

From: [Sandhya Laddha](#)
To: [Planning Commission](#)
Subject: FY 2023-24 Sustainable Transportation Planning Grant Program Call for Applications
Date: Wednesday, January 18, 2023 9:13:38 AM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Be cautious of opening attachments and clicking on links.

Dear Planning,

Caltrans just released the Fiscal Year (FY) 2023-24 Sustainable Transportation Planning Grant Application Guide and Call for Applications. **Applications are due by 5:00 PM on Thursday, March 9, 2023.** The grant awards will be announced this summer 2023.

This year's grant program includes a one-time augmentation of \$50 million in Climate Adaptation Planning grants to support local and regional identification of transportation-related climate vulnerabilities through the development of climate adaptation plans, as well as project-level adaptation planning to identify adaptation projects and strategies for transportation infrastructure.

Caltrans will be conducting grant application workshops to provide a grant program overview and review the resources that we have to assist with competitive application development. Contact the appropriate Caltrans district staff to request workshop information and draft application feedback. They can also help choose the best grant category for your proposed planning project.

Visit the [grants website](#) for workshop dates and times, the Grant Application Guide, application forms and templates, and Caltrans district staff contacts. And contact the District 4 Grant Leads, Becky Frank at becky.frank@dot.ca.gov and Stephen Conteh at stephen.conteh@dot.ca.gov if you have questions.


Caltrans District 4 (Bay Area) will host a Grant Open House on Monday, January 23, 2023, from 10:00 AM to 11:30 AM

<https://cadot.webex.com/cadot/j.php?MTID=mb194bd13c61172b0b53bf2c5fab7681e>

Cheers,

Sandhya Laddha

Policy Director

Silicon Valley Bicycle Coalition 

From: [Mollahan_Ben @ San Jose](mailto:Ben.Mollahan@cbre.com)
To: [Planning Commission](#)
Cc: [French_Amy](#)
Subject: 2023-2031 Housing Element
Date: Tuesday, January 17, 2023 7:07:44 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

Some people who received this message don't often get email from ben.mollahan@cbre.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Be cautious of opening attachments and clicking on links.

Hi all,

My name is Ben Mollahan with CBRE capital markets. After reviewing your cities 2023-2031 Housing Element Draft, we noticed there is not a list of site inventory for potential conversions. Can you please provide an excel list or something similar to that below that San Carlos has?

Our clients want to help the city and this will be the first stepping stone to doing so.



Table 4.A-1: San Carlos Housing Element 2023-2031 Sites Inventory

APN	Address	General Plan	New Zoning	Old Zoning	Size (acres)	Max. Density (du/ac)	Lot Consolidation Potential	Existing Land Use	Very Low	Low	Mod	Above Mod	Total Units
045316130	240 EL CAMINO REAL	MU-L	MU-N-120	MU-N	0.35816291005	120		retail	37	0	0	0	37
045316140	260 EL CAMINO REAL	MU-L	MU-N-120	MU-N	0.72986151373	120	Yes	retail	74	0	0	0	74
050054320	366 EL CAMINO REAL	MU-L	MU-N-50	MU-N	0.21775731992	50		retail	0	0	4	5	9
050054330	356 EL CAMINO REAL	MU-L	MU-N-50	MU-N	0.15040883942	50	Yes	office/commercial	0	0	3	3	6
050074130	1148 SAN CARLOS AVE	MU-M	MU-DC-100	MU-DC	0.11006724477	100		office/commercial	0	0	4	5	9
050074140	1156 SAN CARLOS AVE	MU-M	MU-DC-100	MU-DC	0.04614011285	100		retail	0	0	2	2	4
050074150	1178 SAN CARLOS AVE	MU-M	MU-DC-100	MU-DC	0.07898201292	100	Yes	retail	0	0	3	3	6
050074160	1188 SAN CARLOS AVE	MU-M	MU-DC-100	MU-DC	0.07898864108	100		retail	0	0	3	4	7
050074170	577 LAUREL ST	MU-M	MU-DC-100	MU-DC	0.0885662650	100		commercial	0	0	4	4	8
046114100	575 OLD COUNTY RD	MU-L	MU-N-40	MU-N	0.30662549202	40	Yes	mixed use	0	0	5	5	10
046114110	1059 MC CUE AVE	MU-L	MU-N-40	MU-N	0.08642487515	40		warehousing	0	0	1	2	3
046124110	1064 CHERRY ST	MU-L	MU-N-40	MU-N	0.11931539237	40		industrial	0	0	2	2	4
046124280	663 OLD COUNTY RD	MU-L	MU-N-40	MU-N	0.23168642064	40	Yes	warehousing	0	0	4	4	8
046124290	681 OLD COUNTY RD	MU-L	MU-N-40	MU-N	0.11824554300	40		retail	0	0	2	2	4
046126290	701 OLD COUNTY RD	MU-L	MU-N-40	MU-N	0.17845497158	40		warehousing	0	0	3	3	6
046126300	1070 HALL ST	MU-L	MU-N-40	MU-N	0.08613398935	40	Yes	single family residential	0	0	1	2	3
046126320	713 OLD COUNTY RD	MU-L	MU-N-40	MU-N	0.12097634511	40		warehousing	0	0	2	2	4
046128240	749 OLD COUNTY RD	MU-L	MU-N-40	MU-N	0.17565192090	40		retail	0	0	3	3	6
046128280		MU-L	MU-N-40	MU-N	0.18993049362	40	Yes	vacant	0	0	3	3	6
050034080	1620 SAN CARLOS AVE	MU-MH	MU-SC-120	MU-SC	0.11364707300	120		office/commercial	0	0	6	6	12
050034090	1622 SAN CARLOS AVE	MU-MH	MU-SC-120	MU-SC	0.11483114102	120	Yes	office/commercial	0	0	6	6	12
050034280	1660 SAN CARLOS AVE	MU-MH	MU-SC-120	MU-SC	0.12853867271	120		office/commercial	0	0	6	7	13
050033130	525 SYCAMORE ST	MU-M	RM-59	RM-59	0.12963884137	59		single family residential	0	0	3	3	6
050033140	529 SYCAMORE ST	MU-M	RM-59	RM-59	0.12865995591	59	Yes	single family residential	0	0	3	3	6
050034120	575 PROSPECT ST	MU-M	RM-100	RM-59	0.13093538224	100		office/commercial	0	0	5	5	10
050034130	565 PROSPECT ST	MU-M	RM-100	RM-59	0.14019658422	100	Yes	single family residential	0	0	6	5	11
050034140	557 PROSPECT ST	MU-M	RM-100	RM-59	0.14465043612	100		single family residential	0	0	6	5	11
050062070	508 ELM ST	MU-M	RM-100	RM-59	0.13214334969	100		single family residential	0	0	5	5	10
050062090	510 ELM ST	MU-M	RM-100	RM-59	0.12445253902	100	Yes	single family residential	0	0	5	4	9
050133310	620 EL CAMINO REAL	MU-M	MU-D-120	MU-D	0.13031135444	120		retail	0	0	6	7	13
050133420	628 EL CAMINO REAL	MU-M	MU-D-120	MU-D	0.16254681598	120	Yes	mixed use	0	0	8	9	17
050133320	630 EL CAMINO REAL	MU-M	MU-D-120	MU-D	0.05880756157	120		retail	0	0	3	3	6
050133330	634 EL CAMINO REAL	MU-M	MU-D-120	MU-D	0.05346730209	120	Yes	retail	0	0	2	3	5
050133450	638 EL CAMINO REAL	MU-M	MU-D-120	MU-D	0.08054951935	120		retail	0	0	4	4	8
050133170	648 EL CAMINO REAL	MU-M	MU-D-120	MU-D	0.07977545714	120		retail	0	0	4	4	8
050133440	640 EL CAMINO REAL	MU-M	MU-D-120	MU-D	0.08410986270	120	Yes	commercial	0	0	4	5	9

