CITY OF SAN JOSE
CAPITAL OF SILICON VALLEY

Memorandum

TO: Honorable Mayor & City Council

FROM: Toni J. Taber, CMC City Clerk

SUBJECT: The Public Record June 17, 2021 – July 22, 2021

DATE: July 28, 2021

ITEMS FILED FOR THE PUBLIC RECORD

Letters from Boards, Commissions, and Committees

Letters from the Public

1. Letter from Bob Levy, dated June 22, 2021, regarding: Community Forest Management Plan.
2. Letter from Richard Hobbs, dated June 29, 2021, regarding: Support for San Jose Urban Forest.
3. Letter from Virginia Holtz, dated June 30, 2021, regarding: Community Forrest Management Plan.
4. Letter from Rita Norton, dated June 30, 2021, regarding: San Jose Community Forest Plan.
5. Letter from Barbara Kelsey, dated June 30, 2021, regarding: Sierra Club comment letter re: The Community Forest Management Plan.
6. Letter from Avster Bone, dated June 30, 2021, regarding: F*** You Authoritarian Tyrnat.
7. Letter from Blair Beekman, dated June 24, 2021, regarding: Blair Beekman. Thursday. June 24, 2021. __ SJ Flea Market concerns.
8. Letter from Blair Beekman, dated July 2, 2021, regarding: Blair Beekman. Friday. July 2, 2021.
9. Letter from Dana Friesen, dated July 1, 2021, regarding: Input on Items 10.3 & 10.4 of the 6/22 City Council Agenda.
10. Letter from Kathryn Hedges, dated June 26, 2021, regarding: Conflict between Point In Time Count and FAA sweep.
11. Letter from Julie Smith, dated June 28, 2021, regarding: City Employee Policy Reconsideration.

12. Letter from Lawrence Townsend, dated July 11, 2021, regarding: Please distribute to Mayor and Council.
13. Letter from Blair Beekman, dated July 2, 2021, regarding: ²Blair Beekman. Friday. July 2, 2021. __ Underground Transportation, from Diridon Station to sj airport.
14. Letter from California Public Utilities Commission, dated July 12, 2021, regarding: CPUC - Verizon Wireless - City of San Jose-CA_SJ_SANJOSE_WEST_007 - A-517671.
15. Letter from Santa Clara LAFCO, dated July 22, 2021, regarding: LAFCO Meeting of August 4, 2021 - Cancelled.

Toni J. Taber, CMC
City Clerk

TJT/tt

Fw: Community Forest Management Plan

Agendadesk <Agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov>
Wed 6/23/2021 9:57 AM
To: Rules and Open Government Committee Agendas <rulescommitteeagenda@sanjoseca.gov>

1 attachments (708 KB)
Community Forest Management Plan Letter.pdf;

From: City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, June 23, 2021 8:18 AM
To: Agendadesk <Agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov>
Subject: Fw: Community Forest Management Plan

Office of the City Clerk | City of San José
200 E. Santa Clara St., Tower 14th Floor
San Jose, CA 95113
Main: 408-535-1260
Fax: 408-292-6207

How is our service? Please take our short survey.

From: Bob Levy <[redacted]
Sent: Tuesday, June 22, 2021 7:35 PM
To: The Office of Mayor Sam Liccardo <TheOfficeofMayorSamLiccardo@sanjoseca.gov>; District1 <district1@sanjoseca.gov>; District2 <District2@sanjoseca.gov>; District3 <district3@sanjoseca.gov>; District4 <District4@sanjoseca.gov>; District5 <District5@sanjoseca.gov>; District 6 <district6@sanjoseca.gov>; District7 <District7@sanjoseca.gov>; District8 <district8@sanjoseca.gov>; District9 <district9@sanjoseca.gov>; District 10 <District10@sanjoseca.gov>
Cc: City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>
Subject: Community Forest Management Plan

[External Email]

Honorable Mayor and Council Members,
The draft Community Forest Management Plan (CFMP) is described by Cal Fire as "woefully underperformed". The authors of the attached letter agree with Cal Fire's assessment. The CFMP and the process for creating the document are woefully inadequate. We respectfully request that you halt the current process and reinitiate a process that does an effective job of engaging community stakeholders. Please take into consideration the thoughts and recommendations of the attached letter co-signed by; Linda LeZotte, Michelle Yesney, Barbara Marshman, Fernando Zazueta, Vicki Moore, and Bob Levy.

Best regards,
Bob Levy

June 21, 2020

San José Mayor & City Council
City of San José
200 E. Santa Clara Street
San José, CA 95113

Dear Honorable Mayor and City Council:

The City of San José released its *Draft Community Forest Management Plan* (CFMP) to the public in March 2021. It was described by the project funder, CAL FIRE, as *"woefully underperformed"*. CAL FIRE pointed out many omissions and deficiencies, including failure to meaningfully engage key stakeholders and unfairness towards San José's key urban forest partner Our City Forest (OCF), yet these concerns were not revealed to top City officials.

This citywide plan should never have been directed from a silo of a few City staff without a citywide stakeholder group, yet it was. *This is contrary to all relevant City policies about transparency and community involvement.* We therefore respectfully request that you intervene to: 1) immediately halt this process and 2) form a stakeholder steering committee that will revamp the process, guarantee a robust community engagement process, engage experts across the county, and develop a visionary, state-of-the-art CFMP for all sectors.

Ownership and management of San José's urban forest is the responsibility of many entities, and a solid plan for its future depends on engagement of these stakeholders. The vast majority of any urban forest - as much as 85% - is managed and financed by *non-City* entities. Street trees and park trees comprise the smaller portion, and in San José, even street trees are not the responsibility of the City, but of adjacent property owners. The cross-jurisdictional nature of urban forest management makes it imperative to have a stakeholder group representing many jurisdictions. In turn, this ensures buy-in for plan implementation and future investing.

Tens of thousands of trees grace the streets, parks, schools, and homes in your districts through the efforts of OCF and its many partners, yet the current Draft CFMP minimizes and inaccurately describes the work of this nonprofit model that has added nearly 100,000 trees and shrubs across jurisdictions throughout San José - not only along hundreds of city and county streets, but also 100^{+} parks, 200^{+} schools, and many other sites. Related achievements include obtaining $\$15^{+}$ million in state and federal funds, providing hundreds of green jobs, battling local environmental injustice for decades, and engaging some 200,000 volunteers and residents, with the value of volunteer time alone estimated at $\$30^{+}$ million. This work, including the value of their environmental, economic, health and social impacts, and even the national recognition this has brought to San José, are mostly absent in this CFMP.

Our City Forest's many key partners were also ignored during the process, including Santa Clara County, Valley Water, California Volunteers/AmeriCorps, Caltrans, San José's 24 school districts, 200+ service clubs and associations, and CAL FIRE itself.

According to the project consultant (Dudek), it was DOT staff who managed the process, including the decision to initially give the public a mere 2 weeks to review and comment in order to rush it to T&E in May for approval prior to a June Council vote. The public comment window was ultimately extended due to community pressure, but unfortunately for the public, they are reading a deficient draft along with a message that keeps them in the dark as to the errors, the omissions, and the lack of any true stakeholder engagement and review.

Perhaps most telling that intervention is needed immediately is this public statement made by the consultant in early June, "The Plan is done and out, and the analysis will not change". *This stance was expressed well before the end of the comment period, and completely diregards any forthcoming input from community members or even elected officials.* This is reason enough to halt the current process immediately, return to the batter's box, and start again with a revamped process that is respectful, respectable, and puts San José's tree-loving community first.

So again, we implore you to please address this urgent matter by directing DOT to halt this process and to ensure the formation of an independent and diverse group of citywide stakeholders to drive robust community engagement, bring in urban forest experts, and steer the development of a significantly improved CFMP. The rushed patch-up job unfolding now to "just get it done" is an unnecessary compromise and hits far below any standard we believe San José should be willing to accept.

City leaders have made all the difference for this valuable urban asset in the past, and we are asking the same from you now. San José deserves an inspiring, cutting-edge plan that can be a model for cities across the nation. By pulling together, we can make San José one of the nation's *top green cities* and address the many serious impacts of climate change.

We will be in touch to schedule a call. If you'd like to reach out to us in the meantime, please email Vicki Moore at [redacted]

Thank you for your urgent attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Linda J. LeZotte
Director, Valley Water
Former City of San José Councilmember

Vicki Moore
Vice Chair, Santa Clara County Planning Commission

Bob Levy
Santa Clara County Planning Commissioner
Former City of San José Planning Commissioner

Michelle Yesney
Former City of San José Planning Commissioner
Former City of S.J. Director of the Office of Environmental Management
Former President, Greenbelt Alliance

Barbara Marshman
Former Mercury News Editorial Page Editor

Fernando Zazueta
President, Rotary Club of San José

Public Record: 2

Fw: Support for San Jose Urban Forest

Agendadesk <Agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov>
Wed 6/30/2021 9:04 AM
To: Rules and Open Government Committee Agendas <rulescommitteeagenda@sanjoseca.gov>

1 attachments (48 KB)
FINAL Signed CFMP Letter to Council.pdf;

From: City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, June 30, 2021 8:22 AM
To: Agendadesk <Agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov>
Subject: Fw: Support for San Jose Urban Forest

Office of the City Clerk | City of San José
200 E. Santa Clara St., Tower 14th Floor
San Jose, CA 95113
Main: 408-535-1260
Fax: 408-292-6207

How is our service? Please take our short survey.

