



# Memorandum

**TO:** Honorable Mayor &  
City Council

**FROM:** Toni J. Taber, CMC  
City Clerk

**SUBJECT:** The Public Record  
November 14 – November 26

**DATE:** December 4, 2019

---

## ITEMS FILED FOR THE PUBLIC RECORD

### Letters from Boards, Commissions, and Committees

1. Letter from the Youth Commission received on November 20, 2019, regarding the August 5, 2019 Council Policy Priority List – Progress Report 2.

### Letters from the Public

1. Letter from Ann Goldstein/Verizon, received November 15, 2019, regarding SF San Jose 052 – A, San Jose, CA/GTE Mobilnet California LP.
2. Letter from Mark Lipari, received November 19, 2019, regarding Concerns on 5G Installation in Residential Court (Elkhorn Court, San Jose, CA)
3. Letter from Arifa Nisar, dated November 19, 2019, regarding Concerns on G5 Towers in Elkhorn Court.
4. Letter from Vikrant Shah, dated November 19, 2019, regarding G5 Cell Install Concerns around Elkhorn Ct, San Jose.
5. Letter from Matthew Panos, dated November 20, 2019, regarding 5G Antenna Concerns.
6. Letter from Theresa Dillard, dated November 20, 2019, regarding Cell Tower Concern Near School.
7. Letter from Michelle Podesta, dated November 20, 2019, regarding St. Christopher Cell Tower.
8. Letter from Andrea Powell, dated November 23, 2019, regarding 5G Cell Deployment on Jonathan Ave.
9. Letter from Dave Powell, dated November 25, 2019, regarding 5G Cell Deployment on Jonathan Ave 95125.

Rules and Open Government Committee  
December 4, 2019  
Subject: Public Record  
Page 2

10. Letter from Blair Beekman, dated November 20, 2019, regarding Rules and Open Govt. Committee. (RaOG). Nov.20, 2019. Item: Public Record. Vision Zero.

11. Letter from John Demertzis ,dated November 19, 2019, regarding Employee Parking Lot Relocation at Mineta San Jose International Airport (SJC)



---

Toni J. Taber, CMC  
City Clerk

TJT/tt



---

*City of San José Youth Commission*

---

October 28, 2019

Dear Honorable City Council,

The San José Youth Commission has reviewed the August 5, 2019 Council Policy Priority List - Progress report 2. As the Youth Commission, we would like to express our gratitude for including various priorities that pertain to youth, namely Priorities #10, #11, #13, #14, #15, and #23. In particular, Priority #14, Paid Family Leave, as this may increase the likelihood that youth in the foster care system are given the stability they need by establishing a strong bond with their new families. The Youth Commission strongly supports this priority. However, the majority of the Policy Priorities lack an emphasis on youth and consideration of youth concerns. The Youth Commission recommends that the Council Policy Priority List is more youth-oriented and that City Council considers issues important to youth when deciding which policy items to prioritize.

For example, Priority # 17, the Anti-Displacement Preference Ordinance, places priority on “residents who are being displaced that live in low-income neighborhoods undergoing displacement and/or gentrification”. The San José Youth Commission suggests that a high priority should be placed not just on “residents”, but specifically on youth who are undergoing such displacement. One way of doing this could be prioritizing benefits for residents with at least one minor child. The Youth Commission believes youth should be given greater consideration in affordable housing because it is critical that youth are provided a safe, stable place to call home while they are developing socially, emotionally, and physically.

Concern for the environment is also a prominent issue facing residents both young and old. It is a clear priority for youth, not just in San José, but globally as well, seen in the thousands of

youth in the Bay Area — and millions more worldwide — participating in the 2019 Global Climate Strike these past weeks. However, the Council Policy Priority List does not include any priorities within the Environmental Services Department.

In addition, youth issues in the areas of public safety, public health, and education are high priorities for the Youth Commission. We hope that City Council considers this information as it makes policy decisions moving forward.

