the Democratic can be expected to be all over the media pronouncing the crime to be an isolated incident that shouldn't affect immigration policy. Since the current enforcement is directed at violent illegal aliens, the **message** of this bullet point is to leave these people roaming the US. Implicit is that the lives of their victims count for nothing.

"How you spend your money reveals your priorities."

Remember that the Biden administration paid to have these illegal aliens brought into the US — how many known violent criminals were among them? Remember that Latin American countries used this as an opportunity to empty their jails.

Similarly FEMA (Federal Emergency Management Agency) sent millions to New York City to house illegal aliens in a hotel. Who else needed that support? The victims of Hurricane Helene (2024-09-27) who are still struggling with basics, such as inadequate shelter.

Bullet 6: "*Opposes ... diminishing the ability of the FBI and CIA to respond to security threats, ... and prevent domestic terrorism*"

This clause is simultaneously **outrageous** and an embarrassment. It falsely implies a controversy will ignoring what they actually are. For me, this crosses the line out of being disingenuous to being deceptive.

- Both the FBI and CIA have interfered in US elections, most notably the Presidential elections of 2016 and 2020 and some in 2024.
 - The Hunter Biden laptop: The FBI had it in their custody for eleven months and revealed nothing. The CIA successfully discredited the story, but the super-expediting the approval of the letter from 51 former and current high-level officials. Polling after the election estimated that enough people would have changed their votes to have reversed the result.
 - August 2022 raid on Trump's Mar-a-Lago home: The FBI planted evidence — "*Top Secret*" cover sheets and rearranged the documents and document boxes for a photo-

- op.
- Shortly before the 2020 election, the FBI announced it had thwarted a plot to kidnap Michigan Governor Whitmer. A local reporter sensed that something wasn't right: The 12 who had played significant roles were not indicted. Among the 6 who were was the purported leader who was dubbed "*Captain Autism*" and spent most of his time smoking pot in the basement of a sewing machine shop out of the generosity of the owner. Digging further, the 12 were found to be FBI assets and 2 FBI agents.
Lesson: It's easy to break up a criminal operation if you (law enforcement) are its leaders, funders, recruiters, trainers, planners, reconnaissance, ...
 - In the past 10 years, the FBI has been actively interfering with Trump, both as a candidate and as President.
 - The FBI is a major participant in suppressing dissent by everyday Americans. The scariest of these is the FBI adopting tactics used by the secret police in authoritarian regimes. (see appendix).

Bullet 7: "*Supports science and denounces replacing experts with lay decision makers on issues of scientific protocol and funding priorities*"

Were you not paying attention during Covid and to the many revelations coming from FOIA and elsewhere. The "*experts*" turned out to be frequently wrong, or making pronouncements of fact when there was not evidence and tout junk science over proper science. They rejected important discoveries from elsewhere such as Israel and Denmark. They sabotaged data collection by incentivizing both over-reporting and under-reporting. And rejecting evidence that didn't fit their narrative. A biologist-commentator observed that the experts were so consistently wrong that it being by accident was implausible.

The history of science is so littered with instances of a field's establishment suppressing results and analysis that undermined their theories.

"*Science advances/progresses funeral by funeral*" (many variations).

It was outsiders — your "*lay decision maker*" who "*got it right*". It was statisticians, embalmers, scientists in related fields who read pre-prints from all over the world. It was everyday people researching their medical problems and quickly discovering many others with similar issues that the experts were ignoring or dismissing figments of their imagination and such. In some cases, it was non-US reporters noticing that something didn't make sense and pursuing it.

But the resolution advocates returning the decision-making to those who have financial, professional, reputational interest, who are driven by ego, and whose decisions are driven by factors other than science.

The US NIH circumvented the US ban on gain-of-function research and funded it at the Wuhan lab that had been built to be BSL level 4 (BioSafety Level) but was operating only at BSL 2, which is roughly equivalent to your local dentist's office. Inspectors from the US State Department reported this problem, but as far as what is public, nothing was done.

Science requires observing, questioning and debating. "*Established science*" and "*consensus*" are politics, not science.

The concentration of funding to a very small group has a distorting effect. In medicine, it is the triumvirate of NIH (National Institutes of Health), Bill Gates (Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation) and the Wellcome Trust (Britain).

The experts in virology and their funders conspired — by telephone and email — to suppress

the likely origins of the COVID-19 virus and thereby hindering research into its creation and evolution. The cooperated in blocking effective treatments. And ...

