

From: [William Chrisman](#)
To: [Council, City](#); [Planning Commission](#)
Cc: [Sue Dremann](#); [Laurence, Kathie](#); [Reynolds, Margaret](#); [James Colton](#); [Mark Alloy](#); [Hirsch Bette](#); [Karin Bricker](#); [Elliot Stein](#); [Renee Alloy](#); [Ryan Fisher](#); [Albert Chin](#); [Kevin Hauck](#); [Nancy Madsen](#); [Jeneen Nammar](#); [David Chrisman](#)
Subject: RPP proposed for Green Acres II
Date: Wednesday, May 8, 2019 10:31:51 AM

Dear City Council,

I am highly concerned about safety surrounding hectic traffic in Green Acres II. My 90 year old father was knocked down by a bicyclist passing on the sidewalk. It seems clear to me the current proposal for a limited RPP Zone in Green Acres II will not improve safety. Thankfully my father was not seriously injured by the accident, but he might well have been. You could say the same for the many hundreds of students who bicycle to school daily, and just one such injury would cost the community far more than appropriate mitigation measures.

My nephew, a student at Henry Gunn High, daily joins many hundreds of students bicycling to school on a congested, traffic-hazard prone route where neighborhood streets are hectic, particularly Maybell Avenue, Donald Drive, Willmar Drive and Georgia Avenue. The last thing these streets heading south from El Camino Real are for children is a safe-route-to-school. (For more see **Palo Alto Weekly** article [Gunn High Neighbors Say Street has Become Dangerous for Students](#), by Staff Writer Sue Dremann, <https://www.paloaltoonline.com/news/2018/12/27/gunn-high-neighbors-say-street-has-become-dangerous-for-students>.)

With five schools plus Briones Park in the neighborhood nearby Green Acres II, Palo Alto Safe Routes to School Partnership should be given highest priority. We all sincerely hope the City's Bike Boulevard Phase 2 project may help.

Intending to raise awareness about traffic safety for our students, I have talked with Kathleen Laurence and Margaret Reynolds at Henry Gunn Principal's Office, as well as Rafael Rius, Sylvia Star-Lack, Mark Hur, Josh Mello, PAPD officers patrolling Green Acres II, and other City staff, as well as many parents of students attending our neighborhood schools. The consensus is that cut-through traffic and overflow parking from Henry Gunn impacts Green Acres II in ways that fly in the face of a safe-route-to-school.

When I recommended implementing a full RPP Zone in Green Acres II, the City complained about associated costs to the City. Neighbors in Green Acres II complained it would be an unfair burden to pay to park in front of their home. Stakeholders from Henry Gunn complained where else but Green Acres II would they park? City Planning and Transportation staff

Planning and Transportation Commission Public Comment 5-8-19
complained they aren't free to step in until asked to do so by City Council.
My 90 year old father, when knocked down by a passing bicyclist while
walking on the sidewalk, complained how it didn't feel very good.

On March 27th, City Planning and Transportation staff suggested a limited
RPP Zone for Green Acres II, absent changes to the zone's timing, signs,
or geographical boundaries. Honestly this makes no sense to me. It does
not speak to students' safety riding bicycles to school. Parking overflow
from Henry Gunn is obviously part of the problem but students ignore or
schedule around the existing 9:00 - 10:00 a.m. parking restriction. A full
RPP Zone, during school hours, may address this.

With respect for my neighbors' concerns about having a full RPP Zone in
Green Acres II, I really think we are missing an opportunity to address the
parking problem as just one piece of this public policy puzzle. Again, I
support Palo Alto Safe Routes to School Partnership.

Sincerely,

Will Chrisman
Palo Alto resident
PALY Grad '80

Planning and Transportation Commission Public Comment 5-8-19

From: slevy@ccsce.com
To: [Steve Levy](#)
Subject: Central Valley Economic and Demographic Trends
Date: Friday, May 3, 2019 2:54:13 PM
Attachments: [Numbers-May2019-Central-Valley-Economic-and-Demographic-Trends.pdf](#)

Hi,

The state is initiating another round of thinking about how to improve Central Valley prosperity.

I gathered some data as a friend to those working on this effort and they said i was okay to share with others.

Steve

From: slevy@ccsce.com
To: [Council, City: Planning Commission](#)
Cc: [Shikada, Ed](#); [Lait, Jonathan](#)
Subject: Fwd: Daily Post (Palo Alto) Document
Date: Friday, May 3, 2019 10:11:22 AM

San Francisco Daily (CA)

Daily Post (Palo Alto, CA)

May 2, 2019

City approves large number of new homes

When it comes to housing, Mtn. View outpaces Palo Alto

Author: ALLISON LEVITSKY
Daily Post Staff Writer

Section: News
Page: 1

Estimated printed pages: 2

Article Text:

Mountain View City Council approved more apartments in two hours than Palo Alto City Council has permitted in the last five years.

On Tuesday night, the council approved 541 apartments: a 471-unit apartment complex at 525-769 E. Evelyn Ave. and a 71-unit affordable studio apartment development at 950 W. El Camino Real, to be funded with \$35 million in bonds.

Between 2015 and 2018, Mountain View approved a net total of 2,436 housing units, almost six times as many as Palo Alto, which approved just 407 during the same years.

Of those 2,436 units in Mountain View, 282 are subsidized below market rate. In Palo Alto, 117 of the units approved are subsidized.

Palo Alto's 407 number includes the "net gain" of 54 units that the city claimed last year.

But that didn't take into account the 75 \$2,000-a-month apartments that were taken off the market when the Hotel President was sold to a hotel developer. When subtracting the 75 units that are no longer being rented out at the Hotel President, Palo Alto ended last year with a net housing

deficit.

So far this year, Palo Alto has approved one significant housing project: a 59-unit affordable housing development at 3705 El Camino Real.

The project is the first 100% affordable housing development the city has approved in years.

While Palo Alto has been slow to approve new housing, city officials have touted their work to save Buena Vista Mobile Home Park from being removed for condos.

With leadership from Santa Clara County Board of Supervisors President Joe Simitian, in 2017, the city, Santa Clara County and Palo Alto Housing bought the mobile home park, saving 117 units.

Planning and Transportation Commission Public Comment 5-8-19

From: slevy@ccsce.com
To: [Council, City: Planning Commission](#)
Cc: [Shikada, Ed](#); [Lait, Jonathan](#)
Subject: SB 50 as amended
Date: Monday, May 6, 2019 10:09:02 AM

https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billTextClient.xhtml?bill_id=201920200SB50

My reading is that the bus service and most transit, job rich proposals are in 65918.5 and the up to 4 units projects are discussed in 65913.5 and .6

I hope tonight council can hear about, discuss and hopefully find some agreement with the many other housing bills in the legislature ranging from ADUs to tenant protections to funding options for low and moderate income housing--the other parts of the CASA compact.

AS SB 50 is still being negotiated, I hope council can have a more positive conversation and not repeat well established often out of date positions on a bill that has provoked strong emotions and crowded out local discussion of the many areas we might find agreement on.

Steve

Planning and Transportation Commission Public Comment 5-8-19

From: [Neilson Buchanan](#)
To: [Neilson Buchanan](#)
Subject: high price of affordable housing
Date: Thursday, May 2, 2019 3:08:23 PM

How high can it go?

<https://www.mv-voice.com/news/2019/05/02/the-high-price-of-affordable-housing>

Neilson Buchanan
[REDACTED] Bryant Street
Palo Alto, CA 94301

[REDACTED]
cnsbuchanan@yahoo.com

Planning and Transportation Commission Public Comment 5-8-19

From: slevy@ccsce.com
To: [Council, City; Planning Commission](#)
Cc: [Marc Berman](#)
Subject: Mercury News editorial
Date: Monday, April 29, 2019 4:46:57 PM

<https://www.mercurynews.com/2019/04/28/editorial-the-alarming-magnitude-of-the-bay-area-housing-crisis/>

Planning and Transportation Commission Public Comment 5-8-19

From: [Jeanne Fleming](#)
To: [Filseth, Eric \(Internal\)](#); [Fine, Adrian](#); [Cormack, Alison](#); [DuBois, Tom](#); [Kniss, Liz \(internal\)](#); [Kou, Lydia](#); [Tanaka, Greg](#)
Cc: [UAC](#); [Planning Commission](#); [Clerk, City](#); [Council, City](#); [Hoel, Jeff \(external\)](#)
Subject: Judith Schwartz's investments and conflict of interest
Date: Monday, April 29, 2019 3:37:04 PM

Dear Mayor Filseth, Vice-Mayor Fine, Ms. Cormack, Mr. Dubois, Ms. Kniss, Ms. Kou and Mr. Tanaka,

The revelations in Dr. Jeff Hoel's April 28, 2019, letter to you regarding Judith Schwartz's investments are dismaying. Specifically:

In her letter to you dated April 27, 2019, Ms. Schwartz wrote "In the interest of transparency and full disclosure ... my husband inherited some shares of Verizon, Comcast, and AT&T stock when his parents died. We did not purchase this stock. ... [and] the City Attorney... felt [our holdings] ...did not rise to the level of a material conflict"

However, when Dr. Hoel reviewed Ms. Schwartz's Form 700s/Statements of Economic Interest he found that, during her tenure on the Utilities Advisory Commission, she has owned shares in Verizon, Comcast, AT&T, BT Group (British Telecom), Qualcomm and Vodaphone. Given the broadness of the reporting categories on the form, these holdings could easily be worth hundreds of thousands of dollars.

