

From: [Suzanne Keehn](#)
To: [Planning Commission](#)
Subject: Proposed Objective Standards
Date: Wednesday, June 9, 2021 4:08:00 PM

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

These new 'objective standards' remove privacy and shielding that will impact in the Mayfield neighborhood. The current law says when **"new projects are built abutting existing lower-scale residential development, care shall be taken to respect the scale and privacy of neighboring properties"**. These 'objective standards' remove the current language, that new projects shall take into account the privacy of neighboring residents, and the scale of the project. For transparency I suggest you verify that the 35 ft. height limit for PC's remains in the current code.

In even considering these codes, you need to provide a transparent and communication with the public, especially in the RM zones, on how the proposed design standards changes will effect them, no outreach to neighborhoods has been done.

Provide drawings of examples of the effect of the changes, such as sight lines, privacy, and shading if the code was changed. Compare them to the existing standards.

How do these proposed standards compare with the State-required ones vs. the Staffs suggested changes to our standards. Are they reducing Palo Alto's own ability to review projects based on public input, and our city's own ARB< PTC, and the Council.

The statement in the Report that says the staff is 'interpreting' code, suggests that they are deviating from the standards that already that have been used making such decisions currently, which have existed for many years.

Please support a livable environment, be transparent, communicate with us and listen to our residents.

Sincerely,

Suzanne Keehn
4076 Orme.
94306

From: [Ann Balin](#)
To: [Planning Commission](#)
Subject: Code clean up
Date: Wednesday, June 9, 2021 3:39:34 PM

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

Dear Chair Hechtman & Fellow Commissioners,

I am writing to request that you give the PTC more time to be able to do due diligence regarding the code clean designed by staff. Do not change the code without proper analysis.

This dense data has not been vetted by the community. The impacts appear to not have been addressed. It is advisable to maintain the height limits on buildings. Please retain the height limit at 35 feet. Should height standards be relaxed around apartments and condos this will lead to the a loss of quality of life in neighborhoods.

Please invest the time to allow your body to properly address what is before you by giving the PTC an item by item approach to this critical 'clean up.'

Respectfully yours,

Ann Lafargue Balin

From: [Patience Young](#)
To: [Planning Commission](#)
Cc: [Patience Young](#)
Subject: Zoning codes and related decisions
Date: Wednesday, June 9, 2021 3:00:47 PM

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

9 June 2021

To: the City of Palo Alto Planning and Transportation Commission

From: Patience Young, 157 So. California Avenue, #H202, Palo Alto

Re: Zoning codes and related decisions

I write as a concerned citizen who has resided in the condominium community of Palo Alto Central for 25 years and now fully own my home. The neighborhood has changed somewhat since I arrived here, in ways desirable and regrettable, and I know that any urban area is subject to changes and growth over time. I fully support the intent to provide housing opportunities for all who work in our city—indeed, were it not for the condominium option, I would not have been able to purchase my home within walking distance of my professional life at Stanford.

The issues we face today are not only to establish new housing in Palo Alto, but also to do so humanely, recognizing that all residents are entitled to share a quality of life that our city is known for. Some Palo Alto homes are modest while others are among the finest to be found anywhere, but there has been a standard of living city-wide that all residents want, are perhaps now anxious, to maintain. We take pride in our city, and I hope to take pride in the city's successes to provide affordable housing options; together we will forge ahead to accomplish our goals.

My neighborhood, the California Avenue business district and once the village of Mayfield, is a mixed-use area. Residents enjoy access to public transportation, local shops, and a year-round farmers' market. Businesses may come and go; residents like myself tend to stay, and establish community together, much as in other neighborhoods in our city. As we face urban growth, what do my neighbors—residents as well as business people—need to thrive and maintain our quality of life? What do we see endangered by current and anticipated proposals for our district, by changes in zoning here and elsewhere in our city?

These are concerns for my neighbors:

1. <!--[endif]-->Foremost and basic: access to daylight and fresh air. Height restrictions, setbacks, and density limits are essential to provide all residents, long-time and newcomer alike, with living areas that are truly livable.

2. <!--[endif]-->Traffic congestion: our streets were not intended to carry the load of traffic that will accompany new occupancy in the area.
3. <!--[endif]-->Parking: despite a new multi-level parking structure, parking in our neighborhood will soon become a big problem, if planning does not *require* new construction to provide *truly adequate* parking for occupants, residents, customers, visitors.
4. <!--[endif]-->Green space: new housing in this neighborhood will not have the private lawns and gardens found nearly everywhere else in Palo Alto; nor do we have neighborhood parks for people of all ages to play and exercise. Housing density without public spaces for recreation greatly diminishes quality of living.
5. <!--[endif]-->Noise pollution
6. <!--[endif]-->Density and adequate living spaces: we've seen recent proposals for housing units that are virtually the size of motel rooms. These are disheartening to a resident, oppressive for a residential building, and over-demanding for a neighborhood. See #s 1-5 above.

Failure of the city to address these concerns will lead, in the long run and not-too-distant future, to conditions that fester discontent and distress. Our fair city can lead by example to overcome these early symptoms of urban blight, and to maintain our reputation for quality of living.

This is our home. Yours is here, as well. Quality of life is ours to respect and sustain.

Thank you for your attention to these concerns.

Patience Young

From: [Tirumala Ranganath](#)
To: [Planning Commission](#)
Cc: [Rebecca Sanders](#); [ranguranganath](#)
Subject: Relaxing of height limits near homes with R-1 zoning
Date: Wednesday, June 9, 2021 2:59:30 PM

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

Dear City Planning Commission Members,

I am a resident of the greater Ventura Neighborhood and have been in Palo Alto since 1981. I wish to express my extreme concern to the direction building permitting, as well as exception requests being entertained by the city council due to the recommendations coming out of the Planning Commission. Specifically I am talking about lifting the limits on building height to 50' from the current 35' limit. One of the arguments being used to go along with these exceptions is that transit areas should be allowed these.

First of, I thought Palo Alto needed BMR and low cost housing options and not market rate options. If one were to look at projects being proposed, one sees that BMR units are offered as a small fraction of the total that is being planned. **At this rate, Palo Alto will never build enough BMR and low cost housing to make a real difference.** The question one is forced to ask under these circumstances is whether the constant banter about how PA needing to build 6000 units in the next so many years, is just a huge give away to developer interests with lip service being paid to BMR and low cost housing needs. There is no real interest to address the BMR and low cost housing needs is the unmistakable conclusion that one is forced into.

Another argument that is thrown around is that transit rich areas should have denser housing. I thought the real problem was there were not enough options available to service workers to live in Palo Alto. However using the transit argument, one wonders if the residents of these higher density units are going to take the transit to go elsewhere ? Am I missing something in this picture. How exactly does the proximity to transit argument help solve the housing for service workers that we keep talking about but never really addressing ?

I believe, as Planning Commission members you must be aware of the kinds of questions/arguments I am posing here. What then is your response in terms of actually addressing these issues ? Increasing the building height right next to houses in an R-1 zoned area, such as the project at 2951 ECR begs an honest and direct answer. What happens to the rights of the R-1 property owners affected by the 50' height limit that affects their daylight plane concerns? The transit rich proximity argument is a lame one under these circumstances.

For heaven's sake, please carry out the intent of the zoning code that is already on the books and don't attempt to satisfy developer interests at the cost of residents who have already made their choice and plunked down a boatload of money to get

their property. Fairness demands that you don't suddenly start changing the rules after the game is already in progress.