The resolution advocates returning to a funding structure that failed so catastrophically, resulting in the deaths of millions.

Appendix: Some highlights of the lawlessness of the Biden administration

- Biden issued and tried to execute multiple *Executive Orders* (EO) that he acknowledged were un-Constitutional.
- No adherence to equality before the law on political and ideological matters.
- Rejection of the social covenant in which the individual cedes to the state the administration of justice in exchange for the state's protection.
Example: In the run-up to the overturning of *Roe v. Wade* demonstrators gather outside the homes of Supreme Court justices expected to vote to overturn. This was explicitly illegal, intended to isolate justices from intimidation and other forms of influence. There was no attempt to enforce the law or even push back the demonstrators. One potential assassin was persuaded by a family member (sister?) to surrender himself.
- Biden attempted to arrogate to himself the ability to amend to the Constitution.
- Suppression of free speech by pressuring social media to ban or de-rank opinions and discussions contrary to the Biden administration's own narrative.
- Hostility to religion both in worship and in rejecting religious-based exemptions that had been commonly granted.
- Biden was re-elected on the (fulfilled) promise to re-instate the policies of Obama's "*Dear Colleagues*" letter to colleges on the handling of sexual assault claims. Multiple Federal judges had denounced the process as an abomination.
 - no right to be informed of charges against you.
 - no right to confront witnesses against you.
 - no right to bring your own witnesses.
 - no right to counsel.
 - no right to trial by jury, much less an impartial jury, or anything faintly resembling that. The investigator, prosecutor and judge could be the same person.
 - no remedy to exclusion of exculpatory evidence.
 - no presumption of innocence.

The Obama-Biden process was variously acknowledged to be designed to produce "*convictions, not justice.*" Innocent people lost careers and had their lives ruined, but those are sacrifices that ideologues don't hesitate to inflict on others to advance their beliefs.

Appendix: FBI suppressing Dissent by Everyday Americans: Some Examples

- **Suppression on Social Media:**
The Twitter Files revealed the depth and range of topics that the Biden administration wanted social media companies to suppress, deleting and de-ranking individual posts and banning people. Among the many US departments and agencies making such

request/demands, the FBI was prolific.

- **Intimidation in real life:**

The FBI visiting your neighbors, your employer, your friends and others creates suspicions no matter how innocuous the questions. The message received is that you did something significantly wrong enough for the FBI to conduct those visits. Your employer may fire you, wanting to protect himself and the company from whatever it is you might be involved in.

- The FBI staged middle-of-the-night raids on some dissenters, a terror tactic used by secret police in authoritarian regimes. A justification is that it is timed to when the target will be disoriented when awoken, and thus more safely managed. News coverage periodically covers how such can go very wrong: The target and/or family members may be killed, and occasionally someone in neighboring apartments when bullets go through walls or floors. As the number of officers in the raiding party increases, so too does the risk of *sympathetic/contagious gunfire*. Some psychological reaction causes other officers to join in the shooting, sometimes shooting at the same person or just shooting at whatever.

You might think that this risk would cause the FBI to use this tactic only in extreme circumstances. And you would be wrong.

Several people found out they were being investigated and their lawyers went to the FBI offering to bring their client into the FBI office to surrender and be officially arrested. The FBI ignored the offers and raided the suspects' homes with 20-30 officers in the raiding parties.

What were their crimes? Social media posting that the FBI classified as threats of violence. Nothing I saw crossed the long-establish line between free speech and actionable threats.

Sometimes the raids come with extras:

- One family was handcuffed and sat on the curb outside their house. However, despite the parent's pleadings, their infant was left unattended in the house. Is it unreasonable to think the FBI wanted the parents to become increasingly frantic to the point where they could be charged with assaulting an officer, or violence could be used to "*subdue*" them??
 - Another family was similarly forced to sit on the curb handcuffed, but this time in freezing temperatures. The woman miscarried the next day. It seems to be standard practice for local police to put detained persons in one of their cars. The FBI raiding party had more than enough cars and officers to do this. So why didn't they?
 - The FBI raided the home of a local police officer working undercover. Somehow he had enough time and presence of mind to recognize that this wasn't a hit squad coming to kill him and butcher his family.
- You too can be investigated as a "*potential domestic terrorist*".

How? In late summer 2021 there were multiple highly emotional issues such as whether to re-open the public schools and how/whether various social issues would be taught.

