

1. From: Rebecca Sanders

Sent: Thursday, April 16, 2020 5:40 PM

To: Council, City <city.council@cityofpaloalto.org>

Cc: Furman, Sheri; gsheyner@paweb.com

Subject: PAN'S Outreach to the Community regarding the NVCAP2 Survey

April 16, 2020

Dear Neighbors:

In the "North Ventura Coordinated Area Plan (NVCAP) Community Survey" that is circulating online, the City's Planning Department asks you to opine on three flawed design proposals for the redevelopment of the North

Ventura neighborhood with the Fry's site as its nexus. The survey closes Monday, April 20.

The three proposals are the product of the City's consultants and not of the Council-appointed NVCAP

working group which has yet to have the opportunity to discuss the three proposals or propose their own.

We are inviting you to join us and others, as you fill out the survey, to register your displeasure with this process by protesting this survey. The reasons for protesting are listed at the bottom of this email.

On behalf of the Palo Alto Neighborhoods Executive Committee, we ask you to do the following:

1. Answer the survey (<https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/NVCAP2>), at least up to item 6, which reads:

"6. Do you have additional goals or priorities for the area? (1000 character limit)"

In space allotted, please cut and paste the following verbiage or create a message of your own:

None of these proposals are what the community wants. The proposals overrun Ventura with density, traffic, congestion, and more commercial development while not providing housing for our neediest as well as forgoing community amenities such as adequate parkland and other livability standards. The working group has not been provided an opportunity to discuss these proposals, nor to present their own designs to the community. The community should have a chance to review the proposals of the working group rather than being forced to choose between the three flawed proposals foisted on it. Please allow the working group to do its job.

2. Then fill out the rest of the survey, or alternatively, you may scroll to the bottom of each survey page, click the NEXT button until you reach the end of the survey and click the SUBMIT button.

3. Send an email to city.council@cityofpaloalto.org, NVCAP@cityofpaloalto.org and please cc: Becky Sanders, rebsanders@gmail.com if you would. Please use your own words, but if you are pressed for time, simply say:

Dear Mayor Fine and Council Members:

I protest the current NVCAP online survey as none of the proposals reflect what the community wants and would negatively impact the people already living in Ventura. The community should have the opportunity to review the proposals of the working group, which have not been included in this survey, rather than being forced to choose between the three flawed proposals prepared by the city's consultants.

<your name>

Reasons to Join the Survey Protest

Survey Design

- The survey is riddled with errors. We found more than 16 mistakes in just one map and dozens of problems elsewhere. Many questions are biased and do not offer a "no" vote. Links don't work. Plans are mislabeled.
- None of the plans reflect the lofty goals with which the City Council charged the working group.
- This survey represents a failure of the City staff to empower and effectively utilize the NVCAP Working Group the City Council appointed.
- The railway side of Park Boulevard is part of the Plan Area but is not addressed in any of the three designs. Why is that? Not including the other side of Park in the design plan is a missed opportunity for more housing and additional community amenities.
- The survey is open to all Palo Alto residents, many of whom may have little familiarity with the NVCAP process.

Making zoning and design decisions based on such results may not be well-informed.

Zoning vs Architecture

- None of the proposed plans comply with our existing zoning code, including other existing coordinated area plans.
- What should be a land use and zoning discussion is reduced to commenting on architectural design.
- Respondents are being asked to identify styles and lighting preferences of buildings and of their interiors, which is irrelevant to a coordinated area plan zoning update.
- Alternatives 2 and 3 violate City Zoning by exceeding 50 feet in height. There might be good reasons for additional height (such as allowing additional open space) but adding such a significant change into the designs without any discussion seems inappropriate.
- Every alternative includes office space at the Fry's site even though the site is zoned residential and office space is a non-conforming use. Housing should be a higher priority than office space throughout the area.
- The proposals favor higher-priced units for sale over more affordable rentals and do virtually nothing to create affordable housing. Instead, they maximize developer profits.

Traffic & Parking

- All alternatives violate City Zoning by having only 1 parking spot per unit. Without mitigation, this lack of parking will overwhelm the neighborhood with spillover parking.
- None of the proposals analyze the traffic patterns or rely on any traffic data whatsoever.
- No circulation, parking or traffic studies have been done. No new or existing zones are proposed with corresponding development standards.

