

From: [Shaila Sadrozinski](#)
To: [Council, City](#); [Planning Commission](#); [Transportation](#)
Subject: changes proposed to the residential parking permit program
Date: Wednesday, February 17, 2021 12:26:38 PM

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

According to this morning's Daily Post, City Council will soon be discussing changing the existing residential parking permit program to a system that can be managed with license plate readers. Before spending money on buying license plate readers, I hope you will take into account the following concerns about no longer having hang-tags issued to residents for temporary guests:

1. Under the existing system, a hang-tag is not tied to a specific car and can be used as and when needed
2. And the cost for a hang-tag is \$50, the same as for a sticker, and valid all year
3. If under the new proposal each temporary guest permit is linked with a specific license plate, then if one had two different guests at different times during the same day, one would have to buy two permits
4. This would be an unacceptable cost, especially for low-income or elderly residents who may have more than one caregiver coming to the house in one day
5. Some seniors are not comfortable with doing things online and may not even have good internet connection. This would be an unnecessary anxiety-causing burden on them
6. If you have an unexpected guest, you would have to remember to go online to acquire a temporary permit
7. If you have out-of-town guests visiting for a few days, would you have to remember to go online daily to renew the temporary permit?

I believe this new proposal, while possibly more cost-efficient for the city, would be a financial and bureaucratic burden on residents for whom the RPP program was created in the first place.

Shaila Sadrozinski 62 Churchill Ave

From: [Aram James](#)
To: [Jonsen, Robert](#); [Binder, Andrew](#); [Human Relations Commission](#); [Council, City](#); [Cecilia Taylor](#); [Betsy Nash](#); [citycouncil@mountainview.gov](#); [Kaloma Smith](#); [Greer Stone](#); [chuckjagoda1@gmail.com](#); [rebecca@winwithrebecca.com](#); [Planning Commission](#); [ParkRec Commission](#); [Jeff Moore](#); [DuBois, Tom](#); [Raj](#); [Richard Konda](#); [Council, City](#); [Sunita de Turreil](#); [Roberta Ahlquist](#); [Raven Malone](#); [paloaltofreepress@gmail.com](#); [Jeff Rosen](#); [wintergery@earthlink.net](#); [mark weiss](#); [griffinam@sbcglobal.net](#); [wilpf.peninsula.paloalto@gmail.com](#); [greg@gregtanaka.org](#); [Shikada, Ed](#); [Pat Burt](#); [Cari Templeton](#); [Cormack, Alison](#); [Tanner, Rachael](#)
Subject: NYTimes: Police Forces Have Long Tried to Weed Out Extremists in the Ranks. Then Came the Capitol Riot.
Date: Wednesday, February 17, 2021 6:58:49 AM

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

Police Forces Have Long Tried to Weed Out Extremists in the Ranks. Then Came the Capitol Riot.
<https://www.nytimes.com/2021/02/16/us/police-extremists-capitol-riot.html?referringSource=articleShare>

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Rebecca Eisenberg](#)
To: [Bigelow, Lauren](#)
Cc: [Human Relations Commission](#); [Roberta Ahlquist](#); [Aram James](#); [Gail Price](#); [Angie Evans](#); [Greer Stone](#); [chuck jagoda](#); [Planning Commission](#); [Council, City](#)
Subject: Re: Renters - public schools - legal protections
Date: Tuesday, February 16, 2021 11:38:36 AM

Hi Lauren,

Would you like me to provide you with an introduction? I am in close and positive contact with both the PTSA President at Paly High School as well as the Deputy Superintendent in charge of Equity. They are high-quality, hard working professionals, they do great work, and they always respond to my phone calls and emails. I would be pleased to put you in touch and I don't think there will be any issue with them speaking with you.

Once you give me permission, I will send introductory emails.

I appreciate your observation that I care about these issues, but of course caring is not enough. It is acting that matters. Please allow me to assist you do the best job you can serving our community.

Thank you,

Rebecca

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

On Tue, Feb 16, 2021 at 9:21 AM Bigelow, Lauren <Lauren.Bigelow@cityofpaloalto.org> wrote:

Good morning, Rebecca,

Thanks so much for your thoughtful email and your comments last Thursday. I took copious notes and can tell that this means a lot to you. Truly, thank you for caring as much as you do and consistently showing up.

I've reached out to PAUSD several times and hadn't received any responses. When I reached out to have conversations with the PTA last summer, teachers and parents alike were swamped with how to deal with COVID-19 and distance learning. I promise I've tried, but the moment we find ourselves in has made many conversations with potential partners difficult. I think it's just a case of finding the **right** person to talk to at the right time, which can be hard. That's okay, though. I'm not afraid of hard work at all, so, I'll reinvigorate my efforts and would welcome the opportunity to discuss more.

Warmly,

Lauren

From: Rebecca Eisenberg <rebecca@winwithrebecca.com>

Sent: Friday, February 12, 2021 12:07 AM

To: Bigelow, Lauren <Lauren.Bigelow@CityofPaloAlto.org>; Human Relations Commission <hrc@cityofpaloalto.org>

Cc: Roberta Ahlquist <roberta.ahlquist@sjsu.edu>; Aram James <abjpd1@gmail.com>; Gail Price <gail.price3@gmail.com>; Angie Evans <angiebevans@gmail.com>; Greer Stone <gstone22@gmail.com>; chuck jagoda <chuckjagoda1@gmail.com>; Planning Commission <Planning.Commission@cityofpaloalto.org>; Council, City <city.council@cityofpaloalto.org>

Subject: Renters - public schools - legal protections

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

Hi Lauren,

Thank you for your presentation tonight at the HRC meeting. I wanted to follow up with you on three matters: (1) outreach to the PAUSD; (2) demographic gaps and (3) legal protections to protect tenants. As a means of quick background, I am an attorney with 3 decades of experience in matters involving tenant/landlord relations, economic and tax policy, and social justice.

I am cc'ing some like-minded friends, neighbors, and colleagues, who also have deep experience with working on solutions for tenants in Palo Alto and similar communities. They undoubtedly have their own perspectives, and you may have spoken with them already, but in hopes of helping you move this project to launch, I thought including them again may be efficient.(also cc'ing govt bodies for record-keeping purposes)

First, as I said at the meeting, I think it would be very helpful for you to reach out to the Palo Alto Unified School District as you continue your research into how to protect tenants better in Palo Alto. The PAUSD has in the past (and presumably currently) collected data about public school families, which provides both access to the renters you described as 'hard to reach' (we're not! we're here!) as well as a possibly more complete picture as to what proportion of our community rents their homes, as I believe that the percentage is higher than you report.

