

**From:** [Jacob Patterson](#)  
**To:** [Lemos, June](#); [Munoz, Cristal](#); [Miller, Tabatha](#)  
**Subject:** Public Comment -- 9/13/21 CC Mtg., Item No. 5D  
**Date:** Wednesday, September 8, 2021 10:38:02 PM

---

City Council,

I am pleased that the second amendment was pulled for revision and that we now have a much-improved version for your consideration. These new changes seem fine, unlike the last round. (Did no one do the math last time?) Although I believe this still increases the cost to the City compared to the current contract, none of these amendments are objectionable, in my opinion. The City's contract attorney firm should probably have a performance review prior to considering contract amendments--the staff's opinions of their performance are not particularly relevant compared to the Council's opinions, in fact, staff claiming they are satisfied is probably a warning sign rather than an endorsement because one of the most important functions of an independent City Attorney is serving as a check on the City Manager. Regardless, as one of the most vocal critics of the current direction of the City, I have no serious objections to this revised contract amendment even though the City might be better served by a different engagement structure or, even better, a staff legal position rather than a contract arrangement.

Regards,

--Jacob