Thank you,

Ben

Ben Mollahan

Associate | Lic. 02136790

CBRE Capital Markets | Multifamily Properties



www.cbre.com

Details about the personal data CBRE collects and why, as well as your data privacy rights under applicable law, are available at [CBRE – Privacy Policy](#).

From: [French Amy](#)
To: [Mollahan Ben @ San Jose](#)
Cc: [Planning Commission](#)
Subject: RE: 2023-2031 Housing Element
Date: Tuesday, January 17, 2023 9:27:10 PM

<https://paloaltohousingelement.com/wp-content/uploads/2022/12/Appendix-D-Site-Inventory.pdf>

The above link is to the housing sites inventory for the Housing Element sent to the HCD in December.

You may want to check out the Housing Element webpage: <https://paloaltohousingelement.com/>

From: Mollahan, Ben @ San Jose <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, January 17, 2023 7:07 PM
To: Planning Commission <Planning.Commission@cityofpaloalto.org>
Cc: French, Amy <Amy.French@CityofPaloAlto.org>
Subject: 2023-2031 Housing Element

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Be cautious of opening attachments and clicking on links.

Hi all,

My name is Ben Mollahan with CBRE capital markets. After reviewing your cities 2023-2031 Housing Element Draft, we noticed there is not a list of site inventory for potential conversions. Can you please provide an excel list or something similar to that below that San Carlos has?

Our clients want to help the city and this will be the first stepping stone to doing so.



Table 4.A-1: San Carlos Housing Element 2023-2031 Sites Inventory

APN	Address	General Plan	New Zoning	Old Zoning	Size (acres)	Max. Density (du/ac)	Lot Consolidation Potential	Existing Land Use	Very Low	Low	Mod	Above Mod	Total Units
045316130	240 EL CAMINO REAL	MU-L	MU-N-120	MU-N	0.35816291005	120		retail	37	0	0	0	37
045316140	260 EL CAMINO REAL	MU-L	MU-N-120	MU-N	0.72986151373	120	Yes	retail	74	0	0	0	74
050054920	366 EL CAMINO REAL	MU-L	MU-N-50	MU-N	0.21775793992	50		retail	0	0	4	5	9
050054930	356 EL CAMINO REAL	MU-L	MU-N-50	MU-N	0.15040583942	50	Yes	office/commercial	0	0	3	3	6
050074130	1148 SAN CARLOS AVE	MU-M	MU-DC-100	MU-DC	0.11006724477	100		office/commercial	0	0	4	5	9
050074140	1156 SAN CARLOS AVE	MU-M	MU-DC-100	MU-DC	0.04614011285	100		retail	0	0	2	2	4
050074150	1178 SAN CARLOS AVE	MU-M	MU-DC-100	MU-DC	0.07393201292	100	Yes	retail	0	0	3	3	6
050074160	1188 SAN CARLOS AVE	MU-M	MU-DC-100	MU-DC	0.07693864108	100		retail	0	0	3	4	7
050074170	577 LAUREL ST	MU-M	MU-DC-100	MU-DC	0.08856562650	100		commercial	0	0	4	4	8
046114100	575 OLD COUNTY RD	MU-L	MU-N-40	MU-N	0.30662549202	40		mixed use	0	0	5	5	10
046114110	1059 MC CUE AVE	MU-L	MU-N-40	MU-N	0.08642487515	40	Yes	warehousing	0	0	1	2	3
046124110	1064 CHERRY ST	MU-L	MU-N-40	MU-N	0.11931539237	40		industrial	0	0	2	2	4
046124280	663 OLD COUNTY RD	MU-L	MU-N-40	MU-N	0.23186842064	40	Yes	warehousing	0	0	4	4	8
046124290	661 OLD COUNTY RD	MU-L	MU-N-40	MU-N	0.11824554800	40		retail	0	0	2	2	4
046126290	701 OLD COUNTY RD	MU-L	MU-N-40	MU-N	0.17845497158	40		warehousing	0	0	3	3	6
046126300	1070 HALL ST	MU-L	MU-N-40	MU-N	0.08613398935	40	Yes	single family residential	0	0	1	2	3
046126320	713 OLD COUNTY RD	MU-L	MU-N-40	MU-N	0.12097634511	40		warehousing	0	0	2	2	4
046128240	749 OLD COUNTY RD	MU-L	MU-N-40	MU-N	0.17565192090	40	Yes	retail	0	0	3	3	6
046128280		MU-L	MU-N-40	MU-N	0.18993049362	40		vacant	0	0	3	3	6
050034080	1620 SAN CARLOS AVE	MU-MH	MU-SC-120	MU-SC	0.11364707300	120		office/commercial	0	0	6	6	12
050034090	1622 SAN CARLOS AVE	MU-MH	MU-SC-120	MU-SC	0.11483114102	120	Yes	office/commercial	0	0	6	6	12
050034230	1660 SAN CARLOS AVE	MU-MH	MU-SC-120	MU-SC	0.12653867271	120		office/commercial	0	0	6	7	13
050033130	525 SYCAMORE ST	MU-M	RM-59	RM-59	0.12963884137	59	Yes	single family residential	0	0	3	3	6
050033140	529 SYCAMORE ST	MU-M	RM-59	RM-59	0.12869995991	59		single family residential	0	0	3	3	6
050034120	575 PROSPECT ST	MU-M	RM-100	RM-59	0.13093538224	100		office/commercial	0	0	5	5	10
050034130	565 PROSPECT ST	MU-M	RM-100	RM-59	0.14019658422	100	Yes	single family residential	0	0	6	5	11
050034140	557 PROSPECT ST	MU-M	RM-100	RM-59	0.14465043612	100		single family residential	0	0	6	5	11
050062070	508 ELM ST	MU-M	RM-100	RM-59	0.13214334969	100		single family residential	0	0	5	5	10
050062090	510 ELM ST	MU-M	RM-100	RM-59	0.12445253902	100	Yes	single family residential	0	0	5	4	9
050133310	620 EL CAMINO REAL	MU-M	MU-D-120	MU-D	0.13031135444	120		retail	0	0	6	7	13
050133420	628 EL CAMINO REAL	MU-M	MU-D-120	MU-D	0.16254681598	120	Yes	mixed use	0	0	8	9	17
050133320	630 EL CAMINO REAL	MU-M	MU-D-120	MU-D	0.05680786157	120		retail	0	0	3	3	6
050133330	634 EL CAMINO REAL	MU-M	MU-D-120	MU-D	0.05346730209	120	Yes	retail	0	0	2	3	5
050133450	638 EL CAMINO REAL	MU-M	MU-D-120	MU-D	0.08054951935	120		retail	0	0	4	4	8
050133370	648 EL CAMINO REAL	MU-M	MU-D-120	MU-D	0.07977545714	120		retail	0	0	4	4	8
050133440	640 EL CAMINO REAL	MU-M	MU-D-120	MU-D	0.08410986270	120	Yes	commercial	0	0	4	5	9