According to the PAUSD's research, the last I checked, as many as 70% -80% of all Palo Alto public school students live in homes that are rented rather than owned. PAUSD has 12,000 students at its 18 public schools. Without adequate tenant protection, **as many as ten thousand Palo Alto public school students are at risk of losing their homes...** including my own.

Given this risk to our children, the need for adequate rent control is urgent. I would be happy to put you in touch with appropriate parties at the District, the PTAC and/or local PTAs. Greer Stone, cc'd, is a renter, a city council member, the city council liaison to the

HRC, and an educator (married to another educator!) in the Palo Alto School District- at the high school my son attends. I am sure he can help as well. I hope you share our perspective that the public schools are what drew so many of us to live in Palo Alto, and in many ways are the heart of our community.

The School District also can be a valuable resource for you because it operates the largest and (as far as I am aware) only government-sponsored meal delivery system in Palo Alto. Thousands of PAUSD students receive free or subsidized meals. Additionally, many public school students live in subsidized housing developments. You should be able to reach some of these families through the district, but I would be happy to assist you with introductions as well to my personal friends who live in Palo Alto's few low-income housing developments. Finally, the school district can provide insight into the large percentage of our community who are not easily reached by surveys because the adults do not speak strong English. PAUSD's students include a large number of families where the children are the strongest English speakers in the family. All of these are communities that connect through our Palo Alto public schools.

Second, I wanted to quickly mention some potential gaps with the survey numbers given by the American Community Survey. One of the biggest gray areas is the lack of consideration for vacant homes here in Palo Alto -- a number which has been steadily rising and is not tracked by our city (although it should be). If vacant homes comprise 15% of housing stock as some estimate, that means that 45% of our homes are filled with tenants; 40% are owner-occupied, and 15% are empty.

This actually is a reason that most tenants here in Palo Alto don't feel embarrassed about renting. As I told my kids after we moved back here almost 10 years ago, I am not ashamed of the fact that we do not have four million dollars to spend on a 3-4 bedroom home! For the vast majority of us, including my partner and myself--a 2-lawyer couple in our 50's--buying a home of Palo Alto is an unrealistic expectation. And that is ok, as long as renting is a viable long-term housing alternative as well, which currently in Palo Alto, it too often is not.

Armed with more complete demographic numbers, I think it may be easier to bring attention to the profound problem in Palo Alto, that we are a city composed mostly of renters, living without any meaningful tenant protection laws.

Third, legal protections. Decades of work on affordable housing have shown that the only effective way to level the playing field for tenants is to provide legal tenant protections. You said you are researching other communities for ways to protect tenants better. I think it's most important to look at the cities that do the best job of protecting tenants, as many local communities are failing their tenant communities as much or more than we are.

Below is a brief and incomplete, but possibly representative list of legal protections that Palo Alto lacks - but urgently needs - and that other cities provide:

1. Meaningful rent increase limits. The current cap of 10% is far above market, and does not protect tenants from exploitative and illegal evictions (as most high rent increases are pretextual evictions)
2. Stronger financial protections for tenants, including opportunities for tenants to partner with nonprofits and community groups to spread financial resources and reduce financial

risk for landlords.

3. Legally available means to report landlord violations, and receive fast remedial actions. Rent Boards often serve this role extremely effectively. I am very familiar with San Francisco's Rent Board if you would like to discuss. These reporting channels also must include means to appeal determinations, e.g. through an Appeals Board or even an Ombudsperson.

4. Clarifications to our Municipal Code that it is illegal to remove housing from the market. Palo Alto is the only city in the region that does not follow this ubiquitous legal requirement.

5. Enactment of a vacancy tax, or alternatively, the enforcement of existing zoning codes against empty homes. The vast majority of well-run cities do not allow homes to remain empty, either by considering them zoning code violations due to not being used for zoned residential purposes, or enforcing against them as homes removed from housing stock, or otherwise. Ghost homes harm communities.

5. Tenant unions. Many cities provide public office space and financial resources to enable tenants to share resources and work collectively to even the playing field with landlords, who almost always have greater financial resources and institutional power.

These of course are a few of many different ways that strong city governments can protect tenants to preserve community stability, and to help all residents feel safe that their home today will still be their home tomorrow.

I am grateful for your hard work and close attention to these urgent matters, and I appreciate your consideration of these ideas. I welcome an opportunity to discuss at your convenience, and can be reached at 415-235-8078.

With warm regards,

Rebecca Eisenberg

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

From: [Aram James](#)
To: Rebecca.Tanner@cityofpaloalto.org; [Rebecca Eisenberg](#); [Planning Commission](#); [ParkRec Commission](#); [Human Relations Commission](#); [chuck jagoda](#); roberta.ahlquist@sjsu.edu; [Raven Malone](#); [Greer Stone](#); [Council, City](#); wilpf.peninsula.paloalto@gmail.com; [Greg Tanaka](#); [Joe Simitian](#); [Mark Petersen-Perez](#)
Subject: San Jose may house unhoused along the Guadalupe River—some ideas Palo Alto could adopt on a smaller scale
Date: Tuesday, February 16, 2021 11:36:16 AM

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

Follow the link below to view the article.

https://mercurynews-ca-app.newsmemory.com/?publink=3d3ca40e9_1345c4c

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Aram James](#)
To: [Council, City; Human Relations Commission; rebecca@winwithrebecca.com; Planning Commission; ParkRec Commission; chuck jagoda; roberta.ahlquist@sjsu.edu; wilpf.peninsula.paloalto@gmail.com](#)
Subject: AB 339 -preserving internet -remote- zoom- phone access meeting post Covid 19
Date: Tuesday, February 16, 2021 11:10:02 AM

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

Follow the link below to view the article.
https://mercurynews-ca-app.newsmemory.com/?publink=155ea02ba_1345c4c

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Bhatia, Ripon](#)
To: dona.tversky@gmail.com
Cc: [Planning Commission](#)
Subject: RE: Plans for intersections at El Camino and California Ave & Churchill and Alma
Date: Tuesday, February 16, 2021 8:49:11 AM

Good Morning Dr. Tversky,

This email is a follow up to your concerns at the subject intersections and provides you information on the City's projects and proceedings related to this request.

