

From: [Jennifer Landesmann](#)
To: [Council, City](#)
Subject: Public comment for the Community Engagement study session
Date: Monday, April 10, 2023 12:47:26 PM

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

Hello Council,

Something everyone hears about Palo Alto is how "engaged" our community is. So, how does a highly engaged community end up with a *liability*, like the Pope Chaucer bridge \$25 million and 25 years later? I know, it's complicated, but what shouldn't be complicated is for the City to handle community engagement vis a vis performance targets or objectives - the objectives you were meant to set for priorities.

Community engagement for the sake of engagement is wrong. Talking, listening and communicating without an objective, purpose, goal or any measure to track performance wastes people's time, city resources and while it may work for you during your terms (press articles, etc), it's not good for the City over time. For example, maybe you can escape your time on council without a change in aviation noise levels and feel good about accepting a work plan that you had nothing to do with which is "engaging the SFO Roundtable on GBAS." The public knows that GBAS is about building navigation route procedures but FAA Air Traffic Control has a *different* customer service window to address *usage* of routes. It has happened over and over again around the country and locally, where years are spent on designing routes, only to hear oops, sorry - scratch that.

I'm almost sure that most people will not be rating your individual or collective performance on how much engagement there is with the SFO Roundtable on GBAS.

What people will want to know is what else should the City be doing?; how much time and resources and community engagement did you spend to understand and lead on this issue? And for what? What are you trying to do? Can you explain it? At some point, the question raised is also what are you supposed to be responsible for? You are currently responsible for not missing the 60 day deadline to file a petition for review on procedures that can negatively affect Palo Alto. Saying we "don't know how GBAS will affect the City" is not really an option, the issues are administrative and procedural - you either file or not file and then if it turns out to be bad, it's on you that you failed to meet the 60 days notice.

Not having *any* filters to better understand Council actions over time is a bad risk. I look forward to following up more on this topic as it relates to airplane noise, but it worries me that this is the way an issue that impacts so many people is handled and I hope you will not take community engagement for granted.

Jennifer