Thank you,
Ben

Ben Mollahan

Associate | Lic. 02136790

CBRE Capital Markets | Multifamily Properties



www.cbre.com

Details about the personal data CBRE collects and why, as well as your data privacy rights under applicable law, are available at [CBRE – Privacy Policy](#).

From: [Aram James](#)
To: [Sean Allen](#); [Julie Lythcott-Haims](#); [Jethroe Moore](#); [Tanaka, Greg](#); [Council, City](#); [Rebecca Eisenberg](#); [Jay Boyarsky](#); [Human Relations Commission](#); [Planning Commission](#); [Shikada, Ed](#); [Joe Simitian](#); [Cindy Chavez](#); [Otto Lee](#); [Javier Ortega](#); [Supervisor Susan Ellenberg](#); [Bains, Paul](#); [ladoris cordell](#)
Subject: San Francisco Reparations Committee proposes 5 million each for longtime black residents
Date: Monday, January 16, 2023 12:37:44 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Be cautious of opening attachments and clicking on links.

<https://www.foxnews.com/politics/san-frans-reparations-committee-proposes-5-million-each-longtime-black-resident-total-debt-forgiveness.amp>

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Shani Kleinhaus](#)
To: [Sauls, Garrett](#)
Cc: [Architectural Review Board](#); [Gerhardt, Jodie](#); [Planning Commission](#); [Lait, Jonathan](#); [Council, City](#); [Rani Fischer](#)
Subject: Audubon Comments: 3300 El Camino Project
Date: Friday, January 13, 2023 12:36:13 PM
Attachments: [SCVAS Comment on 3300 El Camino Project.pdf](#)

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Be cautious of opening attachments and clicking on links.

Dear Mr. Sauls,

Following our conversation earlier this week, I submit the following letter regarding the all-glass office project proposed on 3300 El Camino Real. The Santa Clara VALley Audubon Society has no reason to believe that the building, as proposed and with City requirements, will be safe for birds. It seems that the location within 300-feet from Matadero Creek, combined with the all-glass architecture and green roof, are likely to create an unjustifiable and unmitigated hazard to resident and migratory birds. In the attached letter, we elaborate on our concerns, suggest solutions, and provide a list of requirements from nearby cities in our area.

Respectfully,

Shani Kleinhaus, Ph.D.
Environmental Advocate
Santa Clara Valley Audubon Society



advocate@scvas.org





January 12, 2023

To: Garret Salus, Jody Gerhardt, Jonathan Lait
Planning and Development Services Department
City of Palo Alto

CC: Architectural Review Board, Planning Commission, City Council

Re: 3300 El Camino Real Office Project, Application #: 21PLN-00028

The Santa Clara Valley Audubon Society promotes the enjoyment, understanding, and protection of birds and other wildlife by engaging people of all ages in birding, education, and conservation. In the urban landscape, we focus on light pollution and bird safety as part of our interest in urban ecology and biodiversity. We appreciate the opportunity to comment on the 3300 El Camino Real Office Project. The Project proposes to construct a new two-story, 50,355 sf office/R&D project with 40% surface parking and 60% below-grade parking and a 2,517 sf amenity space.

1. Bird Safety

The project is located about 150 feet from the riparian corridor of Matadero Creek, and includes trees and vegetation that attract birds. The building consists of expansive surfaces of transparent glass. The location, plantings, and glass create a deadly combination of location-related and structure-related hazards for migratory and resident birds.

The Staff reports and the Mitigated Negative declaration do not include enough information to ensure compliance with the Palo Alto Comprehensive Policy L-6.3: "Encourage bird-friendly design." The Project renderings show glass walls at the ground floor and surrounding roof gardens, see-through glass elements,¹ and reflective glass areas. However, the Project plans² do not mention and provide no information on any bird-safety treatment. In conversation with staff and further research, we understand that the Conditions Of Approval include,

The project shall incorporate bird-safe glazing treatment that may include fritting, netting, permanent stencils, frosted glass, exterior screens, and physical grids placed on the exterior of

¹ See-through elements are glass elements where birds can see a flight path through a wall, a corner, or parallel walls

²

https://www.cityofpaloalto.org/files/assets/public/planning-amp-development-services/new-development-projects/3300-el-camino/c7_3300elc_plan.pdf

glazing or UV patterns visible to birds. In some cases, bird-friendly treatment is invisible to humans. Vertical elements of the window patterns should be at least 1/4-inch-wide at a minimum spacing of 4 inches or have horizontal elements at least 1/8 inch wide at a maximum spacing of 2 inches. The applicant should reference the San Francisco Guidelines for Bird-Safe Buildings: <http://www.sf-planning.org/index.aspx?page=2506>.

