

**From:** [Wade Kelley](#)  
**To:** [HHS.Commissions](#)  
**Subject:** Attn housing commission public comment.  
**Date:** Wednesday, August 20, 2025 2:27:33 PM

---

Hello, my name is

Wade Kelley,

(Christopher Wade Kelley). For years. I have advocated and spoken out for human rights of homeless human beings on the Third Street Promenade in Santa Monica. I ran for Santa Monica City Council, and I am serving on the Measure GS Resident Oversight Committee, to hopefully work toward solutions to house the homeless, and for Santa Monica to be an example, and help end homelessness in California...showing that progressive government can work and stand up for human rights, meeting the basic needs of all of its citizens. I am writing this letter, not as a plea for my own housing (I have use of my Mom's car, and for now, I have friends I can stay with, unlike many of the homeless), but as a plea for Santa Monica to do a better job in its efforts toward housing the unhoused, the homeless.

I spoke about this event at the First Measure GS Committee meeting, and I'm writing this to update.

On May 14, 2025, Santa Monica held a Homeless Outreach event in the Civic Center parking lot. There were many tables and tents set up, with different organizations that have the goal of helping homeless human beings. This event was supposed to happen earlier in the year, but was postponed due to the Palisades fire. I learned about it from my friend Marcus, a homeless outreach person working for the downtown Santa Monica Inc. I told some homeless friends about this event, hoping that they could get help with housing. I had been to the Santa Monica Housing Authority many times to try to get help with housing for homeless friends, and was told by René and others that they would have to go through one of the non-government organizations, such as People Concern or Saint Joseph's, to get help from the Santa Monica Housing Authority. I was told the same thing, when I wanted to sign up for low income, senior housing after I turned 65 last year. So, I went to the May 14 Homeless Outreach event to see how Santa Monica was helping the homeless situation, and to hopefully sign up for low income, senior housing. I just want to be at the end of the line. Anyway, after some confusion from table to table, I ended up at the People Concern table, and a nice young woman, Sari Thomas, had me fill out the forms, provide documentation for her to be my caseworker, and to get me on my way to being housed. I explained to her that I wanted to sign up for low income, senior housing IN Santa Monica. She said that I had to have an address in Santa Monica, and I told her that I had established my address at the People Concern on Olympic in 2020 during the pandemic (Homeless people can establish an address through some non-government organizations and receive mail.), and I had switched my address to Step Up On Second, a year and a half ago, for convenience; now I was told that I would no longer be able to receive mail at Step Up On Second, because I did not receive services from them. She tried to look up whether I had had an address with the People Concern, and could not find anything. I told her they must have some record of it. That address was my voting address in 2022, and I received some mail through them...certainly they must have some record! She took all of my information and said she would look into it, and get back to me within the week. I waited a week or two, then I emailed her and left a message on the number she had given me with her card. I have still to this day, not received an email or a call from her. Since then, I have been to the People Concern many times. The receptionist found that I had had an address there before, but had received no paperwork from from the caseworker, Sari Thomas. The receptionist said

that it may have been a delayed email. I re-established my address with People Concern. I stopped by a few more times to check for mail, and see if they had heard from my caseworker, Sari Thomas. Still no word. July 7th, I stopped by People Concern, inquiring again. This time, I spoke with a woman named Senea(unsure of spelling). I explained the situation and how I had talked to the receptionist about my caseworker. She explained to me that the receptionist and she do not interact about case work. I told her about Sari Thomas. She finally told me that a Sari Thomas worked at another People Concern, not the one in Santa Monica. I asked, "Why would Santa Monica have a caseworker from somewhere else, that is not connected with your People Concern, to help people in Santa Monica find housing in Santa Monica?"

Anyway, to this date, I have not received word from, Sari Thomas, Senea,...or anyone from People Concern (other than emails asking me for donations to the organization), or anyone having to do with low income housing in Santa Monica. And I am a person without too many dysfunctions, having all my documentations, trying to participate in this "fragile democracy."

As we speak out against the authoritarian government trampling on people's rights, and taking away the basic needs of so many, we must show that there is an alternative! We must show that the progressive government can make sure that its people have the basics. There should be no debate among us, whether people deserve a place to live, food to eat, healthcare, and a good public education. These are human rights that we all need to stand up for! Franklin Delano Roosevelt said, "The test of our progress is not whether we add to the abundance of those who have much. The test of our progress is whether we provide enough for those who have too little."

Santa Monica, we are failing.

California, we are failing. We are spending more, tearing down encampments and cleaning up debris, and incarcerating people than we are in building affordable housing and programs to help people stay in housing.... Especially since the conservative Supreme Court ruling in Grants Pass versus Johnson, Which our Governor supported, making it easier for cities and agencies to criminalize homelessness! Let us work toward being part of the solution and not part of the problem.

Peace love, Wade

Update: on August 13 I stopped by people concern... Still no word from Sari Thomas, or what happened to my application with all of my personal information and documentation. I went to the Santa Monica Housing Authority on August 18... I am still not on the list for below market housing for seniors in Santa Monica, or on the list for section 8 voucher. That list has been closed since April. Kevin said that now I may sign up for below market senior housing online... I said I will try to follow up on what happened to the information I have already given to those that are supposed to be helping the unhoused.