Thank you for listening to my concerns,

Sincerely, Ranganath

From: [Arthur Keller](#)
To: [Planning Commission](#)
Subject: Objective Standards
Date: Wednesday, June 9, 2021 2:25:40 PM

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

Dear Planning and Transportation Commission,

Please do not relax standards while codifying objective standards. For example, height is not subjective and does not need to be relaxed at this time.

We should eliminate at extra FAR and height for hotels at this time, however.

Best regards,
Arthur

From: [Annette Glanckopf](#)
To: [Planning Commission](#)
Subject: On tonight's agenda
Date: Wednesday, June 9, 2021 1:12:41 PM

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

Please DO NOT not relax the current 35 foot height limit around apartment buildings.

Why I do not favor this:

Signaling a willingness to relax height standards around apartment buildings will inevitably lead to the erosion of height standards everywhere and we may well see this as the tip of the iceberg as 50 foot buildings begin to dot the city.

Height, massing and density adds stress on infrastructure that is already inadequately funded. water, schools, roads, parkland etc

Denser development will add to traffic, pollution and will reduce the residential experience quality of life.

Annette Glanckopf

From: [Judith Fields](#)
To: [Planning Commission](#); [Council, City](#)
Subject: proposed zoning change
Date: Wednesday, June 9, 2021 11:49:53 AM

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

My name is Judith Fields. I live in Palo Alto Central, basically at the corner of Grant and Park. The soon to be approved affordable housing complex. is across Park on Grant. Also across Grant (on the other side) is a site for the proposed zone change. At the rate this is going, I'll only be able to see the sun if I go to the parking lot of the Courthouse.

I understand that Palo Alto is under pressure to add more housing. Just as single family residents want to retain their zoning, so do those of use who already live in dense housing.

It seems as if staff has seized on the area around Park Boulevard as the place to solve their housing problem. The numbers may work for the staff, but they don't work for people. Are politics part of this zoning proposal?

How dare you change the density in an already dense area.! You're creating a mid level ghetto at the expense of the people who live here and who would be living here. The impact on circulation is too horrible to comprehend.

I feel I am being pushed beyond my limits. I want the city to leave zoning as it is and allow me some breathing room. Too much density is not good for children and other living things.

thank you, Judith Fields

--

Judith Fields
2581 Park Boulevard, Y103
Palo Alto, CA 94306
650-283-7288

From: [Rebecca Sanders](#)
To: [Planning Commission](#)
Subject: Please do not stick it to apartment dwellers - keep it at 35 feet
Date: Wednesday, June 9, 2021 9:41:38 AM

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

Dear Commissioners:

Thank you for your service. These are exciting times and so many opportunities to serve your community well.

I object to relaxing the 35 foot height limit and I'll tell you why:

It treats apartment dwellers unfairly. Just because you live in an apartment building/condo shouldn't mean you get to wake up to a different view out your window in Palo Alto. Please empathize with your neighbors. I know you wouldn't want to live in such a home or for your child to have less access to air, light and open space. Or at least I imagine that the majority of you would not.

Palo Altans have resisted turning into Mountain View and Redwood City - where denser development has added to traffic, congestion and the erosion of the residential experience quality of life.

Plus there is no law that requires adding **parkland, fire and police protection** commensurate with each new development. Height and massing and density adds to stress on infrastructure that is already inadequately funded,

Thank you for hearing my concerns.

Kind regards,

Becky Sanders
Ventura Neighborhood

From: [Marsha Grossman](#)
To: [Planning Commission](#)
Cc: [DuBois, Tom](#)
Subject: Residential Construction in Palo Alto
Date: Sunday, June 6, 2021 10:56:33 AM

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

City of Palo Alto Planning Commission Members:

Please, please listen to residents with regard to the proposed housing currently being considered by the City of Palo Alto. Existing codes are there for a reason. We want our neighborhoods friendly and safe. Allowing new construction of high-density and buildings over 50 feet should not be permitted.

If you would actually take the time and walk around Park Blvd, you would see the multitude of office buildings that remain vacant. Why not transform some of the buildings to residential housing?

The height requirement must not be changed to accommodate some greedy builders and some staff that might be unaware of these significant changes.

I fully support teacher housing but not at the increased height that is currently proposed. Please let us compromise and work with both current residents and current city guidelines.

A concerned resident,
Marsha Grossman
2563 Park Blvd, P-100
Palo Alto, CA 94306
650-575-3786

From: [Peter Jon Shuler](#)
To: [Planning Commission](#)
Cc: [Council, City](#); [City Mgr](#)
Subject: PTC 6/9/21 Item 2 Discriminates against RM-40 residents
Date: Saturday, June 5, 2021 6:00:22 PM

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

Dear Commissioners,

I am a resident and board of directors member of the 141-unit Palo Alto Central Condominium Complex next to the California Avenue Caltrain station. My wife, Jamie Beckett, and I are writing to express our strong opposition to the planning staff's proposed zoning changes on this week's agenda. We will be out of town on June 9th and not available to attend online, so we are sending this letter. Otherwise we would be there at the meeting to address our concerns in person.

We recently noticed with horror that what the staff is trying to pass off as a minor matter of housecleaning and standardizing of city zoning code will have a potentially disastrous impact on RM-40 zoned neighborhoods like ours.

I find it especially alarming that residents directly affected by this change (us) were given zero notification from the city about it. Apparently, staff doesn't consider residents stakeholders. Apparently staff thinks consulting with architects and developers constitutes sufficient public outreach. I also find it suspicious that these changes are being railroaded through at the same time a major monster project proposed next to our community (123 Sherman) is in the works that would benefit from the changes, to our detriment.

The entire staff report labeled "PTC Review of Objective Design Standards" is riddled with changes that will only increase the inequity in the 2-tiered system the city has created between people in multifamily dwellings and everybody else. And it's being rushed through the ARB and PTC without any true public outreach so residents can understand the impacts on their homes. This obscure process is not an appropriate way to change what's a hugely important issue to many, many residents.

The huge data-dump of new material in this report seems like an elaborate game of three-card Monte where the planning staff appears to be trying to hide what it's really up to and the havoc it will wreak on existing communities like ours.

RM-40 developments are required to have a 35 foot height limit. But in this proposed document, developers building projects next to us are encouraged to "shoot for the moon" and build oversized, under-parked monstrosities that reach 50 or 60 feet or even higher. How is this fair? Why are you punishing those of us who already live in RM-40 zoned communities?

In this new report, staff has practically BURIED one of the most toxic aspects of their presentation to the ARB on height transitions. But just because they didn't mention the change explicitly here doesn't mean they've dropped it from their agenda.

In a nutshell, the change is designed to take away the LAST VESTIGE of protection we have from MONSTER PROJECTS like the one proposed at 123 Sherman (our LITERAL BACKYARD).

If you read the Palo Alto zoning code carefully – which of course you have – it becomes evident that the deck is stacked against those of us living in high-density zones known as RM-40, which are earmarked for multi-family developments like ours.

Current zoning requires developers of most projects to limit the height of their buildings to no taller than 35 feet next to EVERY residential zone in Palo Alto – EXCEPT for RM-40. Commercially-zoned buildings next to us in Palo Alto Central are allowed to be 50 feet high – or possibly even taller.

There is one exception. Under the current code, developers of Planned Community or PC projects face a 35-foot height limit next to every residential zone in Palo Alto -- including RM-40.

The staff had been seeking to close what they probably see as a mere loophole and raise the height limit to 50 feet for RM-40 (and RM-30). But to us, it means stripping us of the last meager protection we have.