1. El Camino Real and California Avenue: El Camino Real is a state-owned facility. The intersection is under the jurisdiction of the State of California, Department of Transportation (Caltrans), therefore, signal timings are controlled by Caltrans Staff. City staff is in the process of communicating with the Caltrans to evaluate the signal timing among other intersection improvements at this intersection for improving safety at this intersection.

1. Alma Street & Churchill Avenue: City currently has a project in the process involving railroad crossing safety improvements at this intersection. The project is a collaboration between Caltrain, Caltrans, and the California Public Utilities Commission and funded through Section 130 Federal Funding. A community meeting was also conducted in January. Also, project information was discussed at the February PABAC meeting. Staff plans to bring the information regarding this project to the Planning Commission and the City Council in near future. The project related information and details are available on the following webpage:

https://cityofpaloalto.org/gov/depts/trn/alma_churchill_section_130_project.asp

We appreciate your input and interest. Hopefully, you find this information helpful. If you have any questions or concerns, or you'd like to be added to project mailing list to receive email updates about this project, please email transportation@cityofpaloalto.org.

Thank You,

Kind Regards,
Ripon Bhatia

From: Dona Tversky <>
Sent: Tuesday, February 9, 2021 8:33 PM
To: Planning Commission <Planning.Commission@cityofpaloalto.org>
Subject: Plans for intersections at El Camino and California Ave & Churchill and Alma

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

Dear Planning commission,

I am a long time Palo Alto resident and mother of two kids with concerns for pedestrian and bicycle safety in two local intersections.

1.) El Camino & California Ave: The walk sign is FAR too short for any running adult to use to cross the street, much less a mother walking with kids or kids alone. Can that please be evaluated and lengthened? Many children use that crosswalk getting to schools.

2.) Churchill & Alma: I just heard plans at the School Board meeting for changes to the crosswalks around Paly (which is great) but no mention of the dangerous Churchill crossing at Alma and the train tracks where there is poor visibility and many young bikers sharing the road with fast moving cars and the background of trains.

Can these two sites be evaluated? Are there plans in place?

Thank you,

Dona

Dona A. Tversky, MD MPH

From: [Aram James](#)
To: [Perron, Zachary](#); [Binder, Andrew](#); [Rebecca Eisenberg](#); [Human Relations Commission](#); [Council, City](#); [chuck jagoda](#); [Planning Commission](#); [ParkRec Commission](#); [roberta.ahlquist@sjsu.edu](#); [Raven Malone](#); [Greer Stone](#); [Kaloma Smith](#); [Jonsen, Robert](#); [DuBois, Tom](#); [Jeff Moore](#); [Raj](#); [wilpf.peninsula.paloalto@gmail.com](#); [wintergery@earthlink.net](#); [Jeff Rosen](#); [mark weiss](#); [Shikada, Ed](#); [greg@gregetanaka.org](#); [Ed Lauing](#); [Cari Templeton](#); [Cormack, Alison](#); [paloaltofreepress@gmail.com](#); [griffinam@sbcglobal.net](#); [Pat Burt](#)
Subject: NYTimes: George Floyd Image With the Words 'You Take My Breath Away' Prompts Internal Police Investigation
Date: Monday, February 15, 2021 8:10:14 PM

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

George Floyd Image With the Words 'You Take My Breath Away' Prompts Internal Police Investigation
<https://www.nytimes.com/2021/02/14/us/lapd-george-floyd.html?referringSource=articleShare>

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Aram James](#)
To: [Binder, Andrew](#); [Perron, Zachary](#); [Jonsen, Robert](#); [Cecilia Taylor](#); [Human Relations Commission](#); [Joe Simitian](#); [Sunita de Turrell](#); [Kaloma Smith](#); [Human Relations Commission](#); [city.council@menlopark.org](#); [citycouncil@mountainview.gov](#); [Jeff Rosen](#); [Jeff Rosen](#); [Raj](#); [Richard Konda](#); [Planning Commission](#); [Council, City](#); [ParkRec Commission](#); [wilpf.peninsula.paloalto@gmail.com](#); [Roberta Ahlquist](#); [rebecca@winwithrebecca.com](#); [chuckjagoda1@gmail.com](#); [Greer Stone](#); [Raven Malone](#); [paloaltofreepress@gmail.com](#); [DuBois, Tom](#); [wintergery@earthlink.net](#); [Shikada, Ed](#)
Subject: Blue Lives Matter is over NYT's Feb 15, 2021 by Charles M. Blow
Date: Monday, February 15, 2021 8:03:15 PM

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

<https://www.nytimes.com/2021/02/14/opinion/blue-lives-matter-trump-impeachment.amp.html>

Sent from my iPhone

From: [mark weiss](#)
To: [Rebecca Eisenberg](#)
Cc: [Human Relations Commission](#); [Planning Commission](#); [Council, City](#); [Aram James](#); [chuck jagoda](#); [Roberta Ahlquist](#); [Raven Malone](#); [Pastor Kaloma Smith](#); [WILPF Peninsula Palo Alto](#); [Carol Lamont](#); [ParkRec Commission](#); [Jeff Moore](#); [alisa mallari tu](#); [Lewis. james](#); [Bunny Chiba](#); [Binder, Andrew](#); [Elizabeth Collet Funk](#); [Elizabeth Collet Funk](#); [info@lifemoves.org](#)
Subject: Re: First tent in front of city hall, downtown Palo Alto.
Date: Monday, February 15, 2021 6:08:04 AM

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

Apropos of my suggestion in a previous letter, below, Democracy's safeword in Palo Alto could be "motion-activated lights set to 'always on'"

-Mark B Weiss

Sent from my iPhone

On Feb 14, 2021, at 10:08 PM, Rebecca Eisenberg
<rebecca@winwithrebecca.com> wrote:

All,

I toured the new six-floor new and empty publicly-financed gigantic parking garage to see if it would be suitable for safe parking. The City needs to clean up the water flood (safe near EV chargers?) and the trash. Otherwise, it looks to be in good enough shape to host vehicle dwellers. Given that the City already is paying to keep every single of the thousands of light bulbs on, every hour of the day and night, how much more hassle can it be to let people park their cars safely there? Also, I measured the spaces and there is ample room for placement of individual shelter mobile units. As a reminder, the California Department of Housing has offered millions of dollars in funding to any city for this very purpose, so it won't even cost anything. Here is a list of some of the many state programs that are excited to give Palo Alto money to house our growing homeless population: <https://www.hcd.ca.gov/grants-funding/active-funding/index.shtml>