The San José Youth Commission will strive to communicate youth voices and priorities to City Council in the future in the hopes that, when making decisions and designing policy, San José's municipal government can more accurately represent the opinions of the residents who are the future of the city, and who, in the future, will face both the benefits and consequences of the actions taken by our leaders today.

Sincerely,

*San Jose Youth Commission*

The San José Youth Commission  
2019-2020



Nov 15, 2019

Consumer Protection and Enforcement Division  
California Public Utilities Commission  
505 Van Ness Avenue  
San Francisco, CA 94102  
GO159Areports@cpuc.ca.gov

RE: Notification Letter for SF SAN JOSE 052 - A  
San Jose, CA /GTE Mobilnet California LP

---

This is to provide the Commission with notice according to the provisions of General Order No. 159A of the Public Utilities Commission of the State of California ( "CPUC") for the project described in Attachment A.

A copy of this notification letter is also being provided to the appropriate local government agency for its information. Should there be any questions regarding this project, or if you disagree with any of the information contained herein, please contact the representative below.

Verizon Wireless

Ann Goldstein  
Coordinator RE & Compliance - West Territory  
1515 Woodfield Road, #1400  
Schaumburg, IL 60173  
WestAreaCPUC@VerizonWireless.com



| JURISDICTION     | PLANNING MANAGER             | CITY MANAGER                    | CITY CLERK              | DIRECTOR OF SCHOOL BOARD | COUNTY      |
|------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|-------------|
| City of San Jose | Elizabeth.Koki@sanjoseca.gov | webmaster.manager@sanjoseca.gov | cityclerk@sanjoseca.gov | N/A                      | Santa Clara |

| VZW Legal Entity            |                     | Site Name           |                  | Site Address                       |                  | Tower Design        | Size of Building or NA |
|-----------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|------------------|------------------------------------|------------------|---------------------|------------------------|
| GTE Mobilonet California LP |                     | SF SAN JOSE 052 - A |                  | 2485 Leigh Ave, San Jose , CA95124 |                  | Utility pole/tower  | Utility pole/tower     |
| Site Latitude               | Site Longitude      | PS Location Code    | Tower Appearance | Tower Height (in feet)             | Type of Approval | Approval Issue Date |                        |
| 37°16'36.92"N               | 121°55'22.912"W(83) | 429042              | Utility Pole     | 43.8                               | Permitting       | 06/28/2017          |                        |

Project Description: NA oDAS

**From:** Mark Lipari

**Sent:** Tuesday, November 19, 2019 1:29 PM

**To:** District 6; The Office of Mayor Sam Liccardo ; City Clerk; [j.guevara@sanjose.gov](mailto:j.guevara@sanjose.gov)

**Subject:** Re: Concerns Regarding 5G Installation in Residential Court (Elkhorn Court, San Jose, CA)

Dear Councilwoman Davis, Mayor Liccardo, City Clerk Taber, and Mr. Guevara,

It has come to my attention that the City of San Jose has partnered with telecommunications companies (including ATT, T-Mobile, Verizon and Mobilitie) to install small cell equipment on City-owned property within Elkhorn Court, San Jose, CA. It has also come to my attention that the City of San Jose has plans to install two to four towers to accommodate the aforementioned installations. I just learned of these plans yesterday. Neither I nor anyone else residing in Elkhorn Court have ever received any official word from the City of San Jose addressing this issue.

I learned that on Nov. 14, 2019, the Office of Councilmember Jones advised the principal of Primary Plus Elementary School that the FCC precluded the City of San Jose from denying any small cell permits based on health concerns. This is inexcusable! If public safety is paramount, why has a representative from Verizon been quoted as saying, "5G cells may exceed the FCC's occupational limit for exposure to radio frequency emissions and an area that extends 4 feet from the antenna face that may exceed the FCC's general population limit for exposure to radio frequency emission."?

Request is respectfully made that any or all of your offices provide references and/or citations which reflect that cellular telephones using 5G technology will emit less EMR AND that the level is not a threat to the health and welfare of those residents in Elkhorn Court. Also, please include evidence that existing pre-5G wireless technology has been properly tested and that it has been deemed safe.

