

April 14, 2025

Krista De La Torre
4 North 2nd St. #595
San Jose, CA 95113

RE: IFPTE's New Information Request (March 25, 2025)

Dear Ms. De La Torre:

We are in receipt of your letter dated March 25, 2025, though we continue to take exception to your characterization of newly propounded requests for information as a “renew[al]” of IFPTE’s previous request for information. As the City has indicated previously, the City has met, and will continue to meet, its obligations with respect to the numerous information requests that IFPTE has submitted.

Response to IFPTE's New Information Request

(1) For context, IFPTE made the following statement after receiving the response that the [City provided to IFPTE on March 11, 2025](#), regarding [IFPTE's information request dated February 24, 2025](#):

- **Unions have greater rights to information than the public generally. The employer's right to deliberative process privileges applies only to union information requests that would reveal collective bargaining strategies or tactics. Departmental responses to budget instructions do not contain information on collective bargaining strategies or tactics, but rather information on various budget balancing measures the agency has contemplated. Policymakers have asked that Local 21 and other city unions provide input on service efficiencies and other budget balancing measures. Knowing which budget balancing measures departments are already contemplating would ensure that these discussions are productive.**

The City again respectfully requests (as it did on March 11, 2025) that IFPTE provide specific legal authority that would support its belief that the City must provide *draft* reports to IFPTE related to the City’s deliberative process as the City works toward developing a final overall budget proposal recommendation to the Mayor and City Council that would then be considered, debated, and potentially modified in open session during the City Council’s formal approval process for the City’s budget.

The City has already expressed readiness to meet to discuss the approaches that the City is considering for inclusion in the City Manager’s Proposed Operating Budget. If IFPTE is interested in such a meeting, I will coordinate this with the City Manager’s Budget Office. The City would also like to invite a meeting to discuss the sheer number and scope of IFPTE’s information requests, as well as how requests that extend to drafts and measures that the City is “contemplating” fall within

the realm of information that is necessary and relevant to represent bargaining unit members regarding mandatory subjects of bargaining, or whether they constitute an undue burden.

(2) For context, IFPTE requested the information above in response to the information that the [City provided to IFPTE on March 11, 2025](#), regarding Business License Penalties.

In the City's response, you explain there are three criteria for qualifying for a write-off including: (1) the total delinquent balance is below \$5,000, (2) no payments have been made within the past four years, and (3) collections efforts by City staff and/or collections agencies have been unsuccessful. Could the City clarify how much in "uncollectable" fees fell into each qualifying category?

Every Business License Penalty write-off met all three criteria.

With best regards,



Aram Kouyoumdjian
Director of the City Manager's Office of Employee Relations
Director of Human Resources