Earlier staff reports (see ARB Staff Report ID # 12197, dated 4/15/21 - Attachment A: Height Transition Memo) spelled this change out in detail, but the new PTC 6/9/21 Staff Report attempts to sweep it under the rug and pretend it never existed. Rather than even mention it as a change in the current code, the staff report to the PTC simply sneaks it into the proposed changes as if it was always there. You have to hunt for it, but tucked away in tiny type, you can find it at the top of packet page 75 (page 68 in the pdf):

(5) For sites abutting an RM-40 zoned residential district or a residential Planned Community (PC) district, maximum height may be increased to 50 feet.

But it doesn't stop there. The report goes on to push for more Housing Incentive Programs and other developer welfare that opens the door to denser, taller, more obtrusive developments practically on top of us. In this new version, apparently, "the sky's the limit" when building next to existing RM-40 communities. Even "context" doesn't seem to matter anymore. The elimination of context-based standards just gives more leeway for the staff to let developers do whatever they want.

The architectural flourishes described as examples in this report for new developments do not change the fact that these overbearing, Soviet-era monoliths will be towering over us, blocking our sunlight and invading our privacy.

If these proposals go through, as city staff seems to hope, the proposed development at 123 Sherman could be an aggressive and intrusive high rise that would tower over our modest community -- depriving us of light and air. We are not the only RM-40 residents in Palo Alto that this would affect. But ours is the case we know best.

And why is this happening to RM-40 zones like ours? Why indeed? We are the "missing middle" that local agencies and officials claim to be trying to keep from migrating out of the Bay Area. We are the people who moved to these multi-family dwellings and transit-oriented developments years

ago before it was fashionable to do so. As pioneers moving into places nobody else wanted, we should be the heroes of this story. But instead we are the disposable ones who are expected to put up with more construction, more traffic congestion, more ugly "fortress-style" developments and dog-eat-dog competition for street parking.

We are treated like the slums of Palo Alto -- where the city comes to dump everything nobody else wants. And WHY? Because the city has FAILED. For many years, the city has approved one massive office building after another -- especially near us on Park Blvd. And now -- because of state mandates and threats -- the city has found religion and wants to build housing. But since it's already allowed the development of acres of office buildings (many of which now sit empty) Palo Alto wants to solve its housing problems and the poor planning decisions of the past ON OUR BACKS!

This is a basic fairness and equity issue. Why don't we have the same rights to sunlight and air as everyone else in Palo Alto? Instead of trying to axe the one protection RM-40 folks like us have, the city should be striving to ensure that RM-40 residents enjoy the same protections enjoyed by all other residential districts in the city. To repeat, you should be ESTABLISHING reasonable height limits for developments next to existing RM-40 zoned neighborhoods --NOT doing away with them.

Finally, let us leave you with this ominous quote from page 3 of the pdf (packet page 10) of the staff's report:

The PTC and City Council typically review projects that include legislative changes (e.g., zoning text or map amendments) and subdivision maps. As such, proposed changes to the AH and WH Overlay Districts, and the expansion of the Housing Incentive Program as an alternative to the PTOD overlay, would reduce PTC and City Council's involvement in these projects.

This is bad policy -- and bad politics. It gives the staff too much discretion in planning decisions that could adversely affect neighborhoods. It seems like this whole thing is designed to take the PTC and Council -- and the public -- out of the review process so developers can do more with less consideration for those in surrounding properties.

Who is calling the shots in Palo Alto City Hall -- the developers and large landowners? It seems like the city works for the rich and the powerful -- not for city residents.

Please prove us wrong and reject this proposal. Or at least give it more time for a public airing. Please prove us wrong and change the code to remove discrimination against people living in RM-40 and provide us with the same protections enjoyed by all other Palo Alto residents.

Sincerely,

Peter Jon Shuler
Jamie M. Beckett
2577 Park Blvd. Unit V203
Palo Alto, CA 94306

From: [Aram James](#)
To: city.council@menlopark.org; citycouncil@mountainview.gov; [Council, City](#); [Planning Commission](#); [Human Relations Commission](#); [chuck jagoda](#); CA18AEima@mail.house.gov; [Josh Becker](#); [Jeff Moore](#); [Roberta Ahlquist](#); [Greer Stone](#); [DuBois, Tom](#); [Jeff Rosen](#); [ParkRec Commission](#); [Joe Simitian](#); wilpf.peninsula.paloalto@gmail.com; [winter dellenbach](#); [Shikada, Ed](#); [Tanaka, Greg](#)
Subject: : Announcement: The ZIM-Chartered Volans left Port of Oakland without unloading!
Date: Saturday, June 5, 2021 3:09:08 PM

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

FYI: From extraordinary activist Donna Wallach

Thanks to the commitment, diligence and solidarity of many San Francisco Bay Area activists, and Local 10 and Local 34, the ZIM-chartered Volans left the Port of Oakland earlier this afternoon (Friday 4th June). Longshoremen and port truckers honored the picket lines, and the ship left unworked.

It looks like the San Francisco Bay Area has now organized the only successful labor action anywhere in the world - to date - against the most current atrocities in Gaza. For 11 days in May 2021, the Israeli Occupation Forces murdered over 240 Palestinian civilians, 66 of them were children, tens of thousands were wounded. Over 13,100 homes were destroyed or made uninhabitable, hospitals and clinics were bombed, as were roads leading to the hospitals and clinics. A major media center was totally demolished, and over 2,300 Palestinians became homeless. These are extremely dire results, since War Criminal Terrorist Apartheid Israel refuses to allow any building or rebuilding supplies into Gaza and also limits the amount of medicines and medical supplies that get in. This is just a brief list.

The Stop ZIM Action Committee is continuing to monitor the situation, to make sure that the Volans doesn't try to sneak back into Oakland Port. We hope other West Coast ports will refuse to work the Volans. In addition, Stop ZIM Action Committee is tracking other ZIM-Chartered and ZIM-Operated ships.

The Stop ZIM Action Committee would like to thank the longshoremen of Local 10, the ships' clerks of Local 34 and the port truckers for honoring the picket line, and the Block the Boat Coalition, consisting of tens of Bay Area organizations, and individuals, for their role in making the picket successful.

in solidarity

Donna

--

"Nobody in the world, nobody in history, has ever gotten their freedom by appealing to the moral sense of the people who were oppressing them."

Assata Shakur

Free Palestine!

Right of Return to Palestine for all Palestinians!

Free all political prisoners!

Leonard Peltier

www.WhoIsLeonardPeltier.info

Mumia Abu-Jamal

www.FreeMumia.com

Ruchell Cinque Magee

<http://denverabe.wordpress.com/prisoners-dabc-supports/political-prisoners-database/ruchell-cinque-magee/>

Russell Maroon Shoatz

<https://russellmaroonshoatz.wordpress.com/>

Mutulu Shakur

<http://mutulushakur.com/site/>

The Holy Land Five:

Shukri Abu Baker

Ghassan Elashi

Mufid Abdulqader

Abdulrahman Odeh

Mohammad Elmezain

<https://www.mintpressnews.com/the-trial-and-conviction-of-the-holy-land-foundation-five/237440/>

and thousands more

End Solitary Confinement

<https://prisonerhungerstrikesolidarity.wordpress.com>

California Prison Focus

http://newest.prisons.org/our_story

End United States of Amerikkka invasions and occupations

U.S. Government and UN Occupation Force Soldiers - Hands off Haiti!