As Dr. Hoel noted, former Council Member Dena Mosser was required to recuse herself from the consideration of a municipal FTTP network because she owned telecom stock—far less telecom stock that Ms. Schwartz owns.

More generally, Ms. Schwartz's portfolio indicates that, far more than the average investor—or Palo Alto resident—she is strongly vested in the fortunes of the telecommunications industry.

Hence I ask you, please do not reappoint Ms. Schwartz to the Utilities Advisory Commission. This Commission considers cell towers, municipal FTTP and many other projects related to the telecommunications industry. How can she not have a conflict of interest when many of her clients come from the telecommunications and telecommunications-related industry, when she invests in that industry, and when, of course, she has misrepresented to you the degree to which she invests in that industry?

Sincerely,

Jeanne Fleming

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

From: Jeff Hoel <jeff_hoel@yahoo.com>

Planning and Transportation Commission Public Comment 5-8-19

Sent: Sunday, April 28, 2019 6:43 PM

To: City Council <city.council@cityofpaloalto.org>

Cc: Jeff Hoel <jeff_hoel@yahoo.com>; UAC <uac@cityofpaloalto.org>; Judith Schwartz <commissioner.schwartz@yahoo.com>; Ed Shikada <ed.shikada@cityofpaloalto.org>; Dean Batchelor <dean.batchelor@cityofpaloalto.org>; Dave Yuan <dave.yuan@cityofpaloalto.org>; Catherine Elvert <catherine.elvert@cityofpaloalto.org>; Suzanne Keehn <dskeehn@pacbell.net>; Jeanne Fleming <jfleming@metricus.net>; Leo Povolotsky <leopovolhoa@gmail.com>; Jerry Fan <jerry.fan@gmail.com>; Francesca Kautz <dfkautz@pacbell.net>; Magic <magic@ecomagic.org>; Unmesh Vartak <unmeshv@yahoo.com>; chow.tina@yahoo.com; Sumitra <ncfnorcalrep@gmail.com>; Amrutha Kattamuri <vkattamuri@yahoo.com>

Subject: Re: Utility Advisory Commission Appointments

Council members,

I'd like to comment (below the "#####" line) on UAC Commissioner Schwartz's message of 04-27-19. (My comments are paragraphs in red beginning with "###".)

Thanks.

Jeff

Jeff Hoel
731 Colorado Avenue
Palo Alto, CA 94303

#####

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: Judith Schwartz <commissioner.schwartz@yahoo.com>
To: City Council <city.council@cityofpaloalto.org>
Cc: Dean Batchelor <dean.batchelor@cityofpaloalto.org>; Michael Danaher <mdanaher@wsgr.com>; Jonathan Abendschein <jon.abendschein@cityofpaloalto.org>; Dave Yuan <dave.yuan@cityofpaloalto.org>; Catherine Elvert <catherine.elvert@cityofpaloalto.org>; Suzanne Keehn <dskeehn@pacbell.net>; Jeanne Fleming <jfleming@metricus.net>; Leo Povolotsky <leopovolhoa@gmail.com>; Jerry Fan <jerry.fan@gmail.com>; Francesca Kautz <dfkautz@pacbell.net>; Magic <magic@ecomagic.org>; Unmesh Vartak <unmeshv@yahoo.com>; "chow.tina@yahoo.com" <chow.tina@yahoo.com>; Sumitra <ncfnorcalrep@gmail.com>; Amrutha Kattamuri <vkattamuri@yahoo.com>; Jeff Hoel <jeff_hoel@yahoo.com>
Sent: Saturday, April 27, 2019 7:24 AM
Subject: Re: Utility Advisory Commission Appointments

Dear City Council,

As someone whose day job includes facilitating customer and stakeholder engagement in the utility sector, I'm always glad to see Palo Alto residents paying attention to the UAC's existence. I appreciate the passion of the FTTP advocates.

Over the past decade, I have established a national reputation as an honest broker who puts the welfare of consumers first and advocates for low and moderate income consumers who cannot afford the popular industry vision of the energy prosumer (owning rooftop solar, batteries, automated home, and multiple

Planning and Transportation Commission Public Comment 5-8-19
EVs). Therefore, it is somewhat disconcerting to be the object of an obviously orchestrated campaign that completely misrepresents my priorities and maligns my character and integrity. I serve as a volunteer trying to help my community and not to further my professional or financial interests.

To address specific issues raised by the letter writers opposed to my participation on the UAC:

Relationship with AT&T

I have been an independent consultant for 32 years. I've had many clients over that time including leading tech companies, utilities, non-profits, utility industry associations, research companies, and government agencies. My engagement as the program director for the first Smart Cities Week was part-time over six months in 2015. AT&T was one of over 50 sponsors of that event. My interaction with their personnel was limited to confirming participation of one of their executives as a speaker. The Smart Cities Council is not currently a client, nor have I had any involvement with the organization after the conference. My current clients are the U.S. Department of Energy promoting their DataGuard consumer privacy initiative and DEFG LLC doing research for their Solar IQ initiative and the Low Income Energy Issues Forum. I led and was **principle** investigator for their Low Income Consumer Solar Working Group in 2018.

In the interest of transparency and full disclosure:

I am a customer of AT&T for residential landline, internet and mobile services, but I do not subscribe to any cable or satellite TV services.

As disclosed on my form 700, my husband inherited some shares of Verizon, Comcast, and AT&T stock when his parents died. We did not purchase this stock. When Jeff Hoel raised the issue of a potential conflict of interest during my first term on the UAC, I checked with the City Attorney who felt the small size of our holdings and Palo Alto's relatively small market share, did not rise to the level of a material conflict for any of the parties.

On various Forms 700, from 06-03-15 to 04-01-19, Schwartz disclosed these telecommunications stocks:

<https://public.netfile.com/pub/?aid=CPA>

- * AT&T \$10K- \$100K
- * BT Group \$10K- \$100K (falling to \$2K- \$10K by 04-03-17) (British Telecom)
- * Comcast \$10K- \$100K
- * Qual comm \$10k- \$100K (acquired by 03-28-16)
- * Verizon \$20K- \$100K
- * Vodafone \$2K- \$10K (acquired by 03-28-16, sold by 04-01-19)

Qualcomm says, "We are the foundation to 5G."

[https://www.qualcomm.com/invention/5g?](https://www.qualcomm.com/invention/5g?gclid=EAlalQobChMI8ISvpMrz4QIVkMBkCh0uawVMEAAAYASABEgKtB_D_BwE&gclidsrc=aw.ds)

[gclid=EAlalQobChMI8ISvpMrz4QIVkMBkCh0uawVMEAAAYASABEgKtB_D_BwE&gclidsrc=aw.ds](https://www.qualcomm.com/invention/5g?gclid=EAlalQobChMI8ISvpMrz4QIVkMBkCh0uawVMEAAAYASABEgKtB_D_BwE&gclidsrc=aw.ds)

On 10-24-05, three Council members were required to recuse themselves on a FTTP issue because they owned stocks in telecom companies: Morton (Comcast, SBC), Mossar (AT&T, Comcast, SBC), Ojakian (AT&T, Comcast, SBC). See page 7 here.

<https://www.cityofpaloalto.org/cityagenda/publish/citycouncil-meetings/documents/051024minutes.pdf>

The City's online database of Form 700 information no longer has information from 2005.

<https://public.netfile.com/pub/?aid=CPA>

But Mossar's Form 700 from 03-01-14 discloses:

- * AT&T \$10K- \$100K
- * Comcast \$10K- \$100K

I think I remember that Mossar said in 2005 or so that these stocks were in a trust, so she couldn't sell the stocks even if she wanted to.

What rules does the City Attorney follow when figuring out whether an official's holdings require a recusal? Does it depend in part on information not disclosed in a Form 700? Have the rules, in effect,

changed since 2005?

My husband and I decided to not trade or sell our shares of any telecom stock while I served on the UAC to avoid even the appearance of inappropriate activity.

Commissioner Johnston took a different approach to trying to avoid even the appearance of impropriety. In his 2016 application as a UAC candidate (page 73) <https://www.cityofpaloalto.org/civicax/filebank/documents/51936> he disclosed that he owned some AT&T and Google stock that might be a problem. In his 04-28-16 candidate interview (2:39:40 on this video) <https://midpenmedia.org/city-council-83/> he said he'd be willing to sell them if it were a problem. And after he was appointed, he did sell them.

My investment advisor did recommend the purchase of Verizon stock in 2012 in an IRA. I continue to own that stock.

My publicly-stated positions on FTTP:

1. In my first (one-year) term, I participated on the Fiber sub-committee and conducted additional independent research to understand the availability of commercially-available broadband wireless and fiber to everyone in town. I learned from interviews with local experts and ISPs that every neighborhood in Palo Alto has access to broadband.

The FCC currently defines "broadband" as being at least 25 Mbps for downloads and at least 3 Mbps for uploads. FCC Commissioner Rosenworcel thinks the FCC should say it's at least 100 Mbps for downloads. <https://www.multichannel.com/blog/rosenworcel-wants-100-mbps-fcc-broadband-base> (I don't know how fast she thinks the FCC should say uploads should be.) But Palo Alto doesn't have to be limited to what the FCC says.

Does Schwartz mean "broadband" is available to at least one premises in every neighborhood? Surely that's not good enough.

This source says Comcast's coverage in Palo Alto is 99 percent (not 100 percent). <https://broadbandnow.com/California/Palo-Alto>

AT&T's wired internet service in Palo Alto is not always "broadband." For example, in my neighborhood, it's 768 kbps for downloads and even slower for uploads.