Here are a couple of my videos:

Parking Garage Tour Part 2 (midnight on Thursday night; all lights on)
<https://www.facebook.com/reisenberg/videos/10158825952918497>

Parking Garage Tour Part 1 (Wednesday afternoon)
<https://www.facebook.com/reisenberg/videos/10158826050273497>

I filed a 311 report regarding the fact that the motion-activated lights were set to "always on" and also reported the flood on the second sub-basement, but when I came back to check a week after filming these videos, the lights were still all during daylight, even on the roof (as well as on every other floor, day and night), and the flood in the sub-basement only had grown bigger rather than smaller. I

also don't think it was very safe for the smokers (whoever they were) to have left their cigarette butts on the floor of the lowest level, next to the used gloves. It is shocking but true that the same contractor who built the already-flooded parking garage was just awarded the contract for the new jail next door to this garage. Although some funds already were spent, isn't it better to avoid a larger sunk cost, and turn this ship around now?

Let's use this empty, well-lit parking garage for safe parking, and let's use the empty lot next door for temporary shelter and affordable housing! We don't need more jail cells or prisons; we need shelter beds and homes. Palo Alto is the only city in the area without *any* shelter beds for our large and growing unhoused population. We also have the largest vehicle dwelling population per capita in the state, if not country. Here, in the most educated and wealthy city on earth, we can and must do better. Please let me know how I can help. Together, we can save lives, restore dignity, and protect families in Palo Alto.

Best regards,
Rebecca

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

On Sat, Feb 6, 2021 at 8:30 PM mark weiss <earwopa@yahoo.com> wrote:

Well, as Chief Seattle said "All things are connected". Chief Seattle the indigenous proto-environmentalist. Not to be confused with Chief Adrian Diaz, the current chief of police in Seattle.

Mark Weiss

In Palo Alto

Re: tents at 250 Hamilton, shantytowns as student agit prop in Hanover, Berkeley and Stanford 35 years ago, homelessness, safe parking, Ladoris Cordell, Al Young, ..., and the trees in blue.

I think Democracy in Palo Alto needs a safe word...

Sent from my iPhone

On Feb 6, 2021, at 6:46 PM, Aram James <abjpd1@gmail.com> wrote:

Hi Mark,

For a day off you still talking like the great poet I know you to be.

Stay on (snip)

You the one with magic pen!! Keep it coming my brother!!

Sent from my iPhone

On Feb 6, 2021, at 4:52 PM, mark weiss
<earwopa@yahoo.com> wrote:

Excuse the digression but in 1985 liberal activists interested in divestment that is to say stopping apartheid in South Africa built on the campus green at Dartmouth College a "shantytown" .. After about six months, right wing activist destroyed it in the middle of the night. Then we had a one day teach-in about racism. Then for a while at the museum, the art museum displayed part of the former Shanty as artwork per se. I wonder if they still have it in storage.

If the tent in this picture is blue maybe it has something to do with the art installation by the Australian couple whose name escapes me but they painted the trees blue so that people will look with fresh eyes at things that were not made by man i.e. nature.

Personally I was kind of tripping out and in fact had a 10 minute conversation today with Officer or agent Craig Lee a 22 year veteran of our police force who was in patrol car was parked on the third floor of the 445 Bryant garage in my neighborhood and I was wondering if he should do a welfare check on the person who was sleeping in the second basement floor still sleeping even at 11 AM on a Saturday. There were actually two homeless people sleeping there. But What sent me there is the idea that apparently we paid tesla to sell us some charging equipment rather than asking them to pay us for the use of our garage which I think of as a type of corporate welfare.

I'm sorry if my argument is all over the map today is actually my off day. Jewish Sabbath and all that.

Mark

Sent from my iPhone

On Feb 6, 2021, at 12:54 PM, chuck jagoda <chuckjagoda1@gmail.com> wrote:

Yes, yes, and yes!


I would also add a guillotine.


On Sat, Feb 6, 2021 at 11:27 AM Roberta Ahlquist <roberta.ahlquist@sjsu.edu> wrote:

m

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

 View on Nextdoor

 Shelly Still, Duveneck - St. Francis

What are your thoughts on this? 
What do you think the city or residents need to do here? Do we watch and let it grow into tent city?

General · Feb 5  2  14

[See 12 previous replies](#)



Shelly Still
What is your solution?
And what is your immediate solution to prevent tent city all over Palo alto?...



Shelly Still
Is that the solution?
So they are encouraging camping in Palo Alto?

[View or Reply](#)

This message is intended for
roberta.ahlquist@sjsu.edu. [Unsubscribe here.](#)
Nextdoor, 420 Taylor Street, San Francisco, CA
94102

From: [Aram James](#)
To: [Van Der Zwaag, Minka](#); [Constantino, Mary](#); [Kaloma Smith](#); [Sunita de Tourreil](#); [Human Relations Commission Council, City](#); [City Mgr](#); [mark weiss](#); [Rebecca Eisenberg](#); [Palo Alto Free Press](#); [chuck jagoda](#); [Jonsen, Robert](#);
Cc: [WILPF Peninsula Palo Alto](#); [winter dellenbach](#); [Joe Simitian](#); [Binder, Andrew](#); [Taylor, Cecilia](#); [Rev. Lorrie Owens](#); [Minor, Beth](#); [Nash, Betsy](#); [Richard Konda](#); [Raj Jayadev](#); [Jeff Moore](#); [Perron, Zachary](#); [supervisor.ellenberg@bos.sccgov.org](#); [Rosen, Jeff](#); [Angel, David](#); [city.council@menlopark.org](#); [Anna Griffin](#); [cindy.chavez@bos.sccgov.org](#); [Greer Stone](#); [Pat Burt](#); [Patrice Ventresca](#); [patthurston2@yahoo.com](#); [Lewis james](#); [Sara Tabin](#); [Dave Price](#); [Bill Johnson](#); [Gennady Sheyner](#); [Tanner, Rachael](#); [ParkRec Commission](#); [Planning Commission](#); [Raven Malone](#)
Subject: Fwd: Time for a critical conversation re hate crimes in Palo Alto and the Bay Area
Date: Saturday, February 13, 2021 6:30:01 PM

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

-
2/13/2021

Dear HRC members and staff,

Below is a detailed story (in today's New York Times, 2/13/2021) outlining the recent increase in hate crimes against members of Asian American community in San Francisco, Oakland, and other parts of the Bay Area. (see link below to the full article : ***A Lunar New Year of Safety Whistles Instead of Confetti Cannons***

HRC Hate Crimes discussion

I know the HRC will be taking up the subject of hate crimes in March (likely at a 2nd March meeting). As a community member I am very concerned about the ongoing proliferation of hate crimes here in Palo Alto.