<http://www.haitisolidarity.net/>

From: [Aram James](#)
To: [Council, City](#); [Human Relations Commission](#); [Rebecca Eisenberg](#); [chuck.jagoda](#); [ParkRec Commission](#); [Roberta Ahlquist](#); wilpf.peninsula.paloalto@gmail.com; [winter.dellenbach](#); [Joe Simitian](#); [Planning Commission](#); [DuBois, Tom](#); [Greer Stone](#); [Tanaka, Greg](#); [Shikada, Ed](#); [Cormack, Alison](#); city.council@menlopark.org
Subject: Fremont approve Safe Parking Program sets aside \$340,000 in federal CARES Act money
Date: Friday, June 4, 2021 9:10:52 AM

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

Follow the link below to view the article.

https://mercurynews-ca-app.newsmemory.com/?publink=3e456879f_1345dd0

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Aram James](#)
To: [Tanaka, Greg](#); [Council, City](#); [Rebecca Eisenberg](#); [Human Relations Commission](#); [Planning Commission](#); [Roberta Ahlquist](#); [chuck jagoda](#); [wilpf.peninsula.paloalto@gmail.com](#); [winter dellenbach](#); [Greer Stone](#); [Jeff Moore](#); [Jeff Rosen](#); [Joe Simitian](#); [mark weiss](#); [city.council@menlopark.org](#); [ParkRec Commission](#); [paloaltofreepress@gmail.com](#)
Subject: California commission to study reparations
Date: Wednesday, June 2, 2021 8:43:00 AM

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

Follow the link below to view the article.

https://mercurynews-ca-app.newsmemory.com/?publink=65b51629b_1345dce

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Aram James](#)
To: [Tanaka, Greg](#); [Council, City](#); [Rebecca Eisenberg](#); [Human Relations Commission](#); [Planning Commission](#); [Roberta Ahlquist](#); [chuck jagoda](#); [wilpf.peninsula.paloalto@gmail.com](#); [winter dellenbach](#); [Greer Stone](#); [Jeff Moore](#); [Jeff Rosen](#); [Joe Simitian](#); [mark weiss](#); [city.council@menlopark.org](#); [ParkRec Commission](#); [paloaltofreepress@gmail.com](#)
Subject: California commission to study reparations
Date: Wednesday, June 2, 2021 8:43:00 AM

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

Follow the link below to view the article.

https://mercurynews-ca-app.newsmemory.com/?publink=65b51629b_1345dce

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Jeanne Fleming](#)
To: [Lait, Jonathan](#)
Cc: [Clerk, City](#); [Council, City](#); [Planning Commission](#); [Architectural Review Board](#); "Tina Chow"; todd@toddcollins.org; wross@lawross.com
Subject: RE: Planning Dept.'s failure to inform public re cell tower applications
Date: Tuesday, June 1, 2021 4:16:08 PM

Dear Jonathan,

Thank you for your response.

As I read your letter, I believe you are confusing pro forma compliance with statutory transparency requirements—e.g., sending what amounts to bulk mail to the “Occupant” of residences within 600 feet of a proposed cell tower—with the actual principle of transparency, a principle that is a cornerstone of democracy.

It was in the interest of true transparency that Palo Alto, like many other cities, established a Wireless Hot Topics website—a website Staff was meant to keep up-to-date and to further support by sending email alerts to residents who’d signed up to be notified when up-dates were posted. But close to two years ago, City Manager Shikada instructed Staff to stop maintaining the Wireless Hot Topics website, even though 1) cell towers are, as you know, an important issue to a great many residents, 2) new cell tower applications are being submitted all the time, and 3) these applications must be turned around within a relatively short time frame.

In response to specific points in your email, I would like to point out that:

1. While there are, as you note, project websites that residents can access which include some of the information about cell tower applications that residents seek, these sites are not kept up-to-date. To pick one example: On the Planning Department’s project website there is no record that the applications for the project you approved on May 25th were ever deemed complete. In other words, the first a resident checking your department’s website would have learned that the set of applications resubmitted on April 27th were deemed complete was *after* you approved them. Moreover, residents checking only Building Eye would still not know today, June 1st, that you had approved the project—this despite the fact that a 14 day appeals clock started ticking seven days ago. (Perhaps you are unaware of these problems. If so, I would be happy to send you the copies I made of the website pages so you can see what I’m referencing.)
2. Building Eye, which is intended to provide alerts to employees and residents regarding development projects, *still* doesn’t work for residents, not with respect

to cell tower projects.

3. As your letter acknowledges, you and your colleagues in the Planning Department are, from my regular emails on behalf of United Neighbors, well aware that I repeatedly asked to be kept updated on the status of cell tower applications. Indeed, Staff assured me that I would be, and the last time I wrote to remind you of my interest was on April 15, 2021. Yet, when twelve days later the application you subsequently approved was resubmitted and then deemed complete, no one in your Department chose to let me know. It is difficult for United Neighbors not to conclude that, rather than keeping us up-to-date, as had been promised, your Department chose to keep us in the dark.
4. *For the first time ever*, a Palo Alto Planning Director chose to approve a set of cell tower applications without first submitting them to the Architectural Review Board (ARB) for their recommendation. How is it possible that no one in the Planning Department thought interested residents might like to know, before the project was approved, that you were in the process of unilaterally approving a set of applications without the input—and without the open-to-the-public hearings—of the ARB?
5. In your email, you say your decision wasn't made in haste. Yet you a) deemed the resubmitted set of applications complete and b) approved them, all within twenty business days of receiving the resubmitted applications. That seems hasty to me ... plus it was unnecessary given the number of days on the shot clock.

In closing, I'd like to call your attention to a theme that comes through loud and clear throughout your email, namely: your complete lack of interest in soliciting the views of residents before you made a decision, even though residents have been actively engaged for the past five years in establishing Palo Alto's cell tower policy. Indeed, I fear it never occurred to you, not only that residents might like to know what was going on before their only option was to appeal your decision, but also that Palo Alto's Director of Planning ought to know—and ought to want to know—what residents are thinking before making a decision of the magnitude of this one.

Sincerely,

Jeanne

Jeanne Fleming, PhD
JFleming@Metricus.net
650-325-5151

From: Lait, Jonathan <Jonathan.Lait@CityofPaloAlto.org>

Sent: Thursday, May 27, 2021 6:57 PM

To: Jeanne Fleming <jfleming@metricus.net>

Cc: chow_tina@yahoo.com; todd@toddcollins.org; wross@lawross.com; City Mgr <CityMgr@cityofpaloalto.org>

Subject: RE: Planning Dept.'s failure to inform public re cell tower applications

Ms. Fleming,

Thank you for your email. I'd like to share a different perspective. Since this application was filed one year ago, our staff has sent nearly 5,000 mailed notices to owners and occupants within 600 feet of these three wireless facilities with our last mailing occurring one month ago. We have updated and maintained a project website with access to project plans and contact information to the project planner. Our staff helped troubleshoot your technical problems accessing the City's application platform (BuildingEye) and responded to your many emails. And, as you have noted, you received a copy of the decision letter, which was also shared with the school district. All of these actions go beyond the municipal code requirements for application processing, which we have also complied with, and include site posting, mailed notification when an application is filed and when a decision is made, and an applicant-sponsored community meeting.

To succinctly answer your question, there is no statutory requirement to provide additional notification when a project is deemed complete. I appreciate from your email that you would have preferred notice when the project status changed and will explore options to inform you accordingly for future wireless applications.

I am sorry that you find our outreach efforts unsatisfactory. I disagree with the suggestion that our efforts represent an egregious lack of transparency or that the decision was made in haste. I believe the administrative record suggests otherwise. If you disagree with the administrative decision that has been made, you may file an appeal.