From: Richard Hobbs <[redacted]
Sent: Tuesday, June 29, 2021 10:46 PM
To: District 6 <district6@sanjoseca.gov>; District1 <district1@sanjoseca.gov>; District 10 <District10@sanjoseca.gov>; District4 <District4@sanjoseca.gov>; District5 <District5@sanjoseca.gov>; Esparza, Maya <Maya.Esparza@sanjoseca.gov>; The Office of Mayor Sam Liccardo <TheOfficeofMayorSamLiccardo@sanjoseca.gov>; District9 <district9@sanjoseca.gov>; District3 <district3@sanjoseca.gov>; Jimenez, Sergio <sergio.jimenez@sanjoseca.gov>; District8 <district8@sanjoseca.gov>
Cc: City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>; Agendadesk <Agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov>; Ryan Allen <[redacted] <[redacted]
Subject: Support for San Jose Urban Forest

[External Email]

Dear Mayor Liccardo, City Council Members, Ryan Allen, and Vicki Moore,

I write to you in support of correcting the process and analysis deficiencies pointed out in the attached CFMP letter.

I am concerned that as San Jose moves forward with new development plans, the stewardship necessary for a sustainable tree-friendly environment will suffer.

Please slow down your process and listen to our environmental leaders.

Human Agenda possesses what we call DECKS values: democracy, equity, cooperation, kindness, and sustainability. I am concerned that all of these values are challenged by the process and analysis that have taken place, with insufficient consultation, stakeholder input, and examination of the role of trees for a healthy local environment.

With great concern,

Richard Hobbs, Esq.
Executive Director, Human Agenda

June 18, 2020

San José Mayor & City Council
City of San José
200 E. Santa Clara Street
San José, CA 95113

Dear Honorable Mayor and City Council:

The City of San José released a completely unvetted *Draft Community Forest Management Plan* (CFMP) to the public in March 2021. It was quickly described by project funder CAL FIRE as "woefully underperformed". CAL FIRE pointed out many omissions and deficiencies, including failure to meaningfully engage key stakeholders and unfairness towards San José's key urban forest partner Our City Forest (OCF). The funder's response indicated the $750,000 project grant was at risk, yet these concerns were not revealed to top City officials.

A citywide plan should never be directed from a silo of a few City staff without a citywide steering group, yet that is what has unfolded. *This is contrary to all relevant City policies about transparency and community involvement.* Without your intervention, the City will lose this opportunity to develop a visionary, honest, accurate, and state-of-the-art plan under the guidance of an informed and diverse steering committee of legitimate stakeholders/investors.

Ownership and management of San José's urban forest is the responsibility of many entities, and a solid plan for its future depends on engagement of these stakeholders. The vast majority of our urban forest is managed and financed by *non-City* entities. Street trees and park trees comprise most of the smaller portion, and even then, San José's street trees are not the responsibility of the City, but of adjacent property owners. It is not difficult to recognize why an invested stakeholder steering group is essential for developing a balanced, holistic plan that results in buy-in for implementation and further investment.

Tens of thousands of trees grace the streets, parks, schools, and homes in your districts through the efforts of OCF and its many partners, yet the current Draft CFMP minimizes and inaccurately describes the contributions of this nonprofit model that has added nearly 100,000 trees and shrubs throughout San José - not only along hundreds of streets, but also 100^{+} parks, 200^{+} schools, and other land use types. Related achievements include obtaining $\$15^{+}$ million in state and federal funds, providing hundreds of green jobs, battling local environmental injustice for decades, and engaging some 200,000 volunteers and residents, with the value of volunteer time alone estimated at $\$30^{+}$ million. These significant efforts, the value of their economic, social and environmental impacts, and the national recognition this model has brought to San José, are mostly absent in this CFMP.

Our City Forest's many key partners were also ignored during the process, including Santa Clara County, Valley Water, California Volunteers/AmeriCorps, Caltrans, San José's 24 school districts, over 100 service clubs, groups and associations, and CAL FIRE itself.

According to the DOT-hired plan consultant (Dudek), it was DOT staff who managed the process in all regards, including the decision to initially give the public a mere 2 weeks to review in order to rush it to T&E in May for a Council vote in June. That window was ultimately extended due to community pressure, but unfortunately for the public, DOT opted to not make any corrections and to re-open the comment period with the same "woefully underperformed" draft.

The consultant has stated, "The Plan is done and out, and the analysis will not change", *regardless of any forthcoming input from key stakeholders and community members.* We find this stance unacceptable, at best.

We implore the Mayor and Council to do better for San José's community and the urban forest. Environmental leadership has made the difference for this valuable urban asset in the past, and you can do the same now by intervening to revamp and optimize this process to ensure a participatory, comprehensive, and visionary CFMP for our city. Done right, it is possible to make San José one of the nation's top green cities.

We would like to discuss our proposed solutions and will be in touch to schedule a call. Thank you for your urgent attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Linda J. LeZotte
Director, Valley Water
Former City of San José Council Member

Bob Levy
Santa Clara County Planning Commissioner
Former City of San José Planning Commissioner

Barbara Marshman
Former Mercury News Editorial Page Editor

Vicki Moore
Santa Clara County Planning Commission Vice-Chair

Michelle Yesney
Former City of San José Planning Commissioner
Former Greenbelt Alliance President
Former City of San José Director of the Office of Environmental Management

Fernando Zazueta
President, Rotary Club of San José

Public Record: 3

Fw: Community Forrest Management Plan

Agendadesk <Agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov>
Wed 6/30/2021 1:42 PM

To: Rules and Open Government Committee Agendas <rulescommitteeagenda@sanjoseca.gov>

From: City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, June 30, 2021 1:00 PM
To: Agendadesk <Agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov>
Subject: Fw: Community Forrest Management Plan

Office of the City Clerk | City of San José
200 E. Santa Clara St., Tower 14th Floor
San Jose, CA 95113
Main: 408-535-1260
Fax: 408-292-6207

How is our service? Please take our short survey.

From: Virginia Holtz <[redacted]>
Sent: Wednesday, June 30, 2021 12:48 PM
To: The Office of Mayor Sam Liccardo <TheOfficeofMayorSamLiccardo@sanjoseca.gov>; City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>; District1 <district1@sanjoseca.gov>; District2 <District2@sanjoseca.gov>; District3 <district3@sanjoseca.gov>; District4 <District4@sanjoseca.gov>; District5 <District5@sanjoseca.gov>; District 6 <district6@sanjoseca.gov>; District7 <District7@sanjoseca.gov>; District8 <district8@sanjoseca.gov>; District9 <district9@sanjoseca.gov>; District 10 <District10@sanjoseca.gov>
Subject: Community Forrest Management Plan

[External Email]

Dear Mayor and City Council Members,

The Community Forrest Management Plan is seriously lacking in analysis, alignment with Climate Smart Plan and Stormwater Plan, and risks loss of funding. Please defer approval of Community Forrest Management Plan until deficiencies are addressed through meeting with environmentalists.

I support the letter signed by Linda LeZotte, commissioners. and Barbara Marshman.

Virginia Holtz
Former Director, Open Space Authority
Former member, San Jose Parks Commissioner

Public Record: 4

Fw: San Jose Community Forest Plan

Agendadesk <Agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov>

Wed 6/30/2021 5:01 PM

To: The Office of Mayor Sam Liccardo <TheOfficeofMayorSamLiccardo@sanjoseca.gov>; District1 <district1@sanjoseca.gov>; District2 <District2@sanjoseca.gov>; District3 <district3@sanjoseca.gov>; District4 <District4@sanjoseca.gov>; District5 <District5@sanjoseca.gov>; District 6 <district6@sanjoseca.gov>; District7 <District7@sanjoseca.gov>; District8 <district8@sanjoseca.gov>; District9 <district9@sanjoseca.gov>; District 10 <District10@sanjoseca.gov>; Rules and Open Government Committee Agendas <rulescommitteeagenda@sanjoseca.gov>

1 attachments (16 KB)

san jose community forest E.docx;

From: City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, June 30, 2021 4:40 PM
To: Agendadesk <Agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov>
Subject: Fw: San Jose Community Forest Plan

Office of the City Clerk | City of San José
200 E. Santa Clara St., Tower 14th Floor
San Jose, CA 95113
Main: 408-535-1260
Fax: 408-292-6207

How is our service? Please take our short survey.

From: Rita Norton <[redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, June 30, 2021 4:18 PM
To: Ryan Allen <rallen@dudek.com>
Cc: City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>; Vicki Moore <[redacted]
Subject: San Jose Community Forest Plan

[External Email]

Dear R Allen and San Jose City Clerk-

Please acknowledge the receipt of this communication and ensure that the Mayor of San Jose and San Jose City Council receive it.

Thank you.
Rita Norton

Honorable Mayor and City Council:
San Jose City Hall
200 E. Santa Clara Street San José, CA 95113 May 30, 2021

Dear Honorable Mayor and City Council:

I am writing in support of a letter you received regarding the Community Forest Management Plan (CFMP) from several environmental leaders. This comprehensive letter is enclosed below.

