

Baumb, Nelly

From: Laurie Leventhal-Belfer <dr.laurielb@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, September 7, 2020 9:33 AM
To: Council, City
Subject: Proposition 20

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

Dear City Council Members,

As a resident of Palo Alto, I am writing to you to ask you to consider issuing a resolution recommending a NO VOTE on CA State Proposition 20, a ballot initiative titled *Restricts Parole for Non-Violent Offenders. Authorizes Felony Sentences for Certain Offenses Currently Treated Only as Misdemeanors*.

This initiative, if passed, will roll back the progress we have made in the criminal justice and prison system in CA in the past decade, when we passed (among other things) Prop 47 in 2014, Prop 57 in 2016 and SOS in 2018. The proposition would undo more than a dozen law changes that have prioritized local public safety rehabilitation programs over long prison sentences. It would undo our compliance with the Supreme Court's mandate to reduce our prison population. Increased overcrowding would also foster the spread of COVID 19 in our prisons. Our crime rates are now historically low and there is absolutely no good reason to turn back the clock on the significant gains we have made in public safety.

Many influential Californians and organizations have come out against Prop 20 including:

Santa Clara County DA Jeff Rosen, Governor Gavin Newsom and former Governor Jerry Brown, as well as the National Center for Crim Victims, Crime Survivors for Safety and Justice, Chief Probation Officers of CA., and the CA Partnership to End Domestic Violence.

Finally, here is something tangible you can do for public safety and progress in criminal justice:

Adopt (and adapt) this **RESOLUTION** that the members of the City Council of [your city] could issue to its citizens informing them of what our city regards as a dangerous step in the wrong direction. Here is the template for such a resolution:

WHEREAS, safety for all Californians is the highest priority for The City Council of Palo Alto and

WHEREAS, since 1981 state prison spending has increased by more than 1500%, driven in part by the construction and operation of 23 new prisons, leading to an annual prison budget today of \$12 billion every year; and

WHEREAS, filling California's jails and prisons beyond their capacity does not stop cycles of chronic illness and nonviolent crime but too often destabilizes people and cuts them off from critical supports; and

WHEREAS, investments in health solutions, mental health and behavioral health supports, and other community-based crime prevention strategies can prevent crime and create safe, healthy, and stable communities; and

WHEREAS, savings from Prop 47 have begun to fund a treatment and prevention infrastructure that millions of Californians have been unable to access for generations, and

WHEREAS, continued reallocation of our investments from prisons to community-based strategies that address and prevent crime before it occurs can lead to continued and longstanding improvements in safety, and

WHEREAS, failure to control the prison population will result in millions of dollars going to a costly and overwhelmed prison system instead of critical community treatment and health infrastructure,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by The Palo Alto City Council that it opposes Prop 20 and urges its citizens to VOTE NO on Prop 20.

Thank you for your attention to this very important Proposition; I would be happy to discuss it further or send anyone interested in learning more a 15 page analysis, *Investing in Failure: 2020 Ballot Initiative to Repeal Justice Reform Would Come At A High Cost to Californians* by Mike Males, PhD. And Maureen Washburn, published in June 2020.

Much appreciation for all that you do for our City

Dr. Laurie Leventhal-Belfer

Bend the Arc: Jewish Action South Bay

<http://southbay.bendthearc.us/>

Laurie Leventhal-Belfer, PhD

Pronouns: She/Her

Adjunct Lecturer of Stanford University, Department of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences, the Stanford University School of Medicine

[4275 Los Palos Ave, Palo Alto, CA 94306](http://www.drleventhalbelfer.com/)

Phone (650) 322-4431 Fax (650) 493-1754

CA License PSY13235

<http://www.drleventhalbelfer.com/>

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: Information contained in this message and any attachments are intended only for the

addressee or addressees. If you believe that you have received this message in error, please notify the sender immediately by return electronic mail, and please delete it without further review, disclosure, or copying.