Personally, I suffer from severe tinnitus (inner-ear disease). I have learned that the installations of 5G equipment has worsened the effects of tinnitus in several residents in close proximity. I do not wish for my condition to worsen!

I trust that each of you is aware that there is a court order in place wherein the FCC must comply with an environmental review before 5G equipment is installed within Elkhorn Court or anywhere else within the City limits. It is my understanding that the environmental review has not been performed to date.

My neighbors and I request and demand that installations of 5G equipment within the City of San Jose be terminated and/or delayed until the FCC complies with an environmental review. In view of the unresolved technological and health issues, we request that the City of San Jose adopt an ordinance which requires set-back distances of small cell 5G equipment of at least 300 feet from houses, 1000 feet from schools and a minimum of 1500 between 5G small cell towers.

Request is respectfully made that all those persons in power within the City of San Jose refrain from "business as usual" politics and/or be jaded by the economic benefits of the installations of 5G equipment. It is imperative that the facts regarding potential health risks associated with the exposure to high-frequency microwave radiation be researched by unbiased experts. 5G may mean denser infrastructure, higher frequency and higher energy radiation for tax-paying residents. There is no proof of safety and no informed consent!

Thank you for your time and consideration.

If you wish to make contact with me, my vital information is as follows:

Mark Lipari



From: Arifa Nisar  
Sent: Tuesday, November 19, 2019 3:14 PM  
To: City Clerk; The Office of Mayor Sam Liccardo ;[j.guevara@sanjose.gov](mailto:j.guevara@sanjose.gov); District 6  
Cc: Waseem Ahmad  
Subject: Concerns on G5 Towers in Elkhorn Court

Dear Councilmember Davis, Mayor Liccardo, City Clerk Taber, and Mr. Guevara,

It has come to our attention that the City of San Jose has partnered with telecommunications companies (including ATT, T-Mobile, Verizon and Mobilitie) to install small cell equipment on City-owned property within Elkhorn Court, San Jose, CA. It has also come to my attention that the City of San Jose has plans to install two to four towers to accommodate the aforementioned installations. I just learned of these plans yesterday. Neither we nor anyone else residing in Elkhorn Court has ever received any official word from the City of San Jose addressing this issue.

We learned that on Nov. 14, 2019, the Office of Councilmember Jones advised the principal of Primary Plus Elementary School that the FCC precluded the City of San Jose from denying any small cell permits based on health concerns. This is inexcusable! If public safety is paramount, why has a representative from Verizon been quoted as saying, "5G cells may exceed the FCC's occupational limit for exposure to radiofrequency emissions and an area that extends 4 feet from the antenna face that may exceed the FCC's general population limit for exposure to radiofrequency emission."?

The request is respectfully made that any or all of your offices provide references and/or citations which reflect that cellular telephones using 5G technology will emit less EMR AND that the level is not a threat to the health and welfare of those residents in Elkhorn Court. Also, please include evidence that existing pre-5G wireless technology has been properly tested and that it has been deemed safe.

Personally, we took the decision to raise our family in this house back in 2013 after making sure that our house falls in safe ranges of the radiofrequency and electromagnetic radiations. We have passed on many houses during our house search based on unsafe radiation levels.

We also took our daughter out of Stratford Elementary School, Los Gatos because of borderline unsafe radiation levels in the school field. It is disappointing to see that the city we decided to call our home, may consider putting our family and neighbors in danger of life-long health issues without putting much thought into it. There are 4 of these tower locations in such a small court, one of them right in front of our house. There are at least a dozen of children growing in Elkhorn court who deserve better than this.

I trust that each of you is aware that there is a court order in place wherein the FCC must comply with an environmental review before 5G equipment is installed within Elkhorn Court or anywhere else within the City limits. It is my understanding that the environmental review has not been performed to date.

Our neighbors and I request and demand that installations of 5G equipment within the City of San Jose be terminated and/or delayed until the FCC complies with an environmental review. In view of the unresolved technological and health issues, we request that the City of San Jose adopt an ordinance that requires setback distances of small-cell 5G equipment of at least 300 feet from houses, 1000 feet from schools and a minimum of 1500 between 5G small cell towers.