While not a resident of San Jose, the urban forest in San Jose contributes to the quality of life for all South Bay residents. San Jose has a reputation as an environmental leader and the adoption of this woefully inadequate plan does a disservice to you and your community. As a retired City of San Jose employee, and a member of the environmental staff from the very early days, it is more than disappointing to see such disregard for such an important aspect of sustainability and climate change mitigation. I would be happy serve on any future committees you elect to convene on this topic. I realize you are very busy, but this is an important issue and needs to be brought back to City Council.

Sincerely,
Rita Norton
[redacted]

The letter:
"It was described by the project funder, CAL FIRE, as "woefully underperformed". CAL FIRE pointed out many omissions and deficiencies, including failure to meaningfully engage key stakeholders and unfairness towards San José's key urban forest partner Our City Forest (OCF), yet these concerns were not revealed to top City officials. This citywide plan should never have been directed from a silo of a few City staff without a citywide stakeholder group, yet it was. This is contrary to all relevant City policies about transparency and community involvement. We therefore respectfully request that you intervene to: 1) immediately halt this process and 2) form a stakeholder steering committee that will revamp the process, guarantee a robust community engagement process, engage experts across the county, and develop a visionary, state-of-the-art CFMP for all sectors. Ownership and management of San José's urban forest is the responsibility of many entities, and a solid plan for its future depends on engagement of these stakeholders. The vast majority of any urban forest - as much as 85% - is managed and financed by non-City entities. Street trees and park trees comprise the smaller portion, and in San José, even street trees are not the responsibility of the City, but of adjacent property owners. The cross-jurisdictional nature of urban forest management makes it imperative to have a stakeholder group representing many jurisdictions. In turn, this ensures buy-in for plan implementation and future investing. Tens of thousands of trees grace the streets, parks, schools, and homes in your districts through the efforts of OCF and its many partners, yet the current Draft CFMP minimizes and inaccurately describes the work of this nonprofit model that has added nearly 100,000 trees and shrubs across jurisdictions throughout San José - not only along hundreds of city and county

streets, but also 100+ parks, 200+ schools, and many other sites. Related achievements include obtaining $15+ million in state and federal funds, providing hundreds of green jobs, battling local environmental injustice for decades, and engaging some 200,000 volunteers and residents, with the value of volunteer time alone estimated at $30+ million. This work, including the value of their environmental, economic, health and social impacts, and even the national recognition this has brought to San José, are mostly absent in this CFMP. Our City Forest's many key partners were also ignored during the process, including Santa Clara County, Valley Water, California Volunteers/AmeriCorps, Caltrans, San José's 24 school districts, 200+ service clubs and associations, and CAL FIRE itself. Page 2 According to the project consultant (Dudek), it was DOT staff who managed the process, including the decision to initially give the public a mere 2 weeks to review and comment in order to rush it to T&E in May for approval prior to a June Council vote. The public comment window was ultimately extended due to community pressure, but unfortunately for the public, they are reading a deficient draft along with a message that keeps them in the dark as to the errors, the omissions, and the lack of any true stakeholder engagement and review. Perhaps most telling that intervention is needed immediately is this public statement made by the consultant in early June, "The Plan is done and out, and the analysis will not change". This stance was expressed well before the end of the comment period, and completely diregards any forthcoming input from community members or even elected officials. This is reason enough to halt the current process immediately, return to the batter's box, and start again with a revamped process that is respectful, respectable, and puts San José's treeloving community first. So again, we implore you to please address this urgent matter by directing DOT to halt this process and to ensure the formation of an independent and diverse group of citywide stakeholders to drive robust community engagement, bring in urban forest experts, and steer the development of a significantly improved CFMP. The rushed patch-up job unfolding now to "just get it done" is an unnecessary compromise and hits far below any standard we believe San José should be willing to accept. City leaders have made all the difference for this valuable urban asset in the past, and we are asking the same from you now. San José deserves an inspiring, cutting-edge plan that can be a model for cities across the nation. By pulling together, we can make San José one of the nation's top green cities and address the many serious impacts of climate change. We will be in touch to schedule a call. If you'd like to reach out to us in the meantime, please email Vicki Moore at [redacted]
Thank you for your urgent attention to this matter.

Bob Levy
Linda J. LeZotte
Vicki Moore
Barbara Marshman
Michele Yesney

Public Record: 5

Fw: Sierra Club comment letter re: The Community Forest Management Plan

Agendadesk <Agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov>
Mon 7/19/2021 10:09 AM
To: Rules and Open Government Committee Agendas <rulescommitteeagenda@sanjoseca.gov>

2 attachments (178 KB)
CFMP Letter to Council.pdf; 6.30.21 Community Forest Management Plan San Jose letter.pdf;

From: City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>
Sent: Thursday, July 1, 2021 9:23 AM
To: Agendadesk <Agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov>
Subject: Fw: Sierra Club comment letter re: The Community Forest Management Plan

Office of the City Clerk | City of San José
200 E. Santa Clara St., Tower 14th Floor
San Jose, CA 95113
Main: 408-535-1260
Fax: 408-292-6207

How is our service? Please take our short survey.

From: Barbara Kelsey <[redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, June 30, 2021 6:41 PM
To: Ryan Allen <[redacted] <[redacted] The Office of Mayor Sam Liccardo <TheOfficeofMayorSamLiccardo@sanjoseca.gov>; City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>; District1 <district1@sanjoseca.gov>; District2 <District2@sanjoseca.gov>; District3 <district3@sanjoseca.gov>; District4 <District4@sanjoseca.gov>; District5 <District5@sanjoseca.gov>; District 6 <district6@sanjoseca.gov>; District7 <District7@sanjoseca.gov>; District8 <district8@sanjoseca.gov>; District9 <district9@sanjoseca.gov>; District 10 <District10@sanjoseca.gov>
Cc: Gladwyn d'Souza <[redacted] Karen Maki <[redacted] James Eggers <[redacted]
Subject: Sierra Club comment letter re: The Community Forest Management Plan

[External Email]

June 30, 2021

Dear Mayor Liccardo and the San Jose City Council,

We support the ask for community involvement in the Community Forest Management Plan by Linda J. LeZotte, Bob Levy, Barbara Marshman, Vicki Moore, Michelle Yesney and Fernando Zazueta in the

attached letter.

Regards,

Gladwyn D'Souza
Conservation Committee Chair
Loma Prieta Chapter Sierra Club

Karen Maki
Forest Committee Chair
Loma Prieta Chapter Sierra Club
Northern California Vice Chair
California Conservation Committee

sent by:
Barbara Kelsey
she/her/hers
Chapter Coordinator
Sierra Club, Loma Prieta Chapter
[redacted]

Hours: Monday-Friday, 9:30 am to 2:30 pm

Please note that our Chapter office in Palo Alto is likely closed until July 19, 2021; so email is the best way to contact us. Thank you.

June 18, 2020

San José Mayor & City Council
City of San José
200 E. Santa Clara Street
San José, CA 95113

Dear Honorable Mayor and City Council:

The City of San José released a completely unvetted *Draft Community Forest Management Plan* (CFMP) to the public in March 2021. It was quickly described by project funder CAL FIRE as "woefully underperformed". CAL FIRE pointed out many omissions and deficiencies, including failure to meaningfully engage key stakeholders and unfairness towards San José's key urban forest partner Our City Forest (OCF). The funder's response indicated the $750,000 project grant was at risk, yet these concerns were not revealed to top City officials.

A citywide plan should never be directed from a silo of a few City staff without a citywide steering group, yet that is what has unfolded. *This is contrary to all relevant City policies about transparency and community involvement.* Without your intervention, the City will lose this opportunity to develop a visionary, honest, accurate, and state-of-the-art plan under the guidance of an informed and diverse steering committee of legitimate stakeholders/investors.

Ownership and management of San José's urban forest is the responsibility of many entities, and a solid plan for its future depends on engagement of these stakeholders. The vast majority of our urban forest is managed and financed by *non-City* entities. Street trees and park trees comprise most of the smaller portion, and even then, San José's street trees are not the responsibility of the City, but of adjacent property owners. It is not difficult to recognize why an invested stakeholder steering group is essential for developing a balanced, holistic plan that results in buy-in for implementation and further investment.

Tens of thousands of trees grace the streets, parks, schools, and homes in your districts through the efforts of OCF and its many partners, yet the current Draft CFMP minimizes and inaccurately describes the contributions of this nonprofit model that has added nearly 100,000 trees and shrubs throughout San José - not only along hundreds of streets, but also 100^{+} parks, 200^{+} schools, and other land use types. Related achievements include obtaining $\$15^{+}$ million in state and federal funds, providing hundreds of green jobs, battling local environmental injustice for decades, and engaging some 200,000 volunteers and residents, with the value of volunteer time alone estimated at $\$30^{+}$ million. These significant efforts, the value of their economic, social and environmental impacts, and the national recognition this model has brought to San José, are mostly absent in this CFMP.

Our City Forest's many key partners were also ignored during the process, including Santa Clara County, Valley Water, California Volunteers/AmeriCorps, Caltrans, San José's 24 school districts, over 100 service clubs, groups and associations, and CAL FIRE itself.

According to the DOT-hired plan consultant (Dudek), it was DOT staff who managed the process in all regards, including the decision to initially give the public a mere 2 weeks to review in order to rush it to T&E in May for a Council vote in June. That window was ultimately extended due to community pressure, but unfortunately for the public, DOT opted to not make any corrections and to re-open the comment period with the same "woefully underperformed" draft.