It is not clear which parts and architectural elements of the structure are subject to this condition, and how it will be evaluated. For example - how is a “window” defined? Will bird safety glazing be required on the entire glazed facade? Will hazardous areas like corners, glazed areas near a green roof and other architectural elements be treated? The Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) Does not address bird collisions, and provides no detail on how the condition of approval will effectively encourage bird safe design.

Palo Alto has yet to develop Program L6.3.1: “Develop guidelines for bird-friendly building design that minimizes hazards for birds and reduces the potential for collisions” Palo Alto seems to refer applicants to the San Francisco Guidelines for Bird-Safe Buildings.³ These guidelines were adopted in 2011 and have been generally appropriate for San Francisco – a dense City that has no surface creeks. Since then, some of the solutions that San Francisco allows have been shown to be ineffective and are no longer recommended. In addition, several Bay Area Cities have recognized the importance of creeks and riparian corridors in the urban/suburban landscape and require 90% of glass facades to be treated with effective glazing treatments for office buildings and other structures, especially if large expanses of glass are proposed, or the projects are within 300 feet of a water feature. Palo Alto should use Cupertino’s ordinance to ensure that the new development implements bird safe design measures⁴ and prohibits ineffective treatments, such as overhangs and UV glazing. Some Cities allow exemptions based on a biological opinion by a qualified biologist. Palo Alto did not require any biological opinion for the Project and provided ambiguous conditions for bird-safety glazing treatment.

Despite the acknowledgement⁵ that “*given the substantial amount of glazing present on the building, bird-safety glazing treatment is integral to the long-term function of the building and safety of birds travel near and around the site*”, the City’s requirements seem to fall short:

- The City’s condition of approval #8 requires the applicant to incorporate bird-safe glazing treatment, but provide a wide spectrum of implementation choices, including “*fritting, netting, permanent stencils, frosted glass, exterior screens, and physical grids placed on the exterior of glazing or UV patterns visible to birds*” (emphasis added). This direction includes an oxymoron, since UV treatments have been shown to be ineffective and invisible to birds, especially in the

³ <http://www.sf-planning.org/index.aspx?page=2506> and https://sfplanning.org/sites/default/files/resources/2019-09/Design%20Guide%20Standards%20for%20Bird%20Safe%20Bldgs_Final.pdf

⁴

<https://www.cupertino.org/our-city/departments/community-development/planning/non-residential-mixed-use-development/bird-safe-and-dark-sky>

⁵ Architectural Review Board Staff Report (ID # 14743), Oct 29, 2022

early morning and in the evening, when birds are active. UV treatments are also ineffective on cloudy days. Lastly, there are many bird species that cannot see treatments that the human eye cannot see, including hawks that are frequent victims of collision with glass in Palo Alto (SCVAS observations).

- The City requires “Vertical elements of the window patterns to be at least 1/4-inch-wide at a minimum spacing of 4 inches or have horizontal elements at least 1/8 inch wide at a maximum spacing of 2 inches, and refers the applicant to the San Francisco Guidelines for Bird-Safe Buildings⁶. The spacing of visual cues is good, but It is not clear what are the “vertical elements” that are required to implement such visual cues to birds. The Project plans show no bird-safety glass treatment on the hazardous curtain walls and large facades, near landscaping or green roofs, or on the Project’s see-through elements.
- Many cities in our region require 90% of glass facades to be treated with effective glazing treatments in areas within 300-ft of a “bird-activity area”, such as a creek or a park. In addition, hazardous architectural elements and see-through situations - especially where situated within 300-ft of a park, a creek or other bird activity areas - are discouraged, or require stronger bird-safety protection regardless of location (See Appendix A).

Please require specific and effective glazing treatments, including:

- Elimination of transparent, see-through and other hazardous architectural elements.
- Effective bird-safe glazing treatment to 90% of all glass surfaces. Please require glazing that achieves an American Bird Conservancy Threat Factor rating of no more than 15. A product database that offers rated glazing solutions is available online⁷.
- Prohibit UV glazing treatments, angled glass and overhangs from being considered bird-safety glazing treatments.

2. Lighting

In most species studied to date, including humans, the biological clock is synchronized by light. This mechanism evolved over millions of years in response to the daily and annual cycles of sunlight—day and night and their varying lengths that correspond to the change of seasons. Different species developed activity patterns that correspond to these changes in light intensity and daylength and developed anatomical, physiological and behavioral adaptations suitable for day or night activity and seasonality.

The transition to lighting with LED technology saves energy, maintenance requirements, and cost per lighting fixture, but it has introduced unprecedented light pollution into our environment, interfered with biological clocks of most organisms, and has shifted the spectrum of the light to a high blue-light

⁶ <http://www.sf-planning.org/index.aspx?page=2506>

⁷ <https://abcbirds.org/glass-collisions/resources/>

component. These changes have adverse impacts on human health, and devastating impacts to environmental health, ecosystems, and both migrating and resident birds, wildlife species, and even trees in the urban forest. Indeed, outdoor Artificial Light at Night disrupts human sleep and hormonal balance, thereby impacting physical and mental health. Outdoor light at night has been scientifically linked to many contemporary ailments including anxiety disorders, diabetes, various types of cancer and more.

Artificial Light at Night impacts plant and animal behavior from the individual level to ecosystem wide disruption. Reproduction, foraging, migration and seasonal dependencies lose ecological synchrony. Birds and insects are especially impacted, due to their (disruptive and often fatal) attraction to light. Migratory birds are attracted to lit environments, where they are increasingly susceptible to collision with man-made buildings. Insects, including many pollinators, are fatally “trapped” in artificial light.

Palo Alto’s lighting requirements are based on the State Green Buildings requirements, which primarily aim to save energy (but include some provisions to protect the night sky). The City code, however, does not limit the light that may emit from the building itself at night. Furthermore, Palo Alto does not set a limit on the Correlated Color Temperature of lighting fixtures, allowing the use of fixtures that emit harmful blue light in their spectrum.

Please require specific and effective lighting restrictions, including:

- Correlated Color Temperature of no more than 2700K for all outdoor installations
- Blinds to close after 11PM so that light in the building is not visible from outside the building.

3. IS/MND

The IS/MND is inadequate since it has not analyzed, discussed or mitigated the potential impact of bird collision.

- Please analyze and discuss the potential impact on bird collision, and provide adequate mitigation.