The request is respectfully made that all those persons in power within the City of San Jose refrain from "business as usual" politics and/or be jaded by the economic benefits of the installations of 5G equipment. It is imperative that the facts regarding potential health risks associated with exposure to high-frequency microwave radiation be researched by unbiased experts. 5G may mean denser infrastructure, higher frequency and higher energy radiation for tax-paying residents.

There is no proof of safety and no informed consent!

Thank you for your time and consideration.



If you wish to make contact with us, our vital information is as follows:

Waseem Ahmad & Arifa Nisar

**From:** Vikrant Shah  
**Sent:** Tuesday, November 19, 2019 9:03 PM  
**To:** City Clerk; The Office of Mayor Sam Liccardo; Guevara, J  
**Subject:** G5 cell install concerns around Elkhorn Ct, San Jose

Dear Councilmember Davis, Mayor Liccardo, City Clerk Taber, and Mr. Guevara,

It has come to my attention that the City of San Jose has partnered with telecommunications companies (including ATT, T-Mobile, Verizon and Mobilitie) to install small cell equipment on City-owned property within Elkhorn Court, San Jose, CA. It has also come to my attention that the City of San Jose has plans to install two to four towers to accommodate the aforementioned installations. I just learned of these plans yesterday. Neither I nor anyone else residing in Elkhorn Court have ever received any official word from the City of San Jose addressing this issue.

I learned that on Nov. 14, 2019, the Office of Councilmember Jones advised the principal of Primary Plus Elementary School that the FCC precluded the City of San Jose from denying any small cell permits based on health concerns. This is inexcusable! If public safety is paramount, why has a representative from Verizon been quoted as saying, "5G cells may exceed the FCC's occupational limit for exposure to radio frequency emissions and an area that extends 4 feet from the antenna face that may exceed the FCC's general population limit for exposure to radio frequency emission."?

Request is respectfully made that any or all of your offices provide references and/or citations which reflect that cellular telephones using 5G technology will emit less EMR AND that the level is not a threat to the health and welfare of those residents in Elkhorn Court. Also, please include evidence that existing pre-5G wireless technology has been properly tested and that it has been deemed safe.

I trust that each of you is aware that there is a court order in place wherein the FCC must comply with an environmental review before 5G equipment is installed within Elkhorn Court or anywhere else within the City limits. It is my understanding that the environmental review has not been performed to date.

My neighbors and I request and demand that installations of 5G equipment within the City of San Jose be terminated and/or delayed until the FCC complies with an environmental review. In view of the unresolved technological and health issues, we request that the City of San Jose adopt an ordinance which requires set-back distances of small cell 5G equipment of at least 300 feet from houses, 1000 feet from schools and a minimum of 1500 between 5G small cell towers.

Request is respectfully made that all those persons in power within the City of San Jose refrain from "business as usual" politics and/or be jaded by the economic benefits of the installations of 5G equipment. It is imperative that the facts regarding potential health risks associated with the exposure to high-frequency microwave radiation be researched by unbiased experts. 5G may mean denser infrastructure, higher frequency and higher energy radiation for tax-paying residents. There is no proof of safety and no informed consent!

Thank you for your time and consideration.

If you wish to make contact with me, my vital information is as follows:

Vik Shah

From: Matthew Panos  
Sent: Wednesday, November 20, 2019 9:45 AM  
To: City Clerk; The Office of Mayor Sam Liccardo; District 6; Guevara, J  
Cc: Nicolette Panos  
Subject: 5g antenna concerns

Hello,

I am a resident of Willow Glen and my wife and I are very concerned about a potential 5g antenna being placed in front of our home. It is a fact that radiation emitted from wireless devices can cause cancer. We have a 4 month old baby and a 3 year old. We want to make sure that no antenna will be placed in front of our home. There is also the risk of our home value depreciating due to an antenna going up. I am a realtor and if we decide to sell our home I do not want to have to debate with potential buyers on whether or not the antennas are safe. This will surely reduce the amount of buyers that are interested in the property. Please let me know what I can do to make sure no antenna is placed on the street light in front of our home.