Liveability

- The proposals would vastly increase the population of Ventura but provide little to no community amenities. At the community meeting in February at Gunn High School, the expected number of residents for each of the three alternatives was shown, but those figures were not in the survey.
- There is inadequate parkland for the number of new residents, as required by the Quimby Act. "Greenways" between apartment buildings do not constitute open space or park land.
- Terms are used incorrectly. Park and open space have legal definitions and are applied willy-nilly to small grassy spots between buildings and rooftop gardens, for instance.
- Alternative 1 does not, as it claims, meet the "Minimum as per Comprehensive Plan" because it does not add the *dedicated* parkland that the Comprehensive Plan requires. Neither do any of the other alternatives presented.

Thank you one and all for considering this request. Ventura really needs our support right now. You can and do make a difference.

Sincerely,

Sheri Furman,
Co-Chair Becky Sanders,
Co-Chair Palo Alto Neighborhoods Palo Alto Neighborhoods
& Ventura Resident

2. From: Ann Balin
Sent: Sunday, April 19, 2020 6:46 PM
To: Council, City <city.council@cityofpaloalto.org>
Subject: Survey

Mayor Fine & Council Members,

The survey that was designed, by a consulting group as directed by the Planning department without any consultation of the NVCAP, is unprofessional. First, why wasn't NVCAP engaged in this process? The members of this group have worked with the community and understand the Ventura neighborhood and environs. This survey does not reflect well on the Planning

department as it is flawed. The consultants have little knowledge of the complexity of the planning issues specific to this community.

The proposals offered in the survey are not what neighbors desire for their community. Language employed regarding parklands is not accurate. The fifty foot height limit is not acceptable to the community. The Fry's site is zoned for residential. I ask that you disregard this bogus survey and involve NVCAP in future.

Frankly, the perception now is that the city has erred. The council's assigning NVCAP to work with the community has been ignored by Planning. Hiring consultants who do not grasp the complexities of this future development boggles the mind.

I urge the council to redirect the Planning department to work with NVCAP and go forward with input from the Ventura community. Please adhere to the standards that citizens require concerning this important development site.

Ann Lafargue Balin

3. From: Peter Brewer

Sent: Friday, April 10, 2020 6:51 PM

To: North Ventura Coordinated Area Plan <NVCAP@CityofPaloAlto.org>

Subject: RE: North Ventura Coordinated Area Plan Survey

Survey is WAY TOO LONG, and gives no indication of what % of the way through one is. Really crappy survey.

4. From: gmahany@aol.com

Sent: Wednesday, April 22, 2020 1:19 PM

To: North Ventura Coordinated Area Plan <NVCAP@CityofPaloAlto.org>; Council, City <city.council@cityofpaloalto.org>

Cc: rebsanders@gmail.com

Subject: hoping for something beter

Hello NVCAP

I sent my NVCAP2 survey early this month and was not pleased with the survey as it was a repeat of the meeting at Gunn.

I've read the letter NVCAP Letter Final 20200416 and I am glad someone (Pan) did a critical detailed review as the survey sure needed one.

This survey and the meeting at Gunn brings up the question are these consultants/city planning department lacking vision of alternatives to standard developments and existing P.A. city zoning.
Gary Mahany

5. From: Carol Scott

Sent: Tuesday, April 21, 2020 12:50 AM

To: Council, City <city.council@cityofpaloalto.org>; North Ventura Coordinated Area Plan <NVCAP@CityofPaloAlto.org>

Cc: Rebecca Sanders <rebsanders@gmail.com>

Subject: North Ventura Coordinated Area Plan

Dear Mayor Fine and Other City Council Members,

I am writing to urge you to reconsider the process by which you are developing plans for the North Ventura area including the site most recently occupied by Fry's Electronics, and specifically to halt any consideration of the three proposals for this area that have been developed by outside consultants.

None of the proposals put forward -- which were the subject of a recent severely deficient community survey, reflect the desires of the current Ventura community or even those who live in close proximity to that area. All of these proposals would negatively impact the people who live in Ventura as well as adjacent areas through increased traffic, demands for parking, and greater density than any area outside downtown Palo Alto with completely inadequate green space/park area and other amenities. These plans, as currently presented, include office space at the expense of housing, which has been one of the top stated priorities for the last few years, and they potentially increase the gentrification of Palo Alto by its focus on higher end housing units.

I understand that the Council appointed a NVCAP working group as a one vehicle through which community input would be developed and incorporated into any proposed plan for this area. However, the consultant's proposals were developed outside this process. The Ventura community, as well as all of Palo Alto (and especially adjacent neighborhoods) should have the opportunity to hear what this working group has to say and to review any proposals it may have. The recent survey did not include any proposals from the working group, but rather forced respondents to choose between the three flawed proposals prepared by City consultants.