So, in at least some parts of town, at most one service provider is offering wired "broadband" internet service.

If a business or individual really wants fiber to their premises they can obtain it, even if it is not as inexpensive as they would like.

Sure, a home or business could get a dark fiber connection from the City. Some homes have paid more than \$20,000 to be connected. After that, service might cost \$1,585 or \$2,600 per month. <https://www.cityofpaloalto.org/news/displaynews.asp?NewsID=1508> In Longmont, CO, residences that signed up for service as soon as it was available in their neighborhood pay only \$49.95 per month for 1-Gbps symmetric internet service.

2. With 50% of our utility staff retiring in the next 3-5 years and our current difficulties recruiting new personnel for our essential services, I worry it is risky for the CPAU to take on a new line of business that would be very labor intensive even if some of the responsibilities were to be farmed out to a 3d party provider.

At the next "annual" joint meeting of UAC and Council (which is overdue), Council should let UAC

Planning and Transportation Commission Public Comment 5-8-19
know whether UAC should be worrying about personnel issues.

On 02-06-19, when UAC was discussing how to be creative about hiring, <https://midpenmedia.org/utilities-advisory-commission-31-262019/> Schwartz suggested (1:16:42) hiring people from PG&E who might be looking for something "a little more stable." But then (1:18:29) "We've got to look at this in a way that is not normal; and if we can't do something like that, then we have to, I think, do a go / no-go -- at what point can we really not operate a utility?" And (1:20:26) "... think outside the box a little bit; because if we can't, we really need to understand -- before five years shows up and everybody's out the door. You know, we need to be planning this in advance. If we have to sell off part of our utilities, or do something else." To me, this is not an effective way to convince potential recruits that the City's utilities are "stable."

Perhaps it would be easier than usual to hire people to work on sexy, state-of-the-art projects like FTTP.

3. I have repeatedly asked advocates for FTTP as well as CPAU staff to explain to us what functions or applications are not available today that would be if FTTP were available. I have been told "it's none of my business" or "they haven't been invented yet" by FTTP enthusiasts

What I've said is that if enough people subscribe to internet services from the City to make municipal FTTP viable financially, then the City shouldn't have to care what they use the service for.

and no one yet has given me an answer that to me justifies a \$70 million investment.

If the \$70 million (or whatever) investment creates a citywide municipal FTTP network capable of paying back the investment, why isn't that an investment worth making?

If someone makes a compelling business case or offers a universally desirable application then I am happy to revisit this opinion.

It's unreasonable to demand that the network make possible a "universally desirable application" that is not now possible.

This article lists some of the things 1-Gbps internet service could be good for. <https://www.atlantech.net/blog/gigabit-internet-5-surprising-business-benefits>

4. I've proposed an "FTTP Scholarship Pilot" so start-ups and individuals who have a compelling reason to have a fiber connection but cannot afford it, could apply to have their connection costs covered. Again, if only a small segment of City residents really need this level of connectivity, let's manage by exception and make the service affordable to them.

I think it a bad idea because it requires the City to pass judgment on what reasons are compelling and what applicants can afford.

5. There are no guarantees that the cost of City-owned FTTP service to Palo Alto residents would be cheaper than what the incumbents offer. The incumbents have deep pockets and could choose to offer lower prices temporarily and hamper adoption of the City's offering to levels below what would be required for break-even operation.

That's a theoretical possibility. But what actually happens in other communities is that the incumbents do lower their prices, to compete with the municipal FTTP network, but the municipal network continues to thrive anyway, because it offers superior products and superior customer service.

On 09-28-15, Council Member Burt did a back-of-the-envelope calculation (page 39 here): <http://cityofpaloalto.org/civicax/filebank/documents/49648>

If having a municipal FTTP network can make the incumbents lower the cost of gigabit internet service by \$40 per month (as CTC consultant Tom Asp said), and 20,000 households benefit from that, then that's

Planning and Transportation Commission Public Comment 5-8-19
about \$10 million per year. ($\$40 \times 20,000 \times 12 = \9.6 million.)

6. Some of the folks opposing my appointment seem to be conflating wireless cell telephony service with internet service. Even if Palo Alto were to fully deploy FTTP, we would still need wireless telephony infrastructure to enable mobile phone service by non-residents or local residents who have stepped away from their home networks.

I haven't seen what folks are saying. Perhaps what they're saying (or should be saying) is that FTTP is a great alternative to the FIXED 5G services the wireless incumbents may be planning to offer.

7. I have actively supported adoption of the FTTN strategy which will enable smart grid applications

The staff report about smart meters (AMI) for UAC's 05-02-18 meeting <https://www.cityofpaloalto.org/civicax/filebank/documents/64784> said that fiber isn't even necessary for smart meters. "Utiliworks (the consultant) recommends the CPAU explore all backhaul options that will be available prior to 2020 deployment and update the AMI Implementation Plan accordingly" (page 35).

But by 01-09-19, staff was saying <https://www.cityofpaloalto.org/civicax/filebank/documents/68314> that it ought to abandon its FTTN efforts to date, and ask Council's permission to start over, this time assuming that AMI ought to guide FTTN development. <https://www.cityofpaloalto.org/civicax/filebank/documents/68314> Possibly on 06-03-19. <https://www.cityofpaloalto.org/civicax/filebank/blobdload.aspx?t=43740.38&BlobID=70929>

and bring our current fiber resources closer to more business and residential customers who might choose to invest in fiber to their own premises.

Just bringing "our current fiber resources closer" with FTTN is a bad idea, compared to the idea of actually passing premises with FTTP.

8. I have actively encouraged members of the CAC and FTTP advocates to apply for seats on the UAC. In fact, I think it will help us to have a subject matter expert knowledgeable about both fiber deployment and wireless technologies.

Palo Alto's municipal code, Section 2.23.050 (Utilities Advisory Commission, Purposes and Duties), says that one of UAC's duties is to advise Council on a number of utilities, including a fiber optics utility. [http://library.amlegal.com/nxt/gateway.dll/California/paloalto_ca/paloaltomunicipalcode?f=templates\\$fn=default.htm\\$3.0\\$vid=amlegal:paloalto_ca](http://library.amlegal.com/nxt/gateway.dll/California/paloalto_ca/paloaltomunicipalcode?f=templates$fn=default.htm$3.0$vid=amlegal:paloalto_ca) It doesn't say anything about wireless.

As you know, as a UAC commissioner, I have neither statutory authority nor direct influence over what contracts staff proposes to the City Council for approval. I am also only one vote on the UAC.

I believe that Commissioners serving on the UAC have the responsibility to learn about all the different resource streams that the CPAU delivers (electricity, gas, water, wastewater, as well as fiber). I have come to realize that it is extremely helpful to have Commissioners with a working knowledge of the various complex issues to better advise the City Council on alternatives and investments competing for resources and support. I hope the Council will allow me to continue to contribute my expertise and familiarity with a broad range of utility innovations and best practices.

In my opinion, it is critically important to listen to our most vocal citizens who come before the commissions (whether it's having a 100% green portfolio, FTTP, protesting pad mounted transformers, or objecting to wireless transmitters) and engage in dialog with them at community meetings and on social media where such exchanges are permitted. However, it is important for you as the ultimate decision

Planning and Transportation Commission Public Comment 5-8-19

makers to realize that these passionate voices do not speak for everyone and there are many in our community who have different priorities, are challenged to pay their utility bills, or can't afford personal investments in new technologies. I am happy to discuss any outstanding questions at my interview on April 29. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Judith Schwartz
Vice Chair, Utility Advisory
Commission

From: [Jeanne Fleming](#)
To: [Filseth, Eric \(Internal\)](#); [Fine, Adrian](#); [Cormack, Alison](#); [DuBois, Tom](#); [Kniss, Liz \(internal\)](#); [Kou, Lydia](#); [Tanaka, Greg](#)
Cc: [UAC](#); [Planning Commission](#); [Council, City](#); [Clerk, City](#)
Subject: Appointments to the Utilities Advisory Commission
Date: Friday, April 26, 2019 3:41:56 PM

Dear Mayor Filseth, Vice-Mayor Fine, Ms. Cormack, Mr. DuBois, Ms. Kniss, Ms. Kou and Mr. Tanaka,

I am writing to urge you to not appoint Gregg Scharff to the Utilities Advisory Commission and to not appoint Judith Schwartz to another term on that Commission.

There is, I know, considerable precedent for appointing a former Mayor to a seat on the Utilities Advisory Commission. But I believe there is ample reason to ignore that precedent in the case of Mr. Scharff. For one thing, while serving on City Council, for well over a year he ignored every phone call and every email from constituents expressing reservations about the cell tower installations in residential neighborhoods which he so strongly supports. His close-mindedness and utter indifference to the concerns of residents should, alone, disqualify him from sitting on the Utilities Advisory Commission, which considers cell towers and issues related to cell towers. Second, while a fixture in public life in Palo Alto for many years, Mr. Scharff has always had an abysmal attendance record at meetings. He is, in short, disrespectful, not only of residents, but of his colleagues and of the process of government in which he is involved. Finally, please note that, last fall, Palo Altans resoundingly rejected Mr. Scharff's bid for a seat on the Board of the Mid-Peninsula Open Space District. There is no reason—none—to believe that the people of Palo Alto want him representing them on the Utilities Advisory Commission, or in any other capacity either.