APPENDIX A: Cities’ requirements for bird safety treatment

NOTE: Cities that require bird-friendly (or birds-safe) design for buildings and other structures include San Francisco, San Jose, Cupertino, Mountain View, Sunnyvale, Burlingame and others.

NOTE: The following summary of Cities regulations reflects the elements of concern that are relevant/applicable to the 3300 El Camino Office Project’s transparent glazing elements. The summary does not include requirements for addressing highly reflective or mirror-like glass, and does not include specific requirements that are not applicable to office development.

1. City-wide and location Related Hazards

Several cities provide regulations throughout the urban landscape, whereas others address location-related hazards. Usually, location-related hazards include projects within 300-feet of park, open space, riparian corridor, hillsides, or a body of water. Some Cities consider the size of the natural/park/water feature in the requirements.

- a. **San Francisco** defines location-related hazards as those within, or at 300-feet of (if line of sight exists), areas that are 2-acres or more and dominated by vegetation, including vegetated landscaping, forest, meadows, grassland, or wetlands, or open water. In these locations, Bird-Safe Glazing Treatment is required such that the Bird Collision Zone, as defined below, facing the Urban Bird Refuge consists of no more than 10% untreated glazing. Bird Collision Zone are the portion of buildings most likely to sustain bird-strikes and includes: (i) The building façade beginning at grade and extending upwards for 60 feet, or (ii) Glass facades directly adjacent to landscaped roofs 2 acres or larger and extending upwards 60 feet from the level of the subject roof.
- b. **San Jose** requires bird safety treatment within 300-ft of a creek
 - i. Citywide⁸: For façades with more than 20 percent glazing within 60 feet of grade and located within 300 feet from a body of water, including creeks and vegetated flood control channels; or within 100 feet of a landscaped area, open space, or park larger than one acre in size, apply a bird safety treatment to at least 90 percent of the glazed areas within 60 feet of grade (required)
 - ii. Downtown⁹: Use a bird safety treatment on facades within 300 feet of a riparian corridor that have 50% or more glazed surface.
- c. **Mountain View**
 - i. Citywide: For Commercial/Mixed-Use, Bird safety is included in REACH Codes¹⁰: Bird-safe glass shall be installed on the exterior of the structure where the structure is \geq than 10,000 square feet or the applicable precise plan requires it.
 - ii. Precise Plans developed after 2020 include specific Bird Safe Design Standards. This includes East Whisman¹¹ and North Bayshore¹² Precise Plans. These plans require Façade Treatments - No more than 10% of the surface area of a building's total exterior façade shall have untreated glazing between the ground and 60 feet above ground.

⁸ <https://www.sanjoseca.gov/home/showpublisheddocument/69148/637520903552430000> section 3.3.6

⁹ <https://www.sanjoseca.gov/home/showpublisheddocument/38781/637268875547770000> section 4.4.2.b

¹⁰ <https://www.mountainview.gov/civicax/filebank/blobdload.aspx?BlobID=31899> MVCC 8.20.11 - 8.20.12 & Table 101.10

¹¹ <https://www.mountainview.gov/civicax/filebank/blobdload.aspx?BlobID=32005> section 3.11

¹² <https://www.mountainview.gov/civicax/filebank/blobdload.aspx?BlobID=38665> section 5.2

d. Cupertino

- i. Citywide: Façades of all projects subject to bird-safe development requirements shall have: a) No more than 10% of the surface area of the façade be untreated glass between the ground and 60 feet above ground, and b) No more than 5% of the surface area of the façade be untreated glass between 60 feet above ground and up.
- ii. Exemptions: The following are exempted from bird-safe treatment regulations: 1) Any historic structure; 2) First floor retail storefronts, up to a height of 15'; and, 3) Residential development in R1 zoning districts outside of Bird-Sensitive Areas.

e. Sunnyvale has guidelines that are implemented as a requirement.

- i. Within 300-ft of a body of water of one acre or more:
 - Avoid the use of multi-floor expanse of reflective or transparent glass in the first 60 feet of the building design, specifically in these area facing the water or open space;
 - Limit the amount of glass on ground level stories, especially in areas adjacent to landscaping;
 - Consider use of opaque, fritted or etched glass on the ground floor in areas adjacent to landscaped areas.

4. Architectural Element Feature-related Hazards

San Francisco

Feature-related hazards include free-standing glass walls, wind barriers, skywalks, balconies, and greenhouses on rooftops that have unbroken glazed segments 24 square feet and larger in size. Feature-related hazards can occur throughout the City. Any structure that contains these elements shall treat 100% of the glazing on Feature-Specific hazards.

Glass walls adjacent to green roof

San Jose

- ii. Citywide: For non-residential uses, apply a bird safety treatment to glazed areas of any building façade with more than 10 percent glazing that is within 15 vertical feet and 20 horizontal feet of a **green roof or a vegetated courtyard**, within or outside of the development (required)
- iii. Downtown: Use a bird safety treatment on the facade of any floor of the building within 15 vertical feet of the level of and **visible from a green roof**, including a green roof on an adjacent building within 20 horizontal feet, if the facade has 50% or more glazed surface. (required)

f. Mountain View

- i. No special requirements since all glazing requires bird safety treatment

g. Sunnyvale

- i. Citywide: Reduce glass at top of building, especially when incorporating a green roof into the design

2. Hazardous Architectural Elements (See-through elements, corners, free-standing walls, glass skyways and other hazardous elements)

a. San Francisco

- i. Citywide¹³: 100% of building feature-related hazards shall be treated. Building feature-related hazards include free-standing clear glass walls, skywalks, greenhouses on rooftops, and balconies that have unbroken glazed segments 24 square feet and larger in size.

b. San Jose

i. Citywide:

- For non-residential uses, apply a bird safety treatment on areas of glazing within 10 feet of a building corner (required)
- Use a bird safety treatment on parallel panes of glass 30 feet or less apart, such as skyways, walkways, and other glass building connectors (required).
- Use a bird safety treatment on transparent atria, free-standing glass features, and glass architectural elements that protrude from the primary building mass. (required).
- Use a bird safety treatment on windows or other glazed areas through which landscaping, water features, or the sky can be seen through the glass (guideline).

