Dear Commenter,

Thank you for your comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Palo Alto Public Safety Building (PSB) and California Avenue Parking Garage at 250 and 350 Sherman Avenue, respectively. The Final EIR with response to your comments has been published and is available for download at https://www.cityofpaloalto.org/gov/depts/pwd/infrastructure_plan/psb_and_cal_ave_garage.asp

Hardcopies of the document are also available for review at the following locations:

1. Public Works Department, Engineering Services Division, 6th Floor, 250 Hamilton Avenue, Palo Alto, CA 94301
2. Downtown Library, 270 Forest Avenue, Palo Alto, CA 94301
3. College Terrace Library, 2300 Wellesley St., Palo Alto CA 94306
4. Mitchell Park Library, 3700 Middlefield Rd, Palo Alto CA 94303
5. Rinconada Library, 1213 Newell Rd., Palo Alto CA 94303

Additionally, the Transportation Impact Analysis (TIA) by Fehr & Peers in the Draft EIR was revised (with a revision date of May 2, 2018) for the following changes:

1. Revised TIA Section 7.0 Other Transportation Considerations, Vehicles Miles Traveled (VMT), pages 58 to 62.
2. Deleted under TIA Section 2.0 Existing Conditions, Bay Area Bike Share, pages 20 to 21.

The full revised TIA dated May 2, 2018 is also available for download on the project webpage at https://www.cityofpaloalto.org/gov/depts/pwd/infrastructure_plan/psb_and_cal_ave_garage.asp

City Council resolution of approval of the Final EIR is tentatively scheduled for June 11, 2018. When available, the agenda for that Council meeting will be posted at https://www.cityofpaloalto.org/gov/agendas/council/default.asp

Thank you,
Matt Raschke
Project Manager
View our other Infrastructure Plan Projects at www.Infrastructure.cityofpaloalto.org.
PLEASE, STOP, narrowing AMARILLO AVE SECTION FROM WEST BAYSHORE DOWN TO THE ENTRANCE OF GREER PARK!

In a time when PARKING is needed you are eliminating Parking that is already in short supply. This stretch of Amarillo needs all the parking for the park attendees, and Parker apartments.

YOU ARE MAKING IT LESS SAFE FOR US THE RESIDENTS. How is EMS SUPPOSE TO RESPOND IN A TIMELY MANOR IF THE STREET IS NARROWER, on lane as opposed to our current two lanes plus parking.

PLEASE RETHINK THIS STRETCH OF AMARILLO. Not every neighborhood should be treated the same.

ITS GREAT TO PUT THE SOEED BUMPS IN AND MAKE BIKE LANES, but keep the parking too!

You don’t live here you don’t know the congestion from use at the park! It will be unsafe for all.

Stella Marinos, RN, BSN, PHN, CNOR
Sent from my iPhone
Dear Members of the City Council, ARB and Planning Commission,

I am a resident in midtown Palo Alto live 600 feet from one of the proposed cell tower installation that was approved by the ARB. First of all, I would like to voice my opposition to this decision which was flawed. How does the Architectural Review Board have the power to decide on the installation of hundreds of pounds of electrical equipment around the city? Shouldn't this be a decision made by the Planning Commission? This isn't really an architectural issue in the first place and thus it make no sense that the final decision should fall under the Architectural Review Board. They make decisions based on aesthetics on a case-by-case basis, which is fine for buildings or homes, but not for citywide deployment of industrial equipment. If this were a decision on installing a nuclear disposal waste site, would it make sense for the ARB to have the final decision on this? Of course not!

In addition, on a technical note, Verizon's recently resubmitted plans appears to be incomplete compared with their prior application -- they failed to include detailed specifications of their "new equipment" (weight, size, etc...) and they failed to submit third party structural modelling of the "new equipment" and its impact on the structural integrity of the telephone poles (bending moment, load testing, etc...). Despite this, the ARB still approved the project with their decision based largely on aesthetics rather than true need and this is yet another reason to overturn their decision.

In most major cities, the installation of industrial equipment, especially hundreds of cell phone towers, falls under the jurisdiction of the Planning Commission. According to the Planning Commissions' webpage, their main mission is: "Preparing and making recommendations to the City Council on the City's Comprehensive Plan regarding development, public facilities and transportation in Palo Alto". I believe that the City of Palo Alto Planning Commission needs to have one or more public hearings about small cell tower installations and that this is where the decisions should be made.

Specifically, I ask that the City Council overturn this decision by the ARB and then work closely with the Planning Commission to draw up a concrete and comprehensive plan regarding wireless technology deployment in the City. Please remember that this set of initial Verizon small cell towers will be the first of hundreds of such cell towers. We need the comprehensive plan to address if, how and when these towers get installed.

Thank you,
Bryan