Regarding Judith Schwartz: Ms. Schwartz is a consultant in the “Smart Cities” arena, and she has used her tenure on the Utilities Advisory Commission to promote the interests of her clients. This includes cheerleading for the telecom industry (take a look at her many recent comments on NextDoor) and undermining efforts to establish a municipal fiber-optics to the home (FTTP) network.

Instead of appointing Mr. Scharff or Ms. Schwartz to the Utilities Advisory Commission, please appoint individuals who will listen to residents, who are not motivated to serve on this Commission by self-interest, and who will view a seat on the Utilities Advisory Commission as a privilege requiring hard work and the highest ethical standards.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Jeanne Fleming

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

Planning and Transportation Commission Public Comment 5-8-19

From: slevy@ccsce.com
To: [Steve Levy](#)
Subject: Bay Area Economic Update
Date: Monday, April 22, 2019 3:36:19 PM

<http://www.bayareaeconomy.org/bay-area-job-watch-36/>

The Bay Area economy added more than 20,000 jobs in the past two months and accounted for nearly 40% of state job growth over the past 12 months.

This came in spite of slowing population growth and was the result of more existing residents entering the workforce and more workers commuting in from outside the region.

It is clear that employers, particularly in tech, want to add more jobs.

The challenge will be to find workers in an already strong labor market.

In the long run, these trends are not sustainable without more housing that most workers can afford.

Steve

Planning and Transportation Commission Public Comment 5-8-19

From: [Jeanne Fleming](#)
To: [Yang, Albert](#)
Cc: [Council, City](#); [Filseth, Eric \(Internal\)](#); [Fine, Adrian](#); [Cormack, Alison](#); ["Tom DuBois"](#); [Kniss, Liz \(internal\)](#); [Kou, Lydia](#); [Tanaka, Greg](#); [Architectural Review Board](#); [Planning Commission](#)
Subject: FW: Wireless Resolution, amended Ordinance and Motions
Date: Thursday, April 25, 2019 2:07:40 PM

Dear Mr. Yang,

I haven't heard from you, so I am writing now to make certain that you received the email I sent you on Monday.

I trust you will let me know if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Jeanne Fleming

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

From: Jeanne Fleming <jfleming@metricus.net>
Sent: Monday, April 22, 2019 9:24 AM
To: 'Yang, Albert' <Albert.Yang@CityofPaloAlto.org>
Cc: 'Clerk, City' <city.clerk@cityofpaloalto.org>
Subject: Wireless Resolution, amended Ordinance and Motions

Dear Mr. Yang,

I would appreciate it if you would please:

1. Give me a copy of the Resolution and amended Wireless Ordinance that Council approved on April 15, 2019.

I have, of course, a copy of the Resolution and amended Ordinance as they appeared in the electronic file that accompanied the Council Agenda for Item 7 on April 15, 2019 and was released before the meeting. But I want to be certain that it is these specific documents that Council was considering when they approved the Resolution and amended Ordinance on the 15th. In other words, I want to be certain that I have in hand final documents that include any changes that may have been made to the documents between when they were released to the public and when Council approved them.

2. Give me a copy of the *final* Staff Report for this item.

3. Give me a copy of Mr. DuBois's Motion exactly as it was passed, of Ms. Kou's Amendment to Mr. DuBois's Motion exactly as it was passed, and of Mr. Fine's Amendment to Mr. DuBois's Motion exactly as it was passed.

I would like to confirm that we know exactly what Council's decisions were.

Thank you for your help. And please let me know if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Jeanne Fleming

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

Planning and Transportation Commission Public Comment 5-8-19

From: [Gregg Cook](#)
To: [Planning Commission](#)
Subject: Fw: Someone has commented on Traffic congestion or traffic safety concern #3726135
Date: Tuesday, April 16, 2019 11:44:41 AM

Hi--

I was in communication with Chris last year about a planned project to widen Churchill at El Camino and move the cross walk to the North part of the intersection. I understand Chris is no longer there. Who can I communicate with in regards to this project?

Thanks,

Gregg Cook

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: Gregg Cook <gecook@pacbell.net>
To: christopher.corrao@cityofpaloalto.org <christopher.corrao@cityofpaloalto.org>
Sent: Friday, February 2, 2018, 9:56:34 AM PST
Subject: Fw: Someone has commented on Traffic congestion or traffic safety concern #3726135

Thanks Chris. Great to hear about the right turn lane. There is a fire hydrant there that will complicate the construction but it will relieve a lot of congestion when complete. If pedestrians are heading toward the Paly entrance on Churchill as you say, doesn't it make even more sense to put the pedestrian/bicycle crossing on the north side thus avoiding the need to cross Churchill to get to the Pally side?

On Thursday, February 1, 2018 4:45 PM, Palo Alto <noreply@publicstuff.com> wrote:

Palo Alto



NEW COMMENT

Hi Gregory Cook,
PLA7891 posted a comment on Traffic congestion or traffic safety concern Request #3726135, a request you reported.

COMMENT

Christopher Corrao:

Thank you for your comment Greg. The City has an approved project in final design that is anticipated to break ground in Summer 2018. The project, called the Churchill Ave Corridor Project, will make improvements to Churchill Avenue between El Camino Real and the Palo Alto High School entrance. Part of the project includes new curb extensions at Castilleja Ave and Churchill Ave. New pedestrian-activated Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacons will be installed in addition to yellow, high-visibility crosswalks. The project also will complete the shared-use path that currently ends at Palo Alto High School, extending it up the Palo Alto High School frontage, and then across El Camino Real connecting with the Stanford Perimeter Trail. The El Camino Real/Churchill Ave intersection will be reconfigured and new traffic signal equipment will be installed. The right turn "pork chop" will be removed, a new curb extension will be constructed, a new right-turn lane will also be installed for right-turning vehicles off Churchill Ave onto El Camino Real. This new turn lane will add vehicle storage at the intersection and will be operated as a "protected right," (aka: right-turn arrow). Bicycle and pedestrians will cross El Camino Real from a protected crossing, using a separate, protected signal phase with bicycle signal heads. This eliminates the concern of right turning vehicles conflicting with crossing pedestrians and cyclists. We considered moving the bike crossing to the north side, however we determined that having a separate signal phase was a safer way to address this crossing. Also, since the majority of pedestrians are heading towards the Palo Alto High School entrance on Churchill Ave and not heading north on El Camino Real, the southern position of the bikeway is one less place for pedestrians and cyclists to conflict. If you have any additional comments or concerns feel free to send me an email at christopher.corrao@cityofpaloalto.org

Feb 1, 2018, 4:45 PM PST by Christopher Corrao (This is visible to Everyone)

https://iframe.publicstuff.com/#?client_id=406&request_id=3726135

Please do not reply directly to this email.

Thanks!

Palo Alto

Planning and Transportation Commission Public Comment 5-8-19

From: [Neilson Buchanan](#)
To: [Gabrielle Layton](#); [Pat Burt](#); [Waldfoegel, Asher](#); [Hetterly, Jennifer](#); [Greg Schmid \(external\)](#); [Allen Akin](#); [John Guislin](#); [Mary Gallagher](#); [Norman H. Beamer](#); [Council, City](#); [Planning Commission](#)
Cc: [Dave Price](#); [Jocelyn Dong](#)
Subject: Fw: [Livable CA Sharing] Attached is text of today's amendments to SB 50
Date: Wednesday, April 24, 2019 8:10:51 PM
Attachments: [Final SB 50 and SB 4 amendments summary \(combined\).docx](#)

Neilson Buchanan
[REDACTED] Bryant Street
Palo Alto, CA 94301

[REDACTED]
cnsbuchanan@yahoo.com

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: Rick Hall <rclistad@gmail.com>
To: LC Sharing <livablecaliforniasharing@googlegroups.com>
Sent: Wednesday, April 24, 2019, 7:59:36 PM PDT
Subject: [Livable CA Sharing] Attached is text of today's amendments to SB 50

>
>
>

--
To join this group use this link:
<https://www.livablecalifornia.org/join-us-for-california/>

You received this message because you are subscribed to the Google Groups "Livable California Sharing" group.

To unsubscribe from this group and stop receiving emails from it, send an email to livablecaliforniasharing+unsubscribe@googlegroups.com.

Visit this group at <https://groups.google.com/group/livablecaliforniasharing>.

For more options, visit <https://groups.google.com/d/optout>.

>
>
> Regards,
> Rick

--
To join this group use this link:
<https://www.livablecalifornia.org/join-us-for-california/>

You received this message because you are subscribed to the Google Groups "Livable California Sharing" group.

To unsubscribe from this group and stop receiving emails from it, send an email to livablecaliforniasharing+unsubscribe@googlegroups.com.

Visit this group at <https://groups.google.com/group/livablecaliforniasharing>.

For more options, visit <https://groups.google.com/d/optout>.

Planning and Transportation Commission Public Comment 5-8-19

From: [Neilson Buchanan](#)
To: [Neilson Buchanan](#)
Subject: Fw: [Livable CA Sharing] Quick summary of SB 50 changes
Date: Wednesday, April 24, 2019 7:12:34 PM

latest interpretation of proposed legislation working its way from Senate to Assembly and perhaps to Governor.

Neilson Buchanan
[REDACTED] Bryant Street
Palo Alto, CA 94301

[REDACTED]
cnsbuchanan@yahoo.com

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: Jill Stewart <jilltepleystewart@gmail.com>
To: "LivableCaliforniaSharing@googlegroups.com" <LivableCaliforniaSharing@googlegroups.com>
Sent: Wednesday, April 24, 2019, 6:55:20 PM PDT
Subject: [Livable CA Sharing] Quick summary of SB 50 changes

Two huge headlines:

— They are creating two sets of upzoning rules, one for the 15 most populated counties and one for less populated counties, and differentials also between smaller cities and larger cities.