Baumb, Nelly

From: Lauren Natoli <Lauren.Natoli@ahf.org>
Sent: Monday, September 14, 2020 2:44 PM
To: Council, City
Subject: Public Comment 9.15.20 Mtg

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

To the Palo Alto City Council,

My name is Lauren Natoli and I work for AIDS Healthcare Foundation. For Item 11, I recommend the endorsement of Proposition 21. Prop 21 will allow for California to enact rent control on local levels. The US, and especially California, are in the midst of a homelessness crisis. Rents are skyrocketing and the economy is a mess, and we have not yet seen the full impacts of COVID-19. Keeping rent costs reasonable will allow for people to stay in their homes and prevent gentrification. Thank you.

Lauren Natoli (she/her/hers)
Senior Program Manager of PHD Advocacy
AIDS Healthcare Foundation
Public Health Division @ Western Wellness Center
Phone: 323.499.2725 | ext. 4471 | 908.601.5425

Baumb, Nelly

From: Nancy <ngkrop@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, September 14, 2020 11:02 AM
To: Council, City
Subject: Endorse Prop. 15

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

Dear Palo Alto City Council,

You have a historic vote tonight, to bring much needed stable, ongoing revenue to support our Palo Alto city services and schools by endorsing Proposition 15.

For Palo Alto, Proposition 15 is estimated to bring in \$20 million a year. When our city recently had to cut \$40 million from the budget, we could've used that \$20 million a year.

Proposition 15 is a long-overdue reform to state tax policy, fixing a problem created over 40 years ago, depriving our local cities and schools of commercial property revenues. When people voted in 1978 for Prop. 13 to freeze residential property assessments at purchase price value, they never intended for large corporations to keep paying property taxes based on 1978 tax values decades later.

Voters never intended to shift the property tax burden onto residential property owners. The idea was to protect homeowners; not to deprive them of top rated schools and local services.

Voters never intended for IBM, for example, to decades later pay approximately **\$200/acre**, on 200 acres, every year, while homeowners in Palo Alto pay over **\$130,000/acre**, on a fraction of an acre, per year.

Every other state in the country re-assesses commercial property every one to 5 years.

The human price we pay for the lack of commercial property tax revenues is excruciating. Since 1980, California built 20 prisons, and trebled our state incarceration budget, but only added one new UC (UC Merced). We send our Palo Alto high school graduates to out of state colleges because our UC system is so severely underfunded.

Our K-12 schools dropped from the top ten in the nation to ranking near bottom academically and in funding (cost of living adjusted). 90% of our students in California do not receive a Palo Alto level education - their schools have no art, no music, no theater, no up-to-date technology, no school supplies, no school nurses, no librarians, no counselors, etc. Even in Palo Alto, with our great schools, we can only offer a full curriculum because we support a parcel tax, an Education Foundation and pay 100s of 1000s of dollars in annual PTA donations.

Thank you for your vote tonight to endorse Prop. 15, joining the many organizations and political leaders endorsing Prop. 15, to restore stable commercial property revenue back to our community:

- Governor Newsom
- Santa Clara County Board of Supervisors
- Education organizations: the alphabet soup of CTA, CA PTA, CFT, ACSA, and so many more.
- Environmental organizations: CA League of Conservation Voters, Sierra Club, and more
- Health organizations: CA nurses, CA school nurses, CA physicians, etc.

Nancy Krop
Barron Park neighborhood

Baumb, Nelly

From: Kevin Ma <kevinma.sd@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, September 13, 2020 10:13 PM
To: Council, City
Subject: Comments on Agenda Item 11 (Measure Positions)

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

Dear City Council,

I ask the council to support Propositions 17 and 18. Recently, we've seen movement from high schoolers to expand the voting rights for the school board, and then the city council since school's are bound under state law. Prop 18 gets some of their demands in, with its allowance of some 17-year-olds to vote in primaries (where some races like assembly or senate might be functionally decided). And in this time where basic democratic tenants are under attack, we should be increasing the opportunities to participate in government.