- ii. Downtown: Use a bird safety treatment on areas of glass through which sky or foliage is visible on the other side of parallel panes of glass less than 30 feet apart (required).

c. Sunnyvale (Citywide)

- i. Prohibit glass skyways or freestanding glass walls
- ii. Avoid transparent glass walls coming together at building corners to avoid birds trying to fly through glass

d. Cupertino (Citywide)

- i. All projects shall: 1) Avoid the funneling of flight paths along buildings or trees towards a building façade; 2) Avoid use of highly reflective glass or highly transparent glass; and, 3) Not include skyways or walkways, balconies, freestanding walls, or building corners made of untreated glass or other transparent materials, or any other design elements that are untreated and

13

https://sfplanning.org/sites/default/files/resources/2019-09/Design%20Guide%20Standards%20for%20Bird%20Safe%20Bldgs_Final.pdf and https://sfplanning.org/sites/default/files/documents/reports/bird_safe_bldgs/Standards%20for%20Bird%20Safe%20Buildings%20-%202011-30-11.pdf page 30-31 Requirements for Feature-Related Hazards.

through which trees, landscape areas, water features or the sky are visible from the exterior or from one side of the transparent element to the other.

3. Lighting

a. San Jose

- i. Turn off decorative exterior lighting between 11:00 p.m. and 6:00 a.m. except during June, July, December, and January due to bird migration.

b. Sunnyvale (Citywide)

- i. Turn commercial building lights off at night or incorporate blinds into window treatment to use when lights are on at night;
- ii. Prohibit up lighting or spotlights;

Wednesday, January 11, 2023 Daily Post

Inmate dies after Taser shock

BY EMILY MIBACH
Daily Post Staff Writer

As the new sheriff was being sworn in, an inmate at the Maguire Jail in downtown Redwood City died after she was tasered by South San Francisco police.

Maycarla Sulapas, 25, of South San Francisco, was arrested by South City police Saturday afternoon after family called the police saying Sulapas was "out of control," and family members could not subdue her, said District Attorney Steve Wagstaffe, whose office is investigating Sulapas' death.

Police attempted to get Sulapas into a WRAP restraint, but were having difficulties so they tasered her by putting the machine's prongs directly against

Sulapas' skin, Wagstaffe said. After tasering her, police took Sulapas to Seton Hospital in Daly City to make sure she was OK, Wagstaffe said. She was cleared and taken to Maguire Jail.

At 3:17 p.m., shortly after being booked into the jail, officers noticed that Sulapas was having a medical emergency. She was taken to the Kaiser on Veterans Boulevard in Redwood City, where she died, according to a statement from the sheriff's office.

As all of this was occurring, Sheriff Christina Corpus was being sworn in to her new position. Corpus defeated her old boss, Carlos Bolanos in the June election. Corpus was the de facto chief of police in Millbrae, which uses the sheriff's office as its police force.

From: [Jeanne Fleming](#)
To: [Baltay, Peter](#)
Cc: [Clerk, City](#); [DuBois, Tom](#); [Kou, Lydia](#); [Planning Commission](#); [Architectural Review Board](#); [Lait, Jonathan](#); [REDACTED]; [French, Amy](#)
Subject: Re: Cell Tower Applications
Date: Wednesday, December 14, 2022 9:43:27 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[image002.png](#)
[image004.png](#)
[image005.png](#)
[image006.png](#)
[image007.png](#)

Thanks for the sleuthing, Peter.

Please understand, however, that from the perspective of residents, the issue is not whether the data (or some portion of the data) on cell tower submissions can be found on Building Eye or on another a city system, but whether we're promptly notified of submissions as they are made.

As you know, cell tower applications have a relatively short "shot clock." Hence it is important for interested members of the public to be notified automatically when a submission is made so that we can, if need be, take action.

There's a second issue as well. Our experience has been that the records on city systems with respect to cell towers are not necessarily up-to-date, nor are they necessarily consistent across systems.

All of this is why my emails to Ms. French have emphasized automatic notification, on which residents presumably can rely. Indeed, that is exactly what Building Eye and the Hot Topics cell tower website are intended to provide to the public, but unfortunately don't.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Best to you,

Jeanne

From: Peter Baltay [REDACTED] >
Sent: Wednesday, December 14, 2022 7:04 PM
To: Jeanne Fleming <[REDACTED]>; Amy French <amy.french@cityofpaloalto.org>
Cc: 'Clerk, City' <city.clerk@cityofpaloalto.org>; Tom.DuBois@CityofPaloAlto.org; Lydia.Kou@CityofPaloAlto.org; Planning.Commission@CityofPaloAlto.org; 'Architectural Review Board' <arb@cityofpaloalto.org>; 'Lait, Jonathan' <Jonathan.Lait@CityofPaloAlto.org>; [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Cell Tower Applications

Hi Jeanne and all,

Following the issue, and your correspondence, with interest, I could not help but test out the 'Building Eye' system.

As of this evening, it is an easy matter to search for all WCF permit applications over a specified time period. From the [Palo Alto Building Eye](#) site, click continue, then click the 'filters' tab in the upper left corner. Ignore the 'application number' box, select the date range and WCF application type, and all applications are shown on a hyperlinked map.

Bravo, Amy, Jon and the technical staff!

-peter b.

From: Jeanne Fleming <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Wednesday, December 14, 2022 4:43 PM
To: Amy French <amy.french@cityofpaloalto.org>
Cc: 'Clerk, City' <city.clerk@cityofpaloalto.org>; Tom.DuBois@CityofPaloAlto.org; Lydia.Kou@CityofPaloAlto.org; Planning.Commission@CityofPaloAlto.org; 'Architectural Review Board' <arb@cityofpaloalto.org>; 'Lait, Jonathan' <Jonathan.Lait@CityofPaloAlto.org>; [REDACTED]
Subject: Re: Cell Tower Applications

Dear Ms. French,

Thank you for your response.

In answer to my question "How many cell tower applications—including applications to modify existing cell towers—have been submitted or resubmitted to the City of Palo Alto since June 1, 2021?", you have written:

"A total of 28 WCF [cell tower] projects were submitted to the City of Palo Alto since last July. "

Please tell me the project number of each of the 28 submissions, and please provide me with a link or links to the submissions.

I am stunned that—despite being signed up for not one, but two, Palo Alto automatic notification systems for cell tower projects—I was never notified of any of these 28 projects.

But I am most appreciative that Director Lait is directing staff to put in place reliable automatic notification to interested residents of new cell tower submittals, resubmittals and modifications to existing towers.

Thank you for your help.