Sincerely,

Jonathan

JONATHAN LAIT

Director

Planning and Development Services

(650) 329-2679 | jonathan.lait@cityofpaloalto.org

www.cityofpaloalto.org



From: Jeanne Fleming <jfleming@metricus.net>

Sent: Tuesday, May 25, 2021 6:32 PM

To: Lait, Jonathan <Jonathan.Lait@CityofPaloAlto.org>

Cc: Clerk, City <city.clerk@cityofpaloalto.org>; Council, City <city.council@cityofpaloalto.org>; Planning Commission <Planning.Commission@cityofpaloalto.org>; Architectural Review Board <arb@cityofpaloalto.org>; chow_tina@yahoo.com; todd@toddcollins.org; wross@lawross.com

Subject: Planning Dept.'s failure to inform public re cell tower applications

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

Dear Jonathan,

Earlier today I received an email from the Planning Department's Amy French informing me that you have approved three new small cell node wireless installations in Palo Alto. (Ms. French's email is appended below.)

As you can imagine, residents have many questions about the process you employed in approving these installations and about the basis for your decisions.

But for the time being, I would very much appreciate it if you would answer just one question: **Why didn't you inform the public when the Planning Department deemed the applications for these facilities complete—that is, reveal to residents weeks ago that the applications were now under active consideration by the Planning Department for approval?**

This would have afforded residents the opportunity to review the completed applications ourselves and make our views known to you, to City Council and to the Architectural Review Board—an opportunity that is a core City of Palo Alto policy and value.

Instead, only now, after the fact, are residents being told 1) that you have approved, at breakneck speed, applications no one knew had even been deemed complete, and 2) that residents' only option is to pay a \$600 plus fee and—within fourteen days, no less—file an appeal of your decision.

As you know, I have repeatedly asked to be kept informed about wireless installation applications, including this set. And the last I was told about this set is that it was deemed incomplete. That was in February, 2021. (Ever since City Manager Shikada made the decision not to keep the Wireless Hot Topics updated, information provided directly by your department has been the only realistic way for residents to keep abreast of the status of cell tower applications.)

Please understand that my question—namely, why were residents not told weeks ago that these applications had been deemed complete?—is not rhetorical. I, and many others, would like you to explain this egregious lack of transparency, a lack of transparency which has had the effect of cutting residents out of the cell tower approval process.

Sincerely,

Jeanne

Jeanne Fleming, PhD
JFleming@Metricus.net
650-325-5151

From: French, Amy <Amy.French@CityofPaloAlto.org>
Sent: Tuesday, May 25, 2021 10:42 AM
To: Jeanne Fleming <jfleming@metricus.net>
Cc: Sauls, Garrett <Garrett.Sauls@CityofPaloAlto.org>; Atkinson, Rebecca <Rebecca.Atkinson@CityofPaloAlto.org>
Subject: City of Palo Alto: Tentative Approval of a Wireless Antenna Approval

Hello Ms. Fleming,
Please see link below to latest Tentative Approvals of three nodes.

<https://www.cityofpaloalto.org/files/assets/public/planning-amp-development-services/new-development-projects/wireless-projects/20pln-00118/20pln-00118-vinculums-cluster-4-decision-letter.pdf>.

The letter includes information on how an interested party may appeal this decision to the City Council. If an appeal is filed, it is anticipated it would occur on Tuesday, June 22, 2021.

From: slevy@ccsce.com
To: [Wong, Tim](#); [Lait, Jonathan](#)
Cc: [Council, City](#); [Planning Commission](#)
Subject: unused retail space and housing opportunities
Date: Tuesday, June 1, 2021 3:00:09 PM

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

<https://www.mercurynews.com/2021/06/01/california-eyes-shuttered-malls-stores-for-new-housing/>

Tim, I think this article would be of interest to the HE group

Steve

From: [Karen Wray](#)
To: [Planning Commission](#)
Subject: Palo Alto Ground Floor Office Ban Outcome?
Date: Tuesday, June 1, 2021 12:02:21 PM

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

Hello,

My name is Karen Wray and I am the owner of The Karen Wray Gallery in Los Alamos, NM. I am contacting you to inquire about the outcome of the ground floor office ban your community considered in 2015, then adjusted in 2020. Our community, Los Alamos, NM, is grappling with this very issue as the Los Alamos National Laboratory and their contractors have been leasing prime retail space in our quite small downtown since the early 1990's. We used to have a vibrant downtown with restaurants, shops, cafes, and other stores, but now have a few stores that are scattered throughout the commercial area. Since the Lab is the major employer for this town and the surrounding communities, the County, commercial property owners, and some County Councilors have maintained that the presence of these large, non-public offices actually help the downtown businesses.

As a local business owner myself, who has discussed this with many others, we find the rent to be quite excessive, considering our somewhat remote location, and the lack of retail continuity to be a large factor in why our business community is faltering.

I am supporting a couple County Councilors in an effort to improve our downtown by banning ground floor, non-public offices from the downtown areas.

Has the office ban been beneficial in restoring some of your retail base, Covid notwithstanding? What unforeseen consequences have you encountered? How has the city dealt with the concerns of property owners?

Is there anyone you could recommend who could help us with this issue?

Thank you so much for your consideration!

Karen Wray

Karen Wray, Owner
The Karen Wray Gallery
1247 Central Avenue, Suite D-2
Los Alamos, New Mexico 87544
(505)660-6382
<http://www.karenwrayfineart.com>
kewray40@comcast.net

From: [Rebecca Eisenberg](#)
To: [Aram James](#)
Cc: [Council, City](#); [Human Relations Commission](#); [Planning Commission](#); [ParkRec Commission](#); [Joe Simitian](#); [cindy.chavez@bos.sccgov.org](#); [Jeff Moore](#); [Jeff Rosen](#); [chuck jagoda](#); [Roberta Ahlquist](#); [WILPF Peninsula Palo Alto](#); [city.council@menlopark.org](#); [DuBois, Tom](#); [GRP-City Council](#); [Cormack, Alison](#)
Subject: Re: Chair's letter of Solidarity with the People of Palestine | Anthropology
Date: Tuesday, June 1, 2021 1:56:54 AM

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

Although I was cc'd on this note, I do not support it. There are several factual errors in this letter. First, Israel has not expanded its lands at any time since founding except to the extent that it gained some land after defending wars that were started by Jordan and other Arab neighbors (most notably the War of 67).

Second, Palestinians have the same color skin as most Israelis - the race "divide" is nothing like the United States.

Third, the balance of inequities is backwards. It is Jews who were slaves in the Middle East, while Arabs often were the slaveholders. Arabs (the category to which Palestinians belong) have a history of persecuting Jews over centuries that cannot be denied. Palestinian Arabs complain of one "injustice" -- the fact that Jews were allowed to return to the Jewish homeland in 1948 after being nationless -- and subject to genocide -- for centuries.

Fourth, calling Palestinians refugees belies the fact that the very reason for the creation of the state of Israel was that no country in the world was willing to accept Jewish survivors after the Holocaust -- not the UK, not the US, and certainly not any Arab nation. When Jews were allowed to settle in their historic homeland, they did displace 750,000 Arabs who had been living there at the time. Those 750,000 Arabs, however, came from families that previously had displaced Jews! How does one return a homeland to its people without displacing those who displaced the indigenous people. Because Jews ARE the people indigenous to Israel.

Fifth, the reference to the millions of displaced Palestinians is a fraction of the number of Jews who were exiled from Arab countries and Israel. For example, in the 10 years after the founding of the state of Israel, more than a million Jews who had been peacefully living in nearby Arab countries and Iran were exiled, even though there was no reason for that exile other than spite. See, e.g. <https://ir.lawnet.fordham.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1881&context=ilj> (which is not an Israeli source but rather, a US law review article).