I additionally ask the council to consider supporting Prop 21, which has some significant changes that mitigate some of the harms that Prop 10 may have created. We should continue to recognize that there's a housing crisis, now compounded by a recession. And the pandemic makes it very clear the necessity of a stable place to isolate oneself. Prop 21 merely grants the ability for a local jurisdiction to enact stronger tenant protections; it doesn't mandate it, so we locally would still have a robust discussion on what exactly should be done. It's a gauze on a wound, whose root causes should still be tackled in parallel (e.g. more housing, a more equitable legal system).

And with our efforts on city efforts on race, I also urge the council to oppose Prop 20 and support Prop 25. Prop 20 is a return to the "tough on crime" model that adds a lot of discretionary powers to extend the punishment of the convicted; this additionally rolls-back recent previous voter initiatives. Prop 25, on the other hand, reduces the impact of money in our justice system. While risk-assessment may have its own flaws, that can be addressed within the system. And let us not forget that Prop 25 only exists as a referendum because the bail bond companies know it'll kill their industry if it passes.

Sincerely,
Kevin Ma

Baumb, Nelly

From: herb <herb_borock@hotmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, September 13, 2020 7:34 PM
To: Council, City
Cc: Clerk, City
Subject: September 14, 2020 Council Meeting, Item #11: Measure RR

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

Herb Borock
P. O. Box 632
Palo Alto, CA 94302

September 13, 2020

Palo Alto City Council
250 Hamilton Avenue
Palo Alto, CA 94301

SEPTEMBER 14, 2020 COUNCIL MEETING, AGENDA ITEM #11 MEASURE RR

Dear City Council:

I urge you to oppose Measure RR that would enact a sales tax to fund the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board.

Sales taxes are regressive taxes that impact lower income residents more than businesses and higher income residents.

Caltrain's projected need for more money should be provided by those who would benefit financially from the projected ridership increases, and are primarily (1) the large businesses that depend on employees traveling long distances to work and (2) land developers whose land value increases when they provide the centralized work places for all those commuters.

Potential Conflict of Interest

What would be different if the Santa Clara County Board of Supervisors or the Valley Transportation Authority hired Caltrain's chief executive officer (CEO)?

Caltrain's current CEO is the husband of Roseann Foust who is the Executive Director of the San Mateo County Economic and Development Association (SAMCEDA).

If a governing body in Santa Clara County appointed Caltrain's CEO, would Carl Guardino's wife become the Caltrain CEO?

Jim Hartnett's source of income from his wife's employment represents a potential conflict of interest because SAMCEDA's Executive Director Foust participates in the research, development, implementation, or preparation of policy or position statements related to Caltrain's decisions, or she promotes or discusses SAMCEDA's policies or positions with CALTRAIN officials (whether or not she actually formulates the policies), rather than just exercising purely administrative duties.

Bonuses Violate Constitution

Hartnett's employer, the San Mateo County Transit District (SAMTRANS) Governing Board, regularly grants Hartnett bonuses after his contract has been entered into in violation of the California Constitution.

Although the employment contract between SAMTRANS and Hartnett includes general language regarding the granting of bonuses, the criteria to determine whether to grant a bonus are not included in the employment contract and have not been the subject of an agenda item in an Open Session of SAMTRANS Governing Board, nor has there been an Open Session agenda item to discuss the criteria used to grant a bonus or whether Hartnett has satisfied those criteria when a bonus award is on either SAMTRANS's or the Peninsula Joint Powers Board's agenda.

The California Constitution at Article IV, Section 17, says, "The Legislature has no power to grant, or to authorize a city, county, or other public body to grant, extra compensation or extra allowance to a public officer, public employee, or contractor after service has been rendered or a contract has been entered into and performed in whole or in part, or to authorize the payment of a claim against the State or a city, county or other public body under an agreement made without authority of law."

Caltrain's Finances are Predicted to Get Worse

The Caltrain Business Plan presented to the Joint Powers Board a year ago, for example, showed that Caltrain's operating expense will continue to rise if Caltrain's Long Range Vision is implemented.

The Business Plan offsets those increased expenses with what are invented dollar amounts for subjective benefits, without accounting for the costs

due to the fact that the commuters created by the overwhelming increase in population and jobs contemplated by the Business Plan will **not** be riding Caltrain, but will be using other motorized transportation to commute to and from work.