I urge you to direct the City staff to consult with the NVCAP working group to develop alternative proposals for this area that will incorporate its concerns and its ideas.

Thank you.

Carol Scott

Resident of Evergreen Park

6. From: Winter Dellenbach

Sent: Monday, April 20, 2020 5:40 PM

To: North Ventura Coordinated Area Plan <NVCAP@CityofPaloAlto.org>

Subject: Terrible NVcap Survey

Folks – About a week ago I took the city’s NVcap survey, finished it, hit the send button, got a stiff drink, and said to my husband – that was the longest and poorest designed survey I have ever taken. Only the fact that I was in for a penny, in for a pound, got me to finish it. It was an utter waste of time and made me angry.

I have taken several city surveys over the years, some better than others, but all within bounds, seemingly done by an outside entity that knew what it was doing. And I have seen, but often not completed surveys by interest groups that were biased, push-pull by design. Last week I was emailed an UC Berkeley survey (maybe some of you got it?) on several issues, yet I couldn’t tell the primary subject – it was that well designed and free of bias, though fairly complex and not short. I also saw 4 surveys done at Buena Vista by Stanford professors that followed research guidelines for survey design. So while I could never design a survey (there are university classes on doing just that), I know a bit about good ones, and the NVcap was so far from the mark that it broke free from earths gravity, out into the solar system.

I could offer many specifics but won’t because it is way too obvious to anyone unless one truly has a predetermined agenda or has blinders on. I don’t care about positions or politics or interest groups about this. It’s simply a really bad survey product that whoever created it shouldn’t have.

If anything is done but shredding this, then you do everyone and the city a disservice because no useful information or informed opinion can come from it. Surely no one can responsibly want that.

Winter Dellenbach

Barron Park

7. From: Rita Vrhel
Sent: Monday, April 20, 2020 1:56 PM
To: Council, City <city.council@cityofpaloalto.org>
Subject: North Ventura Coordinated Area Plan

Dear Council Members: I remain concerned that while there is an excellent and very talented Working Group in place to discuss and advise on the NVCAP, their suggestions and comments seem to be consistently ignored by Mr. Lait and his team.

The Consultants have designed plans which do not incorporate the Working Groups requests but instead reflects the Consultants own biases or input from some source other than the citizen's working group.

Reminds me very much of the Cubberly outcome; who asked for all those fully developed housing plans originate? Still a mystery to most.

There is little wonder why so few residents, as reflected in the PA annual survey, trust City officials or staff.

Also not mentioned in this lengthy survey are all the changes to Zoning or other City regulations required to bring any plan to completion.

And why is the Cannery, a historical resource, long derided by Mr. Lait, not being saved and repurposed?

These current plans, to me, represent another wasted opportunity for the City to do great things.

Thank you

8. From: Elaine Meyer
Sent: Monday, April 20, 2020 3:03 PM
To: Council, City <city.council@cityofpaloalto.org>; North Ventura Coordinated Area Plan <NVCAP@CityofPaloAlto.org>
Subject: Ventura Plan Survey

Dear Mayor Fine and Members of the Council:

The views of the neighborhood are essential in deciding what is to be done in Ventura. For example, Fry's is zoned for housing. I did not see anything that took that into consideration.

The plans shown appear to be developer focused, not resident or neighborhood centered.

The Working Group's views and opinions should be the cornerstone of any plans.

Sincerely,

Elaine Meyer

9. From: Nadia Naik

Sent: Monday, April 20, 2020 1:50 PM

To: Council, City <city.council@cityofpaloalto.org>; North Ventura Coordinated Area Plan <NVCAP@CityofPaloAlto.org>

Subject: NVCAP Survey is highly flawed

Dear Mayor Fine and Council Members:

I'm very concerned about the NVCAP process and the survey that has been sent out. The survey doesn't reflect what the Working Group has been saying the community wants!

The Working Group's proposals were not included in the survey and instead only proposals prepared by the consultants have been included. How are the community generated ideas going to be heard if they aren't included in these types of surveys?

The entire point of having a Community Advisory Panel is to have a process that has meaningful community input. If the process doesn't allow for the Working Group to present their ideas to the Community, then this is a charade.

Let's not repeat the mistakes made early on with the Community Advisory Panel for rail! Please let the Working Group guide the process rather than the consultants.

