
From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, November 30, 2025 5:03 PM
To: Mayor Kate <kate.colin@cityofsanrafael.org>; Maribeth Bushey <maribeth.bushey@cityofsanrafael.org>; Rachel Kertz <rachel.kertz@cityofsanrafael.org>; Eli Hill <eli.hill@cityofsanrafael.com>; maika.llorensgulati@cityofsanrafael.com <maika.llorensgulati@cityofsanrafael.com>; Rob Epstein <rob.epstein@cityofsanrafael.org>; Lindsay Lara <lindsay.lara@cityofsanrafael.org>
Subject: Subject: Clarification Request – November 17 Minutes (Agenda Item 5.a.: Approval of Minutes)

Subject: Clarification Request – December 1, Agenda Item 4. Consent Calendar Items: a. Approval of Minutes for November 17)

Mayor Colin, Vice Mayor Bushey, Councilmembers, City Clerk, City Attorney:

I respectfully request a clarification to the draft minutes of the November 17, 2025 City Council meeting specifically:

OTHER AGENDA ITEMS -

5. Other Agenda Items

a. *Ralph M. Brown Act (Government Code Section 54950, Et. Seq.) Compliance Resolution Responding to a Cease and Desist Demand Dated November 3, 2025 with an Unconditional Promise - Without Admitting Any Violation of the Brown Act - To Cease and Desist Certain Conduct Pursuant to Government Code Section 54650.2(c)*

The minutes, as written, unintentionally narrow the scope of the written demand letter that was before the Council.

The minutes describe the matter solely as a response to a “**Cease and Desist Demand dated November 3, 2025.**” While the Resolution adopted that evening was drafted pursuant to Government Code § 54960.2(c), and therefore addressed only the cease-and-desist component, the written submission actually received by the City on November 3—a letter authored by attorney Nicholas Boylan and attached to the staff report—contained four separate components, three of which were reflected in its title: “**RE: Citizens for Solutions not Secrecy v. City of San Rafael, et al. Cure/Correct, Cease/Desist Demand and Records Request**”

Specifically, the letter included:

1. A Cure and Correct Demand
2. A Cease and Desist Demand (§ 54960.2)
3. A Demand that the City begin audio-recording closed sessions
4. A Public Records Act Request (Gov. Code § 6250 et seq.)

The City Attorney acknowledged receipt of the letter during his presentation, and I addressed portions of this multi-part submission in public comments. Describing the

item solely as a response to a cease-and-desist demand omits the broader content of the letter actually before the Council and attached to the administrative record.

To be clear, I am not requesting that the City revise the Resolution, summarize public comment, or alter any action taken by the Council. My request is solely that the minutes accurately reflect that the City received a multi-part Brown Act and PRA demand letter, and that the Resolution addressed only the cease-and-desist portion, pursuant to § 54960.2.

A simple clarification—such as inserting the phrase, *“The City received a multi-part Brown Act demand letter dated November 3, 2025; the Resolution addressed the cease-and-desist portion pursuant to Government Code § 54960.2”*—would ensure the minutes accurately track the content of the materials the City received.

This correction preserves the integrity of the public record while maintaining consistency with the scope of the Council’s action.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Ken Dickinson