- By speaking at a school board meeting during the public comment period and continuing after your allotted time had been exhausted, or
- You might be a father whose daughter had been raped in a school bathroom and you spoke up when the School Superintendent told the Board that there were no such incidents.
- When the public comment period was abbreviated with many parents still waiting to speak, you, along with others, might shout at the Board.

In late summer 2021 there were multiple highly emotional issues such as whether to re-

open the public schools and how/whether various social issues would be taught. In unacknowledged cooperation with the White House, the leadership of the National School Boards Association (NSBA) sent a letter to Biden and the US Justice Department asking for federal help to protect teachers and administrators from violence. However, the list of incidents attached to this letter didn't support any such need. The attachment was a list of links to media articles and online videos. My judgment was that there wasn't anything requiring more than a few local police officers, and the mere presence of a few officers might have sufficed.

Nonetheless, over the weekend Attorney General Garland whipped out a directive to the FBI with the attachment from the NSBA seemingly meant to provide examples of what was to be regarded as "*terrorism*".

Aftermath: Many school boards cancel their NBSA memberships and about half the states were critical of the AG Garland directive.

From: [LWV of Palo Alto](#)
To: [Council, City](#)
Subject: Re: City Council meeting, Feb. 24, action item 8, Resolution opposing executive orders
Date: Friday, February 21, 2025 10:38:29 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Be cautious of opening attachments and clicking on links.

To: Mayor Lauing and City Council members

Re: Council meeting Feb. 24, 2025, action item 8, Resolution on executive orders

The League of Women Voters of Palo Alto supports Councilmember Veenker and Lauing's Resolution dissociating the city from support of Trump's recent executive orders freezing federal funding already appropriated by Congress or threats to freeze such funding to pressure states and localities to comply with policy goals that violate state or local laws. The Resolution also opposes the firing of federal workers without due process and dismantling efforts to increase representation of women and minorities in the workforce. The League agrees.

The Resolution reserves the city's right to join as amicus curiae in lawsuits against the orders to inform the courts of impacts the unlawful orders have on cities like ours, or to join lawsuits to protect the rights of our city and its citizens.

The freezing of already appropriated federal funds would cause great harm to the public health, safety and welfare of our city and residents, as set out in the Resolution.

The League believes that executive orders freezing funds undermine democracy by violating the separation of powers in our Constitution. Once Congress decides to spend money, the president cannot unilaterally substitute his judgment for that of Congress. The League opposes the freezing of federal funds to cities and states that have elected to limit local officials' role in federal immigration enforcement, including the sharing of personal information. Limiting entanglement in federal immigration enforcement conserves local resources and avoids a deterioration of trust in public institutions like public schools and the police. Collaboration with ICE is associated with housing instability, student absenteeism, and negative child well-being. The executive orders would arbitrarily cut off funding for states and localities simply for adopting reasonable policies which enhance public safety and community well-being.

Palo Alto depends on this funding for essential services that benefit all residents. Blocking these funds would undermine residents' access to critical services including Department of Education grants, School Lunch programs, Emergency Medicaid, Emergency Food Assistance programs, nutrition programs that support food banks, Emergency Solutions Grants which provide funds to prevent people from becoming homeless and help people experiencing homelessness; Department of Transportation grants, and Violence Against Women grants supporting violence crisis centers.

Sincerely,
League of Women Voters of Palo Alto
Karen Kalinsky and Lisa Ratner
Co-Presidents

--

League of Women Voters of Palo Alto

3921 E. Bayshore Road
Palo Alto, CA 94303

Phone: (650) 903-0600

Web: www.lwvpaloalto.org

Facebook: www.facebook.com/PaloAltoLeague/

Twitter: www.twitter.com/lwvpaloalto

From: [Jim Kozelka](#)
To: [Council, City](#)
Cc: [Jim Kozelka](#)
Subject: VOTE YES TO OPPOSE TRUMP'S EOs
Date: Friday, February 21, 2025 9:18:24 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Be cautious of opening attachments and clicking on links.

Dear Mayor Lauing, Vice Mayor Veenker and Members of the Palo Alto City Council,

As this country hurtles towards autocratic tyranny, I am writing to express my strong support for the resolution opposing recent executive orders from former President Trump, as referenced in the Palo Alto Online article dated February 14, 2025. I urge you to take a firm stand in defense of our community's values of truth, justice, equity and human rights.