— They are eliminating single family home zoning in every single part of the state and allowing fourplexes to be built everywhere that allows residential. Like the Milwaukee experiment approved a couple months back but on a vast scale.

Note: Wiener in his testimony to the committee repeatedly referred to his ideas as “interventions.”

Jill Stewart
@jillstewart

--

To join this group use this link:

<https://www.livablecalifornia.org/join-us-for-california/>

You received this message because you are subscribed to the Google Groups "Livable California Sharing" group.

To unsubscribe from this group and stop receiving emails from it, send an email to livablecaliforniasharing+unsubscribe@googlegroups.com.

Visit this group at <https://groups.google.com/group/livablecaliforniasharing>.

For more options, visit <https://groups.google.com/d/optout>.

Planning and Transportation Commission Public Comment 5-8-19

From: [Francesca Kautz](#)
To: [DuBois, Tom](#); [Kou, Lydia](#); [Tanaka, Greg](#); [Filseth, Eric \(Internal\)](#); [Cormack, Alison](#); [Fine, Adrian](#); [Kniss, Liz \(internal\)](#)
Cc: [UAC](#); [Planning Commission](#); [Clerk, City](#)
Subject: No to Gregg Scharff and Judith Schwartz
Date: Friday, April 26, 2019 12:16:55 AM

Dear City Council,

Please do not appoint Gregg Scharff to a seat on the Utilities Advisory Commission and do not give a second term to Judith Schwartz, the current Vice-Chair of the Utilities Advisory Committee. Both are staunch supporters of the telecom industry's plans to put ugly, noisy and potentially hazardous cell towers in our residential neighborhoods. We need UAC Commissioners who will listen to residents' concerns and serve responsibly, putting Palo Alto residents before the interests of multibillion dollar telecommunication companies.

Thank you ,

Francesca Kautz

Planning and Transportation Commission Public Comment 5-8-19

From: [Jerry Fan](#)
To: [Filseth, Eric \(Internal\)](#); [Fine, Adrian](#); [Cormack, Alison](#); [DuBois, Tom](#); [Kniss, Liz \(internal\)](#); [Kou, Lydia](#); [Tanaka, Greg](#); [Council, City](#)
Cc: [UAC](#); [Planning Commission](#); [Clerk, City](#)
Subject: Please do not appoint Gregg Scharff to the Utilities Advisory Commission
Date: Friday, April 26, 2019 8:28:08 AM

And please do not appoint Judith Schwartz to a second term on the Utilities Advisory Commission.

We need UAC Commissioners who are committed to furthering residents' interests—not outside interests—and Mr. Scharff and Ms. Schwartz are not.

In all the times (5 times) that I have petitioned in front of Mr Scharff regarding VzW's cell towers, he has never made eye contact with me and is usually having side conversations with other city council members. He's never listened to what other residences have had to say and his expression during their time to rightfully speak at city council meetings was never compassionate. In short, he has shown himself to be out of step and uninterested with what residents want. Appointing him to in effect represent residents on the UAC makes no sense.

Furthermore, despite spending over \$120,000 of his own money on his campaign last fall to win a seat on the Board of the Mid-Peninsula Open Space District, Mr. Scharff was trounced by Karen Holman. (To remind you, United Neighbors opposed Mr. Scharff and supported Ms. Holman in this race.) Residents didn't want Mr. Scharff on that Board, and if he had to run for a seat on the UAC, he wouldn't win that either.

Both as an elective office holder and as a member of various boards and commissions over the years, Mr. Scharff has had a strikingly poor attendance record. Why appoint someone to the UAC who apparently is too busy to actually serve responsibly in the positions he seeks?

Ms. Schwartz is known to have Smart Cities Council, of which telecom industry giant, as a client. She has aggressively used her position on the UAC to undercut plans for city-wide Fiber-Optics to the Premises (FTTP), i.e., to attack a lower-priced, privacy-protecting wired alternative to services provided by telecom companies. With this context, and with the current sensitivities of our residences, please do not appoint Judith Schwartz to a second term on the Utilities Advisory Commission.

Respectively,
Jerry Fan

Planning and Transportation Commission Public Comment 5-8-19

From: [Jeanne Fleming](#)
To: [Gerhardt, Jodie](#)
Cc: [Architectural Review Board](#); [Planning Commission](#)
Subject: RE: Statement of the ARB on WCF installations
Date: Sunday, April 14, 2019 2:55:19 PM

Thanks, Jodie.

Jeanne

From: Gerhardt, Jodie <Jodie.Gerhardt@CityofPaloAlto.org>
Sent: Sunday, April 14, 2019 6:54 AM
To: Jeanne Fleming <jfleming@metricus.net>
Subject: Re: Statement of the ARB on WCF installations

Jeanne,

Attached is the ARB's letter on WCF.

Planning and Transportation Commission Public Comment 5-8-19

From: [Jeanne Fleming](#)
To: [Brettle, Jessica](#)
Cc: [Yang, Albert](#); [Minor, Beth](#); [Council, City](#); [Filseth, Eric \(Internal\)](#); [Fine, Adrian](#); [Cormack, Alison](#); [DuBois, Tom](#); [Kniss, Liz \(internal\)](#); [Kou, Lydia](#); [Tanaka, Greg](#); [Architectural Review Board](#); [Planning Commission](#)
Subject: RE: Wireless Resolution, amended Ordinance and Motions
Date: Thursday, April 25, 2019 3:23:16 PM

Dear Jessica Brettle,

Thank you for responding. I appreciate your help.

I look forward to reading the materials you have sent, and perhaps asking you a question or two once I have.

Sincerely,

Jeanne Fleming

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

From: Brettle, Jessica <Jessica.Brettle@CityofPaloAlto.org>
Sent: Thursday, April 25, 2019 3:03 PM
To: Jeanne Fleming <jfleming@metricus.net>
Cc: Yang, Albert <Albert.Yang@CityofPaloAlto.org>; Minor, Beth <Beth.Minor@CityofPaloAlto.org>
Subject: RE: Wireless Resolution, amended Ordinance and Motions

Hi Jeanne,

I wanted to follow up and clarify that the Resolution being circulated for signature includes changes to a few typos, and the Ordinance being prepared for second reading is being updated to include the changes presented by Staff at the meeting.

Once we have both of those documents, we will provide them to you.

Sincerely,
Jessica



Jessica Brettle
Assistant City Clerk
250 Hamilton Avenue | Palo Alto, CA 94301
Phone: (650) 329-2630
Email: Jessica.Brettle@CityofPaloAlto.org

From: Brettle, Jessica
Sent: Thursday, April 25, 2019 2:47 PM
To: Jeanne Fleming <jfleming@metricus.net>
Cc: Yang, Albert <Albert.Yang@CityofPaloAlto.org>; Minor, Beth <Beth.Minor@CityofPaloAlto.org>
Subject: RE: Wireless Resolution, amended Ordinance and Motions

Hello Jeanne,

I have attached the Action Minutes from the April 15, 2019 City Council meeting, which includes the full set of minutes for the Wireless item. These are being put in front of the Council for final approval on May 6, 2019.

The final Staff Report on the Wireless Item can be found here:
<https://www.cityofpaloalto.org/civicax/filebank/documents/70193>

The At-Places Memo which was attached to the report is located here:
<https://www.cityofpaloalto.org/civicax/filebank/blobdload.aspx?t=65751.73&BlobID=70529>

The Resolution and Ordinance as they appear in the Staff Report are the exact documents Council considered at the meeting. The Resolution is being circulated for signature and we can provide the final version to you once it has been signed. The amended Ordinance is still being drafted for second reading at a future Council meeting. You should see that document at a future meeting soon.

I hope this helps. Please let me know if you have any other questions. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Jessica



Jessica Brettle
Assistant City Clerk
250 Hamilton Avenue | Palo Alto, CA 94301
Phone: (650) 329-2630
Email: Jessica.Brettle@CityofPaloAlto.org

From: Jeanne Fleming <jfleming@metricus.net>
Sent: Monday, April 22, 2019 9:24 AM
To: Yang, Albert <Albert.Yang@CityofPaloAlto.org>
Cc: Clerk, City <city.clerk@cityofpaloalto.org>
Subject: Wireless Resolution, amended Ordinance and Motions

Dear Mr. Yang,

I would appreciate it if you would please:

1. Give me a copy of the Resolution and amended Wireless Ordinance that Council approved on April 15, 2019.

I have, of course, a copy of the Resolution and amended Ordinance as they appeared in the electronic file that accompanied the Council Agenda for Item 7 on April 15, 2019 and was released before the meeting. But I want to be certain that it is these specific documents that Council was considering when they approved the Resolution and amended Ordinance on the 15th. In other words, I want to be certain that I have in hand final documents that include any changes that may have been made to the documents between when they were released to the public and when Council approved them.

2. Give me a copy of the *final* Staff Report for this item.
3. Give me a copy of Mr. DuBois's Motion exactly as it was passed, of Ms. Kou's Amendment to Mr. DuBois's Motion exactly as it was passed, and of Mr. Fine's Amendment to Mr. DuBois's Motion exactly as it was passed.

I would like to confirm that we know exactly what Council's decisions were.

