

From: slevy@ccsce.com
To: [Steve Levy](#)
Subject: Be Skeptical of Today's job and UE report
Date: Friday, June 5, 2020 8:52:26 AM

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

There are three reasons to be skeptical

- 1) BLS acknowledges that the UE rate would have been 3% higher with proper classification
- 2) Many if not most of the jobs "added" were people receiving paychecks under the PPP but not working
- 3) the reference date for the BLS data is the 12th of May when very few if any restrictions had been lifted toward reopening.

I think this is a big headfake and will be revised.

Here is what I know

- 1) BLS in the release explained that many workers were misclassified as employed and that the UE rate would have been 3% higher with proper classification. The press release quote is below.

"However, there was also a large number of workers who were classified as employed but absent from work. As was the case in March and April, household survey interviewers were instructed to classify employed persons absent from work due to coronavirus-related business closures as unemployed on temporary layoff. However, it is apparent that not all such workers were so classified.

BLS and the Census Bureau are investigating why this misclassification error continues to occur and are taking additional steps to address the issue. If the workers who were recorded as employed but absent from work due to "other reasons" (over and above the number absent for other reasons in a typical May) had been classified as unemployed on temporary layoff, the overall unemployment rate would have been about 3 percentage points higher than reported (on a not seasonally adjusted basis). However, according to usual practice, the data from the household survey are accepted as recorded. To maintain data integrity, no ad hoc actions are taken to reclassify survey responses."

- 2) The pattern of unemployment by duration is unusual.

Less than 5 weeks -10,408,000

5 to 14 weeks +7,810,000

15 to 26 weeks +245,000

26 weeks +225,000

These data support the idea that most of the "added" jobs were people getting paychecks under the PPP. Longer term unemployment rose substantially.

While the PPP support is good news, it is time limited.

- 3) I know some construction and manufacturing activities were allowed to reopen or continue as priority areas so these job numbers may be okay.

But the large job gains in food service and retail are implausible as of May 12th as virtually

none of these establishments had been allowed to reopen.

4) Note also that the job losses in March and April were revised up and I expect today's report will be revised next month.

Steve

650-814-8553

From: [Jeanne Fleming](#)
To: [French, Amy](#)
Cc: [Clerk, City](#); [Shikada, Ed](#); [Lait, Jonathan](#); [Architectural Review Board](#); [Planning Commission](#); board@pausd.org; health@paloaltopta.org; chow_tina@yahoo.com; todd@toddcollins.org; wross@lawross.com
Subject: RE: FYI Crown Castle Cluster 1 withdrawn
Date: Monday, June 1, 2020 3:49:05 PM

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

Dear Amy,

Thank you for this update.

I would appreciate it if you would answer these questions:

1. You refer to Crown Castle/Verizon Cluster 1 17PLN-00416 as having six sites. I am only aware of three, all near Town & Country. What are the addresses of the other three sites?
2. What is the status of Vinculums/Verizon Cluster 3 17PLN-00228 (twelve sites in Old Palo Alto and Triple EI)?
3. What is the status of AT&T 19PLN-00191 (14 sites in University South, Downtown North and Green Acres)?
4. Have any small cell node cell tower applications been submitted since AT&T submitted 19PLN-00191?

As always, thank you for your help. And, of course, please let me know if you have any questions.

Regards,

Jeanne

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

From: French, Amy <Amy.French@CityofPaloAlto.org>
Sent: Monday, June 1, 2020 10:20 AM
To: Jeanne Fleming <jfleming@metricus.net>
Cc: Atkinson, Rebecca <Rebecca.Atkinson@CityofPaloAlto.org>
Subject: FYI Crown Castle Cluster 1 withdrawn

Hello,

This email is to provide you an update specific to one wireless application:

Crown Castle has withdrawn all 6 sites from consideration under 17PLN-00416 Cluster 1.

Amy French | Chief Planning Official

250 Hamilton Avenue | Palo Alto, CA 94301

D: 650.329.2336 | E: amy.french@cityofpaloalto.org

Please think of the environment before printing this email – Thank you!

The City of Palo Alto is doing its part to reduce the spread of COVID-19. We have successfully transitioned most of our employees to a remote work environment. We remain available to you via email, phone, and virtual meetings during our normal business hours.

From: [Jeanne Fleming](#)
To: [Tanner, Rachael](#)
Cc: [Planning Commission](#); ptc@caritempleton.com; [Lait, Jonathan](#); [Clerk, City](#); chow_tina@yahoo.com; todd@toddcollins.org; wross@lawross.com
Subject: RE: PTC consideration of revised Wireless Ordinance
Date: Monday, June 1, 2020 2:40:33 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[image002.png](#)

Dear Rachel,

Thank you for this information.

Stay well,

Jeanne

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

From: Tanner, Rachael <Rachael.Tanner@CityofPaloAlto.org>
Sent: Sunday, May 31, 2020 10:17 PM
To: Jeanne Fleming <jfleming@metricus.net>
Cc: Planning Commission <Planning.Commission@cityofpaloalto.org>; ptc@caritempleton.com; Lait, Jonathan <Jonathan.Lait@CityofPaloAlto.org>; Clerk, City <city.clerk@cityofpaloalto.org>; chow_tina@yahoo.com; todd@toddcollins.org; wross@lawross.com
Subject: Re: PTC consideration of revised Wireless Ordinance

Hello Jeanne,

Yes, the PTC will be considering the revised wireless ordinance. As far as the date, this discussion is tentatively scheduled for August 12, 2020.