Sincerely,

Jeanne Fleming

Jeanne Fleming, PhD
[REDACTED]

From: French, Amy <Amy.French@CityofPaloAlto.org>
Sent: Tuesday, December 13, 2022 11:00 AM
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: Lait, Jonathan <Jonathan.Lait@CityofPaloAlto.org>
Subject: FW: Cell Tower Applications

Hello Ms. Fleming,

I didn't respond because I did not have the answer the day you requested the information. I do now:

Regarding applications filed since July 2021:

A total of 28 WCF projects were submitted to the City of Palo Alto since last July.

Regarding re-submittals:

Building Eye does not provide notifications for re-submittals; it only provides alerts when projects are initially submitted. Building Eye is not sophisticated enough to single out application types when they provide notifications to subscribers. That is, Building Eye will send a notification for every kind of Planning application rather than Wireless Communication Facility (WCF) applications specifically. I believe you would need to sift through notifications to find the ones that are WCF-specific. Director Lait has requested technical staff embark upon an effort with the Building Eye team so that they could target what you are looking for. However, this effort may take some time.

Hopefully, this information is helpful to you.



AMY FRENCH

Chief Planning Official

Planning and Development Services

(650) 329-2336 | amy.french@cityofpaloalto.org

www.cityofpaloalto.org



Service Feedback

From: Jeanne Fleming [REDACTED] <>
Sent: Monday, December 12, 2022 3:12 PM
To: French, Amy <Amy.French@CityofPaloAlto.org>
Cc: Clerk, City <city.clerk@cityofpaloalto.org>; DuBois, Tom <Tom.DuBois@CityofPaloAlto.org>; Kou, Lydia <Lydia.Kou@CityofPaloAlto.org>; Planning Commission <Planning.Commission@cityofpaloalto.org>; Architectural Review Board <arb@cityofpaloalto.org>; Lait, Jonathan <Jonathan.Lait@CityofPaloAlto.org>; [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]
Subject: FW: Cell Tower Applications

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Be cautious of opening attachments and clicking on links.

Dear Ms. French,

I haven't heard from you, so—with the thought that you might have missed my email—I am resending it below.

Thanks and best,

Jeanne Fleming

Jeanne Fleming, PhD
[REDACTED]

From: Jeanne Fleming [REDACTED] >
Sent: Monday, November 28, 2022 5:53 PM
To: 'French, Amy' <Amy.French@CityofPaloAlto.org>
Cc: 'Clerk, City' <city.clerk@cityofpaloalto.org>; Tom.DuBois@CityofPaloAlto.org; Lydia.Kou@CityofPaloAlto.org; Planning.Commission@CityofPaloAlto.org; 'Architectural Review Board' <arb@cityofpaloalto.org>; 'Jonathan' <Jonathan.Lait@CityofPaloAlto.org>; [REDACTED]
Subject: Cell Tower Applications

Dear Ms. French,

I would appreciate it if you would answer this question:

How many cell tower applications—including applications to modify existing cell towers—have been submitted or resubmitted to the City of Palo Alto since June 1, 2021?

As you know, I receive both Building Eye's automatic messaging with respect to building and planning information in Palo Alto, as well as the City's "Hot Topics" cell tower website automatic messaging. Neither has notified me of any new or resubmitted cell tower applications during this period. So I believe the answer to my question is "zero," but I want to be sure.

Thank you for your help.

Sincerely,

Jeanne Fleming

Jeanne Fleming, PhD



From: [Jeanne Fleming](#)
To: [French, Amy](#)
Cc: [Clerk, City](#); [DuBois, Tom](#); [Kou, Lydia](#); [Stone, Greer](#); [Tanaka, Greg](#); ["Julie Lythcott-Haims"](#); ["Vicki Veenker"](#); [Laing, Ed](#); [Planning Commission](#); [Architectural Review Board](#); [Lait, Jonathan](#); [REDACTED];
Subject: FW: Cell Tower Applications
Date: Wednesday, January 4, 2023 4:15:15 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[image002.png](#)
[image004.png](#)
[image005.png](#)
[image006.png](#)
[image007.png](#)

Dear Ms. French,

Happy New Year.

I am resending my email to you of December 14, 2022, with the thought that you may have missed it.

As that email says, I would appreciate it if you would tell me the project number of each of the 28 WCF [cell tower] projects that your December 13th, 2022, email says have been submitted to the City of Palo Alto since June, 2021.

Please note that, while you cite 28 cell tower projects, there are records for only *three* such projects on Palo Alto's Building Eye website. (The project numbers of the three are 21PLN-00260, 21PLN-0213 and 22PLN-00258.)

Please note as well that United Neighbors' members are reporting that Verizon is adding 5G equipment to the cell towers installed in Midtown (original "Vinculums/Verizon Cluster 1"). There is no record of this collocation project on Palo Alto Building Eye.

As I trust you can appreciate, residents are concerned that they do not have complete, accurate or timely information about cell tower applications in Palo Alto.

Thank you, as always, for your help.

Sincerely,

Jeanne Fleming

Jeanne Fleming, PhD
[REDACTED]

From: Jeanne Fleming [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, December 14, 2022 4:43 PM
To: 'French, Amy' <Amy.French@CityofPaloAlto.org>
Cc: 'Clerk, City' <city.clerk@cityofpaloalto.org>; Tom.DuBois@CityofPaloAlto.org;
Lydia.Kou@CityofPaloAlto.org; Planning.Commission@CityofPaloAlto.org; 'Architectural Review Board' <arb@cityofpaloalto.org>; 'Lait, Jonathan' <Jonathan.Lait@CityofPaloAlto.org>;
[REDACTED]
Subject: Re: Cell Tower Applications

Dear Ms. French,

Thank you for your response.

In answer to my question “How many cell tower applications—including applications to modify existing cell towers—have been submitted or resubmitted to the City of Palo Alto since June 1, 2021?”, you have written:

“A total of 28 WCF [cell tower] projects were submitted to the City of Palo Alto since last July. “

Please tell me the project number of each of the 28 submissions, and please provide me with a link or links to the submissions.

I am stunned that—despite being signed up for not one, but two, Palo Alto automatic notification systems for cell tower projects—I was never notified of any of these 28 projects.

But I am most appreciative that Director Lait is directing staff to put in place reliable automatic notification to interested residents of new cell tower submittals, resubmittals and modifications to existing towers.

Thank you for your help.