Thank you for your help. And please let me know if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Jeanne Fleming

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

Planning and Transportation Commission Public Comment 5-8-19

From: [Jeanne Fleming](#)
To: [Yang, Albert](#)
Cc: [Council, City](#); [Filseth, Eric \(Internal\)](#); [Fine, Adrian](#); [Cormack, Alison](#); [DuBois, Tom](#); [Kniss, Liz \(internal\)](#); [Kou, Lydia](#); [Tanaka, Greg](#); [Architectural Review Board](#); [Planning Commission](#); [Clerk, City](#)
Subject: RE: Wireless Resolution, amended Ordinance and Motions
Date: Thursday, April 25, 2019 2:39:24 PM

Dear Mr. Yang,

Thank you for responding.

Since everything I have requested—the Council-passed text of Mr. DuBois’s Motion, the Council-passed text of Ms. Kou’s Amendment to his Motion, the Council-passed text of Mr. Fine’s Amendment to Mr. Dubois’s Motion, the Council-passed Resolution and Amendments to the Wireless Ordinance, and the Staff Report—was finalized at the latest before the end of the evening on April 15th, I trust the City Clerk will be providing me with copies of these materials today.

As I said in my original email to you, we are simply trying to confirm that we know exactly what Council’s decisions were on April 15th.

Thank you, as always, for your help.

Sincerely,

Jeanne Fleming

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

From: Yang, Albert <Albert.Yang@CityofPaloAlto.org>
Sent: Thursday, April 25, 2019 2:10 PM
To: Jeanne Fleming <jfleming@metricus.net>
Subject: RE: Wireless Resolution, amended Ordinance and Motions

Ms. Fleming,

I referred your email to the City Clerk’s office as they are responsible for managing all of the items you requested. I will follow up with them on your requests.

Sincerely,

Albert S. Yang | Deputy City Attorney
250 Hamilton Avenue | Palo Alto, CA 94301
P: 650.329.2171 | E: albert.yang@cityofpaloalto.org

This message contains information that may be confidential and privileged. Unless you are the addressee, you may not use, copy or disclose the message or any information contained in the message. If you received the message in error, please notify the sender and delete the message.

From: Jeanne Fleming [<mailto:jfleming@metricus.net>]
Sent: Thursday, April 25, 2019 2:07 PM
To: Yang, Albert
Cc: Council, City; Filseth, Eric (Internal); Fine, Adrian; Cormack, Alison; 'Tom DuBois'; Kniss, Liz (internal); Kou, Lydia; Tanaka, Greg; Architectural Review Board; Planning Commission
Subject: FW: Wireless Resolution, amended Ordinance and Motions

Dear Mr. Yang,

I haven't heard from you, so I am writing now to make certain that you received the email I sent you on Monday.

I trust you will let me know if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Jeanne Fleming

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

From: Jeanne Fleming <jfleming@metricus.net>
Sent: Monday, April 22, 2019 9:24 AM
To: 'Yang, Albert' <Albert.Yang@CityofPaloAlto.org>
Cc: 'Clerk, City' <city.clerk@cityofpaloalto.org>
Subject: Wireless Resolution, amended Ordinance and Motions

Dear Mr. Yang,

I would appreciate it if you would please:

1. Give me a copy of the Resolution and amended Wireless Ordinance that Council approved on April 15, 2019.

I have, of course, a copy of the Resolution and amended Ordinance as they appeared in the electronic file that accompanied the Council Agenda for Item 7 on April 15, 2019 and was released before the meeting. But I want to be certain that it is these specific documents that Council was considering when

th

Planning and Transportation Commission Public Comment 5-8-19
they approved the Resolution and amended Ordinance on the 15 . In other words, I want to be certain that I have in hand final documents that include any changes that may have been made to the documents between when they were released to the public and when Council approved them.

2. Give me a copy of the *final* Staff Report for this item.
3. Give me a copy of Mr. DuBois's Motion exactly as it was passed, of Ms. Kou's Amendment to Mr. DuBois's Motion exactly as it was passed, and of Mr. Fine's Amendment to Mr. DuBois's Motion exactly as it was passed.

I would like to confirm that we know exactly what Council's decisions were.

Thank you for your help. And please let me know if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Jeanne Fleming

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

Planning and Transportation Commission Public Comment 5-8-19

From: [Leo Povolotsky](#)
To: [Filseth, Eric \(Internal\)](#); [Fine, Adrian](#); [Cormack, Alison](#); [DuBois, Tom](#); [Kniss, Liz \(internal\)](#); [Kou, Lydia](#); [Tanaka, Greg](#); [Council, City](#)
Cc: [Jeanne Fleming](#); [UAC](#); [Planning Commission](#); [Clerk, City](#)
Subject: Re: Opposing nomination of -- Gregg Scharff , Judith Schwartz _ meeting on April 29
Date: Friday, April 26, 2019 10:35:13 AM

Dear Mayor Filseth, Vice-Mayor Fine, Ms. Cormack, Mr. DuBois, Ms. Kniss, Ms. Kou and Mr. Tanaka,

as a long time concerned resident I support United Neighbors in this matter and would like to ask you:

Please do not appoint Gregg Scharff to the Utilities Advisory Commission, and please do not appoint Judith Schwartz to a second term on the Utilities Advisory Commission. We need UAC Commissioners who are committed to furthering residents' interests—not outside interests—and Mr. Scharff and Ms. Schwartz are not.

Sincerely,

Leo Povolotsky
Palo Alto resident

Planning and Transportation Commission Public Comment 5-8-19

From: [Jeanne Fleming](#)
To: [Schwartz, Judith](#)
Cc: [Filseth, Eric \(Internal\)](#); [Fine, Adrian](#); [Cormack, Alison](#); [DuBois, Tom](#); [Kniss, Liz \(internal\)](#); [Kou, Lydia](#); [Tanaka, Greg](#); [Clerk, City](#); [Council, City](#); [UAC](#); [Planning Commission](#); [Batchelor, Dean](#); [Danaher, Michael](#); [Abendschein, Jonathan](#); [Yuan, Dave](#); [Elvert, Catherine](#); "Suzanne Keehn"; "Jeanne Fleming"; "Leo Povolotsky"; "Jerry Fan"; "Francesca Kautz"; "Magic"; "Unmesh Vartak"; chow.tina@yahoo.com; "Sumitra"; "Amrutha Kattamuri"; [Hoel, Jeff \(external\)](#)
Subject: Response to Judith Schwartz" letter re: Utility Advisory Commission Appointment
Date: Sunday, April 28, 2019 12:13:01 PM

Dear Ms. Schwartz,

Thank you for your letter.

As you know, the telecommunications industry succeeded in planting one Trojan horse in Palo Alto's city government, that being Jonathan Reichental. Hence I trust you can understand why citizens might be wary of the motives of another smart cities advocate with apparent ties to the telecommunications industry.

In particular, it is your advocacy for the unconstrained deployment of cell towers in Palo Alto, your opposition to a municipal FTTP network—a network that would compete with many of the services telecommunications companies expect to provide—and the fact that much of your consulting practice is within the smart cities/smart grid arena that have led many residents to be concerned about your appointment to the Utility Advisory Commission.

To put these concerns to rest, I hope you will provide the public and City Council with the following information (none of which is reported in your UAC application):

A list of any payments or gifts you, your consulting firm, your employees or your partners have received since January 1, 2000, directly or indirectly, from telecommunications companies, telecommunications industry trade associations, vendors to the telecommunications industry, companies in businesses ancillary to the telecommunications industry, and attorneys representing a telecommunications company, telecommunications industry trade association or vendor to the telecommunications industry.

The names and affiliations of the boards, committees, commissions and the like on which you and/or your employees and partners currently serve or have served, or to which you or they are or have been an advisor, since January 1, 2000.

The conferences you and/or your employees and partners have attended since January 1, 2000—specifically: 1) where each conference was held and 2) who the sponsors of each conferences were (i.e., who provided financial support for the conference (e.g., AT&T provided major funding for the 2015 Smart Cities Week event in Washington, D.C. for which you were the program director)).

The occasions on which you and/or your employees or partners have given speeches or presentations since January 1, 2000, the topic of each speech or presentation, to whom each speech or presentation was given, and at what location (i.e., Sunnyvale, Maui) each speech or presentation was given.

I appreciate your desire to assure City Council and your fellow Palo Altans that you come to the UAC unmotivated by anything other than the desire to serve our

Planning and Transportation Commission Public Comment 5-8-19
community. I trust you understand why providing this information will put to rest the concerns raised by your consulting practice and your impassioned advocacy for AT&T and Verizon on Next Door.

Sincerely,

Jeanne Fleming

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

From: Judith Schwartz <commissioner.schwartz@yahoo.com>
Sent: Saturday, April 27, 2019 7:25 AM
To: City Council <city.council@cityofpaloalto.org>
Cc: Dean Batchelor <dean.batchelor@cityofpaloalto.org>; Michael Danaher <mdanaher@wsgr.com>; Jonathan Abendschein <jon.abendschein@cityofpaloalto.org>; Dave Yuan <dave.yuan@cityofpaloalto.org>; Catherine Elvert <catherine.elvert@cityofpaloalto.org>; Suzanne Keehn <dskeehn@pacbell.net>; Jeanne Fleming <jfleming@metricus.net>; Leo Povolotsky <leopovolhoa@gmail.com>; Jerry Fan <jerry.fan@gmail.com>; Francesca Kautz <dfkautz@pacbell.net>; Magic <magic@ecomagic.org>; Unmesh Vartak <unmeshv@yahoo.com>; chow.tina@yahoo.com; Sumitra <nfnorcalrep@gmail.com>; Amrutha Kattamuri <vkattamuri@yahoo.com>; Jeff Hoel <jeff_hoel@yahoo.com>
Subject: Re: Utility Advisory Commission Appointments

Dear City Council,

As someone whose day job includes facilitating customer and stakeholder engagement in the utility sector, I'm always glad to see Palo Alto residents paying attention to the UAC's existence. I appreciate the passion of the FTTP advocates.