The consultant has stated, "The Plan is done and out, and the analysis will not change", *regardless of any forthcoming input from key stakeholders and community members.* We find this stance unacceptable, at best.

We implore the Mayor and Council to do better for San José's community and the urban forest. Environmental leadership has made the difference for this valuable urban asset in the past, and you can do the same now by intervening to revamp and optimize this process to ensure a participatory, comprehensive, and visionary CFMP for our city. Done right, it is possible to make San José one of the nation's top green cities.

We would like to discuss our proposed solutions and will be in touch to schedule a call. Thank you for your urgent attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Linda J. LeZotte
Director, Valley Water
Former City of San José Council Member

Bob Levy
Santa Clara County Planning Commissioner
Former City of San José Planning Commissioner

Barbara Marshman
Former Mercury News Editorial Page Editor

Vicki Moore
Santa Clara County Planning Commission Vice-Chair

Michelle Yesney
Former City of San José Planning Commissioner
Former Greenbelt Alliance President
Former City of San José Director of the Office of Environmental Management

Fernando Zazueta
President, Rotary Club of San José

SIERRA CLUB
LOMA PRIETA CHAPTER
SAN MATEO, SANTA CLARA & SAN BENITO COUNTIES

June 30th, 2021

Ryan Allen <[redacted]
Cc: Vicki Moore <[redacted]
Cc: Sam Liccardo, Mayor, San Jose <mayoremail@sanjoseca.gov>
Cc: city.clerk@Sanjoseca.gov
Cc: San Jose City Council:
Chappie Jones <District1@sanjoseca.gov>,
Sergio Jimenez <district2@sanjoseca.gov>,
District3 <district3@sanjoseca.gov>,
District4 <District4@sanjoseca.gov>,
Magdalena Carrasco <District5@sanjoseca.gov>,
Dev Davis <district6@sanjoseca.gov>,
Maya Esparza <District7@sanjoseca.gov>,
Sylvia Arenas <district8@sanjoseca.gov>,
Pam Foley <District9@sanjoseca.gov>,
Matt Mahan <district10@sanjoseca.gov>

Re: The Community Forest Management Plan

We support the ask for community involvement in the Community Forest Management Plan by Linda J. LeZotte, Bob Levy, Barbara Marshman, Vicki Moore, Michelle Yesney and Fernando Zazueta in the attached letter.

Regards,

Gladwyn D'Souza
Conservation Committee Chair
Loma Prieta Chapter Sierra Club

Karen Maki
Forest Committee Chair
Loma Prieta Chapter Sierra Club
Northern California Vice Chair
California Conservation Committee

Public Record: 6

Fw: F[redacted] You Authoritarian Tyrnat

Agendadesk <Agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov>
Mon 7/19/2021 10:09 AM
To: Rules and Open Government Committee Agendas <rulescommitteeagenda@sanjoseca.gov>

From: City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>
Sent: Thursday, July 1, 2021 9:23 AM
To: Agendadesk <Agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov>
Subject: Fw: F[redacted] You Authoritarian Tyrnat

Office of the City Clerk | City of San José
200 E. Santa Clara St., Tower 14th Floor
San Jose, CA 95113
Main: 408-535-1260
Fax: 408-292-6207

How is our service? Please take our short survey.

From: avster bone <[redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, June 30, 2021 8:18 PM
To: City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>
Subject: F[redacted] You Authoritarian Tyrnat

[External Email]

F[redacted] You. Plain and simple. The 2nd Amendment is a RIGHT. You can't tax A RIGHT. Ever heard of a poll tax? That's what this is. Also, all these bulls[redacted] restrictions & requirements you are burdening firearm owners with are blatantly unconstitutional and you KNOW D[redacted] WELL you will lose in court. You are wasting time & taxpayer money. If you don't like guns, move to China. Quit infringing on my rights. There will be mass non-compliance and you are all f[redacted]ing idiots.

F[redacted] you,

Bye

Public Record: 7

Blair Beekman. Thursday. June 24, 2021. __ SJ Flea Market concerns.

b. beekman <[redacted]

Thu 6/24/2021 10:26 AM

To: IPA <ipa@sanjoseca.gov>; Greene, Shasta <shasta.greene@sanjoseca.gov>; Harkness, Kip <Kip.Harkness@sanjoseca.gov>; Ristow, John <John.Ristow@sanjoseca.gov>; Cano, Matt <Matt.Cano@sanjoseca.gov>; San Jose Airport Customer Services <AirportCustomerServices@sanjoseca.gov>; SJFD - Feedback <SJFDFeedback@sanjoseca.gov>; Mata, Anthony <ANTHONY.MATA@sanjoseca.gov>; S.J. Arena Authority <[redacted] Randol, Heather <HEATHER.RANDOL@sanjoseca.gov>; Traffic.Signals <Traffic.Signals@sanjoseca.gov>; Tran, David <david.tran@sanjoseca.gov>; Parra-Garcia, Sabrina <Sabrina.Parra-Garcia@sanjoseca.gov>; Torres, Omar <Omar.Torres@sanjoseca.gov>; Lopez, Robert (HSG) <Robert.Lopez@sanjoseca.gov>; Doyle, Richard <Richard.Doyle@sanjoseca.gov>; Nurre, Shivaun <Shivaun.Nurre@sanjoseca.gov>; Walesh, Kim <Kim.Walesh@sanjoseca.gov>; Wells, Laura <Laura.Wells@sanjoseca.gov>; Kihmm, Michael <MICHAEL.KIHMM@sanjoseca.gov>

[External Email]

Dear San Jose city govt,

To try ro offer, some better words, after RaOG Open Forum yesterday. For over 3 months now, I have been asking, how we can better address, and more honestly work towards - the important, creative ideas & needs, of ELI, VLI, and mixed income, for the future of affordable housing in San José, and across the San Francisco Bay Area.

Is it fearful, to consider the future, of the San Jose Flea market. that can be, at least 40% affordable housing. With 20% ELI, VLI, and mixed income affordable housing.

To consider, more genuine affordable housing ideas, for the San Jose Flea market, at this time - can begin, to better prepare ourselves, in want to expect, for the 2md half of this decade, in San Jose, and the SF Bay area.

As these are the good ideas and practices, of an equity & reimagine future, that can simply, better address homelessness, as well.

From the tone, of sj Housing Dir. Jacky Ferrand Morales, at the morning, 6.23.21, sj council meeting - in comparison to - councilperson Cohen, wanting to possibly hustle, to make July 12th deadlines, for state of Ca. funding possibilities.

It simply feels, San Jose city govt, has not yet, enough negotiated, with the Vendor's Union, with this issue. And made clear, among other things, of a non-rushed process, for this grant; decent, fair

minded, affordable housing ideas; and a better, overall idealism, for the future of the flea market.

They're simply needs to be, a good, open, clear, non-pressured, negotiation process, between the Vendor's Union, the developer, city govt, and everyday community.

Interestingly, whatever is approved, next week, at city council, it may not be, until at least September - there can be, overall better understandings & agreements, for all sides, in working towards, the same direction, & good goals.

Asking for, an additional 90 day, city council mandated continuance, does not seem, that far fetched.

To summarize - More land, for vendors to sell things; a vendors co-op; vendors, having more of a role, in the future design & layout; and 40% affordable housing, with 20% ELI, VLI, and mixed income.

This should be considered, as simple, organized, reasonable asks, in many flea market negotiation points, at this time. And in ways to respect, the overall spirit, and cultural icon, the flea market was, to San Jose, for the past, 60+ years.

It also seems, that parts, of San Jose city govt., and the developer, will simply not be ready to describe, to the Vendors Union, and everyday community - a clear, non-pressured path, with issues around, the July 12th, state of Ca., grant fund deadline.

To also remind, that in negotiating - parts of San Jose city govt., has a lot to balance. And may have, their own asks & needs, for office space & housing, more than the developer & SJ flea market.

I am hoping, office space and job numbers, of 1100 persons, can be negotiated, to 800 persons. Along with, overall, smaller, more organic, office building designs.

And of course, councilperson Carrasco, brought up, the very interesting idea, to designate the SJ flea market buildings, as legally protected areas, of the city, so the flea market, can remain the same.

Good luck, in how we can all work, to make things clear and non-pressured , for all sides, in shared promises, hopes, reminders, and understandings, at this time.

Sincerely,
Blair Beekman

Public Record: 8

Fw: Blair Beekman. Friday. July 2, 2021.

Agendadesk <Agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov>
Mon 7/19/2021 10:10 AM

To: Rules and Open Government Committee Agendas <rulescommitteeagenda@sanjoseca.gov>

From: City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>
Sent: Friday, July 2, 2021 1:01 PM
To: Agendadesk <Agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov>
Subject: Fw: Blair Beekman. Friday. July 2, 2021.

Office of the City Clerk | City of San José
200 E. Santa Clara St., Tower 14th Floor
San Jose, CA 95113
Main: 408-535-1260
Fax: 408-292-6207

How is our service? Please take our short survey.