Sincerely,

Jeanne Fleming

Jeanne Fleming, PhD
[REDACTED]

From: French, Amy <Amy.French@CityofPaloAlto.org>
Sent: Tuesday, December 13, 2022 11:00 AM
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: Lait, Jonathan <Jonathan.Lait@CityofPaloAlto.org>
Subject: FW: Cell Tower Applications

Hello Ms. Fleming,

I didn't respond because I did not have the answer the day you requested the information. I do now:

Regarding applications filed since July 2021:

A total of 28 WCF projects were submitted to the City of Palo Alto since last July.

Regarding re-submittals:

Building Eye does not provide notifications for re-submittals; it only provides alerts when projects are initially submitted. Building Eye is not sophisticated enough to single out application types when they provide notifications to subscribers. That is, Building Eye will send a notification for every kind of Planning application rather than Wireless Communication Facility (WCF) applications specifically. I believe you would need to sift through notifications to find the ones that are WCF-specific. Director Lait has requested technical staff embark upon an effort with the Building Eye team so that they could target what you are looking for. However, this effort may take some time.

Hopefully, this information is helpful to you.



AMY FRENCH

Chief Planning Official
Planning and Development Services
(650) 329-2336 | amy.french@cityofpaloalto.org
www.cityofpaloalto.org



From: Jeanne Fleming [REDACTED] >
Sent: Monday, December 12, 2022 3:12 PM
To: French, Amy <Amy.French@CityofPaloAlto.org>
Cc: Clerk, City <city.clerk@cityofpaloalto.org>; DuBois, Tom <Tom.DuBois@CityofPaloAlto.org>; Kou, Lydia <Lydia.Kou@CityofPaloAlto.org>; Planning Commission <Planning.Commission@cityofpaloalto.org>; Architectural Review Board <arb@cityofpaloalto.org>; Lait, Jonathan <Jonathan.Lait@CityofPaloAlto.org>; [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]

Subject: FW: Cell Tower Applications

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Be cautious of opening attachments and clicking on links.

Dear Ms. French,

I haven't heard from you, so—with the thought that you might have missed my email—I am resending it below.

Thanks and best,

Jeanne Fleming

Jeanne Fleming, PhD
[REDACTED]

From: Jeanne Fleming [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, November 28, 2022 5:53 PM
To: 'French, Amy' <Amy.French@CityofPaloAlto.org>
Cc: 'Clerk, City' <city.clerk@cityofpaloalto.org>; Tom.DuBois@CityofPaloAlto.org;
Lydia.Kou@CityofPaloAlto.org; Planning.Commission@CityofPaloAlto.org; 'Architectural Review Board' <arb@cityofpaloalto.org>; 'Jonathan' <Jonathan.Lait@CityofPaloAlto.org>;
[REDACTED]
Subject: Cell Tower Applications

Dear Ms. French,

I would appreciate it if you would answer this question:

How many cell tower applications—including applications to modify existing cell towers—have been submitted or resubmitted to the City of Palo Alto since June 1, 2021?

As you know, I receive both Building Eye's automatic messaging with respect to building and planning information in Palo Alto, as well as the City's "Hot Topics" cell tower website automatic messaging. Neither has notified me of any new or resubmitted cell tower applications during this period. So I believe the answer to my question is "zero," but I want to be sure.

Thank you for your help.

Sincerely,

Jeanne Fleming

Jeanne Fleming, PhD



From: [Aram James](#)
To: [Binder, Andrew](#); [Shikada, Ed](#); [Council, City](#); [Jeff Rosen](#); [Jethroe Moore](#); [Sean Webby](#); [Julie Lythcott-Haims](#); vicki@vickiforcouncil.com; [Joe Simitian](#); [Winter Dellenbach](#); [Sean Allen](#); [Human Relations Commission](#); [Reifschneider, James](#); [Wagner, April](#); [Greg Tanaka](#); [Tony Dixon](#); [Greer Stone](#); [Ed Lauing](#); [Planning Commission](#)
Subject: San Jose's Police Dogs Under Fire | Campbell, CA Patch
Date: Thursday, December 22, 2022 10:37:52 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Be cautious of opening attachments and clicking on links.

The Campbell Patch has also picked up the Sean Allen & Richard Konda interview:

<https://sanjosespotlight.com/san-jose-police-department-dogs-under-fire-canine-unit-k9-bites-sjpd/>

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Aram James](#)
To: [Miguel Rodriguez](#); [JIM MINKLER1](#); [Molly](#); [Planning Commission](#); [Copy Factory](#); [james pitkin](#); [Tony Dixon](#); [Cecilia Taylor](#); [Betsy Nash](#); [Doug Fort](#); [robert.parham@cityofpaloalto.org](#); [Dr t](#); [Timothy Gray](#)
Subject: San Jose police-dogs-under-fire
Date: Thursday, December 22, 2022 9:23:33 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Be cautious of opening attachments and clicking on links.

<https://patch.com/california/campbell/san-joses->

Shared via the [Google app](#)

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Aram James](#)
To: [Rebecca Eisenberg](#); [Human Relations Commission](#); [Julie Lythcott-Haims](#); [Binder, Andrew](#); [Vicki Veenker](#); [Planning Commission](#); [Council, City](#)
Subject: From The Mercury News e-edition - Two more deaths are linked to cold weather (Palo Alto needs a cold weather shelter too)
Date: Thursday, December 15, 2022 2:03:32 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Be cautious of opening attachments and clicking on links.

I saw this The Mercury News e-edition article on the The Mercury News e-edition app and thought you'd be interested.

Two more deaths are linked to cold weather

https://edition.pagesuite.com/popovers/dynamic_article_popover.aspx?guid=7f3c6468-5efb-422d-89cd-b7d6e6ec6cbe&appcode=SAN252&eguid=b39f1115-1308-416a-bf0e-e2ab2f85c61b&pnum=35#

For more great content like this subscribe to the The Mercury News e-edition app here:

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Aram James](#)
To: [Enberg, Nicholas](#); [Tannock, Julie](#); [Jethroe Moore](#); [Binder, Andrew](#); [Reifschneider, James](#); [Shikada, Ed](#); [Foley, Michael](#); [Michael Gennaco](#); [Sean Allen](#); [Shana Segal](#); [Greer Stone](#); [Julie Lythcott-Haims](#); [Vicki Veenker](#); [Planning Commission](#); [Human Relations Commission](#); [Supervisor Susan Ellenberg](#)
Subject: K-9 training expert analyzes actions of K-9 officer who attacked teen
Date: Wednesday, December 14, 2022 8:37:02 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Be cautious of opening attachments and clicking on links.

<https://youtu.be/ftBTc3e5G0w>

Sent from my iPhone