Here is language from today's New York Times piece that I ask the HRC and staff to consider:

Language form today's NYT's

But in 2021, some community organizers and advocacy groups, including Stop AAPI Hate, have said Asian Americans must look beyond calling for increased police presence in neighborhoods to achieve that justice. "We recognize that policing has led to the criminalization of communities of color, and mass Incarceration," Dr. Jeung said. " Why perpetuate a system that doesn't work? "The people arrested in both the Chinatown incident in Oakland and the fatal assault on Mr. Ratanpakdee are Black, which community organizers said has brought to the fore some anti-Black racism particularly as outrage about the attacks has spread on social media.

Police spokesperson & BLM speaker

I understand that the only speaker currently slated to address the issue of hate crimes at the March HRC meeting is a member of the Palo Alto Police Department. Given the mistrust of many members of our community towards our current police department, and law enforcement generally, and to encourage a balanced discussion of the hate crimes issue, I am requesting that the HRC invite/recruit a BLM spokesperson to also address the issue. Both speakers (BLM & Police) to be given the same time thirty minutes, as an example, to address the HRC and members of the public.

Conclusion

Too often, in my many years of advocating for best police practices in Palo Alto, when either the HRC or City Council have action items or special studies related to our police department on their respective agenda, the conversations are dominated by members of the Palo Alto Police Department. Given the current social justice movement in Palo Alto, and across this country, it is critical that voices other than the police be given equal time to address the many civil rights issues that come before our governmental bodies. Absent equal access by speakers on both sides of police practices issues the public will continue to lack trust in our police and governmental bodies that allow such one sided conversations to occur .

Sincerely,

Aram James

A Tense Lunar New Year for the Bay Area After Attacks on Asian-Americans
<https://www.nytimes.com/2021/02/12/us/asian-american-racism.html?referringSource=articleShare>

Police resistance to time-sharing proposal anticipated

P.S. I would anticipate stiff, behind the scenes resistance by the PAPD command staff and the POA to sharing time with BLM spokespersons on any police practices issue, even the topic of hate crimes. In fact I would not be surprised if at least one member of the HRC might attempt to exercise undue influence over the other HRC members to prevent such a shared time agreement. I request that both the HRC and our City Council not cave to such pressures and, moving forward, insist that equal time be given to speakers who have a different perspective on police practices issues than our police.

From: [Angie Evans](#)
To: [Rebecca Eisenberg](#)
Cc: [Bigelow, Lauren](#); [Human Relations Commission](#); [Roberta Ahlquist](#); [Aram James](#); [Gail Price](#); [Greer Stone](#); [chuck jagoda](#); [Planning Commission](#); [Council, City](#)
Subject: Re: Renters - public schools - legal protections
Date: Friday, February 12, 2021 7:57:58 AM

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

Thanks, Rebecca. I spoke to the registrar last year as well and they told me something like 65% of students were renters. I believe this may have gone up during COVID - it also could've gone down. I look forward to getting that data point again after registration for PAUSD ends today. They don't publish the datapoint or share addresses - I don't believe they can legally share addresses. They may be able to share which schools have the highest percentage but they certainly cannot provide contact info or anything to identify them.

Best,
Angie

On Fri, Feb 12, 2021 at 12:08 AM Rebecca Eisenberg <rebecca@winwithrebecca.com> wrote:

Hi Lauren,

Thank you for your presentation tonight at the HRC meeting. I wanted to follow up with you on three matters: (1) outreach to the PAUSD; (2) demographic gaps and (3) legal protections to protect tenants. As a means of quick background, I am an attorney with 3 decades of experience in matters involving tenant/landlord relations, economic and tax policy, and social justice.

I am cc'ing some like-minded friends, neighbors, and colleagues, who also have deep experience with working on solutions for tenants in Palo Alto and similar communities. They undoubtedly have their own perspectives, and you may have spoken with them already, but in hopes of helping you move this project to launch, I thought including them again may be efficient.(also cc'ing govt bodies for record-keeping purposes)

First, as I said at the meeting, I think it would be very helpful for you to reach out to the Palo Alto Unified School District as you continue your research into how to protect tenants better in Palo Alto. The PAUSD has in the past (and presumably currently) collected data about public school families, which provides both access to the renters you described as 'hard to reach' (we're not! we're here!) as well as a possibly more complete picture as to what proportion of our community rents their homes, as I believe that the percentage is higher than you report.

According to the PAUSD's research, the last I checked, as many as 70% -80% of all Palo Alto public school students live in homes that are rented rather than owned. PAUSD has 12,000 students at its 18 public schools. Without adequate tenant protection, **as many as ten thousand Palo Alto public school students are at risk of losing their homes...** including my own.

Given this risk to our children, the need for adequate rent control is urgent. I would be happy to put you in touch with appropriate parties at the District, the PTAC and/or local

PTSAs. Greer Stone, cc'd, is a renter, a city council member, the city council liaison to the HRC, and an educator (married to another educator!) in the Palo Alto School District- at the high school my son attends. I am sure he can help as well. I hope you share our perspective that the public schools are what drew so many of us to live in Palo Alto, and in many ways are the heart of our community.

The School District also can be a valuable resource for you because it operates the largest and (as far as I am aware) only government-sponsored meal delivery system in Palo Alto. Thousands of PAUSD students receive free or subsidized meals. Additionally, many public school students live in subsidized housing developments. You should be able to reach some of these families through the district, but I would be happy to assist you with introductions as well to my personal friends who live in Palo Alto's few low-income housing developments. Finally, the school district can provide insight into the large percentage of our community who are not easily reached by surveys because the adults do not speak strong English. PAUSD's students include a large number of families where the children are the strongest English speakers in the family. All of these are communities that connect through our Palo Alto public schools.