From: b. beekman <[redacted]>
Sent: Friday, July 2, 2021 12:30 PM
To: IPA <ipa@sanjoseca.gov>; Greene, Shasta <shasta.greene@sanjoseca.gov>; Harkness, Kip <Kip.Harkness@sanjoseca.gov>; Ristow, John <John.Ristow@sanjoseca.gov>; Cano, Matt <Matt.Cano@sanjoseca.gov>; San Jose Airport Customer Services <AirportCustomerServices@sanjoseca.gov>; SJFD - Feedback <SJFDFeedback@sanjoseca.gov>; Mata, Anthony <ANTHONY.MATA@sanjoseca.gov>; S.J. Arena Authority [redacted]>; Traffic.Signals <Traffic.Signals@sanjoseca.gov>; Tran, David <david.tran@sanjoseca.gov>; Parra-Garcia, Sabrina <Sabrina.Parra-Garcia@sanjoseca.gov>; Torres, Omar <Omar.Torres@sanjoseca.gov>; Lopez, Robert (HSG) <Robert.Lopez@sanjoseca.gov>; Doyle, Richard <Richard.Doyle@sanjoseca.gov>; Nurre, Shivaun <Shivaun.Nurre@sanjoseca.gov>; Walesh, Kim <Kim.Walesh@sanjoseca.gov>; Wells, Laura <Laura.Wells@sanjoseca.gov>; Maciel, Zulma <zulma.maciel@sanjoseca.gov>; Aitken, John [redacted]>; Wedge, Douglas <DOUGLAS.WEDGE@sanjoseca.gov>; Bustamante, Silvia <silvia.bustamante@sanjoseca.gov>; Nair, Rajani <Rajani.Nair@sanjoseca.gov>; Beckel, Dolan <dolan.beckel@sanjoseca.gov>; Dao, Vu <Vu.Dao@sanjoseca.gov>; Severino, Lori <Lori.Severino@sanjoseca.gov>; Sanchez, Sarah <sarah.sanchez@sanjoseca.gov>; CivicCenterTV26 <civiccentertv26@sanjoseca.gov>; Herbert, Frances <frances.herbert@sanjoseca.gov>; Moua, Louansee <Louansee.Moua@sanjoseca.gov>; Foley, Pam <Pam.Foley@sanjoseca.gov>; District 6 <district6@sanjoseca.gov>; Aitken, John <[redacted]>; Malloy, Maria <maria.malloy@sanjoseca.gov>; OES <OES@sanjoseca.gov>; McAmis, Jay <Jay.McAmis@sanjoseca.gov>; Riordan, Ray <ray.riordan@sanjoseca.gov>; Morales, Veronica (Posada) <Veronica.Morales@sanjoseca.gov>; Villarreal, Monique <Monique.Villarreal@sanjoseca.gov>; Serge Lilavois <[redacted]>; Path. Ilene G. [redacted]>; Ross, Judy <[redacted]>; Shull, Abigail <Abigail.Shull@sanjoseca.gov>; C.Innvtn. Sarah Papazoglakis <Sarah.Papzolakis@sanjoseca.gov>; Broadband <Broadband@sanjoseca.gov>; Morales-Ferrand, Jacky <Jacky.Morales-Ferrand@sanjoseca.gov>; Rios, Angel <Angel.Rios@sanjoseca.gov>; District5 <District5@sanjoseca.gov>; District8 <district8@sanjoseca.gov>; Jones, Mike (ESD) <Mike.Jones@sanjoseca.gov>; Klein, Nanci <Nanci.Klein@sanjoseca.gov>; Romanow, Kerrie <Kerrie.Romanow@sanjoseca.gov>; District1

<district1@sanjoseca.gov>; Tsukamoto, Kathy <Kathy.Tsukamoto@sanjoseca.gov>; Wilcox, Leland <Leland.Wilcox@sanjoseca.gov>; MacKenzie, Cay Denise <Cay.MacKenzie@sanjoseca.gov>; Sykes, Dave <Dave.Sykes@sanjoseca.gov>; Zelalich, Blage <blage.zelalich@sanjoseca.gov>; Pereira, Paul <Paul.Pereira@sanjoseca.gov>; The Office of Mayor Sam Liccardo <TheOfficeofMayorSamLiccardo@sanjoseca.gov>; Jayne, Stephanie <Stephanie.Jayne@sanjoseca.gov>; Lloyd, Rob <Rob.Lloyd@sanjoseca.gov>; Megan Colvard <[redacted]>; Wu, Carolyn <Qiaojie.Wu@sanjoseca.gov>; Ortbal, Jim <Jim.Ortbal@sanjoseca.gov>; Sato-Anderson, Angela <Angela.Sato-Anderson@sanjoseca.gov>; Sapien, Robert <Robert.Sapien@sanjoseca.gov>; VanderVeen, Rachel <Rachel.VanderVeen@sanjoseca.gov>; Lib. Jill Bourne <[redacted]; Esparza, Maya <Maya.Esparza@sanjoseca.gov>; Bennett, Peter <Peter.Bennett@sanjoseca.gov>; Maguire, Jennifer <jennifer.maguire@sanjoseca.gov>; Taber, Toni <toni.taber@sanjoseca.gov>; District3 <district3@sanjoseca.gov>; City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>; Hughey, Rosalynn <Rosalynn.Hughey@sanjoseca.gov>; Arborist <Arborist@sanjoseca.gov>; Parks&Rec. J. Cicirelli <john.cicirelli@sanjoseca.gov>; CCEC.Laura Mitchell <l.mitchell@sanjoseca.gov>; Cohen, David <David.Cohen@sanjoseca.gov>; Brown, Stacey <Stacey.Brown@sanjoseca.gov>; Mahan, Matt <Matt.Mahan@sanjoseca.gov>; c. attorney Nora Frimann <n.frimann@sanjoseca.gov>; Jéssica Dickison Goodman [redacted]>; PlanningSupportStaff <PlanningSupportStaff@sanjoseca.gov>; Jimenez, Sergio <sergio.jimenez@sanjoseca.gov>; Maciel, Mario <mario.maciel@sanjoseca.gov>; C.Auditor. Joe Rois <Joe.Rois@sanjoseca.gov>; Amiri, Aziza <Aziza.Amiri@sanjoseca.gov>; Chang, Bena <bena.chang@sanjoseca.gov>; Communications. Carolina Camarena <Carolina.Camarena@sanjoeca.gov>; PRNS. Linda Beltran <linda.beltran@sanjoseca.gov>; Doan, Elise <Elise.Doan@sanjoseca.gov>; Struyk, Zachary <Zachary.Struyk@sanjoseca.gov>; Eric Schoennauer [redacted]; Fred Buzo [redacted]>; Catalyze SV. Alex Shoor [redacted]>; Hansen, Russell <Russell.Hansen@sanjoseca.gov>

Subject: Blair Beekman. Friday. July 2, 2021.

[External Email]

Dear San Jose City govt,

Is there going to be, some last-minute efforts, for current flea market developers, to make it to, the state of Ca., affordable housing, funding deadline, of July 12 ?

An important reminder, to make sure to ask, how this situation,, can be very clear, for all sides, if developers, will actually be registering, by rhe July 12 deadline.

What exactly, will be the process - if developers actually make, the July 12th funding date ? There are ways, to negotiate, to be clear, and to make sure - that pressure, from this funding, will not hurt, the vendor union dialogue, in the future.

I feel, the history of the sj flea market, should at least be honored - with the vibrant, good concepts, of ELI, VLI, and mixed income, affordable housing ideas.

It can set, an important precedent, to begin, new, neighborhood affordable housing ideas, based on reimagine. And that will be, an important part, of Bay Area planning, for the second half, of this decade.

The city council meeting, of June 29, was a bit disappointing. But I feel, there can still be time, for open, shared, good dialogue.

I feel, there is still time, for the Vendors Union, to have an important dialogue, with ideas, of minimal office building space, more organic, softer building & landscape design - that can offer, more vendor space, and with, interesting, co-op vendor ideas..Along with, other current guarantees, for vendors.

My beginners words are meant, as help & simple knowledge, in trying to address, large scale planning ideas, by developers.

A final reminder, as some in sj city govt, will want more office space, jobs, and 80% ami & market rate housing - I hope there can also be, simple, caring, good facilitators, within San Jose city govt, and local govt agency providers, at this time.

Interestingly, the current & future development, of the Alum Rock area, is trying to much respect, its historic and cultural past. And with some good planning ideas, from San Jose State Univ. and everyday community. These same good practices, can be applied to, the future of the sj flea market development, as well.

A good luck, in the efforts, to more often hear, the words & ideas, of how to not develop, the sj flea market, at all.

sincerely,
blair beekman

Public Record: 9

Fw: Input on Items 10.3 & 10.4 of the 6/22 City Council Agenda

Agendadesk <Agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov>

Mon 7/19/2021 10:09 AM

To: Rules and Open Government Committee Agendas <rulescommitteeagenda@sanjoseca.gov>

From: City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>
Sent: Thursday, July 1, 2021 2:05 PM
To: Agendadesk <Agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov>
Subject: Fw: Input on Items 10.3 & 10.4 of the 6/22 City Council Agenda

Office of the City Clerk | City of San José
200 E. Santa Clara St., Tower 14th Floor
San Jose, CA 95113
Main: 408-535-1260
Fax: 408-292-6207

How is our service? Please take our short survey.