The Present Value of the Operating Deficit for Caltrain's 40-year time horizon is projected to at least double from the Baseline Growth scenario in both the Medium Growth scenario and the High Growth scenario, while the farebox recovery average is projected to decrease from the Baseline Growth scenario to the higher growth scenarios.

Despite Caltrain's hopes for help from a blended system with California High Speed Rail, the projections for High Speed Rail are even worse.

The Preliminary Qualitative Analysis presented at the October 15, 2019 High Speed Rail board meeting shows that "High-Speed Rail operating expenses would substantially exceed revenues" in the Peninsula Corridor San Francisco - Gilroy segment, while Proposition 1A bond proceeds cannot be used if there is an operating deficit.

Caltrain is not entitled to a dedicated source of funding to pay for its operating expenses.

When the state's voters were given the opportunity to approve Proposition 1A to fund High Speed Rail, a key reason why the proposition was approved was that it included a commitment that none of the proceeds would be used for operating expenses.

Technology Commuters are Becoming Telecommuters

Caltrain's Business Plan assumed that technology companies such as Google, Apple, Facebook, Twitter, and Salesforce would continue building offices along the Caltrain corridor and that the employees of those companies would continue to commute to office jobs, with a percentage of them commuting by Caltrain.

The response of those companies and their employees during the current pandemic indicates that all that office space is not needed and that it is better for those employees to mostly telecommute.

Caltrain, when led by competent leadership, can operate a financially viable commuter train when Caltrain stops spending money on future expansion plans that are no longer necessary because the assumptions in the Caltrain Business Plan are no longer valid, and the staff and contractors being paid to develop, sell to the public, and implement that Business Plan are no longer needed.

Please vote to oppose Measure RR.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Sincerely,

Herb Borock

Baumb, Nelly

From: Nancy Shepherd <nlshep@pacbell.net>
Sent: Sunday, September 13, 2020 7:09 PM
To: Council, City
Subject: Palo Alto Council Meeting 8/14 item #11

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

Dear Mayor Fine and honorable council members,

Below you can find positions from the LWV California on various state-wide propositions. I hope you find this useful during tomorrow evenings agenda item 11.

Take care,

**Nancy Shepherd
President, LWVPA**

Vote with the League!

After careful study and analysis, the League of Women Voters of California offers these recommendations on the [November 3, 2020, Ballot Measures](#):

YES on **PROP 15:** [Schools & Communities First](#) [Gov. Newsom has endorsed]

YES on **PROP 16:** [Opportunity for All](#)

YES on **PROP 17:** [Restore Voting Rights](#)

YES on **PROP 18:** [Voting Rights for 17-year olds](#)

NO on **PROP 19:** [Property Tax Breaks](#)

NO on **PROP 20:** [Rollback on Criminal Justice Reforms](#)

NO on **PROP 24:** [Consumer Data Privacy](#)

YES on **PROP 25:** [End Cash Money Bail](#)

Sent from my iPhone

Baumb, Nelly

From: Nancy Shepherd <nlshep@pacbell.net>
Sent: Saturday, September 12, 2020 8:27 PM
To: Council, City
Cc: Lisa Ratner
Subject: City Council Meeting 9/14, Agenda Item #11

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

Dear Mayor Fine and City Council,

Apologies for not being “at” the zoom meeting Monday night, I will be on vacation with no access to internet.

I am writing in support of the Proposition 15, placed on the California November Ballot this year titled: Increases Funding for Public Schools, Community Colleges, and Local Government Services by Changing Tax Assessment of Commercial and Industrial Property Initiative.

There are two basic points I’d like to make, 1) if this proposition is successful it is estimated that the City of Palo Alto will receive over \$20 million in new revenue annually, and 2) about 10% of the commercial property reassessments will be responsible for about 92% of the new revenue. In total this initiative will create about \$12 billion of new revenue annually for schools, municipalities, special districts throughout the state. It corrects the unfair advantage that some commercial property owner enjoy at the expense of other business and residential properties.