Second, I wanted to quickly mention some potential gaps with the survey numbers given by the American Community Survey. One of the biggest gray areas is the lack of consideration for vacant homes here in Palo Alto -- a number which has been steadily rising and is not tracked by our city (although it should be). If vacant homes comprise 15% of housing stock as some estimate, that means that 45% of our homes are filled with tenants; 40% are owner-occupied, and 15% are empty.

This actually is a reason that most tenants here in Palo Alto don't feel embarrassed about renting. As I told my kids after we moved back here almost 10 years ago, I am not ashamed of the fact that we do not have four million dollars to spend on a 3-4 bedroom home! For the vast majority of us, including my partner and myself--a 2-lawyer couple in our 50's--buying a home of Palo Alto is an unrealistic expectation. And that is ok, as long as renting is a viable long-term housing alternative as well, which currently in Palo Alto, it too often is not.

Armed with more complete demographic numbers, I think it may be easier to bring attention to the profound problem in Palo Alto, that we are a city composed mostly of renters, living without any meaningful tenant protection laws.

Third, legal protections. Decades of work on affordable housing have shown that the only effective way to level the playing field for tenants is to provide legal tenant protections. You said you are researching other communities for ways to protect tenants better. I think it's most important to look at the cities that do the best job of protecting tenants, as many local communities are failing their tenant communities as much or more than we are.

Below is a brief and incomplete, but possibly representative list of legal protections that Palo Alto lacks - but urgently needs - and that other cities provide:

1. Meaningful rent increase limits. The current cap of 10% is far above market, and does not protect tenants from exploitative and illegal evictions (as most high rent increases are pretextual evictions)
2. Stronger financial protections for tenants, including opportunities for tenants to partner

with nonprofits and community groups to spread financial resources and reduce financial risk for landlords.

3. Legally available means to report landlord violations, and receive fast remedial actions. Rent Boards often serve this role extremely effectively. I am very familiar with San Francisco's Rent Board if you would like to discuss. These reporting channels also must include means to appeal determinations, e.g. through an Appeals Board or even an Ombudsperson.

4. Clarifications to our Municipal Code that it is illegal to remove housing from the market. Palo Alto is the only city in the region that does not follow this ubiquitous legal requirement.

5. Enactment of a vacancy tax, or alternatively, the enforcement of existing zoning codes against empty homes. The vast majority of well-run cities do not allow homes to remain empty, either by considering them zoning code violations due to not being used for zoned residential purposes, or enforcing against them as homes removed from housing stock, or otherwise. Ghost homes harm communities.

5. Tenant unions. Many cities provide public office space and financial resources to enable tenants to share resources and work collectively to even the playing field with landlords, who almost always have greater financial resources and institutional power.

These of course are a few of many different ways that strong city governments can protect tenants to preserve community stability, and to help all residents feel safe that their home today will still be their home tomorrow.

I am grateful for your hard work and close attention to these urgent matters, and I appreciate your consideration of these ideas. I welcome an opportunity to discuss at your convenience, and can be reached at 415-235-8078.

With warm regards,

Rebecca Eisenberg

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

From: [Jeanne Fleming](#)
To: [Lait, Jonathan](#)
Cc: [Clerk, City](#); [DuBois, Tom](#); [Stump, Molly](#); chow_tina@yahoo.com; wross@lawross.com; todd@toddcollins.org; [Planning Commission](#); [Architectural Review Board](#)
Subject: Please answer these questions
Date: Thursday, February 11, 2021 2:07:50 PM

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

Dear Jonathan,

I am writing to follow up on my emails of two weeks ago to you and to Planning & Transportation Commission (PTC) Staff liaison Rachael Tanner. (Those two emails are attached below.)

While Ms. French of your office answered one of my questions, namely, what the "Objective Standards" item in the PTC's list of "Upcoming Items" references (it's standards for housing developments), these questions have not been answered:

1. **Why do revisions to the Wireless Ordinance no longer appear even on your list of "Upcoming Items" for the PTC?**

As you know, it is now a year since the PTC preliminarily reviewed Staff's proposed revisions to the Wireless Ordinance and directed Staff to return to them with additional modifications for their final consideration.

2. **When do you anticipate that revisions to the Wireless Ordinance will appear on the PTC's Agenda?**
3. **Are any members of the PTC involved in any way in the decision about when the Wireless Ordinance will appear on the Commission's Agenda? For example, is Commission Chair Bart Hechtman involved in any way in this decision?**

You will forgive me, I trust, for pressing you to answer these questions. As you know, revising the Wireless Ordinance is a matter of considerable urgency, not least because:

1. **Telecommunications companies are not waiting for the revised Wireless Ordinance to be finalized to continue their push to install cell towers all over Palo Alto.**

Indeed, Verizon just filed yet another cell tower application on February 9th.

It is my understanding that cell tower applications your department deems complete need only meet the expressed-at-that-date standards in the Ordinance. In other words, beneficial-to-the-City revisions to the Ordinance

made after that date would not apply to them. If I am wrong about this, please tell me. (I have copied City Attorney Stump on this email.)

2. **With the Ninth Circuit's August ruling, Palo Alto once more has the authority to assert subjective aesthetic standards for the siting and design of cell towers—but for this to happen, these standards must be restored to the Wireless Ordinance.**

As you repeatedly assured City Council, the PTC, the ARB and residents when you recommended eliminating subjective aesthetic standards from the Ordinance two years ago, you stood ready to promptly restore this significant element of local authority should the FCC's September, 2018, Order calling for objective standards be overturned. And as you know, it was indeed overturned in August, when the League of California Cities *et al.* prevailed on this issue in *Portland v. FCC*.

Thank you, as always, for your help.

Sincerely,

Jeanne

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

From: Jeanne Fleming <jfleming@metricus.net>
Sent: Friday, January 29, 2021 12:05 PM
To: 'Lait, Jonathan' <Jonathan.Lait@CityofPaloAlto.org>
Cc: 'Clerk, City' <city.clerk@cityofpaloalto.org>; 'DuBois, Tom' <Tom.DuBois@CityofPaloAlto.org>; chow_tina@yahoo.com; wross@lawross.com; todd@toddcollins.org; Plannning.Commission@CityofPaloAlto.org; 'Architectural Review Board' <arb@cityofpaloalto.org>
Subject: Two Questions

Dear Jonathan,

For some months now, your reports for the Planning and Transportation Commission have included the following on the list of "Upcoming Items:" "PTC Review of Objective Standards."