Thanks,

Matt Panos



**From:** Theresa Dillard  
**Sent:** Wednesday, November 20, 2019 1:34 PM  
**To:** City Clerk; The Office of Mayor Sam Liccardo; District 6 ; Guevara, J  
**Subject:** Cell Tower Concern Near School

To Whom It May Concern,

I am a parishioner at St. Christopher in San Jose and I also have two children [REDACTED] who attend the school there as well, and I live in San Jose in Willow Glen.

It has recently come to my attention that there is a Macro 4G cell tower on the church tower and I am very concerned about the safety and health implications for my children and for the entire church community. Further, I have heard that there are plans to change this to a more powerful 5G tower, without notifying the community, and without the city or the church providing information regarding the implications.

I am extremely concerned that any financial benefit that the church and diocese are obtaining from this tower are at the expense of our children and parishioners. Further, the city of San Jose has a moral obligation to protect its children and not to allow this type of thing to occur. Moreover, many cities across the Bay Area and state have begun to ban even small cell antennas and require setbacks near schools (sometimes after horrifying consequences involving many students coming down with cancer, for example, in Ripon, California), yet here we have a very powerful radiation emitting (soon to be more powerful) 4G tower right on top of our most precious treasure-- our children. It is my belief that San Jose has not yet passed similar restrictions because of its desire to be a forerunner in technology and as part of that, to have widespread 5G at any cost, which is unacceptable and morally corrupt.

I would like some input regarding why this tower is being allowed by the City of San Jose, and what can be done to remove it in order to protect the community, especially the children.

Please let me know if there is someone else to whom I should direct this email. I have also emailed the diocese, school, and church.

Thank you,

Theresa Dillard

**From:** Michelle Podesta  
**Sent:** Wednesday, November 20, 2019 2:20 PM  
**To:** City Clerk  
**Subject:** St. Christopher Cell Tower

To Whom it May Concern,

I am writing to voice my concern about the plans to upgrade the existing 4G cell tower on top of St. Christopher Church to a 5G cell tower. This plan would increase radiation to 1,000 times the existing amount. There have been no safety studies done on this level of radiation. Furthermore, residents in the area have not been made aware of this change. That is horrible communication on the behalf of our city.

In addition, as I am sure you are aware, St. Christopher Church is on the same property as St. Christopher School, which is a school for students in grades kindergarten through eighth. How can we allow this type of cell tower to be put in such close proximity to a large number of children? To me it seems immoral and just plain wrong that you would expose any child to many unknown and known dangers. Also as a parent of a child that attends this school, I am appalled that I received no notification to the events that are happening. My husband and I send our daughter to St. Christopher to give her the best future possible and this could rob her of that.

In fact, cities such as Palo Alto, Los Angeles, New York, and San Diego refuse to allow cell towers to be anywhere near premises where children spend the majority of their time. They are aware that this could significantly endanger their health and their bright futures. Furthermore, the town of Ripon just shut down their Sprint cell tower located near Weston Elementary School in March due to four students, three teachers, and two preschool age children living nearby being diagnosed with cancer.

I ask you to please use your conscious and really reconsider the upgrade and location of this cell tower in general. I hope our city will not stand for endangering children and being responsible for causing them harm. We expect more from San Jose.

Sincerely,  
Michelle Podesta

**From:** Andrea Powell  
**Sent:** Saturday, November 23, 2019 2:51 PM  
**To:** City Clerk  
**Subject:** 5G cell deployment on Jonathan Ave

I am contacting you to express my absolute disagreement with San Jose's plan to place 5G small cell towers on light poles on Jonathan Ave and more specifically on a light pole 35 feet from my home.