The importance of community participation cannot be overstated in situations like these. Allowing the community to only see the consultant's work defeats the purpose of having Community members on the NVCAP. This is a significant project and the more community support you have, the more likely it is to be completed.

Please reconsider this process!

Nadia Naik

Old Palo Alto resident

Chair of Expanded Community Advisory Panel on Rail (XCAP)

10. From: Hank Sousa

Sent: Monday, April 20, 2020 1:44 PM

To: North Ventura Coordinated Area Plan <NVCAP@CityofPaloAlto.org>; Council, City <city.council@cityofpaloalto.org>

Subject: North Ventura Coordinated Area Plan

Dear Friends:

I have followed the NVCAP deliberations with some interest and have even attended one of the large public gatherings.

It seems like an alternative, without an office component, would make good sense. We have heard much about the

over-commuting to PA as one of our ills. Surely residential, open space and some retail is the way to go, yet I don't see that as an alternative.

I support your efforts to push the city to include an option with no office space in it.

Thank you,

Hank Sousa

160 Melville Ave

Palo Alto, CA 94301

11. From: Desiree Docktor

Sent: Sunday, April 19, 2020 9:59 PM

To: Council, City <city.council@cityofpaloalto.org>; North Ventura Coordinated Area Plan <NVCAP@CityofPaloAlto.org>

Cc: Rebecca Sanders <rebsanders@gmail.com>

Subject: re: redevelopment/Fry's site Ventura neighborhood

Dear Mayor Fine and Council Members:

I protest the current NVCAP online survey as none of the proposals reflect what the community wants and would negatively impact the people already living in Ventura. The community should have the opportunity to review the proposals of the working group, which have not been included in this survey, rather than being forced to choose between the three flawed proposals prepared by the city's consultants.

Desiree Docktor

12. From: Jeff Levinsky

Sent: Sunday, April 19, 2020 8:49 PM

To: Council, City <city.council@cityofpaloalto.org>; North Ventura Coordinated Area Plan <NVCAP@CityofPaloAlto.org>

Subject: NVCAP Survey

Dear Mayor Fine and Council Members:

I agree very much with others that the NVCAP survey reflects a very flawed and biased vision of what is needed for the North Ventura community.

We should reduce traffic, substantially reduce non-community-serving offices, eliminate parking problems, and create true below-market rate housing and community amenities. The proposals in the survey don't achieve that.

Frankly, the entire survey is extremely one-sided and biased. In the past, the city has endeavored to run properly-balanced surveys using scientific sampling and citing arguments from various sides. This survey falls far short of that prior standard of competence.

The survey also contains all sorts of false information and errors. For example, comparing the Existing Uses and Alternative 1 makes it look like the latter will add retail to the Fry's site. That's untrue.

The survey also seems to have no input from the majority of members of the very committee the City created to help with North Ventura. Rather than sideline community members who have volunteered countless hours to help, they should have had the opportunity to review and correct problems with the survey in advance.

As it is, the survey will only delay the NVCAP process by creating needless controversy and yield no useful insights as to what the community truly wants. We can and should do much better.

Thank you,

Jeff Levinsky

13. From: Susan Usman

Sent: Sunday, April 19, 2020 5:13 PM

To: Council, City <city.council@cityofpaloalto.org>; North Ventura Coordinated Area Plan <NVCAP@CityofPaloAlto.org>

Cc: Rebecca Sanders <rebsanders@gmail.com>

Subject: NVCAP

Dear Mayor Fine and Council Members:

I took the on-line survey and answered some of the questions, but I protest the current NVCAP online survey as none of the proposals reflect what the community wants and would negatively impact the people already living in Ventura. The community should have the opportunity to review the proposals of the working group, which have not been included in this survey, rather than being forced to choose between the three flawed proposals prepared by the city's consultants.

Susan Usman

14. From: Susan Kemp

Sent: Sunday, April 19, 2020 1:32 PM

To: Council, City <city.council@cityofpaloalto.org>; North Ventura Coordinated Area Plan <NVCAP@CityofPaloAlto.org>

Cc: Rebecca Sanders <rebsanders@gmail.com>

Subject: Concerns Regarding NVCAP Community Survey

Dear Mayor Fine and Council Members:

I protest the current NVCAP online survey because none of the proposals reflect what the community wants and would negatively impact the people already living in Ventura. The community should have the opportunity to review the proposals of the NVCAP working group, which I understand have not been included in this survey, rather than being forced to choose between the three flawed proposals prepared by the city's consultants.