Sixth, and most troubling, is the continued reference to Israel's existence as "occupation." Jews have a historic claim to the land of Israel (a claim older than Muslims), and Jews -- who amount to 13 million total as contrasted with the world's 1.8 billion Arab population -- require a Jewish state in order to avoid extinction, given the fact that Jews lack anywhere else to live safely.

Most importantly - this must be understood - rhetoric such as in the letter Aram sent around demands the destruction of the state of Israel. According to the Free Palestine movement, Palestinians cannot be "free" as long as Jews are allowed to have their small Jewish state - a postage stamp size plot of land on a football field of Arab countries. And if Israel is destroyed, there is no safe place for Jews to go.

See this quora thread for a chorus of insight:

<https://www.quora.com/When-people-say-Free-Palestine-do-they-mean-West-bank-and-Gaza-or-the-whole-region-of-Palestine>

And watch this troubling documentary video:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=hgwtQlwK-hA>

Finally, although I am not a fan of many actions taken by the current Israeli government, I find it frightening that once again the dominant caste is using Israel's current right-wing, but *democratic* government as a justification to destroy the country in totality. When the United States had a terrible President - most recently, Trump - no one seriously argued that the US should be eliminated as a country for that reason.

If the Free Palestinian movement gets its wish and Israel is destroyed, half of the world's Jewish population - which currently resides in Israel - will likely be murdered, for the second time in less than a century. Let's try to avoid that.

I'm not sure what this has to do with the Palo Alto City Council, but I send my response regardless, despite the fact that doing so is likely to result in my being called lots of mean names, and possibly threatened with harm as well, as happened last time I attempted to speak out on this issue. I survived then, and I'll survive this time too.

Thanks,
Rebecca

Rebecca L. Eisenberg Esq.
www.linkedin.com/in/eisenberg
www.winwithrebecca.com
rebecca@winwithrebecca.com
415-235-8078

On Mon, May 31, 2021 at 9:16 PM Aram James <abjpd1@gmail.com> wrote:

FYI:

<https://anthropology.berkeley.edu/chair>'s-letter-solidarity-people-palestine

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Aram James](#)
To: [Tanaka, Greg](#); [Joe Simitian](#); [Human Relations Commission](#); paloaltofreepress@gmail.com; [Planning Commission](#); [ParkRec Commission](#); [Jeff Moore](#); [Jeff Rosen](#); [Raj](#); [chuck jagoda](#); [Council, City](#); [Rebecca Eisenberg](#); city.council@menlopark.org; winter.dellenbach; wilpf.peninsula.paloalto@gmail.com; paloaltofreepress@gmail.com; [Greer Stone](#); [DuBois, Tom](#); cindy.chavez@bos.sccgov.org; [GRP-City Council](#); [Roberta Ahlquist](#); [Binder, Andrew](#)
Subject: California's Novel Attempt at Land Reparations | The New Yorker.
Date: Saturday, May 29, 2021 3:13:46 PM

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

FYI: Can Palo Alto step to the plate can Santa Clara County step to the plate and have a thoughtful and intelligent conversation coming from integrity on reparations owed African Americans and their descents right here in Palo Alto and in Santa Clara County?

Please -ain't it well past time -to confront this issue? I can promise u it won't go away ..the longer we wait the more the reparations will justifiably cost ...if LA County and the state of California can do the right thing for the Black decedents of the Bruce Family in Tony Manhattan Beach-we need to do the same. BTW see just how lame the Manhattan City Council acted in this matter. If it seems eerily similar to the actions of the Palo Alto City Council on all but the most token and symbolic gestures re race issues in our city with non action re our rogue police department —and our county DA's continued failure to file appropriate criminal charges against racist and repeat offenders of the PAPD...don't be surprised!!!

Enjoy your Memorial Day weekend!

Aram "let's stop the coverup of the Zack Perron matter"James

<https://www.newyorker.com/news/us-journal/californias-novel-attempt-at-land-reparations>

From: [Aram James](#)
To: city.council@menlopark.org; [Council, City](#); [Jeff Moore](#); [Planning Commission](#); [Human Relations Commission](#); [chuck jagoda](#); [Rebecca Eisenberg](#); [ParkRec Commission](#); [Greer Stone](#); wilpf.peninsula.paloalto@gmail.com; [Roberta Ahlquist](#); [Joe Simitian](#); [DuBois, Tom](#); cindy.chavez@bos.sccgov.org; [GRP-City Council](#)
Subject: The Women Who Preserved the Story of the Tulsa Race Massacre | The New Yorker
Date: Friday, May 28, 2021 11:16:45 PM

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

<https://www.newyorker.com/news/us-journal/the-women-who-preserved-the-story-of-the-tulsa-race-massacre>

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Lait, Jonathan](#)
To: [Architectural Review Board](#); [Planning Commission](#)
Subject: FW: Planning Dept.'s failure to inform public re cell tower applications
Date: Thursday, May 27, 2021 6:58:41 PM

FYI

From: Lait, Jonathan
Sent: Thursday, May 27, 2021 6:57 PM
To: Jeanne Fleming <jfleming@metricus.net>
Cc: chow_tina@yahoo.com; todd@toddcollins.org; wross@lawross.com; City Mgr <CityMgr@cityofpaloalto.org>
Subject: RE: Planning Dept.'s failure to inform public re cell tower applications

Ms. Fleming,

Thank you for your email. I'd like to share a different perspective. Since this application was filed one year ago, our staff has sent nearly 5,000 mailed notices to owners and occupants within 600 feet of these three wireless facilities with our last mailing occurring one month ago. We have updated and maintained a project website with access to project plans and contact information to the project planner. Our staff helped troubleshoot your technical problems accessing the City's application platform (BuildingEye) and responded to your many emails. And, as you have noted, you received a copy of the decision letter, which was also shared with the school district. All of these actions go beyond the municipal code requirements for application processing, which we have also complied with, and include site posting, mailed notification when an application is filed and when a decision is made, and an applicant-sponsored community meeting.

To succinctly answer your question, there is no statutory requirement to provide additional notification when a project is deemed complete. I appreciate from your email that you would have preferred notice when the project status changed and will explore options to inform you accordingly for future wireless applications.

I am sorry that you find our outreach efforts unsatisfactory. I disagree with the suggestion that our efforts represent an egregious lack of transparency or that the decision was made in haste. I believe the administrative record suggests otherwise. If you disagree with the administrative decision that has been made, you may file an appeal.

Sincerely,

Jonathan

JONATHAN LAIT

Director

Planning and Development Services

(650) 329-2679 | jonathan.lait@cityofpaloalto.org

www.cityofpaloalto.org



From: Jeanne Fleming <jfleming@metricus.net>

Sent: Tuesday, May 25, 2021 6:32 PM

To: Lait, Jonathan <Jonathan.Lait@CityofPaloAlto.org>

Cc: Clerk, City <city.clerk@cityofpaloalto.org>; Council, City <city.council@cityofpaloalto.org>; Planning Commission <Planning.Commission@cityofpaloalto.org>; Architectural Review Board <arb@cityofpaloalto.org>; chow_tina@yahoo.com; todd@toddcollins.org; wross@lawross.com

Subject: Planning Dept.'s failure to inform public re cell tower applications

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

Dear Jonathan,

Earlier today I received an email from the Planning Department's Amy French informing me that you have approved three new small cell node wireless installations in Palo Alto. (Ms. French's email is appended below.)