I would appreciate it if you would tell me:

1. To what does that item refer? Specifically, does it refer to revisions to the

Wireless Ordinance, does it refer to the new “Objective Zoning” standards consultants have prepared at the behest of City Staff, or does it refer to something else?

2. If this language does not refer to the Wireless Ordinance, why do revisions to the Wireless Ordinance no longer appear on your list of “Upcoming Items” for the PTC? As you know, the PTC preliminarily reviewed Staff’s proposed revisions to the Wireless Ordinance almost exactly one year ago, but have yet to conduct their final consideration of these revisions before the revisions go to City Council.

Thank you for your help.

Sincerely,

Jeanne

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

From: Jeanne Fleming <jfleming@metricus.net>
Sent: Wednesday, February 3, 2021 10:56 AM
To: Rachael.Tanner@cityofpaloalto.org
Cc: Planning.Commission@CityofPaloAlto.org; 'Clerk, City' <city.clerk@cityofpaloalto.org>; 'DuBois, Tom' <Tom.DuBois@CityofPaloAlto.org>; 'Lait, Jonathan' <Jonathan.Lait@CityofPaloAlto.org>; chow_tina@yahoo.com; wross@lawross.com; todd@toddcollins.org
Subject: PTC consideration of Wireless Ordinance

Dear Rachael,

I understand from our earlier correspondence that you and Jonathan Lait decide when consideration of revisions to the Wireless Ordinance will appear on the Planning & Transportation Commission’s Agenda. I would appreciate it if you would tell me:

1. Are any members of the PTC involved in any way in this decision (for example, Commission Chair Bart Hechtman)?
2. When do you anticipate that revisions to the Wireless Ordinance will appear on the PTC’s Agenda? As you may recall, on May 31, 2020, you wrote to me that the PTC was tentatively scheduled to consider the revised Wireless Ordinance on August 12, 2020. This in itself represented a delay of many

months.

As I am sure you know, telecommunications companies have been continuing to submit cell tower applications to the city in the year since February 13, 2020, when the PTC directed city staff to return to them with a revised Wireless Ordinance. In short, this is a matter of considerable urgency.

Thank you for your help.

Sincerely,

Jeanne

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

From: [Rebecca Eisenberg](#)
To: [Planning Commission](#); [Council, City](#)
Subject: Re: Gratitude to Commissioner Alcheck, and a few more thoughts on the City's extreme proposal to change T&C
Date: Wednesday, February 10, 2021 9:54:57 PM

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

Quick but important TYPO correction highlighted in yellow/red below. (And one clarifying question added). I still don't know what was decided because I was writing this while they voted 3-2 (1 absent) to approve something the specifics of which I missed! Of course, whatever was decided was a recommendation for City Council's ultimate review and determination.

Thank you again for your hard work, and thank you for considering!

Best,
Rebecca

On Wed, Feb 10, 2021 at 9:21 PM Rebecca Eisenberg <rebecca@winwithrebecca.com> wrote:

Hi all,

Although I have criticized Commissioner Alcheck in the past, and still have questions, I wanted to take the time to call out Michael Alcheck for his courage and integrity in going against what I previously thought would be his script. In particular, I am grateful to be proven wrong, watching Commission Alcheck stand up to the over-reaching demands of Town & Country's landlord, and instead propose less extreme measures.

Also, I wanted to amplify two observations and thoughts that Commissioner Alcheck mentioned, that I was disappointed to see was missing from the Staff Report:

1. Commissioner Alcheck argued that interfering with the markets by changing the law to accommodate one specific party is usually an inappropriate course correction in the context of a larger shift. (I think I heard him correct to say that -- I had hopped back on after my PTC interview!) The general point made here is that it is generally unwise to correct a problem for one party that is certain to impact many parties. The Staff Report failed to mention this, instead acting on the unproven assumption that Town & Country's downward rental pressure was unique.

2. Commissioner Alcheck pointed out that a permanent zoning change is far from the only remedy to this (temporary) problem. For example, because the City has declared a State of Emergency due to the pandemic, Commission Alcheck said, the City has the ability to pass emergency ordinances that will have short-term impact (please refer to the email I sent last month listing and describing legal authority for cities to use States of Emergency to pass emergency resolutions, which I asked either body to run past the City Attorney's Office). Also, Commissioner Alcheck pointed out that if temporary changes are not permitted by the Municipal Code, that the City Council has the authority to make changes to the Municipal Code to allow for temporary changes. (The fact that the Planning Depart failed to propose a change to the Muni Code to enable temporary changes, but instead proposed an extremely impactful permanent change, demonstrated, in my mind, a lack of judgment & critical

reasoning on the part of the Planning Department.)

I think and hope that Commissioner Alcheck's points are important, even though the City Staff appeared to reject them, and unfortunately they may not change this outcome.

As of time of writing, both Chair Hechtman and Commissioner Templeton stated support for the City's recommendation to permanently alter Town & Country by removing a full one-quarter of its retail establishments. Both the Chair and Commissioner Templeton agreed that this drastic permanent change was warranted by current conditions -- even though all 50,000 Stanford students & employees are very likely to return within a year, and the closures of Paly & Castilleja, as well as the lockdowns and quarantining of residents and local employers will end eventually as well.

I also am grateful to Commissioner Alcheck to have the courage and creativity to propose a compromise that allows Town & Country to sign medical offices, but only if those leases are signed this calendar year, 2021.

But given the incomplete report, the failure to publicize this potential huge shift to any impacted groups or stakeholders, including Stanford, PAUSD, local residents, and in particular small businesses... I cannot for the life of me understand why the Commission would do anything other than continue this matter to see how the market shakes out, and to enable input from any of the numerous impacted parties.

The owners of Town and Country claim that Town & Country cannot survive if this permanent change is not made to expand their market. Yet, that owner, Ellis Partners boasts that it is worth more than \$2.5 billion dollars -- and it has **not** revealed whether or not it has applied for and/or received any of the trillions of dollars of CARES relief money that has been provided to other companies in the real estate industry. It also did not state whether how much the landlord has raised rent over the past 10 years, and how low would Ellis have to lower the rent now in order to fill the vacancies-- specifically whether the rent now would have to be lowered to a point less than what rent was charged 10 years ago.