From: Dana Friesen <[redacted]
Sent: Thursday, July 1, 2021 1:35 PM
To: [redacted] <[redacted]> [redacted] <[redacted]>
Hughey, Rosalynn <Rosalynn.Hughey@sanjoseca.gov>; Gomez, Charla <Charla.Gomez@sanjoseca.gov>; Liccardo, Sam <sam.liccardo@sanjoseca.gov>; District1 <district1@sanjoseca.gov>; Jones, Chappie <Chappie.Jones@sanjoseca.gov>; District2 <District2@sanjoseca.gov>; Jimenez, Sergio <sergio.jimenez@sanjoseca.gov>; District3 <district3@sanjoseca.gov>; Tran, David <david.tran@sanjoseca.gov>; Peralez, Raul <Raul.Peralez@sanjoseca.gov>; District4 <District4@sanjoseca.gov>; Brown, Stacey <Stacey.Brown@sanjoseca.gov>; Cohen, David <David.Cohen@sanjoseca.gov>; District5 <District5@sanjoseca.gov>; Carrasco, Magdalena <Magdalena.Carrasco@sanjoseca.gov>; District 6 <district6@sanjoseca.gov>; Groen, Mary Anne <maryanne.groen@sanjoseca.gov>; Davis, Dev <dev.davis@sanjoseca.gov>; District7 <District7@sanjoseca.gov>; Esparza, Maya <Maya.Esparza@sanjoseca.gov>; District8 <district8@sanjoseca.gov>; Arenas, Sylvia <sylvia.arenas@sanjoseca.gov>; District9 <district9@sanjoseca.gov>; Foley, Pam <Pam.Foley@sanjoseca.gov>; Lomio, Michael <Michael.Lomio@sanjoseca.gov>; District 10 <District10@sanjoseca.gov>; Mahan, Matt <Matt.Mahan@sanjoseca.gov>; Quevedo, Matthew <Matthew.Quevedo@sanjoseca.gov>; [redacted] <[redacted]> Kline, Kelly <Kelly.Kline@sanjoseca.gov>; Klein, Nanci <Nanci.Klein@sanjoseca.gov>; Morales-Ferrand, Jacky <Jacky.Morales-Ferrand@sanjoseca.gov>; Ristow, John <John.Ristow@sanjoseca.gov>; VanderVeen, Rachel <Rachel.VanderVeen@sanjoseca.gov>; [redacted] <[redacted]> [redacted] <[redacted]> melissa cerezo <[redacted] <[redacted] <[redacted] plan.review <[redacted] <[redacted] <[redacted] <[redacted] <[redacted] City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>
Subject: Input on Items 10.3 & 10.4 of the 6/22 City Council Agenda

[External Email]

Dear City Council,

I urge you to ensure the redevelopment of the Berryessa Flea Market, a key part of the San Jose community, is as inclusive and vibrant as possible.

As you deliberate on this issue, I'd ask you to consider the points below. In fact, please incorporate them into your motions as conditions of approval before you vote.
1. Enable negotiations with the vendors to build to an agreement: Defer this vote until a true agreement can be reached between the vendors association, property owners & City officials. Right now, they're in the middle of negotiations. Give them time to complete them. Ensure the vendors are always included at the negotiation table. While I want to see this development with new homes, commercial space, and parks move forward, the process must involve the vendors.

2. On the market itself:
a) Affordable stalls: I'm glad the development last month added a 5-acre urban market. Yet will it be affordable to the existing 450 vendors? To prevent displacement, the new stalls must be affordable to existing vendors. Right now, there are no guarantees they would be.
b) Enough stalls: To ensure all existing vendors can sell at the new market, I'd like to see a multi-level market on the BART Plaza site and a plan to close residential streets for additional vendors on weekends studied. If all 430+ vendors can't fit on-site, a replacement site in San Jose needs to be secured.
c) No disruption to businesses: While the current offer from the landowners of $4,400 per vendor is a step towards helping vendors, this is nowhere near enough for businesses that may be displaced or interrupted for months or years. Accommodations should be made during construction to ensure the vendors can maintain places to sell.

3. On the number of homes & building heights:
a) The Berryessa Urban Village is one of the best areas in San Jose for creating a vibrant neighborhood of offices, shops, homes & green space next to a major transit hub. This rare opportunity means we need to maximize the number of people who live, work, and visit the area. Let's make it as easy as possible to achieve that.
b) That's why I'd like the building heights raised throughout the Urban Village. In areas west of the BART Station (where no one currently lives), buildings heights up to FAA regulations should be allowed.

Let's make this development a quadruple win - for the vendors, the landowners, the City & our broad community!

As you look to approve this development, please ensure the Flea Market vendors are not displaced, and this critical part of our community is maintained.
Thank you for considering my perspective.

Sincerely,

Dana Friesen
[redacted]

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Public Record: 10

Fw: Conflict between Point In Time Count and FAA sweep

Agendadesk <Agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov>

Mon 6/28/2021 9:11 AM

To: Rules and Open Government Committee Agendas <rulescommitteeagenda@sanjoseca.gov>

From: City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>
Sent: Monday, June 28, 2021 7:36 AM
To: Agendadesk <Agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov>
Subject: Fw: Conflict between Point In Time Count and FAA sweep

---

From: kathryn hedges <[redacted]>
Sent: Saturday, June 26, 2021 1:06 PM
To: [redacted] <[redacted]> [redacted] <[redacted]> Hughey, Rosalynn <Rosalynn.Hughey@sanjoseca.gov>; Gomez, Charla <Charla.Gomez@sanjoseca.gov>; Liccardo, Sam <sam.liccardo@sanjoseca.gov>; District1 <district1@sanjoseca.gov>; Jones, Chappie <Chappie.Jones@sanjoseca.gov>; District2 <District2@sanjoseca.gov>; Jimenez, Sergio <sergio.jimenez@sanjoseca.gov>; District3 <district3@sanjoseca.gov>; Tran, David <david.tran@sanjoseca.gov>; Peralez, Raul <Raul.Peralez@sanjoseca.gov>; District4 <District4@sanjoseca.gov>; Brown, Stacey <Stacey.Brown@sanjoseca.gov>; Cohen, David <David.Cohen@sanjoseca.gov>; District5 <District5@sanjoseca.gov>; Carrasco, Magdalena <Magdalena.Carrasco@sanjoseca.gov>; District 6 <district6@sanjoseca.gov>; Groen, Mary Anne <maryanne.groen@sanjoseca.gov>; Davis, Dev <dev.davis@sanjoseca.gov>; District7 <District7@sanjoseca.gov>; Esparza, Maya <Maya.Esparza@sanjoseca.gov>; District8 <district8@sanjoseca.gov>; Arenas, Sylvia <sylvia.arenas@sanjoseca.gov>; District9 <district9@sanjoseca.gov>; Foley, Pam <Pam.Foley@sanjoseca.gov>; Lomio, Michael <Michael.Lomio@sanjoseca.gov>; District 10 <District10@sanjoseca.gov>; Mahan, Matt <Matt.Mahan@sanjoseca.gov>; Quevedo, Matthew <Matthew.Quevedo@sanjoseca.gov>; [redacted] <[redacted]> Kline, Kelly <Kelly.Kline@sanjoseca.gov>; Klein, Nanci <Nanci.Klein@sanjoseca.gov>; Morales-Ferrand, Jacky <Jacky.Morales-Ferrand@sanjoseca.gov>; Ristow, John <John.Ristow@sanjoseca.gov>; VanderVeen, Rachel <Rachel.VanderVeen@sanjoseca.gov>; [redacted] <[redacted]> [redacted] <[redacted]> melissa cerezo <[redacted]> [redacted] <[redacted]> Chavez, Cindy <[redacted]> plan.review <[redacted]> [redacted] <[redacted]> [redacted] <[redacted]> advocacy <[redacted]> City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>
Subject: Conflict between Point In Time Count and FAA sweep

[External Email]

I am a resident of District 3 and I am asking the City to negotiate a delay for the FAA sweep of the encampments under the approach to Mineta International Airport (SJC) because of the conflict with the Point In Time Count.

As you know, the Point In Time Count (PIT) could not be conducted in January 2021 due to the pandemic. It is important to have the most accurate count of unhoused residents of San Jose because Federal and State funding for rehousing, shelters, etc. is based on this count. And this year, they're only counting San Jose--not the rest of Santa Clara County. So it's even more crucial for this large encampment not to be swept before it's counted. If the residents are in transit to other encampments on the day of the count, they won't be counted at either location.

Please work with the FAA to reschedule the sweep so the PIT can be completed first. It's in the City's best interest to maximize the funding eligibility for the City and County to help get these unhoused people into housing.

Also, thank you for approving the extension for the eviction moratorium to prevent more homelessness.

Kind regards,

Kathryn Hedges
Sole Proprietor, Splendid Colors
www.splendidcolors.com
CA Certifications: SB,SP-PW #2024613

From: J Smith <[redacted]>
Sent: Monday, June 28, 2021 1:10 PM
To: CEDCommittee <CEDCommittee@sanjoseca.gov>
Subject: City Employee Policy Reconsideration

Public Record: 11

[External Email]

To the San Jose City Council,

I think it is low-resolution thinking to send all employees back to the office/physical place of work because COVID restrictions have lifted. This last year proved that many of these jobs can be just as efficient (in many cases more efficient) working through the internet at home. The old paradigm of the office structure is gone in the age of the internet is upon us and progressive private and government employers need to come to terms with this reality now.

I also don't think we should be causing gridlock and environmental harm just so a few managers can feel important at the office and the higher-ups can virtue signal their adherence to the status quo. It's simple; some employees need to be kept at home, not only to open up space at the infrastructures (that either the private companies or taxpayers are shelling out big time for especially considering all real estate here is worth more than gold) but to keep our already polluted air cleaner.