As you can imagine, residents have many questions about the process you employed in approving these installations and about the basis for your decisions.

But for the time being, I would very much appreciate it if you would answer just one question: **Why didn't you inform the public when the Planning Department deemed the applications for these facilities complete—that is, reveal to residents weeks ago that the applications were now under active consideration by the Planning Department for approval?**

This would have afforded residents the opportunity to review the completed applications ourselves and make our views known to you, to City Council and to the Architectural Review Board—an opportunity that is a core City of Palo Alto policy and value.

Instead, only now, after the fact, are residents being told 1) that you have approved, at breakneck speed, applications no one knew had even been deemed complete, and 2) that residents' only option is to pay a \$600 plus fee and—within fourteen days, no less—file an appeal of your decision.

As you know, I have repeatedly asked to be kept informed about wireless installation applications, including this set. And the last I was told about this set is that it was deemed incomplete. That was in February, 2021. (Ever since City Manager Shikada made the decision not to keep the Wireless Hot Topics updated, information provided directly by your department has been the only realistic way for residents to keep abreast of the status of cell tower applications.)

Please understand that my question—namely, why were residents not told weeks ago that these applications had been deemed complete?—is not rhetorical. I, and many others, would like you to explain this egregious lack of transparency, a lack of transparency which has had the effect of cutting residents out of the cell tower approval process.

Sincerely,

Jeanne

Jeanne Fleming, PhD
JFleming@Metricus.net
650-325-5151

From: French, Amy <Amy.French@CityofPaloAlto.org>
Sent: Tuesday, May 25, 2021 10:42 AM
To: Jeanne Fleming <jfleming@metricus.net>
Cc: Sauls, Garrett <Garrett.Sauls@CityofPaloAlto.org>; Atkinson, Rebecca <Rebecca.Atkinson@CityofPaloAlto.org>
Subject: City of Palo Alto: Tentative Approval of a Wireless Antenna Approval

Hello Ms. Fleming,
Please see link below to latest Tentative Approvals of three nodes.

<https://www.cityofpaloalto.org/files/assets/public/planning-amp-development-services/new-development-projects/wireless-projects/20pIn-00118/20pIn-00118-vinculums-cluster-4-decision-letter.pdf>.

The letter includes information on how an interested party may appeal this decision to the City Council. If an appeal is filed, it is anticipated it would occur on Tuesday, June 22, 2021.

From: [Fred Balin](#)
To: [Planning Commission](#)
Cc: [City Attorney](#); [Tanner, Rachael](#); [Minor, Beth](#)
Subject: 5_26_21 Comments to PTC Re: BCC Handbook Review
Date: Thursday, May 27, 2021 12:49:08 PM

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

FYI

-Fred Balin

2385 Columbia Street

Comments to 5/26/21 PTC Item 3: Review the City Boards, Commissions, and Committees Handbook and Recommend Adjustments to Implement the Handbook's Directions

--

Thank you to those residents who donated their time.

Good evening.

Many thanks to all the appointed officials present and past who have lived up to the letter and spirit embodied in the city's new Boards, Commissions, and Committees handbook throughout their public service.

The handbook includes much needed codification of expectations for preparation, attendance, and punctuality; of roles and responsibilities; of procedures; and of adherence to a code of conduct.

The Chair, or vice-chair as a stand-in, is entrusted to set a positive tone; ensure the effectiveness of the group process, that items move along without delay, all members are heard in a fair and safe manner; and to intercede when called for.

Ways to handle conflicts were presented during a March 31st training session for chairs and vice chairs. And at a late hour, at the end of your meeting two weeks ago, after a commissioner's question about process was misinterpreted as an insinuation of unethical commission behavior and as a personal affront, the chair calmly and appropriately disabused

those notions, and the crucial fault line between addressing the topic, but not the person was upheld.

Amidst the fine work in this guiding document, there are two very significant changes approved by the council related to increased transparency and good government. There is also one recommendation that works counter to those goals. Let's start there and quickly help put it to bed.

Staff is recommending that verbatim minutes of the commission be discontinued. This dubious idea has been raised in the past as a way to save money, but with advances in speech-recognition technology, such as the Zoom transcription I get on my screen it is even harder to justify. This proposed change would make it much more difficult for the public and council to prepare for subsequent meetings or for citizens to research past issues. The proposed replacement, quote/unquote "sense minutes," will not cut it in word or deed. 'Nuff said; let's move on to better news.

Not explicitly called out in the staff report or within the presentation tonite, but within the handbook is an important change to the process related to quasi-judicial items, those in which commissioners in effect act as judges: regarding variances, conditional use permits, home improvement exceptions, planned community and housing zone applications, appeals, and others matters where exceptions to existing code are requested.

Two decades ago, when Karen Holman and Pat Burt were on this body, commissioners instituted a procedural change in which communication with an applicant or the public was strongly discouraged on such items. This procedural change led to a shared, commission norm that kept all discussion on quasi-judicial items in open view and greatly improved public confidence in the commission's work.

Some applicants, however, did not like it and brazenly displayed their disdain in front of the commission and/or excoriated the commission afterward, particularly during two notorious Planned Community applications (for what are now Alma Village and College Terrace Centre), whose plans this body did not recommend.

Both decisions would be appealed to a city council, which had no strong prohibition on speaking with interested parties at any time.

That policy led some commissioners as well as members of the public to view the commission's work as greatly diminished, if, concurrent with, or even prior to the commission's hearings on a quasi-judicial matter, applicants and/or their agents were interacting with council members and counting noses.

Moved by this dissatisfaction, council changed its procedures and protocols handbook in 2011 to support the role of boards and commissions in making independent recommendations to council by discouraging such communications, outside of any noticed public hearing, prior to the final recommendation of the Architectural Review Board or the Planning & Transportation Commission.”

But by that time, a gradual change in that commission's composition had produced a majority that wanted to act more like the council, and so akin two ships passing, unnoticed to each other in the night, just as the council was tightening its rules, that planning commission voted to loosen up its own, by removing its strong prohibition on such communications. It tried to soften the impact via some new disclosure options, which were soon ignored.

The city council, this past November 30th, reinstated the former commission policy. On your packet page 63 or also handbook page 24, middle of the page:

"For quasi-judicial hearings: Communications with an applicant or any

member of the public is strongly discouraged beginning from the time an application has been submitted and until final decision is reached.”

In amending this body’s procedural rules to include the council’s directive the added disclosure options from 2011 should be removed.

Also of great significance, is a new council requirement not in the handbook, but, thankfully, mentioned tonight, requiring staff reports be provided to Boards, Commissions, and Committees, seven days in advance of those meetings. This is a much needed and belated follow-up to the aftermath of the two projects cited earlier. In those days, council packets were released on the Thursday prior to a council meeting and too often followed with significant later revisions before or even at the scheduled meeting. City Manager James Keene moved the packet-release date back, first by one day to Wednesday, and following the implementation of a new agenda management system, an additional one full week. Agendas and staff reports. A major change and transparency win that staff and the clerk’s office was able to seamlessly implement.

It is very important now, that once again, staff, the clerk’s office, and the city manager work together to implement this new policy of an extended packet release window for all boards, commissions, and committees as soon as possible. Of course, this mandates these items be simultaneously released to the public. I notice that this week's PTC packet was released on Thursday, 6 days prior, rather than Friday or, often, Monday. You’re getting closer.

We have been living in very strange times. Tremendous hardship and disruption, and yet for those who make it through, ways to see the world differently.