At very least, shouldn't the Commission demand that the City speak with small businesses, ask the applicant more questions, and seek input from the community before recommending such an extreme and detrimental impact to our community?

Or at very least, isn't reasonable to require a landlord to endure the downside risk that makes its industry so uniquely lucrative? Why do all other landlords (like my husband and myself!) have to lower our rents to adjust to declining rental markets, but this particular landlord (worth \$2.5 billion by its own website) needs to be protected from the well-documented, ever-present swings in the Silicon Valley real estate market?

Without knowing yet the results of this meeting, at very least I appreciate the appropriate critical eye that Commissioners Alcheck, Summa, and Laung gave to this flawed staff report.

Thank you to the Commissioners who stood up to the city, and thank you for all reading this long note. No matter the result, I know that we share an interest in acting on behalf of Palo Alto's community.

And to PACC, thank you for interviewing me tonight.... again!

Best regards,

Rebecca

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

John Kelley
555 Bryant St., No. 714
Palo Alto, CA 94301
jkelly@399innovation.com
(650) 444-2237

February 10, 2021

Via Email: Planning.Commission@CityofPaloAlto.org

Honorable Bart Hechtman, Chair
Honorable Giselle Roohparvar, Vice Chair
Honorable Planning and Transportation Commissioners
City of Palo Alto
250 Hamilton Avenue
Palo Alto, CA 94301

Re: February 10, 2021, Action Item 2, “ADU Code Changes to PAMC Chapter 18.09”¹

Dear Chair Hechtman, Vice Chair Roohparvar, and Planning and Transportation Commissioners,

I write for two reasons:

1. At tonight’s meeting, I urge you:
 - a. to pay particular attention to the expected presentations by Randy Popp, Architect, and other speakers who have been members of the Palo Alto ADU Task Force; and
 - b. to consider in greater detail the proposals detailed in the letter to the City Council from Jessica Resmini, Architect, and Randy Popp, Architect, dated October 5, 2020 (“October 5, 2020 Letter”), a copy of which is attached to the Staff Report, at Packet Pgs. 66-71.

While the Staff Report begins to address some of the issues discussed in the October 5, 2020 letter, much greater consideration should be given to the specific proposals set forth in that letter.

2. The fundamental question that the PTC and our entire community should be addressing is: What kind of community do we want to live in? At the highest level, facilitating actual construction of greater numbers of ADUs and JADUs of different sizes can fundamentally reinvigorate and enhance the Palo Alto community by expanding housing opportunities across a much wider range of income levels. While it is important to change particular zoning rules to enable more and better ADUs and JADUs to be built quickly, other changes must be made as well. Such changes will require considerably greater cooperation between the PTC and other branches of our municipal government.
 - a. To fulfill the state mandate for 60-day approval of ADUs, staffing levels must be increased within the Planning & Development Services Department. This will require recommendations to and consultation with the Finance Committee.

¹ See the [agenda](#) and [Staff Report \(ID # 11756\)](#) (“Staff Report”).

- b. In addition to increasing staffing levels, respecting state law will also likely require changing workflows within the Planning & Development Services Department. Repeated delays in evaluating permit applications act to discourage construction of new housing, and that is simply not acceptable given the present housing crisis. In principle, it should be possible to approve a reasonable ADU or JADU application within a week. Other cities appear to have solved this problem; Palo Alto needs to solve it as well. Members of our community seeking to build more homes deserve much quicker responses to permit applications for ADUs and JADUs. If there are specific requirements that form the basis for review of ADU and JADU permit applications, they should be detailed in ADU- and JADU-specific checklists to which all applicants can be directed. Furthermore, permit applications should be reviewed by a select, specially trained group of planning and building reviewers. These may well be issues that require consultation with the Policy and Services Committee.
- c. Palo Alto has specific goals for housing and for addressing global warming, but, in many respects, different parts of our municipal government are working at cross-purposes in meeting those goals. For example, policies and rates established by the City of Palo Alto Utilities, especially those that were designed to encourage conservation for single dwelling units on a parcel, become completely inappropriate when more than one dwelling unit is built on a parcel. Such policies and rates may be well intentioned, but they operate to discourage production of more ADUs and JADUs. To resolve these issues, consultation with the Utilities Advisory Commission is also likely required.
- d. Obtaining reasonable financing for building additional ADUs and JADUs is another critical issue that requires attention. On-bill payment systems and using municipal assets to make it easier for homeowners and others building ADUs and JADUs to obtain financing quickly and easily are two alternatives that require greater investigation. For example, Palo Alto could become one of the first cities to utilize a portion of its reserve portfolio to provide, guarantee, or backstop ADU and JADU construction loans. Similarly, Palo Alto could help create means for allowing ADU and JADU financing payments to be made through utilities or property tax bills. Creatively exploring such alternatives would probably require cooperation with both the Finance Committee and the Utilities Advisory Commission.

To become a better, more diverse, and more resilient community, we should make it easier to build more ADUs and JADUs. This requires that the PTC work diligently with other parts of Palo Alto's government. The PTC could begin this process by encouraging City Staff to require what types of coordinated consultation and cooperation could be undertaken immediately, and making appropriate recommendations to the City Council.

Thank you for your kind consideration of these concerns.

Respectfully submitted,

John Kelley

From: [Jeanne Fleming](#)
To: [French, Amy](#)
Cc: [Clerk, City](#); [DuBois, Tom](#); [Lait, Jonathan](#); chow_tina@yahoo.com; wross@lawross.com; todd@toddcollins.org; [Planning Commission](#); [Architectural Review Board](#)
Subject: New Cell towers
Date: Wednesday, February 10, 2021 5:31:10 PM

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

Dear Amy,

Thank you for letting me know that:

1. Verizon/Vinculum's Cluster 4 (20PLN-00118) resubmitted application to install new cell towers in the Downtown North, Crescent Park, University South and Community Center neighborhoods has been deemed incomplete by the Planning Department; and
2. Verizon/Vinculums has submitted an application (Cluster 5, 21PLN-00056) to install new cell towers in the vicinity of Stanford Shopping Center.

I would appreciate it if you would let me know what action the Planning Department takes in its initial review of 21PLN-00056 (e.g., whether it deems this application complete).

I am happy to report that I have received from Building Eye, for the first time ever, a cell tower application notification. (Specifically, this notification was for 21PLN-00056.) Thank you for your help in making this happen.

Sincerely,

Jeanne

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