Gridlock is also stressful and slows down our fast-paced and vibrant Silicon Valley life. I have not heard one positive reason for sending certain employees back to work more than once a week, especially those that have jobs that are primarily done on the computer. Including accounting, drafting, coding, CAD, and other similar jobs. These jobs should come in for occasional meetings if absolutely necessary and then sent home. This idea of sending them all back to work across the board, 3 days a week, is exactly why people complain about out-of-touch bureaucrats at the top that are incapable of understanding micro issues or creating efficient systems.

Sending employees that could easily work from home back to an office space is a sign of a tired and old-fashion company or government that refuses to move forward with the times. It also shows a lack of concern for the environment, gas prices/U.S. dependency on oil, wear and tear on our tax paid for roads/bridges/infrastructures, and air quality we all share, plus the employees' mental health.

The mental health issue needs to be addressed. The Bay Area now has a median house price that keeps the majority of the middle-class from ever owning a home. We are rated #1 in the middle-class percentage of income towards housing in the nation. Most of the middle-class here in San Jose who manage to actaully have a roof over their head have inadequate space, unhealthy living situations, and if not, in a mortgage they will never pay off. If we can't fix the affordability crisis the least we could do is end the nightmare commute for many employees.

Many have turned to moving out of the Bay Area to skim by, enduring horrendous commutes, some sadly totaling 3 -4 hours or more each day. The majority of office workers commute an hour to work each way. By allowing these employees to stay home they are given back 10 to 20 hours a week of family and downtime. We have one of the highest rates of depression and suicide in the nation, and is it a wonder when we burden the middle-class to existence and survival alone? When we talk about the housing crisis an important question is "which one?" We can not just fix the homelessness issue and end the discussion on the note, that's a separate housing crisis, we need to fix the extreme burden on

the middle-class that bad policy has created. We have priced out an entire generation creating a horrid generational lotto. Under 45 years of age? Well then, I hope you're in the top 10% of income earners, are willing to take on a mortgage you will never pay off in your lifetime or you plan to inherit.

COVID was a nightmare, but there were some good ideas that came of it. One of the few positives was learning that working from home in many cases can be more efficient, less stressful, and better for our environment. We need to move forward and progress. The future is for the people, businesses, and governments that can adapt. We are supposed to be the leaders in innovation in San Jose, so why is our city government living in the stone age and requiring employees to work 3 - 5 days a week that could do it from home? Shouldn't this be up to the individual's acting manager or the person who works with them directly during the last year? If their performance was as good or better LEAVE THEM HOME. Spare us all. Do you think the diamond line helped gridlock? That will be a drop in the bucket compared to keeping people home.

I'm not an employee of the City of San Jose, but I'm a citizen and believe we have a say in this policy because it will harm everyone living here. Most citizens I know feel exactly the same way as I do about this short-sighted employee policy.

Thank you, Julie Smith

Public Record: 12

Fw: Please distribute to Mayor and Council

City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>
Mon 7/12/2021 8:07 AM
To: Rules and Open Government Committee Agendas <rulescommitteeagenda@sanjoseca.gov>

Office of the City Clerk | City of San José
200 E. Santa Clara St., Tower 14th Floor
San Jose, CA 95113
Main: 408-535-1260
Fax: 408-292-6207

How is our service? Please take our short survey.

From: Lawrence Townsend <[redacted]
Sent: Sunday, July 11, 2021 9:17 PM
To: City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>
Subject: Please distribute to Mayor and Council

[External Email]

Dear Hon. Mayor Liccardo & Councilmembers,
I am quite concerned about the proposal to eliminate decades of careful city planning by eliminating single-family residential zoning in the City of San Jose. This proposal is the antithesis of planning that gives greedy investment groups and individuals whose actions will ultimately destroy our neighborhoods. I am asking that the City Council honor the promises made to its residents who are vested in the treasures San Jose.
This “opportunity housing policy" will be just another political boondoggle that will perpetuate tax and spending that has brought us the homeless issue in the first place. You will just replace permanent families with short term renters who will not be here to pick up the pieces of the unintended consequences.
From a good neighbor I repeat the following;
“Finally. A citywide change requires a citywide vote. Eleven votes from 11 temporarily elected individuals should never decide the future of 1.7 million residents by upending years of city planning and voter approvals. Please honor the promises your predecessors made to us and vote "No" on this flawed proposal or, at the very least, let the people decide. After all, where are we as a community if we can't trust you to do this one simple thing?”

Kindest regards,
Lawrence Townsend
[redacted]
[redacted]

Public Record: 13

Fw: ²Blair Beekman. Friday. July 2, 2021. __ Underground Transportation, from Diridon Station to sj airport.

Agendadesk <Agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov>

Mon 7/19/2021 10:10 AM

To: Rules and Open Government Committee Agendas <rulescommitteeagenda@sanjoseca.gov>

From: City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>
Sent: Friday, July 2, 2021 2:59 PM
To: Agendadesk <Agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov>
Subject: Fw: ²Blair Beekman. Friday. July 2, 2021. __ Underground Transportation, from Diridon Station to sj airport.

Office of the City Clerk | City of San José
200 E. Santa Clara St., Tower 14th Floor
San Jose, CA 95113
Main: 408-535-1260
Fax: 408-292-6207

How is our service? Please take our short survey.

From: b. beekman <[redacted]
Sent: Friday, July 2, 2021 2:42 PM
To: IPA <ipa@sanjoseca.gov>; Greene, Shasta <shasta.greene@sanjoseca.gov>; Harkness, Kip <Kip.Harkness@sanjoseca.gov>; Ristow, John <John.Ristow@sanjoseca.gov>; Cano, Matt <Matt.Cano@sanjoseca.gov>; San Jose Airport Customer Services <AirportCustomerServices@sanjoseca.gov>; SJFD - Feedback <SJFDFeedback@sanjoseca.gov>; Mata, Anthony <ANTHONY.MATA@sanjoseca.gov>; S.J. Arena Authority <[redacted] Traffic.Signals <Traffic.Signals@sanjoseca.gov>; Tran, David <david.tran@sanjoseca.gov>; Parra-Garcia, Sabrina <Sabrina.Parra-Garcia@sanjoseca.gov>; Torres, Omar <Omar.Torres@sanjoseca.gov>; Lopez, Robert (HSG) <Robert.Lopez@sanjoseca.gov>; Doyle, Richard <Richard.Doyle@sanjoseca.gov>; Nurre, Shivaun <Shivaun.Nurre@sanjoseca.gov>; Walesh, Kim <Kim.Walesh@sanjoseca.gov>; Wells, Laura <Laura.Wells@sanjoseca.gov>; Maciel, Zulma <zulma.maciel@sanjoseca.gov>; Aitken, John <[redacted] Wedge, Douglas <DOUGLAS.WEDGE@sanjoseca.gov>; Bustamante, Silvia <silvia.bustamante@sanjoseca.gov>; Nair, Rajani <Rajani.Nair@sanjoseca.gov>; Beckel, Dolan <dolan.beckel@sanjoseca.gov>; Dao, Vu <Vu.Dao@sanjoseca.gov>; Severino, Lori <Lori.Severino@sanjoseca.gov>; Sanchez, Sarah <sarah.sanchez@sanjoseca.gov>; CivicCenterTV26 <civiccentertv26@sanjoseca.gov>; Herbert, Frances <frances.herbert@sanjoseca.gov>; Moua, Louansee <Louansee.Moua@sanjoseca.gov>; Foley, Pam <Pam.Foley@sanjoseca.gov>; District 6 <district6@sanjoseca.gov>; Aitken, John <[redacted] Malloy, Maria <maria.malloy@sanjoseca.gov>; OES <OES@sanjoseca.gov>; McAmis, Jay <Jay.McAmis@sanjoseca.gov>; Riordan, Ray <ray.riordan@sanjoseca.gov>; Morales, Veronica (Posada) <Veronica.Morales@sanjoseca.gov>; Villarreal, Monique <Monique.Villarreal@sanjoseca.gov>; Serge Lilavois <[redacted] Path. Ilene G. <[redacted] Ross, Judy <[redacted] Shull, Abigail <Abigail.Shull@sanjoseca.gov>; C.Innvtn. Sarah Papazoglakis <Sarah.Papzolakis@sanjoseca.gov>; Broadband <Broadband@sanjoseca.gov>; Morales-Ferrand, Jacky