For anyone who complained that voices here are skewed because only

certain people can attend and speak to commission meetings, a new argument will now be needed.

Can you imagine any way in which Palo Alto's future for public meetings, here, at the council, at other boards, commissions, and Brown Act compliant committees, whether de-centralized across public officials' homes or gathered together, once again, within City Hall or another location can ever go back to a world in which the public must appear in person in order to speak?

That is history.

So let the new, fuller engagement continue and flourish with continued release of verbatim minutes here, full compliance with the new quasi-judicial procedures, and release of agendas with complete staff reports for this and all other boards, commissions, and committees a week prior to their meetings.

Thank you.

##

Fred Balin
5/26/21

From: [Baird, Nathan](#)
To: [Ronald Schloss](#); [RevColl](#); [Transportation](#); [Police](#); [Planning Commission](#)
Cc: [City Mgr](#); [Jeff Schloss](#)
Subject: RE: Parking Chaos
Date: Thursday, May 27, 2021 10:17:28 AM

Hello Mr. Schloss,

We have asked our enforcement teams (PD and LAZ Parking) to soft enforce while we work toward resuming normal parking program operations. I will respond directly to your emails this morning and make sure your permit order is received as quickly as possible today.

Thank you,
Nate Baird
Parking and Shuttles Manager
Office of Transportation

From: Ronald Schloss <ronald.schloss@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 26, 2021 7:54 PM
To: Baird, Nathan <Nathan.Baird@CityofPaloAlto.org>; RevColl <RevColl@CityofPaloAlto.org>; Transportation <Transportation@CityofPaloAlto.org>; Police <pd@cityofpaloalto.org>; Planning Commission <Planning.Commission@cityofpaloalto.org>
Cc: City Mgr <CityMgr@cityofpaloalto.org>; Jeff Schloss <schloss@westmont.edu>
Subject: Parking Chaos

Hello - I've been trying for over a year to renew our residential parking permits. My inquiries have gone into a black hole, meanwhile, we've received citations and warnings. The Police Department should not be issuing these if it's impossible to renew one's permit.

Could somebody help me confirm the process and renewal of our permit? I apologize for the broad distribution list and accept the complications introduced by Covid, but I imagine hundreds if not thousands of residents are experiencing the same thing as we are, and the issue needs to be addressed.

Thank you,
Ronald Schloss
POA: M. Joan Schloss
ronald.schloss@gmail.com

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Ronald Schloss** <ronald.schloss@gmail.com>
Date: Tue, May 25, 2021 at 12:40 PM
Subject: Concerned! -- Fwd: Resident Parking Permit (Schloss)
To: Baird, Nathan <Nathan.Baird@cityofpaloalto.org>

Hello - I have heard nothing in response to the below request for Resident Parking Permits. I am told the PA Police are giving out citations, although we have been trying for more than a year and can't seem to get a permit.

I am concerned that this is an untenable situation and look forward to hearing back as soon as possible.

Thank you,
Ronald Schloss on behalf of M. Joan Schloss
ronald.schloss@gmail.com

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Ronald Schloss** <ronald.schloss@gmail.com>
Date: Tue, May 18, 2021 at 10:40 PM
Subject: Re: Resident Parking Permit (Schloss)
To: Baird, Nathan <Nathan.Baird@cityofpaloalto.org>

Hello,

I am applying on behalf of my mother who lives at 401 Webster St. #206, Palo Alto. We are requesting 2 RPP Hangtags, one for me (family caregiver) and one for my mother's outside caregiver. The requested details follow:

Legal Name: Muriel Joan Schloss
Address: 401 Webster St. #206; Palo Alto, CA 94301
Phone: 408-568-0558
Email: ronald.schloss@gmail.com

Proof of Residency Attached.

Thank you for your assistance and we look forward to processing these permits as soon as possible.

Best,
Ronald Schloss (son of M. Joan Schloss, POA)

On Tue, May 11, 2021 at 12:47 PM Baird, Nathan <Nathan.Baird@cityofpalto.org> wrote:

Thank you for contacting the Office of Transportation. To place an RPP permit order, please review the program information below and reply with permit types/quantities desired, and documentation needed.

Thank you,
Nate Baird
Parking Manager

Resident Parking Permit Types

The types of Resident Parking Permits available in an RPP Program are outlined in the specific RPP Program Resolution. All Resident Parking Permit types may be used anywhere in the RPP Program area noted on the parking permit itself. Use of a Resident Parking Permit outside of the designated RPP Program area may result in a citation.

1. Annual Resident Parking Permit Stickers can be purchased by RPP Program area residents. These are decals affixed to a specific motor vehicle and are not transferable between motor vehicles. Annual Resident Parking Permit Stickers are intended for use by the residents of a specific property within the RPP Program area.
2. Annual Resident Parking Permit Hangtags can be purchased by RPP Program area residents for guests. These are annual permits hung from the rear view mirror that may be used for a nanny, baby-sitter, caregiver, household employee, or other regular visitor to the property. Annual Resident Parking Permit Hangtags must be purchased by the resident of the property and may be transferred between motor vehicles.
3. Daily Resident Parking Permit Hangtags can be purchased by RPP Program area residents for visitors for \$5.00 each. These are one-day permits hung from the rear-view mirror that may be used for events or gatherings at a household. Daily permits must be purchased by a resident of the household and are only valid for a single day use. Residents are limited to 50 daily permits per year.

Resident Parking Permit Eligibility

Please provide the following information and documentation needed to obtain a Resident Parking Permit:

1. Legal Name, Address, Phone Number, Email Address
2. A current DMV motor vehicle registration for **each** motor vehicle for which the applicant is requesting a Resident Parking Permit (decal).
3. Proof of residency/ownership in the resident's/owner's name reflecting the permit address in the RPP Program area. Acceptable proof of residency shall be a driver's license, the vehicle registration, a utility bill, car insurance policy, lease agreement or a preprinted personal check with the resident's name and address.

Please let me know which type and how many permits are needed for your parking needs. Each household is eligible for up to four (4) decal permits and two (2) transferable hang tag permits

with the **first decal permit free of charge**. Hangtag or additional decal permits are \$50.00/each and will expire March 31, 2022.

After the appropriate documentation has been received I will reply with your order details and payment instructions (handled by Revenue Collections). Let us know if you have any additional questions.

From: Transportation <Transportation@CityofPaloAlto.org>

Sent: Tuesday, May 11, 2021 10:59 AM

To: Ronald Schloss <ronald.schloss@gmail.com>

Cc: Jeff Schloss <schloss@westmont.edu>

Subject: RE: Resident Parking Permit (Schloss)

Hello Mr. Schloss,

Thank you for your email. I am forwarding it along to staff here within the Office of Transportation.

Your message is essential to us, and staff will respond as soon as possible. Due to heavy volume, responses may take longer than a day. In the meantime, please visit our parking website, <https://www.cityofpaloalto.org/parking>, which may contain the information you are seeking.

Sarah Wilson, Administrative Assistant
City of Palo Alto, Office of Transportation
Transportation@CityofPaloAlto.org
(650) 329-2520

From: Ronald Schloss <ronald.schloss@gmail.com>

Sent: Tuesday, May 11, 2021 9:54 AM

To: Transportation <Transportation@CityofPaloAlto.org>

Cc: Jeff Schloss <schloss@westmont.edu>

Subject: Resident Parking Permit

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

For the residence 401 Webster St. #206, we need to order two hanging residential parking permits. Please let me know how I should proceed. I could not find how to order them from the website.

Thank you,

Ron Schloss

ronald.schloss@gmail.com