I am aware that there is a court order for the FCC to comply with an environmental review before 5G installations, which has NOT been done. I request that the installations be stopped until the FCC complies with an environmental review. In the view of unresolved technical and health issues, I request the City of San Jose adopt an ordinance requiring set-backs of at least 300 feet from homes and 1,000 feet from schools of small cell 5G equipment and a minimum distance of 1,500 feet between 5G small cell towers. Public safety concern includes the following line stated in the approved permit (quote from Verizon:) "[5G cells] may exceed the FCC's occupational limit for exposure to radio frequency emissions and an area that extends 4 Feet from the antenna face that may exceed the FCC's general population limit for exposure to radio frequency emission."

I appreciate your attention to my concern.

Thank you,  
Andrea Powell



**From:** Dave Powell  
**Sent:** Monday, November 25, 2019 10:34 AM  
**To:** City Clerk  
**Subject:** 5G cell deployment on Jonathan Ave 95125

To Whom it May Concern:

I am contacting you to express my absolute disagreement with San Jose's plan to place 5G small cell towers on light poles on Jonathan Ave and more specifically on a light pole less than 35 feet from my home that I share with my wife and my 2 young children.

I am aware that there is a court order for the FCC to comply with an environmental review before 5G installations, which has NOT been done. I request that the installations be stopped until the FCC complies with an environmental review. In the view of unresolved technical and health issues, I request the City of San Jose adopt an ordinance requiring set-backs of at least 300 feet from homes and 1,000 feet from schools of small cell 5G equipment and a minimum distance of 1,500 feet between 5G small cell towers. Public safety concern includes the following line stated in the approved permit (quote from Verizon:) "[5G cells] may exceed the FCC's occupational limit for exposure to radio frequency emissions and an area that extends 4 Feet from the antenna face that may exceed the FCC's general population limit for exposure to radio frequency emission."

I appreciate your attention to my concern.  
Thank you,

Kind Regards,

**From:** b. beekman [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, November 20, 2019 5:53 PM  
**Subject:** a letter from Blair Beekman. Wednesday November 20, 2019. \_\_\_\_\_ Rules and Open Govt. Committee. (RaOG). Nov. 20, 2019. Item: Public Record. Vision Zero.

Dear city govt. of San Jose,

An important point, I did not have time to make, during the Public Record item, at RaOG committee meeting, today - To continue to comment, about the Vision Zero article, in the Metro, last week.

It is my hope, the death statistics, for this year, can be considered, as only, slightly above normal.

And from this, we can all know what to expect, at this time. And, we can all well prepared, to try to bring this number, slightly down, next year.

The Metro article gave, the good statistics, of Sweden and Europe, over a 20 year period. We are in year 4, of Vision Zero, in San Jose.

The Metro article brought out, some definite worries. But I feel, we may not be at, ' a four alarm fire stage ', yet.

It is my guess, that if death statistics, are the same, this time next year, then it may be the time, for serious changes.

I assuming, the overall year-end, 2019, death statistics, may be at about, 48. This would make, two years in a row, 2018 & 2019, with averages lower, than 2015 & 17.

This can be hopeful.

What are the overall, accident rates, not just death rates, in the past 10 years, of car, motorcycle, bike, and ped. ?

Is this, part of the subtleties, of Vision Zero, that can be worked on, in 2020 ?

To conclude, with my own thoughts and feelings.

There was a certain road rage, and the feeling of the auto drivers, are somehow being trapped, in 2018 & 19. I hope we are all getting over this, in some degree. And this may lead to, a more mellow, 2020.

With ourselves, as a community, trying to settle into, new bicycle plans; understanding a certain resoluteness, of city govt. And that, just simply, we may be at, something of an end, of u.s. fracked, fossil fuel use, for automobiles.

People may be at a time, to become more patient and mellow, in 2020. And, with what will be a growth, in law enforcement patrols, and its data collection, 2020 may already have, steady plans.

So Vision Zero, in 2020, is possibly being thought of, as a time, 'of dont spook the horse'. And, 'if aint broke, dont fix it.'

I am guessing, that to review death statistics, at the end of next year, may be the time, to begin to ask, major overhaul questions, of Vision Zero.

sincerely,  
blair beekman

p.s.