Over the past decade, I have established a national reputation as an honest broker who puts the welfare of consumers first and advocates for low and moderate income consumers who cannot afford the popular industry vision of the energy prosumer (owning rooftop solar, batteries, automated home, and multiple EVs). Therefore, it is somewhat disconcerting to be the object of an obviously orchestrated campaign that completely misrepresents my priorities and maligns my character and integrity. I serve as a volunteer trying to help my community and not to further my professional or financial interests.

To address specific issues raised by the letter writers opposed to my participation on the UAC:

Relationship with AT&T

I have been an independent consultant for 32 years. I've had many clients over that time including leading tech companies, utilities, non-profits, utility industry associations, research companies, and government

Planning and Transportation Commission Public Comment 5-8-19

agencies. My engagement as the program director for the first *Smart Cities Week* was part-time over six months in 2015. AT&T was one of over 50 sponsors of that event. My interaction with their personnel was limited to confirming participation of one of their executives as a speaker. The Smart Cities Council is not currently a client, nor have I had any involvement with the organization after the conference. My current clients are the U.S. Department of Energy promoting their DataGuard consumer privacy initiative and DEFG LLC doing research for their Solar IQ initiative and the Low Income Energy Issues Forum. I led and was principle investigator for their Low Income Consumer Solar Working Group in 2018.

In the interest of transparency and full disclosure:

I am a customer of AT&T for residential landline, internet and mobile services, but I do not subscribe to any cable or satellite TV services.

As disclosed on my form 700, my husband inherited some shares of Verizon, Comcast, and AT&T stock when his parents died. We did not purchase this stock. When Jeff Hoel raised the issue of a potential conflict of interest during my first term on the UAC, I checked with the City Attorney who felt the small size of our holdings and Palo Alto's relatively small market share, did not rise to the level of a material conflict for any of the parties. My husband and I decided to not trade or sell our shares of any telecom stock while I served on the UAC to avoid even the appearance of inappropriate activity. My investment advisor did recommend the purchase of Verizon stock in 2012 in an IRA. I continue to own that stock.

My publicly-stated positions on FTTP:

1. In my first (one-year) term, I participated on the Fiber sub-committee and conducted additional independent research to understand the availability of commercially-available broadband wireless and fiber to everyone in town. I learned from interviews with local experts and ISPs that every neighborhood in Palo Alto has access to broadband. If a business or individual really wants fiber to their premises they can obtain it, even if it is not as inexpensive as they would like.
2. With 50% of our utility staff retiring in the next 3-5 years and our current difficulties recruiting new personnel for our essential services, I worry it is risky for the CPAU to take on a new line of business that would be very labor intensive even if some of the responsibilities were to be farmed out to a 3d party provider.
3. I have repeatedly asked advocates for FTTP as well as CPAU staff to explain to us what functions or applications are not available today that would be if FTTP were available. I have been told "it's none of my business" or "they haven't been invented yet" by FTTP enthusiasts and no one yet has given me an answer that to me justifies a \$70 million investment. If someone makes a compelling business case or offers a universally desirable application then I am happy to revisit this opinion.
4. I've proposed an "FTTP Scholarship Pilot" so start-ups and individuals who have a compelling reason to have a fiber connection but cannot afford it, could apply to have their connection costs covered. Again, if only a small segment of City residents really need this level of connectivity, let's manage by exception and make the service affordable to them.
5. There are no guarantees that the cost of City-owned FTTP service to Palo Alto residents would be cheaper than what the incumbents offer. The incumbents have deep pockets and could choose to offer lower prices temporarily and hamper adoption of the City's offering to levels below what would be required for break-even operation.
6. Some of the folks opposing my appointment seem to be conflating wireless cell telephony service with internet service. Even if Palo Alto were to fully deploy FTTP, we would still need wireless telephony infrastructure to enable mobile phone service by non-residents or local residents who have stepped away from their home networks.
7. I have actively supported adoption of the FTTN strategy which will enable smart grid applications and

bring our current fiber resources closer to more business and residential customers who might choose to invest in fiber to their own premises.

8. I have actively encouraged members of the CAC and FTTP advocates to apply for seats on the UAC. In fact, I think it will help us to have a subject matter expert knowledgeable about both fiber deployment and wireless technologies.

As you know, as a UAC commissioner, I have neither statutory authority nor direct influence over what contracts staff proposes to the City Council for approval. I am also only one vote on the UAC.

I believe that Commissioners serving on the UAC have the responsibility to learn about all the different resource streams that the CPAU delivers (electricity, gas, water, wastewater, as well as fiber). I have come to realize that it is extremely helpful to have Commissioners with a working knowledge of the various complex issues to better advise the City Council on alternatives and investments competing for resources and support. I hope the Council will allow me to continue to contribute my expertise and familiarity with a broad range of utility innovations and best practices.

In my opinion, it is critically important to listen to our most vocal citizens who come before the commissions (whether it's having a 100% green portfolio, FTTP, protesting pad mounted transformers, or objecting to wireless transmitters) and engage in dialog with them at community meetings and on social media where such exchanges are permitted. However, it is important for you as the ultimate decision makers to realize that these passionate voices do not speak for everyone and there are many in our community who have different priorities, are challenged to pay their utility bills, or can't afford personal investments in new technologies.

I am happy to discuss any outstanding questions at my interview on April 29. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Judith Schwartz

Vice Chair, Utility Advisory Commission

Planning and Transportation Commission Public Comment 5-8-19

From: [Phil Coulson](#)
To: [Filseth, Eric \(Internal\)](#); [Fine, Adrian](#); [Cormack, Alison](#); [DuBois, Tom](#); [Kniss, Liz \(internal\)](#); [Kou, Lydia](#); [Tanaka, Greg](#); [Council, City](#)
Cc: [UAC](#); [Planning Commission](#); [Clerk, City](#)
Subject: UAC appointees
Date: Saturday, April 27, 2019 12:54:42 PM

Please do **NOT** appoint Gregg Scharff to the Utilities Advisory Commission, also please do NOT appoint Judith Schwartz to a second term on the Utilities Advisory Commission. We need UAC Commissioners who are committed to furthering residents' interests—not outside interests—and Mr. Scharff and Ms. Schwartz are not.

With regard to Mr. Scharff it has come to my attention that he has revealed himself to be not only out of step with what residents want, but uninterested in what they want. Why would any resident wish to have him appointed when this is his stance?

Similarly Ms. Schwartz has shown her telecom leaning stance in the following ways:

- 1) She is a consultant to the Smart Cities Council, of which AT&T is Tech Lead Partner as well as a Palo Alto cell tower applicant.
- 2) She has with great determination used her voice on the UAC to undercut plans for city-wide Fiber-Optics to the Premises in a strategy to attack a lower-priced, privacy-protecting wired alternative to services provided by companies such as AT&T.

In this I respectfully request to **NOT** appoint Gregg Scharff to the Utilities Advisory Commission, and please do **NOT** appoint Judith Schwartz to a second term on the Utilities Advisory Commission. As we residents need UAC Commissioners who stand firm in furthering residents' interests. In my opinion Mr. Scharff and Ms. Schwartz clearly incapable of this.

Regards,
-Phil Coulson

Planning and Transportation Commission Public Comment 5-8-19

From: [Tina Chow](#)
To: [Council, City](#)
Cc: [Clerk, City](#); [Planning Commission](#); [UAC](#)
Subject: UAC candidates
Date: Thursday, April 25, 2019 5:35:26 PM

Dear City Council,

Our various city committees are essential for helping to improve our city and for representing residents to further the interests of the community. I am concerned about two applicants you are considering for the Utilities Advisory Commission who do not have a track record of listening to residents. Ms. Schwartz has opposed plans for a municipal fiber network which would provide high-speed network access throughout the city. Mr. Scharff has a poor attendance record in his service and has refused to talk with residents who oppose small cell towers in residential areas. Please do not appoint them to the UAC.

Sincerely,
Tina Chow

From: [Magic](#)
To: [Filseth, Eric \(Internal\)](#); [Fine, Adrian](#); [Cormack, Alison](#); [DuBois, Tom](#); [Kniss, Liz \(internal\)](#); [Kou, Lydia](#); [Tanaka, Greg](#); [Council, City](#)
Cc: [Planning Commission](#); [UAC](#); [Clerk, City](#)
Subject: Utilities Advisory Commission - Scharff/Schwartz
Date: Thursday, April 25, 2019 10:04:54 PM

Dear Councilmembers,

I respectfully request that you appoint someone other than Greg Scharff to the Utilities Advisory Commission. In more than forty years of interaction with members of the council I'm without ability to name anyone who was less honest, civil, and responsive than former councilman Scharff. In various elected and appointed positions of public trust over the years, Scharff has compiled a record of absenteeism that betrayed that trust. Other residents' antipathy towards Scharff was evident when even spending more than \$120,000 of his own funds was too little to win a seat on the MROSD Board, though his opponent spent a small fraction of what he did. Scharff belongs in the private sector where he can pursue private gain until he demonstrates more convincingly his ability to promote, and interest in promoting common good.