<Jacky.Morales-Ferrand@sanjoseca.gov>; Rios, Angel <Angel.Rios@sanjoseca.gov>; District5 <District5@sanjoseca.gov>; District8 <district8@sanjoseca.gov>; Jones, Mike (ESD) <Mike.Jones@sanjoseca.gov>; Klein, Nanci <Nanci.Klein@sanjoseca.gov>; Romanow, Kerrie <Kerrie.Romanow@sanjoseca.gov>; District1 <district1@sanjoseca.gov>; Tsukamoto, Kathy <Kathy.Tsukamoto@sanjoseca.gov>; Wilcox, Leland <Leland.Wilcox@sanjoseca.gov>; MacKenzie, Cay Denise <Cay.MacKenzie@sanjoseca.gov>; Sykes, Dave <Dave.Sykes@sanjoseca.gov>; Zelalich, Blage <blage.zelalich@sanjoseca.gov>; Pereira, Paul <Paul.Pereira@sanjoseca.gov>; The Office of Mayor Sam Liccardo <TheOfficeofMayorSamLiccardo@sanjoseca.gov>; Jayne, Stephanie <Stephanie.Jayne@sanjoseca.gov>; Lloyd, Rob <Rob.Lloyd@sanjoseca.gov>; Megan Colvard <[redacted] Wu, Carolyn <Qiaojie.Wu@sanjoseca.gov>; Ortbal, Jim <Jim.Ortbal@sanjoseca.gov>; Sato-Anderson, Angela <Angela.Sato-Anderson@sanjoseca.gov>; Sapien, Robert <Robert.Sapien@sanjoseca.gov>; VanderVeen, Rachel <Rachel.VanderVeen@sanjoseca.gov>; Lib. Jill Bourne <[redacted] Esparza, Maya <Maya.Esparza@sanjoseca.gov>; Bennett, Peter <Peter.Bennett@sanjoseca.gov>; Maguire, Jennifer <jennifer.maguire@sanjoseca.gov>; Taber, Toni <toni.taber@sanjoseca.gov>; District3 <district3@sanjoseca.gov>; City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>; Hughey, Rosalynn <Rosalynn.Hughey@sanjoseca.gov>; Arborist <Arborist@sanjoseca.gov>; Parks&Rec. J. Cicirelli <john.cicirelli@sanjoseca.gov>; CCEC.Laura Mitchell <l.mitchell@sanjoseca.gov>; Cohen, David <David.Cohen@sanjoseca.gov>; Brown, Stacey <Stacey.Brown@sanjoseca.gov>; Mahan, Matt <Matt.Mahan@sanjoseca.gov>; c. attorney Nora Frimann <n.frimann@sanjoseca.gov>; Jéssica Dickison Goodman <[redacted] PlanningSupportStaff <PlanningSupportStaff@sanjoseca.gov>; Jimenez, Sergio <sergio.jimenez@sanjoseca.gov>; Maciel, Mario <mario.maciel@sanjoseca.gov>; C.Auditor. Joe Rois <Joe.Rois@sanjoseca.gov>; Amiri, Aziza <Aziza.Amiri@sanjoseca.gov>; Chang, Bena <bena.chang@sanjoseca.gov>; Communications. Carolina Camarena <Carolina.Camarena@sanjoeca.gov>; PRNS. Linda Beltran <linda.beltran@sanjoseca.gov>; Doan, Elise <Elise.Doan@sanjoseca.gov>; Struyk, Zachary <Zachary.Struyk@sanjoseca.gov>; Eric Schoennauer [redacted]>; Fred Buzo <[redacted] Catalyze SV. Alex Shoor <[redacted] Hansen, Russell <Russell.Hansen@sanjoseca.gov>; VTA Board Secretary <[redacted] Supervisor Cindy Chavez <[redacted] Supervisor Susan Ellenberg <[redacted] Supervisor Joseph Simitian <[redacted] Supervisor Otto Lee <[redacted] Supervisor Mike Wasserman <[redacted]

Subject: [2]Blair Beekman. Friday. July 2, 2021. __ Underground Transportation, from Diridon Station to sj airport.

[External Email]

Dear San Jose City govt, and VTA,

To write about, the current ideas & funding, of a Diridon Station to San Jose airport, underground transportation shuttle service.

This underground transit connection route, would serve as, a practical, well reasoned, decent way, to more safely experiment, on the future of automated vehicle ideas & practices.

To first, better practice, the future of AV mass transit , underground - and out of the way, of regular, day to day, community traffic & pedestrians - may speak well, to the current state of av technology. And in the ways , it can better develop & improve.

It is from this, I feel it can help free up, some of the initial positive good intentions of the VTA light rail.

And that, this may be the time, to try to return to, the more, focused, positive, good green sustainability beginnings, of the VTA light rail. And what can be, a more centralized service, of Santa Clara county, transportation needs.

What steps, can we take, to again, begin to feel, the VTA light rail, is helping contribute to, an important, positive, sustainable future, for Santa Clara county.

Sincerely,
Blair Beekman

p.s.

I feel, an overall lack of interest, in the VTA light rail may also be felt - in the lack of will, to create & provide, regular light rail transit services & routines, after recent difficult & tragic, May events.

At this point, at the very minimum, there simply should be, a bus bridge, shuttle service, from Tasman, to downtown San Jose, along the 1st st. corridor.

This is a corridor, that has, a surprising number, of local shops, businesses, restaurants, startups and corporations.. At least, 2 major county govt. office complexes. And much, low, middle, and high income housing.

Most every other light rail transit stop in Santa Clara Co, has a bus line, that runs immediately next to it. Yet, the 1st st, light rail corridor, does not have, many bus transit service lines, at all.

It should not be very difficult, to get emergency federal funding, for a bus bridge shuttle service, between Tasman and downtown sj, along 1st Street.

Buses could run, once every half hour. It would be a half hour trip, from 6 am- 8 pm. With mutual aid help, from other county transit services.

To also note, to simply continue, the route 59 bus, from Baypointe, to the Milpitas BART station, is about .5 miles. It would help a lot, as well, ar this time.

I hope this letter, can offer, a few simple, constructive ideas, to bring back, some positive thinking, for the future of light rail.

In this time, of grief and self- reflection, we should be, ar a time, to start to better address again, our good intentions, of the community process.

The ideas of grief and mourning, have simply shut down, the open democratic process, in San Jose , and for the VTA.

Our grief, should naturally bring ourselves around again, to the positive concepts,, of how, open democratic practices, can always be, the good ways, to develop, our better community practices & operations.

Good luck, in how San Jose, and the VTA, may need to better address this, on summer break.

And in, July, August, and September, of 2021.

- blair

Public Record: 14

Fw: CPUC - Verizon Wireless - City of San Jose-CA_SJ_SANJOSE_WEST_007 - A-517671

City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>
Mon 7/12/2021 9:52 AM

To: Rules and Open Government Committee Agendas <rulescommitteeagenda@sanjoseca.gov>

1 attachments (10 KB)
CPUC_1841.pdf;

Office of the City Clerk | City of San José
200 E. Santa Clara St., Tower 14th Floor
San Jose, CA 95113
Main: 408-535-1260
Fax: 408-292-6207

How is our service? Please take our short survey.

From: CPUC Team <[redacted]
Sent: Monday, July 12, 2021 9:49 AM
To: [redacted] <[redacted]
Cc: [redacted] <[redacted] Koki, Elizabeth <Elizabeth.Koki@sanjoseca.gov>; Webmaster Manager <webmaster.manager@sanjoseca.gov>; City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>; [redacted] <[redacted]
Subject: CPUC - Verizon Wireless - City of San Jose-CA_SJ_SANJOSE_WEST_007 - A-517671

[External Email]

This is to provide your agency with notice according to the provisions of General Order No. 159A of the Public Utilities Commission of the State of California (CPUC) see attachment.
This notice is being provided pursuant to Section IV.C.2.

Jul 12, 2021

Consumer Protection and Enforcement Division
California Public Utilities Commission
505 Van Ness Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102
[redacted]

RE: Notification Letter for CA_SJ_SANJOSE_WEST_007 - 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
[redacted]

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		Santa Clara

VZW Legal Entity		Site Name		Site Address		Tower Design	Size of Building or NA
GTE Mobilnet California LP		CA_SJ_SANJOSE_WEST_007 - A		3530 Stevens Creek Boulevard, San Jose , CA95117		Utility pole/tower	N/A
Site Latitude	**Site Longitude**	**PS Location Code**	**Tower Appearance**	**Tower Height (in feet)**	**Type of Approval**	**Approval Issue Date**	
37°19'23.24"N	121°57'38.762"WNAD(83)	517671	Antenna Rad: 25' 6	30'	Permitting	07/06/2021	
Project Description: Installation (3) Antenna/Radio; (1) Disconnect; (1) Smart Meter; (1) fiber junction box; (4) collar nuts; on new street light pole. Install (1) pull box							

Public Record: 15

Fw: LAFCO Meeting of August 4, 2021 - Cancelled

City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>
Thu 7/22/2021 11:31 AM

To: Rules and Open Government Committee Agendas <rulescommitteeagenda@sanjoseca.gov>; Taber, Toni <toni.taber@sanjoseca.gov>

Office of the City Clerk | City of San José
200 E. Santa Clara St., Tower 14th Floor
San Jose, CA 95113
Main: 408-535-1260
Fax: 408-292-6207

How is our service? Please take our short survey.

From: Abello, Emmanuel <[redacted]
Sent: Thursday, July 22, 2021 11:12 AM
Subject: LAFCO Meeting of August 4, 2021 - Cancelled

[External Email]

The August 4, 2021 LAFCO Meeting has been cancelled and a Notice of Cancellation has been posted on LAFCO's website (weblink).
https://santaclaralafco.org/meetings/commission-meeting-cancelled-2021-08-04-201500

NOTE: In light of COVID-19 response measures from the Governor of the State of California and the Santa Clara County Public Health Department, commencing March 17, all staff of Santa Clara LAFCO are under a "Shelter in Place" directive, working remotely from home. If you have an inquiry, we encourage you to contact us by email at [redacted]

Thank you,
Emmanuel Abello
Commission Clerk
LAFCO of Santa Clara County
[redacted]
Twitter: @SantaClaraLAFCO
www.SantaClaraLAFCO.org