Please remember, the point of Vision Zero, should work the same, as now, centuries, of local democratic practices, of this country.

Day to day, civic govt. law, & good community practices, should take precedence, over law enforcement, technology and surveillance.



**From:** john demertzis [mailto:

**Sent:** Tuesday, November 19, 2019 9:41 AM

**To:** Webmaster Manager <>; Sykes, Dave <>; Aitken, John <>; Lockhart, Bob <>; Naidu, Ashwin <>; Kazmierczak, Matthew <>; Trejo, Sylvia <>; Taber, Toni <>; District 10 <>

**Subject:** Employee Parking Lot Relocation at Mineta San Jose International Airport (SJC)

[External Email]

19 November 2019

Mr. Dave Sykes  
City Manager - City of San Jose  
200 E. Santa Clara Street  
San Jose, CA 95113

RE: Employee Parking Lot Relocation at Mineta San Jose International Airport (SJC)

Dear Mr. Sykes:

Thank you for your prompt response. I sincerely appreciate your empathy about my vehicle burglary and subsequent home invasion.

I received the memorandum from the SJC Director of Aviation, dated 13 November 2019, from my Councilmember's office. Mr. Aitken dedicated nearly three pages of his memo to the business aspect of parking at SJC, and a mere two short paragraphs to parking lot security and safety – the most important component - at the Martin Ave employee relocation parking lot.

The former employee parking lot in Terminal 2 is relatively secure and safe. The new Martin employee parking lot – according to written records by both the SJC Director of Aviation and the Airport Operations Manager - Landside Services – lacks the necessary enhanced security measures: surveillance cameras, enhanced lighting, gate arms, entry/exit barriers, etc., that are present at the Terminal 2 lot. Prior incidents in the Martin lot according to SJPD records will also dispel any notion that the Martin lot in its present condition is secure and safe. Consequently, the employees should not be parking at the unsecured and unsafe Martin lot until all of the aforementioned enhanced security measures are in place.

You reference several discussions with managers of the various Airline tenants pertaining to the relocation plan. These are the same managers that **will not** be relocating to the Martin lot, thus their input regarding enhanced security and safety measures for employee parking at this lot is moot and without merit.

I challenge the City and the Airport Administration to retain an “independent” security and safety expert, to evaluate and compare all current security measures at the

Terminal 2 and Martin lots. Furthermore, invite the collective bargaining agents of all major airline pilot and flight attendant groups currently utilizing SJC parking lots, for an onsite inspection, evaluation and comparison of all security measures currently deployed at the two lots. Anything less is simply trading employee security and safety for additional short term parking revenue, ostensibly covering for poor airport facilities planning and management.

Dave, the City made a mistake by hastily relocating employee parking before enhanced security measures commensurate to the Terminal 2 lot are in place at the Martin lot. I highly recommend an immediate reverse relocation back to the Terminal 2 lot. To ignore this recommendation not only compromises employee security and safety; it also poses significant liability to the City.

I request that all communications and logs, written, electronic, voice, etc., both internal and external between your Office, the City Council, Mayor's Office and the Airport Administration pertaining to the airport employee lot relocation, be retained and preserved. In addition, I request that all records i.e. dates, attendees, etc., of all meetings between the Airport Administration and its airport tenants be retained and preserved. Finally, I request that the San Jose City Clerk place my correspondences with your office in the public record.

Thank you for your time and diligence in this matter.

Respectfully yours,

/s/

John (JJ) Demertzis

cc: Mr. John Aitken – Director of Aviation (SJC)  
Mr. Bob Lockhart – Deputy Director – Airport Operations (SJC)  
Mr. Ashwin Naidu - Airport Operations Manager – Landside Operations (SJC)  
Mr. Matthew Kazmierczak – Manager of Strategy and Policy (SJC)  
Ms. Sylvia Trejo – Sr. Airport Operations Superintendent (SJC)  
Ms. Toni Taber - City Clerk at City of San Jose  
Mr. Johnny Khamis – Councilmember – San Jose City Council – District 10