I urge you also to replace Ms. Schwartz. One of her consulting clients is the Smart Cities Council. AT&T a telecom industry behemoth and Palo Alto cell tower applicant, is a "Global Lead Partner" of the Smart Cities Council. While this connection may seem only to create a possibility for conflict of interest, Schwartz has used her membership in the Utilities Advisory Commission to impede plans for Fiber-optics to the Premises throughout Palo Alto, thus delaying and possibly making less likely provision of a more economical and secure alternative to wireless services provided by AT&T and others.

You are elected by Palo Alto residents. We trust you to appoint people to our boards and commissions who will uphold residents interests. Both Scharff and Schwartz have failed to meet this test.

Thank you for considering these views.

With appreciation,

David Schrom

***** Magic, 1979-2019: forty years of valuescience leadership *****

Magic demonstrates how people can address individual, social, and environmental ills nearer their roots by applying science to discern value more accurately and realize it more fully.

Enjoy the satisfaction of furthering Magic's work by making one-time or recurring gifts at <http://ecomagic.org/participate.shtml#contribute>. Magic is a 501(c)(3) public charity. Contributions are tax-deductible to the full extent permitted by law.

THANK YOU!

www.ecomagic.org ----- [\(650\) 323-7333](tel:6503237333) ----- Magic, Box 15894, Stanford, CA 94309

Planning and Transportation Commission Public Comment 5-8-19

From: [Annette Fazzino](#)
To: [Filseth, Eric \(Internal\)](#); [Fine, Adrian](#); [Alison Cormack](#); [Cormack, Alison](#); [Kniss, Liz \(internal\)](#); [Kou, Lydia](#); [Greg Tanaka](#); [Council, City](#); [DuBois, Tom](#)
Cc: [UAC](#); [Planning Commission](#); [Clerk, City](#)
Subject: Utilities Advisory Commission Positions
Date: Monday, April 29, 2019 9:57:02 AM

Dear Mayor Filseth, Vice Mayor Fine and Council Members Cormack, Dubois, Kniss, Kou, and Tanaka:

I am writing today to ask you to NOT appoint former mayor Gregg Scharff to the Utilities Advisory Commission and to NOT appoint Judith Schwartz to a second term on the UAC. The reason is simple and straightforward: Neither Gregg Scharff nor Judith Schwartz are concerned with resident's interests. Rather, both have demonstrated a commitment to serve outside interests rather than hearing the voices of the residents.

As you know, I have been very concerned about ugly, heavy, noisy, unattractive, radiation-emitting so-called small cell towers next to residents' homes (including my own). When he was mayor, Mr. Scharff showed a lack of interest, and even a lack of understanding, about what residents' concerns were on this issue. He did not respond to even hear the residents. So, why appoint him to an important commission, one that considers cell towers and related issues, when he never responded to residents?

As you must well recall, Mr. Scharff also sought a seat on the Board of the Mid-Peninsula Open Space District. Despite self-funding his campaign with \$120,000, Karen Holman won that campaign handily. So, you see, residents did not want him on that board either. One must surmise that were he to run for a seat on the UAC, he would not have the support to win that either.

As for Ms. Schwartz, she appears to have a conflict of interest in representing residents. As a consultant, one of her clients is the Smart Cities Council. AT&T, a Palo Alto cell tower applicant, is a "Global Lead Partner" on the Smart Cities Council. Furthermore, she has aggressively used her position on the UAC to oppose plans for city-wide Fiber-Optics-to the Premises (FTTP). FTTP is a lower-priced, privacy-protecting wired alternative to the services offered and provided by AT&T and others.

Please remember the residents of Palo Alto!

Thank you, as always, for your consideration. I understand that your positions require a great deal of service and sacrifice and I thank you for your time and ongoing commitment to serve our city.

Yours truly,

Annette Evans Fazzino

Planning and Transportation Commission Public Comment 5-8-19

From: [Unmesh Vartak](#)
To: [Filseth, Eric \(Internal\)](#); [Fine, Adrian](#); [Cormack, Alison](#); [DuBois, Tom](#); [Kniss, Liz \(internal\)](#); [Kou, Lydia](#); [Tanaka, Greg](#); [Council, City](#)
Cc: [UAC](#); [Planning Commission](#); [Clerk, City](#)
Subject: Utilities Advisory Commission appointments
Date: Thursday, April 25, 2019 6:40:57 PM

Please do not appoint Gregg Scharff to the Utilities Advisory Commission, and please do not appoint Judith Schwartz to a second term on the Utilities Advisory Commission. We need UAC Commissioners who are committed to furthering residents' interests—not outside interests, such as those of the telecom industry. And Mr. Scharff and Ms. Schwartz are not.

Thanks
Unmesh & Smita

■ Kenneth Dr
Palo Alto, CA 94303

Planning and Transportation Commission Public Comment 5-8-19

From: [Suzanne Keehn](#)
To: [Council, City; Planning Commission](#)
Cc: [UAC; Clerk, City](#)
Subject: Utilities Advisory Commission
Date: Friday, April 26, 2019 8:29:58 PM

Please do not appoint Gregg Scharff to the Utilities Advisory Commission, and please do not appoint Judith Schwartz to a

second term on the Utilities Advisory Commission. We need UAC Commissioners who are committed to furthering

residents' interests—not outside interests, such as those of the telecom industry. And Mr. Scharff and Ms. Schwartz are not.

Suzanne Keehn
[REDACTED] Orme St
94306

Planning and Transportation Commission Public Comment 5-8-19

From: [Amrutha Kattamuri](#)
To: [Filseth, Eric \(Internal\)](#); [Fine, Adrian](#); [Cormack, Alison](#); [DuBois, Tom](#); [Kniss, Liz \(internal\)](#); [Kou, Lydia](#); [Tanaka, Greg](#); [Council, City](#); [Planning Commission](#)
Cc: [Planning Commission](#); [UAC](#); [Clerk, City](#)
Subject: Utilities Advisory Commissioners
Date: Thursday, April 25, 2019 4:18:29 PM

Dear All,

I would like to request you to **not** appoint Gregg Scharff to the Utilities Advisory Commission, and also **not** appoint Judith Schwartz to a second term on the Utilities Advisory Commission. We need UAC Commissioners who are committed to promoting residents' interests—not outside interests—and Mr. Scharff and Ms. Schwartz are not.

Thanks,
Amrutha

From: [sumitra](#)
To: [Council, City](#)
Cc: [UAC](#); [Planning Commission](#); [Clerk, City](#)
Subject: Utility Advisory Commission Appointments
Date: Thursday, April 25, 2019 5:20:04 PM

Dear City Council Members:

As 31 year resident of the City of Palo Alto, and consistent voter, I am concerned about who gets appointed to leadership positions.

To that end, I strongly urge you **not to appoint Gregg Scharff and not to re-appoint Judith Schwartz to the Utilities Advisory Commission.** I feel that both Mr. Scharff and Ms. Judith Schwartz have shown that they are listening far too much to the tech industry and not listened to the very real concerns of their constituents.

We need people on the Utilities Commission who are going to represent the citizens of our City and not outside interests.

I would very much like to add my voice to the group of Palo Altans who are concerned about the latest technology and how it is being implemented without the consent or full input of its citizens. Please do not appoint Mr. Scharff and Judith Schwartz.

Thank you.

Sumitra Joy
[REDACTED] Princeton St.
Palo Alto, CA. 94306

Planning and Transportation Commission Public Comment 5-8-19

From: [Ofar Bruhis](#)
To: [Filseth, Eric \(Internal\)](#); [Fine, Adrian](#); [Cormack, Alison](#); [DuBois, Tom](#); [Kniss, Liz \(internal\)](#); [Kou, Lydia](#); [Tanaka, Greg](#); [Council, City](#)
Cc: [Architectural Review Board](#); [Planning Commission](#); [Clerk, City](#)
Subject: Verizon Towers
Date: Thursday, April 25, 2019 1:25:46 PM

All,

Please do not appoint Gregg Scharff to the Utilities Advisory Commission, and please do not appoint Judith Schwartz to a second term on the Utilities Advisory Commission. We need UAC Commissioners who are committed to furthering residents' interests—not outside interests—and Mr. Scharff and Ms. Schwartz are not.

With respect to Mr. Scharff:

- He has shown himself to be not only out of step with what residents want, but *uninterested* in what they want. In short, appointing him to in effect represent residents on the UAC makes no sense;
- Despite spending over \$120,000 of his own money on his campaign last fall to win a seat on the Board of the Mid-Peninsula Open Space District, Mr. Scharff was trounced by Karen Holman. (To remind you, United Neighbors opposed Mr. Scharff and supported Ms. Holman in this race.) Residents didn't want Mr. Scharff on that Board, and if he had to run for a seat on the UAC, he wouldn't win that either; and
- Both as an elective office holder and as a member of various boards and commissions over the years, Mr. Scharff has had a strikingly poor attendance record. Why appoint to the UAC this real estate attorney/commercial property owner who apparently is too busy to actually serve responsibly in the positions he seeks?

With respect to Ms. Schwartz:

- One of her clients (she is a consultant) is the Smart Cities Council, of which telecom industry giant—and Palo Alto cell tower applicant—AT&T is a “Global Lead Partner;” and
- She has aggressively used her position on the UAC to undercut plans for city-wide Fiber-Optics to the Premises (FTTP), i.e., to attack a lower-priced, privacy-protecting wired alternative to services provided by companies such as AT&T.

I sure hope you will do the right (and wise) decision.

best

ofer bruhis
[REDACTED] Bryant Street
Palo Alto, CA 94306