These executive orders threaten the fundamental freedoms and protections that make Palo Alto a welcoming and just place for all. It is now more important than ever that our local government acts decisively to protect our residents and push back against policies that undermine our shared values.

I commend the City Council for taking a leadership role in resisting unjust federal actions and ensuring that Palo Alto remains a city that values equity, diversity, and the rule of law. Please continue to stand strong in the face of these challenges and do everything in your power to uphold the rights and dignity of all members of our community.

Thank you for your commitment to justice and fairness. I respectfully urge you to pass this resolution and take further steps to shield our city from harmful federal overreach.

Sincerely,
Jim Kozelka
Proud PA resident for 45 years

--
jk not jk

"Be truthful, gentle and fearless."
- Gandhi

From: [Linda Baker](#)
To: [Council, City](#)
Subject: Strong support for resolution opposing executive orders
Date: Friday, February 21, 2025 7:38:53 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Be cautious of opening attachments and clicking on links.

Dear Mayor Lauing and Members of the Palo Alto City Council,

I strongly support the resolution opposing recent executive orders from former President Trump, as referenced in the Palo Alto Online article on February 14, 2025. I commend the resolution and urge you to take a firm stand in defense of our community's values of democracy, inclusion, and human rights.

These executive orders threaten the fundamental freedoms and protections that make Palo Alto a welcoming and just place for all. It is so important for our local government to act decisively to protect our residents and push back against policies that undermine our shared values.

I commend the City Council for taking a leadership role in resisting unjust federal actions and ensuring that Palo Alto remains a city that values equity, diversity, and the rule of law.

Please stand strong in the face of these challenges and do everything in your power to uphold the rights and dignity of all members of our community. You are setting a powerful example for other cities on how to do what is right, and I hope that your example inspires others across the region and the country.

I am grateful to you for your commitment to justice and fairness. I respectfully urge you to pass this resolution and take further steps to shield our city from harmful federal overreach.

Sincerely,

Linda Baker

From: [Stephanie Compton](#)
To: [Council, City](#)
Subject: Please pass resolution opposing Trump Exec Orders
Date: Friday, February 21, 2025 5:50:27 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Be cautious of opening attachments and clicking on links.

Dear Mayor and Members of the Palo Alto City Council,

I am writing to express my strong support for the resolution opposing recent executive orders from former President Trump, as referenced in the Palo Alto Online article dated February 14, 2025. I urge you to take a firm stand in defense of our community's values of democracy, inclusion, and human rights.

These executive orders threaten the fundamental freedoms and protections that make Palo Alto a welcoming and just place for all. Now more than ever, it is essential that our local government acts decisively to protect our residents and push back against policies that undermine our shared values.

I commend the City Council for taking a leadership role in resisting unjust federal actions and ensuring that Palo Alto remains a city that values equity, diversity, and the rule of law. Please continue to stand strong in the face of these challenges and do everything in your power to uphold the rights and dignity of all members of our community.

Thank you for your commitment to justice and fairness. I respectfully urge you to pass this resolution and take further steps to shield our city from harmful federal overreach.

Sincerely,
Stephanie Compton
Sent from my iPhone

From: [Lisa Heitman](#)
To: [Council, City](#)
Subject: I support resolution opposing Trump's executive orders
Date: Friday, February 21, 2025 3:30:19 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Be cautious of opening attachments and clicking on links.

Dear Mayor Lauing et al - I heartily support the resolution opposing Trump's executive orders and the purging of the US government by DOGE. Please put up the good fight and do what you can/must to Trump-proof Palo Alto! Thank you.

Lisa Heitman
2869 Bryant St.

From: [Gabi Koehler](#)
To: [Council, City](#)
Subject: Strong Support for Resolution Opposing Trump's Executive orders
Date: Friday, February 21, 2025 2:33:43 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Be cautious of opening attachments and clicking on links.

Dear Mayor Lauing and Members of the Palo Alto City Council,

I would like to express my strong support for the resolution opposing recent executive orders from President Trump, as referenced in the Palo Alto Weekly article on February 14, 2025. I urge you to take a firm stand in defense of our community's values of democracy, inclusion, and human rights.

These executive orders threaten the fundamental freedoms and protections that make Palo Alto a welcoming and just place for all. I think it is essential more now than ever that our local government stands firm in protecting our residents and pushing back against policies that undermine our shared values.

