

**From:** [Susan Cameron](#)  
**To:** [WebMail - CCD](#)  
**Subject:** Public comment - Item 14B  
**Date:** Tuesday, June 28, 2022 3:15:25 PM

---

[**NOTICE:** This message originated outside of City of Whittier -- **DO NOT CLICK** on **links** or open **attachments** unless you are sure the content is safe.]

Dear Mayor Vinatieri and members of the City Council,

The proposal to amend the city charter to authorize Whittier's City Attorney to prosecute crimes is a mistake which would result in wasting large amounts of public money. It is also proposed as a permanent solution to a perceived temporary problem, just like the city's exploration of setting up its own public health department a year or two ago, in a fit of pique over a temporary indoor dining ban.

As demonstrated by the staff report, this measure has been proposed entirely because members of the City Council are displeased with the way our current District Attorney has chosen to exercise his prosecutorial discretion. As a solution, staff has proposed funding an election to amend the City Charter forever, even though, by the time this measure could be enacted, Mr. Gascon's term of office will be half over. By the time staff is hired and trained and all other details put in place, the campaign for our next District Attorney will be underway. even if Mr. Gascon is not recalled. If Mr. Gascon is successfully recalled, he is likely to be out of office before this amendment could be put into operation.

This is a short-sighted waste of time and money.

In addition, looking at the timeline that is part of the staff report, a necessary step toward putting this charter amendment on the ballot is a City Attorney impartial analysis, due less than a month from now. However, since this charter amendment, if adopted, would vastly expand the City Attorney's own scope of work, the City Attorney has a clear conflict of interest, and cannot make an impartial analysis. While there must be a way to obtain an impartial analysis for charter amendments that could affect the duties of the City Attorney, it seems highly doubtful that an alternative procedure could be found and implemented in less than a month's time. How much time has the City Attorney's office already billed for studying this potential windfall to their office?

Please stop wasting time and taxpayers' money proposing and studying expensive permanent changes in response to short-term disagreements with County officials.

Thank you for considering the ramifications and unintended consequences of impractical ideas.

Susan Cameron