**From:** [Jacob Wasserman](#)  
**Cc:** [Clerk Mailbox](#); [Nikima Newsome](#); [Heidi von Tongeln](#)  
**Subject:** New State Law: Virtual Meetings for Advisory Bodies  
**Date:** Saturday, October 4, 2025 1:58:06 PM

---

*For distribution to board members and submission as written general public comment for your body's next meeting:*

Hello Commissioners and Board Members! I'm Jacob Wasserman, a member of the Planning Commission, and I wanted to share with you a new state law that was just signed, SB 707, that **allows municipal advisory bodies to meet virtually** if certain steps are followed. Here is the bill: [https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billVersionsCompareClient.xhtml?bill\\_id=202520260SB707](https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billVersionsCompareClient.xhtml?bill_id=202520260SB707). The relevant section is § 54953.8.6 (Sec. 14). I encourage you to read it over.

---

Preface: I am sending this out as information only. Each board can decide for themselves whether virtual meetings, in-person meetings, or a mix of both makes most sense. I only recommend that you at least agendize a discussion about this.

I am also not sending this out representing the City nor the Planning Commission (indeed, my own commission isn't even eligible), just as someone who worked with the legislative staff who drafted the bill. I have not consulted with City staff before sending this.

---

SB 707 allows for advisory bodies to meet virtually or in a hybrid fashion. This can expand the pool of people able to serve and can open meetings up to a wider audience. And while virtual public comment is always an option open to a board, even if the members themselves meet in person, holding virtual or hybrid meetings for the board is also a good occasion to figure out the procedures for and to implement opening up virtual public comment as well (required for virtual/hybrid meetings).

Even if your board plans to mostly continue to meet in person, having a virtual option provides flexibility. For instance, you could regularly schedule every other meeting virtual and in person. Or you could generally meet in person but use the virtual option to hold a meeting that would otherwise be canceled for lack of quorum when certain board members are unavailable to come in person. Or you could always meet in person—with a social (or bylaws-mandated) expectation of in-person board attendance—but allow hybrid participation for members to occasionally participate remotely when they can't make it (without having to worry about the strictures of other, more limited hybrid meetings options under state law).

The rules are described in full in the link above, but in summary:

- **Starts January 1, 2026**
- City Council must first approve each body's use of these provisions. Then the body itself must approve, in person, before meeting thereafter remotely.
- City Council must renew each body's use of these provisions every six months.
- Cameras must remain on if possible at all times.
- A physical location must still be selected by vote of the body to be open for public viewing and comment. A staff person must be there.

---

These are the types of bodies that are eligible:

"For purposes of this section, 'eligible subsidiary body' means a legislative body that meets all of the following:

- ...Serves exclusively in an advisory capacity.
- Is not authorized to take final action on legislation, regulations, contracts, licenses, permits, or any

- other entitlements, grants, or allocations of funds.
- Does not have primary subject matter jurisdiction, as defined by the charter, an ordinance, a resolution, or any formal action of the legislative body that created the subsidiary body, that focuses on elections, budgets, police oversight, privacy, removing from, or restricting access to, materials available in public libraries, or taxes or related spending proposals.

An eligible subsidiary body may include members who are elected officials, members who are not elected officials, or any combination thereof."

I have sent this to all boards to which I think the law could apply: Airport; Arts; Sustainability, Environmental Justice, and the Environment; Disabilities; Housing; Human Services; Recreation and Parks; Audit; Transit Security; Urban Forest; Community Gardens; Virginia Avenue Park; Field Sports; Santa Monica Aquatics

By my read, the following bodies are *not* eligible for the following reasons: Architectural Review (quasi-judicial/not purely advisory); Building and Fire-Life Safety (quasi-judicial/not purely advisory); Landmarks (quasi-judicial/not purely advisory); Library (may set policy on book availability and not purely advisory—can accept money); Personnel (quasi-judicial/not purely advisory); Planning (quasi-judicial/not purely advisory); Public Safety Reform and Oversight (addresses police oversight among primary subject matter); Clean Beaches and Ocean Parcel Tax Citizens Oversight (addresses taxes as primary subject matter); Housing Authority (not purely advisory); Measure GS Resident Oversight (addresses taxes as primary subject matter); Transient Occupancy Tax (addresses taxes as primary subject matter)

---

All bodies, even those ineligible for these new virtual SB 707 provisions, can continue to have certain members participate remotely on a select number of occasions if they have just cause (rules and number of meetings laid out in § 54953.8.3 (Sec. 11) of [SB 707](#), which is mostly the same as the former [AB 2449](#) (2022)).

Please note that I am not a lawyer, and nothing I say here is legal advice. For instance, my listing of eligible and ineligible bodies is only my read of the law, not determinative in any way.

Also please note that **this is all subject to resource and technological constraints**. If your body does not have the staff capacity or equipment to do virtual meetings, though, I still suggest you discuss this, as expressing your desire for a virtual option could then lead to changes that allow it.

More than happy to answer any questions about this!

-----  
Jacob Wasserman  
[Planning Commissioner](#)  
[City of Santa Monica](#)  
<[Jacob.Wasserman@santamonica.gov](mailto:Jacob.Wasserman@santamonica.gov)>  
Pronouns: he/him/his

[Planning resources](#)  
[Sign up for meeting notifications](#)  
[Virtual office hours](#)