I commend the City Council for taking a leadership role in resisting unjust federal actions and ensuring that Palo Alto remains a city that values diversity, equity, inclusion, and the rule of law. Please continue to stand strong in the face of our current and upcoming challenges and do everything in your power to protect the rights and dignity of all members of our community.

Thank you for your commitment to justice and fairness. I respectfully urge you to pass this resolution and take necessary steps to shield our city from harmful federal overreach.

Sincerely,
Gabi Koehler
(177 Monroe Drive, Palo Alto)

From: [Julaine Rosner](#)
To: [Council, City](#)
Subject: Support for Colleague's Memo (Item #8 on Monday's agenda)
Date: Friday, February 21, 2025 12:02:08 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Be cautious of opening attachments and clicking on links.

Dear Palo Alto City Council,
I support the resolution standing up to Trump's policies regarding federal employees, federal grants, ICE, and more. The Council should commit to sustaining Palo Alto's values and interests in the face of the Trump administration actions.
Thank you!

Sincerely,
Julaine Rosner

786 Matadero Ave.
Palo Alto, CA 94306

From: [Linda Frommer](#)
To: [Council, City](#)
Subject: Support for Proposed Adoption of Resolution
Date: Friday, February 21, 2025 11:33:14 AM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Be cautious of opening attachments and clicking on links.

City Council Members,

I am writing to express my support for the "Proposed Adoption of a Resolution Underscoring Council's Commitment to Sustaining Palo Alto Values & Interests in the Face of Trump Administration Actions". Unfortunately, I will be out of town for the Council discussion this Monday, otherwise I would have attended in person. As a retired Federal employee (at VA Palo Alto Health Care System), I very much appreciate the City Council adopting this resolution and stating its commitment to such important values for our community.

Sincerely,

Linda Frommer
1525 Walnut Dr
Palo Alto, 94303

From: [Ken Joye](#)
To: [Council, City](#)
Subject: Sustaining Palo Alto Values
Date: Friday, February 21, 2025 10:14:50 AM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Be cautious of opening attachments and clicking on links.

I see that Mayor Lauing and Vice-Mayor Veenker have authored a colleague's memo for your consideration at the council's 24 February 2025 meeting (agenda item #8).

I am heartened to read the sentiments articulated in the draft resolution and ask that you support it.

thank you for your service,
Ken Joye
Ventura neighborhood, Palo Alto

From: [Jo Ann Mandinach](#)
To: [Council, City](#); [City Mgr](#)
Cc: [Dave Price](#)
Subject: Instead of a memo of protest, why not take CONCRETE Action and...
Date: Wednesday, February 19, 2025 1:30:23 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Be cautious of opening attachments and clicking on links.

Dear Mayor, City Council Members and City Manager,

I read your Colleague's Memo re the Trump Administration's actions and know it will fall on the same deaf ears as the many other similar letters, lawsuits and protests. Instead, since they're so concerned about money, why not hit them where it hurts: in their wallet.

If you REALLY wanted to send a message, how about taking CONCRETE ACTION and cancelling Tesla's contract to run the PA Link shuttles and rescind permission to use our streets as a testing ground for Tesla's autonomous cabs?

You'll note the Tesla folks have been using the Palo Alto partnerships for bragging rights as the first of many partnerships across Silicon Valley,

Is this the type of leadership for which Palo Alto wants to be known? I'd hope not! And I'd hope that in cancelling future dealings you'd stress the reasons why.

Tesla may test 'Cybercabs' in Palo Alto

By [Audrey Asistio](#) • Published October 23, 2024 • Updated on October 23, 2024 at 9:33 pm

<https://www.nbcbayarea.com/news/local/tesla-may-test-cybercabs-in-palo-alto/3687122/>

Palo Alto Link, the city's nascent rideshare service, will remain in operation at least until the end of June after the City Council extended its contract with the contractor that operates the system and left the door open for Tesla to supplement the small fleet with its new robotaxis.

<https://www.paloaltoonline.com/news/2024/11/05/palo-alto-link-gets-a-boost-as-council-extends-contract/>

Palo Alto Link gets a boost as council extends contract

New deal with Nomad Transportation leaves the door open for future Tesla partnership

"In unanimously approving Palo Alto Link for eight more months, council members agreed that the service remains popular and valuable, particularly for seniors, residents with disabilities and those who don't have cars.

Very sincerely,

Jo Ann Mandinach

Palo Alto, CA 94301