Prop 15 does not change the tax rate of commercial and industrial properties—it refreshes the assessed valuation of commercial and industrial properties only and protects residential features that homeowners enjoy. A simple majority vote is required for passage—other concepts that suggest increasing commercial property assessments to 2% or 3% will require a super majority vote of the electorate.

In my professional capacity, I am a retired commercial real estate accountant/controller. For over 25 years I analyzed purchase scenarios, calculated profitability, managed budgets and projections and yes, argued at times with county assessors regarding valuations. Yet, not once could our projects profit from the loophole large corporate owners capture by escaping reassessment valuation from ownership change. Indeed, my husband’s law office building sold soon after a new four-year lease in 2016, and yes NNN fees increased based the new valuation and his prorate share of the building. This happens typically for small business owners, not large corporate property.

Education funding is greatly needed. In the late 1990s I championed Palo Alto Unified School District’s effort to connect all schools in district wide fundraising. Each year fundraising at the individual school sites became more aggressive and private donations made a big difference—yet, fundraising ability and capacity varied between sites. Some schools could raise three times more than others and added educational programs differed between sites. Indeed, some elementary schools were prized by parents and realtors creating “inferior” neighborhoods based on attendance boundaries. It was vital that all Palo Alto schools shared and benefited as a district, and the new fundraising policy captured an equitable formula. Prop 15 offers a similar advantage, new

revenue will be shared with all California schools creating better equity from the estimated \$4.8B in new education funds each year.

Finally, of special note, Santa Clara County should be included in the staff report identifying other Bay Area counties in support of this initiative. In fact, Joe Simitian voted in support of Schools and Communities First along with three other supervisors.

Some of you know, I've been a strong supporter of Proposition 13 for decades, and encourage each of you to vote yes on the resolution and encourage our community to support the correction to Prop 13.

Thank you,

Nancy Shepherd
President, LWV Palo Alto
Former Mayor, City of Palo Alto

Baumb, Nelly

From: Kaaren Powers <kpowers101@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Friday, September 11, 2020 9:09 AM
To: Council, City
Subject: Strongly Urge you to vote "YES" for this Important Proposal!!

Importance: High

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

It is unusual for me to send out a message asking for your support for this proposal, but more and more of our fellow citizens are becoming homeless and not able to survive making it here in California. Our current dual crises of homelessness and COVID urgently requires the city council's response. I strongly urge you to support the proposed changes to the city's safe parking ordinance and the approval of a three-year lease of the City's Geng Road site to the County of Santa Clara for use as a 24x7 safe parking program for vehicle dwellers.

Please do not let our neighbors down when they need our care and compassion more than ever!!

Thank you,
Kaaren Powers

Baumb, Nelly

From: Kathy Jordan <kjordan114wh@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, September 13, 2020 4:35 PM
To: Council, City
Subject: re staff suggestion to 'grow the City's population' to raise City sales tax revenue and other ideas

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

City Council members:

Regarding the staff reports for Monday night: if the City's cost structure cannot be supported by the City's sales tax and other revenue, it is time to cut back the City's cost structure.

It does not mean that it's time to 'grow the customer base' and find ways to increase the population of the City of Palo Alto to attempt to pump up the City's sales tax revenues, to maintain a City cost structure --- though that is what staff suggested in its reports for your upcoming meeting.

Residents do not want to find ways to grow the City's population to generate more sales tax to maintain the City's current cost structure.

Suggestion to grow the City's population to plump up sales tax revenues listed in staff reports for:

- Sept. 14 Council agenda <https://www.cityofpaloalto.org/civicax/filebank/documents/78372> and
- Sept. 15 Finance committee agenda: <https://www.cityofpaloalto.org/civicax/filebank/documents/78372>

No, residents do not want to find ways to grow the City's population.

Staff included another suggestion as though accepted fact:

- Shoppers & cities want retail walkable from housing.

<https://www.cityofpaloalto.org/civicax/filebank/documents/78372>

No, residents do not actually want this, or let's say a large segment of residents do not want this, which seems to suggest adding dense housing close to retail. Many residents want to maintain the character of the community and do not want to see an increased supply of dense housing.

Thank you.

Best,

Kathy Jordan