For me, boiling the choices down to architectural design rather than land use and zoning policy compliance, as well as neglecting the impact of the development on nearby traffic (i.e., on El Camino Real at Page Mill) and transit (Caltrain is (was) already full and VTA's bus service is not frequent enough, reliable, nor well-connected to Menlo Park) makes this survey inadequate and misplaced.

Sincerely,

Susan Kemp

15. From: Victoria Dauber

Sent: Sunday, April 19, 2020 1:01 PM

To: North Ventura Coordinated Area Plan <NVCAP@CityofPaloAlto.org>; Council, City <city.council@cityofpaloalto.org>

Cc: Rebecca Sanders <rebsanders@gmail.com>

Subject: NVCAP

Dear Mayor Fine and Council Members:

I protest the current NVCAP online survey as none of the proposals reflect what the community wants and would negatively impact the people already living in Ventura. The community should have the opportunity to review the proposals of the working group, which have not been included in this survey, rather than being forced to choose between the three flawed proposals prepared by the city's consultants.

The survey is also confusing and difficult to understand. How come there doesn't seem to be any representation for the NVCAP neighborhood working groups proposals. Will they be able to have a more prominent presence on a future iteration of the designs?

I'm disappointed in the continued disregard for neighborhood/community input. I've been to several community meetings and presentations of the NVCAP proposed designs and I am continually amazed that the input they go to the trouble to collect is not then reflected in later iterations.

Best regards, as a concerned Ventura resident,

Victoria Dauber

16. From: Cecile Cummings

Sent: Saturday, April 18, 2020 12:36 PM

To: Council, City <city.council@cityofpaloalto.org>; North Ventura Coordinated Area Plan <NVCAP@CityofPaloAlto.org>

Cc: rebsanders@gmail.com

Subject: NVCAP Online Survey

Dear Mayor Fine and Council Members:

I protest the current NVCAP online survey as none of the proposals reflect what the community wants and would negatively impact the people already living in Ventura. The community should have the opportunity to review the proposals of the working group, which have not been included in this survey, rather than being forced to choose between the three flawed proposals prepared by the city's consultants

Respectfully,
Cecile Cummings

17. From: Chris Donlay

Sent: Saturday, April 18, 2020 11:37 AM

To: Council, City <city.council@cityofpaloalto.org>; North Ventura Coordinated Area Plan <NVCAP@CityofPaloAlto.org>

Subject: NVCAP Survey is Flawed

Dear Mayor Fine and Council Members:

I strongly protest the current NVCAP online survey -- none of the proposals reflect what the community wants and all of the proposed alternatives would negatively impact the people already living in Ventura. The community should have the opportunity to review the proposals of the working group -- I thought that was why it was created? -- which have not been included in this survey. We are tired of being forced to choose between the three flawed proposals prepared by the city's consultants. The city has an disastrous track record when it comes to redevelopment issues; don't make it worse.

Chris Donlay

Pepper Avenue

18. From: Magic

Sent: Saturday, April 18, 2020 10:40 AM

To: Council, City <city.council@cityofpaloalto.org>; North Ventura Coordinated Area Plan <NVCAP@CityofPaloAlto.org>

Subject: NVCAP

Dear Councilmembers,

The NVCAP community "survey" is a disgrace to every community planner with even a shred of integrity. It is riddled with errors and clearly intended to suppress, rather than elicit informed community engagement.

I've attached to this email a summary of an article from the Journal of the American Institute of Planners, "Eight Rungs of Citizen Participation." The lowest is "manipulation." The recent NVCAP community "survey" is a textbook-worthy example of manipulation.

My colleagues at Magic and I once shared a national award for a community planning project in the Atherton/Fair Oaks area. Our current congresswoman, then a county supervisor, is on the

record calling our fees, "The best money this county has spent during my tenure." I know something of what I write here.

Please STOP hiring consultants to manipulate rather than serve your constituents. Honest consultants are, like honest representatives, public servants who respect residents, are competent to bring us together, and support us in shaping the future of our community in a manner consistent with ecological principle.

Thank you for considering these views.

With appreciation,

David Schrom

19. From: Marty DOUGLAS

Sent: Friday, April 17, 2020 4:20 PM

To: North Ventura Coordinated Area Plan <NVCAP@CityofPaloAlto.org>

Cc: Rebecca Sanders <rebsanders@gmail.com>

Subject: NVCAP survey

Dear NVCAP Members:

I recently completed the online survey requesting opinions of the various proposals for NVCAP. I protest the current NVCAP online survey as none of the proposals reflect what the community wants and would negatively impact the people already living in Ventura. The community should have the opportunity to review the proposals of the working group, which have not been included in this survey, rather than being forced to choose between the three flawed proposals prepared by the city's consultants.