Please continue to take care of yourself and your loved ones.

Sincerely,
Rachael Tanner

Rachael A. Tanner, MCP
Assistant Director, Department of Planning & Development Services
250 Hamilton Ave | Palo Alto, CA 94301



D: 650.329.2167 | C: 510.254.4754

E: Rachael.Tanner@cityofpaloalto.org

Quality | Courtesy | Efficiency | Integrity | Innovation

From: Jeanne Fleming <jfleming@metricus.net>
Date: Friday, May 29, 2020 at 12:03 PM
To: "Tanner, Rachael" <Rachael.Tanner@CityofPaloAlto.org>
Cc: Planning Commission <Planning.Commission@cityofpaloalto.org>, "ptc@caritempleton.com" <ptc@caritempleton.com>, "Lait, Jonathan" <Jonathan.Lait@CityofPaloAlto.org>, "Clerk, City" <city.clerk@cityofpaloalto.org>, "chow_tina@yahoo.com" <chow_tina@yahoo.com>, "todd@toddcollins.org" <todd@toddcollins.org>, "wross@lawross.com" <wross@lawross.com>
Subject: RE: PTC consideration of revised Wireless Ordinance

Dear Rachel,

I would appreciate it if you would tell us:

1. Whether the PTC is going to be considering the revised Wireless Ordinance again; and
2. If the PTC will be considering the revised Wireless Ordinance, on what date that will occur.

Thank you for your help.

Sincerely,

Jeanne

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

From: Tanner, Rachael <Rachael.Tanner@CityofPaloAlto.org>
Sent: Thursday, April 9, 2020 1:01 PM
To: Jeanne Fleming <jfleming@metricus.net>
Cc: Planning Commission <Planning.Commission@cityofpaloalto.org>; ptc@caritempleton.com; Lait, Jonathan <Jonathan.Lait@CityofPaloAlto.org>; Clerk, City <city.clerk@cityofpaloalto.org>; 'Tina Chow' <chow_tina@yahoo.com>; 'Todd Collins' <todd@toddcollins.org>; 'William Ross'

<wross@lawross.com>; Atkinson, Rebecca <Rebecca.Atkinson@CityofPaloAlto.org>

Subject: Re: PTC consideration of revised Wireless Ordinance

Good afternoon Jeanne,

1. Whether the PTC will be meeting on April 15, 2020;

The PTC will be meeting on April 15, 2020 at 5:00 pm

2. If the PTC is meeting on the 15th, whether it will be considering the revised Wireless Ordinance; and

The PTC will be taking up 1 item on the 15th regarding electric vehicles and other measures associated w/parking lots.

3. If the PTC will not be considering the revised Wireless Ordinance on the 15th, on what date that will occur.

The wireless ordinance is scheduled to be considered by the PTC on May 27, 2020

I am always happy to answer questions as I am able. Rebecca Atkinson, the staff planner assigned to this project, is always a great first resource as she prepares these items for PTC and other boards, commissions, and Council meetings. You can reach her at Rebecca.Atkinson@cityofpaloalto.org.

Thanks,
Rachael



Rachael A. Tanner, MCP
Assistant Director, Department of Planning & Development Services
250 Hamilton Ave | Palo Alto, CA 94301
D: 650.329.2167 | C: 510.254.4754
E: Rachael.Tanner@cityofpaloalto.org
Quality | Courtesy | Efficiency | Integrity | Innovation

From: Jeanne Fleming <jfleming@metricus.net>

Date: Thursday, April 9, 2020 at 12:50 PM

To: "Tanner, Rachael" <Rachael.Tanner@CityofPaloAlto.org>

Cc: Planning Commission <Planning.Commission@cityofpaloalto.org>, "ptc@caritempleton.com" <ptc@caritempleton.com>, "Lait, Jonathan" <Jonathan.Lait@CityofPaloAlto.org>, "Clerk, City" <city.clerk@cityofpaloalto.org>, 'Tina Chow' <chow_tina@yahoo.com>, 'Todd Collins' <todd@toddcollins.org>, 'William Ross' <wross@lawross.com>

Subject: PTC consideration of revised Wireless Ordinance

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

Dear Rachael,

I understand that you are the Staff Liaison to the Planning and Transportation Commission (PTC).

I would appreciate it if you would tell us:

1. Whether the PTC will be meeting on April 15, 2020;
2. If the PTC is meeting on the 15th, whether it will be considering the revised Wireless Ordinance; and
3. If the PTC will not be considering the revised Wireless Ordinance on the 15th, on what date that will occur.

(This information is not available on the PTC's City webpage.)

Thanks and best,

Jeanne

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

From: [Allen Akin](#)
To: [Planning Commission](#)
Subject: May 27 RPP Study Session / "Quality of Life" Measures
Date: Wednesday, May 27, 2020 7:53:16 PM

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

During the study session the question of "quality of life" measures arose.

This also occurred during the development of the Resident Input document, but was not pursued because the level of detail was inappropriate for the document and because it seemed likely that the measurement process would require more financial resources than the City can commit in the near term. So the document alludes to the issue without proposing a solution.

However, it's certainly possible to develop a "quality of life" framework with quantifiable measures. For example:

Health: Noise level, particulate pollution level.

Safety: Vehicle speed distribution, minimum sight-line distances at intersections.

Accessibility: Mean distance from parking space to home of vehicle's owner.

Sustainability: Traffic volume.

Allen Akin