Marty

20. From: D Caleb Hauser

Sent: Friday, April 17, 2020 11:53 AM

To: Council, City <city.council@cityofpaloalto.org>; North Ventura Coordinated Area Plan <NVCAP@CityofPaloAlto.org>; Rebecca Sanders <rebsanders@gmail.com>

Subject: Ventura survey

Dear Mayor Fine and Council Members:

I protest the current NVCAP online survey as none of the proposals reflect what the community wants and would negatively impact the people already living in Ventura. The community should have the opportunity to review the proposals of the working group, which have not been included in this survey, rather than being forced to choose between the three flawed proposals prepared by the city's consultants.

Caleb Hauser

21. From: Paul Machado

Sent: Friday, April 17, 2020 9:45 AM

To: Council, City <city.council@cityofpaloalto.org>; North Ventura Coordinated Area Plan <NVCAP@CityofPaloAlto.org>

Subject: NVCAP

Dear Mayor Fine and Council Members:

I protest the current NVCAP online survey as none of the proposals reflect what the community wants and would negatively impact the people already living in Ventura. consultants.

You had numerous "community meetings" then ignored the input from them and merely made your own proposals. Your survey, although massive, appears to be limited to what the consultants want to build.

Thank you

P Machado

22. From: Jeffrey Hook

Sent: Thursday, April 16, 2020 11:49 PM

To: Council, City <city.council@cityofpaloalto.org>; North Ventura Coordinated Area Plan <NVCAP@CityofPaloAlto.org>

Cc: Rebecca Sanders <rebsanders@gmail.com>

Subject: NVCAP survey is flawed and inappropriate at this time.

Dear Mayor Fine and Council Members:

I protest the current NVCAP online survey as none of the proposals reflect what the community wants and would negatively impact the people already living in Ventura. The community should have the opportunity to review the proposals of the working group, which have not been included in this survey, rather than being forced to choose between the three flawed proposals prepared by the city's consultants.

I want the working group's proposals to take precedence over those of consultants or developers. I want the city to consider converting existing commercial space to housing, in the post-COVID-19 era where many office workers who have been given the opportunity to work from home under "shelter-in-place" directives will continue to do so, since the environmental benefits are so great. These include clean air, less traffic noise, less CO2 emissions, less wear and tear on roads, vehicles, bridges and other transit infrastructure. It is far past time for humans to recognize our past patterns of land use and traffic have severely degraded the Earth for future generations. We need to work toward a smaller population, traveling much less, interacting with nature more, running the "system" less hard.

What kind of city do you want to leave for your great grandchildren 100 years from now?

Jeffrey Hook

23. From: Brown Jonathan

Sent: Thursday, April 16, 2020 9:22 PM

To: Council, City <city.council@cityofpaloalto.org>; North Ventura Coordinated Area Plan <NVCAP@CityofPaloAlto.org>

Cc: rebsanders@gmail.com

Subject: Objectionable NVCAP Online Survey

Dear City Council and Mayor Fine,

I write to object to the way you are handling the NVCAP process and in particular the current NVCAP online survey. None of the proposals reflect what I have heard community members express as their desire for the area. Yet the survey suggests the three alternatives are the only ones available and represent the will of the working group. To that extent the survey is false and misleading. Each proposal exceeds the maximum density allowed per current zoning and the density needed under Palo Alto's current housing allocation. With COVID-19 spreading most severely in the densest settings, we need less density, not more. We need high-quality,

lower density housing for our most deserving workers with large, attractive parks and shops. These proposals are not those of working group; the process has been hijacked, and the community needs more input. Please allow the working group to do its job. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Jonathan Brown

24. From: christopher jette

Sent: Sunday, April 26, 2020 9:56 AM

To: Council, City <city.council@cityofpaloalto.org>; North Ventura Coordinated Area Plan <NVCAP@CityofPaloAlto.org>

Cc: Rebecca Sanders <rebsanders@gmail.com>

Subject: NVCAP online survey

Dear Mayor Fine and Council Members:

I wish to protest the NVCAP online survey as none of the proposals reflect what the community wants and would negatively impact the people already living in Ventura. The community must have the opportunity to review the proposals of the working group, which have not been included in this survey, rather than being forced to choose between the three flawed proposals prepared by the city's consultants.

Thank you for your time and efforts,

Christopher Jette